UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 14

OCTOBER 1, 1963, TO OCTOBER 15, 1963
(PAGES 18393 TO 19608)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
v.109
pt.14

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Deuteronomy 14: 29: *That the Lord Thy God may bless thee in all thy work.*

O Thou who art the source of all our blessings grant that as we are the heirs and beneficiaries of a glorious past so we may strive to be the faithful trustees and stewards of an even more glorious future.

May we be endowed with that inner peace which lies beyond the reach of any conspiracy of wicked circumstances and which can never be eclipsed and extinguished by feelings of doubt and despair.

Inspire us to lay hold of Thy divine wisdom and power with that greater faith which will fill us with courage and hope when we are confronted by dark days and difficult problems.

Grant that the time may not be far distant when all the impulses of the human heart shall be quickened to nobler issues, for the civilization for which we are praying and laboring cannot be built by the might and power of man but only by Thy gracious spirit.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6754. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. Holland, Mr. Russell, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Mundt to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government" for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 64–5.

CONFEREES ON S. 1576

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read the communication, as follows:

September 30, 1963.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Because of other official commitments previously made, it will not be possible for me to participate in the conference on S. 1576 this week. Therefore, I respectfully request permission to resign as a conferee.

Sincerely yours,
John B. Bennett.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

The Chair appoints as a conferee on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on S. 1576, the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] and the Clerk will notify the Senate thereof.

TREATMENT OF MINORS FOR COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2485) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 23, after "section." insert: "The Director of Public Health or his authorized agent shall exercise reasonable diligence in ascertaining the whereabouts of a parent, or of a person standing in loco parentis to such minor, and if such whereabouts are ascertained shall as soon as practical notify such parent or loco parentis that such minor is affected with a venereal disease, or is a carrier of a venereal disease, and whether he has received or refused such treatment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include copies of the weekly crime report in tabular form from the police department and the script of a WAVA radio station editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as amended, is to amend existing law so as to authorize the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia to treat minors for venereal disease upon their own consent, when they present themselves voluntarily to the Department's health centers, rather than having to obtain such permission from their parents or guardians. However, the Senate amended the measure to provide that the Director of Public Health, or his authorized agent, shall exercise reasonable diligence in ascertaining the whereabouts of a parent, or of a person standing in loco parentis to such minor, and if such whereabouts are ascertained shall as soon as practical notify such parent or loco parentis that such minor is affected with a venereal disease, or is a carrier of a venereal disease, and whether or not he has received or refused such treatment.

This bill passed the House without objection. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia endorsed it and no objection was expressed to it at the hearing held by the House District Committee thereon. The committee concurs in this amendment, and I might say it also has the approval of the Chief of the Bureau of Disease Control, Dr. John Pate, of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, who will be in charge of the program provided in this measure.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I further ask for permission to enclose the crime rating for the past 2 weeks here in the District of Columbia, and again, I want to heartily congratulate Chief Murray and the other members of the Metropolitan Police Force on the fine work they are doing in trying to solve the crime problem here in the District of Columbia under difficult circumstances.

Government of the
District of Columbia,
Metropolitan Police Department,
September 18, 1963.

Hon. John L. McMillan,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman McMillan: Forwarded herewith are copies of the weekly crime report for the District of Columbia for the week beginning September 8, 1963.

Sincerely yours,

Robert V. Murray,
Chief of Police.

Pt. I offenses reported, Metropolitan Police Department, government of the District of Columbia

SEPT. 8-14, 1963

Classification	Week beginning Sept. 1, 1963	Week beginning Sept. 8, 1963	Change	
			Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide	2	4	+2	+100.0
Rape	4	--------	−4	−100.0
Robbery	41	34	−7	−17.1
Aggravated assault	77	76	−1	−1.3
Housebreaking	136	141	+5	+3.7
Grand larceny	30	16	−14	−46.7
Petit larceny	166	142	−24	−14.5
Auto theft	71	78	+7	+9.9
Total	527	491	−36	−6.8

SEPT. 15-21, 1963

Classification	Week beginning Sept. 8, 1963	Week beginning Sept. 15, 1963	Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide	4	2	−2	−50.0
Rape	--------	1	+1	+100.0
Robbery	34	46	+12	+35.3
Aggravated assault	76	59	−17	−22.4
Housebreaking	141	125	−16	−11.3
Grand larceny	16	32	+16	+100.0
Petit larceny	142	131	−11	−7.7
Auto theft	78	72	−6	−7.7
Total	491	468	−23	−4.7

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the enclosed editorial by the WAVA radio station, Arlington, Va., and thought all the Members of Congress would be interested in reading same. I am certain that the House of Representatives has never given any bill more thorough consideration than it did the omnibus crime bill before passing it to the other body for consideration.

I hope the people of this community will come around to the extent that we can get some action on this proposed legislation so the police and other law enforcement officers will not continue to be handcuffed. Crime in the District of Columbia can be substantially curbed if all the law-abiding citizens in this area will get behind the police and the other law enforcement officers and give them a helping hand.

About the only thing that Congress can do to curb the crime in the District of Columbia is to pass laws that will assist all the law enforcement officials in rendering speedy and certain punishment for all criminals.

Washington's Crime Problem

The time is midnight and John Q. Public is turning home after a late meeting in Washington. Striding along the walk toward his car, he is approached by three men. A half hour later, he is regaining consciousness, if he is lucky, from a crashing blow to the head. The only other evidence of the mugging he has just suffered is that his wallet containing $2.10 is missing.

The latest published arithmetic of Washington's darkening crime picture has left frustrated police and city officials in a dismal silence. Stunned as this already hard-to-shake city is with the dull mathematics and occasional big news of name citizens knocked about or murdered here, there has not seemed much evidence or indeed real hope of correcting this shameful picture.

The only real action in months past, it would seem, has come from influential civil liberties organizations, whose attack is not on the soaring crime rate, but in their determined efforts to disarm literally the District police, require mental stability tests for policemen, checkmate the questioning of suspects and similar measures designed to prevent what they protest as a general condition—police brutality. This approach is not only wrong, in our view, but damaging and irresponsible.

The police here need more tools, not less, to carry out their job in tracking down and questioning suspects. But they need something else, and that is tangible public support. We have a situation in which victims, for fear of publicity, won't take their cases to the police—of witnesses who will watch but will not testify, of too many leaders who won't take a public stand, and consequently of criminals assured in the knowledge that if caught, they will probably never be convicted under the system. The cops have become their patsies.

Those who are suffering are both the decent citizens who want no more of living in the District. They are moving out and the city's businessmen who complain that suburban Maryland and Virginia families won't shop in this jungle, and that tourists are reluctant to visit here. They are right, but if these same businessmen will, instead of complaining about the chaos, if they will support the Washington Board of Trade and Police Chief Robert Murray in the plea for stronger law enforcement procedures, then Congress in the omnibus crime bill may correct what is becoming a grim and sorry era of life in the Nation's Capital.

WEATHER RESEARCH SATELLITE SAVING LIVES

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with the tropical hurricane season this year, the weather researchers have been able to give valuable advance warnings based on the discovery of disturbances by weather satellites.

Yesterday's discovery of Hurricane Flora is a prime example. It has been some 30 years since a hurricane hit the lower rim of the Antilles in the area of Trinidad and Tobago. Yet the unexpected did happen, and with great fury. Through the efforts of the U.S. Weather Bureau, using data supplied by a weather satellite, warnings were issued a bare 3 hours before the 110-mile-an-hour winds hit the islands. Because of the 22-mile-an-hour forward speed of the storm, little or no warning would have been possible without the quick work of U.S. weathermen and their new ally, the satellite. While the damage was extensive, untold lives were saved and property damage prevented by the advance warning.

As a member of the legislative committee having jurisdiction over the Weather Bureau, I want to offer a sincere congratulations for a job well done to those weathermen responsible for the speedy work yesterday.

We have not heard the end of this dangerous hurricane, which is continuing its destructive path through the Caribbean. And there may be additional storm activity before the storm season ends in November. But it is reassuring to know that our research activity is already paying such high dividends in lives and property, and will continue to do so in the years ahead.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 6289.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

REAL SOLUTION TO THE COLD WAR

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in his current negotiations for the sale of wheat and other matters, President Kennedy has now revealed his long-secret intention of trying to do business with the Soviet Communists.

In these negotiations, I suggest that the President insist on the following conditions:

First. That the Soviet Communists tear down the Berlin wall.

Second. That the Soviet Communists remove their missiles and troops from Cuba.

Third. That the Soviet Communists hold free elections in the formerly free countries, now under Soviet subjugation.

Fourth. That the Soviet Communists cease subversive operations to undermine free countries.

Fifth. That the Soviet Communists pay us the $11 billion which President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave them under lend-lease.

Then, perhaps, we can discuss selling them our wheat or any other nonstrategic material for hard currency or gold, in view of the fact that the Johnson Act of 1934 prohibits the extension of long-term credit to any nation that has defaulted in its debt to the United States.

LIBERALS TIMID ON ACTION TO OUST CASTRO NOW CALLING FOR MILITARY ACTION TO REINSTATE LIBERAL BOSCH

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the reaction of the normally timid liberals in this country and in Latin American who are now advocating even military intervention in order to reinstate deposed, Communist-sympathetic Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic.

The many timid souls of the far left, who have shrunk at the thought of a blockade of Cuba, or other action short of war, are now advocating such action against the Dominican Republic. Could it be that this issue involves the deposing of a liberal-left President and that this is why the liberal left in this country and Latin America is suddenly getting exercised to the point of calling for the landing of marines to reinstate Bosch?

Where have these liberal leftists been when many of us have been calling for action short of war to oust Communist Castro who also gained power through a military overthrow?

They were criticizing, in excoriating terms, those of us who were calling for such actions at the recognition of a free non-Communist government-in-exile; tightening up of the trade ban; withholding aid to any country trading with Cuba; halting of subversive trainees going to Cuba, including Americans; encouragement rather than discouragement of Cuban exile freedom fighters, a demand for on-site inspections in Cuba; continued pressure to get Russian troops out of Cuba; closing of Cuban air routes over the United States; an insistence that all Alliance for Progress recipients withdraw recognition and stop doing business with Castro's Communist government; and reinstatement of a blockade if other actions fail to oust Castro.

I repeat these proposals here and now and fully expect that the liberal left in this country and in Latin America will come forth with their usual condemnations despite the fact that they are proposing even stronger actions in an effort to return the liberal leftist to the Presidency of the Dominican Republic, Juan Bosch, who let the Communists run wild.

This double standard by the "timids" makes whole cloth of their argument that the United States does not have the right to interfere with the sovereign nations, including Cuba, of this hemisphere.

Consistency, where art thou?

THE LANDIS CASE

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, over in the other body they are holding some very interesting hearings with a Mr. Valachi. He is giving us an interesting explanation of how a family, under their term and definition of a family, can protect the criminal. I am wondering just what family Mr. Landis belongs to when he can fail to report his income tax for 3 years, amounting to $300,000, then come out with only a 30-day sentence and be permitted to serve the 30 days in a private room in a hospital reportedly at public expense.

This is probably one of the most remarkable incidents of protection that has happened in this country under any administration.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have one program and one program only which is aimed at increasing permanent private employment in the economically distressed areas. This is the area redevelopment program.

Mr. Speaker, there is an application pending for a rule before the Committee on Rules. That rule is now being given consideration. The testimony has not been concluded, as I understand it. I hope the committee will give us a rule sometime in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, the ARA legislation contains a small amount of money for grants, but grants are an incidental part of the program. It is a loan program for those areas of the country which have long suffered chronically high unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, when the testimony was going on before the Committee on Rules—and I appreciate the attention that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of that committee [Mr. SMITH], has given us and our testimony and I am sure that consideration will be given to a rule—when we were testifying, a number of the members of that committee remarked that we are in a bad situation as Members of the House if we do not grant something for ARA. We have six agencies, international agencies, which have billions of dollars, three of them operating on all U.S. money and the other three we are the major contributor. They are making these same type loans, as proposed for our people here in the United States through ARA, all over the world, except in the Iron Curtain countries and in the United States, with our money.

Mr. Speaker, for us to refuse to grant a small amount here in the United States as proposed in the pending ARA bill, would be in my opinion, a grave mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this rule will be given every consideration and granted so that the bill can be considered here on the floor of the House.

VOTE NOW ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] with reference to the ARA. I do not know whether the Members realize it or not, but one-third of the counties of the United States are covered in that bill as distressed areas in order to get votes, of course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it ought to be changed to include all of the counties and then they would get all of the votes.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker, is this: I would like to remind the Members of the House that the Democratic Party has a majority in the House, in the Senate, and they have their own administration. They have a large majority on the Committee on Rules.

I suggest to the Democratic leadership that it bring that bill up right now and let us vote on it.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of Outlet Stores, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

HANS-DIETER SIEMONEIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1277) for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reqeust of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DR. JAE H. YANG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1271) for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang and Mrs. Jeong S. Yang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Jae H. Yang and Mrs. Jeong S. Yang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 15, 1953, and September 8, 1954, respectively, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Jae H. Yang shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 15, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill for the relief of Dr. H. Yang."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BAY KOW JUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1273) for the relief of Bay Kow Jung.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

MRS. ANNIE ZAMBELLI STILETTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1566) for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

FERENC MOLNAR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3366) for the relief of Ferenc Molnar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ferenc Molnar shall be held to have complied with the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 3, after the words "shall be held" insert the following: "to have been admitted to the United States as a returning resident alien on December 9, 1961 and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANG SHENG (ALSO KNOWN AS RAFAEL CHANG SING)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3908) for the relief of Chang Sheng (also known as Rafael Chang Sing).

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

ERIC VOEGELIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5902) for the relief of Eric Voegelin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of section 352 (a)(1) shall be inapplicable in the case of Eric Voegelin: *Provided,* That he establishes residence in the United States not later than February 9, 1967.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the word "case" and substitute the word "cases".

On page 1, line 5, after the name "Eric Voegelin" insert the following: "and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin".

On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "he establishes" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "they establish".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENEROSO BUCCI CAMMISA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6316) for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

CHING HEING YEN AND CHING CHIAO HOANG YEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1495) for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

MRS. SANDRA BANK MURPHY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1542) for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a) (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 11, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code, a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIANO CARRESE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6038) for the relief of Mariano Carrese.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

These was no objection.

DR. JAMES T. MADDUX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1201) for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

MORRIS ARONOW AND OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2189) for the relief of Morris Aronow and other employees of the Post Office Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not othewise appropriated, to the persons enumerated below, employees in the Camden Terminal Unit, Camden Post Office, Camden, New Jersey, the sums specified, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States as reimbursement for loss or damage of personal property located in basement lockers at their place of employment which were completely submerged in water on June 23, 1962: Morris Aronow, $24.60; William Baxter, $16.50; Levi A. Beverly, $5; Benjamin Branch, Junior, $11.60; Ulysses G. Cartwright, $36.90; L. Chrzanowski, $25.90; F. C. Cobb, $18.75; Morton Cohen, $14.95; Donald R. Collins, $60.55; Thomas J. Deacon, $42.60; Joseph A. Fennell, $14; George J. Fries, $16; James R. Gambardello, $35.45; Earl C. Hackney, $134; Walter T. Hansen, $17.45; Ernest D. Jackson, $31.85; Leroy A. Jackson, $78.56; Charles G. Johnson, $52; Francis C. Johnson, $12.95; J. A. Jones, $10.50; Kazimierz T. Klauze, $4.02; William F. Kennedy, $23.65; Philip J. Koehler, $41; R. A. Komchak, $17.50; John A. Kwoka, $6; J. A. Macklin, $48.30; Charles Margerum, $32.50; C. J. Martin, $11.93; William L. McKever, $31.83; Harold G. McNeill, $106; Frank Monforte, $37.50; John Moore, Junior, $26.75; William D. Mountney, $82; J. Owsianka, $17.90; Lewis V. Palmer, Junior, $50; David J. Parente, $17; Arnold M. Shepherd, $29.17; Alfred Sinesi, $41.45; Herbert Smith, $30; Howard R. Smith, $19; Carl A. Still, $44; Bruno Szymanski, $19; Ronald Thomas, $49.94; Vincent E. Thomas, $21.96; T. A. Thurman, $7; William T. Tripp, $25; John J. Troy, $23.50; Paul R. Vovcsko, $27.95; Alvin H. Wallace, $38.84; Todd M. Ware, $38.85; and Roscoe H. Williams, $15: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. And person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERNON E. LINTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2811) for the relief of Vernon E. Linth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Vernon E. Linth, a Navy warrant officer retired for length of service, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum certified to the Comptroller General of the United States by the Secretary of the Interior as the aggregate amount of compensation paid to the said Vernon E. Linth for employment as an electrician with the Bonneville Power Administration from March 20, 1961, through November 28, 1962, which employment has been held to have been in violation of section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62). In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike "paid" and insert "paid, accrued, or to be paid, including wages, retirement, and lump-sum annual leave,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JESSE LEIGH, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4099) for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $290 to Jesse C. Leigh, Junior, 40 North Main Street, Hamlet, North Carolina, in full settlement of his claims against the United States resulting from an accident on August 5, 1961, when an Army truck collided with his private car operated by his son in Hamlet, North Carolina. This claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claim Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim or for any subrogated claim. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined a sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM RADKOVICH CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4076) for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

W. V. GRIMES, JAMES A. POWELL, AND FRANK GROVE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4759) for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, and Frank Grove.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) W. V. Grimes, Newport News, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $180.04, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of which liability is relieved by this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. V. Grimes an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. (a) James A. Powell, of Newport News, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $2,380.99, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the amounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James A. Powell an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 3. (a) Frank Grove, of Newport News, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1,862.98, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Grove an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 4. (a) Harry P. Nash, Junior, of Norfolk, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $376.32, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of which liability is relieved by this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry P. Nash, Junior, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 5. (a) Michael J. Neofitou, of Norfolk, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $141.60, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of which liability is relieved by this Act.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Michael J. Neofitou, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act or any other law each annuity payable on the basis of the service of an individual relieved from liability by this Act shall be computed and paid on the basis of the amounts which such individual actually received as compensation for his services as an employee of the Federal Government.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That (a) W. V. Grimes, of Newport News, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $180.04, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virgina. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of which liability is relieved by this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. V. Grimes an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

"SEC. 2. (a) James A. Powell, of Newport News, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $2,380.99, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the amounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James A. Powell an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

"SEC. 3. (a) Frank Grove, of Newport News, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $1.862.98, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Grove an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisons of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

"SEC. 4. (a) Harry P. Nash, Junior, of Norfolk, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $376.32, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of which liability is relieved by this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry P. Nash, Junior, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

"SEC. 5. (a) Michael J. Neofitou, of Norfolk, Virginia, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $141.60, representing overpayments of compensation as the result of an error made in January 1961 by the Government while he was employed by the United States Navy, Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Newport News, Virginia. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of which liability if relieved by this Act.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Michael J. Neofitou, an amount equal to the aggregate of any amounts paid or withheld from sums otherwise due him by reason of the liability referred to in this section. No part of the amount appropriated in this section shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary not withstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

"Sec. 6. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act or any other law each annuity payable on the basis of the service of an individual relieved from liability by this Act shall be computed and paid on the basis of the amounts which such individual actually received as compensation for his services as an employee of the Federal Government."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ZARA M. SCHREIBER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5289) for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Captain Joseph S. Schreiber, United States Army (retired), shall be deemed to have elected under section 3(b) of the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953 to provide the annuity specified in paragraph (1) of section 4(a) of such Act to his wife, Zara M. Schreiber, in accordance with the written election to provide for such an annuity which was executed by the said Captain Joseph S. Schreiber on November 14, 1953, before a duly appointed notary public of the State of California but which was not mailed to the Department of the Army prior to his death.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CWO JAMES A. McQUAIG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4681) for the relief of CWO James A. McQuaig.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

ROBERT H. BAGBY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5746) for the relief of Robert H. Bagby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert H. Bagby of Great Bend, Kansas, the sum of $478.68. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert H. Bagby against the United States for underpayment in salary by the Post Office Department for the period from July 16, 1948, to March 1, 1949, inclusive. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per".
Page 2, line 1, strike "centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. RUDOLPH SANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6181) for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $502.33, to Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, Meriden, Kansas, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for the reimbursement of the amount of expenses and other losses and damages incurred in resettlement as a result of his displacement in connection with the acquisition of land (tract numbered M-1388) due to the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam and Reservoir project, Kansas.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add: "No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD J. BURKE

The Clerk called the the bill (H.R. 6468) for the relief of Harold J. Burke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Harold J. Burke, of Swampscott, Massachusetts, is hereby relieved of all liability and obligation to the United States under a contract designated GSA No. N-Mass-569 for the sale of certain surplus real property facilities known as the harbor defense unit located on Marblehead Neck in the town of Marblehead, Massachusetts, which contract was entered into by the said Harold J. Burke and the Government on the mistaken understanding that the property was residential property and could be utilized as such. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to refund the amount of the bid deposited by the said Harold J. Burke in connection with that contract.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH DI CICCIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7088) for the relief of Joseph Di Ciccio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money remaining in the Italian claims fund created pursuant to section 302 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 571; 22 U.S.C. 1541a), to Jospeh Di Ciccio, of Rural Free Delivery Numbered 1, Gansevoort, New York, the sum of $2,103. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all his claims arising out of loss sustained by reason of damage to his property in Italy during World War II: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike "Jospeh" and insert "Joseph".

Page 2, line 2, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY PAY INCREASE

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I should like to have some explanation of this bill by the gentleman from South Carolina.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 159]

Alger
Arends
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Barry
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bonner
Brock
Buckley
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Carey
Casey
Celler
Chenoweth
Corbett
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dulski
Farbstein
Finnegan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Hansen
Hardy
Hawkins
Healey
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Miller, N.Y.
Monagan
Montoya
Morrison
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pilcher
Powell
Pucinski
Rains
Riehlman
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Vinson
Weaver
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MILITARY PAY INCREASE

The SPEAKER. The question is on the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

Is there objection?

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman to explain the conference report.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I wonder if the gentleman will withdraw his reservation of objection so that we can get the statement of the managers read?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 773)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the "Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1963".

"BASIC PAY

"SEC. 2. Section 203 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

" '§ 203. Rates

" '(a) The rates of monthly basic pay for members of the uniformed services within each pay grade are set forth in the following tables:

" '*Commissioned officers*

" 'Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205						
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10
O-10 [1]	$1,200.00	$1,315	$1,315	$1,315	$1,315	$1,365	$1,365
O-9	1,063.30	1,155	1,180	1,180	1,180	1,210	1,210
O-8	963.30	1,050	1,075	1,075	1,075	1,155	1,155
O-7	800.28	905	905	905	945	945	1,000
O-6	592.80	690	735	735	735	735	735
O-5	474.24	590	630	630	630	630	650
O-4	400.14	515	550	550	560	585	625
O-3 [2]	326.04	440	470	520	545	565	595
O-2 [2]	259.36	375	450	465	475	475	475
O-1 [2]	222.30	300	375	375	375	375	375

" 'Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205							
	Over 12	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-10 [1]	$1,470	$1,470	$1,575	$1,575	$1,680	$1,680	$1,785	$1,785
O-9	1,260	1,260	1,365	1,365	1,470	1,470	1,575	1,575
O-8	1,210	1,210	1,260	1,315	1,365	1,420	1,420	1,420
O-7	1,000	1,050	1,155	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235	1,235
O-6	735	760	880	925	945	1,000	1,085	1,085
O-5	685	730	785	830	855	885	885	885
O-4	660	690	720	740	740	740	740	740
O-3 [2]	625	640	640	640	640	640	640	640
O-2 [2]	475	475	475	475	475	475	475	475
O-1 [2]	375	375	375	375	375	375	375	375

" '[1] While serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, basic pay for this grade is $1,970 regardless of cumulative years of service computed under section 205 of this title.

" '[2] Does not apply to commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member.'

" '*Commissioned officers who have been credited with over 4 years' active service as an enlisted member*

" 'Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205					
	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12	Over 14
O-3	$520	$545	$565	$595	$625	$650
O-2	465	475	490	515	535	550
O-1	375	400	415	430	445	465

" 'Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205					
	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
O-3	$650	$650	$650	$650	$650	$650
O-2	550	550	550	550	550	550
O-1	465	465	465	465	465	465'

" '*Warrant officers*

" ' Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205							
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12
W-4	$332.90	$430	$430	$440	$460	$480	$500	$535
W-3	302.64	395	395	400	405	435	460	475
W-2	264.82	345	345	355	375	395	410	425
W-1	219.42	305	305	330	345	360	375	390

" 'Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205						
	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
W-4	$560	$580	$595	$615	$635	$685	$685
W-3	490	505	520	540	560	580	580
W-2	440	455	470	485	505	505	505
W-1	405	420	435	450	450	450	450'

" '*Enlisted members*

" 'Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205							
	2 or less	Over 2	Over 3	Over 4	Over 6	Over 8	Over 10	Over 12
E-9	------	------	------	------	------	------	$435	$445
E-8	------	------	------	------	------	$365	375	385
E-7	$206.39	$275	$285	$295	$305	315	325	335
E-6	175.81	240	250	260	270	280	290	305
E-5	145.24	210	220	230	245	255	265	275
E-4	122.30	180	190	205	215	215	215	215
E-3	99.37	145	155	165	165	165	165	165
E-2	85.80	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
E-1	83.20	110	110	110	110	110	110	110
E-1 (under 4 months)	78.00	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

" 'Pay grade	Years of service computed under sec. 205						
	Over 14	Over 16	Over 18	Over 20	Over 22	Over 26	Over 30
E-9	$455	$465	$475	$485	$510	$560	$560
E-8	395	405	415	425	450	500	500
E-7	350	360	370	375	400	450	450
E-6	315	325	330	330	330	330	330
E-5	280	280	280	280	280	280	280
E-4	215	215	215	215	215	215	215
E-3	165	165	165	165	165	165	165
E-2	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
E-1	110	110	110	110	110	110	110.'

"'(b) While serving as a permanent professor at the United States Military Academy or the United States Air Force Academy, an officer who has over 36 years of service computed under section 205 of this title is, in addition to the pay and allowances to which he is otherwise entitled under this title, entitled to additional pay in the amount of $250 a month. This additional pay may not be used in the computation of retired pay.'

"BASIC PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CONTRACT SURGEONS

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 201(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'O-2 with two or less' and inserting in place thereof the words 'O-3 with over four, but not more than six,'.

"(b) Section 421(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words 'O-2 with less than two' and inserting in place thereof the words 'O-3 with over four, but not more than six,'.

"SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

"SEC. 4. Section 302(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the figure '$200' in clause (3) and the figure '$250' in clause (4) and inserting in place thereof the figure '$250' and the figure '$350', respectively.

"RETIRED PAY AND RETAINER PAY

"SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in section 1402 of title 10, United States Code, the changes made by this Act in the rates of basic pay of members of the uniformed services do not increase the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of the uniformed services was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act. However, except for a member covered by section 6331 of title 10, United States Code, who became entitled to retainer pay before April 1, 1963, and subject to subsection (j) of this section, a member or former member of a uniformed service who became entitled to retired pay or retainer pay after March 31, 1963, but before the effective date of this Act, is entitled—

"(1) to have the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act recomputed under the rates of basic pay prescribed by section 2 of this Act; or

"(2) to continue to have that pay computed under the rates of basic pay that were in effect under section 203 of title 37, United States Code, on the day before the effective date of this Act, plus the percentage increase provided by subsection (e) of this section;

whichever pay is the greater. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, a member or former member who became entitled to retired pay on April 1, 1963, by virtue of section 1 of the Act of April 23, 1930, ch. 209, as amended (5 U.S.C. 47a), shall be considered as having become entitled to that pay before April 1, 1963.

"(b) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was retired other than for physical disability and who, in accordance with section 511 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 829), is entitled to retired pay or retainer pay computed by 'method' (a) of that section using rates of basic pay that were in effect before October 1, 1949, is entitled—

"(1) to have that pay recomputed by 'method' (b) of that section using the rates of basic pay that were in effect under that Act on the day before the effective date of this Act; or

"(2) to an increase of 5 percent in the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act;

whichever pay is the greater.

"(c) A member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired pay or retainer pay computed under the rates of basic pay that were in effect under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 before June 1, 1958, including a member or former member who is entitled to retired pay under section 7 (b) or (c) of the Act of May 20, 1958, Public Law 85-422 (72 Stat. 130), is entitled—

"(1) to have that pay recomputed under the rates of basic pay that were in effect under that Act on the day before the effective date of this Act; or

"(2) to an increase of 5 percent in the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act;

whichever pay is the greater.

"(d) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was entitled to retired pay on the day before the effective date of this Act and who served as Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps is entitled—

"(1) to have his retired pay recomputed under the formula for computing retired pay applicable to him—

"(A) when he retired; or

"(B) if he served on active duty after he retired and his retired pay was recomputed by reason of that service, when his retired pay was so recomputed;

using as his rate of basic pay the rate of basic pay prescribed for officers serving on active duty in those positions on June 1, 1958, by footnote 1 to the table for commissioned officers in section 201(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (72 Stat. 122); or

"(2) to an increase of 5 percent in the retired pay to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act;

whichever pay is the greater.

"(e) A member or former member of a uniformed service who was entitled to retired pay or retainer pay on the day before the effective date of this Act, other than a member or former member who is covered by subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section, is entitled to an increase of 5 percent in the retired pay or retainer pay to which he was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a member of an armed force who was entitled to pay and allowances under any of the following provisions of law on the day before the effective date of this Act shall continue to receive the pay and allowances to which he was entitled on that day:

"(1) The Act of March 23, 1946, chapter 112 (60 Stat. 59).

"(2) The Act of June 26, 1948, chapter 677 (62 Stat. 1052).

"(3) The Act of September 18, 1950, chapter 952 (64 Stat. A224).

"(g) Chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

"(1) by adding the following new section after section 1401:

"'§ 1401a. Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index

"'(a) Unless otherwise specifically provided by law, the retired pay or retainer pay of a member or former member of an armed force shall not be recomputed to reflect any increase in the rates of basic pay for members of the armed forces if that increase becomes effective after the effective date of this section.

"'(b) In January of each calendar year after 1963, the Secretary of Defense shall determine the percent that the annual average of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the preceding calendar year has increased over that for 1962 or, if later, for the calendar year preceding that in which the most recent adjustment in retired pay and retainer pay has been made under this subsection. If the Secretary determines the percent of that increase to be 3 or more, the retired pay or retainer pay of a member or former member of an armed force who became entitled to that pay before January 2 of the year in which the Secretary makes that determination shall, as of April 1 of that year, be increased by that percent, adjusted to the nearest one-tenth of 1 percent.'; and

"(2) by inserting the following new item in the analysis:

"'1401a. Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index.'

"(h) Title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 1401 is amended by striking out the words ', and adjust to reflect later changes in applicable permanent rates' in footnote 1 to the table;

"(2) Sections 3991 and 8991 are each amended—

"(A) by amending column 1 of formula A in the table to read as follows:

"'Monthly basic pay [2] of member's retired grade.[1]'; and

"(B) by amending footnote 2 to the table to read as follows:

"'[2] Compute at rates applicable on date of retirement.'

"(3) Chapter 561 is amended by repealing section 6149 and striking out the following item in the analysis:

"'6149. Retired pay: computed on basis of rates of pay for officers on the active list.'

"(4) Sections 6151(b), 6323(e), 6325 (a)(2) and (b)(2), 6326(c)(2), 6381(a)(2), 6383(c)(2), 6390(b)(2), and 6394(h) are each amended by striking out the words 'to which he would be entitled if serving on active duty in' and inserting in place thereof the word 'of'.

"(5) Section 6327(b) is amended by striking out the words 'to which he would be entitled if on active duty' and inserting in place thereof the words 'of the grade in which retired'.

"(6) Sections 6396(c)(2), 6398(b)(2), 6399(c)(2), and 6400(b)(2) are each amended by striking out the words 'to which she would be entitled if serving on active duty in' and inserting in place thereof the word 'of'.

"(i) Section 423 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word 'active-duty' wherever it appears and inserting in place thereof the word 'basic'.

"(j) A member or former member of a uniformed service is not entitled to an increase in his retired pay or retainer pay because of the enactment of this Act for any period before the effective date of this Act.

"(k) Section 3(b) of the Act of August 10, 1956, ch. 1041 (33 U.S.C. 857a(b)), and section 221(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 213a(b)) are each amended by striking out the words 'or "the Secretary concerned"' and inserting in place thereof the words ', "the Secretary concerned", or "the Secretary of Defense"'.

"(l)(1) Section 1402(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) A member of an armed force who has become entitled to retired pay or retainer pay, and who thereafter serves on active duty (other than for training), is entitled to recompute his retired pay or retainer pay upon his release from that duty as follows:

“ ‘Col. 1, take—	Col. 2, multiply by—	Col. 3, subtract—
Monthly basic pay [1] of the grade in which he would be eligible— (1) to retire if he were retiring upon that release from active duty; or (2) to transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve if he were transferring to either upon that release from active duty.	2½ percent of the sum of— (1) the years of service that may be credited to him in computing retired pay or retainer pay; and (2) his years of active service after becoming entitled to retired pay or retainer pay.[2]	Excess over 75 percent of pay upon which computation is based.

“ ‘[1] For a member who has been entitled, for a continuous period of at least two years, to basic pay under the rates of basic pay in effect upon that release from active duty, compute under those rates. For a member who has been entitled to basic pay for a continuous period of at least two years upon that release from active duty, but who is not covered by the preceding sentence, compute under the rates of basic pay replaced by those in effect upon that release from active duty. For any other member, compute under the rates of basic pay under which the member’s retired pay or retainer pay was computed when he entered on that active duty.

“ ‘[2] Before applying the percentage factor, credit a part of a year that is six months or more as a whole year, and disregard a part of a year that is less than six months.

However, an officer who was ordered to active duty (other than for training) in the grade that he holds on the retired list under former section 6150 of this title, or under any other law that authorized advancement on the retired list based upon a special commendation for the performance of duty in actual combat, may have his retired pay recomputed under this subsection on the basis of the rate of basic pay applicable to that grade upon his release from that active duty only if he has been entitled, for a continuous period of at least three years, to basic pay at that rate. If, upon his release from that active duty, he has been entitled to the basic pay of that grade for a continuous period of at least three years, but he does not qualify under the preceding sentence, he may have his retired pay recomputed under this subsection on the basis of the rate of basic pay prescribed for that grade by the rates of basic pay replaced by those in effect upon his release from that duty.’

“(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this subsection, and unless otherwise entitled to higher retired pay or retainer pay, a member of a uniformed service who is on active duty (other than for training) on the effective date of this Act, who was entitled to retired pay or retainer pay before he entered on that duty, and who is released from that duty on or after the effective date of this Act after having served on that duty for a continuous period of at least one year shall, upon that release from active duty, be entitled to recompute his retired pay or retainer pay under the table in section 1402 of title 10, United States Code, subject to section 6483(c) of title 10, as that table and that section were in effect on the day before the effective date of this Act, using rates of basic pay prescribed by this Act.

“(m) Section 6483(c) of title 10, United States Code, is repealed.

“SUBMARINE PAY FOR MEMBERS TRAINING FOR DUTY ON NUCLEAR-POWERED SUBMARINES

“SEC. 6. Section 301(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘(2) as determined by the Secretary concerned, on a submarine (including, in the case of nuclear-powered submarines, periods of training and rehabilitation after assignment thereto), or, in the case of personnel qualified in submarines, as a prospective crewmember of a submarine being constructed, and during periods of instruction to prepare for assignment to a submarine of advanced design or a position of increased responsibility on a submarine;’.

“INCENTIVE PAY FOR DUTY INSIDE A HIGH- OR LOW-PRESSURE CHAMBER

“SEC. 7. Section 301(a)(9) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘(9) inside a high- or low-pressure chamber;’.

“MULTIPLE PAYMENTS OF INCENTIVE PAY

“SEC. 8. Section 301(e) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words ‘only one payment’ and inserting in place thereof the words ‘not more than two payments’.

“SPECIAL PAY FOR DUTY SUBJECT TO HOSTILE FIRE

“SEC. 9. (a) Chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

“(1) The following new section is added after section 309:

“ ‘§ 310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire

“ ‘(a) Except in time of war declared by Congress, and under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, a member of a uniformed service may be paid special pay at the rate of $55 a month for any month in which he was entitled to basic pay and in which he—

“ ‘(1) was subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines;

“ ‘(2) was on duty in an area in which he was in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines and in which, during the period he was on duty in that area, other members of the uniformed services were subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines; or

“ ‘(3) was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

A member covered by clause (3) who is hospitalized for the treatment of his injury or wound may be paid special pay under this section for not more than three additional months during which he is so hospitalized.

“ ‘(b) A member may not be paid more than one special pay under this section for any month. A member may be paid special pay under this section in addition to any other pay and allowances to which he may be entitled.

“ ‘(c) Any determination of fact that is made in administering this section is conclusive. Such a determination may not be reviewed by any other officer or agency of the United States unless there has been fraud or gross negligence. However, the determination may be changed on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause.

“ ‘(d) The Secretary of Defense shall report to Congress by March 1 of each year on the administration of this section during the preceding calendar year.’

“(2) The following new item is inserted in the analysis:

“ ‘310. Special pay: duty subject to hostile fire.’

“(b) The Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952 (50 App. U.S.C. 2351 et seq.) is repealed.

“ELECTION BY MEMBERS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS NOT TO OCCUPY GOVERNMENT QUARTERS

“SEC. 10. Section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: ‘However, except as provided by regulations prescribed under subsection (g) of this section, a commissioned officer without dependents who is in a pay grade above pay grade O–3 and who is assigned to quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service, appropriate to his grade or rank and adequate for himself, may elect not to occupy those quarters and instead to receive the basic allowance for quarters prescribed for his pay grade by this section.’

“FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

“SEC. 11. Chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

“(1) The following new section is inserted after section 426:

“ ‘§ 427. Family separation allowance

“ ‘(a) In addition to any allowance or per diem to which he otherwise may be entitled under this title, a member of a uniformed service with dependents who is on permanent duty outside of the United States, or in Alaska, is entitled to a monthly allowance equal to the basic allowance for quarters payable to a member without dependents in the same pay grade if—

“ ‘(1) the movement of his dependents to his permanent station or a place near that station is not authorized at the expense of the United States under section 406 of this title and his dependents do not reside at or near that station; and

“ ‘(2) quarters of the United States or a housing facility under the jurisdiction of a uniformed service are not available for assignment to him.

“ ‘(b) Except in time of war or of national emergency hereafter declared by Congress, and in addition to any allowance or per diem to which he otherwise may be entitled under this title, including subsection (a) of this section, a member of a uniformed service with dependents (other than a member in pay grade E–1, E–2, E–3, or E–4 (4 years’ or less service)) who is entitled to a basic allowance for quarters is entitled to a monthly allowance equal to $30 if—

“ ‘(1) the movement of his dependents to his permanent station or a place near that station is not authorized at the expense of the United States under section 406 of this title and his dependents do not reside at or near that station;

“ ‘(2) he is on duty on board a ship away from the home port of the ship for a continuous period of more than 30 days; or

“ ‘(3) he is on temporary duty away from his permanent station for a continuous period of more than 30 days and his dependents do not reside at or near his temporary duty station.

A member who becomes entitled to an allowance under this subsection by virtue of duty described in clause (2) or (3) for a continuous period of more than 30 days is entitled to the allowance effective as of the first day of that period.’

“(2) The analysis is amended by inserting the following item:

“ ‘427. Family separation allowance.’

“SPECIAL PAY FOR SEA DUTY AND AT CERTAIN LOCATIONS

“SEC. 12. (a) Section 305 of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“ ‘§ 305. Special pay: while on sea duty or duty at certain places

“ ‘(a) Except as provided by subsection (b) of this section, under regulations prescribed by the President, an enlisted member of a uniformed service who is entitled to basic pay—

“ ‘(1) is entitled, while on sea duty, to; or

"'(2) may be paid, while on duty at a designated place outside the contiguous 48 States and the District of Columbia;

special pay at the following monthly rates:

"'Pay grade	Monthly rate
E-9	$22.50
E-8	22.50
E-7	22.50
E-6	20.00
E-5	16.00
E-4	13.00
E-3	9.00
E-2	8.00
E-1	8.00

"'(b) Appropriations of the Department of Defense may not be paid, as foreign duty pay under subsection (a) of this section, to a member of a uniformed service who is a resident of a State, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, a possession, or a foreign country and who is serving in that State, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, that possession, or that foreign country, as the case may be.'

"(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), an enlisted member who, on the day before the effective date of this Act, was permanently assigned to duty at a place outside the United States or in Alaska or Hawaii, shall, during the remaining period of that assignment, but not after that place is designated for the purpose of section 305(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code, be paid the basic pay to which he was entitled on that date plus special pay under section 305 of title 37, United States Code, whenever qualified thereunder as that section was in effect on the day before the effective date of this Act, if the total of that basic pay and that special pay is more than the basic pay to which he would otherwise be entitled during that period under section 2 of this Act.

"(c) The analysis of chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code is amended by striking out the following item:

"'305. Special pay: sea and foreign duty.'

and inserting in place thereof the following item:

"'305. Special pay: while on sea duty or duty at certain places.'

"SAVINGS PROVISION

"SEC. 13. (a) The enactment of this Act does not reduce the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation under section 411 of title 38, United States Code, that any person was receiving on the day before the effective date of this Act or which thereafter becomes payable for that day by reason of a subsequent determination.

"(b) The enactment of this Act does not reduce the basic pay or the retired pay or retainer pay to which a member or former member of a uniformed service was entitled on the day before the effective date of this Act.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 14. This Act becomes effective on October 1, 1963."

And the Senate agree to the same.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
F. EDW. HÉBERT,
ARTHUR WINSTEAD,
WALTER NORBLAD,
WILLIAM H. BATES,
WILLIAM G. BRAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

1. The House bill contained no pay increase for members of the uniformed services with under 2 years of service for pay purposes. The Senate amendment provided increases for enlisted personnel serving in the grade of E-4 and E-5 with under 2 years of service, averaging 5.5 percent. This involved approximately 45,000 enlisted personnel. In addition, the Senate amendment provided increases in basic pay for 45,000 officers with under 2 years of service, ranging from $20 per month for second lieutenants, to $30 a month for first lieutenants, $40 a month for captains, and $50 a month for majors. The Senate receded from this portion of the amendment.

2. The Senate amendment increased the pay of officers with over 2 years of service serving in grades from second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel.

(a) The House bill provided base pay for second lieutenants of $280 a month with over 2 years of service; the Senate amendment provides $300 a month for these officers.

First lieutenants with over 3 years of service received $420 a month under the House bill and $450 under the Senate amendment.

Captains with over 8 years of service received $540 a month under the House bill and $565 a month under the Senate amendment.

Majors with over 14 years of service received $665 a month under the House bill, and $830 per month under the Senate amendment.

(b) The Senate amendment continued the special pay scale for commissioned officers with over 4 years of prior service as enlisted personnel. The House bill deleted this special pay scale.

The increases for this group run from $10 per month for second lieutenants with over 4 years of service, to $20 per month under the Senate amendment for the captain with over 20 years of service.

(c) The Senate amendment added increases over those contained in the House bill, in the enlisted grades, for the E-4 with over 4 years of service ($5 per month); E-5 with over 6 years of service ($5 per month); E-6 with over 14 years of service ($5 per month); and E-7s with over 14 years of service ($5 per month). The House receded to the Senate increases over those contained in the House bill.

3. The Senate amendment provided an increase in special pay for physicians and dentists which was not contained in the House bill.

Under present law, physicians and dentists receive $100 a month special pay upon entering the service.

Physicians and dentists who have completed at least 2 years, but less than 6 years of service, receive $150 a month special pay.

Physicians and dentists with at least 6 but less than 10 years of service receive special pay of $200 a month.

Physicians and dentists with 10 or more years of service receive $250 a month special pay.

The Senate amendment raises special pay for physicians and dentists at the 6-year point from $200 to $250 a month; and from $250 to $350 at the 10-year point. The House receded.

4. The Senate amendment deleted all increases in subsistence allowances.

The House bill provided subsistence increases of $3.12 per month for officers, and an average of a little under $7 per month for enlisted personnel. The House receded.

5. The Senate amendment retains the hostile fire provision providing $55 a month, but eliminated that portion of the House bill which made this provision retroactive to January 1, 1961. The House receded.

6. The Senate amendment retains sea pay as now provided in law but provides that foreign duty pay will be permissive rather than mandatory.

The amendment gives the Secretary of Defense the authority to authorize this pay in locations outside the continental United States that he selects. The House receded.

7. The Senate amendment retained the House provision which provides for a family separation allowance of $30 a month, but eliminated that portion which authorized officers to receive one-third of the basic allowance for an officer without dependents.

The House receded to that portion of the Senate amendment.

8. The Senate amendment added a provision which authorizes officers in the grade of major and above who are without dependents to elect not to occupy Government quarters even though they are available, and at the same time be eligible to receive their quarters allowances.

There was no comparable House provision. The House receded.

9. The Senate amendment deleted that portion of the House bill which would have made the new pay scales applicable to all persons who retire during calendar year 1963.

The Senate receded with an amendment to the effect that any person retiring between April 1, 1963, and before the effective date of the proposed legislation will be authorized to compute his retirement pay under the new pay scales. The language agreed to by the conferees is not intended as a precedent for future pay increases.

10. Under the House bill, persons retired prior to June 1, 1958, who are paid retired pay under the Career Compensation Act, would have been permitted to recompute their retirement pay under existing pay scales, and in addition receive a 5-percent increase.

Under the Senate amendment, these individuals will be entitled to recomputation under existing pay scales, or a 5-percent cost of living increase, based upon their present retirement pay, whichever is greater. The House receded.

11. The Senate amendment deleted that part of the House bill which would have authorized the Commandant of the Coast Guard to receive the basic pay provided for members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The House receded.

12. Under the House bill, permanent professors at the Military and Air Force Academies received two new basic pay increments after 31 and 36 years of service.

The House amendment provided monthly pay of $1,165 for colonels with over 31 years of service (as opposed to a maximum of $1,085 per month for all other colonels with over 26 years of service), and $1,235 per month for permanent professors with over 36 years of service.

The Senate deleted these proposed increments for permanent professors.

The Senate receded with an amendment to the effect that permanent professors at the Military and Air Force Academies would be entitled to a supplemental pay increment of $250 per month while serving as professors, after 36 years of service for pay purposes. Under this language permanent professors with 36 years of service or more will draw the basic pay of colonels with 30 or more years of service, but, in addition, will receive a pay supplement of $250 a month while serving as permanent professors. Upon retirement, however, they will compute their retirement pay on the basis of colonels with 30 years or more of service.

13. The House bill repealed the authority to provide responsibility pay for certain officers.

The Senate amendment deleted the provision in the House bill which sought to repeal the authority to pay responsibility pay. The House receded.

14. The House bill contained a provision requiring 1 year of continuous active duty following recall of retired personnel in order to recompute under any higher rates which might be in effect at the time the individual is reretired.

The Senate amendment required that in order to recompute at the time on officer reretires, he must serve at least 2 years continuously under the new higher rates following recall in order to recompute under any higher rates which may be in effect.

The Senate receded with an amendment to the effect that persons serving on active duty on the effective date of the act may compute their retirement pay under the new pay scales if they have served 1 year or more of continuous active duty following recall, but persons recalled to active duty after the effective date of this act must serve on continuous active duty for 2 or more years following recall.

15. The House bill provided that the pay increase would become effective on October 1, 1963, or on the first day of the first month after enactment, whichever is later.

The Senate amendment provides that the pay increase will become effective on October 1, 1963. The House receded.

COST

The House bill, involved an annual cost of $1,222,345,000 for the Department of Defense. The original proposal submitted by the Department of Defense involved a contemplated expenditure of $1,243,000,000.

The Senate amendment contemplated an annual expenditure of $1,227,330,000, or $4,985,000 more than the House-passed bill.

The conference report involves an annual estimated cost of $1,213,000,000, or $30,000,000 under the Department of Defense proposal, and $892,500,000 for the remainder of fiscal year 1964, or $7,500,000 under the President's budget.

L. Mendel Rivers,
Philip J. Philbin,
F. Edw. Hébert,
Arthur Winstead,
Walter Norblad,
William Bates,
William G. Bray,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to explain to the House the conference report on the proposed military pay increase.

The major areas of disagreement between the House and Senate involved:

First. The question of recomputation of retired pay for those retired prior to June 1, 1958.

Second. The computation of retirement pay for those who retire during this calendar year but before the effective date of the pay act.

Third. Pay increases for members of the armed services with less than 2 years of service.

Fourth. Extra pay for the permanent professors at the military academies.

Fifth. The elimination of increases in allowances for subsistence.

Sixth. The granting of discretionary authority to the Secretary of Defense for the payment of foreign duty pay.

The House bill contained no pay increases for members of the uniformed services with under 2 years of service. We felt that this bill was intended as an inducement for retention of trained personnel, and that it can hardly be said that persons with less than 2 years of service are fully trained since most of them have not been on active duty long enough to constitute a retention problem, as such.

More important, however, is the fact that the Senate amendment did not increase the pay of everyone with under 2 years of service; in fact, the Senate amendment increased the pay of all officers, but only a very small portion of the enlisted personnel.

The Senate receded from its proposed increase for members of the uniformed services with under 2 years of service, and agreed to that portion of the House bill which provides no increases for these persons.

This reduced the cost of the proposed pay increase by $18,400,000 annually.

The next major issue involved those persons who retire during this calendar year but prior to October 1, 1963.

The House bill permitted anyone who retired during this calendar year to compute his retirement pay under the new pay scales.

The Senate deleted this portion of the House bill.

The House conferees felt very strongly about this matter because we know that many persons proceeded with their retirement because they had confidence that the House position would be sustained. We also know that many persons could have delayed their retirement by turning into hospitals. In addition, there were other persons who were involuntarily retired who had no control over their retirement dates. In fairness to all of them, we felt that they should be entitled to compute their retirement pay under the new pay scales, having waited for 5 years for a pay increase.

I am happy to say that the Senate receded from their position, with an amendment, and as a result, persons who retire on or after April 1, 1963, may compute their retirement pay under the new pay scales. This added about $4,400,000 to the cost of the bill.

The next major issue involved the recomputation of retirement pay for those who retired prior to June 1, 1958.

The House bill provided that members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, who are paid under the Career Compensation Act, would receive recomputation plus a 5-percent cost-of-living increase. The Senate amendment provided for recomputation or a 5-percent cost-of-living increase. The Senate conferees were adamant in their position on recomputation, and, reluctantly, the House conferees agreed to recomputation or 5 percent.

We also receded to the Senate amendment which eliminated the increases in subsistence allowances recommended in the House bill for officers and enlisted personnel.

We have been assured that this matter will receive the careful attention of the Department of Defense and that legislation will be recommended to the Congress for action in the next session. We realize that this is an important element of military compensation and adjustments are necessary. The present system of providing subsistence allowances is confused, and in many areas, unfair. It should be revised and we anticipate legislative action next year.

The savings that resulted from the elimination of subsistence allowances were added to the basic pay scales for officers and enlisted personnel, and we agreed with these additions contained in the Senate amendment.

The House bill also provided that the Commandant of the Coast Guard would receive the same basic pay as the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Senate deleted this portion of the House bill, and the House conferees receded from their position.

The House bill eliminated the State of Hawaii as an area in which foreign duty pay was authorized. The Senate amendment deleted this portion of the House bill and provided that foreign duty pay would only be authorized in areas prescribed by the President, which, in effect, means the Secretary of Defense.

The House agreed to this portion of the Senate amendment, and as a result, foreign duty pay will only be authorized in areas prescribed by the President.

While undoubtedly certain people now receiving foreign duty pay will no longer be entitled to this pay, nevertheless it should be remembered that the basic pay increases will offset any reduction in foreign duty pay, and in addition, it must be remembered that basic pay continues after the individual returns to the United States. It is also reflected in his retired pay.

Finally, the Senate amendment raised the special pay for physicians and dentists at the 6-year point from $200 to $250 a month; and from $250 to $350 at the 10-year point. There was no comparable House provision. We are having a very serious retention problem among our physicians and dentists, and the House happily agreed to this provision contained in the Senate amendment.

There are other technical changes contained in the conference report, but these are the major features. I think the House will be interested to learn that the total cost of the pay increase, on a full annual basis, is $1,213 million. This is $30 million under the amount proposed by the Department of Defense. As a matter of fact, the amount recommended in the conference report is less than that recommended in either the House or Senate bill. For the remainder of this fiscal year, the proposed legislation is about $7,500,000 under the President's budget.

I also call attention to a printing error in the printed conference report which appears on page 3 under the pay scales for W-4's with over 12 years of service. It should read $535 instead of $565. The original papers are, of course, correct.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. That $250 for permanent professors will not be included for retirement purposes?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. No, it will not be included.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, as I recall, when the question of an increase in pay for Air Force and Military Academy professors was agreed to by the conferees, it was understood that the deans of these two institutions, who under title 10 United States Code 4335 and 9335 are appointed as additional permanent professors, are included among the beneficiaries of this bill.

Is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The answer to that is "Yes."

Section 4335 of title 10, United States Code, states that the dean of the academic board at West Point:

> Shall be appointed as an additional permanent professor from the permanent professors who have served as heads of departments of instruction at the Academy.

The law further provides that:

> The dean has the grade of brigadier general while serving as such.

Section 9335 of title 10, United States Code, contains similar language for the dean at the Air Force Academy. The conference report says:

> While serving as a permanent professor at the U.S. Military Academy or the U.S. Air Force Academy, an officer who has over 36 years of service * * * is entitled to additional pay in the amount of $250 a month.

Since the law says that the dean shall be appointed as an additional permanent professor, there is no question in my mind that the dean at both academies, if otherwise qualified, will receive the additional $250 a month while serving as a permanent professor and dean.

Mr. BRAY. So the question as to whether these deans are included under "professors" is then in the affirmative?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes. Since the law says that the dean shall be appointed as a permanent professor there is no question in my mind that the deans of both academies, if otherwise qualified, shall receive the $250 additional a month while serving as permanent professor and as dean.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want to take the gentleman back over a point he has already made, but I am still not clear as to this recomputation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I will be glad to explain it to the gentleman. Does the gentleman want me to explain the whole subject of recomputation? Let me explain it quickly. I am glad the gentleman asked me, because it will give me an opportunity to say something that is on my chest.

In 1958 we passed a pay bill. We did many things then. I served with the distinguished gentleman from Texas, our former colleague, Mr. Kilday, who was the chairman. Among other things, we raised the salaries of the enlisted men and officers alike. There was a law on the books then which we call the recomputation statute which gave to all people who had heretofore retired, before any bill went into effect, the right to recompute their retirement pay on the then bill, as it was passed, and which had been in existence for 100 years.

But, as a result of the passage of this bill and the action of the other body, they were denied as of 1958, without notice—I believe it was suspended or partly suspended in 1922—but except for that brief period it had been in existence for 100 years—and without notice they just denied this right to recompute their retirement on the basis of the then existing law, and that has been a bone of contention ever since. There were many, many great heroes of World War II—they were legion—and they were denied the same rate of retirement that their brothers-in-arms, veterans of the identical war were getting as retirees. And we are trying to restore that. The House passed two bills on this and sent them to the other body where they died.

Now this bill came up this year and the President sent up a recommendation for a recomputation for all retirees, prior to 1958, who were denied this right plus a 5 percent cost-of-living which would have made them whole with all of their contemporaries. We passed that, that they can recompute under the 1958. But that is not under this bill—not this one. Under this one, all the retirees have their retirement recomputed, if and when the cost-of-living under the escalator clause provision reaches 3 percent. But we added on this 5 percent which would represent the cost-of-living and the other body denied it. But they did let them recompute and all these people who retired before, and I do not care who they may be, if they are paid under Career Compensation Act, can recompute up to the law as it is today—but not under this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Does this mean you have closed the door to recomputation?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would say yes, but I do not think it is right. There should be this 5 percent and we have that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do want to say this. You should have heard the conferees on the part of the House and the other body. We put up a pretty good fight to try to get them to give up, and if you do not believe it, ask those who served on the conference committee. I tried every way I knew to get that 5 percent and I did not get it. But there are a couple of things that the other body did not get.

Some people would like to know what we gained by going to conference. We saved $18 million on the main bill and protected those who retired after April 1 and before October 1 which is the effective day of this act.

The total cost of the increase on a full annual basis is $1,213 million. This is $30 million under the amount proposed by the Department of Defense. As a matter of fact, the amount recommended in the conference bill is less than that recommended in either the House or Senate bill.

For the remainder of this fiscal year, the proposed legislation is roughly $7,500,000 under the President's budget.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I was wondering about two things in this report, it says in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert other language—and it looks like you have rewritten the whole bill.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would say that.

Mr. CURTIS. This is most unusual, I would say. Of course, it is a technical matter and it does not allow the House to review the language.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would say to the gentleman that it is not unusual. When we get in a conference they strike out all after the enacting clause, and you have to rewrite it. In my 23 years here I do not know how you do it in your committee, but on this committee we do it this way.

Mr. CURTIS. It is not only unusual, but it should remain so unusual that it could be done only under exceptional circumstances, and then when it is explained, and I will tell you why.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It is not unusual.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the record and history of conference reports will back up what I have said, that it is most unusual. I certainly hope that the House will pay attention to this kind of technique. We are not, I hope, going into the process where those who happen to be on the conference committee actually write the technical language and words in a bill this complicated where, of course, the House or even the Committee on Armed Services has not the opportunity to go into it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I take it the gentleman objects to what is in this report. What is wrong with it?

Mr. CURTIS. The rest of the Members of the House are dependent on the understanding of it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have told the gentleman what the variations may be between the two bills.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Certainly. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Then let me finish my statement, because I am simply making the record. There is an obligation, in my judgment, for the committees of the House to realize they are a servant of the House and to try to explain and clarify and not to make the decisions on technical matters like this. And I want to say that my own Committee on Ways and Means is probably as great an offender in this regard as any other committee, so I am not saying this in a personal way to the gentleman from South Carolina, for whom I have a high regard, or any members of the Committee on Armed Services or my own committee, for that matter, but I am simply talking about this technique that is being developed. I see it increasingly used every day in the House where the members of a particular committee think that their job is to make decisions for the House instead of elucidating and gathering material and information so that the House can exercise its judgment. That is the point I am making here, and I would like to ask a specific question of the gentleman, if I may.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course, but let me say this. I was of the opinion we represented the House. I read the Congressional Record which said that we were appointed by the Speaker of the House, and I assumed that we represented the House. I believe we did a pretty good job. And let me tell you something else. Let me finish now.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to ask a question.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me finish. You have gotten all the time you wanted.

We passed this bill in May and I spent over 9 weeks on this bill. This is a technical bill. I have read and I have practically digested every statute I could find pertaining to pay. Let me say this also to you: There is no drama and no headlines in personnel legislation. If there is anything drier in the House of Representatives, I would like to become acquainted with it.

Mr. CURTIS. I think taxes perhaps are drier.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Also I want to say this: You will notice that my committee, the Committee on Armed Services, never came in here and asked for a closed rule.

Mr. CURTIS. I would not agree with the gentleman, and I would just say here that he has pointed to something that I have criticized the Ways and Means Committee—my committee—on many times.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If you had to work for the gentleman from Georgia, Carl Vinson, you would burn the midnight oil, too, because he does does not leave any holes uncovered. We worked on this thing.

Mr. CURTIS. I will say to the gentleman that I think he is missing the point I am trying to drive home, but if you will reread the Record tomorrow on what I have been trying to get at, the gentleman might understand, even though he ended up in disagreement with what I said. The specific question I would like to ask the gentleman—and I really ask it again to point it up—is this:

I am deeply disturbed about section 1401a—"Adjustment of retired pay and retainer pay to reflect changes in Consumer Price Index."

This is a clause increasingly in labor-management contracts. What it is in effect is recognizing probably the facts of life, of which this is one, that we are going to continue to handle our fiscal affairs in such a way that we will always have inflation. This builds inflationary forces that will feed upon those already in existence. For example, when you have inflationary forces that bring about an increase in the Consumer Price Index you immediately trigger into effect these labor contracts which automatically increase wage costs which again feed the Consumer Price Index increases. I have felt that this has been a very dangerous development in the private sector although again I say that I sympathize with and understand the problems involved. When we go to the point of putting in a Government-labor contract—and this is what it is—a pay bill where we recognize the fact that we are not going to be handling our fiscal affairs in a fashion that will maintain the purchasing power of the dollar in fact, we really have reached, I think, a very dangerous impasse.

I think this should not be in the bill. I do not think the Government ever should recognize officially that it is not going to try to preserve the purchasing power of its own employees as well as the purchasing power of our entire citizenry through handling its fiscal affairs in a sound manner. This is not said in criticism of this particular conference report but really to point up what I regard as a very, very dangerous occurrence that we now see coming out in our Government contracts.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman that I hope he does not feel that I was in anywise discourteous or short with him. I can assure the gentleman that I have a very, very high regard for him. His ideas on fiscal integrity I might say are very well known in this House and the only time I have ever known him to be wrong is when he disagreed with us concerning matters under the jurisdiction of this committee.

Mr. CURTIS. To reassure the gentleman—not that he needs it—I enjoy this give-and-take and at no time do I take offense with my colleagues who disagree with me and disagree with me emphatically. Indeed, I encourage them to do so because then we can move forward in this field to better results.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this bill has had a long and tenuous course. This bill, in my opinion, should have been enacted a year ago when we raised the salaries of civil service employees. I would like the Record to show that the gentleman from South Carolina and his committee have been trying to bring about the passage of this bill all the year. The gentleman from South Carolina and his committee wrote a very good bill early in the year. It was modified considerably by the gentleman's committee. It passed this House months ago. I thought it rather unfortunate that we could not get action in the other body and make it effective immediately so that the men who wear the uniform and their families may enjoy a little better standard of living than they now enjoy, more in keeping with that enjoyed by other people who work for our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a compliment to the gentleman from South Carolina and to his committee on their efforts in bringing about the enactment of this needed legislation. I am glad even at this late date we are finally in a position to complete action on it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman very much, Mr. Speaker.

I do not think that this bill really does adequate justice to these men.

Once we had comparability, as I said in my statement back in May, between the military and industry. Then we tried to have comparability between the military pay and our civil service. There is not any comparability between the two of them. The military is still behind. If we did justice, in my opinion, to the military we would raise this bill over $200 million. But I have sense enough to recognize the facts of life. I do not think we can get it. But in order to do justice to these people, I think I should state that that is how far behind they are.

Mr. Speaker, one point which we are going to take up next year is the area of subsistence, which is the food area. There is not any comparability. However, we have done the very best we could with the facts at hand and the atmosphere which we have found for a bill of this character to go through. We have done the very best we know how. However, I do not think it is adequate.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I shall be glad to yield to a member of the committee.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], the chairman of this subcommittee yielding to me. I have no expertise in a technical way involving this legislation. I simply rise for a point of information and to make some legislative history, if the gentleman will be so good as to indulge me.

Insofar as the discussion which the gentleman from South Carolina had earlier concerning the recomputation and, particularly, as referring to paragraph 9 on page 13 of the report, having to do with those who retire during the calendar year 1963, in both instances it states that it is not the intention as a precedent for future pay increases and for recomputation.

But does the gentleman, in fact, think that this and the legislative record that we are making will for those who retire hereafter the enactment of this law, keep them from asking again for recomputation, as has been the history of our Nation for the past 100 years, or will that question arise again and will they too ask for this recomputation?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Since the way in which we treated them in 1958, we thought we had better change this. Not because we could not tie ourselves to a precedent that every time we pass a pay bill that we are today putting into that even another calendar year. I think it is the honorable way to handle it. I think we should do it, but I cannot say we are duty-bound as to the question of recomputation itself. However, there has been a statute on the books on the question for 100 years.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I think it is well to establish this record. I know there is a difference of opinion between the distinguished subcommittee chairman and that there was such a difference of opinion at least when we passed this bill between the gentleman from South Carolina and the chairman of the full committee as to what this might do to the retirement system of our military people as a whole. But I do think they will again request, and probably have, a right to receive recomputation under both of these laws, and I thought that ought to be said on the floor of the House.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman will not find any disagreement with me on that. I think over the years there has been a moral obligation as well as a legal one, until that statute was repealed, and probably this does repeal it.

Mr. HALL. I want to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the conference committee for bringing back less of an expenditure, even under the difficult circumstances, than they went to conference with. But let me address myself to paragraph 6 on page 13 of the report. In view of the, at times, preemptive cessation of programs by the Secretary of Defense; does the gentleman have reassurance from the department downtown that this amendment pertaining to foreign-duty pay will be exercised in hazardous areas such as Laos and Vietnam?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. These are hardship areas.

Mr. HALL. They will receive hardship pay, but what about this specific foreign-duty pay outside the continental United States?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We had to give them discretion for this reason: Certain areas, in our opinion, are not so difficult to live in overseas. For instance, I have in mind Wiesbaden, Heidelberg, Frankfurt, Paris, Naples, and a number of places like that.

Mr. HALL. It is the gentleman's opinion that the Secretary will invoke it in difficult areas?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. HALL. One final question for the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee pertains to paragraph 2, page 12. This is purely a technical question and perhaps the gentleman after all of the hearings and work on this bill does not know the immediate answer. But will constructive credit for pay purposes be allowed for those who would otherwise come under the young officer category, under the 2-year preclusion rule, but where they have a constructive credit for pay purposes as for example by virtue of ROTC training but did not accept a commission, then he accepts a technical commission as an officer? Would he be under the 2-year preclusion rule in receiving the extra or fringe benefits, or would he be considered as having 3 or 4 years' constructive pay credit, and hence receive them? That is a technical question, but I think we ought to make the record complete on that.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Is the gentleman talking about longevity credit?

Mr. HALL. No, I am not talking about longevity credit. I am talking about the fact this bill precludes certain officers.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If you are not talking about that, it does not apply.

Mr. HALL. As an example, assume a young officer who had the draft board "breathing down his neck" and was forced into service and did receive a technical commission; would he receive the benefits of this pay increase even though he was still under the 2-year rule if he had a constructive pay credit by virtue of prior service in the Reserves, or otherwise?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not see how it could count. I do not believe it would.

Mr. HALL. It is the gentleman's considered opinion, and, off the cuff, even though it is on the floor of the House, in a rather difficult, hypothetical situation——

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is my opinion, not an off-the-cuff opinion, either.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman always speaks for the RECORD.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am sure my response to the gentleman would not be otherwise.

Mr. HALL. Then he is excluded, whether it be in the officer status, on the technical basis, or otherwise?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would refer the gentleman to title 37, U.S.C., which show the contents of this act. I am sure it does not apply, but I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the information so that I may be sure.

Mr. HALL. I would like to ask the gentleman to do that. I think it is important so far as young dentists and physicians, and so forth, are concerned.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The doctors are different.

Mr. HALL. As the gentleman knows, I have had considerable experience in the personnel problems of the Army and this question has been asked of me.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The physicians and dentists are treated separately under the statute.

Mr. HALL. Exactly the same thing could apply to a man who received an infantry commission.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We treat physicians and dentists differently. They get $50 a month increase after 5 years, and $100 a month after 10 years.

Mr. HALL. I understand the "incentive pay" provisions for the several categories, but it still is not clear in my mind as to whether they will receive an increase in pay, and the additional benefits of this bill if they are young doctors who have received a commission while the draft board was after them and he has under 2 years of service.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me read this. My counsel just presented me this:

§ 205. Computation: service creditable

(a) Subject to subsections (b)–(d) of this section, for the purpose of computing the basic pay of a member of a uniformed service, his years of service are computed by adding—

(1) all periods of active service as an officer, Army field clerk, flight officer, or enlisted member of a uniformed service;

(2) all periods during which he was enlisted or held an appointment as an officer, Army field clerk, or flight officer of—

(A) a regular component of a uniformed service;

(B) the Regular Army Reserve;

(C) the Organized Militia before July 1, 1916;

(D) the National Guard;

(E) the National Guard Reserve;

(F) a reserve component of a uniformed service;

(G) the Naval Militia;

(H) the National Naval Volunteers;

(I) the Naval Reserve Force;

(J) the Army without specification of component;

(K) the Air Force without specification of component;

(L) the Marine Corps Reserve Force;

(M) the Philippine Scouts; or

(N) the Philippine Constabulary;

(3) for a commissioned officer in service on June 30, 1922, all service that was then counted in computing longevity pay and all service as a contract surgeon serving full time;

(4) all periods during which he held an appointment as a nurse, reserve nurse, or commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps as it existed at any time before April 16, 1947, the Navy Nurse Corps as it existed at any time before April 16, 1947, or the Public Health Service, or a reserve component of any of them;

(5) all periods during which he was a deck officer or junior engineer in the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

(6) all periods that, under law in effect on January 10, 1962, were authorized to be credited in computing basic pay;

(7) for an officer of the Medical Corps or Dental Corps of the Army or Navy, an officer of the Air Force designated as a medical or dental officer, or an officer of the Public Health Service commissioned as a medical or dental officer—four years;

(8) for a medical officer named in clause (7) who has completed one year of medical internship or the equivalent thereof—one year in addition to the four years prescribed by clause (7); and

(9) all periods while—

(A) on a temporary disability retired list, honorary retired list, or a retired list of a uniformed service;

(B) entitled to retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay, from a uniformed service or the Veterans' Administration, as a member of the Fleet Reserve or the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve; or

(C) a member of the Honorary Reserve of the Officers' Reserve Corps or the Organized Reserve Corps.

Except for any period of active service described in clause (1) of this subsection and except as provided by section 1402(b)–(d) of title 10, a period of service described in clauses (2)–(9) of this subsection that is performed while on a retired list, in a retired status, or in the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, may not be included to increase retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay.

(b) A period of time may not be counted more than once under subsection (a) of this section. In addition, the amount of service authorized to be credited under clause (7) or (8) of subsection (a) of this section to an officer shall be reduced by the amount of any service otherwise creditable under that subsection that covers any part of his professional education or internship.

(c) Notwithstanding any other law, service credited under clause (7) or (8) of subsection (a) of this section may not—

(1) be included in establishing eligibility for voluntary or involuntary retirement or separation from a uniformed service;

(2) increase the retired or retirement pay of a person who became entitled to that pay before May 1, 1956; or

(3) increase the retired pay of a person who is entitled to that pay under chapter 67 of title 10, after April 30, 1956, and who does not perform active duty after May 1, 1956.

(d) The periods of service authorized to be counted under subsection (a) of this section shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, include service performed by a member of a uniformed service before he became 18 years of age.

This is longevity. Speaking of this group of people, the answer is yes.

Mr. HALL. They do get the new pay privileges?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This group does. This is a special breed of people. Because they are so critical we have to deal with them this way. We need them badly and want to retain them, and we have some mighty good ones. The gentleman knows whereof I speak because his record is pretty good in this area. If the gentleman had told me to start with he was talking about physicians and dentists, I would have known what he was talking about.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I had a question asked me by telephone yesterday. An officer was retired yesterday, September 30. Will his retirement pay be different than if he had retired on October 1?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Anybody who retires after April 1, 1963, retires under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. He retires under the provisions of this bill. It would be at the same rate of pay after April 1, 1963. If he retired yesterday he would come under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. I desire to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina in his capacity as chairman of the subcommittee that brought this bill to the floor of the House and as chairman of the managers on the part of the House for bringing this conference report back. The gentleman will recall that among many others I have enthusiastically supported his position not only as to the bill as a whole but also as to the position of the gentleman from South Carolina on the question of recomputation of pay for retired officers.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Plus 5 percent.

Mr. FLYNT. I think the conference report which brings this bill back to us is in the best interest of the Defense Establishment of this country. I endorse it and expect to vote for it. I renew my commendation of the gentleman from South Carolina. This bill is long overdue. I think a service to the country has been performed in the form in which this comes back to the House of Representatives for approval.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. I want to join my colleague and say that I, too, am supporting the conference report on H.R. 5555. I want to compliment the gentleman from South Carolina for bringing this conference report to the House.

I want to ask him one question, however. I am advised that the Secretary of Defense has issued recently a directive eliminating efficiency pay as of September 1963. This would mean even though we give the noncom enlisted personnel an increase in this bill, as this directive takes effect, say a noncom gets $40 more a month and he loses his proficiency pay, it would be a loss of $115 a month or a net loss of $75. I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman for his comment on that situation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Under the present law the Secretary of Defense has authority to do this. I am advised that he is making it more difficult to get this proficiency pay, making the conditions whereby it is awarded more difficult. But he has not discontinued it. A lesser number are getting higher pay. The amounts are larger, but it has not been discontinued.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. It has been made larger?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I think the amount is still around $109 million.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. There has been a great deal of concern in the personnel about this situation. Any inquiry the gentleman might make of the Defense Department would be appreciated.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. We have already made an inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On this provision on the cost of living I share the concern of my colleague from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. With this provision it means you are not likely to be back with an increased pay bill for the military? If the cost of living goes above 3 percent, that then becomes automatic? Is this for retirees only?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This is for retirees.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this conference committee report as I believe all of us are, because we recognize that present day conditions justify a pay raise for the men and women in our Armed Forces. I long have supported such an increase and worked arduously for it when the bill was before the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 333, nays 5, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—333

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Lennon
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.

Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—5

Burleson
Curtis
O'Konski
Pillion
Poage

NOT VOTING—94

Arends
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Battin
Becker
Belcher
Bonner
Buckley
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Casey
Chenoweth
Cooley
Corbett
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dulski
Finnegan
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Green, Oreg.
Hardy
Hawkins
Healey
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Meader
Monagan
Montoya
Morrison
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Pilcher
Pucinski
Rains
Riehlman
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Vinson
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Burton.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Ryan of New York with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Schenck.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Becker.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Derwinski.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Thornberry.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Joelson.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Smith of Iowa.
Mr. Tuck with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file reports on several river-basin increases in authorization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 539 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7044) to amend Public Law 193, Eighty-third Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 539, if adopted, would make in order the consideration of H.R. 7044, a bill by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. The rule permits 1 hour of general debate after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Some 10 years ago Congress created the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. Its purpose was to explore, along with a similarly created Philippine Commission, a suitable memorial that would commemorate the sacrifices of both Americans and Filipinos in the epic battle of Corregidor. The report accompanying H.R. 7044 sketches the trials and tribulations that have delayed the completion of this project. As I read the report, two factors have entered into the delay—first, agreement upon an appropriate memorial, and second, a method of financing the memorial. There was criticism and dissatisfaction with the original memorial plan. The U.S. Commissioners together with their Philippine counterparts have now agreed upon what I think is a more meaningful plan. Like so many historical sites in our own country, Corregidor will be turned into a quiet, dignified park-like area with adequate markers that will inform future generations of the heroism of its defenders. An historical film will be produced that will convey dramatically the resistance of these defenders. This more simplified design has resolved the problem of financing. Whereas it was thought that $7,500,000 would be necessary to finance the original more costly plans, it has now been determined that the U.S. share will only be $1,500,000. I am pleased to note that the Philippine Government has put up a similar sum in local currency. This is a one-shot affair. Once this money has been appropriated, the United States has discharged its obligation. Future maintenance will be the responsibility of the Philippine Government.

The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission has nine members. Three of them are distinguished Members of this body—the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD]. They are all to be congratulated on the diligence with which they have carried out their mandate from the Congress. There is one unique feature of this bill that I cannot overlook. It provides for the termination of the Commission upon the completion of the construction authorized in the bill or on May 6, 1967, whichever is the earlier. I cannot recall another instance where a Commission has requested that it be legislated out of business.

I think it is highly fitting that we honor our heroes of Bataan and Corregidor as proposed in the bill which our action on this rule will make in order, if the rule is approved. I urge its approval.

Mankind has always memorialized its heroes.

Where I come from, war, the preparations for war, the rehabilitation of war veterans, and the memorializing of our dead heroes is a serious business.

I live in an area of Alabama that has always ranked very high in the United States in the proportion of its soldiers who volunteered for service.

I, myself, have the honor of having volunteered for military service for my country in World War II.

We honor ourselves when we honor our deceased heroes.

This Bataan-Corregidor Memorial will in the future be viewed by hundreds of thousands of Americans. It will renew their faith in what our country stands for. Millions of Filipinos and citizens of other lands will view this memorial. They will all be impressed with America's respect not only for the heroes of our two countries, but they will be impressed, as well, by the fact that historically America has stood for principle.

They will be impressed that Americans have always been willing to die for the things in which they believe. They will recognize again that our history is that of having supported our allies. Our treaties are not mere pieces of paper. They are undergirded by the good word of America. They are strengthened by our will, by our blood, and by our steel.

I hope America will always erect memorials to its fallen heroes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 539, and at the appropriate time I will move the previous question.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], House Resolution 539 will provide for an open rule with 1 hour debate, for the consideration of H.R. 7044.

The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission was originally created by an act of Congress in 1953. The function of this Commission was to plan a memorial on Corregidor Island in Manila Bay. It would be a tribute to the sacrifices of those Filipinos and Americans who fought side by side in World War II.

As time went on, it was thought that this should cost approximately $7½ million to the United States so far as our share was concerned, to be raised by public contributions. This turned out to be impossible. The Philippine Government and the United States then got together and decided that a much more modest plan would be desirable. That is what we have at the present time under an agreement between the two countries.

I understand the Bureau of the Budget is now in support of the bill, the White House, the American Legion—actually, I know of no organization that is opposed to this particular bill.

It is planned that this will be a dignified memorial area comparable to Saratoga and Gettysburg and the site will be consecrated ground. The Philippine Government has already started to clean up the island to make it attractive to visitors. The bill does carry an authorization for an appropriation for $1.5 million which is $6 million less than the $7½ million which was originally anticipated. The bill also provides for the termination of this committee. I understand the three members who have worked very diligently on this committee are extremely anxious to bring this to a close. I further understand that this might be one of the few times that we are legislating a Commission out of business. In any event, they will cease to function when the memorial is completed or on May 6, 1967—whatever is the earlier date.

So far as I am concerned, I know of no objection to the rule, and personally I am in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. However, I do have a request for time on this side of the aisle and, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Alabama, I will now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 161]

Abele
Alger
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baring
Battin
Becker
Belcher
Blatnik
Bonner
Brock
Buckley
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Celler
Chenoweth
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Fallon
Finnegan
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Green, Oreg.
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harsha
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Jarman
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
McMillan
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
May
Miller, Calif.
Monagan
Montoya
Morrison
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Pucinski
Rains
Riehlman
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Vinson
White
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 316 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult, indeed, to oppose the erection of a memorial on Corregidor in memory of the heroes of World War II. I was in the Philippines during World War II at the liberation of Manila and Luzon. I know the great courage of the Filipino guerrillas, having been with them for some time, as well as the great sacrifices that were made by the American soldiers, sailors, and marines. I think there should be some memorial in the Philippines for our men and for the guerrillas, but I have some question in my mind about this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, on July 31 this House accepted a conference report from the other body in which we established a $30 million fund, and part of that is for educational purposes and to be otherwise used. It would seem to me it would be proper that any expense of this memorial would come out of that $30 million of the American taxpayers' funds.

At the time that we established the $30 million fund instead of paying the obligations we had, I introduced a bill in the House that would set up a living memorial in the Philippines. I suggested that there be a high school built known as the Bataan-Corregidor Memorial High School, and that it be built out of this $30 million fund. In the use of the funds for a living memorial for education, which they need so badly, we could have had the MacArthur Auditorium, the Wainright Scientific Room, and we could have honored our veterans in this living memorial on Corregidor, and it would seem to me we would save the money of the American taxpayers and also do a better job in the Philippines than by the erection of a tablet on Corregidor.

The bill I introduced provided that there be an amendment to this original bill which would set up this $30 million fund. I cannot offer my bill as a substitute, under this rule. But I wanted the Committee on Foreign Affairs to give consideration to it. No consideration was given to it, as far as I know. I asked that I be notified when the Rules Committee was asked for a rule so that I might ask for a substitute rule for that purpose, but I was not notified until it was reported out of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will go back to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I shall make every effort I can to see that it goes back to the Committee on Foreign Affairs not with the idea of defeating a memorial in the Philippines for Corregidor and Bataan, but to see if we cannot have a living memorial and to see if we cannot have it out of the $30 million we gave them on July 31. Rather than just within a few days after we passed the tax bill, and I joined in it, having another authorization for $1,500,000.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fiscal situation and the road on which we are traveling, we had better try every way we can to save money. This $30 million is there for educational purposes. What better living memorial could we have than a high school that the people could use.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for the statement he is making and to say that I agree wholeheartedly. I agree that would be much more practical to have a living memorial of the nature which the gentleman has suggested. I can see no reason why this $1,500,000 should be authorized and new money appropriated when there will be an estimated $30 million residue from the $73 million that was recently authorized by the Congress, and I assume it has been appropriated. There is no reason in the world why this money should not come from that fund.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. May I recall to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, that I introduced this bill which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and that it was reported from the subcommittee June 20 and approved by the full committee on August 6 and the report filed on August 19. The gentleman's bill, to which he has referred, was not introduced until August 21. So there was no request so far as I know for a hearing before either the subcommittee or the full committee in connection with the gentleman's bill. I just wanted to clarify that particular point.

Mr. BOW. In reply to the gentleman, may I say that this bill is shown here as having been reported on August 19 which is some time after the new $30 million on July 30; and I did speak to several members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs about the bill and hoped that it would be considered. Of course, it did not come out of the Committee on Rules until some time after that. I am sure that the committee has knowledge of this new approach and I hope, if we can get the bill back to the committee, that it will be considered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Bataan, and Corregidor constitute one of the great historic sites of the world. This was the scene of heroic deeds which will live forever in the minds of men. These great deeds took place nearly a quarter of a century ago. It is time something was being done to establish a memorial to show that we honor and appreciate what was done there.

Except for the action of the Philippine Government, this scene would be today one of decay and destruction. We have done nothing. The Philippine Government has undertaken the beginning of a memorial. They have obligated themselves to spend 4 million pesos which is the equivalent of about $1,500,000, which is the amount carried in this bill. They already are at work cleaning up the wreckage and clearing out the undergrowth and preparing this site for perpetuation as a memorial to these honored dead. Certainly, we should do our share and we should do it now.

Now, this measure does not call for an ornate structure. It calls for a simple, dignified structure, not a costly memorial.

My good friend, the distinguished, and able gentleman from Ohio, has opposed a change in plans. His proposal on the surface is attractive, but let us take a long look at what has been proposed. First of all, the original intent as embodied in the 1953 legislation is the erection on Corregidor Island of a building or other structures and the use of this island as a memorial to Philippine and American soldiers, sailors, and marines who lost their lives during World War II. If we were to build a hospital or a school or some similar undertaking on Corregidor Island, it would be of little value because of its isolation. Very few people are there. Everyone who used it would have to be transported in and out, and it is not a feasible thing to do for students. If we do not do it on the actual site, then you will have lost the significance of preserving Corregidor as a national memorial.

We are talking here about $1.5 million. I would like to save $1.5 million, but it is not much money in the scheme of things. If we were to change to another program, a school or hospital, you can be certain that it would cost a great deal more than $1.5 million, and then you would have a perpetual costly program of maintenance and operation.

Finally, let me point out that I believe it is not possible to use the funds provided in the Philippine war damage bill for such a purpose. They are funds already appropriated for a specific purpose. If you were to try to divert any unexpended balance, through a bill from the Foreign Affairs Committee, it would be subject to the point of order that it contained an appropriation in a legislative bill.

The legislative history of the Philippine war damage bill makes that abundantly clear.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that what we are undertaking is something that is a "must" insofar as the Congress is concerned. It is something that is long overdue. I think it would be a tragic mistake to try to divert it now into something else and to perpetuate the long series of delays which would further prolong and postpone the construction of an adequate and proper memorial to the brave men who gave their lives there.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the point of order that a quorum is not present and evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 314, nays 12, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—314

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Aspinall
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Conte
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Harding
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Lankford
Lennon
Libonati
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
St. George
St Germain
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Sheppard
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Staebler
Staggers
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Taft

Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Toll
Tuck
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—12

Ashbrook
Bow
Bruce
Edwards
Foreman
Gross
Hall
Leggett
O'Konski
Pillion
Ryan, Mich.
Saylor

NOT VOTING—106

Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Bass
Battin
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Bonner
Buckley
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Celler
Chenoweth
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dulski
Evins
Finnegan
Fogarty
Green, Oreg.
Hansen
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Ichord
Jarman
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Kyl
Landrum
Latta
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Monagan
Montoya
Morrison
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Pilcher
Pucinski
Rains
Riehlman
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scott
Shelley
Shipley
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Vinson
Watts
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Becker.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Arends.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Schenck.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Ryan of New York with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Hoeven.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Lindsay.
Mr. Monagan with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Montoya with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Mathias.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Jarman with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Harris with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Bass with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mrs. Sullivan.
Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Thornberry.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mrs. Hansen.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Scott with Mr. Tuten.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7044) to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a point of order against the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the report on this bill violates rule XIII, the so-called Ramseyer rule. I shall not read the rule as I know the Speaker is familiar with it.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the bill, H.R. 7044, is a bill to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

I further point out in the bill under section (i) there is a change in the plans for the memorial, changing it into the type that is set forth in the bill; and that in the report under changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, the report does show in italic that portion of the amendment.

I further call the Chair's attention to the fact that section 2 of the bill now pending provides "The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission shall cease to exist upon completion of the construction authorized by this act, or on May 6, 1967, whichever shall first occur."

I further call attention to the report of the committee in which they attempt to comply with the Ramseyer rule and in that, although they do comply in the one instance with the italics on the construction, later, in the next paragraph of the report, is this language: "and the Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after such submission of such final report." This is contained in roman printing. It is not in the italic required under the Ramseyer rule. It does not show that this is a change in existing law and, inasmuch as section 2 says that the Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of the construction authorized, the Speaker will find the same language in the bill of 1958 giving the time as to when the Commission will cease to exist. This bill does amend that law by setting a different date for the expiration of the Commission and it does not comply with the Ramseyer rule.

I desire, if I may, to point out the precedents of the House appearing in volume 8 from page 2236 on, and particularly that precedent that says, "Although a bill proposed one minor and obvious change in existing law, the failure to indicate this change" is "in violation of the law." Admittedly this is in a minor and rather obvious position. Nevertheless the report of the committee does not show in italic and it is a change in existing law, and I submit it is a violation of the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I contend that section 2 does not make a specific change in the provisions of the law. Therefore the report of the committee does comply with the Ramseyer rule. Also, the point of order should be too late because the rule has been adopted to provide for the consideration. Therefore, I contend that the point of order does not lie.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, may I reply to the gentleman from Alabama?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BOW. Under the rules of the House, even though the rule has been adopted, the point of order under the Ramseyer rule must come immediately before the House goes into the Committee of the Whole, and it does not come too late. I further point out that there is a complete change in the law as to the time of the expiration of the Bataan-Corregidor Commission.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is prepared to rule. In connection with section 2 that the gentleman from Ohio referred to, that is, section 2 of the pending bill, the Chair will state that this section does not amend existing law specifically and applies only to this bill. Therefore, the report does not, in that respect, have to meet the requirements of the Ramseyer rule. The portion of the bill which specifically amends existing law, as the Chair sees it, is paragraph (i) starting on page 1 and finishing on line 19 of page 2 of that section, and it is very clear that the committee has complied with the Ramseyer rule in connection with that paragraph. So, for the reason stated, the Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7044, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today provides for an authorization of $1.5 million as the U.S. share of developing a battlefield memorial and tourist center on the historic island of Corregidor in Manila Bay.

Having been a member of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission since

1957, I am keenly interested in the passage of H.R. 7044 to develop Corregidor into a war memorial site in honor of the over 4 million American veterans who fought under the American flag in the Pacific theater with their Filipino allies during World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to emphasize here that the Corregidor-Bataan Commission earlier had considered a more ambitious undertaking, which would have cost the United States an estimated $7.5 million. When it became apparent that this was not feasible, our Government proposed a more modest memorial plan, and the Government of the Republic of the Philippines agreed. This memorial—as provided in the legislation now pending before the House—will be comparable to Gettysburg and other U.S. battlefield memorials. The historic Malinta Tunnel and other areas of the island, which have fallen into a state of ruin, will be restored. Historic markers and twin flagpoles to fly the Philippine and American colors will be erected. A small pavilion or tourist center will be built, which will contain an auditorium and a place for historic documents.

Although the U.S. Congress initiated the memorial project, the Philippine Government has already begun clearing and restoring the island as a token of good faith, and has agreed to be responsible for arrangements for guards, tourists' transportation to and from the island, and for sharing with the United States in the production of a documentary film of the story of Bataan and Corregidor. Also, the Philippine Government already has authorized an appropriation of the pesos equivalent of $1.5 million for its share of this undertaking, and most of the labor and materials for the construction will originate in the Philippines. The State Department has stated that the Philippine Republic, who donated the land site, has agreed to accept the responsibility of maintenance and upkeep of the memorial.

I wish to call to the attention of the House that H.R. 7044 authorizes the sum of $1,500,000 as the U.S. Government's total share of the entire expenditure. Under the bill as originally introduced, the money would have been appropriated to the American Battle Monuments Commission. The measure was changed, however, in the House Foreign Affairs Committee so that the funds will be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration rather than the American Battle Monuments Commission. It was agreed that the Veterans' Administration, with an experienced construction division, would be more suitable to act as agent for the Corregidor-Bataan Commission in the construction work that will be necessary. The Bureau of the Budget and the Department of State have agreed to this change.

The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission was created 10 years ago by an act of Congress to plan a memorial for the island of Corregidor in tribute to the Americans and Filipinos who served in the Pacific theater during World War II. H.R. 7044 provides that the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission be terminated upon the completion of the memorial or in May of 1967, whichever is earlier.

Mr. Chairman, presently there is no fitting monument or memorial to pay tribute to the over 4 million American veterans who served in this vital area or to the brave Filipinos who fought and died along with their American allies under the stars and stripes. To commemorate the service and sacrifice of those brave men who fought on Corregidor, who were in the Bataan death march, who participated in many other campaigns in the Pacific is the purpose of this bill. We have erected memorials in the European area which have cost in the neighborhood of $40 million. Conversely, the United States has spent only about $4,500,000 for memorials in the Pacific area—this expenditure going for a memorial cemetery in Manila and one in Honolulu.

The idea of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial has received bipartisan support from both sides of the aisle. Gen. Douglas MacArthur has called it a "Worthy purpose." The memorial effort has the suport of Generals Krueger and Keeny, as well as Admiral Nimitz. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and the Defenders of Corregidor and Bataan have strongly endorsed the bill now pending before the House. The bill is supported by the executive branch of our Government and reflects the views of the President, the Department of State, and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the 1953 law establishing the Commission, the Congress has passed three additional laws which strengthened the original act and reflected a strong congressional desire to pay tribute to the over 4 million veterans who served in the Pacific area. Because of these actions, the Philippine Government acted promptly to create a companion Commission and to set aside the island of Corregidor as a national shrine to be the site of a joint Philippine-United States memorial. That was some years ago, and our Filipino allies are understandably puzzled by the delay.

In a letter to the Chairman of the Commission, Hon. Emmet O'Neal, Gen. Douglas MacArthur said this of the proposed memorial:

> It is indeed a worthy purpose. For no soil on earth is more deeply consecrated to the cause of human liberty than is that of the island of Corregidor and adjacent Bataan Peninsula. There, American and Filipino blood is intermingled to immortalize that gallant stand taken to resist against desperately overwhelming odds the onrush of the forces of despotism which sought to blot the concept of freedom from the face of the earth.

The Corregidor-Bataan memorial as provided in H.R. 7044 serves the purpose outlined by General MacArthur—a tribute to the gallant American and Filipino allies who fought and died in the Pacific. But it is more than that. It serves as a symbol of the bond of friendship between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States. It is to be placed—not in Arlington National Cemetery or in a Washington Park—but on Asian soil as a lasting monument of friendship between our two countries.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this bill to the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, because our distinguished and able friend from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] is busy in New York as U.S. delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, he has asked me to assist in presenting his views on H.R. 7044 to his fellow Members of the House. The gentleman from California has served on the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission since 1959; first, by appointment by former President Eisenhower and also by reappointment by President Kennedy.

During World War II, the gentleman from California served with the U.S. naval forces which participated in the liberation of the Bataan Peninsula and the island of Corregidor.

Following are the remarks of my distinguished colleague from California on this proposal to authorize an appropriation of $1,500,000 as the U.S. share of developing Corregidor Island as a memorial site if it had been possible for him to be present today:

Having served on the Corregidor-Bataan Commission since 1959, originally by appointment of President Eisenhower and presently by reappointment of President Kennedy, I am particularly anxious to have the House approve the bill, H.R. 7044, which is now under consideration. Perhaps my own interest in this matter is conditioned by the fact that I served in the U.S. Navy forces which recaptured the Philippines including the action which took Bataan Peninsula and the Island of Corregidor. However, Corregidor has a symbolic significance to most of those who served in the Pacific theater during World War II for it was on this island that the last heroic defense and final surrender of American forces in the Philippines took place. In spite of this, there has been no major monument in the Pacific to commemorate the great sacrifices of the U.S. forces in the Pacific during the Second World War, except the American cemetery in Manila.

Some time ago, the U.S. Government instituted proposals to establish a suitable memorial on the Island of Corregidor to commemorate jointly with the Government of the Philippines the heroic efforts of American and Filipino armed forces which led to the terrible death march of Bataan and subsequent surrender on Corregidor. While many proposals have been made, some of them perhaps overambitious, the Commission and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs are now presenting a very practical and suitable but modest proposal to which I believe the House should give its overwhelming support.

As I am sure most of the Members know, until recently the Commission had proposed a rather elaborate monument which was estimated to require a contribution of some $7.5 million on the part of the United States. The bill now before you carries an authorization of $1.5 million for a very dignified and simple memorial on the hallowed ground of Corregidor. The Philippine Government has already authorized the expenditure of 40 million pesos—roughly the equivalent of the $1.5 million carried in this bill—with which they have already commenced the cleanup of Corregidor. I realize that there have been other proposals to establish a school or some other so-called living memorial, but such projects obviously could not be located on the historic Isle of Corregidor. In my judgment, such proposals, while meritorious, would not serve the purpose which has been the declared intent of the Governments of our two countries.

I would like to say to my colleagues in the House, particularly those who might have an attitude of indifference toward this project, that to those of us who fought in the Pacific war, there is a significance to a Corregidor memorial that could not be duplicated at any other location and, of course, this site has very special meaning for the citizens of the Philippines. To some of you, perhaps, the fact that the bill now offered for your consideration by the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission provides for its own demise would indicate the cost involved is minor: how many boards and commissions can you abolish for $1.5 million?

As a veteran of 3 years' combat service in the Pacific theater in World War II, as a member of the Corregidor-Bataan Commission, and as an economy-minded Republican Member of this House, I urge your affirmative vote on this bill.

In addition to the statement by the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], I would like to add my own remarks on why H.R. 7044 should be approved.

It is difficult to realize that the seige of Corregidor occurred more than 20 years ago. There is hardly a person in this Chamber who does not remember the valiant defense of Bataan, the radio reports from Corregidor outlining the desperate condition of both American and Filipino troops as they fought against incredible odds to hold out as long as possible.

There were heroes aplenty at Corregidor and on Bataan. There were thousands of them; most of whom are now dead or who still bear the scars of a siege which will go down in history as a proud and courageous defense of freedom.

There are those who will claim that Corregidor and Bataan were a defeat, and they will ask the question "Why should we honor our defeats, when we had so many victories later in the war?"

Corregidor was not a defeat. It was a victory. It slowed the advance of the Japanese, forced them to divert troops scheduled for other actions in the Pacific to put down this valiant defense. The timetable for invasion was thrown off.

When Gen. Douglas MacArthur was ordered to leave the Philippines to head the liberation forces in southeast Asia, he made his famous statement: "I shall return."

He did return to the Philippines at the head of thousands of American troops and freed the islands.

Our Federal Government lived up to its pledge made during the war that we would let the Philippines become a sovereign nation, an independent country dedicated to liberty.

Corregidor is the symbol of friendship between the United States and the Philippines. It was forged in the blood and terror of war. It is a friendship which will never die.

Corregidor is also a symbol of valiant men and women who stood their ground against impossible odds, men and women who would rather die than submit to a tyrant's rule, men and women who realized that "peace at any price" is no peace at all.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to provide the authorization for the U.S. contribution to this memorial to be erected in joint commemoration by the Philippines and the United States.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama who is chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and who also serves as a member of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

As has already been pointed out, it has been almost 25 years since the acts took place. It has been since 1953 when Congress first recognized that some recognition should be given the deeds which took place there in the Pacific. Since that time the Congress of the United States has struggled in several ways to pay the deserved tribute which we ourselves said should be paid.

As a matter of fact, a bill actually passed this body, introduced by a distinguished gentleman on that side of the aisle, calling for the authorization of $7.5 million. That bill died over in the other body. And so it went—with one idea and another idea and proposals and so on. And this matter has strung along until it got to the point, as I talked to several members of the Commission here on the floor that they are absolutely disgusted and frustrated. I am here to tell my colleagues other Members, unfortunately, seem to be too. I think I can say without fear of contradiction our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, took it upon himself to reconcile divergent views and to lift up those who are frustrated and in despair, and breathed life back into this matter which we have under consideration here today. It is because of his dedication, his perseverance, his persuasion, and his conviction that this ought to be done that this matter is here today. I am delighted to have this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleague and to those of our colleagues who served with him on the Commission for seeing to it that this matter is not dead, and once again is brought here for the consideration of this body and of this Congress.

Now I know that the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Iowa are very sincere in what they propose in their approach on this matter. But, I daresay I think any fairminded person would have to agree also that the gentleman from Alabama and those who served with him on the Memorial Commission are likewise sincere and have given this matter very careful scrutiny and study, as has the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific and as has the Committee on Foreign Affairs, both of which committees overwhelmingly reported this matter out. So while I respect and acknowledge the fact that the two gentlemen who oppose this matter are, indeed, sincere and have their convictions, it would seem to me that the sincerity and conviction of the majority far outweigh those who see this matter in quite another way.

Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose it is necessary here to recount the courage and heroism and the glory of those acts which are already written in the history of mankind which took place in the Pacific, and the deeds of those patriotic men and women which still throb and pulse in the hearts and minds of living people who love freedom and who live in this world of ours today. There is no need to recount the sacrifices of those patriotic men and women.

Mr. Chairman, there is no reservation in my mind, and I hope not in the minds of anyone else as to whether there should be some recognition granted to this phase of history and, Mr. Chairman, there is no reservation in my mind about the manner in which it is proposed to give that recognition in this legislation. It has been suggested, and as I said, sincerely so, that a high school be built—that an education would be more practical and logical, and would be a living memorial to give recognition to those deeds of heroism that occurred on Bataan and in the Pacific. But what is wrong with that? Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that what is wrong with it is that it is too logical, it is too practical, it would say nothing of the spirit—of the soul—of the patriotism of those men and women and those deeds that we here seek to accord some measure of recognition and appreciation. That is what is wrong with it. People do not live just with their minds. People live more with the spirit and with the heart.

The memorial provided for in this bill is a satisfaction not only to the minds of men, but it is a satisfaction to the souls of men, both living and dead. It soars with this idea and with this spirit—with this courage and with this strength, which only this type of memorial can give.

I ask my colleagues this question: At the time when the Washington Memorial was being thought of and was actually constructed, would we rather have had a high school out there on those grounds to memorialize the works of that great man who was the first President of this country? When we look into the deep, dark, stark eyes of that great President of the United States as he sits sculfully in a marble chair in the Lincoln Memorial, would you say to yourself, "We should have built a high school there instead"?

When thousands of children and widows go to Gettysburg and see the actual site where people fought and died for the principles they believed in, would you say we ought to abolish that and spend more money for a school of some kind? Well, it may be practical and it may be logical. It has been said that we need a living memorial and that it ought to be educational. Well, Mr. Chairman, what can be more living than thousands of children and adults making the pilgrimage to the actual site in Corregidor? What can be more educational than thousands of children and adults who will stand on that site in awe and in reverence learning and reliving the actual heroic acts and the glorious chapter in Philippine and American history? Sure the Filipinos need schools, and they will have them, and they will build them, but they also need, as we do, a remembrance and a recognition of the great events of World War II that took place in the Pacific, in the Philippines and on Corregidor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know not about what others will do, but I shall cast my vote for the memorial in this bill which shall have the flags of two great countries flying high as a symbol of the courage and of the fight that was fought for freedom and which was successfully conducted so that it will be living forever not only in the minds of men and women but also in their hearts and in their spirits as an everlasting inspiration to young and old.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman in the middle of a very, very fine statement, but I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. We are considering here the establishment of a war memorial with a cost of some million or million and a half dollars.

Mr. FASCELL. The total cost will be twice that much, but the U.S. share will be $1.5 million. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The question occurs to me, does the gentleman have any knowledge of how many American graveyards there are in the Philippines today and how much the annual maintenance cost of them is?

Mr. FASCELL. I believe the distinguished chairman of the subcommitte pointed that out.

Mr. SELDEN. There is one cemetery in Manila, as I understand it, and there is also one in Honolulu, at a total cost of $4.5 million for construction.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. There are certainly many more graveyards than that in the whole Far East.

Mr. SELDEN. There is one in Manila and one in Honolulu that are maintained by our American Battle Monuments Commission. There is a graveyard, but as I understand it, those are the two maintained by the American Battle Monuments Commission.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I think the gentleman from Alabama is correct that all of the dead from various other burying places have now been gathered in and are interred in these two cemeteries.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. For example, those buried on Iwo Jima and Okinawa, and so forth, are all gathered in the one?

Mr. ADAIR. If the gentleman will yield further, I think that is correct. That is my present information.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, for reasons which I think have heretofore been adequately set forth, I would urge the House to adopt this legislation. Proposals relating to this matter have been before us now for a number of years. I think this is a question which has been upon the conscience not only of Members of the House but upon the consciences of those whom we represent. It is my feeling that there has been an awareness of the fact that we ought to give some recognition beyond that which has already been given to those who fought, died, and are now buried in the Pacific-Asian theater of World War II. This seems to me to be an entirely appropriate piece of legislation. For those who, like myself, are concerned with the cost of matters which are presented to this House it can be pointed out that originally such a memorial was estimated to cost $7.5 million. By this legislation we have reduced it to $1.5 million as the maximum cost to the United States. For that there will be created a fine memorial. There will be made available to subsequent generations the opportunity to visit this historic spot where Americans and Filipinos fought and died.

This will be no grandiose monument about which people can argue as to its architectural appropriateness, but it will be a simple restoration of a battlefield with one modest pavillion in which small meetings can be held and in which relics and items of historic interest can be maintained. After the U.S. Government has provided this then it is agreed that the Government of the Philippines will maintain it and will provide transportation between Manila and Corregidor. In fact, I am informed that there is now a boat plying back and forth which will convey people who desire to visit this shrine.

Eventually it is hoped that this will become self-supporting by the charge of a small fee, for transportation or admission. But whether or not that is the case, Members should know that the $1.5 million now proposed is the maximum cost to our Government.

Finally, one other thing, Mr. Chairman. The legislation would permit, however, interested citizens who desire to do so voluntarily to make contributions and through that means add to this memorial. Structures may be created if permission is given or additions may be made to existing structures or, I take it, other appropriate things can be done. But even if those changes permitted by the bill now under consideration are made, it will not be done at governmental cost but as a result of private contributions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this overdue and worthwhile legislation.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUMSFELD. On the last page of the report it states that there will be an auditorium and that movies will be shown in the auditorium and in other appropriate places. What might be the other appropriate places?

Mr. ADAIR. I should suppose it would be any place where people gathered, who had a sincere and reverent interest in this spot; perhaps schoolchildren or older persons in schools, educational groups or clubs.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The gentleman means in this country and other countries?

Mr. ADAIR. It could be either. As I read the legislation there is no geographical limitation put upon places where those movies may be displayed.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Does the gentleman know roughly what the volume of tourists has been or will be in this area?

Mr. ADAIR. The tourist volume up to date has been very small for two reasons. First of all, there has been no restoration up until very recently of the battlefield. Secondly, I am informed that the boat which now plies between Manila and the proposed site has just begun to operate. So we have no basis on which to form an opinion as to the eventual volume of visitors.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. If he would yield further I would like to make one comment on something contained in the report. On page 4 there is a letter from Frederick Dutton of the State Department. Toward the close of the letter he says:

> It would be most unfortunate should it become a matter of legislative controversy since such a turn might be misunderstood in the Philippines.

It strikes me that this type of approach to legislation is very poor. It seems to me it is entirely appropriate for the Congress of the United States to debate and discuss legislation without the fear that in the event we determined that for financial reasons this bill should not be approved, it would be misunderstood in the Philippine Islands.

I just wanted to make that comment.

Mr. ADAIR. In response to the gentleman from Illinois, I would point out that no speaker upon this bill today has put the matter at all upon the basis that he mentions here. We have tried to sustain it by arguments which we regard as entirely legitimate and worthwhile.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This apparently is a World War II memorial.

Mr. ADAIR. I think, basically, that is true, although it could be construed even more broadly, perhaps.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not see how it could be. For instance, the bill says it is to be a World War II memorial. Does the gentleman contemplate that we will be building another memorial for the Spanish-American War dead?

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman from Alabama has said to the Committee that he anticipates this $1.5 million is all that the Government will spend on this. Anything further will be the result of voluntary contributions. If that is desired, I see no objection to it. But I would anticipate that there would be vigorous opposition to the use of further governmental moneys.

Mr. GROSS. Not as vigorous as this opposition.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, there is not a Member of this body who does not recall the first months of our participation in World War II. As a result of Pearl Harbor the focus of the American people shifted suddenly from the events in Europe to those in the Pacific area. Our task as a nation was to move against the enemy to the West as well as to the East. Even while we were making massive preparations for counterattack, the Japanese forces moved rapidly forward. In quick succession Guam fell, then Wake, and then Hong Kong. To secure the southern flank and liquidate the principal bastion of American strength, the Japanese moved on the Philippine Islands. A small dedicated and heroic band of Americans under General MacArthur and General Wainwright, joined by increasing numbers of Filipinos, made a determined resistance against overwhelming enemy forces. Manila and Cavite fell on January 2, 1942. But the United States and Philippine forces fortified their position on Bataan Peninsula and held out until April 9. The island fort of Corregidor at the entrance to Manila Bay did not fall until May 6, 1942.

Like so many stirring events in history it was not the size of the force nor the number of days it fought against a numerically superior enemy that evoked our praise. It was the determination and the spirit of the defenders who wrote some of the most glorious pages in our history that none can forget. Our own sense of pride was, and is, matched only by that of the people of the Philippines. Their men stood side by side with our men in defense of freedom and against tyranny.

Ten years ago, Congress created a commission of nine individuals to work with a comparable group of Filipinos, to prepare an appropriate memorial to perpetuate the heroic deeds performed at Corregidor. As the report indicates the Commission has given consideration to various plans, some of which were exceedingly costly and did not meet with the full approval of the Congress. The present members of the Commission, which includes three distinguished Members of this House, recognizing their obligation, have come up with a plan that is much more modest in scope but equally dignified in approach. The general scope of the proposed plan is to provide appropriate markers and memorials on the island that will enable future generations to recreate and understand fully the defense of Corregidor. I come from an area, Mr. Chairman, that was the scene of many of the most momentous events in the early history of our country. We have commemorated many of those events by simple markers and memorials that serve as an inspiration to all who visit us.

Finally, it should be noted that the Philippine Government has already begun to make this an attractive historic site. Certainly we would be remiss if we failed to contribute our share in peace for the commemoration of our part in the war. I commend the outstanding work of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD] in finding an appropriate solution to a problem that has faced us for some years and urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as one who fought in the Philippines in World War II and who participated in guerrilla combat there and in that time in history, my emotions are deep on the subject before us. There is one thing I must say and that is that we Americans should in fact consider the Filipinos as our brothers who helped our cause as surely as we helped theirs. There should never be a feeling of lack of mutual love and respect between them and our people. It is unmistakable that there could ever be any conflict between us. The mere mention of the possibility of that has sent a shudder through me. On the contrary, though we must take the positions that we think are right for us to take, we have no right to require them at every decision to take the same positions. They are not our colonists. They had a right to the freedom we helped them to secure. They have a right to expect from us a high degree of gratitude for their loyalty and assistance to us. But for them, I would not be alive speaking to you today. But for them, many more American soldiers of two decades ago would have long since ceased to enjoy the air of the living and of the free. We are all deeply their debtors. All Americans are.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further request for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembed, That the Act entitled "An Act to create a Commission to be known as the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission" approved August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366), as amended, is amended by inserting immediately after subparagraph (h) the following new subparagraph:

"(i) The plans for the memorial shall include the following: Twin flagpoles at a high point on Corregidor Island, illuminated at night, from which the flags of the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines would fly; a suitable building, or buildings, for use as an auditorium and tourist center; and a contiguous battlefield park of appropriate size in which may be placed historical markers and mementos of the Pacific phase of World War II. For showing in the auditorium and in other appropriate places, the United States may participate in the preparation, in cooperation with the Philippine authorities, of a documentary film commemorating the story of Bataan and Corregidor, and other appropriate films of the Pacific phase of World War II. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, to the American Battle Monuments Commission, without fiscal year limitation, such sums of money, but not to exceed $1,500,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subparagraph (i). Nothing in this subparagraph (i) shall be considered to prevent the construction of such additional components as may be hereinafter authorized, or as may be provided for from public contributions."

SEC. 2. The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission shall cease to exist upon completion of the construction authorized by this Act, or on May 6, 1967, whichever shall first occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike out "American Battle Monuments Commission" and insert in lieu thereof "Veterans' Administration".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, sentiment is a precious thing, and with legislation that wells from the heart of sentiment we enthrone the traditions of our country and build our national character. We make no wiser use of the taxpayers money than in preserving spots of historic interest, reminders to new generations of the services, the suffering, the sacrifices, and the aspirations of past generations, reminders to our generation that in the same spirit of dedication, the same willingness to suffer, and sacrifice, if necessary, the same determination to persevere and to triumph for God and country, we must live up to and safeguard our national heritage. The restoration of our battlefields in the east and the west, south, and the north, the battlefields of colonial days, of Indian conflict, of Revolutionary, and War of 1812 dating, and of the war of brothers in the administration of Abraham Lincoln, have linked closely the yesterdays with the today. Our tourists visit them by the millions, and take with them their children, and they come away filled with the traditions of our beloved country.

The stand of the Americans at Corregidor is one of the great epics of history. The loyalty of our Filipino brothers, loyal under all pressures of danger, has never been surpassed. The heart of the United States of America and the heart of the Republic of the Philippines forever will beat as one. This is sentiment, and it is in sentiment that nations as well as individuals give the truest expression of their character and find, in the final analysis, the only source of strength that is enduring.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment and commend the members of the committee and the author of this bill for bringing it to the floor of the House today for action.

I would, however, like to be enlightened on one point. How much of this authorization will be spent on the films? I wonder if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] can answer that?

Mr. SELDEN. That would be a matter which would be left to the judgment of the Bataan-Corregidor Commission, as I understand it. I am sure they will be very frugal in their expenditures along that line. It would be in conjunction with the Philippine Commission as far as arranging for documentary films to be prepared and shown on the island, and in other parts of the country, if people desire to get copies of them.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I know that it is the thought of the gentleman from Alabama, but I would like to give voice to it here. It would be a disappointment to us if a large portion of this $1.2 million were given to a movie company, and I appreciate that it is not at all unusual for a movie or TV production to cost much over a million. I am sure, however, you do not contemplate giving a half million dollars, a million dollars, a quarter of a million dollars, or even $100,000 for the making of a film.

Mr. SELDEN. I might say to the gentleman that while I am only one of the three members of this Commission from the House—there are a total of nine—I would be opposed to any large expenditure for films and certainly I would express my views as a member of the Bataan-Corregidor Commission.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman, and I commend him for the great service he has rendered with this Commission. I hope that H.R. 7044 will be agreed to unanimously today. I may say to my good friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] there should not be any controversy over a matter of sentiment. After all, this is not too much money, the same as is being given by the Government of the Philippines, and I think it would bring some feeling of question among the brave people of the Philippines if they thought we were wrangling here in Congress on the sentiment of a monument in honor of their dead and our dead who died as brothers in a common cause. I may say that my interest in the Philippines goes back a good many years. So I am voting for this bill from the bottom of my heart, and I hope it will be agreed to unanimously.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to direct a question to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden], the author of this bill.

I note it says on page 1, beginning in line 8:

> The plans for the memorial shall include the following: Twin flagpoles at a high point on Corregidor Island, illuminated at night, from which the flags of the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines would fly.

May I ask the gentleman, is this a mandatory requirement that the flags of both of these nations fly at night, because the gentleman is well aware of the fact there are very few places in the United States today where that is a mandatory requirement.

Mr. SELDEN. As I read the legislation, Mr. Chairman, I would say this would be permissive, not mandatory.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to a Bataan-Corregidor memorial, but for the life of me I cannot understand why this country, having handed out to the Philippines more than a half billion dollars to pay war damages claims since the end of World War II in two bills passed by the Congress, one only a few weeks ago, plus additional millions for economic aid and military assistance, should have to spend this money. I am unable to understand why the Philippines cannot erect the proposed monument as a token of their appreciation for the sacrifices made by the Americans in the Philippines in World War II.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would point out to the gentleman that the Philippine Government has agreed to put the sum of 4 million pesos into this matter, which we are told at the current rate of exchange is the equivalent of $1.5 million that we are going to put into the fund. Then they have agreed to maintain it indefinitely. They have agreed to provide transportation facilities. On that basis I believe they are doing a fair share.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the fact that there will be an estimated $30 million as the residue from the last $73 million that was dished out to the Philippines, they are not digging up their own money to pay for this memorial. Under those circumstances I do not believe the gentleman will say that their share is coming out of the pockets of the Philippine people.

Mr. ADAIR. I would agree with the gentleman that this country has made available and has given to the people of the Philippines and the Government of the Philippines very large amounts, including the sum which the gentleman just mentioned. But this is a matter apart. I do not regard this as being a part of the other transaction. I think its very nature takes it out of that category.

Mr. GROSS. I would have to disagree with the gentleman as to the nature of the transaction. Slice it thick or thin, the money will be provided, and all of it, by taxpayers of the United States of America. This is the situation with which we are confronted. I know this bill will be approved, and I hope with all my heart and soul that we do not wake up one of these fine mornings and find ourselves engaged in further conflict, and I mean armed conflict, with the Filipinos over the newly organized Malaysian Federation of States. I do not have to remind the gentleman that as of this day the Indonesian Government and the Philippine Government have refused to recognize the Malaysia Federation. The U.S. Government supports the Federation. I do not know whether we are going to end up short of armed conflict with the Indonesians and Filipinos over that issue. I hope you are not doing something here today that will haunt you tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, I am not impressed by the suggestions that $1,500,000 is a small amount of money. There is no valid reason why the cost of this memorial cannot be paid out of the $30 million which is already gone and will eventually be made available to the Philippine Government for purposes other than payment of war claims. I must oppose this bill in its present form and express the hope that the Senate will take the action necessary to use the funds already available.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Natcher, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7044) to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission, pursuant to House Resolution 539, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks I have given considerable study to the foreign aid authorization bill as it relates to the minority views contained in the report which accompanied the proposal to the floor. In my judgment, the allegations made by the minority did much to distort the true picture of the program and did not provide a sound basis on which to objectively analyze the bill. My purpose today is to place the minority report, which was signed by 6 of the 33 members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in proper perspective.

To begin with, the minority charges that the United States is attempting to do too much for too many and too soon. There are few among us who would deny that we are driven by vast needs and desires which will not wait, and that the timing of foreign assistance is extremely important. In light of Cuba there can be little doubt that we have begun extremely late to assist Latin American nations to help themselves. Support of the independence of nations directly confronting the Sino-Soviet bloc cannot wait.

Certainly the beginning of the Marshall plan which resulted in the great West European prosperity of today could not have been delayed. In the late 1940's this Nation was willing to cope with the realities of the cold war with communism. Should we be any less willing in the early 1960's? Should our determination to persevere and endure diminish in direct proportion to communism's stubborn challenge to freedom around the globe? The rising tide of unrest under archaic and complacent social orders, and the rapid awakening of long primitive peoples preclude a policy which would withhold assistance until a country becomes a sure bet for growth and independence.

It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the minority report quotes a part of one sentence of the Clay report and tries to pass this off as the Clay Committee's appraisal of our foreign aid program. What did the minority—it matters little whether advertently or inadvertently—fail to include in its evaluation of the Clay report?

> There should be no doubt, however—

Says the Clay report in the paragraph following the few words which the minority lifted from context—

> of the great value of properly conceived and administered foreign aid programs to the national interest of the United States and of the contribution of the foreign assistance dollar in such programs to the service of our Nation's security. There is ample evidence of the need for foreign aid and that it can be successful under proper circumstances.

The minority also notes that there is considerable congressional and public disenchantment with the foreign aid program. I submit that this disenchantment was compounded by the minority's failure to point out that nine Congresses and three Presidents have affirmed their support for foreign aid as an indispensable tool in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy, and that the program and its objectives enjoy widespread support by the American people.

Again reflecting its own disenchantment, the minority emphasizes our assistance to most of the countries of the world, our diffuse aid effort, our failure to exercise any degree of selectivity, and the resulting impact on the U.S. balance of payments and gold holdings.

The fact of the matter is that the fiscal 1964 aid program is highly concentrated: 20 countries will receive 80 percent of our economic assistance, and 10 nations will receive almost 80 percent of our military aid. And our assistance within these countries is sharply focused on high-priority objectives.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that there are also minimal programs in various other countries and territories. It is also true that these limited assistance programs return large foreign policy dividends for a modest investment.

They demonstrate our interest in the well-being and progress of newly independent peoples. They counter Communist-bloc influence. They help assure access to strategic U.S. facilities. They provide a way to exert a positive U.S. influence on the paths that the emerging nations will follow. And they enable ex-colonial countries to continue receiving large-scale assistance from their former metropoles, without fear of unscrupulous political attacks alleging continued colonial domination.

Highly exaggerated by foreign aid foes is the adverse effect of the program on our balance of payments. The effect, in fact, is small and declining. Among other expenditures which have a larger effect are military spending overseas, and tourism and private investment.

What else do the facts show about foreign aid and balance of payments? They show that an estimated 80 percent of economic assistance funds committed in fiscal 1963 will be spent in the United States. By fiscal 1964 this percentage will be even higher. And, although the minority report fails to mention it, these U.S. expenditures have no adverse effect on the balance of payments.

Here are some other facts to be considered if an objective appraisal of foreign aid and balance of payments is desired:

U.S. military aid in fiscal 1963 resulted in U.S. procurement of more than 100 percent of total expenditures due to associated purchases in this country by recipient nations with their own funds.

The $1.025 billion cut in the foreign aid program is estimated to save in the balance of payments less than $150 million, compared to more than $875 million in losses to U.S. exporters.

Assaulting the foreign aid program on all conceivable—and many inconceivable—fronts, the minority report claims that the volume of U.S. aid may exceed the capacity of recipient countries to absorb it. To support its contention, it cites that some funds which were obligated 5 years ago have not been disbursed, that the foreign aid pipeline is increasing, and that significant amounts of prior aid commitments have been deobligated.

This situation results from the changing nature of the program and from prudent administration, but it does not provide support for the minority allegation. Prudent fiscal management requires that funds necessary to complete a capital project be committed before the project is begun. Otherwise enormous commitments which would require funding in future years would be accumulated without appropriate review and consideration by Congress and the American people.

The increase in unexpended economic assistance funds—which so frustrates the minority—is primarily due to the practice of long-range planning and budgeting, and to the increasing share of development loan projects in the program. It is important to note that the pipeline of supporting assistance grants has declined and will continue to decline.

We must not lose sight of the fact that, just as in this country, heavy construction projects abroad often take 5 or 6 years before the job is completed and funds disbursed. Ships, aircraft, and other equipment provided by military assistance frequently take considerable time to build and deliver.

All programs and projects are under constant review by field missions, Washington staff, agency audit, inspection teams, and the Inspector General to assure that foreign assistance funds are being properly used and satisfactorily implemented. In some cases, if progress is not up to par, or if conditions change, prudent management requires that disbursements be suspended until the situation is corrected. If it becomes clear that such conditions will not improve, the project is cancelled or reduced and funds are deobligated.

It was to encourage prudent fiscal management and to demonstrate fiscal responsibility that the foreign aid budget presentation to Congress included an estimate based on experience. The estimate recognized past deobligations, and new appropriations were requested only for the differences between these amounts and fiscal 1964 program requirements. This is the most conservative way of handling these funds and protecting the interests of the American taxpayer.

Another point which the report tries to make, Mr. Speaker, is that soft loans are extended to avoid hard decisions and may really be grants in disguise. On the contrary, development loans are now repayable in dollars pursuant to a loan agreement executed by the aid-recipient country creating a formal obligation to the United States.

Not only does the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 require a finding of reasonable prospects of repayment, but loans are extended contingent upon the willingness of the aid recipient to make and carry out difficult political and economic decisions, such as stabilization plans, austerity programs, and so forth. In addition, the terms of such loans are hardened as the economic situation of a country improves and demonstrates its ability to meet the additional foreign exchange burden. Greece, Israel, and Taiwan are cases in point.

The report, again hammering on the pipeline, charges that it is the best measure of "the excess in the flow of foreign aid and of the loss of congressional control over this program."

Clearly, the pipeline has no relation to this dual allegation. The pipeline simply consists of funds that have been committed to pay for goods and services which have not been delivered. These unexpected balances exist to meet obligations which have already been incurred. The funds are not available for other uses. They are not squandered. In fact, for the countries listed in the minority report, the development grants and supporting assistance pipeline showed decline more times than increase between the end of fiscal 1962 and fiscal 1963.

Substantial new obligations for development loans and Alliance for Progress loans have accounted for the increase in the total pipeline during the last few years. Disbursements for these loans are about equal to obligations in 1963, and the total pipeline leveled off. In any case, the pipeline table in the minority report has no relation to the suggestion that the recommended authorization is excessive, since the authorization is for new needs.

The minority report also states that the Inspector General has to date no legal authority to review and inspect projects financed out of the Social Progress Trust Fund.

The fact is that the Inter-American Development Bank, as trustee for the Fund, is responsible for providing supervision of its use, and makes full and detailed reports available to the U.S. Government, including the Inspector General for Foreign Aid. The Social Progress Trust Fund is administered as an international multilateral program. As such, it has generated strong and active support among Latin Americans and has been successful in inducing sound reform measures in connection with its project financings.

The minority report quotes the figure of 42,500 persons employed or participating in the foreign aid program.

This figure is misleading, Mr. Speaker, unless viewed in its component parts.

Twelve thousand eight hundred of these persons are foreign nationals employed by the Agency for International Development, the Defense Department, and other Government agencies. These persons, who are generally paid at lower wage rates, include janitors and other staff employees.

Four thousand seven hundred of those foreign nationals are paid in local currency contributed by aid-recipient countries.

Ten thousand five hundred U.S. nationals and officers and men of our armed services serve as advisers, trainers, and administrators in the military assistance program. These men are on active duty and are contributing to the national security of the United States.

Two thousand five hundred U.S. nationals are employees of contractors performing services paid for with AID funds. To count these individuals would be the same as counting all employees of Federal Government contractors as employees of the Federal Government within the United States.

Twelve thousand U.S. nationals are direct hire employees of AID, the Defense Department, or other Government agencies.

The minority, bent on wholesale destruction of the assistance program, also attacks contract foreign aid, which is technical and other assistance provided by private American concerns.

I am indeed pleased, Mr. Speaker, that AID is making an effort to tap the great skills and resources of American private enterprise, universities, and other Government agencies. This deliberate and well-conceived policy of effectively transferring American know-how, knowledge and enterprises to the less developed countries has received strong support from the Congress. I am dismayed that the authors of the minority report apparently object to this policy.

Another charge made in the report is that the executive branch makes long-term commitments without prior congressional authorization.

I would only remind my colleagues that the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 provides the President with express authority to enter into formal long-term commitments subject to the appropriation of funds. The Constitution, I might add, vests all Presidents—Democratic and Republican—with the responsibility to conduct American foreign policy, and our Presidents have long entered into understandings with various countries deemed vital to our own national interest.

The Dantas-Bell agreement, which was cited in the minority report, provides assistance to Brazil and was conditioned not only upon appropriation of funds by Congress, but also upon the Brazilian Government's taking a series of self-help measures. The Congress was fully informed as to the nature and amount of this commitment. And despite all allegations, insinuations, distortions, and rumors to the contrary, the executive branch has made absolutely no commitment to finance India's Bokaro steel mill.

I would also point out that all long-term commitments entered into by the executive branch are made with the clear understanding that the provision of assistance is subject to congressional appropriation of funds. Long-term commitments are sometimes necessary in certain cases to induce maximum contributions from other free world donors and to provide an assured basis for economic action. This enables the country to make and carry out the difficult economic and political decisions related to long-term development and stabilization programs.

Such commitments, however, do not handcuff the Congress, as has been alleged.

In a confusing section of the minority report the administration is criticized for its use of the contingency fund, the use of contingency funds for purposes not related to emergency situations and obligations late in fiscal 1962. The minority then commends the Executive for turning back to the Treasury some of the funds appropriated in fiscal 1963, but states that the above practices should be abandoned promptly.

The fact is, Mr Speaker, that of the total fiscal 1963 contingency fund availability only $148 million was used and that the $117 million balance will therefore revert to the Treasury. The administration of available fiscal 1963 contingency funds is actually the clearest possible demonstration of the Executive's dedication to prudent use of the fund.

As the majority report pointed out, the contingency fund is not intended for use simply in emergency situations but rather is intended to serve as a reserve to meet anticipated requirements which are not firm at the time of the congressional presentation, and unforeseen contingencies. These are precisely the uses to which the executive branch has put the contingency fund, as may be easily checked by examining the quarterly report to the Congress which explains each specific instance of contingency fund utilization.

Another charge made in the minority report is that the executive branch engages in the practice of permitting the use of our aid to create or expand competition by recipient governments with private enterprise.

The facts show that U.S. aid does not provide the means for competition between government and private enterprise. Fourteen development loans authorized in fiscal 1963, totaling $55.2 million, will provide financing directly to private enterprises. In addition, it is estimated that more than $350 million in development loan funds were made available for the financing of U.S. commodities which will go to private enterprise importers and industrial consumers in the aid recipient countries. AID also administers the Cooley loan program under which local currency loans are made to U.S. and foreign private enterprise.

Seeking still another target for its shotgun attack, the minority states that a thorough review of the military assistance program is long overdue. The fact is that, in addition to the Clay study, the military assistance program has undergone two such reviews in the past 5 years.

In 1958 a committee of distinguished business leaders and private citizens under the chairmanship of William Draper, Jr., conducted a review at the request of President Eisenhower. The Draper Committee recommended a continuing level of military assistance of about $2 billion a year. The Committee also recommended sweeping reorganization of the administrative machinery for handling military assistance, which was implemented by the executive branch.

In 1961 the President, Secretary McNamara, and Secretary Rusk reviewed the policies governing military assistance and made substantial changes in those policies. The policy determinations which resulted from this review reflect—

No new commitments of grant material assistance being made to France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Norway, and Japan.

Direct sales for dollars of military equipment, primarily to the developed countries of Western Europe, expected to reach a level of $1 billion a year by fiscal 1964.

A reappraisal of the military assistance program—in the context of the overall foreign aid effort—has just been completed by the Clay Committee. It recommended a phased reduction over the next 3 years to a $1 billion appropriation. Secretary McNamara has expressed agreement with this goal, although he believes it will require 4 years to implement. The administration program presented this year represents one step in this phased reduction.

Thus three separate and thorough reviews of the program have been held in the past 5 years, two of them by outside business and public committees—one in a Republican administration, one in a Democratic administration.

Again it is necessary to point out that although the minority cites the Clay report with approbation, it calls for cutting the military assistance program beyond those recommended by General Clay. They obviously paid little or no heed to the Clay report's warning of the dangers inherent in accelerating the timetable with drastic cuts:

> Mindful of the risks inherent in using an ax to achieve quickly the changes recommended, the committee recommends these reductions be phased over the next 3 years.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues just a few of the many critical salvos which have been fired at the House for its indiscriminate butchering of the foreign aid authorization bill. These comments are a reflection of my grave concern about the future of the cold war and, I believe, accentuate the danger of giving carte blanche validity to the minority report which I have discussed today.

The reputable and conservative Los Angeles Times warns that—

> A meat-ax cut by the House—falling with special impact on the military aid program and the Alliance for Progress—will not solve these (foreign aid) problems. For this year, at least, Congress should go along with the rockbottom $4 billion figure set by the President, provided the administration offers valid assurances that it has indeed read the handwriting on the wall.

The Washington Post observes that—

> There can be little doubt that the deep cuts in the appropriations for both military and economic aid will have a deleterious effect upon the position of the United States in the arena of world politics. It will be more difficult to turn back Communist military thrusts in the border regions and more difficult to promote a rate of economic growth in the underdeveloped areas which would insulate impoverished peoples from the blandishments of Moscow or Peiping.

Prominent news analyst Edward P. Morgan says:

> Let us examine the situation a little more closely in an effort to determine whether there hasn't been, on the basis of isolated mistakes and excesses, an injustifiably reckless disenchantment with the concept of aid, and a growing unreasoned impulse to chuck the baby out of the bath instead of rectifying errors and protecting the colossal investment we have already made in foreign assistance.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, during the past week the American people have been exposed to a political trial balloon. There has been a subtle buildup toward a wheat deal with Russia. I am hopeful, though not certain, that the deal has not already been made. It ought not to be made.

When Congress wrote the Agriculture Act of 1961 it was clearly emphasized in an attached statement of policy that we are opposed to agricultural trade with Communist nations. Despite this expression of the sense of Congress, late news reports indicate that government lawyers have advised the President that there is no legal prohibition against the sale. Technically there may not be. But the Congress is certainly on record against such.

I have no doubt that the President, with the vast powers granted him by the Constitution in the conduct of foreign affairs, can find legal justifications. But I am hopeful that he will not go through with the deal, on other grounds.

There is a considerable body of opinion which believes that the Soviet Union will once again make an Uncle Sucker out of Uncle Sam by reselling at a profit wheat thus obtained. There is a general wheat shortage, and a ready market, in Eastern Europe.

The world market price for wheat today is about $1.30 per bushel. The U.S. domestic price is about $1.90 per bushel. If we sell this wheat to Russia, the American taxpayers will be subsidizing the Russians at the rate of 60 cents per bushel.

In 1961, the last year for which full information is available, Russia sold wheat to her East European satellites at prices 16 percent above the world market price. It is my belief that that sort of profiteering will be repeated if Russia gets her hands on salable wheat.

To sum up the monetary aspects of this deal, if the administration goes through with it, it appears very likely that the American people will be losing 60 cents a bushel while affording the Russian Government the opportunity to make a profit.

Frankly, I do not think the American taxpayers are prepared to enter into such an arrangement.

Moreover, the greatest weakness of the Soviet Union's economic system is agriculture production. It has been determined by competent observers that the present agricultural crisis in the Communist countries is due to the collective farm system and the lack of incentives. Why should we bail out our enemies?

I am opposed to the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union at this time and under existing world conditions. If the Russian people were starving, I would favor feeding them with surplus food supplies through the Red Cross or similar organizations. But I cannot give approval to the trade of agricultural products to them under any other circumstances.

PORT OF OREGON

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the port of Portland is one of the Northwest's proudest economic assets and one of the major ports in the United States.

I am pleased when a stranger to Portland, which I have the privilege of representing, is impressed with the facilities. The latest recognition of Portland's worth as a port was highlighted in an editorial appearing this month in the Oregon Journal. Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the body of the RECORD:

EYES OPENED ABOUT OUR PORT

> He has attended sessions of port authorities in Baltimore and New York, Houston and San Francisco. He was a delegate to the 52d annual convention of the American Association of Port Authorities in Portland. He turned to his Portland host and said:
>
> "I am amazed. I never dreamed that Portland as a seaport ranks with the best in the Nation and the world. It took the trip from New York to this city to open my eyes. You have docks, drydocks, a bulk unloader and grain storage that rank with the most efficient anywhere. You have a channel equal to the needs of the larger ships, but when it is deepened to 40 feet between Portland-Vancouver and the sea, it will safely accommodate the largest.
>
> "We have had at our American Association convention important discussions of merchant marine regulation, regimentation, and legislation. But in my judgment the great continuing value to Portland is the sudden awakening of the leading men in port operation throughout the United States to the indisputable rating of this city as a world port with a great future."
>
> This comment was made after Col. Sterling K. Eisiminger, district U.S. engineer, had given his illustrated talk before the convention on "Portland—Gateway City." Instead of allowing his hearers to dwell exclusively upon ships and cargoes, docks and channel, Colonel Eisiminger graphically showed the vast trade territory which Portland serves at lower transportation costs and greater efficiency because of connecting water-grade routes. And in his climax, Colonel Eisiminger exclaimed:
>
> "A great inland empire—consisting of the lush green Willamette Valley lying at our doorstep and the vast grain and cattle region east of the Cascades—reached through one of the most beautiful funnels of commerce ever created by mother nature. And all served by a thriving deepwater port over 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean—Portland—truly a gateway city."
>
> It is very pleasant to add that Portland people do not need the "awakening" to the importance of Portland as world seaport. They agree with Colonel Eisiminger, "Take away Portland's deepwater channel and modern port facilities and we would have a country hamlet." With their votes and their bonds, they have given the proof—and they will continue to do so.

PROJECT 60

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an article by Ralph de Toledano, King Features Syndicate, entitled "Exclusive: McNamara's Most Dangerous Move."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WILSON** of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call to the attention of the Members of this body a most alarming procurement procedure being initiated by Secretary McNamara in the Department of Defense. It is labeled "Project 60," and it has the most seasoned civil and military heads in the Pentagon weary, if not, indeed, disturbed. However, there is nothing our military can do about it. Ralph de Toledano, of King Features Syndicate, quotes one official in the administration as saying, "In this administration, you do as you're told."

We are rapidly approaching a managed economy and the administration has taken the position that the people do not know what is best for themselves. This is borne out by Theodore C. Sorensen, special counsel to the President, in his new book being published by the Columbia University Press, in which he states, and I quote, "the public does not always know what is best for it."

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of this House will read the following article by Ralph de Toledano entitled "McNamara's Most Dangerous Move" in its entirety:

McNamara's Most Dangerous Move

(By Ralph de Toledano)

Very hush-hush, Defense Secretary McNamara has asked his assistants to make up plans for a new and, I believe, dangerous method of procurement. There is much grumbling and headshaking at the Pentagon over the projected move but as one veteran official put it, "In this administration, you do as you're told."

What Mr. McNamara hopes to put into effect is grandiosely called countercyclical procurement. What it means is chilling to the blood. The Pentagon, if Secretary McNamara has his way, will buy military hardware not as it is needed but as the economy calls for massive pump-priming.

In other words, if there is prosperity in the land, then military procurement will be drastically reduced—no matter what the international situation. If unemployment begins to rise, the Pentagon will rush through orders for new weapons or reorders for old ones. If missiles are in short supply, the Pentagon will ignore the fact—just so long as the Nation's economy is on the rise.

Thus, countercyclical procurement—or procurement that runs against the economic cycle.

Secretary McNamara's Pentagon is being organized to employ this countercyclical procurement as soon as possible on a regional level and in political fashion. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is highly elated over its Project 60 which divides the country into 15 regions. Each region is under a special procurement officer who reports directly to the Secretary ignoring responsible civilian and military officials.

If the regional chief feels that things aren't going too well in his area, he is expected to let Mr. McNamara know so that defense funds can be siphoned off into the district. Here again, this is a new wrinkle. In the past, the Pentagon was expected to favor to some degree depressed areas in allocating defense contracts. But under Project 60, need (political or economic) rather than efficiency or low cost is the major criterion.

Under "counter-cyclical procurement" the Nation's military power will decline when we are prosperous and rise when we are having economic troubles. Or so it would seem. But since the lead time on weapons is so great—and adversely affected by stop-and-go procurement—the monies necessary to prime the economic pump would be a long time going into the pipeline of production—and larger sums would be needed. Designers of new weapons systems—if this administration ever gets around to such matters—would never know whether or not their blueprints are ever to be used. The chaos in procurement would be fantastic.

Under Project 60, there would be another dangerous factor. If regional economic needs are to be the guideline for procurement, who is to say if political considerations are supreme. Already this administration is penalizing States which happen to be Republican, and tossing the juicy contracts to those presumed to be Democratic.

Most frightening of all is the consequence of these new forms of procurement. The Pentagon is the Nation's biggest customer, spending well over $53 billion a year. If it is to pick and choose the time for making this or that weapon, guiding itself (however conscientiously) by its reading of economic signs, then it will in effect begin to control the economy. Its experts, moreover, will have to keep a grip on a variety of raw material sources. This can only lead to a repressive effect on the free market which—to work at all—will have to succumb to wage-price manipulation.

All of this explains why civilian and military officials at the Pentagon look so worriedly at Secretary McNamara. They do not know what he will do next—or what area of the national life will fall into his grasp.

CHEAP FOREIGN IMPORTS' EFFECT ON SHOE FACTORY IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. **WYMAN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WYMAN**. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce the scheduled liquidation of yet another shoe factory in the State of New Hampshire. This time one employing 375 workers. I have repeatedly submited facts and figures relating to the disastrous impact of cheap foreign imports on the New England shoe industry as part of continuing appeals to the President and his special representative, Christian Herter, for quota restrictions on these imports.

None has been forthcoming although the situation in the industry is becoming more critical every passing day. I am beginning to wonder what we must do to have protection for American jobs and American workers in our own markets here at home? How do we get attention? How do we save the jobs before it is too late?

Mr. Herter was not appointed special representative to the President on trade expansion matters to preside over the liquidation of New England industries.

Many of us in the Congress have joined in signing a petition to the President requesting Presidential quota relief. I have appealed separately to Mr. Herter stating flatly that workers whose jobs are at stake are sick and tired of listening to how some of our foreign friends might be disappointed and might not like us so much if we restrict a reasonable share of American market to American production.

The time for this protection is now. The livelihood of another 375 people is on the skids to foreign competition. Winter is coming. These people and their families, along with hundreds of more who have become jobless because of the refusal of this administration to protect them are beginning to ask not what they can do for their country but what is our country doing to them.

Appeals from the shoe industry, from the Congress, from the Senate, from a multitude of voices are either disregarded by the White House or fail to reach it because of State Department interference. If this keeps on, we will have no course left except through legislation to modify the Trade Expansion Act so as to take away from the executive branch the responsibility for this protection and revest it in the Congress itself. This is the long road, however, and in the meantime there will be more and more closings and greater and greater disasters where all this can be stopped by a stroke of the President's pen to provide a reasonable amount of quota protection. When he was a Senator the President was all for protection. What has happened to him?

Let us restrict the cheap imports. Let us give American workers a fair and reasonable share of our own market. These people in this industry are not asking for financial aid. They are only asking for an equal opportunity to compete with foreign products in the markets of the United States. This is their due, their right.

In fact, it is the responsibility of the Government of the United States to act now, not to pretend that action is not permitted under the Trade Expansion Act. Delay, excuses, inaction, laziness, indifference, even an attitude favoring foreign jobs over American jobs seems to characterize this Government's role. I believe it is fair to ask why. Why do you not act, Mr. President and Mr. Herter, to protect New England jobs?

WHAT I WOULD TELL A SON

Mrs. **FRANCES P. BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **FRANCES P. BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, one of the few people in the world who has a right to talk to parents although he has no children is J. Edgar Hoover. He is working more for our children than all of us put together. He has written what we call a credo for parents which, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the

Record at this point as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 21, 1963]

What I Would Tell a Son

(By J. Edgar Hoover)

(Though he never married and never had children of his own, the U.S. leading crime fighter offers a credo for parents.)

As I ponder the problems we find ourselves all but swamped by today, I cannot help thinking that the rules which prevailed in my youth would still work for boys and girls now.

The Hoovers, for example, were a close-knit family. My mother and father shared equally the pleasures and the responsibilities of one daughter and two sons. Our circumstances were modest; yet none of us ever wanted for any necessity of life—and those necessities were, then as now, affection and the security of a balanced home.

Our parents taught us to have a good time, but to do it without trampling on the rights or property of others. The boy who went astray in those days worried a lot more about the punishment he knew was waiting for him at home than about the treatment he might expect from the police, the courts, or other authority. How seldom is this true of problem youths today. * * *

If I had a son, I believe I could help him most by providing him with these five indispensables: a personal example to follow, an understanding of the importance of restraint and ideals, a sense of discipline, a pride in his heritage, and a challenge to meet.

Children certainly need an example to follow. I feel the most important lesson which my sister, my brother, and I received at home was the example set by our honest, hard-working parents. A plaque on our living room wall summed up the whole thing. It read: "To command the respect of others, one must merit respect himself." * * *

If I had a son, I'd think constantly about the part I had in helping him become a man. I would do my level best to understand him, to be a pal without being a pest, to encourage his boyish love of games and adventure, to direct him quietly to the right kind of friendships—those he would find, for example, in the Boy Scouts and the Police Athletic Leagues. * * *

To help him grasp that while life may be hard it is also rewarding, I would impose the gentle pressure of performing regular tasks well within his capacity at each age level. I would gradually increase my requirements and penalize him proportionately if he let them slide—until that welcome day when he would begin to put the pressure on himself.

Above all, I would teach him to tell the truth—and I, in turn, would tell him the truth no matter how it hurt or embarrassed. Truth telling, I have found, is the key to responsible citizenship. The thousands of criminals I have seen in 40 years of law enforcement have had one thing in common: every single one was a liar.

In addition to setting a good personal example, I would also teach a son the importance of restraints and ideals.

Contradictions arise continually in the lives of teenagers, for today our youth must cope with the specter of an adult world rife with inconsistency. To the youngster, adults often appear by their attitudes to be saying: "Ignore traffic regulations." "Make your own rules." "Cheat whenever you think you can get away with it." To turn the screw harder still, there are the unreasoning demands of an often arrogant juvenile world: "Don't be a square." "You're chicken." "Join the crowd."

But teenagers who have a strong set of standards to fortify their native intelligence do not fall prey to the smut merchant, the narcotics peddler, or the rest of the rodent swarm which fattens commercially upon the inexperience and natural curiosity of youth. These young people have developed, with parental aid, the moral restraint to rise above temptation, to turn their backs on the "smart set," and to remain true to their ideals.

Today, too many young people are developing neither the moral standards nor the restraint necessary to get along in a free society. Every community has its share of these youth. They are the members of teenage gangs who belligerently roam the streets in search of "a rumble"; the school dropouts who waste endless hours in unproductive idleness and, often, wrathful despair; the juvenile thrill seekers whose early delinquencies inevitably lead them to progressively more serious crimes.

These are unhappy youth. Their arrogant defiance of authority is a pitiful pose that seeks to conceal the tragic fear and insecurity which they feel. This fear, this insecurity exist because we have failed to prepare them to meet the personal demands and responsibilities of life in our American Republic.

The way out of this dilemma is for youngsters to acquire a sense of discipline. But before a boy can practice self-discipline, he must learn discipline from others. We must establish for him standards of acceptable behavior—and we must enforce those standards.

Children need guidelines. We owe it to them to spell out what they may and may not do. We must hold them strictly accountable when they breach the rules of decent conduct. When we are weak or inconsistent, when we pamper or overprotect—even in the preschool years—we set a pattern of confusion for our children. In the years ahead, our mollycoddling can lead only to their resenting and despising authority.

A youngster also must be taught to have a pride in his heritage. Theodore Roosevelt, a man of great strength and discipline, had boundless love for his country and her ideals. "Americanism" he said, "means the virtues of courage, honor, justice, truth, sincerity, and hardihood—the virtues that made America. The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living, and the get-rich-quick theory of life."

President Theodore Roosevelt knew that America was born of adversity. He believed that her people have risen to their greatest heights in the face of grave challenge. He knew also that softness—mental, physical, or spiritual—is the mortal enemy of all who cherish freedom.

Has a "softening process" begun to set in for this generation and its elders? I earnestly hope not. Still, the danger signs are clear. They signal the growing need for all of us to increase vigilance against this disease that eats from within.

Finally, I want to stress the importance of challenge, which is the indispensible compatriot of freemen. It is a wellspring of alertness and vitality for nations which find themselves tempted to grow complacent and slothful.

Our youth need challenge. We must destroy the false conception which today increasingly saps their spiritual stamina with the lie that life in a democracy is a mere jumble of rights and privileges without responsibilities. From their very early years, young people should have individual chores, specific goals, constructive projects to help sharpen their capabilities and develop strong character.

Above all, our youth need our help to insulate them against the negative forces—immortality, overindulgence, apathy, neglect—which prevail in so many areas of modern life. For doing this vital job in a way that will last a lifetime, there is nothing like a healthy home.

NEW MARKET NEWS SERVICE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear my opposition to the so-called New Market News Service which the U.S. Department of Agriculture put into operation on August 1. I also wish to extend support to Congressman Hosmer's bill, H.R. 8214, which would prohibit departments and agencies of the Federal Government from participating in activities which are in competition with private news services engaged in dissemination of news or other information.

I believe the general opinion of the newspapers and broadcasters is contained in this editorial, which appeared in the September 16, 1963, edition of the Rochester Post-Bulletin published at Rochester, Minn.

Official News Agency Should Be Killed Now

A sure sign of a totalitarian country, or one that is under tight control of a dictatorship, is the official news agency. It is an organ of the Government, putting out such news as will maintain the regime's existence, carefully eschewing all that may do it harm. It controls and disseminates news for its own political purposes.

Even in wartime, this country has had no official news agency. It has had a news code under which the various communications media work voluntarily, not under Government pressure.

All that can change now that Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has begun a service circulating farm market news at no charge to subscribers other than the cost of leased wire transmission. For it creates a medium which can grow over the years until it carries all news in competition with the private news services. With its Government subsidy, it can quickly extinguish them. Then goodbye to America's vaunted freedom of the press. Simply by withholding service, the Government could kill any inimical newspaper.

The time to kill a rattlesnake is when it raises its head, not after it strikes. Congress should make short work of killing off this threat to one of the basic freedoms.

This editorial clearly states the case. I have here a copy of a pamphlet, AMS 510, published by the Department of Agriculture and explaining its wire service. AMS 510 states:

> USDA reserves the right to cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who abuse the service by misrepresentation of reports, or for any other reason when, in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable.

What is a misrepresented report? That is left up to the arbitrary judgment of the USDA and its sole judgment into the bargain.

AMS 510 also says:

> The service is subject to such adjustments as are deemed desirable by the USDA in content, length, scheduling, and timing of reports.

This gives the USDA complete and arbitrary control over all information transmitted, from beginning to end.

These self-made rules of the USDA obviously gives that Department the following weapons:

First. Complete control over all information gathered by people on its own payroll and thus agents of USDA, but transmitted to impartial news distributing agencies for their use.

Second. It gives USDA control over how the information is used, for it can "cancel at any time the connection of any and all subscribers who abuse the service by misrepresentation of reports or for any other reason when, in its sole judgment, such cancellation is desirable."

Third. It gives the USDA further controls amounting to censorship, for it may make "such adjustments as are deemed desirable," in the "content" and the "length" and the "scheduling" and the "timing" of reports.

Meanwhile, it could possibly destroy private news services, which must sustain the added cost of a corps of impartial news gatherers.

I believe that this service is in direct conflict with the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press. It seems to me as a layman, that it could be turned in a matter of moments from a marketing service to a propaganda machine of unlimited proportions. If this so-called service gains headway—and with its low cost made possible by Government subsidy it very well could—it would have a direct teletype line into the offices of many media for public distribution of information. It would have arbitrary control over how the information transmitted on those lines was gathered, how it was compiled and how it was used. Any paper failing to toe the mark in any way could be cut off from service. Even the printing of a report contrary to the opinion of the USDA could be grounds for cutting off service, under the clause of its own rules allowing it to stop service for "any other reason" which in its "sole judgment" is sufficient grounds.

How quickly such a service could be used to propagandize for the Department is easy to see. Once more, according to its own rules as outlined in AMS 510, it would take only an "adjustment" of "content" to turn the wire service into a voice lobbying to the public for, let us say, a favorable vote in a farm referendum.

The rapid transmission of market reports extended at a low cost to news media by the USDA may sound harmless enough on the surface. But as we have seen, it could be quickly converted to other uses. But even if it were not, the precedent set by this network is dangerous.

If the Agriculture Department can have its wire service, why not the Department of State, the Commerce Department, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and all the rest of the executive branch? Why not a wire service for the Congress, in which we could control what was said about us, and release what we wished to be known?

Then, one day, for the sake of efficiency, it could become a Federal Government News Service—or, as some have termed it, an American Tass.

The potential dangers of the USDA News Service are apparent. It is a question fundamental to one of our most fundamental American rights—freedom of the press. Is the government or a department of it, in any way, to be allowed to control the flow of information, or is it not? If it is—in even a small way today—then we may as well prepare for the same control in a much larger way tomorrow. If we are to maintain and support the concept that the American press—and by this I mean both newspapers and broadcast media—is to be free to disseminate news and information it has gathered without any control except the ethics of the journalistic profession, then we should support H.R. 8214 and once and for all make it clear that no agency of the Federal Government is free to compete with the normal functions of the free American press.

In addition, I would like to call your attention to a letter I have received from Mr. William C. Whittenberg, director of the Livestock Market Institute in South St. Paul, Minn.:

> LIVESTOCK MARKET INSTITUTE,
> *South St. Paul, Minn., September 18, 1963.*
> Hon. ALBERT QUIE,
> *New House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just finished reading an article in the August 31 issue of the National Provisioner pertaining to the expansion of the wire service facilities now operated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
>
> Frankly, I was appalled to think that a branch of our government had taken such a giant step in the headlong race to convert our democratic form of government to socialism. I'm afraid I get a little panicky when "Big Brother" from George Orwell's "1984" gets so close at hand.
>
> I sincerely hope that you will support H.R. 8214, the bill introduced by CRAIG HOSMER, of California, which will halt the expansion of the USDA teletype service. You may be aware that within our livestock industry, there is growing feeling that the present teletype system of the Market News Branch of USDA has actually been a disservice to the industry, and helped to break down the pricemaking structure of the markets it claims to serve.
>
> I'm sorry that Representative HOSMER's bill is not broader, so as to stop all Federal agencies from interfering with private industry. However, this is a good start, and I hope that H.R. 8214 will set control and remove the competition between Federal bureaus and individuals who still believe in the basic principles of free enterprise on which our Nation was founded.
>
> Congressman, I urge you to use your influence in the House Agriculture Committee and on the floor to obtain passage of H.R. 8214.
>
> Sincerely,
> WILLIAM C. WHITTENBERG,
> *Director.*

Mr. Whittenberg is in a responsible position within the marketing industry. Yet he feels that this interference as he terms it, is actually a detriment to the marketing industry. He would go further to prevent Federal agencies from interfering in private industry than is provided for in H.R. 8214.

Last week, on the floor of this House, we heard earnest pleas for a tax cut to stimulate the economy. At that time, Members from both sides of the aisle expressed the belief that the free enterprise system has made this Nation great. They said that to continue to expand, the economy needed to be freed from the shackles of high taxation. The gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman MILLS, told us that a tax cut was a "move away from big government."

I heartily agree with the gentleman from Arkansas, Congressman MILLS, that big government should leave as many enterprises as possible in the hands of free enterprise. The free enterprise news services of this Nation are a big business, contributing economically to the Nation as well as in service. Are they to be destroyed by a Government-subsidized news service?

Furthermore, as Mr. Whittenberg points out, there is a feeling in the livestock industry that the USDA dabbling in market reporting is an actual disservice to that industry.

Thus, we are faced here with not only a Government agency in conflict with the constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press, but in conflict with two great industries—the free enterprise news wire services and the marketing industry.

This has all been brought about by the establishment of one wire service—but a wire service such as none of us or our forebears in the United States have ever seen before—one operated, subsidized, and controlled by a Government agency.

So the problem is compounded and becomes not only a moral and ethical question, but an economic one as well.

I urge that every Member of this House show his faith in the concept of freedom of the press, and his faith in the ability of the wire services and marketing industry of our free enterprise system, by supporting H.R. 8214.

FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 24 of this year the House passed H.R. 6016, to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of projects for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in 10 river basins. This additional authorization was in the total amount of $784 million for the 2 fiscal years of 1964 and 1965 for these river basins: The West Branch of the Susquehanna, central and southern Florida, Brazos River, Arkansas River, White River, Missouri River—including authorizations for both the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Interior—Ohio River, upper Mississippi River, Los Angeles-San Gabriel River, and the Columbia River.

This action of the House was to provide for continuation of projects already authorized to be constructed in these river basins, many of which projects are underway at the present time. No new projects were included in this bill; it merely provided for a periodic increase to the original monetary ceilings for work by the Corps of Engineers, and in the Missouri River by the Department of Interior.

The other body emasculated this bill by eliminating entirely all authorizations for river basins for fiscal year 1965, and which will have to be reinstated next year and should be included this year for orderly programing. The Senate thereby reduced the basin authorizations to $161 million for fiscal year 1964 alone, and, at the same time, adding to the bill seven highly controversial new projects for initial authorization in the total amount of $448,547,000. All seven of these projects were removed from the omnibus rivers and harbors bill of last year in conference, and one was rejected by a vote of the House last year. I was ranking Republican conferee on that conference. The river basin authorizations, as passed by the House and the other body, and the projects added by the other body are as follows:

River basin authorizations

	Amounts in H.R. 6016 as passed by House, fiscal years 1964-65	As amended by Senate, fiscal year 1964
West Branch, Susquehanna	$2,000,000	0
Central and southern Florida	21,000,000	$4,000,000
Brazos River	30,000,000	14,000,000
Arkansas River	157,000,000	31,000,000
White River	8,000,000	1,000,000
Missouri River (Corps of Engineers)	80,000,000	0
Ohio River	150,000,000	47,000,000
Upper Mississippi River	11,000,000	0
Los Angeles-San Gabriel River	30,000,000	12,000,000
Columbia River	195,000,000	36,000,000
Missouri River (Department of the Interior)	100,000,000	16,000,000
Total	784,000,000	161,000,000

Projects added by Senate

	Estimated cost
Cape Fear River Basin, N.C	$25,143,000
Trotters Shoals Dam and Reservoir, Ga.-S.C	78,700,000
Flint River, Ga	63,200,000
Dardanelle lock and dam, Arkansas	404,000
Waurika Dam and Reservoir, Okla	25,100,000
Missouri River bank stabilization	3,000,000
Devils Jumps Dam and Reservoir, Ky.-Tenn	151,000,000
Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Mont	50,000,000
Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Idaho	52,000,000
Total	448,547,000
Grand total, as amended by Senate	609,547,000

The addition of these seven highly controversial projects, five of which involve generation of power, has brought action on this bill to a grinding halt, and in the meantime money for the previously authorized development of 7 of the 10 river basins is running out, and work is being stopped, or will be stopped soon. Authorizations for the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin have already been exhausted. All work in this basin would now be stopped were it not for the fact that the Los Angeles County Flood Control District has advanced $2.5 million to the Corps of Engineers to pay the Government's contractors for continuation of the most essential parts of the work.

The Corps of Engineers now plans to send 30-day notices of work termination to contractors constructing projects in the other river basins on the following dates: Central and southern Florida, November 1, 1963; Brazos River, November 1, 1963; Arkansas River, December 1, 1963; White River, January 1, 1964; Ohio River, October 15, 1963; Columbia River, January 1, 1964.

As authorizations for these river basins are exhausted, unless the contractors are able and willing to continue work at their own expense, essential improvements for navigation, flood control, water supply, and other purposes, which have been previously authorized by the Congress, will be brought to a halt. Not only will the necessity for contractors to move off of projects and return later result in additional costs, but substantial delays will result in construction of essential improvements, to the detriment of the public.

This is no time to decide the far-reaching and major issues involved in public power projects which have been added by the other body, and the House should not be coerced into accepting any of these new projects which are not financially feasible and fully justified as a means of securing approval by the other body of additional authorizations for the river basins which are clearly justified and needed at once.

Stoppage of work in the central and southern Florida river basin is going to be highly detrimental to the entire southeastern portion of the United States. Work is now in progress under 30 contracts in this river basin, and following the corps issuance of its 30-day notices of termination of work on November 1, 1963, it is anticipated that contractors will commence shutting down on December 1, and by December 31, 16 contracts will be fully shut down. The remaining 14 contracts are in final stages of completion, and they will be continued until finished. The 16 contracts on which work will be stopped involve a total contract amount of $23,734,400, of which $13,010,000 has been obligated through August 31, 1963.

What will happen in the central and southern Florida river basin is indicative of what will happen in the other river basins, only on a much larger scale. I sincerely hope that in the public interest the other body will not insist upon the controversial projects it added to the river basin authorization bill, but rather that these projects may be considered in an orderly fashion next year when regular omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill is up, when they may be properly and fully evaluated upon their individual merits by the House without the pressure, urgency, and threat of stoppage of work on previously authorized projects in seven of the major river basins of the country.

As a probable conferee on this bill, I believe it my duty to call this matter to the attention of the House in hopes the other body will relent and permit these needed noncontroversial basin-continuing authorizations to pass.

If the Senate fails to relent, the House should consider passing a separate bill containing only river basins authorizations.

RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WHALLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, although residual oil imports have been limited by Executive action since March of 1959, the serious damage to domestic fuels industries and to the economy caused by excessive imports has not been alleviated.

Despite the control program, residual imports have been increased from an original rate of 343,000 barrels per day to the present quotas which are at a rate of 575,000 barrels per day, or an increase equivalent to 84 million barrels per year. Even more important, there has not yet been created a permanent formula to restrict the future encroachment of foreign oil on domestic fuels markets which would permit and, indeed, encourage the proper and necessary growth of productive capacity of domestic fuels; namely, coal and residual oil produced from U.S. crude oil.

It now appears obvious that the sorely needed fuel market stability—the opportunity to plan ahead and compete on an equitable basis with foreign fuel—which the coal producers, miners, and transporting railroads have so long sought can be achieved only through a legislatively established formula.

This is not because of any failure of intent on the part of the executive branch, but rather that a control program of this nature, lacking any guideline of law, is subject to practically irresistible pressure from interested parties on both sides of the question. The result has been an import control program which has not been effective, and which has benefited no one. The history of the control program to date bears this out. There have been a total of 8 increases in quotas since the program was first established in 1959, and permissible imports have been raised from 343,000 barrels daily to 575,000 barrels daily.

Total imports this year will be the equivalent, in energy value, to 50 million tons of coal, or about 11 percent of total U.S. production last year. However, the true impact is even more severe than this would indicate, because all the coal displaced by imported residual along the east coast originates in the hard-hit unemployment regions of the Appalachians, principally in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, East Kentucky, and Maryland. Fifty million tons of coal is equal to some 23 percent of the entire production of coal in these Appalachian fields in 1962.

The present method of setting residual import quotas creates an almost intolerable situation for the President and the Secretary of the Interior. When the time for establishing a new quota nears, the executive branch is subjected to pulling and hauling from all sides. The coal industry strives to hold the line, while spokesmen for the oil importers and some consumers of residual oil along the east coast insist that the program be abolished, or at least further liberalized to permit increased oil imports. In addition to all of the pressures from domestic sources, the President must also contend, at each of these quota-establishing periods, with the demands of the Venezuelan Government, which insists that its economy would be jeopardized without increased quotas.

Passage by the Congress of legislation establishing a reasonable and equitable formula for determining permissible import quotas would relieve the President of these odious pressures. To have any chance of acceptance, the formula outlined in such legislation must be realistic and fair. I recognize, as a political reality, that quotas cannot be rolled back now, and any legislation offered must accept this fact.

I believe the bills which have been introduced adequately meet the problems I have outlined. Stated simply the legislation provides that residual oil imports into Petroleum Administration Districts I through IV—all of the U.S. mainland east of the Rocky Mountains—in any calendar quarter shall not exceed 50 percent of the total consumption of residual oil for fuel in districts I to IV during the corresponding calendar quarter of the previous year. Actual district I to IV imports in the 1963 calendar year under present quotas will amount to an estimated 48 percent of total residual oil consumption.

This is a generous formula. In fact, if this formula had been in effect this year it would have resulted in a 3-percent increase in total imports. However, in future years imports could be expected to stabilize at or near the present level.

The bills also contain a provision to permit the President to grant special allocations on a spot basis to prevent any real hardship shortage, but make it clear that such emergency allocations would not be added to the quarterly total as a part of the base for quota allocations the following year.

From the standpoint of the coal industry, the formula has the virtue of providing permanent stability in the market for competitive fuels. The industry would know what it can expect in the way of imports and can plan accordingly.

This is essential if first, investment capital is to be made available to develop and open new mines to meet future and growing demands for energy, and to replace the mines that are being depleted each year; second, skilled manpower, without which modern coal mining is impossible, is to be encouraged to remain in the labor force and aid in restoring the economy of hard hit coal mining depression areas; and, third, railroads, which transport 75 percent of all U.S. coal and derive a substantial portion of their revenues therefrom, are to be able to maintain and replace equipment and rolling stock to meet growing fuel hauling demands.

Likewise, the users of residual would have clear-cut guidelines as to the amount of cheap imported residual which will be available, and would not be encouraged to invest in new equipment and plants to switch to residual on the assumption that future quotas will be steadily raised to take care of any new demand.

This has not been true under the present import control program. Even the Government has continued to build new installations equipped only to burn residual oil, although it has had in effect a program which, if it accomplished its purpose, should have meant that additional quantities of residual would not likely be available for such new installations.

We believe this legislation will not only establish a formula to hold the level of imports at a fair rate for all concerned, but also will eliminate these unpleasant and disconcerting political pressures which are an inevitable part of the present control system.

NATION'S BUSINESS MAGAZINE TELLS: WHAT YOUR FEDERAL TAXES BUY—AN EXCELLENT TREATISE ON THE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS BOONDOGGLE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record an article entitled "Look What Your Federal Taxes Buy," which appeared in the October 1963 issue of Nation's Business.

It is an excellent, well-researched article which took its editors all over the country as they sought out, and reported on, accelerated public works projects.

The article substantiates my worst fears about this blank check program which has turned into a political slush fund with the President holding the pen.

Created under the guise of drastically reducing unemployment, the program is being used, instead, to insure the continued control of Government by the Democrats.

In debate on the original bill and the 1963 increased ARA authorizations—$450 million—I cited abuses and spending on swimming pools, ski slides, and golf courses. This article substantiates my position in opposition to this program.

The article follows:

Look What Your Federal Taxes Buy

Go to Hollywood, Fla., sometime and stroll on the boardwalk by the sea.

While you're strolling you might want to pay particular attention to the walkway itself. You'd be perfectly entitled to. It was recently extended with the help of Federal funds to which you contributed as a taxpayer, as did other taxpayers all over the country who will never see it or use it.

If you live in the northeast, you could run over to Bridgeport, Conn., P. T. Barnum's hometown, and look at the new 12,000-seat city stadium. You can't see a ball game there yet, but you many enjoy watching workmen put the final touches on a $1 million facility which is costing taxpayers across the country $475,000.

More and more Federal tax dollars, including yours, are being pumped into what Washington euphemistically calls the accelerated public works program. APW (that is WPA spelled backwards) is a year-old, politically potent, come-and-get-it spending machine to build strictly local projects with other people's money.

Your tax dollars are buying mercury vapor street lights for Tahlequah, Okla., a game room for Alma, Mich., traffic signals for Homestead, Pa., barbecue pits at Crab Orchard Lake, near Herrin, Ill., a municipally run parking garage (with a misplaced ramp) in Bluefield, W. Va.

The story is much the same throughout America. In cities, towns, and villages, more than 4,000 accelerated public works projects are underway, and more are coming.

All this started in September of 1962, when President Kennedy signed the Public Works Acceleration Act, "authorizing the appropriation of $900 million for the initiation and acceleration of Federal public works projects already authorized, but not yet financed by Congress, and of State and local public works projects, for which Federal financial assistance had been authorized by prior legislation."

To qualify for APW money, a community must meet one of several standards. In general, these cover communities of persistently high unemployment or low median income.

Communities meeting the qualifications number about 1,100 all over the Nation.

At last count approval had been granted for 4,431 projects 1,535 of which were financed by Federal money alone.

The first $400 million for this quickie spur to the economy was appropriated by Congress a year ago this month. Additional spending of $450 million was okayed last May and, to date, $230 million of it has actually been spent. APW is becoming an increasingly expensive piece of the Kennedy administration's public works program which could cost $9 billion this fiscal year alone. Such spending makes up nearly 10 percent of the Federal Government's total red-ink budget.

Congress now has before it legislation by Representative John A. Blatnik, Minnesota Democrat, which would double the current authorization for accelerated public works.

On the Senate side, similar legislation introduced by Senator Pat McNamara, Michigan Democrat, would provide $1.5 billion more for new projects. Senator McNamara heads the Senate Public Works Committee.

PROJECTS ARE LOCAL IN SCOPE

Unlike conventional public works—huge dams, bridges, military installations, and such—the new program nickels and dimes the taxpayer for projects which cannot conceivably be considered national in scope. Nor could many of the projects be described as meeting an "essential public need" as the act requires.

The funds are flowing into an array of projects including city halls, county buildings, hospitals, road improvements, swimming pools, jails, trash incinerators, fish hatcheries, docks, and many more. So many, in fact, that a recent directory of the projects filled almost 90 pages of small type.

Most of the projects are pint-sized undertakings that individually don't offer much of a target to advocates of Federal economy. Some—by the admission of local officials—were really unnecessary but nonetheless sought in the spirit of, "It's Federal money and everybody's taking it, so let's get some, too."

William A. Peterson, city engineer of Hollywood, Fla., which has nailed down three grants, told Nation's Business, emphasizing that he was expressing his personal opinion:

"As a taxpayer, I'm personally against these Federal giveaway programs in general. I don't believe in the pump-priming theory. But as long as the money is available, and as long as the people in our city are paying Federal taxes, we feel we should try to get our share. We're glad to get the money because it helps our city, but we could get along without it. Hollywood has a low bonded indebtedness, and we could pay eventually for such things ourselves."

The Public Works Acceleration Act provides money for public works for which only financial assistance is authorized by other laws. So, projects for which Congress has only authorized loans are eligible for out-and-out giveaways. The money comes from the Area Redevelopment Administration, after other agencies have approved.

Representative William C. Cramer, of Florida, a ranking Republican on the House Public Works Committee, puts it this way: "The law gives the President a checkbook full of blank checks to buy political goodies practically anywhere it will help him. The President can approve or withhold money for projects in such a way as to influence Members of Congress to back his New Frontier program or buy political support for favored candidates or pay off political obligations. It's a political slush fund paid for by the taxpayers."

The political use of the law was evident in a number of cases during 1962's congressional campaign.

For example, Representative Frank T. Bow, Ohio Republican, was surprised to read in the afternoon papers the day before the November election that his Democratic opponent, Ed Witmer, was officially announcing the approval of a $198,000 grant for an addition to the Tuscarawas County courthouse in Mr. Bow's congressional district. Mr. Witmer said the Housing and Home Finance Agency had informed him of the grant.

But Mr. Bow still won reelection. Moreover, a referendum to approve a bond issue to finance the matching local share of the courthouse addition also lost at the polls.

DO PUBLIC WORKS PRODUCE EMPLOYMENT?

Supporters of accelerated public works—and all public works projects, for that matter—argue that the program has a job-generating effect. An investigation by a team of Nation's Business editors indicates that the program has actually created relatively few jobs but much dependence on Washington.

The editors, who went into communities where Federal funds are being spent, found local officials well informed on the amount of money they were getting and enthusiastic about the projects being built. Most were also highly complimentary about the role their Congressman or Senators had played in obtaining the money. Here are a few of the facts which the investigation turned up.

In Westfield, Mass., the city government cut taxes this year at the same time it was getting Federal dollars for two projects. One is a garage to house city-owned trucks. Overall cost: $93,000—with $35,000 paid by taxpayers all over the United States. A newly approved $200,000 project ($100,000 footed by U.S. taxpayers) involves widening and resurfacing of Westfield streets, improving street drainage, and building sidewalks. This work will take place mainly in a handsome residential section.

In Miramar, Fla., 10 miles north of Miami and immediately west of Hollywood, three APW projects were applied for and all three were obtained. One of the projects is a newly completed, one-story city hall, which also includes space for police and volunteer firemen. Cost of the building: $255,000. U.S. taxpayers' share: $125,000. Miramar, operating in the black, has no real estate or personal property taxes, drawing its income entirely from building permit fees, a 10-percent tax on utility bills, a franchise levy on utilities, and other sources.

Joseph J. Tagg, administrative assistant to the mayor, says: "Without the Federal grant we probably would have put off building a new city hall until the public demanded one. We have been getting along very well as we were."

In Hollywood, Fla., where the broadwalk has been extended 1¼ miles, City Engineer Peterson says that projects in his county—for which nearly $2 million in Federal funds are being spent and another $1.8 million recently granted—have very slightly reduced unemployment. Reducing unemployment is ostensibly the prime purpose of the program.

The contractor for the broadwalk hired no new employees, he says. (Hollywood, incidentally, uses the word broadwalk, rather than the traditional boardwalk because it is made of asphalt instead of boards.)

"My own opinion is that the accelerated public works program does not accomplish the good that Washington expects * * * to put it under the guise of creating employment is a misnomer," Mr. Peterson says.

He adds that the prospect of getting APW funds actually held up expansion of water and sewer facilities to serve some 4,000 people in areas annexed by Hollywood in 1962–63.

In Charleston, W. Va., city officials got a grant of $566,000 for a city incinerator to burn refuse. Total cost of the project is estimated at $1,118,000, with the cost difference to be made up partly by a local revenue bond issue. No local tax money will go into the project, nor will charges for refuse collections be increased.

Charleston's new incinerator will replace one built in the depression under WPA.

The city also is preparing an application for further Federal help for a $1 million enlargement of a civic center, including construction of a skating rink. Here again, the local matching fund would be financed by revenue bonds redeemed by user fees and not local taxes.

In Philadelphia, one project being accelerated is the $1.4 million modernization of an exhibit hall in the convention center. This work was scheduled to be done by the city itself this year and was speeded up by 3 to 6 months at best when Federal money became available. Philadelphia has a 6-year capital improvements program, but has decided not to increase its own spending because of the availability of Federal grants. At one point recently, approval had been obtained on 23 projects to cost a total of $12,379,200, of which the taxpayers of the country will pay almost half.

The top adviser to Mayor James H. J. Tate on city development says Philadelphia's powerful Democratic Representative William J. Green has been extremely helpful in speeding APW action in Washington, adding that Mr. Green's help would be sought in expediting approval of five more pending projects.

In Miami, 9 of 18 APW projects have been OK'd, including three libraries, two fire stations, one sanitary sewer project and three street rebuilding projects totaling $1.6 million. One of the fire stations, already completed, cost $135,000, including $48,500 paid by U.S. taxpayers. Asked about help from local congressmen, City Budget Officer James L. Harris said:

"Representative Dante Fascell has taken a strong interest in this program and has always worked hard to get Federal grants for Miami. I guess we're fortunate in being represented by a man like Fascell, who ranks high with the administration."

In Raleigh County, W. Va., where a grant of $1.2 million was secured to help develop a manmade lake, knowing the right people in Washington played its part. County Court President John C. Ward (President Kennedy's county campaign manager in the critical West Virginia primary of 1960) met in Washington with Richard K. Donahue, a White House aid, to urge the lake project along.

Mr. Ward says of West Virginia Senator Robert C. Byrd: "He sure did knock a lot of heads together to get this project through."

In Bluefield, W. Va., U.S. taxpayers are paying $190,000 of a total cost of $380,000 for addition of two more decks to a city-owned, fee-charging parking garage. The rest of the funds will come from revenue bonds, which will be retired from the public parking authority's fee income.

To beat a tight starting deadline, Bluefield had to rush its plans. As a result, says City Manager R. G. Whittle, Jr., one of the ramps in the garage is being erected in the wrong place.

APW has stimulated local spending in Bluefield, however. A $318,000 grant for a flood control project, which the city is matching on a one-third basis, helped swing a local bond issue for a total of $540,000. These funds will be used for more than $300,000 of strictly local public works projects, in addition to matching the Federal grant.

In New Brunswick, N.J., a Nation's Business editor encountered added evidence of the role which politics plays in the program (APW is putting $2 million into the new Middlesex County administration building and $150,000 into street improvements).

In last year's congressional election in a newly created district it was feared that a hot primary fight might hurt Democratic chances as a result of a split in party ranks. Just before election, the Area Redevelopment Administration announced grants for seven projects in the district. Edward J. Patten, handpicked choice of local Democratic chief David T. Wilentz, a close friend of President Kennedy, was elected. But later, five of the seven projects were dropped as not meeting the APW requirements.

In Asbury Park, N.J., City Engineer Leon S. Avakian, asserts that, "If you're not on the ball, you'll never get anything."

Asbury Park has gotten Federal approval of two projects—1,300 feet of boardwalk ($224,000) and a new water well ($128,000) with APW putting up half the cost. In addition, the city has approval for other projects, including a library renovation.

Mr. Avakian says he worked with Timothy Burke, fieldman for the Housing and Home

Finance Agency, in getting a fast go-ahead on the boardwalk project and repairs to a city pavilion destroyed by fire on August 6.

"Burke knows all the ins and outs," says Mr. Avakian. "We already had the plans for the water well and the boardwalk, but the cost was too high until APW came along. Then we shot the plans right in. We also went to Philadelphia and took the papers from office to office to get the necessary approvals. This is a Republican area, but these fellows treat us wonderfully."

Last month, another fire swept Asbury Park's oceanfront, damaging a second city-owned pavilion and destroying 900 feet of boardwalk entirely separate from the walkway consumed August 6. City Manager Kendall Lee told Nation's Business he would seek APW grants to replace the boardwalk burned in the latest fire, and also to help rehabilitate the second damaged pavilion.

"We're a depressed area and we can't handle these projects without Federal assistance," Mr. Lee said. "Besides," he added, "only the Federal Government has the money to finance construction of monumental-type buildings like our pavilions. They are a page from the past that we would like to preserve."

In Hoboken, N.J., the city council rejected a $715,000 grant for recreational facilities approved by the Federal Government and refused to raise $745,000 in local matching funds. The opposition was led by Council Chairman Edward J. Barrone, who argued that the city needed sewers and other facilities more than recreation. He says:

"We have been losing industries because of inadequate facilities and a rising tax rate which is $125 per $1,000 valuation. I didn't think the new recreation facilities justified the higher taxes."

The project was supported by Mayor John J. Grogan, international president of the Marine and Shipbuilding Workers Union. It became a local political issue and a slate backed by the mayor lost four seats to opponents of the project.

Area Redevelopment Administrator William L. Batt, Jr., claims that a total of 8,205 man-years had already been worked on APW projects as of June 1 this year. Inquiries by Nation's Business in various sections of the country failed to yield any conclusive figures on just how many jobs have been generated.

Individual contractors told of putting on 7, or 10, or 15, or more additional men here and there to handle work stemming from the grants, but a number of contractors said these increases in their payroll probably would have come about anyway.

An official of Alma, Mich., where three APW projects were given a Washington go-ahead, says the grants did not result in a reduction of local unemployment, since "the contractors doing the work came in from outside our city and even from outside our county—and brought their own employees with them."

(In one Alma project a snackbar, TV room, and game room are being added to an existing recreation center.)

In many instances, as in New Brunswick, the kind of workers hired are skilled men who belong to unions and are not on the unemployed rolls.

Similarly, officials of some communities seem unsure as to whether or not the Federal spending serves to trigger increases in local spending. Mayor John W. Smith of Beckley, W. Va., where a municipal building and garage got U.S. money, said no more local funds will be spent as a result of APW.

Mayor Smith's town, like others, had its own unbudgeted and idle funds at hand and was operating in the black when it applied for grants from the Federal Government.

The mayor says Beckley is going ahead with plans for six other projects, to have them ready for application if more Federal money becomes available.

Asked what the city would do if the program were not extended, he said Beckley, which has no general bonded indebtedness, would go ahead with the projects on its own through revenue or general obligation bonds—admittedly at a somewhat slower pace.

Economists have long questioned the benefits of public works projects, especially those of the small-scale variety typified by accelerated public works. But even temporary employment is some relief, particularly in areas with chronically excessive number of jobless workers.

The political appeal of accelerated public works, however, is undeniable. A bridge—or a city hall, a firehouse or a boardwalk—may stand for generations, as a monument to politicians' deeds.

Representative Joe L. Evins of Tennessee, declares in his new book, "Understanding Congress," * * * "the Member of Congress is, of course, a special pleader and a sort of superlobbyist for his constituents and his area. There are students of our Government who have deplored this aspect of a Congressman's responsibility. In my view, his responsibility here is fundamental to our form of government."

Many others, however, are convinced that the Nation is not served best by the tug-of-war of individual interests, but by a dedication to the national interest. They are convinced that public works porkbarreling is both unethical and unneeded in conducting sound government and winning elections.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, civil rights legislation designed to open up the labor market to all citizens should be the first item on the civil rights agenda. The Civil Rights Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee has included an FEPC title in the draft bill. Its merits support and we look to the Democratic majority to keep it in the bill.

Of equal importance is legislation designed to remove daily humiliation from the backs of so many of our citizens. I refer, of course, to the refusal by so many public places to accommodate American citizens because of their race.

It should be remembered that there is nothing new about laws relating to public accommodation. Over 30 States have statutes on their books barring discrimination in public places. These States base their statutes on the Common Law which our forebears brought to this country from England.

English common law on this subject, which any good hotel lawyer will tell you, is common law also in the United States and has a long history. The other day I came across a key English case decided in 1701. Listen to this language written in 1701 from Lane against Cotton, by C. J. Holt:

> Whenever any subject takes upon himself a public trust for the benefit of the rest of his fellow subjects, he is eo ipso bound to serve the subject in all things that are within the reach and comprehension of such an office, under the pain of action against him. If on the road a shoe fall off my horse and I come to a Smith to have one put on, and the Smith refuse to do it, an action will lie against him because he has made profession of a trade which is for the publick good and has thereby exposed and vested an interest of himself in all of the king's subjects that will employ him in the which of his trade. If an Innkeeper refuse to entertain a guest, when his house is not full, an action will lie against him; and so against a carrier if his horses not be loaded, and he refuses to take a packet proper to be sent by a carrier.

Members will also be interested in a pertinent quote from St. Benedict, which, while firmly stating policy, is not without humor. Listen to the words of St. Benedict talking about the right of a traveller to be received in the monastery:

> If any pilgrim monk come from distant parts, if with wish as a guest to dwell in the monastery, and will be content with the customs which he finds in the place, and does not perchance by his lavishness disturb the monastery; but is simply content with what he finds, he shall be received for as long a time as he desires. If indeed he finds fault with anything, or exposes it, reasonably and with the humility of charity, the Abbot shall discuss it prudently, less perchance God had sent him for this very thing. But if he be found gossipy and contumnacious in the time of his sojourn as a guest, not only ought he not be joined to the body of the monastery, but also it shall be said to him honestly, that he must depart. If he does not go let two stout monks, in the name of God, explain the matter to him.

FARM COST PRICE SQUEEZE WORST IN 24 YEARS

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, more bad news for American farmers. The Department of Agriculture announced yesterday the parity ratio for September. It was 77—down 1 point from a month ago, down 4 points from a year ago.

Parity ratio shows the relationship between the prices farmers get and the prices they pay. The last time it sank so low was in 1939.

The Department reported the September index of prices received by farmers was 241 percent of its 1910–14 average, while prices paid by farmers hit 311 of the 1910–14 average. In the past month, prices paid by farmers went up 1 point, while prices received went down 1 point.

The U.S. farmer is in the worst cost-price squeeze in 24 years. The current parity ratio of 77 is in sharp contrast with the 90-percent parity promised by Candidate Kennedy.

SOVIET WELCHES ON $10.8 BILLION LEND-LEASE DEBT TO UNITED STATES—NOT ONE CENT REPAID ON WORLD WAR II AID

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

New York [Mr. Pillion] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the present administration is actively considering the sale of about 100 million bushels of wheat to the Soviet Government.

The Soviet Government has been probing the possibility of the extension of large trade credits to her by the United States.

Although the terms of the proposed $200 million sale of wheat by the United States have not been made public, it is almost certain that the United States will be asked to sell to the Soviet on credit.

It is timely to remind this administration and the taxpayers that the Soviet received $10.8 billion of military and civilian goods from the United States during World War II. These military weapons and civilian goods were a major factor in bolstering the Soviet capability to survive and emerge from World War II as a victorious nation.

After World War II, the United States, contrary to the Soviet-United States agreements, wrote off all military items and such civilian goods as were destroyed during the war. This writeoff amounted to $8.2 billion, leaving a net debt of $2.6 billion due from the Soviet to the United States.

The Soviet has welched on her debt. She has not paid one red cent on the lifesaving $10.8 billion worth of aid and assistance given to her when she was in dire need.

It would be a most foolish proposition to again extend credit to the Soviet when it has conclusively proven itself to be unworthy of trust, and completely lacking in honor and integrity.

The sale of wheat to the Soviet will not appreciably aid the critical deficit in our balance of payments because the Soviet will not pay in gold. The Soviet gold is reserved for the purchase of European industrial machinery and raw materials from the British Commonwealth.

Any purchase made by the United States from the Soviet must correspondingly reduce purchases from friendly countries.

The effect of the U.S. State Department's newest policies are to strengthen Soviet political power and to bolster its sagging economy.

The State Department is embarking upon a policy of faith, hope, and charity toward the Soviet in spite of the fact that there has not been one concrete step or word from the Soviet to indicate any change in the Soviet-Communist campaign of subversion for the destruction of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, a summarization of the $10.8 billion lend-lease transaction between the United States and the Soviet follows:

Soviet-American Negotiations on Lend-Lease Debt

During World War II and immediately thereafter the United States had undertaken large-scale shipments of lend-lease supplies to the Soviet Union. Lend-lease fell into three broad categories: (1) military goods, (2) civilian goods, and (3) pipeline items in both groups on order but undelivered at the end of the war. The total of the first two categories was estimated at $10,800 million. The "pipeline" account for items the Soviets received after the war ended, was set at about $222 million. As of July 1959, the Soviet Union paid $72 million on interest and principal. This account has been regarded as a separate matter from lend-lease. The United States wrote off all military items delivered during the war, except naval vessels, and all civilian goods known or believed to have been consumed or destroyed during the war.

Discussions on settling the lend-lease debt took place in 1947–48 at which time the United States fixed the bill at $2,600 million. In order to expedite settling the issue, the bill was cut in half to $1,300 million and later reduced to $800 million. The Soviets first offered to pay $170 million. In 1951, they raised it to $240 million, and in 1952 to $300 million.

Negotiations on lend-lease, which had been dormant since 1952, were revived after the Camp David meeting between President Eisenhower and Khrushchev. During the discussions at Camp David Khrushchev complained to the President about the multiple restrictions on Soviet trade to the United States. The Johnson Act of 1934 prohibited the extension of long-term credits to any nation that defaulted in its debts to the United States. Other congressional restrictions also existed. In reply, the President declared that agreement on the lend-lease debt would provide a better political atmosphere and also would facilitate efforts to remove the remaining barriers to a full and free flow of trade. At the time it was believed that the Soviet reason for reopening lend-lease discussions was its desire for increased trade with the United States.

Negotiations began in Washington on January 11, 1960, and after four sessions were broken off on January 27. Soviet Ambassador to the United States Mikhail Menshikov insisted that negotiations be broadened to include, (1) a trade agreement and (2) the extension of long-term credits by the United States. Mr. Charles E. Bohlen, the American negotiator, told Menshikov that his demands could not be considered without changes in legislation. At the moment, he said, the Soviet demands were not negotiable, and as long as the Soviets insisted on talking specifically about them, conversations could not be fruitful. The United States insisted on a lend-lease settlement as a separate and independent question. However, Menshikov would not yield his position, and subsequently the Soviet Government reaffirmed this view. During the Bohlen-Menshikov talks, no specific figures for settlement were mentioned; nor did Menshikov indicate the type of trade the Soviet Union was interested in or the scope of credits it desired. In fact, Khrushchev had made it clear at Camp David that he was not asking for credits. Most American officials were said to have been puzzled by the Soviet position. Reportedly, some considered it a probing action directed at discovering whether the United States might soften its position in hopes of achieving agreement with the Soviet Union.

According to the Department of State (in February 1963 and Aug. 16, 1963), negotiations on the lend-lease debt have not resumed since the Bohlen-Menshikov conferences in January 1960.

On the basis of the foregoing data it is apparent that the Soviet Union is in no hurry to fulfill its lend-lease obligations. It could be argued that if the Russians were really disposed toward settling this question, the Bohlen-Menshikov meetings provided the opportunity. Tensions in the climate of affairs had eased, contributing to fruitful negotiations if the intentions to negotiate existed on the Soviet side. Generally, the period in Soviet-American relations from September 1959 to May 1960 was one of relative calm. The deadline in Berlin had been lifted at the Camp David meeting, and a rather friendly spirit seemed to prevail in relations until the U–2 incident and collapse of the Paris summit conference in May 1960. Still, the Russians did not take this opportunity to negotiate seriously. Rather, they used the lend-lease issue as a lever to gain particular economic advantages for themselves.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order that I may inquire of the majority leader what the schedule for the remainder of the week is.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry as there have been some changes in the program for tomorrow.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel] advise that in addition to the matters previously announced, reported out of the Committee on House Administration, three resolutions may also be called up, House Resolution 531, House Resolution 532, and House Resolution 533 regarding additional allowances for communication, postage, and stationery for the Members of the House. I also desire to announce that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] advise that they will not call up the bill, H.R. 6237, on tomorrow as was previously announced and, accordingly, this matter will be dropped from the program for tomorrow.

I desire further to advise that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Davis] has stated he will ask unanimous consent tomorrow to call up the bill, H.R. 8667, authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Can the gentleman give us any information as to what may be scheduled for Thursday and the balance of the week?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not able at this time to make any further announcement with respect to the program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is a probability that there may be some conference reports; is there not?

Mr. ALBERT. There is the possibility that there may be conference reports.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I assume that the gentleman will announce the program for the following week later this week?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct. We will keep the House advised and will advise the House just as soon as we can of any additions to the program this week and also with respect to the program next week.

Mr. **BROWN** of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION IN DISSEMINATION OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **FLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful people in this country are concerned over the increasing imbalance between what we are spending to develop our knowledge of science as against what we are spending to increase our knowledge in the social sciences and humanities. It is a difficult problem. It is not easy to find ways in which the Federal Government can strengthen studies in the humanities and social sciences. It is a most controversial field.

But this bill before us, H.R. 6237, offers a method for strengthening study in one humanistic discipline, American history, that cannot in any way be made controversial, if there is a full understanding of its objectives. It does not subsidize the actual writing of history. It does not subsidize the study of history by any particular scholar or group of scholars at one institution. Its sole aim is to help preserve and disseminate to all scholars, to all jurists and legislators, indeed to all citizens, the authentic manuscript materials that are the sources from which history is written.

We have depended too much on the private foundation for the dissemination of this country's record. Who has supported the publication of the Franklin Papers, the Jefferson Papers, the Adams Papers, the Hamilton Papers, the Madison Papers? The foundations and several of our large commercial and university publishing enterprises have done the most. Altogether, more than $3 million of private funds have been granted or made available for documentary publication projects since the program began in 1951 under the auspices of the National Historical Publications Commission. I think the Federal Government should have been contributing its share from the first. I think it should stand ready now:

First, to come to the rescue of any of these great undertakings when their continuance is threatened by lack of funds; and

Second, to contribute to the enlargement of our country's published documentary heritage by offering partial support to important new projects, particularly those involving the publication on microfilm of unique source materials now held by public and private depositories located throughout the United States.

It has been suggested that if the Federal Government steps in to help with grants, contributions from private sources may fall off. The opposite is true. The foundations feel they cannot continue to carry the entire load themselves in an area where the Federal Government should obviously be doing its share. They are cool to requests for funds for new projects with old ones unfinished, but would help some of them if the Commission could, by its recommendations, guide them as to what is most important and by its grants meet them part way. The Commission is asking the private foundations for twice the funds for its 10-year program—$5 million now for endowment funds and $500,000 each year for grants—as it is requesting from the Federal Government—$500,000 each year for grants—and the foundations, you may be sure, are watching to see if Congress comes through with our part. If you want continued private support, for what is in essence a cooperative program, we must demonstrate our belief in the value of this work by passing this bill. Otherwise we may see collapse a program that has reached its present stage of promise by the generosity of private givers. If we provide only this amount each year, the program will be kept moving forward. The results will be cumulative as successful projects inspire new ones.

We have done something with Federal funds for national historic sites and historic buildings, and their preservation has made our country richer. We could do more. Few activities of our Government are more popular with our people. We have put up costly monuments to our great men, and I do not decry it where these monuments are in themselves great art. But when it comes to publishing the valuable papers of these great men, wherein their greatness is best made manifest and communicated to later generations, that we would leave—if this bill is not passed—to be supported almost wholly by private foundations. Surely this is inconsistent.

The greatest monument to Thomas Jefferson will not be the structure on the Tidal Basin for which we spent more than $3 million. It will be the Jefferson Papers. In some ways the most impressive features of both the Jefferson Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial are the words of these men that are there engraved upon stone. All their wisdom cannot be put upon stone for the tourist coming to Washington. Let us get their words into books that can be put into our school libraries and public libraries throughout this Nation, and into our own homes. Inscriptions on stone were the best the ancients knew, who did not have the printing press and the camera.

All that is asked each year is a fraction of the amount that goes into one of our mammoth interstate highway exchanges, of which we build hundreds, perhaps a thousand or more, each year. For the safety of our Nation, a knowledge of American history is just as important as a highway interchange. I might remind you that the House of Representatives has its member on this Commission, Congressman MILLER of California, and that as chairman of our Space Committee—Science and Astronautics—he was able to trim this budget by hundreds of millions of dollars. And the Senate's member on the Commission, Senator SALTONSTALL, a few days ago lost by a single vote an effort to trim the procurement budget of the Department of Defense by 1 percent, which would have saved $157 million. The distinguished members of the National Historical Publications Commission, both Democrats and Republicans, are not spenders. They want just this small sum that can be used to encourage and stabilize a great program already underway, a program as essential for our Nation's future and for democracy's future as what we are doing for science.

REPORT ON TOURISM

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PEPPER**. The Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, preparing an advisory report on tourism for the gentleman from Texas, Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman, Monday held its first consultation meeting with public and private leaders working in behalf of tourism in the United States.

The subcommittee, consisting of Representatives CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, chairman; RICHARD T. HANNA, Democrat, of California; and WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, met with M. Roger Stake, Florida Development Commission; Irving Sprague, representing Governor Brown of California; Somerset Waters, consultant to the U.S. Travel Service; James Gross and Carl Levin, National Association of Travel Organizations; Jerry Sussman, Miami Beach, representing the hotel industry; Roger Doulens, vice president, Pan American World Airways; Stephen Halsey, vice president, American Express Co., and Voit Gilmore, director, U.S. Travel Service.

The gentleman from Florida, Chairman PEPPER, said that the Government and tourist industry leaders strongly recommended that there be a full-scale study of what the travel industry of the United States could do toward reducing the tourist deficit if its efforts were fully mobilized and coordinated.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] added that the group was agreed that the travel industry of the United States is a "sleeping giant" which needs to be aroused to the full measure of its potential toward meeting the international balance-of-payments deficit by stimulating tourism from abroad and within the United States.

The gentleman from California, Representative HANNA, pointed out that developing more tourism from without the United States and more tourism within the country would not only help reduce the balance-of-payments deficit but would contribute to increased employment throughout the Nation through the expansion of the travel industry.

The gentleman from New Jersey, Representative Widnall, emphasized that in his opinion there is a woeful lack of adequate information abroad about tourist attractions in the United States and the economy of travel in the United States.

Voit Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service said that since two-thirds of the balance-of-payments deficit of the United States as reported recently to the Congress by the President was due to the tourist deficit, public and private agencies working together to promote tourism from abroad and within the United States could contribute greatly toward reducing the Nation's balance-of-payments deficit and at the same time stimulate the national economy.

POSSIBLE CONVERSION TO PEACETIME ECONOMY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we in the United States do some solid thinking about the economic problems of possible conversion to a peacetime economy.

We now spend more than $50 billion annually for military purposes. If the day should arrive when a substantial part of military spending can be reduced, it will be imperative that the manpower engaged in defense contracts be able to find employment in another sector of our economy.

We must prove that the democratic system can meet the economic challenge of peace as well as war.

Khrushchev has bluntly told us that he intends to bury us economically. Being thus forewarned, we would be prudent to start thinking right now about how our Nation will survive the withdrawal of billions of dollars in defense contracts from the economic bloodstream should world conditions so permit. It will be too late to do so when additional millions of Americans are searching in vain for jobs that do not exist.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH CENTER OF U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE IN NORTH CAROLINA'S RESEARCH TRIANGLE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Kornegay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the Record an editorial from the Greensboro Daily News, a daily paper published in my congressional district and in my hometown of Greensboro, N.C., which relates to the desirability of locating the contemplated Environmental Health Center of the U.S. Public Health Service in North Carolina's Research Triangle.

On September 26, 1963, the House and Senate approved the conference report on H.R. 5888, the 1964 appropriation bill for Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor, and the bill is now on the way to the White House for the President's signature. In reporting the bill, the House Appropriations Committee deleted the sum of $1,441,000 for the environmental health center, which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare wanted to locate in the Washington area, leaving the matter open as to the location of the facility. The Senate committee, however, restored the sum and at the same time referred to the location of the center in the Beltsville, Md., area on land which had been made available for that purpose by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In the conference between representatives of both bodies, it was agreed to delete the appropriation of $1,441,000, which had been restored in the Senate.

This action by the House and Senate conferees, as approved by both Houses of Congress, means that the whole question of site has now been opened up, and that the offer of the State of North Carolina to donate a site for the center in the Research Triangle Park can be fully and, I earnestly trust, favorably explored. The Governor and State officials, and the entire North Carolina delegation in the Congress, continue to feel strongly that the Research Triangle Park offers the most logical location for this health facility for reasons which have been rather forcibly presented to the appropriate committees in Congress, to the President, and to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. We entertain this conviction not for chauvinistic or regional interest purposes but because we are convinced that nowhere in the United States can such a desirable and appropriate location be found, with the donation of land by the State, and with the full facilities of three large institutions of learning bounding the points of the triangle comprising the Research Triangle Park—the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the State College of the University of North Carolina at Raleigh, and Duke University of Durham. We shall continue our efforts to have the environmental health center located in the Research Triangle Park, and I am particularly grateful to the conferees of both bodies for deleting the appropriation from the bill and thereby permitting a time of decisionmaking, and what we in North Carolina feel will be the moment of truth for making the right decision. Certainly I intend to continue my efforts unabated to have the fine potentialities for optimum performance of such a center enhanced by its location in the Research Triangle Park, which I am proud to have located in my congressional district.

I have recently received a progress report from the Research Triangle Institute of the Research Triangle Park, dated September 1963, which is an impressive record of accomplishment of the Research Triangle in the short period that it has been in operating existence.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask your indulgence in placing another editorial in the Record in this connection, which appeared in the Chapel Hill Weekly, Chapel Hill, N.C., located in my congressional district, on September 18, 1963, which comments on the Research Triangle Institute and the Research Triangle Park and the fine research and achievement atmosphere which prevails there.

Again, let me say that we intend to plug unashamedly in North Carolina to have the Environmental Health Center located in the Research Triangle Park for, among many other convincing and undebatable considerations, we feel that what has been so beneficial to North Carolina and to the cause of science can also be beneficial to the Federal Government, as has already been demonstrated by the location of the U.S. Forestry Sciences Laboratory, an extension of the Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, which was dedicated and opened in the Research Triangle Park in 1962.

The editorials from the Greensboro Daily News and from the Chapel Hill Weekly follow:

[From the Greensboro Daily News, Sept. 30, 1963]

What North Carolina Has To Offer

There is still a possibility that the Public Health Service's Environmental Health Center will come to North Carolina's Research Triangle.

Just when it appeared that the center would go to a Maryland site near other Public Health activities in the District of Columbia, a House-Senate conference committee deleted a $1,440,000 appropriation for the Maryland site's purchase. Substantially the U.S. Department of Agriculture stepped forward to offer a site, without cost, at Beltsville, Md., so that the cost factor has again been minimized.

But the question of location has been reopened by the conference committee's action and the change of sites, although within a relatively small geographical difference.

Ultimate decision on this facility should be on a strictly factual and public service basis. What is to be done there will affect the health of millions of people, perhaps all of us, and the very best possible job of research and saving should be the governing factor.

We assume that North Carolina's bid is being made on such a basis. Insofar as cost to the U.S. Government is concerned, both the Maryland and North Carolina sites are being offered free of charge. There is one difference: The Government already owns the Beltsville tract; the North Carolina tract would represent a new and additional holding for the Public Health Service. As such it would be another Government asset, leaving the Maryland site for utilization by the Department of Agriculture or any other Federal agency which might need it later.

While there are undoubtedly arguments in favor of having the Environmental Health Center close to Washington health service and activities, there is also an advantage in dispersal of Federal facilities. There is growing congestion in the District of Columbia and immediately adjacent areas. And the Government itself has been advocating dispersal in event, perish the thought, of war. Physically, instantaneous communication and the jet-age have to all practical purposes eliminated distance.

What North Carolina has to offer, however, needs to be emphasized and reemphasized. The Research Triangle offers almost unlimited research facilities, many of which are already being utilized, directly or indirectly, by the Public Health Service and private foundations. Consider the personnel, the facilities and the climate already at hand in adjacent Duke and University of North Carolina schools of medicine and health centers. Rapidly developing is what could be one of the Nation's larger psychiatric research centers at Butner.

Those charged with location of an Environmental Health Center should indeed be interested in environment; and that is what North Carolina truly has to offer in its continuing presentation.

[From the Chapel Hill Weekly]

RTI: A TAR HEEL SYMBOL OF PROGRESS

North Carolina has been bowing its tendons for a decade now trying to land new industry, and as every literate Tar Heel knows, the effort has paid off handsomely.

As it happens with almost everything, though, after a new industry has been here for a while, people start taking it for granted. One ambitious North Carolina project that does not lend itself very well to being disremembered is the Research Triangle.

According to its latest progress report, the Research Triangle, especially its Institute, has in the short span of 4 years become one of the most impressive and significant concentrations of basic research know-how and wherewithal in the entire Nation. It has achieved the compliment of imitation by other States. Both directly and indirectly it is bulking increasingly large in the technological development, not merely of North Carolina, but of the Nation and outer space itself.

The Institute presently pulls in earnings on contract research at about $2,500,000 per year. The backlog of contracts will keep its varied laboratories humming well into 1964, even if no further commitments are made. The corporate giants of America—Bell Telephone, Celanese Corporation of America, Union Carbide, Douglas Aircraft, General Electric, come there to have the tough technological nuts of scientific advancement cracked. Government agencies—NASA, Department of Defense, the National Institutes of Health—also lay their problems at RTI's door.

The number of projects and their diversity boggle the mind—electromechanical systems for outer space, tricky rearrangements of polymer molecules for new fabrics to keep American textiles in their preeminent position, antitumor drugs.

It takes a feat of imagination to comprehend that 5 years ago the site of all this frenetic inquiry lay in tobacco patches and slash pine. What it will ultimately mean to the future of the State is best surmised by electronic computer; human reckoning is at this point entirely too slow.

One guess we might hazard: the Triangle is already a more appropriate symbol of North Carolina than the long leaf pine. It could be that in a few more years the Research Triangle will come full circle, with its scientists studying how to grow pines—in moon craters.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SAM G. BRATTON, FORMER SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call the attention of the House to the recent death of a former U.S. Senator: the late great and gifted man, Sam G. Bratton, of New Mexico.

The news of this event is, of course, a severe blow to all who knew and loved this man of good will and great heart, this patriarch of justice. To some he was known as "Redheaded Sam," to others as "El Colorado Sam," but to all, he appeared as an outstanding example of the Western pioneer spirit, up to date; a man of depth and vision, of quickness and wit, of courage and determination.

A half orphan, Sam was reared by an uncle, without, however, suffering unduly in consequence of this arrangement. Indeed, he thrived on everything in life, from a very early age. A baseball player of considerable distinction and a leader in many school activities, his days as a schoolboy were happy ones.

At the age of 19 he entered the teaching profession which, however, he soon abandoned in favor of the law. Admitted to the bar at the age of 21, he set up a law office in Clovis, N. Mex., and soon had a flourishing practice as well as many admirers numbered among his victorious clients.

Attracting attention as the result of his impressive manner and learned approach to all matters of legal nature, Sam was quickly elevated to a judicial position. By the age of 27 he held a place on the bench of the Fifth Judicial Circuit Court of New Mexico, and by 1923, at the age of 35, he was a member of the State supreme court.

Thereupon turning to politics, Sam was elected, in 1925, to the U.S. Senate, in which he served for 8 years. As a Senator, Sam was decidely liberal in most of his views. During the Hoover administration he voted for the Costigan-La-Follette relief bill, the Democratic Tariff Act and the anti-injunction measure. Following the election of F. D. Roosevelt, he supported the New Deal program with everything at his command.

Aware of the need for political change in a world where political stagnation breeds nothing but disaster, Sam G. Bratton looked upon the Federal Constitution as a mighty document, but not as a rigid instrument to be used as a barrier to social progress. In his eyes it appeared sufficiently elastic to cope with modern problems through proper judicial interpretation.

Retiring from the Senate in 1933 to accept a judgeship on the U.S. Court of Appeals, 10th Circuit, Sam Bratton left behind a record for liberal understanding and conscientious effort, established during his term as U.S. Senator.

His loss is a cause of grief to all of us, including those with whom he was in political agreement and those who merely admired and respected him as a man.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1963]

SAM G. BRATTON, FORMER SENATOR—NEW MEXICO LIBERAL WAS IN OFFICE 1925 TO 1933

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., September 22.—Former Senator Sam G. Bratton, of New Mexico, died this afternoon. He was 75 years old.

A hospital official said Mr. Bratton, a retired Federal judge, was dead on arrival at the hospital.

Mr. Bratton's death came 1 week after that of another former U.S. Senator from New Mexico, Carl A. Hatch. He also was a former Federal judge and a man who had followed Mr. Bratton's political footsteps in New Mexico. Mr. Hatch retired from the bench in 1962.

KNOWN AS NEW DEALER

Mr. Bratton, a liberal Democrat who served in the Senate from 1925 to 1933, was once described as a New Dealer, even before the New Deal of President Franklin D. Roosevelt moved into the ascendancy in 1932.

During the administration of Herbert Hoover, he supported several reform and economic relief bills. After President Roosevelt took office Mr. Bratton voted for the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority, suspension of the gold clause, Federal relief and the 30-hour week.

Later, after his appointment in 1933 by President Roosevelt as a Federal judge of the 10th judicial district—an area including New Mexico, Colorado, Oklahoma, Kansas, Wyoming and Utah—he lived up to his reputation of liberalism by approving the New Deal power program when other jurists were condemning it as unconstitutional.

In his farewell speech to the Senate, Mr. Bratton declared:

"When we review history, we recall that virtually every step of progress originated with the minority, but due to their insistence and their repeated efforts and their constant advocacy of it, it finally became the policy and program of the majority."

In 1937, when President Roosevelt was seeking a man to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court created by the resignation of Justice Willis Van Devanter, Judge Bratton's name was frequently mentioned in news stories of the day as a leading possibility for the post, although finally Hugo L. Black was designated.

While he was in the Senate, Mr. Bratton was a member of a special Campaign Fund Investigating Committee. He was a member also of the Economy Committee, and in the depression of the early 1930's sought to eliminate a $125,000 item providing U.S. diplomats with entertainment, tips and flower funds on the grounds that thousands of American people were in need. He was a strong supporter of measures aimed at placing the regulation of interstate air commerce in the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Born and reared in Texas, Mr. Bratton was a teacher for several years after his graduation from State Normal School in Texas. He read law at nights, however, and became a lawyer in Clovis, N. Mex., at the age of 21. At 30 he was an associate judge of the State district court. Four years later he was a member of the State supreme court. He was 36 when he was elected to the Senate.

Survivors include Mr. Bratton's widow, Vivian, who lives in Albuquerque; two daughters, Mrs. John C. Thompson, of Amarillo, Tex., and Mrs. George S. Johnson, of Albuquerque; a son, Howard C. Bratton, of Roswell, and five grandchildren.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 23, 1963]

SAM G. BRATTON, 75, FORMER SENATOR, DIES

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., September 23.—Sam G. Bratton, 75, U.S. Senator from New Mexico for 9 years and a Federal circuit court judge here for 28 years, died yesterday. A physician said his death was from natural causes.

The Democrat was elected to the Senate in 1925. He resigned to accept an appointment as judge of the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals in 1933 and served in that post until his retirement in 1961.

Mr. Bratton opened a law practice in Clovis in 1915. Four years later he was a district judge and in 1922 was elected to the New Mexico Supreme Court. He resigned from the high court in 1924 to run for the Senate.

Judge Bratton's death came 1 week after that of another former Senator from New Mexico, Carl A. Hatch. He also was a former Federal judge and a man who had followed Judge Bratton's political footsteps in New Mexico. Judge Hatch retired from the bench in 1962.

Judge Bratton's Senate nomination was termed a unique event in politics. He is believed to be the only man ever nominated for the Senate without having had his name placed before a nominating committee. He asserted at the time that a judge should not participate in politics.

Judge Bratton served in the Senate 9 years and then accepted the Federal court appointment from President Roosevelt.

Then Gov. A. W. Hockenhull appointed Judge Hatch to succeed Senator Bratton in the Senate.

Both men came from neighboring States to Clovis, N. Mex., Mr. Bratton from Kosse, Tex., and Mr. Hatch from El Dorado, Okla.

As Judge Bratton moved from State district judge to the U.S. Senate and then to the Federal bench, his friend and associate, Senator Hatch followed in the same positions.

Both men also were members of the same Clovis law firm.

Judge Bratton was born August 19, 1888, in Kosse. His father, Calvin G. Bratton, was a successful farmer.

Upon graduation from State Normal School in Texas, Judge Bratton taught school for several years at Claude and Hereford, Tex.

He became a deputy county clerk at Farwell, Tex., and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1912. Judge Hatch, who like Judge Bratton studied law at night, was admitted to the Oklahoma bar 1 year later.

Survivors include Judge Bratton's widow, Vivian, of Albuquerque; two daughters, Mrs. John C. Thompson of Amarillo, Tex., and Mrs. George S. Johnson of Albuquerque; one son, Howard C. Bratton of Roswell, N. Mex., and five grandchildren.

[From the Albuquerque Journal, Sept. 23, 1963]

FORMER SENATOR, LONGTIME JURIST, STRICKEN AT HOME—PRONOUNCED DEAD ON ARRIVAL AT HOSPITAL

Sam Gilbert Bratton, whose 45 years in public office included service as a judge in district, State, and Federal courts and two terms as a U.S. Senator, died here Sunday afternoon. He was 75.

Judge Bratton suffered an apparent heart attack at his home, 4415 Inspiration SE., and was taken by Gold Cross Ambulance to Bataan Memorial Hospital. He was pronounced dead on arrival at the hospital at 3:25 p.m.

Judge Bratton's death followed by a week that of U.S. District Judge Carl A. Hatch, who succeeded Judge Bratton as a U.S. Senator. The lives of the two jurists were similar.

Both men were members of the Central Methodist Church here. Both men had backgrounds in Clovis. Hatch was in law practice there in 1929, just as Bratton had been in 1915.

Hatch served 14 years as a Federal judge, while Bratton had served on the Federal judiciary for 28 years.

JUDICIAL AIR

Bratton, according to one legend, had a judicial air about him from the day he was born. However, he began his working days as a school teacher in Claude, Tex., but after 2 years of teaching he decided that his true vocation was law.

Therefore he began reading law, and self-taught he passed the Texas bar examination in 1909.

Known popularly as "New Mexico's red-haired judge," Bratton wrote more than 1,200 opinions during his judicial career—enough to fill several lawbooks.

With his experience in thousands of cases, Bratton refused to single out any of them as more important than others. "Every case becomes interesting, even though it may seem dull at first," he said. "Each is different from every other."

Bratton's pleasures were simple ones. His greatest source of enjoyment was working in the library of lawbooks in his home here.

ENJOYED STORIES

He also enjoyed the telling of a good story, even at his own expense. His favorite was about an incident during his early days as a trial lawyer, when he was defending a railroad against a woman's claim for damages.

The case involved a rock, and Bratton asked the woman, "How large was this alleged rock?" She replied "Just about the size of your head, and just as hard."

Bratton was born August 19, 1888, at Kosse, Tex., the son of a farm family. His parents were Calvin Gilbert Bratton and Emma Lee Morris Bratton.

Bratton was graduated from Hereford, Tex., High School and then attended State Normal School. He taught a year at Claude and another year at Hereford, then began his study of law and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1909. For 6 years he practiced law at Farwell.

MOVED TO CLOVIS

In 1915 he moved to Clovis and was in partnership with Harry L. Patton. Three years later he was elected district judge of the fifth judicial district, and held the office from 1919 to 1922. He was then elected associate justice of the New Mexico Supreme Court.

He stepped down from that bench in 1924 to become a candidate for U.S. Senator, and was elected. In 1930 he was reelected to a second Senate term.

He resigned from the Senate, however, in 1933 to accept an appointment from President Franklin D. Roosevelt to the position of judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals, 10th circuit.

RETIRED IN 1961

He continued in the position for 28 years until his retirement on March 6, 1961. In 1956 he had received the added recognition of being elevated to chief judge of the 10th circuit.

Bratton married Vivian Rogers on January 26, 1908, at Hereford. She was the daughter of James Brooks and Harriet Rogers.

There are three children and five grandchildren. The Brattons' children are Mrs. John C. (Emma Lee) Thompson of Amarillo, Tex.; Mrs. George S. (Sammie) Johnson of Albuquerque, principal of the Eubank Elementary School; and Howard Calvin Bratton, in law practice at Roswell.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 24, 1963]

SAM BRATTON, EX-SENATOR, 75

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., September 23.—Former U.S. Senator Sam Gilbert Bratton, 75, died here Sunday. The retired Federal judge had been under a physician's care for some time.

His death followed by only a week the passing of his old friend and law associate, Senator Carl A. Hatch, and the long careers of both men had an astonishing similarity. Both came from a humble environment; both studied law. As Mr. Bratton started to move up the political ladder, Mr. Hatch was right behind him.

When Mr. Bratton left the Senate to accept a Federal judgeship, Mr. Hatch was appointed to his seat. Mr. Hatch in turn retired in favor of a judgeship. Both were New Deal Democrats. Both had met—and practiced law—in Clovis, N. Mex., and when death finally came, it claimed both in the same city, Albuquerque.

Even their personalities were similar in some respects, although Judge Bratton was the more flamboyant. "Red-headed Sam"—his Spanish-speaking constituents in New Mexico called him "El Colorado Sam"—had a booming drawl and a wealth of anecdotes; people swore that he boned up upon Joe Miller's Joke Book before taking the stump.

He was only 36 years old when he decided to run for the Senate after first saying no to friends who insisted on it.

Once committed, the young jurist—he was an associate justice of the State supreme court at the time—waged a vigorous campaign against Holm O. Bursum, a dour, seasoned Republican. He fought him with everything he had, and especially with his sense of humor. In Spanish-speaking districts he had to get his jokes across with an interpreter, but the salty tales lost nothing in the translation.

Sam Bratton won success through sheer determination. A half orphan, he was reared by an uncle. His life at the Kosse public schools was marked by a passion for sports, especially baseball.

At 19 he moved to the Panhandle and taught school. Later, at Farewell, he became a county clerk. He began to study law, satisfying a long ambition.

He was admitted to the bar in 1909 and moved to Clovis, where he set up practice.

Judge Bratton was a liberal before he went to the Senate. During the Hoover administration he voted for the anti-injunction measure, the Costigan-La Follette relief bill and the Democratic tariff act. After President Roosevelt's victory, he supported the New Deal program.

In his philosophy, the Constitution was not a rigid instrument to be used to throw up barricades against social progress; in his view, it was sufficiently elastic to cope with modern problems through proper judicial interpretation.

Privately a modest man with financial resources to match, Senator Bratton took practically no part in Washington social life. He had married Vivian Rogers, of Hereford, Tex., in 1908, and they lived quietly in the Capital with their three children. His hobby was fishing, and he would seize every opportunity to take his family on camping expeditions, on which he did the cooking.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY SHOULD EFFECTIVELY SUPPORT A RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, every citizen who takes pride in his Nation's Capital has a stake in the decision Congress will make this year on the proposed Washington rapid transit system. This decision should be made without undue delay, because the situation is rapidly deteriorating.

Our Nation's Capital is slowly being strangled by traffic congestion. It needs an adequate highway system. Yet all who have studied the problem agree that a highway system alone will not solve the congestion problem. A rapid transit system in Washington is an absolute necessity if we are to solve this problem and thus make our Capital City a vital and healthy place to live, and if we are to preserve and enhance its beauty.

The bills presently pending before the House District Committee to authorize a rapid transit system for Washington, H.R. 6633, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] and H.R. 7249, introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], deserves the support of all Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike. It certainly deserves much stronger and more effective support by President Kennedy than it is getting.

President Eisenhower in 1959 proposed legislation to authorize such a system. His proposal led to the establishment of the National Capital Transportation Agency which was directed to draw plans for a rapid transit system. This is the kind of strong and effective leadership which President Kennedy must bring to this transit matter if the Congress is to enact H.R. 6633 and H.R. 7249.

The bill to establish the Agency was introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] at the suggestion of President Eisenhower, and it was through the able leadership of the chairman of the House Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. MCMILLAN] that the bill passed the House.

Plans for a rapid transit system have been drawn by the National Capital Transportation Agency, and now President Kennedy has proposed legislation to authorize the system.

If President Eisenhower could get legislation through a Congress controlled by Democrats, then President Kennedy should be able to get H.R. 6633 and H.R. 7249 through a Congress controlled by Democrats.

I consider the plan set forth in these two bills, on which hearings were held by Subcommittee No. 6 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia on July 9, 10, 16, 18, 24, 25, 29, and 31, 1963, extremely attractive for two primary reasons:

First, the plan is our only hope of solving the congestion problem. By slicing in half the time it takes to come into downtown Washington by public transportation today, the system will remove thousands of cars from the congested streets of the Nation's Capital and will make it easier for those who want to or must use their autos to get to and from the downtown area.

Second, the plan of financing has been designed to minimize the cost to the Federal Government. Approximately 85 percent of the cost of the system will be borne by the users of the system and by the local governments of the National Capital region. The cost to the Federal Government will be only $120 million, or some $12 million a year for 10 years. From the point of view of the Federal taxpayer it seems to me this system is an outstanding bargain, a once-in-a-lifetime bargain.

In my opinion, the legislation presently pending before the House District Committee to authorize the rapid transit system is a "must" item.

It deserves our vigorous support.

At the recent hearings held by Subcommittee No. 6 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia strong support was voiced for H.R. 6633 and H.R. 7249 by representatives of the Democratic Central Committee of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Republican Committee.

Other organizations supporting these bills are:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Baptist Ministers Conference of the District of Columbia and vicinity (almost 300 ministers, 100,000 communicants).

National Capital Planning Commission.

The Washington Board of Trade.

Downtown Progress.

Federal City Council.

Committee of 100 on the Federal City.

Fine Arts Commission.

Washington Building Congress.

American Institute of Architects.

League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia.

Commissioners' Planning Advisory Council.

Citizens Transit Improvement Association.

Redevelopment Land Agency.

Ivy City Trinidad Civic Association.

Woodridge Civic Association.

Capital Hill Community Council, Inc.

Connecticut Avenue Association.

Southwest Civic Association.

Washington Planning and Housing Association.

Washington Board of Realtors.

Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia (comprised of 40 associations).

American University Park Citizens Association.

Cathedral Heights-Cleveland Park Citizens Association.

Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association.

Connecticut Avenue Citizens Association.

Forest Hills Citizens Association.

Fort Davis Citizens Association.

Friendship Citizens Association.

Kalorama Citizens Association.

North Cleveland Park Citizens Association.

Palisades Citizens Association.

Summit Park Citizens Association.

National Capital Local, Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America.

MARYLAND

State

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Montgomery County

Mayor and Council of the City of Rockville.

Allied Civic Group (65 associations).

Montgomery County Civic Federation (85 associations).

American Institute of Architects—Potomac Valley chapter.

Montgomery County Citizens Planning Association.

Burnt Mills Hills Citizens Association.

Glenmont and Vicinity Citizens Association.

League of Women Voters.

Wheaton Chamber of Commerce.

Prince Georges County

Prince Georges County Commissioners.

Prince Georges County Civic Federation (85 associations).

VIRGINIA

State

The Commonwealth of Virginia, Gov. A. S. Harrison, Jr. ("no objections").

Arlington

Arlington County Board.

Arlington County Civic Federation (36 associations).

Parkway Citizens Association.

Arlingtonians for the Preservation for the Palisades.

North Highland Citizens Association.

League of Women Voters of Arlington County.

Fairfax

Board of County Supervisors.

Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations (120 associations).

Town of Vienna.

City of Fairfax.

League of Women Voters.

Falls Church

Council of the City of Falls Church.

League of Women Voters.

Alexandria

League of Women Voters.

Prince William

Board of Supervisors of Prince William County.

Regional

Interfederation Council (the federation of the federations of citizens associations in Fairfax, Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, District of Columbia, Arlington, and Prince William).

Metropolitan League of Women Voters organization.

Other

American Institute of Architects, Committee on the National Capital.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HARDY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, October 1, 1963, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. WIDNALL, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5555. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5555. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6118. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union with respect to the selection of public lands for the development and expansion of communities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1251. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the U.S. Warehouse Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1252. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of funding practices in the acquisition and management of real and related personal property overseas by the Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1253. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the Quapaw Bath House Co., which will extend the contract for a period of 2 years additional operation of a bathhouse in Hot Springs National Park, pursuant to (67 Stat. 271), as amended by (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1254. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated July 12, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on the Great Lakes Harbors Study—interim report on Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind., requested by resolutions of the committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 18, 1956 and June 27, 1956. It is in full response to a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted March 15, 1949, also (H. Doc. No. 160); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1255. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated August 6, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim hurricane survey of Pawleys Island, S.C., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1256. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for reconsideration of costly proposals under the expansion and improvement program, Coast Guard Academy, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 453. An act to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala.; without amendment (Rept. No. 779). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906; without amendment (Rept. No. 780). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 8611. A bill to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors; without amendment (Rept. No. 781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4018. A bill to authorize establishment of the Saint Gaudens National Historic Site, N.H., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASPINALL: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5949. A bill to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact; without amendment (Rept. No 783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6756. A bill to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7601. A bill for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.; with amendment (Rept. No. 785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROYBAL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 7400. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to authorize the transfer of unused funds from the administrative expense reserve to the contingency reserves of the several health plans under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 786). Referred to the Committe of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3941. A bill to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations; without amendment (Rept. No. 787). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; without amendment (Rept. No. 788). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2436. A bill to amend section 101(18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 789). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Eleventh report on U.S. information problems in Vietnam; without amendment (Rept. No. 797). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 8667. A bill authorizing additional appropriation for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins; without amendment (Rept. No. 799). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 6289. A bill to provide that the Chicago Skyway (Calumet Skyway toll bridge) shall be operated as a freeway; with amendment (Rept. No. 798). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1851. A bill for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife; without amendment (Rept. No. 790). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4766. A bill for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 791). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6182. A bill for the relief of Bryce A. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 792). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6477. A bill for the relief of Capt. Otis R. Bowles; with amendment (Rept. No. 793). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8222. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Maurus; without amendment (Rept. No. 794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SHRIVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W. Rasor; with amendment (Rept. No. 795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 8470. A bill for the relief of Warren A. Jeffers and Francis H. Leik; without amendment (Rept. No. 796). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 8664. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual under a total disability for 2 months shall be considered "disabled" for benefit and freeze purposes even though the disability is not permanent and to permit the payment of disability insurance benefits to an individual from the beginning of his disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 8665. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8666. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H.R. 8667. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 8668. A bill to facilitate the transmission in the mails of certain educational kits containing laboratory apparatus for the use of blind persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 8669. A bill to designate the dam and lock now under construction on the Alabama River at Millers Ferry, Ala., as the "Robert F. Henry Dam and Lock"; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8670. A bill to amend the St. Lawrence Seaway Act to provide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in publicity or promotional activities such as free or paid advertising; solicitation of cargoes; publication of ocean, rail, port or motor carrier rate or service comparisons; or other activities that are actually or potentially disruptive to the flow of waterborne trade among ports in the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 8671. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to make it an unfair labor practice for an employer to impose certain time limitations within which offers for settlement must be accepted; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 8672. A bill to amend section 613(c)(4)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to certain treatment processes considered as mining in the determination of percentage depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 8673. A bill to amend title V of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that the validity of an instrument the recording of which is provided for by such act shall be governed by the laws of the place in which such instrument is delivered, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 8674. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8675. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that the State agency administering any of such provisions in any State may make direct rent payments to landlords on behalf of recipients of such assistance when such action will aid in reducing rentals or improving such recipients' living conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8676. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska Ferry system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 8677. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 8678. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 8679. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 8680. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 8681. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H.J. Res. 762. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.J. Res. 763. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 764. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 8682. A bill for the relief of M. R. Agarwal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8683. A bill for the relief of Erasmo D'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8684. A bill for the relief of Israel Kritzman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 8685. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sedat M. Ayata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 8686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherina Varisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 8687. A bill for the relief of Teresa Giuffrida Nasonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 8688. A bill for the relief of Amir Hooshang Missaghian, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 8689. A bill for the relief of Dominico Sarappa, Madelina Sarappa, Aniello Sarappa, and Guiseppe Sarappa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

332. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Canyon Station, Wyo., requesting that the Committee on Foreign Affairs make a study of the situation in South Vietnam and report back to the House of Representatives their findings in order to answer certain questions, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hearest prayer, to whom all flesh shall come, the inmost soul of us cries out for the living God. The hurrying pace of our fleeting years here frightens and awes us. So teach us to number our days, that we may fill swift hours with mighty deeds and lay up treasures beyond the reach of moth and rust.

If the glowing vision that once lighted our horizon has faded to somber shadows, even standing on the debris of our dearest dreams, may we be stabbed by a strengthening glimpse of divine resources, vista beyond vista, glory reaching out to further glory. Take Thou our faltering hands in Thine. Lead us on, o'er moor and fen, and crag, and torrent, till the night is gone and the day dawns.

In the Redeemer's name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 30, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Public Works, the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilizing of Prices of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Springfield, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that club, for the fiscal year 1962, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Herbert Bernhard, of Columbia, S.C., and sundry other American members of the International Society for Labor Law and Social Legislation, at Lyon, France, favoring the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RIBICOFF, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment:

H.R. 7544. An act to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 551).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H.R. 7195. An act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems (Rept. No. 552).

IMPROVEMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 553)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, and I submit a report thereon, together with the individual views of Senators CLARK and PELL and the minority views of Senators GOLDWATER and TOWER. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual and minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitttd:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Dr. Russell Alexander Dixon, of the District of Columbia, and Dr. Herman Howe Fussler, of Illinois, to be members of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service; and Colin Munro MacLeod, of New York, to be Deputy Director of the office of Science and Technology.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. True Davis, Jr., of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Switzerland.

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Dan H. Fenn, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of August 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, AUGUST 1963 AND JULY 1963, AND PAY, JULY 1963 AND JUNE 1963

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for August 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In August Numbered—	In July Numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In July was—	In June was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,515,008	2,518,857	−3,849	$1,370,056	$1,225,421	+$144,635
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,462,223	1,467,209	−4,986	792,171	699,977	+92,194
Department of Defense	1,052,785	1,051,648	+1,137	577,885	525,444	+52,441
Inside the United States	2,349,172	2,356,351	−7,179			
Outside the United States	165,836	162,506	+3,330			
Industrial employment	567,061	568,503	−1,442			
Foreign nationals	161,597	162,473	−876	27,808	[2] 27,604	+204

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963, and pay for July 1963, and comparison with June 1963*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	114,843	116,679		1,836	$59,645	$50,630	$9,015	
Commerce	32,212	32,494		282	20,766	17,073	3,693	
Health, Education, and Welfare	82,820	82,487	333		44,152	40,077	4,075	
Interior	69,822	[1] 70,343		521	40,904	[1] 36,883	4,021	
Justice	32,127	32,288		161	22,605	19,394	3,211	
Labor	9,670	9,778		108	6,226	5,216	1,010	
Post Office	590,162	590,133	29		291,714	260,272	31,442	
State [2,3]	42,911	43,053		142	23,737	20,988	2,749	
Treasury	86,678	87,473		795	54,338	47,292	7,046	
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	380	381		1	272	263	9	
Bureau of the Budget	498	512		14	466	399	67	
Council of Economic Advisers	46	51		5	42	36	6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	78		1	42	38	4	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	30			24	25		$1
National Security Council	40	41		1	35	30	5	
Office of Emergency Planning	470	493		23	411	353	58	
Office of Science and Technology	50	53		3	36	29	7	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	26	22	4		22		22	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	17	19		2	7	4	3	
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing [4]	4		4					
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	26	1		28	21	7	
American Battle Monuments Commission	435	434	1		89	89		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,267	7,274		7	5,807	5,225	582	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	624	633		9	446	379	67	
Civil Aeronautics Board	862	855	7		697	601	96	
Civil Service Commission	4,073	4,081		8	2,692	2,386	306	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			7	6	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	90	92		2	55	46	9	
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	2	1	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	299	304		5	225	286		61
Farm Credit Administration	237	238		1	186	166	20	
Federal Aviation Agency	46,567	46,549	18		34,785	30,700	4,084	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,532	1,538		6	1,118	957	161	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,304	1,247	57		864	755	109	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,245	1,257		12	906	796	110	
Federal Maritime Commission	243	251		8	192	162	30	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	399	403		4	376	322	54	
Federal Power Commission	1,209	1,222		13	903	787	116	
Federal Trade Commission	1,164	1,176		12	885	771	114	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	144	147		3	86	70	16	
General Accounting Office	4,591	4,651		60	3,225	2,820	405	
General Services Administration	33,017	32,871	146		17,247	15,028	2,219	
Government Printing Office	7,241	7,210	31		4,784	4,088	696	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	14,189	14,302		113	9,443	8,285	1,158	
Indian Claims Commission	21	21			28	23	5	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,413	2,426		13	1,788	1,544	244	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,538	30,582		44	22,768	20,368	2,400	
National Capital Housing Authority	435	434	1		219	193	26	
National Capital Planning Commission	64	66		2	54	46	8	
National Capital Transportation Agency	74	82		8	64	56	8	
National Gallery of Art	316	318		2	149	125	24	
National Labor Relations Board	2,017	2,052		35	1,516	1,302	214	
National Mediation Board	128	136		8	118	131		13
National Science Foundation	971	1,071		100	733	644	89	
Panama Canal	14,987	15,031		44	5,020	4,988	32	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	57	58		1	43	36	7	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,963	2,002		39	1,174	1,040	134	
Renegotiation Board	219	222		3	197	165	32	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	169	165	4		106	95	11	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,391	1,404		13	1,021	876	145	
Selective Service System	6,928	6,926	2		2,366	2,068	298	
Small Business Administration	3,398	3,406		8	2,338	2,008	330	
Smithsonian Institution	1,580	1,633		53	851	720	131	
Soldiers' Home	1,084	1,075	9		379	344	35	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	15	[1] 18		3	11	13		2
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	25			21	20	1	
Tariff Commission	283	290		7	217	192	25	
Tax Court of the United States	158	157	1		130	118	12	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,984	18,017		33	11,743	10,331	1,412	
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	168	155	13		150	109	41	
U.S. Information Agency	11,982	11,957	25		4,262	5,345		1,083
Veterans' Administration	172,577	[1] 173,617		1,040	84,058	73,132	10,926	
Virgin Islands Corporation	616	674		58	146	187		41
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,462,223	1,467,209	686	5,672	792,171	699,977	93,395	1,201
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			4,986				92,194	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,203	2,252		49	1,897	1,656	241	
Department of the Army	378,699	[1] 376,581	2,118		196,601	186,255	10,346	
Department of the Navy	343,864	344,682		818	[5] 198,596	[1] 177,909	20,687	
Department of the Air Force	297,173	297,154	19		163,725	144,293	19,432	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,010	2,002	8		1,080	941	139	
Defense Communications Agency	593	587	6		392	352	40	
Defense Supply Agency	24,951	25,070		119	13,749	12,082	1,667	
Office of Civil Defense	1,097	1,133		36	906	812	94	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			36	31	5	
Interdepartmental activities	14	13	1		9	7	2	
International military activities	59	59			43	38	5	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963, and pay for July 1963, and comparison with June 1963*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	August	July	Increase	Decrease	July	June	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense—Continued								
Armed Forces information and education activities	420	425		5	$233	$203	$30	
Classified activities	1,662	1,650	12		618	865		$247
Total, Department of Defense	1,052,785	1,051,648	2,164	1,027	577,885	525,444	52,688	247
Net increase, Department of Defense			1,137				52,441	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [6] [7]	2,515,008	2,518,857	2,850	6,699	1,370,056	1,225,421	146,083	1,448
Net change, including Department of Defense			3,849				144,635	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] August figure includes 17,242 employees of the Agency for International Development, as compared with 17,206 in July and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 4,674 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 4,660.

[3] August figure includes 1,075 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,151 in July and their pay.

[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11063 dated Nov. 20, 1962.

[5] Subject to revision.

[6] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[7] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658), as follows:

Agency	August	July	Change
Agriculture Department	1,881	1,655	+226
Interior Department	528	267	+261
Tennessee Valley Authority	60	68	−8
Total	2,469	1,990	+479

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	113,598	115,491		1,893
Commerce	31,546	31,882		276
Health, Education, and Welfare	82,171	81,838	333	
Interior	69,287	[1] 69,823		536
Justice	31,758	31,916		158
Labor	9,578	9,675		97
Post Office	588,755	588,673	82	
State [2] [3]	11,118	11,137		19
Treasury	86,065	86,853		788
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	380	381		1
Bureau of the Budget	498	512		14
Council of Economic Advisers	46	51		5
Executive Mansion and Grounds	77	78		1
National Aeronautics and Space Council	30	30		
National Security Council	40	41		1
Office of Emergency Planning	470	493		23
Office of Science and Technology	50	53		3
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	26	22	4	
President's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation	17	19		2
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing [4]	4		4	
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	26	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,231	7,237		6
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	624	633		9
Civil Aeronautics Board	861	854	7	
Civil Service Commission	4,070	4,078		8
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	90	92		2
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	299	304		5
Farm Credit Administration	237	238		1
Federal Aviation Agency	45,507	45,492	15	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,530	1,536		6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,302	1,245	57	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,245	1,257		12
Federal Maritime Commission	243	251		8
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	399	403		
Federal Power Commission	1,209	1,222		13
Federal Trade Commission	1,164	1,176		12
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	103	104		1
General Accounting Office	4,498	4,550		52
General Services Administration	32,995	32,850	145	
Government Printing Office	7,241	7,210	31	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,996	14,112		116
Indian Claims Commission	21	21		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,413	2,426		13
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,525	30,571		46
National Capital Housing Authority	435	434	1	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Planning Commission	64	66		2
National Capital Transportation Agency	74	82		8
National Gallery of Art	316	318		2
National Labor Relations Board	1,984	2,019		35
National Mediation Board	128	136		8
National Science Foundation	958	1,057		99
Panama Canal	167	163	4	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	57	58		1
Railroad Retirement Board	1,963	2,002		39
Renegotiation Board	219	222		3
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	169	165	4	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,391	1,404		13
Selective Service System	6,779	6,776	3	
Small Business Administration	3,343	3,350		7
Smithsonian Institution	1,562	1,614		52
Soldiers' Home	1,084	1,075	9	
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	15	[1] 18		3
Subversive Activities Control Board	25	25		
Tariff Commission	283	290		7
Tax Court of the United States	158	157	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,983	18,016		33
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	168	155	13	
U.S. Information Agency	3,416	3,362	54	
Veterans' Administration	171,578	172,618		1,040
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,397,690	1,402,405	768	5,483
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			4,715	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,143	2,188		45
Department of the Army	327,598	328,264		666
Department of the Navy	319,248	320,309		1,061
Department of the Air Force	271,698	272,256		558
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,010	2,002	8	
Defense Communications Agency	565	560	5	
Defense Supply Agency	24,951	25,070		119
Office of Civil Defense	1,097	1,133		36
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40		
Interdepartmental activities	13	12	1	
International military activities	37	37		
Armed Forces information and education activities	420	425		5
Classified activities	1,662	1,650	12	
Total, Department of Defense	951,482	953,946	26	2,490
Net increase, Department of Defense			2,464	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,349,172	2,356,351	794	7,973
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			7,179	

---

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] August figure includes 3,050 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,990 in July.

[3] August figure includes 719 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 785 in July.

[4] New agency, created pursuant to Executive Order 11063 dated Nov. 20, 1962.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,245	1,188	57	
Commerce	666	672		6
Health, Education, and Welfare	649	649		
Interior	535	520	15	
Justice	369	372		3
Labor	92	103		11
Post Office	1,407	1,460		53
State [1] [2]	31,793	31,916		123
Treasury	613	620		7
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	428	427	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	36	37		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	3	3		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,060	1,057	3	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	41	43		2
General Accounting Office	93	101		8
General Services Administration	22	21	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	193	190	3	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	13	11	2	
National Labor Relations Board	33	33		
National Science Foundation	13	14		1
Panama Canal	14,820	14,868		48
Selective Service System	149	150		1
Independent agencies—Continued				
Small Business Administration	55	56		1
Smithsonian Institution	18	17	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	1	1		
U.S. Information Agency	8,566	8,597		31
Veterans' Administration	999	[3] 999		
Virgin Islands Corporation	616	674		58
Total, excluding Department of Defense	64,533	64,804	83	354
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			271	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	60	64		4
Department of the Army	51,101	[3] 48,317	2,784	
Department of the Navy	24,616	24,373	243	
Department of the Air Force	25,475	24,898	577	
Defense Communications Agency	28	27	1	
Interdepartmental activities	1	1		
International military activities	22	22		
Total, Department of Defense	101,303	97,702	3,605	4
Net increase, Department of Defense			3,601	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	165,836	162,506	3,688	358
Net increase, including Department of Defense			3,330	

[1] August figure includes 14,192 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 14,216 in July. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The August figure includes 4,674 of these trust fund employees and the July figure includes 4,660.

[2] August figure includes 356 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 366 in July.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during August 1963, and comparison with July 1963*

Department or agency	August	July	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,973	3,998		25
Commerce	5,796	5,816		20
Interior	9,015	9,104		89
Post Office	270	271		1
Treasury	5,311	5,255	56	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	279	281		2
Federal Aviation Agency	3,076	3,042	34	
General Services Administration	1,735	1,735		
Government Printing Office	7,241	7,210	31	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	30,538	30,542		4
Panama Canal	7,593	7,620		27
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	164	164		
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,783	14,825		42
Virgin Islands Corporation	616	674		58
Total, excluding Department of Defense	90,390	90,537	121	268
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			147	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 140,447	[2] 140,735		288
Outside the United States	[1] 4,902	[2] 4,636	266	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	197,437	197,903		466
Outside the United States	1,263	1,265		2
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	129,757	130,513		756
Outside the United States	1,082	1,123		41
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,783	1,791		8
Total, Department of Defense	476,671	477,966	266	1,561
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,295	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	567,061	568,503	387	1,829
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,442	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of August 1963, and comparison with July 1963*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	August	July	August	July	August	July	August	July
Canada	33	35					33	35
Crete	78	62					78	62
England	2,974	3,003			121	122	2,853	2,881
France	21,219	21,289	17,341	17,455	12	11	3,866	3,823
Germany	78,132	78,722	66,106	66,631	86	84	11,940	12,007
Greece	247	255					247	255
Japan	50,598	50,732	17,804	[1] 17,906	14,422	[1] 14,449	18,372	18,377
Korea	6,214	6,200	6,214	[1] 6,200				
Morocco	1,494	1,567			738	747	756	820
Netherlands	56	56					56	56
Trinidad	552	552			552	552		
Total	161,597	162,473	107,465	108,192	15,931	15,965	38,201	38,316

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of August totaling 2,515,008. This was a net decrease of 3,849, as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of July.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by month in fiscal year 1964, which began July 1, 1963, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July	2,518,857	9,149	
August	2,515,008		3,849

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of August was 1,462,223, a decrease of 4,986 as compared with the July total of 1,467,209. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in

August was 1,052,785, an increase of 1,137 as compared with 1,051,648, in July.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Agriculture Department with 1,836, Veterans' Administration with 1,040, Treasury Department with 795, and Interior Department with 521. The largest increase was reported by Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 333.

In the Department of Defense the largest increase in civilian employment was reported by Department of the Army with 2,118. The largest decrease was reported by the Department of the Navy with 818.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 7,179 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 3,330. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in August totaled 567,061, a decrease of 1,442.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,515,008 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 161,597 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during August who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in July was 162,473. A breakdown of this employment for August follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	33	--------	--------	33
Crete	78	--------	--------	78
England	2,974	--------	121	2,853
France	21,219	17,341	12	3,866
Germany	78,132	66,106	86	11,940
Greece	247	--------	--------	247
Japan	50,598	17,804	14,422	18,372
Korea	6,214	6,214	--------	--------
Morocco	1,494	--------	738	756
Netherlands	56	--------	--------	56
Trinidad	552	--------	552	--------
Total	161,597	107,465	15,931	38,201

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second itme, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2195. A bill for the relief of Prof. Arturo Serrano-Plaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2196. A bill to provide for the free entry of a rheogoniometer for the use of Ohio State University; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 2197. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Clark, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Hart):

S. 2198. A bill to provide for a separate session of Congress each year for the consideration of appropriation bills, to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, for Mr. Magnuson, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 2199. A bill to provide for a parkway connection between Mount Vernon and Woodlawn Plantations, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2200. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection for emphysema which develops within 5 years from the date of separation from services during a period of war; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2201. A bill for the relief of the widow and children of the late Edwin H. Van Gessel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 2202. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend the period within which certain veterans of World War II may be afforded vocational rehabilitation training under such chapter; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 2203. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. Hartke):

S. 2204. A bill authorizing the project for navigation at Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2205. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe DiCenso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to provide that October 15, 1963, shall be designated as White Cane Safety Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen):

S.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

RESOLUTIONS

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NORTH AMERICAN CONSERVATION HALL OF FAME AND MUSEUM

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. McCarthy) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 205) favoring the establishment of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Humphrey, which appears under a separate heading.)

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HARTKE submitted a resolution (S. Res. 206) to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Hartke, which appears under a separate heading.)

ENFORCEMENT OF PROVISIONS OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR NORTHWEST ATLANTIC FISHERIES

Mr. PELL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 207) to urge the President to secure fuller enforcement of provisions of the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Pell, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORIZATION TO SHIP AUTOMOBILES TO AND FROM ALASKA BY COMMERCIAL MOTOR CARRIER AND ALASKA FERRY SYSTEM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, in behalf of the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and myself, a bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system.

Alaska and Hawaii are treated by the military departments, for many purposes, as oversea duty stations. One of the benefits accruing to armed services personnel, in making a permanent change of station to an oversea area, is that the Government will pay for transportation of one privately owned vehicle per family, between regular ports of embarkation and debarkation. In other words, the family of a member of the armed services, moving on a permanent change of station to Alaska, would be entitled to have the family automobile sent, at Government expense, between Seattle and Anchorage.

As I understand it, some of these privately owned vehicles move by Government vessel, some by charter vessel, and the rest, more than half, by privately owned American shipping services. All of these methods are authorized by statute, and in most oversea areas the only means possible is water transportation. Alaska, however, is connected to the contiguous 48 States by land as well as water routes. Therefore, it would be possible to move these private vehicles by land carriers to and from Alaska. It would be possible, that is, if payment for such transportation were authorized by law. It is not.

It is a general rule that between any two points transportation of cargo by water is cheaper than transportation by land carrier. Between Anchorage, Alaska, and Seattle, Wash., however, on certain items, truckers have become competitive with water carriers. The reason for this is that part of the trip is made on the Alaska ferry system, a State-owned ferry service, connecting points in Alaska with Prince Rupert, British Columbia. By using the ferry, truckers cut their costs way down. In fact, one carrier has advised me that he could save the Government $100 per vehicle if he were given the opportunity to move these privately owned vehicles, which he believes would result in an annual saving of more than $100,000.

Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. Gruening] and I believe, and we are certain our colleagues will agree with us, that the Defense Department should be authorized to transport the privately owned vehicles of military personnel by the mode that is least expensive. This is why we have introduced legislation in this regard. In the interest of increasing economy in Government as well as developing more competition in the Alaska transportation industry, I hope this proposed legislation is taken up for consideration at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2197) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the military departments, in certain cases, to ship automobiles to and from the State of Alaska by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system, introduced by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Gruening), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (1);

(2) striking out the period at the end of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or"; and

(3) adding at the end thereof a new clause as follows:

"(3) in the case of movements to and from Alaska, by commercial motor carrier via highways and the Alaska ferry system between customary ports of embarkation and debarkation, if such means of transport is more economical for the United States than other authorized means."

PROPOSED CHANGE OF GOVERNMENTAL FISCAL YEAR

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a separate session of Congress each year for the consideration of appropriation bills, to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes. I ask that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I believe has jurisdiction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2198) to provide for a separate session of Congress each year for the consideration of appropriation bills, to establish the calendar year as the fiscal year of the Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Clark (for Mr. Magnuson and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am grateful to the Senator for introducing the bill, on behalf of myself and other Senators. Such a bill was introduced by me in previous sessions, in the hope that some of the things suggested even by editorial writers could be done. It would save some money in the long run.

I have discussed the bill with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand he is agreeable to having the bill sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, where I believe it belongs. He has stated that he will take the matter up with his committee.

We can obtain a hearing on the question, for the first time, to determine whether something can be done about doing what every other parliamentary body in the world of which I know does, namely, having what is known as a legislative session and a fiscal session. Even in State legislatures where perhaps there are continuous sessions, at a certain time during the session legislative activity is stopped and the legislature proceeds to consider appropriations and taxes. Then the right hand knows what the left hand has been doing, and there is an opportunity to evaluate progress. This bill would afford a similar opportunity for the Federal Government.

There is an added feature. Adoption of this proposal would allow the Congress to take a recess at the time it should take a recess, and then proceed to consider appropriations, taxes, or whatever might be required for the fiscal year. The proposal has a great deal of merit. It would allow us to consider authorizations and evaluate them, and determine exactly what should be done to implement the authorizations in a fiscal way.

No doubt there will be some "bugs" in the proposal; but I am sure they can be eliminated.

This proposal would change the fiscal year of the Government and make it correspond with the economy of the Nation. It would change the fiscal year to the calendar year, January 1, to December 31.

The way things have been going, the date of July 1 has become a fiction, so far as appropriations for the fiscal year are concerned. I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which deals with the independent offices of the Government. We consider a large appropriation bill, affecting a great many segments of the economy of the country. That bill has not even come to us from the House, yet it is now the 1st of October. Last year it was nearly the end of the session before we received the bill and were able to do something about it. The bill deals with many agencies which have great effect on the economy of the United States. Those agencies do not know what they can do or cannot do. They do not have their appropriations.

This procedure would allow us to go forward in an orderly way. I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania feels that it would be helpful, along with his other suggestions, with which I agree wholeheartedly, as he knows.

This is another key in the business of adapting Congress to the times, particularly in the fiscal field. We cannot guarantee anything, but I believe the Appropriations Committees of the Congress should be given more time and greater opportunity to consider the authorizations. Perhaps committee members should even have time to go home and find out what the people think, in order to make appropriations in a much more judicious, economical, and sensible manner.

There have been many occasions when I have attended meetings of the Appropriations Committee when the committee was discussing an appropriation for a certain program at the same time the Senate was, in this Chamber, discussing the same program and changing the authorization or certain portions of it.

Formerly there was one appropriation bill, and perhaps one or two deficiency appropriation bills at the most.

The Senator from Alabama, who has served a long time on the Appropriations Committee, as I have, knows that the handling of appropriations has been concluded nearer and nearer to the beginning of the calendar year. There is no longer such a thing as having appropriation bills passed by July 1.

This proposal would put some sense and order into the procedure, and add other features. I am pleased to have the Senator from Pennsylvania join me.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] said that at the first meeting of the Judiciary Committee he would ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I hope that the Parliamentarian will see fit to refer it to the Committee on Rules and Administration now, because I think technically and logically it belongs to that committee, anyway.

BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IND.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize navigation improvements for Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind.

Indiana badly needs a public harbor facility to serve the industrial development in our Porter County area. The Corps of Engineers has recommended the project after finding it feasible from both technical and economic considerations. The Bureau of the Budget has now concurred in recommending its construction.

The State of Indiana, Mr. President, has long been interested in total development of its Lake Michigan shoreline. It is today the only State bordering on a Great Lake which does not have a public, deep draft harbor constructed under the Federal navigation improvement program. The Burns Waterway Harbor will provide us with this facility.

There has been considerable delay in the consideration of this project caused by careful study of the land-use priority of the area. After careful deliberation, the executive agencies now concur in recommending industrial and harbor use of this section of the shoreline. Other adjacent sections are of significant value to preserve for conservation and to provide for the recreation of the millions who live around the southern tip of Lake Michigan. The Department of Interior is presently developing a proposal to provide an Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

A bill implementing their proposal will be introduced soon, and I intend to be a sponsor of that legislation also. There is no conflict between the harbor and industrialization of one section of the Indiana Lakeshore and the development of a national park in other sections.

With the introduction of this bill, I am hopeful we will begin our final step toward realization of these two important projects—the Indiana Public Harbor and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.

The authorizing bill we introduce today contains provision to reimburse local interests for work done on the project. The pace of industrial construction in the area has accelerated. The need of harbor facilities is growing. To meet this need, the State of Indiana has undertaken to study the feasibility of locally financed construction of the Federal portion of the harbor. Indiana should not be penalized for taking this initiative. This bill provides for reimbursement if the State is successful in expediting the construction of this badly needed facility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2204) authorizing the project for navigation at Burns Waterway Harbor, Ind., introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

A NORTH AMERICAN CONSERVATION HALL OF FAME

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and myself, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution designed to encourage and commend the action that is being taken to establish a North American Conservation Hall of Fame.

In recent weeks Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag, of Minnesota, has advocated the establishment of such a hall of fame and museum. The State of Minnesota has offered a site high on the bluffs at historic Fort Snelling State Park. On September 10, 1963, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, and the American Fisheries Society, meeting in combined sessions, endorsed the idea unanimously.

This is indeed a splendid idea and long overdue. Governor Rolvaag has likened it to the Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum at Cooperstown, N.Y. This new purpose, however, is to honor the men who have reminded us to conserve and protect the natural resources and the beauty of our land. There is a distinguished line of worthy candidates already: Henry David Thoreau, John Audubon, Gifford Pinchot, Aldo Leopold, Theodore Roosevelt, and many others.

In such a Hall of Fame for Conservation, we do more than honor the pioneers of conservation. We honor the cause of conservation and provide ourselves with a continuous reminder of a most important task of the Nation. We owe much to these early conservationists. In many respects they were literally voices in the wilderness. At that, their amazing foresight did not envision, probably the quick and massive expansion of this continent, the growth of the population, the tremendous needs it had to draw upon the land.

It is all the more important then that their message be heeded. For years we have been prodigal with our natural resources. It was not wise, but there was so much wealth in the land that the raiding could be glossed over. It can be glossed over no longer. We need wisdom in our policy, and a part of getting it is a program of conservation education. The project in Minnesota will contribute much in creating a national consciousness in this important area.

Our natural resources are much more than the minerals under the soil, the timber above it, and indeed the quality and richness of the soil itself. There are also to be considered the fish and wildlife whose conservation is important to us. Recreation for our people is important too. Nothing is more vital in this than to provide opportunities for men to get close to original nature frequently and periodically, to nurture both body and spirit on its variety and beauty, its creative wildness, its deep support of human life.

By honoring those who have gone before, we will remind ourselves of present and urgent duties, and give inspiration to generations to come to maintain, conserve, and enrich the legacy.

The least we can do, and we should not do less, is to commend the actions being taken to establish a national shrine to give honor to the cause and to the outstanding Americans who have kept faith with it.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a press release outlining Governor Rolvaag's plans for the Conservation Hall of Fame be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the resolution and press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

Whereas Governor Karl F. Rolvaag, of the State of Minnesota, has called for the establishment of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum; and

Whereas the State of Minnesota has offered for consideration a site for such a hall of fame and museum at historic Fort Snelling State Park, Minnesota; and

Whereas on September 10, 1963, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and the American Fisheries Society, meeting in combined sessions, declared their unanimous endorsement of the proposal calling for the creation of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum; and

Whereas the establishment of such a hall of fame and museum would serve to honor and pay fitting tribute to the pioneers of conservation whose dedication led to the founding and development of the science of natural resources management; and

Whereas it is appropriate that every effort should be made to promote and inspire leadership in conservation endeavors, and to give lasting recognition to the great conservation leaders, past and present, of the North American countries; and

Whereas such recognition will serve to focus renewed international attention on the need for wisdom in the use of our resources and on the urgency of accelerated programs in conservation education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that there should be established and maintained, as a memorial to the important role played by conservation in the development of our free societies, a North American Conservation Hall of Fame and Museum, and the Senate does hereby commend, encourage, and sanction the efforts of the State of Minnesota, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, and the American Fisheries Society to establish such a hall of fame and museum.

The press release presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

ROLVAAG PROPOSES ESTABLISHMENT OF NORTH AMERICAN CONSERVATION HALL OF FAME AT FORT SNELLING

Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag today offered a Minnesota site for the establishment of a North American Conservation Hall of Fame—a national shrine dedicated to the pioneers of conservation.

In his welcoming address to delegates of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners convened here, the Governor proposed locating the shrine "on historic and hallowed ground, high on the bluffs near old Fort Snelling at the confluence on the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers."

Emphasizing that "our living standard can be no higher than the standards of our natural resources," Rolvaag said that the "creation of such an international edifice would contribute to a new focus on the need for wisdom in the use of our resource heritage and the urgency for accelerated programs in conservation education."

He compared his plan to the national Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum at Cooperstown, N.Y., except that "we would be paying tribute to the Henry David Thoreaus, the John Audubons, the Gifford Pinchots, Aldo Leopolds—to those men who dedicated their lives to making us understand that our national strength stems from those resources we have all too often taken too much for granted."

The Governor said that he had already made inquiries concerning the proposal in the Nation's Capital, and that the idea had met with "enthusiastic support" from Federal officials.

"Key Federal officials are agreed that recognition for conservation's pioneers is long overdue. I personally feel a sense of historical urgency for this proposal," he said.

He urged the assembled conservationists to support the proposal and to "move together in a united effort to insure that future generations, who shall inherit the blessings of resources enriched and preserved through the wisdom of pioneer conservationists, shall not forget them but find them fully honored in a national shrine."

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I submit a resolution to amend Senate rule XXV, to provide for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The time is overdue for the establishment of such a full-scale committee and staff as a counterpart to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House. That committee was established by Public Law 601, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which reduced the number of standing committees in the House from 48 to 19 and in the Senate from 33 to 15. As originally introduced by Senator La Follette, however, the act provided for a 16th Senate committee to be called the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This provision was stricken from the bill at the time in part on the argument that the then limitation of each Senator to two committees would deprive the proposed Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the service of experienced members of the Finance Committee, which still holds responsibility for veterans' pensions, insurance, and compensation. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on the other hand, deals with veterans' education and training, vocational rehabilitation, and GI loans. Under the proposed resolution, the nine-man Committee on Veterans' Affairs would preserve and consolidate the valuable experience of members of these two committees by including three members of the Committee on Finance, three from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and three from the Committee on Armed Services.

Veterans' affairs are of a scope and volume fully warranting, even requiring, a single committee with adequate staff and consolidated responsibility. The more than 20 million veterans in this country are about 6 times the number of farmers in the land and are served by a Veterans' Administration with some 175,000 employees. Seven hundred thousand of them enter the 170 VA hospitals in a year. A million disabled veterans receive non-service-connected disability pensions, 2 million get similar service-incurred pensions, and more than a million survivors of veterans—widows, children, dependent parents—receive death compensation or pensions. In all, the Federal Government's programs in veterans' affairs are a $6 billion annual business.

The heavy business of the Finance Committee and of the Labor and Education Committee leave too little time by either members or staff for thorough consideration of important veterans' affairs from pensions and life insurance to vocational rehabilitation and medical care. As Senator La Follette said as long ago as 1946, a Veterans' Affairs Committee must be set up "in the near future in order to relieve the Finance Committee of a tremendous burden"—and today he might have added, the Labor and Education Committee as well. In the the 87th Congress well over 400 veterans' measures were introduced. Their channeling through a single Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this body is a needed forward step toward their best and most effective handling.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, three who are also members of the Committee on Finance, three who are also members of the Committee on Armed Services, and three who are also members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs."

SEC. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations) is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-eighth Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF H.R. 8363 TO REMOVE LIMITATIONS ON DEDUCTIONS FOR EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES BY MINING INDUSTRIES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on June 27, I introduced on my own behalf and for Senators ALLOTT, BARTLETT, BIBLE, ENGLE, HUMPHREY, LONG of Missouri, MCGOVERN, MOSS, MUNDT, and SIMPSON, the bill S. 1807, which would remove existing limitations on income tax deductions for exploration and discovery expenditures of mining industries. The purpose of this measure is to accord expenditures for exploration and discovery of new mineral deposits the same tax treatment that is allowed research expenditures in other industrial enterprises. By provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, deductions are now limited on exploration expenditures by mining enterprises to a total of $400,000, at a rate of no more than $100,000 a year. Clearly, this limitation penalizes investors in mining enterprises and operators of mines.

As this measure is a logical amendment to the Internal Revenue bill, H.R. 8363, which was passed by the House of Representatives last Wednesday, it has been suggested by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee Mr. BYRD of Virginia, that it be submitted as an amendment to H.R. 8363.

I now send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 8363 to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove limitations on deductions for exploration expenditures of mining industries, in which I am joined as sponsor by Senators BARTLETT, BIBLE, HUMPHREY, LONG of Missouri, MUNDT, and MOSS. I ask unanimous consent that this amendment lie on the table until Friday, October 4, so other Members of the Senate who wish to do so may join me in cosponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR A COMMITTEE TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time allowed on the Committee on Government Operations to file certain reports of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate be extended to December 31, 1963.

This request is made necessary because of the extremely heavy workload now being carried by the subcommittee. There are two reports which have not yet been filed: First, the Department of Agriculture Handling of Pooled Cotton Allotments of Billie Sol Estes; and, second, Pyramiding of Profits and Costs in the Missile Procurement Program. The subcommittee feels that the record of the hearings in the Department of Agriculture investigation will not be complete without hearing the testimony of Billie Sol Estes. Until recently his appearance before the subcommittee has not been possible because there were existing pending court trials in which he was a defendant. The subcommittee delayed his appearance in order not to prejudice or jeopardize these judicial proceedings. This situation no longer exists and at the earliest possible time the subcommittee plans to schedule his appearance. The report concerning the missile inquiry has not been filed as yet because of the inability of the subcommittee to find sufficient time to devote to study of the record. We hope that this also can be concluded in the not too distant future.

On July 2, 1963, the Senate granted permission to extend the time for the filing of these reports to September 30. At that time, it appeared that it might be possible to finish the work by that date. In the light of the necessary delays for reasons I have mentioned above, it has not been possible to do so and I hereby request unanimous consent for the extension of the time until December 31.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OVERTIME SERVICES OF CUSTOMS OFFICERS—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE AT THE DESK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2173) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees, be held at the desk for additional cosponsors until the close of business October 8, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CHARLES H. TENNEY TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that the hearing scheduled for Thursday, October 3, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Charles H. Tenney, of New York, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of New York, vice Alexander Bicks, deceased, has been postponed until further notice.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Mr. Younger had been appointed as a conferee on the part of the House in the conference on the bill (S. 1576) to provide assistance in combating mental retardation through grants for construction of research centers and grants for facilities for the mentally retarded and assistance in improving mental health through grants for construction and initial staffing of community mental health centers, and for other purposes, vice Mr. Bennett of Michigan, excused.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2485) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 5555) to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE STOCKPILE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two editorials, one entitled "The Symington Report," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for September 29, 1963; and one entitled "The Stockpile Report," published in the Washington Daily News of September 30, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 29, 1963]

The Symington Report

There has always been a high degree of political content in the Symington subcommittee's stockpiling investigation. That was inevitable because officials of the Eisenhower administration were being investigated by a Democratic Senator with the aid of a Democratic administration. The flavor of politics continues with the refusal of Republican members of the subcommittee, and of Democratic Senator Thurmond, to sign the report approved by Senator Symington and two other Democratic members.

It would be unfortunate, however, if the report were simply shrugged off as partisan. By and large, the hearings were responsibly and objectively conducted. A distinguished Republican lawyer, Richmond C. Coburn, of St. Louis, directed them as chief counsel for the subcommittee. The report deserves serious attention, and its conclusions are disturbing.

The investigation has established beyond doubt, it seems to us, that unnecessary official secrecy has been used to hide information of the stockpiling program which the public was entitled to; that a program supposed to serve only the national security has been diverted to other purposes, including price support for favored interests and certain foreign policy objectives; that defensible standards for purchase of supposedly strategic materials have been lacking, and have been rigged at times to favor particular interests; and finally that unconscionable profits have accrued to some suppliers who took advantage of the Government.

The most prominent case in the last category involves the M. A. Hanna Co. and its nickel deal, signed in the waning days of the Truman administration just before George M. Humphrey, board chairman of Hanna, became Secretary of the Treasury in the Eisenhower Cabinet. The subcommittee report proves, we think, that this contract never should have been accepted by the Truman administration; that the Hanna Co. took merciless advantage of the Government in time of war in order to gain for itself a highly profitable smelter at no risk and at the public cost.

Mr. Humphrey has never admitted there was anything improper about this deal, but the hard fact remains that the company in which he continued to hold stock while serving the Government acquired for $1,772,000 a $22 million smelter paid for by Government funds. No less than four times during the hearings Mr. Humphrey insisted that the Government investment in the smelter had been "fully repaid with interest," but the report makes clear that in fact Hanna's only outlay for a $22 million plant was $1,772,000, and that the Hanna firm did indeed reap a tidy windfall.

Mr. Humphrey also told the Senate committee which in 1953 confirmed his appointment to the Cabinet that "I have no connection with it whatsoever" (referring to the Hanna deal which had been signed a few days before); but the Symington report establishes conclusively that he made the policy decisions on it and profited from it while he sat in the Cabinet.

This is not a pretty story, and it is not to be glossed over with the cry of "politics." If the Hanna deal and others like it are now water over the dam, they point up an urgent need for legislation proposed by the subcommittee staff to prevent such abuses in the future. Stockpiling for strategic purposes ought not to be used for price support, the Government should be protected against windfall profits to contractors, and full information on the program should be available to the public. The Symington investigation, we would say, has been an extremely useful one.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 30, 1963]

The Stockpile Report

A Senate subcommittee says subsidiaries of M. A. Hanna Co., Cleveland, made unconscionable profits in a nickel stockpiling deal with the Government. Republican members say Chairman Stuart L. Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, slanted the findings against Eisenhower administration officials, notably George M. Humphrey.

Mr. Humphrey was head of Hanna and the contract was signed 3 days before he became Treasury Secretary. This was regrettable timing for Mr. Humphrey.

The report is a good one. It makes no charges of criminal doings against Hanna but establishes that the firm's nickel profits were considerable, to say the least.

What the report boils down to is this:

At grips with the war in Korea, the Government sought a domestic supply of nickel ore. Hanna alone had such a supply. Federal officials sought more favorable terms, but they were outgunned. Hanna had the ore. It also had Mr. Humphrey, a hardheaded businessman famed for driving good bargains.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these two editorials discuss in some detail the Symington report on the so-called stockpile problems. They point out favorably the contribution the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] has made to the solution of this very difficult problem.

On the basis of these editorials and other information the Senate has obtained both within and outside the Symington report, I suggest that the Department of Justice proceed without delay to take note of the fact that Mr. George M. Humphrey, the former Secretary of the Treasury, testified under oath, and it should make a thorough investigation as to the possibility of serious discrepancies between his testimony under oath and the facts, because such an investigation is necessary in order to determine whether Mr. Humphrey has committed perjury and in order to determine whether legal action and prosecution should be instituted.

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, late yesterday afternoon I discussed briefly some of my views on the Dominican Republic crisis. This morning I asked the Foreign Relations Committee to recall before it the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, Mr. Martin; and the U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, Mr. Moscoso; and in addition, I have asked that there be called before the committee the Director of the CIA, Mr. McCone, because as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I am greatly disturbed by information I have received from sources I consider highly reliable.

In my speech yesterday, I referred to the alleged activities in the Dominican Republic of American business interests who, it is said, were behind the military coup, and who are strong opponents of the Bosch regime, which was the constitutional regime of the Dominican Republic. So far as I am concerned, I shall press for presentation to the Foreign Relations Committee of every known bit of evidence in regard to the activities in the Dominican Republic of powerful American business concerns who, it is charged in some quarters, helped engineer the overthrow of the Bosch regime. Not only is it important that the President of the United States be informed of the facts, whatever they may be—for I am satisfied that if such facts exist, he has not been informed of them; it is also important that the American people be informed.

CLOSING OF U.S. BASES IN FRANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article—from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—dealing with the closing of certain U.S. bases in France. I highly commend that course of action.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES CLOSING SOME BASES IN FRANCE AND RETURNING HOME THEIR 5,400 TROOPS—6,200 FRENCH CIVILIANS TO BE DISMISSED AT SUPPLY DEPOTS—GERMAN INSTEAD OF FRENCH PORT TO BE USED FOR STREAMLINED LOGISTICS LINE

WASHINGTON, September 28.—The United States is streamlining its military supply lines in Europe, closing a group of bases in France and sending home the 5,400 U.S. soldiers who man them.

A Pentagon spokesman said the action, announced yesterday, was being taken in the interests of economy. He denied that friction with the government of French President Charles de Gaulle had anything to do with the shutdown.

The 6,200 French civilians working at the military supply depots will be dismissed, the Defense Department said. This move will eliminate nearly one-third of the U.S. Army's civilian French employees, who totaled 19,000 as of last July 1.

Earlier this week, the Pentagon announced that an entire armored division, 16,000 troops, would be airlifted to West Germany in 240 transport planes for a week of maneuvers. The operation will be the largest oversea airlift ever undertaken.

MAY POINT TO WITHDRAWALS

There was speculation at that time that the massive airlift could point the way to eventual withdrawal of some of the U.S. combat troops now stationed in Europe, thus aiding in reduction of the Nation's balance-of-payments deficit.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has said that the airlift would "provide a dramatic illustration of the U.S. capability for rapid reinforcement of NATO forces." He said that it would "project a new magnitude of U.S. military responsiveness."

The Pentagon said yesterday that the port and depot facilities would be closed in France because "shorter, more economical routes of supply * * * will permit forward positioning of military stocks."

The troops to be returned home were identified as the 4th Logistical Command, with headquarters at Verdun. There was no estimate as to when the reorganization might be completed, but similar operations have sometimes taken 12 to 18 months.

FORTY THOUSAND TO BE REDEPLOYED

The troops being brought home presumably are in addition to the 40,000 scheduled for redeployment back to the United States by the end of this year.

Involved in the base shutdown is the organization called the communications zone in France, which backs up U.S. combat forces of the 7th Army in Germany and other U.S. forces in France. It includes port installations, storage and supply depots and transport facilities.

The Pentagon stressed that it will preserve the present capability of the line of communication to expand in event of wartime requirements on short notice.

"This action will permit forward positioning of military stocks and will yield tangible economies in U.S. material and manpower," the Pentagon said. "It will result in more economical and efficient use of transportation resources."

The Pentagon said improved American sea and airlift capabilities, which it called massive, "make it feasible to reinforce these installations if this becomes necessary."

DISCUSSED WITH ALLIES

The new arrangements have been discussed with the French and German Governments, and the NATO alliance council, the Pentagon said.

U.S. Army strength in Europe now stands at around 250,000.

Much of the equipment now used by U.S. forces in Europe is delivered mainly through French ports. Under the reorganization, most of the gear required on a day-by-day basis will move, instead through Bremerhaven, Germany.

All U.S. depot activities, except maintenance, west of Orleans, France, will be reduced or placed in war reserve storage status.

Depot maintenance activities in western France will be shifted to forward depots in Germany and to the continental United States, except for Marine maintenance facilities at Rochefort.

Depot maintenance at Chinon and logistical activities at Saumur and Ingrandes will be trimmed significantly.

In northeastern France, some of the depot sites in the Nancy, Verdun and Metz areas will be closed or converted to war reserve storage.

Depots in France will be reorganized into five general complexes—at Braconne, La Rochelle, Ingrandes, Nancy and Verdon.

DE GAULLE REPORTED ANGERED

The United States was reported, meanwhile, to have offered to share the use of some of its military supply bases in France with West Germany. This move has angered President de Gaulle, reliable sources have said.

Officials in Washington denied the report. They said that all three countries have been holding private discussions on cooperative use of logistical facilities, both in France and elsewhere in Europe for reasons of military efficiency.

French sources here said the bases had been placed in France under a treaty with the United States and they assumed French permission would have to be granted for the Americans to share them with the Germans.

Washington's aim, diplomatic sources believe, is to tie the Germans as tightly as possible to American military power in hope that this would forestall the eventual possibility of Bonn turning to France for a bilateral nuclear deal.

NASSER'S WAR IN YEMEN

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, unnoticed by many Americans, and consigned to the inside pages of the newspapers by more dramatic tales of Indonesia's aggressive activities and the guerrilla warfare in South Vietnam, a virulent shooting war is going on in the strategic Middle Eastern land of Yemen. For nearly a year now, what amounts to an Egyptian army of 20,000 to 30,000 men, equipped with modern Soviet weapons, is fighting an irregular army of Yemen tribesmen supporting a deposed king.

Most observers agree that if the Egyptians left, the Royalist tribesmen would sweep the new republic out of power, and would return their king to the throne. U.S. recognition was extended to the republic only on condition that foreign troops be withdrawn; but Egypt's President Nasser has no intention of deserting his new outpost of empire.

Meanwhile, Soviet influence is gaining in Yemen. The number of Soviet technicians has increased tremendously, and Soviet equipment and personnel are, in fact, making it possible for Nasser to continue his occupation of Yemen.

Mr. President, it is incredible to me that the United States continues, even under these circumstances, to supply Nasser with U.S. foreign aid. Our aid to Indonesia will be curtailed, we are told, in a dramatic gesture of disapproval of Sukarno's aggressive threats against Malaysia. Yet U.S. aid to Nasser, who not only threatens aggression, but sends his troops into a foreign nation, continues unabated. It is further evidence, Mr. President, of the double standard that is applied in the Middle East—a double standard which results in continued U.S. aid to a regime which has violated virtually every principle of international law, and has directly flouted the interests of the free world and of the United States.

Mr. President, it is time to expose and to end this double standard, and to see the facts for what they are. Nasser's aggression to Yemen is no less reprehensible than Sukarno's designs on Malaysia; and the fact that Nasser took advantage of a civil uprising to send in his troops is no camouflage for the Egyptian aggression that now is underway in Yemen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an informative article on the Yemen situation. The article was written by Joseph M. Hochstein, of the Advance Washington bureau, and was recently published in the Staten Island Advance.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YEAR-OLD WAR IN YEMEN GIVES RUSSIA A FOOTHOLD

(By Joseph M. Hochstein)

WASHINGTON.—While the cold war dominates the world spotlight, a shooting war is being waged with amazing results in the strategic Middle Eastern land of Yemen near the Asian entrance to the Red Sea.

Virtually unobserved by outsiders, this bitter conflict is the hottest war on the face of the globe today and now appears headed into its second year.

It has produced gains for the Soviet Union and setbacks for the United States.

The most accurate intelligence obtainable about the fighting in remote Yemen, where no U.S. newsmen are based, has been assembled from various sources here and is as follows:

On one side is a trained Egyptian Army of 20,000 to 30,000 men equipped with modern Soviet jet fighters, jet bombers, and tanks. Propping up a regime that staged a revolt against King Mohamed al-Badr last September 26, the Egyptians hold Yemen's three biggest cities and major roads.

On the other side is an irregular army of 25,000 or more Arab tribesmen native to Yemen's mountainous hinterlands. They support Yemen's deposed king and control two-thirds of the nation, fighting with small arms.

The Soviet-armed Egyptians have been unable to dislodge the mountaineers, and observers on all sides agree that the royalist tribesmen would sweep the Yemen Republic out of power if Egyptian troops were not present.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union has exploited the situation to grab a new foothold in this part of the Middle East.

The number of Soviet technicians in Yemen has increased at least tenfold since the revolt last September, and some 700 to 1,000 are now building a jet airfield that probably will serve as a fueling base for Soviet flights to Africa.

Until last fall, the Soviet presence had been on a decline dating from a break between Yemen and Egypt in November 1961, and had hit a low point of probably fewer than 100 technicians.

The figure today, including technicians from East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, is believed between 1,300 and 1,500

In addition, it has been reported that Soviet airmen have flown as co-pilots on Egyptian bombing missions over Yemen villages.

Washington lacks direct evidence that would disprove or confirm those reports.

But it has been learned that a squadron of Soviet aircraft presumably intended for use in Yemen was delivered several months ahead of schedule to Egypt last year, leaving the Egyptians short of trained men to operate the planes. It is speculated that Soviet fliers filled the gap.

The cost of the war in Yemen to Egypt is estimated between $200 million and $350 million at a yearly rate.

Egypt has maintained as many as 28,000 to 30,000 troops in Yemen and now has at least 20,000. A first group of Egyptian technicians arrived in Yemen by sea the day after the September 26 overthrow of the king. Rotation of troops as replacements has brought perhaps as many as 40,000 Egyptians to Yemen in the past year.

The Egyptians are using Soviet equipment that includes about 40 MIG-21 jet fighters, about 40 TU-16 jet bombers, 40 to 60 IL-28 jet bombers of the type that were placed in Cuba last fall, and enough T-54 medium tanks and Stalin Mark-3 heavy tanks to equip an armored brigade of 5,000 men. The T-54 is the standard medium tank of the Red Army, and the Stalin Mark-3 is the heaviest tank in the Middle East.

The Egyptian force in Yemen has consisted of 5 full brigades of 5,000 men each plus elements of 4 others.

The five full brigades are one armored unit, one motorized infantry brigade with armored personnel carriers, two regular infantry brigades and one commando brigade including two paratroop battalions.

Estimates of casualties place the Egyptian dead and wounded at about 3,000. The Egyptians have lost large amounts of equipment in rugged terrain.

Royalist casualties have been heavy but mainly among civilians, including women and children. Egyptian bombing raids have wiped out at least 200 villages. With accurate figures unavailable, a rough estimate figuring 10 percent of the villagers as casualties would put the dead and wounded in excess of 10,000.

No outside authority has investigated the attacks on civilians. The role of the United Nations in Yemen is to observe and report on the withdrawal of foreign influences.

The United States withheld recognition of the Yemen Republic for almost 3 months until it obtained a promise that foreign troops would be withdrawn, but has been unable to make Egypt's President Gamal Abdel Nasser keep his promise to pull out.

Washington succeeded in April in halting shipments of small arms and bullets to the royalist tribesmen from the neighboring royal government in Saudi Arabia. Those arms were embarrassing Washington, since they had been supplied earlier to Saudi Arabia as U.S. aid.

U.S. officials have given up hope of holding Egypt to its past promise to pull out. No withdrawal is expected by Washington as long as the royalist forces remain able to fight on their own and threaten the Egyptian-backed Yemen Republic.

U.S. officials feel the problem cannot be solved in military terms, and they are now working behind the scenes for a coalition government in which posts would be offered to supporters of the deposed king in return for Egyptian withdrawal.

The proposal could have the effect of sowing dissension among the king's supporters and splintering their strength.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED SENATE VETERANS COMMITTEE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for a number of years I have strongly supported and worked for the creation of a Committee on Veterans Affairs in the U.S. Senate. As a member of a subcommittee which studied this specific question in detail in 1959, and as one who is firmly convinced of the need for a standing committee with special competence in the field of veterans legislation, I deplore the fact that no action has been taken in this matter.

Mr. President, it is said that consideration of a veterans committee should be a part of the overall study of congressional reform and reorganization which has been recommended by the Senate Rules Committee. Yet the creation of a veterans committee is a relatively small step. It has been studied not once but many times, and it is clear that on the basis of rational argument the creation of such a committee is long overdue. To tie the issue in with an overall congressional reform is in my judgment the best way to kill it, or, at the very least, postpone it indefinitely.

I have already included in the RECORD a number of resolutions passed by veterans organizations in support of the establishment of a Senate Veterans Committee. I now ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD a resolution on this matter passed by the 68th annual national convention of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas legislation concerning veterans affairs regularly takes up considerable time of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the House of Representatives has found it helpful to establish and maintain a Committee on Veterans' Affairs to which is referred all bills affecting veterans; and

Whereas the Senate of the United States has no similar committee but assigns such proposed legislation to its Committee on Finance, Labor, and Welfare, and to other committees, all of which have crowded calendars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in 68th annual national convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 4–11, 1963, urges upon the Senate of the United States the immediate establishment of a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION IN THE OPERATION OF THE RAILROADS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Monkey Wrench in Rails," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on September 28, 1963. I commend the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for a series of excellent editorials which they have written ever since the beginning of the crisis in the rail dispute. The editorial is in line with their high standard of journalism.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONKEY WRENCH IN RAILS

The five railroad operating unions, having reduced collective bargaining to impotency, are now apparently trying to perform the same service for compulsory arbitration.

They demand that the board created by Congress to settle the two issues of firemen and crew makeup hold the railroads to all the proposals they have accepted or made in the past 2 years even though the proposals were rejected by the unions. They contend that the arbitrators are bound to this course by the language of the congressional resolution defining their powers, specifically the provision that the board "shall incorporate in (its) decision any matters on which it finds the parties were in agreement * * * and shall * * * give due consideration to those matters on which the parties were in tentative agreement."

The parties were not in agreement on either of the issues before the board. As to elimination of firemen from diesel freight and yard engines, the unions offered a reduction of only a few hundred from the 32,000 firemen in freight and yard service and the railroads rejected the proposal. As to crew makeup, the railroads and the unions could never agree on the classes of service to which an agreed-on procedure should supply. Nonagreement on the two especially stubborn issues is in fact what the arbitration board is all about.

But the unions want to stretch the definition of "agreement" to include concessions made in the course of bargaining in the hope they might lead to agreement, and to include proposals the railroads accepted from two Presidential boards and from Secretary of Labor Wirtz. Howard Neitzert, chief counsel for the railroads, is, we believe, entirely right when he contends these concessions should not be made the floor for the arbitration's board design of settlement. If they were, parties engaged in collective bargaining in the future might be understandably reluctant to offer concessions of substance, or to accept proposals of Presidential boards or mediators as the basis for further negotiations, lest they be held to them in the event of compulsory arbitration. The process of collective bargaining and the procedures of the Railway Labor Act as well would suffer immeasurably in consequence.

The board of arbitration will need all the elbow room it can get in order to do a creditable job. We hope it will not allow itself to be hedged in with old failures. Plainly Congress intent was that the board should profit from the spadework of the Presidential boards and Secretary Wirtz, and should make the most of voluntary agreements before imposing settlements. But we do not believe it was the intent of Congress or should be the policy of the board to penalize either party for proposals made or accepted in a spirit of reasonableness and bargaining in good faith. The cleaner the board wipes the slate, the better it will be able to write on it.

THE GOLD MYTH AND THE DOLLAR DILEMMA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the balance-of-payments deficit problem of the United States and the corresponding fear of some people about the soundness of the American dollar nags us. If it has not been as immediately urgent in business before us as the test ban treaty, or civil rights, it is not far out of sight, and cannot be put out of mind. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], has kept us all in his debt for his depth analyses and commentary in recent weeks.

I myself have called attention to the report of the Brookings Institution and its analysis by Walter Salant and a team of economists. I wish now to call attention to a pertinent and provocative article by the economist and investment banker, William Stix Wasserman. It appears in the Thursday, August 29, issue of the Commercial and Financial Chronicle.

Mr. Wasserman has noted that the American dollar is basically in sound shape. We have had unjustifiable fears about our balance-of-payments position in terms of its effect upon our budget. That is, our adverse balance of payments looks puny indeed against the nearly $100 billion of our ownings abroad. Much of the scare talk simply has not looked at the total picture of our situation.

This is not to say that there are no problems or concerns to which to apply a corrective. There is a problem of "liquidity," of enough cash or credit available at a given time to finance some of the necessary expansion of trade and economic development in the world. On September 3 here, I referred to it as essentially a problem of having more blood to fill the arteries and supply the needs of a larger body. As long as cash and credit is tied narrowly to gold reserves, and as long as they do not grow at the same rate as the economic body does, we will continue to have this problem. No manipulation of interest rates, promotion of American intourism, expansion of our our exports, further tying of our foreign aid to purchases in America—however desirable some of these may be—are going to make much difference. I believe there is a consensus of the economic experts on this now.

Thus far we either talk about this problem in such a way as to create an unwarranted psychological panic or take restrictive and deflationary fiscal measures at home, such as raising interest rates on short-term money, when our own economy needs a contrary attitude and procedure with which to expand. Or, if we do look forward as the Salant report does, to an overcoming of our present deficit in balance of payments by 1968, it is bound, under present circumstances, to be achieved by pinching someone else.

The answer strongly points to a broader base than gold to support international credit.

Mr. Wasserman cites a forceful example of how one can have a lot of gold and literally choke on it. He cites another to underline the economic truth that it is productivity, not gold, which is the basis of a nation's strength and wealth. In the middle thirties we had 12 million unemployed on the streets, while our banks bulged with gold. At the same time, with no gold, Germany was building one of the greatest war machines in history.

Mr. Wasserman acknowledges the psychological hold of gold upon us. He does not think it wise to try to abandon it or its mystique completely. He does advocate the loosening of its stranglehold upon the economy of the free world. He proposes a five point program. In part, it involves international agreement to restrict speculation and hoarding in gold and to achieve greater cooperation of the central banks in using larger amounts of the free world currencies for their reserves. In part, and if necessary, he advocates that the United States pursue a flexible policy upon its buying price for gold and upon taxation of short-term funds borrowed here for use in speculation with the dollar.

I do not profess to be an economist or to have all of the answers. I know Mr. Wasserman to be a conservative in the best sense of that word—which does not preclude learning new duties and new techniques to meet new occasions. He is no advocate of easy money, cheap money, or inflated money.

Whether we are economists or not, we are all going to have to do some serious study, investigation, and learning in this area. By way of bringing Mr. Wasserman's lucid discussion to the attention of my colleagues for study and reflection, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Letter to the Editor: The Gold Myth and the Dollar Dilemma

Editor, Commercial and Financial Chronicle:

For hundreds of years, sea exploration was retarded because most men believed that the earth was flat, and that should they venture too far to sea they would certainly encounter disaster at the earth's rim.

Today, men are held in equal bondage by the myth that gold is essential to their well-being, and that without it their money would lose value in an avalanche of inflated paper. Nothing could be further from the truth. A nation's wealth is based not on its gold supply but its productivity. Two examples of staggering force have occurred within our lifetime to prove the truth of this basic maxim. At the height of the depression in the early thirties when 12 million unemployed walked the streets and this country was in the direst economic straits it has ever been in, our banks and Treasury were bulging with gold. Conversely, despite the opinion of the majority of the banking world that Germany could never go to war because she had no gold, Hitler built the greatest war machine in the history of mankind. Dr. Schacht convinced him that production alone was the real source of wealth, and that if he could put the German people to work he need not worry about gold.

In both cases, solutions to the problems of the times lay in a fresh appraisal and a new economic approach. Our chief problem is one of liquidity where a diminishing gold supply is called upon to finance an ever-increasing volume of business at a time when our balance of payments is adverse.

OUR CONTEMPORARY BANK CURRENCY

It cannot be stated too often that the currency of our times no longer consists of gold or silver, or even a large number of paper dollars, but rather credit or bank currency in the form of checks. Almost all of our major business transactions are conducted on the basis of check or bank deposits. In the long run the Federal Reserve maintains the value of the dollar by regulating the total amount of bank credit outstanding in relation to the amount of goods and services available. Gold has ceased to have any bearing on the problem except as it affects Federal Reserve policies, which must be governed by the necessities of maintaining a balance between the country's credit needs on the one hand and a stable balance of international payments on the other. Today these are in conflict. Domestically we require low interest rates and easy credit. Internationally, to prevent further gold losses, we require tight money and high interest rates to attract foreign balances and to create a psychological climate of confidence by showing we mean to defend our gold position come what may. If the dollar was intrinsically weak there would be some justification for the latter course, but to defend the dollar at the expense of our economy by creating a condition of lessened rather than increased production (tight money always hampers production) seems completely absurd in view of the other steps available.

Logically, we might ignore our gold losses and permit our reserves to dwindle to the vanishing point secure in the knowledge that the intrinsic strength of our currency would eventually maintain its trading value. However, this might create a world panic. The psychological hold of gold on people's imagination is so great that pure logic must be abandoned and a more gradual approach substituted, embodying the retention of gold and acknowledgment of its mystique, while at the same time loosening its stranglehold on the economy.

THE DOLLAR'S INHERENT STRENGTH

Most people fail to realize the great inherent strength of the dollar. They become panicky at our continuing gold losses because they are unaware that we have been trading dollars and gold for the ownership of at least half the fuel resources of the free world, for oil fields in Arabia, Libya, and Venezuela, for refineries, pipelines, and filling stations throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa; for the ownership of at least half the automobile factories of Europe; for a dominant position in the telephone manufacturing companies of England, France, Holland, and Germany; and for ownership of countless other industries where American industry has established profitable subsidiaries throughout the free world.

If the total income of these investments were returned to the United States instead of being used for expansion, a large part of our balance-of-payments problems would be solved. Or, if we decided to curtail our economic and military aid and call in part of our $20 billion of Government loans abroad, the problem would disappear. But neither of these actions is feasible.

What constructive steps can be taken to increase the free world's liquidity and free our economy from its golden chains without upsetting world confidence? Ideally, individual gold speculation should be outlawed, and the tremendous supply now in private hands returned to the central banks to increase their liquid resources. To date, gold has been a one-way street with the advantage to the hoarder. He could always exchange his gold for a usable currency at a rate never below his purchase price and often considerably above. Consequently, most of the free world's newly mined gold has not gone to the central banks but rather into individual hands, for hoarding.

To be sure, to persuade the governments of Europe to prohibit private purchases of gold will be no easy matter. London has for centuries been its leading marketplace and it will be difficult to induce the British Government to pass laws that will diminish London's importance in this respect. In France one will encounter formidable opposition from a people long accustomed to regarding the hoarding of gold as their chief protection against a currency continually devalued. The Swiss, who earn an important part of their living by acting as custodian of the world's private fortunes, and who view private property in all forms as sacrosanct from government interference, will not welcome these measures. Therefore, as a workable compromise the following steps are suggested.

A CONSERVATIVE COMPROMISE

1. An agreement between the Central Banks of the free world that all their dealings in gold will be restricted to transactions amongst themselves. They will not buy from or sell to private banks or individuals any gold whatsoever, with the exception that the purchase of newly mined gold will be permitted providing it is made from certified mining companies. The mining companies, in turn, will be permitted to sell only to the Central Banks. Present individual gold owners will be given a grace period to exchange their gold at present rates for the currency of their choice. This will leave the free markets of London, Zurich, and Paris intact, but without Government support.

2. In the event of the refusal of the Central Banks of London, France, and Switzerland to cooperate in respect to the above, an announcement on the part of the President should be made that the United States reserves the right to lower its buying rate for gold should such action be deemed advisable.

3. Abolition of the present statutory—note cover requirements, whereby some $12 billion of Treasury gold must be kept on hand as a reserve for our combined deposit and Federal note liabilities.

4. The greater use of free world currencies as an acknowledged part of the Central Bank's reserve.

5. Curtailment, by taxation if necessary, of the use of so-called "Euro-Dollar" transactions. "Euro-Dollars" consist of money borrowed on short-term from American banks by both European and Canadian banks, who have used these credits to help finance European speculation against the dollar as well as the boom on the European stock exchanges. Part of these funds have been used for long-term industrial credits and could easily help provoke a liquidity crisis, since their withdrawal would present serious problems. Their existence is one of the main reasons for the present imbalance of the American exchange position. It is estimated that more than $5 billion is currently being utilized to maintain the present "Euro-Dollar" position.

The steps outlined above, by denying the private speculator access to the gold reserves of our Central Banks, would remove the most potent threat to the free world's exchange position. The Central Banks at this point would be exempt from outside pressures. Gold movements would take place only in response to the coordinated economic planning of the central banks, whose basic interest must be to promote exchange stability and economic growth.

In the long run, exchange stability depends on confidence. In the 19th century, the British pound was supreme despite the fact that the Bank of England gold reserves were meager, and that there were often adverse balances of trade and payment. The world knew that Great Britain was the world's leading industrial nation, that she had great invested wealth abroad, and most importantly, had wise economic leadership. Wisdom begins at home. We must teach the American people how strong the dollar really is. Part of our dollar weakness has resulted from our own ignorance and unjustifiable fears in regards to our budget position and balance of payments. Today, America is the world's greatest producer. Our wealth abroad is estimated at close to $100 billion, an enormous sum in comparison with the few billions of adverse balances that have created so much alarm. With a realistic solution to our liquidity and gold problems, we need no longer be inhibited in following a policy of expansion, which is so essential for our own and the world's well-being.

WILLIAM STIX WASSERMAN.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM G. "BILL" REIDY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to express my thanks and best wishes to a gentleman whose long service to this body deserves the gratitude of every Member. I refer, Mr. President, to William G. "Bill" Reidy, until yesterday staff director of the Special Committee on Aging, and who has served since 1947 as a valuable, stimulating, and constructive staff member in the Senate. Bill Reidy has been associated with major legislative enactments of the Congress, which have left a deep imprint on American society in the field of education and health.

I recall his valuable assistance to me in my efforts early in my Senate career to revitalize the Veterans' Administration's medical care program. Without his strong assistance it would have been impossible to accomplish the task.

I am happy to say that the task was fulfilled, and today the Veterans' Administration medical program is one of our finest programs.

I think the RECORD should show at least some of the major programs in which Bill Reidy has been deeply involved during his 16 years in the Senate. In chronological order, they are as follows:

Creation of the National Institute of Dental Research, 1947.

Creation of the National Institute of Metabolic Diseases, Blindness, 1949.

Creation of the National Institute on Arthritis and Rheumatism, 1948.

Creation of the National Library of Medicine, 1956.

Creation of a library service in rural areas, 1956.

Financing of local public health units, 1951.

Aproval of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1953.

Amending Food and Drug Act as regards pesticide chemicals and raw agricultural products, 1954.

Basic amendments to the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act, 1954.

Construction of non-Federal research facilities, 1955.

Poliomyelitis vaccination program of 1955.

National survey of mental illness, 1955.

Creation of the U.S. National Health Survey, 1956.

Institution of a Federal program for training of practical nurses and professional public health personnel, 1956.

War Orphans Educational Assistance Act, 1956.

Teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children, 1957.

Library Service of Captioned Films for the Deaf, 1957.

Construction of Indian health facilities, 1957.

The White House Conference on Aging, 1958.

Grants to schools of public health, 1958.

National Defense Education Act, 1958.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate is losing a valued and trusted associate, and I know that each of my colleagues joins with me today in expressing to Bill Reidy our friendship, our admiration, and our very best wishes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am more than happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Mr. HILL. I join the distinguished Senator from Minnesota in expressing thanks, good wishes, friendship, and appreciation to Mr. "Bill" Reidy. As the Senator from Minnesota has well said, for a number of years Mr. Reidy was a staff member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in connection with health and education legislation. He made many splendid contributions to the work of the committee and the work of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota has referred to a number of bills to which Mr. Reidy has made contributions. I call attention to two bills that have been passed by the Senate at the present session of Congress. They are bills which I consider to be landmark measures. First, I refer to the bill passed by the Senate a few days ago to provide Federal aid for mental, dental, osteopathic, and other health related schools. A measure on this subject has been proposed in the Senate and before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for at least 12 to 14 years. During Mr. Reidy's service with the committee he did much work to bring about the legislation now on the statute books—legislation in which all of us can feel a deep sense of pride. He made many contributions.

The other measure which I consider to be a landmark is a bill which was passed by the Senate not too many days ago, providing for the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have been in conference with the conferees on the part of the House only this morning to iron out differences in that proposed legislation. I believe that legislation will soon be on the statute books. It will be a tremendous step forward in the care, treatment and, most important, the rehabilitation and restoration of the mentally retarded and mentally ill.

Mr. Reidy was with us as a staff member when the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported to the Senate, the bill creating the National Commission on Mental Illness and Health.

That act was the foundation stone upon which rested the subsequent legislation on mental health and mental retardation.

Mr. Reidy made many splendid contributions in the battle we have been waging through the years to bring about the victory which now seems to be within our grasp.

I am happy to join the Senator from Minnesota in expressing appreciation to Mr. Reidy for his work and his many fine contributions toward helping the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Senate and for his services to our country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota is granted 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the Senator from Alabama for the fine tribute he has paid to Mr. Reidy. I can think of no higher praise one could receive than comments from the Senator who has done more for the health of our Nation and for the educational well-being of our Nation than any other Senator; namely, the great senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for his most generous words.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The depth and breadth of our gratitude, respect, and friendship for Bill Reidy has been far more eloquently expressed by the senior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Alabama than I could express it. I wish to associate myself with all that has been said.

In the few years I have served in this body Bill Reidy has always been available to devote his time and his talents to advising me on the many complex problems which arise in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, most recently, in the Special Committee on Aging, of which I have the privilege of being a member. It is a new committee with a new responsibility.

I am deeply grateful for the friendship and talent of Bill Reidy. I express appreciation of literally thousands of people in the State of New Jersey, whose representatives have come to us with their complex problems in connection with the Hill-Burton program and other programs. Bill Reidy was always immediately available to help them with their problems. He has been associated with many of the programs, and has contributed to their success.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is with mixed feelings that we react to the news of the retirement of William G. Reidy, staff director of the Special Senate Committee on Aging.

We are, of course, gratified that Bill will now be free to devote a larger portion of his time to richly deserved leisure. We regret, however, that his valuable abilities will no longer be available to Members of this body.

It has been my privilege to know, and work cooperatively with Bill Reidy while a member of the Special Committee on Aging, sharing his counsels and seeking to frame legislation which would genuinely benefit the more senior segment of our population. Mr. Reidy has proven himself a conscientious gentleman; one who is knowledgeable in many legislative fields, and dedicated to the public interest.

It is a pleasure to join with other Senators in commending Bill for his steadfast and effective service to the Senate, and to the citizens of the United States.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is with mixed emotions that I join in this tribute to William Reidy on his retirement from Federal service.

For his long years of service to the Government, including more than 15 with the Senate, Bill has earned this retirement.

However, after some years closely associated with Bill in the work of the Senate, and as a beneficiary of his advice and counsel, I certainly will miss him.

Of course, so far as Bill is concerned, retirement is only a formal word. I know there are many areas where he intends to put his talents to work; and some of them, I am sure, will keep him within shouting distance of his friends in the Senate.

I first knew Bill as a professional staff member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During that period, his advice and interest were most helpful in the creation of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

Later, it was my pleasure to appoint Bill Reidy as staff director of the subcommittee's successor, the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

Mr. President, indicative of the esteem in which Bill is held is a letter I have received from Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON. In the letter, the Vice President states, in part:

> I just want Bill to know that we will all miss him and wish him well, and that taking a man out of the Senate is something like taking a boy out of the country—you can take the boy out of the country, but you can't take the country out of the boy.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I know we shall not be losing contact with Bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Vice President's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C. September 25, 1963.

Hon. PAT McNAMARA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McNAMARA: I have just heard that after all these years Bill Reidy is getting set to leave the Senate. Personally, I think this is just about as big a break with the "homeland" as took place when his ancestors left Ireland. But since he seems determined to strike out for greener pastures I guess we must accept his decision with regret.

I just want Bill to know that we will all miss him and wish him well, and that taking a man out of the Senate is something like taking a boy out of the country—you can take the boy out of the country but you can't take the country out of the boy.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO FOR CIVIL RIGHTS STAND

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Toledo Blade of September 8, 1963, entitled "Said With 'Vigah'" which makes laudatory comment about the efforts of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAID WITH "VIGAH"

Sounding a robust warning to any fainthearted colleagues in the Senate who would just as soon skip the ordeal of fighting a possible southern filibuster against civil rights, Senator STEPHEN YOUNG calls for 24-hour sessions if necessary. Round-the-clock meetings are used—but rarely—to wear down filibustering Senators by keeping them talking day and night.

The trouble is this requires the antifilibuster forces to remain on duty likewise, even if it means sleeping on cots in cloakrooms to answer quorum calls. And some Senators have questioned the tactic because it might be an exhausting burden on their colleagues up in years. To which Senator YOUNG replies:

"The magnitude of the problem does not justify this excuse for abandoning the fight for meaningful civil rights legislation. We who favor the President's proposal will protect any colleagues who, for various reasons, cannot suffer the hardships that will be involved in breaking a possible filibuster."

Does that sound like a 74-year-old Senator, weary of office, short of stamina, and long on tired blood?

Nope. It sounds suspiciously like and indefatigable incumbent who wants to make it very plain that he's got the moxie needed to become what is generally called a vigorous candidate for reelection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio points out the magnitude of the problem of having civil rights legislation passed by the Congress and the importance of the Senate at least measuring up to the challenge by going into long sessions and remaining at its job until the task is complete.

STATE OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three articles and an editorial dealing with the difficulties we in the Congress in general, and in the Senate in particular, are experiencing in transacting the public business expeditiously and in the public interest, may be printed in full in the RECORD. They are: "Action or Reform," by Roscoe Drummond; "Can Senate Shake Lethargy?" by Charles Bartlett; "State of the Congress," an editorial published in the Washington Post; and "Legislative Peril—World's Parliamentarians Worried", by Roscoe Drummond.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 3, 1963]

ACTION OR REFORM

(By Roscoe Drummond)

This summer and fall will be a good time for the American people—and the Congressmen themselves—to watch and decide whether Congress can go on much longer with its present archaic machinery.

Every student of government who looks upon the functioning of Congress with any detachment is convinced that its machinery must be modernized if it is to recover its eroded authority and have any chance of transacting the public business efficiently and responsibly.

What we are going to learn this summer and fall is not only whether Congress can transact the public business at all.

During the many years I have been in Washington there has always been urgent business before the Congress. At this session there is transcendently urgent business before the Congress. There is the problem of rising racial tension, unrelieved unemployment despite substantial prosperity, a sluggish economy, the matter of tax reduction, and the overhanging threat of a rail strike.

Legislation dealing with all of these matters will be before Congress. The issues are being clearly drawn. The President has done his part by decisively committing his leadership, by alerting the Nation to the problems, and by offering Congress concrete proposals for action.

The initiative is now wholly with Congress. The responsibility for action—or inaction—is with Congress, plus responsibility for the consequences. Congress has the ball.

After 6 months of frittering, no wonder everybody is uncertain about what is going to be done—if anything. From January to July Congress has accomplished little that is visible to the naked eye and nothing significant. And now Washington is filled with talk that Congress can hardly be expected to do two big things the same year—that is, deal with civil rights legislation and tax reduction over a 12-month span. The talk is that if Congress can handle one major problem a year, like civil rights, that would be transacting the public business pretty well.

It wouldn't. It would be a sorry record and one that Congressmen who want to see Congress recover its initiative, authority and prestige cannot and should not condone as an acceptable standard of government.

The truth is that Congress has been continuously losing power to the President for more than a quarter century. We no longer have a system of three coordinate branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. Through its own fault and inefficiency Congress is no longer coequal with the executive and the judiciary. It can retrieve its position only by modernizing its methods of discharging its responsibilities. It has lost control of the budget. It is not an adequate monitor of the administration. It is so burdened with trivia that it is rarely able to give priority to crucial legislation. At most points it is so understaffed with its own experts that, more often than not, it cannot give independent study to Presidential proposals.

How responsibly Congress conducts itself from now to adjournment—what it does and what it fails to do—will disclose the congressional reforms most needed.

Congress now has the ball. What the country is anxiously waiting to see is whether Congress is going to sit on it, throw it into the stands—or run with it.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 4, 1963]

CAN SENATE SHAKE LETHARGY?

(By Charles Bartlett)

The burning legislative question is whether a thoroughly bogged and bored Senate can rise now to the challenge of an awesome agenda at a time when its Members would normally be thinking of home.

Like blobs of whipped cream upon a limp banana split, the nuclear test ban, the civil rights proposal, and imminently, the tax bill, are piling upon a Senate that has shown little taste for even its routine functions.

The situation is unprecedented and unpredictable. No one claims an ability to foretell whether the Senate will react by exploding into a whirl of decisive activity or by continuing to sulk in its impassive tent. A probability of the latter course is indicated by an examination of the factors that are currently at work.

The most important of these is the Senators' awareness of the deep public apathy toward the many things they have left undone. Sensitive above all to the thinking of their voters, they are conscious that the people have not been aroused by the tax bill or any item on the legislative agenda and that many would be pleased if they simply adjourned without further fuss.

DELAY AIDS STRATEGY

Southerners control 10 of the Senate's 16 standing committees and they know that a tactic of delay on every front will strengthen their strategy of obstruction on the civil rights legislation. A filibuster will have its greatest effect if the agenda is already clogged and the leadership is desperate to obtain action on other matters.

This strategy is ardently supported by the Republican leadership, which is prepared to go to the voters next year on a record of blocking administration proposals. The minority band of liberal Republican Senators is ignored as it argues that the party cannot succeed at the polls without constructive positions on major issues. This is an alien philosophy to Republican Senators who have made careers out of riding negative sentiments among their constituents and find the ride at the moment extremely comfortable.

One tendency is to blame the impasse upon the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, who has brought to the post neither the flourish of LYNDON JOHNSON nor the taut discipline of Robert Taft. Senator MANSFIELD's strength as leader rests heavily upon the fineness of his character and the Senators take advantage of his gentleness instead of responding to his problems. He does not, as Senators JOHNSON and Taft did, run the scheduling of the Senate with an iron hand and the Members incline increasingly to operate in their own orbits.

FEELS NO PRESSURE

But the Senate will never respond to an iron hand unless it feels the pressure of urgency and this pressure does not exist. "You can't flog Congress in times like this," says one veteran of the legislative mill. "It's like hitting a sack of potatoes."

The issues raised by President Kennedy this year have failed to evoke this urgency. The momentum of the tax bill has been lost in the popular doubt that it is proper to cut taxes when the Government is running a deficit. Other programs have been stalled by a cautious consensus against new Government spending. The cutting edge of the Negro ferment is dulled by the powerful southern opposition.

Criticism of the President is centered on the point that the impact of his proposals has been badly diluted by their number and that the emphasis of his support has been spread too thin among too many measures. It is argued that Congress, along with the public has been unable to digest the flow of White House proposals or discern their priorities and that the President's leadership has suffered as a consequence.

TOTAL OF 403 REQUESTS

Studies by the Congressional Quarterly show that the President has made 403 legislative requests during the year, more than the 355 in 1961, and 298 of 1962. By comparison, Dwight Eisenhower asked for 44 pieces of legislation in 1953, 207 in 1954; and 232 in 1955.

Only 19 of these requests have been given final approval.

The sense of glut has been compounded by the necessity of placing the complexities of the test ban, civil rights proposals, and the railway legislation before Congress late in the session. The original intention of the White House to concentrate upon the tax bill has been obscured by the diversion of interest to these new issues and by the snail's pace of the House Ways and Means Committee.

When confronted by a pile of work in August and the prospect of delayed adjournment, the Senate usually becomes irritable and unpleasant. But the backlog is now so great and the prospects of adjournment so remote that most of the Senators have settled into a routine of long weekends and short working days. They are conscious of looking absurd as a group but they expect to survive as individuals.

NEWS FOCUS NOTES

There have been no formal discussions between Moscow and Washington on a visit by President Kennedy to the Soviet Union, but Premier Khrushchev is reported to have indicated in private correspondence that he would like the President to repay his 1959 visit here at an appropriate time.

The President is reported to be proceeding with plans to visit Japan, Australia, and Indonesia in early October but there is no indication that a Russian visit will be tied into this trip.

Democratic fears on the President's political future in the South have been brightened by the findings of polls in Texas which show Mr. Kennedy to be considerably higher in public esteem than any of the prospective Republican contenders.

An interesting finding of these polls was that Gov. George Romney received a slightly better response than Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, who had been assumed to be strong in Texas.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1963]

STATE OF THE CONGRESS

Congress is coming in for a new round of criticism as it enters the showdown stage of the present session. For nearly 9 months it has dawdled along with an astonishing lack of systematic effort or sense of purpose. Now it is confronted by hopelessly congested calendars, overworked individuals, and possibly frustrated national objectives.

Senator SCOTT and others are worried by the probability that some Members of Congress may not survive the turmoil of the session-end squeeze. His concern has ample justification. Yet the greater damage is likely to fall in the realm of congressional prestige. Senator JAVITS has pointed out that in the eyes of the people Congress "seems to be listless, halting, haphazard, and half-hearted in its efforts." Consequently, he feels, along with many of his colleagues, that "Congress is in the gravest danger of suffering tremendously in its reputation with the country."

The Congressional Quarterly's boxscore on 26 major bills before the 88th Congress shows final action taken on only 6. These include such routine bills as the corporate and excise tax extension, the debt limit, extension of the draft, and the feed-grains program. Congress did show that it could act in an emergency by promptly passing the railway settlement bill. But that good work stands out in embarrassing contrast to the sluggish motion elsewhere.

Anxiety hangs heaviest over the two biggest bills of the session—the tax-cut and omnibus civil rights bills—now that the test ban treaty has been approved by the Senate. Although the House is scheduled to vote on the tax bill on Wednesday, the Senate has taken no action, and the danger that the tax bill will become entangled in a civil rights filibuster mounts with each day of delay. The civil rights bill itself is still in the House Judiciary Committee.

Less concern over the fate of these measures would be felt if Congress had cleared its legislative channels of the glut of lesser bills. But nearly 3 months after the beginning of the fiscal year, only two appropriations bills—Interior and Treasury-Post Office—have been enacted. Eleven more appropriations bills and a vast number of legislative measures await completion aside from the big bills on which public attention is centered. On three bills which the administration deems to be of major importance, medical care for the aged, unemployment benefits, and the creation of an Urban Affairs Department, no action whatever has been taken.

It is impossible to conclude from this record that Congress is doing well. Many of its own Members have called it variously the "stand-still Congress," the "do-nothing Congress," the "limping Congress," and so forth. It is not a question of whether Congress may ultimately muddle through to a defensible legislative record. What is most disturbing is the failure of Congress to use tested and reliable methods of handling its business with efficiency and dispatch.

The most tangible hope for improvement to come out of the present session is the Senate Rules Committee's approval of a Senate-House committee that would take up the congressional reform trail where the La Follette-Monroney committee left off nearly two decades ago. The Senate committee also approved rules changes that would require Senators to stick to the subject under debate for at least 3 hours a day (why only 3 hours?), permit longer committee sessions and authorize former Presidents to address the Senate.

Even the study resolution sponsored by Senators CLARK and CASE was unfortunately watered down, however, and its chance for survival in the House is considered slender. The country has cause to be alarmed over the plight into which Congress has fallen. Senator CASE was right in saying the other day that it has 'become so ensnarled in its own archaic and complex procedures that the executive and judicial branches of Government have had to take over the primary responsibility for the conduct of the Nation's business."

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1963]

LEGISLATIVE PERIL—WORLD'S PARLIAMENTARIANS WORRIED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

BELGRADE.—The world's parliamentarians are becoming alarmed about the state of their parliaments.

They find parliamentary democracy dangerously weakened in many parts of the world and most of the American delegates say that goes for the Congress of the United States.

This is one of the dominant themes of the 52d Conference of the Interparliamentary Union to which elected lawmakers from 59 nations are gathered here at Belgrade.

The consensus is that many Western parliaments are losing power and prestige, partly because of their own faults, that the newly independent countries are finding that independence does not bring democracy, and that the Communist parliaments are simply facades, pliant tools of the government.

The speaker who offered the most constructive measures which elected parliaments could take to restore their vigor and strength was the chairman of the U.S. delegation, Representative KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE put forward a series of proposals for strengthening parlimentary democracy, a number of which were as applicable to the Congress of the United States as to other parliaments. She advocated that parliamentary government could be improved:

By having the national government assume campaign costs. "The rising cost of running for public office," she explained, "exposes politicians to pressures from affluent groups with special interests. Responsibility for financing political campaigns should be shifted to the public at large."

By preventing the executive from monopolizing the means of mass communication, parliaments, as well as executives, should have fuller use of radio and television.

By expanding and making equally available to all members of the legislature's professional research staff.

By strengthening the power of the national legislature to supervise and control the activities of the government. "The chief modern task of parliament," Mrs. ST. GEORGE said, "was the exercise of delegated power."

By reducing the extraneous workload on parliament, failure to do which, as in Washington, dangerously retards the legislative process.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE's plea to the Communists was that the composition of all parliaments be made "truly representative of the people," and she called for "eternal vigilance to prevent military dictators from seizing power and dissolving parliament or converting it into a puppet regime."

SALE OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, many editorials have been written supporting the sale of wheat to Russia, and many columns have also been written on the subject. Practically all of them that I have read have been favorable.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Why Not Sell Wheat to Reds?" written by Richard Wilson and published in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, September 25, be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT SELL WHEAT TO REDS?—PAST OBJECTIONS VIEWED AS REMOVED BY RUSSIAN WILLINGNESS TO PAY CASH

One thing that neither the Russians nor the Chinese can shoot at us is wheat. We can grow wheat until it runs out of Khrushchev's ears.

What is wrong, then, with selling wheat to Russia and Red China, even if some of it goes to Cuba?

The wrong that would be committed, it is claimed, is that supplying the people of Russia, its satellites and Red China with foodstuffs would help maintain Communist regimes we are otherwise opposing with the dedication of all our lives and fortunes. Why feed your enemies?

This seems to many thoughtful and patriotic people to be a faulty argument. By one device or another the Communist regimes are able to get foodstuffs in sufficient quantity to offset partially their own shortfalls in production. These supplies have proved sufficient to tide Russia and China over some bad periods.

The Communist government in Russia has lived through famines that probably have cost millions of lives without losing political control of the Russian people. The Chinese Communists have survived famines, the most recent a severe ordeal last year.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, poses a pertinent question: "How does a Senator from North Dakota feel when the farmers of his State are told to plant less wheat, while across the border in Canada, farmers are told to plant as much as they can?"

Canada has made a huge wheat deal with Russia—$500 million worth of wheat for cash. Russia wouldn't buy unless a prior commitment was made that some of the wheat would go to Cuba. History long since should have taught the lesson that communism cannot survive on wheat alone, nor fall because of the lack of it.

In the past there have been logical reasons for not selling wheat to Russia. She was not prepared to pay for it on a basis favorable to the U.S. balance of trade. But conditions are different today. Time and again Premier Khrushchev told Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman on his recent trip to Russia: "We can buy. We've got the money." Khrushchev was speaking not merely of wheat. He wanted whole fertilizer plants and other equipment of a nonmilitary nature. "If we can't get it from you, we'll get it somewhere else," Khrushchev said. "We've got plenty of rockets," he added. "We want to build up our agriculture."

That Khrushchev was talking about paying in cash—in gold or its equivalent in American dollar credits—is clearly illustrated by his deal with Canada. And, in these terms, trade with Russia begins to make sense, each deal taken separately and examined for its credits and debits in terms of the national interest.

Selling foodstuffs to Russia can be handled by private trading under Government license. Private traders have tried to sell both butter and grains to the Soviet Union in the past, but arrangements could not be worked out. Russia's trade arrangements are tricky. Congress is always on the alert and Government officials are timid in their interpretation of the rules and regulations on granting export licenses.

The truth is that there is probably no great future in trade with Russia. She does not have much she can supply us to create the dollar credits to buy here—unless, as now seems evident, she is willing to pay in cash.

Nor does it make much sense to supply the Soviet Union with samples of superior American machinery which she can copy in her own version. This is being made clear to Khrushchev.

The Russians like bilateral trade. Three- and four-way multilateral deals that make possible the exchange of goods between many countries aren't part of the Russian way.

But it may be possible to sell part of America's great supply of surplus foodstuffs to the Communist world, and Canada has shown us the way. This is an initiative which shouldn't be lost out of fear of building up our competitors. In fact, it might not be a bad idea if Russia and China were in the end to find themselves dependent in an important degree on the vastly superior agricultural genius of the United States, being unable, as they are, to organize their own agriculture satisfactorily under communism.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think this is a decision the President of the United States will have to make, and the sooner he makes it, the better. I can see much greater advantage in selling wheat to Russia than in withholding it, especially when she is willing to pay us in gold or convertible currency. We have a great surplus of wheat which we cannot use, and we can use dollars to better advantage than we can our surplus. So long as our allies are going to sell wheat to Russia, why not the United States?

SS "AMERICA" PREVENTED FROM SAILING

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, twice in the last month the ship SS *America*, which travels across the Atlantic carrying passengers, has been laid up by the intervention of a union. The first occasion when this ship was stopped from leaving its port was September 14. On board the ship were 956 passengers. They spent the night aboard, waiting for the ship to sail, but the ship lay there, immobilized, because the members of the union refused to work.

Within the last 2 days this same ship again was barred from making a trip.

Thus, in a period of 3 weeks, twice was this liner, sailing under the American flag, prevented from leaving its dock. The owner of the ship, United States Lines, has no dispute with the unions, but there is a fight between two unions, the National Maritime Union, led by Joseph Curran, and the Seafarers International Union, led by Paul Hall. The dispute has evolved out of the presence of one man on the ship who is supposed to be a segregationist. The cause for the stoppage was assigned to the presence of this one man. But the basic fact is that there is a fight between these two labor unions, and with this dispute in progress, the ship has been kept from moving in its regular travels.

My question is, How long shall the American public and the innocent owner of the ship be subjected to the abuses of these two labor unions who have a dispute between themselves, who are unmindful of the rights of the passengers and of the rights of the American public, and are bringing to the owners of the ship economic destruction?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 2 more minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My colleagues may be interested in knowing that the ship the SS *America* was built 22 years ago. The Federal Government subsidized its building by putting up $5,861,000.

Each year the taxpayers of the United States subsidize the operation of the ship in the sum of $4 million. Under the law, the taxpayers of the United States pay the difference in wages that the company has to pay for American labor and what it would have to pay if it hired foreign labor.

I repeat—$5,861,000 in subsidy was paid in the building of the ship; $4 million a year subsidy is paid for paying members of the union who twice stopped the ship from sailing in the last month.

Why this inordinate power in these unions? The U.S. Government could not stop that ship from sailing. Two combating unions are able to do so.

These labor leaders will come to the Commerce Committee one of these days, and the labor unions will be there, asking for increased privileges. This deed of theirs should not be forgotten. What they are doing should be ended, and it should be ended soon, if the American Government is to be supreme and organizations are to be subjects of the Government, amenable to its laws, and, over and above everything else, answerable to the dictations of sound morality.

To those labor leaders, rights of others mean nothing. The rights of others are subordinate to their desires. I cannot subscribe to such conduct and would feel delinquent in my duties if I did not raise my voice in protest. Tomorrow I will introduce a bill making unlawful a strike caused by a dispute between two or more unions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Wasteful and Senseless," published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of September 28.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wasteful and Senseless

The capriciousness of the maritime unions and the stranglehold they exert on this Nation's merchant marine are sharply shown in the case of the liner *America*. For the second time this month the U.S. Lines has had to cancel a scheduled sailing because the *America* was the victim of interunion strife.

On September 15, minutes before the liner was to sail for Europe, the National Maritime Union crewmembers walked off because the company would not summarily remove an engineer whom they accused of racial discrimination. Losses of $650,000 in passenger revenue and $350,000 in crew wages resulted and 1,895 passengers were stranded.

On September 25, the arbitrator for the NMU and the company ordered, after a hearing, that the unlicensed crew, represented by NMU, sail. The engineer was to be transferred to a freighter and promoted to chief engineer. The Marine Engineers Beneficial Association at once intervened and assailed company capitulation to the NMU.

Such reckless use of union power, such irresponsible union feuds with their senseless and costly results, will do more to bring collective bargaining into disrepute than anything the enemies of labor can do.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized to debate the pending bill. I understand that the morning hour has not been concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have another item of morning business.

A TALK WITH VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noticed in the issue of Parade magazine for September 29, 1963, an excellent article, in the form of questions and answers, entitled, "A Talk With Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson: The Latest Word."

This particular article deals with important legislation before the Congress relating to our scientific achievements and research in the field of outer space. The distinguished Vice President has been a leader in promoting U.S. Government activities in the field of space research; and I believe that the editor's note on this article fully states the degree to which the Vice President has devoted his time and attention to this work. The editor's note reads:

> Five years ago this week the United States entered the space race. Father of the legislation was Senator Lyndon B. Johnson who today, as Vice President, heads the National Aeronautics and Space Council. In an exclusive interview with Parade's Fred Blumenthal, the Vice President answers some tough questions about the space program—where we stand today, and what space means to your future.

I ask unanimous consent that the article relating to Vice President Johnson be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Talk With Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson—The Latest Word

(Editor's Note.—5 years ago this week the United States entered the space race. Father of the legislation was Senator Lyndon B. Johnson who today, as Vice President, heads the National Aeronautics and Space Council. In an exclusive interview with Parade's Fred Blumenthal, the Vice President answers some tough questions about the space program—Where we stand today? and, What space means to your future?)

Question. Mr. Vice President, with all our needs on earth, can we afford to spend $20 billion to go to the moon?

Answer. We can't afford not to spend it. Only the United States and the U.S.S.R. have the resources for extensive space exploration. If we are to lead the free world and insure our own security, we must be first in space. This does not mean that we must neglect other urgent needs. We have ample resources to explore space and do the other things, as well.

Question. But why go to the moon? Wouldn't it be wiser and less expensive to concentrate on near-earth space?

Answer. Most of the cost of the moon program involves development of big rockets and massive ground facilities to build, test, and launch them.

Putting a man on the moon is the focal point of an effort to insure that the United States becomes preeminent in all aspects of space science and technology. It is a challenging and dramatic objective, but most of the activity leading to it—in both the Gemini and Apollo programs—will be conducted in near-earth space. From the moon program comes essential and much needed scientific knowledge which America must have. Should we have it as soon as we can get it, or sit by while others pass us by?

Question. What about military requirements? Is there any danger that they are being neglected?

Answer. We have a substantial military space program and most of what NASA is doing can form the basis for military applications, if they are required. For example, the ability to inspect or intercept a potentially hostile satellite requires the ability to maneuver and rendezvous in space—something we will learn in these programs.

It is important to remember that our country has too often neglected new scientific and technical opportunities. The Wright brothers flew the first airplane at Kitty Hawk, but when World War I began, the French had 1,400 airplanes; the Germans 1,000; and the U.S. Army only 23. Dr. Robert Goddard flew the first liquid-fueled rocket in the United States in 1926, but it was the Germans who used his ideas to drop the V-2's on London.

Question. Former President Eisenhower and others have suggested that we are trying to go too fast. Could we save money if we slowed the pace?

Answer. In these long-range endeavors, Fred, there is an optimum pace. To speed it up or slow it down increases costs. I think we are now moving at the optimum pace.

More important, however, we are in an international competition in which our freedom is at stake. We don't know the strength or intentions of the Russians, so we can't ask how little we can do and win, but how much we can do to make sure to win.

Question. If space leadership is so vital, how well are we doing to achieve it? Haven't we had a lot of failures?

Answer. Certainly we have had failures, but the Russians had them last year on many space shots, including attempts to reach the Moon, Venus and Mars. Look at our own record. In 1958, only 5 of our 13 launches were successful. As of today, our ratio of successes to failures is better than 6 to 1—and we've been to Venus.

With a sustained effort we will get to the Moon—and before the decade is out.

Question. The British radio astronomer, Sir Bernard Lovell, hinted after a recent trip to Russia that the Soviets might be interested in a joint program to go to the Moon. What is your reaction to this?

Answer. We already have arrangements to cooperate with the Soviet Union in some space activities and will always be willing to explore ways to extend this cooperation. We must be very careful, however to make sure that any overtures made regarding further cooperation do not cause us to lower our guard. I am unaware of any Soviet proposal of a joint venture on a substantial scale.

Question. What do you think the Russians had in mind recently when they orbited two cosmonauts at once?

Answer. Many have assumed that they were trying to join two spacecraft in orbit. With their big rockets, they may well do this before we do. More likely, they were testing their ability to precisely time and guide the launching of a spacecraft to intercept and inspect another one already in orbit. This would enable them to inspect some of ours.

Question. What of the future? How will our space effort benefit our citizens who are paying the bills?

Answer. Inevitably, as with other major research programs, the scientific and technical knowledge gained will benefit everyone. Our space efforts are teaching us to manage the large research and development efforts of the future. They are broadening the base of university research and graduate education throughout the Nation. There will also be many direct benefits, particularly in weather forecasting and communications.

Question. At the end of 5 years in space, how do you view the progress we have made?

Answer. I think it has been remarkable, especially considering our late start. All the major items needed to go to the moon are already under development. We have had four successful tests of the first stage Saturn I rocket. We have had great success with our communications and weather satellites. The Mariner II flight to Venus and the guidance correction on Syncom II were probably the two most spectacular engineering achievements in space to date.

I think we are ahead of the Russians in our scientific program, and well on our way to overtaking them in manned flight, as well.

Question. One final question, Mr. Vice President. What is our ultimate destiny in space?

I don't know, nor does anyone else. Columbus didn't find what he was looking for, but I think we're all pretty glad that he took that voyage. Einstein, when he produced the formula $E=MC^2$, didn't know that it would change the course of history.

I am sure of one thing—the benefits which will flow from our venture into space will be beyond anything any of us could imagine.

Until now, in space, no shot has been fired in anger. Thank God. My hope is that, in the years ahead, the conquest of space will encourage peaceful cooperation among nations and become a substitute for war.

In the hostile environment of space there are challenges all mankind must share. We—all nations, that is—should go out there together, hand in hand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope, as my colleagues read this article, that they will also be fully aware of the importance of our continued activities in the vital area of space research, and that, despite any talk of pooling our resources with the Soviet Union in the area of the so-called lunar probe or moon shot, we will not retreat from our position of leadership in space research and peaceful exploitation of outer space exploration. This means that we must have the money and the space and research facilities to accomplish the task.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Many Members of the Senate have asked me about the legislative program. Am I correct in my expectation that the plan for today is to vote on the extension of the Civil Rights Commission?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the plan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And, after disposition of that measure, will the Senate take up two bills relating to fisheries?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The two bills are on the desks of Senators. One deals with fishing vessel construction and the other with fishing in U.S. territorial waters. They are Calendar No. 457, S. 1006, and Calendar No. 479, S. 1988. Action on those bills is scheduled for today, following action on the extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

IS CONSERVATISM DYNAMIC?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a speech entitled "Is Conservatism Dynamic," delivered by Mr. Gerald J. Skibbins, of Opinion Research Corporation, before the Conservative Club of Montclair, New Jersey, on August 24, 1963.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Conservatism Dynamic?

(An address to the Conservative Club of Montclair, Montclair, N.J., August 24, 1963, by Gerald J. Skibbins, research executive, Opinion Research Corp., Research Park, Princeton, N.J.)

The conservative movement in America is bristling with controversy, political fireworks, new ideas, splinter groups of all kinds, and a crying need for definition of its basic characteristics, roots, ideology, and purpose. In speaking before the Central New Jersey Conference of Conservatives last fall, I attempted to define the 10 marks of the conservative.[1]

In this paper, I plan to outline the 10 marks briefly, then move on to current public controversy in the following areas: the far right reactionaries, liberals and conservatives, conservative desire for war, conservatives and foreign aid, will conservatives compress the Federal Government?, a strange shift in public opinion.

These 10 marks of conservative political thought in America are:

1. SELF RESPONSIBILITY

The conservative believes that each individual citizen possesses the total responsibility for his life, his obligations, and the consequences of his actions and beliefs.

2. A BELIEF IN THE MORALITY OF PROFITABLE ENTERPRISE

In the long run, earned profits are the surest sign of responsible behavior by all who make up a legitimate enterprise in a free society. Any person can demonstrate the morality of profits to himself by working hard for a year and achieving the goal of having money left over in his savings, after all his expenses and obligations have been satisfied.

3. VOLUNTARISM

Conservatives believe that if individual rights and the choosing of goals are kept in the people's hands, this Nation has its best guarantee of progress, peace, economic growth, and justice for the individual citizen.

---

[1] Printed in the Nov. 15, 1962, issue of Vital Speeches.

4. EQUALITY UNDER LAW

Conservative thought demands a legal and political structure which insures free competition, redress for injury, fair trial, equal rights of participation, and the right of a citizen to protect his home and his property. We do not believe in any kind of second-class citizenship, nor in restricting people in any way for reasons of race, color or hereditary characteristics.

5. RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOCIETY

Conservatives are keenly aware of their responsibilities to family, community, State and society, and they discharge them. They pay the bills for our society, keep the machinery of civilization in operation, create new growth, build career opportunities for others, and help those who need help. You will find them managing most effective businesses, charities and constructive associations to advance society.

6. A BELIEF THAT RIGHTS ARE WEDDED TO RESPONSIBILITIES

With the maxim that you can't get something worthwhile for nothing, conservatives affirm that individual freedom, the greatest human right of all, is tied to its twin—our revolutionary responsibility to extend and preserve freedom within and outside our borders.

7. A BELIEF IN THE DISPERSION OF POWER

Our belief in the checks and balances of our republic impel us to regard any concentration of governmental, economic, or social power as dangerous to the society. For this reason, conservatives would cut down any monolithic, arbitrary power over the whole of society whether it resides in the Government, the State, the church, in a company, a union, or association.

8. A BELIEF THAT LIFE ON EARTH CAN BE IMPROVED

A modern conservative recognizes and wellcomes change. He wants to get on with the job of figuring out how to deal intelligently with today and tomorrow. He believes in the perfectibility of human society and works for it in a practical way.

9. INSISTENCE ON BALANCING THE BOOKS

In a free society, conservatives believe that individuals, cities, States, the Federal Government, and every kind of industrial and commercial enterprise cannot survive unless they balance their books realistically. Responsible individuals and organizations pay their debts, live within their incomes and provide reserves for their future needs. Irresponsible people court bankruptcy by "betting on the come," or incurring obligations for future generations to pay off. In the last 30 years, our largely liberal Governments have demonstrated this liberal belief that the piper never has to be paid. This cannot work.

10. THE IDEA THAT ACTIONS REFLECT BASIC BELIEFS

If men, organizations, or States oppress or exploit human beings, refuse to behave with honor and integrity, repudiate their debts and commit crimes against their fellows they cannot be treated as equals to those who maintain the constructive values of human civilization. Their actions bespeak their degeneracy. Conservatives would seek to establish social instruments that enable society to deal with spoilers for what they are—the living representatives of the lowest and most destructive human impulses.

These, then, are the 10 marks of the conservative.

I would like to move on in this analysis of conservatism because I feel that many exciting and significant areas remain to be explored. Perhaps the best way to do this would be to take up a number of the expressed fears about the conservative movement and explore their validity. Let us look first at the millstone hanging from the conservative's neck.

THE FAR RIGHT REACTIONARIES

Many Americans squirm when they hear the label "conservative" because they think of pre-World War II isolationism, John Birch Society members, America Firsters, segregationists, Ku Klux Klansmen, and many other little groups who feel that freedom means an extra-legal hunting or hating license rather than a responsible privilege held under law. Let us look honestly at the so-called radical right. First, it is not radical at all. Most of its elements either believe in the ancient rule of force outside the law, or else they merely reflect an ignorant unawareness of their world.

As our society grows more complex and changes before our eyes each day, many citizens—especially those who cannot easily change with the times, or who possess little breadth of human understanding—lose their living courage and succumb to fear. Fear always seeks a scapegoat, and rather than see themselves in the mirror for what they are, these people exonerate themselves by finding something or someone to hate. In the past, this element of fear in our American society has burned witches in Puritan times, held African natives in contempt as slaves and sold them as farm animals, shot American Presidents, hated all foreigners, attacked Wall Street barons in the 1930's, screamed Communist at those who sought new ideas; and today it hates the U.N., big business, the Federal Government, and all taxes. These attacks are actually psychotic projections of people who fear that their world is slipping away forever.

This understandable but unforgivable human error is called reactionaryism and it exists on the far right just as much as it does on the far left.

On the far right, you find people striving to turn back the clock of history, rejecting change and new ideas without thinking about whether they might be constructive improvements in society.

On the far left, you find others rejecting all solutions that do not involve the growth of government—especially the Federal Government—without thinking about whether voluntary or private solutions might be more practical in the long run.

The common denominator phrase that describes the actions of these extremist groups, right or left, is "without thinking." Fear unseats their wisdom and installs hate, distrust, and malice in their hearts. From that point on they think no more, but spew out venom whenever affairs of the day are mentioned. The far right and left are each notable for their inconsiderate and opinionated attacks as well as their basic lack of love for their fellow man.

In contrast, most Americans of conservative political belief are constructively responsible and warmhearted citizens of honor and integrity. They do not deserve to be labeled by the existence of a few noisy reactionaries on the right any more than liberals deserve to be labeled detrimentally by the few wild-eyed Socialists and Communists on the left. This brings us to consider the common ground that might exist between liberals and conservatives.

As we penetrate to essentials of conservative and liberal thought, we find the two camps drawing closer together. This is really not very surprising. After all, we are human beings first, political beings secondarily. Two sincere, thoughtful Americans of largely opposite political persuasion have far more in common than they have in disagreement. This fact may be one of the hidden success secrets of America's political stability.

Aren't we all getting thoroughly sick of the postures of politicos, the bunco of groupthink behavior and the name calling that seeks to label the ins and the outs? In the history of this country, many liberals have contributed greatly to our society. Others will in the future, I am sure.

The true liberal sees the conservative as a necessary component of a healthy American society. He really does not want to exterminate you and I suggest we return the favor. For example, Norman Cousins, the liberal editor of the Saturday Review wrote an editorial entitled "In Defense of the Genuine Conservative," in which he said:

"The term conservative has a specific background and meaning. It stands for stability as opposed to innovation; for restraint as opposed to daring; for the preservation of inherited conditions as opposed to drastic reform. These ideas are not only compatible with a free society; they have an essential place in it, along with genuine liberalism. True conservatism is opposed to liberalism, but not destructive of it. The principle difference between conservatism and liberalism is represented not so much by disagreement over the nature of a free society or its goals as by disagreement over the approaches. Both conservatism and liberalism serve as the twin structural supports of constitutional government."

Mr. Cousins' definition of conservative thought does not quite cover what I see as dynamic, creative, and constructive in the conservative idea. He makes us sound a little stiffish about change or innovation—which he arrogates to the liberal a bit too much. He does not perceive that conservatives are far better managers than liberals; however, his definition is not unkind and it has strong merit in its comprehension of these confluent sources of American greatness.

Having spoken of Mr. Cousins, it is natural to look at an issue which obsesses him—the danger of destroying human civilization by atomic war. Some people have intense fears that conservatives want to go to war.

If we wanted to be snide, we might suggest that the political party which is most closely identified with liberal thinking, led this Nation into two of the worst world wars in history, mismanaged the heart-breaking Korean incident and dropped the first atomic bombs ever used on defenseless citizens. However, this would be too pat and too simple a way to look at the issue. When some Americans think of conservative leadership in connection with American foreign policy, they fear that we are eager to blast Cuba, swap rockets with Russia and invade the Chinese mainland. Again, this is too pat and too simple minded to be true. A conservative foreign policy for this Nation would find more economic means to maintain our strength, would firmly advance the cause of human freedom everywhere in an ideological offensive, would not foolishly grant governments our trust and aid, and would have long since protected the Cuban people from their Batistas and their Castros when such a defense was easy to accomplish. The dunderheaded, myopic incompetence with which our liberal statesman have managed our policy with China, at Yalta, or in the Bay of Pigs, and in many other parts of the world, reveals a basic and inherent inability among liberals. They seem unable to handle the commonsense problems of leadership, and vacillate too much to form a wise, constructive foreign policy. Perhaps liberals are more effective as the loyal opposition than as managers of a government. We can do better by a wide margin. Another fear is that conservatives would destroy foreign aid.

New nations are emerging all over the world. In old nations as well as new, the hand is out and Uncle Sam is generous to a fault. I believe in the Constitution and in its limitations on the activities of the Federal Government.

Nowhere in the Constitution do I find the right of Congress to give the $100 billion we have passed out to other nations. Congressman EUGENE SILER, of Kentucky, has offered $1,000 in cash to anyone in our executive branch or in the Congress who can point out to him the section of the Constitution which authorizes our Government to appropriate money for the benefit and use of foreign nations. Apparently, there have been no takers. Yes; conservatives believe in the American people and in their innate generosity which has surpassed that of any other people in history. We believe in our power to stimulate true capitalistic growth in emergent nations. Our many private company managements could create this, if they were permitted the opportunity. We do not believe in giving money to dictators, monarchs, and Socialist states who oppress and exploit their people, yet this is what we have done and continue to do as a Nation. It is a blot on our collective honor as human beings and as Americans. Conservatives know their responsibility in this world. Just as no American can truly enjoy the privileges of his citizenship when he knows that others in our midst are denied them; so too, no nation can truly enjoy its freedom when oppressed and enslaved states exist in this world. Conservatives acknowledge the fundamental mission established by the American Revolution; namely, to free all men everywhere so that they might seek their own happiness, their well-being, and their self-respect in a free, lawful society.

WILL CONSERVATIVES COMPRESS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

On the issue of the size of the Federal Government, conservatives believe that most American citizens know something about work—what constitutes a day's honest toil, what wages should buy in performance, and how work must produce something of value to society. I am sure that many competent and sincere Federal executives and civil servants fulfill all these conditions, however, the fact remains that the Federal Government has grown like a giant uncontrollable cancer to infect every limb and organ of the body politic. This Nation simply does not need 2½ million people employed in Federal functions. Our Federal Government engages in a reported 700 businesses which compete with companies which employ the rest of us. These 700-odd businesses are run by Federal managers who pay no taxes, no interest on capital loans, no dividends to stockholders, but some analysts of their records have reported that these agencies have lost $81 billion. To accomplish that requires incompetence on a scale so magnificent as to be beyond argument. Our colossal $300 billion Federal debt and this year's $100 billion budget provide screaming testimony of generic incompetence in current Federal management.

One way to meet this problem might be to amend the Constitution to limit the Federal power to tax, another might be for our Congressmen to initiate an organized effort to appraise each Federal business and function as to its importance to the function of Government; its infringement on citizenship rights; the inherent constructive value it contributes; whether it duplicates other activities, public or private; whether the public value received is worth the expense.

An honest and fair evaluation of this kind—not a punitive attack—would probably result in the retention of useful new and old Federal functions, and the chopping down of inconsequential busywork. I am sure that sincere, devoted Federal employees and executives would support this effort to make sense of their world and to cut down the fantastic waste of public funds they witness every day.

We believe this reasonable and fair approach would result in cutting the Federal annual budget one-third to one-half its present cost to the people. When such true savings are effected, then it becomes possible to reduce the national debt by substantial amounts, and, eventually, to be in a position to cut down the level of income taxation on our citizens. How many Americans would really be against a conservative policy on Government which would result in better, more efficient Government; a healthier, more dynamic business community which would have the funds to grow and create millions of new jobs; more hard cash in the hands of every American family; a dollar bill which steadily rose in its purchasing power.

There are many more issues which require similar consideration from all of us. For example, State and local government employment has zoomed to almost 7 million persons. How can we justify such exorbitant expense in our own communities?

Conservative thought is new, fresh, and has the opportunity to gain strength from all modern and ancient advances in management organization theory, dynamic economic theory, political theory, the social sciences, and the new techniques of operations research and value analysis. We can, if we will, penetrate to the heart of public functions and create a major advance in the art of government. As long as we continue to think creatively, to consider new ideas, and to reach for a greater future for all Americans, we can combine the social and physical sciences in creating a modern government which can truly advance the freedom and fulfillment of mankind. The Nation is ready for a leadership which combines wisdom with balanced perspective and concern for the rights of the individual.

A STRANGE SHIFT IN PUBLIC OPINION

In closing, I would like to give you some extraordinary news from the field of attitude research. My organization[2] has measured the U.S. public's attitudes toward government over the last 17 years. We have trend lines that show the steady drift toward the socialist concept of assigning all responsibilities to the Federal Government. Every time we measured nationwide over these years, we saw the people of this country drifting left.

However, in August of this year, 1963, we completed our work and were shocked to find that the trend left has stopped, and it may be possible that the Nation is actually changing its attitudes in the direction of conservative ideas. The signal is clear to all politicians and candidates for election in both political parties.

This important shift on the part of American people is too small to constitute a major change but it does look like handwriting on the wall.

CONSERVATIVES MAY NOT BE VOICES CRYING IN THE WILDERNESS

In recent months, we have had farmers turning down Federal handouts and control, a flood of citizen protests telling Congressmen they cannot cut taxes without cutting expenses, and a steadily mounting criticism of union leader arbitrariness in shutting down our economy. These are signs that the average citizen is beginning to understand what we are talking about. This is opportunity. Opportunity to speak out, to think constructively, to plan practical political action and to give this Nation the leadership it needs. I mean an executive branch of the Government run by conservatives, with a Congress in which conservative and liberal thought are each well represented. This dynamic combination would spark America to fulfill its basic role as the conscience and the economic mainspring of mankind.

---

[2] Opinion Research Corp.: "Business Climate Improves," August 1963, the Public Opinion Index for Industry.

"WHY I PREFER LIVING IN A DEMOCRACY"—PRIZE ESSAY BY ARTHUR A. PASQUARIELLO

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in a democracy, the youth of today is the leader of tomorrow. His character and ideals influence the history and destiny of our country.

The thinking of our youth of the moment is a forecast of our strength of the future; and it is most rewarding to have their reasoning—why they prefer to live in a democracy.

The Italian American War Veterans chose just that theme for their 1962–63 essay contest. The several departments of the organization conducted their contest within their areas and the departmental winning essays were entered in a national competition. The contest was under the joint direction of two distinguished Rhode Island educators and brothers, Joseph Leonelli, national commander of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and Dr. Renato E. Leonelli, chairman of the essay contest.

The medal for the national award was won by Arthur A. Pasquariello of 160 Rotterdam Street, Rotterdam, N.Y. A graduate of Schalmont High School, Schenectady, and presently attending Sienna College, young Pasquariello as the good student and good athlete symbolizes the formula of "the strong mind in the strong body" while his character as the good citizen is established by his essay "Why I Prefer Living in a Democracy." I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I PREFER LIVING IN A DEMOCRACY

(By Arthur A. Pasquariello, 160 Rotterdam Street, Rotterdam, N.Y., submitted by Richard P. Gemmett, Contest Chairman, Richard E. Voris Post No. 37, Rotterdam, N.Y.)

I consider myself a very lucky individual. God has blessed me with a land of peace and prosperity—a land of freedom and privilege that will never be denied to me. He has given me the honor of living in the democratic United States of America.

Our democracy had its beginning about 200 years ago. The people of this "New World" had visions of a great country. They dreamed of a land where the people could work as they please, speak and write what they believe, and worship the god of their choice. These "freedom lovers" sacrificed much, even their lives in many cases, to rebel against the mother country and its king, so that they could live in a home of freedom and security, and have no fear of losing them all to a cruel and greedy monarch. The colonists fought superbly and the victory they achieved meant the birth of a land that was to mature into the greatest and most powerful nation in the world.

Many of our people do not realize how well off they really are. They take for granted many of their freedoms, that people of other countries are strictly forbidden to enjoy. Our young people are able to attend schools that are supported, not controlled, by the Government. They are given the freedom to study in any field they choose, and they alone may make this decision. There is no powerful governing body standing over the American teacher telling him what and what not to teach his students.

In the United States, we see no authority forcing our children to accept the idea that obedience to the Federal Government prevails above all else. No, in our schools the children learn of the democratic way of life, where the opportunity is open to everyone to work at the profession of his choice, not the one chosen by the "higher-ups." In the United States, intelligence, wealth, and power are not the factors that start the person on the road to success, but rather potential, initiative, and good hard work.

Our schools do a fine job of developing these basics, and the mature adults they produce are a great tribute to our Nation. As trivial as it may seem to the children attending them, our education system is essential and very beneficial to our country, not only for job training for the future, but to teach the students that our principles of living are best.

To awaken on a Sunday morning and attend the church of your choice is truly a privilege that our people take for granted. Many countries have established an official state religion, and in many cases, they force their people to accept its principles. If these people still desire to worship God in their own way, they must do so in seclusion. The citizens of the United States are able to attend clean and beautifully constructed churches, while in many other lands the people are forced to meet their Creator in cold, dingy caves or dusty, dilapidated barns. We need never be ashamed of our religion, for in our country, the choice of the people ranks above all else, and each individual is able to worship freely and openly.

What impresses me most about our homeland is the way in which its principles and ideals exist in the minds and hearts of the public. Fortunately, we have no class system on our soil where the wealthy, powerful people are saparated from the lowly laboring classes. When walking in the streets, people do not move aside so that the great wealthy one may pass by first. Nor do they fall to their knees in respect when a person of authority enters their home. Our Constitution, the invaluable document by which our Nation is governed, states that all men are created equal in the eyes of God. This does hold true, for most of the population does live on the same economic and social level. There is no extreme wealth or poverty in our country, but an almost national middle class that is able to live a normal and comfortable life.

In our land of opportunity, where a person is given a chance to find success in life, there is a degree of respect for the prominent citizen, but never do we find the downright worshipping of him. In our country a man has to work for his honor.

The strength that exists in our people contributes greatly to the unity and power of our country. This strength is not constructed from just one type of person but by human beings of many different races, colors, and creeds. The French and the English, the Negro and the white, and the Catholic and the Jew make up this intangible force that preserves our democracy. They have all joined together to form one respected individual, the American citizen. The American is given many basic freedoms and, in time, the spirit of love and respect that he develops for his home soil will give him the strength to suppress any attempts to take them away from him. A democracy is not a democracy without people who are willing to stand by it with pride and confidence, no matter what the situation may be. Such a feeling does exist here in our free system of living. I sincerely hope that God sees fit to preserve the American citizen and his rights so that the democratic United States of America can remain a peaceful and prosperous nation, and a wonderful place to live.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the response of the press and the public to the recent administration announcement of a compromise plan for an 11,700 acre Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore shows that support for preservation of the Indiana dunes is strong and widespread. Newspaper editorials have expressed disappointment that the beautiful unit 2 area of the dunes will not be included in the administration plan, but continue to strongly urge favorable congressional action on the park proposal.

Chicago's American, the outstanding Chicago newspaper which has firmly and consistently supported the preservation of the dunes, points out in a recent editorial that the conditions which the Bureau of the Budget says must be met before Federal funds are spent for a Burns ditch harbor may well mean that there can be no Federal harbor. But the editorial correctly points out that the crucial point is whether "the terms of the agreement are honestly observed."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial of September 25 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago American, Sept. 25, 1963]

Compromise on the Dunes

It is not yet possible to pass judgment on the so-called compromise plan approved by the Kennedy administration in the Burns ditch controversy. The plan may represent a gain, though not a victory, for conservationist forces—those who have been fighting to prevent the building of a major lake port for the use of steel plants in the area and to save the dunes land from destruction. On the other hand, it may turn out to be a victory for the steel companies and the Indiana politicians who have championed them. It all depends on how clearly the terms of the plan are defined and how faithfully they are carried out—and on the record, we don't put much trust in the politicians' noble intentions.

The White House program will allow construction of the harbor (which is a defeat, not a compromise, for the conservationists). But it also provides for setting aside 11,700 acres for a Federal dunes park, an important gain. Moreover, it attached two conditions to its approval of the harbor building plan which seem so stringent as to kill off the whole project beforehand.

Since the Indiana port authority and the steel mills can't guarantee to meet these conditions, we must deduce either that they have given up plans for securing Federal money for the port, or that they intend to dodge the conditions. The second possibility seems a lot more likely.

The Federal Government will approve the harbor project and help build it if it is assured, first that one integrated steel mill will be built in the area and that at least 10 million tons of coal a year, exclusive of the steel companies' supplies, will be shipped through it; or second, that two integrated mills will be built and 5 million tons of coal shipped through. ("Integrated" means a plant capable of processing steel all the way from raw ore to a finished product.)

It is extremely doubtful that the Bethlehem and Midwest Steel Cos. can meet these conditions. In accepting them, they and the State government seem to be cutting their own throats.

We doubt that they're really doing so. Loopholes in the plan appear very quickly. First, the State government is not bound by these terms. It could go ahead and build the harbor—using the Federal Government's approval of the project as an inducement to buyers of revenue bonds—then call on the Federal Government to bail it out when the harbor started losing money. Second, the Indiana delegation in Congress still wields a hefty club over the park lands bill, which is separate from the harbor building measure. By blocking anti-lake-pollution provisions in the harbor bill, for instance, they could make the conservationists' "victory" practically meaningless.

The situation is this: If terms of the agreement are honestly observed, the conservationists have won. But there is considerable evidence indicating that they haven't won yet.

THE RIVERTON, WYO., RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill which would provide for the reorganization of the third division and Midvale portions of the Riverton reclamation project to compensate for some difficulties that have developed in those two projects. While I am confident that this legislation—S. 2035—can provide a solution for the problems involved, there are those who contend that the easiest solution is to abandon the project entirely.

This attitude has developed partially because of the continued stream of complaints that have issued from certain of the settlers on these projects and from those who are opposed to the idea of reclamation generally.

Mr. President, the Riverton Ranger, a daily newspaper very close to the situation, has published a series of articles and editorials which make a very interesting and vital point concerning this project and the success of the legislation designed to correct existing difficulties. That point is that while there have been many people vocal in their complaints there are many more who have been completely satisfied with the project and are successful on it but have never bothered to defend it or speak up when the project is criticized.

The Ranger has done an excellent job of trying to rectify this situation, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that these articles and editorials be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 10, 1963]

Editorially Speaking: Midvale's Interest

The reassurances from the Bureau of Reclamation and from the State engineer concerning the project water rights indicate that the water remains sacrosanct as belonging to the State, and controlled by those with the water rights. State Engineer Floyd Bishop states it directly and simply when he says, "The inclusion of the Riverton project as a unit of the Missouri River Basin program should in no way affect the administration or the control of water under the project."

Bishop said it is provided in the Wyoming constitution that the State of Wyoming, through the engineer's office, has the responsibility for the administration of the waters of the State.

The general plan for the inclusion of the Riverton project in the Missouri River Basin program has been outlined in the pending legislation. It should be remembered, too, that after the reauthorization is approved by Congress, the negotiation of the repayment contract itself would be done by the Midvale Irrigation District Board, and the Third Division District Board, should they so choose. District commissioners and attorneys can go over the contract word by word to make sure nothing adverse is included in the new contract.

Farmers are concerned that sometime in the future water might be short and a demand made for water needed for irrigation. There seems to be no justification for that fear.

There is a likelihood that water will be short at various times in the years ahead. A better insurance against ill effects from such a shortage would be the improvement of the irrigation works through additional water conservation measures, such as canal lining, so that better use can be made of water available.

A second source of insurance would be the construction of additional upstream storage of floodwaters, both for Midvale, and for the private ditch companies.

Concern over a shortage of water is a real worry. But there seems to be no basis for fears that the water rights, held under Wyoming State law, are threatened by inclusion under the Missouri River Basin program.

With these assurances firmly given, the best interests of Midvale Irrigation District would appear to be served by the district's joining with the Missouri River Basin project. We add our endorsement to the proposal for reauthorization of the Midvale portion of the project as part of the Missouri River Basin project.

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 17, 1963]

Editorially Speaking: Farm Equilibrium

While most Riverton project farmers are working hard to complete the harvest of what may be a record 1963 crop, testimony is being taken in Washington concerning the future of farming in this area.

For 10 years, since some of the first dreams of veteran homesteaders went sour, the third division of Riverton project has been under a direct attack by a group of articulate settlers. Their voices have been amplified by the Rocky Mountain News and Scripps-Howard newspapers. Their case against Reclamation has gained some credence when constant attention has been focused on errors made by the Bureau.

Throughout the campaign to discredit Reclamation, the main group of farmers who make their living farming have remained strangely silent. Individually, men with faith in farming the Reclamation lands in this area have defended farming in this area. Collectively, work has been done toward a sugar factory. Businesses dependent upon farming have continued to expand, and the good farmers continue to make good. But the success stories remain untold.

The winners in the publicity battle are clearly the spokesmen for third division who are trying to prove that the Government misrepresented the lands offered for homesteads, that their economic plight is the fault of the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Government. They believe they are entitled to recompense for the years they spent trying to farm.

Perhaps it is this hope for a payoff that has kept others who believe in farming quiet throughout much of the long battle. The men leading the battle for third division's closing have tried to create a picture of utter desolation and failure, a failure that they maintain would come because of soil conditions, no matter what efforts they might have made.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that Midvale Irrigation District has been working throughout this time for a program of rehabilitation, drainage, canal lining, and structure replacement on Midvale. This program would cost several million dollars.

Could you imagine a more explosive situation than there is today in Washington? Congress is tired of hearing about the plight of the Riverton project as painted by the third division detractors. They have demanded a solution. Presented as the answer is a program calling for expenditure of several millions of dollars.

Representative Haley, of Florida, says the lands should be abandoned and let the ducks paddle around. The Bureau's spokesman Johnson testifies that, "without completion of canal lining, drains, and structure rehabilitation, the Riverton project can be expected to deteriorate progressively and rapidly to the point of virtual abandonment."

Riverton people remember the hearings conducted by Senators Hickey, McGee, and Burdick in Riverton at which time no favorable testimony was permitted without strong objection.

Wouldn't it be a hilarious development, if, while most of the project farmers were hauling a record crop to market, Congress decided to take the advice of the third division people and abandon not only third division but the whole project?

Sounds ridiculous, doesn't it, but to read the headlines, hear the speeches of the critics, one would think there's no good side to tell about reclamation farming around Riverton. If any farmers are doing well on Midvale or third division, it might be well to speak up, before the case is so badly overstated that something drastic and calamitous takes place.

It would be good for morale if some farmers would tell this newspaper a success story about farming to help restore the equilibrium.

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 20, 1963]

Editorially Speaking: It's Catching

While the decision is being made relative to the future of third division, and while farmers of Midvale Irrigation District debate the merits of the reauthorization of the project under the Missouri River Basin plan, there are going to be many different opinions expressed. The only sure winner apparently so far in the deal is the attorney.

When one settlement proposal a few months back called for an appraisal and judgment by a court, the objection was raised at that time that the country would be flooded with lawyers trying to get the cases.

Joe Hickey, the former Senator, said in Washington this week, that the courts should have an opportunity to review any settlement with landowners. The farmers selling out 10 to 12 years work would want to be in a position to deal on a private sale or appeal the settlement. But it might be that the only real winner in the case would be the lawyers.

While it's the vogue to sue, it's surprising that someone hasn't considered a suit for defamation and slander. The farmer who has spent his life farming on Midvale, for example, and now contemplates selling his place to realize a return on all the money he's plowed back in his business, might be shocked to find out how much the value of his farm has shrunk following a nationwide barrage of publicity portraying the whole Riverton project as a dead horse, and the other names rather loosely applied.

At least a half dozen "second-coming-size" headlines have appeared on the front page of the Rocky Mountain News, (thanks in part to the prompting of those in third division with the pipeline to the editor's ear), portraying in head and story the Riverton project as worthless.

One of the requirements of a slander or libel suit is the ability to prove damages.

The man who thought he had a good farm and who should have plenty of buyers might well be able to prove that the value of his real estate has dropped through the nationwide campaign of vilification. The third division boys may have intended to apply their main heat for the roasting of the Bureau of Reclamation whom they are now suing through Joe Hickey.

But the torch has been rather loosely applied and many innocent bystanders have been scorched. This suing malady is catching. Can't you see the headline in the Denver Post now—in their "second coming type"—"Riverton Project Farmers Get Off Their Dead Horse, Sue RM News for Slander."

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 19, 1963]

D. Lockhart Defends Farms Here

A new blast of adverse publicity about the Riverton reclamation project has brought reaction from several quarters. One third division farmer's story is told in an accompanying article.

With new headlines on papers across the United States calling the Riverton project a "dead horse," and with the 10 years of battle between some of the third division farmers and the Bureau of Reclamation, new comment is expected.

One Midvale farmer is planning a series of stories to rebut arguments put forth in favor of the inclusion of the project in Missouri River Basin.

Another farmer has volunteered, with his banker, to show how he went from zero assets to $120,000 worth on a project farm in a few years.

Another man is pointing out how project lands, partly because of the rain of adverse publicity, will sell for only $100 to $125 an acre. He says a good farmer can oftentimes make that much in 1 year off the farmland.

Following is a letter to the editor submitted by Missouri Valley farmer Don Lockhart.

"A letter to Riverton project farmers:

"Your project is a 'dead horse.' If you didn't know it before, from the frequent times you've been told you know it now. And, it must be pretty bad, if they can smell it in Congressman Haley's State of Florida.

"When will you be ready to stand for a count? I've heard your opinions as you talk to each other, but that's as far as it goes. Are you afraid of making someone angry? Or, do you think there's a chance you'll get in on the 'cake cutting' if there is one?

"This is my opinion of the facts as they have been stated and as I think they actually are.

"Stated: Riverton project is a 'dead horse,' beset by bad engineering and poor soil.

"As I see it:

"Every western irrigation project no matter how successful has some abandoned lands. Everyone of them works. I believe we are only going through the same growing pains the old projects experienced.

"Stated: Bureau of Reclamation lied.

"As I see it:

"That's being real blunt but if it has to be yes or no, they did. Not any more than a real estate man or the Canadian Railway, or a farmer selling out.

"Any man who came into the Valley when I did (1950), had to drive by abandoned land, white with alkali, to get to the new units above Pavillion. Any settler of the 1930's could have told what the lands were if anyone had asked for an opinion.

"Any man who came into the valley when new settlers all made statements of experiences and available capital. Most of us stretched a point here and there.

"Likewise, all the settlers were servicemen. Any serviceman should have had experience enough with the Government's word.

"Stated: Midvale project can never pay off:

"As I see it:

"Under conventional bookkeeping methods it cannot. Under a wider concept, one taking into account humans involved, new wealth created, total business generated, it doesn't lack too much of being paid off now.

"As a summary I believe the project is worth our support. The money asked for to do 'rehabilitation and betterment' work, while not being repaid directly by Midvale would be repaid by Boysen power. That to me is no skin off Florida's nose unless it couldn't get it to dredge out a harbor or build a breakwater. (Those funds generally are nonreimbursable.) The money then would be raised in Wyoming and spent to Wyoming betterment. How often can you say that of Federal expenditures?

"Much of the present problem is economic. Two of every five farmers doing business in the United States in 1950 are gone. Broke, or at least squeezed out. Few of them had the added expense of all new buildings, fences, irrigation structures, a line of machinery and at least 1 year of no crop. Project homesteaders had those added expenses."

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 19, 1963]

THIRD DIVISION FARMER GIES WORTH UP FROM $800 TO $80,000

North Pavillion Farmer Ted Gies, after 13 years of work on his farm in the much-publicized third division of Riverton reclamation project, still plans to make his home and his living on third division.

Although situated on land classified as unfit for farming, Gies has seen his tiny nest egg of $800 cash and an old truck loaded with a few pieces of furniture grow to a present value of $80,000.

From $800 to $80,000 in 13 years is a record to be proud of. Gies and his wife admit they have mortgages and debts.

"But who hasn't these days?" Gies said philosophically.

Gies has been one of the few voices raised against the onslaught of publicity which has pictured the Riverton reclamation project as a mistake. Following an invitation in the Riverton Ranger to successful farmers to tell their story to try restore the equilibrium between the good and the bad, Gies came forward with this information.

Gies made application for a homestead along with the hundreds of other veterans after World War II who swarmed to the new land openings on third division of Riverton project.

He drew No. 22, and by the time 5 ahead of him withdrew, he had the 17th choice on the new land openings. He looked first at a homestead in Hidden Valley, but decided instead on his present place in north Pavillion.

Gies farm is the first one north out of Pavillion, unit No. 69. His original unit had 161½ acres of land with 112 acres irrigable. In the land reclassification of 1953 when the amendment and exchange act was passed for the relief of third division farmers, Gies found all of his land reclassified as class 6 land, lowest there is.

He considered buying his neighbor's farm, the Lloyd Montgomery place, which had 32 acres left after the reclassification.

But in 1954 he paid $1,800 for the Ralph Steers place 12 miles away, buying the improvements. He gained 58½ irrigable acres.

Gies still has faith in the drainability of his own farm. He feels that drains properly placed and on the right grade could improve his land. This year Midvale Irrigation put a concrete irrigation chute across Gies' farm, and that has helped dry out his land.

Gies' success has been partly due to his dairy operation. He raised alfalfa seed through 1958. One year he had a record production of 2,676 pounds of seed from 1 acre. The 1953 crop was the best, but in 1954 and 1955 he grossed $46,000 from his crops, mainly seed.

"Like most everyone else, we stayed in seed production 2 or 3 years too long," Gies said. For all the years he has been farming on his place, his gross income has averaged $14,000.

Both Ted and his wife have worked hard on the farm. He doesn't believe a man can make a go of farming by working at an outside job.

Gies looks with envy at some of the better farms in third division, wishing he had been able to apply his toil to the better land, rather than just his own.

But with his dairy operation, which now includes 60 head of cattle, including some Brown Swiss, Holstein, and Guernsey, Gies is confident he can make a good living.

"We came here in 1950 to make our home and we still believe we can do it. All it takes is some hard work," Gies said.

Does he want a settlement? Gies said he supposes he would have to sell out if the project is shutdown. But he doesn't think that's necessary.

The Gies family includes three boys, Theodore F., an honor junior geology student at the University of Wyoming; Alan, a junior at Pavillion High School; and Burl, a 7th grader at Pavillion.

The Gies family just bought a brand new red car. Their other one was worn out, and it was good for the morale, during a time when a major effort is being made to picture the Riverton project as a worthless wasteland.

[From the Riverton (Wyo.) Ranger, Sept. 20, 1963]

HUFFMAN SAYS: USBR DIDN'T MISREPRESENT

"I am a contented and happy man. I have a good ranch, a good wife, and a happy family.

"For 10 years I have suffered the humiliation of seeing a small group of people tear down what I have been working hard to build up for 15 years.

"I don't seek any personal publicity, but I cannot remain silent any longer in the face of this terribly distorted picture."

Speaking was Stanley Huffman, seated in the living room of his comfortable ranch home near Ocean Lake off the 8-Mile Road.

Huffman was referring to the many recent blasts leveled at the Riverton reclamation project during hearings before the Irrigation Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee early in the week in Washington.

Laid out on a coffee table before Huffman were all of the documents and pamphlets he had received prior to and during his homesteading of his farm on 8-Mile Road in 1948.

"We homesteaders were given a very thorough briefing on every aspect of farming these new lands, Huffman said. "I believe the Bureau of Reclamation was as honest with us as they could be."

Huffman told of being taken out on the land by Floyd Moore, then with the USBR, and looking at the land. He selected his unit, which was No. 57 on the Bureau's mimeographed list.

Both Moore and Alfred D. Perkins (still with the USBR here) advised Huffman that his farm unit was one of the poorer ones. According to the soil classification of that time it had no class I land, 29.2 acres of class II, 63.9 acres of class IV, a total of 124.6 acres of irrigable land on the 160-acre unit.

THOROUGH BRIEFING

"The Reclamation was very thorough with us," Huffman said. They gave him a booklet entitled "Your New Home" which he still has.

Within the booklet was another pamphlet, from the University of Wyoming extension service, which advised on soil conditions. This booklet stated that the soil needed organic matter and that it would take considerable time to build up. The University of Wyoming bulletin also advised that livestock were necessary to make the unit pay. It advised on crops.

The farmers were warned of seep problems, of alkalinity in the soil. They were told they should have at least $5,000 available to be successful in starting their new farm. Most of them didn't have anything like this money.

The USBR bulletin advised that lands were in a raw state, low in organic material, and that even with proper farming practices it would be several years before the land would become economical.

The USBR bulletin advised that it would take 3 to 5 years of growing and plowing under of alfalfa and clover to build up the soil. They recommended strongly plowing under the green material.

"How many settlers have followed this advice?" Huffman said. He has.

The USBR told the settlers that their income would be low, that they would barely make expenses, let alone a big profit. The Bureau warned of the high cost of farm machinery and other things.

The Bureau bulletin listed what could be expected as ultimate crop yields—20 bushels of dry beans an acre, 10 tons of beets an acre, 350 bushels of potatoes an acre, 40 to 45 bushels of oats and barley an acre, 25 to 30 bushels of wheat an acre, 2 tons of alfalfa hay an acre, 120 pounds of alfalfa seed an acre, 300 pounds of clover seed an acre, and so on. All of these figures are considerably below the averages now being grown on the Riverton project.

Huffman has himself far exceeded these goals in the crops he grows.

CAME FROM OREGON

The Huffman family came to Riverton from Oregon. He had farmed on the Yellowstone project near Sidney, Mont., and in eastern Oregon. He saw good and bad farms on both these projects.

"They are still reclaiming land on older projects," Huffman said. "I have seen land that 25 years ago was absolutely worthless, on these older projects, that today are beautiful places."

He and two other prospective homesteaders looked over the USBR material during the evening of their first day here. The other two decided it wasn't good enough for them and left. Huffman stayed, and has never regreted it.

He gave up his school teaching in Oregon, and knowing that his early years would be lean, he secured a job as an English teacher in Riverton High School from then Superintendent Les Jensen.

"We were poor as a church mouse when we moved into our tar paper house. We slept on camp cots. We were in hock to the FHA. We had children aged 1 and 2 years old and another on the way," Huffman recalls. And he signed his official papers for the homestead on Friday, February 13, 1948.

The Huffmans' first winter on the place was the famous winter of 1949. It snowed so hard they had to shovel snow off the roof, which leaked like mad.

"But the good Lord must have been looking after us," Mrs. Huffman recalls, "because it leaked everywhere except on our bed."

Huffman is a firm believer in a large unit of land, a diversified livestock operation in connection with it. And he has made his farming practices work.

From an absolute zero start (Huffman says he didn't have a pot to put beans in when he arrived) he has built up a net worth of nearly $120,000, figures substantiated by his bank.

His place is now fully fenced and cross fenced. He has a concrete-lined ditch. His 1,320-square-foot home has a full basement, three bedrooms, and a fireplace.

Huffman started in 1948 with his 160-acre unit. Since then he amended onto the 160-acre Bob Heumier farm when Heumier left the project in 1954; he bought the Jim Van Trump place in 1954, purchased from the USBR a vacant 160 acres never homesteaded, bought another contiguous vacant unit, and is leasing two units owned by Bill Skelton (originally homesteaded by Jim Broyles and Dale Hobbs).

TOTAL, 1,120 ACRES

Thus he is farming a total of 1,120 acres. Of this amount only 268 acres are classified as irrigable, 200 on Huffman's own farm. As a further example, the Hobbs place has 31.7 acres classified as irrigable, but he has farmed 120 acres.

Huffman is raising 3-4 ton hay on land that has been condemned as worthless.

He points out that you can swamp out any land with poor irrigation practices.

"This land will produce with proper management," Huffman states emphatically.

Interestingly enough, except for a couple of old drain ditches on the Van Trump place, there are no drain ditches on Huffman's place. And he is constantly reclaiming more and more land, that at one time was hopelessly seeped out. Huffman believes that much of the seepage comes from the canals and laterals, and not from the judicious use of water in irrigation.

"Everything I have has come from this land—fences, my home, lined ditches," Huffman states.

He has a beautiful garden, and his farm records show that it has been worth $500 a year to him. In the 15 years he has been on the place this would be $7,500, or nearly enough to buy the fencing on the place.

He has a fine shelterbelt of a mixture of cottonwood, Chinese-elm, ash, cedar, spruce, and Russian-olive. It won a prize, 10 years ago as best in the State.

His orchard is a sight to behold, and produces apples, crabapples, and even grapes.

The Huffmans buy their groceries with the $600 a year they make off selling the eggs from their 200 white leghorn chickens.

SUMMER FALLOWS

Huffman believes in summer fallow. He has about 80-100 acres continuously in fallow and rotation. He controls his weeds in this manner.

A piece of acreage he has in fallow this year, raised 15 bushels of oats in 1950, but raised 120 bushels in 1960.

"After I put in my concrete slip form ditch on this field the seep stopped dead," Huffman says.

He believes in conservation of equipment and is building his own maintenance shop for $600. He will improve his feeding arrangement this winter.

He raised 150 acres of hay this year. After the first two cuttings he will let his sheep harvest the third cutting—and the weeds.

Farming is hard work, and steady. In 15 years of irrigating up to 600 acres, Huffman has missed setting his water at night only once. "You control seep by controlling your water," he says.

Huffman has a Ranger alfalfa seed field, much of it originally seeded 15 years ago from which he expects a 500-600 pound per acre seed crop this year.

His 400 ewes brought him 500 lambs this May. He never feeds them any hay or grain, but fattens them in the field. The sheep have been in a cornfield now for about a month. Later he'll turn the cattle into the cornfield, then bring the sheep back. "Because of weather I had to feed only 3 days last winter," he says.

Huffman raised purebred dual purpose (milk and beef) red polled cattle. His sheep are a cross between Hampshire and Rambouillett, and his bucks are Hamps and Suffolk.

He has 20 acres of beautiful oats harvested on land he has reclaimed on the Van Trump place, now producing a crop for the first time in many years. He raises some potatoes, too.

He kept 39 head of cattle and their 32 calves on 30 acres of pasture all summer long, a pretty good record for the pasture. And he has had 100 percent life on his calves this year, didn't lose a one. Pasture is a combination of brome grass and alfalfa.

In one of the 60 acres of corn he has, Huffman (always experimenting) has planted alfalfa with the corn. "It ought to work," he says.

Huffman keeps his steers 18 months, before sale, so far has kept all his cows while building up his herd of 100.

The Huffmans have five children, Stanley 16, Dan 15, David 14, Benjamin 10, Susan 9, and Mark 2. His wife's name is Eileen.

COLLEGE FUTURE

Each of his boys gets a purebred heifer after completing each year of school after the eighth grade. And he pays the boys wages on the farm. Stan figures that by the time his boys get ready to go to college they'll have a $2,000 start. And he hopes some of them come back to the farm.

"Wyoming has been awfully darned good to me," states Stan Huffman. "I've raised a nice family, have eaten good, and have a good car."

GOLD STAR MOTHERS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on September 29, the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc. observed Gold Star Mothers Day. This day highlighted the weekend of activities which brought hundreds of Gold Star Mothers to Washington.

Mr. President, my acquaintance with Gold Star Mothers stems back to the 80th Congress with Public Law 80-306. I am very proud that this bill which provides a gold star lapel button for widows, parents and the next of kin who lost a beloved one on the battlefield, was the first bill of mine to be enacted by the Congress of the United States. In my judgment, these lapel pins are a very small but fitting tribute to the mothers of these fine young men as an expression of the Nation's deep appreciation for the sacrifices made by those whose memory all of us cherish. Our Nation is free today only because these fine young men have made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. President, we Americans are in debt to these mothers for even more than the fact that they have lost their sons to a national cause. These mothers have given both time and effort in working in veterans hospitals throughout the country. Every year, the Gold Star Mothers donate thousands of hours of their time to comfort the sick and cheer the lonely in veterans hospitals scattered throughout the country.

Mr. President, this year, to show my deep and continuing interest in honoring the loved ones of those who have given their lives to preserve our Nation, I have introduced a bill which would provide gold star lapel buttons for the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who have lost or lose their lives as a result of cold war incidents. It seems to me that this small lapel button, a symbol of both sorrow and pride, would be a fitting expression of gratitude to the members of the families of men who have made the ultimate sacrifice during active cold war conflict.

Mr. President, may I take this opportunity to wish the Gold Star Mothers well and to let them know that we as a Nation are indebted for their many contributions.

PROPOSED VISIT OF MARSHAL TITO TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on September 24 before the Senate I spoke out vigorously in opposition to the proposed visit of Tito to the United States. I am confident that I am not alone in my views as is evidenced by correspondence that has been received by me on that subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dealing with this particular subject and signed by officials of the Slovenian Dramatic Club LILIJA, of Collinwood, Ohio.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Permit us to address this letter to you in the hope that you would voice your protest against the recent invitation extended by President Kennedy to Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia for a visit at the White House.

A reception of Communist Dictator Tito by our President would be an insult to all communism enslaved nations and all decent Americans. It would make a mockery of our democratic principles to welcome the creator and strongman of this Communist police state. This country of ours is the stronghold of democracy and freedom; a symbol and guarantee of liberty; a hope of all those millions who in the slavery of all forms of communism suffer and pray to be someday delivered from this evil.

Regardless of any past differences between Belgrade and Moscow, Tito is and will be a Communist who will in all important decisions always side with the Soviets. He is also a ruthless man who is responsible for the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of men, women and children during the revolution, and a massacre of 12,000 men of the Slovenian National Army, as well as over 100,000 anti-Communist soldiers from Croatia and Serbia. This happened during May and June of 1945, right after the end of the war. Mass graves in the forests and caves of Kocevski Rog in Slovenia alone contain close to 100,000 victims.

This is the true face of Marshal Tito. Our native land is soaked with blood of martyrs whose only crime was that they were opposed to the Communist slavery and wanted their country to be free and democratic.

If President Kennedy wants to live up to his words—and we hope—his convictions, then he will not disgrace the dignity of his high office and the good name and dignity of our country by greeting on our soil the butcher, who is responsible for beastly massacres that can only be equaled to those of Hitler and Stalin.

We know your deep convictions and firm stand against communism, Senator, and we trust that you will do everything in your power to prevent this shameful meeting from taking place.

Sincerely yours,
SLOVENIAN DRAMATIC CLUB LILIJA,
AUGUST DRAGAR, *President*
FRANK HRIN, *Secretary.*

ANTITRUST REVISION COMMISSION RECOMMENDED BY WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EXPORT EXPANSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of my major concerns in introducing, along with Senators HARTKE, COOPER, and BREWSTER, S. 1255, which would create a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws, was the impact which the present, long unreviewed structure of our antitrust laws is having upon our international trade. Much evidence has been coming to light that the drive being conducted by one part of our Government to increase our exports and thereby ease our balance-of-payments problems is being contradicted by the drive of another segment of the Government to enforce an antitrust structure which in large part does not contemplate either our balance-of-payments problems or our export drive.

The White House Conference on Export Expansion held on September 17 and 18 highlighted this conflict. Committee Eleven of the conference, consisting of many of the most distinguished participants in the conference, was charged with considering antitrust aspects of export expansion. The committee concluded that the conflict was of such magnitude that it could not possibly propose substantive revision of the antitrust laws in the 2 days allotted to it and stated:

> It is for this reason that the committee expresses its approval in principle of Senate bill 1255 providing for a Government commission to explore in depth all of the problems associated with the application of the antitrust laws to foreign commerce, as well as the exemption provided by the Webb-Pomerene Act. Only such a commission, given adequate staff, financing, facilities, and support can expect to report adequately upon the problems which have been assigned to this committee.

The committee also found that the balance-of-payments problem is so pressing that it felt it must make some suggestions immediately to alleviate the difficulties by administrative action within the existing antitrust structure and also outlined some typical examples of concrete problems faced by American firms operating in foreign trade.

I believe the committee has performed a valuable service which should be of great assistance in identifying the extent of the antitrust-export conflict and in bringing about a broad scale review of the antitrust laws in the light of the present and future needs of our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee's report be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE 11—ANTITRUST ASPECTS OF EXPORT EXPANSION

Chairman: Alonzo B. Kight, Borg-Warner International Corp.

Vice Chairman: Claude L. Ganz, Dynamo Industries Inc.

Liaison Officer: Peter T. Jones, Deputy to the Secretary of Commerce.

How does U.S. antitrust law affect the export expansion drive? Are there recommendations for policy and other changes? What has been the effect of foreign cartels and monopolies? What are the implications of price differentials in domestic and foreign markets?

The problems involved in antitrust law in connection with export expansion are numerous and difficult. They are beyond the ability of any committee to solve in the course of two sessions lasting less than 1 complete working day. The committee, therefore, realizes that the most significant thing that it can do is to submit a few recommendations dealing with some of the major problems with which members are familiar. We recognize that we have necessarily omitted reference to other problems which will be of equal or greater significance.

It is for this reason that the committee expresses its approval in principle of Senate bill 1255 providing for a Government commission to explore in depth all of the problems associated with the application of the antitrust laws to foreign commerce, as well as the exemption provided by the Webb-Pomerene Act. Only such a commission, given adequate staff, financing, facilities, and support can expect to report adequately upon the problems which have been assigned to this committee.

WHAT MAY BE DONE NOW

The problems facing the United States in the development of its export trade are immediate. The balance-of-payments problem is acute. The country cannot afford to wait for one or more years while the problem is explored in depth. We, therefore, conceive it to be our duty to make recommendations for whatever steps can be taken immediately, or in the near future.

In our consideration of the problem we have found it impossible to separate export from oversea investment. Investments, joint ventures, licensing of patents and know-how, are all important to the export trade of the United States. The members of the committee are unanimous in their judgment that every business would prefer to manufacture in the United States and export its products abroad where it is at all possible to do so. Foreign investments, joint ventures, and licenses are entered into after it has become clear that these ventures offer the only practical means of expanding business abroad. The alternative is not foreign manufacture or exports. It is foreign manufacture or nothing. We are also in agreement that foreign investments, joint ventures, and licenses are ordinarily followed by an expansion of exports both immediately and in the long range.

Accordingly, we have divided this report into two parts. In part I we recommended those steps, although we agree their effect will be limited, which can be taken at once within the framework of present laws and which will benefit the export trade of the United States. In part II we have set forth certain examples which are typical problems faced by U.S. businessmen operating abroad.

PART I—ACTION WITHIN PRESENT ANTITRUST LAWS

The Committee expresses its appreciation to U.S. Assistant Attorney General William Orrick and Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, who participated in part of the Committee's discussions. Mr. Orrick stated that he would approve the extension of the Government's "railroad release" (advance clearance) procedure, now used in merger cases, to problems arising under the antitrust laws as applied to foreign commerce. We believe that although such clearances are not a complete answer, the institution of this practice would help to relieve the anxieties of business faced with antitrust uncertainties in their proposed foreign operations.

Five steps outlined

We believe that such a program requires at least five elements:

1. There should be an announcement of this clearance procedure by the Department of Justice, or jointly by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. The announcement should spell out clearly for the benefit of interested businessmen precisely the steps that must be taken in order to invoke the procedure and to obtain a meaningful clearance from the Department.

2. The clearance should state clearly the matters covered and not covered so that the applicant may know what has been cleared and what has not been cleared.

3. It should be a term of the clearance that it will remain in effect until revoked and for a reasonable time thereafter, which reasonable time to be specified in the clearance letter, and should inform the applicant that the clearance will not be revoked or modified without giving the applicant an opportunity to show cause why it should not remain in effect.

4. The clearance should state specifically that while it is in effect and for a reasonable time thereafter, specified therein, no proceeding, civil or criminal will be brought by any Government agency under the antitrust laws in respect of matters covered by the clearance against the party receiving the clearance or against persons acting in concert with him and relying upon the clearance.

5. The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have concurrent jurisdiction over many of the antitrust questions that may arise in the course of export trade. We believe that it would be undesirable to require businessmen to obtain dual clearances. Therefore, we believe that in the interest of efficient administration clearance should be granted by a single agency, which clearance should be effective for all antitrust prosecutions, both civil and criminal.

Rule of reason

There is a vast gray area in the interpretation of the antitrust laws. Such an area is to some extent inherent in legislation which has a scope and flexibility found to be desirable in constitutional enactments. One of the basic premises of the antitrust laws since 1911 has been the "rule of reason." Reasonableness is by its very nature not a fixed concept and what may have been reasonable in one era and under one set of economic conditions is not necessarily reasonable under another.

We do not suggest that it is the duty of the enforcement agencies to do anything other than to enforce the antitrust laws, but the interpretation and the application of the antitrust laws today, although the words of the legislation have not changed, are not the same in scope and meaning as they were two generations ago under different economic conditions and in a different world environment. We would also suggest that an unreasonable restraint as applied to international commerce does not necessarily have the same meaning as an unreasonable restraint as applied to domestic commerce.

We believe, therefore, that the question of what is an unreasonable restraint of trade deserves reconsideration by the enforcement agencies, and that particularly in determining what is an unreasonable restraint of trade both for the purpose of granting clearances and for the purpose of prosecution the enforcement agencies take into account the economic problems of our era, including in such consideration those problems which have been developed by the increasing complexity and sophistication of international trade as well as the economic problems of the country as a whole.

PART II—TYPICAL EXAMPLES

The U.S. antitrust laws discourage and in many cases prevent U.S. companies from entering or retaining profitable foreign markets for exports either directly or through licensing and joint ventures. Foreign manufacturers are far more free to take full advantage of the opportunities. A few typical problems faced by U.S. businessmen operating in foreign trade are given in the following examples:

An American company decides to appoint an agent or distributor for its product in France. The best agent or distributor available supplies a line of similar goods and is also an important customer because it incorporates the American's components in its finished product. The American company desires to assure itself that its merchandise will not be returned to the United States as part of another product in competition with its own line. Under present antitrust laws an agreement preventing reexport to the United States would be in violation of our antitrust laws.

U.S. firms cannot limit the territories in which licensees or foreign joint ventures will operate without risking, in most cases, violation of U.S. antitrust laws. Therefore, they may run into competition from their own licensees or joint venture partners in their traditional U.S. markets.

For instance, company A makes sophisticated electronic equipment in the United States and wants to license engineering know-how in England. The license agreement includes provisions for the export of machinery and components from the United States. Under U.S. antitrust laws they cannot deny the licensee access to the U.S. market. Company A decided not to license and to forgo substantial engineering fees and export sales because of the danger of building a competitor in its own home market. On the other hand, a foreign firm may often control the markets of its licensees and can establish a licensee outside without concern for competition in its home market. Under the present antitrust laws, the American company is clearly at a disadvantage.

Seeks joint venture

Company B, a U.S. firm, wants to set up a joint manufacturing venture in Japan involving the export of supplies from the United States. On invesitgation they cannot find a legal way to prevent the Japanese company from shipping to the U.S. market. They abandoned the project resulting in a loss of potential license and export sales income to the United States.

Company C wants to acquire an interest in an Italian firm for the purpose of promoting U.S. exports. They find the otherwise well suited Italian company has agreements which with the participation of the U.S. company would be in conflict with U.S. antitrust laws. Company C is forced to drop the project and is unable to expand its exports as planned. A foreign company is under no such restrictions.

U.S. company D, which wishes to do business in country X (a member of the Latin American free trade area) finds that the local government requires it to participate in a joint venture which has monopolistic overtones, prohibited by the U.S. antitrust laws. The company refraints from doing this and the obvious result is loss of income to the United States.

Companies X, Y, and Z make somewhat the same product for the U.S. market. Each is interested in entering the Peruvian market with local manufacturing supplemented by the export of components from the United States. The market is small and can support only one plant. One U.S. company cannot afford to set up in Peru with the threat of competition from the other two. Two companies from Europe can join hands and lock up the market. The obvious result is more income lost to the United States.

Attached to this report is a statement by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America:

"The basic difficulty which the U.S. antitrust laws impose on American business aboard is that they do not permit us to compete on equal terms with foreign business.

"This tends to discourage investment and participation by American business in foreign enterprises. It therefore reduces American income from abroad.

"When an American company competes abroad with a foreign company it must comply with the foreign law to which the foreign company is subject. But our courts have held that the American antitrust laws have extraterritorial effect. As a result, the American company also must comply with the American law, from which the foreign company is immune. To illustrate, American companies encounter obstacles under our antitrust laws if they participate with other American companies or with foreign companies in joint research, development or marketing programs abroad, or in the allocation of foreign marketing areas with such companies. Foreign companies are not faced with these obstacles.

"Instances of these inequalities appear in a staff report and memorandum of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary issued in 1955 pursuant to Senate Resolution 61 of the 84th Congress. I agree with the opinions contained in that report showing the difficulties encountered by American business abroad because of the foreign application of our antitrust laws.

"The net result is that foreign revenues, which American companies could obtain, go to foreign competition.

"I fail to see how it is in the best interests of the United States to place such restrictions on American business abroad. I believe that American business abroad should not have to follow two different sets of rules. Let us require that, subject to our national interest, our businessmen follow only the rules of the country in which their business is transacted. In England, an American company should follow English law; in France, French law, and similarly in other countries. To require more places American business at a serious competitive disadvantage.

"To any who might contend that this could in some instances adversely affect American business, I believe that American businessmen would be sensitive to those matters which would adversely affect their business.

"In addition, because this subject clearly affects the national interest, I suggest that consideration be given to creation of an organization to deal with it, with representation from the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Defense Department, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Trade Commission. This organization would have authority to grant clearance from the extraterritorial application of our antitrust laws wherever the American company involved believed this was in its best interests and could demonstrate that such clearance would not adversely affect the national interest."

ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, an extremely important event is taking place in Washington this week—the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

More than 700 finance chiefs from 100 countries are meeting for the next 5 days to discuss the major issues which confront the IMF today, the most important being—in terms of its potential impact on the future growth of the free world economy—the long-term adequacy of international credit.

The United States and nine other key industrialized countries, the "Paris Club," are expected to be requested by the IMF to undertake a lengthy study of the need to reform the existing international monetary mechanism. The IMF indicated that it will conduct its own year-long study of the liquidity question.

There is little debate regarding the adequacy of international credit for the present. But there is growing belief that not long from now the world may run into a shortage of credit to finance rapidly growing international transactions which, if allowed to happen, would act as a break on the expansion of the U.S. economy as well as the economies of other free world countries.

President Kennedy, in his address to the opening session of the IMF conference yesterday, confirmed a significant change in U.S. policy, foreshadowed by Under Secretary of the Treasury Roosa's article in the October issue of Foreign Affairs, by accepting the idea that there might be a problem regarding the adequacy of international credit for the long term and by endorsing the creation of international machinery to cope with it.

I am pleased to note that the New York Times in a September 30 editorial endorses the need for this appraisal.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's address, and the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1963]

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

(The text of President Kennedy's address at the meeting of the International Monetary Fund yesterday.)

Mr. Dillon, gentlemen: This is the second time that I have had the opportunity to welcome you to Washington and I do so with the greatest pleasure and satisfaction. Yours is a very vital role in the defense of the free world. Your contribution to financial and economic stability among the nations of the world is essential and the results of these efforts will determine in a very large measure whether or how much each nation can use its resources, generous as they are, in the best interests of all of our people.

Since I last met with you, we have suffered the loss of one of the great leaders of the International Monetary Fund, Per Jacobsson. He served the Fund with skill and dedication.

He combined a great deal of wisdom with good humor. We will miss him, but the indelible mark that he left upon your work and upon the monetary systems of the world and upon the IMF will continue to guide us.

To his successor, Mr. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, I extend best wishes as he now guides the Fund. We are grateful to France for releasing him for this service. His broad talents and experience equip him admirably for the heavy responsibilities which now press upon him.

I am glad, too, that the Bank was able to find a talented successor to Mr. Eugene Black. Mr. Black's genius helped give this institution the best reputation any bank or banker can have, a reputation of combining prudence with constructive generosity. I am pleased that Mr. George Woods has been selected to sustain this tradition.

NEED 20 YEARS AGO

Twenty years ago, when the architects of these institutions met to design an international banking structure, the economic life of the world was polarized in overwhelming, and even alarming, measure on the United States. So were the world's monetary reserves.

The United States had the only open capital in the world apart from that of Switzerland. Sixty percent of the gold reserves of the world were here in the United States. The war-torn nations of Europe and the Far East faced difficult tasks of reconstruction with depleted and inadequate capital resources. There was a need for redistribution of the financial resources of the world and the financial strength of the free world. And there was an equal need to organize a flow of capital to the impoverished and underdeveloped countries of the world.

All this has come about. It did not come about by chance, but by conscious and deliberate and responsible planning. Under the Marshall plan and its successors, liberal assistance was given to the more advanced nations to help restore their industrial plant, and development loans were given to less developed countries. In addition, private American capital was made freely available, and there was a steady liberalization of our trade policies. In this effort, your institution, and more recently a growing number of industrialized countries, have made an increasingly important role.

We are now entering upon a new era of economic and financial interdependence. The rise of trading blocs such as the Common Market offers new and greater challenge for trade liberalization. The United States has prepared itself to take advantage of those opportunities by legislation permitting an unprecedented reduction of trade restrictions and trade barriers. Our gold reserves are a healthy but not excessive 40 percent of the world's holdings.

EQUILIBRIUM GOAL

Largely as a result of these changes, this Nation today is engaged in an effort to bring our international accounts into equilibrium, and to maintain the necessary strength behind the dollar. This is not merely, I believe, in our interests. It is in the interest of all those who have placed their faith in the dollar.

To this end we have taken several steps to reduce the drain on our balance of payments. First, we are making a major effort to increase our exports in the flow of trade between the United States and other free nations.

Secondly, we are initiating further savings in our oversea dollar expenditures.

Third, we are seeking to slow down the very rapid increase in oversea demands on our capital markets as well as to retard the outflow of short-term capital resulting from interest-rate differentials.

Fourth, we intend to maintain stable prices and to increase the attractiveness of investment here in the United States.

We do not seek by precipitous acts to improve our position at the expense of others. We do seek by comprehensive effort, consistent with our international responsibilities, to reduce outflows which are weakening our capacity to serve the world community. In short, every nation in the world has a direct interest, for the dollar is an international currency, and the security of the dollar therefore involves the security of us all.

COOPERATIVE ACTION

The operations of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Development Association all play important roles in this effort. Their techniques of cooperative action and the availability of their resources permit capital to be deployed around the world in the most effective and efficient manner.

In a special message to the Congress on the balance of payments, I announced that the United States had for the first time entered into a standby arrangement with the Fund. The attendance of all of you at this meeting underscores the extent of world involvement in these institutions and the determination for so many nations to work together for mutual strength. We have been able to do this in so many fields and we have done it, it seems to me, with such success in recent months and years that I am confident that that intimate association will continue to grow and to prosper.

During the past year many of you have cooperated either through the international organizations or through your own central banks in an improved approach to the problems of foreign exchange and gold markets.

Credit facilities and reserve-holding techniques have been improved. The international monetary systems met with ease the Cuban crisis last autumn, the strains upon sterling early in 1963, and the evidence that our payments situation had not developed as well as we hoped in the first half of this year.

This performance has benefited every nation, large and small, but success should not, I believe, be an encouragement to inaction. This Nation—the United States—must continue its efforts to meet the balance-of-payments problems now confronting us, and we must all assure ourselves by preparations now that we will be ready to meet the international monetary problems of the future.

STUDIES TO BEGIN

I am pleased to learn that studies of these problems and of appropriate measures to deal with them are about to be launched. There is a sharp distinction, however, between long-term questions of international liquidity and the current problems of international imbalance. We do not intend to neglect the latter while pursuing the former.

This Government considers our tax reduction and reform program which has recently been approved by one House of the Congress to be the most important action that Congress can take now to improve our long-range position.

It should help attract capital investment, improve our ability to sell goods and services in world markets, stimulate the growth of our economy and the employment of our people, give greater freedom to monetary policy and play a vital supporting role in our determination to achieve equal rights and opportunities for all of our citizens.

In other areas including the interest equalization tax, and the other steps that I have noted, and the forthcoming trade negotiations, we are proceeding in our efforts to bring our payments into balance.

We are proceeding with caution. We are fully aware of the effects of our actions on our friends, but no one should confuse caution with any lack of determination. We are determined to do whatever must be done in the interest of this country and, indeed, in the interest of all to protect the dollar as a convertible currency at its current fixed rate.

We are determined—and I believe in your interest as well as our own—to maintain the firm relationship of gold and the dollar at the present price of $35 an ounce, and I can assure you we will do just that.

PATIENCE REQUIRED

We recognize that the reserve position of other countries is a mirror image of our own; and as the United States moves toward equilibrium, it will be more difficult for others to increase their reserves.

Some nations will be more handicapped than others, but no nation should be forced to make drastic alterations in its domestic and trading policy because of shortrun movements in its reserve position. The United States, therefore, stands ready to support such measures as may be necessary to increase international liquidity.

Patience will be required in working out these matters. The balance of payment is not a problem to be cured by a single all-purpose medicine. Each country is challenged to find the appropriate blend of fiscal, monetary, trade, and other policies that will enable interest to play its proper role in sustaining rather than straining the system of international payments.

But patience is not the enemy of progress, and I think the last 20 years have provided impressive proof of the benefits of international financial cooperation. We are linked so closely together; our economies are tied so intimately. It is so essential that all of our people benefit and prosper that I am confident that you gentlemen who occupy a position of high responsibility, working intimately together, can maintain our system so that we remain its master. For us to move in an opposite direction, of course, would be not only distressing but inimical to our common interest.

The men who gathered at Bretton Woods 20 years ago were criticized by both those who said that no institutions were needed and those who said nothing useful could be done. Their effort and the success which crowned it are a warning both against pessimism and excessive self-satisfaction.

SEES CONTINUED GAIN

Today we all believe in the achievements of intelligent cooperation; and under the wise and imaginative leadership of the Governors here assembled, I feel sure this cooperation can be enlarged and extended.

There is no more important group, it seems to me, in the free world than you gentlemen who are here; no group it seems to me bears greater responsibility. If you are able to conduct your affairs with success, it benefits all of the people all around the globe and, therefore, we regard this meeting as perhaps the most important that takes place in our capital this year.

Your success will make possible all of the great efforts of the free world which have made such an astonishing and, I think, dazzling effect upon international relations and the security of the West. Our role, therefore, I regard as essential, and we believe in the achievements of a determined and intelligent cooperation which will benefit all of our people.

I look forward in the years ahead to continued expansion toward the goal of economic health for all nations, for this goal—second in urgency to the quest for peace, only to the necessity of peace—is surely indispensable to the free world.

Ladies and gentlemen, I greet you with great satisfaction and we wait on your deliberations with great hope and confidence.

Thank you.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 30, 1963]

REFORMS IN FINANCE

The free world's finance ministers and central bankers, assembled in Washington for the annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, have reason to be satisfied with the performance of both institutions. Since their creation in 1944 both have responded creatively to the challenges of a fast-changing world. The Bank has been an effective pioneer in the field of development finance; the Fund has taken on the role of mainspring in the world's monetary mechanism, erecting a series of defenses against disruptive currency movements.

After 19 years of growth and success in forging expedients, satisfaction should not give way to complacency. A thorough appraisal of the Fund and Bank, with a view to initiating long-range reforms, is essential. There is no present crisis to preoccupy and distract this effort. Mr. George Wood of the Bank and M. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer of the Fund, the new and able men who took over the heads of their respective institutions during the past year, now have the opportunity to go beyond consolidating the gains of their predecessors.

The Bank ought to expand and strengthen its affiliate, the International Development Association, which makes long-term loans that do not meet the standard required by the Bank itself. An even more vital, and infinitely more difficult, examination confronts the IMF. It must see to it that countries suffering from balance-of-payments problems are given sufficient time to take corrective measures without resort to steps that could either harm internal growth or disrupt world trade. This goal means new arrangements to insure an adequate supply of international liquidity, arrangements that can somehow retain the disciplines imposed by the balance of payments without curbs on growth.

These are ambitious objectives. But ingenuity and boldness have characterized the IMF and the Bank from their beginnings. This is the time to start another examination of the same sweeping nature that led to their birth. They must be prepared to assume far greater responsibilities for maintaining the stable growth of the world economy.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention also to an article in the Sunday edition of the Washington Post written by Prof. Robert Triffin, one of the foremost advocates of reforming the IMF into a world central bank with the power to create credit. The Triffin plan, along with plans proposed by Edward Bernstein, Max Stamp, and the British Chancellor of the Exchecquer Maudling and others, have been widely discussed for years.

In this provocative article Professor Triffin, on the eve of the annual IMF Conference, once again calls for an institution empowered to create international credit to aid world economic growth on a noninflationary basis. Professor Triffin believes that such a central reserve institution would lead to a more rational use of credit than is possible through bilateral and uncoordinated arrangements among central banks.

The IMF by announcing a year-long study of the liquidity question has clearly recognized that the future is close enough to begin a thorough appraisal now. The concurrent study by the 10 leading members lends great weight to this exercise. Without the support and approval of these key countries, particularly the United States, such a study would be meaningless.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Professor Triffin, and a pertinent article from the Wall Street Journal of September 30 be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 29, 1963]

FUND WILL CONSIDER FISCAL REFORM STUDY

(By Robert Triffin)

(Professor Triffin, author of "Gold and the Dollar Crisis," is a leading authority on international financial systems. He proposed the European Payments Union in 1947 and negotiated for its subsequent establishment. The Triffin plan, a proposal for endowing the International Monetary Fund with the power to create credit or liquidity, has been the subject of widespread discussion since its appearance in 1959.)

A long overdue proposal for a study of the ways in which the tottering financial system of the Western World may be reformed, will be given top billing this week at the meeting of the International Monetary Fund here.

With so many willing parents, some offspring can be confidently expected, but the pregnancy promises to be long and difficult. There is virtually no danger of premature birth, but rather the opposite. The monetary doctors may find it extremely difficult to eschew entirely the use of tranquilizers. Recent and tragic precedents should warn them, against the temptation to ease their job at the risk of malformation of the child.

Despite such dangers, there are reasons for hope. Considerable progress has been achieved in the last 3 years toward an agreed diagnosis of the problem and even toward a clarification of alternative approaches to a viable solution.

The vulnerability of the present gold exchange standard to speculative capital movements was recognized at the 1961 IMF meeting in Vienna, and a long list of bulwarks have been erected since then to protect it. Secretary Roosa has done an admirable job in steering to success the difficult negotiations that this entailed.

CENTRAL BANKERS CORRECT

The longer run threat posed by a potential shortage of international reserves, or liquidity, is no longer denied, even though central bankers remain somewhat suspicious of its exploitation by politicians seeking in international monetary reforms an escape from the "healthy" disciplines imposed by balance-of-payments pressures upon irresponsible, inflationary, national policies.

About 60 percent of world reserve increases have been fed in the last 5 years by the continuous piling up of dollar balances—U.S. short-term debts, in the hands of foreign central banks. This, plus the U.S. gold losses, accounts for nearly 80 percent of reserve increases outside the United States, which average more than 8 percent a year over the period, and still a much higher rate for the major reserve holders of Western Europe.

Central bankers are correct, therefore, in contending that there is no worldwide shortage of liquidity today and that the most urgent problem is to bring an end to the persistent U.S. deficits of recent years. They now admit, however, that a problem is bound to arise if and when the reequilibration of U.S. payments dries up, at the source, three to four-fifths of the reserves currently created. They insist, on the other hand, that negotiations and agreements on new sources of liquidity creation would be premature, so long as they can be abused in supplementing an already excessive rate of reserve growth, and financing the perpetuation of U.S. deficits.

The Gordian knot will be cut this week by launching a study group on the long-range reforms required for the satisfactory performance of the international monetary system. Actual negotiations and commitments will presumably be postponed, until the elimination of current U.S. deficits transforms the potential liquidity shortage into an actual one.

So far, so good. I see nothing wrong in the tentative agreements outlined above, but I hope that the proposed study will throw further light into some still obscure corners of the great debate.

The first is the link between our current balance-of-payments problem, that of the British, and the question of international monetary reform itself. The sharp reversal of short-term capital movements from large and growing net inflows up to 1959 to even larger and persistent outflows since 1960 accounts for about two-thirds of our recent deficits.

The major—although not the only—factor of explanation undoubtedly lies in the speculative rumors unleashed by the flareup of gold prices in London, in October 1960, and entertained ever since by the enormous and ever-growing size of our short-term indebtedness to central banks. Speculators are far less confident than the experts in the permanence of the cooperative spirit which has restrained so far any massive conversions of such debts into gold, and continue to regard a gold revaluation, or a gold embargo, or exchange controls as a possible—even if not probable—outcome of this situation.

AN ESSENTIAL COMPONENT

International monetary reform should focus initially on a removal of such a threat to the stability of the dollar and to the present structure of world reserves, rather than on increasing present liquidity levels or financing future dollar deficits. The impact of such action on speculative expectations and short-term capital movements would constitute a major contribution to the elimination of these deficits themselves, and should be regarded as an essential component—along with the measures already adopted or announced by the administration—of any program aiming at that objective. Evidence for this diagnosis cannot be presented here, but has been summarized in my recent article in "The Banker" of London.

My greatest concern about the fruitfulness of the forthcoming debate, however, is that the reforms most easily negotiable may avoid the central problem of a rational adaptation of the process of reserve creation to the legitimate needs of the world economy, and perpetuate in fact the root causes of future crises and instability.

To leave the process of reserve creation to be determined by such haphazard factors as gold production in a country threatened by civil war, the whims or policies of the Kremlin, the state of nerves of gold speculators, the size of United States and United Kingdom deficits, and the waves of central bankers' confidence in the dollar or the pound can hardly be the best way to run the world monetary system.

Yet, we shall continue to hear plausible slogans urging us "to prefer evolution to revolution, to build upon existing institutions, etc.," and damning as utopian attempts "to set up a world central bank in advance of a world government" even the most and practicable steps toward a more orderly system of reserve creation. To preserve intact all the present roots of instability in the system, and merely add to them additional and overlapping gimmicks such as new quota increases, general arrangements to borrow à la Per Jacobsson, bilateral swap agreements and medium-term or nonmarketable currency loans à la Roosa, and mutual currency accounts à la Maudling, would give birth to a thalidomic monster rather than to a healthy and vigorous child susceptible of normal growth in the world of tomorrow.

The alternative to such a dreary prospect is to clarify the main directions along which a rational, long-range solution should be sought, before negotiating the transitional adaptations and compromises that may prove necessary in the short run.

First and foremost, the institutional machinery to be created should make it possible to adjust the overall pace of reserve creation to the full noninflationary potential and requirements of world economic growth.

This would entail the continued use of reserve media other than gold as a component of central bank reserves in proportions that would be geared to legitimate liquidity needs of a growing world economy.

Reserve assets other than gold should not be held, as they are now, in a form that exposes creditors to the risk of unilateral devaluation by debtors, and debtors to the risk of sudden or massive liquidation by the creditors.

Among the many ways in which the principle could be implemented, the simplest—though not necessarily the easiest to negotiate—would be for each country to hold the bulk of its reserves other than gold in the form of deposit balances with the IMF.

This would facilitate the achievement of still another objective of a rational world monetary organization: to use the world's thirst for reserves as a means for providing stabilization and—indirectly—developmental loans in support of national policies that promote noninflationary economic growth. The holding of reserve assets other than gold inevitably entails the granting of credit to the debtor. Deposits held with a central reserve institution would permit a more rational distribution of this lending power than the bilateral, precarious holdings of national currencies through the uncoordinated decisions of several scores of central banks.

DELICATE QUESTIONS

Practical negotiations along these lines will admit—and even require—multiple adjustments to take account of past traditions, institutions, and habits of mind, and also of unyielding, but fast-changing, political realities.

The IMF machinery may prove too rigid, complex and cumbersome to serve as the only channel for the implementation of the above suggestions. Particularly delicate questions would be raised by the management of its vastly expanded lending capacity, especially in view of the small voting power wielded in its executive board by the major creditor countries of Western Europe. Moreover, the development of the European Economic Community is most likely to entail major institutional changes in the European monetary system, and similar trends may also accompany the development of regional economic cooperation in Latin America, Africa, etc.

A decentralization of the IMF machinery would overcome both of these difficulties. The Paris agreements of last year may give a cue to the institutional framework most likely to prove acceptable in the forthcoming negotiations. An agreement among major reserve holders—particularly the United States, the European Community, and the United Kingdom as leader of the sterling system—would encompass the bulk of world reserves, and serve as an anchor—and a model—for the arrangements to follow with other countries.

The forthcoming debate will be dominated by the necessity for reaching a compromise between the initial negotiating positions of the reserve currency countries—the United States and the United Kingdom—on the one hand, and the major reserve currency holders of continental Europe, on the other.

The Posthuma plan, on which EEC discussions have been centered for the past year, might provide the most reasonable way to guarantee the key-currency countries against sudden liquidation of their debts while protecting the holders against the arbitrariness and inflationary potential of the present system. It would, however, have to be pruned of its excessive automation which makes it so objectionable—and rightly so—to most central bankers, and the complexity of which led one of them to describe it as requiring the setting up of an "electronic" exchange standard.

Any such agreement among the major industrial powers would certainly be beneficial to other countries as well, but some effort should be made to avoid a mere logrolling exercise and the conflicts of interest in which it might bog down. Some uninstructed delegates, jointly appointed by other countries, might help elevate the debate and focus it on the long-range requirements of the world at large, as well as on those of the major creditors and debtors of the outworn key-currency system.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 30, 1963]

WORLD BANK, IMF OFFICIALS FACE THREE BIG ISSUES AT JOINT CONFERENCE THIS WEEK

WASHINGTON.—More than 700 finance chiefs from the United States and other non-Communist countries meet here this week to swap opinions on three big and largely unrelated questions having to do with money:

Can the United States cure its balance-of-payments deficit, and if so, how soon?

U.S. dollar ills aside, what, if anything, ought to be done to strengthen the free world's collective defenses against crippling international payments problems now only dimly foreseeable?

What new wrinkles can be devised for spurring the flow of investment from industrial nations to the underdeveloped areas of the world?

LITTLE POSITIVE ACTION EXPECTED

Very little in the way of positive, formal action on these issues is expected from the 5-day joint annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and its affiliates which gets underway here today. The two organizations will admit enough new members to bring their membership over the 100 figure and will expand their governing boards to provide representation for the new nations admitted. Both will also hear for the first time from new figures taking over top jobs, and President Kennedy will address the organizations today.

But there also will be enough significant public policy declarations, enough candid conversation in hotel corridors, and enough specific, if informal, action to influence the course of future international financial collaborations in a number of meaningful ways.

In conjunction with the meeting, the United States and nine other key industrial nations are expected to announce a year-long study of the need to reform existing international payments mechanisms to insure adequate "liquidity" for expanding international trade and continued economic growth without constant interruption by balance-of-payment deficits. Liquidity is the total supply of gold, convertible currencies and credit in central banks.

Simultaneously, the IMF disclosed it will conduct its own liquidity study. The fund's new managing director, former Bank of France official Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, said the IMF will spend "a great part of the coming year" studying the payments question.

OPTIMISTIC REPORTS EXPECTED

To improve the climate for these studies, President Kennedy and Treasury Secretary Dillon are expected to give reasonably optimistic reports on American efforts to halt the excess in U.S. payments overseas over receipts of all kinds from foreign countries. This balance-of-payments deficit threatens U.S. gold holdings by placing in foreign countries dollars which can be turned in for the metal. Officials said preliminary estimates of the payments trend in the third quarter indicate some improvement from the $5.2 billion annual rate of the second quarter, by far the worst of any period during the current 4-year-old dollar crisis.

The United States is sensitive to suggestions that it might be pushing for reform of the international payments system as a means of obtaining emergency help for the dollar. Mr. Kennedy probably will stress that a variety of U.S. internal measures are counted on to reverse the payments trend well before the international financial community could get around to overhauling the monetary fund or creating new instruments for international currency bolstering.

The likelihood is that a good deal of controversy will develop not only over the course of the U.S. payments problem but also over the need for further measures to improve the international machinery. European central bankers make no secret of their view that the United States ought to practice still greater internal discipline, through higher interest rates or other measures, to restrain the dollar outflow. Only Britain, Japan, and, more cautiously, the United States have indicated much support for serious efforts to revamp current payments procedures and mechanisms.

The current outlook is for arguments on these questions to get underway in earnest as a 10-nation group gets down to studying the matter formally. This group, embracing the United States, Canada, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Japan, is a sort of industrial elite within the IMF; 2 years ago it combined to create a $6 billion supplemental reserve to enlarge the IMF's capacity for bailing out member nations suffering payments difficulties.

A key element in the coming year of study is certain to be the role played by Mr. Schweitzer, a lean, intense career Government financier who succeeded the late Per Jacobsson earlier this year. Mr. Schweitzer plainly leans toward the side of the more conservative elements, including the management of the IMF itself, which believes that present facilities for expanding liquidity are ample for as far ahead as anyone can see. But he indicated in a press conference his view is that there isn't any harm in studying the matter.

IDLE RESERVES

The third question confronting the Bank and delegates involves what might be called an excess of liquidity—the nearly $1 billion in idle reserves piling up at a steady rate at the World Bank. This institution lends money for economic development and promotes technical assistance for economic planning by backward nations. It also operates an affiliate, called the International Development Association, created to lend money to hard-pressed emerging nations on much more lenient terms than the Bank.

The World Bank's new chief, former banker George Woods, circulated to Bank officialdom in advance of the meeting a memorandum raising the question of whether the Bank's reserves aren't larger than needed as protection against defaults and, if so, how this money could be put to better use. The Bank's less developed members are eager to to see it made available somehow on the easiest possible terms. Many Europeans would have liked to have seen some of this money turned over to IDA, instead of requiring the Association's more industrialized members to put up more money this year to keep it in business. But the decision was made for the United States and other IDA countries to raise another $750 million to finance the organization over the next 3 years. And so the question remains what to do with the World Bank reserves.

Mr. Woods apparently is interested in expanding the Bank's lending role to permit it to lend to private industry; it does have yet another offshoot, the International Finance Corporation, which lends to private industry on a modest scale and only with a guarantee of the loan by the government concerned. Mr. Woods is said to think in terms of a change in the Bank's charter to allow it to lend to private industry without a government guarantee. There is talk too of widening the Bank's area of operation, to include education, for example; at present the Bank deals almost wholly with large-scale economic development projects such as dams, ports, or irrigation projects. Although the Bank isn't likely to make any decisions this week, it is, like the IMF, likely to allot more time to intensive study of its major problems.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, ONONDAGA COUNTY, N.Y.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County, N.Y., favoring the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution No. 303 Directing the Chairman of the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors To Forward a Copy of This Resolution Supporting the Proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963 to Senator Jacob Javits, Senator Kenneth Keating, and Representative R. Walter Riehlman

Whereas the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County has consistently sought to promote civil rights; and

Whereas racial justice is the goal of our democracy, and this goal has not been fully realized in our county, State, and Nation: and

Whereas civil rights laws have been effective in our State, and civil rights laws to define and promote proper moral courses of action between people of different races, creeds, and color; and

Whereas we members of the legislative body of Onondaga County wish to promote in every way possible civil rights in our county, State, and Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we of the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors support in principle the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963, which seeks "to enforce the constitutional right to vote, to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in education, to establish a community relations service, to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights, to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs, to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity, and for other purposes"; and be it further

Resolved, That we as the legislative body of Onondaga County request our Federal legislative representatives, Senator Jacob Javits, Senator Kenneth Keating, and Representative R. Walter Riehlman, to actively support in principle the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963 and to vote for the legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator Jacob Javits, Senator Kenneth Keating, and Representative R. Walter Riehlman by the chairman of the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors; and be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of the Onondaga County Board of Supervisors, shall actively support in principle this legislation and foster the provisions of the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1963 in our own county and thus rededicate ourselves to the cause of civil rights.

I, Frank W. Conway, do hereby certify that the foregoing was duly adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Onondaga County, N.Y., this 3d day of September 1963, a quorum being present. Witness my hand and the seal of this board this 4th day of September 1963.

Frank W. Conway,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, Onondaga County, N.Y.

PREJUDICE

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, today is October 1. Neither House of this Congress has yet acted on the one legislative proposal which appeals to the conscience of America—a proposal which seeks to guarantee the right of every American to a vote, to an education, to employment, and to service in public places throughout the Nation without arbitrary discrimination.

This legislation seeks to provide the equality of treatment and of opportunity for all our citizens which was intended in the Emancipation Proclamation, the 14th and 15th amendments, and the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

We cannot continue to respect ourselves, nor be respected by others, until each American enjoys an equal opportunity to make his full contribution to the future—until ours is truly one Nation with liberty and justice for all.

The final solution to this pressing national problem will require the full cooperation of every branch and level of government and of every citizen.

In a recent issue of the Baltimore Sun, there appeared a report of an interview with Senator Daniel Inouye, my colleague from Hawaii.

Mr. President, I found this article interesting and moving. It has occurred to me that the experience of the people of Hawaii in the successful integration of many races and strains, can teach us much in our effort to find solutions to the very difficult problems which exist in others of the 50 States.

I take this opportunity to pay tribute to our newest State for its achievement in this area. I am proud to have served in both House and Senate with my good friend and Hawaii's distinguished representative, Dan Inouye.

I ask that the report of his interview referred to above be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prejudice: There's No Word for Race in Hawaii

(By Muriel Dobbin)

In the Hawaiian vocabulary there is no word for race. To the Hawaiian—who may be of Oriental, Polynesian, Korean, European, or Filipino ancestry—a man is simply light or dark.

"They would describe a Negro as one with the color of a blackberry, and this would be meant as a friendly description," said Honolulu-born Senator Daniel K. Inouye, of Hawaii, which he believes to be the most peacefully integrated State in the Union.

The Senator, who is the first American of Japanese ancestry to sit in Congress, displayed Oriental tranquility and patience as he compared the racial problems in other States with those remaining in Hawaii.

Settling in an armchair in his office on Capitol Hill, Senator Inouye dexteriously lit a cigarette with his left hand. He lost his right arm during combat in France and Italy in World War II; he enlisted as a private and rose to captain. He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, Bronze Star, and Purple Heart with two oak-leaf clusters.

HAWAII'S MIXTURE

The Democrat from Hawaii admits he misses his native State, and it is one of his favorite topics of conversation. "I am not claiming that Hawaii is a racial paradise," he emphasized, "but I feel that we have taken more steps toward better understanding than any other section of the United States.

"To say that the Hawaiian population is a mixture is an understatement. It consists of about 40 percent Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino, 35 percent European origin, 25 percent Polynesian, some Puerto Ricans, and only 1 percent Negroes—yet our first woman mayor is a Negro.

A FORM OF SEGREGATION

"Hawaii has come a long way, when you think of the conglomeration of people we have. They did not come from the elite classes of their respective ethnic groups, either. My maternal grandparents came to Hawaii to work as field hands, laboring long hours for small wages. This situation applied to many of those who came to Hawaii. So there was a large segment of the society made up of men and women who were ill educated, of little means, and who had been brought up in a tradition of class segregation."

There had been clashes between the different groups in Hawaii, he conceded. "But this was usually brought about by the language barrier, and by fears, usually those unfounded fears which are the cause of prejudice. When people don't know another group, they fear it."

At one time the Hawaiian school system was virtually segregated, although not in the same manner as schools in some mainland communities, he recalled. "Our so-called segregated schools were known as English standard schools. They were supported by public funds, but admission required that children pass both a written and an oral examination, which made it almost impossible for youngsters of a plantation background, whose parents still spoke their native tongue."

Beginning in the early 1940's, it took Hawaii about 12 years to develop a truly integrated school system, said Senator Inouye, and this was done gradually, class by class, year by year. "It was the judgment of the authorities that to integrate the schools abruptly at that time would have been chaotic," he explained.

LABOR RIOTS YEARS AGO

The Senator gazed thoughtfully at the aquarium of tropical fish in a corner of his office. "We had race riots of sorts in Hawaii, back in the early 1900's, when one ethnic group was pitted against the other in labor strikes," he recollected. "But you must keep in mind that due to the political situation elsewhere, the Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans were natural enemies at that time."

Senator Inouye's infrequent but warm smile appeared as he spoke of what he considered one of the most important factors leading to the present almost complete integration in Hawaii. "The Polynesians," he said affectionately, "are a remarkable people, and we owe them so much.

"They have one great virtue, and that is love. The word 'aloha,' which we consider most sacred, means not only hello and goodby, but also 'I love you.' These are people who practice love. If you are a stranger yet are hungry, they will give you the last morsel of food from their icebox and open their home to you. This feeling of brotherly love has slowly spread through the community in general."

INTERMARRIAGE AND EDUCATION

The Polynesians were living in the same circumstances and coping with the same problems of lack of education, fear, and poverty, he said, yet they were willing to share with everyone. "As a result, we have few pure Hawaiians. They were the first to intermarry—white, yellow, black, or brown, to them it was not distasteful. It was a good thing."

Another contributory factor to Hawaiian integration was the educational system, he added. "Ours might not be the finest, but it provided education for children whose parents and grandparents had never had it. That played a great role in bringing about understanding."

The Senator became nostalgic. "I had a happy childhood," he said. "Perhaps one reason was that it was a more simple life than that of many children today. That aquarium, for example. When I was a kid, if I wanted an aquarium, I went to a stream for a fish or two, begged an empty mayonnaise jar from the grocer, and that was my aquarium."

STILL SOME PREJUDICE

Friendship on an integrated basis was another of the intangible lessons he learned as a child. "In school I sat next to kids who were Chinese, Hawaiian, Filipino, European, and Puerto Rican. We got to know each other pretty well. That way you don't have fears about people," he said.

There is still some racial prejudice in Hawaii, he admitted. "But much of it is individually suppressed. The people of Hawaii are gentle by nature; perhaps they are more sensitive to the feelings of others. There are, for instance, no signs in restaurants which refuse admission to certain persons."

The Senator's introduction to southern segregation came when he spent 13 months in Army training in Mississippi during World War II. He still remembers the day that his company commander addressed the regiment. "He said it distressed him to have to tell us this, and he knew it would distress us to hear it. He knew we in that regiment—the men were all Americans of Japanese ancestry—were fighting two battles, one against nazism, and the other to combat prejudice and prove that Americanism was a matter of mind and heart, and not of color or race."

BACKS KENNEDY ON RIGHTS

"But he had to tell us that the Mississippi authorities had decided to consider us as white, so when we saw signs reading 'white' and 'colored,' we should follow the former. He added that however we felt, we should remember we had to win the battle against nazism first."

Senator Inouye, stressing his support for President Kennedy's civil rights legislation, said he believed the people of Hawaii could demonstrate that the mixing and integration of all kinds of persons was not something to be feared.

But he felt strongly that, in the end, integration must be achieved through the efforts and wishes of the people. "You cannot continually depend on legislation to solve problems. That can go only so far, and after that you must leave it to community action."

For example, he said, if the public accommodations provision became law, restaurants would be forced to admit Negroes. "But they are still likely to be shown to a table beside the kitchen door, and to receive slow service and cold soup. When people become accustomed to seeing them, they will lose that hidden fear which is at the root of much prejudice. Then the headwaiter will begin putting the Negro at a table next to the dance floor."

ADDRESS BY DANIEL F. FOLEY, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Daniel Foley, the newly elected national commander of the American Legion, delivered an inspiring acceptance speech at the Legion national convention recently concluded at Miami Beach, Fla.

He reaffirmed the faith of the Legion that—

> Governments are instituted among men to promote peace and to preserve the inalienable rights of man as a creature of God.

Calling attention to the American Legion as one of the great stabilizing factors in American life, he noted well that—

> History has revealed to us time and again that the course of extremism, either to the right or to the left, is the course of failure.

In recent years, we have heard much about discovering American goals. Such statements often are made as if we do not have any goals, and will have to manufacture some. Therefore, I applaud very much Dan Foley's emphasis on the point that the task is one of rededication and rediscovery "of America herself in the light of her great history." Mr. Foley noted well that the "problems of yesterday are not necessarily the problems of today or tomorrow."

The problems are indeed new; but the basic ideals of America and its goals of peace with justice, the achievement of security with freedom, and the exercise of power with compassion, are as sound for today and tomorrow as they were for yesterday.

With wise caution that we must remember that communism has not abandoned its aims of conquering the world with its ideology, and that we must maintain a strong moral and material guard against it, Mr. Foley expressed a hope for progress. Speaking of the nuclear test ban treaty, he said:

> It would * * * be our fondest hope that the Soviets have entered into this agreement in all sincerity and that they will live by its terms. We would hope that it might even lead to the exploration of other areas of agreement to further ease the cold war tensions.

His message of "hope" while "keeping our powder dry" is good advice.

There are many passages of sound advice, thoughtful reflection, and inspirational dedication in Mr. Foley's address, which I commend to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Acceptance Speech by Daniel F. Foley

My fellow Legionnaires, for me, this is the most thrilling moment of my life, and I cannot find words to adequately express my deep gratitude and appreciation for the devoted assistance of my many, many wonderful friends in the ranks of the American Legion who have helped to make this moment a reality for me.

I also believe this to be a moment of truth for me—for I have campaigned for the high office of national commander of the American Legion for some 2 years. During this period I have been telling my fellow Legionnaires how I will propose to discharge the great responsibilities which accompany this office. The time for talking is over—the time for action is at hand.

I am proud for my department, I am grateful to all of you who have afforded me this opportunity to serve. I am humble in the knowledge of the tremendous work to be done this year, and I am confident that with your help and with God's guidance that it shall be done.

This convention of the greatest of all veterans' organizations, which now draws to a close, has given me direction for the year ahead. By your deliberations and the mandates which we have adopted here, I believe we have given all of America new cause to look to the American Legion to chart a true course along the path toward preservation of our basic freedoms and the great American heritage that is ours.

We have here reaffirmed our faith that governments are instituted among men to promote peace and to preserve the inalienable rights of man as a creature of God. We have here, through the various resolutions of our several commissions, determined what we believe to be the most effective policies for achieving the objectives of all of our fine action programs which have proven their worth through the years—not only for the benefit of the veteran population, but for the benefit of all Americans.

History has revealed to us time and again that the course of extremism, either to the right or to the left is the course of failure, and that to follow such a course has brought about the downfall of many men, of many governments, yes, even of entire civilizations. During my formative years, as I watched the activities of the American Legion in my home community, then in my early years as an American Legionnaire observing the work of my own post and its members, I became thoroughly convinced that this was the type of organization with which to cast my personal lot if I wished to offer some tangible service to my God, to my country, and to my fellow man.

I firmly believe this American Legion of ours to be the greatest stabilizing factor in America today, and I believe that through close adherence to the principles, policies and programs of the American Legion that America and the free world will be better prepared to fight and to win the struggle with the forces of atheistic communism.

The American Legion has a glorious past and an even brighter future, and I pledge to you my very best efforts to help us to realize that bright future. We have not even scratched the surface of our potential, and within the next 2 weeks I will be off on a tour of 21 regional membership conferences to help convince other eligible veterans that we can do well with their help in this endless battle to keep forever free the land they already have fought to protect.

It is my fondest hope that this year may mark the beginning of a new era in the life of the Legion where courageous men and women with brave hearts rededicate themselves to service in the high cause of freedom. We shall realize that objective if we, as Legionnaires, remain true to the principles which brought us together nearly 45 years ago.

I look forward to my term of office as a year of rededication—a year of rediscovery, if you will, not just of the principles of the Legion, but a year of rediscovery of America herself in the light of her great history and of action to safeguard and preserve our priceless heritage in these momentous times in which we live.

The problems of yesterday, Legionnaires, are not necessarily the problems of today or tomorrow. Yet, if we are aware of our past we cannot help but be better prepared to live today and to face tomorrow. The solutions to the problems of yesterday may not be applicable to the problems of today, but knowledge of the past and the sacrifice that was required to solve the problems of other eras will give us new wisdom and courage to cope successfully with the problems of our own times. A rediscovery of America and of ourselves is, I believe, an essential element to successful living today.

The American Legion constantly is rediscovering itself through a continual process of reevaluating the problems with which we are concerned in order that we may approach those problems on a realistic basis, in keeping with our times, and that we may make a constructive contribution to the growth of our free society.

First, and most importantly, we must concern ourselves with the preservation of that society and history has taught us that, in order to do so, the Nation's defenses must be maintained at adequate strength and the very finest quality to deter the threat of aggression.

Because the Soviet Union has been willing to become a party to a partial nuclear test ban is no evidence that communism has abandoned its long pronounced objective of world conquest. It simply means that, for the time being, it does not best serve the cause of communism to engage in an all-out nuclear arms race.

It would, of course, be our fondest hope that the Soviets have entered into this agreement in all sincerity and that they will live by its terms. We would hope that it might even lead to the exploration of other areas of agreement to further ease the cold war tensions. This we will believe when it comes to pass for the Communist record of shattered treaties and agreements is one of the most infamous in the annals of international relations.

Again we are reminded of our past and of a famed quotation from history as we look to the solution to a modern day problem. The quote I have in mind is "Keep your powder dry."

In our day this simply means the maintenance of defensive forces unsurpassed by any potential attacker. This is a policy that the American Legion has advocated since our founding days—it would have served us well in other days. This is the policy which the American Legion advocates today, for it will serve America well today.

The Communists have shown no inclination to decrease pressures now being applied to our sister republics to the south. Red Cuba, just some 90 miles from where we are gathered, is the springboard for introduction of propaganda, sabotage, and potential open revolt in some areas of the hemisphere. This can mean only that America must exert her best efforts to maintain hemispheric solidarity, and the American Legion believes this can best be achieved by the elimination of Fidel Castro and his government.

Our defenses must go beyond the military and into the area of people, for they must be designed to last beyond the lifetime of this audience. The American Legion, through its great Americanism programs, seeks to build a stalwart citizenry for tomorrow.

We believe that if we give our youth the proper guidance that they will discover the basic principles for which America stands while we are rediscovering them for ourselves, and that in so doing they will find the will and the way to defend the freedoms we solemnly pledge that they shall inherit from us.

We cannot and we shall not abandon our sacred obligation to defend and preserve the rights and privileges of the widows and orphans of our deceased comrades. We shall continue to fight for them as we shall carry on the battle on behalf of the disabled veteran and those who by reason of advancing years can no longer adequately discharge their responsibilities to their loved ones. Our legislative-rehabilitation program must be geared to meet the changing needs of the veteran population.

The problem of the aged and aging veteran may well be one of the most serious with which we have ever come to grips in the entire history of our rehabilitation program. But we propose to meet this problem head on, and one of our high priority objectives of the coming year will be the establishment of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

All these great ideals, my friends, will have no tangible value if we should lose our freedoms, and as your national commander for the coming year, I commit our organization to this pledge.

"Though the forces of atheistic communism may beat with all their fury on the breasts of liberty, this Nation shall endure strong in justice. This Nation shall prosper, rich in compassion. This Nation shall stand down through the corridors of time, secure in freedom."

May each of us as individuals and as an organization so conduct our lives and affairs that we might continue to contribute significantly to the high cause of freedom. In so doing, we shall glorify God, bring honor to our country, and contribute to the establishment of a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON—EXTENSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 3369.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the report issued yesterday by the Commission on Civil Rights is another major contribution to better understanding of the Nation's civil rights problems.

The chronicle of civil rights denials set forth in the Commission's report makes it evident that monumental challenges still lie ahead in the struggle to make the promises of the Constitution a reality for all Americans.

The Commission can be of tremendous assistance in the future in helping America overcome these injustices. This report, like the others the distinguished members of the Commission have presented, is compelling evidence of the need for a permanent extension of the Commission and enactment of a meaningful civil rights bill during this session of Congress.

One shocking fact revealed in this report is the extent to which the Federal Government continues to subsidize segregation. I strongly endorse the Commission's plea to the President that he direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies to insist upon and enforce a policy of nondiscrimination in all federally assisted programs. It is unconscionable and unconstitutional for Federal officials to approve the expenditure of Federal tax funds in any manner which makes the Federal Government a silent partner of segregation.

This aspect of the Commission's report illustrates the important function it has served as a civil rights watchdog. Almost every Federal agency has an internal control system for accounting purposes, but many agencies have been extremely lax in making an accounting to the Commission for the way they handle Federal funds. The Commission has repeatedly called attention to this situation, in its present report and in its previous reports.

In doing so, it may have upset some officials who do not want to be distracted by the Constitution in spending the taxpayers' money. The Commission's report should be required reading for everyone of these officials, and I hope the President will see fit to issue the directives recommended by the Commission.

Let us also take heed in the Congress of the urgent conditions which exist and give this subject of civil rights the prompt and diligent attention it deserves. This report makes it obvious that we have already delayed action beyond any reasonable period and that we must give civil rights the highest priority in the days ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending amendment, to extend the life of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for 1 year. The subject has been debated, and Senators understand it well. However, I wish to make three points, which to me are critically important.

First, in Congress we talk about staffing congressional committees adequately, to give them an opportunity to dig into the processes of government in order to do their job intelligently and adequately. When we have an opportunity like this, in an extremely complex field, with an enormous range of details which must be analyzed and digested and authoritatively set forth in such a critical issue as this, which the Civil Rights Commission does for us, we certainly should not jettison it. The Commission represents one of the finest staff agencies in the Federal Government that Congress has formed to find the facts in an authoritative way.

Second, I value it highly because it has southern members. It is extremely important that the tradition of having southern members on the Commission which was established by President Eisenhower, be carried on by President Kennedy and by succeeding Presidents; so that when we get a report from the Commission, we will have in it the southern point of view as well.

One of the most gratifying things about the U.S. Civil Rights Commission's report, which it is required to make at the close of its term, and which we received yesterday, is that it is unanimous. The southern members are distinguished men in their own communities. I refer to President Storey, of the Southwestern Legal Foundation at Dallas, Tex., and Chairman Rankin, of the Political Science Department of Duke University. In their unanimous report, they say:

> Finally, we must state that survival of the honorable doctrine of States rights imposes coterminous obligations. It is shortsighted indeed to force citizens of the State to look to the Central Government alone for vindication of rights about which there is no substantial disagreement. As we have said on so many occasions: Civil rights carry with them civil responsibilities. So, too, States rights carry with them State obligations to all its citizens.

Here is expressed what is the basis of the argument made by people like myself: If it is said that there should not be Federal legislation on civil rights because the States will look after their own, including the rights of citizens as citizens of the United States, the answer is that for 110 years the States have gone the other way, in endeavoring to pursue segregation themselves with State laws which are unconstitutional.

There are southerners on the Commission. I hope there will always be. This is a very good thing in terms of fair evaluation of the facts which are found, and the determination of what the American people ought to do in the light of the facts.

Third, all of us have faith in the conscience of the country. Without regard to my own civil rights views or to the views of any other Senators, I hazard the guess that all Senators, even from States which consider segregation a part of their social order or social pattern, have faith in the conscience of the country and in the sense of fairplay of the American people in their dedication to the ideals of freedom and justice.

This issue cannot be acted on without having the facts available. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is the one agency which in a consolidated way can ascertain and digest the facts.

The Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice does not stand in this place. It is, essentially, a prosecuting agency, as it should be. A prosecutor cannot make a complete analysis of the facts. It cannot engage in hearings. It must save its materials for the courts. On many occasions it cannot disclose the things that it has found, because for a prosecutor to do so would be contrary to the canons of legal ethics. It is not an agency which can give to the public information upon which the public conscience and the public judgment can act.

This is critical to our country. In my opinion, there are two ways of attaining justice in terms of segregation and discrimination; one is by law, and the other is by an aroused conscience on the part of the American people. In order to act intelligently, in the American tradition, the American public must have the facts. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission has done an extraordinary job in digesting and putting forward the facts. In addition, it has given skillful consideration to its recommendations. The report issued by the Civil Rights Commission is one of the most extraordinary documents I have ever seen issued by any governmental agency.

To bear out what I mean about the conscience of the citizen, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement issued by 53 Birmingham lawyers in regard to the tense situation in that city. In part, they said:

> A citizen's obligation to obey the law cannot be modified by an election or by personal preferences because the law exists to protect all—minority and majority alike.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY-THREE LAWYERS URGE BIRMINGHAM AMITY

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., September 28.—Fifty-three Birmingham lawyers issued a public statement today calling for obedience to decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and an end to violence.

The statement said that a decision by the Supreme Court was "the law and must be obeyed." It went on:

"A citizen's obligation to obey the law cannot be modified by an election or by personal preferences because the law exists to protect all—minority and majority alike."

Most of those signing the statement were young lawyers who have successfully campaigned for a change in the city government and are known here as the more liberal members of the Birmingham bar. However, a few older, more conservative lawyers were among the signers. The signers made up about one-sixth of all white lawyers in Birmingham.

COURT RULING CITED

The statement followed several weeks of racial violence and bombings here. It referred specifically to a decision on September 6 by U.S. Circuit Judge Walter P. Gewin.

The judge overturned a petition supported by Gov. George C. Wallace asking that school integration in Birmingham be rescinded because of the possibility of violence.

The statement said:

"The rule of law is essential to our way of life. The law as announced in decisions of the courts is sometimes unpopular. In America the public has the right, protected by our courts, to criticize court decisions.

"Each of us has on occasion felt that a particular case should have been decided differently, but whether we agree or disagree with the result, in each case the Court decision is the law and must be obeyed.

"The Supreme Court of the United States is the highest in our judicial system and its decisions upon questions arising under the Constitution are the law.

"As Judge Walter P. Gewin of Tuscaloosa states in his opinion of September 6, 'the question is now not approval or disapproval of the law but whether the law and order and educational practices will prevail over violence.'

"As lawyers we subscribe to the following principles:

"No man is above the law.

"Courts cannot permit violence or delay or deceit of the law.

"Without law and obedience to its rule neither this city nor this State nor this Nation can survive.

"A citizen's obligation to obey the law cannot be modified by an election or by his personal preference because the law exists to protect all, minority and majority alike."

Following are the names of the lawyers who signed the statement:

J. Vernon Patrick, Jr., George Eyuard, Jr., Thomas C. Majjar, Jr., Charles Majjar, Ervin H. Levy, William W. Conwell, David N. Brooks, James L. Permutt, E. M. Friend, Jr., Karl B. Friedman, John S. Foster, Douglas P. Wingo, Charles Nice, Jr., Jerome A. Cooper, George B. Longshore, Don M. Jones, George R. Stuart 3d.

Also, Shuford B. Smyer, George A. Mitchell, Richard Bite, A. Berkowitz, Eugene Zeidmen, Izas Bahakel, George Whitcher, Claire A. Witcher, Marvin Cherner, W. F. Pritchard, Bruce Robertson 3d, Robert H. Loeb, Paul Johnston, Frank Dominick, Manly Yerlding, George Taylor, Kenneth Howell.

Also, Arnold Lefkobits, William A. Jackson, C. H. Erskine Smith, Charles A. Speir, A. Lamar Reid, David Vann, William G. West, Jr., Harold Apolonsky, Charles Cleveland, Eric Embry, James Fullan, Ray Lange, Stanford Skinner, Perry Asman, Robert S. Gordon, Sam Tannenbaum, Ed Ledford, and Robert Esdale.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, that is the way in which the American mind can determine what it wants to see our Government do. The U.S. Civil Rights Commission is absolutely indispensable to that process.

Finally, there is no glossing over the fact—and even an empty Senate Chamber does not gloss over it, because it is pretty well taken for granted that this measure will pass—that the situation is extremely tense so far as the civil rights struggle is concerned. We are really engaged in a battle of forces. Will the forces of Government act in time, and effectively enough, so that the people will not feel that they must take the law into their own hands and repair to the streets instead of to the courts?

This process must be couched in terms which make it practical, terms which relate themselves to experience and to the question whether what little we have already done is adequate or successful, even to a limited extent, or whether it is inadequate. In all these respects the U.S. Civil Rights Commission is extremely important.

First, the Commission gives us in its latest report an evaluation of what our laws to secure the voting right have meant. We find that they have not meant very much.

In 5 years the amount of participation by Negroes in voting has risen from 5.1 to 8.3 percent in 100 counties in the South, where a survey was made to determine whether the provisions with respect to the right to vote were adequate as they were extended to Negroes.

In the same report the Commission covers a wide range of other matters and gives practical recommendations for legislation upon which Congress can act, with the knowledge that they have not appeared yesterday, and based upon factual considerations that have been tried out in the field. That is an indispensable service to Congress and to the Nation. I do not know what we would do without the Civil Rights Commission. It even seems to me it is just as essential for those who are against civil rights legislation as it is for those who favor it to have such a commission, so that there may be an authoritative statement at the highest Government level as to what are the facts and what ought to be the remedies.

I end as I began upon this subject. I observe again that distinguished southerners serve on the Commission. I am sure that southerners will continue to occupy an important place on the Commission. This is an extremly vital challenge to the Commission's work. It is extremely vital to the country to have this opinion asserted on such critical questions.

In view of my long-term support for the Commission, I am proud to see in the report this year that in the large group of recommendations and important conclusions of fact the Commission is unanimous, including the views of the southern members.

I hope that shortly the Senate will extend the Commission for at least 1 year. Personally, I think it is a great mistake to extend the Commission for only 1 year. I think it should be extended for a few months, and then have the question of its permanent establishment and its expanded powers considered when the entire civil rights question is debated. As it is, the Commission is neither fish nor fowl. Nevertheless, it is essential that the Commission be continued.

Last night a plea was addressed to the employees of the Commission not to quit; that the Commission and the country need them.

Therefore, if this 1-year extension is the best we can get—and apparently it is, at this stage—without prejudicing the fight which is coming on the omnibus civil rights bill, to make the agency permanent and to strengthen its powers, I hope the Senate will approve the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I opposed the creation of the Civil Rights Commission as provided for in the Civil Rights Act of 1957. I likewise opposed a 2-year extension of the Commission which was granted in 1959. Even more emphatically did I oppose an additional 2-year extension of the life of the Commission enacted by Congress in 1961. Today we are confronted with two amendments to H.R. 3369, an act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason. One amendment purports to make permanent the Civil Rights Commission in the executive branch of the Government and to vastly broaden the scope of its duties. The other amendment would extend its life for 1 year, without any change in its duties and powers. I am opposed to both of these amendments, particularly in regard to the first. In my judgment, it is essential that this Senate take a long and considered look at the implications behind the amendment before it takes any precipitant action either to extend the life of the Commission for a time certain, or forever, and to give to it these new, novel, and all-comprehensive additional powers and duties.

Leaving aside for a moment any consideration of the so-called civil rights issue, the establishment and development of the Civil Rights Commission presents one of the most perfect examples of how the seeds of Federal bureaucracy are first planted and then grow and develop into a labyrinth of tentacles that extend the Federal power into every area of human relationship in the life of individual citizens of this country. The day is fast coming when no individual in the United States can hope to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as guaranteed by our Constitution without having some Federal agency or agent holding the hand and looking over the shoulder of the private citizen, the business establishment, or the corporation and telling one and all exactly what he can and cannot do to enjoy "freedom and liberty" under our system of government. The big brothers of bureaucracy are intent upon regimenting and straitjacketing the economic, political, and even the social life of every State and community throughout the length and breadth of this country. The Civil Rights Commission has demonstrated beyond question, by its past activities, that if it becomes a permanent agency it will develop into the greatest irritant ever designed in modern Federal bureaucracy.

Consider, Mr. President, the simple language investing the powers and duties of the Commission as originally founded:

> (1) Investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;
>
> (2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and
>
> (3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

These powers and duties were contained in an act which was concerned solely and alone with providing means of further securing and protecting the right to vote. It is crystal clear from the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 that if this Commission had a primary duty, that duty was to concern itself with investigating allegations, under oath or affirmation, regarding the deprivation of so-called voting rights. The Commission in its 6 years of existence has roamed so far afield from its original purpose that it is sometimes hard to recognize the baby that was born in 1957. Its reports to the President and the Congress have covered a universal list of subjects and areas ranging from the ownership and control by an individual citizen of his own private property or private business, through employment practices of individuals and corporations; the lending policies and practices of practically every kind and character of financial institution in the United States, to a complete social integration of the white and colored people in these United States.

The membership of the Commission, which once had some degree of balance as to the divergent points of view held by many in this country, both on basic issues of constitutional law and the differences of opinion held by individuals in regard to fundamental social, economic, and political issues, has now developed into a cohesive unit which spews forth an unending series of fantastic and unconstitutional recommendations which would destroy our republican form of government as we have known and enjoyed it since the founding of our country. It now proposes to receive legal sanction for the unauthorized activities in which it has previously engaged by adding to its existing powers:

> (4) Serve as a national clearinghouse for information and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

I submit, Mr. President, that the powers contained in the above carry with them the blueprint for the complete socialization of this country, and will result in this Commission attempting to completely regiment the daily life and activity of every citizen of every State; every local official, and every corporate and business enterprise. The vanity and conceit of these Commission members and their staff is beyond human comprehension. From their own words they consider themselves to be the fountain of all knowledge—the final authorities on the meaning of the Constitution. As if possessed with the wisdom of Solomon, they think they can solve and direct the most intricate problems of human relationship. In truth and in fact, their past hearings, investigations, and recommendations have accomplished nothing but to stir up strife and discord in every area of human relationships upon which they have touched, and to create a climate of confusion and consternation. The Commission has become the agent and tool of one single minority pressure group composing roughly less than 10 percent of the population, and in order to further what it considers the "rights" of this pressure group, it will destroy and emasculate the rights of all other citizens and create a situation where, under Federal law, the minority will be a privileged class and the majority will be the underprivileged class, without retaining any constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities.

To express this in another way, the Commission is apparently dedicated to destroying the civil liberties of individual citizens upon the excuse that civil regimentation by Federal personnel is a protection of civil rights against State interference.

The staff director of the Civil Rights Commission, testifying before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, explained the need for the newly sought powers contained in the existing amendment in this language:

> The Commission already performs a limited service of providing information to Government agencies, organizations, and individuals in dealing with civil rights problems. The difficulty is that as long as these efforts are necessarily subordinate to the performance of the factfinding and reporting function of the Commission, a function mandated by law, only a very small part of the Commission's resources can be devoted to them. S. 1117 would add information and assistance to the specific duties of the Commission and would enable the agency to concentrate its operations upon those areas which most need attention.

I deny that the Commission, under the present statutory mandate, performed only a limited service in providing information to Government agencies, organizations, and individuals in dealing with civil rights problems; but it is obvious that if Congress gave to the Commission the additional powers proposed in this amendment, that with an increased budget and an expanded staff it could vastly increase its meddling and needling of Government agencies and organizations in dealing with civil rights problems. The infamous Gesell report and the McNamara directive implementing this report in the armed services is a prime illustration of how an outside group can force its ideas upon a Government agency to the point where it strikes at the very heart of this Nation's power to defend itself from outside aggression. No department is more sensitive or vital to the preservation of this country than is the Defense Establishment, and when these do-gooders and social planners attempt to impose their social reforms on the Armed Forces, it is time for Congress and the people to put a halt to it. This type of activity will be compounded if the Civil Rights Commission is given this vast extension of scope and power. Mr. Bernhard explains how this will be done in this language:

> The President pointed out in his civil rights message that the Commission "has advised the executive branch not only about desirable policy but about administrative techniques needed to make these changes effective." In many areas of Federal programs, the problem has not been the absence of policy so much as difficulties in implementing adequately rules and regulations requiring nondiscrimination.

Here is where the new activity of the Civil Rights Commission would come into play. This Commission claims that it has both the wisdom and the ability to devise for the agencies and the organizations the necessary rules and regulations that can implement so-called policy. I also take it that the Commission feels that this new power would make it the "appropriate machinery" to do the following:

> The Commission has recommended in several of its reports on education, employment, and housing, that the Federal Government obtain assurances that its funds will be expended only for nondiscriminatory purposes. Such recommendations are best implemented by establishing appropriate machinery within the executive branch for securing and supervising agreements that Federal money will be expended for the benefit of all citizens without regard to race. When this is done, experience has demonstrated that Federal funds are distributed on an equitable basis without impairing the operation of the program. As policy has developed in the area of Federal operations there has been a growing need for advice from a competent source on the substance and administration of Federal civil rights requirements.

Mr. President, to me the ever recurring use of this term "policy" is inexplicable. Whose policy? What policy? As long as this Congress exists as a separate branch of the Government under the Constitution, it and it alone is the agent which can create and delineate "policy" under the Constitution. The extreme limit to which the Supreme Court can go is to interpret the policies delineated by Congress and determine whether or not they are consonant with the mandates of the Constitution. The Supreme Court is not a policymaking body, and if the division of powers is to be maintained, it can never become one. If it is to arrogate unto itself the legislative power that is vested in this Congress, then we are confronted with the novel situation where there are two policymaking bodies under the Constitution. If the President of the United States, limited by the Constitution to a mandate that he will take care that the laws be faithfully executed, arrogates unto himself the function of a policymaker and legislates policy by Executive orders, then confusion is compounded, and we have three agencies which devise the "policy" of the United States. I challenge both the staff director and members of the Civil Rights Commission to point to one line in any statute or law now in existence in the Statutes at Large which sets forth a policy that would permit the Commission or the President, or any governmental agency, to say how and to whom federally appropriated funds can be given and to whom they can be withheld.

Mr. Bernhard then turns to another area. He states:

> Similar needs for assistance exist on the State and local levels. In the North, there are increasing demands for governmental action to deal with school segregation, racial housing practices, and discrimination in employment. State and local governments are seeking information and guidance in drafting ordinances and adopting effective policies to deal with these problems.

I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that the last thing that State and local governments want is for an agency such as the Civil Rights Commission to meddle in their local affairs and give them any information, guidance, or assistance of any kind or character to deal with their local problems. I read with interest in a recent newspaper dispatch from Boston that the Boston School Committee told the Attorney General of the State of Massachusetts and the Governor that they neither wanted nor required any advice and assistance from these State officials in regard to the problems with which they were confronted within the Boston school system, and assured both the Governor and the Attorney General that they were competent and capable of solving their own problems without this State interference. How would this school committee react if the Civil Rights Commission of the Federal Government attempted to stick its nose into their purely local situation?

Here are other areas in which the Civil Rights Commission desires statutory authority to do what it has already been doing without legal sanction:

> In areas where no formal governmental machinery has been established, there may be an even greater need for Federal assistance, so that racial disputes can be resolved in a rational and peaceful manner, rather than through violence. For example, the continuing protest against exclusion of Negro citizens from public facilities suggests the desirability of a forum for representatives of business, civil rights organizations, and Government to seek means for implementing a policy of equal access to such facilities. As more employers and unions turn their attention to the need for developing merit hiring and training programs, they find a need for advice and assistance. And community organizations in many localities are just beginning to come to grips with the question of how to afford equal access to housing without suffering the upheaval of stable neighborhoods which frequently occurs when real estate speculators are permitted to purvey misinformation and stimulate panic.

Here again the omnipotent and all-wise Civil Rights Commission is declaring itself capable and competent to enter these additional areas and solve all the problems of human relationship. By and large, Mr. President, the Civil Rights Commission devoted most of its activities during its 6 years of life to collecting misinformation in regard to the Southern States and basing most of its original recommendations to Congress on proposals that would cure so-called abuses of civil rights in the South. When one considers the areas in which it now proposes to enter, there is no State in the Union that is not going to be put under the scrutiny of the Civil Rights Commission. There is no area of human relations with which they are not going to tamper. This newly sought power would create a permanent agency which will be the apex and the capstone in a form of federalism that is undreamed of in the history of this country. I can testify as to how it works, from bitter experience. My State has probably been the greatest single target of the present Commission. We are evidently the subject of a special report, which has not yet been released to the public. This I will discuss later. We have managed to survive and develop in spite of the Civil Rights Commission—not because of it—and I can assure you that we will continue to manage our own political, economic, and social affairs irrespective of the Civil Rights Commission. But from experience, I would not advise the elected representatives of other States of this Union to deliberately expand the scope and power of an agency that is sooner or later going to turn on their people and subject them to the same degree of harassment, meddling, and interference as the people of the State of Mississippi have already experienced. In all sincerity, Mr. President, I have attempted to devote this part of my discourse to the horrors of Federal bureaucracy and to the folly of creating a Federal agency and giving it powers which transcend constitutional limitations and permits it to roam the length and breadth of this land as a devoted zealot to a limited point of view which has become dedicated to curing what it calls an illness in the body politic by attempting to kill the patient.

Mr. President, the 1961 report of the Civil Rights Commission to the President and the Congress, transmitted in September of that year, was so detailed and voluminous that it could not be properly digested and analyzed at the time the debate took place in the Senate to extend the life of this Commission to September 30, 1963. Most of the President's recommendations to Congress that are contained in his so-called Omnibus Civil Rights Act of 1963 (S. 1731) are to be found in one portion or another of the Commission's recommendations. Some of the Commission's recommendations have been implemented by the use of executive orders. The details of the report and recommendations are startling to the casual reader; alarming to the careful student, and frightening to those who believe in the maintenance of the system of government created by the Constitution of the United States. The recommendations would create a limitless Central Government, restricting the freedom and destroying the liberties of individuals, and controlling and usurping the essential functions of the State and local governments. If the recommendations set forth in this report should be adopted, the following would result:

First. The administration of justice by all local and State law enforcement officers and courts would be usurped, supervised and regulated by the Federal Government. Federal control would extend from the first telephone call by a citizen asking police protection through the arrest, arraignment, indictment, trial, sentence, and imprisonment of the criminal. Civil and criminal penalties would be held over the heads of every State and local law enforcement officer in the United States.

Second. The Federal Government would take over from State and local authorities all steps in the election of local, State, and Federal officials, including all voter qualifications, the registration of voters, the counting of votes, the establishment of voting districts for State and Federal elections, the establishment of electoral districts for the election of State and Federal legislators, with civil and criminal penalties for any action or inaction which Federal personnel claim to be arbitrary.

Third. A Federal agency would be created to supervise the administration of all grammar schools, high schools, and colleges in the United States supported by local and State funds—four members of the Commission wish to extend this to private educational institutions; every local board of school trustees in the United States could be required to file periodic reports with the agency; conformity to the desires of Federal personnel would be forced by civil and criminal penalties; Federal employees would be sent into the local school districts as "social workers" and "technical workers"; Federal bodyguards would be provided "to protect the school board members, supervisory officials, and teachers from bodily harm, harassment, intimidations and/or reprisals by officials or private persons"—it is not specified whether these bodyguards would be Federal marshals or Federal troops. Although the present recommendation is limited to the field of race, the ultimate result is stated in the negative on page 48 of volume 6:

> In any such Federal action taken, it should be stipulated that no Federal agency or official shall be given power to direct, supervise, or control the administration, curricula, or personnel of an institution operated or maintained by a State or political subdivision thereof.

The fact that the Commission's recommendations concerning voting and enforcement of State criminal laws are not limited to matters of race foreshadows similar unlimited recommendations in the educational field. Once the pattern is set, the negative will become affirmative, the exception will become the rule and Federal personnel will direct, supervise, and control the administration, curriculums, and personnel of all grammar schools, high schools, and colleges in the United States.

Fourth. In the field of business and industry the Commission recommends that the Federal Government take over the relationship of employer and employee to be manipulated, controlled, and regimented in accordance with the desires of Federal personnel through the establishment of a Federal agency to police and control—with civil and criminal penalties available—all employment created or supported by Government contracts or Federal aid funds, all federally assisted training programs, activities of all labor organizations, all State agencies receiving any Federal assistance. The present recommendations are limited to the field of race.

Fifth. Finally, there has been recommended by the Commission and already tentatively effectuated by Executive Order No. 11063 issued by President Kennedy on November 20, 1962, a Federal takeover of homes and homebuilding whereby the all-pervading hand of Federal personnel—having available civil and Criminal remedies to bring about their desires—is about to grasp by the throat homeowners, realtors, building and loan associations, banks, financial institutions engaged in the mortgage loan business, local public housing authorities, contractors, developers, and the governing authorities of municipalities. How tight the squeeze will be is to be determined by Federal personnel. This Federal action will invade all phases of homeownership including, in the words of the order, "the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of residential property and related facilities—including land to be developed for residential use—and the occupancy thereof." Federal personnel will be looking over the shoulder of every citizen when he buys land to be developed for residential use, buys or builds a home, rents a room in his home, or sells his home.

All of this is in the name of civil rights. All of this will result in the wholesale destruction of civil liberties. Now that the Federal Government is using its financial power to bring about political and sociological ends consonant with the desires of the political party in power, there is no reason to believe that the exercise of this power will end with matters of race. The foot is in the door. The shadow of the past and present is thrown upon the future. The end is not yet. The Commission itself points toward the end of the trail on page 97 when it says:

> Currently, the Commission has made a number of recommendations for Federal action, but these by no means exhaust the needs or possibilities for improvement.

Tens of millions of Americans have financed their homes through lending institutions and/or through loans to which the Federal Government has given financial support in varying degrees. The Commission says on pages 63 and 64:

> The Federal Government has been without question the major force in the expansion of the housing and home finance industries. * * * The present study emphasizes the extensive nature of the Federal contribution. The private housing and home finance industries, through which governmental housing assistance largely reaches the American people, rely heavily on that contribution. * * * At the end of 1960 the Nation's nonfarm home mortgage debt stood at $160 billion. More than 60 percent of this amount ($100 billion) is held by financial institutions that are benefited in varying degrees by the Federal Government and closely supervised by one or more of four Federal regulatory agencies—the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. National banks (regulated by the Comptroller of the Currency), and Federal savings and loan associations (regulated by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board) operate under Federal charters and are subject to the exclusive control of the Federal Government.

The report points out that these institutions have assets in excess of $890 billion. Heretofore conditions attached to such financing have been largely upon a reasonable business basis. The tremendous power thus placed in the hands of Federal personnel should not be perverted to bring about political and sociological ends desired by the political party then in power. Yet, this is the very end sought by the Commission on Civil Rights and by Executive Order No. 11063 issued by President Kennedy on November 20, 1962, as a result of the Commission's recommendations.

What will happen to homeowners, realtors, building and loan associations, contractors, banks, municipalities, professional persons and others in this field is foreshadowed by the recommendations of the Commission and the provisions of Executive Order No. 11063, which include a directive that Federal personnel through the "departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government take all action necessary and appropriate" to enforce the dictates of the Federal Government concerning race—part 1 of Executive Order No. 11063:

> (a) in the sale, leasing, rental, or other disposition of residential property and related facilities (including land to be developed for residential use), or occupancy thereof, if such property and related facilities are—
>
> (i) owned or operated by the Federal Government, or
>
> (ii) provided in whole or in part with the aid of loans, advances, grants, or contributions hereafter agreed to be made by the Federal Government, or
>
> (iii) provided in whole or in part by loans hereafter insured, guaranteed, or otherwise secured by the credit of the Federal Government, or
>
> (iv) provided by the development or the redevelopment of real property purchased, leased, or otherwise obtained from a State or local public agency receiving Federal financial assistance for slum clearance or urban renewal with respect to such real property under a loan or grant contract hereafter entered into; and
>
> (b) in the lending practices with respect to residential property and related facilities (including land to be developed for residential use) of lending institutions, insofar as such practices relate to loans hereafter insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government.

To enforce these determinations of Federal personnel, all executive departments and agencies involved are authorized to:

> (a) cancel or terminate in whole or in part any agreement or contract with such person, firm, or State or local public agency providing for a loan, grant, contribution, or other Federal aid, or for the payment of a commission or fee;
>
> (b) refrain from extending any further aid under any program administered by it and affected by this order until it is satisfied that the affected person, firm, or State or local public agency will comply with the rules, regulations, and procedures issued or adopted pursuant to this order, and any nondiscrimination provisions included in any agreement or contract;
>
> (c) refuse to approve a lending institution or any other lender as a beneficiary under any program administered by it which is affected by this order or revoke such approval if previously given.

In addition the Attorney General is authorized to institute civil or criminal proceedings in case of "violations of any rules, regulations, or procedures."

The strong dissent filed to recommendation No. 3 concerning housing by Hon. Robert G. Storey, Vice Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights, former president of the American Bar Association and head of the Southwestern Legal Center in Dallas, Tex., is a masterful statement of the situation faced by the American people today. Such recommendation No. 3 appears on page 75 and is as follows:

> That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take appropriate measures to require all financial institutions engaged in a mortgage loan business that are supervised by a Federal agency to conduct such business on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to direct all relevant Federal agencies to devise reasonable and effective implementing procedures.

While this dissent is specifically limited by Mr. Storey to recommendation No. 3 in the field of housing, in my opinion it applies to the entire massive effort of the Federal Government under the cloak of civil rights to gain control of all five areas of housing, employment, education, voting, and justice encompassed in the Commission's report. Mr. Storey's dissent appears on pages 75 and 76 and is in part, as follows:

> While I am fully agreed that it is not in keeping with American principles that a person be denied a housing mortgage loan solely on the basis of his race, religion, or national origin, I am, nevertheless, very much opposed to further intervention by the Federal Government into the affairs and policies of private financial institutions. It is important to recognize that under democratic capitalism there must be a realm of institutional autonomy. Private financial institutions, even where their activities are in part already regulated by the Federal Government, are primarily business institutions and not institutions for social reform. * * *
>
> What constitutes the appropriate sphere of governmental intervention in private institutional financial policies may be a relative matter, but some separation must be kept between political, social, and economic affairs. Every increase in Federal supervision of the economic life of the Nation for the purpose of achieving certain specific social objectives automatically diminishes the function that the free competitive market discharges under democratic capitalism. In the long run, this can lead only to autocracy.
>
> Recommendations, such as this, for increasing Federal control assume a totally powerful National Government with unending authority to intervene in all private affairs among men, and to control and adjust property relationships in accordance with the judgment of Government personnel. It is at this level that a more serious and obvious weakness arises, for political employees are seldom absolutely objective. It is impossible to keep Federal intervention from becoming an institutionalization of special privilege for political pressure groups. This must lead eventually not to greater human freedom but to ever-diminishing freedom.
>
> Therefore, a great deal of caution is needed before succumbing to the politically tempting suggestion of resorting to the Federal Government for increased control. Reliance on the Federal Government for the solution of all problems of discrimination can bring about only a weakening of confidence in the capacity of the institutions of a free economy to serve democratic values. I am firmly of the belief that in the majority of instances a free economy is better able than the Federal Government to work out fairly the problem of discrimination in mortgage loans. This, in turn, will halt the tendency to shrink freedom of private enterprise to smaller dimensions.
>
> The issue here is much more than the technical problem of devising new controls to deal with financing minority housing. It is the issue of freedom versus authority. The success of a democratic free enterprise economy depends as much on what the Federal Government does not do, or does not have to do, as on what it does.

Do we now live under a government of laws, or a government of men? How far will the executive department go in taking over legislative functions? Congress has repeatedly refused to require racial integration in Federal housing. It has never granted that authority to the President. Yet President Kennedy issued, without legislative authority, Executive Order No. 11063; and he did so in the face of repeated congressional denial thereof.

I have just begun to scratch the surface of the reasons why the Civil Rights Commission should be allowed to die sine die today without affirmative action by the Senate on either of the amendments to extend its life which have been submitted. If and when the omnibus civil-rights bill reaches the floor of the Senate, I assure you, Mr. President, that I will state in great detail, and with particularization, the manifold reasons why I am opposed to making this Commission a permanent body and increasing the scope of its powers and duties.

The proposed extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission is a part of the President's request which now is being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee. As chairman of that committee, I do not believe it should be bypassed in this way and prevented from giving its essential consideration to this grave subject. That is an additional reason why I oppose the pending amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment which calls for continuation of the Civil Rights Commission. It has served the Nation well and faithfully. Yesterday, the Commission on Civil Rights submitted to Congress its third biennial report since its establishment 6 years ago. The report comes to us at a time when our moral fiber as a nation is once again being put to the test. As the months of 1963 have unfolded, the legacy of slavery has brought upon us new and terrible reminders that there are among us some who are not yet free. Our public conscience has slowly been aroused to a new sense of the urgency of correcting our public deeds and our public policy toward our fellow citizens. The test we face has never been more directly or more plainly put to us, as makers of public law, than it is by the report submitted to us by the six good men who compose this Commission, which Congress itself created. The recommendations made in their report cover virtually every issue which is now daily finding its way onto the front pages of our newspapers: voting denials, which we thought we had corrected; inadequate, unequal, and racially stigmatized education, about which our courts issued correcting decrees almost a decade ago; job discrimination based upon race, at a time when public tax dollars have come to reach into virtually every sector of our economy; housing restrictions, which are crippling the benefits that Congress believed it was bestowing with its unprecedented support of slum clearance, urban renewal, and private homes; continuation of two kinds of justice in too many places; racial segregation in hospitals built with funds appropriated by Congress; public affront and insult, instead of public service, in places licensed for public accommodation. The list prepared by the Commission is long, specific, and honest.

Apart from its timeliness, perhaps the most important thing about this report is that its recommendations are unanimous. Six good men—southerners, northerners, lawyers, teachers, black, white, Republicans, and Democrats—have put before this Congress the challenge of our time. It is time we asked ourselves whether we are big enough, honest enough, or, if nothing else, scared enough to seize that challenge for once, and to rid this Nation of the most unfortunate part of its past, and whether we are prepared to act as brothers, to heal wounds, to strengthen our own decency. The Commission has given us a strong dose. Perhaps it shocks us less today because we have heard the cries of pain and anguish of our fellow Americans. Perhaps we are finally ready for the strong medicine we have known we must take, but somehow have failed each year to take.

In the weeks immediately ahead, Mr. President, each of us will have the chance to rise above party, to rise above region, to rise above our fears, and to agree upon a course of action that either will restore self-confidence and self-esteem to our Nation, or will return us to our fears. I believe Congress and the Senate can meet the test of our time, if they will but do so.

Mr. President, during the last few days, I have heard many things said about the Civil Rights Commission, some good and some bad. I want to remind Senators what a revolutionary concept this Commission was when it was created and what an outstanding job it has done in a most difficult situation. It is not easy to point out to a nation which prides itself on being the land of the free that whole peoples have been denied the right to vote, a chance to go to a decent school, and an opportunity to find a job a man can be proud of. It is not popular to point out that the God-given freedoms set forth in our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence have yet to be extended to substantial portions of our people.

No one likes to be criticized, Mr. President; but certainly the only way anyone ever improves himself is by recognizing that he is not perfect.

When we are told where we are wrong, when we are told that in this country, both North and South, there are places where democracy does not apply, then, and only then, can we work up the courage and the determination to do something about it. Mr. President, I believe the Civil Rights Commission has pointed out what needs to be done; and now it is up to Congress and the people of the United States to do something about it.

I believe the Commission has done an excellent job. To those who work for the Commission, I wish to say that, although this measure will serve to extend the life of the Commission for 1 year, it is my great hope and expectation that before that year is out we shall pass the President's civil rights bill and shall give the Commission a more satisfactory extension so as to allow it to complete its pioneering and necessary work.

An editorial published in this morning's issue of the Washington Post presents a powerful and persuasive argument for this agency's perpetuation. The Commission has pointed the way for constructive action in the field of civil rights here in Congress and throughout the Nation. The Commission's recommendations are sound, and represent urgent business for American democracy. I commend the Commission. I ask that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOW PROGRESS

The latest, and perhaps final, report of the Civil Rights Commission affords the most powerful argument possible for the agency's perpetuation. Whether one agrees with its recommendations or not, the report is a storehouse of information about race relations in the United States. To read it is to understand the resentment and impatience and unrest among Negroes all over the United States today and to recognize the imperative need for drastic and dramatic change.

There has been progress in the extension of civil rights to Negroes during the past few years; but it has been dishearteningly slow and grudging. The Commission made a study, for example, of the right to vote in 100 counties of 8 Southern States. In 1956, the last year before the enactment of legislation to secure the right to vote, about 5 percent of the voting age Negroes in the 100 counties were registered to vote; despite the subsequent passage of two civil rights acts and the bringing of 36 voting rights suits by the Department of Justice, Negro registration in these counties has risen to no more than 8.3 percent today.

In another area, education, the Commission found that nearly 10 years after the Supreme Court decision in the school segregation cases, Negro schoolchildren still attend segregated schools in all parts of the Nation. The Supreme Court's order continues to encounter the most stubborn resistance on the part of most southern school boards. "Even token desegregation usually has come only after a lawsuit is threatened or prosecuted," the report declares. "The Commission has found no evidence that this resistance is dissipating."

The most hopeful aspect of the civil rights situation, in the Commission's judgment, is an increased awareness of it throughout the Nation. Two observations by the Commission seem to us of great significance. One is that "the civil rights problem cannot be solved piecemeal." It is idle to say employment opportunity or the franchise or education is the key to Negro emancipation. No single key will suffice. All the doors must be opened at once.

Secondly, the Commission concludes that "government alone, at whatever level, cannot hope to solve the Nation's civil rights problem. The issue is too fraught with moral implications to be capable of exclusively legal solutions." We think this is profoundly right. The problem presents a challenge to the religious and educational and civic leaders of the American people. It is a problem that can be solved only through an awakening of the American conscience. This is the supreme task of leadership.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also call to the attention of the Senate an editorial published today in the New York Times. The editorial is entitled "The Urgency of Civil Rights." This editorial expresses strong support for the administration's civil rights program and for the extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE URGENCY OF CIVIL RIGHTS

That most useful Supreme Court phrase, "all deliberate speed," entered the language of civil rights nearly 10 years ago. Apart from school desegregation, it today has special urgency in respect to two interlocking legislative proposals before Congress. The first is the administration's civil rights program; the second is extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

The Congress is not so overworked that it cannot handle both a tax bill and a civil rights bill in the same session. This ought not be a question of either/or. Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, who has garnered southern applause by casual remarks that civil rights should be a matter of States' rights, now declares that a tax bill and a civil rights bill would be too much for Congress this year. Why should this be so?

Months of research and long hearings are not still required on the administration's civil rights bill. What is at issue here already is a part of the fabric of American life—for whites. The research has, indeed, been spread across the front pages every year in the accounts of violence in Little Rock, Ark.; in Birmingham and Montgomery, Ala.; in Orangeburg, S.C.; in Americus, Ga. These places and others bear a message for Congress: that Federal legislation is imperative now to prevent bloodshed and lawbreaking in the name of States rights; that the broadly defined guarantees of citizen equality under the Constitution must be underscored in their particular aspects by a civil rights program of law.

Closely related to the specifics of the omnibus civil rights bill is the need for prolonged life for the Civil Rights Commission. This body's valuable reports have unearthed the facts of second-class citizenship in many places, North and South; its recommendations have frequently served as a spur to action. The Civil Rights Commission has been a useful thorn in the conscience of the Federal Government. It should not be allowed to die.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several articles relating to the report of the Civil Rights Commission and certain excerpts from the report.

There being no objection, the articles and the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

RIGHTS UNIT ASKS STIFF GUARANTEE OF NEGROES' VOTE—COMMISSION URGES UNIFORM REQUIREMENTS AND SEEKS ENFORCEMENT PENALTIES—CONGRESS GETS REPORT—BROAD PROGRAM IS OFFERED TO ERASE DISCRIMINATION—FINDINGS UNANIMOUS

(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, September 30.—The Commission on Civil Rights called today for uniform voter-registration standards and other sweeping changes to erase racial discrimination.

The proposals appeared certain to arouse new opposition among southern lawmakers, already threatening a filibuster in Congress over the administration's pending civil rights legislation.

In addition to uniform voter standards, the Commission recommended a fair employment practices law, authority for the Attorney General to institute legal action to desegregate schools and elimination of racial discrimination in various programs supported by Federal funds.

The Commission's third biennial report, submitted to the President and Congress, differed from previous reports in these major respects:

For the first time in its 6-year history, the Commission's findings and recommendations to Congress were unanimous. Previously, white southern members on the Commission had dissented from some proposals.

Also for the first time, the Commission said it was able to report "an atmosphere of hopefulness" in the civil rights struggle.

But the Commission warned against complacency. It reported:

"The present conflict has brought about some progress, but it has also created the danger that white and Negro Americans may be driven even further apart and left again with a legacy of fear and mistrust. These new hopes and dangers have transformed the American civil rights struggle."

To wipe out discrimination, the Commission recommended legislation and executive action in nearly all fields of conflict—employment, education, voting, health facilities, urban areas, the Armed Forces, and agencies of justice.

MAJOR PROPOSALS

Among the major recommendations were the following:

A fair employment practices law, assuring the right to equal opportunity in employment assisted by the Federal Government or affecting interstate commerce. The authority to issue orders and institute action would be vested in a single administrator in the Department of Labor.

A law requiring schools that assign pupils on the basis of race to adopt desegregation plans within 90 days. The Attorney General would be authorized to institute legal action upon failure of schools to do so.

Elimination of racial discrimination in vocation education programs, manpower training programs, and hospitals built under the Hill-Burton Act of 1946.

Authorization for the Attorney General to intervene in or initiate civil proceedings to prevent denials to persons of any rights, privileges, or immunities guaranteed by law or the Constitution.

Denial of Federal funds to school districts in impacted areas (such as areas surrounding military bases) unless all children in the districts are assigned to schools without regard to race.

The Commission also called on President Kennedy to get the Navy to do more to assure equality of opportunity for Negroes.

VOTING STANDARDS SOUGHT

Some of the most far-reaching proposals were in the field of voting rights.

The Commission recommended uniform standards of qualification for voter registration, limiting disqualifications to age, length of residence, legal confinement, judicially determined mental disability, conviction of a felony, and failure to complete six grades of formal education or its equivalent.

To back this up, the Commission recommended that the President be authorized to order an investigation into any political subdivision where 10 or more persons file sworn affidavits alleging discrimination in registration.

If action is found to be warranted, the President would be authorized to appoint a Federal official to act as a temporary registrar.

The Commission recommended that, if all else failed, Congress reduce representation in the House proportionately by the number of citizens denied the right to vote on the basis of race or color.

TWO SOUTHERNERS CONCUR

Underscoring the demand for uniform voter standards, a concurring report was filed by the Commission's two white Southern members—Robert G. Storey, of Dallas, former dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School, and Dr. Robert S. Rankin, of Durham, N.C., head of the department of political science at Duke University.

The two native southerners said they had opposed similar proposals in the past because they had believed voting rights could be secured "without disturbing, even temporarily, our long-standing Federal-State relationships."

But they noted that "the evil of arbitrary disfranchisement has not diminished materially" and progress toward equal voting rights is at a virtual standstill in some areas.

For these reasons, they said "we have concluded sadly but with firm conviction, that without drastic change in the means used to secure suffrage for many of our citizens, disfranchisement will continue to be handed down from father to son."

CRITICIZES SLOW PROGRESS

The entire Commission was critical of the slow progress in securing voting rights through Federal litigation. However, it praised efforts of the Department of Justice in seeking to handle the matter in this way.

"After 5 years of Federal litigation, it is fair to conclude that case-by-case proceedings, helpful as they have been in isolated localities, have not provided a prompt or adequate remedy for widespread discriminatory denials of the right to vote," the Commission reported.

"At this time in our history," the Commission said, "we must fulfill the promise of America to all this country's citizens, or give up our best hope for national greatness. The challenge can be met if the entire Nation faces its responsibilities."

The Commission noted that in 1956, the year before passage of legislation to secure voting rights, about 5 percent of the voting-age Negroes in 100 counties in 8 Southern States were registered.

Today, the Commission continued, the most recent statistics indicate that only 55,711, or less than 8 percent, of the 668,082 Negroes of voting age in those 100 counties have access to the ballot.

The eight States in question are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

SCORES CURBS ON PROTESTS

The Commission was critical also of efforts of some States and localities to limit the right to free assembly and expression of grievances.

While noting that some racial demonstrations might have exceeded the boundaries of free speech and might have interfered with peace and order, the Commission said that cases it had studied had shown that most of the protests "have been peaceful and orderly and well within the protective guarantees of the first amendment."

The Commission said that there had been only limited employment of Negroes as policemen, prosecutors, judges, jurors, and other agents of government. It called for Federal grants-in-aid to assist localities in recruiting and training qualified Negroes for agencies of justice.

In surveying the educational picture, the Commission concentrated largely on problems created by de facto segregation in the North and West. In past reports, the emphasis was almost entirely on segregation in southern schools.

The Commission noted that nearly 10 years after the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision of 1954, Negro schoolchildren still attended segregated schools in all parts of the Nation.

"In the South, most schools continue to be segregated by official policy. The Commission has found no evidence that this resistance is dissipating," the report stated. "But in the North and West," the Commission continued, "school segregation is widespread because of existing segregated housing patterns and the practice of assigning pupils to neighborhood schools.

"Whether this northern-style segregation is unconstitutional has yet to be considered by the Supreme Court, but the contention that it runs counter to the equal protection clause is being vigorously asserted."

It found the status of Negroes in the military services generally satisfactory but said that the Navy lagged behind the Army and Air Force.

The Commission also, like the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, which issued a report last June, stressed the adverse impact of discrimination against Negroes in areas near military installations.

Unlike the earlier report, which suggested the closing of military bases in areas practicing discrimination, the Commission limited itself to endorsing sanctions against segregated off-base installations.

However, it recommended abandoning Reserve Officers Training Corps programs at schools and colleges practicing racial discrimination.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has issued a memorandum calling upon local base commanders to discuss desegregation of facilities with the implicit threat of sanctions if desegregation is not achieved.

Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, has denounced the McNamara memorandum as an attempt to use the military forces for political and social reform. It has also aroused criticism and complaints in many Southern communities.

Comparing desegregation in the various services, the Commission said that Negroes in the Army accounted for 11 percent of total personnel; in the Air Force and the Marine Corps 8 and 7 percent, respectively, and in the Navy, less than 5 percent.

It said that Negroes constitute slightly more than 3 percent of all Army officers, in comparison with about 1 percent in the Air Force and 0.3 percent and 0.2 percent respectively in the Navy and Marines. The Navy and Marines lag not only in the numbers of Negro officers but also in the ranks they achieve, the report noted.

The Commission also reported on urban area problems. It termed the solving of these urban problems "the challenge of the sixties" and suggested Presidential awards of merit for individuals and groups seeking to solve the problems on a local level.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 1, 1963]

COMMISSION SAYS CONFLICT THREATENS TO WIDEN U.S. RACIAL RIFT

(By James E. Clayton)

The Civil Rights Commission said yesterday that there is now an "atmosphere of genuine hopefulness" in the Nation's race relations, but "no cause of complacency."

It said incidents in 1963 have increased awareness of civil rights problems and brought some progress. But the present conflict, it said, "has also created the danger that white and Negro Americans may be driven even further apart and left again with a legacy of hate, fear, and mistrust."

The six-man Commission's views were contained in its report to the President and Congress submitted on the last day of its legal existence. Many of its employees have already made plans to take other jobs while Congress debates a measure to extend the Commission's life for another year.

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE

Included in the Commission's report was a long series of recommendations that, if adopted, would put much greater Federal pressure on States and cities to move forward on civil rights problems. Several of its previous proposals, denounced as radical when made, are in the administration's civil rights bill this year.

The Commission said it could no longer agree with those who argue that voting by Negroes is the key to civil rights progress. It said the intent of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 to let Negroes vote freely has been frustrated through the South. Major changes are now needed in Federal laws dealing with education and housing as well as with voting, the Commission said.

But it added that the racial issue "is too fraught with moral implications to be capable of exclusively legal solutions." The United States needs a "rededication in deeds, not in words, to the basic principles upon which it was founded," the report said.

The two Southern members of the Commission, agreeing for the first time with all of its recommendations, also attached a short statement calling on States to meet their obligations as well as to talk about States' rights.

The two, Robert G. Storey, president of the Southwestern Legal Foundation at Dallas, and Robert S. Rankin, chairman of the political science department at Duke University, said:

"We must state that survival of the honorable doctrine of States' rights imposes coterminous obligations. It is shortsighted indeed to force citizens of the States to look to the Central Government alone for vindication of rights about which there is no substantial disagreement * * * States' rights carry with them State obligations to all its citizens."

OTHER MEMBERS

The other members of the Commission are John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University; the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University; Erwin N. Griswold, dean of Harvard Law School, and Spottswood W. Robinson III, former dean of the Howard University Law School. Robinson is the only Negro Commissioner.

Among the Commission's many recommendations were:

That Congress pass a law requiring every local school board to publish, within 90 days, a plan for desegregating its schools.

That the President call a White House conference of educators and civil rights experts on how the Federal Government can help localities give all children an equal educational opportunity.

That Congress take away from the courts and give to the President power to appoint Federal officers to register prospective voters in counties where discriminatory practices are used to keep Negroes off the voting lists.

That the Defense Department act to see that Negroes have the same opportunities as other Americans to serve in the Navy.

That military commanders undertake a vigorous program aimed at assuring equality of treatment for servicemen in off-base housing, education, and public accommodations.

That Federal funds be cut off for job retraining and vocational education programs in States where segregated, discriminatory practices are observed.

That Congress authorize the trial in Federal courts, rather than in State courts, of persons charged with State crimes if the attitude of local officials indicates the State courts will not protect their civil rights.

REGISTRATION GAIN SLOW

The Commission's 268-page report also said that in 100 key counties in 8 Southern States, the number of Negroes of voting age who are registered to vote increased only from 5 to 8.3 percent in the last 7 years.

In the field of education, the Commission said the resistance of southern school boards to desegregation does not seem to be dissipating and that segregation exists in the school systems of many Northern and Western States as well.

Turning to health facilities, the Commission said Negro patients and physicians in many cities, including Washington, are denied services at facilities that have received Federal grants. It said that more than $2 billion in Federal funds has been spent since 1946 under the Hill-Burton Act, much of it on segregated hospitals.

The Commission said that it had looked into desegregation demonstrations in Birmingham, Baton Rouge, Jackson, and Memphis and decided that State and local officials clearly violated the constitutional rights of the demonstrators. It also found that Negroes are often barred from participating in the agencies of justice, as policemen, lawyers, and jurors.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

TEXT OF PREFACE TO CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION'S REPORT

WASHINGTON, September 30.—The Commission issues its third biennial report to the President and the Congress at a time of increased awareness of the Nation's civil rights problems. Sharpened controversy and quickened hopes have accompanied this new awareness. A sense of futility has given way in recent months to indignation and an avowed determination to see revered principles translated into the practices of everyday life without further delay.

Long before this Commission was established in 1957, the doctrine of equal opportunity had been firmly embedded in the law. It was eloquently stated in the Declaration of Independence and reaffirmed in the Bill of Rights and the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution. It has since been implemented in a series of judicial decisions which affiarm without qualification that racial segregation in any aspect of public life violates the Constitution. Federal Executive action and State and local legislative action during and following World War II further enlarged its application and, for the first time, established administrative machinery to implement it.

Yet, as the Commission was to learn from 6 years of study and investigation in all sections of the Nation, the civil rights of citizens—particularly of Negro citizens—continued to be widely disregarded. The Commission also learned that the long denial of equal opportunity has inflicted deep wounds upon the Negro community.

Until recently, however, the growing discontent of Negroes did not manifest itself in overt action compelling the Nation's attention. Thus it was possible for other Americans to believe that the activities of civil rights organizations did not reflect any strong dissatisfaction on the part of the Negro community at large.

FINDS ILLUSION SHATTERED

The events of 1963 have shattered this illusion. Negroes throughout the Nation have made it abundantly clear that their century-old patience with second-class citizenship is finally at an end. The Nation, in turn, gives evidence of recognizing that the current civil rights crisis constitutes a grave challenge.

This Nation was founded on the ringing affirmation that all men are created equal. It has traditionally served as a haven of freedom in a world plagued by oppression. It gave freely of its sons to "make the world safe for democracy," and again to save it from the racial madness of Hitler and his allies. It assumed the leadership of the free world in the perilous postwar era. Clearly such a nation cannot continue to deny equality to Negro and other minority groups without compromising its integrity and eroding the moral foundation that is its greatest strength.

Although the Nation's struggle to redeem the promise of its ideals is primarily a domestic problem, it is also of worldwide concern. To our friends, the vitality of our ideals is a measure of the strength and reliability of the Nation whose leadership they have accepted. To the new and uncommitted nations, most of which are nonwhite, America is what it practices, not what it professes. To our enemies, our civil rights record provides a wealth of propaganda to help persuade neutral nations that America practices hypocrisy.

SEES NATION MOVING

America needs a rededication in deeds, not in words, to the basic principles upon which it was founded. It is now 100 years since this Nation, lagging behind the civilized countries, abolished slavery. Yet today, the descendants of those freed slaves still suffer from customs, traditions, and prejudices that should have died with the institution in which they flourished.

The Nation now appears to be moving toward the eradication of slavery's lingering aftereffects. There is a growing realization that a great effort will have to be made to achieve this end. At the Government level, such an effort must embrace action against all phases of racial discrimination in public life. As the Federal Government has learned, the civil rights problem cannot be solved piecemeal. The studies and reports of this Commission have provided much material to show that all facets of the civil rights problem are inextricably interrelated, and that none can be solved in isolation.

To the southern Negro, born in a sharecropper's cabin, educated in segregated schools designed to prepare him for a Negro's traditional station in life, and wholly dependent economically on the white community, the right to vote may be nonexistent in practice, even though it may have been repeatedly vindicated in legal theory.

The President's latest civil rights proposals deal with education, employment, and public accommodations, as well as with voting. They give evidence that the executive branch recognizes the imperative need for dealing with the civil rights problem as a whole. Furthermore, there appears to be an increasing determination on the part of the Federal Government to use all the instruments at its disposal to secure the rights of citizens. A start has been made toward assuring that public money will not be spent in ways which foster and support racial discrimination. Affirmative programs are being considered which would enlarge educational and economic opportunity for all.

State and local governments have also been increasingly active in the protection of the rights of their citizens. Laws, ordinances, and Executive orders now protect various aspects of civil rights in 34 States and numerous cities. All this the Commission views with gratification.

STORE OF LATENT GOOD WILL

Yet government alone, at whatever level, cannot hope to solve the Nation's civil rights problem. The issue is too fraught with moral implications to be capable of exclusively legal solutions. A full mobilization of America's moral resources is required at this crucial time. The Commission firmly believes that the Nation has a great store of latent good will on the subject of civil rights. If this good will can be made effective, our civil rights problem can be solved.

At this time, there is indication that the Nation at large is awakening to its responsibilities in the current crisis. An increasing number of religious and civil leaders have clearly expressed their views and those of their organizations. The President has provided guidance in public speeches and private meetings with leaders of business, labor, the professions, and women's organizations. These efforts have evoked some positive response, and the Commission urges that they be continued and increased.

For the first time, then, the Commission is able to report an atmosphere of genuine hopefulness. But if there is reason for hope, there is no cause for complacency. There is a broad gulf between the abandonment of enforced segregation and the achievement of a society in which race or color is not a factor in the hiring or promotion of an employee, in the sale of a home, or in the educational opportunity offered a child. The present conflict has brought about some progress, but it has also created the danger that white and Negro Americans may be driven even further apart and left again with a legacy of hate, fear, and mistrust.

MORE IS REQUIRED

These new hopes and new dangers have transformed the American civil rights problem. Since its organization, this Commission has gathered the facts about denials of civil rights and suggested remedial actions. Now more is required. Many communities are bewildered by the magnitude of their civil rights problems, the existence of which was officially denied or only dimly realized in the recent past. Many seek guidance and assistance in developing corrective programs and establishing the lines of communication that made such programs possible.

A number of this Commission's State advisory committees have rendered highly effective assistance to their communities despite a lack of staff and funds, but this is not enough. Guidance and assistance are urgently needed. If this Commission is assigned the function of a national civil rights clearinghouse, in accordance with the President's request, it will be able to offer such help.

In the present circumstances, the need is to translate findings into effective action at the local, State, and Federal levels. The Commission believes, therefore, that its factfinding and reporting functions must become a part of a larger and more comprehensive effort to meet this Nation's most urgent domestic problem.

At this time in our history, we must fulfill the promise of America to all this country's citizens, or give up our best hope for national greatness. The challenge can be met if the entire Nation faces its responsibilities.

CONCURRING STATEMENT

In the following concurring statement, two Southerners on the Commission on Civil Rights—Robert S. Rankin, of Duke University, Durham, N.C., and Robert G. Storey, head of the Southwestern Law Center, Dallas—explain why they now join in recommending strong voting rights proposals similar to ones they opposed in past years:

"The right to vote is the cornerstone of our democratic society. A citizen's respect for law rests heavily on the belief that his voice is heard, directly or indirectly, in the creation of law. And his sense of human dignity depends on his receiving the same treatment at the registrar's office and at the voting booth as is accorded to his fellow citizens. Yet, today, thousands of citizens—of the United States and their respective States—have no effective right to vote in parts of seven Southern States.

"We have never questioned the legal and moral right of qualified citizens to vote. Our past disagreement with proposals such as those in which we now join was concerned with means, not ends. In 1959, and again in 1961, there was reason to believe that the right of every qualified citizen to vote, irrespective of his color, race, religion, or national origin, could become a reality without disturbing, even temporarily, our long-standing Federal-State relationships. We had hoped that an increasing awareness of the 14th and 15th amendments would bring about a greater acceptance of their commands. Moreover, new legislation embodied in the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 remained at that time untested."

URGE DRASTIC CHANGE

"Now, 2 more years have passed since the most recent of these acts. The evil of arbitrary disfranchisement has not diminished materially. The responsibility which must march hand in hand with States rights no less than the civil rights has, as to the right to vote, often been ignored. Progress toward achieving equal voting rights is virtually at a standstill in many localities. For these reasons we have concluded sadly, but with firm conviction, that without drastic change in the means used to secure suffrage for many of our citizens, disfranchisement will continue to be handed down from father to son.

"The present proposals set exacting standards at the same time as they provide for a flexible attack on discrimination in voting so that the disruption of traditional Federal-State relationships will be only so great as is necessary to achieve the necessary constitutional goal of equal voting rights for all our citizens.

"Recommendation 1 limits voting qualifications to those which are as objective as is possible in dealing with such a complex matter. At the same time it recognizes most of the qualifications which the individual States have found necessary to preserve the sanctity of the ballot. Thus, in contrast to the similar proposal made in 1961, Recommendation 1 permits States to exclude as electors persons who have not achieved a sixth-grade education or its equivalent, and persons who have been judicially declared mentally incompetent.

"Recommendation 2 provides for the appointment of local Federal officials as temporary voting registrars in localities in which 10 or more individuals state in writing and under oath that they have actually attempted unsuccessfully to register to vote, and that they believe that they were denied registration because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. Significantly, these registrars would serve only so long as the President deems necessary.

"Recommendation 3, calling for enforcement of the representation provisions of section 2 of the 14th amendment (the allotment of House Members), is expressly made a last resort. We are fully aware of the apparent unwillingness of Congress to make use of this provision of the Constitution, and we pray that this recommendation will never have to be acted upon. We do think, however, that the voting problem is sufficiently urgent today to warrent its consideration.

"Finally, we must state that survival of the honorable doctrine of States rights imposes coterminous obligations. It is short sighted indeed to force citizens of the State to look to the central government alone for vindication of rights about which there is no substantial disagreement. As we have said on so many occasions: Civil rights carry with them civil responsibilities. So, too, States rights carry with them State obligations to all its citizens."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS

VOTING

1. Limit State voter disqualifications to age, length of residence, legal confinement, judicially determined mental disability, conviction of a felony, and failure to complete six grades of formal education or its equivalent.

2. Authorize the President to order investigation into any political subdivision where 10 or more persons file sworn affidavits alleging discrimination in registration. If investigation warrants action, the President would be authorized to appoint a then-existing Federal official in that State to act as a temporary registrar.

3. In event first two recommendations proved ineffective, Congress would be expected to enforce section 2 of 14th amendment by reducing representation in U.S. House proportionately by number of qualified citizens not allowed to vote.

EDUCATION

1. Require every school board maintaining schools to which pupils were assigned on basis of race to adopt a desegregation plan within 90 days. If the board failed to do so, the Attorney General would be authorized to institute legal action.

2. Authorize Civil Rights Commission to provide technical and financial assistance to school districts seeking help on problems resulting from school segregation or desegregation.

3. Suggest that the President call a White House conference of experts to discuss how the Federal Government can assist in solving the problem of giving all children an equal opportunity in education.

4. Amend the urban renewal law so that it not impede local efforts aimed at eliminating or reducing racial imbalance in schools in or near the renewal area.

EMPLOYMENT

1. Establish a right to equal opportunity in employment that is assisted by Federal Government or which affects interstate commerce, with authority to institute action vested in Administrator in Department of Labor.

2. Require that federally assisted vocational programs be nonsegregated.

3. Enforce nondiscrimination in selection and referral of trainees for training classes.

4. Establish vocational programs for persons who lack educational prerequisites needed to qualify for technician and other courses and provide manpower funds to permit training in functional literacy and basic work skills.

5. Permit the Federal Government to make arrangements for manpower, literacy, and work skill training with education agencies other than State vocational agencies which cannot provide such training on a nonsegregated basis.

6. Direct that affirmative steps be taken to insure that employment, directly or indirectly, generated by Federal loan, grant, or aid programs to be open to qualified persons regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

HOUSING

No recommendations.

JUSTICE

1. Empower the Attorney General to intervene in or initiate civil proceedings to prevent denials to persons of any rights, privileges or immunities guaranteed by law or the Constitution.

2. Enact a program of grants-in-aid to help States and local governments, upon their request, to increase the professional quality of their police forces.

3. Make local governmental units employing officers who deprive persons of their rights jointly liable with the officers.

4. Permit removal by a defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a district Federal court in cases where the defendant cannot, in State court, secure civil rights because of State laws or acts of individuals administering the laws.

HEALTH FACILITIES AND SERVICES

1. Refuse approval of applications for grants under the separate-but-equal provision of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946.

2. Refuse approval of applications for Federal funds under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 when plans call for duplicate facilities to be used on a racially segregated basis.

3. Assure that grant recipients comply with the nondiscrimination requirements of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946.

URBAN AREAS

1. That the President encourage resolution of civil rights problems at local level, possibly through the form of Presidential awards of merit given annually to persons and organizations.

ARMED FORCES

1. That the President direct that corrective action be undertaken by the Navy to assure equality of opportunity for Negroes to serve as officers and enlisted men and to broaden their occupational assignments and promotional opportunities.
2. That the President direct the Secretary of Defense to reappraise testing procedures used in procurement of enlisted and officer personnel.
3. That the President request the Secretary of Defense to undertake periodic reviews of recruitment, selection, assignment, and promotion policies and develop programs to utilize fully both Negro and white manpower resources.
4. That the President request the Secretary of Defense to discontinue ROTC programs at any college or university which does not accept all students without regard to race or color.
5. That the Department of Defense seek to remove all vestiges of racial discrimination from military installations and insure that in dealings with local communities the policy of the Armed Forces of equality of treatment prevails.
6. That the granting of funds for construction and operation of schools under the impacted area program be conditioned upon assurances that all children in the district be assigned without regard to race.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am most hopeful that the amendment I have submitted to H.R. 3369 will be adopted, because we need to continue the Commission. Furthermore, at present, a number of the competent staff members of the Commission are in doubt as to what will be their future activities.

Therefore, I urge that favorable action be taken on the extension of the life of the Commission.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment submitted by the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], but I shall do so with full recognition of the regrettable fact that a pistol was pointed at the head of the Senate. What both your party, Mr. President, and mine promised the American people; namely, to create a Civil Rights Commission on a permanent basis cannot, alas, be approved by the Senate, because of the inevitable "talkathon" which would ensue.

Mr. President, I remember very well when General Eisenhower, as Chief Executive of our country, sent to the Senate his recommendation for a Civil Rights Commission to be approved by legislative action. The people whom he chose to discharge a responsibility that was long overdue came from every section of our land, and represented then, as indeed they do now, able, honorable, decent Americans who simply are devoting their public service to the hallowed American principle of equal treatment under law.

I believe it is to the credit of the incumbent Chief Executive, President Kennedy, that he has continued in service a number of the Americans who originally were appointed to the Commission by President Eisenhower.

At any rate, now that a capitulation has regrettably, but of necessity, been made, I hope we may proceed on a temporary basis to continue a public agency whose functions are eminently important and whose duties require a continuing recognition by the Congress as well as by the American people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be discontinued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bartlett in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had hoped that in the current extension of the Civil Rights Commission I would find it appropriate either to remain completely silent and vote against the extension or perhaps even to remain silent and vote for the extension, because some things done by the Civil Rights Commission in the several years of its existence have, I believe, been constructive.

Unfortunately, developments in recent years and particularly yesterday, when the 1963 Civil Rights Commission report was made public, have been such that I cannot sit silently in my seat since I feel that I should state in the Record my feeling that the Civil Rights Commission has outlived any usefulness that it may have had. It has shown itself to be unfair and now imbued with almost an obsession that it is a messianic agency, so that it is suggesting things to be done which are not only completely unconstitutional but are thoroughly against existing law, against the best interests of our country, and against the bringing about of any real degree of national unity and understanding.

First I wish to say a word with reference to the current organization of the Civil Rights Commission. When the Civil Rights Commission was first named there was some effort to make it representative of the best and most constructive thinking of all parts of the country. I well recall that I was approached and asked to make any suggestions which I considered appropriate with respect to highly representative and reputable citizens in the southern area of our country, so that there might be representation on the Civil Rights Commission from our part of the country which would command respect on the part of our citizens in general, whether white or colored. I was one of several Senators who made such recommendations. Two of the several fine citizens whom I recommended were appointed to the first Civil Rights Commission. They were former Gov. Doyle Carlton of my State of Florida and former Gov. John Battle of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. They both had intelligence enough to get off the Commission when they saw the turn it was taking, did they not?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is an interpretation which might be given to their actions. Perhaps they were completely exhausted by their difficult efforts up to that time. I do not know the reasons why they left the Commission, but they declined to be considered for reappointment.

Not only did I suggest the names of those two eminent citizens who were appointed, but also the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], who made several suggestions as to appointees to be considered, included on his list both of those particularly eminent citizens of our area. They were appointed.

I am sorry to say that no such policy has been continued as to the appointment of the current membership of the Civil Rights Commission. I believe the Commission has suffered because of the fact that in recent years there have not been on the Commission truly representative members who were citizens of the area of those States most affected, and who could be fully respected from one end of our Nation to the other.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to my able friend.

Mr. TALMADGE. I concur in the statement made by the able senior Senator from Florida. It seems ridiculous to me to have a Commission allegedly acting as a factfinding body when only one point of view is represented on the Commission. I am sure the able Senator will recall some of the many extreme recommendations which the Civil Rights Commission has proposed, one of them being a recommendation, in the spring of this year, as I recall, to cut off all Federal funds going into the State of Mississippi—social security benefits, veterans' benefits, and all funds of any kind or character. Does the able Senator recall that recommendation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall it well, and with great sorrow.

Mr. TALMADGE. I should like to read a statement, and ask if my friend from Florida remembers the author of that statement.

> I don't have any power to cut off the aid in the way proposed by the Civil Rights Commission and I would think that it would probably be unwise to give the President of the United States that kind of power.

Does the Senator recognize that statement; and, if so, does he remember the author thereof?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I well remember that when the recommendation reached the present President of the United States, President Kennedy, he reacted to the recommendation in the words just quoted by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. That particular statement was made by the President of the United States before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 19, 1963.

I should like to read another statement and ask if the able Senator recognizes it; and, if so, if he remembers the author thereof:

> Another difficulty is that in many instances the withholding of funds would serve to

> further disadvantage those that I know the Commission would want to aid. For example, hundreds of thousands of Negroes in Mississippi receive social security, veterans, welfare, school lunch, and other benefits from Federal programs. Any elimination or reduction of such programs obviously would fall alike on all within the State and in some programs perhaps even more heavily upon Negroes.

Does the able Senator recall the author of that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. Though my recollection is not so clear as in the other case, it is that the President of the United States made that statement also.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct. That was the statement of the President in a letter dated April 19, 1963, to the Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission.

I ask the able Senator if, notwithstanding those two statements by the President of the United States, this partisan group renewed the same recommendation in its report submitted yesterday?

Mr. HOLLAND. They did, I am sorry to say. While I shall not mention that particular recommendation, because I am trying to confine myself to recommendations which are relatively new, I am sad that this group saw fit to overlook the fact that that kind of action, if carried out, would put our Government in the same position the whole world complained of when a certain power destroyed the village of Lidice merely because someone there had affronted it. That is a policy of punishment by association, in the sense of people living together in a great area being equally punished regardless of their guilt or innocence and regardless of their need. Aside from the un-American character of such action, it is blind for an agency established to give aid to an underprivileged group to suggest a course which is sure to bring greater disaster upon members of that underprivileged group than upon the public generally.

Mr. TALMADGE. In effect, it would expel an entire State from the Union, would it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is, from the benefits, though not from the taxation.

Mr. HOLLAND. It would, indeed. We have not witnessed anything like that since Reconstruction days, when Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, duly elected by their respective States—on the theory that there had not been any breaking up of the Union but that instead there had been a victory for preservation of the Union—were refused their seats. When newly elected Senators and Representatives came to Washington, they were not permitted to take their seats but, instead, there were enacted punitive measures called the reconstruction acts, aimed against certain States, refusing to permit them to be heard in the councils of the Nation until they took several very distasteful courses, such as the reframing of their own constitutions, approval of the 14th amendment, and other steps which I shall not mention.

This is a following up or a renewal of the philosophy which prevailed in those days to such an extent that a Congress overrode, not once, but repeatedly, vetoes of the President, who at that time was trying to bring the Nation back together into unity.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator. I agree with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his intervention.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not heard the previous discussion. I just came into the Chamber. But I am sure the Senator will realize that despite all the trials and indignities that were heaped upon the South in the Reconstruction period, there was never any proposal for genocide such as is contained in the recommendation of the Civil Rights Commission—for starving the weak, the poor, and the indigent in a State, taking taxes from the people of a State but not permitting the return of one 5-cent piece of that money. Taxation without participation is worse than taxation without representation.

Dark as were the days of reconstruction even Thaddeus Stevens did not advocate total war on women and children. They did advocate shooting men who had served in the Confederate Army and Navy, but they did not propose a deliberate campaign designed to inflict hardship and suffering on all the women and children of both races in the South.

Compared to the vicious proposals of this Commission, Sumner and Stevens will appear in a more favorable light.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Even Thaddeus Stevens never proposed anything that went so far as this recommendation. I am very sure the people who made this as one of almost innumerable recommendations have not given serious thought to it, because I know there are some good people on the Civil Rights Commission, and I could not understand how they could ever come to the point that they would make such a heartless and inhuman recommendation of this unconstitutional character. It does not smack of anything that has happened heretofore in America, even in Reconstruction days.

I am glad my distinguished friends have called attention to this point.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator would have to go back to the days of Attila and Tamerlane to find anything to equal this.

Mr. HOLLAND. To go back to the Commission, not only has the Senator from Florida not been approached about any recommendations for appointment of members of the Commission, but he finds, in discussing the same matter with his friends generally who come from the South, and who are Members of the Senate, that none of them has had any request for such recommendations.

Aside from the violation of the normal rule in the Senate that when appointments are to be made that singularly apply to sections that certain Senators are trying to represent, their viewpoint is usually sought by the appointive power, the very standing of the Commission has suffered greatly by reason of the departure from the earlier rule which I think was one that involved both courtesy and wisdom. Referring to the men named to succeed the former Governor of Florida, Doyle Carlton, and the former Governor of Virginia, John Battle, two good men, I shall have nothing derogatory to say about these new members. But the appointment of a teacher from North Carolina, regarded as highly liberal in his point of view, was made without either one of the two Senators from North Carolina having been asked for his opinion on his appointment. I do not think that was a wise course.

I find, representing the Commonwealth of Virginia, a former dean of Howard University Law School, Spottswood Robinson, was appointed. I am sure, from what I have heard, that he was a resident of Virginia. I noticed the President announced yesterday that he was going to appoint him to the District Federal bench, indicating rather clearly that here in Washington is where his present active connection is, rather than in Virginia. But I am asking Senators to decide for themselves what kind of substitutions for former Governor Carlton and former Governor Battle these two appointees were.

The Civil Rights Commission has suffered in the eyes of reasonable and moderate thinking people. I may not be a reasonable person, but I believe I am moderate in this field, and that everything I have done through the years shows it.

The Commission has suffered irreparable damage in that great part of the Nation where over 50 million people live and which is so directly affected by the departure from the earlier rule and by the type and character of the new appointees.

I shall mention briefly four matters which appear in the report published yesterday, which show how very far from its proper function, at least in my judgment, the present Commission has gone, and how far from the following of a reasonable course the present membership of the Commission has strayed.

In the first instance, I call attention to the field of defense. I am not going to mention many other matters which are of interest, but only one matter, because it is so new. I call attention to recommendation 4, on page 215 of the recommendations of the Commission. On that page, in the field of defense, the Commission includes this recommendation—and I leave it to the sense of the Senate and of the general public to judge how completely unsound a recommendation it is from the standpoint either of serving the security of our Nation or of protecting the rights of qualified members of the Negro race to serve as officers in the ROTC. Recommendation 4 reads:

> That the President request the Secretary of Defense to discontinue ROTC programs at any college or university which does not accept all students without regard to race or color.

The meaning of that—which I think is a hopelessly foolish recommendation—would be that in several of the States both members of the white race and members of the Negro race who have not only the desire to serve their country in the uniform of the armed services as reservists, but who also have aptitude in that field, would, if that recommendation were carried out, be deprived of their chance to receive ROTC training or commissions or any standing in the Reserves. I think it is not only unwise, but unjust.

I could take 5 or 10 minutes to put into the RECORD, the names of some distinguished sons of the South, most of them white, some of them Negro, who have served this Nation with distinction in time of war. There are more of the same kind elsewhere. In my own State this recommendation would apply to cut off white men at the two State universities and the young Negro men at the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, where some 3,000 Negroes are being educated, and where there is a fine Reserve unit, from any opportunity of fulfilling their desire to qualify themselves to serve their Nation in the Reserve forces.

How could it be made more clear that these members of the Civil Rights Commission have decided that the defense of our Nation does not count for much, after all; that the protection of the rights of young individuals, regardless of their color, to serve their Nation in uniform, to prepare themselves to serve it, does not count for much? Furthermore, this recommendation will so operate on large Negro schools in several States as to disqualify every member of the student body in those schools who wants to qualify for ROTC training, and destroy his opportunity to do so.

I cannot remember any more foolish recommendation that strays further from the protection of our Nation or the protection of the race that the Civil Rights Commission is supposed to protect.

The next point I wish to mention is in the field of voting. The Civil Rights Commission in its report of yesterday makes a statement which, insofar as my State is concerned, is not true. The Commission states:

> In seven States, the right to vote—the abridgement of which is clearly forbidden by the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States—is still denied to many citizens solely because of their race.

That does not happen to be the case. The statement is applied to my State because in counting the States, which are recited one by one, Florida is one of the seven Southern States named and because in listing the States one by one Florida is one of the Southern States listed. I find this small statement in the text, which is applicable to Florida:

> Florida contains 5 of the 100 counties. No litigation has occurred in the State. Registration has increased in two counties and remained virtually unchanged in the other three. Though the number of voters in these counties has increased from 76 in 1956 to 512 in 1962, fewer than 5 percent of the voting-age Negroes are registered.

There is no poll tax requirement in the State of Florida. There is no educational or literacy test requirement in the State of Florida. There is no unwillingness to register Negro citizens who are qualified by reason of age and residence to vote. Over 200,000 of them are registered.

The report selects five counties, four of them very small counties, where for some reason or other, sufficient to themselves, Negro citizens generally have not seen fit to claim that right or privilege, have not seen fit to register in large numbers, although the registration has increased in such counties from 76 in 1956 to 512 in 1962. The report makes the statement that Florida is one of the seven States mentioned where citizens are deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race.

It has been found in Florida that the Negro citizens in all areas do not respond equally or with equal speed to the invitation to vote, which was extended to our citizens in 1937, when we abolished the poll tax entirely in our State and when we offered the opportunity to vote to every citizen otherwise qualified in the States, without a literacy test, without a grandfather clause, and without any artificial measure to prohibit adult residents from voting. Several dozen counties became very active quickly—others have followed. The five counties listed merely happen to be at the end of the list of counties insofar as the effort to register and to vote on the part of the Negro population has been manifest.

There is no evidence cited in the report, or otherwise, as to anyone having been kept from registering. The report states that no suit has been brought in Florida. There is no showing of any citizen having been kept from registering. There is a showing of substantial improvement of the situation in one or two of the five counties.

It is not right to have a great State, which is moving with relative speed in this matter, held up by the report of the Commission as having, by the operation of its laws, or otherwise, deprived colored citizens of the right to vote because of their race. That does not happen to be true. I challenge anyone to refute my statement. To prove that it is not true, I cite the fact that more than 200,000 of our Negro citizens have registered; and most of them are voting regularly, as our other citizens do.

I come next to the question of education. In consideration of that question, the Civil Rights Commission makes the statement that the citizens of the South, including Florida, are not moving as the Supreme Court required them to move, and not moving so as to comply with the rulings of the Court in the matter of education.

It is true that in a great many areas in our State there is no integration in the schools. Lack of integration in certain schools is explained in one of two ways:

The first explanation is that no Negro citizen has been sufficiently desirous of placing his or her children in white schools to bring suit or make his or her wishes known; or, second, they do not wish to have their children in the white schools under any circumstances.

There is a strong showing in my State, from what has come to me as an individual citizen who has a large number of friends among the colored citizens of his State, of an expression to the effect that they feel their children do better if they are confined to contacts with their own kind, with their own people, during their years of education.

Not only is that true, but it is made clear by what they are doing voluntarily, because in many cases they have preferred to go to an institution where they are with their own people.

On page 65 of the Commission's report of yesterday are assembled the statistics with respect to Florida. The table on that page shows a total of 1,183,714 children enrolled in the schools. It shows that of that number, 956,423 are white, and 227,291 are Negro. It shows also that 1,551 Negroes are enrolled in desegregated schools, or a total percent of Negro pupils enrolled in desegregated schools of 0.682, or less than 1 percent.

I know not only from what Negro parents have told me, but also from the practice which is prevailing in my State, that many of our Negro people prefer to have their children remain in the segregated schools, where they think they can do better with children of their own kind.

A short time ago I delivered the commencement address at the Junior College of Dade County, at Miami, Fla. There are 6,000 youngsters enrolled as students in that junior college. Of that number, I was told, some 200 to 250 are colored, and the remainder are white.

At the commencement address I noted that a dozen or 15 of the graduates of close to nearly 300 were Negro youngsters.

The fact remains, however, that a larger number of the Negro youth of this same county, Dade County, who have the right to enroll and to attend that junior college without much expense, and to live at home at the same time, prefer to go, and do go, to our segregated university for Negro youngsters at Tallahassee. That is a fine school, with an attendance of approximately 3,000 youngsters. It has produced some very fine teachers, doctors, lawyers, preachers, and others who have engaged in some leading profession or calling through which they have been able to serve their people. That school has produced a great many notable athletes, among them Althea Gibson, who is still recognized as the finest woman tennis player in the past two or three decades.

Bob Hayes won all the speed races over in Europe during the recent tour there of the American track team. Willie Gallimore, of the Chicago Bears; and others are from that school. They learned football there and are now playing in the professional league.

It is just as true as can be—and no one can controvert it, because it is happening every day—that more Negro families in the Dade-Miami area, for reasons sufficient to themselves, prefer to send their youngsters at some expense to the Tallahassee school 500 miles away, and are doing so. Does that not show rather clearly that they have a preference themselves to continue the segregated form of education?

The Civil Rights Commission says in its report that the South is dragging its feet and that we are keeping Negro children—and the report includes Florida in its summary—from going to schools of their choice. That does not happen to be true, because everywhere that a suit has been brought, and in some counties where suits have not been brought, Negro children who have shown any desire to go to integrated schools are now pupils in those schools. The Civil Rights Commission does not appear to have ever considered the idea that, first, the Supreme Court does not require the integration of all schools, but by its order provides simply that no student who is a Negro can be deprived of his or her right to go to a publicly supported school that is integrated.

Apparently they have not thought the problem through and do not realize that there are millions of Negro citizens in the South who apparently prefer the segregation of their own children, and show it by their continued practice year after year.

In the field of education, as in the field of voting and in the field of the security of our Nation, the Civil Rights Commission has gone completely off base. Apparently, with all of its study, it still does not understand that under the opinions of the Supreme Court there is no intention to require compulsory integration of all schools throughout the South or anywhere else; but that the sole meaning of the decisions that have been handed down is that no child may be deprived of the legal right to attend a public school solely because of his race.

The Commission seems not only to misunderstand that part of its mission which has to do with education, but it seems also to misunderstand the fact that a vast number of Negro families prefer a segregated type of education. I have talked with a good many teachers who are of the Negro race. They believe the worst thing that could happen to them, so far as their right to continue in professional education is concerned—and they have prepared themselves for their profession—would be to require integregation of all publicly supported schools.

A search was made not long ago to ascertain whether there was a single president of a non-Negro university or college outside the South who was a Negro. At that time, none could be found. In the South there are perhaps a hundred or more Negro presidents of Negro institutions and colleges. The fact that there are hundreds of deans and professors in colleges, and thousands of principals of high schools—does not seem to have been considered by the Civil Rights Commission; nor does it seem to have occurred to the Commission that many of those people feel—and I say this because I know it of my own knowledge; they have come to me with their complaints—that their right to continue in their livelihood, which they have chosen in an effort to be of service to their own people, will be greatly hurt and in many respects completely obliterated if universal integration in the schools of the South should be accomplished.

The fourth point that I wish to make has principally to do with the findings of the Civil Rights Commission in its report of yesterday with reference to the field of health. The Commission discusses at great length the Hill-Burton Act.

I digress to pay my tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the outstanding effort and wonderful results which have occurred through his cosponsorship of that act.

The members of the Civil Rights Commission go so far as to recommend, by a fixed recommendation, that a clear provision of the Hill-Burton Act be ignored in the distribution of Federal funds appropriated under that act. I quote, first, this provision, which appears on page 130 of the Commission's report of yesterday:

> However, the act provides an exception to the nondiscrimination assurance "in cases where separate hospital facilities are provided for separate population groups, if the plan makes equitable provision on the basis of need for facilities and services of like quality for each such group."

There is no doubt that the Hill-Burton Act contains that provision. It does so because it was realized that one of the groups that most needed better health facilities was the Negro group, and that in many States separate facilities would be provided either under the same roof or under a separate roof. So that provision was placed in the law. The Civil Rights Commission indulges in this casuistry:

> If the Supreme Court of the United States had decided the school segregation cases of 1954, 8 years earlier, or if the Hill-Burton Act of 1946 had been enacted after 1954, it is unlikely that the act would authorize the use of Federal funds for racially separate medical facilities.

In other words, the Commission bases its recommendations upon this thinking: That, unfortunately, the Hill-Burton Act was enacted too soon to have come within the provisions of the 1954 school decision; otherwise, in the opinion of the Commission, the act would not have included this particular provision.

Let us consider the recommendations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, before the Senator leaves that point——

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not about to leave it; I was about to read the recommendations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry; I will not interrupt the Senator. I thought he was about to discuss another point.

Mr. HOLLAND. No. I want it to be clear that after recognizing the Hill-Burton Act and after expressing regret that it was enacted before the 1954 Supreme Court decision—because the Commission says that if that law had been enacted later, it would not have contained this provision, which the Civil Rights Commission thinks should not be enforced—it proceeds, on page 143, to make its recommendations. I read recommendation 1:

> Recommendation 1: That the President direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, to refuse to approve applications for grants submitted under the separate-but-equal provision of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946.

In other words, it does not make any difference what the law provides. It does not make any difference that the Supreme Court had not passed on the law. The Civil Rights Commission, again following its feeling that it has a sort of messianic status, states that it wants the President to direct, by Executive order, transcending the legislation which has been on the book all these years, and has done so much good through all these years, this action:

> The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, to refuse to approve applications for grants submitted under the separate-but-equal provision of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946.

That is the Hill-Burton Act.

Now I come to the second recommendation. They were afraid the first one would not go far enough and might not be held to apply when all the hospital was to be under one roof, and different wards or different rooms were to be assigned to people of different races. So recommendation No. 2 is included, as follows:

> Recommendation 2: That the President direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service, to refuse to approve applications for Federal funds under the Hospital Survey and Construction Act of 1946 when the plans for the proposed construction provide for duplicate facilities to be used on a racially segregated basis.

In other words, Madam President, if the plans for a hospital provide for two wings—one for one race and one for the other—or for two ward rooms—one for one race and one for the other—or for a different group of private rooms—some for one race and some for the other—even assuming that they are to be exactly equal—in fact, duplicates—and "duplicate" is the word used in the report, "duplicate facilities" for the different races—the Commission still asks the President to direct the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General never to approve such a program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad the Senator has brought up this point. I believe it is fairly typical of the recommendations which have been made by the Civil Rights Commission over the years it has been in existence. Does not it completely both ignore and run contrary to what Congress itself has directed should be done?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is entirely correct. Not only does the Commission ask the President to proceed exactly counter to what the law provides, but, in addition, its report shows that the Civil Rights Commission did not feel itself bound by the Constitution or by the laws, but felt bound only by objectives which it regards as so overriding and so compelling that, in its opinion, we need not worry about the Constitution and the laws. The Commission is saying, in effect, "We are going to straighten this out without giving any regard to either the Constitution or the laws."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not the feeling of the Senator from Florida that over the years the Civil Rights Commission has been functioning in exactly that way? I believe it was established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957; and its life has already been extended several different times. Does not the Senator from Florida feel that in many instances during its life the Civil Rights Commission has made recommendations that either were without reference to the law or openly sought to flout the law?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly has. I have already named several particulars, in the course of my brief remarks; and I could point out many more in the report, which was issued only yesterday.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I recall that only a little while ago the Senator referred to the fact that last year or in the interim report during the present year the Civil Rights Commission recommended the withholding of funds; and the Senator from Georgia, I believe, quoted to the Senator from Florida a very forthright and direct statement which the President of the United States made at that time—namely that he did not feel that under the Constitution anyone had a right to do that; furthermore, he said that, in his opinion, no President ought to be clothed with that authority. But now, in spite of that, this report of the Civil Rights Commission makes the same recommendation. Is not that true?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Alabama is correct. The Senator from Georgia also mentioned the fact that the President, in replying to the recommendation made earlier this year, stated that he felt he should call attention to the fact that if he acted upon that recommendation, he would hurt a great many members of the underprivileged race whom he was interested in helping, and whom the Civil Rights Commission was established to protect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and of course the Senator knows that to be true. There are not as many members of the Negro race in the State of Florida as there are in my State, I presume—or nor as high a percentage in Florida as in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and a number of other States; but in the State of Florida there are enough for him to know that the percentage of the members of the Negro race there who are the beneficiaries of these various Government programs is greater than the percentage of the members of the white race there who benefit from them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly that is true in my State. In Florida, we have approximately 900,000 members of the Negro race, and most of them are fine citizens. They are enjoying the opportunities they have. They are advancing themselves daily. There have not been great troubles in our State. We are trying to deal with this problem moderately; and we are tired of being maligned by the Civil Rights Commission, and we are tired of having the Commission make recommendations which it admits, by its own earlier statements, fly directly in the face of the provisions of existing law.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the Senator from Florida is entirely correct. Of course I am sure he believes that now that the Civil Rights Commission has wound up its term and has finished it by making its report, the existence of the Commission should end, and this report should be its final one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, the Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. I feel that the death of the Civil Rights Commission would not be deeply lamented by most of the good people of this country; and I feel that an organization that has gone as far afield as this one did in its recommendations of only yesterday, the very day when the question of extension of the life of the Commission was before the Senate, has clearly shown how completely irresponsible it has become and how completely it has become submerged in its own objectives, to the extent of being blind to the requirements of law and to the requirements of this grave problem, which exists mostly in the minds and hearts of men.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for one more question?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield again to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that there are already in the Department of Justice two different divisions that are supposed to handle race relations and to deal with problems such as this, and that the Civil Rights Commission really constitutes a third?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. The Civil Rights Commission is a third thumb. I have never known of any useful employment for a third thumb; but that is what this Civil Rights Commission has been throughout its existence.

Mr. President, I shall hurry to state my conclusion. I note another recommendation by the Commission, in its report of yesterday, which I believe should be called to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the public. That one is to be found on page 125 of the report; it is recommendation No. 3, and reads as follows:

> Recommendation 3: That Congress amend section 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code to make any county government, city government, or other local government entity that employs officers who deprive persons of rights protected by that section, jointly liable with the officers to victims of such officers' misconduct.

Mr. President, under such a provision, we would include in the basic law affecting civil rights—section 1983 is an important part of the law which has to do with the protection of civil rights—a provision that any county government, city government, or other local government entity that employs any officer—meaning particularly peace officers—who trespasses upon the civil rights of any person, would become equally liable with the peace officer for the wrong done.

Mr. President, I wonder how carefully the members of the Civil Rights Commission have thought that through.

In my home county there are more than 200,000 people. Suppose that a constable, a deputy sheriff, a conservation officer, or any other officer in that county clothed with the power of arrest should do something that might be interpreted by a citizen of the Negro race as depriving that citizen of his civil rights. Under such a provision, as recommended by the Commission, all the citizens of our country through our organized government could be held jointly liable for the misconduct of the one officer who was alleged to have trespassed in that field.

I do not believe that many people in the United States wish to use that kind of approach to a problem which couples the innocent with the guilty, which couples the race that it is trying to protect with the majority race, which makes Negro citizens, through their tax contributions, as answerable to that kind of misconduct, if there be such misconduct, as are white citizens through their tax contributions. The thinking of the Commission is warped and unsound in a suggestion of that kind. Aside from its having the various qualities which I have already mentioned, it would follow that thinking which we despise so greatly and which we arraigned before the court of world opinion so severely when the Lidice instance occurred during World War II.

Mr. President, do the members of the Civil Rights Commission think that by following a course of the kind proposed, which would trespass so greatly upon our ideals of justice and fair play and our constitutional and other statutory approaches to problems of that kind, they can advance us towards better recognition of civil rights?

I have quoted only a few of the recommendations published yesterday by the Civil Rights Commission. To my mind they show clearly and conclusively the fact that the Commission has gone far astray. It has forfeited any right to be respected by decent citizens of any color. It has become so obsessed with the importance of its mission that it has forgotten that it, too, is a part of America; that it, too, is functioning under our Constitution and under our statutes; that it, too, is functioning under our ways of doing things and under our traditions. It has made quite a number of so-called factual reports which are not factual and recommendations which depart entirely from our American way of doing things.

Going back to the recommendation made in the field of security, affecting our Armed Forces, I call attention to the fact that the recommendation made at that point, that the President request the Secretary of Defense to discontinue ROTC programs at any college in which segregation exists, whether it be a white college or a colored college, also flies in the face of the provisions of law which apply to that subject. Since its passage the Morrill Act has specifically provided for separate racial facilities in the various programs under that act. I am so advised by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Armed Services

Committee, and who has much greater familiarity with the act than I. I have always had the belief that that is the case, but I am now making that statement because the Senator so advised me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that the statement will stand up.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for having sent me that advice. That is but the second instance in an important field of the operation of our Federal law—this time under the Morrill Act, the other under the Hill-Burton Act, respecting hospitals and hospital facilities—in which the Civil Rights Commission, so-called, in its recommendations of yesterday, specifically recommends that the President shortcut all the judicial process, and bring about a situation which would be in accord with the Civil Rights Commission's objectives, and which it thinks should prevail, regardless of provisions in the Constitution and regardless of contrary provisions in existing law.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I scanned the report of the Civil Rights Commission yesterday when it reached my office. The recommendation to which I shall refer appears, I believe, on page 125. I notice that the Commission has recommended the removal of all cases from any court to the Federal court under certain conditions. Is the Senator looking at that section of the report? I believe it appears at page 125.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I have not had an opportunity to refer to all its statements that depart from American procedure.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the view of the Senator from Florida that even a traffic case in the remotest village or community in America could be transferred, under that recommendation, to a Federal court through the whim of a bureaucrat?

Mr. HOLLAND. If Congress were foolish enough to enact such a law, that would be the result.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the Senator's view that a divorce originating in the State of Florida, and subject only to the laws of the State of Florida, could be removed to the Federal court under that recommendation?

Mr. HOLLAND. It certainly is. The recommendation is not limited at all as to what classes of cases are concerned. It simply states—and I shall quote the whole statement in the RECORD—

> Recommendation 4: That Congress amend section 1443 of Title 28 of the United States Code to permit removal by the defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a district court of the United States in cases where the defendant cannot, in the State court, secure his civil rights because of the written or decisional laws of the State or because of the acts of individuals administering or affecting its judicial process.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it the view of the Senator from Florida that under that recommendation a lawsuit affecting title to real estate, and which is bound by the laws of 50 different States, could be removed to and tried by the Federal court at the whim and caprice of some Federal bureaucrat?

Mr. HOLLAND. Replying to the question of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, it certainly would be possible to remove to the Federal court such a cause or any other cause, whether it arose solely under State laws or solely in the field of rights protected by State law, if the conditions recited existed.

Mr. TALMADGE. Under that recommendation, a case in the courts of Kansas involving speeding could be removed to the Federal court; could it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the defendant alleged that the judge was prejudiced against persons of his color or of his race, such removal would be possible.

Mr. TALMADGE. If someone was indicted for crap shooting in the State of Oregon, California, or New York, under that recommendation the case could be removed to the Federal court; could it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It could, if crap shooting were a crime in any of the good States mentioned by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is an outstanding lawyer. In all the years that he has been practicing law has the Senator ever seen a recommendation so extreme in its nature?

Mr. HOLLAND. I had not until I read the catalog of recommendations in yesterday's report. I have found several such recommendations, some of which I have cited, which I believe are as bad, indefensible, extreme and, I believe, as un-American.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would not the purport of that recommendation, if it were enacted into law by amending the Constitution, or whatever action might be required, have the effect at one fell swoop of abolishing the integrity of all courts in our land save the Federal courts, and including municipal courts, county courts, and State courts in the 50 States of our Union?

Mr. HOLLAND. It might well have exactly such a deleterious effect.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator. I agree with him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had not meant to take this long. I wanted the RECORD to show affirmatively some of the ridiculous things contained in the report made yesterday. In my judgment, the things included in this report of yesterday, if considered only by themselves, would suffice to support a unanimous finding by the Congress of the United States that the Civil Rights Commission, as now constituted, should not be extended but instead should be allowed to die and be forgotten.

I yield the floor.

CRISIS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, things are changing so rapidly in Latin America, particularly with reference to the Dominican crisis, that I break into the debate on the Civil Rights Commission for a few brief moments to read to the Senate a cablegram I received from Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico this morning. As the Senate knows, Muñoz-Marín is one of the great statesmen of the Western Hemisphere, a great leader of the Government of Puerto Rico. I am sure no one would challenge my observation that he is also one of the outstanding world statesmen. He is very much disturbed by the developments in the Dominican Republic.

As Senators listen to his cablegram they will become aware that he is also disturbed as to what the American position is to be.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] spoke on this subject yesterday afternoon in a brilliant address on which I commented yesterday, with which I agreed in part, taking exception only, as my speech of yesterday shows, to the procedure he would follow in seeking to restore a democratic regime in the Dominican Republic.

This morning I received the following cablegram from Muñoz-Marín, sent to me because of my position as the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which deals with Latin American Affairs:

> Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
> *U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> I have just sent the following cable to President Kennedy regarding Santo Domingo situation: The United States faces a problem, a challenge, and an opportunity. As a citizen and as a neighbor of the Dominican people I feel it my duty to make my views known to you.
>
> I unreservedly favor taking a hard line toward the usurping government of Santo Domingo. No recognition, no economic aid. A soft line would result as I see it in the following:
>
> (1) A further demonstration of the powerlessness of the United States to support the democratic governments in the hemisphere;
>
> (2) A chain reaction of military coups in Latin America (Honduras is now said to be on the verge);
>
> (3) A shot in the arm for communism as the Batista dictatorship in Cuba turned out to be;
>
> (4) Deprive Alliance for Progress of a number of democratic partners compelling United States to deal with the oligarchies that oppose the reforms that are the basis of the Alliance;
>
> (5) Depend on military usurpation to combat communism instead of depending on democracy;
>
> (6) Allowing to lapse the opportunity of using the Santo Domingo situation for a stronger policy orientation under very favorable psychological circumstances.
>
> A strong line would refuse to recognize the stability of infamy as "stable government" and demand thorough respect for the freedom of the Dominican people to have their own democratically chosen government. I believe that such steadfast position on the part of the United States would strengthen democracy in Latin America immeasurably and that the puppet government and its military masters would crumble and open the way to action both viable and honorable in Santo Domingo.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN.

Mr. President, I share every view expressed by this great Puerto Rican leader.

Tad Szulc, one of the most reliable and accurate journalists who writes on Latin

American affairs—a journalist for whom I have such high regard that I recommended to my subcommittee, and the recommendation was unanimously adopted last year, that Mr. Szulc be called before the subcommittee for an executive briefing of his views concerning Latin America—has written an article, published in this morning's New York Times, the headline of which is "United States Believes Army May Move To Take Over Regime in Honduras."

I am satisfied, on the basis of information within my possession, that Mr. Szulc is completely correct in respect to the danger in Honduras that he points out in the article. He says in part:

> U.S. officials and Latin American diplomats reported today that information from Honduras indicated that the army, led by Col. Elias Lopes, may be on the verge of revolt to prevent presidential elections October 13.
>
> Officials said that the chance of a Honduras coup had become "90 to 10" since Dominican military leaders overthrew the regime of President Juan D. Bosch in the Dominican Republic last week.

He goes on to discuss the serious situation in Honduras; and I ask unanimous consent that his entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as well as an article entitled "Junta Seeks World Ties," written by Henry Raymont and also published in the New York Times, October 1.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

U.S. ARMY MAY MOVE TO TAKE OVER REGIME IN HONDURAS

(By Tad Szulc)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. officials and Latin-American diplomats reported today that information from Honduras indicated that the army, led by Col. Elias Lopes, may be on the verge of a revolt to prevent presidential elections October 13.

Officials said that the chance of a Honduras coup had become 90 to 10 since Dominican military leaders overthrew the regime of President Juan D. Bosch in the Dominican Republic last week.

The Honduran military leaders, who until last week still seemed to be undecided, may have been inspired by the Dominican coup d'etat to depose the democratic regime of President Ramon Villeda Morales.

It was understood that the U.S. Ambassador to Honduras, Charles R. Burrows, was actively seeking to dissuade Colonel Lopes and his military and civilian associates from overthrowing the Government.

A coup in Honduras would bring to four the number of military takeovers in Latin America this year. It would represent another painful blow to the Alliance for Progress, the U.S. aid program. The program aims at bringing economic and social development to Latin America within a democratic framework.

The Alliance had been intended as a practical response to the Communist character of the Cuban revolution. The overthrow of the Bosch regime and the earlier army takeovers in Guatemala and Ecuador has weakened the political posture of the Alliance.

The Government in Honduras has been attempting to improve political, social, and economic climate of the country after a long period of stern dictatorship. President Villeda Morales has been serving for nearly 6 years.

As in the Dominican Republic, the military in Honduras contends that the Villeda Morales regime has been partial to communism. They insist that any elected successor would also favor communism.

In next month's elections, Modesto Rodas Alvarado, backed by Dr. Villeda Morales' Liberal Party, is expected to defeat Ramiro Ernesto Cruz of the Nationalist Party, a conservative group.

Despite military charges of the Government's alleged "softness" on communism in Honduras, the record appears to show that Dr. Villeda Morales' policies have, instead, led to a loss of Communist influence.

Communists were reported several months ago to have been ousted from the leadership of the Banana Workers' Union of the Standard Fruit Co., the country's second largest.

Latin American diplomats said that the military pressures were based in part, on the military's fears that the ruling Liberal Party might favor the civil guard, the national militia, over the army.

But, the diplomats said, the main inspiration in favor of a coup seems to stem from the conviction of extreme rightist groups that a change of regime is necessary for patriotic and political reasons.

In the Dominican situation, administration officials insisted again that the United States had no immediate plans to recognize the military-backed civilian junta there or to restore suspended economic aid.

They said there was no truth in published reports that there was a split over hard and soft positions toward the junta and that the administration remained highly disturbed over last week's events in Santa Domingo.

JUNTA SEEKS WORLD TIES

(By Henry Raymont)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC.—Confident that it has firm internal control of the country, the Dominican Republic's de facto regime concentrated today on obtaining international recognition.

In a series of communications with foreign diplomats here, the new civilian junta made every effort to stress that it will rule without military interference, respect civil liberties and follow a strongly pro-Western foreign policy.

The principal target of this effort is the United States, which has recalled its Ambassador, John Bartlow Martin, and expressed strong disapproval of the military coup that deposed President Juan D. Bosch last Wednesday.

Dr. Bosch, on whom Washington has put many of its hopes for the success of the Alliance for Progress, the Kennedy administration's Latin-aid program, as a countermeasure in the Caribbean to the violent revolution advocated by Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, was on a Dominican frigate today, en route to Guadeloupe. The deposed president was accompanied by his wife and a military escort.

Unofficial contacts between members of the new government and the U.S. Embassy here were reported to have taken place over the weekend.

Washington's recognition is regarded as essential for the ambitious economic and industrial program the new Government hopes to begin with continued U.S. aid.

Donald J. Reid Cabral, the new Foreign Minister, formally appointed this afternoon Jose Antonio Bonilla Atiles to become the new Dominican delegate to the Organization of American States. He will also be designated Ambassador to the United States once the two countries resume diplomatic relations, Mr. Reid said.

Dr. Bonilla Atiles was Dominican Foreign Minister under the Council of Government that ruled the country for 2 years between the deposition of the Trujillo dynasty and Dr. Bosch's inauguration last February 27.

The new Ambassador is scheduled to fly to Washington tomorrow to assume his new post at the Organization of American States and to explain to U.S. officials the political and economic goals of the junta.

The Dominican situation has confronted the Kennedy administration with one of the most difficult decisions of its policy on the Western Hemisphere. The military coup here was the third in Latin America in 6 months, and easy recognition by Washington is seen by many as tantamount to encouraging similar moves in countries such as Honduras, El Salvador and Venezuela, where right-wing military leaders are opposed to the democratic reforms of the constitutional governments.

The predicament for the United States may have been eased a little by a division that emerged today on the issue of recognition among the Latin-American missions here. While Venezuela, Mexico, and Bolivia called home their diplomatic representatives, the envoys of Brazil and Argentina urged their governments to give immediate recognition to the civilian junta.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say to the State Department that the situation is as serious in Honduras as it was known by the State Department to be serious in the Dominican Republic before the coup occurred, yet on the basis of such briefings as I have received to date from the State Department about all we did, when all is said and done, was merely to advise them not to conduct the coup.

We cannot stop coups that way.

Furthermore, there is much evidence being made available to us now, almost hour by hour, that the record of the United States in the Dominican Republic prior to the coup was a rather sorry one.

That is why this morning I asked to have the U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic called before our committee, and, in the absence of the Secretary of State, to have the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Martin, called before the committee. I have also asked for a thorough briefing of information which the CIA has available to it, and have suggested that it be made available to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The information we have been receiving—and we have received confidential information twice this morning—indicates that there are American business concerns in the Dominican Republic which helped finance the coup; including American business concerns that financed largely the campaign of the opponent of President Bosch. There are American business concerns which had been very close to Col. Wessin y Wessin, the Fascist-minded State-police-type of military leader who was the brains of the military coup in the Dominican Republic.

So long as I serve in my position I shall continue, no matter what embarrassment it may cause some, to insist that the American people be provided with the facts as to what happened in the Dominican Republic prior to this coup. I say most respectfully to the Secretary of State that it is his clear obligation to give orders that the facts be made available to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations without further delay.

I shall withhold from the public and from the Senate for the time being, until that briefing occurs, the information which has been given to me as to what American concerns were involved and what officials of those American concerns were involved. We cannot justify at any time any intermingling, intervention, muddling, or meddling on the part of American businessmen abroad with American foreign policy.

The State Department in its briefing the other day said that foreign aid had been cut off.

From the floor of the Senate I ask the Secretary of State, at this moment, "Have you brought back from the Dominican Republic the entire personnel of our AID group in the Dominican Republic? You ought to bring them back immediately." That is the test, in the eyes of Latin America, as to whether or not we are going to cut off aid. I want to say what my suspicion is, because I express my suspicion after receiving a briefing from the State Department. My suspicion is that we plan to follow the old pattern of a slap-on-the-wrist performance. We are protesting the overthrow of a democratic regime, and we will protest it, if we follow the pattern, for another 10 days or 2 weeks, and then the State Department will throw up its hands and say, "What other course have we? We have to have some dealings with the Government. After all, they say they are anti-Communist and pro-Western, and in another 2 years they will have elections and restore a democratic regime. Therefore we have decided to recognize them."

I do not "buy" that argument. Not only do I not "buy" it, but I say that it is gross hypocrisy. The sad thing about American foreign policy is that it is characterized by hypocrisy.

I commend Mr. Marin for the cablegram he sent to the President and for the position he has taken.

I am disturbed about another item in the New York Times this morning with regard to the Dominican situation. It is the old pattern all over again. This is what the New York Times said, speaking about the Dominican Republic situation:

> The predicament for the United States may have been eased a little by a division that emerged today on the issue of recognition among the Latin American missions here. While Venezuela, Mexico, and Bolivia called home their diplomatic representatives, the envoys of Brazil and Argentina urged their governments to give immediate recognition to the civilian junta.

Are we surprised at that from Brazil and the Argentine? Argentina has followed the same pattern. In the Argentine the military took over, and the United States shortly thereafter recognized that military junta.

We know that in Brazil there are Fascist forces at work seeking to destroy the image of democratic government in Brazil.

I am not surprised at the position taken by the Argentine and Brazil, but we are reaching one of the most serious crises in United States-Latin American relations in a quarter of a century, for the chips are down, as a result of what has occurred in the Dominican Republic. We are either going to support constitutional democratic government in Latin America when it is established, and refuse to give support to military juntas that overthrow it, or we are going to lose any following in Latin America we can hope to obtain by throwing billions of dollars into Latin America.

There is nothing more critical facing the administration; and I urge that the State Department and the CIA make available to the President of the United States and to the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses of Congress immediately all the facts, including the ugly facts, in respect to what transpired prior to the military takeover in the Dominican Republic. We need the information now as to what the plans of this administration are in regard to the handling of this military junta.

I close by making the point on the floor of the Senate that I made last night, but which needs to be made over and over again: Let the American people not be fooled by a three-man civilian commission or council in the Dominican Republic that the military leaders have purportedly set up to run governmental affairs. They are civilian stooges, and they have no freedom of movement except the freedom of movement that the military dictators grant them. It is another example of the type of hypocritical pattern that is established in Latin America. In the past the United States has given support to that kind of subterfuge.

The time has come to make clear to the Dominican Republic that we are suspending relations with them, stopping trade with them, stopping any Alliance for Progress support for them, until a democratic regime is first restored in the Dominican Republic and the people themselves get rid of their military dictatorship, which acts behind a facade of civilian stooges.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. First of all, I thank the Senator from Oregon for the kind and most generous words which he uttered on the floor yesterday about my remarks concerning the developments in the Dominican Republic. I find myself in agreement with the position he has taken today. I share his views about Governor Munoz-Marin, of Puerto Rico, who is one of the world's great statesmen not only in the field of Caribbean affairs, but throughout Latin America. It is in a sense regrettable that he is operating in so small an area as Puerto Rico, although his influence can be, is, and should be, felt throughout this hemisphere and beyond.

This problem we now face in the Dominican Republic is a difficult one because we are, unfortunately, facing an accomplished fact. We are considering locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. We are concerned about the lost liberties of the Dominican people after they have been taken away. I think our criticsm should be directed toward the reason why these things were not prevented before they happened and to see what we may do to prevent their happening elsewhere. It is easy to ask, "What should we do now?" and to find disagreement at the answers. The proposal I made yesterday on the Senate floor with which the distinguished Senator from Oregon, chairman of the Inter-American Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, disagreed, was made because we had not acted beforehand to prevent the disaster. Why could we not have prevented this situation? I find it difficult to understand why this great Nation, with all its wealth, power, influence, and prestige, could not prevail upon and prevent a handful of tin-horn gangsters not to overthrow a constitutional government established after a free election, which had been recreated under our sympathetic auspices and our approval, and the approval of the whole free world.

It seems to me that is the direction in which we should launch our investigation.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon proposes calling on the nations of the hemisphere to join us, in withholding recognition of the Dominican junta, but, as he himself has pointed out, the very fact that Argentina and Brazil would not join—and they will not be the only ones—demonstrates that a majority of the governments are sympathetic toward the same kind of junta military government which operates in those countries and now in Santo Domingo and which we regrettably have aided by recognizing them, and giving them all kinds of aid—financial, economic, military. That is true of Peru, Ecuador, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and others. Only a minority of free, democratically functioning nations in that area will join us. The United States will not get a majority of OAS members to join us in withholding recognition and imposing sanctions.

What then is the answer? We want to work jointly with the other nations of this hemisphere, but if only a minority are governed by free regimes, if a junta is either in charge or is preparing to take over in others, and will not join us, what is to be our course of action? The Senator from Oregon rejects the idea of unilateral action. I reject the idea of the kind of intervention the United States engaged in in the early days of this century, the so-called gunboat diplomacy, when we sent Armed Forces into Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Mexico, without the assent and against the opposition of those people. But that is not the type of intervention which I have proposed.

Instead we have in Santo Domingo the situation of a duly constituted freely elected democratic regime being overthrown, with arms which the United States furnished. The tanks and other equipment used in the military coup, and for these usurpers to retain control have come from the arsenal of the United States. They were supplied to the previous dictator, Trujillo under our military aid program. Let me say, parenthetically, that I, with a number of distinguished senatorial cosponsors, have proposed an amendment to the foreign aid bill to abolish all military aid to Latin American countries. As I pointed out in a previous speech, and as I shall point out again, this aid has not added and is not adding to the security of the Western Hemisphere or to the protection of the countries of Latin America from invasion or infiltration by communism, but is merely serving as an instrument for the overthrow of established democratic regimes by the military, as is the case in the Dominican Republic.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will also wish to see the aid to the new junta in Santo Domingo withheld permanently, and will not rely on its promises, because such promises will not be adhered to and are not pertinent in any event. If the administration follows the policy it has hitherto followed, as the Senator points out, within 2 or 3 weeks it will find a face-saving formula under which we shall be told that the beneficiaries have promised to do better; that they have promised to make reforms. We have found, by past and very recent experience, that such promises are utterly worthless and we have no excuse for not knowing it. We should say that there will be no recognition and no aid, not for 2 weeks or 3 weeks or 6 months, or any specified time, but until there is an entirely new deal, and a return to democratic practices. These gangsters do not have to comply, but they should not have our recognition or aid till they do.

How can a return to democratic practices be secured? That is difficult to achieve. How are the Dominican people going to revolt when a gang of sordid power-grabbing gangsters are in control of the tanks, planes, guns, and other military equipment that we have sent to those countries? That is a problem which I believe the United States ought to have the ingenuity and intelligence to solve. We have not yet solved it.

If we look at the situation in the Caribbean, we find that it is worse than it has been. We have lost Cuba to Castro and Khrushchev. We served notice on the dictator in Haiti, Dr. Duvalier, that we would not recognize the validity of his last election. We withdrew our economic aid from him. We did not withdraw our Ambassador. Duvalier kicked out our Ambassador and relations are severed. Yet this Haitian dictator appears to be more securely entrenched than ever before. I believe the same thing will happen in the Dominican Republic unless we show more foresight, imagination, guts, determination, and more action than we have hitherto.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the Senator's reading from the New York Times, there is brewing in Honduras a plot to overthrow the present government. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would the Senator proceed to prevent it from succeeding?

Mr. MORSE. I would make representations, through the American Ambassador down there, to the potential military junta in Honduras, that if they follow a coup course of action all connections between the U.S. Government and Honduras will be broken off.

Mr. ELLENDER. They should already know that.

Mr. MORSE. They do not know that. Quite to the contrary, they know that they can go ahead with their coup and that after a few days they will obtain recognition and probably will also get a response by way of a good many millions of dollars, so that they can stabilize their government as a result of the revolutionary coup. They know that they can blackmail the United States. They have blackmailed us in coup after coup, and the American taxpayers have been fleeced out of millions of dollars through this kind of shoddy performance.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will remember that we were at odds with respect to what was happening in the Dominican Republic prior to the Bosch regime. At the time of my visit in the Dominican Republic I said it was a mistake for us to do anything to throw Trujillo out. We did it. Today there is turmoil, and it can be expected to continue. That has been true since Trujillo's overthrow. Since the death of Trujillo we spent more than $65 million in economic aid alone, and that is only a beginning.

As I pointed out, there is no question that Trujillo was a dictator. There is no doubt that he might have had to kill a few persons to get where he was. He did it with force. However, that is the condition we find all through the South American countries.

If the distinguished Senator from Oregon or the distinguished Senator from Alaska believes that they can establish democracy, as we know it in this country, he is mistaken. It will require time to do so. If Trujillo had not been killed, I venture to say that much of the property that he owned would have been distributed among the people. He had started to do that. Unfortunately, he was shot before that operation could be carried out. After that happened, I predicted that there would be chaos in that country. It will take millions of dollars to restore order, and we may never be able to restore the prosperous economy that existed prior to the death of Trujillo.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana knows that he and I have for years been in complete disagreement with regard to our policy toward the Trujillo regime. In my judgment we should have stopped giving him any support a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. We gave him very little support.

Mr. MORSE. We gave him a good deal of support. We gave him a good deal of support in connection with the sugar monopoly. We gave him a great deal of support by way of aid and abetment constantly. We made a sorry, bloody job of it by our support of the tyrant Trujillo in the Dominican Republic. I was sorry to see him assassinated, as I am sorry to see any human life taken. However, having him removed from power in the Dominican Republic was one of the greatest things that could have happened in that country to the cause of freedom and human rights.

I have another great difference with my friend from Louisiana, and that is with regard to the potentiality of the establishment of democratic regimes in Latin America. They can be established if the U.S. Government follows its own democratic principles in handling all of its relationships with those countries. Our professings are usually quite different from our practices in Latin America.

Over the years we have continued to support the military leaders in Latin America. They have no friendship for democratic processes. The military aid support that we have given Latin American countries over the years is one reason why Latin America today is on the verge of communism. If we continue to follow our present course in Latin America, in my judgment we shall be chiefly responsible for driving one Latin American country after another into the arms of communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to take a moment to commend the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska, even though I must say that I disagreed with the suggested remedy offered yesterday by the Senator from Alaska. However, the purpose of his speech is one with which I am in full agreement. Later, after the vote on the extension of the Civil Rights Commission, it is my intention to address the Senate on the subject of our relationship with the Dominican Republic and the relationship with the military coups and juntas that plague this hemisphere.

The senior Senator from Oregon is correct. We should make it crystal clear that we will have "none of it," that we will not contribute a penny, that we will sever relations, and that we will do everything we can to bring these juntas to destruction.

It seems to me that the sooner we make that clear, the better will be the policy of the United States not only in this hemisphere, but throughout the world.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much for his comment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, join the Senator from Minnesota. We spoke on this subject yesterday. I hope that all Senators who feel that way will join in supporting the plea that the President should not, as was done in the case of Peru, jump into recognition of the military junta without calculating the overall cost to us in Latin America, especially in the Caribbean area.

I and others have advocated some form of Central American-Caribbean defense program, which would bring into closer alliance the nations that are particularly interested in those two areas, as contrasted with the OAS. The OAS, with all due respect to it, has proved to be leaden-footed in connection with this situation.

I hope that if the President does not jump into it—and he should not, and I thoroughly agree with my colleagues—perhaps through the method which we always used in this country, namely, by debate, we can find a better way than the one we have been pursuing, because the OAS does not seem to have the steam to start to deal with the problem, and therefore we must find another way, a way that does not make the mistake of jumping into recognition.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct. He has been in the forefront of the proposal for a hemispheric defense system. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], who has just left the Chamber, is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has been one of the leaders in the committee of that concept. I have always supported it. I think we must try to come to it, for I believe it will bring about much greater stability in the Western Hemisphere, so far as hemispheric defense is concerned, than any proposal that has been made to date.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to place this problem in proper perspective. As I recall, the Senator from Oregon was present when testimony was given that four situations contributed heavily to what happened:

First, the readmission of the exiled Communists was tolerated by Bosch. The Communists who had been driven out of the Dominican Republic came back.

Second, the Government rented a school to a Communist group for the teaching of Communist doctrine. Protests about that act were made to Bosch. They remained pending for months, but he did nothing about them.

Third, the government-operated radio was used by Communists to spread Communist doctrine.

Fourth, a Cuban base was used without challenge. Dominicans went to Cuba, and Cubans came into the Dominican Republic, spreading communism.

Those four facts were clearly established by the testimony of State Department representatives.

In addition, there was a mass closing of business, about which not only businessmen, but also working people, complained. There was a complete strike of the economy, mainly protesting the soft hands that were applied to the Communists.

Those statements of fact cannot be challenged. I respectfully say that this is not a one-sided question.

Are we to give aid to operate a country that lets its schools teach Communist doctrine; that allows its radios to be used to spread Communist doctrine; that allows a Cuban base, which teaches communism, to be used unchallenged; that invites exiled Communists to return from everywhere?

This issue is not so clear and simple as has been suggested. It has been said that that government should have remained in office. The people of the Dominican Republic have some judgment.

We were quick to recognize Castro; and all the proof was that Castro was a Communist. No one complained about that.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Ohio is quite mistaken.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There was very little complaint about Castro.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is mistaken about that. Let him read the Record. The Senator from Ohio does not know what he is talking about when he makes that statement, because apparently he has never read the Record, so how would he know?

The senior Senator from Oregon spoke day after day against the Castro regime. Yet the Senator from Ohio seeks to leave in the Record the impression that no one objected to the Castro regime. I do not intend to let the Senator from Ohio get by with that statement. I do not intend to let him get by with the red herring he has just drawn across the floor of the Senate.

I do not yield to the Senator from Ohio to draw a red herring across the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not a red herring.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call the Senator from Ohio to order. I do not yield further to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield further.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the four points made by the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio has said that the Bosch regime agreed to the admission of Communists to the Dominican Republic. He did because that is their national policy. I stand before the Senate today, with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] sitting next to me, as one of the three authors who added to the Smith anti-Communist bill authored by the Senator from Maine the amendment that outlawed the Communist Party in the United States. The third author was the then Senator from Massachusetts, John Kennedy. It was a mistake for the Dominican Republic not to outlaw the Communist Party; but that was its sovereign right.

In the campaign that resulted in the election of Mr. Bosch as President of the Dominican Republic, every candidate favored the readmission of the Communists and other exiles to the Dominican Republic. That is the record. Bosch's opponent took the same position. It was represented to us by the State Department, in the briefing to which the Senator from Ohio referred, that apparently the reason was that they had suffered so long under the dictatorship of Trujillo, and so many people had had to flee the Dominican Republic, that it was thought, as a matter of national policy, that all exiles should be readmitted.

I think the Dominican Government made the same mistake on this matter that Betancourt made in Venezuela. The Government of the Dominican Republic ought to have profited by the mistake made by Betancourt; although I suppose it is rather difficult for those of us who have not been exiles, who have not suffered all the cruelty that goes along with an exile policy, to appreciate fully the desire of the candidates of the Dominican Republic, as it was also the desire of Betancourt in Venezuela, to say, "It is better to let them in and watch them than it is to keep them out or to drive them into the underground." I do not share that point of view; but that was the policy that was followed. Therefore, I do not think it is proper or fair to give the impression that Bosch favored letting the Communists come back to the Dominican Republic, without pointing out at the same time that that was the position of all the candidates in the campaign.

Now we come to the school incident. The briefing by the State Department representatives was that an old school building in the Dominican Republic had been taken over by a Communist group. Here, again, the sad fact is that the Communist Party of the Dominican Republic has never been outlawed. That was a great mistake. I hold no briefs for the mistakes of Bosch or the mistakes of any other President in any other Latin American country. But those mistakes have nothing to do with the underlying principle of whether the United States should support military juntas that overthrow constitutional governments. It is true that the old school building has been used by some Communist group which has held meetings in it. Apparently, as was said by a representative of the State Department, Communist doctrine was taught. The American Embassy had taken it up with President Bosch. He kept promising that he would do something about it. Apparently some steps were underway to do something about it when the coup occurred. But is the school incident an argument that justifies our supporting a military junta that destroyed a constitutional government which was elected by the then free people of the Dominican Republic?

It was pointed out also by the State Department that there was a general strike by businessmen in the Dominican Republic, although actually it reached effective proportions only in the capital city. There was little effect in other parts of the country. There were a good many reasons for that strike. Bosch had sought to put into effect a rather stringent taxing program. A considerable amount of restriction and limitation had been placed upon the economy of the Dominican Republic in an attempt to benefit all the people. It was that program that resulted in the demonstration by businessmen but it was a strike that lasted, relatively, for a few hours. It ran its course in 1 day, and the following day the stores were open again so we were told by the State Department. It was a demonstration. Is that justification to support a military junta that throws out a constitutionally elected regime because some business interests in the country have demonstrated against it? What nonsense is that?

Some of the details of the coup and the events which led up to it are described by Prof. Ronald Hilton of Stanford University in today's New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent to have this account printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

REPORT ON SANTO DOMINGO—LATIN AMERICAN SPECIALIST OUTLINES EVENTS LEADING TO COUP

(The writer of the following is editor of the Hispanic-American Report, Stanford University.)

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

With what may be an all-too-common lack of prescience, the American press did not have a single representative in Santo Domingo at the time of the coup which overthrew President Juan Bosch.

There were well-founded rumors that a coup was being prepared to defend the old order, the pretext being an alleged Communist threat; the only doubt was when the coup would be launched and whether the President would be able to devise some means of meeting brute military force. The observations of one who witnessed the coup may be of some interest.

The visitor to the Dominican Republic was immediately struck by the fact that the military-cum-police was still intact, and virtually unchanged. It should be remembered that the military who assassinated Trujillo did so not out of love of freedom and democracy but because the tyrant had become an embarrassment and threatened the privileged position the military had built up. Under the Bosch regime, the military police state continued to live side by side with the relatively powerless civilian regime. The cat was simply waiting to pounce on the spirited mouse.

SHAMELESS CONTRIVANCE

The coup was contrived with a shamelessness which was scarcely credible. The merchants' association called a strike, which was a miserable failure even though the small shopkeepers were bribed to participate. Three radio stations and one TV station incited the people to revolt in a clearly subversive fashion.

President Bosch used his constitutional powers to close them down; the anti-Bosch elements who were inciting the crowd to overthrow the Government denounced this as an infringement on popular rights. The army staged a coup and immediately forced all the radio stations in the republic simply to rebroadcast all day long the junta propaganda. It would be hard to conceive of a grosser non sequitur.

The merchant's strike was sparked largely by local Spanish interests. Conversations with business leaders, both Dominican and foreign (including German), revealed that by and large they were delighted with the coup. It was assumed that the new military regime (with civilians as a figleaf) should make life easier for business.

They denounced Bosch as a "Communist," and when asked for details provided "facts" which were carefully checked with well-informed diplomatic observers. Almost without exception, the "facts" were clearly unfounded; sometimes the charges were clearly inspired by resentment that the Government had refused to give the company a contract or had awarded it to a competitor.

The elections which brought Bosch to power were witnessed by Organization of American States observers, and Bosch's enemies were therefore unable to claim they had been fraudulent. The rightist minority revealed that inability, all too frequent in Latin America, to understand the nature of democratic elections. If you can't win in the elections, some other way must be sought to grab power. The successful candidate must be denounced as personally incompetent or corrupt.

ACCUSED OF CORRUPTION

Bosch was described as both. It was strange to hear Bosch, who dismissed the one adviser suspected of corruption, being accused of corruption by people who clearly have no general objection to it. It may well be that Bosch, an author who had for years lived outside of the Dominican Republic, lacked both the technical skills and the personal knowledge of present-day Dominican affairs to be an ideal President, but his opponents are in general scarcely more attractive.

Bosch was regarded by sober American observers as sufficiently attractive to be worth widespread support. The United States and the Alliance for Progress had a much wider commitment to support the Bosch regime than is generally realized. The planning of the country was largely in the hands of CIDES (Centro de Investigaciones de Desarrollo Economico y Social), supported by the Ford and Parvin foundations and by the Agency for International Development; its director, Sacha Volman, a U.S. citizen, is one of the bêtes noires of the new regime. He took refuge in the U.S. Embassy while the army searched his home.

Former Vice President Wallace was in the Dominican Republic at the time of the coup; he had a project to develop appropriate strains of hybrid maize to increase the corn production. This is just one of many projects with which the United States was attempting to get the economy off the ground. Incidentally, Ambassador Martin and his staff deserve high commendation.

It may be that no regime can save the Dominican Republic. A ride across the country bears graphic evidence of what we know from vital statistics. There may be no country in the world where one sees such a high proportion of children, most illegitimate, for whom there is no prospect of education, training, and jobs. Perhaps the example of Puerto Rico offers some hope. Otherwise within 50 years the Dominican Republic will be another Haiti.

RONALD HILTON.

Mr. MORSE. As to the use of the radio by the Communists the fact is that the Communist Party was not outlawed in the Dominican Republic. However, the broadcasts were not extensive although I think they should have been outlawed. We were told by the State Department that President Bosch was about to submit this and other Communist control problems to the Congress but was prevented from doing so by the coup.

Mr. President, the alleged mistakes and weaknesses of the Bosch regime do not justify U.S. support of a military junta overthrowing the Bosch regime. However, the Senator from Ohio forgot to point out what the State Department briefed us on, in regard to the governmental objectives of the Bosch regime and the good things he has sought to inaugurate for the peoples of the Dominican Republic. He was in the process of carrying out his campaign pledges including the land reform program, tax program, employment program, strict economy by eliminating waste and graft. His insistence on trying to help with the employment problem and his attempt to bring about the necessary reforms in the sugar industry and the rest of industry of the Dominican Republic won for him the enmity of the military leaders and their business allies.

Let us face it. President Bosch followed what is generally recognized to be a liberal program in the Dominican Republic, based upon the good old American concept that the government has a responsibility to come to the assistance of its people when the people cannot assist themselves, and when something needs to be done for the common good and for the general welfare, and it is not being done by the private segment or sector of the economy. Democratic government owes a responsibility to protect the general welfare of all the people. This is a pretty good American democratic doctrine.

All the red herrings, all the non sequiturs, all the side issues raised by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] do not change the controlling fact, that a constitutional, democratic form of government was overthrown in the Dominican Republic by a military junta. It raises a major foreign policy question for the United States: Are we going to recognize it? Are we going to aid it? Are we going to follow the past practice, after a few days, of coming in and maintaining the military junta in power?

In my judgment, if we do it, the predictions of Muñoz Marín will come true, and the predictions of other authorities on Latin America as to what will happen to American prestige in Latin America will come true.

We will lose Latin America because democratic forces in Latin America will have a clear demonstration that they cannot trust the United States.

Bosch took the position that his administration had to get the Dominican Republic on the move. He was attempting to come to the economic assistance of the general mass of the people; and, of course, that was bound to bring him into conflict with the vested interests, including, I am afraid, some foreign business interests. His progressive program was bound to raise objections from the oligarchy. It was bound to raise objections from the remnants of the old Trujillo regime. But it does not make a case for the United States aiding and abetting or now giving support to a military junta that has overthrown a constitutional government. The fact remains that the people of the Dominican Republic did not remove Bosch. He was removed by a military clique, and they in effect destroyed the constitution. They in effect removed the civilian commander in chief of the army. As I said yesterday—and this was brought out also in the briefing by the State Department, about which the Senator from Ohio forgot to tell us—Bosch was seeking to remove Col. Wessin y Wessin who, after all, was seeking to usurp civilian power. Bosch saw it coming. He was about to call a session of the legislature under the constitution to lay his case before the Congress, and the military did not want to face any public disclosure of its traitorous intrigue, so they overthrew him.

The last time the plain people of the Dominican Republic were given a voice in their government, they chose Mr.

Bosch to be their president. The question remains—is the Government of the United States going to support a military overthrow of the constitutional Government of the Dominican Republic elected by the people of the country? If we do we belie all our professings about supporting freedom and democratic government in Latin America.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for just one moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield, provided that in doing so I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oregon is correct in his statement with a few of the other matters that he mentioned, but I want it observed that there has been no denial of the statement made by me that there were four factors dealing with intensive Communist activities that caused general dissatisfaction. Those four factors were, as I have enumerated them: The return of the exiled Communists; the actual conduct of a school teaching communism in a government building; the use of the government radio in spreading the Communist doctrine; and the use of a Cuban base for the exchange of Communist technique and philosophy.

Now there are two sides to every coin. The only point I wish to make is that this is not a one-sided argument.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, judging from the colloquy between my friends the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], it would seem that in the regime established by us, the "Commies," who were thrown out by Trujillo before his death, were permitted to come back. That seems to be the great difficulty that caused this overthrow.

In regard to the statement made by my good friend the Senator from Ohio, that nobody objected to the recognition of Castro, I wish he would read my report—I still have a few copies.

In 1958, when I came back from South and Central America, I prescribed a course of action that we should follow toward Cuba. But my advice, and that of the Ambassadors who were there—Smith, and others—was not followed by the State Department. I begged Mr. Rubottom, who was the head of the Latin American desk at that time, that we should under no circumstances recognize Castro.

But we did. In less than 6 months we regretted it, and we withdrew our Ambassador.

Mr. President, I do not wish to go into details on what has happened in the Dominican Republic. But as I stated several years ago, at that time I knew of no government in South or Central America that was not dependent for its existence on an army, on force. I believe the only one I mentioned that was not in such a position was Uruguay.

Mr. President, it will take time, and much effort, in order to teach the people south of us about democracy as we know it. I am very hopeful, and I agree with my good friend the Senator from Oregon, that we should under no circumstances assist these juntas by giving them aid of any kind. I know what the pattern has been, and it was no surprise to me to see it fall.

I again state that I regret that Trujillo was assassinated. As I said in my report, I was in South and Central America in 1952 and in 1958. I said in 1958 that there was no country in South or Central America that made greater progress during that period of time, in all of South and Central America, than the Dominican Republic. I was challenged when I made that statement, but I am glad to say that every American who visited there after my visit stated they found conditions as I described them. The island had made great progress; the people had a much better way of life than they had ever enjoyed before.

All of that came about through what I would term a benevolent dictatorship. It is a sad thing that at the time Trujillo was in the process of dividing up much of the land that he owned and was attempting to distribute it among the people, he was assassinated.

We now find ourselves in a position in which we must now spend millions of dollars in order to maintain the status quo. When Trujillo was in power, we contributed only $2.9 million in economic aid to the Dominican Republic. He was a good administrator, and the economy of his nation flourished. Since his death, we have given the Republic, to date, $65.5 million in economic aid alone.

It is true that we gave Trujillo the same advantage that we gave to Cuba and to many other countries in which sugar is produced. But all in all, a grave mistake was made when we encouraged, not the assassination, but the change of government in the Dominican Republic.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON—EXTENSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, at a time when we are faced with deficit budgets and the possibility of a tax cut that will further deepen the deficit, and at a time when we are hearing promises galore that Federal expenditures will be maintained at the current levels or even reduced in areas where reduction will not harm the national security, I once again rise to oppose extension of the Commission on Civil Rights. I am certain of two things: First, that allowing this ill-conceived and malformed child of the executive branch to die a natural death will in no way affect our national security. Second, that its demise will end a useless, multimillion-dollar drain on the National Treasury.

Since 1957, the Commission has expended $4,483,000 of the taxpayers' money. It has grown from a budget of $200,000 in 1958, to an estimated budget of $985,000 in 1964. The number of its personnel has grown from 16 to 76, if I recall the figures. When the 1964 estimate is added to the previous expenditures, the total is $5,468,000. And this money has gone to support a group that advocates that all Federal money should be withdrawn from the Southern States unless integration is made the order of the day.

Personally, I would like to find some way to insure that the taxpayers of the South could withhold their funds from the support of the Commission. Indeed, there is no reason to say the South alone, for I am confident that the actions and policies of the Commission are an affront to the vast majority of American taxpayers all over this Nation. On this account alone, the Commission should be allowed to die.

And what has been gained by the expenditure of this $4½ million, aside from providing a high and supposedly influential haven for some members of the Howard University Law School? Let us look at the record and note just what that expenditure has accomplished.

That record is composed of a series of reports, recommendations, and hearings with which the Commission has seen fit to busy itself over the last 6 years. These reports are generally notable for their bias, and the essence of their bigotry is perhaps best summed up in its recent interim report to the President concerning Mississippi. That interim report recommended that the President and Congress explore the possibility of cutting off all Federal expenditures being made to the State of Mississippi. Reading it over, I felt as if the Constitution did not exist, and that the dangers of concentrated power which our forefathers so rightly and correctly feared had already progressed past the point of no return.

Indeed, if there is an underlying theme of all the reports and activities of the Commission, it is that no good whatsoever can flow from local government and the powers of the individual States.

Their efforts are aimed at breaking down that power, and trampling over the rights of the local people to deal with local problems. This is true in their reports on the schools, on the voting processes, and spills into such areas as our housing problems. As such, the Commission undermines our American way of life.

Mr. President, I have taken the position that the activities of this Commission, as indicated by the recommendations made in its various reports, will cause far more harm than good to the very individuals it is supposedly trying to help. The American people will not stand still for the implementation of these proposals, and alienation and ill-feeling toward the Negro will undoubtedly grow more and more pronounced. We have seen indications of this already, in all parts of the country.

To outline the type of total integration the Commission has in mind, I would like to quote a few short excerpts dealing with its many recommendations as contained in its reports.

First, from its interim report of this year, dealing with Mississippi:

> The people of Mississippi and of the other States should know that according to information available to the Commission in fiscal year 1962, the Federal Government received from all sources in Mississippi $270 million. During the same period, payments from the Federal Government to the State, counties, municipalities, and individuals exceeded $650 million for grant-in-aid programs, U.S. Corps of Engineers construction contracts, military prime contracts, and direct civilian and military payrolls. Examples of additional Federal programs benefiting Mississippi include area redevelopment loans and grants, small business loans, accelerated public works projects, and Federal Aviation Agency grants.

I might add here that apparently the Commission was unaware of the amounts of the Federal welfare payments that go to benefit a great number of Mississippi Negroes. Here is a prime example of the harm that would accrue in the name of doing "good."

The same principle is evident in its publication "With Liberty and Justice for All," of 1959, where we find this recommendation:

> We recommend that Federal agencies act in accordance with the fundamental constitutional principle of equal protection and equal treatment, and that these agencies be authorized and directed to withhold funds in any form to institutions of higher learning, both publicly supported and privately supported, which refuse, on racial grounds to admit students otherwise qualified for admission.

In "Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education, 1960," we find that the Commission suggests that the Federal Government take such measures as may be necessary to assure that funds under the various programs of Federal assistance to higher education are disbursed only to those public institutions of higher education that do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. Such measures should stipulate that no Federal agency or official shall be given the power to direct, supervise, or control the administration, curriculums or personnel of an institution operated and maintained by the State or a political subdivision thereof.

Turning to the field of employment, we find that the Commission recommended that Federal statutory authority be granted to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity or that an entirely new agency with such authority be established empowering it to first, encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in all Federal and federally supported employment; second, promote and enforce a policy of equality of opportunity in the availability and administration of all federally assisted training programs and recruiting services; and third, encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity applying to labor unions which operate directly or indirectly under the Federal funds, contracts, or grants-in-aid.

Nothing will do more to alienate our white citizens than the above recommendations, should efforts be made to enforce them overnight.

In the volatile field of housing, we find the Commission believes as follows:

> Recommendation 2(c): Direct FHA and VA, in selling or leasing reacquired housing, to take appropriate steps to assure that such Government-owned housing will be available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

And in the same publication:

> Recommendation 5: That the President direct the Urban Renewal Administration to require that each contract entered into between local public authorities and redevelopers contain a provision assuring access to reuse housing to all applicants regardless of race, creed, or color.

If these recommendations are ever implemented by the strong hand of the Federal Government, we will enter into an era of domestic strife that we have not seen since Reconstruction. The Senate may take my word for it.

My opposition to the Commission is doubtless well known. As a final word, let me point out once again that shortly after the Commission was given life, a Civil Rights Division was established in the Department of Justice. Although the budget of this Division is roughly comparable to that of the Civil Rights Commission, its activities and responsibilities are almost entirely overlapping. Nothing of benefit has yet come from this double expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar and, in my opinion, nothing ever will.

Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study carefully the report published yesterday by the Civil Rights Commission. I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a few excerpts, with comments, from this most recent civil rights report.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, 1963

Recommendation 1: That Congress, acting under section 2 of the 15th amendment and sections 2 and 5 of the 14th amendment (a) declare that voter qualifications other than age, residence, confinement, and conviction of a crime are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny the right to vote on grounds of race and color; and (b) enact legislation providing that all citizens of the United States shall have a right to vote in Federal or State elections which shall not be denied or in any way abridged or interfered with by the United States or by any State for any cause except for inability to meet reasonable age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied to all persons within a State, failure to cmplete six grades of formal education or its equivalent, legal confinement at the time of registration or election, judicially determined mental disability, or conviction of a felony; such right to vote to include the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have one's vote counted.

Comment: This recommendation completely disregards sections of our Constitution which give the States the absolute right to prescribe the conditions which must be met by their electors.

Recommendation 3: That, if the steps previously recommended prove ineffective, Congress further act to assure the attainment of uniform suffrage qualifications as contemplated by section 2 of the 14th amendment, through enactment of legislation proportionately reducing the representation in the House of Representatives in those cases in which voter qualifications continue to be used as a device for denying the franchise to citizens on the grounds of race, color, or national origin.

Comment: Concerning this so-called recommendation, it is sufficient to say that it would carry us back to the Reconstruction era for which the Civil Rights Commission apparently has so high a regard. We of the South had quite a little experience with the era of Reconstruction, and its unhappy lessons provide ample reason for us to oppose the President's civil rights proposals.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Recommendation 1: That the Congress enact legislation requiring every local school board which maintains any public school to which pupils are assigned, reassigned, or transferred on the basis of race, to adopt and publish within 90 days after the enactment of such legislation a plan for prompt compliance with the constitutional duty to provide nonsegregated public education for all school-age children within its jurisdiction. The Congress should authorize the Attorney General, in the event the board fails to adopt or to implement a plan, to institute legal action to require the adoption or implementation of such a plan or any other plan the court finds more appropriate and consistent with the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

Comment: It is easy to see what is sought after here. This recommendation, if given substance by legislation, would entirely preempt and eliminate the power and control of the local school boards. Can anyone imagine one of the small, rural school districts of Louisiana being controlled and regulated by the Attorney General from here in Washington? I cannot, but apparently the Civil Rights Commission can.

EMPLOYMENT

Recommendation 1: That Congress enact legislation establishing a right to equal opportunity in employment when that employment is assisted by the Federal Government or affects interstate commerce, with authority to institute action and to issue appropriate orders vested in a single administrator located in the Department of Labor, and provision for appeal to an independent authority.

Comment: Here again we see the Commission turning to Washington for the solution to every problem. Here again we see them calling for the ever-increasing concentration of power in the hands of the Federal Government. And here again we see them calling for those hands to be extended into the affairs of virtually every business in America, forcing employers to hire persons they do not wish to employ, and to displace persons who may be doing a good job but whose face is the wrong color.

JUSTICE

Recommendation 1: That Congress empower the Attorney General to intervene in or to initiate civil proceedings to prevent denials to persons of any rights, privileges or immunities secured to them by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

* * * * *

Recommendation 3: That Congress amend section 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code to make any county government, city government, or other local governmental entity that employs officers who deprive persons of rights protected by that section, jointly liable with the officers to victims of such officers' misconduct.

Recommendation 4: That Congress amend section 1443 of title 28 of the United States Code to permit removal by the defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a district court of the United States in cases where the defendant cannot, in the State court, secure his civil rights because of the written or decisional laws of the State or because of the acts of individuals administering or affecting its judicial process.

Comment: The first of these recommendations would give more power to the Attorney General than has ever been visited upon any man charged with the administration of justice in the history of our Nation. As such, it would pave the way for a despot, for power can be used for both good ends and bad. No matter what we may think of the actions of the present Attorney General, there is no way to ascertain who will follow him. Given the power envisioned in recommendation 1, the actions of the next Attorney General may make the actions of Mr. Robert Kennedy pale into insignificance.

Recommendation 3 is unjust on its face, while No. 4 would do away with and usurp the power of our State courts which form the cornerstone of American jurisprudence.

MILITARY

Recommendation 2: That the President request the Secretary of Defense to reappraise testing procedures currently used by all services in the procurement of enlisted and officer personnel so that they will be validated for performance both in general and for persons differing in educational, economic, regional, and other background factors.

Comment: When this recommendation is translated into plain English it clearly means that Negroes should be given preferential treatment in the testing procedure now in effect in all of the military services. On the basis of tests given him when a man enters military service, he is assigned a training school in one of the needed specialties, such as electronics, mechanics, or metalworking. Our military preparedness and effectiveness is directly dependent on the enlisted man's performance of his duty upon completion of his training. When allowances are made for "persons differing in educational, economic, regional, and other background factors"—in other words when some men receive preferential treatment over others who may be better able to do the job, our total preparedness is bound to suffer. Also antagonisms among the men cannot help being created.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I agree with my senior colleague from Louisiana, and with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], who discussed the Civil Rights Commission problem. I shall vote with them in this matter. If I were convinced that I could persuade Senators to vote in the same manner, I would speak for whatever length I thought might be effective in aiding the cause. However, I believe my colleagues who have spoken before me have made the case very well.

HEARINGS BEFORE FINANCE COMMITTEE ON TAX REDUCTION BILL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this morning the Senate Committee on Finance voted on a motion to close hearings on the tax reduction bill recommended by the President, on November 1.

As one who voted against the motion, I would like to make clear for the record my reasons for voting against this proposal. It is my feeling that the proposal had merit and that the committee could well schedule its hearings to conclude the testimony of administration witnesses, as well as public witnesses, by the first of next month. On the other hand, the committee did not have before it a proposed schedule of the date on which hearings would commence, the list of witnesses to be heard, or the date on which the chairman would propose that the hearings should be concluded.

It was my feeling that the chairman of this committee, as well as the chairman of any other legislative committee, should propose a schedule for the dates on which witnesses would be heard on important measures of this sort. Until the proposed schedule of witnesses is before the committee, members have no basis upon which to decide whether the procedure suggested by the chairman is appropriate.

As one member of the committee, I would not wish to dispute the procedure recommended by the chairman over the difference of a matter of several days.

It is also my feeling that the committee should seek to proceed expeditiously with the tax bill and offer the Senate the opportunity to vote on this measure before it adjourns for this session. In that respect, my views are parallel to the views of the President.

After all, each year the Appropriations Committee of the Senate acts upon a number of important measures which by custom, if not by constitutional requirement, are required to originate in the House. It is agreed procedure that these bills must be enacted before the Congress adjourns for the session. I would hope that the Senate Committee on Finance would take the same attitude with regard to the tax cut proposal, although I fully recognize that neither I nor anyone else has the power to require this.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on the subject of the meeting of the Finance Committee this morning, but since the Senator from Louisiana has made his statement I believe perhaps it should be supplemented.

It so happens that I was the Senator who made the motion—first, that the committee hear the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation for the remainder of this week; that we ask the Secretary of the Treasury to testify next Monday, October 7; that we should complete the public hearings on or before November 1; and that statements could be filed in certain cases in lieu of open testimony. I regret that the motion received only 4 votes and was defeated with either 11 or 12 negative votes.

I appreciate the conciliatory statement made by the Senator from Louisiana, which is characteristic of him, but in my judgment the action of the Committee will mean the death of the President's tax program.

This is a crushing defeat for the administration, and it is disheartening to those of us who have tried to get the case of the administration before the American people. I have a deep feeling of disappointment within my breast, but I believe perhaps it would be better if I did not express it or go into it in too great detail.

The trouble started last January when the Democratic caucus refused to enlarge the membership of the Finance Committee. Had it been so enlarged, some of the "faint hearted" might have had courage to go ahead. But that was not done.

Measures can be killed not merely by open opposition but also by delay.

The Times Dispatch of Richmond as of last Thursday quoted the chairman of the committee as saying that he planned to have the staff brief the committee for a week or more and that public hearings would not begin until the week of the 14th of October and that the public hearings might run for approximately 6 weeks, which would cause the public hearings to be concluded approximately the 1st of December. If this schedule is followed, of course it will mean that there will be no tax bill this session, and a vital part of the administration's program will go down the drain. For after the hearings are concluded there will have to be a further period of making policy decisions in committee and also drafting changes. Then the bill will have to go to the floor of the Senate and to conference.

I think we may as well recognize what has happened. I regard it as a calamity of the first order—not that I regard the tax bill as perfect. It is in fact a very imperfect bill. I would strive to improve it, to give a larger share of the benefits to those with incomes of under $10,000 a year, and to reduce the benefits to those with incomes of over $50,000 a year. Nevertheless, on balance, as of the present moment, I regard the bill as having more good in it than bad.

It is always somewhat ungracious to fight these committee battles out on the floor of the Senate, and I had not intended to speak until my good friend from Louisiana—and I assure him he is my good friend—raised the issue; but I do not think we can purposely gloss it over and say we will have another chance. I know there is an old saying that "He who fights and runs away lives to fight another day," but if we continue to yield time after time, the effectiveness of resistance continually diminishes. I think this should be recognized, very frankly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission. It that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota wish to take me off my feet?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. I apologize. I thought the Senator from Illinois had concluded his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall complete it very shortly.

We may as well recognize the fact that what happened this morning was a defeat for the Kennedy administration—a defeat administered by both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I say, in response to the Senator from Illinois, that I am not at all prepared to concede that the vote this morning meant the tax bill would not be voted on this year. Had I felt that was the effect of the vote, I believe I would have voted the other way. I do believe, however, as I said in my statement, it would be best to proceed and see how the chairman of the committee proposes to handle the bill. The Senator from Illinois knows, as I do, that the chairman of the committee would probably vote against the bill. I think, as a matter of fairness, he would proceed on the basis that would offer us an opportunity to hear the administration witnesses and the public witnesses, and I hope we would have an opportunity to vote on the bill prior to the time Congress adjourns this session.

If that does not happen, the Senator has the same recourse every other Member of the Senate has, to offer all phases or portions of the tax bill as amendments to other bills that are on the calendar. Of course, the Senator is familiar with that fact.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON—EXTENSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] for himself and other Senators.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. Aiken and Mr. Prouty], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senators from Vermont [Mr. Aiken and Mr. Prouty], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] would each vote "yea."

The pair of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—15

Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La
McClellan
Robertson
Russell
Sparkman
Talmadge
Thurmond

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken
Allott
Case
Dominick
Engle
Fong
Hayden
Johnston
Mansfield
Metcalf
Prouty
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Young, N. Dak.

So the amendment offered by Mr. Humphrey, on behalf of himself, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Dirksen, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy that Senators have an opportunity today to save the Civil Rights Commission from dying of neglect. The work of the Commission is too important to let it fade out of existence. The 1-year extension proposed by this amendment will prevent the Commission shutting up shop before the Senate has a chance to consider and debate the 4-year extension with expanded functions proposed for it in the administration's civil rights bill.

Already the uncertainty regarding the extension of the Commission's life may have done serious damage to its effectiveness. According to press reports, Berl I. Bernhard, the very competent staff director, and other top administrators have submitted their resignations. It would be most unfortunate if the Commission were to lose its trained staff at a time when their knowledge and experience have an important role to play in the fight for justice and equal rights for all.

I hope that in view of today's action, these men will reconsider their resignations. But it is obvious that piecemeal extension of the Civil Rights Commission will make it very difficult to hire and retain competent personnel. A 4-year extension would enable the Commission to work effectively without the constant threat of dissolution affecting the morale of its staff. This amendment is a stopgap measure, but I know that we will be able later in the year to give the Commission the 4-year duration which the administration has recommended.

The Civil Rights Commission has long since proved its worth. Its careful investigations have produced a series of valuable reports on the brutal effect discrimination has had on the lives of our Negro citizens. The spotlight the Commission has thrown on the evil practices of bigotry have made us all aware that this is not a sectional problem but one which must be squarely faced by all Americans. The work of the Commission has provided a solid base of evidence for the administration's civil rights bill, which incorporates many of the suggestions of the Commission. As legislators and as citizens, we cannot act wisely and effectively to end the evils of discrimination without accurate and impartial evidence. As a factfinding body the Commission has splendidly performed the task assigned to it by the Congress.

It is a good omen that this proposal for the extension of the Civil Rights Commission has been introduced by the leadership of both parties. This bipartisan approach is not only a tribute to the fine work which has been done by the Commission, but a sign that the Negro's struggle for equality goes beyond partisan questions and touches our conscience as men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not hear the Chair state the question which is now before this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill H.R. 3369. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 15, as follows:

[No. 180 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Symington
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—15

Byrd, Va.
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Hill
Holland
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
McClellan
Robertson
Russell
Sparkman
Talmadge
Thurmond

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken
Allott
Case
Dominick
Engle
Fong
Hayden
Johnston
Mansfield
Metcalf
Prouty
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis

So the bill (H.R. 3369) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STANLEY FRANK MUSIAL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Sunday afternoon, September 29, one of the outstanding athletes of this century, Stanley Frank Musial, drove in a run, with a sharp single into right field, and then retired from baseball.

Stan Musial is more than a great athlete. He is a great man—an inspiration to every American who respects the priceless combination of character with ability.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article, written by Bob Burnes, and published in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of Sunday, September 29. The article is entitled "A Salute to a Great Man."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SALUTE TO A GREAT MAN

(By Bob Burnes)

The name by which Stan Musial is best known grew, like Betty Smith's tree, in Brooklyn.

Unlike most ballplayers, there was no colorful name which attached itself immediately to Musial—a name like the Babe for Ruth or the Splendid Splinter for Williams.

Since it is commonplace to attach descriptives to athletes, everybody tried. Stan early was called the Greyhound or the Donora Dynamiter. Those who knew him best called him Stash, the Polish diminutive for Stanley. None exactly fit.

In fact, he had been in the major leagues for 7 years, had won two batting titles, twice had been named the league's most valuable player before a nickname was born.

When it was found, it was a pip.

It happened in Brooklyn on May 18, 19, and 20, 1948. Musial, coming back from an appendicitis operation, was en route to his greatest batting season. In the process, he was about the delightful business of destroying the Dodgers, a ball club against which he dearly loved to hit, especially in the chummy surroundings of Ebbets Field in Flatbush.

He warmed up to his task on May 18 by obtaining two hits in four times at bat. On the following day he went five-for-five, three singles, a double and a triple. On the third day, he went four-for-six, a single, two doubles and a home run. In 3 days he had 9 hits in 15 times at bat as the Cardinals won, 4–3, 14–7, and 13–4.

It was not a series to enchant the diehard Dodger fans. Every time they looked up, Musial was headed plateward, carrying lumber and gazing longingly at the right field screen.

And every time he did the fans moaned "Here comes that man again."

And that's where the name "The Man" by which Stan Musial is known everywhere was born.

The Dodger fans were paying him the supreme tribute as a ballplayer.

Millions of Americans, baseball fans and those who have never seen a major league game, now pay him the same tribute. They all call him "The Man" and they mean it in every sense of the word.

More than a great name, a familiar number and a ball player who belongs even now in the hall of fame will go to bat for the last time as a Cardinal, Sunday, when Stan Musial plays his last game.

A living legend will die.

This writer, who saw Stan play his first game and will see him play his last, says honestly that something will go out of his life as a reporter when No. 6 no longer is on the Red Bird roster.

He never expects to see anyone like Musial again.

This is the unbelievable hold that Stan Musial has on an American public—The Man who has captured a tough public merely by being a simple, wonderful human being.

Waiters and cabbies in New York, dowagers in San Francisco, the movie colony in Los Angeles, and every American from coast to coast who has ever heard of baseball knows of St. Louis No. 1 citizen and talk of him as an old friend. They have stood in every city and given him tremendous ovations, even hard-bitten fans who wouldn't rise up if Abner Doubleday came back to visit.

They all say the same thing, "Stan can't retire. Baseball won't be the same without him."

Indeed it won't.

Oh, this is not merely a case of a man with a yard of statistics and a roomful of plaques to prove his prowess. Stan has them all. "He got so many on our last trip," one Cardinal player said, "that we were thinking of using them for poker chips in the card game."

You name the town and Stan has a statistic there or a memorable event.

In Chicago, he drove out his 3,000th hit in dramatic fashion in a pinch role. Or in Boston where he went five-for-five for the fourth time in a season, in this instance against five different pitchers. Or in San Francisco where, late in 1962, he almost destroyed pennant hopes with still another five-for-five day. ("In my younger days," he said apologetically on that occasion, "they would have been five doubles—but I don't run quite as fast.")

Or in Los Angeles, where he broke the National League record for total hits in a career with a single off Ron Perranoski.

Or in Cincinnati, where he ignored a doctor's orders, got up out of a sick bed, staggled to home plate almost too weak to swing the bat and lashed a pinch homer that won a game the Cards needed.

Or in Pittsburgh, his home town, where he almost wrecked the Pirates' pennant hopes in 1960 with decisive late inning hits.

Or in Milwaukee, where he and his counterpart, ageless Warren Spahn, have had so many personal duels. Where even this year, he singled home the winning run off Spahn who said, "I oughta know better than to try to pitch to him."

You name it. He's been there and left his mark.

Ask the fans in Brooklyn. They know. They named him. Little wonder that Buzzy Bavasi, the general manager of the transplanted Dodgers, in sending in a ticket order for the Musial testimonial dinner on October 20 wrote feelingly: "I'll be there. I want to make sure he retires."

But this is the story only of Stan the baseball Man.

The story of Stan the Man reveals even more completely his stature.

You name the year. He's been there and left his mark. You name the situation and he's had the answer for it.

Some of them have been big stories. They've made the headlines. Others have been little stories, of importance only to the people involved.

There is a big story and perhaps the most important of all in 1946. Here was Stan Musial, still a young man in baseball. He was just back from service. He was not yet in the big money class in baseball. Now he was seated at the kitchen table in his modest home on Mardel Avenue and a man was filling that table with money.

Nobody counted the money. The guest said there was $100,000 in cash on the table. There was more to be had if Stan agreed to jump his contract with the Cardinals and go to Mexico. Technically, it was not illegal. Others had done it and more would. Stan looked at the money and shook his head.

He didn't or couldn't know then that in less than 10 years he'd be making that much with the Cardinals. He didn't know that because he would stay with the Cardinals, other good fortune would come his way and before he ended his career he would be independently wealthy.

All he knew was that there was $100,000 in front of him for the taking. And he turned it down.

There was no histrionics. He explained "I knew I could never look my son in the eye if I took that money."

A big story, yes. But then there were little, humane stories, too, like the one former teammate, Del Rice, tells.

As good fortune touched Musial, Rice's luck went the other way. He was nearing the end of his career. His wife was dying of leukemia. His home was badly damaged by fire. As Rice wearily and despondently returned home from the hospital late one night, there was Musial sitting on the front steps.

No story, no cameras, no nothing but a friend in need.

"I just thought maybe you'd like somebody to talk to," Stan said simply.

This again is why they call him "The Man."

Yes, this man-boy out of the Pennsylvania coalfields who never lost youthful enthusiasm for the game he loved.

This was the son of an immigrant coal miner whose boyhood idols were pitcher Carl Hubbell of the Giants and hitter Paul Waner of the hometown Pirates. He would have relished signing with either one but the Giants were late with their offer and the Pirates wanted him to stay close to home. The Cardinals offered him a chance to travel—all the way to Williamson in West Virginia.

This is the boy who came home from his second year in the minors and married Lillian Labash, his sweetheart from schooldays. Lillian knew then, as she still knows today, that she has to share her man with baseball.

"He was occasionally late for a date," she said, "especially if he passed a ball field on the way to my house. And he's late for dinner once in a while now if there's a ball game going on in Francis Park. He always has to stop and watch."

This is the Man who survived the only near disaster of his career—with the help of a friend he never forgot.

In 1940, at Daytona Beach, Fla., where he played the outfield when he wasn't pitching, Stan landed on his left shoulder—and the shoulder went dead. With a child on the way for the family, Stan despaired of a future in baseball. But the team manager—Dickie Kerr—persuaded the Musials to stick it out. The Kerrs took the Musials into their own home.

That encouragement started Musial on his way to the majors as a tremendous hitter. He never forgot the kindness of Dickie Kerr and he proved it in two lasting ways.

That son for whom the Musials were waiting was named Richard—for Dickie Kerr.

A few years ago, Stan quietly bought a home for the retired Dickie Kerr in Houston, then was terribly embarrassed when the story came out months later.

The stories of Musial's quiet kindness are endless—of the time when a Santa Claus headed for an orphan home became sidetracked in a bar and Stan dropped his own decorating on Christmas Eve and, answering an urgent plea, took over in his place. There was never any publicity on the story. Stan wanted it that way.

Or there is the Stan Musial who is the despair of his family on Halloween. There is always open house at the Musial residence that night. Youngsters from all over town form a steady stream to trick and treat—and Stan is always there to greet them.

"I thought one year we might slow it down," Lil Musial said, "because I thought it might be wearing on Stan. He said he enjoyed it and insisted on doing it."

Lest you get the impression that Stan Musial is some sort of maudlin do-gooder, you look to another facet.

On planes, in the clubhouse, anywhere the ball club descends, he is the life of the party. There is always some sort of music in the clubhouse—guitar, harmonica and raucous singing, plus Stan supplying the rhythm by beating a coathanger on the side of a trunk. "Stan's happiest at times like that," says long-time roommate Red Schoendienst.

For years he has been an amateur magician. When an illusion works, Stan has a pleased smile. When it doesn't, he laughs uproariously at his own blunder.

Some years ago, the Cardinals had trouble getting from New York to Cincinnati during a railroad strike. Somehow they got as far as Columbus and commandeered a fleet of taxicabs.

En route something went wrong with the hood of the cab in which Stan and others were riding. Musial hopped out, leaped up on the hood, flapped it in place and told the driver "start moving." The cavalcade rolled into Crosley Field with Stan still riding front gunner on the lead cab. The Cardinal management was quite a time recovering from that one but, as Stan explained simply, "we had to get there and that's the only way I could figure to do it."

Much has been made over the years of the fact that Musial gets on well with umpires. He has drawn high praise from them openly, a rare feat. Al Barlick, a close friend, once stopped a game to shake hands with Stan when another record was set.

Jocko Conlan told an assembly of players "if all you guys were like Stan, our job would be a hundred times easier." Recently Ken Burkhart, a one-time teammate, stopped in the Cardinal clubhouse to tell Stan how much he regretted Musial's retirement.

It leads to the impression that Stan does not concern himself with the umpires. He has never been ejected from a major league game. He was thumbed out once by a class D umpire who was as much a rookie as he was.

"I argue with the umpires," Stan has said. "I fight for our rights as much as anybody but I try to do it quietly. I think I've been close to being thrown out three times in my career.

"Once when I started out to the mound after a pitcher knocked me down, Al Barlick got out there fast and stopped me. Another time I yelled bitterly and loudly at George Barr, another good friend, about a bad call. It shocked him and he leaped back and said 'I thought it was a good pitch, Stanley.' It struck me funny and I started to laugh and we forgot it.

"There was another time when I was called out on what I thought was a bad pitch. I started to say something but the look in the umpire's eye stopped me and I just started walking. The other players said he watched me all the way to the dugout. They said if I had turned around, he would have run me.

"Funny thing," Stan went on, "he was a good friend. The fellows thought he just wanted the honor of being the first to run me."

It has been a great and wonderful life for Stan Musial, whose records will live on long after his career ends.

From the days of an immigrant's son, he has risen to be St. Louis' best known citizen. It is something indeed when an immigrant's son is called to the President's box during an All-Star game for a personal visit—and for Stan to note "they said you were too young and I was too old and we both fooled 'em."

He lives comfortably in a pleasant home in southwest St. Louis. He is a splendid father to his four children, Richard, Geraldine, Janet, and Jean. "Stan is strict with the children," Lillian says, "and if their schoolwork is not up to what he wants, there are serious sessions."

When Dick was enrolled at CBC, the brother-director voiced the hope that Stan would be an active member of the Fathers Club. "Only," Stan said, "if I am known as Dick Musial's father." He kept his word, was chairman of numerous events, and so did the school. Lillian performed in a similar role in the Mothers Club.

Throughout his career, he has been active in civic enterprises. He served as chairman of the Globe-Democrat's Old Newsboy Day and took great pleasure in the job. Two years ago, he was called upon to speak at McKendree College in a series of lectures delivered by prominent people in a variety of fields. Though called upon often to talk, Stan does not relish the chore. But he worked hard on the lecture and made a splendid presentation.

As a restaurateur, banker, prominent citizen and churchman, the demands on his time are exorbitant. But after working a full day on all these, he turns nights and weekends to his first love—baseball.

There he asks no favors. He is just 1 of 25 on the ball club. His durability, his refusal to buckle under minor injuries contributed to many of his records. When he did have an injury, he demanded flesh-colored tape to avoid any touch of showboating.

Only once in his career has he asked for a favor. When his son graduated from Notre Dame, he wanted to attend and the Cardinals approved it. After all, how many ballplayers stay around long enough to see their only son graduate from college?

Otherwise, No. 6 is no different from No. 11 or No. 38.

He has always had the same answer when asked his biggest thrill in baseball, "Just putting on the uniform every day."

This is "the man" most people know and love.

This is "the man" who has left an indelible mark on baseball, not because he alone was a great player but because he was a greater man.

This is "the Man."

They named him well in Brooklyn.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "A Hit for 22 Years, Stan the Man," written by Bob Broeg, sports editor of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HIT FOR 22 YEARS, STAN THE MAN

(By Bob Broeg)

Stanley Frank Musial, baseball's Horatio Alger, goes to bat today for the last time. The poor Polish immigrant's son who struck it rich by playing a boy's game better than most men, will end his great baseball career in the Cardinals' regular-season windup with Cincinnati at Busch Stadium.

A living legend, a homer-hitting grandfather at nearly 43, Musial has set more than 50 major and National League records for batting and durability in the course of 22 years. He has played more games for one team than any other player in the 87-year history of major league baseball. And he is first in career total bases and extra-base hits and second only to Ty Cobb in base hits.

With the Cardinals, throughout his big league career, Musial, at his peak, was a swift baserunner, talented outfielder and good first baseman. As baseball's highest paid handyman—at $100,000 a year—ever to smooth a troubled manager's furrowed brow, he's the only player to put in 1,000 games in both the infield and outfield.

Although he'll be remembered as long as baseball recordbooks are kept, Millionaire Musial will be remembered most for the personal qualities that have made him rate with Babe Ruth as baseball's most popular celebrity. While the Babe achieved his appeal through a booming bat, booming voice and blithe spirit, "the Man"—respectful Brooklyn fans gave Stan his nickname years ago—remained to the end a trim athlete and good family man. He made news on the field, seldom off it. But he reached the public everywhere with his talent, team consciousness and even temperament. Polite, patient, and proud, he was a ballplayer's player—as well as a fan's player.

Success most decidedly did not spoil Stanley Frank Musial, the Horatio Alger of baseball. Will there ever be another like him?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Musial's Records Hard To Beat," written by Bob Broeg. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a chart showing the alltime high position of Musial in our national pastime.

There being no objection, the article and the chart were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 29, 1963]

MUSIAL'S RECORDS HARD TO BEAT

(By Bob Broeg)

The giant following table tells graphically the stature of Stan Musial, the batter as the comes up to the final game of one of the most amazing careers in baseball history.

Musial's virtues as a person are praised today in the Sunday pictures section of the Post-Dispatch, and paeans will be sung to our man Stan on the field this afternoon as a public-spirited citizen, modest hero, team player, family man, and model for American youth.

But, as that table so clearly proves, Musial would have been a man to be remembered even if he had been a grade A heel. Only "Babe" Ruth and "Ty" Cobb or, more accurately, Cobb and Ruth, made a comparable statistical impact in offensive baseball.

The question is, "Will anyone ever replace Musial as, for instance, he replaced Ruth in career extra base hits and Cobb in total bases?"

Maybe, but not necessarily so. Musial himself thinks that hitters like Henry Aaron, Vada Pinson, and Al Kaline, all of whom started even younger than he did and briskly, if not quite so fast, have a crack at 3,000 hits. And it's the exclusive 3,000-hit club that is the springboard to king-sized totals, the open sesame to the record book.

HILL GETS STEEP

Pinson, just past 24, has played little more than 5 years in the big leagues and averaged 200 hits, Musial's own hot pace to the 1,000-hit milestone. Aaron, a 10-year man and not yet 30, is just short of 1,900 hits. And Kaline, who also has played 10 seasons in the big leagues and won't be 29 until December, is near the 1,700-hit mark.

However, already injury prone, the talented Kaline recently went to Mayo Brothers' clinic, completely exhausted. And if the Detroit star is beginning to feel the strain, his chances will be lessened.

Even Cincinnati's Pinson and Milwaukee's Aaron, though headed in the right direction, could be detoured by illness, injury, or earlier athletic aging.

"A ballplayer is at his peak between 28 and 32," Musial often has said. The Man had his own best year, .376, with 230 hits, 104 of them for extra base hits, and 429 total bases, when he was 28.

"I didn't really begin to feel my age until I was nearly 38," baseball's famous No. 6 told the Chicago Cubs' Ernie Banks the other day.

"Then I began to need to work out in the winters and watch my diet even more closely."

Musial hit an incredible .330 when he was nearly 42 years old, but the fact is that, reaching the 3,000-hit goal in early 1958 when he was just past 37, he needed five-plus seasons for the final 628 hits before this weekend windup.

So Pinson, Aaron, and all others, even if able to assault successfully the steep 3,000-hit plateau, will find it extremely difficult removing Musial from his National League pinnacle.

SIX THOUSAND FOR NO. 6

The man who has played the most games, batted the most times, scored the most runs, knocked in the most runs, and had more doubles than any player in National League history is the proudest of having collected the most hits. He broke early last year the 45-year-old record held previously by western Pennsylvania's other legendary baseball celebrity, Honus Wagner.

Of the more than 50 National League or major league records Musial owns, it's his opinion that the most enduring well could be his major league marks for extra-base hits and total bases.

Earlier this year Stan snapped Ruth's 27-year-old standard (1,356) of extra-base blows. A year ago he surpassed Cobb's 34-year-old record for total bases, 5,863.

As the only player ever to reach 6,000 in total bases, just as Ruth was the only performer to pass 700 in homers and Cobb the sole athlete to get 4,000 base hits, Stan (The Amazing Man) Musial might have set a standard to have and to hold—and to keep.

Yes, just as we who've followed him through 21 playing seasons have memories of his many big moments to have and to hold—and to keep. It'll be most interesting to watch the pack try to follow our man Stan up baseball's highest mountain.

The man stands tall in top batting categories

	Runs	Hits	2-base hits	3-base hits [1]	Home runs	Runs batted in	Average [2]	Extra-base hits	Total bases
1	Cobb	Cobb	Speaker	Crawford	Ruth	Ruth	Cobb	Musial	Musial.
2	Ruth	Musial	Musial	Cobb	Foxx	Gehrig	Hornsby	Ruth	Cobb.
3	Musial	Speaker	Cobb	Wagner	Williams	Musial	Jackson	Gehrig	Ruth.
4	Gehrig	Wagner	Wagner	Beckley	Ott	Foxx	Browning	Cobb	Speaker.
5	Speaker	E. Collins	Lajoie	Connor	Gehrig	Cobb	Brouthers	Speaker	Gehrig.
6	Ott	Lajoie	P. Waner	Speaker	Musial	Ott	O'Doul	Foxx	Ott.
7	E. Collins	P. Waner	Gehringer	Clarke	Mathews	Williams	Delahanty	Williams	Foxx.
8	Williams	Anson	Heilmann	Brouthers	Mantle	Simmons	Keeler	Ott	Wagner.
9	Gehringer	S. Rice	Hornsby	P. Waner	Mays	Goslin	Williams	Hornsby	Williams.
10	Foxx	Crawford	Medwick	E. Collins	Snider	Hornsby	Hamilton	Wagner	Hornsby.

[1] 3-base hits: Musial, 17th.

[2] Average: Musial, 28th.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. Stan Musial has been a personal friend of mine and a personal friend of my colleague for many years. He is both a great athlete and a great citizen, and we are very happy and proud to have had him in our stadium. He has made a great contribution to the American way of life.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that we shall now take up a number of so-called private bills to which there is no objection. Later, we shall take up the two fishery bills, Calendar No. 479, Senate bill 1988; and Calendar No. 457, Senate bill 1006. The latter is controversial, so there may be a record vote on the question of its passage. That will be the final measure to be called up today.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar bills No. 490 through No. 501.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now consider these bills, in order.

JOHN JOSEPH

The bill (S. 1287) for the relief of John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Act of October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1247), to provide for the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens, John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef), shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 1 of that Act.

HANNAH ROBBINS

The bill (S. 1838) for the relief of Hannah Robbins was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (4) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hannah Robbins may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This section shall apply only to grounds for exclusions under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

LYDIA ANNE FOOTE

The bill (S. 1881) for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any period of time in which Lydia Anne Foote may reside in France within five years after the date of enactment of this Act shall not be deemed to be residence in a foreign state within the meaning of section 352(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

JAN KOSS

The bill (H.R. 1280) for the relief of Jan Koss was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FIORE LUIGI BIASIOTTA

The bill (H.R. 3648) for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH KOLLOIAN IZMIRIAN

The bill (H.R. 2303) for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ANNA C. CHMIELEWSKI

The bill (H.R. 3762) for the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NORIYUKI MIYATA

The bill (H.R. 4075) for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MARGUERITE LEFEBVRE BROUGHTON

The bill (H.R. 7022) for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SUSANNA GRÜN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1096) for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanna Roth), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Susanna Grün (Susanne Roth) shall be held and considered to be a returning resident alien within the purview of section 101(b)(27)(B) of that Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GABRIEL KERENYI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1341) for the relief of Gabriel Kerenyi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gabriel Kerenyi may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ALESSANDRO A. R. CACACE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1488) for the relief of Alessandro A. R. Cacace, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alessandro A. R. Cacace shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Mr. Hilton D. Hall, a United States citizen.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADMITTING FORMER PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SEAT IN THE SENATE AS SENATORS AT LARGE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar 484, Senate Resolution 78.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 78) admitting former Presidents of the United States to a seat in the Senate as Senators at Large with certain privileges, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"8. Former Presidents of the United States shall be entitled to address the Senate upon appropriate notice to the Presiding Officer who shall thereupon make the necessary arrangements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was amended and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas, pursuant to rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, former Presidents of the United States are accorded the privilege of the floor while the Senate is in session; and

Whereas, it would seem particularly beneficial for the Senate to know the views of former Chief Executives who by experience are uniquely qualified to comment on grave national problems: Now, therefore, be it

PROHIBITION OF FOREIGN FISHING VESSELS WITHIN THE TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 479, S. 1988.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1988) to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "United", to strike out "States" and insert "States,"; in line 6, after the word "United", to strike out "States and" and insert "States,"; in line 7, after the word "possessions", to insert "and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico"; in line 9, after the word "Shelf", to strike out "claimed by" and insert "which appertains to"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "party.", to insert "However, the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a license authorizing a vessel other than a vessel of the United States to engage in fishing within the territorial waters of the United States or for resources of the Continental Shelf which appertain to the United States and to land its catch in a United States port, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior that such permission would be in the national interest and upon concurrence of any State, Commonwealth or territory directly affected."; after line 14, to strike out:

(b) The vessels and all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act, or the monetary value thereof, may be forfeited.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(b) Every vessel employed in any manner in connection with a violation of this Act including its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo, and stores shall be subject to forfeiture and all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the monetary value thereof shall be forfeited.

On page 3, line 21, after the word "process", to insert "including warrants or other process issued in admiralty proceedings in Federal District Courts,"; on page 4, after line 14, to insert:

(e) Such person so authorized may seize any vessel, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo and stores, used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder or which it reasonably appears has been used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder.

At the beginning of line 21, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)"; in the same line, after the word "so", to strike out "authorized," and insert "authorized"; in line 22, after the word "lawfully", to strike out "found" and insert "found,"; on page 5, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)"; in line 6, after the word "shall", to strike out "stay the execution of such process, or"; and in line 9, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "property" and insert "fish"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is unlawful for any vessel, except a vessel of the United States, or for any master or other person in charge of such a vessel, to engage in the fisheries within the territorial waters of the United States, its territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or to engage in the taking of any fishery resource of the Continental Shelf which appertains to the United States except as provided by an international agreement to which the United States is a party. However, the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a license authorizing a vessel other than a vessel of the United States to engage in fishing within the territorial waters of the United States or for resources of the Continental Shelf which appertain to the United States and to land its catch in a United States port, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior that such permission would be in the national interest and upon concurrence of any State, Commonwealth, or territory directly affected.

Sec. 2. (a) Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Every vessel employed in any manner in connection with a violation of this Act including its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo, and stores shall be subject to forfeiture and all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the monetary value thereof shall be forfeited.

(c) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of a cargo for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such cargo or the proceeds from the sale thereof, and the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this Act, insofar as such provisions of law are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 3. (a) Enforcement of the provisions of this Act is the joint responsibility of the United States Coast Guard, the United States Department of the Interior, and the United States Bureau of Customs. In addition, the Secretary of the Interior may designate officers and employees of the States of the United States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and of any territory or possession of the United States to carry out enforcement activities hereunder. When so designated, such officers and employees are authorized to function as Federal law enforcement agents for these purposes.

(b) The judges of the United States district courts, the judges of the highest courts of the territories and possessions of the United States, and United States commissioners may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue such warrants or other process, including warrants or other process issued in admiralty proceedings in Federal District Courts, as may be required for enforcement of this Act and any regulations issued thereunder.

(c) Any person authorized to carry out enforcement activities hereunder shall have the power to execute any warrant or process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of this Act.

(d) Such person so authorized shall have the power—

(1) with or without a warrant or other process, to arrest any person committing in his presence or view a violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder;

(2) with or without a warrant or other process, to search any vessel and, if as a result of such search he has reasonable cause to believe that such vessel or any person on board is in violation of any provision of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, then to arrest such person.

(e) Such person so authorized may seize any vessel, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo and stores, used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder or which it reasonably appears has been used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder.

(f) Such person so authorized may seize, whenever and wherever lawfully found, all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder. Any fish so seized may be disposed of pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, or if perishable, in a manner prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2464 of title 28 when a warrant of arrest or other process in rem is issued in any cause under this section, the United States marshal or other officer shall discharge any fish seized if the process has been levied, on receiving from the claimant of the fish a bond or stipulation for the value of the fish with sufficient surety to be approved by a judge of the district court having jurisdiction of the offense, conditioned to deliver the fish seized, if condemned, without impairment in value or, in the discretion of the court, to pay its equivalent value in money or otherwise to answer the decree of the court in such cause. Such bond or stipulation shall be returned to the court and judgment thereon against both the principal and sureties may be recovered in event of any breach of the conditions thereof as determined by the court. In the discretion of the accused, and subject to the direction of the court, the fish may be sold for not less than its reasonable market value and the proceeds of such sale placed in the registry of the court pending judgment in the case.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] whether there is any particular controversy over this bill. I understood there is not.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct. Insofar as we understand the situation, there is no controversy whatsoever; but I do wish to submit an amendment to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] was most cooperative in agreeing to postpone his remarks on another subject until we had concluded our action on the measure for extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. I promised that soon thereafter, I would yield to him. So after the committee amendments are considered en bloc, I shall yield to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this bill provides for enforcement procedures and penalties to protect the U.S. territorial waters and Continental Shelf resources from foreign intervention. The bill is cosponsored by Senators Ervin, Jackson, Kennedy, Magnuson, Morse, Neuberger, Scott, Smathers, and Thurmond. It was supported in committee hearings by the State Department, Department of the Interior, Department of the Navy, Department of the Treasury, and it received the very strong endorsement of the entire fishing industry. The bill was passed out of committee without opposition. This is legislation that is needed. Its need has become urgent during this past summer with the numerous incidents in which foreign vessels have engaged in fishing activities within our territorial waters.

The basic purpose of the bill is to provide for the enforcement of our territorial waters and of our claim to resources on the Continental Shelf which as yet has not been determined.

This bill makes no claims of new jurisdiction. For example, the bill provides for penalties on foreigners taking fishery resources within our territorial waters. The bill does not define territorial waters. This has been accomplished by custom and executive pronouncements over a period of many years.

By the same token reference is made to Continental Shelf resources which appertain, or in other words belong, to the United States. The bill does not itself establish any claim over the resources but provides for penalties for the taking of such resources that are claimed by the United States.

This point was made quite clear in the hearings and in the committee's action in accepting the amendment proposed by the State Department to change the word "claim" to "appertain." Webster's dictionary and Black's Law Dictionary define "appertain" as meaning to belong or pertain.

The basic question in regard to the Continental Shelf provisions of the bill is what resources appertain or belong to the United States.

At the present time there are two possible bases of claim. The first is pursuant to the 1953 Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act. This is made clear in the title to the Submerged Lands Act which provides that the purpose of the act is "to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabeds of the Continental Shelf seaward of state boundaries." Section 9 of the act reads as follows:

> Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, as defined in section 2 hereof, all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed.

The natural resources of the subsoil and seabeds of the shelf include not only mineral but living resources of the shelf. The same act defines the term "natural resources" as follows:

> The term "natural resources" includes, without limiting the generality thereof, oil, gas, and all other minerals, and fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life but does not include water power, or the use of water for the production of power;

Therefore, we established a claim over not only oil, a resource of the subsoil, but also marine animal resources of the seabed.

I believe that we established a claim quite clearly to all resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf. This would I believe include certain coral, oysters, and clams resources. It appears also that shrimp and finny fish are not included.

The Outer Continental Shelf Act makes it clear that the provisions of that act are not intended to interfere with fishing in waters above the Continental Shelf. But there can be no question but this was a clear unilateral claim, one that has been repeated by numerous other nations, and has been recognized in international law.

It is true that the U.S. Government has never specifically and formally named the resources of the Continental Shelf which are included. Under the Outer Continental Shelf Act, the United States has claimed certain living coral reefs off Florida outside the 3-mile limit and on the Continental Shelf. This bill does not attempt to identify these exact claims either. However, it does provide for the immediate enforcement of these claims when clarified and when a question is properly raised. I think that this is significant and can be seen quite clearly in the fact that the catch of oysters, clams, and dungeness and king crab totals over $50 million a year.

The second basis is a claim by the United States over resources of the Continental Shelf found in the International Convention on the Continental Shelf. The Convention will take effect on the ratification of one more nation and it is anticipated that a ratification will be added shortly. The bill would provide for the enforcement procedures to assure the protection of resources claimed by the United States pursuant to this Convention. The nations which have ratified to date are: Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Cambodia, Columbia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark Guatemala, Haiti, Israel, Malagasy Republic, Malaya, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Senegal, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Union of South Africa, United States, and Venezuela.

I, therefore, believe that this legislation is essential for the protection of our territorial waters and our resources of the Continental Shelf.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill before us proposes: first, to protect our territorial waters from encroachment by foreign fishing vessels; and, second, to preserve our marine resources on, or attached to, the Continental Shelf.

Foreign vessels violating the provisions would, for the first time, be subjected to penalties which would include forfeiture of catch, tackle and cargo, imprisonment up to 1 year, and a fine not to exceed $10,000.

Introduced by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the bill is cosponsored by 12 other Senators, including myself. The East, South, and West are all represented among the sponsors.

The bill does not define territorial waters, either in terms of width or depth—and for good reason.

Congress has never fixed the width of our territorial waters by statue, nor is there international agreement on this question.

Other countries have established or are claiming territorial waters of varying width from their shores, the trend in recent years being to extend their boundaries outward.

An accord conceivably may be reached eventually on this problem through the medium of an international conference, but in the meantime it behooves us to protect those resources of the oceans which by their nature or location near our shores it is in our national interest to do so.

This is not being done today; it has not been done in the past by our Government, and our Government presently lacks the statutory authority to protect these resources. This bill would provide that authority.

Early in our history we, and many other nations, informally accepted 3 miles as a suitable limit to our territorial waters. At that time 3 miles was about the maximum distance a shore-based cannon could fire a cannonball. In other words it was approximately the distance the adjacent seas could be defended from a nation's shores.

Times and technology have changed but here in the United States we continue to consider 3 miles seaward the limit of our territorial waters, not on the basis of any law but by custom or tradition.

Many other countries have departed, or are departing, from this custom, which had its beginnings in another age.

Soviet Russia and Iceland claim 12 miles; Mexico 9 miles.

Norway has a 4 mile limit, but also asserts jurisdiction over waters out to 12 miles for fishing purposes.

Canada has a 3 mile limit but is extending its territorial waters to 12 miles in May, 1964.

Denmark observes a 3-mile limit for its home waters, but has established a 12 mile protected fishing zone for Greenland and has announced a similar zone around the Faroe Islands will be maintained next year.

Ecuador, Chile, and Peru have entered into a tripartite agreement to claim jurisdiction over fisheries in waters outward to 200 miles from their shores, an unrealistic and extreme claim that I am sure other Nations do not support.

The United States, United Kingdom, and Japan still accept a limit of 3 miles.

National interests, Mr. President, may require our Government in the near future to reconsider the extent of our own territorial waters.

Military as well as economic considerations may compel a broadening of our jurisdiction. In any event, S. 1988 leaves the question of the extent of our territorial waters completely flexible and open to any adjustment Congress or the administration may wish to make.

The able senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has described on the Senate floor specific violations of our territorial waters by foreign fishing vessels.

Unfortunately, about all we can do now when such violations occur is to politely ask the masters of the vessels to please move back beyond our 3 mile limit.

Violations by both Russian and Japanese vessels have occurred. The Russians are especially indifferent as to where their right to fish the high seas ends and where the U.S. jurisdiction over our territorial water begins.

They have not been indifferent, however, to violations or presumed violations of waters within the 12-mile limit they have imposed by the fishing vessels of other nations.

During the past 10 years, for example, the Soviet Government has seized 854 Japanese vessels and 7,024 Japanese fishermen.

I do not know what disposition Soviet Russia has made of the catch aboard these ships or of the vessels themselves, but I do know, from Japanese reports, that some of the fishermen seized have been detained in Russia for more than 2 years.

The August issue of Japan Report, published by the Japanese Information

Service, announced happily that the Soviet Government had promised to release "about 120" Japanese fishermen "now in Soviet custody who have been found guilty or indicted on charges of violating Soviet territorial waters or operating in Soviet waters."

> The decision to release the fishermen, according to the Soviet Ambassador—

The report continues—

> was made by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet on August 22 in the interests of promoting friendly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. Most of the fishermen to be released are from Nemuro and Wakkanai in Hokkaido (Japan's most northern large island), and some have been detained in Russia for more than 2 years.

Mr. President, according to this account of the Soviet motive for releasing Japanese fishermen held as prisoners, perhaps one way of "promoting friendly relations" between ourselves and Russia would be to seize some of the Russian vessels violating our territorial waters and detain their crews until more friendly relations could be established by releasing them. Not even this, however, could be done at present.

Nor is such action the purpose of this bill. The object of this bill is not to promote more friendly relations with the Russians or the fishermen of any other nation who invade our waters. The object of this bill is to protect our marine resources and our national interests.

Soviet Russia has gone further to protect her resources than to establish a 12-mile limit. In addition she has sealed off the vast Okhotsk Sea between the Kurile Islands and the Siberian mainland to Japanese trawlers and to salmon fishing, and has established a quota on king crab which limited Japanese production in 1962 to 126,000 cases.

The Okhotsk Sea is larger than Hudson Bay and has almost the same area as the Gulf of Mexico.

Soviet strictures on Japanese fishing increase the pressures on Japanese fishermen to encroach upon our salmon fisheries, our halibut fisheries, and our king crab fisheries, in other words to increase Japan's pressures on us. Possibly this is one purpose of the Russian restrictions, I do not know.

But I do know that we must withstand these pressures, whatever their origin, and that if it is our intention to withstand them, the passage of this bill is essential.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask how the term "territorial waters" is defined.

Mr. BARTLETT. The bill makes no effort to define "territorial waters." It leaves that subject untouched. The bill does two things, one of which should have been done long before now; and the other had best be done now, instead of later.

Under existing law, a foreign fishing vessel can come within the territorial waters of the United States, and the Federal Government has no authority to do other than to suggest that the invading ship leave the territorial waters.

There are no penalties whatsoever against such intrusions. The bill very properly would apply them. It is done by many other nations and, in my judgment, should have been done here long ago.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the penalty that would be invoked?

Mr. BARTLETT. The penalty provided in the bill is a fine of $10,000, 1 year's imprisonment, or both, for the master of the ship or the person in charge of the ship.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am quite sure that other countries have similar laws. Some of the shrimp fishermen in my State are constantly being harassed by Mexican gunboats, and arrested when they claim that they are 10 or 12 miles offshore.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is true. It is also true that American tuna fishermen are similarly treated off the coast of South America. There are no penalties whatsoever for U.S. territorial water violations.

Mr. RUSSELL. In our country there are two sets of territorial waters. The States whose laws derive from the common law of England have a provision for territorial waters which extend out 3 miles from the shore, whereas States that follow the Napoleonic code or the Spanish law claim up to 12 miles, and, in some cases, out to the end of any shelf that might project itself under the waters.

Mr. BARTLETT. Realizing the situations which the Senator from Georgia has explained, the committee thought it proper not to touch upon that phase at all, and made no effort in the bill to define the extent of territorial waters. So the law would be unchanged by the language of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator think that a conviction would stand if a Russian fisherman were fishing 3 miles off the Massachusetts coast and were arrested?

Mr. BARTLETT. Within the 3-mile limit?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. BARTLETT. Clearly there could be no doubt about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. How about the waters off Cape Canaveral, Fla.? Florida claims jurisdiction over 12 miles of territorial waters. If such a fisherman were within 6 miles of the shore, what would be the legal situation?

Mr. BARTLETT. The determination would have to be made by the court. We did not think it proper to seek to define the extent and limits of territorial waters if a fisherman were arrested off the coast of Florida at a point claimed by the State of Florida, which claim might or might not be recognized by the Federal Government. It is far, far better for that judgment to be made by the Federal court than by language in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no sympathy whatever with international poachers, whether they are fishing in our waters or are there for the purposes of gathering intelligence. But I am becoming a wee bit leery of vesting a great deal more jurisdiction in the Federal courts.

Mr. BARTLETT. We see no other way out. Each State is entitled to make its own laws on the subject. Many States do. Perhaps most—or, for all I know, all of them—do. But the individual States do not have the necessary naval craft; they do not have access to the Coast Guard. They cannot enforce those laws. In recent months there has been a rash of incidents of that kind, many in Alaskan waters, which have been certified by the Coast Guard. But that is not all. In other coastal areas foreign ships have come within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has Alaska established any jurisdiction over territorial waters?

Mr. BARTLETT. Alaska has, and Alaska has laws against fishing by foreigners within such waters, with penalties attached. But the Alaskan navy is not adequately equipped, and seldom can catch the fast Russian or Japanese vessels. To our discouragement, we find that not in every case can the Coast Guard cutters catch fishing trawlers. Sometimes they give heel to the Coast Guard cutters.

Mr. RUSSELL. Has the Senator thought about equipping a small plane with a 20-millimeter cannon and letting it go out and fire across the bow of such a vessel, halting it in the manner that has been known since time immemorial, when one party demands that the other should heave to and halt the ship?

I wish to help the Senator. I have never had an answer to the question as to how far out the jurisdiction of Alaska extends into territorial waters.

Mr. BARTLETT. Three miles.

Mr. RUSSELL. Three miles. I would have thought that the Senator's State would have adopted the Spanish territorial jurisdiction, inasmuch as it has such valuable fishing waters, because that jurisdiction is 12 miles.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Alaska is a bit disturbed at the moment, as is his colleage from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], who is present in the Chamber, because within the last week Russian trawlers operating—it is true, in international waters, but close to Kodiak Island—have repeatedly, obviously, and deliberately destroyed king crab gear owned and operated by Alaskan fishermen. We are apprehensive on many scores. One of them is for the reason to which the Senator alluded, in a manner of speaking, a few moments ago. Fishermen, whether they are in Alaska, Masachusetts, Rhode Island, Louisiana, Washington, or elsewhere, are independent and free-minded men.

When they see their means of livelihood being destroyed and they are driven from their historic fishing banks, they are likely to react. In the present case Governor Egan of Alaska, my colleague [Mr. GRUENING], and all others concerned have a lively apprehension that an international incident may occur unless the Russians withdraw from those waters, which have been fished by us for so long and not by them, and they should do so with great promptitude.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would be glad to support the Senator in connection with the bill. It seems to me that the bill would have little effect in sustaining a criminal indictment. But I am perfectly willing to support it and try it. If it does not work, the Senator's fishermen constitutents can always file a complaint with the Civil Rights Commission and it will arrive at some solution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Do I correctly understand that the Federal court would have jurisdiction over cases arising within boundaries established by the States?

Mr. BARTLETT. The bill applies only to the 3-mile territorial waters as recognized by the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. Suppose one who is not within the jurisdiction is arrested. Who would then be responsible?

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask what the Senator means by the term "not within the jurisdiction"?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not heard that the bill defines jurisdiction, which I believe is necessary.

Mr. BARTLETT. This definition has been in effect——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I should like to finish my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for clarification of the point. So far as the Federal Government is concerned, the territorial waters of the United States were set out in 1793 as 1 sea league, or 3 geographic miles.

This was done under the administration of President Washington, and was done specifically by the then Secretary of State Jefferson after several episodes involving the seizure of British ships by French ships off our coast, those two nations then being at war.

The territorial limit of 1 sea league has never been described in law. This has been left for Executive action, and Jefferson was very careful at that time, in enunciating the policy, to add that he did not assert that this represented a definitive conclusion which ought to be established for all time. It was a pliable instrument which could be changed at the will of the President.

Mr. ELLENDER. In any event, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, as the Senator says, the limit is fixed at 3 miles.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. What the Senator means in the bill, when there is reference to jurisdiction, is jurisdiction over the rights we have within the 3-mile limit?

Mr. BARTLETT. And we may depend upon it. The enforcing authorities—who in this instance would be chiefly, and perhaps altogether, the Coast Guard—would so construe it, because they would have to deal with territorial limits as defined by the U.S. Government, not as defined by the States.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it would be the Federal jurisdiction which would be involved?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is my interpretation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from Alaska has already given the definition I would give. The definition relates to territorial waters of the United States. That does not mean any particular State, but the United States. In section 3(b) of the bill it is stated:

> The judges of the United States district courts, the judges of the highest courts of the territories and possessions of the United States, and United States commissioners may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause,

Mr. ELLENDER. What prompted my question was the statement by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it correct that at the present time it is unlawful and prohibited for any foreign fishermen to fish within the 3-mile limit off the U.S. coast; and is it correct that the only remedy available now is to escort them, if they do so, beyond the limit, and tell them never to come back again?

What is sought by the bill is to provide a penalty, a fine, or a jail sentence, for such persons if they violate the law; is that not correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. As always, the Senator from Rhode Island has compressed the issue concisely and effectively.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the whole purpose of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. That is the whole purpose of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is to put teeth into the law.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I gladly yield.

Mr. GRUENING. If it should eventuate that proposed legislation to extend the territorial waters limit to 12 miles should be enacted, would the passage of this bill have any effect? Would the bill have to be amended, or would that limit be covered?

Mr. BARTLETT. The bill would not have to be amended.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has stated the situation correctly. I agree with his statement. Of course, there are added penalties, which are entirely consistent with the principle involved.

Mr. PASTORE. Entirely consistent.

Mr. BARTLETT. The purpose is to keep them out of our waters.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

I should like to ask about the language of unique character with respect to the Continental Shelf. Does the Senator understand, and should the legislative history show, that language will mean whatever international law and agreement may make it mean?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is the case, with one postscript which I should add. When one reads the bill for the first time, one might gain the inference that it goes much further than it actually goes. I said at the outset that the bill would do one thing which should have been done long ago. The bill also proposes to do a thing which would be better done now than later.

As the Senator from New York knows, the Geneva Conference of 1958 was directed to the subject of what resources of the Continental Shelf are owned by the coastal States. That convention will be ratified when one more nation, the 22d nation, signs it.

The pending bill seeks only to extend to the Continental Shelf, wherever it may be, the same enforcement provisions provided for the territorial waters. It asserts no claims on our part. It does not seek to disturb the situation otherwise.

The Senator from Rhode Island offered the language to me which I have proposed in the amendment sent to the desk, which clarifies the situation and makes it clear that we are not claiming in this bill the Continental Shelf itself. We are merely claiming the fishery resources thereof.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, if I may restate the situation, we are not seeking to establish new or unilateral positions with respect to the Continental Shelf by passing the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are leaving it open deliberately.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Second, this is a small step of putting teeth into our law, as stated, for the territorial waters.

The entire question of territorial waters was before the conference in Geneva in 1958, and it got into a stalemate over navigation and military purposes, but all of the countries there agreed that fishing is a different thing. It may not even follow a coast line.

This is a first step. We are leaving the question open deliberately, because, as surely as I am standing on this floor, within the next 5 or 10 years there must be international agreements on fisheries on the whole high seas or there will not be fish left for anybody.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will yield for one brief further point, we, the outstanding advocates in the world of freedom of the seas, would not wish to give the impression that we are laying down, as it were, a ukase, an ultimatum to the world, saying, "This is it. Take it or leave it."

We are, as the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington have so ably stated, making our legislation conform to the international agreements which we may enter into or which are on the desk, as it were, for signature, or any new ones which may come along. We are not endeavoring unilaterally to establish new international rights.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I invite the attention of the Senator from New York to the fact that the language on "the Continental Shelf" merely applies to crabs and shellfish that crawl on the ground, and does not apply to fish that swim.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator understands that I have no desire to restrict our country in any way in its freedom of action. Sometimes when we believe we are leaving ourselves free we cause mischief in other directions when we are to get a benefit.

I believe Senators have done exactly the right thing. I am glad to see it done. I am for the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe the Senator described his bill and its purpose quite clearly, and I have no questions about it.

The people in my State share the apprehensions which the Senator from Alaska described to the Senator from Georgia. I compliment the Senator upon this piece of proposed legislation, which perhaps is too narrow in scope in terms of the total problem, but which will serve effectively to fill the gap in the statute which applies to the policy and in the law which applies to the protection of our rights in our own territorial waters.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator from Maine has been one of the chief supporters of fisheries legislation which has been offered in this Congress. We appreciate his help.

I wish to comment also on the appropriate statement that he made; namely, that the proposal does not go as far as we need to go if we are to preserve fisheries. As the Senator from Washington said so correctly a moment or two ago, if we do not do something about the problem, and do it soon, there will not be any fish left for anybody.

Mr. MUSKIE. It serves the additional purpose of putting other nations on notice that we are alert to encroachments of our fishing rights and intend to protect them.

Mr. BARTLETT. I point out that in 1956 we were the second fisheries nation in the world. Now we are fifth.

Mr. President, I send amendments to the desk, which I ask to have stated. The amendment is submitted as only a nonsubstantive charge designed to make absolutely clear that resources of the Continental Shelf are to be protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 1, line 8, after the word "any", to insert "Continental Shelf", and in the same line, after the word "resource", to strike out "of the Continental Shelf".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Alaska.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the bill S. 1988 and to urge its enactment.

Frankly I do not believe there can be any serious question about the need for new legislation on this subject. The interests of our national security and the interests of our fishing industry require the additional protections which would be provided by the enactment of the bill.

Existing Federal law already prohibits foreign vessels from fishing in the territorial waters of the United States, but the prohibition is little more than an empty gesture because no penalties are provided and no effective means of applying the prohibition exist under present law. All that the Coast Guard can do now is simply to tell the offending vessel to leave U.S. waters.

This bill would finally put some teeth into the law. It provides for penalties involving fines of up to $10,000 and imprisonment for not more than a year, or both, for persons violating the prohibition against fishing in U.S. waters.

The bill is critically necessary because of the enormous increase, within the past 2 years, of exploitation of the fishing grounds adjacent to the United States by the fishing fleets of foreign nations, and by the increasing numbers of these foreign fishing vessels which encroach on the territorial waters of the United States. There is no need for me to detail the tremendous numbers of Russian fishing vessels, for instance, which have been operating on Georges Bank, almost within sight of Cape Cod, and off the shores of Alaska. A committee of the House of Representatives recently determined that Russia maintains a fleet of from 200 to 400 fishing vessels in the North Atlantic. More than a dozen large seagoing Russian trawlers now make regular round trips between the North Atlantic fishing grounds and Cuba, and on their trips south, these vessels hug the south Florida coastline, at times well within the 3-mile limit. A number of these trawlers equipped for special electronic capabilities which can serve military purposes have been observed close to our shores within the last 2 years.

Under these circumstances, I think it is high time we took effective steps to protect our own interests, as other nations have long ago done, by enactment of effective penalties against poaching.

In this regard, I think we are indebted to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] for his foresight and vision in bringing this problem to the attention of our committee and to the attention of the Senate. And I say this pointedly because the administration has done nothing on its own initiative with respect to this problem, despite its critical implications for our security and the welfare of the fishing industry. The administration has not called this problem to the attention of Congress. It has not acted on its own to meet the situation. Despite its vast resources, the most the administration has done is to support the foresighted efforts of the sponsors of this bill to get action, as have many of the rest of us.

The failure of the administration to realize the need for effective action in this area might have had serious consequences but for the alertness of Senator BARTLETT and others like him who have called our attention to this problem and suggested this effective remedy. Other steps may have to be taken. Careful consideration, for instance, should be given to the possibility of extending the territorial waters of the United States, for fishing purposes only, from the present 3 miles to 6 or 12 miles, as other nations have already done.

In addition, the provisions of this bill, when it is enacted, must be enforced vigorously and effectively by the administration if we are to safeguard both our security and the vast food resources of the fisheries adjacent to our shores.

In conclusion, I point out that the maritime traffic off our shores has increased 10 times in the past 2 years, and I think it is high time we made sure our laws in this respect are adequate to safeguard our interests. This bill is a long step in the right direction, and I hope it will be approved.

THE TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES SHOULD BE PROTECTED FROM EXPLOITATION BY FOREIGN FISHING THEREIN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am pleased to support this fine measure (S. 1988) for the protection of American territorial waters from invasion by foreign fishing vessels. In the past, we have been protected from such violations only by our distance from other fishing nations. Now the major fishing nations of the world are sponsoring large modern fishing fleets that can operate within our waters. There is much evidence of an increasing number of violations by foreign fishing vessels, which will increase unless we show a greater determination to stop the practice. Our fisheries are being depleted and our domestic fishing industry damaged by these invasions by foreign fishing ships.

This bill would accomplish that result through establishing enforcement machinery and providing penalties for violations. It is important to note that these provisions are similar to those in effect in most other maritime countries of the world. Our fishing fleets have been harassed for years by other countries attempting to enforce far more onerous restrictions against our vessels in what they claim are their waters. Boats of the Texas shrimp fleet have frequently been victims of harsh action by other countries because of their innocent activities. We may hope that this legislation may inspire a greater willingness by foreign vessels to insure reciprocal treatment for our fleets than has previously been the case. There are no teeth in our present laws to protect our territorial waters; this bill will put enforcement teeth into our domestic law.

I congratulate the Senator from Alaska for his leadership in this matter, and urge passage of this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill is a long overdue piece of legislation and it should receive widespread support because its approach is completely justifiable. It merely says that where the United States claims rights—to its territorial waters or to its resources on the Continental Shelf—effective measures will be available to protect these claims.

This bill does not create or expand any offshore claims of the United States. That is a matter which must be handled apart from this bill—by legislation, by executive action, by international negotiation, or by international law, as the case may be. Therefore, this bill does not advocate unilateral assertion of claims in the international sphere.

Moreover, it does not authorize unilateral sanctions in the international sphere. The sanctions enacted under this bill would operate only within the range of our domestic claims; only within our sovereign domain, where other nations have no justifiable claims of international rights, and have no basis for expecting multilateral action.

Under existing Federal law, fishing in U.S. territorial waters by foreign vessels is prohibited. But this prohibition is of little more effect than mere words. The existing Federal law does not provide effective sanctions to enforce the prohibition. The Coast Guard may only order a foreign vessel, trespassing in a territorial fishery, to leave the territorial sea. No more effective remedy is provided to enforce U.S. law. Similarly, we have no way to enforce our claims to the resources of the Continental Shelf off our shores.

In my judgment, the existence of such hollow prohibitions and paper claims is unwise. It is not effective. It is an invitation to violators. It does not instill an attitude of responsibility to law. It does not allow the United States to back up its edict, and it certainly does not generate respect from others. It artificially limits the alternatives available to our enforcement officers.

These considerations make the need for more effective sanctions abundantly clear in my judgment. This is reenforced by the wide support given to the bill at the committee hearings, and it is confirmed by the unanimous judgment of the Commerce Committee. And if we need further evidence, the United States is not alone in its desire to protect its fishery resources. Australia, Canada, France, Japan, and Russia all have provided by law strong sanctions to deter territorial violations.

I do not believe that, when this Nation claims rights off our shores, the U.S. Senate should tell our fishermen we will do nothing to protect those rights and make them meaningful. I urge the Senate approval of this bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, even though there have not yet been any reports of invasions of the territorial waters of the State of Washington by fishing vessels of foreign nations in recent weeks as there have been in other areas of the North Pacific, the need for S. 1988 is no less apparent to protect the rich fishery resources of these waters where Pacific Northwest fishermen operate. The increased fishing effort off our coasts by foreign fishing fleets equipped to search out, capture, and process large concentrations of fish cause us to reexamine the inadequate laws we now have to protect our coastal fisheries.

This search for large concentrations of fish by these efficient fleets, coupled with the fact that our important migratory species do congregate in our territorial waters as they prepare to enter the several rivers and estuaries of Washington and the Fraser River in Canada, makes it absolutely imperative that we establish mechanics for the enforcement of a law to prohibit fishing by foreign-flag vessels in our territorial waters and to provide penalties for violations. Salmon is the best known and most valuable U.S. resource involved, but many other important resources are also covered by this measure.

The absolute prohibition against fishing in our territorial waters by foreign-flag vessels contained in this bill with the accompanying enforcement authority and penalty provisions constitutes the kind of positive action that is essential to prevent trespass on water areas that have formerly been inviolate since the establishment of the Republic.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of S. 1988, I would like to present the following statement in strong support of the bill.

The State of Hawaii well knows the implications of frequent incursions and excursions into the territorial seas of the United States by foreign fishing and whaling vessels. A significant portion of the island State's economy is bound up with the fishing industry. In terms of per capita consumption of seafood, I would say that we in the State of Hawaii are probably the highest in the United States. And yet, the fishing industry in Hawaii has been hard hit by a declining number of men and boats. The postwar deep-sea fleet numbered 31 ships and a crew count of 373 men. Today, for various reasons, the fleet numbers 19 and lists 170 crew members. I dare say the same proportionate decreases in ships and men would hold for Alaska, the Pacific, and Atlantic Coast States.

S. 1988 seeks to clarify the situation with regard to foreign fishing operations within the sovereign jurisdiction of the United States, a point which has been attested to by a representative of the U.S. Navy. It is, in this regard, comparable to fishery laws which prevail in other sovereign nations, seeking to protect their own fishing grounds. The least that we can do is give our domestic fishermen the same protection their counterparts receive from their own governments. Those of us who may doubt the wisdom of S. 1988 should read and reread the testimony of Mr. James Ackert, president of the Atlantic Fishermen's Union. He repeatedly points to the wanton and reckless operations of the Russian fishing fleets off the Atlantic coast wherein no concern is paid to established conservation practices in the United States—350- to 400-foot-long Russian nets with their insides laced by smaller mesh liners, which have been picked up by U.S. fishermen, proves the complete lack of any conservation interest by the Russians.

The representative of the Department of State, on September 5, 1963, stated that the Department fully approves of the purposes of the bill and that there are no objections from the standpoint of U.S. foreign relations. The Department further indicated that frequent illegal incursions into U.S. territorial seas have indeed occurred.

The Department of State, through its Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife, has further indicated before the Senate Commerce Committee that existing legislation is ineffective in dealing with instances of foreign vessels fishing in U.S. territorial seas. U.S. authority, for all practical purposes, is limited to expulsion of the vessel and thus provides no real deterrent to them.

The Department of the Interior, through its Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, has indicated much the same. It is in favor of enactment of legislation, such as S. 1988, which will prohibit foreign vessels from engaging in fishing within the territorial seas of the United States and which will also provide criminal sanctions for fishing by such vessels in violation of these conditions. It further feels that existing legislation is unclear and is ineffective due to lack of adequate provisions for sanctions to serve as a deterrent to foreign fishing in territorial seas of the United States.

Together with my distinguished colleagues from the Pacific and Atlantic coast States, I strongly urge serious consideration of S. 1988, which provide for specific sanctions in order to deter these incursions and also clarifies existing legislation in this most crucial area of our domestic fishing industry.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the American fishing industry has been in decline for some years, and for this reason I am pleased that two bills to help this important industry are scheduled for Senate consideration today.

My State, one of the oldest in the Union, has always had a deep interest and stake in fishing, but during the past 20 years Connecticut's fish catch has dropped by over 50 percent.

In 1940, the catch was 14 million pounds. By 1960 this figure had dropped substantially, to only a 6-million-pound catch for Connecticut fishermen. And there has been no change in this downward trend since 1960.

To a very large extent, the decline of the American fishing industry can be attributed to the impact of foreign competition. Fishermen of foreign nations, many of whose governments susidize their ultramodern fishing fleets or extend help to the fishing industry in various other ways, are able to operate in waters traditionally fished only by the American fleet.

And the basic reason why we have lost out in waters that the United States has traditionally fished, is that our fishing vessels do not compare favorably with those of some of our competitors.

Just a brief survey of the facts that have been developed by the Commerce Committee and several of the executive agencies clearly brings home the staggering disadvantage under which our fishing industry operates.

A great part of our fishing vessels are obsolete and inefficient; 32 percent of the vessels operating in 1961 were between 21 and 50 years old; 50 percent of the large trawlers fishing out of New England were more than 20 years old.

Opposed to this are the up-to-date foreign fleets, with refrigerated mother ships up to 350 feet in length. These vessels are able to sail farther from their home ports and stay out for longer periods of time than is possible for American ships.

There are other technological advances which the American fishing industry is unable to fully utilize. For instance, adaptations of radar and sonar enable foreign fleets to find and follow schools of fish efficiently, so they need not merely wait until they happen upon a school.

How can we help the American fishing industry reverse its decline and at least hold its own, or even improve its competitive position?

We can go right to the source of the problem, which is the inability of American fishermen to meet the prohibitive costs of constructing new and large fishing vessels incorporating the latest developments in refrigeration and other advanced fishing techniques.

Ever since 1792, American fishermen have been forbidden to land fish in the United States from a foreign-built vessel. This means that they cannot purchase ships from foreign countries, where construction costs are much lower than here.

In 1960, Congress took a first step to help meet this problem, by providing a subsidy not to exceed 33⅓ percent of the costs of constructing a fishing vessel in a domestic shipyard.

This program expired in June of this year, but the bill before us, S. 1006, would extend the subsidy program for another 5 years, until 1968, and increase the maximum Federal contribution from 33⅓ to 55 percent.

I will support this bill, and I will do so for two reasons:

First. It seems to me that it is a matter of equity and simple justice for the Federal Government to help defray the high cost of constructing fishing vessels in domestic yards. It is a matter of firm and traditional national policy to require their construction in American yards, to make sure that our shipbuilding industry is maintained and kept in readiness for any national emergency. But in so doing, I think we have an obligation to help the domestic fishing industry make up for the disadvantages this policy causes, in the form of higher construction costs than its competitors must pay.

Second. The larger subsidy provided in this bill is the result of our experience with the previous 3-year program. The two-thirds of the costs that has had to be financed by vessel owners has been beyond the means of most vessel owners, and credit from conventional sources has been difficult to obtain. The 55 percent subsidy will leave only 45 percent of the construction costs to the owners, and I am hopeful that this will lead to greater activity in the construction of large and modern fishing vessels.

I am afraid that if we do not extend and expand this program of subsidies for fishing vessel construction, our fishing industry will suffer an even greater decline in the future, perhaps to the point of no return, where we can no longer reverse the trend of recent years. At least we have a chance to do so now, and I hope the Congress will do so this year.

The second bill would not have as large and beneficial an impact on the fishing industry, but I think it is a worthwhile measure which in the long run is necessary and important to the American fleet.

S. 1988 would make clear the fact that foreign vessels are prohibited from fishing in our territorial waters and from taking Continental Shelf fishery resources. It also would set up enforcement procedures and establish penalties for violators.

During the last few months, we have seen foreign fishing operations on an unprecedented scale close to our shores, and violations of our territorial waters are becoming more and more frequent.

To the indignity of losing our traditional fishing areas, has been added the injury of foreign fishing fleets working in sight of the mainland. In fact, these foreign vessels have even come into our own territorial waters.

Clearly, we should not permit this. We have to make other nations understand that they cannot encroach this far into our fishing grounds. And once this policy is announced, as a matter of law, we can use the stronger enforcement procedures and penalties to effectively discourage further violations in our waters. As matters now stand, Federal officials can only expel violators of our territorial waters from the territorial area. This does not provide a real deterrent to violators but I believe the authority contained in S. 1988 will do so.

The bill would permit fines, imprisonment, and forfeiture, and it would also authorize procedures for the seizure of foreign vessels operating illegally.

This is by no means a final answer to the problems of the fishing industry. But S. 1988 will be helpful, and in conjunction with the construction subsidy program, Congress will be taking two important steps toward assisting in the revitalization of the American fishing industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1988) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is unlawful for any vessel, except a vessel of the United States, or for any master or other person in charge of such a vessel, to engage in the fisheries within the territorial waters of the United States, its territories and possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico or to engage in the taking of any Continental Shelf fishery resource which appertains to the United States except as provided by an international agreement to which the United States is a party. However, the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a license authorizing a vessel other than a vessel of the United States to engage in fishing within the territorial waters of the United States or for resources of the Continental Shelf which appertain to the United States and to land its catch in a United States port, upon certification by the Secretary of the Interior that such permission would be in the national interest and upon concurrence of any State, Commonwealth or territory directly affected.

SEC. 2. (a) Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(b) Every vessel employed in any manner in connection with a violation of this Act including its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo, and stores shall be subject to forfeiture and all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the monetary value thereof shall be forfeited.

(c) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of a cargo for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such cargo or the proceeds from the sale thereof, and the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this Act, insofar as such provisions of law are applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Enforcement of the provisions of this Act is the joint responsibility of the United States Coast Guard, the United States Department of the Interior, and the United States Bureau of Customs. In addition, the Secretary of the Interior may designate officers and employees of the States of the United States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and of any territory or possession of the United States to carry out enforcement activities hereunder. When so designated, such officers and employees are authorized to function as Federal law enforcement agents for these purposes.

(b) The judges of the United States district courts, the judges of the highest courts of the territories and possessions of the United States, and United States commissioners may, within their respective jurisdictions, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue such warrants or other process, including warrants or other process issued in admiralty proceedings in Federal district courts, as may be required for enforcement of this Act and any regulations issued thereunder.

(c) Any person authorized to carry out enforcement activities hereunder shall have the power to execute any warrant or process issued by any officer or court of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of this Act.

(d) Such person so authorized shall have the power—

(1) with or without a warrant or other process, to arrest any person committing in his presence or view a violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder;

(2) with or without a warrant or other process, to search any vessel and, if as a result of such search he has reasonable cause to believe that such vessel or any person on board is in violation of any provision of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, then to arrest such person.

(e) Such person so authorized may seize any vessel, together with its tackle, apparel, furniture, appurtenances, cargo and stores, used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder or which it reasonably appears has been used or employed contrary to the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued hereunder.

(f) Such person so authorized may seize, whenever and wherever lawfully found, all fish taken or retained in violation of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder. Any fish so seized may be disposed of pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, or if perishable, in a manner prescribed by regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

(g) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2464 of title 28 when a warrant of arrest or other process in rem is issued in any cause under this section, the United States marshal or other officer shall discharge any fish seized if the process has been levied, on receiving from the claimant of the fish a bond or stipulation for the value of the fish with sufficient surety to be approved by a judge of the district court having jurisdiction of the offense, conditioned to deliver the fish seized, if condemned, without impairment in value or, in the discretion of the court, to pay its equivalent value in money or otherwise to answer the decree of the court in such cause. Such bond or stipulation shall be returned to the court and judgment thereon against both the principal and sureties may be recovered in event of any breach of the conditions thereof as determined by the court. In the discretion of the accused, and subject to the direction of the court, the fish may be sold for not less than its reasonable market value and the proceeds of such sale placed in the registry of the court pending judgment in the case.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which we have just passed, S. 1988, prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States, there are certain thoughts which I would like to advance.

The United States is now the leading naval and maritime nation in the world. We have the capability of controlling the seas more effectively than any nation in the history of the world. Our powers for control are truly three dimensional in nature: we not only dominate the surface of the seas because of our swift moving and massive Navy, but we control the skies above our ships, and we are presently going a long way—thanks to our submarine programs—to being able to control the seas beneath the surface. All told, our worldwide seapower is far greater and more absolute than was the control of the British Navy in its heyday. And, the British and we are the only two modern nations who can ever be said to have dominated all the oceans' seas.

With these implicit powers go great responsibilities for a just and proper future. The one great undiscovered, unexplored new frontier in cur world today is the ocean floor. We have as yet no clear estimate of the abundance of riches to be found there. I am not just thinking of fishery resources, but of the important mineral resources and other resources that may be found there. Perhaps some day in the more distant future there may be actual undersea colonies of human beings living and exploiting the resources of the deep.

Because of our paramount naval position and because there are so many possible gains for the United States at the bottom of the oceans, I believe that our national interest is best served by keeping the control of the ocean floors as well as surfaces as international as possible, so that we can exploit all the ocean bottoms of the world. We may well discover that the mineral or other resources on the ocean floors are not too far from the shores of other nations and on their Continental Shelves. At this very time the Coast Guard cutter *Northwind*, is making various surveys along the northern shore of the Soviet Union, often within sight of land.

It would seem to me that ours should be the last nation to advance, as a matter of U.S. national interest, any proposal which would remove from the world's oceanic areas and oceanic floors their international nature. I can see why a nation with a large army, like the Soviet Union or a nation with no fleet, like Ecuador, might hazard bold proposals to the effect that fishery resources hundreds of miles out to sea should be considered their own and not in the public domain. But if we should ever follow this policy, it seems to me that we may be setting a very dangerous precedent, in opposition to our total national interest.

My own thought is that we should approach this problem from a multilateral viewpoint—so that we do not limit ourselves in the future by setting an example now which other nations might apply later against us.

I would suggest a twofold approach to this problem; first by beefing up the existing Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention, and second, by securing the necessary final ratification of the Geneva Convention on the Continental Shelf. Our objectives with respect to the former could be achieved by the adoption of a multilateral enforcement policy within the Northwest Convention, setting forth the provision that the enforcement arm of any signatory nation can board and inspect any fishing vessel within the prescribed waters. This could then serve as a guideline policy for other fishing conventions to which we are signatory. I would even suggest that our own Coast Guard, which has great experience in this area, be made the investigating and inspecting agent for the convention. Presently the U.S. Coast Guard undertakes international responsibility in such areas as the International Ice Patrol, the North Atlantic and Pacific weather stations which also carry beacon and radar services for all aircraft, and the long range electronic navigation stations which service all countries which wish to avail themselves of these navigational aids.

The next scheduled meeting of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention will be at Halifax this coming spring. I believe we should press for a much earlier meeting, and that we should send a strong delegation to it with specific responsibility for putting enforcement teeth into this convention, to increase its effectiveness. I would also recommend enlarging and strengthening the convention secretariat which presently has only an executive secretary—Canadian—a biologist-technican—Canadian—and three clerk-typists—American—so that it can administer the convention policies with greater effectiveness.

My second approach toward resolving this problem is to urge the Department of State to make every effort to secure one more country's ratification of the Geneva Convention of 1958 on the Continental Shelf. This convention would give the coastal State sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring and exploiting the natural resources of the Continental Shelf. Then, too, the shelf is defined in such a manner that little doubt would exist as to the rights granted therein to any coastal State. One more ratifying country would put this convention into effect, and thus could resolve our problems with respect to ocean resources in that area.

These procedures would also give an opportunity to the Soviet Union, which is a party to both conventions, to demonstrate her willingness to engage in further peaceful, international activities—an attitude which she avows, but which she has yet to demonstrate, but which we hope may stem from our agreement on the partial nuclear test ban treaty.

These multilateral approaches, in my judgment, would constitute a most sound and wise way to act in our world today. It is the way of responsible nations, who are willing to cooperate to the mutual benefit of all. It is an old and accepted way in which matters of international concern are settled. I consider it a wise method and one which can set the guidelines for other and future agreements to protect and conserve the resources of our oceans.

I realize that my distinguished friend and colleague from Alaska, Senator BARTLETT, and the cosponsors of S. 1988, are acting with a just and proper concern for the preservation of our fishery resources, and the protection of our domestic fishing industry. I, too, share that concern, not only for the fishermen from my own State of Rhode Island, but for all our fishermen.

I am in complete accord with the objective of the legislation which has just passed as it applies to our territorial waters and voted for this legislation.

But I do believe we should be careful in exercising the power we have now given ourselves by legislating in advance with respect to fishery resources which the United States at some future date may determine belongs to us. We have in effect set the stage for unilaterally extending our jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit once the Executive makes a determination that any single fishery resource belongs to this country. While I have complete confidence in the judgment of the Executive, I would still prefer to advance our objectives in the long accepted and traditional method of international agreements.

With these thoughts in mind, I am submitting a Senate resolution requesting the President to secure acceptance by all concerned Governments of the two proposals recommended by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries which are designed to facilitate the establishment of international control and inspection in this area. As I suggested previously, this could then serve as a guideline policy with respect to other international agreements to which we are a party.

I also urge the Department of State to bend all its efforts to securing that one final ratification to the Convention on the Continental Shelf, so that it, too, may be put into effect.

I believe this twofold approach to this problem can accomplish our national objectives regarding the conservation and protection of our fishery resources in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and would do so in an internationally accepted manner.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 207) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> Whereas the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, signed at Washington, District of Columbia, under date of February 8, 1949, has been ratified or adhered to by the Governments of 13 countries, including the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and
>
> Whereas such contracting Governments have agreed to promote the conservation and protection of the fisheries resources of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean in order to make possible the maintenance of a maximum sustained catch from those fisheries; and
>
> Whereas the establishment of the right for any contracting Government to carry out the inspection of all fishing vessels of any other contracting Government in the convention area would promote the objectives and insure the observance of the convention: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the President is hereby requested to make such efforts as may be necessary to secure the acceptance of all the Governments parties thereto of the two recommendations adopted by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries and transmitted by the Commission to the United States as depositary Government on July 10, 1963, as proposals of the Commission to amend the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries in order to facilitate the establishment of measures of international control and inspection of all fishing vessels of any Contracting Government in the Convention area.
>
> SEC. 2. The President is further requested to make all such efforts, through the U.S. delegation to the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as may be necessary to place before such Commission for its consideration at the earliest possible time, either at a special meeting or at the next regular annual meeting, proposals for measures establishing further necessary regulations to protect and conserve the fisheries resources in the area to which the International Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries applies.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 457, Senate bill 1006.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (1006) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments on page 2, line 24, after the word "substitute", to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert "$10,000,000", and on page 3, line 3, after "June 30,", to strike out "1972" and insert "1968"; so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Act of June 12, 1960, as amended, may be cited as the "United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act".
>
> SEC. 2. The Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), is amended as follows:
>
> (1) in section 2 delete the word "and" at the end of subsection (6); add a new subsection (7) as follows:
>
> "(7) the vessel will be of advance design, which will enable it to operate in expanded areas, or be equipped with newly developed gear, and will not operate in a fishery, if such operation would cause economic hardship to efficient vessel operators already operating in that fishery, and;" , and renumber the present subsection (7) as subsection (8);
>
> (2) delete section 4;
>
> (3) in section 5, delete the phrase "33⅓ per centum" and substitute "55 per cent";
>
> (4) amend section 9 to read:
>
> "SEC. 9. If any fishing vessel constructed with the aid of a construction subsidy in accordance with the provisions of this Act, as amended, is operated during its useful life, as determined by the Secretary, contrary to the provisions of this Act or any regulations issued thereunder, the owner of such vessel shall repay to the Secretary, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe an amount not to exceed the total depreciated construction subsidy paid by the Secretary pursuant to this Act and this shall constitute a maritime lien against such vessel. The obligations under this section shall run with the title to the vessel."
>
> (5) in section 12, delete "$2,500,000" and substitute "$10,000,000"; and
>
> (6) amend section 13 to read:
>
> "SEC. 13. No application for a subsidy for the construction of a fishing vessel may be accepted by the Secretary after June 30, 1968."

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I wanted to make an inquiry—I think several Senators who are interested in this bill would like to know also—whether it is intended to continue consideration of this bill after the Senator from Wisconsin makes his statement, which I understand will take him about 20 minutes.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Yes, indeed. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin will take 20 or 25 minutes, and the Senate will proceed with the consideration of the bill thereafter.

DO WE SELL THE ROPE TO HANG US?—WHEAT FOR THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk about the probability that the United States might sell as much as $400 million worth of wheat, at the world price, to the Soviet Union. That world price is 55 cents below the American domestic price.

I have listened for 5 hours to detailed explanations and justification of this act by the Secretaries of Commerce and Agriculture and the Under Secretary of State and their spokesmen, and I am emphatically opposed to this proposal.

VIOLATES CONGRESSIONAL POLICY

This transaction would violate the policy of Congress as set forth in the Agricultural Act of 1961.

In August 1961, Congress passed the Agricultural Act, which stated as follows in the Statement of Policy of the act:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480 and in no manner either subsidize the export, sale, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nation other than such friendly nation.

"Friendly nation" is defined in section 107 of Public Law 480 as follows:

> A friendly nation means any country other than the U.S.S.R.—

That is the first point.

The language continues:

> or any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

Mr. President, there is no way we can avoid the fact that this is a direct contradiction of the declaration of policy in the Agricultural Act of 1961, which would forbid the sale of wheat under the only terms under which there is any possibility of selling it to the Soviet Union.

The New York Times reports this morning that few Members of Congress oppose the sale of this wheat. This is said to be based on interviews with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee after a meeting held yesterday.

It may well be that few Members of Congress will oppose this kind of arrangement for the President to act in contradiction of the specific language of Public Law 87–128, the Agricultural Act. However, if this be true, if only a few Members of Congress would oppose it, what is wrong with having Congress act?

The fact is if there is virtually unanimity of opinion in Congress, Congress can act promptly. No showing has been made that there is any real urgency in this matter. There is no urgency in any of the presentations I have heard from the State, Commerce, and Agriculture Departments on the part of Russia, and certainly there is no urgency on our part.

It would seem to me a resolution from the appropriate committees of Congress would give us an opportunity to understand the issue, debate it, and dispose of it in a matter of a relatively few days, because this does constitute a major change of policy.

ECONOMIC BENEFIT TO U.S.S.R.

The present agricultural sales to the U.S.S.R., which are not subsidized agricultural products, but are of agricultural products which move where the world price and domestic price are about the same, constituted last year $4½ million. The sale of the wheat would be 100 times as much as that, in one sale—about $400 million.

The economic effect on the Soviet Union would be very substantial.

This one arrangement, this one deal, would apparently consume almost 10 percent of the Soviet Union's gold and foreign exchange, which is said to be between $4⅛ and $8 billion.

If the U.S.S.R. wants to make this arrangement, which would consume this much of her gold and foreign exchange, and more than 1 year's gold production in the Soviet Union, it would obviously be considered or proposed by the U.S.S.R. only if it would result in great economic benefit to the Soviet Union. It would. In the first place it would be very helpful to the Soviet's food reserves. The way in which the Soviet economy operates, to produce that amount of wheat would require an enormous amount of manpower, because of the inefficiency of Soviet agricultural production. And, of course, manpower is the essence of any economy's strength.

There is no question that the production of that amount of wheat would take many tractors and other farm machinery and would consume a great deal of steel, electrical production, and require much chemical fertilizer, all of which would have not merely an effect on the Soviet economy, but a profound and serious and substantial effect.

HELPS U.S.S.R. MILITARY

In the second place, there is no question that it would have a significant effect on the Soviet military effort. The sacrifices for defense which we make in this country are substantial. The Soviet Union makes three times as substantial a contribution to their military in terms of the gross national product. The Soviet Union's military effort takes 30 percent of her gross national product, as compared with 10 percent in this country. So obviously any big and substantial support of the Soviet Union's economy will directly benefit her military effort.

The sale of this wheat would have a significant military effect in terms of military food reserves, manpower, and military strength.

HELP U.S.S.R. TO DOMINATE SATELLITES

A main argument against this deal is that this wheat will be primarily used by the Soviet Union, according to all the testimony available, for export.

NOT FOR FAMINE RELIEF

It is true that we have two precedents in which the United States of America has given assistance in the past to Russia. The first time was in 1892, when there was no Communist regime, but when there was a tyrannical regime. Even that assistance encountered a great deal of public criticism in this country. The second time was in 1921, when there was a Communist regime, but where the situation was entirely different, where crop failure had led to widespread famine in Russia. Some 9 million people were fed by the American relief organizations, under the direction of Herbert Hoover.

If we had that kind of situation today, I am sure every Member of Congress would support such aid. To supply relief for hunger under the American flag is appropriate, proper, and desirable, from any standpoint. Any country, including a Communist country, which would request this kind of assistance would undoubtedly receive substantial consideration by all branches of the Government.

But this is something different. This is a sale to the Soviet Union at the subsidized price, which is below the domestic price. It is a sale to the Soviet Government, not for use by the Russians primarily, but for use in keeping its commitments to its satellites.

Elliott Janeway, in last night's Washington Star, wrote, and I quote as follows:

> Theorizing apart no one knows how severe the failure may have been within Russia herself; how much of a reserve she may have; or how much of her present purchases are really scheduled not for her own internal use, but instead for resale throughout free Europe and for rationing and political bribery among the satellites.
>
> We don't need Russia to get in between us and our allies and friends in free Europe, and to resell our premium commodities to them for their good money when they are our creditors. It is to the mutual interest of all in the Atlantic Community for us to earn more by direct sales to Europe. No doubt about it, free Europe needs wheat and it has the money to pay for it. True, Russia will offer to pay us in gold which we badly need, but so will Europe.
>
> The satellites need our wheat even more, and this is a time for us to trade out a tangible political return on all that we have been giving to Poland and to Yugoslavia as well as for us to look for our own back in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

This is a mighty persuasive argument against the sale. If we have the wheat, and other countries are willing to buy the wheat, why should we sell it to the Soviet Union, the world's largest producer of wheat, so that it can continue its export of wheat to satellite countries and to Western Europe, in following its own interests? Why should we ourselves not sell it, particularly to free Europe?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I heard the Senator from Wisconsin describe the law as it now exists. I should like to point out what the law provides. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin that under the Agricultural Act of 1961 the policy of Congress was declared to be—and I am now referring to section 2(c):

> To expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator has stated the law precisely as it is, and he has referred to the proper section. I concur completely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That declaration of policy is that we shall sell at subsidized prices to friendly nations, and that we shall in no manner sell or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Wisconsin that it is our declared policy that our Government will sell at subsidized prices to friendly nations only, but not to unfriendly nations?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. The particular reference to Public Law 480 explains, in a very simple and very direct way, what a friendly nation is. I read from section 107 of Public Law 480:

> As used in this act, "friendly nation" means any country other than (1) the U.S.S.R.

It then goes on to speak of any country dominated or controlled by international communism. The U.S.S.R. is explicitly and clearly defined as not a friendly nation for purposes of the act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, under the Agricultural Act of 1961, reference is made to Public Law 480 in ascertaining the definition of a friendly nation. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator again state how Public Law 480 defines a friendly nation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Section 107 of Public Law 480 states:

> As used in this act, "friendly nation" means any country other than (1) the U.S.S.R.

Then it refers also to any nation dominated or controlled by international communism.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it proper, in interpreting that language, to come to the conclusion that, as a prerequisite to the right to sell at a subsidized price, the buyer must be a country friendly to the United States?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the country is unfriendly, the declaration of policy, as specified in Public Law 480, prohibits the sale.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To sell to Red Russia, the conclusion must be drawn, from the provisions of Public Law 480, that Red Russia is friendly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is a rather strained and tenuous conclusion, is it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe so. However, I have seen some very strained and tenuous conclusions reached to make the argument that we are talking about a country like Red China or Cuba. However, the law is clear, explicit, and precise. The law says:

> (1) The U.S.S.R. is not a friendly country.

That is the only country cited. There is no mention of any other country. There is no mention of Red China or Cuba. It mentions only the U.S.S.R.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Section 107 is applied completely to Red Russia. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It provides that Red Russia shall not be considered a friendly nation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is what it says.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Nor shall any other nation be considered a friendly nation which is under the control of Red Russia.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Section 107 also provides:

> Or any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the interpretation of the Senate from Wisconsin that if we sell to Red Russia at the subsidized price, we must declare it to be friendly to our cause? Would it not require us to say that the Soviet Union is a friendly nation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would seem that way, unless the President is willing—it is hard to find the exact phrase—unless he is willing not to abide by the policy declaration of Congress. If he does not wish to abide by it, he can make the sale. If he wishes to abide by the declaration of Congress, he cannot make the sale under any circumstances, because the law is that clear. It is not a matter of interpretation—10,000 times 10,000 lawyers could not make any other interpretation from that language. The interpretation is absolutely clear. It is as clear as it can be.

However, the President, if he wishes, can ignore or overlook or not abide by—I believe that is the best phrase—the declaration of policy that Congress has made in the preamble to the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it or would it not follow that if the administration is allowed to sell wheat at a subsidized price to Red Russia, it could also sell wheat at a subsidized price to Red China and Cuba?

Mr. PROXMIRE. My interpretation is that it would be easier under this law to sell to either Cuba or China, because China and Cuba are not mentioned in it. If the President or his advisers want to say at any time that Castro and Mao are friendly, or at least not unfriendly, they are free to do so. But the U.S. Government cannot sell to the U.S.S.R. unless it is willing to ignore or to overlook the explicit prohibition or explicit statement of policy by Congress.

The question that arises is whether there has been a significant, substantial change in the last 2 years that would make it clear that Russia has taken a different tack; that Russia can no longer be categorized as not a friendly nation. I feel that it would take the greatest imagination to find such a change.

It is true that Russia concurred in the test ban treaty. I am glad Russia did so. But, after all, since the act of August of 1961 it has been revealed that the Russians put their missiles in Cuba, 90 miles from our shore. That has taken place since that act of Congress. Certainly that is an unfriendly action and would completely counterbalance any subsequent friendly action which has taken place since then that I know about. Is that not correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in the Senator's statement. But is it not also true that if we now make a declaration that Russia is friendly, that declaration would be in complete conflict with the definition of friendly countries as contained in section 107 of Public Law 480?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So even if we wanted to say that Russia is friendly and therefore shall have the beneficence and the act of our charity, such a declaration would be in conflict with the specific language of the statute.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we are to decide that Russia has changed its ways and that it is helpful and friendly to us, should the proposed action be taken through a modification of the law, or should it be done by having the administration make a declaration on the subject?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recognize that the President has the prime responsibility. There are times when the President should take steps which might directly contradict earlier policy statements by Congress. But it seems to me that when those steps are taken, there should be a clear justification for them and an overwhelming consensus that the steps are necessary and wise. But to take such a step in these circumstances, without any action by Congress, would seem to me to make statements of policy by Congress in the future meaningless.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for the information he has given.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, a prime purpose of the wheat sale would be to permit the Soviet Union to continue to hold the grip it now has over its satellites. There is no question that one of the reasons why the Soviet Union is able to dominate and operate in Cuba is that the Soviet Union is the prime source of wheat and all other food and material for Cuba. This is true in the other satellite countries, as well.

PROPOSAL COULD HELP RED CHINA

The newspapers this morning reported that the food shortage situation in Red China is worse than it has been at any time in recent years—worse, even, than in 1961. In 1961, many experts said that there was a possibility—certainly not a probability, but a possibility—that conceivably there could be a revolution in Red China, a revolution that might overthrow the Communist regime. I admit this is unlikely. Of course, it is always unlikely, but it may have been possible.

Now the reports are that the food shortage in Red China is worse than it was then. Although the State Department may assure us that it will try to make certain that this enormous amount of wheat will not be transshipped from Russia to China, the fact is that that is always a real possibility. While it is true that there is a conspicuous and vehement ideological dispute between Red China and the Soviet Union, the fact is that if the Communist regime in Red China is faced with a situation in which an anti-Communist revolution might succeed, it is perfectly obvious that Russia would ship wheat, at whatever sacrifice is necessary, into Red China, in order to prevent that kind of revolution. This is another reason why it would be a mistake for our Government to contradict the clear and explicit statement of Congress in the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PROPOSAL CONTRADICTS J. F. K. UTAH SPEECH

As a Democrat, I was proud of the magnificent speech delivered by President Kennedy at the Mormon Tabernacle in Salt Lake City last week. It was a great speech. It was a speech which made me proud to be an American, as well as to be a Democrat. But what does that speech really mean in terms of this kind of proposal? The President said:

> As we go, so goes freedom. No other nation has the power to maintain world freedom. Our U.S. interest is best served by preserving and protecting a world of diversity, in which no monolithic power can acquire that ability to dominate.

The fact is that the monolithic powers of Red China and the Soviet Union are based on economic strength. There is no question at all that if we were to provide the enormous amount of wheat that has been proposed—more than 200 million bushels, valued at $400 million—if we concluded that kind of deal, the economy of the Soviet Union would be strengthened in its capacity to dominate not only its own people but the people in the satellite countries, as well.

RUSSIA CANNOT GET WHEAT ELSEWHERE

There has been one prime argument in favor of making such an agreement. It is the one argument in which those who support it seem to persist. The argument is that if we do not make this arrangement, Russia will get the wheat anyway; that all we would be doing by refusing to deal with Russia would be to make it possible for other countries to make more money. It is said that we would be preventing American farmers from increasing their income and preventing our wheat traders from making a profit. This argument does not stand up at all, because if Russia is to get wheat without getting it from us, from whom will she get it? Canada has already committed every bushel she can possibly deliver; and there is a real question whether Canada can deliver what she has committed.

Where will our European allies get wheat? This was as bad a wheat growing season in Western Europe as it was in Eastern Europe. This was a poor wheat growing season in the entire Eastern Hemisphere. Wheat is short in West Germany, in France, and in Italy. No surplus of wheat is available to be sold to the Soviet Union.

It has been argued that if the United States does not sell wheat to the Russians, our allied countries will buy the wheat from us and resell it to the Soviet Union. What does that mean? It certainly does not mean that our farmers will be out in this kind of arrangement.

Our farmers would still produce the wheat and profit from it. Our traders would still sell the wheat and gain from it.

The argument that our wheat would be sold to the West Germans, the French, the English, or the Italians, and would then be resold to the Russians, is what this contention comes down to. It is said that if we do not sell wheat to the Russians, they will get it anyway, because there just is no other place from which to get it.

The fact that Russia cannot get enough wheat in Western Europe, Canada, or any other part of the world is the reason why Russia is coming to us.

RIDICULOUS THAT 200 MILLION BUSHELS BE RESOLD TO U.S.S.R.

Suppose it is true that some of the wheat which we sell to West Germany or any of the other Western European countries might find its way to Russia or the Russian satellite countries. It is almost inconceivable that we would sell 200 million additional bushels of wheat to our Western European allies or to any other purchaser without having any idea where it would go, so that we might establish some kind of exchange control, some kind of surveillance of shipping, some kind of information sources, so that so vast an amount of wheat, which would take many ships over many months to deliver, could not be shipped without our knowing whether it was being delivered to Russia. Of course we would know. Certainly we could stop it, if we wanted to stop it. There is no question about it.

Also, Mr. President, there is no question in my mind if we specify to our allies we are buying this wheat and it is not to be resold I am convinced that they would not resell it, not simply because I have faith in them but because they have the brains to recognize that we would know that they did resell it and we could make it clear that we would not go out and sell it to them again under those circumstances. So the argument that the U.S.S.R. would get the wheat anyway does not stand up.

WHY SHOULD U.S. TAXPAYER SUBSIDIZE U.S.S.R.?

I think the most telling argument is that we are selling this wheat to Russia at a subsidized price. The world price is 55 cents below—roughly below the domestic price. In the first instance we pay a 55-cent subsidy for the benefit of the American farmer, a subsidy to keep his very low income from going even lower, a subsidy which the majority of the Members of Congress, and the administration, and past administrations, have supported.

To be honest, I believe we have to recognize that this is also a subsidy of the consumer, the foreign purchaser—a subsidy to both farmer and consumer; to the purchaser because he gets his wheat for less, the subsidies keep agricultural production up and thereby keep prices low. It is a subsidy in effect to the consumer.

Under any stretch of the imagination, this is a subsidy of substance to the Soviet Union if we make this deal because the Soviet Union will get the wheat for less. It is argued that this is not a subsidy to the U.S.S.R., because if the U.S.S.R. does not buy it from us at the world price they will buy it elsewhere at the world price. This argument does not hold up because obviously if the Soviet Union could in fact buy at the world price, that is, at the price we offer, under the circumstances they would certainly not come to the United States.

The sale of such a huge amount of wheat in a year of acute shortage, throughout the Eastern Hemisphere, is bound to affect the world price itself when we sell it at a subsidized low price. We keep the world price down. We keep it substantially below what it would be otherwise.

There is no question if Russia tried to buy this much wheat in the world market in the next 6 months, the price would be much higher—perhaps even higher than the domestic price. If Russia insisted on buying world wheat it would pay a price higher and probably much higher than they will pay the United States. So it is perfectly clear this does constitute a subsidy to the Soviet Union paid by the American taxpayer.

One of the distinguished proponents of this proposal asked the other day, what is our wheat for? He asked, "What is our wheat for, to look at, to store, or to pay storage on it?" He said, "Wheat is for human consumption and we want to have it consumed by human beings."

Now our wheat certainly is for human consumption. But there is no question in my mind that this wheat has not been produced to sell at a subsidy price to the Soviet Union. There is not a Member of Congress who would have voted for the Agricultural Act which would have had that consequence. Of course it was not produced for that purpose.

Let me sum up, Mr. President, and then I am through.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the able Senator from Wisconsin for the sound position he has taken in this matter and for the logical reasoning on which his position is based. Does not the Senator consider that food is an important weapon of war, just as much so as a gun?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question about it, and further there is no question in my mind that the greatest weakness in the Soviet Union, and the greatest weakness in all the Communist countries, is their inability to produce food, the utter failure of collectivized agriculture. This is America's greatest economic strength and it is their greatest economic weakness. By making this kind of deal we are compensating them for their weakness and strengthening their economy.

Mr. THURMOND. Does not the Senator feel that if we sell wheat to Russia, we shall be helping them to make their system—which now is deficient in that respect—stronger?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct; there is no question about it.

Mr. THURMOND. Does not the Senator feel that if this wheat goes to the Soviet countries behind the Iron Curtain, the people there will never know that the United States furnished them this subsidized wheat? Would not the same thing happen there that happened, several years ago, when we furnished wheat to Poland, and the Polish authorities took the wheat out of the bags labeled "United States," and placed it in bags with markings of their own country, and the people of Poland never knew where that wheat came from?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct. The fact is that this wheat will be sold by the Soviet Union to its own satellite countries, and help Russia control its own satellite countries.

Mr. THURMOND. So the Senator is ably making the point that we would thus be subsidizing the Soviets to the extent of 55 cents a bushel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. So I ask, why—and I believe the American people will wish to know why—should the United States subsidize the Soviet Union?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Certainly there is absolutely no sound political reason and certainly there is no sound military reason for it. All those arguments are against it. There is an economic reason of course because there would be a temporary increase in income, I presume, for the American farmer and for the American wheat trader. We would make money out of it. As Lenin boasted if communism triumphs over capitalism it will be because the capitalists will sell the rope that the Communists will hang us with.

We would sell them the rope which will hang us; that is what we are doing—to "make a buck."

Mr. THURMOND. Thus we would be providing the Soviets with munitions, so to speak, if we sold them wheat, because if men are to fight, they must have both food and weapons. In addition, the people who are going to back up that war machine must be fed.

The Russians are now undergoing a very terrible ordeal, I understand, for lack of proper food. Would this be the proper time to put such pressure on the Soviet Union, rather than to try to relieve them of it, if we wish ever to free the countries which now are behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. There is ample precedent for that. In 1921 or 1922 when the American Relief Administration under the direction of former President Herbert Hoover went into the Soviet Union, and it was then under Communist control, America was able to feed 9 million people. This is the way to solve the problem in an humane way, so as to see that people do not hunger. But to provide for a sale of wheat to the Soviet Government, the tyrants who control the Soviet Union, so that they can control their satellites, makes no sense.

Mr. THURMOND. Does not the Senator feel that if we sell this wheat to the Soviet Union or to the countries behind the Iron Curtain, we will assist the economic systems of those countries, rather than be trying to injure those systems—which we should be trying to do if we are interested in trying to destroy communism?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Again I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the able speech he is making and for the very sound position he is taking.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina very much.

Mr. President, to sum up this action, if we consummate the deal by selling a substantial amount of hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union, this clearly violates the sense of Congress as specified in the declaration of policy in the Agricultural Act of 1961.

Two, it will strengthen the economy of the Soviet Union. It will strengthen their military force and it will strengthen their political grip over their satellites. And it will strengthen their position with regard to the rest of the world.

Three, this situation could easily help Mao in Red China and Castro in Cuba. As a matter of fact the Canadian wheat deal specified that $33 million of that wheat be shipped directly to Cuba. If Cuba needs more wheat, this deal we might make would enable the Soviet Union to make additional commitments.

Fourth, the Soviet Union could not get 200 million bushels of wheat without this deal, certainly not at a price which we are willing to sell it to them. To get it, they would have to pay far more. No one else now has it. Certainly we can control the resale of this enormous amount of wheat.

In the fifth place, I am against the proposed arrangement because it means that the American taxpayer would subsidize the Soviet Union by more than $100 million. At the very least, it seems to the Senator from Wisconsin that the entire arrangement raises a very serious question, and that Congress should have an opportunity to debate, discuss, and act upon it. If Congress chooses to do so, it should be free to revise the declaration of the policy of 1961. It can do so through a simple resolution in a relatively few days.

I yield the floor.

During the delivery of Mr. PROXMIRE's speech,

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield 30 seconds to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, with the understanding that I will not lose the floor, and that the remarks of the Senator from Oregon will be printed either before or following my remarks, I yield 30 seconds to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to have the RECORD show that I am leaving the Chamber to return to my office. I am not attending any drinking party in the precincts of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon takes a serious risk with this record of sobriety unless the Senator intends to make such a record every night. The Senator from Oregon is doing to himself what a certain first mate did to his captain. The captain logged in the ship's book that the first mate came aboard drunk. The next time the captain went ashore the first mate logged that it was a great and memorable day for the ship for on that day the captain came aboard sober.

So let public and posterity know that the Senator from Oregon always—not just on this occasion—comes aboard sober.

ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AGENCIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in connection with S. 1466, a bill I cosponsored, dealing with administrative practices and procedures, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement published in the Federal Bar News, written by Edmund D. Edelman and Erwin G. Krasnow, titled "Admission of Attorneys To Practice Before Federal Administrative Agencies."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMISSION OF ATTORNEYS TO PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

(By Edmund D. Edelman and Erwin G. Krasnow)

A major issue pending before the 88th Congress is civil rights and "equal accommodations" for Negroes. However, there is a less dramatic legislative item being considered by the Congress which involves civil rights, States rights, and equal accommodations for lawyers practicing before Federal agencies. The Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure recently concluded hearings on S. 1466, which eliminates the unequal treatment imposed by agency admission procedures for lawyers.

S. 1466 provides, in part: "Any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of any State, possession, territory, commonwealth, or the District of Columbia, in which he resides or maintains an office, may represent others before any agency."

This bill, sponsored by eight members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, is based on the right of a person to be represented by counsel of his choice. This right is now recognized by 36 agencies. However, four agencies require lawyers to submit to special admission procedures. S. 1466 also provides that agencies must deal with the attorney chosen by the citizen to represent him. Complaints have been registered against agencies who refuse or are reluctant to give an attorney information, serve him with notices, or confer with him on a client's matters. Section 2 of S. 1466 makes it clear that an agency must deal with the attorney in the matter covered by the representation, that notice to or service upon the attorney constitutes valid notice and service upon the party.

The situation present by Federal agencies requiring attorneys to make separate applications to practice can be explained more readily by history than logic. History shows that the "bewildering array of regulations" for attorneys practicing before Federal agencies arose mainly as an antidote to the corrupt practices of claim agents in the post-Civil War era. After the Civil War there were a flood of pension claims filed in Washington, D.C., by widows and relatives of deceased soldiers. Many persons held themselves out as experts in prosecuting these claims. Most of these "experts" were not lawyers. When the well of pension claims dried up, the so-called experts turned to prosecuting patent and Indian claims. Because of the highly flamboyant advertisements, fraudulent and questionable practices, a movement began to regulate these matters. The situation is vividly described in a statement contained in a report of the House of Representatives in 1873: "An Indian claims agent * * * is generally bankrupt in moral, religion and politics. * * * He will marry a squaw and become an Indian to secure influence with them, and will abandon his victim and children, if necessary, for gain. He will abandon American citizenship for that of a band of Indians solely to divide their property with them and with that done, will abandon them. In short, if there is anything that an Indian claims agent will not do, it is that he will not treat his clients, the Indians, honestly. (H. Rep. 98, Investigation of Indian Frauds, 42d Cong., 3d sess., Mar. 3, 1873, pp. 76–77.)

Congressional action first came in 1884 in a bill appropriating money to those who had "lost horses" during the Civil War. Persons representing claimants were required to possess "good character" and the necessary qualifications to enable them to render "valuable service to the claimants." (23 Stat. 258, 5 U.S.C. 261.) The Secretaries of the Treasury and Interior were authorized to prescribe rules and regulation governing the recognition of agents, attorneys, or other persons representing claimants before these Departments. In the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, Congress provided that a party to a proceeding before the Commission may "appear * * * and be heard in person or by an attorney." Since no distinction was made by Congress between an attorney-at-law and an attorney-in-fact, most agencies concluded that Congress intended that nonlawyers should be allowed to practice before them. This grouping together of lawyers and laymen practicing before Federal agencies led to the same regulations being imposed on both. The regulations grew as the bureaucracy of the Federal Government increased in size. The situation became so confusing and annoying to lawyers that in 1957 the Office of Legal Counsel in the Department of Justice recommend that all agencies discontinue individual admission regulations and permit attorneys in good standing in the various jurisdictions to represent others before agencies. A number of agencies voluntarily accepted this recommendation. S. 1466 is directed at those agencies which have persisted in separate admissions, specialized bars or selective enrollment.

There are now four agencies that have separate procedures. The Interstate Commerce Commission, which does not oppose the enactment of S. 1466, requires an application under oath, a certificate of the clerk of the court or, in lieu of the certificate, the sponsorship of three practitioners (49 C.F.R., secs. 1.8 and 1.9). An attorney, in order to practice before the Patent Office, must make application on a prescribed form showing good moral character, good reputation, plus legal, scientific, and technical qualifications sufficient to render clients a valuable service. In order to handle patent cases, he must also pass an examination (37 C.F.R., sec. 1.341). To practice before the Veterans' Administration, lawyers must complete VA form 2–3186 and are required to file a power of attorney in each particular matter (38 F.R.F. 14.629).

The complex admission procedures for practice before the Treasury Department are specially set out in 70 sections, totaling 21 pages of fine print, in the Code of Federal Regulations. It is necessary to obtain enrollment cards which are issued only upon a showing of good character and reputation and the possession of necessary qualifications to render valuable service to clients (31 C.F.R. 10.0; 26 C.F.R. 601.501). A power of attorney must be filed with the department for each client before the attorney is properly before the agency in a representative capacity.

It may be argued that nonlawyer representatives who are not subject to an already existing code of professional ethics should be subject to standards set up by a Federal agency. Indeed, it would seem to be incumbent upon Federal agencies to impose such standards to insure protection of the administrative process. The question remains, however, whether attorneys, who are already subject to high standards of competence and character, should be further subjected to admission requirements imposed by governmental agencies. Are there substantial dangers involved in allowing a governmental agency to select those attorneys who may practice before it? Is the matter of competence and integrity of lawyers within the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts and bar association? If formal specialization is to be engrafted upon the legal profession, should the profession rather than a governmental agency undertake the task of establishing the requirements for specialization? Is a client rather than a governmental agency in a better position to determine whether an attorney is able to render valuable service? These and other basic questions were raised at the Senate hearings on S. 1466.

During the hearings, representatives from the Treasury Department asserted that separate admission requirements and procedures were necessary because membership in good standing in a State bar did not guarantee sufficient integrity in tax matters. It was alleged that all too often a lawyer might be convicted of a serious tax crime and yet not be disciplined by the State or local bar association. These assertions, of course, raise serious questions as to the policing ability of State bars to deal adequately with disciplinary problems involving tax matters. Even assuming arguendo that disciplinary measures have not been taken by State bar associations against attorneys for tax crimes, it would seem that this is hardly a valid reason to transfer the policing responsibilities of the local bar to a Federal agency in Washington. In this connection, it should be remembered that a lawyer is admitted to the practice of law upon a showing that is of good moral character and that he has the necessary professional knowledge. He subscribes to an oath of admission and a code of ethics. He is subject to investigation prior to admission and to continuous surveillance by bench, bar, and public after admission. All these requirements seem to afford the public the necessary degree of protection against incompetence and dishonesty.

S. 1466 has received the endorsement of the Federal Bar Association and the American Bar Association, as well as many State and local bar associations. Senator EDWARD V. LONG of Missouri, chairman of the Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee, stated it was his hope that "through the passage of this bill these cumbersome admission requirements for attorneys will be swept away, returning the general practitioner in this area to his traditional role as a recognized officer of the forum before which he appears as an advocate." Proponents of S. 1466 testified that restriction of practice before an agency is wrong in principle and has overtones of a closed shop or guildism. Senator KENNETH KEATING, of New York, stated the argument against agency control over admissions in unminced language: "It is absurd to bar from practice before a Federal administrative agency attorneys who are considered qualified to present cases before the highest court of a State or the Supreme Court of the United States."

A single admissions standard for all agencies would eliminate the maze of complex and differing rules and procedures for practice before Federal agencies. In addition to ending the "nuisance factor" for attorneys, the agencies would be freed from the time, money and manpower now being expended in administering these admission rules. The Second Hoover Commission Report stated that at least $3,000 a year could be saved by the Treasury Department alone if it eliminated some of its formal procedures for admission of attorneys.

A favorable report on S. 1466 is expected by the Senate Judiciary Committee. Passage of the bill by Congress would give to lawyers the "equal accommodations" before Federal agencies so long denied. Under S. 1466, disciplinary action could still be imposed by the agency but membership in good standing in a State bar would be sufficient to qualify an attorney to practice before the agency. In a sense, a corresponding duty would be placed upon State and local bars to insure that their members are fully qualified to practice before these agencies.

CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 1006) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 457, Senate bill 1006, to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the bill represents one small step to save and preserve America's oldest and most historic industry—the fishing industry.

This is an industry that despite neglect and harassment in recent years still employs more than half a million of our citizens, today caught in a cold and losing wet war with Soviet Russia, Japan, and other foreign nations.

Enactment of this bill also is necessary to conserve the rich resources at our doorstep, resources now being plundered by massive fleets of foreign vessels and their foreign crews.

Members of the Senate Committee on Commerce have in their possession many documents, photographs and even motion pictures of the type of foreign vessels, Russian and Japanese, now involved in fishing on the high seas in historic American fishing banks.

These foreign fleets are stripping our nearby waters in preference to their own because the world's richest fishing grounds lie off our coast and that of Canada.

Heavily subsidized by their Governments, these fleets, some with as many as 200 and 300 modern fishing vessels, will remain in our waters as long as the fish are there.

Our fishermen have neither the ships nor gear to compete with or against them.

At the present catch rate in these waters there may be, within the next 10 years, no prized food fish left there for any fishermen, Americans or foreigners.

Already American fishermen and American consumers are suffering the effects of over-fishing by our competitors.

Our pollock catch in the Atlantic fisheries last year was the lowest since 1933.

The catch of ocean perch, among the prime targets of Russian fishing fleets off both New England and Alaska, was the lowest since 1944.

Yellowfin tuna landings dropped 66 million pounds below those of the previous year. So serious had become the depletion threat to this important species that the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself cosponsored a conservation measure in its behalf, which was approved by the Senate and the House and signed by the President.

The downward trend continues.

This year there has been almost a total failure of red salmon in Bristol Bay, Alaska, where several hundred Soviet and Japanese vessels, many of them huge factory ships, have scoured the waters in recent years.

Red salmon landings by American fishermen in the entire North Pacific area are only 25 percent of those last year.

The salmon catch of all species is 22 percent below what it was last year at this time.

Halibut landings are down 5 million pounds.

Albacore tuna is down 50 percent from last year, blue fin tuna 40 percent, skipjack 20 percent, and yellowfin, suffering the least decline, perhaps because of the legislation we enacted, 13 percent.

New England fishermen, competing against overwhelming foreign fleets, also are suffering depletion of their resources and livelihood.

The ocean perch catch is 15 million pounds below that of the previous year.

Haddock and scrod are down 4,500,000 pounds.

The pollock catch is 2 million pounds below that of last year which, as previously stated, was the lowest since 1933.

Cod landings are down 3 million pounds.

Unless this downward trend is halted, our billion-dollar fishery industry is doomed and we Americans will have been denied, during this decade of depletion, even our rightful share of the vanishing treasure from the seas around us.

The Committee on Commerce is convinced that both the industry and resource must be saved.

They must be saved because they have an important role in our military and economic security, and in the health and welfare of future generations.

How is this to be accomplished?

The committee has given long and searching thought to this problem; has held frequent and extended hearings to obtain the best judgment of union and industry leaders and of scientists and experts in this distinctive field.

As a result, three steps have been determined to be essential.

The bill before the Senate, which would provide a measure of assistance for the construction of modern fishing vessels to correct inequities imposed by statute, is one step.

A second step, to prohibit fishing by foreigners in our territorial waters, has been taken by the Committee in reporting S. 1988, which has now been passed by the Senate.

The latter bill does not attempt to define territorial waters, either in terms of width or depth. The discussion of the bill is in the RECORD today. I will not pursue it further, but it is the second step determined by committee.

Territorial waters have never been defined by statute. But nothing in the bill precludes our extending our territorial waters outward beyond the present accepted 3-mile limit, as many other nations have done. Soviet Russia, for example, enforces a strict 12-mile limit, but does not hesitate to invade the territorial waters of other nations, including our own.

A third and necessary step to preserve our fisheries already has been taken by the Senate, and will prove invaluable when the bill now before the Senate is enacted.

On September 14 of last year a group of distinguished Senators who have long fought to strengthen our fishing industry, joined me in sponsoring Senate Resolution 392, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should propose an international conference on the conservation of fishery resources.

Cosponsors of this important resolution were the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and his colleague [Mrs. SMITH]; the Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING]; the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]; my friend and colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself.

As a corollary to this resolution the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and I prepared an amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

This amendment was adopted on September 18, was subsequently accepted by the House, and today is section 323 of the act. So important potentially to the fishing industry is this amendment that I shall take the liberty at this time of quoting it in full. It reads:

> Upon a convocation of a conference on the use of conservation of international fishery resources, the President shall, by all appropriate means at his disposal, seek to persuade countries whose domestic fishing practices or policies affect such resources, to engage in negotiations in good faith relating to the use and conservation of such resources.
>
> If, after such efforts by the President and by other countries which have agreed to engage in such negotiations, any other country whose conservation practices or policies affect the interests of the United States and such other countries, has, in the judgment of the President, failed or refused to engage in such negotiations in good faith, the President may, if he is satisfied that such action is likely to be effective in inducing such country to engage in such negotiations in good faith, increase the rate of duty on any fish (in any form) which is the product of such country, for such time as he deems necessary, to a rate not more than 50 percent above the rate existing on July 1, 1934.

Six days later, on September 24, the Senate resolution previously referred to was approved by the Senate.

The proposed international conference has not yet taken place.

Although the resolution and the amendment have already been enacted they are, in fact, the third of three steps, the first two of which have not yet been enacted.

The second has now been acted upon by the Senate. The third is before the Senate. The culmination of the two is reserved for action by the House.

Pending enactment of S. 1006, the bill before the Senate today, I am not certain that we are prepared to participate on equal terms in an international fisheries conservation conference.

We have not utilized and are not utilizing our own fishery resources to an extent commensurable to our position or our needs as a great and relatively wealthy nation.

Instead we have let our fisheries decline, our fishing fleets deteriorate and become obsolete, our fishery resources in large measure unharvested. Other nations, naturally, have taken advantage of these inadequacies.

Conservation of these resources is in the interest of these other nations, in my opinion, if the Northwest Atlantic and the Northeast Pacific are not to become barren of commercial food and industrial species. But that interest is not to them immediate and pressing when the nation adjacent to these fisheries is neglecting their utilization and seemingly content with the fish that somehow have managed to escape their nets, or, in other words, the "leavings."

This is the argument Japan advanced in its efforts last fall to break down the barriers to halibut fishing in the Bering Sea, and Japan's arguments could or would set a pattern for other foreign fishing nations.

S. 1006 will help correct the inferiority of our fishing fleets and their ability to utilize our fishery resources realistically when sound conservation policies are established.

Enactment of S. 1988, to come before the Senate later, also will strengthen our position by serving notice on foreign vessels that they can no longer poach with immunity in our waters.

With enactment of these two measures and with prospects of an international conference in which all maritime nations will be invited to participate, the thoughts of sensible men in government and industry the world over will turn to tomorrow's supply rather than to today's landings.

Increasingly they will recognize that the world's fishery resources cannot be both abundant and at the same time subjected to unlimited exploitation and the consequent inevitable depletion. One cannot wantonly squander resources and retain them.

As world population expands the demand for the rich, high-protein foods from the sea will become urgent and insistent.

By the year 2000, the National Academy of Sciences informs us in its latest population study, the world population will have doubled to 6 billion people; that of the United States, now nearing 190 million, to around 380 million. Soviet Russia's population, as that of Canada and Argentina, also is expected to double in 35 to 40 years. In most European countries and in Japan the growth date is a little slower and it may take 50 years for the population to double, but in the underdeveloped areas of the world, in Africa, southeast Asia, and in most Latin American countries population is growing faster than in the United States, Canada, Soviet Russia, or the Argentine, in some areas doubling every 20 years.

More and more these peoples will be forced to turn to the sea for nutritious protein foods.

Will they find the oceans and the seas by then turned to biological deserts by man's profligacy or carelessness, or will they find these resources restored, increased, and abundant as a result of sound worldwide conservation policies?

The answers lie with the nations and their governments, and to a not insignificant degree with us sitting here today in the Senate. We have proposed and in part enacted a program which can save this resource for tomorrow's world.

The answer—the affirmative answer—will be found in a worldwide conference of all maritime, fishing nations mutually agreeing on limitation of catches to the scientifically determined reproduction rates of valuable species, and for that purpose specifying practices and gear and assigning quotas in productive areas as we have sought to do in the North Pacific Fisheries Convention and in the yellowfin conservation program.

To do this it is axiomatic that we must lead from a position of strength and not from that of weakness, the weakness that exists today with our obsolete and declining fishing fleet. That is why the enactment of the bill before us is so important.

But, someone may suggest, the year 2000 which is cited to indicate the full impact of the world population explosion on the world's terrestrial and marine food supply is far away. The projection given is long distant and, therefore, not urgent.

Not so—our fishing fleets are shrinking now. Many of our small and ancient fishing vessels are ready for the graveyard now. Our historic fishing ports are waning now with once-proud ships rotting at their docks. Our fishing industries are in distress now. Foreign armadas are infesting our traditional fishing grounds now, stripping their treasures from the sea. Long-prized fishing stocks are being depleted now. Population pressures are mounting now while our marine food resources dwindle.

Every 11 seconds in the United States there is an additional mouth to feed; every half hour another 165 citizens are added to our population. By noon today, the Census Bureau estimates, our population will have reached 190,102,175. By 1970 it will be 214 million; by 1975, 235 million; by 1980, approximately 260 million, 70 million more than today. Many of us, God willing, will then be still alive.

One reason for this population explosion is that Americans are living longer than previously in our history. Our longevity is increasing not only because of tremendous medical advances but also because there is a sufficiency of nutritious food. Americans always have insisted on nourishing, health-giving protein foods; and such foods spawn in our streams, swim at our doorsteps. More and more as population mounts we will seek from the sea these rich and delicious foods.

"Well," someone may say, "our population density of approximately 60 per square mile is still much lower than that of many European and Oriental nations. Isn't concern over our marine resources a bit premature?"

The very fact of heavy population densities in other countries intensifies their demands upon these resources, their pressures exemplified by their huge fishing fleets in our waters. To preserve these resources not only for ourselves, but for them also we must lead—and lead from strength—in the crusade for worldwide conservation and sound utilization of marine resources everywhere—and we must lead now.

We must do more than that. To feed our own people, to help feed the starving or undernourished children in foreign lands, to supply our Armed Forces here and overseas which last year consumed 9,024,000 pounds of American fisheries products, we must expand the scope of our fishing activities.

Japan has done this; Russia has done this; the Scandinavian countries, Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, South Africa, the United Kingdom and West Germany in the free world, Communist East Germany and Poland on the other side of the Iron Curtain all have done this; all are sending their big, modern, all-weather ships far from home to garner the treasures of the sea.

All, with the exception of South Africa, are fishing in North American waters on the other side of the ocean from where their vessels sail.

In contrast, our American fishing craft with few exceptions keep close to our own historic grounds; the industry remains dependent on coastal waters, venturing to sea for the most part only in favorable weather. Why?

Not because our sturdy fishermen are wanting in courage or enterprise. They are among the bravest of the brave. The reason is their small and aging boats which were not built for long voyages or heavy seas and which—if they did venture a considerable way from home, and if they did, by this venture, obtain a substantial catch—lack the storage and preservation facilities to return it in prime condition for the market.

Even in our home waters, our tiny fishing craft are being impeded, harassed, and driven from the seas by the fleets of massive, modern fishing armadas of foreign nations.

Fifteen thousand fewer U.S. fishing vessels are operating today than in 1950, and each year their number declines.

Thirty-two thousand fewer fishermen and 10,000 fewer shoreworkers are today employed than in 1950, driven from their jobs by foreign fishermen employed on superior foreign fishing vessels.

Our American fishing industry is simply being outnumbered and overpowered in our own adjacent waters.

It is fighting for survival and fighting, I may add, almost alone and with what I consider minuscule support from our Congress and our Government.

It is fighting for survival not only against the giant 200- and 300-vessel fleets of foreign nations monopolizing nearby waters, but against the foreign governments which subsidize their fleets, either heavily, as do our free-world competitors, or totally, as does Soviet Russia and her satellites.

The American fishing industry is at a tremendous disadvantage in this contest for the ocean riches along our shores. They suffer a disadvantage that if not corrected will doom the industry and mean the surrender, within a few brief years, of God-given resources at our very doors.

With command of these resources won through our default, foreign governments and industries would command the channels by which the fruits of the sea now reach merchant and the housewife, would command the price the housewife would have to pay for the Friday dinner.

The bill before the Senate today is a step toward removing the disadvantage under which our American fishing industry operates; a step toward correcting the gross inequities that confront it; a step toward rescuing the industry from its welter of despair; a step toward saving it and restoring it to new vigor so that again, as in the olden days, it may sail proudly in our own waters and face up to the competition of any nation.

The bill before the Senate provides for modest Government assistance—modest and limited assistance, may I say—to American fishermen for the construction of a necessarily small number of new and modern fishing vessels.

Someone, of course, might ask why the industry itself does not get busy and invest in new and modern ships. This has been done in a small, but very small way. It has not been done extensively, and cannot be done to a greater extent than formerly, for two reasons.

Mr. President, as I and other Senators have stated previously on this floor, the United States has dropped since 1958 from second to fifth place among the Nations in total fisheries catch. Japan, Peru, Soviet Russia, and Communist China all lead us, and Canada is close behind.

It may likewise be of interest that we now also are in fifth place in the total number of motorized fishing craft of all types, all of which are small.

Japan has 14 times as many motorized fishing vessels, Norway 3½ times as many, Canada and Soviet Russia more than twice as many. Russia in the past 5 years has more than doubled the number of her fishing vessels, and many of her new ships are the largest fishing craft the world has ever known.

This bill does not propose to attempt to match Soviet Russia, Japan, or Canada either in numbers or in dimensions of their fishing vessels. That is not necessary. We do not, like Russia and Japan need great fleets that can travel thousands of miles to the rich North American fishing grounds. What we do need are modern ships that can efficiently harvest the fish at our doorstep and by doing so preserve our right to preserve and save these resources from extinction.

S. 1006 will do that.

First, the fishery industries of the nations with whom we are competing can obtain newly constructed ships in those countries at from one-third to one-half the cost of American-built fishing vessels.

American fishermen cannot acquire ships from foreign yards. This is the law—and I consider it a wise law—enacted by Congress in the early years of the Republic. It has preserved our shipbuilding industry, so vital to victory in two World Wars, and while the law is a handicap to our fishing industry without it we would risk both the industry and the capacity and skills to construct ships.

When I speak of the low cost of building fishing vessels in foreign yards, I want it made clear that the fishing industries of most foreign nations only bear a portion of that cost, and in several countries none of the costs at all, while in some other countries the costs are financed by long-term, low-interest loans or other forms of subsidy.

Later in my remarks I intend to discuss at some length these foreign subsidies to their fishery industries. These subsidies place foreign governments as well as foreign ships and foreign fishermen in competition—cutthroat and ruthless competition in many cases—against our own crippled and hamstrung fishing industry.

Foreign governments are financing construction of giant stern trawlers, refrigerated vessels, floating canneries and mother ships not, with the exception of Canada, for taking fish in their home waters but for making greater catches in American waters, not only of pelagic species but of our anadromous fishes that spawn in our own fresh water streams.

Not only must the American fishery industry compete against massive, subsidized, foreign fishing fleets for the fish themselves; it must compete with them pricewise when the American landings are sold in the market—our market.

One does not have to be an economist to observe that foreign industry, using low-cost and subsidized ships and gear and paying subsistence wages to their crewmen, can land or dump their fishery products on our market at similar low cost.

Through efficient processing and marketing methods and by holding ex-vessel prices to a minimum—a hardship to the fishermen—shore branches of the industry have managed in the main to meet this foreign competition pricewise. Frequently this has been accomplished by industry's willingness to accept smaller returns on the American products than on equivalent foreign products.

Yet, as any housewife knows, many of the fishery products on our market shelves bear foreign labels, labels which disguise the fact that the high-protein contents were taken from our own American waters.

Whatever the economies practiced by our domestic industry, our fishermen and fishing vessel operators who, in almost all instances are also working fishermen, have been left stranded on the shoals of indifference and neglect. No margin has been left them to acquire a more efficient ship or modernize their gear. No way remains by which the industry, at the very time when the resources on which its livelihood depends are being pillaged by ruthless, subsidized, and aggressive foreign competitors, can augment his capacity to produce and thereby increase his catch.

Each year as the American fisherman's ships and gear grow older his plight becomes more desperate. Within a very few years, unless some measure of relief is provided such as that projected in the bill before the Senate, the American fisherman and his ships will have vanished from the seas.

The demise of America's oldest and most historic industry would not be his loss alone; it would be the Nation's loss, and the loss to our Nation would be gain for Soviet Russia, for her Communist satellites, and for the other foreign nations fattening on the living treasure taken from American waters.

In more ways than one, Mr. President, it would also mean a significant and substantial military gain for those nations which may, after all, be as content to sink us as to bury us.

It cannot be imagined that Soviet fishing vessels prowling our coasts—east, south, west, and north—are not obtaining extensive military knowledge of these waters, their depths, currents, canyons, and channels, densities, sea mounts, and shoals; knowledge of our shores and inlets, knowledge that would facilitate navigation of enemy surface ships or submarines, the laying of mines or attack by missiles fired from underwater.

It is no secret that reserve officers of the Soviet Navy serve aboard Soviet fishing vessels as do also oceanographers and other scientists. Sophisticated scientific instruments also have been noted on certain of these vessels which are quite superfluous to the business of catching fish, and on some of these ships there has been no sign of any nets at all.

Soviet Russia may not yet know as much about the waters along our coasts as we do but they are learning fast—they have the facilities for learning fast—and most important they are here along our Atlantic coast, along our gulf coast, and along our Pacific coast which is longer than the others combined.

If they are not at any certain point along our coasts at this moment they have been there—from Newfoundland to the tip of Florida, from Florida to Mexico, from the Arctic Ocean to Lower California. They have been there with their innocent-appearing trawlers, large or small, singly or in fleets up to 300. They can and doubtless will again, cruise where they will along our coasts, and do so again and again.

But if we look across the Pacific and to the Siberian coast or to other Soviet or Communist coastal areas it is obvious that none of our own fishing vessels are there.

True, we have no desire to go there, and few fishing craft that would be capable of such a voyage, if that desire existed, would. Even if the desire existed we could not approach the Russian coast closer than 12 miles and the Russians have a very broad interpretation of their 12-mile limit.

The Japanese have had some very saddening experiences by venturing too near, or what the Russians considered to be too near, Red shores. Scores of Japanese fishing vessels have been seized and hundreds of Japanese fishermen tossed into Soviet prisons, many to remain there for months. One hundred seventeen Japanese fishermen were in Soviet custody the first of the month, many of them held there for over 2 years, but the Russians have promised now to release them.

Meanwhile, of course, both Russian and Japanese fishing ships have breached our own 3-mile limit of territorial waters with impunity, violations which should be halted by enactment of S. 1988 today.

May I apologize for this brief digression from my discussion of S. 1006, the bill presently before the Senate.

American fishermen neither need nor want modern fishing vessels to fish in Soviet waters or the waters of any other European nation. They want and need these ships to fish in waters traditionally and geographically American, although not necessarily U.S. waters or the territorial seas. They want and need these ships to fish in our home waters on a parity with the fleets of nations across the seas which are invading in depth and in strength our historic fishing grounds.

American fishermen want ships that would be capable also of serving as auxiliaries to our Navy in time of war, as they have done so eminently in every one of our past wars.

It is a matter of record, Mr. President, that in World War II, a total of 285 fishing vessels were acquired by our Navy to serve as patrol ships, minesweepers, degaussing vessels, diving tenders, covered lighters, net tenders, and for other purposes.

These were purchased or chartered from owners at fishing ports on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Gulf of Mexico, Hawaii, and Alaska. As a young naval officer, I once was flown hastily to Alaska to negotiate for a number of fishing vessels the Navy needed desperately for immediate service in the Aleutians where Japanese had occupied several strategic islands.

I doubt that more than a handful of our fishing craft today would be suitable for high seas use in another national emergency. The fleet in the main is still the fleet we had prior to World War II, which opened 22 years ago. Many go back to World War I, some to the Spanish-American War and one to the War Between the States.

I would assume that the six ships completed or under construction under the act of 1960 which we are now seeking to expand would be available on the east coast. On the west coast we have 10 purse seiners based at San Pedro which have been built since the World War II years, but the youngest was built 12 years ago, in 1951. At San Diego, we have 44 purse seiners constructed since World War II, most of them immediately following the war years, but only 11 launched in the past decade.

This is a pitiable record for the Nation that prides itself as the strongest and most prosperous in the world.

Mr. President, there are possibly a few more fishing craft that might be suitable for limited naval use in the event of a national emergency, but the total is far short of the 285 the industry made available for our defense in World War II.

Enactment of the bill before the Senate today will add potential strength to our national security while providing immediate peacetime safeguards to vital living resources in American waters.

S. 1006 provides a measure, a very modest measure it is true, of Federal assistance to our fishing industry for the construction of fishing vessels of advance design which will enable them to operate in expanded areas, or be equipped with newly developed gear, but which would not operate in a fishery if such operation would cause economic hardship to efficient operators of U.S. fishing vessels already operating in the area.

These would be all-weather ships such as the other major fishing nations have developed. They would be capable of preserving en route to market far larger catches than the small and inefficient craft we have today.

The Federal Government would bear up to 55 percent of the construction costs of these ships but the total assistance could not be more than $10 million in any one year and such assistance would terminate at the end of 5 years.

In other words, this is a 5-year, $95 million program to modernize and rehabilitate our fishing fleet, of which the Federal Government would bear $50 million of the cost, industry the remainder.

Later I will set out why I think the returns to the Federal Government and the Treasury from this investment will far outweigh the costs, but first I would like to summarize what some of our competitors are doing to expand and improve the efficiency of their fleets.

Soviet Russia's totalitarian government is investing $320 million a year in its fishing industry, or 32 times the assistance which it is proposed in the bill that the U.S. Government extend to the American fishing industry.

In Russia, of course, the industry is wholly a Government operation. The Government constructs the ships, designates the officers and crews, directs the operations, determines wages, and controls distribution of the catch. There are no privately owned production units in the Soviet fisheries.

Soviet Russia has the world's most modern and largest, tonnagewise, fishing fleet and it is being constantly expanded. Three percent of that nation's entire industrial investment budget has been allocated to this industry.

Soviet Russia is expanding its fleet of mammoth fishing vessels faster than Soviet yards can build them. For this reason Russia is and has been placing huge orders for ships in foreign yards.

Here are a few samples:

Russia has recently contracted with a Japanese yard for five 5,000-ton tuna factory ships to cost 6.3 billion yen or the equivalent of 17.5 million U.S. dollars. The first vessel was to be delivered within 13 months of the contract date, and the others at 3-month intervals.

Danish yards recently delivered to the Russians the second of four 2,600-ton, 300-foot, stern-ramp fish-freezer vessels with the remaining two still under construction.

These ships brought to 37 the number of fishing vessels constructed in this particular Danish yard for the Soviet Government, 25 of the 37 being large refrigerated vessels. I regret that I do not have the figures on the amounts paid by the Soviet Government for the sizable new fleet.

Ironically, at the same time Danish yards are building ships for Russia, the Danish Ministry of Fisheries has been plagued by cases of Soviet interference with Danish fishing operations in the eastern Baltic Sea where the Danes have long maintained a salmon fishery.

Danish salmon cutters have been apprehended by the Russians on the pretext that they were in Soviet territorial waters.

Yet in the Kattegat, the narrow straits between Denmark and Sweden, Soviet trawlers have been discarding worn out gear to foul the screws of Danish fishing craft. Denmark, a little nation, can do little more than protest.

Soviet trade officials recently placed an order in Sweden for 10 large refrigerated vessels to serve as mother ships for the Russian trawler fleets. The cost of these 10 ships, each of about 8,000 deadweight tons and with 450,000 cubic yards of refrigerated cargo space, will approximate $50 million.

West Germany 2 years ago completed a Soviet factory ship of 17,000 gross tons at a cost of $16 million which is now operating in the North Pacific, and another is scheduled for delivery.

As early as 1958 the British had completed a multi-million-dollar Soviet order for twenty 190-foot, 1,300-ton trawlers, far smaller than the Russians are now constructing. A Soviet world tender of $84 million for 16 vessels, 10 of which would be fish factory and processing ships, was reported in December by the London Times.

We do not have complete knowledge of how many large fishing vessels Soviet Russia has under construction in her own yards, but we do know of mother ships displacing 17,140 tons, floating canneries of 12,875 tons, and whale factory ships of up to 32,000 tons.

In a later speech I expect to give many more details concerning the Soviet fisheries expansion program.

Soviet Russia's objects, in my opinion, are not only to dominate the fisheries of the world to acquire the bulk of their rich food resources, but also to gain mastery of the oceans blanketing 72 percent of earth's surface.

The $10 million a year in assistance to our fishing industry which the bill before us would provide—and then only for the next 5 years—is indeed a small investment when compared with Communist Russia's annual $320 million outlay, a 100-percent subsidy for her fishing industry.

Small as our investment would be it will, I and a majority of our committee are convinced, save a sick and dying American industry.

Nor will this assistance be unusual. Every free world nation with a substantial fishing industry is providing substantial assistance to that industry through grants or loans or both.

Some of these nations are small, their revenues limited, but in most of them the financial assistance to the industry is greater than that proposed in this bill which we are now considering.

Great Britain 10 years ago became aware of the necessity of modernizing its white fish and herring fleets. This has been done through assistance provided by the British White Fish Authority and the Herring Industry Board.

Grants were and are being given to apply on the construction of new fishing vessels, the modernization of older vessels, the conversion of vessels to oil-firing or diesel propulsion, a program that is virtually completed, and to the procurement of new and more powerful engines.

From 1954 through March 1961—I am sorry that later figures are not available—the White Fish Authority had extended in assistance to the industry the equivalent of slightly under $112 million in loans and grants.

Of this the equivalent of $79 million had been in the form of loans and $32.9 million in grants. For fiscal 1961 loans totaled the U.S. equivalent of $16,520,000 and grants that of $7,140,000.

In addition to this, operational subsidies in the nature of allowances for each day the fleets were at sea were paid by the Government in both the white fish and herring industries.

Operational subsidies to the former in the last reported year were the equivalent of $5,880,000, and to the latter, $916,000.

That is not all. The British Government grants loans for acquisition of nets and gear by inshore fishermen, and subsidies under which it acquires surplus herring for reduction to industrial products.

Even the processing industry has been assisted by the British Government. From 1953 through 1959—later figures are not available—the Government extended 15 year loans to processors for financing 80 percent of the costs of new plants. The amount thus expended in this period totaled the equivalent of almost $4 million.

Japan makes loans for improvement, construction, or purchase of fishing vessels, and for nets made of synthetic fibers, waives any payment on the principal for the first 2 years. The loans are for a period of 10 years or less, and vary from 50 to 80 percent the cost of the project.

Canada, our neighbor to the north, and which has suffered with us the invasion by European and Asiatic fishing fleets of her historic fishing grounds, grants a capital subsidy of 50 percent of approved costs for the construction of steel fishing trawlers, and $250 per gross ton for the construction of Atlantic coast wooden vessels of 45 feet or over.

In addition to Federal construction subsidies the Dominion Government guarantees private loans for financing up to 60 to 70 percent the cost of acquiring new fishing vessels and equipment, modernization of existing vessels, and constructing shore installations. Loans approximating $150 million had been guaranteed in 1961.

Canadian fishermen also receive assistance from their Provincial governments.

Newfoundland grants bounties of $160 per gross ton for boats up to 150 registered gross tons, but the Lieutenant Governor also may approve grants for larger vessels. The Province also assists in providing bait service and other fishermen's needs.

New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, and Prince Edward Island all have loan programs to support their fishing fleets or finance new construction.

Norway finances the construction and reconversion of fishing vessels up to 60 percent of their cost by long-term, very low interest loans, and pays an additional subsidy on cod landed.

Belgium makes loans up to 70 percent of construction costs and guarantees loans by Belgian credit institutions. Guarantees may not exceed 2½ billion Belgian francs and also maintains a 2 billion franc revolving fund to assist in enlargement of its fishing fleet.

Denmark makes loans to cover 85 percent of the cost of new fishing vessels at moderate interest rates and with long repayment periods. In one recent year the loans of this small country for construction of new ships totaled approximately $4 million. Additional assistance is granted fishermen in Greenland waters, and those fishing off the Faroe Islands.

Portugal, Spain, Sweden, South Africa, and Turkey are extending liberal subsidies to their fishing industries to build new and larger ships and to modernize those in existence. Spain and Portugal, in particular, are devoting substantial amounts from their limited budgets for this purpose.

Some of the countries I have mentioned, but not all, have been the beneficiaries of extensive American aid since World War II. To some fishing nations have gone millions and to several, billions either in direct aid or loans. I am not criticizing this assistance.

I have no doubt, however, that through these dollars we have helped a number of nations to rebuild and expand their fishing industries. And again I have no objection. Some of these foreign countries are dependent on the sea for almost all of their protein food supply. Perhaps their new and modern fishing fleets will help stir greater interest in our own long-suffering and decaying industry.

I think, Mr. President, that it is time we begin thinking more about our own, and about taking sound and constructive steps to save our own and their vital industry.

One of these steps—to provide limited construction subsidies to modernize our fishing fleet—is being considered by us here on the Senate floor now. We can, and I believe will, pass it.

Passage will bring new encouragement and new hope to one of our most beleaguered and depressed industries.

It will benefit our Nation and help reduce our annual deficit in international payments, help stop the drain of American gold across the ocean, help restore employment and purchasing power here at home. To illustrate: Last year American processors paid out $381 million to American fishermen for their products. These dollars remained in the United States. They supported tens of thousands of American citizens and their families.

These citizens, through taxes paid out of their incomes, contributed to the support of American schools, American communities, States, and National Government.

At the same time American processors were paying out $381 million to American fishermen, they were impelled, to meet the public demand for fishery products, to pay out $474 million—nearly half a billion—for fish and fishery products imported from foreign countries.

These dollars did not stay in the United States. They contributed nothing to our schools, to local and State taxes, to our national defense. Instead they went abroad to support foreign fishermen, to help build new foreign fishing vessels, to increase the revenues of foreign countries, and to employ, not only foreign fishermen but foreign workers in foreign shipyards.

Ten million dollars, the amount of the subsidy proposed annually for 5 years for modernization of American fishing vessels, is less than 2.2 percent of the American dollars now going abroad for fishery products, many of which were caught in our own waters, and would have been caught by American fishermen had they but the ships and gear to harvest them.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator from Washington to yield for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request which relates to votes on proposed amendments to the bill before the Senate, as well as to a vote on the question of passage of the bill.

I have discussed the proposed unanimous-consent agreement with the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I believe I have discussed it also with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

The idea would be to have 1 hour on any proposed amendment, the time to be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Washington, and 2 hours on the bill, 1 hour to each side, for and against. Of course, time could be yielded from the time on the bill for any amendments which might require more time than one-half hour for each side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had hoped that the Senate would pass the bill tonight. That was also the hope of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and other Senators who have a deep interest in the bill. I know the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is interested in having it done.

Several Senators have left. I am particularly concerned about the fact that the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], who strongly supports the bill, had to leave. Senators understand why.

The Senator from Delaware and I and the Senator from Alaska have plenty of time. I was hoping that the bill might be discussed at length tonight, but I can appreciate the situation. If it is agreeable to the Senators from Massachusetts and the Senator from Alaska, I will agree to such a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is certainly agreeable to me. The bill is of great importance. I congratulate the Senator from Washington for introducing it. I believe the proposed unanimous-consent agreement would permit ample time for discussion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How does the junior Senator from Massachusetts feel?

Mr. KENNEDY. I agree with the proposal which has been made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I ask each Senator to be attentive, so that this time there will be no misunderstanding as to what the unanimous-consent agreement is, word by word, and its meaning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, October 2, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1006), to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]: *Provided,* That in the event the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand there is to be 2 hours debate on the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One hour on each side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. One hour on each side. I would prefer to have only 15 minutes on each amendment. I do not believe any amendments will be offered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The time has been requested.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Senators can yield back time, in their generosity, if it is not needed. That is a noble precept. I would not wish to have it diminished in the request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I note that the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is in the Chamber. He has had a deep interest in the bill. The Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL] are also interested and present, as are the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. The support for the bill is nearly unanimous geographically, because it also includes the Great Lakes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wanted to be sure we were included.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Great Lakes are included. There may be many requests for time, since Senators are interested in having the bill passed. I know they will wish to say something about it. I shall try to accommodate all Senators.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, since the distinguished Senator from Washington mentioned the Great Lakes, I hope he will not overlook the Gulf of Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there seems to be no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the order is entered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the acting majority leader of the Senate what the schedule will be after the pending business is concluded tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] indicated to me that it was his intention, after the Senate completed action on S. 1006, to take up order No. 480, House Joint Resolution 247, which is known as the equal-time proposal. It is a joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of the Communications Act.

If action is completed on that measure, which I think may be done tomorrow, the Senate may proceed to amendments to the Highway Act or to some of the resolutions relating to the organization and operation of the Congress. I am not sure of that, so I would not want to be held to it.

FISHING VESSEL CONSTRUCTION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1006) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska, who has a perfecting amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is technical in nature. It need not be stated tonight, but may be stated tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Washington for his fine statement. He may have covered this statistic, but I did not hear it. Am I correct in saying that in 1946 the United States imported only 16.6 percent of its fishery supplies and produced 83.4 percent of the U.S. catch, and in 1962 the United States imported 47 percent of the catch and caught only 53 percent?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only has the Senator cited a correct figure, but our own production is not increasing. We are a growing country and will still have to import many of our fishery products, and we expect to pay for them; but a growing country like this, with its great resources, ought to maintain its resources.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator from Washington is not attempting to cut off imports. He is attempting to aid American industry so it can compete with the new fast ships foreign countries are using to catch fish. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I recommend to Senators the reading of the report, which shows what other countries have done for their fisheries industry, because they realize its importance. The step represented by this bill is almost a minor step compared with what other countries have done.

Senators have seen pictures of the new modern ships. I had a film of Russian ships off the New England coast. The mother ship looks like the *Queen Mary*.

Even Senators whose States may not be involved in fisheries ought to realize that on every one of these new, modern ships, the Soviet Union and other countries have oceanographers. They are probing the oceans for scientific purposes, which is fine. We do not have any of that. We are far behind. This is one simple way to bring us up to date and to modernize our fishing fleet.

It is in the interest of all areas of the country. It is not merely a question of the so-called subsidy. We provided for 33 percent, but it did not work. This proposal is limited as to amount and time.

The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator from Washington for his leadership, not only in the matter of American flag ships on the high seas, the merchant marine, and fisheries, but for his long and determined leadership in the subject of oceanography.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Washington has had much help from the Senators from Texas, Alaska, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Maine, California, and other States, who have seen our fishing industry continue to go down because we have not paid attention to it.

Mr. President, if this had happened to any other industry, even to the extent of one-half of this magnitude, there would have been action almost immediately.

I do not accuse the present administration or the previous one, but it seems it is true of all of them. Even in international conferences on trade, the fisheries industry is some kind of orphan, for some unknown reason. There is today greater awareness in the State Department and the Commerce Department than there has ever been. That is because Congress has become more active on this subject. We have had a long, difficult time to get Congress to act. The Senator from Alaska and I have voted for many proposals, because we thought they were justified, to keep other industries alive and healthy. We hope other Members of Congress, whose States may not be along shorelines, will appreciate the magnitude of the problem of fisheries.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I commend the Senator from Washington for pointing out that States that do not have a shoreline or are not on the Great Lakes also have an interest in this subject. Because the charts which are contained in the report cannot be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that since 1935, while the population of the United States has greatly increased our catch of commercial fisheries has gone down.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, reference has been made, in the colloquy between the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] to the report which accompanies S. 1006. I hope every Senator will find time to read the report. It is one of the best reports that has ever been printed to accompany a bill. I do not think anyone can read it without becoming convinced of the necessity for affirmative action on the bill.

Before the session closes tonight, I want to say with reference to the bill passed a while ago, S. 1988, that the junior Senators from Rhode Island and Massachusetts [Mr. PELL and Mr. KENNEDY], who are now in the Chamber, gave most effective support and help, as they did with reference to the bill now under consideration. They come from coastal States intensely interested in this problem. They testified before the Commerce Committee on this issue, which, as the chairman of the committee has said, is of paramount importance. Their work has been constructive and helpful in every way. I desire to congratulate them for their efforts in the field of building up our fisheries, which, as has been said here, particularly today, and will be said on tomorrow and on succeeding days, must be revived for the benefit of the whole Nation.

On a personal basis, I also wish to call attention to the effective and fine work done on S. 1988 by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to say to the Senator from Washington and Senator from Alaska that those of us who have entered this body recently have found the most inspirational leadership under the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington in the whole matter of fishery problems and the fishing industry.

As has been pointed out by the Senator from Alaska, I come from a fishing State. However, I believe that the service which has been performed by the Senator from Alaska and by the Senator from Washington has been a distinct national service, a service for the whole country. Those of us who have had the great privilege of living by the sea are keenly aware of the problems that the fishing industry has had to face for many years, and I believe the Nation is coming to have a greater appreciation of these problems.

Certainly the Senate has once more acted responsively and responsibly on the major piece of legislation it has passed today, dealing with adequate enforcement procedures for territorial waters and also for the protection of our own claims on the Continental Shelf, as interpreted through international law, and as they will be in the future interpreted under international law and as a result of appropriate domestic actions.

The vote today represented one more significant service by the Senators from Washington and Alaska. Both the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Washington, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, have performed a great service on this and other measures in behalf of seafaring States that will be considered in this session of Congress.

The State of Massachusetts, and also the States which those Senators represent, must recognize with no little satisfaction the great contribution that they have made. The Senator from Washington has pointed out that the Senate has responded to the will of the people, and that this has been done through the diligence and hard work that have been performed by the committees on which these Senators serve.

I wish particularly to express our gratitude to the Senator from Alaska and to the Senator from Washington for their devoted interest and great contribution to this industry, which has contributed so immeasurably to the welfare not only of the people who participate in the industry, and to the welfare of the many millions of people who depend on the products of the sea, but also to the welfare of the people of my State who may not be involved in the industry but who nonetheless appreciate the extraordinary efforts that have been made in their behalf.

I wish to underscore the very fine sentiments that have been expressed respecting the leadership in connection with these important pieces of legislation.

Mr. PELL. I thank my friend the Senator from Alaska for his kind words and congratulate him on the fine job he has done in guiding this bill through the Senate.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, one of the gravest problems facing our fishing industry is the obsolescence of our fishing fleet when compared with those of the other major fishing nations of the world. This situation is unfortunately becoming intensified each year.

Under Federal law a vessel built in a foreign shipyard cannot be documented for fishing in the United States. As steel vessels can be built abroad for about half of the cost in this country, our fishermen have to pay twice as much for a vessel as their foreign competitors. This places them at an obvious disadvantage and, in most cases, has made it uneconomical for them to build the new modern vessels needed for present day fishing. On the Pacific Coast, our fleet contains many vessels 35 to 40 years old, with few new vessels. Many of our fishing vessels designed for fishing in Puget Sound are being forced to fish as much as 300 miles offshore. In addition to being uneconomical they are unsafe. The high cost of construction has prevented their replacement with new, larger, modern vessels.

Public Law 86-516 was passed to assist the fishing industry to pay the increased costs caused by our vessel documentation requirements. It was passed for a 3-year period which has now expired. S. 1006 is vitally necessary to extend and expand this act so that our fishing industry may regain a competitive position with other nations.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I would like to urge passage of S. 1006, a bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of certain inequities in the construction of fishing vessels. I think that this is a very fair bill and seeks to right an injustice long endured by our domestic fishing industry.

I have received several telegrams from the State of Hawaii strongly urging Senate passage of S. 1006 in order to help stop further deterioration of an important part of our economy. Hawaii's multimillion-dollar fishing industry has suffered from foreign competition, along with other States. Foreign fishing vessels, mostly subsidized by their governments, have provided what amounts to unfair competition to ships of the United States.

In view of a clearly apparent trend among the world fishing vessels to larger and longer range ships, much more expensive to construct and operate, I feel that S. 1006 is imperative in order to help our domestic vessels compete on a fairer basis. This bill would make it possible for the United States to participate in the construction of a fishing fleet that will not fear competition from the best and largest government-subsidized fleets from other countries.

Up to the present, the U.S. fishing industry has been handicapped by the provisions of the act of June 12, 1960, which authorized a subsidy payment for construction of fishing vessels not to exceed one-third of the total cost. This bill would permit that subsidy to be increased to 55 percent with funds to be expended from a $10 million appropriation. Furthermore, the 1960 act has expired, for all practical purposes, as of June 12, 1963. S. 1006 would extend the date of effectiveness to June 30, 1968.

The necessity to favorably consider S. 1006 is sharply emphasized when we study subsidy grants made by foreign countries to their own fishing industries. In Canada, a subsidy of 50 percent of all approved costs is paid by the Government toward construction costs of long-range steel fishing trawlers. In Norway, fishing vessels are financed by their Government up to 60 percent by long-term, low-interest Government loans. Similar favorable government aid is accorded the industry in France, the United Kingdom, and Germany. The Soviet Union's magnificent trawling fleet is, of course, wholly subsidized. Japanese fishing vessels of modern design and construction have been blessed by lower construction costs, often running 50 percent less than comparable construction costs in the United States for steel vessels. I also understand that wooden vessels can be constructed at costs more than one-third less as compared to our construction costs.

What does this all add up to?

This has meant that the U.S. fishing fleet is probably the most outmoded of the larger fleets of the world. We have fishing boats built in 1865 and 1872 still operating. The California purse seine fleet which catches tuna is a good example of our outmoded fleet. Of 37 vessels out of San Pedro, none have been built since 1951. About 27 of them were built during World War II years. For boats out of San Diego, 56 out of 67 were built during the years 1927 to 1952. Only 11 have been built during the last 10 years. The story can be repeated for other fishing fleets. Eighty percent of the Chesapeake sail dredge vessels were built before World War I. The average menhaden seiner in the Chesapeake Bay region was built in 1915.

This outmoded U.S. fishing fleet has suffered in international competition. In 1956, only the Japanese outranked the United States as a fishing country. However, figures in 1961 indicate that we have sadly deteriorated since then. We follow Japan, Peru, Red China, and the Soviet Union. Each of the first three countries almost doubles our percentage of the world catch of fish, running 16.3 percent, 12.7 percent, and 12.2 percent, respectively, to our 7.1 percent.

Mr. President, unless we are completely satisfied to have our outmoded and outclassed fishing vessels of a bygone era compete with swift, modern, long-range foreign trawlers heavily subsidized by their governments, unless we are unconcerned to see our fishermen and the fishing industry having to cope with insurmountable handicaps imposed by the superior speed, range, and efficiency capabilities of these foreign ships, then I think it is crucially necessary to support passage of S. 1006.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am willing to yield the floor. Before I do so, I wish to reiterate—and I know I speak for the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] as well as myself—that we are gratified and pleased by the fine support given to us by our friends, the Senators from Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Hawaii.

RIGHT OF FORMER PRESIDENTS TO SPEAK ON FLOOR OF THE SENATE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am very glad that my resolution calling for the right of former Presidents to speak on the floor of the Senate has been approved by the Senate.

Similar legislation has been introduced 19 times in 19 years, but, for one reason or another, the idea has always foundered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a compendium prepared by the Library of Congress of the previous measures which have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives that are similar to Senate Resolution 78 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the compendium was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bills Making Former Presidents Senators at Large—78th to 87th Congresses

THE 78TH CONGRESS

H.R. 5055, Mr. Canfield, June 19, 1944 (Judiciary): Ex-Presidents of the United States shall be eligible to hold office as Senators at Large except when holding offices which make them ineligible to serve in either House of Congress. Such Senators at Large shall have the same privileges, salary, etc., as Territorial Delegates in the House of Representatives, and the allowance for clerical assistants given Senators who are not chairmen of a standing committee and are from the most populous State.

THE 79TH CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 231, Mr. Martin of Massachusetts,[1] July 18, 1945 (Judiciary), constitutional amendment: Ex-presidents of the United States shall be made Senators from the United States at large, unless removed from the Presidency by impeachment. Ratification must be within 7 years after submission to the States.

THE 80TH CONGRESS

S. 1625, Mr. Brewster, July 14, 1947 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large for ex-Presidents of the United States.

H.R. 504, Mr. Canfield, January 6, 1947 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States.

H.R. 4215, Mr. Kunkel,[1] July 15, 1947 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large for ex-Presidents of the United States.

THE 81ST CONGRESS

S. 209, Mr. Brewster, January 5, 1949 (Rules and Administration): Creates the office of Senator at Large for ex-Presidents of the United States.

H.R. 154, Mr. Canfield, January 3, 1949 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States.

THE 82D CONGRESS

S. 2757, Mr. Brewster, February 27, 1952 (Rules and Administration): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall not be entitled to vote.

S. 2956, Mr. Humphrey,[1] March 31, 1952 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall not be entitled to vote.

H.R. 6503, Mr. Roosevelt, February 7, 1952 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents and former Vice Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall have the right to debate but not to vote.

H.R. 7362, Mr. Cannon,[1] April 2, 1962 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall not be entitled to vote.

H.R. 7396, Mr. Celler,[1] April 4, 1952 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for ex-Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall not be entitled to vote.

THE 83D CONGRESS

H.R. 182, Mr. Roosevelt, January 3, 1953 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents and former Vice Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall have the right to debate but not to vote.

THE 84TH CONGRESS

S. 1010, Mr. Kilgore, February 8, 1955 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall have the rights of a Senator except the right to vote.

Senate Joint Resolution 125, Mr. Magnuson,[1] January 25 1956 (Judiciary) constitutional amendment: Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents of the United States who have served 2 years or longer and who have not been impeached. Such Senator at Large shall have all of the rights and privileges of a Senator except the right to vote.

H.R. 3886, Mr. Chelf,[1] February 10, 1955 (Judiciary): Creates the office of Senator at Large in the Senate for former Presidents of the United States. Such Senator shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges accorded to Members of the Senate except the right to vote.

THE 86TH CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 613, Mr. Chelf,[1] February 16, 1960 (Judiciary), constitutional amendment: Proposes an amendment to the Constitution so as to make former Presidents of the United States Members of the Senate.

THE 87TH CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 96, Mr. Chelf,[1] January 4, 1961 (Judiciary), constitutional amendment: Proposes an amendment to the Constitution so as to make former Presidents of the United States Members of the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 360, Mr. Monagan,[1] April 10, 1961 (Judiciary), constitutional amendment: Proposes an amendment to the Constitution so as to make former Presidents of the United States Members of the Senate.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it will be noted that many distinguished Members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate have sought to advance the concept of having ex-Presidents be given the privilege of addressing a House of the Congress. In fact Senator Humphrey in 1952 and Senator Magnuson in 1956 both introduced legislation providing for the concept of ex-Presidents being Senators-at-large. I thank Senators Magnuson and Humphrey for all their past labors in this regard as well as Senator Cooper, all three of whom cosponsored and helped secure the adoption of Senate Resolution 78 which unanimously passed this body today.

Furthermore, I wish to thank my old friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., who, when he was a Representative, submitted similar resolutions in two different Congresses and who helped stimulate my thinking in this regard.

It is obvious that the idea of introducing this type of legislation was not original with me and that many fine and able Members of Congress in both Chambers have given much thought to this type of resolution over the years.

Now that the Senate has approved this resolution, I believe that the luster of our body will be even further increased by the occasional presence of former Presidents. To be specific, I think it would have been very helpful indeed if former Presidents Hoover, Truman, and Eisenhower had given their views to the Senate relative to the test ban treaty right here on the Senate floor.

In a more personal vein, I know what a great advantage it would be to me or to any newer Senator to have the advice and know the views of former Presidents when, as sometimes happens, we find that the views of our President are in direct variance with the views of the committee chairman of the same party. Here, I am thinking specifically of the controversy of the RS–70.

Finally, the adoption of the resolution is a step in the direction of bridging the present schism between our legislative and executive branches. It could mean that we in the Congress will be more aware of the problems facing the Executive and thus avoid positions of deadlock.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to know that the Committee on Rules and Administration reported my resolution, as amended, to this body and it has secured its adoption today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOSCOSO RECEIVES ANNUAL PEACE AWARD OF CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the past weekend, the Catholic Association for International Peace convened in Washington for its annual meeting. The theme of this year's conference was "The Christian Challenge in Latin America." It was most appropriate therefore that the association chose to honor with its Annual Peace Award the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso. I join President Kennedy and Secretary Rusk in congratulating Mr. Moscoso. I congratulate the association for its wisdom in honoring the man who guides U.S. participation in the Alliance for Progress. No American has done more—and been rewarded less—during the past 2 years, to bring peace and progress to Latin America, the area which President Kennedy again described this past weekend in his message to the Catholic Association for International Peace Convention as "the most critical area in the world." I am only sorry that I could not be present at the award luncheon at which Mr. Moscoso received the Annual Peace Award.

I am also pleased that the Catholic Association for International Peace honored me with an invitation to present my own views on "Latin America: The Challenge to Peace." I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks and an article entitled "Red Halt Called in America," published in the Washington Post of recent date, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA: THE CHALLENGE TO PEACE

(Address of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey prepared for delivery at the annual convention of the Catholic Association for International Peace, Friday, September 27, 1963, at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.)

The "challenge to peace" in the world today is stated succinctly in a brief passage from Pope John XXIII's encyclical Mater et Magistra: "Given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persists."

The "challenge to peace" in Latin America today lies in the shocking economic and social inequality between privileged and impoverished, between glittering capitals and festering slums, between booming industrial regions and primitive rural areas. The challenge to peace in Latin America is the revolutionary challenge of an unjust social order, a social order in which true peace—peace based on justice—is impossible.

It is this peace based on a just social order that is the aim of the Alliance for Progress. This aim, as defined in the Declaration of the Peoples of America which precedes the Charter of Punta del Este, is to "unite in a common effort to bring our people accelerated economic progress and broader social justice within the framework of personal dignity and political liberty." The first and foremost challenge to peace in Latin America is the accomplishment of this purpose.

---

[1] Indicates present membership in Congress.

In this nuclear age there is no area of the world whose peace is immune to the challenge of nuclear weapons. The external challenge to peace in Latin America today lies in a spread of the nuclear rivalry of the super powers to Central and South America. It lies in a repetition of the arms race that now plagues the Middle East, it lies in a nuclear rivalry which if extended to Latin America could only lead to the squandering of resources needed to overcome the internal threat to peace, the threat of violent social revolution. In examining the challenge to peace in Latin America today, we must consider both the internal threat of violent social revolution and the external threat of nuclear rivalry. It is to the first of these that I will now turn my attention.

I will not elaborate here on the conditions and circumstances which stimulated President Kennedy's call for a new Alliance for Progress in this hemisphere and which inspired 20 American republics to subscribe to the Alliance program in the Charter of Punta del Este. These conditions are known to all of you.

They have been discussed earlier in this forum on "The Christian Challenge in Latin America"; by Monsignor Gremillion in his paper on "The Challenge of International Justice," and by Professor Tannenbaum in his discussion of "The Challenge of Social Revolution."

It would be appropriate, I hope, to offer a brief appraisal of the Alliance for Progress as it looks to a U.S. Senator after 2 years of operation.

On the second anniversary of the Alliance, which we celebrated last month, we heard repeated cries of desperation, doom, and despair about the fate of the Alliance. I do not share this judgment of pessimism and gloom.

My own conclusion today remains approximately the same as stated in the opening sentence of my "Report on the Alliance for Progress" issued in March of this year: "In terms of where it was a year ago, the Alianza para el Progreso has taken a giant leap forward. In terms of where it has yet to go, it has taken only a short faltering step." I would only add that in a number of important countries, the pattern of progress has become less "faltering" in the past 6 months. I would like to elaborate on this conclusion in terms of (1) what we have learned in the past 2 years; (2) what we have accomplished; and (3) what remains to be done.

Much of the premature pessimism about the Alliance results from an underestimation of the magnitude of the task and from false expectations about what could be achieved in a brief period of time. Today we are well aware that nostalgic recollection of the dramatic success of the Marshall plan in restoring economic and social vitality to the war ravaged, but highly advanced modern societies of Western Europe should not delude us. We are aware that this European experience does little to illuminate the path to speedy economic and social development in underdeveloped areas in Latin America. The reform and modification of social and economic traditions that have persisted for 2 centuries are not going to be accomplished in 2 years—and probably not in a decade. It should be understood by now that the Alliance for Progress has just begun. It is premature to pronounce any definitive judgments on its success or failure.

It took most of the first 2 years to assemble the organization and find the qualified personnel to run the Alliance programs both in the United States and in Latin America. If all of the problems of organization and personnel have not yet been solved, sufficient progress has been made to permit Alliance programs to be launched in all of the 19 Latin American countries.

Among the more difficult lessons to be learned during the first 2 years, none proved more resistant than the fundamental truth outlined in the Alliance charter—that the Alliance is not just another U.S. aid program. Rather it is a cooperative endeavor by 19 Latin American countries and the United States to enjoy more fully the cultural, spiritual, and material riches available in the 20th century and to make these accessible to the whole population rather than to a select few. Following from this there is today a wider—if still imperfect—understanding of the fact that the actions of Latin American countries themselves in achieving the goals of the Alliance are far more important than those of the United States. In quantitative terms, it agreed that 80 percent of the material resources for Alliance programs must come from the Latin American countries themselves. But far more important, the leadership necessary to mobilize both the quantitative and qualitative resources of the societies must come from within. A key role will invariably be played by the political leaders of the countries who are currently in power. The political decisions taken or not taken will in great part determine the progress or failure of the Alliance in a given country. The ability of the U.S. Government to influence these political decisions is always limited, sometimes nonexistent. Political leadership is the most important ingredient in determining whether Alliance programs will progress in a given country. If we are today buoyant with hope about the prospects for Peru and Argentina, it is because of the promise engendered by the election of a new set of political leaders who are determined to convert the disillusions of the past into valid programs for the future.

If we are despondent this weekend about the Caribbean area, it is because we have witnessed once more the vulnerability of a government which could not rely on a strong, well-developed, democratic institutional structure. We need strong democratic institutions to support strong leaders. The assault on a recently elected constitutional government of the Dominican Republic by those who have not experienced a tradition of free democratic government is a cruel blow to political freedom in this hemisphere, and to the Alliance for Progress.

If a government can inspire confidence and hope among its people, it can advance toward the Alliance goals—regardless of where it starts. Disillusionment in this hemisphere has not been greatest in the least advanced countries—but in the most politically unstable countries—which in some cases means some of the most advanced economically.

We are likely to experience disappointment and disillusionment again in certain Latin American countries over the course of the next decade. In most cases these will be caused by a failure of political leadership, and a failure to build political institutions which are capable of sustaining and implementing the basic structural modifications in their societies called for under the Alliance for Progress.

I hope that the experience of the past 2 years has also shown that political democracy is an indispensable basis for the success of the Alliance for Progress. Although we have witnessed in several cases interference with constitutional governments and the suspension of political democracy, I hope that these represent only temporary aberrations, not a permanent trend. The restoration of free constitutional government in Peru and Argentina would seem to support this hope. The recent events in the Dominican Republic make me less confident. Although we cannot assume that juntas will vanish from the hemisphere, it remains my belief that the support in this country and in Latin America which the Alliance for Progress program requires for its success cannot be sustained if political democracy is readily sacrificed before some short-range expediency. Indulgence in short-range expediency is frequently the road to long-term disaster.

As the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress has stated, the Alliance includes not only a social revolution against the scourge of hunger, disease, and illiteracy, but a political revolution whose "single most important force" is "the quest for first-class citizenship." "Free countries," Mr. Moscoso concludes, "do not develop on bread alone." Political democracy and free constitutional government must remain an indispensable goal of the Alliance for Progress. The Alliance for Progress needs more than money. It needs the will to succeed, a dedication to social and economic change, and a faith in free, constitutional government.

It is of utmost importance for the Alliance in the years ahead that we have in the past 2 years managed to discard many of the old cliches which have governed our thinking about Latin America in the past. We now know, first of all, that Latin America is not a homogeneous unit, but a continent of widely diversified peoples, sharply varied economies, and both highly advanced and grossly underdeveloped regions.

Each country has its own history, background, and culture and each must be treated individually. Each republic or area has its own problems, as well as acknowledged assets, and each country must be looked upon as a separate and distinct entity. Our use of the term "Latin America" in reference to this geographic area should not conceal this fact of diversity.

Another cliche, now exposed in all its hollowness, is that which portrays the Latin American countries as being divided between avaricious oligarchs and primitive masses, the former united in a concerted plot to oppress the latter. This explanation will no longer do. There remain oligarchs and there remain oppressed masses—far too many of both. But such a dichotomy ignores the growth of a substantial middle class in most of the larger Latin American countries. It ignores the growing number of enlightened progressive leaders springing from the aristocracy, the military and the church. It ignores the growth of well-organized unionized workers in most metropolitan centers of the hemisphere. It ignores the growing awareness in the hemisphere of the truth of President Betancourt's statement that "If we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich." Although the middle-class citizen, enlightened aristocrat, and the unionized laborer may be far too few in number, it is from these groups, that the leadership for the Alliance for Progress program must come. It is time for the old cliches to be dropped and these new realities faced.

In summary, the experience of the past 2 years has taught us that the Alliance is a long-term program, that the Latin American continent includes a diverse and rapidly changing group of societies whose social, political, and economic systems cannot be explained in terms of the cliches of the past.

I would now like to shift from what we have learned to what has been accomplished. Despite the brevity of the period, there are concrete accomplishments one can point to after 2 years. President Kennedy has given us an excellent brief summary of these: "Some 140,000 new housing units have been constructed, slum-clearing projects have begun, there are 8,200 new school classrooms, more than 700 new water systems have been built. Land reform and tax reform measures have been adopted by many countries, more than 160,000 agricultural credit loans have been made and more than 4 million schoolbooks have been distributed.

"Our Common Market agreements are gaining new impetus, a revolutionary step has been taken to stabilize the price of coffee in world markets.

"More than 9 million children are being fed in 18 countries in a food for peace school-lunch program. Road construction, especially in some agricultural areas, is proceeding rapidly."

This summary touches only very sketchily on the concrete accomplishments—many of which you have already discussed in greater detail at this conference.

For the long-range future of the Alliance, one of the major accomplishments of the past 2 years has been the beginning of a change in attitude within the traditional elite groups toward the problems of social and economic reform. A few years ago it could be said that the indifference and fatalism of the ruling groups of Latin America was well expressed in the remark of the late 19th century Chilean President Barros Locco: "There are only two kinds of problems facing society: Those which get solved by themselves—and those which defy solution." This attitude is no longer characteristic of all the ruling groups. There are individuals from the traditionally privileged groups—the military, the landowners, the businessmen, the universities and the church—who are beginning to take the lead in championing the economic and social reconstruction of their societies prescribed by the Alliance Charter. If they remain exceptions to the rule, if they are far too few in number, if they are a half century late in asserting their leadership—it is nevertheless a fact today that an increasing number are joining the representatives of the rising middle class to provide the leadership that will be necessary to insure the success of the Alliance. What is still doubtful is whether they will move fast enough and with the desperate sense of urgency that the situation calls for.

One of the most hopeful signs in Latin America in recent years is the renaissance of the Catholic church and a new awakening on the part of the church leaders to the shocking social and economic problems of the continent. Since the meeting of the Latin American hierarchy at the Eucharistic Congress in Brazil in 1955, church leaders have begun to focus sharp attention on the social injustice perpetuated by the traditional indifference of the privileged classes to social and economic problems.

Today in Chile, Panama, Venezuela, northern Brazil, Argentina, and Colombia, members of the hierarchy are pushing actively the reforms stipulated under the Alliance charter. Whereas formerly the active espousal of progressive social and economic policies was largely confined to religious orders like the Maryknoll priests or to isolated pastors, today they are supported by occupants of metropolitan sees.

The farsighted social and economic philosophy of Pope John's recent social encyclicals "Mater et Magistra" and "Pacem in Terris" is being strongly pushed by the Vatican. Men who once would have been promoted to mountain parishes for their advanced views are now being appointed bishops and cardinals.

Probably the best-known among those bishops and cardinals who are now providing progressive leadership is the Archbishop of Santiago, Chile, Raul Cardinal Silva Enriquez. Cardinal Silva's advanced social views are well expressed in the now well-known pastoral letter issued in November of 1962 by the Chilean bishops on "Social Reform and the Common Good."

The pastoral letter scathingly criticized existing social and economic abuses, deplored the inequality in distribution of incomes, and called on the Government to extend and speed up its reforms and its social welfare program. Offering its own example, the church in Chile is now redistributing most of its own lands to local peasants. At a luncheon which I gave in honor of Cardinal Silva during his visit to Washington in July of this year, he outlined to members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the pilot project which he is now sponsoring in the field of agrarian reform, a project utilizing the full resources of modern technology, scientific agricultural planning, and modern credit facilities. Such a model project is designed to demonstrate that agrarian reform is not merely a rhetorical slogan, but an achievable reality.

As many of you may know, Chile has become a veritable laboratory for experimentation and for developing new institutions to cope with new social problems created by modernization. Groups affiliated with the church are well represented. Today in Chile one finds specialized institutions exclusively devoted to training student and intellectual leaders; one finds some devoted to training labor leaders; some to preparing project applications and feasibility studies for submission to international lending agencies; some to training cooperative leaders; others to preparing special programs for the hundreds of thousands of slum dwellers that ring Santiago and Lima, Rio de Janeiro and Caracas; still others to educating businessmen, managers, and financiers on the role they must play in achieving social and economic justice in their societies.

The last mentioned of these, the Chilean division of the International Federation of Christian Employers (commonly referred to by its initials UNIAPAC) is part of a joint effort by socially enlightened businessmen, financiers, and managers in Europe and in Latin America to effect a basic modification of the social and economic order in the light of Christian social doctrine. To accelerate this movement, which is already well established in several Latin American countries, UNIAPAC is sponsoring a Latin American Forum in Economic Development in Sao Paulo, Brazil, in November of this year. I am much encouraged by this movement and have actively engaged in arranging for a strong delegation from the United States to participate in this conference.

If I dwelt at some length on Chile, it is because it is here that great progress has been realized in institution building—in the establishment of indigenous specialized institutions which will in time be able to stand on their own, well prepared to deal with the complex and highly specialized social and economic problems confronting a modern society. Outside help is needed in the beginning—and in many cases this external assistance should properly come from nongovernmental sources. I am told by Latin American friends that much of the remarkable success enjoyed by these recently established Chilean institutions can be credited to the unified, systematic program of regular financial support provided by the German Bishops Fund, which now raises $8 million per year for Latin America through an annual collection. I am confident that the increasing interest of the United States in Latin America, combined with the proven record of generosity on the part of the American Catholic community, will result in other appropriate systematic programs of support for establishing similar institutions in other parts of Latin America, programs of support that might perhaps be discussed by members of the Catholic Association for International Peace convened to discuss "The Christian Challenge in Latin America."

In the 2 years since the Alliance was launched there have therefore been significant accomplishments—even if these accomplishments rarely make a dent in solving the staggering problems of the hemisphere. We have begun to appreciate the cooperative nature of the Alliance. We have a better appreciation of the importance of political leadership and viable political institutions in achieving the aims of the Alliance. We have witnessed at least a beginning of interest among the traditional ruling classes in the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

I would like to turn now to assess briefly some problems confronting the Alliance which must receive our immediate attention.

First of all we must translate our new understanding of the cooperative nature of the Alliance into the formal machinery which administers Alliance programs. The spurning by certain nations 2 years ago of a U.S. suggestion to establish a multilateral system for making Alliance decisions contributed heavily toward the development of the present bilateral system under which the principal decisions are made by the U.S. Government. Former Colombian President Alberto Lleras Camargo's conclusion that this represents "the Alliance's greatest error in procedure" would appear to be valid. Writing in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, he states "Inter-American organs were set up to study and prepare plans for national development, but it was left entirely to the U.S. initiative not only to find the way in which its contribution should be made available, but also to arrive at some standard of judgment as to how and when and to whom support should be apportioned for carrying out Alliance plans. The result was to create a pattern of bilateral operation which, on the one hand, set the tone of the discussions between the United States and each separate Latin American nation for each particular case; on the other hand it caused an unending series of misunderstandings, resentments, conflicts, and—though quite exceptionally—opportunities for scoring in the political game."

President Lleras, joined by former Brazilian President Kubitschek, has proposed that the multilateral character of the Alliance (which he refers to as the "original character") be accomplished by establishing an inter-American body to administer the Alliance. The newly formed Inter-American Development Committee may be the body which could appropriately be entrusted with the responsibility of scrutinizing the extent to which each country, including the United States, fulfills the commitments it assumed at Punte del Este. Although I am in no way qualified to pass judgment on the particular procedure to be adopted, I accept the basic premise of increasing the role of the Latin nations in making the basic decisions which will govern the operation of the Alliance in the hemisphere as a whole. Our experience with the participation of European governments in the administering of the Marshall plan suggests that we should not fear this change away from a strictly bilateral approach and toward a multilateral system in administering the Alliance.

A second item which must receive the highest priority is a more rapid implementation of the new extensive Alliance programs in the rural areas of the Continent. I have long believed that the explosive political and social situation in many countries is due to continued neglect of the rural areas, where even today over half the population lives.

In my view Alliance officials were far too slow in recognizing this imbalance between urban and rural areas. Today much is being done to develop these areas and integrate the long neglected masses into the political and social life of the country.

Progress is being made in extending credit for agriculture and half of the countries of the Continent have received sizable Alliance loans for agricultural credit. Cooperatives are being formed in some areas. Programs are underway to open up new areas by building penetration roads. Land distribution under agrarian reform programs is proceeding in Venezuela, Colombia, and Chile.

The importance of rural development can hardly be overstated. Over half of the countries of Latin America continue to spend sizable amounts of precious foreign exchange reserves to import food to feed their populations. This occurs in countries that are primarily agricultural. For the common man in half of Latin America, the key to a higher standard of living in the near future is still an increase in agricultural productivity. In this field the United States has a record of proven performance. We abound in technical expertise in the field of agriculture and the key to success appears to be our ability to secure the widespread adoption of known and proven techniques.

Another reason for increasing our emphasis on agrarian reform and rural development has been stated by President Lleras Camargo: the imbalanced growth of population in Latin America places an increasingly heavy burden on cities. "For there is no sort of economic expansion, however swift or successful, that can assimilate both the rural masses who cease to live by agriculture and the new surplus hands, whether in the town or in the country, who come year by year to glut the labor market." To the extent that rural modernization slows down the exodus to the city, it alleviates the problem engendered by rapid population growth.

The economic development of the rural sector is intimately linked to the progress of the industrial sector, for industrialization can flourish only if it has available progressively widening markets. The purchasing power of a modernized rural sector is of great potential stimulus here.

I am not disturbed by the criticisms that the Alliance is now focusing too much attention on rural areas and too little on Latin America's troubled cities. I would sustain this new emphasis on rural development and in many countries increase it. I am not suggesting that we attempt to reverse the long-range secular trend toward urbanization which is characteristic of our modern technological world. Nor am I suggesting that we attempt to discourage industrialization and encourage concentration on production of raw materials through a predominantly agricultural economy.

Indeed, today we are witnessing one of the ironies of Marxist determinism. Today we see the Soviet Union, which has for decades assailed the United States for preventing industrialization and keeping Latin American economies confined to producing raw materials, imposing upon Cuba a modern day mercantile system in which Cuba is the raw-material-producing colony for Russia, and the captive market for the Soviet Union's manufactured goods.

I insist that the Alliance programs must give special consideration to rural and agricultural development because it is necessary that someone redress the balance which events have tilted heavily in favor of urban development. Modern societies are governed by urban men, and financed by urban-oriented financial institutions. The whole complex of international lending institutions—the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, private banking houses—is heavily geared toward urban and industrial development. Most of these institutions do not find it possible to channel substantial capital into agricultural programs. And yet the basis of the modern agricultural revolution—which we have experienced in the United States—is heavy capital investment. It is investment in machinery, in fertilizer, in seeds, in scientific research and in technical training. According to Dr. Earl Buty, dean of agriculture at Purdue University, agriculture is one of the biggest users of capital in the United States. The total capital assets of U.S. farms in 1963 is estimated at $214 billion. In a study of Indiana farms, the total capital investment per farm was $138,000, averaging out to an investment of over $78,000 per man. This is four times the average capital investment per industrial worker in this country.

If agricultural and rural development is to flourish in Latin America, large amounts of capital will be required. In the absence of other sources, the Alliance agencies such as AID and the Inter-American Development Bank must be principal sources for this capital.

But once again it is not only the economic consequences of rural underdevelopment that is of importance. The glaring gap between booming industrial urban regions and primitive rural areas is social and political dynamite. We are rapidly learning that the situation most susceptible to violent revolution is the existence of vast differences in the level of development, income, and growth within a country. To the oppressed peasant of northeast Brazil, the dazzling splendor of São Paulo is more of an incitement to revolution than the faraway places of the rich United States. Political and social stability demands that the gap between rich regions and poor be narrowed.

The growth of stable political and social institutions requires that the bulk of the citizens be integrated into the political and social life of the society. Today in most Latin American countries the mass of the rural people remain utterly cut off from the political life of the nation. Political democracy is the province of the few. It is not valued by the many who are hungry, impoverished and illiterate. Indeed, it is often viewed as a luxury for the few at the expense of the many.

If political democracy is to survive and flourish in Latin America it must be proven that the neglected masses can enjoy the benefits which we associate with it. This presupposes a decent standard of living, of education and of health as an essential prerequisite to active participation in the political processes of society. Rural development and modernization is therefore a requirement in the path to the goal of first-class citizenship for all.

In discussing priorities for the Alliance for Progress, I would like to include at least a brief reference to the role which private voluntary associations must play. As many of you know, I have long been a stanch advocate of emphasizing the people-to-people approach to foreign aid, of channeling aid through voluntary associations to the greatest extent possible. In Latin America there is a vast array of voluntary groups, made up of both local and U.S. citizens. These agencies are often closer to the people at the grassroots level than those in official governmental positions.

In Latin America today much of the success of our food-for-peace program is due to the tireless efforts of the two voluntary agencies that handle the distribution of the food under Public Law 480, the Catholic Relief Services, and CARE. They are largely responsible for our success in sharing American agricultural bounty with the 30 million Latin Americans who now regularly receive food under this program.

I am happy to note that the work of voluntary agencies in Latin America is receiving more attention from Alliance for Progress officials. I am happy to note a definite change in the attitude of Alliance officials in the past year toward voluntary associations. I believe that a good deal of the credit for this change in attitude within the U.S. Government should go to the man whom you have chosen to honor at this convention, the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Mr. Teodoro Moscoso. Today there is a greater appreciation of the role voluntary groups can perform, not only in alleviating the sufferings of the poor, but also in fostering needed economic and social development and in introducing the political skills necessary for a functioning democratic government.

The important role played by voluntary associations of all types in promoting economic progress is also reflected in their contribution to the growth of stable political institutions. This is too often overlooked. If the masses of Latin America, who have for decades remained outside the political process are to be capable of achieving and exercising the rights of citizenship, they must acquire the skills and knowledge necessary for participation in the political process. These skills, and this knowledge cannot be acquired in an atomized society. It is the atomized society that is easy prey for totalitarian government. In one of the best capsule definitions of totalitarian government, Hannah Arendt once defined it as the elimination of all subgroups between the individual and the state. Tocqueville remarked over a century ago on the many private voluntary organizations in the United States which provide the training ground, the school for acquiring the knowledge and experience which are necessary for political participation. Such elementary things as how to organize a meeting, run an election, conduct a debate, or decide a disputed issue are learned primarily in private groups and associations. Once having been learned there, they can be easily applied to participation in local, State, and National political life. Voluntary associations have a vital role to play in accomplishing both the political and the economic aims of the Alliance for Progress.

Having considered at some length the internal challenge to peace in Latin America, I now turn to the external challenge to peace—the threat of nuclear rivalry in the hemisphere. Nuclear weapons are superfluous in Latin America. They would serve no useful purpose whatsoever in preserving the security of Central and South America. A possible external military threat to the security of the Latin American Continent can and will be repulsed by the United States. The U.S. action on Cuba in October 1962 proved our ability and our determination to defend this hemisphere, both north and south, from external military threat.

In visiting Latin American countries during the past year, a primary topic of conversation with the leaders and the people was the problem of the physical security of the regions south of the Rio Grande. In fact, this concern was so close to their lives, to their thinking, that I am sure it was distracting them from the urgent job of economic rehabilitation, economic progress and social improvement—a job that permits no delay for any reason whatsoever. In other words, the fear of attack, the fear of subversion, the fear of revolution, of disorder, all of which has been augmented by the flow of arms into this area, primarily into Cuba, and from Cuba, but into other countries as well—all this has weakened the programs of economic progress, or weakened the possibility of fulfillment of the Alliance for Progress.

I am convinced that the leaders of these countries do not want nuclear warheads and delivery systems, or delivery vehicles stored on their soil or ready for use in any other part of Latin America. The conclusion is inescapable that the United States, in concert with its sister republics in the Western Hemisphere, has a solemn obligation and a great opportunity to encourage a multilateral agreement banning the manufacture, the storage, the testing, and the combat use of nuclear arms and delivery systems in Latin America. The area is ripe for this type of pact—a pact embodying these principles. This is a pact that gets right at the problem of staged disarmament, better termed "arms control." The time is right to pursue this—in the wake of the test ban treaty.

A denuclearized Latin America should thus be high on the priority list of Latin American diplomatic goals. Agreement on the establishment of a denuclearized zone should be worked out by the Latin American countries themselves—just as the formal proposal of such a zone was appropriately made by Brazil in April, joined by four other Latin American countries. The United States is just as concerned as any of the Latin American nations as to whether nuclear weapons are to be introduced into the Latin American area of this hemisphere. We acted firmly in Cuba because there was no alternative. But an agreement to keep nuclear weapons out of the Latin American area and to subject this agreement to adequate verification offers a hopeful way of preventing further incidents like the recent Cuban crisis.

I insist that we give some leadership to this project and not merely tacit approval by means of a statement from some official spokesman. We ought to embrace it; we ought to make it a primary objective. It would be an excellent follow-up to the recently ratified test ban treaty.

A denuclearized zone in Latin America could be negotiated through the Organization of American States. This is a functioning organization which has been surprisingly effective in handling hemispheric problems. The OAS, if it wished, might call upon the United Nations, or the United States in particular, for special services or assistance in connection with the implementation of such a denuclearized zone. The United Nations, for instance, might suggest some of the personnel for the zonal control commission in the event that the OAS decided some nonregional personnel should be involved in implementing that agreement. The OAS could give regular progress reports through the UN on the operation of the verification system so that other UN members could profit by the experience in Latin America.

A denuclearized zone in Latin America should, if possible, lead to the creation of a zone emptied of conventional weapons as well. Any curbing of the amount of arms going to Latin American nations under effective and balanced safeguards would have a healthy impact on the economies of that area. Yet each of them, with the possible exception of Costa Rica, is busily engaged in buying arms, and we have yet failed to place the matter of regional disarmament and a denuclearized zone at the top of the agenda.

I repeat that our Government should encourage the Latin American nations to make any arms control agreement as broad as possible so as to limit the large amount of funds which are so often wastefully devoted to armaments. The current situation in which the small countries compete for military forces which are too large for their immediate needs, and far too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance, is deplorable.

The whole matter of arms assistance to Latin America requires immediate scrutiny. And it is not enough for the United States alone to take this initiative. This is why I said it must be done in the OAS, because if we were to deny certain countries military assistance, they could get it someplace else. We must arrive at some kind of a hemispheric agreement on this matter, and quickly, for I am here to say that we will weaken and possibly cause the failure of the Alliance for Progress and all that the Alliance means unless something is done to implement an effective arms control agreement in this area.

What I am suggesting is that we will have to approach this matter methodically, carefully, and by plans. What I am advocating is a total approach which will strike at the multiple ills afflicting Latin America. In Latin America it is still possible to do something. Today there is a first-class arms race on in the Middle East, and these impoverished countries are destroying themselves.

The whole world stands on the precipice of disaster because mankind thought it was more important to concentrate on getting arms into the hands of people who did not know how to take care of them, but knew how to fight and how to kill. In Latin America, there is still time to prevent this.

Now, in dealing with the question of the prospects for a denuclearized zone in Latin America, I have tried to make clear that I advocate this step from two overriding points of view. First, from the point of view of other countries and regions which might wish to follow suit, and second, from the point of view of a region which desperately needs to devote a maximum amount of its resources for developing free, productive, diversified economics. Here the arguments in favor of a rational, adequately verified arms control agreement are compelling. We can approach this problem of regional or zonal arms control methodically, scientifically, carefully, in terms of the security interests of ourselves and others.

Unless we are successful in meeting this second challenge to peace—the challenge of nuclear rivalry—there is small likelihood that we can successful meet the first. If the Latin nations mobilize the resources needed to push ahead in implementing Alliance social and economic programs, they will not be able to indulge in the unnecessary and nefarious luxury of missiles, hydrogen bombs and nuclear submarines. If they should decide to indulge in the fallacy of competing for nuclear weapons, they will do so at the expense of the welfare of their people. Today all the time and money and effort of the Latin American nations is required to meet the first challenge—the challenge of social revolution. Today the Latin American nations must decide whether they will follow peaceful revolution leading to progress or violent revolution leading to tyranny. Today they still have a choice. Tomorrow they may not.

The choice between peaceful revolution leading to progress and violent revolution leading to tyranny is also a choice for the United States. Our commitments under the Alliance must be honored as well as those of our Latin American neighbors. Nothing is more harmful to our prestige, to our national image and to our foreign policy interests than the appearance of reneging on commitments made. The recent action of the House of Representatives in drastically reducing the Alliance for Progress funds requested by the administration is interpreted in every Latin American country as precisely that. Most of the major Latin American newspapers, including those most friendly to the United States, did not fail to note that the House figure approved for the entire Latin American continent was only slightly above the total Soviet aid to Cuba alone. I do not believe the Senate will permit this assault on America's prestige, this blot on America's reputation to stand. I know that at least one Senator is determined that the Senate will do its duty to honor in full the U.S. commitment under the Alliance for Progress.

With the firm support of the United States, the Latin American nations can meet the internal challenge of social revolution and the external challenge of nuclear rivalry. They can with our help meet the challenge to peace in Latin America today.

Red Halt Called in Americas

President Kennedy said yesterday that the United States and its Latin American neighbors are determined that there shall be no more Communist states in this hemisphere.

And the way to be sure this does not happen, Mr. Kennedy said in a message to the Catholic Association for International Peace "is to remove the grave social and economic inequities that are the breeding ground of communism."

The association, now in annual conference here, gave its annual peace award yesterday to Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the U.S. Alliance for Progress program for economic and social development of Latin America.

From the Vatican came a message saying Pope Paul VI sent his blessings to the conference, and an expression of gratification for its theme: "The Christian Challenge in Latin America."

Mr. Kennedy, who is now traveling in the West, congratulated Moscoso on receiving the association's award, referred to him as "this most valued public servant." The association is connected with the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is an organization of U.S. bishops of the Roman Catholic Church.

The President's message to the conference did not mention Cuba by name in his reference to existence of a Communist state in this hemisphere.

He called Latin America "the most critical area in the world today," and recalled that he had previously used the same words.

"The critical situation in Latin America can best be met by the Alliance for Progress, a joint effort of the United States and the Republics of Latin America to stimulate economic growth and to provide better health and educational facilities and more adequate job opportunities for all of our neighbors south of the border," he said.

"Together, we are determined that there shall be no more Communist states in this hemisphere, and we know that the only really effective means to this end is to remove the grave social and economic inequities that are the breeding ground of communism.

"More than that, we realize that the United States has a responsibility in justice and charity to do what we can to make it possible for our neighbors in Latin America to enjoy a better life."

THE CRISIS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today, in a discussion with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], I said that it was my intention to comment on the crisis in the Dominican Republic—indeed, the crisis in our relationships in the Western Hemisphere—as a result of the military coup in the Dominican Republic, following several coups by military juntas in other countries.

Several times during the past year I have expressed the view that political democracy is an indispensable basis for the success of the Alliance for Progress. I stated this at the time of the inauguration of the new government of the Dominican Republic in February of this year. I repeated it at the time of the Peruvian elections, which saw the restoration of constitutional government to that country. I repeated it at the time of the Argentine election which chose the new government that will be inaugurated in October of this year.

On those occasions I voiced the hope that the several cases of interference with constitutional governments in Latin America during the past year would represent only temporary aberrations, not a permanent trend. The restoration of free constitutional government in Peru and now in Argentina lent substance to that hope. Today, however, after witnessing the third military coup in 6 months against legally constituted governments, I have less confidence in my earlier judgment.

The assault on the recently elected constitutional government of the Dominican Republic last week is a cruel blow to political freedom in this hemisphere. It is also a cruel blow to the Alliance for Progress and all that that great program stands for.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield momentarily?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I know the Senator intends to speak at some length on this issue. I think I have a rather clear idea of his position. The Senator will recall that we both attended the inauguration of President Bosch.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. It was a memorable occasion, considering what had preceded in the Dominican Republic.

I express my solidarity with the position taken by the Senator from Minnesota, a position, roughly, taken by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening]—although none of us agrees with the idea of military intervention, expressed by the Senator from Alaska—that our Government should not, under any circumstances, recognize the junta or the civilian triumvirate, or any part of it, until we have considered thoroughly what can be done to save freedom in that part of the world, where freedom has for so long been denied.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from New York. I would have expected him to take a firm, strong stand in behalf of constitutional government and political democracy in the Latin American countries, as he does with respect to every area of the world. It is very necessary for Senators to do so. Since they have a unique responsibility in connection with the development of the foreign policy of this country, because of their constitutional prerogative to advise and consent to the nomination of ambassadors and to the ratification of treaties, it is very important that Senators speak up, so that at least the countries in the Western Hemisphere will know that the elected representatives of the American people who serve in the Senate are very much disturbed by the trend—which appears to be growing in the Western Hemisphere—toward the development of military juntas which take over and destroy the elected governments.

This afternoon the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] expressed my point of view with such clarity and with such determination that there is very little I can add now, except to state my views in regard to the kind of cruel hoax that takes place when elected governments are thrown out by a handful of military gunmen who, with brute force and weapons, take over the established government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for one interruption?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Before the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] leaves the floor, I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for the position he is taking on the crisis in the Dominican Republic. His position does not surprise me at all, in view of the kind of leadership in foreign policy that the Senator from Minesota has given us in the Senate for many years.

I believe it is very interesting that the Senator from New York and the Senator from Minnesota are taking this position today in the Senate. Many persons do not know what a great contribution these two Senators are making to United States-Latin American relations. I speak of the program the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York are spearheading, in connection with private investments in Latin America. To date their emphasis has been on Mexico. They have been leaders in a movement that seeks to encourage American investments in Mexico—a program, with proper safeguards and restrictions, that provides for securities investments in better economic relations between the United States and Mexico. In my judgment, this program goes to the heart of the great need for strengthening the relationships between the United States, Mexico, and all the rest of the countries of Latin America, for it goes to the question of exporting—as many Senators have heard me say almost to the point of boredom, I am sure—economic freedom, as the only guarantee for the establishment of a democratic way of life in Latin America.

I want to congratulate both Senators. As they know, I am an enthusiastic supporter of their program; and I underwrite and endorse every detail of it.

Mr. President, since I spoke earlier this afternoon, and since I had a brief conversation with the two Senators some hour and one-half ago, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] has reported to me that this afternoon he has had a conference with Mr. Moscoso, the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and that he put to him the $64 question: "Have you yet withdrawn the AID personnel from the Dominican Republic?" He elicited the information that there are some 21 members of that personnel; and the answer was "No." The reason why the answer was no, so Mr. Moscoso reported to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], was that the State Department did not approve it.

Mr. President, I want to know from the State Department, not later than tomorrow, why it does not approve it. I want to know what kind of double-talk and hypocrisy the State Department is engaging in, in connection with the Dominican Republic, for I know the Department's pattern, and I am perfectly satisfied that it has brought back the American Ambassador only as a grand gesture which means nothing, and that the test of whether the State Department is cutting off our relationships with the Dominican Republic is to be found in whether the Department gets the AID personnel back here quickly. Let the Department bring the AID personnel back here, and then the people of the Dominican Republic will know that we are beginning to mean business when we say we are not going to support the military junta and the three civilian stooges who are carrying out the dictates of that military junta. Those civilian stooges are trying to sell the bill of goods that within several years there will be an election in the Dominican Republic. But what kind of an election would it be?

It would include only the procedures to which the military junta would agree.

Furthermore, since I talked this afternoon to the two Senators, I have received more information in regard to American business intervention in connection with the junta and the coup. I am satisfied that American business interests are involved over their heads in supporting that military junta—to the everlasting disgrace of the United States; and in connection with the coup, the hands of the United States are not clean.

To the President of the United States I say, "Mr. President, I am satisfied that you have not known these facts. But now you have a duty to call on the State Department for the necessary action and to get the Secretary of State back to Washington. There is no place more important for him to be right now than in the city of Washington. You should get a briefing from the Secretary of State and you should get a briefing from the CIA; and you should wash America's hands of any involvement there, and should make perfectly clear to those responsbile for the coup, to the military junta, to the civilian stooges, and to the American business interests that our country is washing its hands of the Dominican Republic until democratic government is restored there, and that that means the return of the constitutional President of the Dominican Republic until the people, by the exercise of their democratic processes, under their constitution—that the military junta has destroyed—take their constitutional action, whatever it may be."

Mr. President, we cannot countenance the overthrow of the constitutional government in the Dominican Republic, and then, 10 days or 2 weeks from now—which, I am satisfied, is the present plan of the State Department—recognize the military junta. Let me say now to the President of the United States, "If that is done, your administration will be disgraced."

The President must decide whether all the talk we have heard during past years about supporting democratic procedures in Latin America is only talk, or whether it represents the policy of the United States. I am satisfied that if we follow the policy presently contemplated by the State Department in regard to the Dominican Republic, there will be a coup in Honduras, too. And we must also watch out for Venezuela and for several other hot spots in Latin America. If we wish to have Latin America or a large segment of Latin America delivered to the Communists in the immediate future, we have only to follow the course of action—which I believe is contemplated in the State Department—of an early recognition by us of the military junta.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, again I commend the Senator from Oregon for his forceful, eloquent, and unmistakably clear statement as to what he believes should be the policy of this Government. I am sure many other Senators also believe it should be the policy of this Government.

To condone such military juntas is to condone a plague in this hemisphere, because it is a fact that other countries are threatened. More than 2 months ago, I said, here in the Senate, that there was danger of a military coup in the Dominican Republic, and that the President of that Republic knew that his reform program was meeting with this kind of resistance. I also said there was danger of a military coup in Honduras—and there is; and there can be the same danger in Colombia and in Venezuela.

Mr. President, we had better make unmistakably clear to all parties that this Government does not intend to sit idly by and permit those constitutional Governments to be destroyed by lieutenants, captains, colonels, generals, or trigger-happy, would-be dictators.

I remind my fellow Americans that the Republic of Venezuela stands in mortal danger every hour of the day because of the gunmen, the Communists, the Castroites, and the followers of the former dictator. The extremists and the ragtag ends of dictatorship of the right and the would-be dictators of the left, backed up by a handful of the military who know only how to shoot and bully their way into power, are threatening to end constitutional, democratic government in country after country in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, we talk about the problems of Africa, Asia, and Europe. But if there is any one area in the world where the influence of the United States of America ought to be evident for good and constructive purpose, it is in this hemisphere. We have told other nations to stay out of the Western Hemisphere. Senators have spoken time after time about a more modern application of the Monroe Doctrine. If we tell other nations to stay out of the Western Hemisphere, we had better try to help other peoples of this hemisphere who want freedom, democracy, and an opportunity to survive as free people. We are witnessing an increasing trend toward military dictatorship, which does not defeat communism or bring progress, but rather provides a fertile seedbed for a Communist takeover once the dictatorship of the military or of the extreme radical right has served its time.

The military coup in the Dominican Republic, so lacking in justification, indicates once more the vulnerability of a government which could not rely on a strong, well-developed democratic institutional structure. It indicates once more that we need strong democratic institutions to support democratic leaders. Under the Trujillo dictatorship, the basis of a democratic institutional structure was all but totally destroyed.

Dictatorship adulterates. It corrupts. It erodes a society. Any country that rids itself of a dictatorship that was as firmly and entrenched as, for example, the Peron dictatorship in Argentina or the Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic, has a difficult time. Such a country has a difficult time to survive in the fresh sunlight and air of freedom. It requires care, patience, and the help of friends to make crystal clear that the tender plant of democracy needs time to gain roots and to be more firmly implanted in the soil of that country, and the plant must be protected in order that it may survive.

The training of political leaders, the development of a competent civil service, the growth of a responsible free press—all of these were impossible under the Trujillo tyranny.

When constitutional government was restored to the Dominican Republic and the President chosen by the Dominican people in a free election was inaugurated in February of this year, it inherited a political vacuum.

Worse than that, it inherited almost chaos. It lacked trained political leaders on which to rely. It lacked a strong political party to mobilize support for the government's programs. It lacked trained, honest, competent administrators to carry out the government's policy. It lacked an effective security system to guarantee social stability. Nevertheless it was a free government which attempted to implement the social and economic programs prescribed by the Alliance for Progress Charter.

I invite the attention of Senators to an article entitled "Time Sewed Up Bosch's Hopes," by Max Freedman, published in the Washington Evening Star, Monday, September 30. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which is pertinent to my remarks, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME SEWED UP BOSCH'S HOPES

(By Max Freedman)

When I saw President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic in June, he told me to remember that his greatest enemy was time itself. He did not know whether he would be granted the margin of time to carry out his reforms. Now he has been plucked from power by a union between the army and the plutocracy, who both repudiate his hopes and ideals for the Dominican people.

Seated outside his office in the palace were two soldiers with sawed-off shotguns in their laps. A third soldier carefully checked my appointment card and the purpose of my visit. In the inner office, together with President Bosch's two senior secretaries, sat a general with a gun strapped to his waist. Then I came to the President's own office and his first words were an apology for the show of force.

He said these pitiable trappings of military power were imposed on him by his own security officers. During the Trujillo dictatorship, the palace had bristled with military arrogance to hold the nation in the grip of fear.

All his anxieties centered on the reform movement. The tragedy was that he himself embodied those reforms. Without him they had no meaning and no future. So the generals struck at him to destroy a movement which they feared and hated. They dreaded its success even more than its failure, for its success would mark the decline of their privileges and power.

On most days President Bosch came to his office at 5 in the morning and worked late into the night. So oppressive was the shortage of trained people to help him when he took office he found only two professional agronomists working for the Government. All the rest were on Trujillo's vast estates. Without the help of specialists from the United States and Puerto Rico he could never have made his brave start.

Before he talked about his own country's problems, he wanted to hear about President Kennedy and the new stirrings in Washington. He thought of himself not as an isolated reformer in a small country, but as part of a larger tradition which sought to lift the burdens from people cast into the bondage of poverty and illiteracy. With flashing phrase and imperious conviction he explained the differences between Castro's false revolution in Cuba and his own program for the Dominican Republic.

He thought the greatest threat of a revolt against his rule would be in the first year. During these early months the country would be chafed by change; the peasants in the countryside would not yet have their promised reforms; and the irritation of the privileged classes would be sharpened into fury. Despite these omens of danger, he believed his opponents would be afraid to strike because they might provoke a sullen national uprising. He was wrong. His fear was a better prophet than his hope.

President Bosch knew the risks of not moving more strongly against the Communists. Two different reasons explain his policy. He had the strongest evidence for believing that a drive against the Communists now would soon become a cover for reaction and would destroy the reforms which alone could end the grievances on which communism feeds. In the second place, he believed that President Betancourt of Venezuela, his great friend, had actually increased the danger of Castroism by his stark and premature challenge to the Communists.

Fate put a finger on the wheel of fortune, and robbed him of a chance to prove the wisdom of his cautious policy. He has been overthrown by forces eager to exploit the cry against communism for their own selfish ends. Meanwhile, the workers and peasants—mute, dispersed, intimidated—have raised no shout of anger at the return of evil. Perhaps he yet will return to power in coming months.

The United States has no cause to reproach itself for the sad result. It did the right thing in supporting President Bosch, and its policies could not have been better applied than by Ambassador John Bartlow Martin and his colleagues. The odds against success were simply too great. A lament over failure is the negation of statesmanship. The United States must move now to save what it can from the wreckage, and to lighten the agony of the Dominican people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, whatever have been the shortcomings of the President of the Dominican Republic, Juan Bosch, the fact is that he was a democrat with a small "d." He believed in freedom. He was an idealist. He may not have been the best administrator. He may have had many shortcomings. But he was elected in a free election. I suggest to those who are also the recipients of victory in free elections that we protect the institution of the election process, and that we speak out in every way we can to guarantee its security and safety. Of course, there are honest differences of opinion as to whether President Bosch did as good a job for the Dominican Republic as some of us had hoped he would. Apparently there are honest differences of opinion in the United States as to whether any President does as good a job as some people think he ought to. That is why there are opposition parties. In every State in our Union there are political differences. We have elections when the opponent of the incumbent seeks the office of the incumbent. He points out the shortcomings of the present Governor, Senator, Representative, mayor, President, or the occupant of whatever office is up for election. Obviously, President Bosch can be criticized. I heard criticism this afternoon about the fact that he permitted the Communists to come back to the Dominican Republic. The Council of State, the government that preceded the present President of the Dominican Republic, also had in its constitution a provision that exiles could return, because the Trujillo tyranny and dictatorship exiled anyone who stood in its way.

I hold the view that Bosch would have found out in due time, as he was beginning to find out, that we can be so idealistic in terms of the principles of democracy that we lose the capacity to govern in times of crisis and emergency. President Bosch would have learned.

But I am not merely arguing about the personality of Juan Bosch, the President of the Dominican Republic. And he is still President. He was elected. I am arguing about what happened in the Dominican Republic to destroy constitutional government, the attempt made to destroy what we in the Senate and our President said would be the showcase of democracy.

We thought the Dominican Republic could be a demonstration of what free people could do in cooperation with the great free United States. We thought that it could be an example for the world close at hand and the tyranny of Castro in Cuba—in close physical proximity. We thought—and when I say "We," I mean the Dominican people, supported by the help of the people of the United States—that it would be possible to show what a free people in a free society with a constitutional government could do as compared with what a puppet government, a dictatorial government, a Communist-sympathizing government, and a Communist-motivated government could do in Cuba.

Mr. President, what have we to show today? All we have to show is that we could do little or nothing, or that we did little or nothing to prevent a handful of trigger-happy, gun-toting, machinegunning military officers drive out of that country the duly elected President, destroy the Cabinet, close up the Congress, and, for all practical purposes, make illegal two of the most important political parties in the Dominican Republic, the party that elected Juan Bosch and the Christian Democratic Party.

Then, of course, they made illegal the Communist Party, too. In the name of fighting communism, the military in the Dominican Republic are paving the way for a Communist-Castro takeover or for complete chaos in that sad and unhappy island.

Mr. President, as a free constitutional government whose program was patterned on the Alliance for Progress, the United States supported the new Dominican Government. In view of the almost insuperable obstacles facing the new government, in view of the high priority which we placed on restoring both stability and social and economic progress in the Caribbean, the U.S. Government not only supported the new government, but supported it enthusiastically.

Now the Government that we supported has been overthrown—the victim of machinegun-toting colonels who understand neither the virtues of political democracy nor the nature of the Communist threat which they insist is the pretext for their action.

I say to the Senator from Oregon that it is common knowledge that far too many "fast-money artists," far too many plain ordinary "crooks" from the United States and elsewhere, moved into the Dominican Republic in the hope that under the new government they would be able to gain some special favor in the name of freedom.

It is a well recognized fact that the President of the Dominican Republic, Juan Bosch, who is accused of being a poor administrator, was so much aware of the possibilities of corruption that he approved any appropriation of funds or use of funds personally if the amount involved was more than a few hundred dollars. It was obviously an insuperable task. The man loved his country. He believed in political freedom. He wanted to see corruption erased from his nation. He made the effort. The fact that he was incapable of doing it as well as some of us hoped he would in no way diminishes him and in no way justifies his destruction by illegal methods.

There are ways under the constitution of the Dominican Republic to remove a President. There are ways to call for new elections. Surely it is not proper to do so at the point of a gun.

I say that this pretext of action—namely, to save the nation from communism—is pure unadulterated bunk.

This pretext is a hollow mask—and should fool no one. Although we may not have been completely satisfied with the efforts of the Dominican Government to crack down on some leftist-oriented individuals that have returned to the country before the new government was inaugurated, the available evidence does not indicate that Communists had gained appreciable strength in the Dominican Republic. On the basis of all information available to our Government, the claim of a Communist threat by the military junta should be rejected.

The Cuban Communist leader Che Guevara has stated that Communists find it much easier to overthrow dictatorships than democratic governments, because democratic governments provide some kind of anodyne for the people which inspires popular support of the government. One can imagine Guevara and Castro and their Communist cronies in Cuba rejoicing today. A new military dictatorship in the nearby Dominican Republic could well become for Castro a ripe plum to be picked in the Caribbean.

As I understand it, it is the U.S. policy in Latin America, the area which President Kennedy just last weekend again described as "the most critical area in the world," to oppose dictatorship and to support freely elected constitutional government. This is the assumption on which our Congress is operating in support of U.S. participation under the Alliance for Progress.

I believe that now is the time to enforce this policy in the Caribbean.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate tonight. The time to enforce this particular assumption and principle of political democracy is now. Just as we recently have decided to stop talking and start acting in our belief in racial equality in this country, it is now the time to act on the basis of our belief in constitutional government. The President demonstrated in October of 1962 that this Nation is capable of decisive action, that this Government is capable of decision action. I believe that if we are capable of forcing the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba, we are capable of taking decisive action to bring about the downfall of the present illegal government and a return to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic.

I would dislike to have it said that the same government which could meet Mr. Khrushchev head on and make Mr. Khrushchev back down and withdraw his missiles cannot get rid of a handful of gun-toting colonels who have taken over a duly constituted government in the Dominican Republic.

We have wisely suspended diplomatic relations and called back our Ambassador and our economic mission. We should call back our military mission immediately—not only the head of the military mission but the entire mission.

We have no desire to intervene in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic or any other Latin American nation. But we do desire to promote and protect free constitutional governments in this hemisphere. That is our objective. I do not claim any qualification to prescribe the specific means for returning to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic. There may be several ways, and I am confident that the responsible Dominican leaders, assisted by their freedom-loving friends in this hemisphere, can find suitable ways of shifting to a constitutional pattern of government. They need the unqualified support of this Republic.

We need to make it crystal clear that we are not going to tolerate, or help, or accommodate ourselves to this military junta that has taken over.

The brazen attack on Dominican democracy by an unprincipled ambitious military clique is an attack on U.S. policy in this hemisphere—represented by our support of and participation in the Alliance for Progress. It is an attack on everything we stand for. It is a blow to our prestige—a blow which should not be allowed to stand. It is a blow to free constitutional government in this hemisphere. If it is permitted to stand, it is an open invitation to those military groups in Venezuela and Honduras who are already plotting to emulate the coup of their Dominican cohorts. If the anticonstitutional military groups in other countries are convinced that coup d'etats are compatible with continued U.S. economic and military assistance, the temptation to overthrow constitutional government will surely prove irresistible.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators have made this point again and again. We must let these fellows know that if they use guns to force their way into office over duly elected free governments which are friendly to this country we are not going to help them, we are not going to give them one nickel—not even a penny. In fact, we should do everything we can to destroy them, to bring down their military coup into a rubble and into the wreckage it ought to be.

Certain of our responses to military coups in the past are not likely to discourage them in their plotting. The time to take a firm stand is long overdue.

In the confines of this Government I have made this unequivocally clear not only on the Senate floor but also in private consultations.

Mr. President, we are in trouble in this country with the foreign aid program. Let the record be crystal clear. We are going to be in more trouble. It does not advance the cause of the administration's foreign aid bill this year to have another body blow to the Alliance for Progress. If this administration means what it says about high priority of the Alliance for Progress—and I believe it means exactly that—it certainly will not permit a military clique to prevent the restoration of constitutional government in the Dominican Republic.

I say to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State—men to whom I am dedicated in terms of my political loyalty and my friendship—"If you want to strike a blow for an effective foreign aid bill, if you want to see funds restored for the Alliance for Progress, then do what needs to be done to the little outfit which has just taken over in the Dominican Republic. Make it crystal clear that military juntas are out, that they will not be given any help, that they will not be recognized, that they will not be tolerated." I can think of nothing that would do more to save the Alliance for Progress. And I can think of nothing that would do more to destroy the Alliance for Progress and literally to destroy the foreign aid program than to condone what is being done by these military juntas in the Western Hemisphere.

Frankly, it becomes very difficult for a Member of Congress to support such a well-conceived program if such a program can be turned aside by a crowd of colonels and generals.

The Alliance for Progress is put forward as the orderly, progressive way of accomplishing the economic and social reforms needed within a framework of political liberty. This is the alternative to dictatorial rule. If we permit some power-happy gang of generals that wants to take a crack at ruling a country to flout the whole concept of the Alliance, then perhaps it is time to say that we just cannot afford to be involved in the affairs of that particular Latin American country. The American people and the American Congress are not interested in spending money to finance military cliques.

I regret that, with all the military assistance we have given those countries, we apparently have not been able to indoctrinate the military of those countries in democratic value and virtues. We have taught them how to use our tanks, but apparently they have never read the Declaration of Independence or the Emancipation Proclamation; nor do they understand the responsibility of constitutional authority.

It is to the everlasting credit of the military in America that it has brought forth some great generals, who have loved their country more than they have the particular unit of their professional service—men of the qualities of General Marshall—yes, of General Eisenhower; men of the competence of General Bradley and General Bedel Smith, to mention only a few, and men in our Military Establishment today who understand the relationship of the military to constitutional government, who understand the importance of military and civil authority.

Why do we not inculcate these ideas into others? Do we teach at our military schools only tactics, strategy, the use of weapons; or do our military programs for hundreds of officers from Latin-American countries has something to do with social science, the humanities, the virtures and values of democratic institutions? It seems to me we might well examine into what is being taught in these military programs.

Mr. President, I have been a firm supporter of the Alliance for Progress. I believe in it. I have worked in the Congress to gain approval for the appropriations needed to support our participation in it. I hope to be able to continue supporting it, but I am going to be very watchful and observant as to what we are doing in this instance, when a military junta has taken over. I do not believe in idle threats, nor do I want to be governed by emotions, but it becomes very difficult even for the most ardent and avid administration supporter to ask his colleagues to support additional appropriations for the foreign aid program and the Alliance for Progress when we see those funds utilized and captured by little, tinhorn dictators.

The military junta in the Dominican Republic today presides over millions of dollars of American taxpayers' funds that have been given to that country, and I do not want any more given—not 1 nickel, not 1 dollar—until constitutional government is restored there.

I cannot be sure that Senators who have fought hardest and longest in the support of the Alliance for Progress will continue to do battle in this cause if the result is to see constitutional government fall before the assault of military schemers with only a mild protest by the United States. I know who in this Congress supports the Alliance for Progress program and who does not. I can say that most of those who are its strongest supporters, most of those who will fight the long hard battle to win the appropriations needed for it, firmly adhere to the belief that political democracy and constitutional government are as essential to the success of the Alliance for Progress as economic progress. They will not take lightly this latest assault on constitutional government.

Those in the executive branch who are most interested in and concerned with the success or failure of the Alliance might do well to note that those in the Congress who are most concerned with this latest attack on the Alliance are not those who regularly attempt to slash and defeat the program, but rather its strongest backers.

Now is the time to bring this illegal Dominican Government to its knees and to assist the responsible democratic Dominican leaders in returning constitutional government to that troubled island.

This could be said of other countries, but because we have a great stake in this little land not so far away from our shores, because of its unusual relation to developments in the Caribbean, where Castro and his Communist stooges seek to spread their poison and system, I believe any Senator who can speak up now for freedom, democracy, constitutional government, and free elections in the Dominican Republic and other countries will be doing his country great service.

I want to be sure the President of the United States, who has to make difficult decisions, gets our support. I want him to know that, as his best friends in this body, we are asking him to take positive, determined action, and that in so doing he will not weaken his administration, but, to the contrary, he will see his programs carried out. We must face the fact that we do not have too much of a choice left. That is why I have spoken up on this matter.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I know it is very late. I do not wish to detain the Senate or the staff.

According to the familiar harbingers, the standard preliminaries, and the hackneyed hoisting of trial balloons, we are soon to be officially informed of a radical shift in our foreign policy.

Without any approval from Congress, in fact in the face of expressed congressional disapproval, our Government is to sell to Russia subsidized wheat at a price substantially below that paid for it by the American taxpayer. This would be, in effect, an initial subsidy to Russia of more than $100 million.

Only a few weeks ago this would have been unthinkable, as it was in 1961 when Congress passed Public Law 87–128 which states the sense of Congress that subsidized agricultural commodities should not be made available to the Soviet Union or to countries dominated by the U.S.S.R.

But this morning's press states:

> Official American sources are not too impressed with Congress restrictions against selling subsidized grain to unfriendly nations.

This proposed policy shift has not yet been officially announced, it is reported, because the President is still weighing the political consequences.

I believe that there will be many adverse political consequences, both in the broader sense of the term, and in the narrower sense.

And, while the decisionmaking process is still going on, I wish to state my opposition to any wheat deal with Russia, and the reasons for this opposition.

It is generally considered that we are in the midst of a cold war, forced upon us by the Communists.

This cold war is said to threaten our survival and because of it 3 million young Americans are in uniform; the larger part of our national budget is devoted to military purposes; and we have given away $100 billion to help other nations protect themselves.

Since the days of World War II when the slogan "Food Will Win the War" was on everyone's lips, we have all known that foodstuffs, and especially wheat, are strategic materials.

This is particularly so in the cold war and especially so with respect to Soviet Russia and Red China, for whom the agriculture dilemma has posed insoluble problems on a massive scale.

These problems have gravely impeded the aggressive capacity, the unity, the stability and the scientific and productive potential of the Communist world, and before we propose to bail them out with cutrate wheat, let us look carefully at what we are doing.

We know that the Soviet agricultural failure is one of the major sources of discontent and internal weakness within the Soviet Union.

It confronts every man, woman and child behind the Iron Curtain with daily evidence of the abject failure of the Communist regime and of the bankruptcy of Marxist doctrine.

It obliges the Red leaders to consider permitting some freedom in Soviet agriculture, which could have revolutionary consequences.

It forces the Soviets to divert huge percentages of their manpower, machinery, and scientific effort to the farm problem, and away from cold war purposes.

It constrains them to welsh on their commitments of grain to their satellites, with grevious consequences for Communist unity.

It compels them to abandon or to scale down their use of food exports as a weapon of subversion in the cold war.

It requires them to cancel their trade agreements with non-Communist nations and thus to lose the chemical and machinery imports which they need to build their industrial and military machine.

This being true, and I know of no one who disputes it, the proposed wheat deal with Russia will have, inevitably, the following consequences:

Every bushel of subsidized wheat we ship to Russia will help divert manpower from the farms and into the Soviet military and industrial machine.

Every bushel of wheat we ship to Russia will help to lessen discontent within the Iron Curtain and will help to mask the Communist failure in agriculture.

Every bushel of wheat we ship to Russia will help the Communists to carry on their export programs to their satellites, an important source of Soviet control.

Every bushel of wheat we ship to Russia constitutes a subsidy to the Communist regime of about 50 cents, and there are to be 250 million of these bushels as a beginner.

These are the larger political consequences of the proposed wheat deal. And there are others.

Congress, which puts up the money of taxpayers to pay for this wheat has said that it does not want it shipped to the Russians, but administration spokesmen are not too impressed with what Congress wants. This ought to expose for all time the worthlessness of sense resolutions as a substitute for airtight restrictions on the executive branch. And this is not all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join the Senator in the observation he has made about so-called sense resolutions in the Senate. I have always opposed them.

Mr. DODD. I know the Senator has, and I commend him for it.

Mr. MORSE. I have always recognized them for what they are—facesavers. However, they do not save faces. If the Senate has reached an opinion with regard to a matter of policy, it should express it in legislation.

Mr. DODD. I, too, think so.

Mr. MORSE. Back in 1955 the then Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman, persuaded me to go ahead with him on this kind of resolution, for a congressional expression of opinion relative to a policy that had developed with respect to discrimination against American Jews and Catholic priests in certain places abroad. I was persuaded that the way to do that was to adopt a sense resolution.

I always try to learn from experience. I joined in that resolution. I thought perhaps there was something to the argument of those who said, "WAYNE, when are you ever going to agree to take half a loaf?"

All I got was the cellophane wrapper. One cannot eat that. We soon recognized that although we had adopted a sense resolution, the State Department proceeded to ignore it.

It was not until the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I, in 1955, had the language added as an amendment to the foreign aid bill that it took on any meaning at all. It still has some shortcomings. I only mention this point as an example of my experience with the so-called sense resolutions.

I therefore join the Senator from Connecticut in the observation he has made that we ought to stop doing it, that we ought to enact legislation, and not engage in this kind of legislative gesturing.

The Senator is raising a subject matter which perplexes me very much. I believe we must have a more thorough consideration of it in the Foreign Relations Committee than we have had up to now. The Senator from Connecticut knows that yesterday there was an informal meeting in which members of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and other Senators also, participated in a rather informal discussion with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Ball.

The Senator from Connecticut knows that tomorrow the committee will return to a markup of the foreign aid bill. I predict that the administration will travel a rocky road, and that a good many tires on this juggernaut will be punctured before it reaches the end of that journey.

It is very important, I believe, that we have the top man at the meeting, the Secretary of State himself, and that we raise with the Secretary of State some of the problems the Senator from Connecticut is raising this evening. I intend to reserve my judgment until we have had an opportunity to discuss in some depth with the Secretary of State the implications of this and related economic policies that are impinging upon it in the field of foreign relations. There are many facets of this situation which disturb me. I am greatly disturbed, from the evidence that has been submitted. We were asked, "Why should we not sell the wheat to Russia? We sell it to West Germany, and West Germany manufactures it into flour and sells it to both East Germany and Russia, at a neat profit for West Germany." So the argument is made—how plausible it is, I do not know, "If you are going to countenance that sort of international sleight of hand, we had better do it directly."

I am troubled also by the conduct of our allies, including our friend to the north. Frankly, I say to the Senator that for the life of me, I do not know what the answer should be. The Senator and I owe it to our constituency to do exactly what the Senator from Connecticut is doing tonight, as he so frequently does; namely, to get all the facts out on the table for full public disclosure. As the Senator has heard me say many times, America's foreign policy belongs to the American people, and they are entitled to know all the facts before the Government, either in the executive or in the legislative branch, takes a final course of action.

Therefore, I commend the Senator from Connecticut for taking the time tonight to lay this problem out before us. I hope he will take it a step further and in the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow bring up the problem and officially request that the Secretary of State be brought before us at an early date.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from Oregon. It comforts me greatly to hear his statement. He knows how much I respect and admire him. He is a great figure in the Senate. I admire him for his ability, his independence, his insight, and his integrity. I assure him that I will raise this question with the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, for many years, the American people, with many misgivings, have endured a sacrifice of several billion dollars annually to pay for a national farm policy that sought a fair return for the farmer and a stable economy for the Nation. In seeking these goals I have voted for farm subsidies and I voted for the administration farm program, despite the fact that they are opposed by the farmers of my own State. I shall not do so again, if this deal goes through.

There are others who will not do so.

The farm program is not so invulnerable that it can afford these defections.

Before we commence to use the farm program as a vehicle for trade with Soviet Russia, I think we might well ask ourselves—can an already unpopular program stand another crushing liability in the eyes of a patient people who must foot the bill?

There is another political consideration, a partisan one, which I do not hesitate to pose.

I believe that millions of Americans in both parties are willing to make tremendous sacrifices to carry forward the cause of freedom but who will not willingly give a single dollar for aid and trade with the Communists.

This new course of action, of which the wheat deal will be only the first step, will help erode the confidence of millions of citizens in the foreign policy of their country and in the wisdom of those who make that policy.

Those who trifle with that sentiment may reap a harvest far different from their expectations, and it won't be in wheat.

The shopworn arguments that have been dredged up to support this wheat deal are among the most insubstantial ever brought forward to sustain a shift of policy.

One argument is that such a deal will be useful in combating the outflow of gold and in reducing our bulging surpluses.

Does anyone contend that our international fiscal position is so flimsy that we must turn to our enemies to bail us out? Or that our surplus problem is so hopeless that we care not who gets it? If this is true, here indeed is an admission that will shock the Nation. Here indeed is a new light in which to evaluate our foreign aid program. For if we are so weak that we must seek relief at the price of materially aiding our enemies, how can we continue to pour out our gold to aid our friends?

It is argued that this is a true horse trade. They get wheat, which they need. We get gold, which we need. What nonsense! Gold means nothing to the Communists; wheat means everything. We do not need their gold. They desperately need our wheat. Let them pay the price for it, not in gold bars, but in concessions to the cause of freedom.

It is argued that this will be good for the farmers. On this basis, spokesmen for farm groups, in and out of Congress, have come out in its support.

This argument is understandable but ignominious. It has a surface plausibility but an essential shortsightedness that may be the last straw for people who are already fed up with farm politics and farm raids on the Treasury.

I say to those who claim to represent the farmers of this Nation:

Each year you come before us and ask us to tax our people billions of dollars to support a wasteful, extravagant, unpopular farm subsidy program on the ground that the national interest and the interest of common justice compels it. And we have supported you, with American gold. Do you now tell us that a little Russian gold and a few cents increase in the price of wheat is more important than that same national interest and that same sense of justice?

If you cannot rise above the selfish interest of some of your constituents, in behalf of the Nation's welfare, then there are many of us who will never again support the welfare of your constituents at the expense of the Nation's interest.

It is argued that since the Canadians have already begun to sell wheat to the Russians, and since other nations may do so, we might as well get in the game while the getting is good.

If this is true, is not every aspect of our foreign policy at the whim and at the mercy of every selfish allied interest, even those of minor allies?

Our course is not to abandon our policy because an ally decides to play both sides of the street.

Our energies should be directed, not to joining in the race for Communist markets, but toward influencing, even pressuring and sanctioning, our allies to refrain from such trade.

It is argued that this trade agreement is a step toward peace. It is not a step toward peace. It is a step toward war because it helps to heal a fatal, debilitating weakness of our enemy. It helps them to maintain their control over their own people and over their enslaved peoples, and it helps them to solve a problem which otherwise would force them to slow down the growth of their technology and their industry and thus their capacity to wage war.

These are some of the practical reasons for opposing the wheat deal. There is another reason, a less tangible reason.

Yesterday morning's cartoon in the Washington Post touched upon it. It showed a representative of the wheat producers on the telephone, and the caption was:

> Wait a minute—did you say those atheistic warmongers are willing to pay cash?

This caption leads me to my final argument against the wheat deal. It demeans our national integrity; it makes a mockery of the noble and costly struggle we have made against the Communists; it resurrects in every nation in the world the infamous legend that the dollar sign is the all-important factor in American policy. It forces us to ask ourselves why are we allowing American boys to die in South Vietnam at the hands of an enemy to whom we now propose to distribute our largesse.

We cannot, we must not do this. If there were a famine behind the Iron Curtain, of course, we would help; we would send wheat but we would send it under the American flag so that all would know that these shipments represent, not Communist success, but Communist failure, not American greed, but American compassion.

So I speak out today, hastily and without adequate preparation, in an attempt to protest against this transaction before it is an accomplished fact.

If we do this deed, we will be subsidizing those who are sworn to destroy us; we will be strengthening the Communists at their weakest point; we will be helping them to enslave their own people and other people; we will enable them to continue to sustain Cuba and their other puppet states; we will lower the floodgates to a deluge of East-West trade which we will use for dollars and which they will use for aggression; we will establish vested interests in the United States which depend upon the Soviet Union in part for their livelihood; and we will abandon our golden opportunity to use their great need and our great abundance to wrest concessions from them in the cause of freedom around the globe.

Surely these considerations are more weighty than a temporary monetary gain.

And so, in friendship and in deep concern, I urge the President and his advisers not to do through questionable executive action what they could not accomplish through the legislative process.

Let us solve our gold problem and our farm problem with an honest fiscal policy and an honest farm policy and not through an infamous tactic of giving away the physical and moral heritage of the American people for a paltry return that will haunt us through many a dark day.

This problem belongs, first of all, with Congress. It ought to be fully discussed here. I feel strongly about it. That is why I have spoken without preparation at this late hour tonight, and have detained my colleagues and our aides in the Senate, something which I ordinarily try to avoid. But I believe the hour for speaking is late. It may be too late. The decision may have already been made. What a tragedy if that is so.

I fear that we in the legislative branch, who represent the people of the 50 States, are seeing whittled away almost every day our responsibility toward those whom we represent. For by Executive fiat and by the decisions of unknowns in the executive branch the will of the American people has frequently been thwarted in the past.

So I earnestly urge all Senators, however they may feel about this question—and I know there are many different views, I do not claim infallibility; I merely try to honestly state my own views—I plead with them to urge the President not to take this step until we have had an opportunity to fully explore it in every detail; until, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon suggests, we have heard more witnesses in the Foreign Relations Committee. This is not a trivial matter; this is a matter of great importance, both in substance and in procedure.

I say to the Senator from Oregon, in closing, that I am deeply grateful for his observations. I know his mind is open, as it always is, on these matters. I know he will think it through, as he always does; and I appreciate the comments he has made in the course of my remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for raising this issue tonight, for I think it must receive much more careful consideration than we have been able to give it thus far.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 1, 1963:

U.S. District Judge

Spottswood W. Robinson III, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, vice James W. Morris, deceased.

California Debris Commission

Lt. Col. Robert H. Allan, Corps of Engineers, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Col. John A. Morrison, Corps of Engineers, to be retired.

Col. Robert E. Mathe, Corps of Engineers, to be a member and secretary of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507) (33 U.S.C. 661), vice Col. Herbert N. Turner, Corps of Engineers, reassigned.

In the Navy

Vice Adm. Edward N. Parker, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Walter A. Churchill.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Richard A. Evans.
Robert B. Bell.

In the Navy

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Benavides, Jaime M., Jr.
Boyd, Winton R.
Burke, Francis W.
Callis, Charles M.
Climie, Charles F., Jr.
Davis, Robert L.
Dobbie, Robert P., Jr.
Doohen, Donald J.
Doolan, Paul D.
Edwards, Donald W.
Erdbrink, Wayne L.
Fultz, Robert E.
George, Frederick W., III
Greenburg, Rolland E.
Hosp, David H.
Jones, Kenneth P., III
Jones, Roland W.
Kent, Donald C.
Loweecey, Edward D.
Margileth, Andrew M.
McClenathan, James E.
Millar, Jack W.
Mitchel, Robert E.
Montgomery, Duncan O.
Parmelee, Kenneth A.
Peckinpaugh, Robert O.
Preston, Frank "R"
Reinhardt, Roger F.
Sanborn, Neal D.
Spicer, Donald W.
Trier, William C.
Troy, John W.

SUPPLY CORPS

Becker, Charles
Berning, John R.
Bishoff, Jack T.
Breen, Owen J., Jr.
Brosseau, Oswald J.
Busby, John C., Jr.
Byrd, Hugh D.
Cummings, Newell J.
French, Ferris L., Jr.
Gardiner, Charles V.
Hanson, Earl J.
Jensen, Harold B.
Johnson, Carl P.
Keers, David B., Jr.
Kenyon, Lawrence H.
Kovar, Isadore M.
Lascara, Vincent A.
Law, Kenneth S.
Lee, Charles R.
Maggard, Talmadge P.
Maiden, Robert W.
Mason, Stanley R.
Neely, Carroll E.
Neely, Joe B.
Nelson, George C. Q.
O'Connell, Arthur W., Jr.
Owen, Charles S.
Pawson, Richard P.
Rehberg, Jerome A.
Reid, Donald P.
Russell, George D.
Sanford, Edward A., Jr.
Scharf, Samuel L., Jr.
Sherman, Joel H., Jr.
Simpson, Harold W.
Smith, Joe G., Jr.
Starr, Donald A.
VanPelt, James C.
Warren, James A.
Wieseke, Edward M.
Williams, Earl O.
Winkels, Fred C.
Woodard, William K.
Wright, John E. C.
York, Edward S.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Austin, Henry E.
Humphreys, David M.
Jones, Robert Q.
Sneary, Earl D.
Walsh, William J.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Beaver, John F.
Burke, John L.
Christensen, Wayne J.
Graves, Lenson, W.
Harper, Milton J., Jr.
Loeffler, Harry H., Jr.
Scanlan, Melvin E.

DENTAL CORPS

Benson, Lambert A.
Boyne, Philip J.
Brauer, Frank J.
Bruce, Robert W.
Cave, Amos W., Jr.
Courage, Guy R.
Evans, Joseph R.
Fedi, Peter F., Jr.
Firestone, Dale L.
Gossom, John N.
Gunther, Lewis L.
Kratochvil, Frank J., Jr.
Marble, Howard B., Jr
Parry, Donald E.
Perkins, Robert R.
Prince, Clifford H., Jr
Rigterink, Ray A.
Robinson, Jack W.
Sorenson, Adrian E., Jr.
Webre, Harvey P.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bell, Gordon C.
Beretta, John J.
Edrington, Harold G.
Gilpin, John H., Jr.
Goldman, David E.
Herrmann, Robert S.
Hooper, Robert F.
Jacobs, Joseph J.
Johnson, Calvin F.
Madden, William F.
McGehee, William G.
Sanders, Ernest
Skow, Royce K.

The following-named officers of the U.S Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Alspach, Rodger L.
Anderson, Richard R.
Arnest, Richard T., Jr.
Arthur, Ransom J.
Barrick, Richard H.
Beckwith, Frederick D.
Bishop, Calvin F.
Brown, Dudley E., Jr.
Burgoyne, David S.
Cady, Gerald W.
Cox, John W.
Dalave, Daniel P.
Dobel, Gerald F.
Esterly, Harold D., Jr.
Edens, Fred R.
Ewing, Channing L.
Gossett, Clarence E.
Gregg, Paul C.
Hart, George R.
Hinton, Benjamin F.
Horgan, Joseph T.
Johnson, John D.
Johnson, Thomas S.
King, Lawrence M., Jr.
Kirk, Robert F.
Kitrinos, Nicholas P.
Lynch, Mary T.
Meekings, Walter J., Jr.
Mitchell, George D.
Ninow, Earl H.
Nuredini, Skender
O'Connell, Fred H.
Oftedal, Sverre J., Jr.
Osgood, Morgan F.
Ragland, Stuart, Jr.
Richter, Tor
Simpkins, Carl N., Jr.
Sode, Jonas
Spaulding, Raymond C., Jr.
Szakacs, Jeno E.
Trabaudo, Lawrence E.
Trostle, Henry S.
Turner, Thomas W.
Watkins, Tommie K.
Wilson, Almon C.
Wire, George E., Jr.
Wurzel, John F.

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderson, William "B" Jr.
Anweiler, Calvin R.
Armstrong, Edmund S.
Audino, Joseph R.
Austin, Robert C.
Banchart, Robert J.
Barnett, William H., Jr.
Bassing, Bernard H.
Beale, John W.
Benfell, Leonard H., Jr.
Bliss, Roger C.
Borchert, William H.
Braley, Charles R., Jr.
Bray, Walter H.
Bristow, John M.
Broili, Robert T.
Butler, Herbert F., Jr.
Byrd, James L.
Calhoun, Thomas N.
Carlson, John C.
Carmer, Elwood A.
Carrington, James H.
Cecil, William A.
Chadwick, William A.
Chegin, George I.
Chester, Francis J.
Chetlin, Norman D.
Child, Arthur L., III
Colbert, Bryan R.
Coryell, Rex S.
Cosby, Francis B.
Coughlin, James E. M.
Crozier, Wayne R.
Culwell, Charles L.
Daley, Edward J.
Dasovich, Michael
Dickson, Holton C., Jr.
Doddy, William F.
Donnelly, Joseph A.
Downs, Thomas R.
Dunbar, Robert F.
Edsall, Arthur R., Jr.
Edson, Stephen R., Jr.
Edwards, Howard R., Jr.
Ellingwood, Leonard D.
Elwod, Joseph L.
Fabian, Robert G.
Ferrell, Reginald G.
Finn, John F.
Foil, John L.
Forehand, Joseph L.
Frahler, Andrew L.
Funk, Raymond W.
Futral, Hershchel E., Jr.
Garbelinski, Walter
Ghormley, Robert L., Jr.
Gifford, Robert L.
Graziadei, John D.
Growden, Ellwood W.
Haberthier, Jack H.
Hagedron, Lawrence D.
Hamill, William T., Jr.
Hardy, John F.
Hatfield, John H.
Hausold, Robert P.
Heindel, Donald D.
Henker, Donald E.
Higgins, Evertt C.
Hobkirk, Carl M.
Hopkins, Leroy E.
Houkem, Leif A.
Humphrey, Harvey R.
Ingram, Thomas J., III
Johnson, William H.
Kapp, George H.
Kocher, Edward M.
Kolinsky, Jaromir J.
Kulczycki, Alfred S.
Leventhal, Robert S.
Levine, Alan Y.
Lillis, James F.
Linthicum, Walter E.
Martin, Donald V.
Martin, John T.
McCrory, Walter J.
McEnearney, John E.
McGovern, Austin F.
McKeen, Edward N.
Morgan, James P., Jr.
Morphew, Karol M.
Murphy, George A.
Murphy, Ralph F., Jr.
Naismith, James A.
Newman, Carl H.
Nicol, Robert G.
Packard, Harrison G.
Pillar, Samuel A.
Prestwich, John P.
Purnell, Rodney K.
Rampey, Alvin H.
Rendelson, Paul L.
Roberts, Calvin W.
Ryon, George G.
Sartor, Alvis D.
Schmidt, Robert V.
Scott, Harold K.
Selden, Claiborne T.
Sharp, Herbert C.
Slattery, John G.
Smeds, James H.
Smith, Charles M.
Smith, Roy F.
Snyder, William J.
Speer, Wilburn A., Jr.
Stark, Warren H.
Stratton, Ogden K.
Sundberg, Daniel G.
Swanke, Charles C.
Swenson, Darrell E.
VanMalsen, Wesley W.
Vantol, Peter H. B., Jr.
Veazey, John W.
Vogel, William J.
Wagner, Paul F.
Wallace, William E.
Walters, Melville J., Jr.
Webster, Kenneth B.
Welch, Gordon E.
White, Warren P.
Wier, Richard A.
Wilson, Dorsey V.
Witte, Anton L.
Woodbury, Orpheus L., Jr.
Woodworth, Fred I., Jr.
Ziegler, Bryan W.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Barlik, Robert F.
Bodle, Harold D.
Boyd, George T.
Carlson, Kenneth W.
Carnes, John H.
Cohill, John W.
Crabtree, Roger L.
Doermann, Martin J.
Eaton, Hal H.
Frank, Joseph A.
Fulfer, George W.
Gibbons, Alan R.
Griffin, Gordon H.
Hardman, Samuel R.
Hawkins, Elmo M. T.
Hershberger, George M.
Ivers, Victor J.
Jones, Edwin S.
Kirkbride, Donald L.
Leonard, Guy M., Jr.
Little, James S.
McMillan, Robert C.
Michael, Don M.
Nickelson, Jay V.
O'Connor, John J.
Odell, Robert W.
Osman, Robert E.
Prickett, Albert D.
Roberts, Stacy L., Jr.
Robertson, Alla W.
Richardson, Edward L.
Riess, Paul G.
Rogers, Lowell R.
Saeger, Alfred R., Jr.
Seiders, Marlin D.
Sire, Elwin N.
Solomon, Charles W.
Spinney, William J.
Symons, Harold F.
Trett, Robert L.
Vanderpoel, George E.
Vinson, William H.
Weber, Oscar
Weidler, Edwin R.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Anderson, Gordon A.
Bacon, Howard I.
Bafus, Raymond A.
Bibbo, Domenico N.
Bird, David R., Jr.
Birnbaum, Philip S., Jr.
Brown, Warren F.
Cavendish, Lynn M.
Clements, Neal W.
D'Ambra, Rudolph F.
Day, Francis W.
Day, James C., Jr.
Dickman, Robert E.
Dobson, John F.
Dunn, Robert H. P.
Fluss, Richard M.
Galloway, James E.
Graessle, Howard D., II.
Hardy, Richard T.
Hoffman, George L.
Howe, Charles M.
Johnson, William M., Jr.
Jones, Frank W.
Kauffman, Steven K.
Kirk, Randolph
Lemmon, William R.
Loomis, Raymond W.
MacCordy, Edward L.
Marquardt, Walter E., Jr.
Marron, James P.
Marsh, Edward H., II
McManus, Edward A.
Michael, Edwin M.
Nelson, Robert H.
Padden, Thomas J., Jr.
Parsons, John E., Jr.
Richeson, William J.
Schley, Gordon W.
Semple, William H.
Swecker, Claude E., Jr.
Tinklepaugh, Richard L.
Vivoli, Pierre L.
Washburn, Jack E.
Watson, John D., Jr.
Welton, Dexter M.
Wittschiebe, Donald W.
Woodworth, Robert P.
Wynne, William E.

DENTAL CORPS

Amman, Fred M.
Atkinson, Ray K.
Bagby, Robert W.
Baird, Daniel M.
Barrow, Paul E.
Cullom, Robert D.
Davy, Arthur L.
Farrell, Paul E.
French, Gordon K.
George, Raymond E.
Glasser, Harold N.
Hartnett, Joseph E.
Hickey, Loren V.
Hotz, Philip C.
Howard, Roger H.
Janus, John T.
Johnson, Walter N.
Kresl, Bernard F.
Leupold, Robert J.
Lyons, James J.
Mendel, Robert W.
Nelson, Jack D.
Oenbrink, Philip G.
Pennell, Ernest M., Jr.
Sachs, Samuel J.
Schweitzer, John R.
Scruggs, Charles "S"
Slater, Robert W.
Smith, Scott M.
Thomas, Julian J., Jr.
Weber, Irving J., Jr.
Wyda, Andrew, Jr.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Allen, Cleo R.
Allen, Robert V.
Arm, Herbert G.
Duckworth, James W.
Green, Irving J.
Hull, Edward F.
McWilliams, Joseph G.
Munroe, Barbara
Walter, Eugene L., Jr.
Werner, Gordon W.
Williams, Wayne E.

NURSE CORPS

Bittle, Miriam E.
Chelf, Anne J.
Dalton, Marie F.
Dehler, Erma J.
Heimberger, Peggy S.
McCleary, Catherine M.
Miller, Lucile P.
Richman, Anna
Rothermel, Alice M.
Shedyak, Alice M.
Sterner, Doris M.
Tidwell, Dorothy C.
Tomichek, Martha A.
Vitzkievitch, Helen V.
Walker, Ella M.
Yankoski, Adelyn M.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be majors

Barclay, Kenneth K., O65285.
Cory, Rennie M., O65207.
Dean, George B., O87500.
Nachtsheim, Henry J., Jr., O61139.
Replinger, Richard T., O61277.
Woodman, Richard T., O61779.

To be captains

Brown, Beauregard, 3d, O75964.
Brown, Gene L., O87693.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Dunlap, Clarence R., O29975.

To be lieutenant colonel

Barker, James W., II, O30001.

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Belsit, Hazel, N2122.

To be major, Women's Army Corps

Herbert, Selma L., L47.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be colonel

Benade, Leo E. (MSC), O37433.

To be second lieutenant

Foulds, David G. (MSC), O94388.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Verser, Fort A., Jr. (CMLC), O65321.

To be second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Hockenberry, Earle W. (Armor), O93199.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Ey, Bruce H., O1913356.
Hayes, Douglas W., O967069.

To be captains

Downs, Charles E., O4021304.
Green, James A., O1020383.
Headley, Fred C., Jr., O1936668.
Jones, Albert F. P., O1926754.
Lacy, David W., O4002203.
Lazenby, Ray D.,O4027026.
Malcom, Archie G., O4030824.
Miller, Frank C., O4041972.
Moran, John F., Jr., O4005590.
Norris, William S., Jr., O4003573.
Phelps, John F., O4059967.
Rich, Jordan M., O4026569.
Rose, Harold P., O4033719.
Schwarz, Robert L., O4071249.
Spencer, Joseph L., Jr., O4010822.
Tansey, James, O2274230.
Tharp, Bobby E., O1936371.
Tito, William J., Jr., O4039012.
Ward, Felker W., Jr., O4012341.
Zabcik, Franklin M., O2207177.

To be first lieutenants

Anderson, James P., O5210348.
Baena, George, O2295960.
Bennett, Edward L., O5202119.
Campbell, Jerry P., O5310328.
Daniels, Wesley E., O5304104.
Davis, Wayne B., O5304750.
Dilworth, Robert L., O5306176.
Dolan, Edmund J., Jr., O5005369.
Dunn, Carle E., O5309168.
Eames, Robert F., O5208279.
Flack, Louis E., O4074809.
Mullin, Robert E., O5308594.
Piper, Larry D., O5400818.
Plaster, Roy C., O5307515.
Slaby, Charles O., Jr., O5508891.
Thomas, Dale D., O5310694.
Torrans, Michael E., O5408257.
Trebbe, John M., O5307546.
Westmoreland, Verlon E., O4025892.
Williams, Michael K., O5704557.

To be second lieutenants

Alligood, Ray L., Jr., O5211475.
Amlong, Thomas K., O2307531.
Binzer, Solomon V., O5701829.
Buttner, Peter, O5009441.
Canavan, Thomas J., Jr., O5210701.
Drum, Ted E., O5309902.
Eggleston, Daniel M., Jr., O5215608.
Evans, Donald A., O5315208.
Hollis, Glenn D., O5411751.
Jones, Theodore S., O5209023.
Kara, Miles L., O5515245.
Kish, Joseph P., O5514076.
LaBay, Paul H. M., III, O5008657.
Lambert, Jerry V., O5007216.
Langley, Larry L., O5405857.
Millet, James S., O5705940.
Paul, Gerald D., O5410416.
Poole, Joseph L., O5310929.
Ray, David E., O5515698.
Richardson, Johnny L., O5405932.
Richardson, Joseph L., O5314741.
Riley, James E., O5412878.
Sandquist, David L., O5513497.
Schaibly, John W., O5211204.
Spicuzza, William L., O5211869.
Staten, Eugene B., O5213078.
Stepan, Jacob F., O5707611.
Swan, Dayle L., O5503188.
Tipton, James D., O2306830.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, and 3294.

To be major, Dental Corps

Norlind, Gunnar, O1933975.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Adams, John C., O4027880.
Atwood, Robert B., Jr., O5301104.
Byzewski, Lewis R., O5501238.
Conley, Patrick J., O4055622.
Endicott, William R., O5518400.
Hart, Richard I., O5500586.
Jones, Richard A., O5501264.
Krakowiak, Francis J.
LeBourdais, Robert L., O5213670.
Nelson, Robert N., O5408645.
Rubin, Morton, O5217244.
Shelton, David W., O4076787.
Shepherd, John R., O5202605.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Blechschmidt, George F., O2291585.
Croft, Carl L., O73654.
Donovan, John A., Jr., O5012550.
Holtzapple, Kenneth E., O5212276.
Lipp, Edward B., O5215474.
Love, Jack W.
Peterson, Hugh D., O3045415.
Reisz, Peter B., O5212260.
Smith, Roger H., O5518137.
Witschi, Thomas H., O5013011.
Wright, Robert H., Jr., O5306869.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Blair, James D., O805785.
Coyle, George B., O991737.

To be captain, Veterinary Corps

Anderson, William L., O5500709.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Dietrich, Maryanne T., N901219.
Foltz, Mary J., N2311576.
Morse, Elsie K., N2311932.
Small, Norma R., N2293566.

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

Patterson, Jimmie F., O5518915.
Walowitz, Charles, O5210046.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Bowman, Forest J., O5212941.
Nelson, William W., O2313938.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Blight, Edward M., Jr., O5303843.
Calamita, Frank P., O2309199.
Carter, Tom E., O2305300.
Colton, John W.,
Cooper, John D., O2309202.
Hedlund, Kenneth W., O4085567.
Henderson, Robert L., O5306613.
Hering, Herman D., O2309164.
Hollander, Arnold I., O5210028.
King, Everett G., O5408136.
McIver, William J., O5304643.
McNamee, Philip I., O2309406.
Schettler, William H., O5306739.
Stucker, Paul J., O2309177.
Thibeaux, Albert Jr., O5408345.
Whiting, Edward G., Jr., O2309175.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Dudek, Peter G., O2302281.
Edwards, Lewis M., O4027012.

Lanier, Daniel, Jr., O2296609.
Vance, William M., O5213408.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Robinson, David M., O5219966.
Sims, William M., Jr., O2305363.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Cusick, Judith M., N5519079.
Knox, Rhona M., N5411589.
Scott, Lois E., N5707226.
Surowitz, Andrea B., N5411591.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Hill, Arthur E., O5007440.
Hill, Thomas W., O5213442.
Lyons, Gerard A., O2306081.
Martin, Mathis G., O5410388.
Montgomery, Gordon K., O5412504.
Spencer, William R., O1934976.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Coppin, Thomas D.
Sadberry, John R.
Segal, Herbert E.
Waters, Henry J.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adams, Doye W.
Amos, Albert R., Jr.
Anderson, Dennis K.
Bagley, Philip J., III
Banner, David K.
Barrett, Thomas P.
Benton, Robert B.
Bidwell, Robert L., Jr.
Blakely, William M., Jr.
Bloodhart, Raymond G.
Brown, Kent R.
Caffrey, John P.
Choate, Pat
Corrigan, Robert E., Jr.
Crane, Jay L.
Dueland, Richard C.
Fitzpatrick, Edward A., Jr.
Franklin, William W.
Freeland, T. Clyde
Freemyer, Norman D.
Galster, Robert W.
Getman, Charles L.
Goodwyn, Eugene R., III
Greenlee, Ronald E., III
Haecker, George P. C., O5531598
Hansen, William G.
Harris, James A.
Hawk, Richard V., Jr., O5319275
Hickey, Joseph M., Jr.
Hill, Richard F., III
Hilliard, Tommy L.
Holscher, Richard W.
Ingram, Charles W.
Kasprzyk, Richard C.
Korecki, Eugene M.
Leckey, James G.
Lessard, Paul A.
Levinson, Philip J.
Makarewicz, Theodore W.
Maupin, David L.
Meinke, Gary E.
Monroe, James W.
Nordwall, Paul R.
Pahris, James M.
Perez, Anthony R.
Pierson, J. Terry
Poole, Barry G.
Reese, Thomas S.
Roberts, Terry R.
Sawyer, John M.
Schweitzer, Jeffrey S.
Sheetz, James R.
Stafford, Billy W.
Steinberg, Barry P.
Stephens, Robert F., Jr.
Sutton, Melvin J.
Timmerman, Washington P., III
Warvari, Harold E.
Watz, James H.
Wengert, Walter D.
Winch, Gerald J.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence Day of the Republic of Nigeria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today Nigeria celebrates the third anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe; and His Excellency, the Nigerian Ambassador to the United States, Julius M. Udochi.

The Federation of Nigeria is a populous and prosperous country on the southern coast of west Africa. This anniversary is a special one for Nigeria, since October 1, 1963, will also mark the date of Nigeria's transformation into a republic under a new constitution. Nigeria will remain a member of the British Commonwealth, but a President, elected every 5 years by the Nigerian people, will replace the Queen of England as Nigeria's head of state.

The first 3 years of Nigeria's independence have been a transitional period during which the Nigerians have modified and adapted the political structure bequeathed by the British to the realities of independent Africa. A fourth federal region has been created, based on a referendum vote which resulted in overwhelming approval for establishment of the new region. The new midwest region is seen by many Nigerians as the logical outgrowth of an old tribal kingdom; its creation is viewed as a recognition of, and attempt to utilize, tribal solidarity in molding a viable federation.

The democratic Western World is impressed with Nigeria's constitution-writing and nation-building process, for the Nigerians, in modifying the institutions and political framework created by Britain, have built on, not destroyed, their parliamentary heritage. We are wholly sympathetic to Prime Minister Balewa's point of view—that Nigeria must evolve its own type of democracy—and we congratulate the Nigerian constitution drafters on the judicious decisions of the recent constitutional conference. We found particular satisfaction in the conference's rejection of a proposed preventive detention act. It is only too easy for a new country faced with the many difficult problems of developing a national consciousness in peoples of different tribal loyalties to succumb to the temptation of political repression of the opposition. A preventive act provides a good excuse for such repression. Rejection of the proposed preventive detention act confirms Nigeria's dedication to democratic principles and gives evidence of that country's determination not to succumb to the trend to authoritarianism so enticing to new nations.

It must not be thought that Nigeria's transitional period has simply been a period of suspension, of changing gears, for Nigeria has made noteworthy progress in the economic and educational spheres in the first 3 years of independence. Educational facilities at all levels have been expanded considerably since independence, with the result that whereas only 40–45 percent of the total school-age population was attending primary school in 1960, today free and nearly universal primary education is being provided everywhere but in the north where progress has been somewhat slower. The economy has been enjoying a steady rate of growth amounting to an average annual increase in national output of about 4 percent. A 6-year development plan initiated in 1962 is focused on increasing and diversifying Nigeria's agricultural output as well as encouraging additional industry. Already Nigerian petroleum, a rich but until recently largely unexploited source of wealth, has increased in export value from nil in 1957 to $45 million in 1962. Before the end of the year work is scheduled to begin on the nearly $200 million Niger River Dam, one of three major hydroelectric projects planned in Nigeria.

Nigeria's natural resources, her human potential, her steady rate of economic development, and her skillful political leaders have already made her a leader among the new African states. We congratulate you, President Azikiwe, Prime Minister Balewa, and the Nigerian people on the third anniversary of your independence.

Congress Looks at Electronic Data Processing Automation in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks:

CONGRESS LOOKS AT ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING AUTOMATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Remarks by Chairman ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat, of Montana, Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, before the Washington chapter of the Systems and Procedures Association, September 25, 1963)

When you sent an invitation to our subcommittee for a speaker for your meeting this evening, I decided that I would like to accept the invitation myself. This gives me the opportunity of becoming acquainted with your association, and at the same time telling you something about our work.

My understanding is that you would like me to discuss automatic data processing in the Federal Government and the results of our subcommittee hearings and reports. This is a good subject, and of interest to all of us, but I shall talk about EDP (electronic data processing) rather than ADP (automatic data processing), if you don't mind. In addition, I should like to tell you about some of the other EDP activities of Congress so that you can appreciate how deeply we have become involved in this new technology. With the foregoing objectives in mind, I have selected the topic, "Congress Looks at EDP Automation in the Federal Government."

EDP—A USEFUL TOOL

Now, fortunately, Congress isn't like the fellow who in commenting on the atom bomb test ban said that he is all for it if it works. Congress (and I believe I speak for the majority) knows that EDP works, and our job then is rather one of making it work better.

In general, Congress looks at EDP as a useful tool which should be applied sensibly, skillfully, and economically to help perform the work of the Federal Government and I am sure my fellow Democrats and Republicans alike would agree. As a matter of fact, it may be of interest to you to know that there is a total absence thus far of partisanship on EDP issues. As chairman of the subcommittee, I have received excellent cooperation and support from my Republican associates, as well as from the Democratic side.

Now, I referred to applying EDP sensibly. By this I mean getting away from the idea that an EDP system is a status symbol. There is still some inclination for everyone to want a big system (we used to call these fellows "the erector set boys" and a few of them are still with us), but by and large agencies have become more mature in these respects. Congress, I can assure you, wants agencies to have EDP systems when they need them, but certainly not for purposes of creating some kind of an organization image.

I said also that Congress wants EDP applied skillfully. Such a system certainly is not much good unless an agency has the expertise to use it and this is where we are falling short in many cases. Our vision of EDP potential is not sufficiently forward looking; we are not working hard enough toward integrated systems; we look at EDP as a tool to be used in one application in one bureau or one department when we must look at it from a Government-wide point of view, as the Comptroller General has pointed out.

In regard to applying EDP economically, have you ever stopped to realize that no one knows how much EDP has saved the Federal Government? Everyone does his best to respond to our questions about savings, but as our committee report will say, the information simply is not available. Congress goes along with the agencies when they say that they now process their workloads faster and cheaper, but frankly, we'll just have to have statistics to back up some of these claims.

EFFECTS OF EDP ON JOB SECURITY

In encouraging greater use of EDP, I want to make clear that Congress has certain reservations. These concern the relationship of automation to unemployment. We want economy in the operations of the Federal Government, but Congress is concerned about the effect of automation on unemployment, and we certainly want the employees of the Federal Government to be treated with full consideration for the security of their jobs. I am happy I can tell those of you who are Government executives and supervisors that so far you have done a good job in protecting the job security of your employees. You are doing this by planning the conversion of operations to EDP well in advance, by keeping employees informed of what is going on, and by retraining employees for the new EDP jobs, and by avoiding costly RIF procedures.

We want to commend you for what you have done, but also we want to caution you that much remains to be done. There are a number of individual cases of Government employees being automated out and some Federal employees have had their grades cut. Others have been offered the choice between moving to another city or being separated. Now, moving from one city to another is an expensive matter. On the average, it costs an employee and his family about $550 out of their own pockets, and the amount can run into thousands if the sacrifice sale of a home is involved. Government transfer allowances are just not adequate at present, and our committee is looking into the need for remedial legislation in this matter.

I want also to ask you to look ahead to the future when we will face the real effects of EDP automation on job opportunities and I would suggest that you take care not to be misled. Each of you has heard at one time or another that there is no such thing as technological unemployment. For example, recently the vice president of a large corporation wrote to me saying, and I quote:

"Obviously, you are greatly concerned about the job loss as a result of automation and we all should be. However, some of us are of the persuasion that these jobs won't be lost but rather the nature of jobs will change. But perhaps more importantly, the direct cost dollars released by increased efficiency will be put to work to create more jobs for all."

Now, I like this idea and I hope the gentleman is right, but it is very difficult to tell this to a person who has just been automated out of his job. He doesn't take much satisfaction from the theory that he doesn't have anything to worry about now because if he's patient, eventually this new technology will take care of him. And let me repeat now what I said earlier, that we just don't have the facts to prove that we have such increased efficiency.

I have heard it said also that through technological advances we won't be worrying about the number of jobs in the future. Rather, we are going to be worrying about what to do with our spare time. Being naturally lazy, this idea appeals to me also, just so that as unemployed we don't make a career out of spare time.

Now, maybe some of you read in a recent editorial in the Washington Daily News the suggestion that we should stop fretting about automating people out because the number of jobs in the Federal Government is increasing, and that maybe we should start worrying about the taxpayer. I think EDP is serving the purposes of the taxpayer and that it wouldn't be worth much if this were not the case. Also, I don't think this country could have reached the high gross national product of recent months without automation—if you don't believe me, go out and try to hire a good secretary.

Of all of these views, I subscribe more to some of the ideas of Roy Hallbeck, President of the AFL–CIO Postal Clerks, presented in a two-part report in the News by John Cramer in the September 6 and September 9 issues. If you haven't already read them, I suggest that you do.

Mr. Hallbeck starts by discussing "* * * the ability of certain creatures or things to perform feats which experts say are impossible.

"Or, conversely, their inability to do the very things they were engineered to do best."

He goes on to take the example of the bumblebee, and says—"any scientist worth his salt can prove absolutely that this bug will never fly because his design violates every known principle of aerodynamics.

"But the bumblebee doesn't know this."

Mr. Hallbeck wonders whether EDP systems, having been designed for the job, will perform equally well in opening "new vistas of economic progress and social enlightenment."

I am sure that this is the hope of all of us, but we cannot proceed on hope alone.

The second section of Mr. Hallbeck's comments refers to President Kennedy's statement that "the major domestic challenge of the Sixties is to maintain full employment at a time when automation is replacing men." Mr. Hallbeck discusses the possibility of a Presidential Commission on Automation "to study, identify and describe the major types of worker displacement likely to occur during the next decade." Mr. Hallbeck mentions also that "our committee has just asked the President for an evaluation by the Budget Bureau of the impact of automation in Government." I shall go into this a little further later on. The message I want to leave with you at this point is to be watchful in the future of EDP automation and its effects upon employment. Anticipate these effects and plan ahead so that we can have the benefits of automation with a minimum of hardship and dislocation on personnel.

Before I leave this subject, I should like to mention one area which is of considerable concern to me personally. This is the possible effect of automation in the Post Office Department as the new ZIP Code comes into use. Let me quote from a recent report made by the Post Office Department:

"It is apparent that some device must be developed to process the possible 15 billion ZIP coded documents that cannot be presorted. To this end the Post Office Department has initiated a development effort to design automatic address reading equipment which can mechanically read the ZIP Code. It is expected that this optical character recognition (OCR) device will be hooked up with the sorting machines which are currently in use. The OCR principle will require the use of the previously mentioned code sorting technique; i.e., an electronic memory to store the cross reference between ZIP Code and the pocket in which the letter is to be placed. This device will make it possible to simplify internal post office processing for ZIP coded mail which has not been presorted."

Now, what happens to over 100,000 postal clerks if and when optical scanning takes over? I know that the clerks are already talking about being "Zipped" out of a job and I want to assure you that we will watch this development closely.

EDP COMES TO CONGRESS

To go on with other observations about the Congress on EDP automation, I am not sure that Members know what to think. In addition to the articles I have just drawn to your attention, a Congressman must have seen considerable EDP coverage in his CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and it even has been mentioned in connection with the sentence that a person known to all of us received for failure to file a tax return. EDP, the story tells us, in effect, may bring about uniform justice in enforcing tax laws. Another personality in the news recently discussing the Defense Department referred somewhat disparagingly to "those who rely on computers to determine policy."

At this point the individual Congressman might say to himself, "Is it any wonder EDP is always coming up in my committee meetings." He thinks, too, about the work his colleague, Mr. PUCINSKI, of Illinois, is engaged in. He is looking into the possibility of a national science and information retrieval center. But what the Congressman recalls most vividly is the afternoon of July 18, 1963, when the entire body of the House of Representatives was involved for the better part of 6 hours in debating an EDP issue. Irrespective of everything the Congressman has heard and read, he wonders now as he wondered then how EDP made the floor of the Congress as a major piece of legislation.

I had addressed the House on a previous occasion in support of Comptroller General Campbell's EDP purchase versus lease report of March 1963, and therefore discussion of the subject was not new to the Members, but full scale debate was quite another thing.

The occasion was consideration of the bill H.R. 5171 of my colleague, JACK BROOKS, of Texas, which if ultimately enacted into law would centralize authority over EDP in the

General Services Administration. The reaction of the individual Members of the Congress was varied. Some commended the Committee on Government Operations for bringing the subject to the floor because EDP is an important part of our budget and the cost of EDP is certainly going to increase. Others asked questions about the bill and others proposed amendments. Some, and I dare say it was a goodly number, were amazed and chagrined at the complete involvement of the Congress in EDP. Several of us who were directly associated with EDP or with agencies which would be affected by the bill, spoke out against it vigorously.

For my part, I agreed with the Comptroller General's recommendations which started the whole issue, but I could not go along with the bill. My position is set forth in the interim report of the subcommittee, and I quote:

"The subcommittee recommends, therefore, that the President authorize the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to evaluate the present EDP policies and practices in the Federal agencies and to develop guidelines for future Federal policy on EDP. In conducting the review, the Director should (1) consult widely with Members of Congress and with representatives of the principal Federal agencies, industry, business, labor, professional groups, and others concerned, (2) cooperate fully with pertinent congressional committees and keep Congress advised periodically concerning his progress, and (3) on or before June 30, 1964, submit a report and make recommendations to the President and to Congress for such administrative and legislative changes as are determined to be in the public interest.

"The subcommittee proposes, therefore, that a letter recommending the above actions be sent by the chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee to the President."

Chairman MURRAY's letter to President Kennedy was sent on August 1. Only last week a reply was received from the President which reads, in part, as follows:

"House Report No. 627, Interim Report on the Use of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Agencies, which you forwarded with your letter to me of August 1, 1963, has been reviewed with much interest. It deals with many of the problems involved in the use of automatic data processing (ADP) equipment for which there is no easy solution.

"I agree with your recommendation and I have requested the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to initiate a study of the administration of automatic data processing in the executive branch of the Government, along the lines you have suggested. The Director will submit appropriate recommendations to me and to the Congress by June 30, 1964."

I am sure you know also that EDP is before the Senate, or the other body, as we say. Senator DOUGLAS has introduced an EDP bill, and, of course, the Senate has the Brooks bill to consider. So now, both Houses of the Congress are involved.

The staff of the Senate Government Operations Committee has gone about the job very methodically, beginning with a briefing session on the various aspects of EDP and I am sure that they will be looking into the entire matter most thoroughly and give every Federal agency a chance to be heard.

ROLE OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS

Now, how did the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics become so deeply involved in EDP? You all, know, I am sure, that the Bureau of the Census was the pioneer of EDP applications in the Federal Government. Naturally, as EDP found its way into all census operations, it was necessary for our subcommittee to evaluate EDP as a part of the census program. The same thing occurred in all of the data collection and compilation responsibilities of the subcommittee. We simply couldn't review the effectiveness of these operations without some understanding of EDP technology. Now since, by House Resolution, our subcommittee handles the investigation phase for the Congress of all data compilation activities in the Federal Government, we could not discharge our responsibility these days if we ignored EDP. Moreover, the importance of this responsibility is now being accentuated by the increased recognition given to people in EDP systems and workers in the Federal Government are, of course, the concern of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. So, our subcommittee has a two-way interest in EDP and we plan to pursue these interests "with vigah," to coin a phrase.

ADDITIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Now, before I close, let me briefly summarize some of our subcommittee conclusions, one subject at a time.

Organization: We conclude that the agencies' EDP organizations need improving and that the matter should be carefully reviewed. This includes the responsiveness of the EDP organization to the mission for which it was established. We think that EDP cannot be mixed in with a lot of other things and operated successfully. Our recommendation is that EDP be run by an official at the top of the organization and that official should be solely responsible for EDP functions and EDP functions only.

Management: While our hearings were going on last summer, we were receiving reports from the General Accounting Office about agency shortcomings. Frankly, we heard a lot more about the real problems of the agencies from the General Accounting Office than we heard from the agencies themselves in direct testimony. This leads us to believe that agencies should be more alert to their problems on their own and that they should report them. We have recommended that agencies undertake management review with this purpose in mind.

Now, in order to solve the man/machine ratio problem, we have to educate the top managers, and let me quote from some Navy testimony on this point:

"The educational problem that we have is not with technicians solely, in developing competent individuals to develop and make ways of making use of the equipment; but it is with top management, getting them alerted to what can be done to assist them in better decision-making, determining what appraisal performance indexes they need. This is what is going to govern the ultimate sophistication of computers, eventually."

EDP Contracts: For the most part, agencies just don't know how many EDP systems are being used by contractors in connection with Government work, nor how they are being utilized, nor whether it is proper for the contractors to have title to the machines rather than the Government, and so on. The Bureau of the Budget's 1963 inventory, to be released soon, will show 1,248 in-house EDP systems. Contractors may be using this many again, and maybe more. The subcommittee thinks we should know a great deal more about them. So does the Comptroller General, who is looking into these arrangements in a number of agencies.

Man/Machine Ratio: I think the Navy was the first Department to go on record that we need a better balance between people and machines. Machines seem to have gotten out ahead, somehow, and it wasn't until the Department of Defense clarified the point for us that we realized that personnel costs are half of all EDP costs. As we say in our report, never have we heard so little about so much.

You all know, I'm certain, that the greatest personnel need is in programing. We need more and better programers, and we need a breakthrough in automatic programing technology. These days we are fortunate if we can keep current with our regular programing load, let alone reviewing and rewriting old programs, and this situation is costing the Federal Government money, plenty of it.

Now, some good work is being done on automatic programing languages, but there are differences of opinion about them and the arguments seem endless. We think it's time we began to break some of these programing bottlenecks.

Working Conditions: I now would like to talk to you for a minute about people whom I consider to be the unsung heroes of EDP. They are the men and women who through the early hours of the morning, and on weekends and holidays, keep the reels spinning, the circuits operating, and the programs from looping. I think we should fully recognize the contribution these employees are making to the EDP programs of their respective agencies. I think, too, that management should see to it that the conditions under which they work are as pleasant as possible and that accommodations and facilities for them are adequate. By that, I mean adequate transportation or parking facilities, hot food if they want it, and anything else that contributes to their wellbeing. Certainly, an employee who works irregular hours should not be expected to undergo hardships simply because he is working on a night shift.

Reports, statistics, and evaluation guides: With EDP, we have the typical example of the shoemaker's children not having shoes. If you think of the reports, statistics, and printouts turned out by EDP systems, you might expect that we would have similar comprehensive information in regard to EDP itself; but, outside of the annual inventory of the Bureau of the Budget, we have very little information about EDP for the Government as a whole.

We need a Government-wide reporting system of EDP activities, including personnel and personnel costs as well as machines. We need to back the system up with measures of the effectiveness of our utilization of EDP equipment, and we should be able to evaluate our EDP accomplishments.

Purchase versus lease: Of all the EDP problems we have, this one is the most controversial. In this audience, I wonder how many of you purchase your EDP systems? Would you raise your hands. How many lease them? How many don't know?

This is not a problem in Government alone, you know. The differences of opinion in private industry are just as divergent. We had one insurance company testify in favor of renting its equipment. Another insurance company wrote to us and made an equally strong case for purchase.

What the subcommittee is asking for the time being, is that agencies be completely objective in the matter. Base your decisions on facts, and not how you feel about it or how you think an appropriation subcommittee will react. Try to look at the problem from the point of view of the Government as a whole.

Meanwhile, we are recommending that a study be made of manufacturer's pricing systems and other factors so that we can learn the underlying causes of the problem, and we would like to see a study made of the possibility of using the competitive bidding process. We assume that at present we must use negotiated contracts, but no one has made a thorough study of competitive bidding as it might apply to EDP.

We would like also to see more use of discounts and installment purchase plans in EDP procurement.

Standardization: Our subcommittee concurs with the National Bureau of Standards that "at the present time we have just begun to attack seriously the problem of compatibility and standardization." We have also taken special note of the work being done by the American Standards Association, Inc., the Business Equipment Manufacturers Association, and the Standardization Panel of the Budget Bureau Advisory Council, but progress seems slow. As stated in the June 1963 issue of datamation, and I quote:

"Standardization progress, like a glacier, move slowly. This is partly because the work is generally conducted by part-time, widely scattered committees made up of people who spend most of their time doing other things * * * earning a living, for instance. And it's partly because standardization can be as rigidly and frigidly binding as a glacier. Another panelist summed it up: 'A bad standard is worse than no standard at all.' "

The subcommittee believes we need a more dynamic program of EDP standardization and our report will make specific recommendations on this point. We know the job is a difficult one, but this is all the more reason to attack it strenuously. The stakes for the Federal Government alone are very high. We all know how costly it is to go from IBM to Univac to RCA and back again, and yet we recognize the problems require a careful and studied approach.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, let me ask you, the members of the Washington Chapter of the Systems and Procedures Association, and through you your 73 other chapters, and your full membership of 3,300, have you noticed how many of the EDP problems I have mentioned tonight can be resolved by professional systems and procedures personnel? There are a lot of them, including the real tough ones. This is what I had in mind when I accepted your invitation. I wanted to pinpoint these problems and to stimulate your thinking about them. And, if you have some ideas, send me a letter about them. Congress will be in this business for a long time to come.

Thank you so very much for you attention and especially for your patience.

Overcoming Risks and Disadvantages of Test Ban Treaty Costly but Vital to United States National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 1, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for the information of my colleagues, I have asked that a copy of my September 24 letter to President Kennedy, relating to the actions necessary to minimize the admitted risks and disadvantages of the partial nuclear test ban treaty, be reproduced here. The letter is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1963.

Re reductions of risks and disadvantages of the limited test ban treaty.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Secretary Dean Rusk, Secretary Robert McNamara, Under Secretary Roswell Gilpatric, Dr. Glenn Seaborg, you and others in your administration have conceded that there are risks and disadvantages in the limited test ban treaty. This concession is implicity from your assurances and promises to take steps to reduce the effects of these risks and disadvantages upon the national security.

The assurances and promises given have been instrumental in obtaining both Senate and public support for ratification of the treaty. In this sense, they constitute a solemn compact between you and the American people, which must be kept.

Amongst the steps to be taken, as outlined in separate communications each dated August 23, 1963, to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman, Senate Committee on Armed Services, from Under Secretary Gilpatric and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are the following:

1. The conduct of comprehensive, aggressive, and continuing underground nuclear test programs.

2. The maintenance of modern nuclear laboratory facilities manned by top-flight scientific personnel.

3. The maintenance of facilities and resources necessary for prompt resumption of atmospheric testing in the event of Soviet abrogation of the treaty or should the national security otherwise require.

4. The improvement of our capability to detect treaty violations and Sino-Soviet nuclear activity, capabilities, and achievements.

Unfortunately, these assurances and promises have been only general in nature. What, specifically, in terms of personnel, materiel and programs are needed to meet and keep them are yet to be determined. The Joint Chiefs communication defined them as "criteria" and added that they were stated "necessarily in general language since additional study will be needed to determine specific standards and programs."

Obviously and regrettably, these specifics were not worked out before the treaty was negotiated. Had this been done, perhaps the treaty terms might have been written to make them less onerous and less expensive to carry out. In any event, the fundamental security of the country depends first, upon determining what they are, and, second, upon actually taking those actions specifically determined to be necessary to meet the "criteria." Any error risking action less than the minimum necessary must be scrupulously avoided. Uncertainties always must be resolved positively, on the safe side, to make certain we adequately flesh-out all the necessary specifics of each of these skeletal general criteria.

Unfortunately, these specifics will involve a considerable effort because of the magnitude of the risks and disadvantages involved.

You, yourself, on February 7, 1962, described an atmospheric treaty without an adequate "inspections system" guarding against preparations for surprise abrogation as "extremely vulnerable." The treaty at hand, of course, has no "inspections system" at all—adequate or inadequate.

Again, on March 2, 1962, you warned that if we are to maintain our scientific momentum and leadership, "our weapons progress must not be limited to theory or to the confines of laboratories and caves." The treaty at hand, of course, does fix such limitations.

At that time you also warned: "in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place at an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not only difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative and found it impossible of execution."

Thus, observing your assurances and promises respecting the treaty calls for doing the difficult and, in addition, what you yourself have described as the impossible. It will surely call for a large expenditure and a large effort—much larger than Secretary McNamara indicated during his treaty testimony. For instance, his off-hand estimate of the cost of maintaining a readiness-to-test posture was $200 million. My own calculations, detailed below, considerably enlarge this figure.

Unfortunately, also, there appears to be a line of resistance developing domestically against the taking of these vitally necessary actions at all. This was hinted in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times written by the scientist, Dr. Eugene P. Wigner. It was amplified in a letter to the editor of the New York Herald-Tribune by the scientist, Dr. Leo Szilard, who argued that should the vigorous underground testing program be carried out, "then, rather than furthering the cause of peace, the test ban agreement would be likely to do just the opposite." Presumably his same reasoning also would apply in opposition to the other three categories of action to which you are committed. I note with apprehension that the thinking of even some of your official family seems to parallel that of Wigner and Szilard.

Thus, keeping your assurances and promises regarding steps to reduce the risks and disadvantages of the test ban treaty will require, on your part, overcoming the resistance of some of the very people who work closely with you, as well as others who have given you strong and consistent political support.

In determining what, specifically, will have to be done to meet and keep your assurances and promises, certain fundamental considerations must be in mind. With respect to each of the criteria, these include:

UNDERGROUND TEST PROGRAM

Either a community must be built at the Nevada test site for personnel working there, or a rapid transit system from Las Vegas must be constructed in order to attract and keep topflight personnel on the work.

Due to the proximity of both the city of Las Vegas and the Hoover Dam to the Nevada site, there is a limitation on the yield of devices which can be tested underground there without unacceptable off-site seismic shock damage. It will be necessary to find and develop a second underground testing site for high-yield experiments.

Much greater discretion and flexibility in scheduling events and conducting tests will have to be given laboratory and test site personnel than was the case during our 1962 test series. At that time, I personally pointed out to Dr. Jerome Weisner, your science adviser, that his tendency, in your name, to act as test director from his office in Washington, remote from the Nevada and Pacific test sites, operated both to decrease the scientific data gained from the tests and increase the cost and difficulty of conducting them.

MAINTENANCE OF LABS AND RETENTION OF TOP-FLIGHT SCIENTISTS

The test-site improvements and testing discretion at the laboratory and test-site levels discussed above also have a bearing on our ability to keep topflight scientists' interest in the nuclear weapons program under partial test-ban conditions.

The added difficulties of analyzing samples from underground experiments—contaminated with extraneous elements from the soil—requires added radiochemistry facilities and personnel. Simulation facilities for other than underground environments and other limitations imposed by the treaty also require a boost in personnel and new laboratory physical facilities, equipment, and instrumentation for diagnostic and extrapolation purposes.

The flow of qualified and capable new, young, topflight scientists into the nuclear weapons laboratories must be stimulated and encouraged by stepped-up activities at such nonweapons, but related facilities, as the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley.

The importance of immediate starts on new laboratory facilities—as encouraging physical evidence to our nuclear weapon scientists now working that their efforts are not devoted to a dead-end program—is most vital to prevent them from drifting away from the laboratories.

PROMPT READINESS FOR ATMOSPHERIC TESTING

This capability must include readiness to proof test weapons systems in stockpile, new experimental devices, and weapons effects in a variety of environments and under all operational conditions.

Since testing, if and when resumed, will be under emergency conditions, considerable redundancy in test hardware is necessary in order that tests may be conducted promptly and not suffer delay from the unavailability of standby equipment.

A complete missile range, including ICBM silos at both ends and operational anti-ICBM installations at one end must be in readiness for proof tests of both ICBM and anti-ICBM weapons, as well as to determine effects of nuclear explosions on the reliability and capabilities of each.

Johnstone Island, little larger than an aircraft carrier, is unsuitable for installing equipment which must obtain test data simultaneously from different directions. This "triangulation" problem must be solved. Proper readiness involves an iron-clad agreement with the British for continuing access to and availability of Christmas Island facilities, installation of necessary testing equipment and facilities at Howland and Baker Islands, and construction of two, better three, unmanned floating test diagnostic ships, together with nuclear submarines which connect with these ships by underwater cable to protect test personnel safely underwater from the effects of weapons being tested.

Present aircraft available for collecting radioactive air samples at various vital altitudes are about worn out. They should be replaced by a new fleet of approximately 12 fully equipped aircraft.

A second fleet of three diagnostic aircraft should be provided in addition to the fleet of three aircraft now being readied. This will provide both a stand-by capability and a simultaneous testing capability for air-dropped experimental devices.

Both drop aircraft and rocket vehicles must be in readiness for the delivery of test devices.

Facilities should be provided for constantly updating and revising test schedules for instantaneous use in the event of test resumption—similar to procedures for keeping our strategic deterrent plans always current.

BROADENING AND IMPROVING DETECTION CAPABILITIES

Both the importance of, and difficulties regarding, this effort, plus a necessity for strict classification of equipment and installations, call for a relatively large effort and expenditure in this area.

The very fuzzy situation respecting both space-detection hardware and space-testing procedures requires prompt clarification.

My preliminary estimates of the capital expenditure required for hardware and facilities to meet your assurances and keep your promises to take the actions necessary for reducing the risks and disadvantages of the partial test ban treaty are as follows:

	In millions
Underground testing program:	
Nevada test site improvements and additions	$50
Additional high-yield test site	50
Total	100
Maintenance of labs and top-flight scientists:	
Los Alamos laboratory	25
Sandia laboratory	25
Livermore laboratory	50
Department of Defense laboratories	50
Education, training and encouragement of top-flight scientific personnel at weapons labs	10
Total	160
Readiness for atmospheric testing:	
Test range, silos, missiles, A-ICBM equipment, etc., etc	150
3 pairs—surface/submarine effects tests units	300
Drop aircraft and rockets for launching experimental devices	20
2d standby diagnostic fleet (3 fully equipped jet aircraft)	25
3 aircraft for shuttling samples from test sites to labs for prompt analysis	10
Air sampling fleet (12 jet aircraft)	15
Johnstone/Howland/Baker/Christmas Island testing complex	30
Rear base logistic facilities	10
Upper atmosphere and space diagnostic/detection equipment	50
Total	610
Detection system improvements:	
Classified items	80
Miscellaneous and contingencies	50
Grand total	1,000

In addition to the foregoing capital outlays, which should be made promptly if we are to have a readiness for testing, it is estimated that the cost of maintaining, improving, and keeping this capability in constant readiness to move on an emergency basis will involve operating outlays of approximately $250 million annually.

It is sincerely hoped that you are planning to call upon Congress forthwith for funds of the foregoing magnitude to take the actions necessary to forestall, to the maximum extent possible, the disadvantages and risks to U.S. national security and survival inherent in the partial test ban treaty. Under the circumstance I see no possible course for me but to support such a request vigorously.

Very respectfully,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all life, whose light is truth, whose warmth is love, we are grateful for the daily miracle of dawn which calls to holy dedication of renewed powers; for noontide, with its summons to play our part in a solemn day that demands the best from each of us. We thank Thee, too, for the quiet of twilight like bells at evening pealing, which bring whispers of the realm where, beyond these voices, there is peace.

In the busy hours of life's midday, so teach us to think and act and toil, that we may justify the lofty pedestal of our privilege as we strive to open for each human being the gates of an equal opportunity and an equal chance to become the best it is in him to be.

Our eyes having seen the glory of a government of law, bring peace and prosperity within our own Nation. Give us a steadfast faith that a lawful order can be established for the whole world. In this faith, steel our hearts to march forward toward the clean world our hands can help to mold.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 1, 1963, was dispensed with.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a recess for 1 minute, for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the majority leader to escort into the Chamber His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate took a recess for 1 minute.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY HAILE SELASSIE I, EMPEROR OF ETHIOPIA

Following the recess, His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mrs. SMITH, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by his interpreter, Dr. Menassie Haile, Chief of the Political Section of His Imperial Majesty's Private Cabinet.

Also escorted into the Chamber and seated were:

His Highness Ras Imru Haile-Selassie, second cousin of the Emperor.

His Excellency Tsahafi Tezaz Teferra-Work Kidane-Wolde, Minister of the Imperial Court.

His Excellency Yilma Deressa, Minister of Finance.

His Excellency Ketema Yifru, Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs.

His Excellency Dr. Tesfaye Gebre-Egzy, Permanent Representative of Ethiopia to the United Nations.

His Excellency Maj. Gen. Wolde-Selassie Bereka, Special Chief of Staff in his Imperial Majesty's Private Cabinet.

Brig. Gen. Assefa Demissi, Principal Aide-de-Camp to His Imperial Majesty.

Mrs. Yohannes Kidane-Mariam, Private Secretary to His Imperial Majesty.

Hon. Angier Biddle Duke, Chief of Protocol of the United States.

Mr. William Tonesk, Deputy Chief of Protocol.

Hon. Edward M. Korry, American Ambassador to Ethiopia.

Brig. Gen. John J. Tolson, U.S. Army, American Military Aide to His Imperial Majesty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is a great honor and privilege to welcome to the Senate an outstanding head of state from the great continent of Africa. He governs a nation which is among the oldest, in a historic sense, in the world. It is also among the newest in its dynamic search for a more satisfying participation for all its people in the mainstream of progress in the second half of the 20th century.

The man whom I am to present to the Senate is the Emperor of an ancient land. He is also an exceptional international statesman whose constructive outlook has made a profound impression upon the contemporary councils of the world.

This man has been a living part of the great events of our times. He has experienced these events personally; and he has experienced them as the personification of a peaceful nation, determined to live its own life and to work out its own way of life. He and his nation were both caught up in the fearful tragedies, the high hopes, the illusions, and disillusions—in short, in the cataclysmic upheavals—of a globe in massive transition since the end of World War I. He has suffered much. He has risen above suffering with the wisdom which suffering alone brings; and he has triumphed, not in arrogance, not in vengeance, not in pride. His has been the enduring triumph of humility and a deep human understanding.

The Senate will remember his lonely appearance at the League of Nations in 1936. He spoke, then, from his heart, not only to save his people from invasion, but also to arrest the course of self-destruction upon which a smug, a glib, and an indifferent world was embarked. He was listened to, but he was not heeded. He was persuasive, but the nations of the world were not persuaded. And a few years later that smug, glib, and indifferent world began to crumble about those who did not heed, who were not persuaded.

Once again, on Friday, our distinguished visitor will go to address the nations of the world, assembled in the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations. The times are different now; the faces are different; even the nations are different than they were when he appeared in Geneva almost 28 years ago. One would hope—and I am sure that it is a well-founded hope—that his words, enriched by these decades of tragedy and triumph and by profound personal experience, will find in that great assemblage of the world a deep response of heart and mind.

I should like now to present to the Senate, His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor of Ethiopia.

[Applause, Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if one were to search for suitable words most aptly to describe the country and the people represented by our distinguished visitor, I believe, first of all, one would have to use the word "durability." Two other descriptive terms come to mind—the wisdom and the prudence that are born of long experience and familiarity with history.

In our own time and generation we recall the assaults that were made upon this defenseless country. Those assaults would have tested the durability of any people; they would have tested the stamina of any leader. Yet, under those very trying circumstances, he kept his people together; and that is a testament to their character and to their stamina.

There is today in his country a bicameral system of government. It did not come into being overnight, for although the upper body is selected by His Majesty, they do have a body elected by the people. It was not clothed with complete authority, nor did it spring full-blown from the brow of man or from any accidental circumstance. They understood their own limitations; and, as a result, they gradually endowed this popular body with continuing accretions of power. Therefore, it has become a stable parliamentary body in every sense of the word, representing the people.

That is the course of prudence; that is the road of wisdom. It comes out of experience and out of a real understanding of the historic efforts made by people in nearly every generation to find their place in the sun of freedom.

It is, therefore, no accident that Addis Ababa and the great country of Ethiopia are today the center of the African unity effort. I believe that fact, too, is a great tribute to our distinguished guest of today.

So I share the sentiments expressed by our distinguished majority leader, and I join with him in extending the hand of welcome to our really distinguished guest.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes, for the purpose of paying our respects to the Emperor of Ethiopia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon the Senate took a recess for 5 minutes.

During the recess, the Emperor of Ethiopia was escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate in front of the Vice President's desk, and was there greeted by Members of the Senate, who were introduced to him by Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. DIRKSEN.

Following the informal reception, the Emperor of Ethiopia and Dr. Menassie Haile, his interpreter, were escorted to the rostrum; and from his place on the rostrum, the Emperor of Ethiopia delivered the following address:

ADDRESS OF HAILE SELASSIE, EMPEROR OF ETHIOPIA

Emperor SELASSIE. Mr. President, in 1954, during our first visit to the United States, I had the honor and pleasure of addressing the Senate of the United States. At that time I stated that the United States is a freedom-loving country. Ethiopia is a country that has also maintained its freedom. Our countries for a long time have had much in common and have had bonds of brotherhood between them. Hence there has been a great deal of permanency of interest.

Since my last visit to the United States 10 years ago the world has changed quite a bit. Many changes have taken place. African countries have gotten their independence. Although some of them have not yet acquired independence, it is our sincere desire that independence may come soon to the people who are still under the bondage of colonialism.

The Senate of the United States has had a long history. Ours is new. But we want to assure you that ours is increasingly becoming known throughout the world.

I also appreciate very much the references made by the majority leader to the Senate and House of Representatives of Ethiopia.

Human equality, as you all know, is something that is quite indispensable to the effort to preserve world peace, and such an august body as the Senate of the United States, I am sure, will increasingly, with greater vigor, follow such a policy of achieving equality, which is an essential element for the preservation of world peace.

The recent conference that was held in May in Addis Ababa of the heads of state of Africa resulted in the signing of a charter which in a few days I shall have the pleasure of depositing with the United Nations. The basic significance of the charter is that all human beings are equal, and that each one is entitled to the basic rights and freedoms that are contained in the document signed at Addis Ababa.

We appreciate the kind words said in the Senate of the United States about us, our country, and our institutions and we are most thankful for them.

Since we have come here I have been extremely delighted at the reception that the people of the United States have accorded us here and elsewhere during our stops on our way to Washington.

I am also very much delighted and happy to tell you that my conversation with the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, has been successful. I want to express my sincere appreciation for all the efforts made to strengthen the friendly relationship between Ethiopia and the United States of America.

In conclusion, I wish to say that without peace in modern times, no one can live in security anywhere on the globe. My fervent hope, desire, and aim is that the various talks that are held in many parts of the world with the aim of preserving world peace and tranquillity will continue to achieve success and bring forth results that are compatible with the basic desire of human beings throughout the world.

Thank you.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

At 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Vice President, and resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements be limited to 3 minutes in connection with the morning hour.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I object, and call for the regular order under rule VII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. MILLER and **Mr. FULBRIGHT** addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Evening Star for Tuesday, October 1, appeared an article entitled "Question On Tax Cut Is 'When?' " by the columnist Charles Bartlett.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. CLARK. The point of order is that the Senator from Iowa is not presenting a petition or a memorial. The Senator is therefore out of order under rule VII.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Presiding Officer define what is a petition? I petition the Senate to make a speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reads from rule VII, under "Morning Business," which states in part:

> The Presiding Officer shall then call for, in the following order:
>
> The presentation of petitions and memorials.
>
> Reports of standing and select committees.
>
> The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.
>
> Concurrent and other resolutions.
>
> All of which shall be received and disposed of in such order, unless unanimous consent shall be otherwise given.

Mr. MILLER and **Mr. MANSFIELD** addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Arkansas, advises the Senate that a petition is a paper presented to the Senate by some party desiring certain legislative relief or proposing certain measures.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will state his point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. The last action which was taken by the Senate was to take a recess. The Senate met today after adjournment on yesterday, and the Senate was then recessed subject to the call of the Chair. I submit that when the Senate reconvened after a recess a morning hour was not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the recess taken for the most recent purpose is not the same as a recess taken from 1 day to another.

Mr. RUSSELL. Where does the Presiding Officer find any rule on the subject that makes any distinction between recesses?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Please allow the Chair some time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am discussing a point of order. I have seen the majority leader move for a recess of the Senate after an adjournment, when he had a majority with him, to avoid the morning hour. I have seen him move to recess for 10 minutes. The Senate recessed for 10 minutes, and when it reconvened there was no morning hour because the Senate had been in recess.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I be heard on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I note that there has been objection to the unanimous-consent request that statements be limited to 3 minutes in the morning hour. I also note that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, effective at the conclusion of routine morning business—evidently there will be no morning business—the unfinished business will become the pending business under a time limitation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wonder if it would be in order at this time for me either to ask unanimous consent or move that S. 1006, the unfinished business, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business, in view of the fact that there seems to be no possibility of having a morning hour this morning.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Montana, the Chair rules that such a motion would not be in order until 1 hour after the Senate met, but a unanimous-consent request to the same effect would be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that there may well not be a morning hour, that S. 1006, which is the unfinished business, be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK. I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN and **Mr. RUSSELL** addressed the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not like to appeal from the decision of the Chair——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I do not lose my right to the floor, I withhold the suggestion, but only on condition that I be recognized to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If so, to whom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. To the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, did the Chair make a formal ruling overruling the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overruled the point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair. I know of no precedent anywhere in parliamentary history that distinguishes between recesses; and if the Senate takes a recess and then reconvenes, there is no morning hour. That has been the ruling since time immemorial. I know of no ruling anywhere that distinguishes between recesses. I have seen the Senate meet after recess, when a certain parliamentary situation would arise, and the majority leader would move adjournment for a certain purpose, for 20 minutes, and then the Senate would meet after adjournment, so as to provide for a morning hour. Certainly the reverse of that is true. If the Senate recesses and then reconvenes and there is no morning hour——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will postpone his parliamentary inquiry for one moment, the Senator from Illinois has the floor, and he has yielded to the Senator from Georgia.

The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the recess that was taken to hear the Emperor of Ethiopia was for a definite, specific purpose or reason, and would be different from a normal recess from day to day.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the Chair cite any precedent on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that this has been the custom and usage. The Chair is unable to cite a precedent.

Mr. RUSSELL. It has not been a precedent for 30 years. There is no difference based upon the purpose for which the Senate may recess. When the Senate recesses, it recesses. There is nothing in the rules to the effect that it recesses for this purpose or that purpose. I confess that there have been times when the Senate has recessed to do work, or to rest, or to meet social engagements; but in this case the recess was not for the purpose of meeting a social engagement.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to ask the Chair if it is not a fact that the Senate has often adjourned for a specific time in the middle of a session in order to create a certain parliamentary situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that that has been the custom in order to close a legislative day after a series of recesses.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

What is the difference between making a motion to adjourn in order to close a legislative day and making a motion for a recess in order to avoid the consequences of an adjournment? Both are parliamentary moves made for a specific purpose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator yield for a point of order?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a point of order. I do not want the Senator to get his point of order ahead of my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Illinois still has the floor and has yielded to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know just where I lost the floor. I rose to make an inquiry. I do not know at what stage I lost the floor, but I am perfectly willing that the distinguished minority leader shall have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the situation to be that the Senate recessed for a definite purpose, subject to the call of the Chair. When the Chair called the Senate to order, the Senate then resumed the consideration of the matters before the Senate prior to the recess.

Mr. RUSSELL. I respectfully direct the attention of the Chair to page 369 of "Senate Procedure" by Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian, and Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian. I read the following language:

> When the Senate convenes following a recess, morning business is in order only by unanimous consent or pursuant to a order of the Senate agreed to by unanimous consent.

That language cites rule VII as a precedent.

That was the construction of the rule when this book on procedure was written by an eminent Parliamentarian. The language is as clear as can be. This issue does not mean anything to me. However, I do not like to see the Senate set a bad precedent, contrary to the practice it has always followed.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator——

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Georgia. I think the question ought to be resolved. The question is simple: Is the Senate in recess; and is there a morning hour? I would like to see the question resolved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites the attention of the Senator from Georgia to page 369 of "Senate Procedure," half way down the page:

> In one instance it was decided that morning business should be resumed following a recess taken under that order of business from 12:45 to 12:55 p.m.

Then footnote 11 is cited.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language is "in one instance." Of course, there are conflicts. There are precedents on both sides of almost every parliamentary situation that can arise. But the general rule of the Senate is as clear as any procedure of the Senate. When the Senate reconvenes following a recess, there can be morning business only by unanimous consent. The Senate has recessed. I respectfully submit that while Senators are not bound by rule VII when the Senate convenes following a recess, I dislike to see the Senate make this action a precedent.

Time and again I have heard the majority leader move an adjournment in order to commence a new legislative day in the middle of a day. He would move an adjournment for 5 or 7 minutes. There have been times when I have been vehemently opposed to such action being taken for certain parliamentary purposes. But the Senate has a right to take such action.

When the Senate recessed in this instance, a morning hour was avoided. There may be, somewhere, some single holding to the contrary; but there are decisions on both sides of almost every parliamentary question. Nevertheless, rule VII of itself is very clear in this instance.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first, I should like to ascertain whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia intends to press his appeal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to have the Senate vote on this question.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether the rule which he read from page 369 of "Senate Procedure" might not more properly be read in light of the unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate is operating today, which provides: "That, effective on Wednesday, October 2, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business," and so forth.

So the Senate is really operating under a unanimous consent agreement which very clearly provides that there is to be routine morning business. I suggest that perhaps this agreement would tend to modify the rule which the Senator read from page 369.

Mr. RUSSELL. That issue was not raised. The Chair has already ruled on it. The Senator from Iowa probably has a good point, but it is already water over the dam, because the Chair has already ruled on that question. But if the Senate has not surrendered its right, it has a right to vote on the establishment of a precedent in this case.

I wish to say to Senators who are interested in the leadership of the Senate that they are very foolish if they bind themselves by voting that they can have a recess, and thereafter there can be a morning hour or after adjournment. They are tying their hands for all future time.

I am usually in the minority in opposing the leadership. I undertake to find rules that sustain my position. But I believe in orderly procedure. There is no question in my mind that this would be a very damaging precedent, if it should be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Concurring in the sentiment of the Senator from Georgia, I yield to him for the purpose of proposing the appeal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have appealed from the ruling of the Chair. I do not know whether it is necessary to discuss it further. I think the Senate ought to have the right to avoid establishing such a precedent.

Mr. President, I formally but regretfully appeal from the ruling of the Chair, because I do not believe the Senate ought to establish this kind of precedent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the parliamentary situation, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] objected to the unanimous-consent request. The Chair ruled that under the regular order the provisions of rule VII bound the proceedings. The Senator from Georgia has appealed from the ruling of the Chair. A vote "yea" will sustain the Chair. A vote "nay" will overrule the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the floor. I now suggest the absence of a quorum. A quorum of the Senate should be present before the Senate proceeds to vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to recognize that right.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the exact wording through which the majority leader requested a recess, which was the basis for unanimous consent for a recess, might throw some light on this problem. I have ascertained that the Official Reporter now at the desk does not have that wording. I ask that the wording be made available before the Senate disposes of the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from Florida think it is necessary for the majority leader to state the purpose of a recess, or is that merely for the information of the Senate?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the production of that wording will show it to be somewhat different from that which was stated, as I understood, by the Chair, under the advice of the Parliamentarian. I thought I understood the majority leader to ask for a specific recess for 5 minutes, rather than a recess to be called to an end by the action of the Chair later.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Senator from Florida is undoubtedly correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope we may have the exact wording, with the hope that it may throw some further light on this particular subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In that connection, I submit that the language of the Presiding Officer as to whether a recess was declared would be very compelling. I do not believe Senators can search behind his ruling as to the reason for it. Consequently, the language used by the Presiding Officer ought to be considered. I am not now speaking of the present occupant of the chair; I am speaking of the Vice President, who occupied the chair at the time the recess was declared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's ruling upon the former unanimous-consent request by the Senator from Montana was that the Senate would stand in recess for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that the Chair has ruled that at the conclusion of the recess a morning hour was proper?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that morning business was in order under the rules.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it true that a morning hour can be had only—and I repeat the word "only"—by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Senate adjourns from one day to the next, on the following day there is a morning hour unless unanimous consent is given to proceed with other business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is a morning hour unless unanimous consent is given to proceed with other business? Then, there is a morning hour without unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized under the morning hour for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator from Illinois will yield, I understand this has been cleared——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, have I been recognized for 3 minutes?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the Senator is out of order. A point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. I object to the Senator from Montana continuing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

SALE OF WESTERN WHEAT TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the press is carrying reports that Chancellor Adenauer has criticized the sale of Western wheat to the Soviet Union.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I do not yield.

His criticism——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Pennsylvania does not have the floor. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the press is carrying reports that Chancellor Adenauer has criticized the sale of Western wheat to the Soviet Union. His criticism that such a transaction tends to strengthen communism is one which should be examined thoroughly. Indeed, it is being so examined, not only by the administration but by appropriate Senate committees.

May I say, Mr. President, that speaking for this country, we are quite competent to form our own conclusions in these matters and if we did need objective advice from abroad it could hardly come from West Germany. For there is in this comment of the German Chancellor something of the hypocritical preachment: "Do as I say but not as I do."

The truth of the matter is that West German trade with the Soviet Union alone, as was noted in a report to the Senate in January 1963 by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and myself, amounted to $400 million in 1961. The amount was roughly equal to all of our trade with Eastern Europe in that year.

One might note, in addition, that for several years Western Germany's trade with Eastern Germany has been in excess of $400 million per year, irrespective of the ebb and flow of crises in Berlin with which we, not the Germans, are compelled to deal. But, say the Germans, this trade is needed in order to keep open the hope of Eastern Germans that they may some day emerge from under Communist control.

I find it somewhat difficult to follow the logic which suggests that the trade of wheat by other Western countries to the Soviet Union for hard cash or useful goods strengthens communism but that West German sales currently in the range of $150 million a year to the Soviet Union and consisting largely of iron and steel products, chemical products, and machinery tend to weaken communism. Indeed, only last week there was an announcement that West Germany intended to sell 250,000 tons of wheat flour, of all things, to the Soviet Union.

I would point out, further, that West German total trade—imports and exports—with all the Communist regions of Europe is now at an annual rate of $1.3 billion. The total trade of Western Europe, as a whole, with Eastern Europe is in the neighborhood of $3.5 billion. By contrast, U.S. commercial trade with the Soviet Union is at an annual rate of about $36 million. And with all of the other Communist countries, the total is $125 million.

So let me say again, Mr. President, that we must indeed examine most carefully the implications of a major sale of wheat to the Soviet Union or any Communist country. There are significant international political implications in any such transaction and there are also significant domestic implications for, as the distinguished and brilliant Cartoonist Yardley in the Baltimore Sun makes clear this morning, we are buried under wheat surpluses and we have just voted $2.7 billion more of the taxpayers money to support agricultural prices.

In any event, preachments from Bonn or elsewhere in Western Europe on this question are not likely to be helpful in reaching a sound conclusion as to what is in the best interests of this Nation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point several articles from American newspapers which by contrast are likely to be helpful in this connection.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Sept. 27, 1963]

WHEAT AND THE RUSSIANS

Russia has gold and not enough wheat. The United States has a wheat surplus and is losing gold at a rate worrisome to the defenders of the dollar. The United States sells wheat abroad, but only by subsidizing American exporters to cover the margin between the world market price and the political support level guaranteed at home. Russia has recently bought a half-billion dollars worth of Canadian wheat.

One reason Russia is buying wheat is that her hazardous plow-up of semiarid "virgin" lands for wheat culture has failed to pay off for another year. Khrushchev was forced into this risky business by a compelling demand for more wheat. From her old eminence as a wheat exporter in the czarist days Russia has steadily declined. She is working hard at improving her farm methods, and the test ban treaty may enable her to divert funds from weaponry to fertilizer plants and other farm aids. It will be tougher to guarantee regular rain in the virgin lands.

Will Russia then be returning from time to time in the future to the world market for wheat? Her shift from seller to buyer might have an effect on world prices. Would this moderate American subsidy needs? Already American wheat producers have rejected a tight Government plan for extra-high wheat supports. Of course, the gold and hard foreign exchange—surely this would be required—the Russians paid for wheat could not be spent for less pacific commodities, including military potentials. Her gold exports enhance the gold stock of the West in a time when expanding international credit facilities are under consideration. She has little to sell in the way of the standard commercial items.

These are some of the economic points (diplomatic issues are another matter) that government people will weigh in deciding what to do about actual or prospective Russian feelers for wheat purchases in the United States. Obviously the answer they grope for is one serving the American and the Western interest, in the "peaceful competition" Khrushchev says he welcomes.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1963]

LET US SELL WHEAT

If President Kennedy was really looking for advice on whether or not to sell U.S. Government surplus wheat to the Soviet Union, he has only to heed his own Democratic Party leaders. They told him yesterday morning to go ahead and sell. There is nothing unique in sending wheat to Communist countries; we have been exporting it to Poland for a long time.

The free world is not going to triumph over communism in Europe, in China, or in Cuba by trying to make people go hungry. This is a case where good morals, good politics, and good business go together. We have immense quantities of surplus wheat. The Russians will pay in hard currency, and the presumption is they will pay the world market price. It has been rising steadily and was $1.80 yesterday.

By any calculation, the spectacle of capitalistic, imperialistic, America and Canada selling huge quantities of surplus wheat to the Communists is not going to do the cause of democracy any harm. A refusal to sell would.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Oct. 1, 1963]

Adenauer Raps Sale of Wheat to Russia—Says Macmillan Should Quit; Wilson Speaks of Plans for Summit Talks as Prime Minister

(By Henry L. Trewhitt)

Bonn, September 30.—Chancellor Konrad Adenauer tonight criticized sale of Western wheat to the Soviet Union and suggested Prime Minister Macmillan should have resigned some time ago.

At a reception for the foreign press corps, his last as Chancellor, Adenauer was in good spirits and, as a nervous member of his staff put it, "firing rockets in all directions."

He did not mention the United States specifically in the context of the wheat sales. Presumably he meant to include all Western nations that could wear the shoe.

DENNING REPORT QUESTION

The West had been devoting great energy to show that the Communist system would not work, he said, but then was stepping in with wheat just when the Communists were proving it themselves.

In the swiftly moving conversation as correspondents flocked around the Chancellor, it was not clear why he felt Macmillan should have resigned. Questioned about the Denning report on scandals in the British Government, he did say he would rather read a good detective story.

Moreover, he said he had been worried about the British Government for some time.

The correspondents did not escape the Chancellor's censure. Much of West Germany's improvement in the world picture could be traced to their work, he said, but he added that during his 14 years in the Chancellery their efforts had deteriorated, become more superficial.

Most of his barbs were delivered in a jocular mood. He showed some exasperation as he waved away a question about lessening of East-West tensions. It was a gesture fully in keeping with his view that the Communists only want Western concessions and are unwilling to get at what he considers the cause of tension—the division of Germany.

Lessening of tensions? he sniffed, and wondered if the Russians wanted to lessen tensions when they set out to buy Western wheat.

EXTRA DAY IN OFFICE

Two weeks before his resignation to make way for Ludwig Erhard, Adenauer looked at least 24 years younger than his 87 years. He told with obvious relish how he will remain Chancellor 24 hours longer than originally planned.

After his resignation is handed in October 15, he said, President Heinrich Luebke undoubtedly will ask him to remain as acting Chancellor until Erhard is sworn in the next day.

Under the ground rules of the reception, correspondents were asked not to quote the Chancellor directly.

TO CONTINUE WORK

Looking into the future, Adenauer said he will work diligently as a member of Parliament and as chairman of his party, the Christian Democratic Union. As time permits, he said, he will write about his official life—he rejected the word memoirs.

He had never kept a dairy, he reported, out of fear that he would see events falsely in the heat of the moment. However, he explained, he has full records of meetings and his daily schedules.

A suite of rooms and a small staff has been set aside for Adenauer in the Bundeshaus, the Federal Building, after his retirement from the Chancellery.

Where the Buck Stops

(By Thomas J. O'Neill)

Washington.—Presidents of the United States encounter no easy problems. Only the hardest to crack reach the White House desk where in President Truman's time a card proclaimed that "the buck stops here."

Were Mr. Kennedy the complaining sort he could make a persuasive case that the volume of such puzzlers has swollen to extraordinary proportions in his tenure, some of them impossible of satisfactory solution, most of them bewilderingly complex, all of them politically explosive. The last is the reason they come to him.

The hot potatoes tend to arrive with a minimum of warning. It was so when the racial crisis boiled over at Birmingham. So it was again when there was unceremoniously dumped in the Presidential lap the question of authorizing wheat exports to the Soviet, a little beauty involving a head-on crash between hard economics and inflamed domestic emotions.

Posed for Mr. Kennedy was a step plainly of promise in easing the nagging problems of an adverse trade balance and dwindling gold reserves at the cost of adding to his considerable stock of political hindrances as an election year approaches. It was not as though he was in need of more electoral burdens. The civil rights storm has already clouded his reelection prospect by alienating the Democratic base in the South. Political opponents, led by the adaptable Richard Nixon, are doing their best to rouse public distrust of the test ban treaty, having recognized that popular approval endows the President with a powerful springboard toward a campaign on the slogan, "Peace and the pursuit of prosperity." The list of liabilities, great or small, incurred by forthright and pioneering actions is almost endless.

Attempts to encourage Congress to ease the Presidential burden and spread the political responsibility on the wheat sale decision by a window-dressing resolution of approval ran into a blank wall. The Republican leadership preferred to preserve the second guess, whereby it could picture the President as wrong whatever he did.

All of this, curiously, without any tangible evidence that the Russians are prepared to buy under conditions that would apply—cash in hand.

Arguments against the suggested trade skirted the most compelling consideration recommending it: The Communists can get it elsewhere. They have been doing just that.

Canada, which already sells to Red China, eagerly effected a half-billion dollar sale of wheat to the Soviet, in the market because of its own crop failures. Other friendly nations, notably West Germany, mill American wheat and send it on to Russia as flour. In other areas, Japan sells industrial plant to Red China, and Great Britain sends the Chinese aircraft, from which American-made navigational instruments have been removed.

Nikita Khrushchev was serene, during a discussion with Orville Freeman, the American Secretary of Agriculture, on the point of availability of nonmilitary supplies in the free world. The discussion turned upon the Russian need for chemical fertilizers. The Soviet boss told the American that Russia has the money to pay for what it wants and that finding suppliers, if the United States balked, would be no problem. The record bears him out.

Nations allied with the United States and presumably on the American side in the cold war sell about $5 billion yearly to the Communist bloc. All the trade is officially described as nonstrategic, under standards much more tolerant than the United States applies.

Hard line advocates in this country class foodstuffs as strategic, relying upon the argument that an army marches on its stomach. Others add a conviction that food shortages in the Communist bloc would weaken the regimes, possibly bring them down. It is a belief firmly held, even though the Communists have maintained political control in Russia through famines that killed multitudes, and as lately as last year in China. Senator AIKEN appraises the sentiment for denying foodstuffs as a hope to starve the Communists into democracy.

Basically, the opposition represents the uneasy sense that any relaxation in international tensions constitutes a Munich, and the emotional content is high.

How extensive is that sentiment, and its consequent political potential, are topics of debate. Congress respects it mightly, a caution reflected in the hesitant approach to the test ban treaty. On that point, Congress appears to have been overly apprehensive. President Kennedy, during his western swing, got his warmest reception upon mention of the treaty as a step toward peace. This, too, in John Birch country, where dire warnings against any dealings with the Russians had been pronounced by the John Birch fugleman, Robert Welch.

Senator FULBRIGHT sized up the Presidential problem in a capsule comment. Mr. Kennedy, he remarked, would be criticized regardless of the action he took.

[Associated Press dispatch, Oct. 2, 1963]

West Germany is not a big grain producer and must import to meet its own needs. But efficient West German millers are able to sell flour on the world market, bringing in the grain from abroad at low world prices.

Twice this week the outgoing Chancellor has alluded unfavorably to Western countries selling wheat to the Soviets. At a farewell reception for newsmen Monday night he said that for years the Western nations have been arguing that communism was unable to make its farms work efficiently. Now, he said, these countries are propping up the Russians.

He said in a speech yesterday that the Soviets ought to show by deeds that they want peace before the West gives them any help.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the floor. I yield for no inquiry. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I interpose a word?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does the Senator from Illinois withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withhold it.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the fact that the Chair recognized the Senator from Montana, has the Chair held that the Senate is in a routine morning hour, wherein 3-minute speeches may be made? If so, there is no purpose in appealing the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the Chair has so ruled, and that I was speaking in the morning hour.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am asking the Chair if that is the parliamentary fact.

Mr. CLARK. This is highly irregular procedure.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senate will be in order. The Chair can listen only to one point of order at a time. The Chair rules that the pending question is the appeal. That question is debatable.

Mr. CLARK. There has been no morning hour at all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then how did I speak?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withhold it, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recognize the difficulty in which the Chair finds itself. I assure the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that I would not have proceeded as I did if I had not been assured that the Senate was in the morning hour and that I was entitled to speak for 3 minutes.

I may point out that if there is not to be a morning hour, in view of the entry of the unanimous-consent agreement, such unanimous-consent agreement would have prior consideration over all other matters. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not have priority over a point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over all other business.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Illinois will yield to me, I am sure I can help the Senate out of its dilemma.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing, today, to withdraw my request for the regular order, in view of the attitude taken by the Senator from Georgia that the Senate is in recess.

I shall return to the fight another day when the question of the recess will not complicate the regular parliamentary procedure, with respect to which the Chair and the Parliamentarian were sustaining me when the question of the recess arose.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator withdraws his objection, that is one thing, although I am not asking him to withdraw his objection. If the Senate had not recessed, I would be supporting the Senator as vigorously as I could.

Mr. CLARK. I will be back another day.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate had been following rule VII, after having adjourned, that would be one thing, but in view of the recess, I cannot agree with the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. I want the support of the Senator from Georgia. Therefore I withdraw all my reservations and objections previously made.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the objection of the Senator from Pennsylvania is withdrawn, I will withdraw the appeal. There is no point in beating the straw after the grain has been removed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the appeal withdrawn?

Mr. RUSSELL. I withdraw the appeal, in view of the fact that the parliamentary situation which gave rise to the appeal has been resolved by the Senator from Pennsylvania withdrawing his objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the air has been cleared, may I ask the Chair whether the Senate is in the morning hour?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senate will be in order, so that it may proceed with the transaction of morning business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 1696. An act defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies (Rept. No. 554).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2206. A bill to validate the salary overpayments made to certain officers and employees incident to the salary adjustment provisions of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2207. A bill for the relief of Remedios R. Yankton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2208. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

BUS TRANSPORTATION COMPACT RELATING TO TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2208) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

BUS TRANSPORTATION COMPACTS

President Kennedy in a message to Congress on transportation has called for the employment of compacts among the States to meet some of the problems of aiding our troubled public transportation. Two such interstate agreements designed to relieve essential public bus transportation of some of the burdens occasioned by State lines have been developed by conferences of Northeastern State officials called by the New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Cooperation. The bus license proration and reciprocity agreement and the compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses will provide a more equitable distribution of tax revenues among the States and will greatly improve public transportation.

REGISTRATION PRORATION

The proration agreement for registration and other fixed fees, while limited in application to buses, follows almost exactly existing highly successful compacts for the same purpose covering both trucks and buses among 15 Western States from California to Illinois. In fact, the new agreement has been deliberately designed so that its provisions with respect to buses will constitute a common agreement on buses covering the member States of both the eastern and western compacts, a result which has been publicly invited by the State administrators of the western agreement. The proration compact will be particularly important with respect to furnishing of local service by interstate bus carriers. At present, interstate buses providing intrastate service in States which have no provision for proration must be registered at full fees in each such State.

The result is substantial duplication of registration fees at prohibitive cost.

Consequently, the interstate carriers are frequently forced to curtail or abandon intrastate service and concentrate on comparatively long-haul interstate operations. Since local patronage is not enough to justify wholly intrastate operators, except in a relatively few large metropolitan centers, the tax situation is inducing the reduction of intrastate bus service. On the other hand, proration would make it economically possible for interstate operators to qualify all of their buses for intrastate as well as interstate use in all States through which they pass, without placing an economic penalty on them, and the public would benefit thereby.

MOTOR FUELS USE TAX

The taxation of motor fuels compact deals with apportionment of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses. It would establish consumption of such fuels within the State as the criterion for taxation by each of the party States, thus eliminating multiple taxation of motor fuels purchased by bus operators in one State but consumed on interstate runs in other States. The agreement would assure that all States receive their fair share of revenue from taxation of motor fuels consumed by buses. The motor fuels tax compact would also serve the purpose of promoting intrastate bus service.

Action by Congress to provide for membership in these two compacts by the District of Columbia is essential. First, the District is a strategic transportation center and its failure to join would deter joinder by the States of the area and impair the effectiveness of the agreements for those who did participate. Second, action by the District would be the real test of Federal encouragement of transportation compacts among the States. The Federal Government must meet its responsibilities and insure District of Columbia participation in this cooperative endeavor.

In their 1963 legislative sessions, four Northeastern States passed both compacts, despite the fact that the draft legislation was not available until the middle of January. Four other States have directed their study by interim committees and preparation for introduction in their 1964–65 sessions.

RESOLUTION

DESIGNATION OF FILM "TROUBLED WATERS" AS SENATE FILM REPORT NO. 1

Mr. **McNAMARA** submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 208), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the film report on water pollution, entitled "Troubled Waters," prepared by the Committee on Public Works, shall be designated as Senate Film Report numbered 1, Eighty-eighth Congress, and that there be printed seven additional copies of such film, five for the use of that committee, and two for the Library of Congress. The Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent funds of the Senate, the actual cost of reproduction of these copies of the film: *Provided*, That copies of said film may be made available to nongovernmental agencies or individuals at the cost of reproduction.

INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAX REDUCTION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. **GORE**. Mr. President, I submit, for printing and appropriate reference, four amendments which I will offer to the bill H.R. 8363, the so-called Revenue Act of 1963. I will request that the hearings which the Finance Committee is soon to begin on this bill include testimony on the subjects covered by these amendments and by one or two others on which I am working, but which are not yet in final form.

Two of these amendments deal directly with the outflow of capital from this country. Strong claims in the balance-of-payments area have been advanced for this House-passed bill—claims which in my opinion cannot be substantiated. Since this subject has been opened up by proponents of the bill, however, it seems to me that the Finance Committee should consider more direct action to stem the outflow of dollars and gold and I expect, therefore, to press for the adoption of these two amendments. Both directly affect the outflow of capital.

One amendment consists of the language of the interest equalization bill which has been proposed by the administration and which is now before the Ways and Means Committee. It seems logical to me to move ahead with this measure so as to guarantee its early consideration by the Finance Committee and the Senate.

The second amendment consists of language which I offered last year, and which was last year supported by the administration, which would tax currently the profits realized by domestic taxpayers through the operation of foreign corporations which they control. Legislation was enacted last year in this field, but unfortunately it was watered down to a point where it was and will continue to be largely ineffective in accomplishing its balance-of-payments purpose.

The third amendment would terminate the preferential tax treatment now extended to holders of restricted stock options. The bill deals with stock options, but ineffectively. Actually, by introducing a lower tax rate and inclusion factor applicable to longer term capital gains, the bill may be said to encourage even greater abuses with regard to stock options. My amendment would eliminate that portion of the bill dealing with stock options and substitute what amounts to a repeal of section 421 of the code, which section now deals with restricted stock options.

I would hope that Secretary Dillon and other spokesmen for the administration would strongly support in their testimony before the Finance Committee the position which the administration adopted last year and earlier this year on these and other amendments which I expect to have ready for printing within the next few days.

My fourth amendment is more basic to the philosophy and concept of the bill itself. This amendment would substitute for the new and lower rates in the bill, for both individuals and corporations, an increase in the personal exemption from the present figure of $600 to $1,000. This would result in a considerably smaller revenue loss and at the same time, in my opinion, make the measure far more equitable. Whatever chances this bill may have of encouraging some healthy expansion in the economy would likewise be enhanced.

In 1940, the personal exemption was $800, $2,000 for married couple, and $400 for each child or other dependent. The total exemption for a family of four thus amounted to $2,800 in 1940 as against $2,400 today. A family of six—that is a married couple with four children—had in 1940 personal exemptions of $3,600, the same total personal exemptions which this family would have today.

The original purpose of the personal exemption, so far as I can determine, was to allow a subsistence level income to be received by a taxpayer free of income tax. In 1940, $2,800 would provide a decent minimum living for a family of four in many parts of the country.

During the war, the personal exemption was rather sharply reduced, and for two reasons: First, it was necessary to raise additional revenues, and second, it was felt that this move would discourage consumer spending, thus relieving some of the pressure on our production facilities so as to allow a higher degree of conversion to war production.

After World War II, only a part of this broad consumer purchasing power was restored by raising the personal exemption somewhat. If we are now in a position to lose $9 or $10 billion of revenue for the purpose, hopefully, of spurring the economy, I can think of no better way than to restore some of this broad purchasing power to the lower income groups by raising the personal exemption. The lower income groups are much more apt to spend this marginal income completely and quickly than are the upper bracket taxpayers, who in many instances, under the terms of the bill, would receive an increase in after tax income of 100 percent or more.

Equity would certainly be served if we moved toward restoring as early as possible the concept of an untaxed subsistence level income. Of course, we cannot do this completely because the cost of living is now more than twice what it was in 1940, but by raising the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000 we would give to a family of four at least a $4,000 income untaxed.

I hope these amendments will be fully and favorably considered by the Finance Committee.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. **BAYH**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 649) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AID TO SOUTH VIETNAM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on September 12, I introduced a resolution (S. Res. 196) to cut off aid to South Vietnam unless needed reforms were made in the Diem government. Since the time of my last announcement on this resolution, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] has requested that his name be added to the list of cosponsors of this resolution. The addition of Senator Byrd's name brings to 33 the number of Senators who now sponsor this resolution. I ask unanimous consent to have Senator Byrd's name added to the list of cosponsors at the next printing of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 981, TO ASSIST IN PROVISION OF HOUSING FOR DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I announce that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on S. 981, a bill to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor. These hearings will be held on October 15 and 16, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. each morning.

All persons wishing to testify should contact Mr. Dudley L. O'Neal, Jr., chief counsel of the subcommittee, room 5228, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 1200

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I announce that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on S. 1200, a bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by FHA insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under FHA insured mortgages.

The hearings will be held on October 17 and 18, 1963, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will begin at 10 a.m.

All persons wishing to testify should contact Mr. Dudley L. O'Neal, Jr., chief counsel of the subcommittee, room 5228, New Senate Office Building.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Aspinall, Mr. Rogers of Texas, Mr. Haley, Mr. Saylor, and Mr. Westland were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang;

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy;

H.R. 2189. An act for the relief of Morris Aronow and other employees of the Post Office Department;

H.R. 2811. An act for the relief of Vernon E. Linth;

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Ferenc Molnar;

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.;

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber;

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin;

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.;

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke;

H.R. 7044. An act to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; and

H.R. 7088. An act for the relief of Joseph Di Ciccio.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 1280. An act for the relief of John Koss;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian;

H.R. 3648. An act for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta;

H.R. 3762. An act for the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski;

H.R. 4075. An act for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata; and

H.R. 7022. An act for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1271. An act for the relief of Dr. Jae H. Yang;

H.R. 1542. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sandra Bank Murphy;

H.R. 2189. An act for the relief of Morris Aronow and other employees of the Post Office Department;

H.R. 2811. An act for the relief of Vernon E. Linth;

H.R. 3366. An act for the relief of Ferenc Molnar;

H.R. 4099. An act for the relief of Jesse Leigh, Jr.;

H.R. 5289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber;

H.R. 5746. An act for the relief of Robert H. Bagby;

H.R. 5902. An act for the relief of Eric Voegelin and Luise Betty Onken Voegelin;

H.R. 6181. An act for the relief of Mr. Rudolph Sanderson, of Meriden, Kans.;

H.R. 6468. An act for the relief of Harold J. Burke; and

H.R. 7088. An act for the relief of Joseph DiCiccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7044. An act to amend Public Law 193, 83d Congress, relating to the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TAX AND CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, about 45 minutes ago, during what I thought was the morning hour, I proceeded to ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an article published in the Evening Star of yesterday. A point of order was made that my request to insert the article and to speak on it was not a petition or a memorial; and the point was sustained by the Chair.

About 5 minutes ago I found that the Senate was back in the morning hour, with no petitions or memorials being submitted, but, instead, the same type of material that the Senator from Iowa had proposed to speak on being inserted in the Record. I must say that this is quite a confusing way to run a railroad.

As I said before, in last evening's Washington Star, there appeared an article by the columnist Charles Bartlett entitled "Question On Tax Cut Is 'When?'"

In the course of the article Mr. Bartlett writes:

> The administration is fervently against the Republican proposal to set the civil rights bill aside to make way for the tax bill.

I do not know where Mr. Bartlett got the idea that there was a Republican proposal to set the civil rights bill aside in favor of the tax bill. To be charitable, perhaps this is a typographical error, because to my knowledge, all the Republicans I have been in touch with feel that the tax bill should be set aside and that the civil rights bill should become the No. 1 priority bill in both the Senate and the House. That is my feeling, too.

I regret very much that the tax bill was given No. 1 priority in the House. I hope it will not receive No. 1 priority in the Senate. I also hope that Mr. Bartlett will see fit to come forth with the names of the Republicans who he alleges made the suggestion. If he cannot do so, I hope he will retract his statement.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the Record in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 1, 1963]

Question on Tax Cut Is "When?"—Senate Finance Committee Passage Seen Certain, With Timing in Doubt

(By Charles Bartlett)

Initial readings on the disposition of the Senate Finance Committee indicate that the Nation will almost certainly obtain its tax cut but great doubts remain on the question of when.

All except 2 of the 11 Democrats on the committee are expected to favor the tax-cutting measure. Since nine votes constitute a majority, the decisions of the six Republicans will not be crucial to the outcome. Important divergences exist, however, on the issue of timing.

The administration is fervently against the Republican proposal to set the civil rights bill aside to make way for the tax bill. Swift enactment of this sensitive measure is believed essential to the President's objective of cooling the aroused passions on both sides of the racial issue and there is no instinct to let the matter drag into 1964.

Some argue that the timing of the tax bill's enactment is not important, since January 1, 1964, will be the effective date of the reductions whether they are passed this November or next March.

Against this view, the Treasury maintains that the stimulative value of the tax cut may depend heavily upon when it is enacted. Its potential for generating economic momentum is clearly greater if its passage comes while the economy is stable. If it comes after the start of the downturn that is possible next winter, its impact may be largely defensive.

The tactical hope of passing both major bills before the end of the year lies in the chance that the Senate will enact the tax law before it locks itself in a filibuster on civil rights. But the pursuit of speedy action on the tax measure is obstructed by the presence on the Finance Committee of four southern Democrats, who want to delay the tax bill to strengthen their leverage in civil rights, and six Republicans, all disinclined to assist the administration toward its objectives.

The delicacy involved in prodding the Finance Committee was demonstrated last week when Chairman HARRY BYRD reacted indignantly to a letter from two Democratic committee members, PAUL DOUGLAS of Illinois and CLINTON ANDERSON of New Mexico, who urged that the committee proceed expeditiously to consider the tax legislation.

BYRD observed in this letter several arguments that had been put to him directly by Treasury officials and embraced an assumption that the letter was an effort inspired by the administration to stir a revolt against his leadership. This was heinous interference in a chairman's prerogatives and a just cause for wrath.

Although BYRD is one of the two Democrats on the committee who flatly oppose the bill (ALBERT GORE of Tennessee is the other), his hold on the committee's procedures is strengthened by the fact that he has rarely, unlike other southern chairman, used his powers to obstruct a measure that he did not approve.

In the similar circumstances of the 1962 tax bill, BYRD allowed Robert Kerr, the late Senator from Oklahoma who ranked just below him on Finance, to take control of the committee. But he is unlikely to make a similar concession to the new No. 2 man, RUSSELL LONG of Louisiana, a very able politician who is separated from BYRD by a gap of 30 years.

The Senators are unlikely also to respond warmly to the argument that it is unnecessary for them to hear again the testimony taken in some 27 days of open hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee. In the interest of speed, the Treasury will accept the bill passed by the House without raising any of the controversial proposals that have been eliminated.

But this shortcut will not be acceptable to some of the members, particularly to GORE, who will use the discarded provisions to underline his contention that this is a rich man's tax bill. Although his views on taxes command few votes in the Senate, GORE is a determined and resourceful man who will not be put aside easily.

The members of the Finance Committee are a uniquely individualistic group of Senators. They will ultimately enact a tax cut, but they will do it as Senators—in their own fashion and their own time. Nobody knows when that will be.

SOVIET-AMERICAN COOPERATION IN SPACE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in his speech before the United Nations General Assembly on September 20, President Kennedy made a number of creative proposals for improving Soviet-American relations and strengthening world peace. Foremost among these was the President's suggestion that we explore the possibilities of "joint efforts in the regulation and exploration of space," including a joint expedition to the moon.

For reasons which I shall set forth in detail in the near future, I do not believe that space exploration, and especially the project for landing on the moon by 1970, can be regarded as being among the highest priority needs of the American people. At a time when our public education is starved for funds, when over 4 million Americans are unemployed—not least because of the inadequacies of our public education, and when our cities are blighted by spreading slums and rising crime rates, I do not see how we can regard the $5.35 billion authorized for the space program for the current fiscal year, to say nothing of the minimum cost of $20 billion for the moon project, as anything but an unwarranted diversion of resources from the Nation's most pressing needs.

Space exploration is nonetheless an important and potentially rewarding enterprise. The problem before both the Executive and the Congress is to assign to the space program an appropriate priority which will not destroy or cripple it, but will bring it into a realistic relationship with other, more important national programs.

Soviet-American cooperation in space, as proposed by the President, would serve two valuable purposes: First, it would greatly reduce the costs of space exploration, releasing funds for important domestic programs, such as education, employment, urban renewal, and conservation of resources; second, it would further reduce world tensions by opening up a significant new area of Soviet-American cooperation.

A joint Soviet-American effort in space would enable—and perhaps encourage—both countries to divert resources to civilian needs. As the President pointed out, there is no problem of national sovereignty in space since, by resolution of the General Assembly, the members of the United Nations have renounced claims to territorial rights in outer space and celestial bodies. Why, therefore, as the President asked, should the United States and the Soviet Union, in preparing expeditions to the moon, "become involved in immense duplications of research, construction, and expenditure"?

The President's point is unassailable. Wealthy as we are, we are beset by continuing deficits in our national budget and balance of payments and by great and growing domestic needs. We simply cannot afford to refuse to explore a means of saving vast sums of money through a joint effort in space. Again and again, we have been told that domestic needs in the fields of education and employment must be delayed because of the high costs of national defense. A joint moon project would release funds for long-neglected domestic needs, without impairing the needs of our Defense Establishment, and, indeed, without impairing the space program itself.

The second major advantage of Soviet-American cooperation in space is the potential effect of such a joint effort in improving the state of international relations. As the New York Times commented in an editorial on September 21:

> The political fallout from any such combined effort, the example of cooperation toward a common goal, would, of course, exert a highly beneficial influence toward bringing the nations of the Soviet and Western Worlds together.

Or as Charles Bartlett wrote in the Washington Star on September 17:

> It is a question of whether this new dimension of man's activity is to become a unifying challenge or merely an extension of the cold war battleground.

Cooperation in space could be a constructive sequel to the nuclear test ban treaty in our national strategy of peace. When a prominent member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Dr. Anatoly A. Blagonravov, suggested earlier this month that the Soviet Union was prepared to consider the possibility of cooperation on the lunar project, a valuable opportunity was opened to explore whether the Russians are really willing to open a new avenue toward peace. It may be, of course, that we shall be disappointed; that, as so often in the past, the Soviet offer will turn out to have been a hollow gesture of propaganda. But to dismiss such a proposal out of hand—whether for some trivial reason, such as the difficulties of reconciling the metric system used by the Russians with our system of inches and feet; or even for more substantial reasons, such as the sensitive military implications of revealing information relating to rockets and guidance systems—would be to admit that our own past proposals for cooperation in space were issued only for propaganda purposes.

Fortunately, the President replied affirmatively and courageously to the Soviet suggestion. It may be that the President's initiative will be rejected by the Soviets. But there is nothing to be lost by exploring the possibility of cooperation in space. At best, it could result in a joint expedition to the moon which would not only be a great technical achievement, but also would be a dramatic demonstration of the willingness of the two great powers to work together in peace. At the very least, an honest exploration of the possibilities of cooperation in space would demonstrate that the United States is genuinely dedicated to the objective set forth by President Kennedy in his inaugural address, in these words:

> Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together, let us explore the stars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Purifying the Moon Project," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post of September 24, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 24, 1963]

PURIFYING THE MOON PROJECT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President has made his suggestion of collaboration in going to the moon at a time when there is some improvement in U.S.S.R.-U.S.A. relations. It happens also to be a time when there is a growing doubt among American scientists and among the people generally about the commitment to put an American man on the moon by the year 1970.

The President's proposal at the U.N. is, it seems to me, excellent even if the joint effort proves to be technically and politically impracticable. It is excellent because it may offer an honorable way to correct the mistakes of our original commitments about going to the moon.

There were two big mistakes. One was the commitment to put a man, a living person rather than instruments, on the moon. The other mistake was to set a deadline—1970—when the man was to land on the moon.

These two mistakes have transformed what is an immensely fascinating scientific experiment into a morbid and vulgar stunt. The use of living men rather than instruments has given a gruesome color to the whole enterprise which is akin to that of the circus performer who shoots a flower out of his daughter's mouth. For this is showmanship and not science, and it contaminates the whole affair. We shall be back in the realm of honest science when we proclaim as our objective the landing and orbiting of instruments which can send back exact data.

The setting of 1970 as a target date turned the enterprise into a race in which the objective is not to explore the heavens but to be one up on the Russians. By fixing a date, by making it a race, we are not only prostituting the nature of the scientific effort but are distorting it. We have multiplied the cost many times and, what is even more damaging to our society, we are straining beyond the proper limits our relatively small supply of scientists and technicians. Not since the Pharaohs built the pyramids has a society devoted such gigantic sums to a purpose which has almost nothing to do with its security or its welfare.

And yet, the exploration of space will bring a new understanding of the universe and of life, and this is a noble end for which to work. But all this will be done best—all this, it may be, can be done only—if the impulses of the project are purified, if they are cleansed of showmanship, chauvinism, and morbid commercialism. Opening up the heavens is too big an enterprise to be mixed with concern about which nation gets the first headlines and the biggest ones.

As I see it, the best way to purify the moon project is to do what the President has suggested, to work out with the Soviet Union at least a common program with growing exchange of scientific data and increasing consultation. It does not matter much whether the first trip to the moon is made by an American astronaut and a Soviet astronette. What does matter is that we should agree to treat our separate efforts as a scientific and not as a cold war operation.

PERSONAL STORIES OF THE ASTRONAUTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on September 17, it was announced that the Nation's 16 astronauts have signed contracts with Life magazine and Field Enterprises, Inc., selling exclusive rights to their personal stories for over $1 million. Under these contracts, each astronaut will receive $16,250 a year for 4 years.

I believe that the decision of the astronauts to enter these arrangements was an unfortunate one, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration showed poor judgment in authorizing the contracts. There are differing opinions about the wisdom of the space program, and especially about the project for landing on the moon before 1970; but all Americans have been united in their admiration and pride in the astronauts themselves. The injection of a private commercial element into the space program may tend in some small measure to tarnish our pride in this national scientific undertaking, and to reduce the worldwide admiration which space exploration has won for the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an editorial entitled "Let Us Explore the Stars," published in the New York Times of September 17.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The sale of the astronauts' personal stories represents a stain of commercialism on the record of the space program. The astronauts are not movie stars or baseball heroes whose achievements in some private field of endeavor have made them objects of public interest. The motive of private profit has an honorable and legitimate place in the world of commercial endeavor, but that world does not embrace the tasks the astronauts have voluntarily agreed to attempt. If they are underpaid for the kind of job they do (a condition that exists very widely in the Federal Government) they should be paid more; but they should be paid by their employers, the people of the United States. They should not be permitted to reap enormous private profits from outside sources on the basis of their participation in a great national effort.

CONDITION SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA ON GETTING OUT OF CUBA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has just called attention to the fact that Chancellor Adenauer, of West Germany, has objected to the sale of wheat by our country to the Soviet Union at a subsidized price, on the ground that such a program will only help communism. I wholeheartedly agree with the distinguished majority leader that Mr. Adenauer is scarcely in a position to make such an objection, in view of his practices and the practices of his Government in dealing with Russia. Nevertheless, I do believe that Chancellor Adenauer is correct in his conclusion that sales of wheat to Russia would, in fact, help communism. I suggest that there would be no real quid pro quo. Russia needs wheat, in order to help strengthen relations with her satellite countries. What we would get in return would be sterile; the gold we would get would, in my judgment, be of relatively little value to us.

I would propose that instead of simply selling the wheat at subsidized prices for gold, we should insist on at least one of the following concessions:

One, that the Soviet Union agree to withdraw its troops and its missiles from Cuba.

Or, two, that the Soviet Union agree to knock down the Berlin wall.

Or, three, that the Soviet Union agree to repay the United Nations for its pro rata cost of United Nations operations in the Congo and the overall amount past due by the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations.

Or four, that the Soviet Union stop pouring money, propaganda, and guerrillas into Latin America, to subvert this hemisphere.

Or five, that the Soviet Union allow free elections under United Nations supervision in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and all other captive nations.

Or six, that the Soviet Union limit its personnel going to new African nations to genuine technicians, and that it strip Soviet embassy staffs of propagandists, revolutionary agitators, and trouble makers.

Or seven, that the Soviet Union allow a real cultural and educational exchange with the West, and allow a sharp increase in freedom for the Soviet people, as an important bridge toward peace.

Or eight, that the Soviet Union allow full freedom to U.S. citizens to travel in the U.S.S.R.

Or nine, that the Soviet Union agree to unlimited onsite inspection of U.S.S.R. missile bases, and that in return it accept our agreement to permit the U.S.S.R. to inspect our missile bases.

Mr. President, if we could get such an agreement it would be a realistic quid pro quo, and a reason for helping the Russian economy, because the concessions I am suggesting would be real and substantial concessions to freedom.

PROPOSED SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, being a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I attended the informal meetings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Agriculture Committee, held for consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Under Secretary of State, upon the advisability of selling approximately 100 to 200 million bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union. At the outset, I should like to say that my study of the legislative acts relating to trade with the Soviet Union indicate that they do not restrict the authority of the President of the United States, acting through the Department of Commerce, to permit the issuance of export licenses to the private grain industry of the United States to export wheat to Russia.

What I do question, and this is the purpose of my remarks, is whether the sale of wheat to Russia in this isolated transaction should be made without reviewing with the Congress and with our allies the total trade policy of the United States and its allies on one side, and the

Soviet Union and Communist-dominated countries. For I do not think it can be contradicted that it has been for many years, and is now, the declared policy of the Congress—a policy which the executive branch of the Government has observed and in which it must be assumed the executive branch concurred—that trade between the United States and the Soviet Union and Communist-dominated countries should not be carried on except under very limited circumstances.

It is certainly the declared policy of the Congress that subsidized agricultural commodities—such as the wheat in question—shall not be sold, or made available in any way, to the Soviet Union.

The Agriculture Act of 1961, Public Law 87-128, August 8, 1961, states in its declaration of policy:

> SEC. 2. * * * it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to * * * (c) expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, 83rd Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1707), and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance;

Section 107 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, to which the Act of 1961 refers, reads as follows:

> SEC. 107. As used in this Act, "friendly nation" means any country other than (1) the U.S.S.R., or (2) any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement. (7 U.S.C. 1707.)

The Export Control Act of 1949, which authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail exports from the United States, contains in section 3 the following language:

> (c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

This section excludes surplus agricultural products from the export controls authorized by the act, but contains an exception to effectuate the trade policies set forth in clauses (b) and (c) of the act. Clauses (b) and (c) of section 2 do call attention to the significance of exports to our national security, and declare the policy of the United States to use export controls, and I quote:

> (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security of the United States.

Let me say that the Export Control Act also imposes upon the executive branch the obligation of coordinating our export policies with our allies.

While not dealing directly with such an issue as the sale of wheat to Russia which the executive branch is considering, the Battle Act of October 26, 1951, the Foreign Assistance Acts, even the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 passed last year, set up restrictions of various types which confirm that it has been, and that it is today, the settled policy of the Congress, declared through many legislative enactments, that our general policy looks with disfavor upon trade with Russia or the Communist-dominated countries—and in certain cases specifically prohibits such trade.

If the proposal were to relieve hunger in Russia, I have no doubt that there would be no great objection by the Congress and the people generally, because the relief of hunger wherever it may occur has been the traditional policy of our country. If the proposal were a part of a settled and declared change in trade policy by our country, which had been thoroughly discussed with the Congress of the United States and with our allies, I think that would have significance. But it is not claimed by the executive branch of the Government that the wheat is needed to relieve hunger in Russia. And those who met with us said that it did not represent any change in trade policy; to the contrary, it was stated that it was an isolated transaction.

If it is true that the proposal is not intended to satisfy hunger, and is intended solely to assist the Soviet Union—and that is what it was agreed it would do—to meet its own export commitments to the Communist countries of Eastern Europe and its commitments to Latin America, and if it does not represent any change in our trade policy, evidently the only reason for engaging in this isolated transaction is the desire to make a deal to secure the purchase price of several hundred million dollars, either in dollars or in gold.

I do not question that we need the money, but I think that an insufficient reason for a great nation like the United States to contravene its declared policy.

There may be good and sufficient reasons for a change in our total trade policies with respect to Russia and the Communist-dominated countries. I can see from such information that I have that some changes could be made. It may be that limited trade would be helpful to the economy of our country and not in derogation of our national security. But if that is correct, I believe the administration would be on firmer ground if, before embarking on a new course, it would review our entire trade policy and that of our allies with the Soviet Union, and present its conclusions to the appropriate committees of Congress. If the Congress should indicate its approval of a change in trade policy, it would be very helpful to the executive branch, and to a definition of our trade policy and its effect upon our domestic and foreign policy. Even if the Congress did not concur wholly, the President, unless actually prohibited, would have the authority to make such decisions as he might consider to be in the national interest, and he would be buttressed by the fact that he had presented to the Congress and to the Nation the reasons which he felt demanded a change in our trade policy.

I should like to repeat and emphasize that such a change in trade policy would be a change in a policy which has been, without question, the policy of the Congress which has been followed and observed by three administrations since World War II.

I conclude by saying that the proposed sale of wheat may not be a major transaction. On the other hand, it would not relieve hunger in the Soviet Union. It would enable the Soviet Union to meet its trade commitments. And it would at least contravene the declared policy of the Congress.

A broader question than a single sale of wheat is involved—and that is the question of our total trade policy with the Soviet Union and with Communist-dominated countries. That is an issue which in my judgment is vital. It has great significance to our economy. It is vital to the security of the United States, and to our relationships with our allies. I believe it should be determined as a result of broader considerations than the approval of an isolated wheat transaction which, on the basis of the evidence we have heard thus far, would have no purpose except to secure several hundred millions of dollars, much as we need it, either in dollars or in gold.

I dislike seeing the United States, great nation that it is, chasing off in a grubby manner after Russian gold without great consideration, and without a review of our total trade policy.

For these reasons, I am opposed to this sale of wheat to Russia.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator from Kentucky. He has been a distinguished Ambassador. He is an expert on foreign policy, a man who is most moderate and thoughtful about our foreign aid program and its relationships in the world, a man who has been an outstanding advocate of everything we can honorably do to secure peace. The responsible, careful legal and policy analysis by the Senator from Kentucky adds great weight to the cause of those of us who have been contending that the administration should take a long and careful look before selling to the Soviet Union for gold a great amount of wheat under the circumstances.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

LET US KEEP HOSTILE FISHING FLEETS 12 MILES FROM OUR SHORES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Senate yesterday passed S. 1988 to prohibit fishing in territorial waters of the United States by persons other than U.S. nationals or inhabitants. This bill was introduced by my able and distinguished colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], who is to be highly commended for the skill and efficiency with which he managed the bill on the floor of the Senate. Much praise is also due to the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce for his assistance and determination in passing this measure.

S. 1988 is a simple bill to put teeth into an existing prohibition governing the invasion of the territorial waters of the United States.

The passage of this bill is long overdue.

We in Alaska fully realize and have for some time now protested the invasion of our waters by Japanese and Russian fishing fleets of great size.

Just recently the Governor of the State of Alaska wrote a strong letter to President Kennedy protesting the Russian invasion of the waters off Kodiak Island. The Russian methods are ruthless and destructive. Knowing that Americans fishing for crab in those waters are experienced and knowledgeable about where the crabs are located they wait until the pots are set and then rushing in with their nets scooping up crabs indiscriminately and deliberately destroying the crab pots of the Alaskan fishermen. In taking such actions they ignore sound conservation measures which must be followed by Alaskan fishermen. If the Russian and Japanese fishing fleets are permitted to continue as they have, the time will not be far distant when these valuable fishing grounds will be depleted and destroyed.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter sent by Governor Egan to the President be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Now that S. 1988 has passed, it is time to take action on a bill which I introduced on behalf of myself and the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie]. That bill, S. 1816, would authorize the President, under certain circumstances to prohibit fishing by foreigners lying within 12 miles off the shores of any of the States.

Canada has taken that action unilaterally. Similar action by the United States is needed and overdue.

It is imperative that action along the lines proposed in my bill be taken because the Russian trawling fleet is not within the 3-mile limit. Governor Egan has requested the President to declare that crab is a resources of our Continental Shelf. I join Governor Egan in this request and trust that he will act on this request with all speed. I also hope that the Senate Commerce Committee will take early action on S. 1816 which would further protect our fishing resources against Russian depredations.

Exhibit 1

State of Alaska,
Office of the Governor,
Juneau, September 27, 1963.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: Enclosed is a carbon copy of a letter I have sent to President John F. Kennedy and Secretary of State Dean Rusk. I enclose also, for your use and information, a copy of the transcript I referred to in that letter.

I am going to fly, this very afternoon, to Kodiak to meet with the fishermen who are assembling there as a result of a recent Russian invasion of the crab ground area. I don't know how long the fishermen will resort to simply withdrawing and retiring from our historic fishing grounds. I suspect that it may not be for too long.

Sincerely,

William A. Egan,
Governor.

State of Alaska,
Office of the Governor,
Juneau, September 27, 1963.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed please find a transcript of testimony taken by the State's attorney general at a hearing convened at Kodiak, Alaska, on September 14, 1963. The hearing was convened at the request of the fishermen themselves. The expense of attending the hearing and the transcription of the testimony taken was borne by the fishermen at Kodiak.

The testimony of 16 witnesses was taken. Several of the fishermen left their boats and flew in to Kodiak by airplane to attend the hearing and to give testimony as to what they personally observed concerning the Russian crab fishing effort in the waters just off Kodiak Island. Each witness was sworn. The testimony herein indicates conclusively that the Russians were in the waters off Kodiak for the purpose of taking king crabs in what amounts to commercial quantities.

Their method of taking crabs was destructive, not only to American fishing gear in the area, but also to the crab fishery itself. Whereas our conservation restrictions have limited our fishermen to the use of crab pots and to the taking of adult male crabs over a certain size, the Russian fishing effort is limited by no such restrictions. Their use of trawl gear, which was once available to American fishermen but no longer, destroyed and continues to destroy many of the crabs which are not picked up by the gear itself. Further, the Russians did not return to the water small male or female crabs, which are necessary to the perpetuation of the fishery.

Last year when a representation of the U.S. State Department was at Kodiak, he suggested that Kodiak fishermen mark their buoy markers floating above their crab pot fishing gear plainly so that the Russians could see them and avoid running over them. Although our fishermen, at that time, attempted to explain to your representative that the Russians would pay no heed to marked gear, such attempts went unheeded. It was your representative's view that if any crab pots had, in fact, been destroyed, that it was inadvertent destruction on the part of the Russians and not willful.

The testimony herein indicates conclusively that such was not and is not the case. The Russian fishermen are aware that our own people know where the richest crab grounds are located. Hence, the Russians go where they see our boats and our gear (plainly marked) fishing for crab. They are not content merely to compete, but have undertaken destruction of the crab pot gear belonging to our people in full view of our fishermen. The reason for doing this is simple enough to understand. By destroying a number of crab pots, they have forced our fishermen to remove their remaining gear and retire from the area. Our fishermen cannot, of course, stand idly by while their fishing gear and means of making a living are destroyed. They must either give up grounds which we; i.e., the U.S. Department of the Interior and that State of Alaska, have cultivated and helped to bring to their present rich yield, or they will take some aggressive action against the invaders. I have consistently pointed out to the fishermen that violence will not resolve the matter and that the exercise of restraint is necessary. I can do no less than give you my impression of the situation, however, which is that our people will wait only so long before they take some sort of direct action against the Russians.

When the State Department filed a protest with the Russians, logic compelled our fishermen to wait and see and hope for a good outcome. However, on Saturday, September 21, 1963, and Tuesday, September 24, 1963, Russian vessels were again destroying our firshermen's crab gear off Kodiak Island. The situation is serious and warrants your direct action at once. The clearest and most direct solution to the problem is for the United States to declare that crab is a resource of our Continental Shelf. Other methods, such as protests to the Russian Ambassador or even directly to the Russian Government at Moscow through our Ambassador, will consume a great deal of time, even if such protests are effective ultimately in securing Russian withdrawal from crab fishing on the Continental Shelf.

This transcript contains the testimony of a Coast Guard officer, who was called to testify to his personal observation of the Russian crab effort. His testimony corroborates that of the fishermen.

I urge you to give this matter your immediate and serious attention.

Sincerely,

William A. Egan,
Governor.

State of Alaska,
Office of the Governor,
September 27, 1963.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: Enclosed please find a transcript of testimony taken by the States attorney general at a hearing convened at Kodiak, Alaska, on September 14, 1963. The hearing was convened at the request of the fishermen themselves. The expense of attending the hearing and the transcription of the testimony taken was born by the fishermen at Kodiak.

The testimony of 16 witnesses was taken. Several of the fishermen left their boats and flew in to Kodiak by airplane to attend the hearing and to give testimony as to what they personally observed concerning the Russian crab fishing effort in the waters just off Kodiak Island. Each witness was sworn. The testimony herein indicates conclusively that the Russians were in the waters off Kodiak for the purpose of taking king crab in what amounts to commercial quantities.

Their method of taking crab was destructive, not only to American fishing gear in the area, but also to the crab fishery itself. Whereas our conservation restrictions have limited our fishermen to the use of crab pots and to the taking of adult male crab over a certain size, the Russian fishing effort is limited by no such restrictions. Their use of trawl gear, which was once available to American fishermen but no longer, destroyed and continues to destroy many of the crab which are not picked up by the gear itself. Further, the Russians did not return to the water small male or female crabs, which are necessary to the perpetuation of the fishery.

Last year when a representative of the U.S. State Department was at Kodiak, he suggested that Kodiak fishermen mark their buoy markers floating above their crab pot fishing gear plainly so that the Russians could see them and avoid running over them. Although our fishermen, at that time, attempted to explain to your representative that the Russians would pay no heed to marked gear, such attempts went unheeded. It was your representative's view that if any crab pots had, in fact, been destroyed, that it was inadvertent destruction on the part of the Russians and not willful.

The testimony herein indicates conclusively that such was not and is not the case. The Russian fishermen are aware that our own people know where the richest crab grounds are located. Hence, the Russians go where they see our boats and our gear (plainly marked) fishing for crab. They are not content merely to compete, but have undertaken destruction of the crab pot gear belonging to our people in full view of our fishermen. The reason for doing this is simple enough to understand. By destroying a number of crab pots, they have forced our fishermen to remove their remaining gear and retire from the area. Our fishermen cannot, of course, stand idly by while their fishing gear and means of making a living are destroyed. They must either give up grounds which we, i.e., the U.S. Department of the Interior and the State of Alaska, have cultivated and helped to bring to their present rich yields, or they will take some aggressive action against the invaders. I have consistently pointed out to the fishermen that violence will not resolve the matter and that the exercise of restraint is necessary. I can do no less than give you my impression of the situation, however, which is that our people will wait only so long before they take some sort of direct action against the Russians.

When the State Department filed a protest with the Russians, logic compelled our fishermen to wait and see and hope for a good outcome. However, on Saturday, September 21, 1963, and Tuesday, September 24, 1963, Russian vessels were again destroying our fishermen's crab gear off Kodiak Island. The situation is serious and warrants your direct action at once. The clearest and most direct solution to the problem is for the United States to declare that crab is a resource of our Continental Shelf. Other methods, such as protests to the Russian Ambassador or even directly to the Russian Government at Moscow through our Ambassador, will consume a great deal of time, even if such protests are effective ultimately in securing Russian withdrawal from crab fishing on the Continental Shelf.

This transcript contains the testimony of a Coast Guard officer, who was called to testify to his personal observation of the Russian crab efforts. His testimony corroborates that of the fishermen.

I urge you to give this matter your immediate and serious attention.

Sincerely,

William A. Egan,
Governor.

ALASKA'S ESKIMOS ARE WINNING THE FIGHT TO SURVIVE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a report in the New York Times of Monday, September 30, carries the headline "Eskimos Losing Fight To Survive; Crime and Alcohol Become a Problem as Civilization Changes Arctic Culture." The article, by Walter Sullivan, science editor of the Times, who is a very able member of the fourth estate, reports information which was divulged by Arctic specialists at a recent symposium held at Montreal, Quebec, Canada, under the auspices of McGill University and the Arctic Institute of North America.

I would like to comment on the article in order to point out that the Eskimos about whom this concern was expressed are Canadian and not Alaskan residents. The symposium dealt with the Canadian Arctic.

Although my administrative assistant, George Sundbork, was a speaker there, his address on the U.S. Arctic in Alaska simply drew comparisons with the Canadian Arctic and of course contained no dire report on the Eskimo, because the fact is that the Alaskan Eskimo, far from losing his fight to survive, is thriving. Alaskan Eskimos participate fully in the government of the 49th State. In fact, the President of the Alaska State Senate in its first session after the arrival of statehood was an Eskimo, William Beltz. Other Eskimos serve with distinction in our State legislature today. They include Senator Eben Hopson of Barrow, Representative Raymond Christiansen of Bethel, Representative Axel C. Johnson of Emmonak and Representative Jacob A. Stalker of Kotzebue. In earlier years Eskimo legislators in Alaska have included Senator Percy Ipalook of Wales, Representative Arthur D. Johnson of Nome, Representative Grace Johnson of Nome, Representative John Nusunginya of Barrow, Representative Frank Degnan of Unalakleet, Representative Charles Fagerstrom of Nome, Representative James K. Wells of Noorvik and Representative Clinton Grey of Nome. I might mention that the President of the Alaska State Senate in the Third State Legislature, which is the one now in being, is Senator Frank Peratrovich, who is an Indian from Klawock.

The report made at Montreal about the Canadian Eskimo was to the effect that these people are fighting an almost hopeless battle against the northward march of the white man's civilization and that the prognosis for survival of their culture is poor.

In Alaska, too, we are witnessing a passing of the old way of life of the Eskimo, but I am happy to be able to report that these wonderful people have been able to integrate themselves in the modern civilization which has been carried north by the white man and to hold their own in it. Perhaps one of the most striking evidences of the ability of Alaska Eskimos to adapt is found in the recent employment of 15 native youths as electronic technicians on the DEW line, the BMEWS System and the White Alice Communications System. Brought out of their native habitat for training in New York City and Los Angeles, these Eskimo youths made excellent grades in their studies and without a single exception were graduated possessed of highly sophisticated technical skills enabling them to obtain employment in what I am sure is one of the most modern and most exacting industries in the world today.

Other Eskimos have demonstrated their ability to operate bulldozers, maintain utilities, fly, maintain and overhaul airplanes, and succeed in many other positions of skill and responsibility.

It is true that old ways of life are changing for Eskimos, but I think it is no more true of them than it is for some of our own citizens who have moved in comparatively recent times from the coal oil lamp and the one-horse shay to the age of electric light and the automobile. The point which I think is important and which reflects great credit upon the Eskimo in Alaska is that he has been able to bridge the gap of centuries so as to survive in the modern world as he did in the era when whale hunting and ivory carving were parts of the main way of life.

The number of Eskimos in Alaska has increased steadily to where in 1960 it totaled 28,637. In 1890, which was about the time of the coming of the white man to the part of Alaska in which the Eskimo lives, the total was only 16,412. I believe the lot of the Eskimo has improved along with the increase in his numbers and that we are winning the battle to correct health, social, and employment conditions which in the Arctic have been problems in the past. I am proud of the record the Eskimo citizens of Alaska have made and are making in developing the 49th State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the article to which I referred, entitled "Eskimos Losing Fight To Survive," by Walter Sullivan, published in the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

ESKIMOS LOSING FIGHT TO SURVIVE—CRIME AND ALCOHOL BECOME A PROBLEM AS CIVILIZATION CHANGES ARCTIC CULTURE

(By Walter Sullivan)

Although the Eskimo has been to the world a model of industry, fortitude, and ingenuity, the prognosis for survival of his culture is poor.

This was the view expressed by a number of Arctic specialists who recently took part in a symposium organized in Montreal by McGill University and the Arctic Institute of North America.

Dr. Jacques Rousseau, a leading authority on the North, cited changes that have already taken place in the Far North. In a voice charged with shock and indignation he said:

"I am told there is a jail at Frobisher Bay, filled all the time with drunks and other offenders."

Frobisher Bay is on Baffin Island, deep within the realm of the Eskimo. Until a few years ago, jails were unknown at such outposts.

Other speakers told of drunkenness, minor crime, juvenile delinquency, and even prostitution springing up from Alaska, across the Arctic to Greenland. The Eskimos were depicted as fighting an almost hopeless battle against the northward march of the white man's civilization.

Dr. Rousseau, who has devoted much of his life to studying the plants and people of northern Quebec, said with passion:

"I hope we will not have to deplore the cultural genocide of the Eskimo people."

What emerged from the symposium was a picture of the ancient, simple, and in many respects noble, Eskimo way of life in inescapable confrontation with the way of the white man.

Tribute was paid to the walrus hunter and igloo builder, a jovial companion on the blizzard-swept trail. But it was felt his way could not survive in an age of jet planes, television, and air conditioning. We cannot, said Dr. Rousseau, put the Eskimo in a "zoological preserve."

Dr. Jacob Fried, anthropologist at McGill University, and others told how white men who went north once lived off the land like the natives and hence were close to them. They tended to remain there many years, if not for a lifetime, as trappers or pioneers.

Now the white man brings his environment with him, serves out his contracted tour of duty at a radar site, mine, or native settlement, then returns to his native habitat in the south.

The early-warning radar sites, with their taped television shows, stateside menus, and synthetic climate are one extreme example of the "canned urbanism" transported to the north.

One speaker told of meeting a man at such a site who had been there 6 months. "He went for a walk the first day, but apparently the weather was not to his liking and he had not been out since."

Thus the gulf between the Eskimo and his new neighbors has grown to vast dimensions. According to Margaret Lantis, U.S. anthropologist, Alaskan Eskimos have traditionally been their own bosses. Now they are trying to fit into a complex civilization where they work fixed hours, earn wages and have to become "good consumers."

Many, unfortunately, have only learned to consume alcoholic beverages. This problem, however, is limited chiefly to larger settlements, populated by hundreds, that are economically tied to the outside world. Many other Eskimos still live in remote, family sized communities, much like their ancestors.

The Eskimos have never been numerous. The Canadian Eskimo "working force" of males between 15 and 35 years of age is estimated at less than 2,000. Hence they are highly vulnerable to absorption by other races.

Dr. Helge Larsen, head of the Department of Ethnology at the Danish National Museum and a veteran of eight field seasons in Greenland, said that there were practically no pure Eskimos left in the ice-covered land.

They consider themselves "Greenlanders," he said, although they still speak their own brand of Eskimo and only 5 percent speak Danish. While drunkenness and minor crimes have been a problem, the rate, he said, has declined in the last few years.

LANGUAGE A BARRIER

There was wide agreement that the inability of many officials to speak Eskimo made it even more difficult for the inhabitants to live by a code they did not understand and was not of their own making.

One of the chief manifestations of the gulf between the Eskimos and their administrators has centered on the dog ordinance, which requires Eskimos to keep their huskies tethered.

Dr. Frank G. Vallee, a sociologist of McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, who has been living at Povungnituk on the northeast shore of Hudson Bay, told of efforts to curb an outbreak of rabies in that region. Not until the Eskimos were told that any loose dogs would be shot did they tether dogs, and then only with considerable resentment.

TREVOR GARDNER

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I want to say a few words today about Trevor Gardner, former Chief of Air Force Research and Development, who died a few days ago at the age of 48.

Trevor Gardner's death at the height of his powers is a grave loss to the Nation. But his family and friends have one great consolation: his place in history is assured. As a brilliant, dedicated, and fearless man, he, more than any other person, was responsible for this Nation achieving the intercontinental ballistic missile—in time.

Born in Wales—becoming an American citizen in 1937—Trevor Gardner studied engineering and business administration at the University of Southern California. By 1945 he was general manager and executive vice president of the General Tire & Rubber Co. of California. In 1948 he became president of the Hycon Manufacturing Co.

He came into the Government in 1953 as special assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development. Very quickly, he did not like what he saw. And by the time he resigned as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force in February 1956, his fight was well underway to unsnarl the ICBM program from bureaucratic redtape.

Before most of his countrymen understood the issue, Trevor Gardner had understood it. This Nation was engaged in a race of discovery for the ICBM, and failure in that race would cause a serious—even fatal—deterioration in our military and political position.

Trevor Gardner brought three qualities to this most important fight of his life:

First. Professional competence: He knew what he was talking about.

Second. Dedication: He knew that the United States, to survive, must spend its money, talent, and time on the missile program.

Third. Courage: He knew that stepping on important toes was necessary, and he was not afraid to do it. He knew that he must arouse concern and stimulate action in responsible Government circles, and he accepted the personal risks.

Upon his resignation, in protest against the foot dragging, Trevor Gardner kept up the fight, and with good results. The Government finally prosecuted the ICBM program energetically, and the Soviet Union beat us to this critical new weapon by only a few months.

As president and board chairman of Hycon, Trevor Gardner continued his energetic work to identify critical new projects and solve critical new problems in electronics, communications, data processing, and nucleonics. From 1960 to 1961 he served as chairman of the U.S. Air Force Space Task Force.

He held the Presidential Certificate of Merit and the Naval Ordnance Award.

Trevor Gardner gave the great part of his life to aid the cause of national defense—and he died, literally, in the service of his country.

We shall miss him. He represents the kind of patriot we need today more than ever before.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the New York Times, in an editorial in this morning's edition, describes the White House formula for preserving 11,700 acres of the irreplaceable Indiana dunes as a partial victory for the Nation.

The editorial correctly points out that "the tragic part" of the administration's compromise proposal "is that the victory comes after more than 1,000 acres of the loveliest of the dunes have been flattened by the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s bulldozers." It also observes that:

> The conditions the compromise plan establishes for the building of a Federal harbor are so restrictive that there is sound reason to suspect they will never be met.

The New York Times has been a stanch supporter for many years of the effort to save the Indiana dunes from industrialization and I know many Members of Congress will welcome this editorial statement of the continued interest of the Times in this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1963]

SAVING INDIANA'S DUNES

The conservationists who have fought so hard and so long to save what is left of the gleaming Indiana dunes have won a partial victory—and so has the Nation—in the White House decision to support an 11,700-acre national park in the dune area on the southern shore of Lake Michigan. True, the project is hitched to the development of another part of this priceless area as a harbor to serve integrated steel mills; and at least 700 acres of the land most worthy of protection against commercial spoliation is outside the proposed park.

Nevertheless, the White House approval of the compromise formula is a crucial first step toward protecting a tract three times as large as any the Save the Dunes Council believed possible when that dedicated group of volunteers (whose stanchest ally in Congress has been Senator Douglas, of Illinois) began its battle 5 years ago. The tragic part is that the victory comes after more than 1,000 acres of the loveliest of the dunes have been flattened by the Bethlehem Steel Co.'s bulldozers.

Nothing can be done to restore these demolished natural treasures, but the conditions the compromise plan establishes for the building of a Federal harbor are so restrictive that there is sound reason to suspect they will never be met. This likelihood keeps alive the hopes that more duneland can eventually be included in the park for the permanent enjoyment of all Americans.

HIKERS LOSE HEARTS IN SAWTOOTHS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, many people who have "lost their minds" in the busy rush of Washington must annually retreat to more primitive settings to regain their sanity. Some of the more knowledgeable Washingtonians make the trip to the Idaho wildnerness to make their communion with nature and restore their equilibrium. Recently, 43 members of the Potomac Appalachian Trail Club made a hiking trip through the Sawtooth area in central Idaho. Their reaction, predictable to all who know that beautiful area, was "we lost our hearts to that magnificent country."

This is the very area, Mr. President, which would be created a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park by S. 2188, a bill which I introduced on Monday of this week.

The trip by the trail club was reported by Dorothy M. Martin in an article which appeared in the outdoors section of the September 20 issue of the Washington Post. The article is entitled "Hikers Lose Hearts in Sawtooths." I am well aware that travelers to the Sawtooths may lose their hearts to that area, but they will regain their peace of mind. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1963]

Hikers Lose Hearts in Sawtooths

(By Dorothy M. Martin)

Forty-three members of the Potomac Appalachian Trail Club invaded the Sawtooth Mountains in Idaho.

We lost our hearts to that magnificent country.

The first day's hike was an eyeopener and a blister raiser. (There was a sellout of moleskin at the little general store connected with the lodge where we spent the night.)

That first day the hikers ate dust stirred up by their 80 pounding feet. (We excoriated the horses that had pulverized the sand and the stone into a gray dust.) But, because the trails were built for pack trains, the Forest Service had graded them well with switchbacks. This made hiking into the mountain country fairly easy.

The 200,900-acre Sawtooth wilderness sprawls across three national forests—Sawtooth, Challis, and Boise. It is a land of ragged peaks and deep canyons, alpine meadows and glacial lakes.

We quickly learned not to keep together. So, the second day, we split into "fast and fars," "moderates," and "slows." But by 10 a.m. the slow group had overtaken the moderates; at day's end the moderates had traveled farther than the fast-and-far contingent.

Eventually, we settled on conversational groups, spaced to avoid one another's dust.

Our headquarters was 40-year-old Redfish Lake Lodge, which provides a magnificent view of Mount Heyburn and the Grand Mogul, guardians of Redfish Creek Canyon. Gas heaters warmed the lodge rooms but cabin dwellers depended on fireplaces for early morning and after sunset heat.

Between dinner and bedtime, we saw slides of the country; one night a forest naturalist presented a program on the joys and satisfactions of mountain climbing. Another evening, we eastern tenderfeet participated in a western hootenanny, led by Dick Pierce, a guitar-playing deputy sheriff.

During the Idaho excursion, some members dug in old mines and rock slides for crystals, threw stones against other stones in search of agates and even walked home with a cup of "diggins" from an old gold dredge in Yankee Fork Canyon.

Those who climbed Blackman Peak spent 15 minutes watching a badger which was annoyed enough by the group to spit twice. When the hikers left, he turned his back and resumed digging his hole.

There were chippies to feed; black squirrels raced around like kittens; rock rabbits ventured out to see who had invaded their privacy. Deer fed near the lodge and one evening nine hikers traveled to Decker Flats to see elk feed. This was little better than a back-home snipe hunt.

Amateur botanists identified pentstemon, gentian, arnica, lupin, paintbrush, monkeyflower and pink elephant heads blooming profusely in the sandy soil. There were trips to Custer, once a thrilling mining town of 350, now a ghost village.

The second week, after feet had been toughened on climbs to Bench Lake, Alpine Lake, Sawtooth Lake, Fishhook Creek, Hell Roaring Creek and Mount Blackman, 19 of us were ready for a 4-day trek into the wilderness.

Menus, carefully planned in Washington, were revised. Much of the food had been mailed from home. Friday night found packs being weighed and reweighed and nonessentials cast out.

Each person had to carry a share of community gear—food, lightweight tarps for rain (which fortunately never fell) and gasoline stoves and fuel.

Preparations were made for below freezing nights and sharp winds as well as blistering sun. Finally, weights were reduced to about 30 pounds, except for a couple of camera fiends, Fred Blackburn and Kenneth Roberts, who carried 45 to 50 pounds.

The hike started at Pettit Lake, the trail rose gradually to Alice Lake and the Twins over a 9,300-foot pass and down to Toxaway Lake. From there the climb was steep to 9,300-foot Sandy Pass.

The trail crossed a snowfield and over a knife edge before it dropped sharply, slabbing a stony mountainside, leading finally to Edna and Virginia Lakes at the head of the South Fork of the Payette River.

A right turn near Virginia Lake took the group up over a pass in back of Payette Peak. The trail circled Mount Cramer and descended into the great cirque which cradles the three Cramer Lakes. From here it led downhill through Redfish Creek Canyon and out to the head of the lake where the group was met by boats 6 miles from the lodge.

Long to be remembered was the delicious eastern brook trout caught by our lone fisherman—Jeanette Fitzwilliams—and eaten by all for breakfast.

Main courses, planned by John and Suzanne Kominsky, were rice and chicken, beef and spuds, noodles stroganoff with chicken and a dehydrated green salad. Desserts varied from chocolate pudding with coconut to date nut roll with topping, and applesauce with cookies.

Lunches were standard—cheese, hard sausage that needed no refrigeration, chocolate bits, nuts and raisins, and a special grape mix for water or snow.

We met on the third day a fellow Washingtonian way back in the mountains, covering almost the same route but in reverse and on horseback—Edward P. Cleff, Chief of the Forest Service. With him were the regional forester from Ogden, with his recreation assistant, two forest supervisors, two forest rangers, and a wrangler.

The hikers presented a picture strange enough to frighten the horses. Some were wearing sunbonnets, many were smeared with white zinc oxide, kelty packs riding high over their heads.

Mental pictures remain of the glow of the setting sun on reddish brown and gray spires, of clear cool water in which every twig and stone was visible, of snowbanks in little pockets on the mountains, of grand vistas at the top of the pass which opened up a whole new canyon.

But most of all the group will remember the peace of mind that came in this bleak and barren country—the satisfaction of living with the weather and harsh terrain of the high lands.

Each of us vowed to explore again the wilderness that looks much the same as it did when Idaho was first settled, hoping that nothing would ever disturb this land which looks so harsh, which can be brutal, but which is fragile and should remain forever wilderness.

ADDRESS OF JOHN W. MACY, JR., DELIVERED BEFORE THE FEDERAL HEARING EXAMINERS CONFERENCE SEMINAR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., delivered an outstanding address at a luncheon meeting of the Federal Hearing Examiners Conference Seminar on September 24.

Chairman Macy stressed the high quality of the public service in this field. Many important cases come before these hearing examiners and their judgment and decisions can have long-range implications and often affect the lives and fortunes of millions of our citizens, both present and future.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

The Need To Know

(Address by John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, given Tuesday, September 24, 1963, at a luncheon meeting of the Federal Hearing Examiners Conference Seminar in the National Lawyers Club, 1815 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C.)

The last time I was privileged to address an audience of Federal hearing examiners, I delivered the long sought and much desired word that hearing examiners had finally shattered the "supergrade barrier," at least to the magic number of 99. Circumstances do not permit me to repeat that delightful performance today. But I am personally optimistic that on this pay front Congress will follow through on the comparability concept of the Salary Reform Act and adjust upward the new salary scales which are scheduled to become effective in January.

Rather than pursue the crass subject of dollar compensation at an educational meeting, however, I plan to talk today in terms of other compensation—the type of compensation which accrues to you, your Government, and your fellow citizens when you seek to improve your grasp of issues—and thus your qualifications—through the pursuit of education for personal enrichment and extended capability.

This seminar is a historic occasion marking a combined recognition of this type of compensation by hearing examiners, educators, and Government officials. I am proud to represent the Civil Service Commission and its keen interest in the launching of this important educational enterprise in the public interest. The opportunity to collaborate with the Federal Hearing Examiners Conference in this project has been extremely gratifying and marks another contemporary advance toward the objective of high quality public service.

Your attendance at this seminar indicates your awareness that as conditions change, professional people must prepare themselves to be responsive to that change—indeed, that professional people must become partners to progressive change.

It becomes increasingly apparent that the tried-and-true, the comfortably familiar, the "standard" methods and procedures of yesterday are often not adequate in the face of today's new needs.

You who hold responsible positions in the regulatory agencies of Government, who hear all sides of the argument, who weigh the facts with great care to arrive at an appropriate decision, must assure yourselves that your ruling or your recommendation takes account of the long-range implications as well as the more visible hard evidence at hand.

Since your judgment in a given case might have a major impact on the lives and fortunes of millions of citizens, present and future, the burden is upon you to have a broad grasp of all the ramifications. You, perhaps more so than any other group of professionals, must guard constantly against the temptation to become static.

The most effective antidote to the paralysis of complacency is knowledge—updated knowledge—hence your attendance at this seminar.

The nature of your work dates back at least to the reign of King Solomon, in recorded history, and logic compels us to believe that even that wise monarch must have been guided by laws, rules, and precedents as he groped for the decisions which would result in justice for all.

The course of human history has generated complexities of government and society that necessitate an ever expanding circle of laws, rules, and precedents which must be interpreted and applied with logic and equity. The escalation of technology, the explosion of population and the diversity of economic forces have imposed vastly greater responsibilities on those who must reach fair and equitable judgments in the public interest.

A specific and timely example of these trends which comes to mind from recent headlines is the venerable railroad situation with its clash of social, economic, and technical forces. For nearly a century, the railroad, as the principal means of American transportation, was a major employer and an essential pace setter for economic growth. For years the rail systems were powered by steam locomotives requiring both an engineer and a fireman. During these years railroad workers became highly organized. Their brotherhoods constituted a major example of labor union activity for other industry employees to follow. This development produced the labor-management bargaining table, the work contract, and the negotiation process which provided examples for other industries. Because of the essential nature of the rail industry and its interstate character, labor-management laws were enacted and strengthened.

Then, through a technological advance, a locomotive which could be operated by one person was conceived and produced.

Railroad management, responsive to the interests of stockholders who sought higher profit through increased efficiency, adopted the new engines.

Rail unions held out for work guarantees for employees.

All the elements required for a major showdown were present.

The controversy stormed beyond the bargaining table, beyond the regulatory process, and through the courts to a final decision. The Supreme Court ruled that the railroads would no longer be required to employ firemen for locomotives on which they were not needed. Railroad management announced its intention to operate diesel locomotives without firemen, and negotiations between the unions and the railroads failed. A date was set for a strike. And ultimately, legislative action was required to avert a national crisis which to some degree would have touched the life of every citizen. And, of course, the basic issue is not yet resolved.

My point in discussing this already familiar subject is not to make the point that an all-American hearing examiner could have resolved the issue at the first level, and thus have extinguished a brush fire before the entire forest was threatened.

Rather, I feel this situation illustrates the enormous complexity and significant interrelation of issues in our times. It places into perspective the need for responsible people at all levels to maintain an awareness of all the ramifications of a given case.

The rail issue might be more far reaching, more complicated, and more profound than some of the cases you hear, but I dare say that few if any of your cases are simple, solitary, or without deep significance.

It is for this reason that I commend this seminar and urge you to continue your education beyond the law, beyond the rules, beyond the precedents—and that you become tomorrow minded in the application of laws to the case at hand.

You can only become tomorrow minded by maintaining an open, inquisitive mind, and through the pursuit of further education—an education that must continue throughout a career.

Your basic education, your admission to the bar, your familiarity with laws and pertinent regulations are basic essentials which form the bedrock upon which you base further learning.

It is the objective of the Civil Service Commission to work with you and the heads of your agencies in the development and initiation of a variety of interagency training courses for hearing examiners. These courses should be designed to meet the needs we jointly recognize as essential for continuing improvement of performance.

This objective is an integral part of the Commission's broad determination to provide, in concert with agencies and examiners, the best and most enlightened program of personnel administration which can be conceived under existing statutory authority. It is our definite purpose to move assertively to clear away any administrative underbrush which hampers your efficiency or stands in the way of your continued development.

When we met in March, I recited a number of steps we have taken to improve the hearing examiners personnel system and to make that system more responsive to the needs of modern government. Our efforts have not waned in the succeeding 6 months.

The most significant demonstration of this effort has been in the review and improvement of the examining machinery for the selection of future hearing examiners. For a period of several months and in the course of many, many meetings the Commission's Advisory Committee on Hearing Examiners, chaired by National Labor Relations Board Chairman Frank McCulloch and with representation of your conference, Paul Pfeiffer and Leo Pellerzi, has worked with the Commission in a creative and hardheaded fashion to design this new machinery. A revised and updated announcement of this new examination will be published around the first of the year. It will reflect a determination to establish high standards of qualification for entry into the hearing examiner corps of the future. These higher standards will include the requirement of membership in the bar and additional relevant experience in administrative law. The Commission is grateful to the advisory committee membership for its significant contribution to this project. I can assure you that your representatives reflected your interests and sentiments in the process of developing this new examining machinery.

Good personal administration, we know, requires more than merely the getting of good men for important jobs. It means keeping a good incumbent on the rolls, preparing him for greater responsibility, and providing an atmosphere which is conducive to individual excellence.

We are more than willing to work with the heads of your agencies to attain these goals; we are eager, for it is in the national interest to have the best hearing examiner program our resources can provide.

The need to know has never been more imperative.

This need is evidenced in many areas of Federal operation. We have observed it in the Federal Government's exercise of leadership in the installation of computers. We have learned that "skills retreading" can be accomplished for clerical personnel whose jobs require new capability to deal with new techniques. In research and development there is mounting evidence that scientists, engineers, and managers can be improved through specially designed retreading processes.

It would be folly for us to assume that hearing examiners could not or should not become the beneficiaries of the same process.

I believe that more solid improvement has been made in the administration of the Federal hearing examiner program in the past 2 years than was made in any comparable period.

I say this not in an attempt to boast of the Civil Service Commission's contribution to that progress but rather to illustrate that a greater awareness of the importance of your function has become manifest.

The progress which we have made to date, while significant, must be considered a prelude to the further progress we can make.

I want to assure you of the Civil Service Commission's intent to make the hearing examiner program better. And I want to reemphasize how important it is for you to make it better through continued efforts to improve yourself.

Today's need is for excellence in all of the ocmplex aspects of government administration. Whatever can enhance the capabilities of the hearing examiner corps serving our Government and our Nation is worthy of the best efforts of all of us.

THE FOREIGN AID BILL—ARTICLE BY REPRESENTATIVE WINFIELD DENTON

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on September 4, 1963, there appeared in the Corydon Democrat an article by the distinguished Representative WINFIELD K. DENTON, of Indiana. The article, headlined "Congress Battle on Foreign Aid This Year Is Over," deals with the manner in which the House of Representatives cut the foreign aid appropriations.

Having studied this problem extensively, Representative DENTON has brought out many enlightening points on the necessity of enactment of the foreign aid bill.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee since his election to the 81st Congress, Representative DENTON has developed a great knowledge of appropriations bills. Mr. President, because of his expertise on foreign aid appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that Representative DENTON's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS BATTLE ON FOREIGN AID THIS YEAR IS OVER

(By Congressman WINFIELD DENTON, of Indiana)

The House has passed the controversial foreign aid bill by a relatively close vote of 224 to 181. A surprising number of Democrats voted against the measure on final passage and it would not have passed without some Republican support.

Generally, however, the Republican Party was opposed to the measure. During the Eisenhower administration the Democrats supported the foreign aid program, since they felt that the administration needed a great deal of discretion and support in its defense and foreign aid program.

When this year's bill came before the House the Republican opposition was unusually bitter—the most bitter I have seen in years. They offered 25 amendments to the bill and took advantage of every parliamentary trick and device to prolong the bill's hearing and delay action on the bill.

Several of the amendments were adopted, trimming the amount authorized, $585 million, to $3,502,075,000. The Democratic leadership pointed out many times in the course of debate that they had displayed a cooperative attitude on foreign policy and national defense during the Eisenhower administration and deploring the fact that the

Republicans were not taking a similar attitude under a Democratic administration.

I think that it is exceedingly unfortunate that the Republicans have developed such an attitude and assumed the position they have. I feel that we cannot afford to let down our guard at this period of the cold war. I look upon the foreign aid program as a military expenditure of the cold war.

We are spending $50 billion a year in armaments and preparedness which we pray will never be needed. Through our foreign aid program we are helping underdeveloped countries to become self-supporting through educational and technical assistance. We are making great strides at present. We are also helping these countries to maintain armies to help in the defense of the free world.

Of the total foreign aid expenditures, $1,200 million is for military assistance to these foreign countries. If these countries were unable to maintain their armies we would probably have to provide American troops to do the work they are doing. Obviously it is much less expensive to assist the countries to maintain their own armies than it would be to supply our own troops for defensive purposes.

Although I have been critical of the foreign aid program in the past, I have generally supported the program. I feel that too much money has been expended; that planning for the spending of the money has been insufficient, and that we are spread out entirely too thin in our operation of the program.

I feel that the foreign aid program is a part of our cost of the cold war. Any good soldier knows that the time to attack is when the enemy is divided. The rift between the Russian and Chinese Communists has divided the Communist world. It is effecting changes in behavior of Communists all over the world. The fight started last fall over the Cuban situation. You remember, of course, that while the Kennedy administration inherited the Cuban situation from the former administration, it dealt with the problem in a masterful way. Khrushchev was arming the island with nuclear weapons and upon President Kennedy's demand, he withdrew the weapons. Many people have said this was the turning point in the cold war. The Chinese Communists immediately said the Russians were yellow and cowardly. Khrushchev, on the other hand, disclaimed the charges, saying that he was a man of peace and had acted accordingly. At any rate a rift has developed and is growing bitterly at the present time. I believe that now is the time for our all-out offensive against Communist encroachment of the free world and that our foreign aid program is one part of that offensive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of a number of nominations on the Executive Calendar which I understand have been cleared by both the minority and the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. True Davis, Jr., of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to address the Senate today in support of the pending nomination. Mr. W. True Davis, Jr., who has been nominated by the President to be our Ambassador to Switzerland is a warm, personal friend and one of the most able men I have ever had the privilege to know. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Foreign Relations Committee for the expeditious manner in which it considered and approved this nomination.

Mr. President, the many accomplishments of True Davis demonstrate clearly that he possesses a keen mind, a capacity for leadership, and an ability to work with others. I could spend considerable time reading his accomplishments in the business world into the record. He has been an officer and/or a member of the board of directors of about 2 dozen business corporations. However, I would call the Senate's attention to only two of these positions which give clear evidence of his abilities. True Davis until recently has been president and a director of Philip Roxane, Inc., one of the Nation's major firms producing pharmaceuticals in the human, animal, and plant health fields. He has also been vice president and a director of Philips Electronics & Pharmaceutical Industries Corp. In these positions, he has gained wide experience not only in the national business world but in the international business world. Such experience seems uniquely essential to the ambassador post in Switzerland.

True Davis, while achieving success in the business world, has not neglected his community, his State, or his Nation. His civic contributions have been many and varied. He has been a director of the National Association of Boys Clubs of America and director of the Little League. He has served on the executive committee of the United Fund. He has been active in the Veterans of Foreign Wars serving as chairman of the State Americanism committee. He founded and operates a foundation which last year purchased the large building and grounds of the former Convent of the Sacred Heart in St. Joseph and gave them to the city of St. Joseph for use as a museum. During World War II, he served in the Navy as a lieutenant senior grade. He was chief test pilot at the Naval Air Station at Pearl Harbor. Also, he has served as a member of the Department of Commerce Export Expansion Council.

To return to the business field, True Davis has been active in the National Association of Manufacturers and the State chamber of commerce. He has received a number of recognitions including his election to the Academy of Missouri Squires.

I could continue for some time along this line for the list of True Davis' activities, accomplishments and recognitions is very long. However, I shall bring my comments to an end by pointing out he is a member of the Christ Episcopal Church of St. Joseph.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to act favorably on this nomination for I believe the record shows clearly that Mr. W. True Davis, Jr., is eminently qualified for the post of Ambassador to Switzerland. I am confident that he will serve our Nation well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dan H. Fenn, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about Mr. Fenn. Mr. Fenn has performed outstandingly as a citizen of Massachusetts and as a member of the White House staff for the past several years. I believe he will be an excellent addition to the Tariff Commission.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will be state the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Colin Munro MacLeod, of New York, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Russell Alexander Dixon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term of 4 years expiring August 3, 1967.

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Herman Howe Fussler, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for a term of 4 years expiring August 3, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 503. All these measures have been cleared with the minority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first measure.

WILMER R. BRICKER

The bill (H.R. 1191) for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

KATHRYN MARSHALL

The bill (H.R. 1458) for the relief of Kathryn Marshall was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. WOODHOUSE

The bill (H.R. 1726) for the relief of William H. Woodhouse was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JUSTINE M. DUBENDORF

The bill (H.R. 2770) for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EDWIN AND BRUCE BENNETT

The bill (H.R. 3219) to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN COUNTIES IN SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

The bill (S. 721) to amend section 124 of title 28, United States Code, to transfer Austin, Fort Bend, and Wharton Counties from the Galveston division to the Houston division of the southern district of Texas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (1) of section 124(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The Galveston Division comprises the counties of Brazoria, Chambers, Galveston, and Matagorda.

"Court for the Galveston Division shall be held at Galveston."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 124(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Houston Division comprises the counties of Austin, Brazos, Colorado, Fayette, Fort Bend, Grimes, Harris, Madison, Montgomery, Polk, San Jacinto, Trinity, Walker, Waller, and Wharton.

"Court for the Houston Division shall be held at Houston."

GEORGIE LOU RADER

The bill (S. 1206) for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act providing for the barring of claims against the United States," approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Georgie Lou Rader, of Knoxville, Tennessee, the sum of $1,440, representing the amount of the six months' death gratuity payable to her upon the death of her son, Second Lieutenant Kenneth R. Rader, who died on March 27, 1945, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, the said Georgie Lou Rader having relied upon erroneous information from United States Army personnel that she might file application for such gratuity at any time: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ARIZONA MILLING CO. OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The bill (S. 1269) for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co. of Phoenix, Ariz., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Arizona Milling Company, Phoenix, Arizona, the sum of $4,880.05. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of such company arising out of certain expenditures made by it for labor, methyl bromide gas, and other materials and equipment purchased or rented by it in order to accomplish a fumigation process in the company's Tucson plant which was made necessary when the United States Department of Agriculture imposed a twenty-day quarantine on such plant on the basis of a mistaken determination by the Department that specimens of larvae collected at that plant were grain feeding insects known as khapra beetles, the Department having subsequently removed such quarantine after notifying such company that the specimens had been erroneously identified: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

WILLIAM C. DOYLE

The bill (H.R. 1192) for the relief of William C. Doyle was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CAPT. LEON M. GERVIN

The bill (H.R. 1281) for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

OLIVER BROWN

The bill (H.R. 1459) for the relief of Oliver Brown was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL COMMISSION ON DISPOSITION OF ALCATRAZ ISLAND

The bill (H.R. 1709) to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JOSE DOMENECH

The bill (H.R. 2256) for the relief of Jose Domenech was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JESSE FRANKLIN WHITE

The bill (H.R. 2751) for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HERBERT B. SHORTER, SR.

The bill (H.R. 3450) for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WALLACE J. KNERR

The bill (H.R. 3843) for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H.R. 4965) for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD T. HUGHES

The bill (H.R. 5307) for the relief of Edward T. Hughes was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

L. C. ATKINS & SON

The bill (H.R. 5811) for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

QUALITY SEAFOOD, INC.

The bill (H.R. 5812) for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT L. NOLAN

The bill (H.R. 6373) for the relief of Robert L. Nolan, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARGARET L. MOORE

The bill (H.R. 6443) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. GENEVA H. TRISLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R 2268) for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Geneva H. Trisler, of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, the sum of $322.56. This sum represents the amount remaining due as compensation for services rendered the United States Post Office, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, during the period November 1, 1949, to and including May 7, 1952: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SP5C. CURTIS MELTON, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6377) for the relief of Sp5c. Curtis Melton, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$1,180.95" and insert "$1,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ELMER ROYAL FAY, SR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 573) for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$5,644.24" and insert "$228.68", and in line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "April 2, 1945" and insert "July 1, 1947"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise authorized appropriated, to Elmer Royal Fay, Senior, captain, United States Army, retired, of Hillcrest Heights, Maryland, the sum of $226.68, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for compensation for retired pay which was withheld from him by the United States during the period from July 1, 1947, through August 11, 1947, while the said Elmer Royal Fay, Senior, was an employee of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, at Washington, District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABOLITION OF FORMAL TERMS FOR DISTRICT COURTS

The bill (H.R. 2845) to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection. I thank the Senate for its consideration.

TRIBUTE TO HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN ON THE 96TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, again October falls upon the calendar. It prompts our annual tribute to a former colleague within whose life 96 milestones bear the date of October 2.

Theodore Francis Green greets this day in his Rhode Island home in the midst of birthday greetings numbering in the thousands. Yet they make only a small fraction of the millions whose lives he has influenced for the better.

As Governor of his native Rhode Island and as Senator in these Halls of his long patriotic service there have been few statesmen whose immediate labors have meant so much for so many.

It has been my privilege on many occasions to dwell upon the character of a friend I hold in deepest appreciation and affection. His character was indelibly unselfish. He had one goal—perfection in public service.

Brown University—the college of his lasting loyalty—has an honor roll of great sons. To recall only a few—there is John Hay in statesmanship; Charles Evans Hughes in judiciary; John D. Rockefeller in philanthropy. To these I would add Theodore Francis Green—for citizenry.

Indeed, Brown University has lately published a biography of its beloved son, "Theodore Francis Green—His Rhode Island Years." The author, Erwin L. Levine, has captured much of the color of the political background against which this young man of Brown—of Bonn and of Harvard law—rose to power and responsibility.

The biography is an engrossing study and yet there are those of us who know chapters more intimate than can be caught by any printed page. We knew in him some of the scholarly wisdom of Woodrow Wilson; something of the decisiveness of Harry Truman; much of the humanitarianism of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was contemporary with all of them and contained something of the particular Americanism of each of them.

But we can borrow for our final accolade the last lines of his new biography, their summary: "A gentleman, a leader, a wise politician, and an able statesman—Theodore Francis Green was all of these."

To all this we give our assent and add our personal affection, and our heartfelt wish and prayer, on this October 2 of 1963, of health and happiness to Theodore Francis Green—valued friend and great American.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join in the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island, who served so long, so ably, and so well with our former colleague. I am sure the Senator recalls that Theodore Francis Green was given an unusual honor by his colleagues in the Committee on Foreign Relations when he was named chairman emeritus. That honor, I believe, is an indication of the esteem in which he is held.

I am sure also that Theodore Francis Green is pleased with his extremely capable successor, CLAIBORNE PELL. I need not say anything about the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who of course has established a reputation of great renown, not only throughout his own State but also throughout the country and the world. Along with CLAIBORNE PELL, he gives to Rhode Island, I believe, about the best possible representation in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to add a word of tribute to former Senator Green. As one who served with Theodore Francis Green when we each held office in our respective State governments, when he was Governor of Rhode Island and I was Speaker of the House of Massachusetts, we had a number of relationships. Then when I came to the U.S. Senate, we had a very pleasant time. I respected him particularly because of his keen wit. I always knew that if I made any statement of a character that required a reply, Senator Green's reply would always be better than the remarks I had made to start the discussions.

So I join the Senator from Rhode Island in congratulating Theodore Francis Green on his 96th birthday. We miss him here.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I now yield to my colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my colleagues in honoring our old friend, and my predecessor, former Senator Theodore Francis Green, on the occasion of the 96th anniversary of his birth.

While I am sad to say that today his body is laid low by a broken leg, I can report that his mind and his spirit are keen and vigorous.

I wish him a quick recovery, and many more and happy birthdays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES IN CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order of yesterday, the Senate will now resume the consideration of S. 1006, relating to the construction of fishing vessels. There is a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to this bill limiting debate and controlling the time.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1006) to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARTLETT obtained the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute, and it is for the purpose of announcing that at the conclusion of action on the pending business the next order of business will be House Joint Resolution 247, a joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934. I wanted to make that announcement for the information of Senators.

If the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] would yield to me, I would like, under the time on the bill, to suggest the absence of a quorum without his losing the right to the floor.

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, debate on S. 1006 was commenced yesterday. I do not propose to make an extended statement.

It is noted that minority views have been filed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. Their objections, as I read them, go to the point that this is a subsidy program. And so it is. We concede that. We know it. In reporting the bill from the committee it was the determination and conclusion of the Committee on Commerce that such a subsidy program is essential if the American fishing industry is to be revived.

There are two subsidy programs in effect already. One was intended to be operative as a consequence of a law enacted by the Congress in 1960. That law provided for a subsidy payment in construction of fishing vessels on the part of the Federal Government to a maximum of 33⅓ percent. It was surrounded by such restrictions and so many limitations that, since the time it has been in effect, only six vessels have been built under the program, and subsidy payments have been made on the order of something like three-quarters of a million dollars.

That program has not worked. It cannot work. There has been ample demonstration of that fact. But, Mr. President, there is another subsidy, and it is paid by someone else entirely. It is paid by American fishermen, and has been paid by American fishermen for more than two centuries.

Long ago it was the conclusion of the country, as reflected through its Congress, that all fishing vessels of 5 tons or more would have to be built in U.S. shipbuilding yards. And so they are. A vessel built abroad is not permitted to land fish at an American port.

What has been the effect? It has been disastrous. It costs far more to build a fishing vessel or, for that matter, any other kind of vessel, in an American yard than in a foreign yard. This was realized by the preceding Congress, when it increased the subsidy for the construction of our subsidized vessels in the foreign trade to a maximum of 55 percent. It is true that this maximum figure is not always reached, but in some cases it is essential, if the American ship operator is to have a decent chance to compete against foreign vessels. What is happening now? Most fishermen are independent operators. For a long time, the little fishermen have been paying out of their own pockets to support what has been determined to be a national need, namely, a viable shipbuilding industry. This is altogether unfair. It should not be permitted to continue. S. 1006 proposes to solve that problem by permitting a subsidy payment of up to 55 percent for the construction of a fishing vessel. In all cases, of course, the maximum of 55 percent will not be required, although in some cases it will. My judgment is that even if it were required in every case, it would still be justified.

The program, under the bill as reported to the Senate, is for a 5-year period. It is for a total of $50 million, $10 million a year. It will be said, I am sure, by opponents of the bill that this is a foot-in-the-door approach; that if we pass the bill it will be discovered that the proponents of the legislation will seek extensions. This may very well be true. If the program works well, if it does what we believe it will do, I believe it ought to be extended. The cost to the American taxpayer will be much less than the benefits that will come to the country.

Let me illustrate what I mean. As recently as 1940, the United States imported from foreign nations fishery products with a total value of $41 million. Every year since then, in the 23 years which have followed, the amount and value of such imports have increased. Last year it was discovered that we imported fish, edible and nonedible, from the east, the west, the south, and the north with a total value of close to half a billion dollars—$473 million, to be exact. In all this time, it is not so much that the American fishing effort has lagged, because of obsolete equipment, vessels, and gear, but because the foreign fleets have been modernized and improved, and have ranged over the seven seas, discovering new fishing grounds. Now, as we know all too well, they are coming into waters which we have regarded as historically our own.

The Committee on Commerce, which reported the bill, was told that West Germany, for example, is scrapping, in favor of newer ships, fishing vessels that were built as recently as 1954. In the United States a 1954 vessel would be regarded as absolutely new. The committee was told that one American vessel, still fishing, was built almost a hundred years ago. It is still operating out of a Florida port. There are several more that are scarcely less aged.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to report to the Senator from Alaska that we in Massachusetts lost one last year which was more than 73 years old.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is rather typical. It is typical, also, that off the New England coast and off the Alaska coast and off other coasts the foreign fishing vessels, some of them larger and with more tonnage than an American heavy cruiser, are moving in, equipped to stay on the fishing grounds for months.

We are in a competitive world. We are a great maritime nation. We have been a great fishing nation. There is some doubt about whether we still are. We ought to revive it for our own good, for our own people, for our own national interest.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

Fishing has played an important role in the history of this Nation from its very beginnings. From the days of colonization, through the Revolution, during the early years of independence, and into the

19th century, the fishing industry made a significant contribution to our survival. Now we are called upon to contribute to its survival.

At the present time a Russian fishing trawler, one of a modern fleet of over 300 ships, is anchored off Truoro, Mass., harbor for repairs. This fleet has been operating in increasing numbers on what we have considered our traditional fishing grounds. I understand we may expect a Japanese fleet on Georges Bank next year.

We must maintain a strong fishing industry for reasons of prestige and security. In terms of national prestige, we cannot afford to permit this industry to falter because of inattention and neglect. In the law which terminated this past June, Congress recognized that the Defense Establishment requires a strong modern fleet of fishing vessels readily adaptable to small craft operations in times of national emergency. The pending bill would reaffirm this program.

Over one-half million persons are employed directly or indirectly in the U.S. fishing industry. This figure includes not only fishermen, processors and retailers, but also transporters, brokers, equipment manufacturers, wholesalers, shipyard employees, and those in related service trades. Thus, these people, as well as their dependents, who number about 2 million, are affected by the welfare of the industry. The passage of S. 1006, by stimulating shipbuilding, would also serve to increase employment in each of these fields.

As a nation we are becoming increasingly dependent upon others to catch our fish. As imports increase, more American dollars are going abroad. Imports of groundfish fillets and blocks for the year 1962 amounted to 221 million pounds, an increase of 8 percent over the previous 1961 high. These imports supplied the U.S. market with 71 percent of the total. Think of it: 71 percent of these fish that we eat comes from abroad. In 1962 the fishery products imported by the United States were valued at $473,698,000. Our share of the world fish catch has been nearly halved since 1946 from 13 to 7 percent. The domestic industry's share of the total U.S. consumption of groundfish fillets has declined from 55 to 29 percent. A strong domestic industry is essential, therefore, if consumers are not to be placed at the mercy of prices set by foreign operations.

The above figures are only manifestations of the central problem. Our fishing fleet is disintegrating. The average age of large trawlers operating from Boston and engaged in the groundfish industry is 22.4 years. The average medium trawler fishing in North Atlantic waters was built in 1941. Small trawlers are even older—the average vessel having been built in 1938. Over 84 percent of the Massachusetts fishing fleet is comprised of ships over 15 years old. In contrast, Germany is scrapping trawlers that are only 9 years old. Turning to Gloucester, the size of the fleet in this Massachusetts city has decreased by 50 percent since 1950. These figures are representative of the cancer which is destroying fleets in other areas of the country. While the age of the Massachusetts fishing fleet increases, its size decreases. If we are to improve our competitive position, it is imperative that this trend be reversed.

Another important consequence of our failure to concern ourselves sufficiently with the maintenance of a strong and thriving fishing industry is that young people who normally would be attracted to the work are turning elsewhere. Today few recruits are being obtained and there are insufficient replacements for those who are retiring. Young men may hear the call of the sea, but they will not be enticed to enter an industry which is decaying more each year.

The income derived from fish and fish products has remained nearly the same. However, the costs of ship construction, insurance, maintenance, and equipment have risen sharply. In other words, gross income has remained almost the same, but the cost of doing business has greatly increased. Much of the U.S. fishing industry, therefore, has degenerated to the status of marginal or submarginal operations. Within a period of 3 years, the United States dropped from second to fifth place as a fishing nation. Essentially the problem stems from the obsolescence of our fleet. During the first session of the 87th Congress, we learned that the U.S. Government was helping 20 foreign countries improve their fisheries. In addition, the Governments of Russia, Japan, Canada, Great Britain, and Germany are doing far more to aid their fishing industries than is the United States. Our fleet is inferior in terms of size, age, and equipment. Because shipbuilding costs in the United States today are almost prohibitive for our fishing industry, and because our laws do not permit the use by our fishermen of cheaper vessels built abroad, Government assistance is urgently needed.

S. 1006 would, I believe, be a significant incentive to the modernization of our fishing industry. The subsidy program would last until 1968 and the annual authorization for Federal assistance would be increased from $2.5 to $10 million. The maximum subsidy would be increased from 33⅓ to 55 percent of domestic costs. The actual cost, therefore, would be brought into line with that of foreign yards, since large steel vessels can be constructed abroad for approximately 50 percent less than in domestic yards. In addition, the bill before the Senate today would make a greater portion of the industry eligible for assistance These, then, are the basic provisions of S. 1006.

My colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and I, and my colleague's brother, the present President of the United States, when he was a Member of the Senate, have cosponsored a number of bills in past sessions and at the present session to assist the fishing industry, bills which I hope will be helpful in revitalizing our fishing industry, a fine old industry which has meant so much to the east coast and west coast of our country. S. 1006 is a most urgently needed measure, and is most vital for the survival of this traditional industry.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts on his fine, effective statement.

Mr. President, I ask for the consideration of the committee amendments to S. 1006.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 24, after the word "substitute", it is proposed to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, America's fishing industry is at a critical point.

The hearings on the proposed legislation are filled with proof of this. Our fishermen feel a deep sense of urgency about the serious deterioration of their competitive position. And their alarm is doubly significant because fishermen are self-reliant, independent men. They do not complain quickly, and they are among the last to ask for help.

But today they are faced with a threat as real and immediate as a Soviet collective farm would be in Iowa. The threat of modern, powerful, state-supported competition will overwhelm our aging fleet, unless we do something about it now.

The Russians have been off both our coasts all summer. They are out there with an armada. Their massive fleet off Cape Cod comprised at least 169 vessels in August. This included medium trawlers, large trawlers, freighters, and large factory ships, all of the most modern design. The Russians dramatically portray the competitive disadvantage which our fishermen face from state-subsidized foreign vessels.

Other major fishing nations also subsidize fleets equipped with the latest in vessels and gear. The Canadians, the Norwegians, the Germans, the French, and the British all do it. The foreign fleets are superior because of their advanced modern technology, which is directly encouraged by their governments.

In contrast, our fishing vessels are old and inadequate. The average age of large trawlers fishing out of New England is over 20 years, and very few of them are over 125 feet in length. Many of the foreign vessels competing with them are less than 5 years old and range up to 300 feet in length.

The clear and simple proof of our competitive disadvantage comes from the import figures. In the last 15 years imports have doubled. They now make up almost one-half of our domestic supply. In 1962 imports of fisheries products directly competitive with New England products reached a record high.

We cannot afford to lose our domestic fishing industry under the weight of this foreign competition. There are many reasons why. I would like to mention some of them, for they make a convincing case for this bill:

We cannot afford such a loss in terms of our national prestige.

We cannot afford it in the interest of our national security. In the subsidy law which just expired, Congress recognized that the Defense Establishment requires a strong, modern fleet of fishing vessels readily adaptable to small craft operations in wartime. The bill before the Senate would reaffirm this program.

We cannot afford to allow the destruction of the one-half million jobs which depend on our fisheries. Most of our fishing centers already suffer from serious economic dislocation. We must revitalize these areas. This bill would help the basic industry, and thereby improve every phase of the economy associated with the industry.

A strong domestic industry must be maintained if our consumers are not to be placed at the mercy of prices set outside this country by the foreign fisheries.

Without assistance to the industry, millions of American dollars for food will go abroad instead of remaining in this country through the production of expanding domestic fisheries.

Specifically, the bill will stimulate the modernization of the fishing industry. It will be of great significance in helping the industry to help itself. The bill will broaden the act to make a greater portion of the industry eligible for help. It encourages modern technology and design. The program would run long enough to permit the incentives to be widely felt.

We have reached the point where the future of our fishing industry is at stake. The program embodied in the proposed legislation will make a very great difference to our fishermen. I believe that it will mark the turning point for a resurgence of our fishing industry. I urge its approval today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not my colleague agree with me that of the six new ships which have been built, two have come into our State? One day last autumn, he and I looked at one of the new ships; and one could see the difference between that ship and the rest of the great fishing fleet we now have. A modern ship makes all the difference in the world.

Mr. KENNEDY. As my colleague points out, not only did we have an opportunity to visit the new ship, but I believe that the figures which have been revealed since it went to sea show a dramatic resurgence, in terms of catching additional fish. They show the economic stimulant to the company which participated in the acquistion of the ship. After talking to the men who have sailed on it, we realize that a wholly new spirit has developed.

Massachusetts is fortunate, as my senior colleague has just mentioned, to be among the States from which this ship and other new ships sail, as a result of the act of 1960 which has now expired. I believe the most dramatic proof of the importance of this proposed legislation is obtained by talking both to the owners of the ships, who already have derived greater economic benefit from their use, and to all the men who have benefited from the increased catch, who have benefited for themselves and their families.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I merely wish to make sure that the RECORD discloses that both Senators from Massachusetts are sponsors of this proposed legislation. In addition, I should like to say that we on the west coast, who are so very much concerned with all aspects of fishing, are notably heartened and strengthened by the great assistance which both Senators from Massachusetts have given us.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to ascertain the cost of each of the ships in the Massachusetts group.

Mr. KENNEDY. It is listed on page 22 of the committee report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has an amendment which he wishes to submit to page 2 of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the consideration of the committee amendment be postponed until after the Senator from Ohio has had an opportunity to submit his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am sure the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Ohio, who have submitted minority views, and also all Senators who favor the proposed legislation desire a full attendance of Senators in the Chamber. So I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum. I know the chairman of the Commerce Committee will be here shortly: but momentarily he is detained on other business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have no objection to having a quorum call at this time. The reason why I made the suggsestion is that the committee amendment proposes to raise the appropriation from $2.5 million to $10 million annually. The necessity and justification for the full $10 million will depend upon Senate action on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. If his amendment is adopted, it will strike out, on page 2, the specified language; and that will reduce the subsidy from 55 to 33⅓ percent. So, if his amendment is agreed to, there will be no need for the full $10 million. Therefore, I believe it would be orderly procedure to determine first what rate of sudbsidy will be paid, and then discuss the amount of money to be appropriated.

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot agree with the Senator's conclusion as to the amount of money needed. Nevertheless, I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now in order for the Senator from Ohio to submit his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment: On page 2, strike out lines 8 and 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I definitely disagree with the position of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendment, if adopted, will restore to the bill the 33⅓ percent limitation on the amount of the subsidy that may be granted for the construction of such a ship.

The law that has been in existence for the past 3 years provides that the Federal Government, in the building of fishing vessels, shall be allowed to subsidize the construction costs up to 33⅓ percent.

The bill pending before the Senate changes that limitation of 33⅓ to 55 percent. Thus, if my amendment is adopted, the maximum subsidy that will be authorized for any single ship will be 33⅓ and not 55 percent.

When the original bill of 1960 was passed, Mr. President, it was argued that this is a sort of trivial participation by the Federal Government. The bill of 1960 authorized the appropriation of $2,500,000 a year for each of 3 successive years, aggregating $7,500,000. It was also argued that the subsidy would be only 33⅓ percent, while the general merchant marine subsidy had a limitation of 55 percent. Therefore, in this case, we have a repetition of the old and well established rule: "If the camel's nose once gets under the tent, no matter how slightly, eventually his whole body will enter it."

The subsidy started at 33⅓ percent. It is now proposed to raise the limitation to 55 percent. In the beginning there was a maximum authorization of $2.5 million a year for 3 years. It is now proposed to raise that amount to $10 million a year for 5 years. We started with the condition that subsidies should be granted only in instances in which the fishing industry would be denied relief by the Tariff Commission after the submission of a petition to raise the tariff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Three important aspects of the program which were vigorously argued in 1960 on the basis that it was a trivial entrance into the field are now being changed. Three years ago it was argued that the authorization would exist for 3 years. It is now argued that it will terminate in 1968. I suggest that the program will be permanent.

If we subsidize the fishing industry, why should we not also subsidize the pottery industry of Ohio, the scissors industry, the machine tool industry, the bicycle industry, and the athletic equipment industry? If we subsidize one industry, we establish a precedent for other industries to ask for subsidies.

I cannot approve of the argument that since Red Russia is spending money for that purpose, we should do so also. If that argument is sound, we might as well throw overboard our system of government and adopt the economy of Red Russia, where all things are owned by the Government and all activities are subsidized. The people become slaves. Everyone works for the government and begs back from the Government some alms.

The bill involves more than the mere $50 million contemplated to be expended. It involves an encroachment and an intrusion into our philosophy of government. For that reason I opposed the bill 3 years ago. I do not believe it should be passed now.

I can see why Massachusetts, Washington, Oregon, and Alaska want it.

Mr. BARTLETT. And Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And perhaps Ohio fishermen would want it, because I understand that they would become beneficiaries of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator, provided that he speaks on his own time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield myself 1 minute. It is true that the fishermen of the Great Lakes region would benefit. It is true that some of the Ohio fishermen have expressed affirmative interest in the proposed legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I filed minority views on the measure, which are set forth in the report of the committee. We are subsidizing the merchant marine. Since 1947 the merchant marine of the United States has received a largess from the taxpayers of the Nation in the sum of $2,454,195,395.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

A subsidy was provided for the merchant marine on the theory that in case of war, the merchant marine vessels carrying cargo and passengers could be converted for defense purposes.

Three years ago the argument was made that, "We will build these fishing vessels on the ground that they will be converted in case of emergency for national defense purposes." That is a sophisticated argument. It cannot be rationalized. By the wildest stretch of the imagination, I cannot visualize that the fishing vessels could be fitted or converted for vessels of war or for transportation in case of an emergency.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask that the time be charged to the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to point out to the Senator, in relation to the remarks that he has just made, that the vessels contemplated to be built could be used as mine sweepers. Similar vessels were so used in World War II. They would be of value for that purpose as well as for other purposes.

I also point out to the Senator from Ohio that, first, the Secretary must approve of the person making the application, and must find that the vessel will be operated in such a manner as to be suitable for use for the national defense.

I emphatically point out to the Senator that the proposed subsidy of up to 55 percent would be a maximum. The amount of the subsidy would be fixed in comparison with costs abroad. The difference between costs abroad and our costs has increased so that, in order to make the act of any value, we must increase the percentage of subsidy from 33 percent. That provision does not mean that the subsidy will reach 55 percent. It means that they will get the differential as construed by the Maritime Administrator.

I point out that while the proposal is a subsidy, it would be based on defense needs. It would be supervised by two different agencies of the Government, and it would mean survival of our fishing industry.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate very much the arguments made by the Senator from Massachusetts. I hold him in deep respect. His congeniality and courtesy are so rich that he overpowers his opponents with the simplicity of his arguments and genuineness of approach.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate those remarks, and, as a result, I hope that the Senator will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At that point we separate.

Mr. President, I should like to point out another interesing aspect to the problem. When the Merchant Marine Act was passed in 1936, it provided that the taxpayers should subsidize the building of a merchant marine to an extent not to exceed 50 percent.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

At that time the argument was made that, as time goes on, the competitive position of the shipbuilders of the United States will improve. While the limitation was fixed at 50 percent, it was declared that in the course of time, because of the elimination of competition, the 50 percent figure would gradually fall.

I ask Senators to take a look at the facts now. In 1960 the shipbuilders came before the Congress and said that the 50 percent limitation was not adequate. We were told that we must increase it to 55 percent. We did so.

I do not feel that that method of solving the problem is the correct approach. If the position of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is sound, the problem ought to be approached through an increase in the tariff so that American fishermen will be able to compete with Russian and other fishermen.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I just came into the Chamber. I understand that the Senator from Ohio has offered an amendment to the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Under the agreement, 30 minutes of debate is allotted to each side.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment which I have offered would restore the subsidy to a limit of 33⅓ percent instead of the new 55 percent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be brief in my remarks on the Lausche amendment.

The amendment would absolutely nullify the general objectives of the bill, for the reason that a 33⅓-percent provision has existed for some time. The result has been that very few have been able to take advantage of the construction subsidy. We seek to rebuild our fishing industry and to make it competitive with others. The amendment would, for all practical and economical purposes, nullify the bill, the purpose of which is to rebuild the industry.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. One of the objectives sought to be obtained by passage of the bill is to put our fishing fleet into a more competitive position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. One of the principal points of opposition of the Senator from Ohio seems to be that the bill is not in the spirit of the free enterprise system. As I understand the proposed legislation—and the hearings show this very well—the purpose of the bill is to make it possible for our fishing fleet to be more competitive with various nations throughout the world, whose fishing fleets receive heavy governmental assistance. This bill will advance the ability of our vessels to compete, and further the cause of competition and free enterprise, in my judgment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I know that the Senator from Massachusetts is familiar with the situation. If any Senator has any doubt about whether we would be embarking on a new field, in the fierce world of fishing competition, all he has to do is to read in the report what the other countries are doing to keep their fishing fleets competitive and alive on the high seas.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would it not be true, therefore, that if the Lausche amendment were agreed to it would put our fishing fleet in a less competitive position with respect to the fishing fleets of other nations

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Every time there is an argument in the Senate—and there are many, and sometimes very justifiable ones—about whether we should do something for an industry which is an integral and important part of the economy, there are statements that the subsidy, or whatever one wishes to call it, is wasted, that the amount of money is too great and the expenditure should not be made.

No one ever seems to mention the fact that this is an industry which could provide up to $2 billion for our economy, if handled correctly. This industry pays taxes, like all others. It contributes to the welfare of the Nation and to the economy.

Many times we find that the amount of help we provide, when necessary, comes back to the Government, to the Treasury, and to the people, in jobs, and taxes and other ways in a far greater amount than the subsidy itself.

The proposal which is made is something like saying that when business goes bad in some place the owner should close all the shutters and all the doors. Business will become worse if he does that. Sometimes it is necessary to provide funds to revive an industry, so that it can make more money to pay back the money and help the economy, the country, and the Government.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe another point should be added to the points the Senator from Washington is making so well.

One question involved in the problem is whether we shall undertake to enable our own industry to harvest our own natural resources. We are talking about the harvesting of fish off our own shores, a harvest now being encroached upon increasingly by other countries.

We all know that the Senator from Ohio is against subsidies, not only for the fishing industry, but also for all other industries; but the amendment does not strike at that point. The amendment strikes at the question of what is a realistic level of subsidy, if we are to subsidize this industry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And what is a sensible expenditure?

Mr. MUSKIE. And what is a sensible expenditure. If a 33⅓-percent subsidy will not accomplish the desired result, we must consider the level of assistance required to do so. Since the Senator from Ohio is against all subsidies, he should be against both proposals.

On the question as to what is a reasonable measure of Government assistance to the industry, I think consideration should be given to what other countries are doing. I noticed that in the testimony by Mr. E. R. Kinney before the Senate Commerce Committee, there was mention of subsidies provided by Canada. According to his testimony, there are subsidies of 50 percent of the cost of construction available from the Canadian Maritime Commission.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment on that point?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. There was even more specific testimony, relating to Canadian subsidies. The committee was told that not only does the Dominion Government of Canada subsidize, but also that in some cases the Provincial governments subsidize. We were informed that one fisherman acquired a vessel valued at more than $200,000 with only $10,000 of his own investment being required, the remainder being furnished by Provincial and Dominion subsidies.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Alaska is quite correct. I believe that was done in the Province of Quebec, where the Provincial government provides a loan of 90 percent of the unpaid balance over and above the Dominion Government's subsidy.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator has refreshed my memory. I recall now that was in Quebec.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me just a moment, I point out that immediately after the war Germany was a defeated country, and was economically down. Of course, we helped to bring Germany back, and we are glad she is doing so well. But the first thing Germany did in 1948 was to scrap her obsolete fishing fleet and spend a large amount of money to get back into the fishing business, which is now contributing much to her reviving economy. That is only one instance.

Mr. BARTLETT. She did it by way of a subsidy program.

Mr. MUSKIE. Norway has an interesting way of furnishing Government aid. I understand that ships are financed up to 60 percent of their cost by long-term, low-interest Government loans, and only 15 to 20 percent by private capital.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Maine is familiar with the facts. We engaged in much research in this field for the purpose of the report. I think this is one of the best reports on the subject I have seen before the Senate.

The present American fishing fleet is made up of 11,964 vessels. Senators will find, by referring to the chart on page 2 of the report, that the average age of the ships in this fleet is probably 15 to 20 years more than the average age of the ships in any other competitive fleet in the world. We have one ship in our fleet that was built in 1865. That is an extreme case, of course, but it was built in 1865. Only 171 ships were built in 1960, and 105 in 1961.

In our part of the country, where there is some shipbuilding of what are called tuna clippers, only one keel for a new tuna clipper has been laid in 16 years in this fiercely competitive field.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Can the Senator point out, for the benefit of Senators, the reasons why our own fishermen have to purchase their ships within the boundaries of the United States, and why they are disadvantaged by the impossibility of purchasing their fishing vessels in other parts of the world, where they could take advantage of cheap labor and lower cost materials? If left to their own resources, those fishermen could take advantage of lower costs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If there were not in effect restrictions upon the use of foreign-built ships, which restrictions have borne very heavily upon the fishermen of this country, they could go to foreign countries and have fishing vessels built there at somewhat lower prices. But if that were done, shipyards all over this country, particularly the smaller shipyards, would lose the work and there would be a loss of jobs.

We want to keep our smaller shipyards alive, so they can remain in this business.

Aside from the question of the dollars and cents involved, I am not so sure that we should depend on foreign yards, anyway, because once we rely upon foreign yards to build our fishing vessels, and put them in competition with those of the same country building the vessels, we could run into some problems. The country might decide to charge us more, or put some restrictions on us, which is possible in this fiercely competitive industry.

I would like to know that we could depend on the construction of ships in our own yards. This has been the policy of the United States.

Mr. MUSKIE. Turning again to page 2 of the committee report, to which the Senator referred a few moments ago, and the table there showing the age distribution of U.S. fishing vessels, I think it would be of interest to place in the RECORD at this point the fact that the number of ships that have been built in recent years in this country has declined. In 1957, 422 vessels were built in this country. In 1958 the number rose slightly to 434. In 1959 it went down to 290. In 1960 the number dropped to 171. In 1961 it dropped to 105.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The estimates for this year are that 99 ships will be built here.

Mr. MUSKIE. So this program, which was enacted into law in 1960, has not stemmed the tide. In other words, the 33⅓-percent subsidy has not been sufficient. The argument for the 55-percent subsidy is that we must try, by a greater amount, in order to turn the tide in the competitive field of fisheries.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Under this program we have limited the amount and the time in the bill, so we shall know, at the end of a certain period, exactly what can be accomplished by such a program.

This period also marks the beginning of the invasion of the other fleets. They started in 1955 or 1956, and they have been growing. Unless we do something about it, I do not think there will be anything left for us in the Georges Banks and Grand Banks fishing areas.

I wish everyone could see some of the moving pictures of some of the modern

Russian ships. People would be amazed. As I said yesterday, some of the mother ships look like the *Queen Mary*. They are large, modern ships. They have all the facilities necessary on the ships to process and freeze fish. In addition, they have many oceanographers on these modern ships, who do much work on oceanography, which we cannot do, because our ships are not able to accommodate the personnel and equipment. They chart the currents, depths of the water, temperatures, and the bottoms of the ocean. We should be doing the same, for many reasons.

The bill before us is limited. I believe the Lausche amendment would defeat the general purpose of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I agree thoroughly on that point. If the Lausche amendment should prevail—which I hope it will not, despite my affection for the Senator from Ohio—we probably would not need $10 million. We would probably not need much. But I am sure that would not displease the Senator from Ohio. Even with the 33½-percent differential, the Government would still be subsidizing American fishing vessels, and they still would not be able to compete with foreign ships.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator from Alaska knows, some of us have been concerned about this problem for a long, long time. I always know where the opposition comes from when we move in this field. I am sympathetic with their view. I give a great deal of thought to how we can approach the problem of the dwindling of our fishing fleet and fishing economy. Despite the fact that certain persons oppose this particular method, no one has suggested any other way to meet the problem. All I can conclude is that, unless we do it by such a program, the entire industry will go down the drain.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Washington and I serve on the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Is it not true that we have encountered the problem of operating subsidies and construction subsidies on ships, and the question is whether we want to have any sort of merchant marine, or whether we want to throw it over, so that a fleet will not be available to us in the event of war. The same question applies to fishing vessels. Fishing vessels must be modernized and must be constructed of steel if they are to compete successfully with other ships. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me close with these comments, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

If the bill would help to put the fishing industry of the United States back into a competitive position, so that the vast resource off our shores, a natural resource that is ours, which we have not utilized, is utilized, the amount of expenditure involved would be made up for many times over by the return to our economy and otherwise. If we do not do it, it will become less and less. That is especially significant in view of the fact that the per capita consumption of fish in this country during the past 16 years or so has gone up 3.7 times over what it was formerly. Our fishing industry proved that point, because it has gone down by six or seven times, despite the fact that the market has trebled. This seems to be a way in which we can do the kind of job we want to do.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to add to the point my distinguished senior colleague made when he was addressing himself to the importance of providing this limited type of assistance, which aids our fishermen and the shipyards of our country. We know that if these funds are made available, they will not go to the fishermen or to the fishing companies, but will go directly to the shipyards themselves, although they benefit the fishing industry. That is the point my senior colleague was making with reference to the importance of these small ships to our national security. That point was dramatically emphasized during the last war, when many of the Massachusetts ships which were employed in fishing activities were lost in the service of our Navy. The people of Massachusetts recognize full well the importance that the small craft can have in wartime.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, both Senators from Massachusetts have alluded to the national defense purposes served by the fishing fleet. I believe this fact was shown to be true in the past. We all recall what these small craft, many of them fishing vessels, meant to Britain in the crisis there. Insofar as Alaska is concerned—and doubtless this is true of every coastal State—the Navy and the Army took over most of the fishing vessels, because they were imperatively needed to perform a great service.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Unless some other Senator wishes to speak, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to have some time yielded to me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will withhold my offer until the Senator from Delaware has spoken.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, I join my colleagues in the Senate in expressing my confidence in the American fishing fleet and in complimenting them on what they have done in the past.

I point out, however, that what they did was done without benefit of a subsidy. It has been described how the fishing vessels, some of them 50 or 100 years old, have been built in the past. They were built without a subsidy. The first subsidy was established 3 years ago. Tribute has been paid to our country's fishing fleet for its service during two World Wars. There is no doubt so far as that is concerned. The argument has been made that we should expand this subsidy, because if we do not do so, the industry will be in trouble. What is wrong with our free enterprise system, under which our country has operated for 180 years? There is no reason for more and more and newer subsidies to be paid.

Sometimes I wonder whether our history is correct when it speaks of our forefathers settling this country, because at that time there was no Federal aid program of any character, yet our forefathers developed one of the greatest countries in the world. All we need is a little more confidence in the free enterprise system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The world has grown very much smaller. When our forefathers came to New England, they built small wooden fishing ships. The same thing was done on the west coast. They were not confronted with large Russian fishing fleets off their coasts. I am told that a big Russian fishing ship is now anchored off Cape Cod, undergoing repairs. I am also told that there are approximately 150 of these foreign ships off the Georges Bank.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Those Russian ships were built with 100 percent subsidy. No one is going to suggest, I am sure, that it is necessary to have a 100-percent subsidy in this country. Those Russian ships were not built under a free enterprise system. They are wholly owned by the Government. We should keep away from that socialistic system in this country. We cannot keep our free enterprise system unless we keep free of such a subsidy system. It is not possible to continue to expand the subsidy program and underwrite the responsibilities of the private operators, guaranteeing them a margin of profit and at the same time expect them to maintain control of their own private business.

We started this subsidy 3 years ago. At that time I joined the Senator from Ohio in opposing it. At that time I said it would be only a short time before the proponents would be back asking for the full 55 percent; that it would be a case of the camel getting his nose under the tent flaps.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. The proponents said, "No, this is a new subsidy for a new industry; 33⅓ percent will be adequate; we will not come back and ask for more."

Yet they are back now asking for the full 55 percent, and asking for an increase in the appropriation of 400 percent over the preceding appropriation.

I believe it is time to stop this continuing expansion of this program. The argument has been made that there was something in the bill for everyone along the Atlantic seaboard, the gulf coast, the Pacific coast, and through the central part of the country, along the rivers. That is true; there is something in it for everyone—that is, for everyone except the taxpayers. They will have to pay and pay. At a time when we are having a $9 or $10 billion deficit, when our Government is spending more than it is taking in, someone should start putting an end to these programs and start cutting them back. It cannot be done by continuously expanding the programs every year. I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to question the distinguished Senator on his justification for the statement that the receiving of some kind of subsidy would infringe on the free enterprise system. This subsidy does not go to the men who operate the fishing ships. It does not go to the owners of the ships. It goes to the shipyards. The employees of the shipyards will be paid wages as a result of the subsidy. It will stimulate the economy of our shipbuilding communities.

I have some difficulty in following the Senator's reasoning in saying that paying such a subsidy would in some way take away the spirit of initiative which has been such a distinct part of the fishing industry. I do not feel that it would do so. It will not restrict the fishermen who own and operate the boats. They will not be controlled. They will not be directed or influenced by the Government. They will be free to conduct their operations with their customary independence and initiative. I feel that it would stimulate the industry and make it more competitive, even in the face of the extraordinary competition from abroad.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Long before the Senator from Massachusetts and I came into this world, men argued about whether the chicken came first or the egg came first. That argument will continue long after both of us have passed from the scene. Whether the subsidy is paid to the shipping companies or the shipbuilders, or wherever it is paid, it boils down to the same thing. The man who owns the fleet gets something cheaper than he did before. If I buy something that costs a thousand dollars to build, and the Government pays $550 of the cost, and I have to pay only $450 for it, it cannot be argued that I am not getting the subsidy. The shipping companies will get the benefit, and the taxpayers will have to pay and pay. I do not think we can get away from that fact.

To show how far this idea reaches, when such bills as this come before the Senate one at a time, I will call attention to another bill that will be coming before the Senate later, S. 927, a bill to change the war risk insurance law. If the pending bill were passed, and later the other bill was passed—and it is supported by the same committee—these ships could be insured with war risk insurance at Government expense under a formula where the Government would guarantee the payment of full, fair market value, based not on what was actually paid for the ship but on the Government's investment as well.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not wish to debate the merits of that bill now, but the companies concerned will pay premiums. That is a mutual fund, and the Government would simply disburse the money from the mutual fund, just as a private insurance company would.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am familiar with how the fund operates and how it operated before. The Treasury of the United States underwrites the insurance and pays the damages. That makes all the difference in the world. Therefore, the claims may well be paid by the taxpayers. It is not suggested that payment of the war risk insurance will be contingent upon enough money being in the fund; and the U.S. Government itself would have no responsibility to make good the claim.

Mr. BARTLETT. I can guess at the only reason why the Treasury would support the bill, if it does support it; that is, that it paid several hundred million dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It might interest the Senator to know that the Treasury is not supporting it, and as I understand no agency of the Government is supporting it, except the Senator's committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thought the Senator said the Treasury supported it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Treasury Department opposes the measure, although when it was reported by the committee, I was left with the impression that it supported the measure. What we will be providing will be war risk insurance, a new privilege and a new subsidy to the shipbuilding industry and those interested in shipbuilding.

The Senator from Delaware did not mention that when we shall have finished with the two bills he has mentioned, there will be a third one, which would give us $500 million by amending the law to make it retroactive in some form.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. It seems that some company did not quite get under the tent before, so a third bill has been introduced to make the payments retroactive.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let us stick to the debate on this bill. We will enjoy a good debate on the other bill when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will stick to this bill. It is bad enough, but they are all related. We cannot get away from the fact that at some time we shall have to kick the camel out and let it sleep outside the tent. Today the taxpayers are confronted with the highest debt in the history of the country. It has been said that the world is growing smaller. I agree that modern methods of transportation are accomplishing that. But the world is not growing smaller to the same extent that our national debt is growing bigger.

The administration now in power boasts that it is deliberately planning deficits—yes, it is creating deficits deliberately. At the same time, it advocates a tax reduction financed by the borrowing of more money. I cannot balance the argument in favor of subsidies against the argument for a balanced budget or controlled expenditures. The only way to control expenditures is to oppose bills such as this, which seek to expand spending programs.

I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio. I hope we can use good judgment and at least hold subsidies at their present level.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate for 6½ years. I am a member of the Committee on Commerce. In those 6½ years, there has been a program for the expansion of the merchant marine—if the bills which are now pending are passed—in the number of at least five such measures.

Several years ago Congress adopted an expansion program which brought the drydocks within the subsidy program. Until that time, the construction of ships was subsidized in an amount not to exceed 50 percent of their cost. Someone dreamed up the idea of bringing drydock facilities within the subsidy program. That proposal was adopted.

Subsequently, the thought was conceived to expand the subsidy from a 50 percent to a 55-percent limitation. That idea was adopted.

Then someone dreamed that it would be grand if the fishing industry could be brought into the subsidy program. So, as I said previously, 3 years ago Congress authorized $2,500,000 a year for a period of 3 years, but with a limitation of 33⅓ percent. It was then said that that was a meager, trivial sum to spend.

We now have before us a bill to provide $50 million, $10 million for each of 5 years, with the limitation lifted from 33⅓ percent to 55 percent.

Then came the idea of giving to navigating companies a rebate on expenditures which they made which were not allowed by law.

Now comes the final dream, which is to expand the subsidy to the fishing industry.

I repeat what I said a moment ago: If this is a bill to provide jobs for the shipbuilding industry, why not spend money to provide jobs for the textile industry in Rhode Island? Why not provide subsidies to create jobs in the machine tool industry of Cleveland and Cincinnati? How can we keep out the ceramics industry and all the other segments of our economy that are suffering from foreign competition?

In my judgment, a subsidy cannot justifiably be given to one industry without giving it to others. In Ohio, some industries are perishing. They are perishing because of the competition of foreign industries. The glass industry is suffering. When will the idea emerge and when will the dream come: "Get a subsidy from the Federal Government"? I feel rather certain that the time will come.

As we move on, more and more we detach ourselves from our base of an economy in which the individual's creative capacity, his purpose to keep his business operating and competing, will be destroyed.

Consider what is happening. We are subsidizing the merchant marine. About 3 months ago, every American ship sailing under the flag of the United States, on the east coast and the gulf coast, was paralyzed. The ships were immobilized at their docks; they could not enter upon the high seas to deliver the goods of our country. Industry within the country was beginning to suffer from a strike by workers who are being subsidized by our Government.

The steamship *America* was supposed to leave the dock in New York on September 14, with 956 passengers aboard. They were waiting for the whistle to blow, indicating that the ship was about to leave its dock. The whistle did not blow. Then it was announced that the ship would not leave because one labor union was having a dispute with another labor union and refused to work the ship. Yet the Government is subsidizing the operation of the *America* at the rate of $4 million a year. That happened on September 14. Three days ago, the ship was again ready to leave. The same union, because of a dispute with another union, refused to work. My question is, what is the purpose of the subsidy program? Does it induce an individual to try to help himself? Not in the least. The subsidy program induces him to grab more and more. He feels that the taxpayer will dig down into his pocket and will pay the bill.

I served in World War I, and so did other Senators. I served in the belief that this Nation will continue to live as long as free enterprise reigns, liberty prevails, and each man works to make our system a success. I did not believe that as time went on the main thought dominating Washington would be: "Dig up new subsidies and new expenditures."

Mr. President, I have not tabulated the new subsidies that have been provided during this session of Congress. I do know that the Senate voted for a subsidy of local mass transportation systems which will, if it is enacted, cost at least $10 billion, although the supporters of the measure claim it will cost only $6 billion.

Mr. President, I do not believe the bill now before us should become law; but if it is to become law, the subsidy should remain as it was provided in the original bill—namely, at 33⅓ percent, not the 55 percent which has been proposed.

Mr. President, I do not know how long my service in Congress will continue; but I do know that if it continues for only a reasonable time longer, I shall be hearing the same argument—but with greater frequency and greater intensity—3 years, 5 years, or 10 years from now, because more and more we will be moving away from the fundamental principles which have made our country so great and so successful.

To conclude, Mr. President, one who argues that this proposed subsidy should be provided because Red China is subsidizing 100 percent, should then go farther in that direction, and should say, boldly and frankly: "Americans, adopt the Communist system. Give up your system of free democracy."

Mr. President, I am not one willing to do that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is this vote to be taken on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio; namely, on page 2, to strike out lines 8 and 9.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senators from New York [Mr. KEATING and Mr. JAVITS] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 181 Leg.]

YEAS—14

Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Ellender
Goldwater
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Miller
Mundt
Proxmire
Russell
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—57

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Monroney
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—29

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Cannon
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Humphrey
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Long, La.
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Morse
Moss
Neuberger
Prouty
Robertson
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Tower

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment. The opponents to the committee amendment have 30 minutes remaining, and the proponents have 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time on the committee amendments. I ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the committee amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, what was the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was that the committee amendments be considered en bloc. The request has been agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington explain why there is a need for $10 million, or a 400-percent increase over last year's appropriation? The bill would raise the subsidy rate from 33⅓ percent to 55 percent, which is about a 60-percent increase in the subsidy rate, yet the request is for a 400-percent increase in the appropriation. I wonder how the Senator can justify a request for a 400-percent increase in the appropriation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. How can the Senator from Washington justify a 400-percent increase in the appropriation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will read the testimony given by the witnesses who appeared—and there were literally scores of them—he will find that this was the minimum amount necessary to do the job we are trying to do, about which we have been talking for 1½ hours. Under the old law the subsidy was $2.5 million a year, at 33⅓ percent. That did not work. No one could take advantage of it to build a competitive ship. That is the basic reason for the failure. This is the minimum amount needed. We have limited it to so much per year. We have limited the time. I do not know of a witness who was against it; and we invited everybody.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have read the testimony.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] reminds me that only six ships have been built under the program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The testimony to which the Senator refers came from witnesses from the industry which is to benefit. Certainly those witnesses would ask for $10 million, or even $20 million. They would take what they could get. I wonder about the feelings of those who will have to pay the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator asking me a question? I will answer any question the Senator has, and then yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am merely making the statement that I do not see any reason why we should increase the program by 400 percent. If the Senator does not wish to answer, and does not have any reason for it, that is all right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I gave the Senator the reason. It will not work unless we provide the amount proposed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from Washington asked that the committee amendments be considered en bloc. Has that request been withdrawn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has agreed to consider the committee amendments en bloc.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, would my amendment be in order after the committee amendments have been agreed to, or prior to that time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was my understanding that the committee amendments had been agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senate agreed to consider the committee amendments en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I see. I thought the Senator from Washington had asked that they be agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc. Then the Senator from Delaware can submit his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Provided it will not deprive the Senator of any right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, after talking with the Parliamentarian, I find that while it could be done in that way, the most feasible course would be to permit the Senator from Delaware to offer an amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well. I withdraw that request. The Senate is now considering the committee amendments en bloc, and the Senator from Delaware can offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, line 24, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I recognize that the Senate is in the mood to approve the full amount. Nevertheless, I believe Senators should have an opportunity to vote on holding it down to a minimum of double what was provided last year. I see no reason in the world why the amount should be increased 400 percent over what it was last year.

I understand from the committee report that less than $1 million was spent last year. If the Senate does not agree to the amendment it will be authorizing an increase of 1,000 percent in the expenditures for next year. At some point the Congress must stop increasing expenditures which go up not by 50 or 100 percent but by 1,000 percent over the expenditures of last year.

Even with the adoption of this amendment, it would still leave a 500-percent increase. That is the very least that we should do.

I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator from Washington will do likewise.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] to the committee amendment.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 1, after lines 6 and 7 it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

> (1) That in order to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to pay in accordance with this Act a subsidy for the construction of such vessels in the shipyards of the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify section 1 of the act that is amended by this bill. This amendment has been requested by the Department of the Interior, under letter to Senator Magnuson, chairman of the Committee on Commerce and dated September 12, 1963. The amendment simply clarifies the purpose of the bill and expresses this purpose in an amendment to section 1 of the basic act. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Department of the Interior be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1963.
Hon. Warren G. Magnuson,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Magnuson: During the course of recent hearings on legislation similar to S. 1006 a bill "To amend the Act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes," before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the subcommittee chairman requested that this Department advise the House committee whether guidelines concerning our administration of this legislation should be included in the bills pending before the committee. The chairman also wanted our suggestions as to what these guidelines should be, if they were necessary.

We advised the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that no new legislative guidelines will be necessary. A copy of our letter to that committee is enclosed for your information. However, in considering the committee's request, it was brought to our attention that this legislation should be amended further. While your committee recently has reported out S. 1006, we believe that our recommended amendment to the House also should be brought to the attention of your committee.

The principal purpose of this legislation, as indicated in the title of S. 1006, is to correct the inequities that have been created by the law which now prohibits foreign built vessels from engaging in our domestic fisheries. If it were not for this fact, this legislation would not be necessary.

The additional cost of constructing these vessels, which are competing with subsidized foreign built vessels, in our domestic shipyards gave rise to the act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212) and the need for extending this authority to the entire commercial fishing industry. Indeed, we must consider this underlying purpose when determining whether an individual's application for a subsidy should be approved or not.

In this regard, we believe that section 1 of the 1960 act should be amended to read as follows:

"That in order to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to pay in accordance with this Act a subsidy for the construction of such vessels in the shipyards of the United States."

In our opinion this amendment is essential, if it is intended to extend the act's coverage to the entire commercial fishing industry, as we previously stated in our report of May 6, 1963, to your committee. There we stated that the deletion of section 4 of the 1960 act is both desirable and necessary, because that section effectively limited the act's coverage to certain depressed segments of the industry. We believe the above amendment removes any implication that the 1960 act, as amended by S. 1006, is still so limited.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK P. BRIGGS,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, I offer some technical amendments.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will state the amendments.

Mr. **BARTLETT**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc and that the reading of them be waived.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc and the reading of them will be waived.

The amendments offered by Mr. BARTLETT are as follows:

On the first page, line 7, strike out "(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

On page 2, line 7, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

On page 2, line 8, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(4)".

On page 2, line 10, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(5)".

On page 2, line 23, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

On page 2, line 25, strike out "(6)" and insert in lieu thereof "(7)".

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Who yields time?

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be offered, I yield back my time on the bill.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I do not believe the Chair has stated whether the technical amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what the amendments do?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. They are technical amendments submitted by the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Do they make any change in the substance of the bill?

Mr. **BARTLETT**. No; they are only technical.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, if there are no further amendments to be offered, I yield back my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time on the amendments is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the technical amendments offered by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, I wish to speak for only a few moments.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, I shall vote against this measure. I shall do so because it raises the subsidy from the present level of 33⅓ percent to 55 percent. It eliminates the condition which formerly was contained in the bill—that before the subsidy could become available, the applicant had to show that he was denied relief by the Tariff Commission.

I shall vote against the bill also because what began as an innocuous, trivial expenditure of $2.5 million in 3 years has now grown into a subsidy of $50 million in 5 years. This is a new beginning. This is a precedent for all other industries that cannot compete with foreign markets to ask for subsidies from the U.S. Congress.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. **MAGNUSON**. I yield back my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time has been yielded back. The question is on passage of the bill. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea."

Mr. **KUCHEL**. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from New York [Mr. KEATING and Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 14, as follows:

[No. 182 Leg.]

YEAS—57

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Monroney
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—14

Byrd, Va.
Curtis
Dirksen
Douglas
Ellender
Goldwater
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Proxmire
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—29

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Cannon
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Humphrey
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Long, La.
McCarthy
McGee
Metcalf
Morse
Moss
Neuberger
Prouty
Robertson
Simpson
Smathers
Stennis
Tower

So the bill (S. 1006) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 12, 1960, as amended, may be cited as the "United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act".

Sec. 2. The Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), is amended as follows:

(1) Strike out the first section and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That in order to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to pay in accordance with this Act a subsidy for the construction of such vessels in the shipyards of the United States.";

(2) in section 2 delete the word "and" at the end of subsection (6); add a new subsection (7) as follows:

"(7) the vessel will be of advance design, which will enable it to operate in expanded areas, or be equipped with newly developed gear, and will not operate in a fishery, if such operation would cause economic hardship to efficient vessel operators already operating in that fishery, and;", and renumber the present subsection (7) as subsection (8);

(3) delete section 4;

(4) in section 5, delete the phrase "33⅓ per centum" and substitute "55 per cent";

(5) amend section 9 to read:

"Sec. 9. If any fishing vessel constructed with the aid of a construction subsidy in accordance with the provisions of this Act, as amended, is operated during its useful life, as determined by the Secretary, contrary to the provisions of this Act or any regulations issued thereunder, the owner of such vessel shall repay to the Secretary, in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe an amount not to exceed the total depreciated construction subsidy paid by the Secretary pursuant to this Act and this shall constitute a maritime lien against such vessel. The obligations under this section shall run with the title to the vessel.";

(6) in section 12, delete "$2,500,000" and substitute "$10,000,000"; and

(7) amend section 13 to read:

"Sec. 13. No application for a subsidy for the construction of a fishing vessel may be accepted by the Secretary after June 30, 1968."

SUSPENSION OF EQUAL TIME PROVISIONS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT FOR THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 480, House Joint Resolution 247.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements for section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the office of President and Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "the", to strike out "seventy-five day" and insert "sixty-day", and on page 2, line 17, after the word "charges,", to strike out "rates,".

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader with respect to the program for the remainder of the day and also as to what he apprehends for the calendar of business for tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I cannot give the distinguished minority leader definite answers to the questions he has raised, but the Senate is now considering the equal time measure, which, I understand from the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], will not take much of the Senate's time.

Then, after agreement with the distinguished minority leader and the members of the Committee on Finance, it is planned to bring up Calendar No. 529, H.R. 7555, to amend the Social Security Act; then Calendar No. 530, H.R. 7195, relating to the Federal-aid highway system.

There will be a speech or two and some further remarks, particularly on the anniversary of one of our most beloved colleagues, if not our most beloved one. The Senate will probably be in session tomorrow, but the possibility of going over from tomorrow night until Monday is fairly good.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the distinguished majority leader apprehend any yea-and-nay votes for tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not that I know of at the moment. I would not want Senators to take that as a hint for them to pack their bags and leave, because there may be some votes tomorrow. This is not a commitment on my part. So I would advise Senators to sit tight.

THE 86TH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF HON. CARL HAYDEN, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that today is the 86th birthday anniversary of a former sheriff of Maricopa County, Ariz., who comes from a town whose name has been changed since he left there and came to Congress. He has a reputation not only as a lawman but also as a law-abiding Senator. I refer, of course, to our beloved President pro tempore, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], who is celebrating his 86th birthday. Let us hope that he will be here for 86 years more.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with typical modesty, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, who has been a fugitive from the representatives of the press for at least 30 years, has left the Chamber.

I cannot let this occasion pass without saluting him as a valued friend, one whom I admire very greatly. I will not undertake any fulsome laudations at this time.

Carl Hayden is a great American who has contributed much to his State and to his Nation and who has set a standard of character and integrity in his dealings in this body that would well be emulated by all those who associate with him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, October 2 is a day of especially affectionate remembrance for me. It is a day set apart for two good friends who are a continent apart and yet congenially together. One is from my native Rhode Island—one from far-off Arizona. October 2 is their common birthday.

The paths of all three of us met in these Halls of the Senate. Theodore Francis Green celebrates his 96th birthday in retirement. Carl Hayden, 86 years young, with all the vigor of his frontier days, has risen until he is third in succession to the President of the United States.

Frontiersman though he may be, we of New England, through Carl Hayden's Connecticut Yankee father, like to claim fame through association.

Whether our genial colleague presides over the Senate as a whole or over his responsible Appropriations Committee, he does it with the aplomb of the onetime sheriff of Maricopa County or the silent strength of Stanford University's strapping center—he was that, too—but always as the genial colleague—both able statesman and understanding friend.

We are told that Arizona is from an Indian name meaning "little spring." We would translate it into the language of our affection to mean "eternal springtime"—and that is our wish—everlasting springtime of health and happiness for the ever-young and ever-beloved Carl Hayden.

SUSPENSION OF EQUAL TIME PROVISIONS OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT FOR THE 1964 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is House Joint Resolution 247.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 247 would suspend for 60 days immediately preceding November 3, 1964, the voting day for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, a part of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States.

This is what was done in 1960, to make possible the famous debates between former Senator Kennedy and former Vice President Nixon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the action proposed to be taken this year, as it was taken 4 years ago, is confined wholly to the candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, and does not deal with any other candidates for any other offices, either national, State, or local?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend the Senator from Rhode Island. I favor the proposed legislation.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the provision of section 315 that is to be suspended is known as the equal opportunity provision which requires a licensee of a broadcast station who permits any legally qualified candidate for a public office to use the broadcasting station to afford equal opportunities to all other candidates for that office in the use of the broadcasting station.

At present, section 315(a) of the Communications Act requires a licensee of a broadcast station who permits any legally qualified candidate to use his broadcast station to afford equal opportunities to all other candidates for that office in the use of his broadcasting station. House Joint Resolution 247 will suspend the equal opportunity requirement of section 315 of the Communications Act for the 1964 presidential and vice-presidential campaign. This suspension will be limited to a period of 60 days immediately preceding November 3, 1964, in effect making the period of suspension of section 315 run from September 4, 1964, through November 2, 1964, both days inclusive.

Section 2 of the joint resolution provides that the FCC shall make a detailed report to the Congress not later than May 1, 1965, with respect to the amount of time made available, disposition of time during various phases of the campaign, clearance by individual stations of network programs concerning the candidates or issues as well as other particulars.

This bill is substantially identical with the provisions of the legislation enacted in the 86th Congress which made possible the joint Kennedy-Nixon appearances on radio and television during the 1960 campaign.

The bill would afford the licensees complete freedom, as in 1960, to exercise their judgment in developing programs and making time available for presidential and vice presidential candidates. I feel that the adoption of this legislation will assure that the 1964 campaigns of the major presidential and vice-presidential candidates will receive as equally extensive if not even greater broadcast coverage than in 1960.

The committee made two amendments, as follows:

On the first page, line 9, change "75" day period to "60" day period. The purpose of this amendment is to shorten the period during which the suspension would be in effect from the 75-day period contained in the House version of the resolution to a 60-day period. This 60-day period will run from September 4, 1964, to November 2, 1964. When the House adopted its version of the resolution, the date of the Democratic National Convention had not yet been determined. Since then, it has been announced as August 24–28. Thus, by the end of August 1964, the nominating conventions of the two major parties will have been held and the committee believes that the ensuing 60-day period will be sufficient to achieve the purpose of the legislation.

Page 2, line 16, strike the word "rates." This amendment would relieve the FCC of the requirement of requesting information from broadcasting stations on "rates" charged political candidates. The committee agrees with the FCC that this information would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to gather and present to the Congress in a relevant and meaningful fashion because of the many possible combinations of numbers, length and frequency of broadcasts which are sold at different rates.

I believe that the public interest will be served by the enactment of this bill.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to answer any questions Senators may desire to ask.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I believe the passage of House Joint Resolution 247, to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, will be valuable in that it will open the way to freer exposure of the views of our presidential and vice presidential candidates next year. However, I do not believe this measure goes far enough. It has been my contention and it is still my contention that we should, instead of suspending the provisions of section 315(a) for just certain candidates in 1 year, completely repeal the equal time requirement.

The argument for complete repeal is expressed more fully in the additional views I filed with the Commerce Committee report on House Joint Resolution 247. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these additional views be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the additional views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Additional Views of Senator Vance Hartke

Although I concur in the decision of the committee to recommend suspension of the equal time provisions of the Communications Act during the 1964 campaign by candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, I do not believe the committee's recommendations go far enough. In 1962 and again this year, I introduced legislation to completely remove the equal time provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act. Thus, my bills would have excluded all candidates for public office from the equal time requirements.

In its final report to the Congress on April 17, 1962, the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee pointed out that the equal time provisions were enacted originally to "preserve for the public the benefit of the viewpoint of all the candidates for a given office, whenever broadcast facilities were used for the viewpoint of one candidate."

The report goes on: "Equal time was not conceived to serve candidates for public office. Equal time was designed to serve the public. Licensees were denied the privilege of deciding arbitrarily that one candidate could be heard by the electorate, while another candidate for the same office could not be heard."

This principle appeared sound when it was enacted. However, over the years, the equal-time rule was found to restrict rather than promote free exposure of views. Broadcasters, faced with the obligation of giving the same amount of time to all candidates of any and all parties in a race for a certain office, often preferred to give no time at all.

Congress, recognizing this situation, first amended the equal-time provision in 1959 so as to eliminate the applicability of section 315(a) to legally qualified candidates on any newscast, news interview, news documentary, on-the-spot coverage of news events, or panel discussions. At that time, Congress incorporated into the law a long-standing policy of the Federal Communications Commission, the so-called fairness doctrine, which provides that it is the obligation of the licensee to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance. Broadcasters who violate the statutory obligation are subject to loss of their license.

The Freedom of Communications Subcommittee explained the fairness doctrine and the basis for it in this way: "* * * it is incumbent upon every radio and television newscaster to bear in mind at all times, in the selection and manner of presentation of political news, that the medium being utilized belongs to the public. It is this aspect—the ownership of the airwaves by the public as contrasted to the private ownership of newspapers and news magazines—which places radio and television newscasts in a different frame of reference * * *. There is no question but that considerable latitude in the exercise of editorial judgment by licensee is necessary. No licensee has time to report all of the news fit to be broadcast. However, in the sifting and selection process of what news is to be reported over radio and television, the licensee has to be constantly aware of this public-interest obligation. Particularly in reporting political news and discussion of controversial issues, the licensee has to walk a tightrope. But this is simply a measure of responsibility, and those unwilling to act responsibly in utilizing a public privilege are subject to the loss of the use of that privilege."

There is nearly unanimous agreement now that the 1959 action was wise and beneficial to the public. Chairman Henry, of the Federal Communications Commission, in discussing this action recently stated:

"As a result of this amendment, broadcast licensees are, in our opinion, better able to carry out their functions of reporting the news concerning the political without being bound by the equal opportunity provision of section 315."

A second temporary modification in section 315 was made in 1960 when Congress suspended the equal time requirement for presidential and vice presidential candidates for the duration of the 1960 campaign. Our experience in that election campaign again proved the wisdom of the congressional action. That suspension made possible the great Kennedy-Nixon debates which added a new dimension to our democratic electoral process. The TV debates, electrically channeled into the living rooms of homes all over America, were witnessed by millions and they sparked new interest and enthusiasm in the most important of all contests, the race for the Presidency. Chairman Henry also commented on the results of this action:

"The purpose of the 1960 suspension was to permit wider and more comprehensive radio and television coverage of the presidential campaign. On the basis of elections prior to 1960 it was clear that, without such suspension, a great number of presidential candidates would qualify for equal opportunity under section 315(a), thereby inhibiting coverage of the major candidates in the campaign.

"As the Commission previously indicated to the Congress, the 1960 suspension did result in wider and more effective coverage of the major presidential and vice presidential candidates, particularly in connection with the so-called great debates. Our experience with respect to the operation of the 1960 suspension disclosed no serious administrative problems flowing from it; * * *."

It is my opinion that now, with the successful 1959 and 1960 actions behind us, we should do away with piecemeal suspensions which apply only to candidates for the highest offices and completely repeal the equal-time provision of section 315. The broadcasting industry, by its own objectivity and good judgment in reporting political news and events of the last few years, has proved that it is mature enough and responsible enough to abide by the dictates of the fairness doctrine and to continue and expand its service to the public in the area of political broadcasting.

An informed public is a wise electorate and the future of our Nation rests upon the wisdom of its people. We owe it to our people and to our country to put all our vast and wonderful communications resources at the disposal of the people and to allow to be presented the widest possible exposure of political candidates and their points of view. Not to do so would be to restrict the freest operation of the democratic process. We have proved we can facilitate dissemination of information by relieving our broadcasting industry of the restrictions imposed by section 315(a). I will continue to work toward this end.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, as has been fully explained by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the purpose of this legislation is to suspend for the 1964 presidential campaign the equal time requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

I support such a suspension and hope the bill will be enacted.

From a strictly political point of view, and as a Republican, perhaps I should be pretty chary about this legislation because there is a substantial body of evidence to indicate that Vice President Nixon may have lost the 1960 election as a result of the great debates which resulted from our suspension of section 315 for the 1960 presidential campaign.

But regardless of the outcome of the 1960 election, there can be no doubt that those debates were a major innovation in the conduct of presidential campaigns. They made a tremendous contribution to the general understanding of the issues and personalities. And they made a tremendous contribution to the general welfare of our entire system of government, because only if the electorate is informed and interested can we expect our form of government to survive and grow.

We would be evading a major part of our responsibilities to the people of this Nation, in my view, if we were not to approve the pending legislation with respect to the 1964 campaign.

Passage of this bill may result in another series of great debates next year, but the radio and television networks and stations would not be restricted to such a format. Other techniques may be used, and other formats employed to present the presidential candidates of the two major parties in such a way as will make the campaign most meaningful for the millions of Americans who will make their choice on November 3, 1964.

I am fully confident that the radio and television industry can use the talent and resources available to them in such a way as to present the campaign in the most effective and useful way possible, without preferring the candidates of one major party to those of the other, and without stifling the voices of those candidates representing what we usually call, for sake of convenience, the minor parties.

There are many who would prefer to see the Congress repeal the rigid equal time provisions of section 315 of the Communications Act and rely instead on the more flexible requirements for fairness in the presentation of controversial subjects. Such an approach may have much to commend it, but I think we must realistically recognize that it would be subject to a considerable amount of controversy and disagreement. Clearly, however, suspension of the equal time requirements for the presidential campaign of 1964 will give us all more experience and more familiarity with the advantages and disadvantages of the fairness approach on the one hand and the equal time approach on the other, which will be beneficial in the future.

Therefore, Mr. President, I support the pending bill and urge its adoption so that every American will have a reserved front row seat in front of his TV set for the 1964 presidential campaign, which may be one of television's alltime great spectaculars.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 247) was read the third time and passed.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH PROGRAMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 529, H.R. 7544.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment, on page 8, line 18, after the word "State", to strike out "agency" and insert "agency, which may be an interdepartmental agency,".

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am pleased to bring before the Senate, H.R. 7544, designed to assist in preventing and combating mental retardation. This bill was sponsored in the House of Representatives by Mr. WILBUR MILLS. I am proud to sponsor it in the Senate. It is exceptionally rewarding to be the sponsor of a bill which I know from my experience as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is of vital importance to the American people. As Governor of Connecticut and as Secretary, I looked into the many problems faced by the mentally retarded and their families, into the gaps in services, the need for assistance to the States in strengthening their programs of prevention, the need for research, the need for comprehensive planning. I became convinced of the necessity for measures such as those incorporated in the bill before you. This conviction was strengthend by my close association with the distinguished experts who were members of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation.

The bill has had careful consideration in the House Committee on Ways and Means under the able direction and leadership of my good friend, Mr. MILLS. It was thoroughly discussed on the House floor where it enjoyed virtually unanimous support. It has the full support of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles the HEW budget, Mr. FOGARTY, who introduced a similar bill in the House and has consistently given leadership along with Senator HILL in health matters. One part of this bill is substantially identical with a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama in the last Congress. Secretary Celebrezze has vigorously pressed for these clearly needed measures.

This bill is one of two major proposals designed to carry out the recommendations of the President in his special message on mental health and mental retardation on February 5, 1963. That message is eloquent testimony to the need for the Federal Government to step up its assistance to States and local communities in their efforts to prevent and combat mental retardation, which the President has called a major national health, social, and economic problem.

In his special message President Kennedy outlined a national program to combat mental retardation. He made a number of proposals including the following five recommendations:

First. A new 5-year program of project grants to stimulate State and local health departments to plan, initiate, and develop comprehensive maternity and infant care programs helping primarily women in high risk groups who are otherwise unable to pay for needed medical care.

Second. Doubling over a period of 7 years the existing $25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for maternal and child health, a significant portion of which will be used for the mentally retarded.

Third. Doubling over a period of 7 years the present $25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for crippled children's services.

Fourth. New research authority for the Children's Bureau for research in maternal and child health and crippled children's services.

Fifth. Providing special grants to the States on a one-time basis for financing State reviews of needs and programs in the broad field of mental retardation.

These recommendations represent a part of the administration's program for a bold new approach to the problem of mental retardation.

Prevention of mental retardation must receive the highest priority. To this end we must increase our resources for the protection of the health of mothers and children by assisting States and local communities in developing comprehensive programs to deal effectively with this problem.

A healthy start in life should be the birthright of every child born in the United States. Unfortunately, this is not now the case. Despite efforts put forth by State and local health agencies in partnership with the Federal Government, much still remains to be done to promote the health of mothers and their offspring so that these children may be both physically and mentally fit—so that they may be, indeed, the Nation's greatest asset.

In order to accomplish this goal, the present programs for maternal and child health and crippled children including clinical services for mentally retarded children must be extended and improved. The need for these services is steadily mounting because of the rising child population, the increasing cost of medical care, and changes in the practice of medicine and public health resulting from the application of research findings. The results of research and modern medical practice should be more widely available, especially to mothers and children with critical needs.

Expectant mothers with low income often receive little or no prenatal care. Frequently they have complications of pregnancy, and are most likely to deliver prematurely. Their babies as a consequence are particularly prone to brain damage and mental retardation. These mothers and their babies constitute the vulnerable group in special need of care.

H.R. 7544 has been carefully designed to expand existing statutory authority and to provide new statutory authority in order to help the States in their efforts to prevent and combat mental retardation.

INCREASE IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

The Federal-State program of maternal and child health services was authorized under the Social Security Act in 1935. The amount of Federal funds going into this program is now approximately $25 million annually, the existing authorization ceiling. State and local funds amount to almost 3 times as much and in 1962 totaled more than $70 million, thus making a combined expenditure of $95 million in fiscal year 1962. This grant-in-aid program has become a major factor in the prevention of disease in infancy and childhood and in promoting the health of mothers and children. States use these funds, together with State and local funds, for prenatal clinics where mothers receive medical examinations and advice regarding care during pregnancy; home visits by public health nurses before and after childbirth; well-child clinics where mothers bring their children for health supervision, and for information on the prevention of disease and on the care of babies; immunization against communicable diseases; school health services; and dental services for children.

In order to meet more nearly the needs for expanded maternal and child health services, this bill would increase the amounts authorized for annual appropriation for such services from the present $25 million as follows: $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; $40 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; $45 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969; $50 million for the fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter.

Each year a significant part of the increased funds would be expended on programs for the mentally retarded.

The expansion of maternal and child health services would contribute to the reduction of infant and maternal mortality. States vary widely in rates of infant mortality—ranging from 20.3 to 37.8 per 1,000 live births in 1961—and in rates of maternal mortality—from less than 2 to over 8 per 10,000 live births in 1961. I know that these rates could and should be reduced through application of measures such as maternal and child health services. For the United States as a whole, infant mortality declined more than 13 percent between 1950 and 1962. Since 1955 the rate of decline has slowed up considerably.

In 1962, 10 other countries had lower infant mortality rates than the United States. While our record of accomplishment is an excellent one, I am deeply concerned that the United States stands in 11th place among 15 countries with low infant mortality rates.

The child population under 21 increased by one-third from 54 million in 1950 to 71 million in 1960. While maternal and child health services have expanded and broadened, progress is seriously affected by a combination of a high birth rate and the increasing costs of providing services. The large increase in the number of children has resulted in great crowding of prenatal clinics, well-baby clinics, and school health services. In some communities it is of such proportions that well-baby clinics can accept only infants under 1 or 2 years of age. A report at the 1960 White House Conference of a study of well-baby clinics in an eastern metropolitan area showed that physicians were able to spend only 5 minutes on each baby.

With increased appropriations, the States will be in better position to keep pace with increased demands for maternal and child health services as the child population continues to increase. More mothers will receive prenatal care, thus making possible earlier detection and treatment of the complications of pregnancy and early application of measures to prevent premature birth. More children will have child health supervision. Medical school health examinations, vision and hearing screening tests, and all kinds of immunizations will be stepped up.

Of major importance is the fact that more mentally retarded children will be served through special diagnostic clinics for these children provided by State maternal and child health programs. In 1962 about 19,000 children received services through these clinics in 46 States. In 1961 over 15,000 children received clinic services. Despite this increase, applications for these services continues to exceed the resources of the clinics, and waiting lists are long.

Increased grants will be made for demonstration programs and specialized training of staff in maternal and child health and mental retardation.

INCREASE IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

The bill will also increase the amounts authorized for annual appropriation for crippled children's services in the Social Security Act from the present $25 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1964; $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; $40 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; $45 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969; $50 million for the fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter.

Expenditures for crippled children's services amounted to approximately $79 million in 1962, of which about $54 million was from State and local funds, and $25 million, the full amount authorized, from Federal funds.

Just to keep up with the expected increase in the child population, State crippled children's agencies will have to provide services for 625,000 children by 1970. In 1961, 375,000 children were cared for under the program. About 45 percent had orthopedic handicaps. The rest had conditions such as cerebral palsy, epilepsy, loss of hearing, cystic fibrosis, congenital heart disease and many other conditions. The average daily cost of hospital care per patient continues to increase at the rate of about 7 percent a year. In 1951, it was $16.77—in 1961, $34.98. Almost 40 percent of the expenditures in the crippled children's program are for hospital care. The techniques of modern medicine, far more complex and effective than those of a generation ago, are also far more expensive. Recently developed surgery enables children with congenital heart disease to lead normal lives. Open heart surgery costs State agencies over $2,000 per case—the cost for private patients is $4,000 to $5,000.

The increases proposed in the bill for services for crippled children are comparable with those for maternal and child health services. With these increases, services will be available to more mentally retarded children with physical handicaps.

States will be able to take care of more crippled children and to keep pace with the following needed developments already underway in crippled children's programs:

First. Further broadening of the definition of "crippling" until all State crippled children's programs would serve children with any kind of handicapping condition or long-term illness, including the retarded with physical handicaps.

Second. The development of outpatient centers for handicapped children organized and staffed to provide the comprehensive services needed by children with multiple handicaps, thus bringing together the services now provided in many separate clinics.

Third. The development of inpatient and outpatient facilities appropriate for adolescents.

Fourth. Increased provision for demonstration programs and specialized training.

The increases in authorizations for the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs will bring them to the level approved by the 87th Congress for child welfare services in the public welfare amendments of 1962, thus permitting continued orderly growth in each of the children's programs under the Social Security Act.

It will be noted that the committee report estimates that at least 10 percent of the additional funds provided under both the maternal and child health and the crippled children's programs will be expended directly on programs for mentally retarded children. Because I am convinced of the overriding importance of moving ahead on mental retardation I have in my discussions with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and his staff urged them to plan to utilize a much higher proportion of the new funds for services which will help to prevent the occurrence of mental retardation in our children and the amelioration of its tragic consequences when it does occur. This bill strikes at the very roots of the problem by making available adequate services for mothers and children who otherwise would not have them.

SPECIAL PROJECT GRANTS FOR MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE

The report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation points out that the risk of having a mentally retarded child is much greater among women in the lower income groups who receive poor maternity care. Studies are cited which show that women who have had no prenatal care are two or three times as likely to have premature babies as those who have had adequate prenatal care. And brain damage with resultant mental retardation is reported in over one-fourth of the premature babies weighing less than 3½ pounds.

Our efforts to prevent mental retardation must, therefore, include programs to provide good maternity care for women who have various complications of pregnancy which increase the hazards of childbirth for themselves and their babies. Such complications are more prevalent in low income families than among the rest of the population. For such expectant mothers, good maternity care provided during the prenatal period, labor and delivery, and the postpartum period is of critical importance. Hospitalization may be necessary during the prenatal period in order to postpone the premature onset of labor by providing complete bed rest.

Section 4 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a 5-year program of grants to provide essential health care to prospective mothers who, as determined by the State or local health agency, will not otherwise receive such care because they are from families with low income or for other reasons beyond their control. In addition to care during pregnancy, at the time of and following childbirth, the care would include health care for mothers and their infants. This care would be available particularly for prospective mothers who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to their own health or to the health of their babies, including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants.

The annual authorization for these grants is $5 million for the fiscal year 1964, $15 million for fiscal year 1965, and $30 million for the next 3 fiscal years.

In view of the relationship between maternity care and mental retardation, the fact that there is a large and increasing number of expectant mothers who are receiving unsatisfactory maternity care is a matter of great concern to me. In the District of Columbia last year one-half of the women giving birth at the District of Columbia General Hospital had no prenatal care.

In Philadelphia, 10,000 women were delivered last year who had poor or no prenatal care.

In Atlanta, about one-fourth of the women having babies at the Grady Hospital had no prenatal care.

In Dallas, one-third of the women who were delivered as free or part-pay patients had no prenatal care.

At the same time our public clinics and hospitals are greatly overcrowded. In Baltimore during the decade 1950–60 infants registered at public well-baby clinics increased 59 percent and women registered at public prenatal clinics, 133 percent.

Dr. John D. Thompson, professor and chairman of the Department of Obstetrics at Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, recently stated:

> The failure of large charity hospitals to maintain programs of excellent maternity care is often due to circumstances beyond their control, such as the lack of funds to pay for a nonprofessional and professional staff sufficient in number and competence, the lack of funds for adequate facilities, and the overwhelming task of providing for the medical needs of an enormous number of indigent patients.
>
> On the obstetrical services of these large charity hospitals, the massiveness of the prenatal clinics is unbelievable. It is simply not possible to give adequate prenatal care under these circumstances of too many patients; too few doctors, nurses, social workers, etc.; and inadequate facilities. Each patient is seen for only a very few minutes by a doctor. The doctor does not get to know the patient and the patient does not get to know the doctor. Many important aspects of prenatal care have to be omitted.

In order to have room for the large volume of maternity patients in these hospitals the mothers—and usually their infants with them—have to be discharged 24 to 72 hours after delivery and sometimes even earlier. Private patients, on the other hand, customarily stay in the hospital 5 to 6 days.

To alleviate this increasingly grave situation, H.R. 7544 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a 5-year program of project grants to provide necessary health care to prospective mothers who have—or are likely to have—conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to their health or the health of their babies. Health care after childbirth will also be provided for these mothers and their babies. The State or local health agency will determine that the mothers and babies will not otherwise receive necessary health care because of low income or other reasons beyond their control. These project grants will make possible necessary maternity care to selected high risk patients and will greatly improve the quality and adequacy of care for these patients. They will also contribute to our knowledge of ways of reducing childhood disability that is related to damage during childbirth. Such grants which will not exceed 75 percent of the cost of projects will enable health departments to: first, to increase the number of prenatal clinics; second, bring the clinics close to the population to be served; third, establish special clinics for patients with obstetric complications; fourth, pay for hospital care for high risk patients in voluntary nonprofit community hospitals providing care of good quality, thus relieving the overcrowded conditions in city and county hospitals. In many communities, when public hospitals are greatly overcrowded thus increasing the difficulties of providing the special care needed by high-risk patients, voluntary hospitals are frequently operating at less than capacity; fifth, provide for medical consultations essential for many high-risk patients; and, sixth, provide hospital care for premature infants in special units.

Through the development of these programs, all of the available resources in a community could be mobilized to provide the kind of care that is needed for high-risk mothers and their babies, thereby helping to reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing and to decrease the number of premature births. Notably larger numbers of children born prematurely have handicapping conditions, including mental retardation.

RESEARCH PROJECTS RELATING TO MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES AND CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Section 4 of the bill provides new authority to the Department of a research grant program in maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Its purpose is to enable the Children's Bureau to carry out more adequately its responsibilities in child health research. Since 1912, under the basic act creating it, the Children's Bureau has had responsibility "to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life among all classes of our people." Under this act, the Bureau may conduct its own studies but it does not have specific authority for a research grant nor can it enter into other cooperative financial arrangements for research studies. As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I was keenly aware of this gap in the research authority of the Bureau and it is my firm conviction that this legislation is urgently needed. The proposal is based on the premise that an agency operating a service program should have authority and funds to stimulate and support studies, investigations, and research directed toward improvement of services.

Such authority will enable the Children's Bureau to support studies directed toward improving maternal and child health and crippled children's services. As an agency administering funds for services, the Children's Bureau is concerned that the quality and efficiency of such services be maintained at a high level. A research grant program directed primarily toward a study of services can accomplish this.

The present proposal is similar in substance to H.R. 9299 introduced in the House by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee on September 19, 1961, and in the Senate as S. 2273 by Senator Kerr, for himself and Senator Hill, on July 18, 1961. These identical bills were companion legislation to that for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and were part of the President's plan for improving the health of the Nation's children. The Congress enacted the legislation for the Institute but no action was taken on this complementary bill.

Activity of this kind is a well-established pattern in the Department. In the Public Health Service, the Institutes of Health, for example, carry out basic research while research relating to programs is a function of the Bureau of State Services. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has similar research grant authority and in 1956 the Congress provided for such a program of research in the Social Security Administration, which is now available to the Welfare Administration. In 1960, the Social Security Act was amended to give the Children's Bureau authority to make grants for research and demonstration projects in child welfare. Only the child health programs of the Children's Bureau are without this authority.

This proposed program in no way encroaches on the activities of the new National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, which is concerned with basic research. There will be no duplication or overlapping of function between the Children's Bureau and the institute.

Though obviously interested in the application of research findings to programs of service the new Institute will be concerned with basic research. Under the authorization contained in this bill, the Children's Bureau will concentrate on research directed toward the evaluation of programs and improving the development, management, and effectiveness of the programs which are authorized or expanded under this bill. The Children's Bureau and the National Institutes of Health, after discussion of their appropriate roles, have developed a memorandum of understanding which will serve as a means of preventing duplication. Provision is made for liaison between the two agencies, so that their programs can be mutually beneficial.

Under this section of the bill, certain collaborative efforts will be possible. For example, the establishment of a rare case registry for mental retardation clinics would enable research workers wishing to study a particular condition to locate similar cases in other clinics, thus providing a large enough base for adequate research. A study to follow over a 5-year period the effect of treatment in phenylketonuria in preventing retardation, for which the research design is prepared but for which funds are not available could be launched as a cooperative endeavor.

Among the types of questions which this program would answer are:

How many children with operable congenital heart conditions are not receiving care, and why?

How does the changing pattern of conditions cared for in pediatric units of hospitals affect the need for hospital beds and for outpatient services?

What methods of assessing a mentally retarded child's potential for progress are applicable in the office of a pediatrician or general practitioner?

How can crippled children with defects such as congenital dislocation of the hip be protected from excessive X-ray exposure during their long course of treatment?

What are the health problems which bring adolescents to adolescent medical clinics?

What are the costs and comparative effectiveness of providing clinical services to mentally retarded children through various settings—hospital, local, district health department, and so forth?

What is the availability of services for blind retarded children and what kinds of services do they require?

Many more such questions could be added, but this sample shows the variety of unanswered questions of concern to administrators of maternal and child health and crippled children's programs.

This new authority will be especially useful in implementing the recommendations of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation.

The President, in his special message to the Congress on mental illness and mental retardation named these objectives: Study of the causes, increase in skilled manpower, and strengthening and improvement of programs. It is for this third objective that this section of the bill will be especially effective. Program expansion and improvement should rest squarely on facts about program, on data relating to need and on tested methods of providing care. This research grant program would permit the Children's Bureau to acquire such knowledge through applied research.

GRANTS FOR PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE ACTION TO COMBAT MENTAL RETARDATION

The one-time appropriation of $2.2 million for grants to assist States in developing plans for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation is designed to carry out one of the recommendations made by President Kennedy in his message on mental health and mental retardation. With respect to planning grants, President Kennedy said:

> The fact that mental retardation ordinarily exists from birth or early childhood, the highly specialized medical, psychological, and educational evaluation which are required, and the complex and unique social, educational, and vocational lifetime needs of the retarded individual, all require that there be developed a comprehensive approach to this specific problem. * * *
>
> The key to the development of this comprehensive new approach toward services for the mentally retarded is twofold. First, there must be public understanding to meet all problems * * *. States and communities need to appraise their needs and resources,

> review current programs, and undertake preliminary actions leading to comprehensive State and community approaches to these objectives. To stimulate public awareness and the development of comprehensive plans, I recommend legislation to establish a program of special project grants to the States for financing State reviews of needs and programs in the field of mental retardation. * * *
>
> Grants will be awarded on a selective basis to State agencies presenting acceptable proposals for this broad interdisciplinary planning activity. The purpose of these grants is to provide for every State an opportunity to begin to develop a comprehensive, integrated program to meet all the needs of the retarded.

In many ways, the mentally retarded require help throughout their lives—through childhood, adolescence, adulthood, and old age. Their special needs change according to their age and to the degree of retardation. They require education, rehabilitation, employment, health, legal protection, family and residential care, and a variety of community services.

Community services generally take the form of diagnostic and clinical services, care in residential institutions, special education, vocational rehabilitation, and social services—such as professional work with parents' groups, casework, group work, and day care.

However, resources for the mentally retarded vary widely from State to State and among cities and communities within the States.

The President's Panel on Mental Retardation made a series of recommendations to encourage the States to undertake the joint planning and coordination of services for the mentally retarded. It urged the Governor of each State to review the array of services that are or should be available to the retarded and to assess the extent to which each function should be strengthened.

The President's Panel also recommended that Federal activities reinforce the principle and practice of comprehensive planning and coordination at the regional, State, and local levels. To this end, the Panel specifically recommended that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be authorized to make grants to States for planning leading to comprehensive State and community action on mental retardation.

These grants would assist the States in working out a plan which would assure full consideration of all aspects of services essential to planning for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

These grants would have four primary objectives:

First. To provide a means for encouraging all the States to initial systematic follow-up action on the report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation;

Second. To enlist the support of the State Governors, top officials, and outstanding laymen in planning to meet present and future needs in the field of mental retardation;

Third. To enhance public awareness and understanding of the massiveness of the problem and of the resources and modern knowledge now at our disposal to combat it; and

Fourth. To foster the development and coordination of the mental retardation aspects of programs of education, rehabilitation, welfare, employment, health, recreation, and protection of the legal rights of the mentally retarded.

One final point: I wish to assure Senators that there is no duplication between H.R. 7544, which I hope will be approved overwhelmingly, and S. 1576 passed by the Senate with amendments on September 19 and now in conference. Each of these bills is a part of the administration's bold, vigorous, and new approach to the problem of mental retardation. Each has been carefully designed to strengthen existing authority and to establish new authority in order to bring about national action to combat mental retardation.

H.R. 7544 is directed toward preventive measures to reduce the incidence of mental retardation, applied research in evaluation and improvement of programs, and State planning to develop public awareness of the problem, to coordinate resources and to establish programs of State and local action to combat retardation. S. 1576 provides for the construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded. H.R. 7544, on the other hand, does not provide for any construction.

The proposals contained in H.R. 7544 will carry out five of the recommendations made by the President for combating mental retardation. His eloquent message to the Congress last February is ample evidence of the overriding need for it. More than enough is known about the needs of mothers and children to make important inroads against some of the causes of mental retardation. It is to this end that the bill I am discussing is addressed. With the Senate's approval, it will be possible to prevent mental retardation in many of our children, to salvage the lives of thousands now retarded and to move forward to finding solutions to the tragic circumstances in their lives, their families, and their communities.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 7544) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the last two measures were passed.

Mr. **McNAMARA**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROPOSAL FOR SWEEPING NEW FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. **TALMADGE**. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion in recent days as to whether or not we in the United States should sell wheat to the Soviet Union.

One of the major objections raised by the opponents of such a venture is that, in order for us to sell wheat to Russia at the world price, the American taxpayers will have to subsidize the Communist purchase.

U.S. growers sell wheat at the farm for about $1.90 a bushel in the domestic market. But the competitive export price is around $1.30 a bushel.

This means that in order to sell wheat abroad—whether to a friend, a neutralist or an enemy—and at the same time maintain farm income level at home, the Federal Government must pay an export subsidy of 60 cents a bushel.

This is paid to the exporter—the man who buys, sells, and ships the wheat. But, in effect, it subsidizes the foreign purchase. And this means that if the Russians buy 100 million bushels of wheat from us—assuming we will sell it to them—the American taxpayers will help the Communists out with a subsidy of $60 million. If the purchase is for 300 million bushels, the subsidy will amount to $180 million.

Mr. President, I am not at this point arguing the question whether we should or should not sell wheat to the Communist countries. But what I am trying to point out is that this situation should spotlight the crying need for a sweeping revision of our farm price support and export subsidy programs.

Through the years we have created a costly, inefficient hodgepodge of agricultural laws and programs that drastically need to be straightened out and brought up to date.

Most of our basic agricultural laws were written in the 1930's in the midst of the depression, when the farm population of America comprised 30 percent of the people. Our agricultural population now represents only about 7 percent of the people in the United States.

The principal difficulty with most of our price support legislation is the fact that it makes a pawnbroker out of the Government of the United States. The farmer pawns his farm commodities to the Government, and if the price goes below the pawn value of the crop, the Government takes title to the crop.

This gives the Government the responsibility of acquiring or buying farm commodities, storing farm commodities, shipping farm commodities, and selling or giving away farm commodities.

The cost of all these commodity price support and directly related activities amounts to approximately $2.2 billion annually, and this does not include the cost of foreign assistance programs involving farm commodities which amount to an additional approximately $2.2 billion per year.

The only justification for a price support program is to assure the farmer of a fair share of the national income and a fair price for his product. Any extraneous activity in the hands of the Government should be eliminated, not only in the interest of the taxpayers but also in the interest of our farmers and to assure a free market.

We have two farm programs now that do not require the Government to be a pawnbroker. These are the Sugar Act and the Wool Act, both of which provide price supports to the farmer.

Under the Sugar Act, payments for the production of sugarcane or sugarbeets are made direct to the farmer. This program works so efficiently and so well, and is so popular, that the last time this issue was before the Senate, it was approved by a vote of 54 to 12.

The Wool Act provides price support for the production of wool, but under its provisions, the Government is not engaged in the business of buying, storing, shipping, warehousing, selling, or giving away wool. The price support is paid direct to the farmers.

The last time the Wool Act program was before the Senate it was approved without question as a part of the Agricultural Act of 1961.

There have been no major complaints from the farmers, the taxpayers, or the wool and sugar industries over the continuance of the Wool Act and Sugar Act programs.

In sharp contrast, two of our basic farm commodities in this country—cotton and wheat—are in great difficulty.

We have stored in Government-owned or Government-licensed warehouses 1.1 billion bushels of wheat which cost the Government $2.1 billion.

At the beginning of this marketing year, August 1, the carryover of cotton was more than 11.1 million bales, of which the Commodity Credit Corporation owned approximately 8.5 million bales. The cost of this cotton to the Government was $1.4 billion.

Neither of these commodities—cotton or wheat—can be shipped overseas unless the Government pays an export subsidy of $42.50 per bale for cotton, or nearly 60 cents a bushel for wheat.

This means that, in addition to what the Government has sustained in losses on these products, which must be paid by the taxpayers, there must be sustained a further loss of dollars to ship into foreign channels of commerce.

This also means that the American consumer must pay an artificially high price when these products are sold domestically.

There has been much comment in recent days regarding the Soviet Union purchasing wheat or corn from the United States of America. We have found that the United States alone cannot impose a food blockade on either the Soviet Union or the Communist bloc. All of our allies are selling wheat or corn or whatever nonstrategic commodities they might have to any member of the Soviet bloc, including Red China. Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have sold their surpluses of wheat, leaving the United States of America with the only wheat surplus in the world today.

If we had a program of compensatory payments on our basic farm commodities, the cost of the buying, storing, shipping, financing, and disposing of our farm crops could be immediately eliminated. This cost was over $1 billion in the fiscal year 1963.

We would have no problem regarding the exporting of any of our farm commodities if we provided for a system of compensatory payments. The crops would go into the channels of private trade at their realistic price, and such subsidies as are paid would go directly to the farmer, not to foreigners, not to the warehouseman, not to the railroads, not to government bureaucrats supervising such activities.

We could eliminate at one fell swoop the problem of export trade by paying the subsidy direct to the farmers. This would be particularly beneficial in our cotton industry.

We have seen a half million jobs and half a thousand textile mills eliminated in the United States since the conclusion of World War II, due to two things:

First. Premium prices that American mills must pay of $42.50 a bale for American cotton above the price foreign mills pay for that same American cotton.

Second. Unfair importations from foreign countries whose workers earn only about 10 percent of what the American textile workers earn.

Mr. President, I introduced in the Senate earlier this year a Cotton Domestic Allotment Act, which would do away with this iniquitous two-price system for cotton, eliminate the need for the export subsidy, and end acreage controls on the planting of cotton.

My bill, I am convinced, is not only badly needed but would go a long, long way toward solving the many ills that beset our sorely ailing cotton industry—both on the farms and in the mills.

I would heartily welcome my colleagues' assistance in getting this badly needed legislation passed.

For the last several years I also have introduced the Talmadge farm plan which would apply to all basic farm commodities the same treatment that the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act would apply to cotton.

The Talmadge farm plan would eliminate all acreage controls and Government loans and instead assign to each farmer a domestic production quota. The farmer would be guaranteed the difference between the price he received for his domestic production quota and 100 percent of parity.

Such a program would eliminate the need for costly export subsidies. It would take the redtape out of the farm program. It would end the regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls. It would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it as he pleases.

It would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, and selling farm commodities. It would guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income, and restore agriculture to a free-enterprise, competitive basis.

Such an approach would mark a fresh start on our agricultural programs. It would reduce costs to the taxpayer and it would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry while putting American agricultural products, both raw and processed, back on the world market at competitive prices.

It would give the farmer protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and the right to collective bargaining, and industry's tariff and Government contracts and subsidies.

This sort of program would not only end the necessity of American taxpayers subsidizing foreign purchases, but it would strengthen our agriculture and its family farm system, and it would strengthen the entire broad base of our national economy.

Mr. President, I would hope that, if not this year, then surely next year, Senators will come around to the realization of the need for this sweeping revision of our farm laws, and will join me in this effort on behalf of the farmers and every man, woman, and child in the United States of America.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the able Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator from Georgia for his persistence and his eloquence in championing his farm proposal. I can recall that 3 or 4 years ago the Senator from Georgia delivered in the Senate a most impressive address on this subject. I shall never forget it. It was one of the best farm addresses I have heard since I have been in the Senate.

Today, the Senator from Georgia has pointed out one of the very serious weaknesses of the proposed sale of wheat to Russia. Did I correctly understand him to say that, in his judgment, under the present law, if we sell the wheat to Russia we shall, in fact, be providing to the Soviet Union a subsidy of approximately 60 cents a bushel—or, on a 100-million-bushel sale $60 million; or on a 300-million-bushel sale, approximately $180 million?

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

First, however, let me thank the able Senator from Wisconsin for his complimentary remarks. I am deeply grateful. He has served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I also have the honor to serve; and he has been dedicated in his zeal and in his efforts on behalf of the American farmer. He has particularly taken leadership in connection with the proposed dairy legislation that has come before our committee—primarily because of his keen knowledge of the area, and also because of the fact that the State of Wisconsin, which he so well represents, is the leading dairy State in the Union.

To amplify, in response to the question of the able Senator, let me state that there are price supports for the basic farm commodities in the United States; and the prices of most of them are higher than the world market prices. Unfortunately, our price-support program for our farmers is totally unrealistic, because it makes the U.S. Government a pawnbroker for those farm commodities.

For instance, if a farmer produces a bushel of wheat, and if he desires to sell it in the United States the price support at the present time is about $1.90 per bushel, as I recall; and he can sell it in the open market. If he cannot get $1.90 for it, he deposits it in a Government-licensed warehouse; and if the price goes below the loan value, the farmer forfeits his title to the wheat. To whom? To the Government. The Government then takes ownership of that bushel of wheat; and if the Government can find no American miller who will pay more than the loan value of that particular bushel of wheat, the Government is stuck with it. So the Government first acquires title to the wheat, and then has custody of the wheat, which it must either place in a Government warehouse or must pay storage charge on it if it is placed in a private warehouse. Frequently the Government is engaged in the business of transporting the wheat. Finally, if it can sell wheat in the oversea market, because the price support is some 60 cents higher in the United States than in the world market at the present time, it can sell that bushel of wheat only by paying an export subsidy of 60 cents a bushel, which goes to the exporter.

A man buys the wheat and then sells it overseas at a loss, and the Government makes up the difference. So my answer to the question is "Yes." It is a subsidy, both to the American farmer and to whoever buys it overseas. The taxpayers have an investment of 60 cents or more a bushel in the wheat that they lose. Whoever consumes the wheat has the benefit of that subsidy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I understand, those who contend that the proposal would not be a subsidy to the Soviet Union—and I certainly do not join them—argue that if we do not sell the wheat to the Soviet Union, the U.S.S.R. will buy it at the world price elsewhere. My answer has been—and I ask the Senator from Georgia if I am correct—that when 100 or 200 million bushels of wheat are sold abroad, there is a great effect on the world price, particularly in a year in which there have been very serious crop shortages throughout the Eastern Hemisphere. If we do not sell that wheat, it will be necessary for the Russians to pay substantially more than the world price at the present time in order to obtain that much.

Mr. TALMADGE. That may or may not be true. I should like to answer the Senator's question in the following way: The United States has learned that a one-nation food blockade cannot be effective, either on the Soviet Union or other members of the Communist bloc. We have been very strict in not selling many of our commodities to the Soviet Union. However, we do have some trade with the Soviet Union. The only legal prohibition against it, as I understand the law, is an export law. Anyone who exports any commodity from the United States must acquire an export license, which must come from the Department of Commerce. The prohibition against exports to the Soviet Union is only against the exportation of strategic materials. Wheat and food have not been held to be strategic materials. We have exported some food commodities to the Soviet Union. But we have not heretofore exported any commodities to the Soviet Union in respect of which there was a loss in the transaction to the Government of the United States, which in effect would be a subsidy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is an explicit sense-of-Congress provision in the preamble to the Agriculture Act of 1961 which specifies that we will sell subsidized agricultural products only to friendly nations. The term "friendly nation" is defined specifically as excluding the U.S.S.R. So as far as the sense of Congress is concerned—and I admit that this is aside from the explicit provisions of the law itself—the sense of Congress is that such a sale should not be made.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct. I believe the Senator is referring to the Latta amendment that was placed in the preamble to Public Law 480 the last time it was before the Congress, which I believe was in 1961. The Senator has attended briefing sessions with me and other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on Foreign Relations. We have been advised by the highest representatives of the Cabinet that there is no legal prohibition against the export of this wheat to the Soviet Union. But I agree with the Senator that it does violate the sense-of-Congress statement that was incorporated in the preamble to Public Law 480.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TALMADGE. Further in response to the able Senator, as he knows, the Soviets have been buying a good deal of wheat from many of our greatest friends and strongest allies. Canada has sold wheat; Australia has sold wheat to the Soviet Union. Many other countries that are friendly to the United States—in fact, some that are allied with us—have sold wheat to the Soviet Union. But the only country in the world that has a wheat surplus today is the United States. As the Senator knows, there is also evidence that the Soviet Union has been buying wheat in Western Europe that has come from us. I refer particularly to West Germany and other countries which manufacture the wheat into flour and export it to the Soviet Union for cash. I have not firmly made up my mind as to what my position would be on the export of wheat that is ultimately exported to the Soviet Union. Certainly I would not favor giving it to them. As the Senator knows, we are now giving wheat to Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Poland.

I would not favor giving it to them. I would not favor giving them any inordinate credit terms. But if they are willing to pay us in convertible cash, gold or dollars, the question arises as to whether or not we will still pay storage costs on surplus wreat, give surplus wheat to certain Communist countries, and refuse to sell it to other Communist countries.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is absolutely correct in his statement that we now have the world's only surplus of wheat. Canada probably cannot deliver another additional bushel. Western Europe has had bad agricultural conditions, so it does not have sufficient wheat. The wheat must come from our country anyway. So if we refuse to sell it to the Soviet Union, I point out that, first, the farmers of our country will be as well off, if we sell to our allies, and let them sell.

Second, if we have 200 or 300 million bushels—a quantity so vast that it would take many months to deliver it in many ships—it seems to the Senator from Wisconsin that it would be practical and possible for us to specify that the wheat should not be milled into flour and sold to the Soviet Union in large quantities, or sold to the Soviet Union in any other fashion in large quantities. It might be possible to sell a few million bushels without our "knowledge," but to sell 100 million bushels, or even 50 million bushels, would be obviously impossible without our knowing, in view of the time required to deliver the wheat, and the fact that we know very well that Western Germany does not consume anything like that quantity. The same thing would be true of any other country.

Mr. TALMADGE. As the Senator knows, we have tried to apply some restrictions of that type. But I point out that when we sell our wheat, title is vested in the purchaser. He may take any action that he sees fit to take. There is really no way in which we could impose restrictions or obligations upon a foreign country as to what it might do with wheat purchased from us. It would become the property of that country, to be disposed of as it saw fit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is right. It seems possible to the Senator from Wisconsin that we could specify use of the wheat by the countries receiving it. There is no reason we could not talk to them about it. In view of Adenauer's statement yesterday that our sale to the U.S.S.R. would benefit communism, we could talk to Chancellor Adenauer and, I presume, to almost any head of state, including de Gaulle, pointing out that we are completely and totally opposed to having the wheat go to the Soviet Union. We could say that we shall follow whatever policies we must follow to see that it does not go to the Soviet Union, including, if necessary, action to cut off wheat shipments to other countries if it is obvious that they are shipping millions of bushels to the Soviet Union when we sell it to them.

Mr. TALMADGE. That statement is undoubtedly true. The Senator knows that the determination of policy on that question will have to be made at the highest level of government. I do not know whether it will be an Executive policy or whether Congress will be requested to participate in that policy. My information on the law is as the Senator has stated.

There is no legal provision against it. But there is a statement in the preamble of Public Law 480 as amended in 1961 by what is known as the Latta amendment which recommends against the sale to the Soviet Union. I have some misgivings about the matter. Since we have been engaged in a deadlock and controversy with the Communist bloc since the conclusion of World War II, we view these questions with misgiving. But we realize that our one-nation blockade has been totally ineffective. I believe that we have on hand about 1,200 million bushels of wheat, which is purchased and stored at a fantastic cost to the Government of the United States. Our allies have already liquidated their surpluses. Many of them have gone to the Soviet Union. I do not know what final action will be taken. Any elimination of the surplus, whether it be in this country or in other countries, will benefit not only the farmers of America, but wheat producers throughout the world.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

While I personally support the projected sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, and do not necessarily agree with the farm program advanced by the Senator from Georgia, I congratulate him very much indeed for stressing the need for new, forceful, and across-the-board thinking on the question of agricultural production and supports. My own hope is that in our much vaunted free enterprise economy eventually the law of supply and demand will be able to operate with greater freedom. I am sure that is also the hope of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Indeed, it is. I am grateful to my distinguished friend for his comments. The program I have proposed would be a long step in that direction.

There are now provided very rigid price support programs. There are rigid acreage quotas. The small farmer is prevented from expanding his production. Many farmers of our country who grow wheat or tobacco or cotton or other commodities upon which price supports are paid have been reduced to fantastically small acreages. If they were receiving 200 or 300 percent of parity, they would be unable to make a living.

I visualize allocating a domestic quota to the farmer, based on his history of production, giving him complete freedom to plant whatever he sees fit over and above the domestic allotment, with the price supports to be paid only on his share of the domestic consumption and the price support itself to go to the farmer, as is now done under the Wool Act and under the Sugar Act. In that way we would save more than a billion dollars a year in the costs of acquisition, storing, shipping, selling, giving away, and supervising these farm commodities.

STRANGE POLITICAL BODY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Senate voted to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for another year over the vigorous protests of those of us who believe that this politically inspired Commission serves no useful purpose and in fact is so ill advised, intemperate, and biased that it does much more harm than good in the area of human relations.

In an editorial of September 30, the Atlanta Journal, of which Jack Spalding is editor, wrote with great truth that the Commission has come up with some preposterous ideas for "dissolving the Union," such as its recent recommendation to withhold Federal funds from States which do not deal with their racial problems the way the Commission thinks they should be handled.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHTS COMMISSION

> If the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission is ended by Congress it will mean the end of a strange political body in this country. For it was this Commission which wanted to plant seeds which could weaken the Federal Government more than any States righter would ever dream.
>
> The Commission recommended to the President that Federal funds to Mississippi be cut off because of the way that State was handling its race problem. The President declined to follow that advice.
>
> If the President had brought about a cutting off of Federal funds to that State, then Mississippi would have been quite justified in embargoing all Federal taxes coming from there.
>
> And once the ties of money between Jackson and Washington were cut, there wouldn't be much left to hold them together.
>
> If Congress sees fit to continue the life of the Commission it should be interesting to see what other ideas it can come up with for dissolving the Union.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the Wall Street Journal for October 1 there appeared an excellent article concerning the rate of unemployment, especially among married men. I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal article repeatedly emphasizes a point which has been made by many others; namely, that we need much more qualitative analysis of the unemployment figures which we have. For example, the Wall Street Journal quotes Mr. George W. Taylor, chairman of the industry department at the University of Pennsylvania:

> There is need for greater emphasis on qualitative analysis of employment statistics, as opposed to sweeping, quantitative analysis which tends to focus on magic numbers.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Statistics Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee I have been very concerned about this matter for a number of years. In 1962 this subcommittee issued a report, "Employment and Unemployment," which dealt entirely with the inadequacies of our present statistics on unemployment and proposals for improvement. I would urge the Members of this body to take a look at that report. Its first and most general recommendation is as follows:

> 1. The most serious gap in our knowledge of unemployment concerns the nature and attitude of the unemployed. We need to know far more about their degree of aggressiveness in seeking work, as shown by registration and calls at employment offices and agencies, efforts to secure training or retraining, search of help wanted ads, travel to find jobs, willingness to move to accept jobs, and efforts at self-employment. We need to know more about the effects of income, especially unemployment compensation, relief payments, and social security benefits (described by one witness as the social minimum wage) on the efforts and attitude of the unemployed in seeking work. We also need to know more about the relation of unemployed workers to family units—are they heads of households, second or third workers in households, or are they outside family units? More knowledge is also needed about the effect of poor health on susceptibility to unemployment.

Other recommendations included in this report were that more use should be made of the information now being processed; that the nature, uses and especially the limitations of the statistics should be expanded; and that more information on the nature and composition of the labor force is needed.

Following the recommendations of this report, a report was issued in September of 1962 by a presidential commission to appraise employment and unemployment statistics. This Commission indicated among other things that substantial improvements were necessary in the counting of both unemployed and employed. The areas covered included the self-employed, the nature of occupations, statistics on the number of persons who had stopped looking for work, and especially on the nature of those who are unemployed but looking for work. For example, the report urged that information be made available on the number of hours of work which people wanted, the specific ways in which individuals searched for jobs, the nature of work that the unemployed were willing to accept.

Mr. President, as the Wall Street Journal and our committee report clearly point out, this is not an academic statistical question. The major underlying justification for many economic policies which we in the Congress are urged to pass upon is that unemployment exists.

In fact, from the economic standpoint I would say that is the major justification. Yet our information on the nature of this unemployment is very inadequate. We should certainly have both in the Congress and in the executive branch, as well as in the private economy, much more information on the nature of the unemployed, their real desires for work, the types of work which they are willing to accept, their skills and their aptitudes.

This sort of information would, I am convinced, significantly influence the nature of policies which we would consider. I believe quite strongly, for example, that overall aggregative changes in demand, such as might be induced by tax reduction, will simply accentuate the bottlenecks which we are experiencing at the present time with respect to certain types of labor skills, such as engineering ability, scientific research training, and so forth. At the same time I strongly suspect that such aggregative policies will do very little to aid those specific groups in our society that are now having the greatest difficulty in obtaining jobs.

To take this out of the realm of the academic, I am talking about whether a tax cut really will help people who do not have the education or the skill or the background to seek employment. For those, we will need far more specific types of proposals such as retraining programs, further educational work, and so forth.

EXHIBIT 1

BUSY BREADWINNERS: RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG MARRIED MEN DROPS TO 6-YEAR LOW—MANY COMPANIES PLAN TO LIFT HIRING; FURTHER DECLINE IN OVERALL JOBLESSNESS SEEN—SOME FIRMS CAN'T FIND HELP

Unemployment among married men has slipped to the lowest level in more than half a decade.

Joblessness among all toilers combined—men, women, boys, girls—nears a 3-year low. And a bubbling autumn economy suggests it may drop lower still.

New claims for unemployment insurance in September averaged around 220,000 weekly, down from some 280,000 weekly 3 years ago—when the Nation's population was 10 million smaller than today.

These are the highlights on the job front as summer fades. They stand out through the fog of talk about job destruction by automation. They are not obscured by much-publicized idleness among 14-to-19-year-olds. They are not nullified by widely noted long-term job contraction in special areas like the Appalachian mine country.

BEHIND THE STATISTICS

Statistics on the job front bring this comment from Ira T. Ellis, economist for Du Pont Co.: "Unemployment is a serious problem for the individuals involved, but the problem is very much less than the headlines indicate. Unemployment is relatively high among unskilled workers, particularly the very young. But it is relatively low among professionally trained and other technical workers."

And this from George W. Taylor, chairman of the industry department at the University of Pennsylvania: "There is need for greater emphasis on qualitative analysis of employment statistics, as opposed to sweeping, quantitative analysis which tends to focus on magic numbers."

The latest official check (August) shows only 2.96 percent, or about 1 million, of the country's job-desiring married men unemployed, the lowest rate since 1957. The rate for the entire labor force is down to 5.48 percent, only a whisker above the 5.34 percent reached in a temporary drop last October—which was the lowest level since early in 1960.

Here's how both these rates have come down from the high points of the past two recessions, reached in 1958 and in 1961. Figures represent percent unemployed.

	1958 high	1961 high	Latest rate
All civilians	7.62	7.11	5.48
Married men	5.80	5.09	2.96

The unemployed rate among married men, the major breadwinners, is now only half as high as in the 1958 recession.

Today's unemployment is highly concentrated among women and teenagers. Some women support families, of course. Some teenagers do. But the husband is still the primary family supporter.

Official calculators say 55 of every 100 people unemployed now are women or teenagers. The more-than-half proportion of these among the jobless is something new. As recently as 1957 the figure was only 47 per 100 unemployed.

Just before World War II, less than 20 percent of the teenage girls and less than 40 percent of the teenage boys participated in the labor force. Today nearly 30 percent of the girls and nearly 50 percent of the boys participate. Participation in the labor force consists of having some kind of job or else seeking one—and, if just seeking, being counted unemployed.

INVASION OF WOMEN

A startling statistic: Today around 50 percent of all American women in the 45-to-54 age bracket are holding some kind of job or looking for one—and, if just looking, being labeled unemployed. In prewar 1940, less than 25 percent of the women in this age group were in the labor force.

The 6-year low in unemployment among married men "shows there's a job for the breadwinner who really needs one," says Eugene C. Zorn, Jr., economist at Republic National Bank, Dallas. "If he's willing to go out and look for a job—and perhaps even move to another city—he can get a job."

Mr. Zorn adds: "I think there's too much emphasis put on the overall unemployment figures, anyway; sometimes the unemployment picture changes when you look behind the figures."

An indication that breadwinners are indeed busy comes from a loan officer of First-Citizens Bank & Trust Co. in Greensboro, N.C.: "I can't remember when we've last had a loan request from an unemployed married man—there just don't seem to be any in Greensboro."

OVERALL RATE SEEN DROPPING

Many businessmen and economists believe the Nation's overall unemployment rate—led by the dropping rate among breadwinners—will decline further in the months just ahead.

"I expect to see an additional inroads in unemployment as industrial production continues to rise in the coming months," says an economist at Bankers Trust Co., New York.

Donald Sherbondy, labor relations director of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., says, "As business gets better, and there's every indication it will, I think you'll see more young men going back to work and the general unemployment rate going down."

Many executives plan to boost their work forces in the months ahead. In many instances, it's noteworthy, the new jobs will be opening up not in factories, where employment trends often get the most attention, but in the service field.

The 3,000-man sales force of Combined Insurance Co. of America, Chicago, will be doubled in the next 2 years, reports W. Clement Stone, president. "Anyone can get a job by going into sales," Mr. Stone asserts.

Aerospace Corp., a nonprofit organization supplying technical support to Air Force installations in the Los Angeles area, has taken on some 400 more workers in the past year, to bring its total employment to about 4,400, and expects to hire another 300 before mid-1964, a spokesman says.

W. F. Stemmons, president of Stemmons, Inc., Tulsa, Okla., operator of Thrifty Rent-a-Car System, expects to double his staff within a year. Mr. Stemmons already has added 40 employees to handle his expanding car rental service since the year's start.

Frank Zacher, director of personnel of Norton Co., reports the Massachusetts abrasives firm will add 20 to 30 employees to its Worcester work force in the next few weeks. Norton now employs about 4,300 at its Worcester facilities, up from 4,100 6 months ago.

Tufts-New England Medical Center near Boston now employs 1,900 full-time personnel, 200 more than a year ago. "And employment will probably rise even more in the next year," a spokesman says, "because we are expanding a research lab and setting up a facility to produce enzymes synthetically for distribution to other institutions."

WORKERS WANTED

Some administrators even report difficulty hiring as many new workers as they need.

"We've been having trouble getting and keeping qualified workers," says Don Gearheart, president of Hupp Corp., a Cleveland-based producer of heating equipment and appliances. The company's infrared heating division is especially in need of skilled personnel, Mr. Gearheart says.

New England Life Insurance Co. is having trouble finding enough key punch operators to handle electronic data processing equipment recently installed by the Boston company, a spokesman reports. Another shortage at New England Life: Girls who can transcribe material from dictating machines to paper.

"We're having trouble finding the people we need to staff new stores in some communities," says an executive of Stop & Shop, Inc., a Boston retail chain with 11,346 employees, up from 10,186 a year ago. Since the start of 1963, the retailer has added five food supermarkets and seven self-service department stores.

NOT ENOUGH TEACHERS

Checks with school districts show hiring of teachers would rise more sharply if school budgets would permit.

The New York City school district can't fill 500 jobs for specially trained teachers because of insufficient funds. The instructors would have trained backward pupils.

Michigan State University is facing a faculty shortage because of a money pinch. There are 2,000 more students at the university this year than last, but only 14 more faculty members.

Expanding employment in many fields, however, hasn't altered the concern of many economists about the Nation's long-term job picture.

These observers fear, despite its growth, the economy won't be able to expand fast enough in the years ahead to provide jobs for the millions of post-World War II babies who will be entering the job market. And they doubt that a tax cut, now pending in Congress, can be of much help to the jobless workers who lack special training in an age when skills are so much in demand.

"The current decline in unemployment is a result of good business conditions, but shouldn't be construed as a sign that the basic trouble is diminishing," says Richard Vogt, a vice president of the First National Bank of Miami. "On the contrary, I see a much bigger unemployment rate ahead—how high I don't know, but it will be high for a long time to come."

TAX BILL ENFEEBLES AMERICAN REVENUE SYSTEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Times published a couple of days ago another editorial, its second on the tax bill.

Once again the New York Times has indicated in its editorial why it is growing concerned about the question of whether the tax bill should be passed. It calls it a "Christmas grab bag," in which "there is something for everybody, particularly tax experts."

It points out that what it would do is reduce the force, the power, and the authority of the Internal Revenue Act and make it more difficult for the Internal Revenue Act to do the task for which it was basically designed, raising revenues for the Government.

As the editorial concedes:

> There is much less prospect that the bill will succeed in producing a balance between outlays and receipts. This goal could have been accomplished if tax revision had broadened and strengthened the tax system. But this bill calls for a shrinkage of the tax structure combined with preservation of existing loopholes. It stresses generosity, not sacrifice.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAX BILL—II

> There is nothing stingy about the revised tax bill as passed by the House. Like a Christmas grab bag, there is something for everybody, particularly tax experts.
>
> It is generous to those in low-income brackets, eliminating tax payments for some 1,500,000 citizens. It is equally magnanimous to those in high-income brackets, who will benefit from lower rates, a reduction in capital gains taxes and the retention of many inexcusable preferential loopholes.
>
> A cut of $7 billion (on 1964 incomes) may look like small change in an economy of close to $600 billion. The relief granted middle-income taxpayers will hardly seem noticeable. Yet the bill will have an effect through release of additional purchasing power. Consumers who normally spend the bulk of their after-tax incomes will stimulate production, which in turn will increase—to some extent—both jobs and wages. Corporations will benefit from rising sales volume which will mean higher profits and dividends, and increased outlays for new plant. If the administration does hold down spending, the increased activity stemming from tax cuts may produce enough additional revenue to keep the deficit from getting entirely out of hand.
>
> There is much less prospect that the bill will succeed in producing a balance between outlays and receipts. This goal could have been accomplished if tax revision had broadened and strengthened the tax system. But this bill calls for a shrinkage of the tax structure, combined with preservation of existing loopholes. It stresses generosity, not sacrifice.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 530, H.R. 7195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7195) to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-Aid Highway Systems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 5, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 6. Section 307(c) (1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(c) (1) Not to exceed 1½ per centum of the sums apportioned for each fiscal year prior to the fiscal year 1964 to any State under section 104 of this title shall be available for expenditure upon request of the State highway department, with the approval of the Secretary, with or without State funds, for engineering and economic surveys and investigations; for the planning of future highway programs and the financing thereof; for studies of the economy, safety, and convenience of highway usage and the desirable regulation and equitable taxation thereof; and for research and development, necessary in connection with the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of highways and highway systems, and the regulation and taxation of their use."

And, after line 17, to insert a new section, as follows:

> SEC. 7. (a) Subsection (c) of section 106 of title 23 United States Code, is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(c) Items included in any such estimate for construction engineering shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total estimated cost of a project financed with Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds, after excluding from such total estimated cost, the estimated costs of rights-of-way, preliminary engineering, and construction engineering: *Provided*, That such limitation shall be 15 per centum in any State with respect to which the Secretary finds such higher limitation to be necessary. For any project financed with interstate funds, such limitation shall be 10 per centum."
>
> (b) The second sentence of subsection (d) of section 121 of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Payments for construction engineering on any project financed with Federal-aid primary, secondary, or urban funds shall not exceed 10 per centum of the Federal share of the cost of construction of such project after excluding from the cost of construction the costs of rights-of-way, preliminary engineering, and construction engineering: *Provided*, That such limitation shall be 15 per centum in any State with respect to which the Secretary finds such higher limitation to be necessary. For any project financed with interstate funds, such limitation shall be 10 per centum."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I present to the Senate the Federal-Aid Amendments Act of 1963, H.R. 7195, as amended by the Committee on Public Works. The pending measure, which was reported unanimously by the committee, contains six amendments to Federal-aid highway legislation which are basically housekeeping provisions, which have all been recommended or approved by the executive branch, and which entail no new authorization of funds.

The Committee on Public Works conducted a hearing on the proposed legislation on June 10, at which time, and subsequently, we received testimony from individual Senators, representatives of the Department of Commerce, the American Association of State Highway Officials, and the road-building industry.

Since Senate Report No. 552 contains a detailed explanation of the provisions of H.R. 7195, I shall only briefly summarize the intent and effects of the different sections of the bill.

Section 2 amends section 104(b) (3) of the United States Code by eliminating a special provision applicable to Vermont and Connecticut in the apportionment of urban highway funds. Under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, special provision was made for apportionment of urban funds to towns of Connecticut and Vermont regardless of their incorporated status. The intent was to provide equal treatment for Connecticut and Vermont in relation to the apportionment of urban funds to the other States.

Due, however, to a change in the definition of "urban population" adopted by the Bureau of the Census in 1960, the special provision for Connecticut and Vermont in the act of 1944 has resulted in those States receiving additional apportionment of funds from counting some of the same persons in both rural and urban categories. This so-called preferential treatment, which has had the effect of additional apportionments for the fiscal years 1963, 1964, and 1965, was not revealed to the Congress until the publication of the Comptroller General's report on August 15, 1962. Because the States of Connecticut and Vermont had already obligated funds for fiscal 1963 and 1964, and had planned their highway programs for 1965, the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Public Works have decided to eliminate the special provision on the date of enactment of the pending measure, rather than make it retroactive to recapture the excess already apportioned.

Section 3 of the bill would amend paragraph 5 of subsection (b) of section 104 of title 23, United States Code, to provide for a change in dates when the Secretary of Commerce is to submit to the Congress new cost estimates for the completion of the Interstate System. Under the present law, three more cost estimates must be presented to the Congress by the Secretary of Commerce. The proposed amendment would provide for the same number of estimates, but would establish January 1965 as the the date for submission of the estimate on which apportionment of funds would be based for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969.

Additional estimates would be presented in January 1968, for the apportionment of 1970 funds; the final apportionment of 1971 would be based on the estimate to be submitted in 1969. Because of the necessary leadtime which must be provided for highway planning and construction, the committee considers it essential to the effective administration of our highway program that the proposed new dates for the submission of cost estimates be adopted.

Section 4 of the bill amends subsection (b) of section 109 of title 23, United States Code, by eliminating the 1975 interstate "design date" as set forth in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. At the time Congress enacted this measure it stipulated that all projects on the Interstate System must be constructed according to design standards which would accommodate traffic projected for

1975. It is anticipated that the Interstate System will have been half completed by the end of 1964. Under the present legislation, therefore, the closer we come to 1975, the less realistic and less economical become our design standards for the remainder of the Interstate System.

It is the general consensus of highway engineers that the optimum design for major highways is that which will accommodate the volume of traffic projected for 20 years from the time of construction. The proposed legislation therefore substitutes the 20-year period for the design date of 1975. However, the committee report indicates—and I reiterate this point—that the 20-year period should be administered with sufficient flexibility to accommodate the reasonable and necessary timelag between traffic studies and preliminary designs and the final approval of plans, specifications, and estimates for actual construction of a given project.

Section 5 of the bill extends to July 1, 1965, the cutoff date prior to which a State may enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Commerce to qualify for the additional one-half of 1 percent of its Federal apportionment for a project as a bonus for controlling outdoor advertising along the right-of-way.

Section 6 and section 7 are Senate amendments to H.R. 7195 as we received it from the other body. Section 6 amends section 307(c)(1) of title 23, United States Code, to provide for reimbursement of the States for development as well as research projects in connection with highway planning, design, construction and maintenance. The present law allows the States to use 1½ percent of their apportioned funds for research. The word "development" occurs in paragraph (a) of section 307 and provides the basis for the practice of the Bureau of Public Roads in reimbursing the States for development projects which they conduct under the initiative of the Federal Government. However, present law provides no specific authority for the reimbursement of the States for such projects conducted under their own initiative. This amendment would offer such authority. In so doing, it would make development in the highway field an integral part of a research and development program, as in most other Government agencies, and it would stimulate the States to greater initiative and a more active role in this area.

Finally, section 7 of the bill proposes a measure which the Senate passed on earlier in this session but on which the other body has not acted. This section would amend subsection (c) of section 106 of title 23, United States Code, to raise the limitation, at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, on payments for construction engineering for Federal-Aid primary, secondary, and urban projects from 10 to 15 percent. Since this provision would apply only to the Federal share of payments, the maximum net benefit to any State, with reference to the affected projects, would be a 2½ percent transfer to construction engineering costs of Federal funds which would otherwise be used for the Federal share of actual construction. No State would receive under this provision more or less than the total funds apportioned it under present legislation.

During the past decade or more, highway construction costs have remained stable, while engineering construction costs have increased considerably due largely to more stringent Federal requirements and the necessity to employ more highway engineers. In Alaska, where the construction season is an unusually short one, and in some of the Western States where projects may be far removed from established housing facilities, the engineering costs have increased well beyond the 10-percent limitation for Federal participation allowed by the present law. It is the opinion of the committee that enactment of this provision would alleviate the difficulties incurred by some of the States under these conditions.

We have had helpful leadership in the committee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. All members of the committee have been cognizant of the needs of the highways of the Nation.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to congratulate my colleague the senior Senator from West Virginia for his ability in handling this bill, in presenting all the facts to the committee, and receiving therefrom a unanimous vote. I am particularly grateful for the inclusion of the provision which was previously passed by the Senate, enabling the people of certain States, under the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce, to increase the engineering costs from 10 to 15 percent.

It should be pointed out that the Senate had originally passed a bill on that subject, but, in the interest of speed, and because of possible delay in the House, and with the consent of the appropriate committee in the other body, this provision was agreed to.

I am very grateful to the members of the committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the chairman of the full committee, for their very efficient work in this matter.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky, who serves so ably as the ranking minority member of the committee. He was reasonable and realistic in the progress of the measure from the committee to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. I serve on the Subcommittee on Highways of the Committee on Public Works, under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph]. In the hearings on the bill, as in all hearings over which the Senator from West Virginia presides, full testimony was heard on the amendments which became a part of H.R. 7195, the Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1963. All who wanted to testify before the committee were given the opportunity to do so, and full discussion was had in the subcommittee and in the full committee.

I believe the amendments will promote a more effective development of our highway system. I commend the Senator for his deep interest in the highway program and his very effective chairmanship of the subcommittee.

I also commend the able chairman of the full committee, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara].

I wish also to pay tribute to the minority members of the committee for their substantial contribution during consideration of the pending measure.

Finally, I am happy that the amendment which the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and I offered was accepted, to extend the time for States to take advantage of the bonus offered if their legislatures enact authority to control billboards on the areas adjacent to the Interstate and Defense Highway rights-of-way.

I hope the measure will pass.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator. On this measure, as on so many others to come before the Committee on Public Works, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] has demonstrated his competence and his commitment to the improvement of the highway program in Kentucky and throughout the United States.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sorry that necessities of time make it necessary for me to address the Senate on another matter. I must leave the Chamber shortly.

First, I wish to say that earlier this afternoon I missed two yea-and-nay votes in the Senate, one on the Lausche amendment to the so-called fishing vessel bill, and the other on passage of the same bill, S. 1006, to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes.

Had I been present, I would have voted against the Lausche amendment and in favor of the passage of the bill.

Because of the interest in my State on the part of my political critics with regard to my voting record in the Senate, for future reference I wish the Record to show that I was necessarily absent because of my work on the Foreign Relations Committee. Because of my connection with that committee the President of the United States had invited me to the State luncheon for His Majesty, the Emperor of Ethiopia. The Record should show that that was the reason for my absence.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS SITUATION IN CAMBRIDGE, MD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, next I wish to make some brief remarks, in my capacity as an honorary vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in connection with two civil rights matters.

First I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Congres-

SIONAL RECORD an article appearing on the front page of the Washington Post entitled "Amendment on Rights Defeated in Cambridge."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post]

AMENDMENT ON RIGHTS DEFEATED IN CAMBRIDGE—DESEGREGATION PROPOSAL LOST BY 274 VOTES

(By William Chapman)

CAMBRIDGE, MD., October 1.—Cambridge residents today rejected by 274 votes the proposed equal accommodations amendment which was designed to settle months of racial strife in this Eastern Shore city.

The total vote was 1,994 to 1,720 against the amendment to desegregate lunchcounters and restaurants in Cambridge.

The vote in the predominantly Negro second ward was 587 for the amendment and 32 against. More than 1,500 Negroes are registered in the ward.

Only 40 percent of the Negro voters cast their ballots, compared to 76 percent in the white wards.

The vote indicated that a large number of this city's Negroes refused to vote on what they consider a human right, not subject to an election.

STUNNING SETBACK

It was a stunning setback for efforts of leading white citizens of this community to end a racial struggle that broke into open street warfare this summer.

Mayor Calvin W. Mowbray, speaking at a brief press conference after the vote was known, said he had no plans for any future racial settlement here. He laid the blame for the defeat on Negro leader Gloria Richardson and said the amendment would have passed if her followers in the second ward had voted in as great a number as the other wards.

"We'll have to start all over again, so as to speak," Mowbray declared.

Asked if local law enforcement officials could handle any future demonstrations, he replied, "No."

Brig. Gen. George M. Gelston said he has no plans for removing his 400 National Guardsmen "in the immediate future."

"Not until the Governor can be assured that there is no probability of unrest down here," he said.

Guardsmen in battle dress stood with rifles on key streetcorners surrounding the Negro district tonight in the largest security measure ordered by Gelston since violence broke out in July.

In Baltimore, Gov. J. Millard Tawes said he was "terribly disappointed. * * * I will have no further comment until I've had a chance to talk with the local people."

White leaders who supported the amendment, including Mayor Mowbray, were shocked and dejected at the outcome. They had predicted an easy victory.

The most unexpected reversal came in the first ward, which includes the city's more affluent citizens. Supporters of the amendment had predicted a comfortable victory margin there, but it lost, 593 votes to 512.

The big margin in the Negro ward was not sufficient to overcome a heavy loss in the fourth ward, a predominantly blue collar district of Cambridge whites.

The moderate turnout in the Negro district indicated that Mrs. Richardson, who led demonstrations throughout the early summer, still maintains a strong following despite the bitter denunciation of her boycott by white officials and the open opposition of Negro ministers and the NAACP.

Mrs. Richardson's group gave no immediate indication of what its next step would be.

"We will give the city an unstipulated period in which to organize and implement any alternative plans," a statement by the Cambridge Nonviolent Action Committee said.

On the possible resumption of street demonstrations, Mrs. Richardson's committee said, "Obviously we won't be out in the streets tomorrow, but we could demonstrate eventually on any number of things."

Philip Savage, field secretary for the NAACP, called it a tragic defeat for Cambridge.

"We are not going to support any demonstrations immediately," Savage declared.

The local NAACP sent a telegram to Governor Tawes urging him to issue an executive order banning discrimination in public accommodations throughout the State—a step which Tawes has said he cannot legally take.

Assessing the defeat, the Reverend T. M. Murray, Dorchester County NAACP president, said, "Certainly the so-called responsible citizens of the first ward failed to deliver the votes they promised."

Had Mrs. Richardson not opposed the referendum, a larger Negro vote "possibly could have affected the outcome," Mr. Murray said.

He said support for future street demonstrations would be determined by him and fellow ministers "and will not result in any dictation from anyone or any group"—an obvious reference to Mrs. Richardson's rival organization.

In a desperate 11th-hour attempt to increase the Negro vote, several Negro ministers and NAACP representatives buttonholed workers leaving factory jobs and pleaded with them to go to the polls. Many Negroes turned them down on the spot.

William Wise, head of the white citizens group which opposed the amendment, later tonight said Mayor Mowbray should resign.

Told that Mowbray had no plans for future action, Wise said, "If he feels he cannot control the situation and carry out his responsibility, he should resign."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a great civil libertarian in Cambridge, Md. She is Mrs. Gloria Richardson. She has been subject to a great deal of criticism, which I consider to be unfair criticism. At least I wish to put myself in the position of sharing that criticism when that criticism is directed at her.

In my judgment Mrs. Richardson has been absolutely right in the position she took in discouraging Negroes in Cambridge, Md., from voting in the referendum to determine whether Neroes should be allowed to enjoy their basic constitutional rights.

It is unthinkable that it should be proposed by any segment of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, or by any group within the administration of this government, or the government of the State of Maryland, or by any other group, that Negroes should be asked to go to the polls to vote on whether or not they should be allowed to enjoy basic constitutional rights, the same rights that white people enjoy, with reference to admission to public accommodation.

I wish to pay my respects to Mrs. Gloria Richardson. I congratulate her on her courage. In recent months few persons have stood up against the kind of public criticism that this great colored woman in Cambridge, Md., has faced.

I hope there will not be a repitition of a situation in which various governmental agencies seek to bring the kind of pressure upon Negro leaders that was put upon them in Cambridge, Md., in trying to get them to induce their fellow Negroes to the polls to vote on whether or not they should be allowed to enjoy public accommodations in restaurants and similar public places.

What Mrs. Richardson taught the colored people was that it is not possible to compromise a principle and have any principle left. It is that simple. A basic principle of civil liberties was involved. I am glad that this great colored woman in Cambridge, Md., had the courage to stand up and take the abuse and castigations that were heaped on her. It is not possible to solve the civil liberties problems in that way. But if it were possible to establish that precedent, does anyone mean to tell me that if it is followed in Cambridge, Md., it should be followed elsewhere in the United States? What chance would it have in those areas of the country, North and South, where racial bigotry prevails? What chance would it have of winning in such a referendum in those areas? People in our own administration who urged this referendum were playing into the hands of the bigots and racists of America.

This is quite different from the issue of public accommodation legislation in Congress. We have a constitutional mandate to enact whatever legislation may be appropriate for enforcement of the 14th amendment, and for regulation of interstate commerce.

But the enjoyment of constitutional rights must not be made subject to popular referendum. The very reason why certain rights and procedures are written into the Constitution is to make certain that they will not be subject to the vagaries of prejudice and ignorance. What do freedom of speech or freedom of the press mean, for example, if they can only be exercised in cases where a majority votes for them?

The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment is a constitutional right of all citizens, white and colored. It is uniform everywhere in the United States. It deserves to be enforced uniformly everywhere in the United States, and I shall vote for enforcement legislation. But it is not subject to popular vote, and I commend Mrs. Richardson for her recognition of that fact.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND DEDICATION OF A HOUSING PROJECT IN PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, again in my capacity as an honorary vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I have a few comments to make for the consideration of the Portland, Oreg., chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

It had been planned that the President of the United States, on his recent western trip, would stop off in Portland, Oreg., and dedicate, on the invitation of the Democrats in the Oregon congressional delegation, a housing project for the elderly. It was announced by the leaders of the Portland chapter of the

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that if the President of the United States stopped off to dedicate that project, they would picket it.

The Democrats on the Oregon delegation, after due deliberation, advised the President that in our judgment he should not accept the invitation to dedicate the project.

I say to the members of the Portland, Oreg., chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that it is not good manners to invite a guest to one's home, and then insult and embarrass him. Some segment of the press of Oregon questioned this great President's courage and criticized him for not stopping and dedicating the project in spite of that threat. But the President's visit to Portland was not canceled by him; it was canceled because the Democrats on the Oregon delegation requested him not to stop.

We did not want our State to be embarrassed. We did not want to be a party to issuing an invitation to the great President of the United States that would result in the kind of embarrassing situation that was threatened by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, local chapter, Portland, Oreg.

I say to the members of that chapter that it was a question of good manners. It was a question of paying proper respect to an honored guest who had been invited to the State of Oregon. I cannot think of anything that would have been more impolite than to invite the President to Portland and then to put him in that kind of embarrassing situation. He will return to Portland. He will return in the midst of political campaigning. There is no question about this great man's courage. What was proposed was purely a matter of decency. I have apologized to the President. An apology was due for the threatened incident that made it necessary for the Democrats in the Oregon delegation in Congress to respectfully suggest to the President that, under the circumstances, he bypass Portland.

To the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I say: "You did the State of Oregon a great disservice. You ought to have welcomed the man who, in my opinion, is the greatest friend of civil liberties in the United States, and therefore the greatest friend you could have welcomed to the city of Portland."

There was no justification for the picket line, even if the President were not coming to Portland, on the ground that the Portland Housing Authority had violated the rights of Negroes in respect to that particular project. An investigation had been conducted by the Federal Housing Authority, and the Portland Housing Authority was given a completely clean bill of health concerning the handling of that project. It was, in fact, desegregated. The argument by some members of the Portland chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was that they thought the project ought to have been more desegregated. They thought more apartments ought to have been set aside for colored people. However, the official report shows that due notice, for months, had been given that the apartments would be rented in the order of priority of applications. An investigation was made of the handling of the applications, and the Portland Housing Authority received a completely clean bill of health with respect to the handling of the applications. Negroes who applied for apartments received equal treatment with all others in accordance with the dates of filing of their applications.

I am sorry it is necessary for me to take time on the floor of the Senate to discuss a local matter, although it has great national importance and implications. But because such a furor has been caused about it in my State, and because the Democratic members of the Oregon delegation in Congress have each received a letter from the president of the Portland Chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, a letter which, in part, is not factual, I have taken time this afternoon to answer that local chapter in public.

I think my President is due the statement I have made, setting forth the circumstances that led to his cancellation of his trip to Portland. I repeat: He canceled it upon the strong recommendation of the Democrats in the Oregon delegation in Congress.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7195) to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call up the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and me and ask that it be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** On page 2, line 3, it is proposed to add:

> This provision shall be effective with respect to all apportionments made with respect to fiscal year 1965 and following.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as now written, section 2 of the bill would restore to a nonpreferred position the States of Vermont and Connecticut effective in the fiscal year 1966 and thereafter. This amendment would restore these States to nonpreferred status effective with the fiscal year 1965.

To understand the situation, one should realize that a special provision was placed in the basic act to provide equal treatment for Vermont and Connecticut with that of all the other States in the apportionment of urban highway funds.

In these States, towns are considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status. The term "town" usually refers to a political subdivision which may contain both incorporated and unincorporated communities which are urban in character. As used in the 1940 Federal census, however, the term "urban population" did not include the population of unincorporated areas unless those areas met certain population density standards. So, when the Federal Highway Act was drafted, a special provision had to be included to give Vermont and Connecticut equal status.

Following the census of 1960, the Bureau of the Census revised the definition of "urban" in those areas. As a result, the States of Vermont and Connecticut have acquired a preferred status. Under present law, the population of each town in Connecticut and Vermont having 5,000 or more inhabitants is used as the basis for apportioning Federal-aid urban highway funds, regardless of its rural or urban characteristics.

Where the area is determined by the census to be actually rural in character, it is also included in the rural population data upon which the apportionment of Federal aid secondary funds is used. This results in the population of those towns in those two States being counted twice in the allocation of Federal funds.

In 1961, Congress might have had an opportunity to change this situation, because the Bureau of the Census revised its definition of "urban population" in 1960. Unfortunately, Congress did not have this problem brought to its attention until 1962, when a report of the Comptroller General, entitled "Review of Apportionments of Federal-Aid Highway Funds, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, for Fiscal Years 1956–63," showed the effects of this double count. Specifically, the report noted that for fiscal year 1963 Connecticut received approximately $810,000 more urban funds and Vermont approximately $73,000 more urban funds than would have been received if the urban population in those States had been apportioned in the same manner as in all the other States.

With the change in definition by the Bureau of the Census in 1960, it might be said that the ground rules were changed. Starting in 1962, these two States, between them, received approximately $883,000 a year more than they would have been entitled to under the original intention of Congress to treat all States fairly and alike. The same was true with respect to 1963.

For all practical purposes these funds have long since gone; there is no possibility of recouping them, so far as I can see.

What about fiscal year 1964, the year we are now in? I am advised, on good legal counsel, that an effort by Congress to change this formula effective with respect to fiscal year 1964 probably would have met with constitutional objections, not only because these funds were apportioned by the Bureau of Public Roads to Vermont and Connecticut, but also because these States, in reliance upon these apportionments, have obligated themselves, under contracts, for the expenditure of these funds, and also in view of the prohibition against retroactive violation of contracts, I believe that such an attempt by Congress to affect the

1964 apportionments would run afoul of constitutional objections.

What about the funds for the year 1965? The funds for the fiscal year 1965 have also been apportioned by the Bureau of Public Roads to the States, but we are advised that these funds have not been obligated under contracts by the States. Accordingly, the memorandum from the Bureau of Public Roads which the General Counsel furnished the Committee on Public Works states that there would be no constitutional problem if we sought to prevent this unfair enrichment of Vermont and Connecticut with respect to the fiscal year 1965.

I should like to make it very clear, Mr. President, that throughout the study of this problem and throughout the report of the Comptroller General there is absolutely no intimation that there has been any illegality whatsoever on the part of anyone involved in the Bureau of Public Roads or in the States of Vermont and Connecticut. The Bureau of Public Roads and these States have gone forward in good faith in reliance on the law as written by Congress.

I should also like to point out, Mr. President, that the original intention of Congress, in setting up a special provision to take care of Vermont and Connecticut, was not to give them a preferred treatment, but was to give them treatment equal to that given to the other States.

However, in the interim, change has occurred, as the result of action by a separate governmental agency. Neither Congress nor the Bureau of Public Roads nor the States of Connecticut and Vermont had anything at all to do with that action. The Bureau of the Census changed its definition, and that change in definition was tied in with the language of the basic act.

I pointed out that the States of Vermont and Connecticut have received, through the year 1964, approximately $2,649,000 more than I am sure Congress ever intended to have distributed to them. However, that has been done; our task now is to determine the best course in the future.

As of today, we can proceed to let nature take its course—in short, leave the bill exactly as it is, and permit these States to receive, for yet another year, a windfall in the amount of approximately $883,000, which all the States would have to shoulder; or we can take action to end the present arrangement as early as legally possible.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] and I, in a completely bipartisan effort, have joined in submitting this amendment, because we believe that since it is constitutionally possible to modify this apportionment formula with respect to the fiscal year 1965, that should be done. It is for that reason, Mr. President, that the amendment has been offered.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Iowa, I wish to say that this amendment was carefully considered in the Subcommittee on Public Roads and in the Committee on Public Works, chaired by the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara].

The amendment was decisively defeated in the committee. The Senators from the States of Connecticut and Vermont counseled with us at length, and strongly opposed the proposal which has been made here today. The committee amendment, in fact, represents a compromise between the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa, and the requests strongly urged by the Senators from Vermont particularly [Mr. Aiken and Mr. Prouty] that the committee extend the present method of apportionment for another 2 years in order to allow the affected States time to adjust to the new provision.

Unfortunately, most of the Senators from Connecticut and Vermont are unable to be here at this time, though I am gratified to note the presence of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff].

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me? I should like to make a brief statement in connection with this matter, and then ask several questions.

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. I am glad to yield.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. First, I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, the special provision of existing law which the bill before us will repeal was originally included in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944. This special provision was then necessary because of the way population has been counted in New England towns under special rules utilized by the Bureau of the Census in enumerating the population in the 1940 Census. The State of Connecticut should not now be penalized for acting in good faith under the Federal law. Yet that will be exactly the result if the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is adopted.

So my answer to the Senator from Iowa is that it would be grossly unfair to Connecticut if the Senate were to agree to this amendment. The apportionment for the fiscal year 1965 has been made. Advance planning based on this apportionment has already been completed by the State highway department. To withdraw these funds at this point would be an injustice to Connecticut; and I must strongly protest against any such action.

Now let me turn to one additional aspect of this matter. Repeal of the special provision of existing law, as proposed in the pending bill, is now justified on the ground that the Bureau of the Census has amended its rules in the 1950 and 1960 decennial censuses, thus ending the need for the special provision. But even without the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, which I am hopeful will be rejected, I am concerned that not only Connecticut but also many other States will be penalized as a result of the new rules.

It is my understanding that present Federal highway legislation does not include the increment of population in places of 2,500 to 5,000 in either the rural population which is used as a factor in apportioning the secondary funds or in the urban population in places of 5,000 or more which is used in apportioning urban funds. Consequently, this segment of population is not counted in Connecticut and other States in computing either the urban or the secondary apportionments. According to the State highway commissioner, in Connecticut over 60,000 people will not be counted in arriving at future apportionments.

I have written the Secretary of Commerce, and have asked for a report on this situation; but to date I have not received one. I hope he can clear up this confusion administratively between the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Public Roads, so that an accurate count for highway fund apportionment purposes can be realized. If this cannot be done administratively, then additional legislation might be required.

At this time, I wish to ask a few short questions.

The States of Connecticut and Vermont acted always in good faith, did they not?

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. That is correct.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. The allotments and apportionments have been made in accordance with the formula adopted by Congress, which also was adopted by the Bureau of Public Roads, have they not?

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. Yes. The funds were apportioned according to the acts of the Congress.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. And the State of Connecticut has undertaken a large road program, with advance planning and advance commitments, relying upon the apportionments which they thought they were to receive under the old formula; is that not correct?

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. Yes. I believe a hardship would be inflicted on those States if the amendment were to prevail.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. **COOPER**. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. **RANDOLPH**. I am glad to yield.

Mr. **COOPER**. I should like to say that this question was very carefully considered in the subcommittee, and in the full committee. I believe the Senator from Iowa has stated the situation correctly in a chronological way, but the practical situation and also the correct situation is that the actions taken were taken under the law. There is no question of any illegal action of any kind. The States of Connecticut and Vermont acted in good faith, following the intention of the law. As a practical matter, 1962 was the first time Congress could have acted on this matter. The biennial authorization was made in 1962, and at that time no change was made because they did not have knowledge of the situation. As a result, the fiscal 1964 apportionment was made and obligated, and the apportionment for fiscal 1965 has been made, and relying upon the 1962 act, the States of Connecticut and Vermont have made their plans for the use of these funds.

The Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Vermont were aware of the efforts that have been made by their States, and the good faith in which they have acted; they have supported the act as it was intended in 1962, and they oppose this amendment. I believe that was also the attitude of our committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to reiterate what I stated at the beginning of my remarks on this amendment; namely, that we wish to make very clear that there is no inference or allegation whatsoever that there is or has been any lack of good faith on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads or the States of Vermont and Connecticut.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the RECORD should show absolutely clearly that the Senator from Iowa has made that statement in a manner which cannot possibly be misunderstood, so far as the good faith of all the parties is concerned.

Mr. MILLER. Indeed so; and I appreciate that statement by the Senator from Montana. I should like to suggest that his gracious statement was also extended to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], because we have worked in bipartisan fashion on this amendment. Neither of us wishes there to be the slightest inference of a lack of good faith on the part of anyone concerned. We submitted our amendment only because of the fact that the Comptroller General, in a report to Congress, pointed out that the previous action of Congress in attempting to place the States of Connecticut and Vermont in an equal status, had now, due to a change by the Bureau of the Census, in the ground rules, resulted in placing them in a preferred status, as a result of which Vermont received $73,000 more in urban funds and Connecticut received $810,000 more in urban funds, for the fiscal year 1963.

We point out that approximately the same result would have occurred in 1962 and in 1964, and that at present nothing can be done about the matter from a constitutional standpoint. All we are urging is that a change be made for the fiscal year 1965.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I concur in the expression of the majority leader. Earlier this afternoon the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] made the remark—not on the floor of the Senate, but in talking with Senators—that in the committee's consideration of the legislation now before the Senate, there had been an objective approach—a bipartisan approach. Certainly no member of the committee is more conscious of his responsibility on subjects affecting highways than are the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin. We know the tenacious matter in which they pursued the subject in the subcommittee and in the full committee. Both Senators remember the result in the committee. That is why the majority of the committee members hope the amendment will be defeated in the Senate, as it was decisively defeated in the committee.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for that statement. I am not so sure that I would care to thank him for his help, but I thank him for his statement with respect to the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Iowa.

I should also like to add one statement. The point was made in the committee and on the floor of the Senate that if the amendment were adopted, some kind of hardship or inconvenience would be caused to those States, because there has been a certain amount of planning. I should like to point out that if there had not been the windfall of over $2,400,000 for the years which are beyond recoupment now, the planning would have been in a great deal more inconvenient position than it will be if the amendment is adopted. These plans will not be drastically revised because of an amount of $73,000 for Vermont for 1 year and some $810,000 for Connecticut for 1 year. I believe it was pointed out in committee that they represent only about 15 or 20 percent of the total amount of the highway program, affecting urban localities in those States. But the point is, Should the rest of the States of the Union continue to bear what has turned out to be an unjust enrichment to those States? I do not believe that they should. I think that when we have the power to do something about it with respect to the fiscal year 1965, we should.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND IN CITY OF DETROIT, MICH., FOR A LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 487, the bill H.R. 772, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 772) to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken tonight on the bill (H.R. 772) which has been made the unfinished business.

Tomorrow it is anticipated that, in addition to consideration of Calendar No. 487 (H.R. 772), the Senate will possibly consider Calendar No. 447, the bill (H.R. 3306) to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission. It would be expected that Senators most interested in the bill would be on hand.

The Senate will then proceed to consider Calendar No. 455, the bill (S. 1049) relating to the Indian heirship land problem; also Calendar No. 450, the bill (S. 1172) to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518.

Then it is expected that the Senate will consider Calendar No. 482, a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 192) relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years; also Calendar No. 458, a bill (S. 283) to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; also Calendar No. 488, a bill (H.R. 4842) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meeting and for other purposes.

It is anticipated that if consideration of those measures is completed tomorrow, together with Calendar No. 483 (S. Con. Res. 1) to create a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress and recommend improvements therein, the Senate will go over to Monday.

On Monday next it is anticipated that the Senate will proceed to consider Calendar No. 531, the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to be followed by what other bills may be available at the time.

It is anticipated that on Wednesday or Thursday the Senate might get around to consideration of Calendar No. 425, the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes, which is the so-called Proxmire bill.

Tentatively, I say to the distinguished minority leader, that is the outline of the schedule as far as I can see it for this week and the next.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATORS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe it is accurate to say that the Senate has had a very productive day today.

In this regard I wish to thank Senator MAGNUSON and Senator BARTLETT for their fine work in bringing the fishing vessel construction bill to a successful vote in the Senate, and to thank the

Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] for their contributions to the debate thereon.

I also wish to thank the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] for his work in bringing the equal time bill to the Senate floor and to a final vote.

Congratulations are also in order to the Committee on Finance, and especially to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], a distinguished member of that committee, for their work in achieving Senate passage of the act to aid those who are mentally retarded.

Finally, I extend my thanks to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for their excellent work, both in committee and on the floor, in achieving Senate passage of the Highway Act amendments.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senate on a most successful day.

AUTHORIZATION FOR BILL TO REMAIN AT DESK

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2185) be permitted to remain at the desk for 1 additional week so that Senators wishing to cosponsor the proposed legislation may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINANCING OF THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATIONS IN THE CONGO

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, here we go again. I am referring to an article which appeared in the New York Times of October 1. The article, by Thomas J. Hamilton, points out that the United States, Britain, Canada, and other Western powers have agreed to make special donations totaling approximately $1.3 million to help maintain the United Nations force in the Congo for 6 months beyond December 31.

And guess which country will bear the lion's share of this? The United States, of course—to the tune of $772,700. This special donation is subject to congressional approval but, apparently, we already have been committed. In addition, the article notes, the United States has agreed to pay approximately $2,140,000 to meet the current shortage of $3.6 million for Congo operations in the second half of 1963.

Mr. President, I feel these special donations should bear close scrutiny when they are presented to the Congress. The United States cannot continue bailing out this organization when other member nations are in arrears, as of August 31, a total of $104,798,433—$5,624,299 for the regular budget, $27,268,656 for the emergency force budget, and $71,905,477 for the Congo operational budget. Unless the other nations, including the Soviet Union, start meeting their obligations, it may well be in order for us to reexamine our position and at least sound the warning that we intend to draw the line.

The Soviet Union could well clear the air if it were to pay up its share of assessments. As of August 31, the Soviet Union owed a total of $46,271,050—$14,218,288 in emergency force dues and $32,052,762 in Congo force operations. By paying up its dues, this Communist nation could demonstrate its willingness for better world relations.

In this connection, it is heartening to note that at least one nation behind in its Congo dues is apparently awakening to the need to pay its just debts. I am speaking of Yugoslavia. In the Evening Star of October 1, the Associated Press reported that the Yugoslav Ambassador has expressed his Government's intentions to pay its arrears for the period from November 1, 1961, to June 30, 1963—an estimated $90,000 to $100,000. However, it should be pointed out that Yugoslavia still owes in Congo assessments a total of $238,853 for the period from July 14, 1960, to October 31, 1961.

I hope this portends a change in thinking on the part of the other Communist-bloc nations. I doubt that it will, however, until the Soviet Union acts. But at least it is a step in the right direction. And it is to be hoped that the observation made by Warren Unna in the Washington Post of September 28 proves to be correct. Mr. Unna reported:

> Yugoslavia's new decision to pay up back assessments is looked upon as a big step in getting all members of the U.N. to recognize that a peacekeeping force is a major part of the U.N.'s responsibilities and one that should be supported by all U.N. members.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles entitled "West Promises U.N. Congo Funds," "Yugoslavs Pay on Congo Debt," and "Belgrade Breaks Red Holdout Line on U.N. Support" may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1963]

WEST PROMISES U.N. CONGO FUNDS—AGREES TO DONATE $1.3 MILLION TO HELP MAINTAIN TROOPS THERE AN EXTRA 6 MONTHS

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., September 30.—The United States, Britain, Canada, and other Western powers have agreed to make special donations totaling approximately $1.3 million to help maintain the United Nations force in the Congo for 6 months more.

Reliable sources said today that this would pave the way for the introduction of a resolution this week. Under the resolution, the General Assembly would impose assessments to cover the remainder of the cost of maintaining the force in the Congo until next June 30.

The total expense for the period between December 31 and June 30 is estimated at $16 million.

WITHDRAWAL WAS ORDERED

Nigeria and the Congo are leading the campaign among African members to obtain the passage of the enabling resolution by October 12.

This was the new deadline fixed by the Secretary General, U Thant, if the Assembly decided that the Congo force should be kept on.

Last July, Mr. Thant gave orders for the complete withdrawal of the force by December 31, when funds now appropriated would be exhausted. On September 2, however, he announced that he was submitting the issue to the Assembly.

He said that if it wished to extend the force's stay for 6 months it should provide the money by Saturday.

According to reliable sources, however, Mr. Thant has now agreed to wait until October 12 for Assembly action. His cost estimates were submitted today to the Assembly's Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, which hopes to complete its study by tomorrow.

The Assembly's Budgetary Committee has agreed to give priority to the Congo force resolution, and nations advocating the 6-month extension hope to start the debate Wednesday. If this timetable holds, the Assembly is expected to complete action next week, meeting Mr. Thant's deadline.

The United States, the Congolese Government, and other members advocating an extension of the force have told Mr. Thant that 3,000 officers and men can maintain order until retraining of the Congolese Army is completed. In his report to the Security Council on September 17, however, Mr. Thant said that 3,000 would not be enough and that 5,000 would be the absolute minimum.

ENVISIONED FORCE OF 5,350

Ten days later Mr. Thant reported to the Assembly that he envisioned a force of 5,350, at a total cost for the additional 6 months of $19.2 million. Of this, however, the Congolese Government has agreed to pay the equivalent of $3.2 million in Congolese francs, leaving the $16 million to be provided by the United Nations.

According to reliable sources, the Western powers have agreed upon the same formula for financing the force during the 6-month extension that is being used during the second half of 1963. The first $3 million would be imposed by assessment, using percentages employed in fixing assessments for the regular United Nations budget. However, the assessments of underdeveloped countries for the remaining $13 million would be reduced by 55 percent.

These reductions would result in a shortage of $1.3 million. Subject to congressional approval, the United States has agreed to make a special donation of about $772,700, in addition to paying its regular assessment of 32.02 percent, to help make up the difference.

The shortage for the second half of 1963 is estimated at a total of $3.6 million.

The United States, in addition to paying its regular assessment, has agreed to pay approximately $2,140,000 to meet this current shortage.

Fifteen other members have agreed to make extra donations. They are: Australia, Austria, Britain, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and Sweden.

According to reliable sources, the same 15 delegations have agreed, subject to approval of their Governments, to make further donations against the impending shortage for the extended stay of the Congo forces.

These sources said that France was suggesting that the Advisory Committee ask the Assembly to reduce Mr. Thant's cost estimate for next year to $15.5 million. Alternately, it is understood, France wants the Assembly to ask the Secretary General to hold the cost to $15 million.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 1, 1963]

YUGOSLAVS PAY ON CONGO DEBT

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., October 1.—Yugoslavia says it will pay some of the money it owes for the United Nations operation in the Congo.

The Yugoslav Ambassador, Miso Pavicevic, announced yesterday after a meeting with U.N. Secretary General U Thant that his Government will pay its arrears for the period from November 1, 1961 to June 30, 1963—an estimated $90,000 to $100,000. The period is that beginning with Mr. Thant's election to office.

Yugoslavia owes a total of $361,958 from July 14, 1960, to the beginning of September. It is the first Communist country to offer to pay anything.

Mr. Pavicevic said the question of paying the assessment for the last 6 months of this year is still under discussion. Yugolavia's participation in the operation during the first 6 months of 1964 will depend on the assembly's decision to continue the U.N. Congo force, he said.

Yugoslavia's contribution for the 6 months would be a little more than $6,000.

Mr. Pavicevic noted that his country had bought $200,000 of U.N. bonds—much of which went into the Congo—and helped sponsor the resolution authorizing the bond issue.

At the special assembly session considering U.N. money problem last spring, Yugoslavia said it might reconsider its stand on the Congo payments.

It has always paid its assessment for the Middle East peacekeeping operation and has units with the U.N. force there.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1963]

BELGRADE BREAKS RED HOLDOUT LINE ON U.N. SUPPORT

(By Warren Unna)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., September 27.—Yugoslavia has decided to break the Communist logjam against paying up on back assessments to the United Nations' peacekeeping operation in the Congo.

The move, confirmed by Yugoslav officials to the Washington Post here today, is causing excited ripples among Western delegates to the United Nations. They say it could either:

Portend a change of heart on the part of the Soviet Union, with which Yugoslavia is having increasingly warm relations, and lead the way for an eventual contribution to the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations by the whole Communist bloc, or

Embarrass the Communist bloc, which up until now has contended that the U.N.'s peacekeeping operation in the Congo is illegal and nothing more than an imperialistic attempt to control Africa.

FAR AHEAD OF REST

Actually, Yugoslavia's record in the U.N. has been far ahead of the rest of the Communist bloc. Yugoslavia contributed some troops in the earliest stages of the U.N. Congo operation in 1961. This year it bought two $100,000 bonds, in January and in April, to help ease the tremendous indebtedness the U.N. now is in because of its expensive Congo operation.

Yugoslavia also has contributed troops to the current U.N. observer operation in Yemen, and has been a financial contributor to the U.N. Emergency Force in the Gaza Strip.

Nevertheless, Yugoslavia's new decision to pay up back assessments is looked upon as a big step in getting all members of the U.N. to recognize that a peacekeeping force is a major part of the U.N.'s responsibilities and one that should be supported by all U.N. members.

Yugoslavia owed only $300,000 in back Congo assessments as of June 30, a relatively small amount because of her relatively poor status. But a total of 56 nations now owe the U.N. almost $72 million and a change of heart by Yugoslavia on its small debt presumably could have a chain-reaction effect on the other delinquents.

SET OFF BY THANT VISIT

Members of the Yugoslav mission to the U.N. here said their country's change of policy started with the visit of U.N. Secretary General U Thant to Yugoslavia in May and his talks with President Tito.

In June, during the General Assembly's special session on U.N. finances, the Yugoslav delegate declared that while his country had had serious objections to the way the U.N. military forces were operating in the Congo under the late Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, it was inclined to look differently on U Thant's efforts.

The World Court and the General Assembly both have agreed that financial assessments for the U.N. peacekeeping operations are binding on all members. And under article 19 of the U.N. Charter, a nation that is delinquent more than 2 years in its payments loses its vote in the General Assembly.

Yugoslavia, because of its other contributions, is in no immediate jeopardy of losing her vote anyway. But if the Soviet bloc, which accounts for the major share of the membership arrears, does not make some payment by the end of this year, each of the Communist countries stands to lose its vote when next year's session of the General Assembly begins.

FRANCE MAY LOSE VOTE

France, which also has refused to make any financial contributions to the U.N.'s Congo operations, stands to lose its General Assembly vote in 1965.

Observers here underlined the fact that although the recent thaw in Soviet relations with the West has been evidenced in many directions, there has been no sign of any softening of the Soviet opposition to U.N. peacekeeping operations, which give this world body its teeth.

They now see some possibility of Yugoslavia's new action becoming a "harbinger" of things to come.

FOOD FOR PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives, my Michigan colleague, Representative JAMES G. O'HARA, called attention to what he termed an abuse of Public Law 480, often known as the food for peace program. As Representative O'HARA pointed out, this has resulted in serious injury to processing plants and employment at those plants in three States, including Michigan. I wish to associate myself with my colleague's remarks, which appear on page 18286 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday, September 30.

Abuses of the intent of Public Law 480 have brought about an artificial shortage of what are known as wheat clears, a raw material needed by the three processing plants if they are to continue operations. Recently, the three companies—Hercules Powder, Midwest Solvents, and National Industrial Products—have been unable to purchase second clears, a byproduct in the production of patent flour. One of the companies was told no second clears will be available to domestic processors until January of next year.

The reason for the scarcity of second clears is the Public Law 480 program. Although clears are not in surplus and in spite of the fact Public Law 480 is limited to surplus agricultural commodities, they are being exported as flour under Government programs. The shortage, as Representative O'HARA has pointed out, was attributed mainly to large shipments of flour to the United Arab Republic under Public Law 480.

This is a serious mistake in the administration of the food for peace program. I join my colleague in urging that immediate steps be taken by responsible officials to right this wrong and again make second clears available to our domestic processors.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

W. True Davis, Jr., of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Dan H. Fenn, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1969.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Colin Munro MacLeod, of New York, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named persons to the position indicated:

Dr. Russell Alexander Dixon, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for term of 4 years expiring August 3, 1967.

Dr. Herman Howe Fussler, of Illinois, to be a member of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for term of 4 years expiring August 3, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 2:15: *Study to show yourselves approved unto God.*

Almighty God, grant that the minds and hearts of all mankind may be touched and transformed by the redeeming and regenerating power of the Holy Spirit and be blessed with a deeper appreciation and experience of Thy grace and favor.

May we daily carry on in faith and faithfulness, availing ourselves of Thy divine greatness and goodness as we endeavor to be the heralds of peace and the builders of a better world.

We pray that the Members of this legislative body may become increasingly strong in the possession and power of the spiritual resources.

Show us how we may fortify our beloved country against those evil forces and corrupting influences which are seeking to undermine and destroy the principles of democracy.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1280. An act for the relief of Jan Koss;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian;

H.R. 3648. An act for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta;

H.R. 3762. An act for the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski;

H.R. 4075. An act for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata; and

H.R. 7022. An act for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grun (Susanne Roth);

S. 1287. An act for the relief of John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef);

S. 1341. An act for the relief of Gabriel Kerenyi;

S. 1488. An act for the relief of A. R. Cacace;

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins;

S. 1881. An act for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote; and

S. 1988. An act to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 26, 1963.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg leave to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Honorable John B. Connally, Governor of Texas, my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the 10th District of Texas, the resignation to become effective the 20th day of December, 1963. A copy of my letter to the Governor is attached.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
HOMER THORNBERRY.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1963.
Hon. JOHN B. CONNALLY,
Governor of Texas,
Austin, Tex.

DEAR GOVERNOR CONNALLY: I hereby tender to you my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the 10th District of Texas, the resignation to become effective the 20th day of December 1963.

Warm personal regards.

Sincerely yours,
HOMER THORNBERRY.

ELECTRIC CONSUMERS IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, ROGERS of Texas, HALEY, SAYLOR, and WESTLAND.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 104(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1975c(b)), is amended by striking out 'September 30, 1963' and inserting in lieu thereof 'September 30, 1964'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

SOVIET INTENTION CONCERNING MOON LANDINGS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk recently about the Russians giving up on their announced intent to land a man on the moon before the United States. I have suspected, although I make no pretense of having accurate information concerning their intentions, that the Russians are not going to give up their leadership and prominence to the United States in this field without making a great effort. The article that appeared in the Washington Post last Monday, September 30, 1963, rings the bell as having some element of truth in it. To say the least, the article is well worth reading. To me it sounds as if Russia is anxious to pull another first and embarrass the Americans again.

YURI GAGARIN SEES RUSSIA NO. 1 ON MOON

PARIS, September 29.—Soviet Spaceman Yuri Gagarin predicted today that Russia will land a man on the moon before the United States.

He made the prediction in a copyrighted article in Le Journal du Dimanche, a Paris newspaper published on Sunday.

His statement that "there (on the moon) we will again be first" strengthened the beliefs of scientists at the 14th International Astronautical Congress here that Russia was not eager to accept President Kennedy's proposal of a joint American-Soviet lunar expedition.

Observers said Gagarin would not have made the bold prediction if it did not reflect Soviet scientists' confidence that they are ahead of their American rivals in heavy rocketry.

TO LAY ON THE TABLE HOUSE RESOLUTION 514

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules reported House Resolution 514 concerning a trip to be made by members of the Committee on Agriculture. The matter did not get through until after the trip was over. It is now on the Calendar. I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 514 be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 535 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 17, Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof (consisting of not more than five members), is authorized to travel outside the United States for the purpose of conducting studies and investigations into—

(1) international communications, including allocation of the radio spectrum and the operations of the Communications Satellite Corporation;

(2) civil aeronautics, including international routes and fares, and prototype aircraft; and

(3) the administration by the United States Travel Service of the International Travel Act of 1961; while such committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, is attending (which attendance is hereby authorized) the International Telecommunications Conference convening at Geneva, Switzerland, on October 7, 1963, and the Conference of the International Civil Air Organization, convening at Salzburg, Germany, and at Rome, Italy, on October 22, 1963, and while traveling to and from such conferences.

Notwithstanding H. Res. 17, Eighty-eighth Congress, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available in accordance with section 502 of the Mutual

Security Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 1754) to the committee for expenses of its members and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 190d), subject to the following limitations: (1) no member or employee of the committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget, (2) no member or employee of the committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs, and (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members or employees of the committee in any country where counterpart funds are available for such purpose.

Each member or employee of the committee shall make to the chairman of the committee an itemized report showing (A) the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, (B) the amount of per diem furnished, and (C) the cost of transportation furnished by public carrier or, if such transportation was furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 3 through 7, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "meetings of the International Telecommunications Union commencing at Geneva, Switzerland, October 7, 1963, and meetings of the International Air Transport Association commencing at Rome, Italy, October 7, 1963, and while traveling to and from such meetings."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO GRANT ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 536 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 38, Eighty-eighth Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to designate and appoint not to exceed five members of the Committee on Agriculture and not to exceed two employees of such committee to attend the Twelfth Biennial Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations meeting in Rome, Italy, November 16 to December 5, 1963, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is further hereby authorized to direct the members of the committee and the employees designated and appointed by him to visit and to conduct studies in such countries of Europe, the Mediterranean area, and the Near East as may be directed by the chairman of said committee, to carry out the committee's statutory responsibility for legislative oversight of Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954, and to observe the operations of other United States programs in such countries as may be visited while overseas to attend the conference set forth above.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the members of the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First, I do not understand why these resolutions are not available at the desk. I finally managed to get a copy after the first one had gone through. I would suggest to my good friend from Virginia that in the future we have available copies of these resolutions.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia this question: Several members of the Committee on Agriculture are just back from a trip to Yugoslavia. Is this another trip for members of the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There was no resolution passed on the trip that the gentleman speaks of. It was conducted by a subcommittee. This is a subcommittee to enter into certain international conferences pertaining to agricultural matters in which this country is vitally interested. For instance, they attended, while there, a conference in respect to Public Law 480 where we spend a great deal of money, as the gentleman knows, and it has done a great deal of good.

Mr. GROSS. This has no relation then to that granddaddy of all junketing organizations, the Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman refers to the Interparliamentary Union, and he has done so for many years, as a junket. Why does he not go himself? Why does he not take some interest in this great organization? He has been invited, the gentleman is a Member of the American Congress and is eligible and should become active as a member of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. He has sniped at all of us who are interested in the Interparliamentary Union year after year. It is not a junketing expedition. In Belgrade everybody who was there worked seriously morning, noon and night. The gentleman snipes at it. Why does he not go? The gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. HOEVEN] goes, but the gentleman from Iowa just continues to snipe at the Interparliamentary Union. I read the gentleman's statement while I was in Belgrade. I did not want to go to Belgrade, but I went there, because I am interested. I have served 16 years with that organization, and one half of that time I have served as a member of the Executive Committee. During all of that time the gentleman from Iowa sits back and snipes and complains. The gentleman says the Committee on Agriculture has been on a junket. Your distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] has been interested in the Interparliamentary Union for many years. It is difficult for me to understand why you continue to complain.

Mr. GROSS. I have not gone on these junkets because, among other reasons, I have some concern for the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have yielded to the gentleman from North Carolina. There are several innings to a ball game. The gentleman from North Carolina has had his inning. I think the gentleman from Iowa should now have his.

Mr. GROSS. In the first place, the gentleman from Iowa does not care to indulge in any of these junketing deals. The Interparliamentary Union would not have been the junketing organization that it is if it were not for the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. I do not know of one of these trips he has missed in 15 years I have been in Congress. I am going to continue, I may say to the gentleman, to snipe at all junketing organizations. So just keep your feet braced.

Mr. COOLEY. The Interparliamentary Union has been in operation for 74 years, long before either of us came to Congress, and I am certain that it will continue long after both of us have gone. The gentleman just does not know anything about the Interparliamentary Union and apparently refuses to learn anything about it. Certainly there is no reason to bring the Interparliamentary Union into this discussion. The resolution under consideration is not in any way related to the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. GROSS. Since the gentleman has extended his remarks, and with a reference to me, I feel completely free to do so.

The gentleman says I know nothing about the Interparliamentary Union and refuse to learn anything about it. I say to him that it has no record of accomplishment except to provide the excuse for a number of Members of Congress and their wives, sometimes even other members of their families, to take a jaunt somewhere over the world with much if not all the expense borne by the taxpayers of America. This much I do know about the organization.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman from Ohio wish any time on this resolution?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; no time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 163]

Adair
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Bass
Battin
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bruce
Buckley
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cameron
Chenoweth
Corbett
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dulski
Feighan
Fogarty
Ford
Fuqua
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Harris
Healey
Hébert
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Hosmer
Jarman
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kelly
Kilburn
Kyl
Laird
Latta
Lesinski
Lloyd
Long, La.
McDowell
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Montoya
Morrison
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Ostertag
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Pucinski
Quie
Rains
Reifel
Riehlman
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St. Onge
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scott
Shelley
Sibal
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vinson
Westland
White
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 317 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PROVIDING AN ADDITIONAL STATIONERY ALLOWANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Commitee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 533 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, in addition to any amounts authorized by law and until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives an additional allowance for stationery of $600. Such payment shall be made to each Member and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico serving as such on or after the date of adoption of this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This resolution means, I take it, if approved, that there is to be a $600 annual increase in the stationery allowance for each Member, is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. This would raise it from $1,800 to $2,400?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And the $2,400 would be permanent thereafter?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman thinks the Members need $2,400 as a stationery allowance?

Mr. FRIEDEL. There is no question in my mind about it. A great many Members need it. As early as June and July we received requests because Members were overdrawn. We feel it is not fair to have a Member dig down into his own pocket to pay for official business. We have over a hundred letters and phone calls from different Members on both sides of the aisle who are overdrawn.

Mr. GROSS. "A great many Members" is 100 Members out of 435, is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Will the gentleman repeat the question?

Mr. GROSS. The "great many Members" to whom the gentleman referred totals 100 out of 435?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I used the figure of 100, but it is more than that. Almost all the new Members are overdrawn.

Mr. GROSS. When did the committee approve this resolution?

Mr. FRIEDEL. We had hearings on this about 10 days ago. The subcommittee met yesterday and passed it unanimously, then we passed it this morning in the full committee by unanimous vote. It was put on the calendar for today's business.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Only this morning, between 10 and 12 o'clock, was this resolution approved by the committee and here it is on the House floor. This is really fast action.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, but we have had it up for consideration for several months.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I see no justification whatever, in view of the tax reduction bill and in view of the condition of the U.S. Treasury, for an increase of $600 in the stationery allowance for each of the 435 House Members. I am opposed to this resolution and the other resolutions, along these same lines, which I understand are to follow.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURNISHING OF AIR MAIL AND SPECIAL DELIVERY STAMPS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 532 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That (a) in addition to postage stamps authorized to be furnished under any other provision of law, until otherwise provided by law, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall procure and furnish United States airmail and special delivery stamps (1) to each Representative and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico serving as such on and after the date of adoption of this resolution, in an amount not exceeding $100 and (2) to each standing committee of the House of Representatives, upon request of the chairman thereof, in an amount not exceeding $60.

(b) In addition to postage stamps authorized under any other provision of law, until otherwise provided by law, the Speaker, the majority and minority leaders, and the majority and minority whips of the House of Representatives shall each be allowed United States airmail and special delivery stamps in an amount not exceeding $90, and the following officers of the House of Representatives shall each be allowed such stamps in the amounts herein specified as follows: The Clerk of the House, $160; the Sergeant at Arms, $120; the Doorkeeper, $100; and the Postmaster, $80.

(c) There shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary to carry out this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 215, noes 22.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has counted a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE FOR TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 531 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration, such amounts as may be necessary to pay (1) toll charges on strictly official long-distance telephone calls, and (2) charges on strictly official telegrams, cablegrams, and radiograms, made or sent by or on behalf of each Member of the House of Representatives (including the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico), other than the Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, the majority whip, and minority whip, aggregating not to exceed ten thousand units. The units authorized under this resolution shall be in addition to the number of units to which such Member otherwise may be entitled during a term.

SEC. 2. As used in the first section of this resolution, the words "unit" and "term" shall have the meaning given such words by section 2 of the Act of June 23, 1949 (2 U.S.C. 46g).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me see if I understand this correctly. Each Member is now allocated what?—80,000 units?

Mr. FRIEDEL. 90,000 units.

Mr. GROSS. This would take it to 90,000?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This will bring it to 100,000.

Mr. GROSS. That is worse than I thought. May I ask the gentleman this question: How many units are required for 1 minute of long-distance telephone conversation?

Mr. FRIEDEL. For each minute of telephone conversation it is 5 units. The minimum is 3 minutes; so for 3 minutes it is 15 units.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman figured out how many hours this would allow each Member, assuming that it was all used for long-distance telephone calls?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I have not figured that out. But I know this, in the 87th Congress 85 Members at least—and we have a list of the Members who were overdrawn—had to go into their own pockets to pay for telephone calls and telegrams. If Members do not use these units, they do not get the money. This is only for the units that are used.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, it still costs the taxpayers money for those who do use the more than 300 hours of long-distance telephone communication this would provide; is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am afraid I do not quite follow the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out, as the gentleman from Maryland said, you do not have to use these minutes, if you do not need them. I have not used mine—I had been fortunate. Some Members have people who spend more time on the telephone. Of course, some Members spend more time on getting things in the RECORD and using money that way. I would just like to point out, you also do not have to take this stationery allowance, if you do not need it and you do not have to take the stamps if you do not need them. As ranking member of the committee, I am going to kind of keep a little tabulation to see who does and who does not.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Do not all Members use this money in the business of representing their constituents?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. PASSMAN. These expenditures are incurred strictly in connection with the Members' official duties, are they not?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Having had this sterling endorsement by the gentleman from Louisiana, I hardly think anything else needs to be said. But I do feel this—this is official business. There are some districts that could well be called sleeper districts where very little congressional business is done. Other people serve their districts well. If you do service your district well, as I see it I think it ought to be paid for as a public expense because it is just like a businessman—it is business—or a public expense so I am for this increase. The further thing I would like to point out is this, some of us have paid more than $500 in the last session for extra expenses. I try to service my district and I hope this resolution goes through because we need it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the House owes the distinguished gentleman from Maryland its thanks for the work he has done in this field. The gentleman was the author, if I recall correctly, of the bill that provided reimbursement to Members for two round trips between their homes in their respective districts and Washington. I would point out, Mr. Speaker that the gentleman from Maryland has to travel only to Baltimore to get to his home. He has only to call to Baltimore to reach his constituents. The gentleman is not acting in a selfish interest. Few Members need this legislation less than he. The gentleman is interested in helping all of his colleagues give their constituents better service. He is acting in the public interest, and I commend him.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. An insufficient number having arisen, the yeas and nays are refused.

The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain my opposition to H.R. 531, H.R. 532, and H.R. 533. I certainly would not take issue with any Member who indicates a need in his or her office for the allowances in these resolutions. The need is not the issue. I have deposited over $1,000 in my stationery account this year. We know that self-discipline comes a little easier on these matters if the money is not there. This House has just voted a tax cut—which we assume will be enacted into law. Now, within a few days we see this additional expense, which can and will be used by each Member, being voted by the same House.

The same is true with postage and telephone allowances. The issue is not "Can we use this expediently in the operation of our offices," because the obvious answer is "Of course, we can." The question should be "Can we possibly get along without these allowances when we face a deficit of about $12 billion?" Again, I think the answer is that "we can."

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY UNDER PUBLIC LAW 86-272

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 497, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the additional expenses of conducting the studies authorized by Public Law 272 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, as amended, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $83,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the Judiciary Committee preparing to study?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is to continue the study of State taxation of income derived from interstate commerce. It is for the continuation of a study of the perplexing problems dealing with all different taxes in different States. There are no uniform laws now throughout the whole country.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNDS FOR STUDIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 38

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 499 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 38, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. **GROSS**. What does House Resolution 38 provide? Will the gentleman inform us as to the nature of this study? I am talking about the investigations authorized by House Resolution 38. Would the gentleman please inform us as to the nature of the study or investigation under House Resolution 38? What is contemplated by it?

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. The Committee on Agriculture is responsible for screening and approving or disapproving all projects involving more than $250,000 of Federal funds and not containing any single structure impounding more than 4,000 more feet of water—under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Virtually all expenditures made so far in this Congress have been in connection with this responsibility. This program has an appropriation rate of $60 million annually. Since the program started in 1955, 190 projects involving a Federal expenditure of more than $237 million have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture for approval. As a result of thorough consideration by the committee, they have declined to approve 12 projects involving a Federal expenditure of $14.9 million.

Mr. **GROSS**. Is this a study of watersheds?

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. That is part of it, yes. There are other activities involved.

Mr. **GROSS**. This has nothing to do with the sale of 225 million bushels of wheat to Russia?

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. No.

Mr. **GROSS**. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND HOUSE RESOLUTION 226, 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 521 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That H. Res. 226, Eighty-eighth Congress, providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (agreed to February 27, 1963) is amended by striking out "$245,950" and inserting in lieu thereof "$278,450".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUNDS FOR INVESTIGATION UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 504

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 523 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective September 11, 1963, the expenses of the investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by H. Res. 504, not to exceed $553,000, including expenditures for the employment of professional personnel, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **GROSS**. To what committee does this money go?

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. This is a select committee.

Mr. **GROSS**. Is this the select committee to delve into research and development contracts, that sort of thing?

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Yes.

Mr. **GROSS**. This is the committee recently established by the House, a couple of weeks ago, to study research and development contracts?

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. This is a special or select committee authorized recently and this resolution is for funds to make those investigations.

Mr. **GROSS**. I was only trying to find out to what committee this money goes and for what purpose. I think I now know. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. **FRIEDEL**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 528 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 153, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000 in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such studies, investigations, and inquiries, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIVER BASIN PLANS

Mr. **DAVIS** of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8667) authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. **LENNON**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. **DAVIS** of Tennessee. Of course, I yield.

Mr. **LENNON**. Is this the same bill that passed the House on about June 10, went to the other body, came back to the House, and went to the Committee on Rules on objection from the floor?

Mr. **DAVIS** of Tennessee. Yes; I can give a much fuller explanation than that.

Mr. **LENNON**. I think the House is entitled to it.

Mr. **DAVIS** of Tennessee. I should like to go into committee and make that full explanation then.

Mr. **LENNON**. I think the explanation should be made now; otherwise I object to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I shall be glad to make the explanation now.

Mr. LENNON. Very well; Mr. Speaker, I withhold my objection to the unanimous consent request.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the first Flood Control Act was passed in 1936. Subsequent acts have been passed by the Congress. There are 21 so-called river basins in the country. That is where you have a comprehensive plan for the development of a river; for instance, the Mississippi River, the Ohio River, the Columbia River, and others.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 8667, does not provide for an increase in the number of projects. It does not authorize any funds for projects which have not already been approved. It simply provides a ceiling for the Committee on Appropriations beyond which they will not go.

Mr. Speaker, we have within these 21 river basins a situation where the committee found there were 7 which would run out of money between now and July 1, 1964. The Members of the House will recall that last year we passed an omnibus bill. We had certain highly controversial projects which were denied by this body. We agreed to have hearings this year, which we did. Most of these projects were both strongly supported and strongly opposed. These projects have nothing to do with the basins. This bill, H.R. 8667, is emergency legislation for the basins only. Our bill earlier this year, H.R. 6016, authorized enough money for the next 2 fiscal years for 10 basins. The amounts were the minimum increase in authorizations so that the work would not be curtailed or stopped.

Mr. Speaker, we found in Los Angeles that the work would stop, at a cost of several million dollars. However, the Los Angeles people have borrowed the money to keep it going.

Mr. Speaker, if these authorizations are not made in this bill, we could well suffer loss of life and certainly great economic loss. Therefore, quite correctly, in June of this year, our Committee on Public Works, recognizing that these basins needed this additional authorization to take care of them for 2 years, passed a bill. It reached the other body and they added some seven—and I repeat—seven highly controversial projects. They passed their bill in July of this year. It came back to the House and I asked that the bill go to conference, because, in addition to adding the controversial projects, they had changed the monetary authorizations of our bill in these river basins, which was passed after debate in this House, and which projects were certainly noncontroversial. They reduced it from 2 years to 1 year. When I asked that it go to conference, some 20-odd of our Members stood and objected.

I have been here 23 years and that is the first time I have seen that many object to a bill going to conference. Now, we have returned for further consideration of the matter because on October 15 a great number of contractors on projects in Ohio and West Virginia will receive notice that authorization and, therefore, funds will be exhausted in 30 days.

Later, in the Brazos River and in central Florida, those projects will have to stop. So, what did we do? Recognizing further that these controversial projects which were added in the other body would take time for resolution, we came back with this emergency bill H.R. 8667, accepting the figure of the other body. In other words, we went to conference, without going to conference. We said, "All right, if the other body wants to authorize a 1-year extension, we will agree." Of course, we brought it in on the basis of six basins.

Mr. Speaker, there is one omission, Los Angeles. We took care of it in a separate bill which we passed some months ago to meet that emergency for about 3 months. My distinguished friend and colleague from California will introduce an amendment which, of course, the full committee accepts, which will put Los Angeles on the same basis, the same footing, as these other six projects and will take care of them for 1 additional fiscal year, through fiscal year 1964, rather than the 2 years as we passed the bill in June of this year.

It is just that plain, Mr. Speaker. This is highly necessary. There is no controversy. We are following the practice of many years' standing and we have reached the point where it is necessary to protect the interest of many sections of the country and to protect life and property and the expenditure of money by authorizing this additional amount, not for 2 years but for 1 year, as the other bill provided.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Does the gentleman recall the date that the Senate bill came back to the House floor and objection was made that it be sent to conference?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That was August 6.

Mr. LENNON. The gentleman has informed the House that at that time there were approximately 20 Members who objected.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LENNON. I wonder if the gentleman recalls having made some long distance telephone calls to Members from certain sections of the country insisting that those Members come back immediately?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I do not recall that. I did not make any such telephone calls.

Mr. LENNON. Let me ask the gentleman: Does he recall having appeared before the Rules Committee in an effort to get this bill sent to conference?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. No, sir. We have not gone before the Rules Committee.

Mr. LENNON. I am talking about this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Not this year, because we had these additional highly controversial projects.

Mr. LENNON. The bill is before the Rules Committee now, is it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Yes, it will be when we make application; but these projects found opposition last year, like Cape Fear River Basin, N.C.; Savannah River Basin, Ga.-S.C.; Flint River Basin, Ga.; Big South Fork, Cumberland River, Ky.-Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; and Burns Creek. It was with great difficulty that we finally presented a bill last year, which was accepted in conference. We took care of a great many other projects by the authorizations in last years bill.

Mr. LENNON. The gentleman does not recall having made any effort to get the bill out of the Rules Committee to send it to conference?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I do not know what the gentleman's interest is, what particular project he has in mind, but I may say that the subcommittee handling flood control matters met and with one exception, that gentleman voting "present" because he had a project among the highly controversial projects, voted unanimously, with that one exception, to reject those projects added by the other body.

Mr. LENNON. I think the gentleman knows the interest I have in mind. I have conversed with the gentleman on it a number of times.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman refresh my memory?

Mr. LENNON. The Cape Fear River Basin in North Carolina.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Oh, yes. I am glad the gentleman reminded me of that.

Mr. LENNON. Let me ask the gentleman when does the gentleman hope that the House will work its will on this so-called controversial legislation?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The Cape Fear River was highly controversial, as the gentleman will remember. I did not preside over the hearings that were held; my colleague from Alabama [Mr. JONES] presided.

Mr. LENNON. I recall that.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. There were a great number of witnesses. That will be considered by the Committee on Public Works as a whole when we finally resolve all of these differences looking toward bringing a bill before the House.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, we are facing a very critical situation with respect to the extension of these basin authorizations. Just last evening and again this morning I conferred with General Wilson, the Chief of Engineers, with General Graham, Chief of Civil Works for the Corps of Engineers, and Colonel Cochran, Huntington, W. Va., district engineer. Unless additional authorization is obtained, notices will go out to contractors on October 15, requiring stoppage of 11 vital construction projects in the Ohio River Basin.

Mr. Speaker, we have been concerned with providing additional employment possibilities in this area through the Area

Redevelopment Administration, accelerated public works program, and through other means. Now if these corps projects are stopped, it will set us back a long way, not to mention the terrible loss to the taxpayers in interrupted work which it will be costly to pick up again on the same basis.

I feel very deeply that the image of Congress itself suffers a serious blow if we cannot demonstrate that democracy can work in this respect. We must reach some type of agreement for the sake of all these river basins throughout the country. I appeal to my colleagues to arrive at some solution for this critical problem and extend the basin authorizations.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I must object to consideration of this bill at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. The gentleman assumes that responsibility.

The **SPEAKER.** Does the gentleman object?

Mr. LENNON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

FLOOD CONTROL ON IRONDEQUOIT CREEK

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today calling for a survey of Irondequoit Creek, N.Y., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Army to have such a survey made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, with particular reference to flood control improvements on Allens Creek, N.Y.

In the spring of each year, there occurs a flooding problem along Irondequoit Creek in Monroe County and one of its tributaries, Allens Creek. This annual overflow brings serious inconvenience and costly property damage to many of my constituents in the area of the town of Brighton.

The flooding condition is worsening each year. Leonard A. Boniface, the supervisor of the town of Brighton reports to me that the situation has been aggravated by altered drainage patterns resulting from the many residential developments which are being built in the affected area.

In March of this year, the Corps of Engineers inspected the area in question at the request of Mr. Alexander Gray, Monroe County director of public works, to consider the advisability of making a study of flood protection under section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act, as amended.

On April 1, the engineering division of the U.S. Army engineer district in Buffalo, N.Y., furnished the following information to Mr. Gray as a result of its inspection:

> The areas of greatest flood damage are located along the main stems of Irondequoit Creek and Allens Creek, but significant damage also occurs on tributaries of each. No single reservoir could protect all the separated problem areas and there appears to be no opportunity to develop adequate storage capacity in the Allens Creek area. It is therefore probable that a comprehensive flood protection plan would include several separate units, including local protection projects. The total Federal cost of a complete plan would exceed the limit of $1 million, set by section 205 as amended.
>
> It would be preferable to initiate the study under an authorization which would not limit the number or size of the improvements which could be considered. If, as the study progressed, only a small degree of improvement should be found economically justifiable, that work could be recommended for construction under section 205, to take advantage of faster construction procedure.
>
> There has not been any previous study of flood control in the Irondequoit Creek basin, so a study could not be authorized by committee resolution. The authorizing legislation could take the form of a special act of Congress or of a clause in a flood control act. In either case, the wording would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to cause a survey of Irondequoit Creek and tributaries for flood control and allied purposes to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers.

As a result of this reconnaissance report by the district engineer, officials of the town of Brighton contacted me last month. Subsequently, I wrote the chief of the civil works division at the Department of the Army headquarters outlining the matter. Shortly thereafter, I received a reply from Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, U.S. Army, director of civil works. After citing the necessity of having congressional authority made available before the Chief of Engineers can consider initiation of a study of this nature, General Graham wrote:

> You may be assured that should authority be made available for a survey of Irondequoit Creek, N.Y., every consideration will be given to requesting funds for its initiation and accomplishment.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill in an effort to take the required "first step" of providing congressional authority for such a project.

I believe the facts of this situation are self-evident. The flooding condition represents a major problem for which there is a Federal remedy. I respectfully urge expeditious consideration of this measure in order to overcome the difficulties resulting from a lack of flood control and protection systems along Irondequoit and Allens Creeks.

PHONY REPUBLICAN AMENDMENT; PHONY REPUBLICAN PRESS RELEASE

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the press release by the National Republican Campaign Committee on the recently passed tax cut bill is an indication of the type of Republican campaign that can be expected in the presidential and congressional elections next year.

In this release it appeared that I was singled out for attack in voting against a Republican amendment and for what they charge is a continued waste of taxpayers' money.

The fact that I was only one of a majority of 226 House Members who voted against the phony Republican amendment shows how deceptive and dishonest their news report is.

Distinguished and respected leaders of the House like the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, and others, pointed out how the Republican amendment would not really limit spending, that it was purely deceptive and would not have the result that was claimed.

The Republican attack on Democratic proposals as wasteful spending is nothing more than an effort to defeat essential legislation that they pretend to favor, but which is in conflict with GOP philosophy. It is an attack on investments in programs like area redevelopment, public works, conservation, education, and health projects designed to provide job opportunities and to end the waste in human and natural resources.

Instead of a frontal attack on popular programs which Republicans have historically opposed, they use scare words and fear propaganda to defeat legislation that the people and the Nation need. Yet nothing is more costly to the public than Republican fiscal and economic policies. A good example is the additional $2 billion annually which the taxpayers must pay for the Eisenhower-George Humphrey hard money policy.

The greatest waste comes with unemployment and lost productivity, lost educational opportunities and health services and GOP success in watering down or blocking the President's proposals to meet national needs.

It would be more ethical and intellectually honest if the Republican committee would follow national Young Republicans in frankly expressing their opposition to taxes based on the ability to pay, and their hostility to social security and other such Democratic programs which they have always opposed.

GOP propagandists underestimate the intelligence and good sense of the American people, most of whom are opposed to Republican trickle-down theories and their efforts to confuse and deceive the public with phony amendments and press releases.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he can give us the program for the rest of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, we will have no other legislative business this week. I hope to have the program for next week ready tomorrow.

"EDITORS IN GOVERNMENT"

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see any reason why the Federal Government should put itself in direct competition with free enterprise.

Many Members of Congress are in serious disagreement with the U.S. Agriculture Department on the subject of providing market news on agricultural matters to subscribers who will pay the Government for this service.

This is in direct competition with non-Government book publishing, and non-Government service. The Agriculture Department cannot possibly argue that the taxpayer does not get nicked in the process. After all, there have to be Government employees to "manage" this news service.

The Comptroller of the Currency has started a quarterly magazine called "The National Banking Review." Selling for $1 a copy, and carrying no advertising, it seems clear that the taxpayers are being charged again.

There has been some editorial comment on these developments, and I include the lead editorial that appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on September 28, 1963, at this point:

[From the New York World-Telegram Sept. 28, 1963]

EDITORS IN GOVERNMENT

On August 1, the U.S. Agriculture Department started a leased wire to provide market news to subscribers who would pay for it. The wire is leased from the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which has exclusive rights to sell the service.

Later, Comptroller of the Currency James J. Saxon started a slick-paper quarterly magazine, called "The National Banking Review."

The book sells for $1 a copy—hardly enough to pay costs. And since it carries no advertising, it obviously is being subsidized by the taxpayers.

Agriculture Secretary Freeman's excuse for the market wire is he doesn't think any private news service should have the exclusive right to transmit information collected by the Government.

So he lays out a system, at taxpayer expense, for sending out this information by exclusive Government wire.

The excuse for Saxon's publication is that it will provide "a medium of expression for those who are concerned with public policies in the field of money and banking." As if there were no periodicals in this field. (Six book reviews also appear in the first issue.)

The first issue also contains an article critical of the Federal Reserve Board, with which Saxon currently is in dispute.

These two developments both come under the head of attempts by Government bureaucrats to manage in their own way the news about the public's business.

They are in direct conflict with the frequent protestations of the Kennedy administration that it is not trying to manage the news.

And it all is being done by a debt-ridden Government at taxpayer expense in competition with taxpaying private enterprise.

One of the purposes, of course, is perpetuation of the same old crowd in office.

Mr. Speaker, one of the functions of Congress is to be a proper watchdog over waste, duplication, and unnecessary Government entry at taxpayers' expense into the private arena.

Having touched upon two episodes, let me now refer to another of a little different nature.

The National Institutes of Health apparently is running a 3-year study on child development costing the taxpayers some $200,000 a year. Now it comes to light that part of the money is being spent in the observation of newlyweds through one-way mirrors in order to ascertain how family arguments are settled.

Well now really, Mr. Speaker, can we not get along without this? What is wrong with the old-fashioned system of allowing newlyweds to work out their problems in private? Why do we not advance the study a little bit and try to figure out why they got married in the first place? How about wiring for sound the young men as they are dating their girls. And after the wedding when our young newlyweds are becoming "adjusted" I suppose all the Government seismographs will reach the breaking point the first time a wife or husband heaves the oatmeal at the other. Whether the Government inspectors know it or not, that may be the very thing that will save the marriage, and I doubt if the later born children will be emotionally unstable because of it.

In any event, I am sure that the taxpayers in the 17th Congressional District of New York will be gratified to know that their emotional problems may be relieved by the fact that a collection of newlyweds in the Washington area are becoming "adjusted" under the watchful eye of Federal employees.

GIVE NATO EXCLUSIVE CONTROL OVER RED TRADE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I recomment that the United States and other NATO countries suspend all unilateral trade—wheat or otherwise—with Communist countries. In addition, I propose we take the lead in establishing a permanent NATO trade council to promote free competitive world trade and with the exclusive power to regulate trade with the Communists. The council would also have the responsibility to develop a unified NATO trade policy with non-Communist countries and within NATO itself.

Communists use trade for economic warfare. If free nations trade at all with the Communists, they must band together and do the same. Otherwise, we are likely to be outfoxed every time. Communist economic warfare is controlled in Moscow. To meet this challenge, free world economic warfare must be united. That is why I propose a ban on unilateral trade with the Communists, with the power to regulate all trade with the Communists placed in the hands of a NATO trade council.

Here is the text of a letter I have sent to President Kennedy presenting this proposal:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have requested congressional reaction to the proposed sale of wheat to Soviet Russia. This letter will supplement views I presented to Secretaries Freeman and Hodges during the recent joint meeting of the House Agricultural and Foreign Affairs Committees on the wheat proposal.

I oppose the sale, and believe it would be a fundamental error with far-reaching adverse consequences. As the leader of the free world, we have a moral responsibility to set a high example. Trading with the enemy is a poor example.

Soviet Russia has not abandoned her aims of world conquest. She occupies Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Cuba, part of Finland, part of Poland, part of Germany, and part of the Japanese island of Sakhalin. In addition the Soviets have a strong voice in Yugoslavia and Poland and direct the Communist network in the free nations.

Soviet Russia is not trustworthy. She has broken nearly every agreement of strategic importance since the days of Lenin. Just last year Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko lied to you about his country's occupation of Cuba.

Soviet Russia is not a good business risk. She has never paid an $800 million lend-lease obligation dating from World War II days. She refuses to pay her obligations to the United Nations. Why deal further with a bad risk?

To the Communists, trade is an arm of foreign policy, a powerful weapon in the cold war. They use it for power politics, and the wheat deal is no exception. They use trade to divide and conquer, make individual nations dependent and therefore vulnerable, as well as fill strategic shortages.

The wheat controversy has served one useful purpose. It has brought to light the little-known fact that the United States has been trading with the Communists on a rather broad scale for some time. This should stop.

Trading with the enemy is bad business whether it be wheat or electronic gear. Both have strategic importance to the Communists.

I strongly urge that you suspend U.S. trade with all Communist countries, refrain from any negotiations to sell wheat—or anything else—to the Communists and urge other NATO countries to do likewise.

The Soviet Union may or may not have suffered a crop failure. We may never know. We can be certain of only one point: Khrushchev wants us to believe a crop failure has occurred.

Newspapers are now reporting the Soviets have had production problems in agriculture for several years, with the 1963 crop down 10 to 15 percent below last year.

If all this is correct, Khrushchev can solve his own wheat problem simply by cutting out Soviet wheat exports.

For 1962, for example, the Soviet Union reports a net export trade in grain valued at $523 million—up more than 10 percent from the previous year. Of this, $340 million was in wheat.

For 1961 the Soviets reported net grain exports valued at $476 million. Of this $309 million was wheat. In 1960 the net grain export was $395 million, and in 1959 it was $405 million.

If the Communists have had short supplies in grain in recent years, as they now claim, why the exports? The answer may be they prefer to earn foreign exchange instead of feeding their own people. If so, how can we be sure the wheat we supply will be used to meet a food shortage?

Whether the crop failure is genuine or not, I consider trading with the Communists extremely unwise, especially on a unilateral basis.

Therefore, in addition to suspending all unilateral trade with Communist countries, I strongly urge that you request an immediate top-level conference of the 15 NATO countries with these objectives:

1. A permanent NATO trade council with the power to regulate all trade with Communist countries and the responsibility to develop a unified NATO trade policy with the non-Communist countries and within NATO itself.

2. An agreement signed by each NATO country banning all unilateral trade with Communist countries.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

MORE NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the American Newspaper Publishers Association is demanding that the Federal Government abandon its news service system in the Department of Agriculture. Every American who believes in freedom of the press should support the newspaper publishers in denouncing this unwarranted intrusion into the activities of American news media.

Not only is this news service—to be called national communications system—a threat to the free press of this country, but it can well be a foot in the door for subtle and effective censorship by Government.

We need to strengthen, not weaken, our free press and free enterprise system and a good way to start would be to see to it that the "Freeman News Service" program is abolished.

This managed wire service, providing farm market news and press releases, was put into operation August 1 by the Department of Agriculture thereby placing the Government in the business of collecting and disseminating news in competition with private news agencies. Although the service is available on request to any newspaper or person, Secretary Freeman can cancel subscriptions according to his own whim.

This means that Government employees obviously control the news from the preparation to the editing. They feed the copy into the wire circuits. There is no screening, checking, probing, digging and evaluation by persons independent of Government employment.

In recent memorandums, President Kennedy asked all executive departments and agencies to cooperate in establishing a unified Federal Government communication system designed to disseminate news across the Nation. The President's action will only compound the error already created by the establishment of the managed news service in the Department of Agriculture.

The great tradition of the free press is freedom of expression. Government employees must hue to the line of the administration and therefore cannot qualify as independent reporters.

The slightest encroachment upon the freedom of the press in this country, is a dangerous precedent-setting move on the part of the administration which could lead to control of news media from every Federal Department. This dangerous innovation is directly contrary to our traditional American freedom of the press, and should be stopped immediately.

"KENNEDY WHEAT"—TO EMBRACE RUSSIA

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, despite administration propaganda drums, it is clearly apparent that the American public and informed observers in our Nation's press are not at all impressed by arguments being advanced for the sale of farm commodities to the Soviet Union.

There is no practical reason why we should follow the shortsighted errors by the Canadians in this field, and I include in my remarks at this point an article which appeared in the Monday, September 30 edition of the Chicago Tribune by Eliot Janeway, which focuses proper attention on this subject.

UNITED STATES SHOULD MAKE OWN HAY WITH WHEAT

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, September 29.—Even before the test ban treaty was signed, it was clear what the next step in "good relations with Russia" was going to be. Trade was certain to follow diplomacy. And it is. Russia has turned up with at least a partial answer to our No. 1 farm problem—what to do with our perennial wheat surplus?

This is a particularly pressing problem this year, what with the Federal Government running out of money, farm spending standing as an obstacle in the way of a tax cut, the wheat growers having voted down the Kennedy administration's plan to limit production, the United States needing more export income, and U.S. wheat exports needing subsidies Washington can no longer afford to pay. Russia's answer to this ominous array of problems is that she wants to buy some of our surplus wheat—for cash.

As everyone knows, this proposition follows on the heels of Russia's massive purchase of wheat in Canada, which just about cleaned out the market there and strengthened grain prices and shipping rates all over the world.

Like it or not, the question is not whether the United States is going to do more business with Russia, but on what basis—beginning with the basis on which we let her ease our wheat problem.

The way Russia played her hand in Canada suggests guidelines and peril points. The Canadian Government has been so worried about its financial situation in general, and its wheat surplus in particular, that it apparently did not dare stop to ask any questions (especially as the present opposition has its political base in the Western wheat Provinces). But hungry, though the United States is for wheat customers, any new trade deal with Russia here is certain to be subjected to searching scrutiny and debate, before the second-guessing starts.

Before Russia cleaned out the Canadian wheat surplus, no outsider knew how much she was short for her own domestic requirements; and no one knows even yet. All that anyone knows is that some of the wheat she bought will be resold to Cuba—partly to keep Castro on the Kremlin's side of the argument with Peiping; that China, which needs Canadian wheat and has been buying a great deal of it, is temporarily frozen out of the Canadian market; and that Russia's satellites in eastern Europe will share a ration with Cuba.

COUP FOR RUSSIA

Economically, it's adding up to a bailout for Canada, and to a bonanza for the grain and shipping markets. But, politically, it looks more like a coup for Russia. In terms of guidelines and peril points for national policy, the United States needs the bailout and wants the bonanza, and there's a very specific reason why we should be able to trade it out for ourselves without inviting Russia to score another political coup at our expense.

The reason is that the entire European land mass seems to have suffered a wheat crop failure this year, while nature has been bountiful on this side of the Atlantic. Theorizing apart, no one knows how severe the failure may have been within Russia herself; how much of a reserve she may have; or how much of her present purchases are really scheduled not for her own internal use but instead for resale throughout free Europe and for rationing and political bribery among the satellites.

We don't need Russia to get in between us and our allies and friends in free Europe, and to resell our premium commodities to them for their good money when they are our creditors. It is to the mutual interest of all in the Atlantic Community for us to earn more by direct sales to Europe. No doubt about it, free Europe, needs wheat, and it has the money to pay for it. True, Russia will offer to pay us in gold, which we badly need, but so will Europe. And if we trade hard enough, we'll even persuade those who take out wheat to take it away in American ships.

SATELLITES NEED WHEAT

The satellites need our wheat even more, and this is a time for us to trade out a tangible political return on all that we have been giving to Poland and to Yugoslavia, as well as for us to look for our own back in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Remember

Cuba had actually become a flush customer for Canada, and Russia is set up to use the wheat deal as a wedge between them.

We will do well to remember how cleverly Russia has used the sugar she bought from Cuba, the coffee she bought from Brazil, the oil from the Middle East she added to her own production, and the ships she chartered from Greece. Precious little benefit ever got through to Russia's forgotten man—the consumer. The great bulk of it was used as an entering wedge in countries Russia is trying to take over as she took Cuba—by economic penetration. We will do well to make sure that Russia does not bluff us into letting her convert European cash customers for U.S. goods into political clients of the Soviets.

Before any semisecret transaction is finalized, Congress and the public deserve to have the fullest explanation not only of present contracts with the Reds but of past commitments, conversations, and of future plans that the administration has to move to closer embrace the Soviet Union.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Nedzi, for Wednesday, October 2, through Monday, October 14, 1963, on account of official committee business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Bell) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Fino.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Harding) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Shelley in three instances.

Mr. Murphy of New York in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1096. An act for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grun (Susanne Roth); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1287. An act for the relief of John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1341. An act for the relief of Gabriel Kerenyi; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

S. 1488. An act for the relief of A. R. Cacace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1838. An act for the relief of Hannah Robbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1881. An act for the relief of Lydia Anne Foote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1988. An act to prohibit fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by persons other than nationals or inhabitants of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1280. An act for the relief of Jan Koss;

H.R. 2303. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Kolloian Izmirian;

H.R. 3648. An act for the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta;

H.R. 3762. An act for the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski;

H.R. 4075. An act for the relief of Noriyuki Miyata; and

H.R. 7022. An act for the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1257. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the July 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1258. A letter from the national shipswriter, Navy Club of the U.S.A., transmitting the proceedings of the 26th annual reunion held in Elgin, Ill., June 21–23, 1963; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1259. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1260. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1261. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 16, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on an interim survey of the Maumee River Basin, Findlay, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act and the River and Harbor Act, approved December 22, 1944, and March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 158); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 533. Resolution providing an additional stationery allowance for Members of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 800). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 532. Resolution to provide additional postage for Members of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 801). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 531. Resolution providing an additional allowance for telephone and telegraph service for Members of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 802). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 497. Resolution to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary under Public Law 86–272; without amendment (Rept. No. 803). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 499. Resolution to provide funds for the further expense of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 38; without amendment (Rept. No. 804). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 521. Resolution to amend House Resolution 226, 88th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 805). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 523. Resolution to provide funds for the investigation authorized by House Resolution 504; without amendment (Rept. No. 806). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 528. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 153; without amendment (Rept. No. 807). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 8677. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to set aside funds for research into spinal cord injuries and diseases; without amendment (Rept. No. 808). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 8690. A bill to provide for the redesigning of the 5-cent George Washington regular postage stamp so as to incorporate George Washington's immortal words "to bigotry no sanction"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 8691. A bill to repeal certain requirements relating to signs in section 114 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 8692. A bill authorizing a survey of Irondequoit Creek, N.Y., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, with particular reference to Allens Creek, N.Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 8693. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Horseshoe Bend; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8694. A bill to provide that eligibility for compensation of certain veterans suffering total disability from wartime-service-connected multiple sclerosis shall become effective from the date with respect to which a confirmed medical diagnosis establishes total disability arose therefrom; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 8695. A bill relating to rates of postage on certain materials for blind persons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 8696. A bill to authorize establishment of the Tocks Island National Recreation Area in the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 8697. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans and their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 765. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation designating the first week in March of each year as "Save Your Vision Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 540. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8698. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. M. E. Whitman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 8699. A bill for the relief of Dr. Aman D. Farajiani and his wife, Leticia Aticuza Farajiani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 8700. A bill for the relief of Julianna Banda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 8701. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alkinoos Vourlekis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

333. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles W. Winegarner and others, Citizens Congressional Committee, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States which has virtually outlawed the right to pray or read Scripture in public schools and other institutions, and requesting that the initial steps be taken that are necessary to bring about an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which will forever guarantee the protection of our Christian traditions and the right of our people to pray and honor Holy Scripture in their institution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

334. Also, petition of Sam C. Hanna, Rochester, N.Y., relative to submitting additional material relating to his petition of September 18, 1963, recorded as No. 304, which relates to civil action No. 9922, U.S. District Court for Western New York State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Lief Erickson Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, Lief Erickson Day commemorates the discovery of North America about A.D. 1000 by Leif Erickson. The explorations of the brave Norseman in this hemisphere are an early milestone in the development of our continent and our Nation.

Lief was the son of Eric the Red, a Norseman who discovered Greenland in A.D. 945, and founded a colony there. Lief discovered land to the west of Iceland which he called Vinland and which was probably what is known today as Nova Scotia. He was particularly struck with the charms of Vinland, where he spent one winter. His explorations took him to lands "of which he had previously had no knowledge," where "self-sown" wheat grew, and vines, and "mosur" wood. Lief took specimens of all these, and returned to his father's home in Greenland.

Lief Erickson Day reminds us of the heritage that all Americans have received from these early explorers and from the generations of Nordic peoples who followed them to these shores in the centuries that have followed. Of the latter-day voyagers from Norway many have found their way to San Francisco. Norwegian sailors have been sailing into the port of San Francisco since early days, and it was Norwegian fishermen who introduced modern methods into the whaling industry on the Pacific coast. They have also played a large part in the development of shipping and in the navigation of inland waters. The marine surveying in our ports is largely in the hands of Norwegian engineers.

With their varied crafts and professions the Norwegians make a vital contribution to the colorful, bustling life of San Francisco. They are deeply proud of their adventurous Norwegian forebears and so Lief Erickson Day is a particularly meaningful occasion for them. I join them in commemorating the memory of this great explorer.

No. 11—Oregon: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Oregon, about gambling in that State.

Only $11 million was gambled at the horse race tracks last year in Oregon. Other forms of gambling amuse Oregonians more than betting on horses. The late Senator Neuberger summed it up in an article entitled "Oregon Goes to the Dogs." He estimated—back in 1951—that four times as much was wagered on greyhounds as on horses. I am certain the ratio has since increased.

Not all of Oregon's gambling is legal. The late Senator said that the city of Portland was a lush source of dividends for a strange collection of doubtful characters. This is not surprising. Oregon's share of the annual national illegal betting estimates presented to the McClellan committee exceeds one-quarter of a billion dollars a year. A fat treasury for the underworld crime syndicates.

Legalized gambling on the horse and dog tracks was not initially popular in rural Oregon. Not until the gambling syndicates got a brainstorm. They cut the hypocrites in on the take. They bought off the rural bluenoses by getting the State to assign a portion of its percentage of the gross to the county fairs. Later, the legislature added the Pacific Coast Turkey Show and the Corn Show.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I would be talking turkey to the Corn Belt if I changed my national lottery proposal to provide that gambling revenues pay for the masses of surplus agricultural commodities that are cluttering up huge Government warehouses. After all, it worked in Oregon.

The United States needs a National Government-run lottery to drag gambling out of the criminal domain and bring the moneys now financing the underworld into the public treasury.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski evokes memories of gratitude and esteem in the hearts of Americans. October 11 has been designated as General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include my address at the 28th annual Pulaski Day ceremonies at Polonaise Hall, Staten Island, New York.

(Address by Rep. JOHN M. MURPHY at Polonaise Hall, Staten Island, New York)

It is a genuine honor to speak to you here at the Polonaise Hall to honor a gallant

Polish warrior. I notice that today's rain undoubtedly washed the red and white stripe that should have been painted on Bay Street for the parade that was canceled this afternoon.

I would also like to congratulate Miss Carol Ann Osowiecki whose success here today in being crowned Miss Polonia is another tribute to the great contributions Poland has made to this country.

Today time brings us to the 183d anniversary of Pulaski's death. Like Lafayette and his own fellow countryman, Kosciusako, he came across the seas to aid the American States in establishing a new order of things, based on individual liberty.

Casimir Pulaski, better known to us in America as Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski of Revolutionary War fame, was born in Winiary, Poland, in 1748. He was the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski, a venerable old man who belonged to the Polish nobility. The father was the chief magistrate of Warsch and was noted for his knowledge of jurisprudence.

Pulaski, almost from the moment of his birth throughout his short life of 31 years, was devoted to horses and the cavalry branch of the fighting forces. His father was obliged to keep a large band of armed retainers on his great estates and, from their frequent clashes with invaders, Pulaski derived his earliest lessons on warfare. As a boy, from the family cook around the large cozy kitchen hearth, he listened to harrowing tales of the swift, merciless Cossacks whose cavalry raids slaughtered all before them, men and animals alike.

Young Casimir received his early education in the local parish school. This was followed by rigorous training in the Latin classics. Before he reached his majority, the youth became interested in the efforts to redeem Poland. A nation, then one-fifth larger than France in area and containing a population of approximately 20 million people, had been torn asunder. This catastrophe did not come about all at once, but gradually.

When the puppet of Catherine of Russia was elected by the Polish deputies, under the impending threat of the Russian Army, who surrounded the Polish Diet at the time of the election, he became a tool in her hands for the execution of her will in Poland. Such patriotic and gallant Poles as Count Joseph Pulaski—the father of the man we honor today—realized it was time to arouse the spirit of their countrymen. Under the circumstances they took the risk of resorting to force. Pulaski's father was then about 60 years of age. He advised his three sons of a plan derived by himself and other Polish nobles to forestall the enemies. They formed an organization in the town of Bara—in Podolia—about 20 miles from the Turkish border. It was known as the Confederation of the Bar.

Under the most trying conditions and the greatest adversity, this patriotic organization fought the enemies of Poland against overwhelming odds. Casimir Pulaski and his brother, Francis, became the life of the movement. At the head of a small force of cavalry, he performed heroic feats. With his brother they crossed and recrossed Poland and carried the revolt into Lithuania. During the winter of 1769–70, he maintained himself in the mountains of Galicia, and became a constant terror to the Russians.

The failure of this movement ended Pulaski's career in Poland. His aged father died in prison. One of his brothers was killed before his eyes. The youngest brother was taken into captivity. Many of his countrymen were doomed to slavery.

The energy Pulaski possessed to fight in the cause of freedom did not desert him. He escaped into Turkey and journeyed on to France and eventually came to Paris.

During his stay in Paris, Pulaski read and heard of America's struggle for freedom. Through an old family friend he obtained an introduction to Benjamin Franklin. This elder statesman forwarded to Gen. George Washington excellent letters of introduction. Wrote Franklin to his Commander in Chief—

"Count Pulaski of Poland [is] an officer famed in Europe for his bravery in defense of the liberty of his country against the three powers, Russia, Austria, and Prussia. * * * The opinion here is that he may be highly useful to our Service."

On the occasion of the laying of the cornerstone of the monument to Pulaski's memory at Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1853, it was stated:

"Across the Atlantic came to [Pulaski] the tidings that the people of another hemisphere had bid defiance to oppression and were arming for the struggle. The sound stirred the heart of Pulaski like the voice of a battle trumpet. It was a struggle for liberty. It was his cause, whoever the people and wherever the scene of conflict. Fate forbade him to achieve the independence of his own country, and true to the noble impulses of his soul he came to aid in establishing that of America."

He saw—

Jared Sparks, in his "Library of American Biography" says:

"a new field opened for vindicating with his sword the same principles, the same rights of mankind, the same unchangeable laws of justice as those for which he had wielded it with so much courage and singleness of purpose in his own country."

George Washington seemed much attracted by this dashing newcomer when introduced to him personally by Lafayette and recommended to Congress that Pulaski be commissioned as a brigadier general and be given command of the cavalry. Washington added in a letter to John Hancock, dated August 27, 1777:

"The Count appears, by his recommendations, to have sustained no inconsiderable military character in his own country; and as the principal attention in Poland has been for some time past paid to its cavalry, it is to be presumed that this gentleman is not unacquainted with it."

Up to the time Pulaski arrived in Boston in July 1776 and met Washington the following month there had been no regular cavalry in the American Army. Four regiments were projected and Washington suggested to Congress that Pulaski be put in command of all the cavalry. Pulaski was, of course, born to the saddle.

Flinging himself into combat, Pulaski presently organized the cavalry unit which became known as Pulaski's Legion, by which he will always be remembered. He participated in the battles of Germantown and Trenton, was attached to the main army at Valley Forge during the winter of 1777–78, and was later detailed to join Gen. Benjamin Lincoln for the southern campaign.

At the Battle of Brandywine it was Gen. Casimir Pulaski's gallant request of General Washington to use his own bodyguard, some 30 horses, and launched a furious charge at the pursuers, the British Army which had broken through the American lines. It was this small group led by Gen. Pulaski which threw the British ranks into confusion and saved the day for the American forces.

On February 2, 1779, Pulaski was ordered to the support of General Lincoln in South Carolina. He arrived at Charleston on May 8. Learning of the approach of General Provost northward from Savannah, he rushed to the attack of the British advance guard but suffered defeat.

Pulaski now joined forces with General Lincoln, who, assisted by the French fleet, was preparing to attack Savannah. On August 19 he wrote Congress a long letter in which he detailed the disappointments that he had encountered and expressed the hope that he might still find the opportunity of proving his devotion to the American cause.

On October 9, at the siege of Savannah, he bravely but impatiently charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry and fell with a grapeshot in the loin. He was removed to the *Wasp* where surgeons were unable to remove the bullet. He died on board, probably October 11, 1779. Whether he was buried at sea, or beneath the oaks of St. Helena's Island, or in Greenwich, has never been established.

Thus ended the career of a gallant soldier.

In Savannah, Ga., there is a shrine which every year has a memorial service for the memory of this gallant Polish count whose contributions to America were so great that he did not even live to bear the fruits of citizenship.

Our celebration is not without sadness for Poles and Americans of Polish descent. Poland was not free when General Pulaski fell on Ocotber 11, 1779, in defense of American liberties. Poland is not free now. Its people cannot raise their voices for Polish interests, nor act as Polish patriots, nor openly cherish what is good and noble in Polish traditions.

But there is profound inspiration and comfort in the fact that Poles have survived partitions, conquests, and suppressions over the centuries. The Polish character, personality, and culture have survived in the hearts of a freedom-loving people.

We are reminded that Pulaski's cause was the cause of freedom. It is our present cause. It is the eternal cause of mankind. In its steadfast pursuit lies the best hope of the world.

A Columbus Day Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of the United States, the energies and customs of the people of all nationalities forwarded the rapid and continuous growth of this Nation in which we, their descendants live. But, during our labors for freedom and the pursuit of happiness we are constantly reminded of the adventurous spirit of one man who contributed so singularly to our country. On October 12, citizens in the United States will pay homage to the man with whom we credit the discovery, on this day in 1492, of the Western Hemisphere. Pageants and parades are scheduled and performed while children recite appropriate poems and plays. Yet, we should think of Christopher Columbus not only as a famous explorer or admiral of the seas. We should recognize him as a national of Italian origin, destined to lead a group of Spaniards, Portuguese, and Italians, to the New World. As the leader of this multinational group, he established a principle which would contribute to the development of the greatest Nation in the world, the bringing together of many nationalities to live and build together in this new land a new life.

In San Francisco the celebrations for Columbus Day are citywide; yet the Italian community of 96,000 leads in the festivities for their countryman. There is a Columbus Avenue in San Francisco and appropriately on October 12, the Italian Americans parade on that concourse. They represent one of the largest concentrations of Italian Americans in the United States and have become an integral part of the city since its founding.

San Franciscans look with pride at the offices of the Bank of America, founded by A. P. Giannini amidst the ruins of the fire in 1906. This bank is now one of the richest and largest in the world.

There is Angelo Rossi who became mayor of the city and who has left behind him a legend of an honest and hardworking administration.

The San Francisco Opera grew to greatness because of its Italian managers and singers. Louisa Tetrazzini was discovered in 1905 by San Franciscans, who thereafter claimed her as their own.

We must look not only to the individual Italian Americans who contributed so much to the growth of the city. We should remember the part the Italian community played during the great fire when they fought the flames with their precious barrels of wine, thus saving Telegraph Hill from destruction.

Just as the Italian community of the North Beach area is part of San Francisco, so are all the communities of San Francisco a part of the United States, all contributing their efforts to their country. Columbus sought a route to the Indies but found the Americas. It is therefore fitting that all citizens of the United States, whether of Italian, Spanish, German, or Irish origin, joyfully and reverently pay tribute to his services to our great Nation.

Independence Day of the Republic of Guinea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today the Republic of Guinea celebrates the fifth anniversary of her independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President, Ahmed Sekou; and His Excellency, the Guinean Ambassador to the United States, Bangoura Karim.

The Republic of Guinea, which emerged as an independent nation on October 2, 1958, has been called a sphinx buried in an enigma by a Washington Post writer on Africa, and many Americans are still looking for clues to solve the Guinean enigma. Guinea's accession to independence was startling and abrupt: a "No" to the Constitution of the Fifth Republic and to joining the French Community; the withdrawal of the French; and aid from the Soviet Union. The Western press announced that Guinea had gone Communist.

But today, 5 years after Guinea's accession to independence, things look somewhat different. Guinea has not become a Soviet satellite. Guinea was among the African countries which at the 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly voted for a resolution appealing to the Soviet Union not to explode a 50-megaton bomb. At the 17th General Assembly Guinea's position diverged from that of the Soviet bloc on several important disarmament and East-West items. Guinea's alinement is with the neutralist African nations, not the Soviet bloc.

In addition, Guinea seems to be the African nation where Soviet aid has gone most wrong. The Soviet bloc extended $125 million to Guinea in low-cost loans and aid grants, and bilateral trade agreements were negotiated for exchange of goods. But Guinea received Russian shoes that fell apart and textiles imported from Egypt, then reshipped at a higher price. Much of the Soviet loan money was allocated for propaganda projects, and Soviet equipment turned out to be inferior.

Also, the attempts at interference in Guinea's internal affairs by Soviet representatives have not been welcomed by the Guinean Government. Soviet Ambassador Danil Solod had to be recalled at the end of 1961 because Guinea charged that his Embassy had been used to foment student demonstrations against the Government.

This is the backdrop to recent changes in Guinea's policy, changes warmly welcomed by the West, for they indicated the failure of the Soviet Union to win Guinea to the Soviet bloc. No new Soviet projects were begun in 1962, and near the end of the year only 700 Soviet bloc technicians remained compared with 12,000 the previous year. After a reappraisal of the socialist economic structure, the Sekou Toure government decided in April 1962 to open its doors to private enterprise. A new industrial code has been enacted which is designed to protect and to give certain advantages to foreign investment. As a result, a number of Western private firms have initiated industrial development projects in Guinea.

Symbolic of Guinea's new policy, and perhaps the most important indication of Guinea's new approach to the West, was the signature of agreements between Guinea and France in May 1963, ending 5 years of strained relations between the former administering power and its former colony. The agreements call for a settlement of debts, technical assistance by France including the training of technical and administrative personnel as well as the dispatch of scientific and technical missions, and the development of cultural relations. Relations with the United States have also been extended; Guinea is now purchasing American movies, newspapers, magazines, and books.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Guinea's independence we would like to take the opportunity to welcome the Sekou Toure government and the people of Guinea in their renewed relations with the West. We understand their desire to remain nonalined. We respect their foreign policy, above all their support for, and their initiatives in, the African unity movement. We commend their pragmatism and their willingness to modify policies which do not prove effective.

Hydrofoils Operation and Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report:

HYDROFOILS OPERATION AND GOVERNMENT FINANCING

(By Congressman JOHN M. MURPHY of New York)

On July 15, 1963, American Hydrofoil Lines, Inc., initiated the first commercial use of a hydrofoil boat in the United States. At 8:30 a.m. in the morning a boatload of passengers left Port Washington, Long Island, for a nonstop trip to Wall Street. Not only was this the first commercial use of a hydrofoil in this country, but it was the first use of a hydrofoil in the Western Hemisphere for commuter service. Today, only 2 short months from the commencement of this new commuter service, the 21-mile Port Washington to Wall Street run is as routine as any other form of commuter service. The operating time has been reduced from 52 minutes to 47 minutes and schedules have been met with clockwork accuracy despite many days of adverse weather during this period.

In connection with the time factor for hydrofoil commuting from Port Washington, it is interesting to note that the hydrofoil is from one-half hour to 45 minutes faster to Wall Street than any other form of commuter service (auto, Long Island Railroad, and subway). In addition to the hydrofoil's speed, added features are personal comfort for the passengers, in the form of individual reserved seats and scenic beauty aboard the hydrofoil.

The Soviet Union has been aware of the importance of travel by hydrofoil since 1950. Regular hydrofoil boat schedules are maintained on the Volga and other Russian rivers and lakes. It is estimated that the Soviet Union has several hundred commercial hydrofoils operating at the present time. The Soviet Union is not the only European country utilizing hydrofoils as commuter boats; Italy, England, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries have also been expanding the use of hydrofoil boats. Recognizing the growth possibilities for hydrofoils in the United States, the Secretary of Commerce has recently referred to statistics supplied to him by a research institute showing that hydrofoil business in the United States will amount to over $750 million in the next 10 years.

American Hydrofoil Lines feels that a substantial portion of hydrofoil development in the next 10 years will provide better transit systems for metropolitan areas surrounded by water and the expediting of transit between cities connected by waterways. In that connection, there are over 26,000 miles of nature's highway in this country capable of being used by hydrofoil boats. Communities interested in hydrofoil commuting to assist in solving the transportation problems of metropolitan complexes must also solve one of the other major problems of our cities in the 20th Century—financing. Of all the forms of commuter service available to points within a city such as New York, the hydrofoil boat definitely offers the lowest overall cost per passenger mile in the development of new commuter routes. New railroad or subway lines would require expensive condemnation for new rights-of-way, not to speak of the capital construction costs that would be required after the land is acquired. Even the use of buses at speeds close to that of hydrofoils would require extensive modification of our already overcrowded roadway facilities in and around the city.

Hydrofoil boats on the other hand do not require any condemnation of land or expensive construction costs for terminals. For the most part, hydrofoils can operate out of existing dockage along the New York waterfront with little or no modification.

The right-of-way for hydrofoils is nature's highway, thus again saving tremendously in initial capital construction costs. Once in operation, maintenance on hydrofoil boats is minimal. The only major moving parts on a hydrofoil boat are its rudder and power unit while other forms of transportation have to contend with axles, wheels, springs and other equipment not required in hydrofoil operation.

It is not possible at this time to explore all aspects of hydrofoil operation; however, American Hydrofoil Lines has developed extensive economic data pertaining to hydrofoil commuter service and has also been cooperating in a study being conducted by the Nassau Planning Commission of water transportation for Long Island. These statistics could be made available on request. American Hydrofoil Lines has examined several means through which hydrofoil commuter boats could be financed in the metropolitan area. Similar programs would be applicable in other cities. The balance of this memorandum will be devoted to those several means.

SALE OF PORT AUTHORITY BONDS

In 1959, New York State Legislature provided for a New York State railroad equipment program. The program was created to provide public financial assistance in the purchase of new passenger car equipment for leases to three railroads operating in the New York City area. For example, the Long Island Railroad is scheduled to receive 30 cars under the program before the end of this year. The 30 cars are expected to handle 3,750 commuters daily. It would be interesting to speculate what 30 hydrofoil boats of the *Albatross* class could do in commuter service from Brooklyn or Staten Island to Manhattan.

In a 2-hour morning rush hour period, 30 hydrofoil boats could carry approximately 4,320 people.

Under the equipment program, the port authority is authorized to sell special port authority commuter car bonds which are State guaranteed and then purchase cars for lease to the private carriers. There is no reason why legislation for a similar program, on the basis of the same public interest, could not be passed for State guaranteed port authority bonds to aid in the purchase and subsequent lease of hydrofoil boats.

If the port authority would not be the acceptable public authority to handle such a bond issue, other agencies should be considered for a similar program.

NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY OPERATION

Most rapid commuter transit in the city of New York is operated by the New York City Transit Authority (transit authority). While it would require enabling legislation, the transit authority could make outright purchases of hydrofoil boats and operate them on regular routes much the same as buses and subways. Another possibility would be transit authority bonds guaranteed by the city or State for the purchase of hydrofoil boats and operation of the boats by the transit authority.

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND AVIATION OPERATION

At the present time, the New York City Department of Marine and Aviation operates ferryboats for the city between several points within the city. Therefore, should it be decided that New York City prefers public operation of hydrofoil service within the city rather than private, marine and aviation could be the logical city agency to expand its operations to include hydrofoils. Marine and aviation has the harbor know-how needed for any hydrofoil commuter operation. Financing could be arranged through bond issues or outright purchases of boats by the city.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Under the provisions of the Kennedy administration's mass transportation proposal now pending before the 88th Congress, it is possible that additional Federal assistance would be available to metropolitan areas such as New York to assist in "the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems * * *." New York City has already received some Federal assistance for mass transit in a grant made by the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency (FHHFA) last June. This grant of $3,185,000 was made under the provisions of a law which expired on June 30, 1963. One area of study, according to the announcement made by the FHHFA in making the grant, is whether new short connecting links between present transit facilities can help eliminate bottlenecks.

In that connection, we suggest that experiments could be conducted, under the terms of the grant, to establish hydrofoil feasibility between Staten Island and lower Manhattan. With the population expansion on Staten Island that can be expected when the Verrazano Bridge is completed, experimentation on a new short and faster connecting link between Staten Island surface lines and transit facilities in lower Manhattan is certainly in order and would unquestionably be in the public interest. The legislation for mass transit currently pending in the 88th Congress would, for practical purposes, provide authorization for grants similar to the grant just mentioned. However, the legislation is considerably broader than any transit legislate ever before enacted and would provide the means for a massive attack on mass transit problems.

The Senate has already passed mass transit legislation, S. 6, and the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives has favorably reported H.R. 3881, a bill in most respects similar to the bill already passed by the Senate. The prospects for the enactment of legislation to provide massive ($500 million) assistance to metropolitan transit systems appears to be good. If not in this session of Congress the bill is almost assured of passage in the next session. In addition to programs for outright Federal grants and Federal loans to finance effective mass transportation, the proposed legislation calls for an accelerated research, demonstration, and development program for all phases of urban mass transportation.

It is in this area that hydrofoil development could be substantially furthered. The proposed legislation requires that a project must be one which could produce results usable in other areas. It is apparent that the results of a demonstration program of hydrofoil operations between Staten Island and lower Manhattan could be readily usable in other areas of the country. In connection with the loan provisions of the bill, it should be noted that loans for transit facilities can be made to public bodies where the transit operation is self-supporting but may have difficulty in obtaining financing at reasonable terms.

This provision would be of particular interest should a New York City public body such as marine and aviation or the transit authority decide to purchase and/or operate hydrofoil boats. Grants and loans under the legislation must be made to public bodies, however, the legislation specifically provides that the equipment or facilities financed may be leased to private companies for actual operation. Thus, it would be possible for the port authority, the Tri-State Transportation Committee or other public body to arrange for the financing of hydrofoil boats and lease the boats to a private carrier to operate.

CONCLUSION

While some of the means for public financing have been discussed in this memorandum, it should be kept in mind that there is a great deal of flexibility. American Hydrofoil Lines believes that hydrofoils can help solve the complex transportation problems of many metropolitan areas in an economical and efficient manner. The Soviet Union has shown that hydrofoil commuter service is feasible and we believe after our 2 months of service in the New York area that hydrofoils are feasible in New York and will be accepted enthusiastically by the public.

Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, this great Republic has been the true refuge for all classes of people who have sought freedom from autocrats and tyrants. We are infinitely proud that our Republic was and still remains a safe haven for political refugees. Among a host of peoples who have taken advantage of this situation the Poles are among the most deserving and they have also profited most by it. They have come to this country by the hundreds of thousands, and, besides finding happy homes, they have found unexpected opportunities here for bettering their economic, social, and cultural life. Thus today we find them very active and successful in all trades and professions. As intellectuals and hardy laborers, as artists and scientists, as doctors and lawyers, politicians, as public servants, and as statesmen, Americans of Polish descent are unexcelled in many of our communities throughout the country. Only the other day a distinguished public servant of Polish descent was sworn in as Postmaster General in the President's Cabinet, which indicates that there is no limit to the height a deserving citizen may climb in this truly democratic Nation. We are rightly proud of all these people, especially of those whose forebears had settled around the Bay Region of San Francisco more than 100 years ago. But since today marks the 225th birthday anniversary of a great Pole who gave the best of his mature and active life for the cause of our independence, I would like to say a few special words about this singularly great man and gifted warrior.

Casimir Pulaski was born into a fairly wealthy family in 1748. His father was a prosperous lawyer, active in Polish politics and especially concerned with Poland's fate. He wanted his son to embrace his patriotism and show intense interest in national issues. Fortunately young Casimir showed remarkable aptitude in manly sports and as a leader. While in school he did not shy away from studies, he loved physical activity even more. As soon as his secondary schooling was over he became the courtier or the aid of a prince, and here his interest turned to matters concerned directly with warfare. Soon he became painfully aware that Poland's leaders were helpless against the powerful enemy forces of Russia. But by 1768 Pulaski had become a young man of action, and at the head of some 8,000 men he was fighting the Russians. During the next 4 years he led the best organized and bravest fighting guerrilla bands in Poland against the Russians, but outnumbered and overpowered, he was forced out of Poland in 1772, never to see it again.

Late in 1775 he arrived in Paris, penniless and without employment. Someone suggested that he go to America and fight in the Revolutionary War here. A year later he was in touch with Benjamin Franklin who on May 29 of 1777 in a letter recommended Pulaski's services to Washington. Pulaski arrived in Boston in July, and met Washington, who recommended him to the Continental Congress. On August 27 he was placed in command of all the cavalry, thus he became the father of our cavalry. In September he joined Washington and participated in the Battle of Brandywine with distinction. He commanded the cavalry during the winter of 1777 at Trenton, later at Flemington, and acted in unison with General Wayne in scouting for supplies for the famishing troops at Valley Forge.

In 1778 Congress gave Pulaski permission to organize an independent corps of cavalry. Having accomplished this task, finally he was sent in May of 1779 to Charleston, S.C. Then on October 9 at the siege of Savannah he bravely charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry and fell with a grapeshot in the loin. This was the last daring act of this great Polish patriot and soldier of freedom. He gave his life for the noble cause of our freedom and independence, and today on the 225th anniversary of his birth we honor him and pay tribute to his blessed memory.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 3, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 3: 2: *Set your affection on things above.*

Almighty and ever-blessed God, may all our ambitions during this day be aspirations to gain a firmer hold upon that which is eternal and a longing to abound in the fruits of the spirit.

May we never become the victims of worldly desires with their supreme emphasis upon the temporal and that of gaining an accumulation of material things which we someday must leave behind.

Inspire us to be more scrupulous in the doing of Thy will and bless us with an increased measure of faith in order that we may have a greater measure of peace and power.

Grant that in these times of strained relations between men and nations we may be touched with feelings of sympathy and seek to exercise an influence that is healing and helpful, elevating and ennobling.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1191. An act for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker;

H.R 1192. An act for the relief of William C. Doyle;

H.R. 1281. An act for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin;

H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Kathryn Marshall;

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown;

H.R. 1709. An act to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island;

H.R. 1726. An act for the relief of William H. Woodhouse;

H.R. 2256. An act for the relief of José Domenech;

H.R. 2751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White;

H.R. 2770. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf;

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 3219. An act to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett;

H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.;

H.R. 3843. An act for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr;

H.R. 4965. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States;

H.R. 5307. An act for the relief of Edward T. Hughes;

H.R. 5811. An act for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son;

H.R. 5812. An act for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.;

H.R. 6373. An act for the relief of Robert L. Nolan; and

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler;

H.R. 6377. An act for the relief of Sp5 Curtis Melton, Jr.;

H.R. 7195. An act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems;

H.R. 7544. An act to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 247. Joint resolution to suspend for the 1964 campaign the equal opportunity requirements of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 for legally qualified candidates for the offices of President and Vice President.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.;

S. 721. An act to amend section 124 of title 28, United States Code, to transfer Austin, Fort Bend, and Wharton Counties from the Galveston division to the Houston division of the southern district of Texas;

S. 1006. To amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes;

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader; and

S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co. of Phoenix, Ariz.

SALE OF SURPLUS WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, based partially on the theory that fewer wars are declared between nations with substantial trade relations than otherwise, it is the opinion of this Representative that the executive branch of Government should proceed and consummate the proffered sale of American surplus wheat to the Soviet Union for hard currency—at least in a 1963–64 trial sale.

Political thought has ranged far and wide on Capitol Hill over the past week concerning the current political intentions of the Soviets—some suspecting the Russians of the best intentions and some of the worst. The Capitol is always full of doubting Thomases who never take a position until after the fact and spend a lifetime as a Monday morning quarterback.

The administration appeared before Members of both Houses of Congress during the last few days asking for direction respecting a commercial transaction with Russia. I think it fair to conclude that though substantial bipartisan sentiment was expressed favoring a sale, the direction sought was not forthcoming. Perhaps the inability of 535 Representatives and Senators to coordinate their thinking on this issue points up the need for the requirement of an executive branch. Action is obviously required.

What are the factors this Nation must consider respecting this transaction?

First. Do we have the wheat and do we want to get rid of it? In 1954 we had on hand in CCC stocks a modest 470 million bushels of wheat valued at $1.089 billion. Under Eisenhower this surplus climbed substantially to the billion bushel level, reaching a high point of 1.2 billion bushels last year for a $2.484 billion investment. Our 1963 volume is slightly down but a bumper crop is projected. Our current inventory is sufficient to cover two-thirds of our CCC dispositions for the last 10 years. On a first in, first out basis, this year we will dispose of wheat purchased in 1957. Carrying charges for wheat alone since 1954 amount to $2.147 billion. Annual average storage charges for the past 10 years on basic crops, excluding peanuts and tobacco, is $466.8 million—better than a million dollars a day. The taxpayers of my district find it difficult to forget that we have got this wheat and they want to sell it.

Second. Can we use the hard currency offered in return for the wheat? Again, the taxpayers of my district have complained and expressed themselves. In 1958 we lost $3.5 billion, balance payment, including $2.3 billion gold loss; in 1959 $3.8 billion including $1.1 billion gold; in 1960 $3.8 billion, including $1.7 billion gold; in 1961 $2.4 billion and $851 million gold; in 1962 $2.2 billion and $890 million gold; this year $2.2 billion in the first half alone with gold loss at $423 million through August 31. I stated a few weeks ago that it would be tragic if the United States contracted its worldwide interests because of a dogmatic gold policy. I reiterate this statement; however, hard currency is desirable.

The issue, therefore, seems simple: "Do we get rid of a plentiful item, to-wit, wheat, for a scarce item, to-wit, hard currency?" The simple answer is that we do unless there are good reasons not to.

I do not believe Congress has furnished such reasons to date. Midwestern bipartisans are presuming a sale with their only interest being to firm up or raise the price of wheat by opening up Russian markets to commercial sales. I believe the American taxpayers should receive the primary consideration here. If sales are to be made I would strongly encourage a sale under existing law of wheat entirely out of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to the European commercial trade at world prices without an export payment by the United States of any kind. This type of action, I believe, would discourage a demand for a massive wheat allotment increase next year anticipating a continuing Russian demand. The general authority in the Commodity Credit Corporation charter legislation empowers this agency to dispose of surplus commodities without disruption of commerce and I personally can think of no less disruptive action.

Third. Is there precedent for commercial transactions with the Soviets? There is. I review periodically the Quarterly Report under the Export Control Act. For the second quarter 1963 there are listed $9.2 million worth of materials exported to the Soviets, including $4 million worth of fertilizer and nearly 100 other commodities, including the following: radio receivers, air conditioners, machine parts and valves, farm wagons, harvester machines, aluminum, alcohol, cotton, antibiotics, chemical sprays, and wood pulp—total quarterly sales to the Soviet bloc—$16.5 million.

Clearly it should not be our national purpose to promote the success of communism. Neither, however, should it be to promote one Cuban crisis between atomic powers after another.

This Nation is going through a process of reappraising the possibilities of coexistence with the Soviets. The Soviets, I believe, have substantially cooperated. Missiles and many soldiers have been withdrawn from both Cuba and Turkey. Russia is allowing the free transmission of the Voice of America. A Russian fishing boat saved the life of an American flyer. Life magazine, Drew Pearson, and Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman recently individually reported firsthand a de-Stalinized peaceful Russian people who appeared to be dedicated to a healthy economic competition—apparently, we are the winners this year.

We have also recently ratified with 81 percent support an international ban on atmospheric testing of atomic bombs. There is evidence with the Soviet split with China that communism is not necessarily international—this is healthy for the west. I believe the peace chasm opened up should be further probed.

Hungry people are nonetheless hungry because they are Russian. Perhaps not since Aladdin's time has such a deal been offered.

For further reference of the body, I include following my remarks a portion of the just issued quarterly report under the Export Control Act which sets forth the nature and volume of our trade with the Soviet bloc for the past several months.

The following is the 64th quarterly report by the Secretary of Commerce to the President, the Senate and House of Representatives:

SECURITY EXPORT CONTROLS

LICENSING TO EASTERN EUROPE [1]

During the second quarter 1963, the Department processed applications for export licenses to Eastern European destinations in the amount of $17,319,026. This was approximately 50 percent more than the value of applications processed in the first quarter 1963 ($11.3 million) and the second quarter 1962 ($12.0 million).

For the first half of 1963, the dollar volume of applications processed for these destinations totaled $28,577,110. This was almost 10 percent above the volume in the first half of 1962, which reached $26,065,277. Applications approved in the first half of 1963 totaled $26,454,835, compared with $24,176,178 in the same period 1962. Rejections for this half-year period totaled $2,122,275, compared with $1,889,099 for the first half of 1962.

APPLICATIONS APPROVED FOR EXPORT—SECOND QUARTER 1963

During the second quarter 1963, the Department approved applications for export to Eastern European destinations valued at $16,594,852. This compares with approvals in the preceding quarter ($9.9 million) and in the second quarter 1962 ($10.8 million). Of this volume, more than 60 percent constituted proposed shipments of agricultural commodities ($6.7 million) and an organic chemical ($4.0 million). The principal commodities approved were: Soybeans, $1,990,124, for Czechoslovakia and Hungary; rye, $1,700,000, to East Germany; wood pulp, $929,501, to the U.S.S.R.; cotton linter pulp, $596,200, to the U.S.S.R.; cotton linters, $440,924, to East Germany; gum and wood rosins, $213,434, to Czechoslovakia; dried beans and peas, $187,806, to Rumania; and Mexican-origin raw cotton, $664,118, to the U.S.S.R., which, although of non-U.S. origin, required a validated export license upon entry at a U.S. port to permit intransit shipment through the United States to its bloc destination; various industrial-type chemicals, $2,204,211, to Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R.; caprolactum monomer, $3,998,750, to the U.S.S.R. for the manufacture of nylon fibers; a chemical defoliant, $717,800, to the U.S.S.R. for agricultural use; polyethylene (synthetic resin), $435,078, to Czechoslovakia, and Hungary; crude sulfur, $430,200, to Czechoslovakia; synthetic rubber, $392,699, to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania for the manufacture of rubber and chemical products; and gift parcels, $235,158, to the U.S.S.R.

Also included in the total value approved was various equipment, totaling $154,199, to be exhibited at trade fairs or used in connection with the East-West exchange program and either returned to the United States or delivered to another free world destination. (See footnote to table 2.)

TABLE 1.—*Dollar value of export license applications processed and issued and of actual exports, to U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, quarterly, 1954–63*

[Thousands of dollars]

Quarter	Total processed	Licenses issued	Actual exports (including reexports)
1954:			
1st quarter	[1]42,142	4,011	330
2d quarter	4,472	3,097	463
3d quarter	3,661	1,340	850
4th quarter	17,987	[2]10,355	[3]4,478
1955:			
1st quarter	[1]30,911	4,968	[4]2,979
2d quarter	4,203	4,006	2,065
3d quarter	4,839	2,778	1,051
4th quarter	1,809	1,625	948
1956:			
1st quarter	8,915	8,582	3,186
2d quarter	4,301	4,116	3,615
3d quarter	19,555	[5]9,983	2,016
4th quarter	7,650	6,350	2,428
1957:			
1st quarter	20,499	[6]16,435	5,718
2d quarter	21,637	[7]19,435	5,190
3d quarter	25,932	25,109	29,779
4th quarter	16,067	6,442	45,408
1958:			
1st quarter	19,132	5,153	21,419
2d quarter	5,909	5,563	25,490
3d quarter	13,135	12,939	44,702
4th quarter	16,005	10,213	21,514
1959:			
1st quarter	21,800	6,627	18,863
2d quarter	18,325	7,247	9,961
3d quarter	28,168	[8]11,446	40,322
4th quarter	31,968	30,540	20,123

See footnotes at end of table.

---

[1] The term "Eastern Europe" as used throughout this report is employed in a special sense, and is defined to include the following countries: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany (including the Soviet sector of Berlin), Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland (including Danzig), Rumania and the U.S.S.R.

TABLE 1.—*Dollar value of export license applications processed and issued and of actual exports, to U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe, quarterly, 1954–63*—Continued

[Thousands of dollars]

Quarter	Total processed	Licenses issued	Actual exports (including reexports)
1960:			
1st quarter	42,595	35,420	26,875
2d quarter	27,430	24,473	43,863
3d quarter	22,969	19,536	48,584
4th quarter	26,223	15,596	74,531
1961:			
1st quarter	48,742	23,825	60,383
2d quarter	[9] 15,734	12,905	40,136
3d quarter	15,916	13,167	17,731
4th quarter	13,573	7,871	15,074
1962:			
1st quarter	14,046	13,340	45,466
2d quarter	12,019	10,836	42,076
3d quarter	[10] 61,475	16,859	21,389
4th quarter	10,896	8,530	16,205
1963:			
1st quarter	11,258	9,860	21,365
2d quarter	17,319	16,595	([11])

[1] See "Thirty-first Quarterly Report," pp. 7–8, for an explanation of the sharp rise in the value of license applications received in the 1st quarters of 1954 and 1955.

[2] Includes $5,152,000 of food grains, medicinals, and insecticides licensed under the President's flood relief program for the Danube Basin.

[3] Includes $3,227,000 of food grains and agricultural insecticides shipped to Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany under the President's flood relief program for the Danube Basin.

[4] Includes $1,511,000 of corn and $5,000 of aureomycin shipped to Czechoslovakia and Hungary in January 1955 under the President's flood relief program for the Danube Basin.

[5] Includes $3,200,000 of butter, beans, corn, and wheat licensed to Hungary in July 1956, under the President's relief program to relieve distress in Eastern Europe caused by severe winter weather.

[6] Includes $4,075,645 of relief shipments licensed to Hungary under U.S. Government International Cooperation Administration programs, and $632,400 of relief shipments under auspices of the American Red Cross and other nongovernmental relief organizations and private individuals.

[7] Includes $1,392,975 of relief shipments licensed to Hungary under U.S. Government International Cooperation Administration programs, and $113,859 of relief shipments under auspices of the American Red Cross and other nongovernmental relief organizations and private individuals.

[8] Includes $1,447,679 of goods and equipment licensed for the U.S. national exhibition in Moscow.

[9] Covers cases with total value of $46,000 approved in 2d quarter but actual licenses issued in 3d quarter.

[10] Includes cases approximating $47,000,000 which have been held by the Department over a substantial period of time. (See the "61st Quarterly Report," p. 12.)

[11] Not available.

TABLE 2.—*Commodities licensed for export to Eastern European destinations in the 2d quarter 1963*

Country and commodity	Value in dollars
All Eastern European countries	16,594,852
Bulgaria:	
Pine oil	9,086
Soybeans	7,900
Drugs and medicinal preparations, n.e.s	101
Glandular products	154
Medicinal chemicals	4
Sulfonamide drugs	2,340
Herbicides	48
Styrene molding compound	3
Flasks (research laboratory equipment)	180
Electromagnetic separator	1,075
Rotary pumps	290
Magnetic tapes (for voice and music)	1,073
Magnetic tape recorder-reproducer (voice and music)	4,829
Sound spectrograph (waveform measuring instrument) and accessories	3,492
Automotive replacement parts	211
Auto shock absorbers	108
Auto, starting, lighting and ignition equipment	56
Total	30,950
Czechoslovakia:	
Gum rosin (naval stores)	108,000
Soybeans	846,000
Wood rosin (naval stores)	105,434
Antibiotics	77,711
Asthma, catarrh, and hay fever preparations	1
Compounds and mixtures containing antibiotics	2,393
Culture media	5,337
Drugs and medicinal preparations, n.e.s	3,757
Glandular products	1,464
Medicinal chemicals	116
Parenteral solutions	35
Sulfonamide drugs	170
Surgical and medical instruments)	1,789
Vaccines, serums	353
Vitamin preparations	40
Caprolactum monomer (industrial chemical)	159,950
Carbon black, channel	28,886
Celulose acetate buytrate (industrial chemical)	10,600
Cellulose acetate phthalate (coal tar product)	4,400
Coal tar dyes	206
Ethylene diamine (industrial chemical)	53,599
Ethyl hexal alcohol (industrial chemical)	148,810
Fungicides	59
Isobutyl alcohol (industrial chemical)	68,800
Lactic acid (industrial chemical)	1
Monoethylene glycol (industrial chemical)	7,350
Natrium pyruvicum (industrial chemical)	120
Photo developer (photographic chemical)	8,400
Polyethylene (synthetic resin)	210,030
Polystyrene (synthetic resin)	13,500
Rubber antioxidant (rubber compounding agent)	65
Silica gel (chemical specialty compound)	9
Synthetic rubber	298,675
Tertiary butyl alcoholic (industrial chemical)	4,497
Parts for optical measuring instruments	36
Parts for ultracentrifuges (research laboratory apparatus)	455
Air conditioners and parts	882
Ball bearing (for electric saw)	6
Brushes (parts for industrial instruments)	1,032
Electric motor	76
Humidity controller	9
Industrial sewing machines, parts and accessories	3,011
Parts for electronic industrial process control instruments	642
Parts for nonmilitary industrial tractor	137
Parts for weatherometer (physical properties testing machinery)	22
Pipe valves	116
Pneumatic consotrol computing station	178
Pressure controllers, flame detectors and parts (indicating, recording, and controlling instruments and parts)	362
Rotary pumps, hydraulic	162
Shoe machinery replacement parts	1,336
Tire vulcanizer	578
Electron tubes	11
Recorder (electrical quantity recording instrument)	2,475
Auto parts	10
Silo unloaders (agricultural machines)	2,695
Ammonium metavanadate	6,600
Crude sulfur	430,200
Wire cloth mill	1,456
Motion picture projector	186
Animal products (inedible)	52
Casamino acid (dairy product)	90
Casein, purified (bacteriological reagent)	3
Hearing aid batteries	9
Used clothing (gift)	1,000
Wearing apparel	81
Total	2,624,465
East Germany:	
Lactalbin hydrolysate (dairy product)	323
Raw cotton linters	440,924
Rye	1,700,000
Wood rosin	6,063
Antibiotics	2,250
Culture media	5,930
Medicinal chemicals	173
Parenteral solutions	1,050
Veterinary biological products	27
Veterinary medicinals and preparations, n.e.s	28
Vitamin A	25,594
Agricultural insecticide	23
Glass polishing compound	3
Hydrated silicon dioxide (industrial chemical)	1
Hydrogenated methyl ester of rosin (synthetic resin)	543
Cases for optical tonometers	1
Microscope lenses	1,200
Spectral energy recording attachments for spectrophotometer	790
Potentiometers (electronic equipment)	350
Total	2,185,273
Hungary:	
Cotton linter pulp	13,779
Dairy products	52
Hybrid grain sorghum seed	113
Safflower seed	110
Soybeans	1,144,124
Winter wheat	14
Antibiotics	66,552
Antibiotic feed supplements	79
Compounds or mixtures containing antibiotics	11,992
Culture media	62
Drugs and medicinal preparations, n.e.s	5,506
Glandular products	1,390
Medicinal chemicals	82
Parenteral solutions	935
Surgical and medical instruments	6,100
Vaccines and serums	6,291
Veterinary biological products	8
Veterinary medicinals and preparations, n.e.s	22

TABLE 2.—*Commodities licensed for export to Eastern European destinations in the 2d quarter 1963*—Continued

Country and commodity	*Value in dollars*
Hungary—Continued	
Amino acids (industrial chemicals)	15
Carbon black, furnace	199
Cellulose acetate molding composition	10
Cellulose acetate phthalate (coal tar product)	931
Chlordane wettable powder	18
Coal tar products	26
Diallyl maleate monomer (industrial chemical)	1
Methylcellulose (industrial chemical)	9,000
Orthocresol (coal tar product)	23,750
Plastic sheeting (synthetic resin)	37
Phenol (coal tar product)	55,500
Polyethylene (synthetic resin)	225,048
Reagent chemicals for laboratory use	322
Surface acting agent	9
Synthetic rubber	54,424
Triethyl phosphate (industrial chemical)	16,530
Vinilsilm (waste) cuttings (plastic products)	1
Burets (research laboratory equipment)	393
Flowmeters (research laboratory equipment)	108
Heating mantels (research laboratory equipment)	53
Opacity standard for vaccine (research laboratory equipment)	1
Parts for spectrophotometer	500
Peroxide bomb (research laboratory equipment)	102
Photometer (optical measuring instrument) and parts	3,400
Steromicroscopes (optical instruments)	805
Micro surface tension apparatus	10
Parts and accessories for airconditioners	85
Pneumatic motorized sequency water valves	45
Time switches (indicating measuring instruments)	54
X-ray thickness and infrared width gages, parts and accessories (steel mill equipment)	38,057
Crystal diodes	46
Electron tubes	1,523
Electronic equipment, n.e.s	177
Magnetic recording tape (voice and music)	23
Paper condensers	4
Resistors	6
Voltmeters (electrical quantity indicating instruments)	58
Accounting machines	[1]40,950
Cutting oil and compound	160
Heat transfer oil	235
Automotive replacement parts	28
Outboard motor	115
Passenger car	3,000
Seed cleaning machines and parts	2,480
Cotton sewing thread	2,147
Crimping tool (hand tool)	57
Filament electric bulbs	11
Geographic maps	30
Hearing aid batteries	12
Micro switches and accessories (electrical machinery)	349
Metal caps for whisk brooms	3,110
Used clothing (relief)	1,656
Total	1,742,822
Poland:	
Synthetic rubber	173
Densitometer and parts	4,046
Spectrophotometer with parts and accessories	2,858
Dual directional coupler (accessory for electrical testing instrument)	160
Electron tubes	1,221
Oscilloscope with plug-in units	[1]900
Transistors	8,780
Electronic integrators (industrial process control instruments)	647
Gear generator and parts	56,640
Parts for electronic industrial process control instruments	450
Parts for electrolytic tinning line (metalworking machine parts)	195
Physical properties testing instrument	125
Rotary rock drill bits	3,310
Electrical steel sheets	82,673
Nickel alloy rods	150
Automotive engine lubricating oil	48
Automotive gear oil	7
Lubricating oil (petroleum product)	5
Marine diesel bunker fuel	5,681
Electronic computer system and accessories	[1]87,500
Aircraft tail wheel (part for landing gear)	21
Total	255,500
Rumania:	
Dairy products	217
Dried beans	95,650
Pea beans	92,156
Antibiotics	119,655
Antipyretics and analgesics	194
Asthma, catarrh and hay fever preparation	1
Compounds and mixtures containing antibiotics	827
Culture media	10,206
Drugs and medicinal preparations, n.e.s	7,347
Glandular products	2,997
Medicinal chemicals	2,510
Parenteral solutions	910
Salves and ointments	360
Sulfonamide drug	2,377
Surgical and medical diagnostic instruments	1,610
Vaccines and serums	1,287
Veterinary biological products	69
Veterinary medicinals and preparations, n.e.s	3
Vitamin preparations	466
Ethylene carbonate (industrial chemical)	86,698
Fungicides	65
Itaconic acid (industrial chemical)	101
Reagent chemicals for laboratory use	1
Styrene molding compound (synthetic resin)	3
Synthetic resins, n.e.s	3,742
Synthetic rubber	39,600
Air conditioners	4,167
Book jacketing machine	21,180
Dielectric heating unit generator	7,150
Diesel engine generator sets	12,565
Parts and accessories for generators	172
Flame detectors (industrial instruments)	800
Switchboard control panel and parts	2,083
Volt-ohm-milliammeter (electrical quantity indicating instrument)	49
Passenger car	5,456
Canvas tents, tent bag and cover	150
Carbon brushes	92
Incandescent mantle lanterns and parts	20
Plaques or shields (plastic products)	800
Plastic air mattresses	26
Wearing apparel	195
Total	523,957
U.S.S.R.:	
Cotton linter pulp	596,200
Raw cotton (Mexican origin)	664,118
Tobacco	224
Wood pulp	929,501
Antibiotics	1,823
Compounds and mixtures containing antibiotics	445
Culture media	41
Drugs and medicinal preparations, n.e.s	8,050
Gas anaylzer amplifier (surgical equipment)	1,988
Glandular products	4,530
Medicinal chemicals	3,689
Parenteral solutions	1,221
Sulfonamide drug	85
Surgical and medical diagnostic instruments, n.e.s	15,814
Vitamin preparations	63
Butyl acetate (industrial chemical)	231,650
Butyl alcohol (industrial chemical)	78,000
Caprolactam monomer (organic chemical)	3,998,750
Cellulose acetate sheets (cellulose plastics)	67
Diamethylacetamide (industrial chemical)	217
Dibasic lead thalite (industrial chemical)	4
Rubber compounding agents	36
Herbicides	760
Insecticides	910
Isobutyl alcohol (industrial chemical)	573,300
Itaconic acid (industrial chemical)	53,070
Lead silicate	1
Methyl bromide (industrial chemical)	183,600
Monoethanolamine (industrial chemical)	35,274
Monoethylene glycol (industrial chemical)	322,500
Para phenetidine (coal tar intermediate)	53,548
Perchloroethylene (industrial chemical)	94,500
Polyethylene (synthetic resin)	240
Propylene oxide (industrial chemical)	72
Polyvinyl chloride compound (synthetic resin)	18
Sodium chlorite (industrial chemical)	952
Synthetic resin sheets	34
Tributyl phosphorotrithioite (chemical defoliant)	717,800
Trichloroethylene (industrial chemical)	65,000
Amino acid analyzer	16,244
Densitometer (research laboratory equipment)	1,770
Fluorometers (spectrum measuring instruments)	6,945
Infusion withdrawal pump	530

See footnote at end of table.

See footnote at end of table.

Table 2.—*Commodities licensed for export to Eastern European destinations in the 2d quarter 1963*—Continued

Country and commodity	*Value in dollars*
U.S.S.R.—Continued	
Research laboratory centrifuges	11,687
Research laboratory shaker and accessories	37
Batteries for TV sets	210
Capacitor (electronic equipment)	3
Magnetic tape recorder and reels (voice and music)	192
Radio receiver	[1]6,814
Radio transmitters	[1]14,630
Recording instruments and accessories	[1]3,405
Television sets	660
Air-conditioners and parts	11,714
Electric motor and timer motor	28
Dicing machines (industrial equipment)	63,000
Junction boxes (parts for industrial process instruments)	260
Parts for plastics processing machines	984
Parts for mining machine loaders	4,057
Parts for shuttle cars	58
Parts for (textile) viscose staple fiber cutting machines	350
Pipe valve	460
Transmission chains	1,253
Warp sizing machine (textile machine)	35,170
Welding wire	24
Farm wagons	12,000
Forage harvesters (agricultural machines)	43,015
Calcined petroleum coke	75,000
Diesel engine lubricating oil (petroleum product)	435
Residue fuel oil (petroleum product)	1,713
Copyflex machine (photocopying equipment)	12,147
Motion picture projector and accessories	525
Photographic film (unexposed)	265
Photographic paper, sensitized	5,518
Automotive replacement parts	70
Sale for racing yacht	250
Passenger car	9,300
Watch batteries	17,000
Gift parcels, containing food, linens, and clothing	235,158
Aluminum ladder	9
Office staples	498
Tracetate staple fiber	117
Live virus	100
Wearing apparel	95
Total	9,231,795

[1] To be returned to United States or delivered to another free world destination.

APPLICATIONS REJECTED FOR EXPORT—SECOND QUARTER 1963

Applications rejected during the second quarter 1963 for export to Eastern European destinations fell mainly in the chemical and industrial equipment categories and totaled $724,174. These two categories, comprised mainly of many kinds of commodities of unexceptional value, accounted for about 97 percent of rejected applications. The principal commodities, by value, were: antiozonants (rubber compounding agent), $154,480, and hexachlorobutadiene (industrial chemical), $136,000, both for the U.S.S.R.

LICENSING TO OUTER MONGOLIA

During this quarter, an application was approved for this destination covering camping equipment, valued at $354, for use by American personnel in connection with a field study.

LICENSING TO COMMUNIST CHINA AND NORTH VEITNAM

Notwithstanding the general policy of total embargo in effect on all U.S. exports to Communist China and other Far Eastern Communist-controlled areas, the Department's policy provides for the approval of license applications where the consignee is a diplomatic mission of a friendly foreign country located in these areas, provided there is reasonable assurance that the commodities involved will not enter the economies of these areas.

TECHNICAL DATA

The Soviet bloc maintained its interest in U.S. technical data during the second quarter 1963, particularly in connection with industrial equipment, processes, and plant technology. Firms in the United States continued to seek the view of the Government on the desirability of their licensees, affiliates, or subsidiaries abroad furnishing technical data and/or equipment and material for construction of facilities of strategic importance to Soviet bloc destinations.

During this period, the Department approved 15 export license applications and a partial application, covering shipments of technical data to Eastern European destinations. The majority of these applications were submitted in order to provide quotations or offers to inquiries received directly from the Soviet bloc countries, or from free world countries wishing to make quotations or offers based on the use of U.S.-origin technical data. These applications covered:

For Czechoslovakia: Technical data (assembly, erection, installation, and MRO) of a chemical recovery boiler for a sodium bisulphate pulp mill (reexport from United Kingdom).

Technical data (for quotation, erection and MRO) for a continuous annealing line for processing low carbon steel (reexport from France).

Technical data (for quotation, erection and MRO) for cold drawbenches for drawing welded steel pipe (reexport from France).

Technical data (for quotation, comprising plans and specifications) for the treatment of rayon and nylon tire cord fabric.

Technical data (for quotation, erection and MRO) for (a) one drawbench for cold drawing of steel tubes; (b) one cold tube reducing mill for simultaneously rolling and reducing a multiple number of steel tubes; and (c) one pipe galvanizing line for zinc coating pipes (reexport from United Kingdom). (This represents a partial application; the balance is reported under technical data denied.)

For East Germany: Technical data (for quotation, erection, and MRO) for a rotary flying hot saw for cutting steel pipes (reexport from Italy).

For Hungary: Technical data (process plant and equipment design, engineering, startup, and MRO) for carbon dioxide removal plant (part of a synthetic ammonia plant for the manufacture of urea fertilizer).

For Poland: Technical data relating to services of a consultant to assist in the startup operations of an electrolytic tinning line.

For Rumania: Technical data (for quotation, erection, and MRO) for one sheet galvanizing line and one hot dip tinning line (reexport from United Kingdom).

Technical data (equipment specifications, detailed process information, startup and MRO) for a dissolving wood pulp mill.

Technical data (for a quotation, process, erection, and MRO) for a granulation and pelletizing unit for a complex fertilizer plant (reexport from France).

Technical data for a proposal on a pulp mill evaporator to be shipped to Rumania and, if successful in obtaining the contract, technical data covering assembly, installation, and MRO of the evaporator in a kraftliner and fluting mill.

For the U.S.S.R.: Technical data (for quotation relating to process, erection, and MRO of two granulation and pelletizing units for installation in complex fertilizing units (reexport from France).

Technical data for a proposal on a pulp mill evaporator and, if successful in obtaining the contract, technical data covering assembly, installation, and MRO of the evaporator in a magnesium-base pulp mill.

Technical data (erection and MRO) for 4 Cottrell electrostatic precipitators which will be equipped with two 25 kv.-a. power supplies.

Technical data for quotations (published and typewritten data and schematics relating to installation, erection, and MRO) for yarn preparation, weaving, knitting, and finishing machinery for the textile industry.

In approving these applications, the Department, after careful evaluation, concluded that neither the military nor the economic contribution to the bloc's economy would be sufficient to be detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States.

Three applications and a partial application, covering technical data to bloc destinations, were denied during this period. These covered:

Technical data (design and detail drawings) for heat-treating and forging furnaces for a rolled steel wheel and tire plant for Czechoslovakia.

Technical data (for a quotation, erection and MRO) for a cold tube reducing mill for simultaneous reduction of stainless steel tubes for Czechoslovakia. (Partial application.)

Plans and specifications for a passive tank stabilization system for installation in trawlers (reexport from France) for the U.S.S.R.

Technical data (assembly, installation, startup and MRO) for two electric dehydrators and two electric desalters of crude oil (reexport from United Kingdom) for the U.S.S.R.

In addition, licenses for the export of technical data were granted in 21 cases involving the filing of patent applications by U.S. firms with the Governments of Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Rumania.

It is extremely difficult to place a dollar value on exports of technical data, since eventual payment for the data, provided the contract were negotiated, would depend almost entirely on the extent to which the contract covered technical data (including training and operating instructions); design, engineering, and construction services; and materials and equipment.

PARTICIPATION OF COMMERCE FIELD OFFICES IN EXPORT CONTROL FUNCTIONS

The Department announced that effective April 25, 1963, its Phoenix, Ariz., field office was added to the list of those offices authorized to act on certain types of requests for amendment of export licenses, and requests for certification, validation, and amendment of U.S. import certificates. This raises to 17, the total number of Commerce field offices so authorized. This action was taken in the interest of providing better service to exporters.

REVISIONS IN POLISH GRO EXCEPTIONS LIST

During this period, the Department extended its validated export license requirements for shipment to Poland to electrometers capable of measuring currents smaller than 0.01 microamperes. Also, it removed from validated license control to Poland: N-type rubber (copolymers of butadiene and acrylonitrile) containing 50 percent or more butadiene; and polyethylene resin, in unfinished and semifinished forms, not containing any boron. These latter items are now exportable to Poland under general license.

COMPREHENSIVE EXPORT SCHEDULE

A revised Comprehensive Export Schedule was issued by the Department on April 1, 1963, replacing the issue of April 1962. The schedule, an official publication of the Department's Bureau of International Commerce (Office of Export Control), is the basic reference manual on export controls available to all exporters. It contains a complete listing of all currently applicable export control regulations as published in the Federal Register; explanatory material intended to clarify and supplement export regulations and to describe departmental operating procedures to exporters; the Positive List of Commodities (see ch. V of this report); specimen export control forms; and numerous other items of interest to the export community relative to export control procedures.

The schedule is published in looseleaf form. It is kept current by the issuance of supplementary Current Export Bulletins. Both the schedule and the bulletins may be purchased from the Department's field offices (listed on the inside of the back cover) and from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. The annual domestic subscription rate is $6; the foreign subscription rate is $7.50. Special airmail service is available to domestic subscribers for an additional $4 a year.

CIA TRYING TO FORM U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from the Washington Daily News of October 2, 1963.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Daily News there appeared disturbing reports that the CIA was again trying to form U.S. policy, had been at odds with our Ambassador, and was showing an unrestrained thirst for power—all of this in tiny South Vietnam, where the difficulties of U.S. relations have been strained of late.

The continual problems that the United States has with the CIA and other intelligence agencies stem from allowing these agencies to run in all directions like spirited horses without bridles. If we had a joint congressional committee to watch over the activities of our intelligence agencies, then the United States would have a sounder and better coordinated intelligence and information system. I have introduced legislation in the form of House Joint Resolution 211, that if enacted by Congress would establish a joint watchdog committee to oversee the activities of our intelligence agencies. The United States cannot afford another Bay of Pigs mistake that occurred in Cuba, or any similar type mixup. I urge the adoption of my legislation, and insert at this point in the RECORD the article from yesterday's edition of the Washington Daily News concerning the CIA and its role in South Vietnam:

ARROGANT CIA DISOBEYS ORDERS IN VIETNAM

(By Richard Starnes)

SAIGON, October 2.—The story of the Central Intelligence Agency's role in South Vietnam is a dismal chronicle of bureaucratic arrogance, obstinate disregard of orders, and unrestrained thirst for power.

Twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, according to a high U.S. source here.

In one of these instances the CIA frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought with him from Washington, because the Agency disagreed with it.

This led to a dramatic confrontation between Mr. Lodge and John Richardson, chief of the huge CIA apparatus here. Mr. Lodge failed to move Mr. Richardson, and the dispute was bucked back to Washington. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and CIA Chief John A McCone were unable to resolve the conflict, and the matter is now reported to be awaiting settlement by President Kennedy.

It is one of the developments expected to be covered in Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's report to Mr. Kennedy.

OTHERS CRITICAL, TOO

Other American agencies here are incredibly bitter about the CIA.

"If the United States ever experiences a 'Seven Days in May' it will come from the CIA, and not the Pentagon," one U.S. official commented caustically.

("Seven Days in May" is a fictional account of an attempted military coup to take over the U.S. Government.)

CIA "spooks" (a universal term for secret agents here) have penetrated every branch of the American community in Saigon, until nonspook Americans here almost seem to be suffering a CIA psychosis.

An American field officer with a distinguished combat career speaks angrily about "that man at headquarters in Saigon wearing a colonel's uniform." He means the man is a CIA agent, and he can't understand what he is doing at U.S. military headquarters here, unless it is spying on other Americans.

Another American officer, talking about the CIA, acidly commented: "You'd think they'd have learned something from Cuba but apparently they didn't."

FEW KNOW CIA STRENGTH

Few people other than Mr. Richardson and his close aids know the actual CIA strength here, but a widely used figure is 600. Many are clandestine agents known only to a few of their fellow spooks.

Even Mr. Richardson is a man about whom it is difficult to learn much in Saigon. He is said to be a former OSS officer, and to have served with distinction in the CIA in the Philippines.

A surprising number of the spooks are known to be involved in their ghostly trade and some make no secret of it.

"There are spooks in the U.S. Information Service, in the U.S. operations mission, in every aspect of American official and commercial life here," one official—presumably a nonspook—said.

"They represent a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone," he added.

Coupled with the ubiquitous secret police of Ngo Dinh Nhu, a surfeit of spooks has given Saigon an oppressive police state atmosphere.

The Nhu-Richardson relationship is a subject of lively speculation. The CIA continues to pay the special forces which conducted brutal raids on Buddhist temples last August 21, although in fairness it should be pointed out that the CIA is paying these goons for the war against Communist guerrillas, not Buddhist bonzes (priests).

HANDS OVER MILLIONS

Nevertheless, on the first of every month, the CIA dutifully hands over a quarter million American dollars to pay these special forces.

Whatever else it buys, it doesn't buy any solid information on what the special forces are up to. The August 21 raids caught top U.S. officials here and in Washington flatfooted.

Nhu ordered the special forces to crush the Buddhist priests, but the CIA wasn't let in on the secret. (Some CIA button men now say they warned their superiors what was coming up but in any event the warning of harsh repression was never passed to top officials here or in Washington.)

Consequently, Washington reacted unsurely to the crisis. Top officials here and at home were outraged at the news the CIA was paying the temple raiders, but the CIA continued the payments.

It may not be a direct subsidy for a religious war against the country's Buddhist majority, but it comes close to that.

And for every State Department aid here who will tell you, "Dammit, the CIA is supposed to gather information, not make policy, but policymaking is what they're doing here," there are military officers who scream over the way the spooks dabble in military operations.

A TYPICAL EXAMPLE

For example highly trained trail watchers are an important part of the effort to end Vietcong infiltration from across the Laos and Cambodia borders. But if the trail watchers spot incoming Vietcongs, they report it to the CIA in Saigon, and in the fullness of time, the spooks may tell the military.

One very high American official here, a man who has spent much of his life in the service of democracy, likened the CIA's growth to a malignancy, and added he was not sure even the White House could control it any longer.

Unquestionably Mr. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor both got an earful from people who are beginning to fear the CIA is becoming a third force, coequal with President Diem's regime and the U.S. Government—and answerable to neither.

There is naturally the highest interest here as to whether Mr. McNamara will persuade Mr. Kennedy something ought to be done about it.

FLOYD STARR, FATHER TO MANY UNDERPRIVILEGED BOYS

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, October 6, will mark the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Starr Commonwealth for Boys in Albion, Mich. Mr. Starr, the founder of this home, has aided and assisted more than 10,000 boys who have been under his care and direction. This diligent man is a credit to the State of Michigan and to the United States. He has been an inspiration to all of the people who have come to know him. We in America are greatly indebted to him for the tremendous work he has done with our troubled youth. It is an honor to heartily congratulate him on this golden anniversary of his years of service to humanity. Because I feel the story of his success would greatly interest the Members of Congress, I would like to take this opportunity to acquaint the Members of this honorable body with his achievements in working toward the rehabilitation of the youth of our Nation. Floyd Starr, pioneer youth counselor, founded the Starr Commonwealth for Boys in Albion, Mich., 50 years ago in October.

Establishing a home for emotionally disturbed and homeless boys was his childhood dream that materialized in 1913. It began with an old barn, an aging apple orchard, a blue, blue lake, and 40 thistle-covered acres of farmland which he purchased with his own money.

In writing the creed for the home, Starr said:

> We believe that boys should be treated, not as a class, but as individuals, and that each boy in order that he may reach his highest development, must be understood. We hold his ambition must be stimulated and developed, and that he must be encouraged and loved toward perfection.

His unique philosophy for rehabilitating "boys who have gone wrong" won him national recognition for 50 golden years of service to the American community. His success in curbing juvenile delinquency through character building has been immortalized in letters from grateful mothers, youth authorities, and Federal judges.

More than 10,000 boys, now doctors, lawyers, teachers, ministers, and workers, recall with love and respect their home among the evergreens.

At Starr Commonwealth, boys from throughout the United States find personal dignity and the path to adulthood. There, they find family happiness in cottage life where loving houseparents counsel and care for them.

Starr, an architect in human relations, created a constructive program for the purpose of establishing firm, intimate relationships between boys and adult social workers, teachers, and trained youth personnel. A well-balanced schedule of studies, sports, chores, and church, offered at the home, is the foundation Starr prescribes for ardent and useful citizens.

Writing to him frequently are hundreds of adopted sons who have found a place in a previously confusing world. Their letters indicate undying affection and gratitude. One only has to read the following letter to realize the extent of Starr's dedication and the respect he now receives:

> Every time another forward step in our lives occurs we can't help pondering over what might have been if you hadn't accepted us at Starr Commonwealth 13 years ago. The fact that I had no self-respect, no self-confidence, no self-trust, and just no point in living when I came to you, and still you saw through me and helped me to understand myself makes me never endingly grateful.
>
> DON GRAY, 1943.

American communities plagued with juvenile problems will find that there is hope for disturbed youth through redirection. Ninety percent of the problem boys who attended Starr Commonwealth are now strong contributors to the American society.

Today, the school has nearly 200 boys, and the farm has grown to 3,000 acres. The school campus has more than 20 buildings. Its reputation for educational, vocational, and spiritual instruction is excellent. Under the very able leadership of Floyd Starr, the home is considered one of the best in the Nation.

As the official golden anniversary date approaches, letters of congratulations and appreciation continue to mount. The Honorable Clair Black, former judge of probate for St. Clair County, Port Huron, said this about Starr:

> I have sent many boys to the Starr Commonwealth who have benefited by the training it affords. Floyd Starr can take confused boys and develop with them the ability to work with hands and minds in unison. He can create within them a love of beauty, order, and spiritual values. If they have leadership qualities, he brings them out. He insists on their knowing the best social usages. Quite a job, it is true, but I have seen him do it over and over again. And the older boys carry away a deep gratitude for what they have gained from his tutelage.

Floyd Starr is to be commended for his intense efforts to help troubled youth. He has performed, and in many ways surpassed, the duties of a father. For 50 years his porch light has been on to welcome boys whose hearts are dark and troubled.

It is my hope that his life will be a resplendent example for all Americans and that they will seek to imitate his humanitarian goals.

BROADCAST OF CHET HUNTLEY

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the NBC Television Co. authorized the Chet Huntley news commentators to make a report on the Negroes in Washington. I have had numerous letters since that program was broadcasted over the country advising me that it was the most biased report they had ever heard broadcast over any television network. I personally did not hear the program; however, I understand the photographs were factual. However, the complaints I have received were against the editorial comments in connection with the report.

I requested Mr. James Clark, the clerk of the House District Committee, who was a practicing attorney here in the District of Columbia for approximately 15 years before accepting the position of clerk of my committee, to cooperate with Chet Huntley in presenting the actual facts to the public concerning conditions in the city of Washington. Mr. Clark spent several hours on several occasions in an effort to give Chet Huntley representatives the true facts surrounding the House District Committee, which, in my opinion, is the finest committee that has ever represented the District of Columbia during the 35 years I have been on Capitol Hill.

It is regrettable that the Chet Huntley program did not portray the actual facts that were given to him by the committee clerk, as not once during the 25 years I have been a member of the House District Committee has anyone on that committee discussed civil rights or the colored situation here in Washington, as we feel this is the prerogative of the House Judiciary Committee and not the District Committee. I, as chairman, will continue to gavel down any person who makes an effort to bring this subject up for discussion in the House District Committee, as that problem is not under our jurisdiction.

The House District Committee has held approximately 240 hours of hearings during the present session of Congress and has been successful in having the House of Representatives pass approximately 35 bills, a record that cannot be matched by any other committee having jurisdiction over the District affairs. Still, commentators, the magazine writers, and local newspapers continue to try to discredit and smear the members of the House District Committee. We have only 8 members out of 25 who claim to be from the South, while the Chet Huntley program broadcasted over the United States that we had 10 members from the 13 Southern States. He did not tell the television that we had 25 members on the committee.

I presume the only way we can please the press, the news commentators, and magazine writers is for us to do nothing, and then I presume they would have a reason to tell the country that we should have home rule, since Congress would do nothing to correct crime and other problems in the District of Columbia.

The following two letters from two of the leading lawyers in the State of South Carolina is a sample of the type of letters I have been receiving since the Chet Huntley report, which appeared on NBC television, Thursday night, September 26, 1963:

> SEPTEMBER 27, 1963.
>
> Mr. CHET HUNTLEY,
> *National Broadcasting Co.,*
> *New York City, N.Y.*
>
> DEAR MR. HUNTLEY: I was one of the unfortunate victims who sat through your television show last night, which was sponsored by Xerox, in which you narrated on the Negro situation in Washington, D.C.
>
> In my lifetime of 55 years, I can truthfully say that I have never seen or heard any program that was more biased than yours last night. Some of the Negroes which were on your program could hardly read their script. I believe, that if you would make an unbiased study of the facts, you would not try to brainwash educated people with such propaganda.
>
> I now have more respect for our honorable Representative, JOHN L. McMILLAN, for not giving you a statement or appearing on such a program as yours of last night.
>
> You even went so far as to insinuate that the blame for the Washington mess should be attributed to the Southern Congressmen. I can readily understand, after seeing your program, why the good white people have moved out of the city of Washington. I believe, if you will check the records of the employees of the different governmental departments, you will find that in the city of

Washington the percentage of Negro employees is far greater than the white, according to the population of the country.

I have never been one to take advantage of the colored people. I was reared this way, and my father had two colored employees who stayed with him over 30 years; and they sent their children to college. However, I am an American, and I believe in fairplay. All of the foreignisms have the same basic principle: communism, socialism, and Hitlerism. Tell one big enough, loud enough, long enough, and the people finally get to believe it.

I certainly hope that the intelligent people in the United States will band together and put a stop to this brainwashing, biased propaganda. When I say intelligent people, I do not mean the overeducated people who have been educated beyond their ability to absorb education.

Yours truly,

J. WALTER BAGWELL.

GREENVILLE, S.C.

UNION, S.C., *September 27, 1963.*

Congressman JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: I wish to commend you for your refusal to appear on the Chet Huntley program which was televised last night in this area. The slanted reporting of the television media is too obvious for comment. I am sure that you would have been subjected to obnoxious cross-examination by a commentator for whom I have little respect. His colleague is no improvement. And while I am about it, I might ask the question who does your Iowa committee member think he is fooling.

After seeing the program in which the only pleasant thing involved was your refusal to appear or be interviewed, I could not refrain from expressing my approval to you.

Sincerely,

L. H. JENNINGS, Jr.,
Attorney at Law.

LATEST CRIME REPORT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 22, 1963

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a copy of the latest crime report for the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I realize the House has done everything possible to correct the terrible crime situation in the Nation's Capital, and I hope other responsible parties will take favorable action on the crime bill we have enacted in the House at the earliest possible date.

We all realize this proposed legislation is not a certain cure; however, we feel it will prove to be of great assistance in reducing crime if the legislation can be enacted into law at an early date.

The report follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
October 1, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCMILLAN: Forwarded herewith are copies of the weekly crime report for the District of Columbia for the week beginning September 22, 1963.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT V. MURRAY,
Chief of Police.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT

Part I offenses reported, Sept. 22–28, 1963

Classification	Week beginning Sept. 15, 1963	Week beginning Sept. 22, 1963	Change	
			Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide	2	3	+1	+50.0
Rape	1	4	+3	+300.0
Robbery	46	40	−6	−13.0
Aggravated assault	59	72	+13	+22.0
Housebreaking	125	147	+22	+17.6
Grand larceny	32	30	−2	−6.2
Petit larceny	131	155	+24	+18.3
Auto theft	72	70	−2	−2.8
Total	468	521	+53	+11.3

EFFECT ON THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECTS OF NONEXTENSION OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members ought to be alerted to a very critical situation which has arisen with respect to the continuance of Corps of Engineers projects all over the Nation. Unless the public works authorization is extended, work will grind to a screeching halt on Corps of Engineers projects all over the land—in California, Florida, Texas, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, West Virginia, and many other States. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], very eloquently and ably outlined the problem on the floor of the House yesterday. I am sure that all Members realize the seriousness of this situation. In the Ohio River basin, for example, in 12 days the Corps of Engineers will have to send out notices to its contractors to stop work on 11 construction projects in the Ohio basin. This same situation is occurring all over the Nation.

So far as the entire Appalachian area is concerned, it makes little sense to pass legislation like the Area Redevelopment Administration and accelerated public works, and then turn around and cut off projects which also have a direct effect on stimulating the economy. We are really faced with a serious challenge to the effectiveness of Congress itself when projects in process are stopped. Think of the tremendous loss to the taxpayers of the Nation if these projects are abruptly stopped, with the ensuing confusion and waste of money, men and materials. We must demonstrate to the Nation that the legislative process is equal to the situation.

I trust that Congress will very soon find the way to correct this critical problem, and I am confident that an amicable solution will be worked out.

HOUSE INTERIOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS ANALYZE ISSUES AFFECTING MINING INDUSTRIES

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include statements by Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. BARING, and Mr. SAYLOR at the convention of the American Mining Congress in Los Angeles, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the convention of the American Mining Congress was held this year in Los Angeles from September 15 to 18. I am pleased to report to the House that the 2,700 participants in the meetings displayed a serious concern for the problems facing the mining industry.

I am likewise pleased to have participated in these meetings with several other members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I have the honor of being chairman.

In addition to the remarks that I made as chairman of the session on public lands, three members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs delivered major addresses on subjects of national concern in the area of mining and minerals. The participation by our members in these meetings is typical of the cooperation that exists between our committee and the members of the industry. We may not always see eye to eye but we do have, I think, mutual understanding which permits us to work together for the common good.

Under leave previously granted, I am pleased to include as part of my remarks first, the address by the Honorable ED EDMONDSON, chairman of the Mines and Mining Subcommittee, who spoke on September 16, 1963, at a session on stockpiling. Other participants on the platform with Congressman Edmondson were Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning; Jess Larson, who directed acquisitions for the stockpile when he was with the Government; and J. Allen Overton, Jr., the executive vice president of the American Mining Congress.

STOCKPILES AND VICTORY IN THE COLD WAR

(Remarks of Representative ED EDMONDSON, Democrat, of Oklahoma, American Mining Congress, September 16, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege to appear before this distinguished organization, and to participate in discussion of a matter of vital concern to American security and to victory in the cold war.

Let me begin by saying that one of the finest summaries ever written about this subject is the document "The Stockpile Story," published in February of 1963 by the American Mining Congress. I do not know who its editor was—whether it was Allen Overton, or Harry Moffatt, or Julian Conover, or some ghost in the backroom—but this publication is an outstanding contribution to public understanding of an issue that has been badly distorted by many elements of the press.

My thanks are also due to the able and distinguished American who is with me on this program, and who heads today the executive agency with major responsibility in the field, the Honorable Edward A. McDermott.

Mr. McDermott's agency, the Office of Emergency Planning, at times moves in directions which create doubt and apprehension in this area of Government responsibility, but Mr. McDermott himself has given convincing evidence, in testimony before our subcommittee, of his knowledge and outstanding ability. I am particularly obliged to him for supplying an advance text of his remarks today, and for the many hours he has spent in conference with me on this subject.

Another word of thanks is due another distinguished American on this panel, one of the best informed men in the Nation on the subject, the Honorable Jess Larson. Mr. Larson has also given generously of his time and talent to enlighten our subcommittee, and his choice to participate in the panel was a wise one.

If I am not well informed today on the subject of stockpiles, then Mr. McDermott and General Larson must share some of the blame for my condition, for both have labored long in the field of educating an Oklahoma Congressman on the subject.

Before my exposure to either AMC or Mr. McDermott or General Larson, however, I was initiated in the ABC's of stockpile wisdom.

As a naval gunnery officer in World War II, I sailed aboard merchant ships with the challenging and dangerous assignment of bringing to America the more than 70 items urgently needed from overseas to maintain our war effort.

It was my good fortune to have that duty in the Pacific, and we needed no convoys to bring from South America and the Far East some of the most critical materials of the war.

Thanks to an inferior Japanese submarine force which concentrated most of its effort on military vessels, our merchant ship losses in the Pacific were few.

In the Atlantic, however, it was another story—a bitter, costly, tragic story—in which more than 6,000 merchant vessels were sent to the bottom. Our heaviest naval casualties in the Atlantic were found among the armed guard crews assigned to merchant shipping.

A long time ago, some wise Chinaman is supposed to have said that a picture is worth a thousand words. The picture on the cover of the AMC publication, "The Stockpile Story," is the most compelling argument I know for the wisdom of an adequate stockpile policy.

With hundreds of crosses, as shown in Adm. Samuel Eliot Morrison's "The Battle of the Atlantic," it shows the ocean graveyards of thousands of American and allied merchant sailors who gave their lives in World War II, because of the folly of a prewar policy which neglected this important phase of preparedness.

It is difficult if not impossible for me to be impersonal or detached in my viewpoint on this subject, Mr. Chairman.

For I have stood on the beaches of New Jersey, in the early months of American involvement in World War II, and have watched the fires on the horizon as our tankers went down in flames.

I have seen those beautiful beaches turn black with oil and debris from our shattered shipping.

I have said goodbye to shipmates who never returned—whose graves will forever be in the silent ocean depths—as sacrifices to our terrible need for critical materials in time of war.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I know that our terrible losses in World War II—losses which almost lost the war for us before we had been in it for a full year—were accomplished by an enemy navy with submarine strength of less than one-fourth the submarine strength of one potential enemy we face today.

I have used the expression "less than one-fourth," but this is conservative indeed. When the size, range and striking power of today's Communist submarine force are all considered, I do not believe it is out of line to estimate their strength at 6 or 7 times the maximum strength of the Nazi submarine force in World War II.

This is a central, cardinal truth about our stockpiles' importance in the world today, and I do not believe it is possible to overemphasize that truth.

For the solemn fact of life remains with us today, despite all our progress in airborne commerce and the use of substitute materials—the lanes of the sea continue to bring us our major supplies of many vital and indispensable materials. Never before has the danger of having those sea lanes closed been as great as it is today.

This is an argument which the advocates of stockpile reduction have yet to answer, to the satisfaction of at least one subcommittee in the Congress.

But we are told that reserves for a 5-year war are no longer necessary—that a 3-year reserve is more than adequate for present maximum stockpile objectives—and that no stockpile at all is necessary in some critical materials which we import in great quantity each year.

The 5-year estimate was considered both valid and prudent during the administration of President Truman and for more than 5 years in President Eisenhower's administration, but for some magical, mysterious reason, in the year 1958, a 3-year standard was substituted for it.

Some people have sought to attack and criticize the Eisenhower administration for some of its stockpile purchases; in my own judgment, that administration is much more likely to be judged harshly by history for its decision that stockpiles adequate for a 3-year war are all we need.

I have never been able to learn the reasoning of the experts who made the 3-year decision, although our subcommittee has tried, again and again, to learn it.

Did something happen in 1958 to reduce the danger of Communist aggression?

Did something happen to make certain the fact that any war in which we participated would be much shorter than World War I or World War II?

Did something happen in 1958 to increase by 40 percent our margin of security and military safety, or to reduce by 40 percent the danger of a long war?

If the answer to any of these questions is "Yes," I have never been able to learn what that something was.

In my own judgment the danger of Communist aggression is just as great today as it was in 1957—perhaps greater, in view of the current policies of Red China.

In my own judgment, the likelihood of a long war—if war comes—is just as great as it was in 1957. Certainly the chance of quick and decisive victory over a major Communist power is no greater in the light of efforts now underway to build our conventional fighting forces and reduce the chances of nuclear war.

If we fight a war against any major military power without the use of nuclear weapons, by what process of reasoning do we conclude that such a war today will be concluded in less than 3 years?

Mr. Chairman, reduction of our stockpiles today, without a clear and concise answer to that question, would certainly be a policy decision of doubtful wisdom.

No thinking person today, who is realistic about the world in which we live, is advocating unilateral disarmament, in terms of the weapons of war. In fact, the President has assured us all, in the strongest possible terms, that the test ban treaty now being debated in the Senate is not in any way a step toward unilateral disarmament.

Yet there are some who advocate a substantial reduction of our stockpiles—despite the fact that these stockpiles are recognized on all sides as important, vital assets in the cold war, indispensable elements of American defense, and substantial deterrents in themselves to enemy attack.

Such a reduction, on the basis of present conditions and incomplete study, would amount to nothing less than unilateral disarmament by the United States.

I can assure you it will meet with determined, bipartisan opposition in both Houses of Congress.

In conclusion, I would like to refer once again to the statements of policy which accompanied the legislation originating our stockpiles.

The basic declaration of policy is found in the act of June 7, 1939, at 50 U.S. Code 98:

"The natural resources of the United States in certain strategic and critical materials being deficient or insufficiently developed to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the country for common defense, it is the policy of the Congress and the purpose and intent of * * * this title to provide for the acquisition and retention of stocks of these materials and to encourage the conservation and development of sources of these materials in the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in times of national emergency."

Let it be noted that the purpose and intent of the law, from the first, was to provide for the acquisition and retention of stockpiles necessary for the common defense.

Finally, let no one forget the further policy statement which appears at 50 U.S.C. 98b: "*Provided*, That no material constituting a part of the stockpiles may be disposed of without the express approval of the Congress except where the revised determination is by reason of obsolescence of that material for use in time of war."

The express approval of Congress should certainly continue to be a basic requirement for any reduction of our stockpile, in these troubled and dangerous times.

With public understanding of the issues involved, I hope and trust that it will.

Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1963, I acted as chairman of a two-part session on public lands: One part was devoted to pending wilderness legislation and the other to the need for revision of the mining laws.

Congressman WALTER S. BARING, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Lands, spoke on the wilderness bill along with Dr. James Boyd, president of Copper Range Co.

Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, ranking minority member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, engaged in a panel discussion on the need for revision of the mining laws. Others on the mining law revision panel were John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior for land management; C. H. Burgess, vice president of the Kennicott Copper Corp.; and Raymond B. Holbrook, counsel for the U.S. Smelting, Refining & Mining Co. at Salt Lake City.

Under leave previously granted, I include as part of my remarks my statement at the opening of the public lands session together with the speeches by Congressmen BARING and SAYLOR:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WAYNE N. ASPINALL, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM COLORADO, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE HOUSE INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, AT THE PUBLIC LANDS SESSION OF THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS ANNUAL MEETING, BILTMORE HOTEL, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1963

I hope that representatives of the mining industries assembled here will not get tired of hearing me say that I am pleased to be with you on the occasion of your annual meetings. The fact is that I am pleased because I personally enjoy our associations and again I take pleasure in an interchange of ideas concerning matters of vital importance to the Nation.

A year ago, when I acted as chairman of the public lands session at San Francisco, I indicated to you my belief that "we must be ready to consider revision of the mining laws and freely discuss the best means possible to continue the development of minerals in our public lands in the light of modern technology and current land use demands." Since then, in a series of talks, I feel that I have developed the need for a thorough review of all our basic public land laws. Last month I proposed the establishment of a bipartisan commission composed of representatives of the executive and legislative branches to undertake this review. Legislation to carry out this proposal was introduced by me, as well as by Congressmen BARING, UDALL, and KYL. The first hearings on these bills were held last week and I think we are well on our way toward being able to report out and have approved by the House legislation establishing a Public Land Law Review Commission.

In the series of talks which I made, I stressed my continuing philosophy that, as a conservationist, I must seek to achieve the wisest possible use of all our natural resources. It is therefore necessary that we focus our attention on the resource use aspect of our public land laws. It is with this in mind that I wrote the proposed charter for the Commission. As far as mining is concerned, I think you should welcome a study of this kind because, in the absence of an overall review, it is the unfortunate fact that today our mineral resources might slip further back in the order of priority among all other resources.

The core of the difficulty stems from the fact, which you all know, that in many instances it is uneconomical for domestic mining and minerals industries to compete with foreign imports. Simultaneously, gold, long the mainstay of our valuable minerals, cannot be mined profitably because of the fixed monetary value of $35 an ounce, established back in 1934. In addition, mining is at times thought by some to be incompatible with other, and sometimes more popular, uses such as recreation.

It is essential, therefore, that we have a high-level group study the entire spectrum of public land use and natural resource development in order to make sure that the long-range requirements and national needs are given the proper weight in relation to the short-range demands. Stop and think, if you will, for just a moment of how many people in and out of Government would like to see all Federal public lands retained in Federal ownership and put under some management program in the name of conservation or recreation. Only through a comprehensive review of all the public land laws can we be positive that the proper attention will be given to all requirements.

There are, of course, many ways in which such a review could be undertaken. My approach is through a body composed of six Members of the House of Representatives, six Members of the Senate, and six representatives of the executive branch. The advantage of a body of the type which I advocate is that we obtain the services of people who are not committed to the preservation of any particular bureaucratic structure and are therefore not committed to keeping lands in public ownership. Accordingly, we can expect these people to place and keep all the natural resources in their proper perspective, as they recommend the long-range policies to be followed by the Government.

One of the essential factors in my plan is the preponderance of Members of the House and Senate on the Commission. I think this is proper because this study is primarily a legislative function. By having representation from the executive branch of the Government we assure that their views will be given consideration but we also assure that they will not take congressional prerogatives away from the congressional representatives. From its standpoint, the executive branch is given the freedom of being able at a later date to comment on the Commission recommendations without being rigidly bound to support those recommendations.

An important ingredient of the Commission study is the provision for the establishment of an advisory council on which there is to be representation of various user groups, including mining interests. Each State would also be invited to cooperate in the study.

The legislation provides for a full-time chairman of the Commission and for its proper staffing in order to insure that the best talent will be available for this most important task.

We have, in the last few years, received many communications taking exception to the manner in which various public land laws, including the mining laws, are being administered. Our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been able to go into these matters only to a limited extent and then only when considering specific legislation. I think that the Commission, in order to evaluate the effectiveness of existing statutes and their need for revision, will of necessity have to inquire into administrative procedures being employed by the executive agencies. I have, accordingly, included in the duties of the Commission the requirement that it study existing regulations and review the policies and practices of the Federal agencies and then I would grant to the Commission the power of subpena. I submit that it would be an empty gesture to require the Commission to make these broad studies and then not give to it the power to require the attendance of witnesses who may have information bearing on the subject.

Because I recognize the fact that there is need for immediate action, I have indicated that, if the Commission bill is approved, I will support temporary legislation establishing the principle of multiple use for the interim management and administration of Bureau of Land Management lands and would, likewise, support interim legislation to give the Secretary of the Interior additional authority to sell public domain lands that are required for the orderly growth and development of communities. In order to assure close committee surveillance during the period of the Commission study and while multiple-use authority is in effect, I have introduced a bill (H.R. 8305) requiring the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to withhold certain public land actions for 60 days after notification to the Senate and House of Representatives.

I recognize the possibility of need for legislation to establish a new category of exploration claims giving prediscovery protection to prospectors on public lands during the period that the Commission is studying the overall problem. You will recall that I informed you last year that I had directed a member of the committee's professional staff to work with industry representatives and Department of Interior personnel, in order to develop a framework of legislation in this field. I think that we are close to agreement but it is not yet a reality. The progress that has been made in the last year is due primarily to the efforts of Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., who, a few minutes from now, will inform you of his views toward an exploration claims bill. If a bill is developed and it receives departmental approval, if it is approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and if it is submitted by an executive communication as the administration's recommended legislation, I shall introduce the bill in keeping with my general policy, even if I have reservations about portions of the bill. In this way, an administration bill can become the vehicle through which the committee can give consideration to the problems involved.

This summarizes the situation relative to public lands today. I am hopeful that the immediate future will see the development of needed policy guidelines governing the public lands and that Congress, as the policymaking body, will establish rules governing the use and disposition of the public lands.

In this latter connection let me make a comment concerning the wilderness legislation, and that comment is that we are continually making additional Members of the House of Representatives aware of the basic constitutional question requiring affirmative action by Congress in the designation of wilderness areas. Inasmuch as Congressman WALTER BARING, chairman of our Subcommittee on Public Lands, which has jurisdiction over the wilderness legislation, is going to speak to you on this subject in a few minutes, I will not go into its status.

THE WILDERNESS BILL

(Remarks of the Honorable WALTER S. BARING, a Representative in Congress from Nevada, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, at the public lands session of the American Mining Congress annual meeting at the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., Tuesday, Sept. 17, 1963)

At the outset, let me state what I think all of you already know: I see no need for any legislation for so-called protection of wilderness areas. I think the primitive and wilderness areas in our national forests have been and are being given pretty good protection by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service.

Despite my personal views reflecting the absence of need for this legislation, I am willing to assume my responsibility as chairman of the House Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Public Lands and listen to reason. But, I assure you, I will never support a bill that takes millions of acres of land and puts them forever out of reach of public benefit unless we have satisfied ourselves that the lands are not good for anything else.

Against the background of these basic factors, I would like to examine briefly with you this morning some important aspects of the pending wilderness legislation and its status. There have been introduced in the House of Representatives 13 bills for the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system; in addition, 1 bill, S. 4, passed the Senate April 9, 1963. All 14 bills have been referred to my subcommittee. Because all 14 bills express the same basic philosophy, I will not discuss the minor variances among them but will treat them as a group.

First, let us nail down a distortion spread by some of the wilderness advocates who say that this legislation would not interfere with any presently authorized use. This is a half-truth because, although present mining on patented grounds would be allowed to continue, the authorized use of allowing anyone to enter upon these public land areas and engage in new mineral development would be terminated the day the bill becomes a law. Furthermore, even the right to prospect would be curtailed, except "for the purpose of gathering information about mineral" resources and then only if the activity "is not incompatible with the preservation of a wilderness environment."

Members of Congress from the mining States are not going to be fooled by this provision which I will examine in greater detail because it typifies the attempt by the wilderness proponents to make things seem what they are not. Section 6(c)(8) of S. 4 says:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent within national forest and public domain areas included in the wilderness system, any activity, including prospecting, for the purpose of gathering information about mineral or water resources or to prevent the completely subsurface use of such areas, if such activity or subsurface use is carried on, in a manner which is not incompatible with the preservation of the wilderness environment."

There is much legitimate concern about the possibility that we will be denying future generations the use of valuable minerals and valuable essential sources of water if we close off these areas for wilderness preservation. This provision that I have read to you is apparently intended to make people who are not familiar with the realities of the situation believe that the wilderness bill does not lock up these mineral resources about which everyone is concerned. You and I know that the provision doesn't mean a thing because nobody is going to risk the capital investment required for exploration today unless he has an assurance that he will be permitted to develop a mine if he makes a discovery. The Senate-passed wilderness bill denies this assurance.

Likewise, we will expose in the House of Representatives the fact that the proposed authority of the President to permit prospecting and mining is meaningless except in the context of anticipating the day when the United States has no mineral resources any place else. The mining industry and its friends know how long it takes to find and develop a mine. We recognize that it is ridiculous to say that these resources, although locked up, will be available in the event of an emergency—time just would not permit finding and developing mineral resources after we are enmeshed in an emergency situation.

My conclusion, therefore, is that if we are going to have wilderness legislation there must be realistic provisions relating to the discovery and development of our mineral resources. I assure you that if a bill is reported out of my subcommittee it will have simple, unmistakable language that even the lawyers will understand, prescribing the guidelines for any restriction on mining activity.

Last year, when the House Interior Committee reported a wilderness bill that represented an effort by the committee to effect a compromise between the proponents and opponents of wilderness legislation, 6,822,400 acres of forest land were classified by the Forest Service as "wilderness," "wild," and "canoe"; and the House committee version of the wilderness bill would have given these 6.8 million acres of land immediate wilderness status subject to continued mineral exploration and development for a 25-year period. In the year that has passed since that bill was reported out, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chief of the Forest Service have added over a million and a half acres in these categories so that there are now 8,391,648 acres in wilderness, wild, and canoe areas.

Areas presently classified as, and given wilderness protection by the Department of Agriculture, restrict the type of use that can be made of the areas. Miners have demonstrated that they can prospect for and develop the mineral resources while preserving the wilderness characteristics. In answer to some of the arguments that maintain that the wilderness areas possess no mineral values, we have a report prepared by the Chief of the Forest Service indicating that, since the first wilderness bill was passed by the Senate September 6, 1961, 350 mining claims were filed in wilderness and wild areas and an additional 187 claims have been filed in primitive areas within the national forests.

These statistics point up a few things: (1) There are mineral resources in the areas embraced by the wilderness bill; (2) prospectors are willing to enter these undeveloped areas in search of valuable minerals; and (3) the 350 acres in wilderness and wild areas, at 20 acres per claim, would involve 7,000 acres out of over 8 million acres, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the area that would have been given wilderness protection by both the Senate bill and the House committee bill of last year. Incidentally, I do not know what method the Chief of the Forest Service used but he estimated that, of the 350 claims, only 88 "may be valid," thereby reducing to 1,760 acres the area in which we may expect mining development to take place. I do not think that mining threatens the wilderness.

The bill reported out by the House committee last Congress tried to compromise the mining issue by providing the 25-year period I referred to earlier, during which mining would be permitted and after which the lands would be withdrawn from appropriation under the mining laws. Let us review some of the other important provisions of that bill.

The wilderness, wild, and canoe areas have been identified with preciseness; however, the primitive areas must still be delineated. Therefore, we can blanket in the wilderness, wild, and canoe areas because we know exactly what land is affected. But we cannot do the same with the primitive areas because even the wilderness advocates recognize that these areas must be reviewed. Only after they have been reviewed can we in Congress pass on whether specific areas should be given wilderness protection.

The committee sought to preserve the traditional position of Congress as making policy in the field of land management and leaving it up to the Executive to carry out those policy guidelines. If, on top of the protection given by the executive branch to these wilderness areas, we are going to provide legislative protection, it is necessary for Congress to pass on each individual area.

At this point, let me give you an example of what I consider to be a weakness in the Senate wilderness bill: Under section 3(b)(1) of S. 4, the Secretary of Agriculture would review the primitive areas and then the President would submit his "recommendations," which would become final unless vetoed by Congress, providing for any alteration in the boundaries of the primitive areas subject to the proviso that any primitive area recommended for inclusion in the wilderness system could not be larger in area than the amount classified as primitive on the effective date of the act. In some of the primitive areas there are thousands of acres of land devoted to uses, such as roads, that are incompatible with wilderness. The Senate bill would therefore permit the Department to drop out 10,000 or 50,000 or more acres of roads or other uses and substitute 50,000 acres of land that might be potentially valuable for resource development; or, to put the example in practical terms, the Executive could drop 50,000 acres of rocks, stones, and rattlesnakes and include in the wilderness 50,000 acres of mature timber. In order to make certain that Congress acts based on full knowledge of the facts, I assure you that, if there is going to be a wilderness bill, there will be provision for affirmative action by Congress after the Chief Executive or his Cabinet officers have made their review and submitted their recommendations to the Congress.

We have not scheduled any hearings on wilderness legislation because, right at the moment, there seems to be no point in doing so. Should it develop that the wilderness proponents are willing to move in the direction of the compromise offered by the House committee last year, I would be willing to schedule hearings on this legislation.

I recognize the fact that no direct specific testimony was received by our committee on the proposals offered by the House committee. Accordingly, if the House of Representatives recesses during November and legislation along the lines of the House committee compromise wilderness bill seems possible, I will seek authority to hold hearings in the West on proposals that might lead to such compromise along the lines of that bill. If the House does not take a recess, then it seems to me the best we can hope for would be to have the staff work completed this fall and to hold hearings in Washington in the early part of next year, relying on national organizations such as yours to obtain the views of the people of the West on the specific proposals contained in the House committee bill.

I am pleased to have had this opportunity to discuss this legislation with you on the same platform with the chairman of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; I feel certain that he will continue to support me in my views that hearings on the wilderness legislation would serve no purpose unless we have some advance indication or assurance that the wilderness advocates will move in the direction of the House committee bill.

Presented at the Public Lands Session, Tuesday, September 17, 1963, American Mining Congress Mining Convention, Los Angeles, Calif., by the Honorable John P. Saylor, U.S. Representative From Pennsylvania

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues in the House, and colleagues on the panel, and friends, having been the individual in Congress who introduced in the House of Representatives the first wilderness bill and who introduced the bill to modernize the mining laws and after hearing the comments that have been made, I take consolation in the fact that in the dark days of President Lincoln's administration when he looked everywhere for friends and could find few, he was delighted one day to have call upon him a group of people that he had known in Springfield, Ill. They asked him, "Mr. President, how do you like your job?" It is reported that he leaned back in his chair and stretched his long legs and looked at them and said "Well I'll tell you it reminds me very, very much of the man who had been tarred and feathered and was being ridden out of town on a rail," and he said "that if it wouldn't have been for the honor he would just as soon have walked."

Now many people have asked me why you from Pennsylvania take an interest in the West. Let me tell you that I come from an area in Pennsylvania—and I'm delighted to look out in this crowd and see a former Johnstowner, Mr. Williams, who is here as one of the officials of the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co.—he can tell you that in the section of Pennsylvania from which we come—we are very much interested in mining. And I am delighted to have this opportunity to come here and talk to you, because, sometimes, it is from those who are not in your organization that you might find some of the things that are causing other people to look at you askance. One year ago at this meeting, Chariman Aspinall said this to you: "One of the difficulties of the public lands laws including the mining law is that they have been in existence for a long time without an overall review and overhaul. The scope of the mining law of 1872 has been curtailed by the Mineral Leasing Act. The procedure, however, for locatable minerals remains exactly the same despite the fact that just about everything else in the United States has changed." And I'd like, one year later, to say "Amen" to that statement—because it's true—even truer today than a year ago.

One of the reasons that I have introduced a bill to revise the mining laws is that there are groups and people in this country that look upon you as despoilers. This I do not believe. But unless something is done by the American mining industry to help create a better atmosphere and a better impression among the American people, you are in trouble. If you are afraid of change—then you are in more trouble. If you want to hang on to what you have and say that a hundred years ago it was given to you and that you will not move from your present position—I am afraid that some day in the near future you may have many things handed to you that will not be to your liking. And, because I believe that a great, a healthy and a prosperous mining industry in this country is one of the real cornerstones of the American economy, I have tried to issue a challenge to the American mining industry.

Now I do not at this time or at any other time want to tell you that I have all the solutions to your problems because I know that I do not. But I hope that my approach may cause you—the brains of a great industry—to think about your present job and about your future.

Before I introduced the bill to revise the mining laws I sent it to a number of my friends in the mining industry and it came back with this remarkable analysis. Those men that I classify as middle age and over, all thought it was terrible and those that I classify as below middle age—I mean by that those younger than myself—all thought it was marvelous.

Now let me see what I have tried to do. This bill has two purposes. First, it would protect the interest of the legitimate prospectors and miners by establishing an orderly procedure for the exploration and discovery of mineral deposits and the patenting of mining claims on public lands. I might tell you folks that you are one of the few groups in this country that has the right to get a patent but believe it or not there are other groups in this country that are looking at this right that you have and saying that if the miners have it, why can't we. Just a few days ago, in Washington, when our committee was conducting hearings on Chairman Aspinall's bill, H.R. 8070, to provide a commission for the overall review of the public land laws, a representative of the cattle industry, and a very able representative, stated that when cattlemen go on the public range and they place developments on the public range, why should they not be given the right to get a patent to that land just as the miner does when he discovers a mineral. Let me tell you, my friends, that you've got a hard answer to come up with because the cattle industry is also an important cornerstone in this great country of ours and they, too, use large sections of this public domain and they have improved our range and they have prevented rushing washoffs and rapid runoffs and they're spending their money to make sure that they can continue to have a healthy operation.

The second purpose of the mining revision bill that I introduced is to protect the overall public interest in public lands, on which mining activities are permitted, by assuring that mining is conducted in a manner compatible with other multiple-use objectives of the public lands.

Now the legitimate miner has been held up to public ridicule and scorn because of the weekend miner. A man who takes advantage of the loopholes in the law of 1872 to get himself a piece of the public domain under the guise of mining and who gets a personal and preferential use in outstanding recreation, scenic, hunting and fishing areas, is abusing the law and bringing criticism on all. One of the outstanding cases is one that occurred a few years ago in the State just north of here. You are all familiar with it. Patents were issued under the guise of mining. Let me tell you that the payroll, as shown by the reports that were filed, would not have paid for the 8 years' assessment work on the claims; but, in the meantime, on the lands which were patented, over 2 million board feet of valuable timber was cut. Oh, they got a little mineral, that's true; but they didn't get much. And I am satisfied that it was never the purpose to get minerals in the first place.

Now if your industry really believes that you can stand on the law of 1872 then I as an easterner warn you today—and as a friend I warn you—that you are in trouble. I hope that from this convention you, who are the brains of the industry, will come forward not only to your Congress, but to your Secretary of Interior and to your Secretary of Agriculture, with a constructive revision program so that in the years to come we may continue to have a healthy American mining industry.

QUESTIONS ON PROPOSED UNITED STATES AND RUSSIAN COLLABORATION ON MAN-ON-THE-MOON PROJECT

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the President's recent proposal that the United States and Soviet Russia collaborate on the man-on-the-moon project, I respectfully raise these two questions:

First. If this moon-shot project is not expected to contribute substantially to our military know-how and national defense, how can we justify to the American taxpayers the many billion dollars of cost which it involves?

Second. If it is definitely anticipated that this project will develop vital military information and thus contribute to national defense, how can we justify making Soviet Russia a partner in the project, and, therefore, a cobeneficiary of that vital military information?

I would like to hear an uncensored and unexpurgated answer to these two questions from the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE CIA

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the growing press reports to the effect that there has been a breakdown of relations, even of communication, between the State Department and the CIA in South Vietnam can no longer be ignored. It is bad enough that U.S. policy in this part of the world can, at best, be described as "misunderstood"—and therefore clumsy—but when clumsy policy is divided up between quarreling U.S. agencies it is even worse. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] has just referred to an additional press report of the divisions, disagreements, and breakdowns in communication between the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency in South Vietnam. Now if these reports are right, we should not be sitting still. If they are wrong, they should be exposed as false and the record set straight. In any event if seems plain that there have been leaks from one agency or the other or both.

Eighteen Members of the House of Representatives, I among them, have introduced resolutions calling for the creation of a joint committee to supervise the intelligence community. At least two Members of the other body have introduced identical resolutions. A few weeks ago I spoke for an hour on the floor on this subject. I think we Members of the House would not be living up to our obligations as legislators were we to ignore this question.

Recently Hanson Baldwin, distinguished journalist and expert on military and security affairs—a person who individually believes in executive control in matters of this kind—has written a second major article on the U.S. intelligence community and has again pointed to the absence of congressional supervision over this giant, billion-dollar complex.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech by the Director of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, so much is being said about the job of rural electrification being finished that there is a real danger Members of the Congress may be misled into accepting a false impression of this vital and constructive program.

It is refreshing then to have the views of the man who is in position to gage the status of rural electrification today, the very able Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, Norman M. Clapp. These views are being expressed by Mr. Clapp in a series of meetings around the country with the men and women who direct and manage the rural electric cooperatives which have wrought a miracle in bringing the benefits of electricity to areas far from the central station plants which produce light and power for our cities and suburbs.

In this speech Administrator Clapp is proposing "A Program for Growth" which he believes is necessary if the rural power systems are to succeed in achieving the objectives of the Rural Electrification Act. Toward this goal, he proposes an orderly and businesslike approach to the unfinished business of rural electrification through a program which will permit the rural electric systems to become self-sustaining.

It should be understood that the proposals and the program he offers are the product of his experience and deep personal interest in REA, cooperative rural electrification, and the development of rural America. He has brought to this task the background of his long and close association with the rural electric cooperatives in his native Wisconsin, and the habit, which he developed while publishing a county seat newspaper, of weighing a situation fairly and objectively, in meeting his obligation to all the people. Thus he has shaped a policy which he believes will serve the interests of every American, while helping to assure the future security and effectiveness of the rural systems which serve those who created them, the 5 million member-owners of the REA-financed rural electric cooperatives.

A Program for Growth

(Remarks of Norman M. Clapp, Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, before the 1963 regional meetings of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association)

It was approximately 3 years ago, on September 22, 1960, at Billings, Mont., when President Kennedy, then a candidate for the presidency of the United States, assured the people of rural America that if elected he would (and I quote the President's words) "restore REA to its former role of preeminence, freeing it from constant concern over political interference, higher rates of interest and budgetary starvation and enabling that remarkable American institution to get on with its work of providing low-cost electricity and telephones for every American farm family."

This commitment to the American people, since President Kennedy's election, has become the mandate for rural electrification under his administration.

For nearly 3 years now following his inauguration in January of 1961, the Department of Agriculture and the Rural Electrification Administration have been engaged in the challenging task of translating these words into action.

The cloud of political interference which had hung over the loan authority of the rural electrification administrator under the previous administration was clearly and emphatically dispelled by Secretary Freeman in one of his first official announcements of policy as Secretary of Agriculture under the new administration. The controversial loan for a much needed generating plant for the cooperative electric systems in southern Indiana, which had been blocked through high level political intervention under the previous administration, was approved in June of 1961. It was not only the largest generation and transmission loan ever made by REA, it was among the first substantial fruits of the New Frontier.

It was made crystal clear that this administration would not be badgering REA borrowers to accept a higher interest rate. The present 2 percent interest rate on REA financing is admittedly a more favorable rate than would otherwise be available to the rural electric systems of this Nation. But this favorable rate is still a necessary equalizer to enable rural systems to overcome other inescapable higher costs of rural service. It is recognized that this rate in the present state of the public money market and under present Federal fiscal conditions represent some cost to the Government. I am sure we all look forward to the time when the need for such an equalizer in rural electrification will diminish and disappear. But that day is not here yet.

To bring the dawn of that day will take sustained effort in further building the potential economic strength of the rural systems. To know when it is here will take careful and expert study. To be stampeded into such a decision by the free-wheeling judgments of partisan propagandists or enticed into it by the blandishments of special interests would be a tragic error not only for rural America but the entire Nation.

The theme of your regional meeting this year is "the Challenge of Growth." This administration is firmly committed to the growth and strengthening of the electric systems which the rural people of this country built to serve themselves. We believe in them; we believe in you. We have faith in your future.

Growth takes capital. In the electric business, it takes great quantities of capital. For most rural electric cooperatives REA is still the major source of that necessary new capital.

So immediately following President Kennedy's inauguration there began a review of the previous administration's budget proposals for fiscal year 1962 to determine if they were equal to the task ahead. The previously recommended loan authorization of $145 million for rural electrification loans for fiscal year 1962 was raised to $195 million, and the Congress even added an additional contingency fund of $50 million to make a total of $245 million available for rural electrification loans in fiscal year 1962.

For fiscal year 1963 President Kennedy requested the Congress to authorize $400 million for rural electrification loans, the largest amount ever requested by a President and approved by Congress in the history of the REA electric program. In the budget for this present fiscal year, 1964, President Kennedy has recommended an authorization of $425 million, another record-breaking request in the history of the program.

These are the deeds which are translating into action the words spoken 3 years ago at Billings, Mont., and enabling all of us to get on with the work of providing low-cost electricity for every American farm family and rural consumers generally.

On no front has meeting the problems of growth been more challenging than in the field of power supply. Rural electric systems financed by REA still get 38 percent of their power from the commercial power companies; 39 percent comes from various Federal sources such as TVA, Bureau of Reclamation, Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern Power Administration, and Southeastern Power Administration. A small percentage comes from public power districts, public utility district, and municipally owned systems. Only between 16 and 17 percent of their needs are supplied from REA-financed generation. Yet the REA generation and transmission program and the ready availability of REA financing for such purposes is vitally important not only to assist in meeting the rapidly growing needs of the rural systems for more power but also in providing an available escape for the rural systems from unnecessarily high power costs and restrictive power contracts.

From January 1961 to the close of this past fiscal year on June 30, 1963, a span of 30 months, REA under this administration has made loans totaling more than $384 million for generation and transmission purposes including loans to 37 power-type borrowers. This is more than three times greater than the generation and transmission loans, totaling $111 million, made in the last 30 months of the previous administration. Investment of these funds provided in the generation and transmission loans made in these past 30 months will reduce wholesale power costs to REA-financed rural electric systems by $64,196,000 during the first 10 years of plant operation.

Perhaps even more far reaching, this aggressive program backed by the Kennedy administration has enhanced the bargaining power of rural electric borrowers. Already in negotiations with eight power companies REA borrower systems have been able to secure reductions in rates totaling $660,000 annually. There are more to come.

Demonstrated availability of REA financing has also produced dramatic results for the rural electric systems in their constant struggle to free themselves from oppressive and restrictive power supply contracts with hostile power suppliers. It has been said that man does not live by bread alone. It can also be said that rural electric systems will not survive on a favorable power cost lone. There are times and circumstances when an otherwise reasonable wholesale power rate can and does become a Trojan horse which, if accepted, carries with it the shackles of dual rates, the menace of territorial invasion, and other possibilities of damage which a hostile power supplier can inflict upon a wholly dependent customer. It was in clear recognition of this fact that REA has adopted the third criterion for generation and transmission loans.

The work of providing every American farm family and every rural resident with low-cost electric service depends upon the security and effectiveness of the rural electric systems which have brought service to rural areas when no one else would.

I am proud to report that we are making substantial progress in eliminating dual rates and restrictive provisions in wholesale power contracts. In 1961, 19 power companies in contracts with 189 REA-financed rural electric systems were requiring some form of dual rate restrictions on the resale of their power in cooperative service territory. Under this administration we have refused to approve dual rate contracts as they have come up for renewal. As a result, such restrictions have not been dropped by 8 of the 19 companies, serving approximately 65 borrowers. We are going to keep at it until we eliminate these restrictions in the rest.

All this is involved in the work of providing electricity at the lowest possible cost for rural consumers. Also involved are the steps that have been taken to win a greater measure of territorial protection for the rural electric systems of this country, the growing movement for rural area development in which your cooperatives as well as REA are playing a highly significant role, and the development of sounder operations, better management, and greater member service through your cooperative organizations.

It is not surprising that our efforts to get on with the work of rural electrification have prompted an attack on REA and the rural electric cooperatives of unprecedented fury. This, unfortunately, is one of the challenges of growth. Selfish interests which previously were content to wait for the rural electric cooperatives to die on the vine are suddenly alarmed that there is a new determination to make it possible for these systems to survive as a permanent and constructive yardstick in an essentially monopolistic industry.

It is not that these rural systems threaten either the existence or the well-being of the commercial power companies. Great as their accomplishments have been, it is a greatness measured more against the handicaps overcome, rather than by comparison with the size or resources of the commercial power companies. As controversial as the REA G. & T. program has become, REA-financed generation still is less than 1 percent of the total generating capacity of the industry. The real cause for the fury of the attack being directed against the rural electrification program now is a realization that under a revitalized REA program the rural electric cooperative systems can survive and will not eventually succumb to the high cost of rural operation, to be taken over and assimilated piece by piece as the convenience of the commercial power companies dictates.

Yet in spite of the intensity of this attack, we have moved forward. The REA-financed rural systems have grown to meet the needs of the growing numbers of people moving into their territories each year and the growing use of electricity by people who have it available.

Although there is a steady decrease in the number of farms as the technological revolution in agriculture works its changes, producing an increasing number of idle farm services in many areas, other people are moving into rural areas resulting in a net increase of rural consumers served by REA-financed systems of approximately 100,000 each year. REA-financed rural electric systems now serve about 5.1 million consumers.

The average use of electricity for farm and residential purposes continues to increase. It now averages approximately 400 kilowatt-hours per month as compared to 182 kilowatt-hours per month 10 years ago.

With the coming of electricity to rural areas has come also the possibility of business and industrial development in rural areas.

You and your cooperatives have had a direct hand in this. In one State alone, North Carolina, the rural electric membership corporations there have helped in the development of 65 business and industrial projects in the rural areas, creating almost 7,000 new jobs and injecting into the economy of those areas $29 million of new capital, of which more than 90 percent came from non-Federal sources. There was one $25,000 section 5 REA loan. The balance of the financing was secured from other sources. This kind of progress is coming in many States.

We have also made progress in the development of larger scale generating sources and power pooling arrangements which in turn mean cheaper power for rural consumers. In North Dakota REA is financing the largest lignite-burning plant on the North American continent now under construction by the Basin Electric Cooperative. This is a 200-megawatt unit which will supply the increasing power needs for an estimated 226,000 rural consumers served by 97 electric cooperatives in eight States of the Upper Missouri Basin. Using the Bureau of Reclamation's 4,000-mile transmission system and getting its standby from the Bureau of Reclamation's hydro capacity, it will rank among the most economical plants financed in the history of the REA program.

In Colorado the new Colorado-Ute plant under construction at Hayden will bring to 42,000 rural consumers of the Colorado and Wyoming area the most dramatic reduction in power cost per dollar invested in the history of the REA program. In Missouri the REA-financed cooperatives have entered into a large-scale pooling arrangement with three of the State's commercial power companies and the Southwestern Power Administration, which will materially reduce the cost of power to the rural consumers in that State. In Minnesota there has been developed a power plan by which the cooperatives expect to combine the benefits of low-cost lignite fuel in North Dakota with the transmission economies of power displacement with two power companies to produce a highly significant breakthrough in the wholesale cost of power for the cooperatives of that area.

Although REA-financed projects are being delayed in some States and defeated in one through regulatory review or court litigation, there have been significant victories in recent months. The rural cooperative systems have scored signal advances toward recognition as an accepted part of the electric industry in cases successfully concluded before regulatory commissions in Arizona, Colorado, Kentucky, and Mississippi.

Progress is also being made in achieving recognition in the courts. Mississippi and Oklahoma decisions have upheld the cooperatives' right to continue service in rural areas which are annexed to municipalities. The Arizona, Georgia, and Nevada courts have rejected power company attempts to invade cooperative service areas.

Important progress has been made toward achieving the goal of territorial integrity, but there is a great deal to be done.

Many of you who are here today will remember my warning of this crisis in rural electrification at the 1961 regional meeting. I said then—and I repeat today—territorial encroachment cannot be met satisfactorily on a case-to-case basis. The only effective remedy was and is State legislation—"fair-play" legislation.

Your organizations have moved in several States. Although relatively few legislatures met in general session in 1962, electric cooperatives in five States sponsored territorial protection legislation. Their efforts will undoubtedly be renewed at future sessions. In the more active legislative year which has just closed, the rural electric systems in 15 States sought such legislation.

Eight States enacted laws dealing with this subject. Alaska and Nevada gave cooperatives territorial protection through the State's regulatory body. They required the issuance by their utility commissions of certificates of convenience and necessity on a "grandfather clause" basis which recognized existing service. Idaho amended its 1957 antiduplication law to put more teeth in it and came to grips with the problem of municipal annexation. Iowa for the first time subjected electric utilities to commission regulation and extended a measure of protection to electric cooperatives with respect to duplication and municipal annexation. Nebraska made a start toward solving some of its territorial conflicts. South Carolina gave statutory recognition to the rights of electric cooperatives in annexed areas. Vermont clarified its 1957 antiduplication law. South Dakota suffered a legislative setback.

In seven States, cooperative efforts met with failure. These were due largely to the opposition of power company interests. In one State, the power companies vigorously sought legislation which would have required the rural cooperatives to sell out to them.

I do not feel at all that the cause was lost in these seven States. The legislative effort has clarified the issues for the cooperatives' members, for the general public, and for the legislators. What was not accomplished in 1963 should be sought in 1964, in 1965. It can be achieved. Fair play for the cooperatives is just, it is in the public interest—and it must prevail.

The objective of rural electrification has always been and still remains the bringing of the blessings of electricity to rural areas. It is to provide these blessings in a measure comparable to those enjoyed by people living in the city. It is to make possible the same high standards of living comfort and convenience in the country that electricity affords in the city. It is to make possible economic opportunity in the rural areas comparable with the opportunity for economic growth in urban areas to the extent that electric service can do so. The objective of rural electrification, therefore, is really a parity of electric service and rates for rural people with those of city people.

As we look forward to the capital requirements of the rural electric systems, it is clearly apparent that we cannot raise the interest rates on REA loans without jeopardizing the objectives of rural electrification unless we first narrow the present gap of consumer density and revenue now so wide between the REA-financed systems and the urban-based utility systems.

Even today the REA-financed systems nationwide serve an average of only 3.3 consumers per mile of line compared with the 33 consumers which the class A and B commercial utilities average on each mile of their lines. The gross revenue of the REA-financed rural systems is only $414 per year per mile of line. The gross revenue of class A and B commercial utilities is $6,580 per year per mile of their line.

To offset the inescapable higher costs of rural service resulting from this relatively low density of consumers compounded by a lack of large power users and a lack of diversity in power load, all of which are extremely imporant in securing the maximum use of an expensive type of capital plant, the REA program has provided certain necessary equalizers. One important equalizer has been supplied by the rural consumers themselves in the nonprofit operation of their systems through cooperative-type organizations. The capital investment which rural consumers are contributing in growing amounts toward the increasing equity they are building in their cooperatively owned systems is a loan they make which bears no interest, not even 2 percent. At the present time that capital loan of the rural people themselves amounts to over three-quarters of a billion dollars. It represents an equity in their systems of approximately 22 percent. Its only return to the consumer while it is being used by the cooperative is a return in service at cost.

The two great equalizers provided by the Federal Government through the REA program have been REA technical assistance and long-term capital available at a favorable interest rate. Even the 2-percent interest rate of REA loans does not fully equalize the impact of the interest cost when compared to that borne by the consumers of commercial power companies. Because of lower revenues per dollar of investment, the rural consumer on REA-financed systems pays an average of 7.4 percent of his light bill for interest while the consumer served by the commercial power company with its higher revenue base pays an average of only 6.2 percent of his light bill for interest on the company's indebtedness.

These equalizers have been indispensable in the basic development of the rural electrification program in America. Only to the extent that these rural systems can strengthen their own economic base and develop their full operating potential can the need for these equalizers in the future be diminished or eventually eliminated.

You must have territorial protection, for only through the retention of the growing portions of your service territories can you be expected to close the gap of density and revenue which now requires the REA equalizers. You must have the right to serve the larger loads as well as the small loads in your service territories for the same reason.

You must promote economic development of the rural areas you serve, for this too serves to close the gap of density and revenue which constitutes the basic handicap of rural service.

You must develop the best possible power supply arrangements providing power sources that are not only adequate and economical, but also conducive to the security and effectiveness of your system operations.

You must seek constant improvement of your management, your operations, and your member services.

The REA program under this administration is directed toward the full assistance of your efforts to accomplish these purposes. This is why we have suggested a model Territorial Integrity Act for your consideration in your States. This is why we are determined to eliminate restrictive dual rate provisions in your wholesale power contracts. This is why we are assisting you through our rural area development activities in the economic development of your service territories. This is why we have recently established a new Power Supply Survey unit in the Administrator's office to assist borrowers in finding the most effective power supply arrangements through early study, long-range planning, and more active negotiation. This is why we have launched our five-star member service program to assist you in reappraising your organizations, their management and operations, and member services.

This is the course on which we are embarked. This is the challenge of growth. For those who clamor for a change in the interest rate, a curtailment of Federal assistance for rural electrification in this country, this is a challenge to support us in building stronger rural systems so that such equalizers may eventually be eliminated without destroying the basic values of this program.

To follow the other course, to leave the rural systems open to creeping dismemberment as portions of their service territories become attractive to the selfish designs of other utilities, to deny them the tools needed for the economic development of their service territories, to force them to depend upon high cost wholesale power as captives of hostile power suppliers will not only perpetuate the need for Federal equalizers and assistance, but intensify it.

All this we must understand and the American public must understand if, as President Kennedy said 3 years ago, we are to "get on with our work" of providing lower cost electricity in rural America.

THE NEED TO PRESERVE AND PUBLISH DOCUMENTARY SOURCE MATERIAL OF SIGNIFICANCE TO U.S. HISTORY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial entitled "The Nation's Past," appearing in the October 2, 1963, edition of the Washington Post, states concisely and with clarity the case favoring prompt approval of H.R. 6237 which authorizes grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States.

This editorial reads as follows:

THE NATION'S PAST

The House votes today on a proposal to authorize Federal contributions of $500,000 a year to projects encouraged by the National Historical Publications Commission. These projects include the completion of the collection and publication of papers of great American statesmen now underway, the completion of the documentary history of the Constitution and the first 10 amendments and the editing and publishing of the records of the First Congress.

The proposals suffer from their modesty and may, by reason of it, fail to secure deserved support. In a burst of interest, the Congress once authorized the expenditure of $2.8 million on the papers of the "War of the Rebellion." Congress didn't get its money's worth because the work was not done under the supervision of the community of historical scholars. It has, so far, been less generous with projects for the preservation of the great historical documents of the period of the Nation's founding. With very little money, the Historical Publications Commission, in the past decade, has encouraged and aided a score of large undertakings concerned with the source materials of American history. These include the papers of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, James Madison, John Jay and Alexander Hamilton. Funds from private sources have endowed these projects and made them possible and funds from nongovernmental sources will continue to bear a great part of the burden.

The appropriations to be made under the authorization on which the House is to act will bolster this effort with Federal assistance and grants. Federal participation is essential to maintain the continuity of the effort. It should, in all justice, be a larger Federal participation. A people with an appropriate respect for its historic past and its priceless documentary records can no longer withhold modest financial support for this program.

As suggested in this editorial, Federal participation in this field is not new. On numerous occasions in the past Congress has authorized and appropriated funds in support of special projects of importance to the preservation of documents and material vital to our national history. Unfortunately, this essential work has never been completed.

H.R. 6237 would translate prior sporadic Federal participation into a coordinated program. Under the plans developed by the National Historical Publications Commission, Federal funds during an initial period would be utilized principally in the preservation and publication of material relating to the debates on the adoption of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the works and debates of the First Federal Congress.

It is tragic indeed that almost 200 years have elapsed without our scholars and students and the public generally having the fullest knowledge of the critical period during which our Nation was formed. Yet, unless and until the documentary source material of the period is compiled and published, we will continue to be handicapped in our knowledge and understanding to the same extent as if this material at some time in the past had been destroyed or was not otherwise available.

It is unthinkable that this best evidence of what occurred, what was said, and what was done, should be lost to us and to future generations.

H.R. 6237 deserves the overwhelming support of the House of Representatives for through this more effective program we can obtain a clearer insight into our history.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader if he would advise us as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the acting minority leader, I advise the House that there is no further business for this week and that it will be our intention to ask to go over when we have announced the program for next week.

Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day, and there are five suspensions. First is the resolution agreeing to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3369, involving extension of the Civil Rights Commission. Second is S. 13, transfer of land to Fayetteville, Ark. Third is H.R. 2436, benefits for veterans with conditional discharges. Fourth is H.R. 3941, veterans burial allowances. Fifth is H.R. 8611, indemnification of research contractors.

Tuesday there is scheduled the conference report on H.R. 7179, 1964 appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Wednesday is undetermined.

For Thursday and the balance of the week there is scheduled the independent offices appropriation bill for 1964.

Mr. Speaker, this, of course, is made subject to the general reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, may I advise Members that we expect rollcall votes on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday of next week.

It may that there will be other business on Wednesday which will necessitate the presence of Members.

Mr. ARENDS. Might I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he is aware as to whether or not they have reached agreement on the Department of Defense appropriation bill?

Mr. ALBERT. No; the gentleman from Texas, I think, is here today. They have not reached agreement, but this matter is programed at the request of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ARENDS. It is scheduled in anticipation of an agreement being reached by that time?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to express to the leadership my appreciation of the scheduling of H.R. 3369 for consideration under suspension of the rules on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which I introduced and which has been amended in the Senate. I have a very deep interest in the legislation and I express my appreciation to the leadership for scheduling it.

Mr. ARENDS. Would the gentleman object if I referred to it as the McIntire bill?

Mr. McINTIRE. If the gentleman will yield further, not at all, sir.

Mr. ALBERT. I advise the gentleman that we are pleased to cooperate with the distinguished gentleman from Maine.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1963

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

WE ARE DEEPLY INDEBTED TO THE GOVERNMENT OF CHILE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the third Inter-American Music Festival in Washington, D.C., was postponed early this year because sufficient funds could not be raised.

The total effect of this failure—and it was a failure of leadership on the part of this administration—in terms of our relationships with the peoples of the nations of Latin America was very harmful, particularly in view of the emphasis which both Cuba and the Soviet Union are placing on the arts, and the financial support they are giving the art programs designed for export as a means of winning friends in, and influencing the peoples of, these great nations.

Fortunately for us, the Government of Chile has now taken the initiative and organized a series of cultural programs of outstanding merit in our Nation's Capital.

President Kennedy, speaking to the members of the Alliance for Progress on March 13, 1961, said:

> We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need teachers of your literature and history and tradition, access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers.

Ambassador Sergio Gutierrez Olivos brilliantly responded to President Kennedy's invitation, and it is well for us to carefully observe, for we have much to learn from Chile and the other nations of Latin America.

Let us hope that other Latin American countries will follow Chile's shining example in the fine arts which unite us, for this is a major way for our peoples to reach a deep and sympathetic understanding of each other, something that is truly a necessity in these critical days of cold war, subversion, and intrigue.

I include as part of my remarks relevant articles from the leading newspapers of Washington, D.C.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 23, 1963]

PRESIDENT GIVES MAESTRO ADVICE

(By Pat Saltonstall)

"Give up music and go into politics—and if you do, I'll quit," President Kennedy advised Concert Maestro Leonard Bernstein last fall.

The flattering quip from the Nation's top politician was recalled by Mr. Bernstein, a world renowned conductor-composer, in a sudden flashback. He was surrounded by people asking how he had become such a skilled speaker.

The Chilean Embassy reception where this took place followed the presentation of "Image of Chile" at the State Department's west auditorium. The series of cultural programs spotlighting Chile was inaugurated with a program of ancient music along with poetry readings by Mrs. Bernstein, actress Felicia Montealegre, who retired from the stage and television screen 5 years ago.

TEARS

Mrs. Bernstein's magic, as she read the selections of two Chilean poets in English and then in Spanish, managed to reduce her husband to tears, he admitted later.

But the man, known to millions as the conductor of the New York Philharmonic, held center stage himself as he eloquently told the audience the story of his love for Chile, finally bringing him marriage to his Chilean wife.

When he finally visited there in 1958, he recalled, he managed to cross paths with another American on a now famous Latin American trip—Richard Nixon.

Mr. Bernstein received accolades, "roses * * * kisses," he said. The Nixon reception included tomatoes, eggs, and worse—momentos of an angry, hostile people.

The two finally met and compared notes. "Where does the difference lie?" Mr. Bernstein said they asked themselves. "In music. We had music and he didn't."

Pleading for constant and expanding cultural exchange programs and whimsically asking his audience not to take the "financial structures of the State Department too seriously," Mr. Bernstein then spotted Mrs. Dean Rusk down front and said:

"Mrs. Rusk, please convince the Secretary of State to send us back to Chile."

The plea had a hearing during an intermission as Mrs. Rusk asked pointed questions to secure the specific information she said she needed in order to report back to her husband. Also on hand were Assistant Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs Lucius Battle and his wife.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz introduced Mr. Bernstein, who then introduced Chilean Ambassador Gutierrez.

In his remarks, the Secretary recalled the words of the late labor leader, Philip Murray, that what he wants for the workingman is a carpet on the floor, pictures on the wall, and music in his house.

In his tribute to Chile he noted that it "may be just geographical coincidence" but that the Andes and all Latin American mountains run north and south so that there are no barriers between the two continents. He called these the "backbone of freedom among the Americas."

NO BARRIERS

As to boundaries in general, Secretary Wirtz said they may exist between nations, but that there are none between "people and ideas and beauty."

The Ancient Music Group of the Catholic University of Chile, which gave the concert of 17th century music, turned up at the late reception. So did the Wirtzes and other principals.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Oct. 1, 1963]

RECITAL CONTINUES SERIES

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy was the host last evening when Chilean pianist Claudio Arrau presented a recital in the Department of State auditorium.

The program was one of a series being given by the Embassy of Chile with members of the Cabinet as cosponsors.

The Attorney General made the remarks and introduced the Chilean Ambassador, Sergio Gutierrez Olivos, who introduced the guest artist.

Mr. Arrau, considered one of the foremost living interpreters of Beethoven, performed five Beethoven sonatas.

Ambassador Gutierrez said the cultural series—first of its kind—was arranged in response to President Kennedy's call for increased cultural exchanges between the United States and Latin American nations.

Invitations were by members of the Cabinet.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 25, 1963]

CHILEANS PRESENT EXQUISITE IMAGE

(By Irving Lowens)

Washington's music lovers got their first exposure to the "Image of Chile" last night at the Washington Cathedral.

Before a surprisingly large audience (which broke precedent by applauding before the concert was 10 minutes old), the Ancient Music Group of the Catholic University of Chile presented the first in an intriguing month-long series of events designed by the Embassy to give residents of the Nation's Capital an idea of Chilean culture based on knowledge rather than ignorance.

The ensemble, unobtrusively directed by Sylvia Soublette, might as well be called the Chilean Pro Musica, since it is frankly modeled after Noah Greenberg's renowned New York Pro Musica. It is, if I am not mistaken, the only such group active in Latin America.

For the most part, yesterday's program consisted of pieces drawn from the marvelous 16th century Spanish repertory which Mr. Greenberg has revitalized. Miss Soublette offered both familiar and unfamiliar works, some of them (such as Juan del Encina's "Una sanosa porffa") of unsurpassed loveliness and eloquence.

But it was not in this music that the Chileans made their strongest impression; rather, it was in the alternately simple and exotic early music of their own country.

As the intermission approached tenor Rene Ramos sang (with guitar accompaniment) a transparent, unaffected strophic song of colonial Chile called "Anoche estando durmiendo." This was so plainly novel that it had the unprecedented effect of turning the great masterpiece by Guerrero which followed it on the program into something of an anticlimax.

The same magic was recaptured in the concert's final group, three perfectly stunning choral-instrumental pieces from the little Chilean town of La Tirana, ritual in character, with villancico elements, echoes of folksong and chant, and even traces of the indigenous music of the region.

It must be reported that the Chileans did not show the polish of the New York Pro Musica, hardly surprising since Mr. Greenberg is without peer in this field. Furthermore, there were difficulties with pitch at times, aggravated by the Cathedral's acoustics and the temperamental instruments. And while the vocalists were quite excellent, the players seemed so concerned about getting the notes right that not much attention could be paid to such subtleties as nuance shading.

However, Miss Soublette was not trying to compete with Mr. Greenberg. I think that she was trying to show that Chileans, like Americans, know the wonderful and too long neglected heritage of medieval and renaissance music. And she was also trying to show that Chile not only shares this heritage, but has an ancient music of its own worth hearing.

She was successful on both counts. Indeed, I think she was overly modest in programing so little of the music of her own country and other Latin American countries, all virtually unknown in the United States.

The group will have two more opportunities to be heard on the local scene. A previously unannounced concert takes place tomorrow night on the University of Maryland campus, and on Saturday afternoon at 2:30 p.m., the Ancient Music Group will be at the National Gallery.

Washingtonians are welcome at both events. The interest of the Chilean music alone should draw you to one of these fine concerts. This even the New York Pro Musica can't bring you.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 25, 1963]

CHILEANS EXCEL IN CATHEDRAL CONCERT

(By Paul Hume)

Chile is enriching Washington with a marvelous outpouring of her cultural life this autumn in programs of music and literature and exhibitions of painting and photography.

Last night the Ancient Music Group of the Catholic University of Chile sang and played an evening of exquisite beauty in Washington Cathedral. With dulcimer, lute, viols, guitar, recorders, harpsichord and an excellent quartet of singers, they traveled with an ease that comes from knowledge through music of the 15th and 16th centuries.

Seated on a raised platform at the Cathedral's crossing, the musicians were heard easily from any point in the great church. It was fascinating to study the sound of this music, often intricately woven, often of pure melody, and to note that it traveled clearly and without loss of volume. Surely this has to do with the fact that much of the music was written in a contrapuntal style that is suited to such a building.

The members of the Chilean group are sensitive artists, beautifully skilled on their instruments and in their song. There are seven players and four singers whose mutual respect and common taste made for a succession of constantly sustained beauties in sound.

There were some particularly wonderful combinations especially when the lyric tenor of Rene Ramos mingled with Sylvia Soublette's clear, fine soprano in a lovely work in which the instruments imitated the voices. The quartet of recorders within this group is the finest I can recall hearing anywhere.

The Ancient Music Group will appear Saturday at 2:30 p.m. in the East Garden Court of the National Gallery. It will be a rare treat for those fortunate enough to be there. The concert is open to the public without charge.

We are already deeply indebted to the Embassy of Chile for its generosity and imagination in bringing us this glimpse of its musical wealth. Before the month of October is over, we shall have come to know these friendly neighbors better than ever, thanks to this unparalleled procession of her arts.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Sept. 22, 1963]

MUSIC FESTIVAL IS SAD LOSS

(By Irving Lowens)

Because no way could be found to raise approximately $50,000, Washington (and the whole country) lost the Third Inter-American Music Festival. Originally scheduled to take place here last spring, at last report it has been indefinitely postponed.

It is difficult to estimate the total effect of this fiasco in shaping the image of the United States that prevails in Latin America, where music and the arts are considered important, but I would guess that it could hardly enhance our popularity.

Now, the Embassy of a single South American nation this week launches an extraordinary series of cultural events here in an attempt to project the image of Chile.

It is significant that music is the heart of this ambitious undertaking.

FANCY INAUGURAL

The inaugural, an invitation affair in the State Department's plush auditorium, takes place tonight.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz is scheduled to preside. Leonard Bernstein will follow; then comes a brief concert by the Ancient Music Group of the Catholic University of Chile; finally, Felicia Montealegre (the Chilean actress who in private life is Mrs. Leonard Bernstein) will bring the evening to a close with readings of Chilean poetry.

After this stylish opener, two exhibits, four panel discussions, and nine concerts will be presented within the next 30 days. Here is the music schedule:

September 24: Ancient Music Group, Catholic University of Chile; Washington Cathedral, 8:30 p.m.

September 28: Ancient Music Group, Catholic University of Chile; National Gallery, 2:30 p.m.

September 30: Claudio Arrau, pianist; State Department Auditorium, 8:30 p.m. (invitation only).

October 8: Claremont String Quartet, with Mario Miranda, pianist, assisting; Pan American Union, 8:30 p.m.

October 13: Chilean Folklore Group, Eugenio Dittborn, director; Lisner Auditorium, 8:30 p.m.

October 14: Alfonso Montecino, pianist; Cramton Auditorium, 8:30 p. m.

October 17: Chilean Folklore Group; Pan American Union, 8:30 p.m. (invitation only).

October 18: Ena Bronstein, pianist; Pan American Union, 8:30 p.m.

October 21: Edgar Fischer, cellist; Pan American Union, 8:30 p.m.

On October 24 at American University, a roundtable discussion of the "Image of the Music" winds things up.

IMAGE OF CHILE

There will be not only Chilean artists, but Chilean music as well—yes, there is Chilean music—and other music of the Western Hemisphere.

What is our image of Chile? Is it just that long stringbean of a country on the west coast of South America, filled with strange foreigners who are just waiting for cultural enlightenment from here?

I am afraid so—and and it is a terrible distorted image. It is difficult to find an educated South American who is not conversant with our literature, our art, our music; it is just as difficult to find an educated American who can even recognize the names of the creative spirits among the Chileans.

Until we know more than we do about a nation like Chile, how can we possibly hope to exert any real influence there.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

As Prof. Eugene Current-Garcia, of Auburn University puts it, "for years our general knowledge of Latin America has been limited to the glamorous tourist advertisements and feature articles of the flying-down-to-Rio variety. Small wonder that the American public, lulled into somnolent apathy for so many decades, is now electrified and bewildered by the ominous turn of events in Cuba since 1959."

On March 13, 1961, speaking to the members of the Alliance for Progress, President Kennedy said:

"We invite our friends in Latin America to contribute to the enrichment of life and culture in the United States. We need teachers of your literature and history and tradition, access to your music, your art, and the thought of your great philosophers."

Ambassador Sergio Gutierrez Olivos, who arrived on the Washington scene only last February, has done no more than accept the President's invitation. Yet the boldness of his "Image of Chile" project could have a profound effect on American cultural provincialism.

Like many brilliant ideas, this is a remarkably simple one. Other embassies are watching with the keenest interest, and other spectacular displays may follow.

In passing it might be noted that enough funds had been raised in Chile to send a symphony orchestra to the United States to participate in the Third Inter-American Music Festival when we called the whole thing off.

During the next month, it behooves us to listen carefully. As President Kennedy humbly and accurately noted "we know we have much to learn."

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGES "A BEACON OF HOPE"

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, a significant facet of our Government's educational and cultural exchange programs, which have been so justly described by a citizens' advisory group as "a beacon of hope," is the foreign leader program. Under its auspices influential and articulate citizens of other countries visit the United States and see for themselves our people and our land, the day-to-day workings of a truly open society.

I was privileged recently to attend a reception at the Department of State for such a group of visitors: 13 women civic leaders from 7 Latin American countries who were just beginning a 2-month tour of observation and study in the United States. I commend to readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the brief but eloquent welcome extended by our former colleague, Mrs. Catherine D.

Norrell, presently Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs:

Remarks by Mrs. Catherine D. Norrell, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, at a Reception for Latin American Women Civic Leaders Visiting the United States Under the Foreign Leader Program of the Department of State, September 20, 1963

The Department of State, through the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, extends to you, our guests from Latin America, a cordial welcome.

If this is your first visit to the United States, our hope is that you look upon it as a voyage of discovery. One of the things you will become aware of is that we are made up of a variety of races and nationalities—that, through the waves of peoples coming here, we are an amalgam of peoples; that through a fortunate alchemy, these varied strains have, we believe, been brought together to show the essential relatedness of all men.

So we know our dependence on other nations and the contributions they have made through those who have come here to live.

You will find, as you travel the length and breadth of the United States, that we have our problems—much unfinished business. We no doubt have problems that are common to both Americas. Perhaps through the interchange of ideas, both countries can come nearer to a solution of these problems.

We in the Bureau are fortunate to be part of a program of educational and cultural exchange. Our comings and goings constitute a great two-way street in the world today. We believe that these are among the most hopeful roads to mutual understanding and peace.

You who come to our country bring much to us, and we are grateful for it. We are hopeful that when you return to your countries that your luggage will contain not only some knick-knacks of American life, but a deeper understanding of this young, open, and evolving society.

We appreciate the honor you pay us in visiting us. May it be a rewarding experience in every way and may we express the hope that we will "keep in touch"—that this is the beginning of many warm friendships.

DECISION ON SALE OF WHEAT BY THE UNITED STATES TO RUSSIA IS IMMINENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Staggers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, a decision on the sale of wheat by the United States to Communist Russia is imminent. I feel it should be considered with great care and all implications should have a great deal of study.

I wish to express my opposition to this proposed sale. As I have said many, many times, before and since becoming a Member of Congress, it is my belief that God-fearing people and Communists cannot coexist peacefully.

LUNAR LANDING LUNACY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the House Committee on Appropriations is scheduled to report a bill to provide funds to finance the space program for fiscal year 1964. In this connection, I have some additional observations which support my previous statements in favor of a substantial cut in the $5.4 billion authorized by Congress for this agency.

According to the newspapers the President has launched a vigorous fight against a threat to cut his budget request. The President is quoted as saying "an energetic continuation of our strong space effort is essential, and the need for this effort is, if anything, increased by our intent to work for increasing cooperation if the Soviet Government proves willing."

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the space program and in particular the Apollo moonshot project, let me first recall that President Kennedy, speaking to a joint session of the Congress on May 25, 1961, delivered what was described as a special message on urgent national needs.

In this message, as my colleagues will remember, the President told Congress he believed this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before 1970, of landing a man on the moon. He made it clear such an effort was intended to beat the Soviets in this lunar landing and not only would this be a race but that the purpose of winning the race was, as he said, to make an impact on the minds of men everywhere. In other words the objective was world prestige.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years and several billion dollars of the taxpayers' money has gone since that goal was established. The other day President Kennedy at the opening of the United Nations General Assembly's 18th session made another speech. This time the subject of space was again in his remarks. To the United Nations the President posed a question by which he completely reversed his former position. "Why, therefore, should man's first flight to the moon be a matter of national competition?" he asked.

In other words, the President, to everyone's surprise, has now about-faced. It was, only last July, at a press conference that Mr. Kennedy dismissed the idea of cooperation with Russia. He said, then, it was essential for us to dominate space.

The question naturally arises, why this complete turnabout? I think Congress and the people are entitled to an answer.

According to Newsweek magazine there are compelling down-to-earth reasons which explain the President's about-face. This magazine said the first of these reasons was that the United States appeared to be racing to the moon alone, and secondly it appeared that this project timewise has lagged and there is no chance of the 1970 target date being met.

As to the slippage in the Apollo moonshot project it seems obvious such a delay will result in postponement in paying for the program. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations has been more successful than I have in obtaining information about such deferment. If contracts are behind schedule, the reimbursement of contractors also should be behind schedule. Space Agency officials, however, have not been able to furnish me with the detail of how much of the money programed for payment in 1964 will not be needed until 1965.

As to the President's sudden reversal in policy Walter Lippmann had this comment. He said there had been two big mistakes.

One, he said, was the President's original commitment to put a man, a living person, rather than instruments on the moon. The other mistake was the 1970 dateline when the man was to land on the moon. Mr. Lippmann pointed out that these two mistakes transformed a fascinating scientific experiment into what he described as a morbid and vulgar stunt.

Administrator James Webb, Director of the National Space Agency, having rejected the joint United States-Soviet moon project one day in a St. Louis speech, after the President's United Nations talk, changed his tune overnight. However, he could not cancel previous comments by his associates such as one made 13 days before by Robert R. Gilruth, Director of the Manned Space Flight Center, who had said he trembled at the thought.

A month ago, Mr. Speaker, it seemed I was almost alone in Congress in my misgiving about spending so much money to land a man on the moon. As the facts have become better known, I am beginning to find I have company. Others are beginning to question the desirability, both of cost and of haste, as I have questioned them.

As to the suggested collaboration with the Russians, Mr. Speaker, I am sure from what American engineers say, technical impediments to a joint venture, if nothing else, should discourage any really serious consideration. Personally, I hope President Kennedy's gesture in coexistence with the Communists will be speedily forgotten. From a military standpoint scientific cooperation is risky. In fact, it is worse than that. Our military leaders and those charged with the responsibility of our national security must have shuddered when word reached them of this new proposal.

From a scientific angle, of course, the idea while attractive at first blush is quite impractical and the added cost in billions of dollars should be enough to kill it.

On the plus side perhaps now, Mr. Speaker, without losing too much prestige, the lunar landing project can be slowed down or phased out. Our goal instead of world prestige might well be instead to increase the knowledge of all mankind. When the basic causes of the cold war are removed, and when manifestations of the international conspiracy such as the Berlin wall and Cuba are solved with better grace I could support a United States-Russian joint program. I do not think Mr. Khrushchev is interested in humanity the way we are.

The Apollo program for landing men on the moon at a $20 to $40 billion cost should be deferred. Why not institute a reappraisal of a goal to be done by scientific experts and I do not mean political experts.

If this were done I predict the lunar landing project would be deemphasized and the President's national goal of a moon landing would be canceled, at least until there is evidence that the Russians are developing new and larger boosters—so the United States would not be in a race alone.

On the other hand, unmanned exploration of space might well be upgraded because this cheaper program could provide necessary and better evaluation of space potentials.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to take political considerations out of space exploration. The scientists and professional engineers should be the ones to be consulted. An independent study is needed to determine what is or what is not justified in light of the value of the knowledge to be gained. This should not be a "moondoggle" or a leaf-raking WPA. Either stop now or it will be never.

Mr. Speaker, Congress can save billions of dollars and at the same time assure that the basic interests of science are achieved within our capability and within costs we can afford. We should meet this issue now before it is too late. Let us get this program back on the track—the way it was intended before we got "moonstruck."

INVITATION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO VISIT VIETNAM AND THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal pride and a feeling of deep appreciation that each of us accepted the invitation of the Secretary of the Army to visit Vietnam and the Kingdom of Thailand, as well as other countries in southeast Asia. We were briefed informatively and participated in field operations and studied various phases, including military procedures, of our Nation's activities in the several countries.

The distinguished escorting officer, Lt. Col. William D. Lynch, and officers assigned to us at the various points of embarkation, bent every effort to supervise arrangements, conducted, advised, and controlled our actions, as well as adding to our comfort and well-being. These superb military leaders honored us by their interest and presence. The pleasing personalities of these gentlemen of class made our fatiguing and exhausting journey a pleasant and happy one. We owe a debt of gratitude to Gen. Paul D. Harkins, commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam; Hon. Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., U.S. Ambassador; Maj. Gen. Charles J. Timmes, chief, Military Assistance Advisory Group; Col. John P. Jones, Jr., Army attaché; Adm. Harry D. Felt, commander, South East Asia Treaty Organization; Hon. Kenneth Todd Young, U.S. Ambassador to Thailand; Maj. Gen. Theodore J. Conway, chief, Joint U.S. Military Assistance Group; Col. Frederick H. Gaston, Jr., Army attaché; and Lt. Col. Elbert S. Kerstetter, USAF, Office of A. of S. Operations, for their many contributions to the success of our undertaking. The party included the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI], chairman; the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY], Mr. Urian of the House Appropriations Committee, joined by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], and the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

The growth of American world power after the Second World War, plunged our Nation into many foreign commitments and responsibilities, resulting in a new and consuming study of our future role in international affairs, and resulting in the formulation of a new American foreign policy.

Our entrance into the United Nations, with new alliances and regional pacts, and our worldwide struggle against Sino-Soviet world domination, only served to alert us to the dramatic perils facing the liberty-loving nations of the world.

Further, the Korean conflict hastened our rearmament in the West and enticed Japan and Germany into the circle of Western security.

The average citizen of the United States must realize that each segment of the world's population has its different customs, culture, and living standards—each different from the other; that these millions aspire to, perhaps, the same things in life that we do but do not have our rich inheritance of freedom and opportunities, so that the approach to establishing in their minds the true purposes of the American people to protect and safeguard their liberties, improve their economy by increasing opportunity to develop their industries and learn, through education and experience, to bring about abundance for a better life must be carefully studied—and each peoples handled differently in an overall flexible foreign policy.

Most of the population of South Vietnam are young, the biological study in 1955–56 indicated that 85 percent of the males and 90 percent of the females were married before attaining their 29th year. A survey by a French team—Mission Economie et Humanisme—in 1957–59 found that in a number of localities about 50 percent of the population was under 15 years of age; further observed a high mortality rate among children at an early age mainly due to nutritional problems and other health factors.

The physical and geographical location of the Republic of Vietnam contributes to those conditions inimical to good health. It lies between 8° and 17° north latitude with an area estimated at 178,000 square kilometers—96,000 square miles—and a long coastline on the China Sea. Three geographical areas can be defined:

First. A narrow strip of coastal plains in central Vietnam hemmed in by the Anamite chain.

Second. The Highland Plateau.

Third. The extensive delta of Mekong.

The tropical climate and monsoon influence the change of the seasons—in Saigon and the delta region the rainy season starts in May and lasts until November when the dry season starts ending in May. The rainy season influences the high atmospheric pressures which prevail in the winter months thus equalizing changes in temperature in the delta region—the average in Saigon 25° to 30° Centigrade. But in the north distinct differences of temperature between winter and summer prevail—the dry season is extended—as in Nha Trang Oui Nhon of 8 months duration. Modified temperatures are influenced by the altitude as in the highlands—Dalat—that enjoys a mild climate. These physical features are a favorable influence for raising agricultural products needing good soil, fair temperatures, and water.

The coastline of 1,800 kilometers long offers many estuaries and natural havens. It is bordered by a shallow "continental shelf" which runs narrowly along the central Vietnam and expands to the south, facing the Mekong Delta, favoring good living conditions for numerous species of fish and lobsters. Also worth mentioning in the delta is an important network of canals and streams, presenting a lot of facilities for transportation, irrigation, and also fishing.

The inhabitants must live and work in the water. This environment leads to the transmission of any number of organic agents of disease. The main foodstuff, rice, is dependent on water from the canals, rivers, and sky. May—in the place cited—has summed up the situation in Vietnam as follows:

> From the waters people get their food, also their cholera, their dysenteries, their typhoid fevers, their malaria; from the earth they get their hookworm; from the crowded villages they get their tuberculosis and their yaws; from the type of housing they have been forced to adopt, they get their plague and typhus; and from the food which earth, temperature, and rain produce, their beriberi.

There is no doubt that the entire economy and health of the country hinge on water for better or for worse.

POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHY

According to the last general census in 1959, estimates of population give the figure of 13,789,000 people unequally distributed on 171,665 kilometers of land.

About 17 percent of them live in urban or suburban areas, the rest of the population—83 percent—being supposed to live in rural areas. The area devoted to food, textile, rubber, and other crops have been estimated to 28,628 square kilometers, that is only 16.7 percent of the total area. It is also worth noting that 87 percent of these cultivated areas are kept for paddy growing.

The population consists of four main ethnic groups.

First. Vietnamese, comprising about 85 percent of the total.

Second. Moi or Highlanders, estimated at about 250,000 living entirely in the plateau regions of central Vietnam.

Third. Cham numbering some 20,000 scattered in small communities in certain regions of central Vietnam.

Fourth. Chinese, living predominantly in urban areas.

The population density map reflects somewhat this distribution by racial origin and shows that Vietnamese ethnic groups live in flat delta regions, with only a few exceptions the refugees from North Vietnam, resettled in certain highland regions.

It may be worth noticing the massive immigration of 850,000 people from North Vietnam in 1954.

The birth rate is now estimated at about 36 percent for the whole Republic, with local variations—35.5 percent in Saigon and 50 percent in Hue.

The strategic hamlet Ap-Ha is at Vinh Binh village, 24 kilometers from My Tho in the district of Ho Dong. It is 1 of the 10 such hamlets that constitute the village of Vinh Binh. The hamlet stretches along the two banks of the Canal Viah Loi and is bordered west by the hamlet Dong and on the east by the village Thanh Tri. Its population of 611 gain their living chiefly from the cultivation of rice, from fishing, and from small village trades.

The term "Ap" is used to signify "hamlet." Ha was selected as a strategic hamlet November 1961. Most of the work has been completed.

According to Lt. Nguyen Van Tien, chief of Hoa Dong district, the civil administrative staff, the military, and groups of young people have been schooled in the concepts and guiding principles behind the organization of these hamlets. These policies guided their work to build for the greatest security, as well as social and economic development.

This work was accomplished in two stages—establishing a basic administrative organization together with the building of a defense system.

The later stage of reinforcing these services for such improvements as would contribute to the economic, spiritual, and social development of the inhabitants with the restoration of peace.

The work accomplished in the administrative field resulted in a completed census—the election of their chiefs by 25 groups of interrelated families. A temporary administrative committee was designated awaiting the election of the official hamlet council.

In this new busy defense community, two groups of Republican youth were organized. A building for the youth movement was erected and several other structures are planned. The National Revolutionary Movement has 46 members, and the Vietnamese Women's Solidarity Movement numbers 33.

A defense wall of 1,200 meters in circumference is being built to encircle the hamlet running along nearby rice fields. The round belt consists of a large trench about 2 meters wide and 1½ meters deep, with the piled up earth serving as an embankment inside.

The trench is covered with snares and the top of the banked earth with sharpened bamboo stakes pointing in all directions embedded in thorny branches, with mines placed on the side.

It was a tedious task and yet in spite of the slow work—half the project achieved—the youths who are responsible for the defense of the hamlet became more confident every day. The morale of the youth is stronger now, being trained by the local Bao Au to use guns, hand grenades, and sidearms and trained to fight under professional supervision.

Here and there in strategic spots are watch towers manned day and night by the young people, while others lie in ambush along the paths leading to the hamlet.

Lieutenant Tien revealed that at the very beginning of the program, the local people had exposed a secret agent of the Vietcong who had hoped to sabotage their work.

This action showed courage and confidence—no one would have dared before to denounce a Vietcong for fear of reprisals. Bamboo fences are constructed around their homes. White washed fences make the detection of prowlers at night easier. With the distribution of arms and weapons taken from the Communists, a new spirit pervaded the community. They were now permitted to defend themselves with the very weapons—although not of the latest model—which in the hands of the Communists constituted a constant menace of death for them.

In a touching show of solidarity, 17 families that had been liberated by the men of the 7th D.I. were given food and lodging by the villagers until such time as they were able to settle themselves. This should not be long in a hamlet whose defenses are strong and who have confidence in their work to reach their ultimate goal for all—a happy life with economic, social, and spiritual well-being in a peaceful and prosperous community.

The United States provides each such hamlet with equipment, guns, rifles, barbed wire, telephones, radios—to give warning upon attack. To each village whose elected officials adopt a project or promotion to aid the economy, the United States will give financial help. The building up of its resources or small public works—as a dam or bridge—or improvements—such as a road—gives each inhabitant a proprietary feeling to defend it against the Vietcong forces. These little democracies are making the difference in diluting the sympathies of the rural areas' population for the Vietcong movement.

There is no question that the Reds in South Vietnam are seeking to stem the growing confidence of ultimate victory by the South Vietnamese in this southeast Asian Republic.

The U.S. Ambassador, Frederick Nolting, Jr., speaking at the opening on Wednesday, November 14, 1962, of a new Vietnamese-American cultural center, at Hue, north of Saigon, said, "the struggle will persist, perhaps for years but, today, the Communists are being forced to the defensive. The blows of the Vietnamese armed forces are forcing them to abandon large formations and to resort, instead, to harassing, small-scale attacks of stealth and murder—the tactics of gangsters.

The strategic hamlet program numbering in excess of 17,000 hamlets is cutting them off from the people, and the opportunity to steal food and kidnap recruits. Intelligence reports reveal, increasingly, that the morale of the Vietcong is slipping.

Every kind of precaution is taken by the Government to prevent materials, foodstuffs, and supplies from falling into the hands of the enemy—the commercial shipment of rice to Vietcong infested territory is forbidden to five provinces. Also, strict supervisory provisions are exacted in the shipments to nine other provinces in an effort to starve out the guerrillas. The Government has taken over the shipment of rice to Quang Duc, Darlac, Pleeku, Kontum, and Phu Bon provinces. Trucks carrying rice to the other nine provinces are requested to have one door in the van which is sealed by the Saigon police and opened by the local authorities at their point of destination. Each shipment requires a permit, issued by the police. Three thousand blankets were airlifted to Hue and distributed to Montagard refugees who fled Vietcong-controlled mountain areas.

Large Government ground forces are airlifted to areas where Vietcong units are reported to be operating—endeavoring to make contact. U.S. helicopters, H–2, are used to facilitate the transportation of these troops. One such, Operation Eagle, in Rhing Dinh Province—85 miles north of Saigon—at the time we were there, failed to make contact with a 200 Vietcong unit operating in the area.

Reports have been received of the timidity of Vietnamese officers in the field as occurred in the fiasco by the Vietnamese forces in the Mekong River Delta at Ap Bac, where a Vietcong ambush riddled and shot down five U.S. helicopters and the demoralized Vietnamese soldiers and officers refused to counterattack. As a result there was a great deal of criticism voiced by unidentified U.S. military advisers. The U.S. commander in South Vietnam, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, referring to this incident tried to assuage tempers and said:

> I believe that anyone who criticizes the fighting qualities of the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam is doing a disservice to the thousands of gallant and courageous men who are fighting in the defense of their country.

And the distinguished military leader further said:

> About 10,000 Vietnam soldiers have been killed in action in the last year—1962—and almost 30,000 dead Vietnam insurgents attest to their courage.

U.S. advisers are not permitted by President Ngo Dinh Diem of the Vietnamese Government to lead or command the South Vietnamese in battle. He rules his military forces with an iron hand and refuses to be called by the

Communists as a vassal of the United States.

The U.S. experts have been concentrating on developing a strong military leadership both among the officers and noncommissioned officers, but it is said that unfortunately the more intelligent and educated officers are seldom assigned to the field troops, but rather to headquarters companies.

The battalions and rifle companies are led by officers who are apprehensive of the threat of removal by the President Diem—also War Minister—after their units suffer casualties, and therefore are discouraged to press the enemy in battle. Further, there are no survival benefits for the next of kin, and the Vietcong dedicated to their cause, subvert the regulars which result in many desertions.

The U.S. efforts to change the attitude of the Vietnam Government in this area has had no effect.

It is unfortunate that the Buddhist population of South Vietnam—estimated at 80 percent—of the isms are faced with a most perplexing problem—the vociferous complaints and public demonstrations of their own priests, nuns, and students that complain their Buddhist religious observances are being suppressed. President Diem's government, heretofore, has enjoyed popular support and he is still the best leader to protect U.S. interests, but we could ill afford the reputation of financing a regime that would embarrass the United States throughout southeast Asia as being anti-Buddhist. President Diem is a devout Catholic—his brother, Archbishop Ngo Dinh Thuc is the Catholic leader of the 1½ million Catholics of the nation—certainly neither would assert that only Catholics are anti-Communists. There are Buddhists acting as officials in the regime, and the great majority of the electorate are Buddhists who voted for President Diem. It would be a tragedy if this great leader were lost to the cause of freedom through a religious revolt that could easily be averted by granting the promised reforms of yesteryear.

This religious conflict has retarded the action and dissipated the war effort against the Vietcong. The military advantages may be lost through the dividing of the people resulting in a disunity of the armed forces. President Kennedy recently has made known his sentiments through General Harkness—that repressive measures against the Buddhists must stop.

A recent visit to Pope Paul VI by U Thant, Secretary of the United Nations, seems significant, especially in that in recent weeks the subject matter of religious bigotry practiced by officials of pro-Western governments has become a turbulent issue in Western circles. There is little choice between a government of communistic suppression of all religious liberty and one that curbs through aggressive laws a certain religious group. To stir up a civil religious revolution in a so-called prodemocratic country, breeds civil strife—and destroys the confidence of the people in its leaders. The U.S. Government and its people demand complete tolerance of all religious practices.

It is the sincere wish that through the holy office of Pope Paul, and the good office of Secretary U Thant, and the efforts of our present distinguished Ambassador, Cabot Lodge, President Diem can be induced to conform to an American basic request—a guarantee of religious freedoms for all.

Nations through the ages, like men, have been and are guilty of prejudicial practices against their fellow countrymen at social, religious and economic levels of their society. These attitudes are fostered in fear, ignorance, and tradition. The South Vietnamese are no exception.

We as a nation in leadership, suffering from similar ills, must be tolerant and understanding in dealing with their problems.

Our investment in maintaining their security as a free and independent nation, costing millions of dollars both to their military and civilian needs, and in excess of 14,000 instructing and activated military officers and personnel—suffering over 100 killed—cannot abandon their cause without suffering a complete reversal of the international confidence in our loyalties and pledges to the freedom-loving nations of the world.

We must endeavor to seek a common ground of understanding and an immediate solution with President Diem and his government, that he and his valiant people owe to the citizens of the United States the highest degree of responsibility to maintain the basic standards of the philosophy of American life.

We only ask that this great leader of his people, President Diem, having with his loyal and brave citizens established a democracy, maintain that same type of government for all of his people.

Otherwise the American people and their leaders will lose confidence and respect for his leadership—perhaps even to the point of regret—for ever having joined with him in his nation's cause.

May President Diem, with the blessings of his Creator, see the light and know that the people of America have great confidence in his leadership to a point, and seek only guidance for him to alleviate the serious problems confronting our President treating with the unfortunate series of events in Vietnam which have shaken the solidarity of American opinion in behalf of President Diem's regime. Reforms are in order—otherwise all is lost.

The United States, both in its official family, and its citizenry, demand that the American image throughout the world must not be sullied or distorted by practices antireligious or otherwise that reflect upon our established principles of conformity to God's will—a nation's challenge incorporated in the preamble of the Constitution—by lending support and aid to a nation that disregards with impunity the God-given rights of its own citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the kingdom of Thailand nurtures the freedom of Asia. It is the bastion of independence faced by Communist China on the north about 80 miles from its northern border, Laos on the northeast and east, Vietnam parallel thereto, and Cambodia on the south.

The military operations of the two Communist campaigns to the east in Laos and Vietnam on the south shadow her borders.

Thailand maintains a formidable army skilled in maneuvers and specialist training afoot or mounted. We had the honor of attending the military exercises as guests of the Government at Bangkok celebrating King Pumiphan Aduldet's birthday. Some 3,500 men of the military representing the four services—Army, Navy, Marines and Air Force, gave a terrific performance including military drill and intricate field formations—mounted.

Its forces would, if attacked, present a strong initial defense—so necessary to alert the U.S. forces in the area.

Thailand is struggling to improve the social welfare, living standards and economic condition of its people. In a limited national economy it is impossible to build needed roads, flood control and irrigation. Social security and pensions are out of the question when the family income is limited to less than $100 per year in the Bangkok area, and half that amount in other communities.

The economy of Thailand has been increased about 5 percent per year, although last year the export trade balance lagged $50 billion behind its imports. The U.S. Agency for International Development and the earnings resulting from the foreign exchange earnings of tourists equalized this financial discrepancy.

In spite of these obstacles, the Government has an effective electric power program, farm to market roads, educational expansion facilities and social programs. The great problem of increasing agricultural production to provide exports, in trade for machinery and consumer goods is still a pressing one.

Our Ambassador, Kenneth Todd Young, is highly respected for his sincere efforts in cooperating with the Thailand authorities in our mutual concern for the changing developments in east Asia—and in the United States.

King Pumiphan Aduldet was born in Boston while his father was attending Harvard. He is a friend of the United States. He sent troops to Korea. Also to Laos although he was in disagreement of our policy there, and in the Cuban question immediately took a firm stand with us.

The future of Thailand in remaining freedom land is important to the United States. It stands as the only obstacle in the march of communism throughout southeast Asia. Thailand is the seat of SEATO. With our continuing aid and assistance, both as to its economy and military support now and in the future, these courageous and liberty loving people will remain as the American anchor and symbol of our defense in southeast Asia.

May I, with the permission of the Congress, reiterate a previous statement made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 9, pages 12118 and 12119, as chairman of that Commission visiting the military forces in Germany, that seems pertinent at this point:

The Members of the Congress of the United States enjoy the high privilege and responsibility of protecting the public interest and guiding through enactment of legislation to preserve the economic destiny, welfare, and defense of the Republic.

One of the informative approaches to orient the membership in acquiring knowledge in these areas, preparatory to the consideration of legislation, is to travel to the sites of areas where pertinent factual data on these subjects can be accumulated for study. Many of the mentally alert and proficient Members of Congress are reticent about accepting a special study assignment necessitating foreign travel because of the criticism one may be subjected to in traveling at public expense.

There is a growing suspicion in the public mind that all travel is unnecessary and a waste of public funds. That the expense serves no public purpose in Government and only satisfies the suppressed desire of the individual official to travel at public expense for his or her personal aggrandizement as participating in a junket tour.

Certainly traveling 25,000 miles by plane, close to 1,000 by helicopter and auto, being briefed 5 to 8 hours a day, watching troop operations and firing of heavy armament, studying enemy frontier activity, eating on the run, sleeping 3 to 5 hours a day with scarce 2 to 3 hours a day of open time for ourselves, giving speeches, asking questions and giving answers, and so forth, taking copious notes, writing reports, is not anyone's idea of enjoying a sojourn overseas, especially during the holiday period.

Yet all of this effort and more was worth the great honor paid to us by our dedicated U.S. officers and men in the field, schools, and camps that we visited. Just the warm clasp of the friendly hands of the troops from our respective States gave each of us a sense of how much all this meant to the troops and ourselves in being just another American.

It is to be understood that the purpose of this report is to treat analytically, in a limited sense, the data, facts, and material made available through the agencies, publications, and services presenting the same. The subjects at hand have enjoyed a wide and growing public interest—primarily through the exhaustive study and writings of expert columnists whose detailed articles appear in the press and journals for avid public consumption.

The material presented herein is a compilation of both the briefings received from experts in this field and authoritative reportings by distinguished newspapermen and columnists.

The papers drawn for this report are not to be considered as having the approval of the members in attendance, but must be considered as a factual report of the subjects studied. Any comments or conclusions reached by the chairman are subject to the specific reservation of each member. Someone had to write a report. Therefore, if in error—may it be an unintentional one.

There are references noted in this report that are complimentary to the present administration and several others that are critical. These statements are only made for the purpose of calling attention of the reader to the administration's position in the matter. Certainly my Republican colleagues have the reserved right to disagree with these conclusions—perhaps the criticisms at least should stand as accepted.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. BELL), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINO in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEERMANN.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MORRIS in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 573. An act for the relief of Elmer Royal Fay, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 721. An act to amend section 124 of title 28, United States Code, to transfer Austin, Fort Bend, and Wharton Counties from the Galveston division to the Houston division of the southern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1006. An act to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1206. An act for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1269. An act for the relief of the Arizona Milling Co. of Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5888. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1262. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the comparison of fund requirements for lease and Government ownership and other matters relating to the leasing of small-size and medium-size postal facilities by the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1263. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the unnecessary procurement of helicopter components by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1264. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on Communication Satellite Act of 1962—the first year (Rept. No. 809). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 8702. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 8703. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that all adulterated foods seized and condemned under that act must be destroyed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 8704. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 8705. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 8706. A bill to promote the security and welfare of the people of the United States by providing for a program to assist the several States in further developing their programs of general university extension education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. **STAEBLER**:

H.R. 8707. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to enlarge, improve, and make permanent the student loan programs thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. **WHALLEY**:

H.R. 8708. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit the use of aircraft to carry out certain activities directed toward weather modification unless the occupants of the underlying lands consent thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. **DWYER**:

H.R. 8709. A bill for the relief of Eugene R. Wooster, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8710. A bill for the relief of Joseph K. Bellek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **FINNEGAN**:

H.R. 8711. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Dancevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **MULTER**:

H.R. 8712. A bill for the relief of Michel Harari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **ROBISON**:

H.R. 8713. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vincent Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8714. A bill for the relief of Dr. Geronimo B. Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **SCHENCK** (by request):

H.R. 8715. A bill to provide for the modification of the existing mortgage (held by the Federal National Mortgage Association) covering Overlook Mutual Homes in Dayton, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Thursday, October 3, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, as creatures of time and sense, with the fever of mortal days upon our spirits, with wistful longings which haunt the depth of our being, we turn to Thee who art from everlasting to everlasting.

We change with the changing days. We are fretted by every passing wind, tempest tossed and afraid; but Thou art the same yesterday, today, and forever.

Day by day in this Chamber, in the ministry of public affairs, those chosen by the people to speak and act for them face perplexing decisions affecting the lives and fortunes of untold millions who look to them for the wise word and the right action. Wilt Thou lift us all from the confusions and bafflements of these days into the unhurried calm of Thy presence and to the peace which is the gift of Thy grace, and the wisdom which is from above.

May the spiritual verities by which alone we really live, assert their sovereignty and ascendancy over our hearts and minds, as with unbroken vigil we keep the perpetual light of faith burning over the inner shrine of the soul. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4759) for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 5888) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4759) for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, Frank Grove, Harry P. Nash, Jr., and Michael J. Neofitou, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the month of July 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Unnecessary Procurement of Helicopter Components

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement of helicopter components, Department of the Navy, dated September 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Comparison of Fund Requirements for Lease and Government Ownership of Postal Facilities

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on comparison of fund requirements for lease and Government ownership and other matters relating to leasing of small- and medium-sized postal facilities, Post Office Department, dated September 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Need for Reconsideration of Costly Proposals Under Expansion and Improvement Program, Coast Guard Academy

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for reconsideration of costly proposals under the expansion and improvement program, Coast Guard Academy, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated September 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Funding Practices in Acquisition and Management of Real and Related Personal Property Overseas

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of funding practices in the acquisition and management of real and related personal property overseas by the Department of State, dated September 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Proposed Amendment to Concession Contract in Hot Springs National Park

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed amendment to the concession contract with the Quapaw Bath House Co., in Hot Springs National Park (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Suspension of Deportation of Certain Aliens

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Operations in Connection With Bonding of Government Officers and Employees

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on operations in connection with the bonding of Government officers and employees, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be dispensed with.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the clerk will proceed to read the Journal.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is an amendment to the Journal in order after the clerk reaches the portion of the Journal which a Senator may wish to amend, or should the amendment be offered after the conclusion of the reading of the Journal?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment to the Journal should be offered after the entire Journal has been read.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would a Senator lose his right to offer an amendment to the Journal by then suggesting the absence of a quorum? The Constitution requires that a quorum be present for the transaction of business, and it is evident that a quorum is not now present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the precedents of the Senate are to the effect that a quorum call is not in order while the Journal is being read.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; I mean after the Journal has been read, but before an amendment to the Journal is proposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum call would be in order at that time, and the Senator would not lose his right to propose an amendment to the Journal by suggesting the absence of a quorum at that time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will resume the reading of the Journal.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I serve notice that I shall propose an amendment to the Journal. I suggest the absence of a quorum. It might be well to indicate that it will be a live quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has suggested the absence of a quorum, and the clerk will call the roll for the purpose of ascertaining the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 183 Leg.]

Allott
Anderson
Burdick
Clark
Cooper
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McGovern
Monroney
Morton
Neuberger
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent due to illness.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Vermont [Mr. Aiken and Mr. Prouty] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. Beall, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. McNamara, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Yarborough entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had intended to propose an amendment to the Journal that would enable the historians of the future who may peruse that document to be perfectly clear as to the issue that was before the Senate yesterday when the point of order was raised.

The Journal stated the ruling of the Chair. However, the ruling did not include any statements from Senators who espoused the point of order, as to the reason why the point of order was valid.

On consideration—perhaps this is due to my innate modesty—I intend not to propose the amendment, because if I were to do so I would be in the unusual position of fighting for an amendment to have my own words and contentions placed in the Journal.

I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the Senator object if, for the Record, and for the benefit of historians of the future who may refer to the Journal, if I called attention to the fact that the position of the Senator from Georgia is shown in the Record? It would be eminently fair to do so and completely right. The Senator's statement is found at pages 18536 to 18540 of the Congressional Record.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. That might overcome the suggestion about the excessive modesty of the Senator from Georgia that he has referred to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's kind comment.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the event that a resolution were submitted under the fourth part of rule VII, providing for the meeting of a subcommittee of the Senate over a given period of time while the Senate was in session, would such resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and would it be considered an amendment to the rules?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, may I be heard on that point of order before the Chair rules?

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator if he wishes me to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would be delighted to have the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Chair and the Senator from Georgia.

I had intended to ask, as soon as I was able to obtain the floor, that the regular order under rule VII be followed. As the Senator from Georgia has stated, that would call for the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate certain matters, in the priority indicated in the rule, until concurrent and other resolutions were called for.

When that point had been reached, it would have been my intention to send to the desk a short resolution, which I should like to read:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to sit while the Senate is in session from today, October 3, 1963, to November 30, 1963.

It was my view, after consulting with the Parliamentarian and discussing the precedents, that the resolution would be in order when submitted, and could be called up for immediate consideration under a somewhat sketchy ruling of the late Vice President Barkley, made in 1949, which is the only precedent to which the Parliamentarian was able to refer me as dealing with this point. My purpose was to prevent one Senator from objecting to a meeting of a committee, as has been the case for several years in the Senate. I thought that I had the law on my side in that regard, because the Reorganization Act provides:

> No standing committee of the Senate or of the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit without special leave while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session.

At a hearing before the Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Committee on

Rules and Administration, held in June of this year, the distinguished coauthor of the Reorganization Act, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] testified:

> In the Reorganization Act we did not intend absolutely to prohibit committees from sitting during Senate sessions except by unanimous consent.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The Chair cannot hear the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. **CLARK**. I continue to read:

> We meant that they should not sit during the Senate session without special leave.

I was requesting, by my resolution, special leave. I had hoped that this could be done without a great deal of discussion, and that the Senate would pass reasonably promptly on this request.

I was prepared to make my argument on why I thought it was desirable for this committee to have leave to sit.

I still hope that I may have the opportunity to present this matter in due course. I realize that many parliamentary obstacles can be thrown in my way. I make this comment to the Presiding Officer before he rules, in order that he may understand what I was trying to do.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. President, perhaps I am unduly suspicious. Of course, I have no particular feeling about the resolution that the Senator wishes to submit. As Will Rogers used to say, about all I know about what is proposed for the rest of the year is what I read in the papers.

At least one of those proposals has involved a great many circuitous parliamentary proceedings in the past in order to get it before the Senate. I am referring, of course, to the misnamed but ill-advised civil rights legislation. It never gets to a committee, and is brought up under a very tenuous construction of the rule. I am somewhat suspicious that a resolution would be offered.

Under the provision to which the Senator refers, leave would be granted to committees to meet when the Senate was in session. That is a proposal which I would not approve. It is difficult enough to bring four or five Senators to the Chamber to undertake to enlighten them, without having them all off attending committees by leave of the Senate.

I merely wish to ascertain the procedures that will be followed. It is my intention to let the Senator from Pennsylvania submit his resolution in the morning hour, but I wish to find out the procedure to be followed, so that I will know what steps I may take to counteract such proposals in the event a rash of resolutions of this nature is offered in the future.

The Senator knows that he may ask for unanimous consent. There is no question about leave being granted by unanimous consent for committees to meet. Such requests are usually granted by unanimous consent; but, of course, anything that can be done by unanimous consent can be done by resolution.

Mr. **CLARK**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. **RUSSELL**. I yield.

Mr. **CLARK**. First, the subject of this investigation deals entirely with employment, unemployment, and the proper utilization of manpower. I assure the Senator that there are no overtones of civil rights involved. The subcommittee had a civil rights matter before it earlier this year, but it was disposed of, and has been reported to the full committee. So that question is not involved.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. I do not want to beg that question with the Senator, but almost anything that will be done now or during the remainder of this year will have some overtones of civil rights. It has been tied into practically everything that has come up. I have read numerous articles, editorials, columns, and comments about the relationship of civil rights to the tax bill. Certainly civil rights has about as many overtones in relation to the tax bill as it has with respect to the Senator's resolution.

I intend to let the Senator submit his resolution, but I wished to advise him what the parliamentary situation would be in the event the Senate should be confronted with a number of similar resolutions.

Mr. **CLARK**. The hearings which we request—rather, the meetings which we request—are purely for the purpose of taking testimony. It is not intended that the subcommittee should meet to mark up any proposed legislation. I do not know whether our subcommittee is less diligent in attendance than some others; but, by and large, frequently only one Senator is present to take testimony, and rarely are more than two or three present, although the members of the subcommittee are conscientious and drop in at the hearings from time to time. So far as attendance on the floor of the Senate is concerned, I cannot believe that this particular resolution would have any great bearing.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. When Senators are away from the Chamber, the Senate is that much weaker.

If the Senator will permit me to inquire, I think I know what the Chair's reply will be. Then I wish to propose another parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **CLARK**. The ruling made by Vice President Barkley in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] appears in the third column of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 3, page 3964.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. I am not familiar with that ruling; but I was of the opinion that it was an obiter dictum decision. It was not a live case that was before the Senate; the ruling was made in response to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. **CLARK**. I should like to read the ruling for the benefit of the Vice President.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Very well.

Mr. **CLARK**. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had requested leave for a committee to meet while the Senate was in session. The Vice President made his ruling. I say again that it is not too definitive a ruling, but it is the only one we have been able to find. The request was for leave for a committee to meet. Vice President Barkley ruled:

> The motion would undoubtedly be debatable; but the Chair is inclined to the opinion, without having looked into the matter, that such a motion would be a privileged matter and would, therefore, take precedence over the pending question. But that is not a final decision of the Chair.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. I do not believe that such a ruling would be in order, because there is no question pending in the morning hour. There cannot be a pending question if the steps outlined in rule VII are followed. However, I think the Senator's resolution is in order. Any Senator may submit a resolution to have the Senate grant leave for a committee to meet. There is no question about that. Of course, the resolution would be debatable.

Mr. **CLARK**. Yes.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Therefore, it would not mean a great deal if a Senator who submitted such a resolution had an ulterior purpose.

Mr. President, I should like to have a ruling on my original parliamentary inquiry.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The Parliamentarians have considered the inquiry and have prepared a statement with respect to it, with which the Chair is in agreement.

> If a motion is made to give a committee leave to sit for 1 day, it would appear that the motion, of necessity, would be privileged, but debatable. The time problem would seemingly make it necessary that such a motion be considered privileged, since otherwise the motion or resolution would have to lie over a day. The above conclusion appears to be the intent of section 134C of Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress—

Which, as the Senator is aware, is the Reorganization Act—

> A motion to permit a committee to meet while the Senate is in session, over a long period of time, would appear to be a suspension or change of the rules and would not be entitled to a privileged status, since the time element is not of the same significance as in the case of a 1-day leave for a committee to meet. Thus, such a motion involving the meeting of a committee for several days would be treated like any other resolution as far as procedure is concerned. If objection is heard to its immediate consideration, the resolution goes over for 1 day and would be laid down the next legislative day after the conclusion of the morning business. If not disposed of by 2 o'clock it would go to the calendar when there is unfinished business, subject to be brought up later on motion.

This is the recommendation of the Parliamentarian and the Assistant Parliamentarian. It is based on the ruling made by Vice President Barkley, which was tentative and referred to a specific time and specific date, and thus had privileged status. It loses its privileged status when a number of days are covered.

The Chair concurs in the recommendation by the Parliamentarian and the Assistant Parliamentarian.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. If objection were heard to a resolution which provided for a committee to meet for a period of several days, the resolution would go to the calendar, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution would lie over 1 day.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would lie over 1 day; and if the Senate adjourned, then on the next day that the Senate met, the resolution would come up, under rule VII, for consideration by the Senate. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration be in order at that time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The resolution would be debatable when it was called up on the following day, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the motion to refer to committee would be debatable, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, if the resolution were not disposed of by 2 o'clock, it would be returned to the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would be returned to the calendar; and if it were returned to the calendar, it would carry with it the motion to refer to committee, would it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair proceed with the regular order, under rule VII.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is in order under rule VII. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Georgia does not desire to offer his amendment to the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President, I do not desire to offer my amendment to the Journal, for the reasons assigned previously.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I correctly understand the Chair to state that morning business is now in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct; morning business is in order, under rule VII.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, to permit him to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Is not my motion that the Chair proceed in accordance with rule VII in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That would be the regular order, unless a request to proceed otherwise were made and were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I correctly understand the Chair to state—before the question was raised by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]—that we are in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the morning hour take precedence over the presentation of petitions, memorials, and reports of standing and select committees?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a part of the morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a part of the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If a Senator then seeks recognition, in order to submit morning hour business, will it be in order for him to be so recognized?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If a Senator asks for the regular order, he will have to ask for the regular order as specified under rule VII, which is, first, the presentation of petitions and memorials.

When that is concluded, then Senators will be recognized for the submission of reports of standing committees.

When that is concluded, Senators will be recognized for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

All that is in accordance with the rule.

The presentation of petitions and memorials is now in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I seek recognition under the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my request, because in the meantime I wish to make a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, Mr. President; I have decided not to make it, for I believe it would be turned down.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana could make a motion to take up any morning hour business he wishes to have taken up.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a few remarks on certain subjects, and to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with these remarks, certain speeches, comments, newspaper articles, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with deep regret, I must object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then I wonder whether there are any petitions and memorials to be presented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any petitions and memorials which Senators wish to present?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE OF ILLINOIS CALLS FOR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have a resolution, from the Illinois House of Representatives, which calls upon Congress to pass a certain law. Is the presentation of that resolution now in order, under the rule?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order; and, under the rule, it will be received and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. This is a petition——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is not now debatable.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It is a petition of the Illinois House of Representatives, requesting Congress to pass the GI bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate on the resolution is not now in order.

The resolution presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH is as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the key to the success of this country in the future is based upon the education of its citizens; and

Whereas the Congress of our Nation was indeed very wise in extending certain educational benefits to veterans who were inducted prior to January 31, 1955; and

Whereas veterans who were inducted into the armed services after January 31, 1955, no longer received such educational benefits from our Nation and as a result our country is suffering: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to extend educational benefits to our veterans who were inducted after January 31, 1955.

JUNE 20, 1963.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SENATE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which was adopted by the National Convention of Disabled American Veterans, urging that the Senate go on record as recommending the establishment of a Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs. In the presentation of this——

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Senators on this side of the aisle cannot hear the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the presentation of the resolution, am I entitled to be heard briefly?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; debate is not now in order.

Mr. KEATING. Then I now present the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD, under the rule.

The resolution presented by Mr. KEATING was received, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS IN THE U.S. SENATE

Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives has a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs while the Senate has none; and

Whereas a similar committee in the Senate would be of immeasurable assistance in the study and review of all legislation pertaining to veterans; and

Whereas such a committee would stimulate a better understanding of the veterans' problems among their colleagues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans in national convention assembled at Atlantic City, N.J., August 19-25, 1962, go on record as recommending the establishment of a Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the U.S. Senate.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND IN CITY OF DETROIT, MICH., FOR A LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business, which is Calendar No. 487, House bill 772.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 772) to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. The question is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business, Calendar No. 487, House bill 772.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not debatable. The motion is made under the authority of rule VII, paragraph 3:

> 3. Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the Calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer.

The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair can entertain such motion.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. The motion is not debatable. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 772) to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia withhold that suggestion?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to speak on this bill; but first, in accord with the traditions and customs of the Senate—all of which I do not agree with—I believe this is a good time to bring up some other subjects.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator from Montana yield the floor?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I believe I had better wait until I obtain the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending bill is debatable; but the debate does not necessarily have to be germane to the bill. The Senator from Montana may proceed.

REQUEST FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour and that the time available to each Senator who participates in the morning hour be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

THANKSGIVING AWARD BY CLARKE COLLEGE, DUBUQUE, IOWA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I received a letter from a very dear friend of mine, Sister Mary Benedict, BVM, President of Clarke College, of Dubuque, Iowa. In the letter she states:

> Because the welfare of our country is a dominant value in your life, we believe that you may be interested in the enclosed announcement.
>
> We ask your prayers that the Thanksgiving Award may help to "refocus attention on the true meaning of Thanksgiving," and to inspire our youth to greater reverence for their heritage, greater awareness of their responsibilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the press release covering this subject, from Clarke College, of Dubuque, Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> On October 3, 1863, Abraham Lincoln issued the first national Thanksgiving proclamation.
>
> In recognition of the centennial anniversary of the proclamation, Clarke College is planning to confer a Thanksgiving Award on an American whose life reveals awareness of the blessings of freedom, opportunity, and dignity insured by the Constitution of the United States, and whose service to the country and its citizens merits distinction.
>
> The first award will be made at a special Thanksgiving convocation on November 26 at the college. It will be a symbolic figurine designed by the Clarke art department.
>
> Sister Mary Benedict, BVM, Clarke president, announcing the convocation and the award, said that they are a means to achieve in a special manner one of the aims of the college: "to alert students (Clarke is a college for women) to their potential (as women) for influencing world situations and transmitting spiritual and esthetic values."
>
> With pressure increasing against public recognition of God in the daily life of the public schools, church-related schools, Sister believes, have an extra duty to reverence Him as the source of life and truth. A new emphasis on Thanksgiving as a significant and symbolic holiday may help to achieve this.
>
> The Honorable Win G. Knoch, judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago and a member of the Clarke Lay Advisory Board, is chairman of the committee which will select the first Thanksgiving Award recipient. Committee members are Clarke faculty and lay board members. The recipient will be announced early in November.
>
> "Originally a day of thanks to God for the blessings of life in the New World," Judge Knoch observes, "Thanksgiving has become for many people a festival of food and football, excellent things in themselves but not substitutes for faith and freedom. The aim of the award is to refocus attention on the true meaning of Thanksgiving, without abandoning its traditional trimmings."
>
> Significantly, Clarke believes, a woman was influential in inspiring Abraham Lincoln to make the 1863 Thanksgiving proclamation.
>
> Sarah Josepha Hale, editor of Godey's Lady Book, had urged successive presidents to proclaim a national day of thanks to God. Her final editorial on the subject appeared in the September 1863 issue of the magazine. Lincoln's response followed within a month.
>
> In 1621, William Bradford, Governor of the Plymouth Colony, ordered the first Thanksgiving celebration in New England. In 1754, the Dutch Colony of New York observed such a day.
>
> George Washington issued a proclamation in 1789 in thanksgiving for the adoption of the Constitution. But the national holiday dates from 1863.

CONFLICTING SCIENTIFIC VIEW ON THE EFFECTS OF RADIATION ON CHILDREN IN THE STATE OF UTAH RESULTING FROM ATMOSPHERIC TESTS CONDUCTED IN NEVADA LAST YEAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the New York Times of October 2, 1963, there appears an article, by John W. Finney, which deals with the conflicting scientific views on the effects on children and infants in the State of Utah from iodine 131 fallout which resulted from the nuclear tests in the atmosphere in Nevada last year.

The Atomic Energy Commission now admits, apparently, that "a few" Utah children may have received a dosage of 7 to 14 rads of iodine 131 to the thyroid from these tests, although other scientists have suggested that the figure is much greater. In any event, we should bear in mind that the Federal Radiation Council recommends that the dosage to children's thyroid be held to below half a roentgen a year; and a roentgen and a rad are about the same measure. In short, the Atomic Energy Commission, after a disturbing and prolonged reluctance to face this matter frankly, has now acknowledged that "a few" children have been exposed to cancer-inducing radiation of the thyroid many times above what is regarded, not as safe—no radiation is safe—but as tolerable. And how many children constitute "a few children"?

In short, Mr. President, this news story underscores what was a major consideration in the Senate's recent endorsement of the nuclear test ban treaty—the danger of nuclear tests, wherever they may take place, to the health of all human beings, and particularly to the health of children. If a postscript is needed as to the wisdom of the decisions the Senate reached in agreeing to essay this first step, this article provides it. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1963]

AEC RETREATS ON UTAH FALLOUT—SAYS A FEW CHILDREN MAY HAVE GOT HIGH DOSAGES

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, October 1.—The Atomic Energy Commission has acknowledged that "a few" children in Utah may have received radiation doses exceeding permissible peacetime limits as a result of atomic tests in Nevada in 1962.

The Commission, however, disputed contentions by non-Government scientists that thousands of children in States adjoining the Nevada test site had been subjected to medically significant amounts of radioactive iodine as a result of atmospheric tests in the last 12 years.

The Commission statement, supplied to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, represented the latest chapter in a sometimes bitter debate over the amount of iodine 131 that was falling near the Nevada test site and entering the thyroids of children.

REPORT TO COMMISSION

The debate began about a year ago when Dr. Harold A. Knapp, then of the Commission's Fallout Studies Branch, submitted a scientific paper suggesting that some children in communities near the Nevada test site might have received doses to the thyroid from fallout iodine measured in hundreds of roentgens.

The Federal Radiation Council, for normal peacetime operations, recommends that the thyroid dose to infants be limited to half a roentgen a year.

The Knapp report was challenged on the grounds that the conclusions rested on unproved assumptions.

It was apparent that the Commission staff was reluctant to permit publication of the report for fear it would reflect unfavorably on the oft-repeated assertions by the Commission that the Nevada tests were so conducted that no significant amount of radioactivity went beyond the test site.

The debate came out into the open in August in the fallout hearings by a joint atomic subcommittee.

Following much the same line of analysis as Dr. Knapp, a University of Utah group and the St. Louis Committee for Nuclear Information submitted reports showing that in some small communities in Nevada and Utah children could have received radiation ranging into the hundreds if not thousands of roentgens from atomic tests since 1952.

The Commission statement, reportedly the result of considerable debate, was supplied the committee in answer to these assertions.

The statement said that "it may be that a few Utah infants received as much as 7 to 14 rads [a radiation unit closely corresponding to a roentgen] to the thyroid gland in the summer of 1962."

The statement gave no definition of how many children it meant by "a few" or how it had reached the conclusions on the amount of radiation.

ADDRESS BY DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE ANNUAL MEETING OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excellent speech by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, before the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund, Before the Annual Meeting of the International Monetary Fund, Tuesday, October 1, 1963

At the outset of my remarks, I ask you to join with me in paying tribute to our late, great colleague and good friend, Per Jacobsson. Firmly dedicated throughout his long and distinguished career to the cause of financial stability, he guided the International Monetary Fund with a deep understanding of the needs and realities of his times. The responsibilities of Managing Director have now passed into the capable hands of Pierre-Paul Schweitzer. His willingness to assume these duties provides us with fresh assurance that the Fund, building on its current strength and influence at the center of the international monetary system, will successfully meet the fresh challenges that lie ahead.

It is also a pleasure to welcome to the Fund family an unusually large number of new members, bringing our group to more than 100. The election of a 19th Executive Director who will cast the votes of a group of the many new African members is symbolic of the increasing usefulness of the Fund to the emerging nations.

I am sure that each of these new members will profit from the important assistance the Fund can render to their further development through its expanding program of technical assistance in the areas of central banking and fiscal practices and policies, through its regular consultations, and by providing timely financial support for well-conceived stabilization programs. In addition, the new compensatory financing facilities announced last March mark an important and constructive advance in the services available to members heavily dependent upon exports of primary commodities.

These activities in support of balanced, dynamic growth are, of course, complemented by those of the Fund's companion Bretton Woods institution, the World Bank and its affiliates, now under the able direction of George Woods. I should mention particularly at this year's meeting the work of the International Development Association, whose activities in so short a span of time offer so much promise for the future. Action by the Part One countries on the proposals for increasing its resources will mark another milestone in the work to which it is dedicated and in which we are all joined together.

The successive annual reports of the International Monetary Fund have expertly traced the evolution of our international monetary systems since World War II. They have also made clear that new problems have a way of emerging as older ones are solved. The report for 1963 is no exception. In particular, it deals at some length with the adequacy of existing arrangements for providing international liquidity during the coming years. The authors point out that liquidity is not simply a matter of the aggregate of official holdings of gold or foreign exchange, and they review the progress made in recent years—in considerable part under the auspices of the Fund itself—in supplementing these resources with international credit. But the report also recognizes that the needs of nations for assured means of financing balance of payments deficits—either by drawing upon a stock of liquid assets or by means of borrowing—can be expected to increase over time. At the same time, as the deficit in the balance of payments of the United States is narrowed and closed, that deficit will no longer contribute to the liquidity of other nations in the manner and magnitude of the last few years.

The Fund's report has now been supplemented by the thoughtful and important statement of its new Managing Director. Mr. Schweitzer indicated that the Fund expects to study the problems of international liquidity and has expressed the Fund's readiness to cooperate with others in such a study. He points out that studies of this problem are timely even though there is at present no sign of any shortage in international liquidity. He has also given us his view that the Fund should be at the center of whatever strengthening of the international monetary system may prove to be desirable. The United States finds itself in general agreement with all of these thoughts.

But in discussing this matter, I would like to make one point crystal clear: The United States does not view possible improvements in the methods of supplying international liquidity as relieving it of the compelling and immediate task of reducing its own payments deficit. Indeed, it is largely the prospect of the elimination of the U.S. payments deficit that makes it necesasry and advisable to undertake these studies.

Nor can the provision of appropriate facilities for international liquidity relieve nations of their joint responsibilities for effective and timely action to eliminate such imbalances in trade and payments as may arise in the future. In a world of fixed exchange rates and convertible currencies, deficits and surpluses emerge from a wide variety of causes, both domestic and international. The necessity to make cash outlays for defense and aid, shifts in the basic pattern of demand for internationally traded goods, the development of new products, resources and production techniques, and developments in capital markets can be just as important as changes in average price levels and aggregate demand within countries.

The adjustments necessary to correct these deficits and surpluses take time if they are to proceed in an orderly fashion, without damaging consequences for either domestic growth and stability or the free flow of trade among nations. That is why, as part of the adjustment process, a country experiencing deficits needs reserves to draw upon, or credit that it can rely upon. That is also why a country receiving the counterpart in surpluses needs assets of assured value, in amounts and forms that will not disrupt its own economy. But in the last analysis without effective adjustments by both deficit and surplus countries, no amount of liquidity will enable us to achieve the mutual benefits of a closely integrated world economy within a framework of steady growth accompanied by monetary stability.

The challenge implicit in this situation is clear. Side by side with our studies of possible liquidity needs, we must consciously seek out means of improving the process of international adjustment itself, while preserving our separate abilities to meet our respective domestic needs.

This is a large order, but one that is well within our capacities. Much has been learned from the experience of recent years. We have come to recognize that in shaping domestic policies and choosing from the various tools available for use, their varying impact upon our external accounts, and upon those of our trading partners, must be taken fully into account. There is greater awareness of the need to identify and eliminate those market rigidities that inhibit the process of adjustment. And we are learning that new techniques can be developed for assisting the process of adjustment that are consistent with domestic goals and competitive markets.

Much of this can be illustrated by analysis of the position of the United States, faced as we are with the twin tasks of achieving more rapid growth at home while simultaneously closing the troublesome gap in our balance of payments. And many of the lessons of this experience, I believe, will prove sooner or later to be more generally applicable to the problems of international adjustment.

Business activity in the United States has continued to expand over the past year at a fairly steady pace. Total output has now reached a rate of over $585 billion a year—in real terms more than 13 percent above the level of early 1961.

Measured against other peacetime expansions of the past 40 years, this performance has been encouraging. All but one of these recovery periods have now been equalled or exceeded in terms of percentage increase in output, and that single exception took place only after the steep declines in production during the early 1930's. Prices of manufactured goods have remained virtually unchanged during the current expansion, extending the period of stability that has existed since 1958. However, unemployment is still excessive. And we are not fully utilizing our available savings of our existing productive plant capacity. True, investment activity has risen in response to increases in demand and to measures introduced a year ago to liberalize the tax treatment of depreciation and provide an investment tax credit. But new investment still remains below the levels required to support a full employment economy and to assure the position of our industry among the leaders in technological progress.

At the same time, our overall balance of payments has responded slowly to the series of measures we have undertaken since 1961. The overall deficit was reduced to $2.2 billion in 1962, from $3.9 billion in 1960, and $2.4 billion in 1961. But the deficit grew markedly larger during the first half of 1963.

When this situation first became apparent, we made a thorough-going review of our entire balance-of-payments program, which culminated in a series of decisions announced by the President on July 18. Resulting programs now underway will, by the end of next year, bring a reduction of $1 billion in the annual rate of dollar expenditures abroad for defense, aid, and other Government programs. Savings of similar magnitude are also expected on capital accounts as a result of the proposed interest equalization tax and the firmer structure of short-term interest rates accompanying the recent one-half of 1 percent increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate. We can already see indications that the deterioration in our accounts during the first half of the year is being arrested.

These new actions will complement and reinforce the longer run measures we have been taking to achieve both external balance and more rapid domestic growth. Basic to our strategy for achieving these twin goals is a broad program of individual and corporate tax reduction totaling $11 billion, which, after passage by our House of Representatives last week, is now before our Senate. It will provide an impetus to the domestic economy in a manner consistent with our international position. It will give increased flexibility to our monetary authorities in meeting balance-of-payments requirements. The added incentives for use of capital in the United States will enhance the relative attractiveness of investment here for Americans and foreigners alike. At the same time, the increased productivity associated with rising investment, together with greater incentives to develop and market new products and to apply more rapidly the fruits of our vast research capabilities, will reinforce the efforts we are making to increase our exports.

Our ability to expand production—which is implicit in our current unemployment, in our rapidly growing labor force, and in our margin of underutilized industrial capacity—provides protection against upward price pressures as the stimulus from the tax program takes hold. Meanwhile, we are continuing successfully to finance our budgetary deficit outside the banking system. For instance, in the year that ended August 31, the latest date for which figures are available, the combined holdings of Government debt in the hands of our Federal Reserve and commercial banks declined by more than $1½ billion. We have also made further progress in improving the maturity structure of our marketable debt. As a result of our latest advance refunding, the average life of that debt exceeded 5¼ years for the first time since 1956. We are not faced, therefore, with the kind of excessive liquidity that could fuel inflationary developments as our economy moves toward fuller employment.

Perhaps most significant of all in terms of the outlook for prices, our manufacturing labor costs per unit of output have declined over the past 3 years—the first time since World War II that this basic measure of our competitive strength has improved for so long a period, or during a time of substantial recovery. And the rate of wage increases in our manufacturing industry is holding within the range of past and anticipated productivity increases.

In this way, we are encouraging basic corrective forces in terms of costs and prices that should provide a firm base for improving our trading position, thus contributing to the orderly adjustment of our entire balance of payments. Highly tentative, but nonetheless encouraging, signs of an improvement in our international competitive position are developing. But it is clear that the contribution that exports can make to overall balance will be heavily dependent upon the adjustment policies of other nations as well. By this I do not, of course, mean to suggest that surplus nations have a responsibility to inflate, any more than it would be consistent with our internal needs to force deflation. Nor, in our particular situation, would it be reasonable to look only—or primarily—to increases in our commercial trade balance as the solution for our payments problem.

But opportunities do exist for surplus nations, in instances where inflationary pressures are evident, to serve the interests both of their own domestic stability and of external balance by reducing or eliminating barriers to imports, including those from the United States. In the search for effective adjustment mechanisms within the context of a convertible currency system, this kind of action, it seems to me, can become, for surplus countries, a modern substitute for the inflationary price adjustments that we must all do everything we can to avoid.

A basic factor in our own deficit position has been the heavy burden we carry for the defense of the free world and for assisting the development of less favored nations. This burden, in a wider context, is an inescapable part of the kind of world we live in. But we are also learning that methods of handling these Government outpayments, and more appropriate distribution of their balance-of-payments impact, can also contribute to the adjustment process without subverting their essential purpose.

Important savings have already been made in this area, reducing net outflows under our defense and aid programs from $3.8 billion in 1960 to $3 billion in 1962. A large portion of this improvement can be traced to the recognition by some European countries of their growing capacity to assume a greater share of the foreign exchange costs of the common defense. As a result, the drain on our payments from maintaining our troops in Germany and Italy is now virtually fully offset by their purchase of military equipment and supplies from the United States—equipment which, because of the size and flexibility of our defense industry, can be produced more rapidly and more economically in the United States than in their own countries. Thus these arrangements have simultaneously strengthened the free world's military and economic defenses.

In addition, we have adopted a policy of providing the great bulk of our economic aid to developing countries in the form of goods and services, so that it can be brought within the limits of our capacity without impairing its effectiveness. When current commitments are fully reflected in actual disbursements, only some 10 percent of the aid from our various foreign assistance programs will be provided in the form of dollars. At the same time, I believe that we must guard against any tendency to make the tying of aid into a subtle new form of protection for home industries. Rather, the logic of our efforts to expand multilateral trade and promote international efficiency through competition among the producers of all Nations demands that it be used as a temporary device, reserved for periods of balance of payments strains.

With forces of adjustment underway in both our Government and our commercial trade accounts, the most pressing problem in terms of our balance of payments has been the recent acceleration in the outflow of long-term capital. The net outflow of such capital during the first half of this year reached an annual rate of $3.8 billion. This was fully $1.3 billion higher than the already substantial figures for 1962, and nearly double the rate maintained over the years 1959–61. While some of this recent increase stemmed from direct investment, a flood of new foreign borrowings totaling nearly $1 billion in only 6 months was the major factor. This is considerably more than three times the volume we have been accustomed to.

It is entirely consistent with restoration of full equilibrium in international payments that the United States, with its capacity to generate large savings, continues to supply reasonable amounts of capital to aid the development of other nations. But, it is perfectly clear that maintenance of outflows at the recent pace, far from being a constructive force in world payments, would soon put intolerable strains on the international monetary systems as a whole.

As our program of tax reduction takes hold and there are stronger incentives to employ a larger portion of our savings at home, normal market forces will work strongly in the direction of reducing this outflow of long-term capital to more tolerable levels. But the experience of the past year makes clear that we cannot rely on these longer-term forces of adjustment to meet our immediate problem. Nor is it feasible to speed the process of adjustment by artificial attempts to force our entire structure of long-term interest rates sharply and suddenly higher. If possible at all in the face of the huge supply of savings flowing into our markets, this course of action would require so drastic a tightening of credit as to seriously jeopardize the prospects for domestic expansion.

In this situation, we have recommended enactment of a temporary interest equalization tax which will have the effect of raising the costs of portfolio capital in our market by 1 percent for borrowers in the developed countries abroad. This will bring these costs into a rough alinement with those in most other industrialized countries. The purpose is quite simple—to speed the essential redirection of capital flows in a manner comparable to an equivalent, but presently impracticable, rise in our entire structure of interest rates.

We view this tax solely as a necessary—but temporary—expedient to meet a specific situation that has arisen in large part out of a structural imbalance in the capital markets of the free world. Borrowers from deficit and surplus countries alike converge upon the New York market, not only because of our lower structure of long-term interest rates—since equivalent or lower rates can be found in at least two other countries—but because it is still the only source for international capital in whatever size and form desired, freely available to any borrower able to meet the normal market test of credit worthiness, and offering highly efficient distribution facilities with low issuing costs. In contrast, potential alternative markets are in most cases subject to official controls or have difficulty in supplying the needed funds in the volume required. And, with few exceptions, they are characterized by high and rigid rate structures. In the face of this situation, we must temporarily help to redirect the demands pressing on our market through a tax that will increase the costs of long-term borrowing here by foreigners.

The impediments to the development of more adequate European capital markets are currently under close and continuing study within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and progress is beginning to be visible. As efforts to improve European capital markets come to fruition and the remaining controls and restrictions are eliminated—and as our own domestic demands for capital put increased pressures upon our supply of savings—there is every reason to believe that the need for extraordinary action of the kind we are now taking will be eliminated.

When the Fund was established, there was great apprehension that sudden and massive short-term capital movements might again become a disruptive influence as they had in the disturbed climate of the 1930's. Gratifying progress has been made in developing sturdy defenses against such threats to our convertible currency system through the concerted cooperative efforts of the industrialized countries. A chain of new facilities for coping with such pressures is now in place and tested, and there are grounds for confidence that the processes of adjustment can be shielded from perverse speculative flows in the future.

With the restoration of convertibility, however, it has become apparent that a sizable volume of capital is ready to move from country to country in response to relatively small shifts in interest rates. Thus, the stability of exchange rates and freedom of markets toward which we have all worked in the postwar period carries with it the implication that short-term interest rates in the major trading countries must inevitably be kept reasonably well in line with each other.

Both problems and opportunities are implicit in these circumstances. Domestic objectives will sometimes limit the practicable range of fluctuation in interest rates that can be undertaken for facilitating balance-of-payments adjustment. But, since the margin between rate relationships that attract or repel short-term funds is likely to be relatively narrow, it will usually be feasible to encourage small changes in short-term rates in the interest of speeding restoration of international equilibrium without disturbing the domestic economy.

Most promising of all in terms of facilitating the adjustment process is the increasingly close and continuous consultation on these matters that has developed in the forums provided by this institution, by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, and by the Bank for International Settlements. This has been particularly evident in the area of short-term capital flows and interest rates. But we are also coming to understand that this same kind of consultation and cooperation is essential in other areas as well. We know that any adjustment demands offsetting changes in the position of deficit and surplus nations. We also know, in the last analysis, that these adjustments must take place, for no workable international monetary system will allow a nation to continue to run a deficit—or for that matter a surplus—for an indefinite period.

The critical question is how the adjustments are to be made. Balance can be—and too often in the past has been—forced by measures that endanger domestic stability or the prospects for growing trade. Those alternatives are not open to us today if the bright promise of all that has been accomplished since Bretton Woods is to be fulfilled. Nor can the industrialized countries afford to undermine the defenses of freedom or to withdraw their support of the developing nations.

The only realistic solution is to find effective ways for reconciling the requirements of a convertible currency system based on fixed exchange rates with the freedom of each nation to pursue domestic growth and stability. No methods will work instantaneously, and one prerequisite to their proper functioning is the availability of adequate liquidity—in the form of international reserves or ready access to credit. The studies now being launched provide fresh assurance that these liquidity needs will be met effectively in the more distant future, just as they are being met effectively today.

But adequate liquidity will not make our machinery of adjustment work automatically, nor can its development be safely put off until emergencies arise. Instead, its effective use will require governments of all nations with a stake in a liberal trading order to work together continuously in many areas: in developing a mix of domestic policies appropriate to external circumstances—in adjusting trade policies—in sharing the burdens of aid and defense—in providing long-term capital—and in eliminating rigidities and inefficiencies in their economies that impede and distort the adjustment process. That willingness, I believe, is now being demonstrated more fully than at any time in the past. This is the real source of my confidence—not only that the United States will restore balance in its own accounts, we intend to carry out that responsibility in any event—but also that a true equilibrium can be restored within a framework of expanding trade, flourishing growth, and monetary stability.

"I WALK TOWARD MONTANA"—PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CONSERVATION TOUR OF THE WEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, while the President of the United States was in Billings, Mont., he quoted the following statement by the great writer Thoreau:

> Eastward I go only by force; westward I go free. I must walk toward Oregon and not toward Europe.

Then the President said, "I walk toward Montana." The President showed his usual good judgment.

Mr. President, the recent trip of the President of the United States, starting at the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies at Milford, Pa., and extending through the Western States, has done a great deal to interpret to all citizens the potentialities of the new, hopeful era of conservation and resources development in which we live—an era in which science is helping to multiply our usable resources many times.

Since the days of Malthus and Ricardo, who won for economics the title of the dismal science by their gloomy predictions of declining resources and mounting poverty, a great many people have been convinced that with growing population mankind was doomed to an increasingly meager, hard life.

President John Kennedy, on his western trip, dramatized another view of the world of tomorrow. He described to the Nation and the world the potentialities of a third wave conservation movement which can increase our abundance and the living standards of all mankind.

Gifford Pinchot and Teddy Roosevelt led the first wave of attention to conservation in the United States. In their period, we set aside national parks and forests; we initiated reclamation and waterpower development and other conservation movements.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt sparked the second conservation wave in the thirties, when the TVA, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, and other programs were launched.

President Kennedy, on his Western trip, has brought into focus the nature of today's conservation movement—a wave in which we are bringing science to bear on resource problems, vastly multiplying our productive ability, and making practical the preservation of great natural areas for the enjoyment of present and future generations.

By splitting the atom, by developing processes to use low grade ores economically, by developing new crops and more productive agriculture practices, by controlling and using water more efficiently, and in a thousand other scientific ways, we are today disproving the theories of Malthus and Ricardo and demonstrating that man can enjoy increasing abundance in spite of population growth.

This cannot be done unless we implement the necessary programs—as the Senate has done in approving continuation of reclamation programs, water resources research, the preservation of great wilderness areas, seashores and parks, saline water conversion, continued nuclear research, development of space sciences and other essential conservation measures. Resource planning bills, yet to come before us, will further implement "third wave" conservation.

President Kennedy has called on the Nation to mount a new campaign to preserve our national environment and expand our resource potentialities, so those who come after us will find a green, rich country; to educate our children so they can use mankind's growing knowledge to the full; and to promote peaceful relations between countries so we can enjoy what God has given us. His Western speeches will have growing significance as their implications are fully understood.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's speeches on his nonpolitical conservation tour of the Western part of the United States, as they were actually delivered, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so they will be more readily available for the study and thoughtful consideration they merit.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT PINCHOT INSTITUTE FOR CONSERVATION STUDIES, MILFORD, PA., SEPTEMBER 24, 1963

I appreciate the warm welcome from Pennsylvania's most valuable natural resource, and we are glad to have the students of this community here today.

Governor Scranton, Dr. Pinchot, Secretary Freeman, Secretary Udall, Mr. Cliff, Senator Clark, Congressman Rooney, Mrs. Pinchot, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express the pleasure of us all from Washington at coming here today, and I also want to express our particular appreciation to the members of the Pinchot family, and also to the men and women who are here today who have worked so many years in the field of conservation. Every great work is in the shadow of a man and I don't think many Americans can point to such a distinguished record as can Gifford Pinchot, and this institute, which is only the latest manifestation of a most impressive legacy, I think can serve as a welcome reminder of how much we still have to do in our time.

There is no more fitting place to begin a journey of 5 days across the United States to see what can be done to mobilize the attention of this country so that we in the 1960's can do our task in preparing America for all the generations which are still yet to come. There is no more impressive place to begin that journey than here in this town, at this house, in this State of Pennsylvania. James Pinchot was an early leader of the American Forestry Association, and his son Amos, who has many claims to fame, and many claims in our regard, was an active leader in the fight for preservation of natural resources. The oldest of James Pinchot's three children, of course, was Gifford Pinchot, whose career was best summed up in his own statement upon the 40th anniversary of the Forest Service he had helped to found. "I have been a Governor now and then," he said, "but I have been a forester all the time * * * and shall be to my dying day." He was more than a forester; he was the father of American conservation. He believed that the riches of this continent should be used for all the people to provide a more abundant life, and he believed that the waste of these resources, or their exploitation by a few, was a threat to our national democratic life.

But all this strong feeling about the resources of America became important because it was disciplined, and because it was directive. He viewed his analysis of the American natural resources scene through the eye of a trained scientist. His career marked the beginning of a professional approach in preserving our national resources. He was a gifted administrator. He was an articulate publicist. He was a tutor of Presidents. In the space of a few short years, he made, as Dr. Pinchot said, conservation an accepted virtue, and part of our life which we take for granted today. It is far more fitting and proper, rather than merely ordering what he did, to dedicate this institute to active work today. By its nature it looks to the future, and not the past. The fact of the matter is that this institute is needed, and similar institutes across our country, more today than ever before in our history, because we are reaching the limits of our fundamental needs—of water to drink, of fresh air to breathe, of open space to enjoy, of abundant sources of energy to make life easier.

Today's conservation movement must, therefore, embrace disciplines unknown in the past. It must marshal our vast technological resources in behalf of our resource supplies. It must concern itself with nuclear energy as well as silviculture, with the physics, and chemistry of water as well as TVA, with the economic and engineering factors of open space as well as the preservation of all scenic treasures.

Government must provide a national policy framework for this new conservation emphasis; but in the final analysis, it must be done by the people themselves. The American people are not by nature wasteful. They are not unappreciative of our inheritance, but unless we, as a country, with the support, and sometimes the direction of Government, working with State leaders, working with the community, working with all our citizens, we are going to leave an entirely different inheritance in the next 25 years than the one we found.

Have we ever thought why such a small proportion of our beaches should be available for public use, how it is that so many of our great cities have been developed without parks or playgrounds, why so many rivers are so polluted, why the air we breathe is so impure, or why the erosion of our land was permitted to run so large as it has in this State, and in Ohio, and all the way to the west coast?

I think there is evidence, however, that this Nation can take action—action for which those who come after us will be grateful, which will convert killers and spoilers into allies, by buiding dams for many purposes, by State, and local and national parks, by developing the productivity of our farms, reclaiming land, preventing soil from washing away.

These and other activities demonstrate beyond doubt that what Gifford Pinchot pioneered is now accepted, and no one maintains that this can be left merely to chance in the future. Conservation in the real analysis is the job of us all.

It is not always the other person who pollutes our streams, or litters our highways, or throws away a match in a forest, or wipes out game or wipes out our fishing reserves. Private commercial establishments who occasionally leave this land to be scarred and move out through strip mining and a waste of resources, I think all of us therefore must commit ourselves in 1963, in this State and in this country, to a determined effort to preserve what is left, to develop what we have, to make the most effective use of all of the resources that have been given to us, and I can assure you in this effort the Federal Government will play its proper role. Its attitude, effort, and legislation must set an example for all of the country. The competition for the Federal budget (dollar) is keen, and that is proper, and we must choose between many different projects, but in the field of resources, the opportunities which are lost now can never be won back. With the principles of Mr. Pinchot clearly in mind, we began 2 years ago to increase the resource development and conservation effort in a variety of ways:

The total national investment by the last Congress in the conservation of water resources reached an all-time high—more than $2½ billion, and among the nine new reclamation projects approved were the Fryingpan-Arkansas and the San Juan-Navajo Indian projects, two of the largest projects of that kind ever approved in a single Congress.

Secondly, three national seashores were created. I don't know why it should be that 6 or 7 percent only of the whole Atlantic coast should be in the public sphere and the rest owned by private citizens and denied to many millions of our fellow citizens. In the last Congress three national seashores were created for all of our people—Cape Cod on the Atlantic, Point Reyes on the Pacific, and Padre Island on the Gulf—representing the first major additions to our coast-to-coast national park system in 16 years—more seashore parks, more seashore parks—and I can assure you they are wholly inadequate—but more seashore parks than were authorized all throughout our history. Other parks and recreation areas are being added, and their ranks, I hope, will soon include the Tocks Island National Recreation Area on the Delaware River. We need recreation areas where the people live, and this can be closer to the largest amount of people in the country, and I am confident Congress will move ahead with it.

Third, steam from the Hanford atomic reactor, which used to blow away and was wasted, will now be used to produce the equivalent of two Bonneville Dams.

Fourth, a full-scale attack on water pollution has been mounted, and under the 1961 amendments to the Water Pollution Control Act, we are doing three times more than was ever done before, and we are doing not nearly enough.

Fifth, the saline water conversion program has been given new emphasis. There are three demonstration plants now in operation. But even in this area, which can promise us a richer harvest than almost any other scientific breakthrough, even here there is a good deal of unfinished business.

Sixth, our urban areas have been aided in the acquisition of open space for park and recreation and other purposes under the provisions of the Housing Act of 1961.

And finally, studies have been initiated under a new nationwide program to provide the States and local governments with information on regulating the use of flood plains and minimizing flood losses.

There are a good many things left to be done, in our forests, on the land, but I hope that this trip over America over the next 5 days, which started out so auspiciously, will serve to remind us that every time we drive through a park, go to a park on the beach, see a great national resource which has been preserved in the West, that that has been due to the effort of some people. I hope that in the years to come, that these years in which we live and now hold responsibility, will also be regarded as years of accomplishment in maintaining and expanding the resources of our country which belong to all of our people, not merely those who are now alive, but all those who are coming later, and what Gifford Pinchot, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt and Amos Pinchot and others did in the first 50 years of this century will serve as a stimulus to all of us in the last 50 years to make this a country we love.

Thank you.

Remarks of the President, Upon Arrival at Ashland Airport, Ashland, Wis., September 24, 1963

Governor Reynolds, Senator Nelson, Secretary Freeman, Secretary Udall, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be back in northern Wisconsin. I am, I think, the second President of the United States to spend the night in Ashland. Calvin Coolidge was here for some weeks, some days, but he never said a word, and I was here for 1 night and spoke all the time. In any case, I appreciate very much your coming out and welcoming us back.

This trip, which is a conservation trip across the United States, came about as a result of a suggestion by your junior Senator, Gaylord Nelson, who made conservation his great work as the Governor of Wisconsin, and has had a strong conviction as Senator, as do I, that every day that goes by that we do not make a real national effort to preserve our national conservation resources is a day wasted. Anyone who flies over those islands, as we just did, looks at that long beach, looks at those marshes, looks at what a tremendous natural resource this can be, and is now, for nearly 50 million Americans who will live in this section of the United States in the coming years, must realize how significant this occasion is.

What we are doing here, which is concentrating the attention of the people of the country on this great natural resource, must be duplicated in every State of the Union, all the way from Massachusetts to Hawaii, if we are going to make this country as good a place to live in for our children as it has been for us. So I am glad to come to this section of the country, which has experienced so many economic hardships, which has lived so close to nature, which has understood the importance of preserving this resource for many years, and come here and tell you that we, with you in this State, and with your Governor, will work closely to develop the resources of northern Wisconsin so that this area can rise and provide a life for its people and an attraction for people from all over the Middle West.

This State has seen the result of waste and indifference, and it has seen what can be done by dedication and determination. This section of Wisconsin, like other sections of the United States, which in the past depended upon a few natural resources, has known what economic distress can do when those resources are exhausted or when indifference lays them waste. We are seeking to help correct those conditions, through area redevelopment programs, through conservation programs, rural area development programs, and increased fisheries research. These things won't happen. They are going to be made to happen. And they must represent the dedicated effort of us all. And I believe we have the brightest hopes in this section of Wisconsin for the development of outdoor recreation facilities.

If promptly developed, recreational activities and new national park, forest, and recreation areas can bolster your economy and provide pleasure for millions of people in the days to come. If we do what is right now, in 1963, we must set aside substantial areas of our country for all the people who are going to live in it by the year 2000. Where 180 million Americans now live, by the year 2000 there will be 350 million of them, and we have to provide for them, as Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin Roosevelt and the others provided for us.

The precise manner in which these resources are used, land and water, is of the greatest importance. There is need for comprehensive local, State, regional, and national planning. I think you are fortunate that in this State government, in this State, because of Gaylord's work and because of John Reynolds' work, you have made a detailed study of the resource development potential of the south shore of Lake Superior. Wisconsin is the first State in the Nation to prepare a comprehensive plan for the development of its resources. You are also fortunate in having underway a $50-million program for acquiring recreational resources.

Unless you do this in your State, all these resources will be wasted away, will be used by a few, will be underdeveloped, and this area of the State will fall behind. In an effort to correct this, improve it, develop it, enrich it, I pledge you the cooperation of the Federal Government.

Lake Superior, the Apostle Islands, the Bad River area, are all unique. They are worth improving for the benefit of sportsmen and tourists. In an area of congestion and pollution, men make noise and dirt. Lake Superior has a beauty that millions can enjoy. These islands are part of our American heritage. In a very real sense they tell the story of the development of this country. The vast marshes of the Bad River are a rich resource providing a home for a tremendous number and varied number of wild animals. In fact, the entire northern Great Lakes area, with its vast inland sea, its 27,000 lakes, and thousands of streams, is a central and significant part of the fresh water assets of this country, and we must act to preserve these assets. Earlier this year, industrial accidents dumped millions of gallons of oil into the Minnesota River, causing the destruction of thousands and thousands of ducks and other wildlife, and damaging the recreational use of that river for 100 miles. Preliminary studies show that the pollution of the upper Mississippi River is growing worse.

I am, therefore, announcing under provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act the convening of an enforcement conference to investigate the pollution of the water of the upper Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers to be held in St. Paul, Minn., in January. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has allocated $250,000 to commence the study of the pollution of this area. If, in cases such as these, we fail to act, if we fail to learn our lesson from the past, and this lesson has been a hard one for the people of this area, then the pressures of a growing population and an expanding economy may destroy our assets before our children can enjoy them. But with the proper spirit and effort of the people living in this section of Wisconsin, the people living in this State, the people living in this country, we can do in the 1960's what was done at the turn of the century, and that is, make this great country of ours more beautiful for those who are here now and those who come after us.

I want to thank you again for welcoming me back to Wisconsin, which carries many memories with it, and to tell you, as I look around here, that I see many familiar faces and I hope we are going to have a chance to say hello to some of you personally.

Thank you.

Remarks of the President to Delegates to Northern Great Lakes Region Land and People Conference, University of Minnesota Fieldhouse, Duluth, Minn., September 24, 1963

Senator, Senator McCarthy, Senator Humphrey, Governor Rolvaag, Governor Reynolds, Secretary Freeman, Secretary Udall, majority leader of the U.S. Senate, Senator Mansfield, ladies and gentlemen, I actually came a thousand miles to hear Hubert Humphrey make a speech, but unfortunately, I arrived too late. But I appreciate the chance to be here.

I understand that we have three different groups tonight, those who are interested in the conference of land and people, and it looks like that audience over there, and then those who are interested in the Democratic Party, and it is difficult to identify them, and those who are wondering, and then those who are students. Actually, my speech is more or less addressed to the members of the conference on land and people, but I would like to say one or two other things about the Government for the benefit of those who are students and who might be wondering what they should do.

The problem, of course, that we face as a country, is to try to determine those policies which will help maintain the security of the United States, and the peace of the world; to do both. And it was determined in the years following the Second World War, and quite properly and rightly, that our security was best served in a world of diversity. If there could be a whole variety of sovereign states stretching around the world, living, we hoped, in internal freedom, but in any case in external freedom, not part of the Communist bloc, not part of the Communist apparatus, under those conditions it would be impossible for any group to mobilize sufficient force to imperil the United States, and in order to do that, we assisted Western Europe, we allied ourselves more intimately with Latin America, we helped rebuild Japan, we joined the SEATO treaty in southeast Asia, we associated ourselves with the CENTO treaty. In the last 4 or 5 years we have played an intimate role in the developing countries of Africa.

Our basic objective has been to maintain the security and interest of the United States by maintaining the freedom of other countries. And they are stretched around the world. This has been an assignment which no country in history has undertaken.

I don't think the American people realize how extraordinary has been our responsibility, and how extraordinary has been our effort. To attempt to maintain the freedom of dozens of countries, 30 or 40 of which are newly independent in the last few years, with limited traditions, with a limited number of educated people, to try to maintain the balance of power against a monolithic Communist apparatus, was an assignment which challenged even the resources, the wealth, and the experience and the dedication of our own people. There have been some disappointments and some defeats. But it seems to me all in all, as we look at the world, however imperfect it may be, however frustrating it may be, however limited our authority may be on occasions, however impossible we may find it to have our writ accepted, nevertheless, the United States is secure, it is at peace, and a good many dozens of countries are secure because of us.

This was a policy carried out through three administrations of different parties, but I think every American citizen, 180 million of them, can take satisfaction in that record. One million Americans serve outside the United States tonight. No country in the long history of the world has ever had such a proportion of its population serving outside of its native land without regard to conquest, without regard to material return, but in order to assist to maintain the freedom of countries stretching 10,000 miles away.

So I must say to all of us who are here, that however weary we may get of the burden, however disappointed we may be, however frustrated we may be, it is worth it. This country is rich, prosperous, it can be more prosperous. It has nearly doubled its wealth in 15 years. With the exception of the great failure we had at the time of Korea, we have lived in peace. We have many hazards, many dangers, but we have moved through a period of change almost unmatched in history for 18 years, and we still are strong and we still have many hopes.

To maintain, it seems to me, that effort, we have to be strong here in the United States. This country cannot afford to move and limp from recession to recession, with increased numbers of people unemployed, with a fifth of our population on the bottom end, passing on, in a sense, from generation to generation a lack of education, a lack of opportunity, a lack of hope, and feel that we can continue to be indefinitely the leaders of the free world. The fact of the matter is, it is our responsibility as a nation to master our domestic problems so that we are able to carry our responsibilities abroad, so that we can continue to live here at home in peace, and we cannot say when Western Europe, which was prostrate at the end of the 1940's, has been able to move through a period of 13 years without a recession, its major economic problem has been a shortage of people for work, when Italy, which was regarded, particularly in its south, as almost an insolvable problem, now has an unemployment rate that is less than that of the United States.

We must, of course, decide on those policies which will help put our people to work, which will prevent the kind of recession and movement which we had at the end of the 1950's, from 1958 when we had a recession to 1960 when we had a recession, and which we may, if we do not take the proper steps, move into a period of decline perhaps in the months and years ahead. So we are here today to determine what we can do to maintain our domestic rise, to make sure that it is shared by the widest possible number of our people, to make sure that in this very rich country which carries so many burdens abroad, that we also meet our responsibilties here at home. And you cannot be a student at this school, or be a citizen of the United States and not know well that we are capable of looking at the problems as they exist and taking those measures after this extraordinary record abroad and after an impressive record on the whole here at home—of taking those measures which will do the job.

Therefore, I am here to take part in a conference of Land and People in an area of the country which shares with certain other areas the difficulties which come when the mines run out, when we are far away from markets, and when, in many cases, the skills have been developed for industries which are no longer with us. What has happened here in this section of Minnesota has happened in West Virginia, has happened in the eastern section of Kentucky, has happened in southern Illinois, has happened in parts of Ohio, and parts of Indiana. It is on the whole confined to those areas which, of course, are the great mining areas of the United States, where the mines have run out, the owners have left, and the people remain, and where we have in some cases chronic unemployment of 15 or 20 percent.

This is a national responsibility. This country cannot continue to expect a steady rise in our national growth rate unless these areas of the United States which have been islands of poverty in many cases and islands of distress in nearly every case in the last decade are dealt with.

I do not make this problem simple. There is no one answer. There are a number of answers but no one answer. And every answer requires the effort of the U.S. Government, the effort of the State government, and the effort of the people, most of all here in these communities. What is true here is true also in northern Wisconsin, Ashland and the others where we visited today. What I want to say is that I believe that the Federal Government has a role to play, and I want to make it clear that we intend to play that role because this is a matter which affects the well-being of the United States. This northern Great Lakes region has land, water, manpower, resources, transportation and recreation facilities. It also has distress. The unemployment rate is twice that of the Nation as a whole, which is, itself, too high. Economy of a region which we feel must be prospering has reflected itself in a series of economic setbacks as the mines and mills have shutdown. Year after year this area has the short end of every economic indicator and in the winter it is much worse.

Moreover, whatever the statistics show, these are people and their families, and their standards of living. Economic indicators reflect what has happened in this summer, or last spring. What we have to concern ourselves with is what is going to happen this coming winter and the next spring and the next summer. A waste of human resources is disastrous, far worse than a waste of natural resources. And I think this conference, which represents a cooperative effort by the people who live in this area and by the State government and the National Government I think gives us some hope that the attention of all will be devoted to these areas until this problem is solved. And I think that the presence of so many representatives of different Federal agencies who have concern for these matters is an indication of our interest.

There are several Federal programs which have been enacted and which must be renewed, which I believe have some importance. We have a good deal of struggle, as JOHN BLATNIK knows better than anyone, perhaps, with some of these matters. The Federal Government, it is charged should be less active. We should withdraw our efforts; we should be indifferent. But the fact of the matter is unless we meet our responsibilities on the national level, this area, and areas like it will be left to time until the people finally move out.

Therefore, I suggest the following programs which I hope will have your support and the support of the people of the United States:

First is the education and training of the labor force. In the aftermath of all the changes which are taking place in science and technology, no American can expect that any skill which he has now can carry him throughout his life. This is a time of change, and a time of opportunity. Therefore, we have to concern ourselves not only with the education of our children but also with the education and the retraining of those who are already at work. This is particularly true in those areas where we have had so many people dependent on two or the three basic industries. This is an area which prides itself in education. The attendance at the University of Minnesota at Duluth I think indicates the preeminence which the citizens of this part of the United States have given to educating their children, even if it has meant sacrificing other necessities.

In this effort, Federal programs have been of help. Thirty-two Minnesota colleges and universities participate in the current Federal student loan program and already that program has been cut back in the last 3 weeks. Some of your sons and daughters will not be able to go to school as a result of it. Two-thirds of all the students in the secondary schools take advantage of federally financed school guidance. Over 500,000 Minnesotans are receiving new or improved Federal library services. Almost 100,000 are getting vocational education to improve their skills. This program is sustained by the National Government. We must strengthen that program. The one thing we will not need in the next 7, or 8 or 9 years is unskilled labor.

I said, speaking the other night on television, this country has to find 10 million jobs in 2½ years. We are going to have many more times as many young men and women coming into the labor market in the sixties as came in the fifties, and 7 or 8 million of them will be school dropouts who have no skills, who have only their labor to give at a time when machines are doing the job that men did 10 or 20 years ago. What are we going to do with all of them? Where are we going to find work for them? What we are talking about are 10 million jobs in 2½ years. And we are not going to have them unless we do something about it on the national level as well as the local level.

We have 100,000 people getting new vocational training in this State. As I said, we have a program before the Congress to strengthen vocational training. And I think we need that if we are going to find work for our people.

Under the manpower training and development program, this State alone has 42 projects approved in the brief period of slightly more than a year. But more must be done. Education must be improved. Higher education must be strengthened. We are going to have twice as many boys and girls going to our colleges in 1970 as went in 1960. That means we have to build as much plant in our colleges in 10 years as we built in 150 years. And these boys and girls are going to be your sons and daughters. And if they get to college, their life prospects are much more secure. If they finish high school, they are still secure. If they drop out of high school their chances are bleak. So this is a job for all of us. It certainly is a job primarily for the State of Minnesota, but this is an area where also I think the National Government can play a stimulating role. Both the National Defense Education Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act must be strengthened. I hope those who speak against these programs would come to these areas where they are so desperately needed.

Second, we must increase our aid to areas of chronic and substantial unemployment under the Area Redevelopment Act, these areas which are chronically hard-hit, where business doesn't want to come, unless we make it attractive to them to come. Business would rather establish themselves near the big cities, where the markets are. They are not going to come up into northern Minnesota unless a real effort is made, unless credit and loans are developed, unless retraining is there, unless we develop the resources, unless we put in highways. Otherwise, they are going to move closer to the large markets. What attraction is it for a new industry to go to West Virginia or eastern Kentucky or southern Illinois unless we give them fresh water and pure water, unless we give them retrained labor, unless we give them highways, unless they can get loans at a reasonable rate of interest? They then may be attracted to go. Otherwise, these areas are left behind.

And your U.S. Senators, GENE MCCARTHY and HUBERT HUMPHREY, worked harder on the Area Redevelopment Act than almost any other act. We have passed that, but we have to renew it, or otherwise a good deal that we have accomplished will be left behind.

Twenty economically depressed areas have been identified in Minnesota and within these areas 27 projects for financial assistance and 14 for technical assistance have been approved. Ten other projects to train people in job skills in short supply have been awarded, and the technical assistance program of ARA is exploring new uses for low-grade iron ore.

All these subjects do not have the drama of the great struggle over the nuclear test ban treaty, but these are the hard jobs of Government, and this country will be able to fulfill its responsibilities as a great, free society if we take care of the matters back home. And if we take care of the undramatic matters which make the difference between life and death in a community and happiness or depression for a family. These programs have some way still to go.

And third, the accelerated public works program, adopted only last year, has created useful employment in hard-hit areas. More than $6½ million was invested in conservation projects in National and State forests in the three-State area, creating jobs for hundreds of men, even though there are thousands but at least for hundreds of men, who otherwise would have been out of work last winter.

One hundred eighty projects costing over $11 million in this area have benefited from this legislation, and I am hopeful that there will be more action in this area in the future.

Fourth, the proposed Youth Conservation Corps, which has been sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY in the Senate, if passed by the Congress, can serve a dual purpose. Patterned after the CCC's of the 1030's, it will provide jobs for thousands of young men entering the labor market, and that is the place where unemployment is the highest. At the same time, it will provide a ready means of advancing the conservation work in our national and State forests. The young men joining this corps will be working for our country, getting a chance to develop some skills, leaving something behind them which will be memorable, instead of being on a street corner waiting for a job that doesn't come.

Fifth, we need to speed up the rural area development program, launched last year to encourage more productive use of the land, to create income-producing outdoor recreation, and to aid in the location of industry in rural areas. Unless we all work on this program, we are going to have, as I said before, industry concentrating in the great population centers. The people will go there and the rural areas will be left behind.

Sixth, I think the tax cut, which the House of Representatives will vote on tomorrow, I think can stimulate the entire economy, and its effects will be felt over the United States.

And seventh, and finally, Federal, State, and privately financed research must apply the genius of American science and technology to the development of this region. A combination of the tax depreciation law of last year and new technological breakthroughs is producing investment and new hope, for example, in the large-scale use of taconite. Senators HUMPHREY and MCCARTHY and Congressman BLATNIK have joined Governor Rolvaag in a bipartisan group to encourage the leaders of the steel industry to plan investments on the scale of hundreds of millions of dollars in this new iron ore technology. The more than $540 million already invested in facilities producing 17½ million tons of ore each year will be increased by $550 million, raising the production to more than 32 million tons. Employment, it is estimated, will increase from 5,700 at present to over 10,000, and provide steadier employment than the old-style mining operations of the past.

Another important scientific activity undertaken by the National Government and the State government is to control the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes. This could help restore the fishing industry and serve once more as an attraction to people to come to this area of the United States, and there will be nearly 50 million of them in this area in the next years. Also, the Nation's first fresh water quality control laboratory is being constructed by the Federal Government here in Duluth, on the shores of Lake Superior, and at the juncture of the two States which have the greatest number of lakes in the Union. I think it can provide an enormous supply of fresh water, and it is located in the district of the father of the Federal water pollution control program, the program which is giving us some hope of cleaning up our streams and rivers faster than we can pollute them, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, and this is going to mean industry all over the country.

These are some of the dry, routine businesses of Government, but I think it deserves your support. What we have to decide is where do we go from here? The programs I have talked about are still quite limited. There are hundreds of thousands of people that need assistance, and we are talking still in the thousands. But if this economy can boom ahead, if we are able to take those steps economically this year which have been recommended to the Congress, I think this country can miss a recession, I think we can enjoy prosperity, I think we can reduce our unemployment rate, and we can concentrate our attention then on those areas of the economy which are not sharing in the general prosperity.

These programs which I have discussed can be most effective if there is a general lift of the economy throughout the entire country. If you have a slowdown in the economy, the kinds of programs which I am discussing won't do the job. There is not enough in there. There are not enough people being retrained. There are not enough area redevelopment programs. But if the economy, as a unit, can move ahead, we can bring our unemployment rate down to the 5 percent or below, and then we can concentrate these programs on the hard-hit areas and we can make an appreciable difference.

We can, I believe, solve a good many of our problems. I think they are manmade and they can be solved by man. And I think we must not keep our attention so fixed on those great issues of war and peace which are perhaps the most desperate and the most serious aand the most important, or the great issues of space, but also concern ourselves with what happens in the United States, and particularly in those areas of the United States which have been left behind.

I suggest to any students at this college that he, in considering his efforts in the field of public service, no matter how attractive service may be abroad, and I urge it, there is also a good deal of unfinished business here at home. To those men and women who may be members of one of our great political parties, we still need your help. And to those members of the conference who are interested in land and water, what I have suggested here only indicates the strong support that we give to the effort you make here.

In the final analysis, the energy in this country runs from the community through the State to Washington. It comes back, I hope, with renewed impact, because of these kinds of conferences, which give us some indication of the direction in which we should move. Nearly every program I have described has come about as a result of concentrated work by dedicated individuals on the local level. Out of this conference we ask for new suggestions and new ideas, as to how we can coordinate this one great country of ours, the 180 million people in it, and make this a better country in which to live.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA FIELD HOUSE, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., SEPTEMBER 25, 1963

Mr. President, Governor Guy, Senator Burdick, Secretary Udall, Senator Mansfield, Senator Metcalf, other Members of the Senate who may be here, ladies and gentlemen, politics is a somewhat abused profession in the United States. Artemus Ward once said, "I am not a politician and my other habits are good also." But I would want to say that it has some advantages. It permitted me to go from being a somewhat indifferent lieutenant in the U.S. Navy to becoming Commander in Chief in the short space of 15 years, and it has also permitted me to become a graduate of this university in 30 seconds, when it takes you 4 years. So in determining what career you should follow, you might consider this lowly profession.

I am glad to be here at this college. Prince Bismarck, who was named after Bismarck, N. Dak., once said that one-third of the students of German universities broke down from overwork, another third broke down from dissipation, and the other third ruled Germany. I do not know which third of the student body of this school is here today, but I am confident I am talking to the future rulers of not only North Dakota, but the United States, in the sense that all educated citizens bear the burden of governing, as active participants in the democratic process.

I have come on a journey of 5 days across the United States, beginning in Pennsylvania and ending in California, to talk about the conservation of our resources, and I think it is appropriate that we should come here to North Dakota where this whole struggle for the maintenance of the natural resources of this country, for the development of the natural resources of this country, in a sense, began. I do not argue whether it was Harvard University or North Dakota that made Theodore Roosevelt such a man and such a conservationist, but I am sure that his years here in North Dakota helped make him realize how expensive, how wasteful was indifference to this great resource and how valuable it could become. He put it on much more than a material plane. He said it was the moral obligation of a society in order to preserve that society to maintain its natural endowment.

In 1963 we face entirely different problems than we faced at the time of Theodore Roosevelt. The fact of the matter is that because we have so much in surplus in the United States, there is some feeling in many parts of the country, and I am sure not here, that we can afford to waste what we have. I don't believe that at all. I think what we have to decide is how we can put it to best use, how we can provide in 1963 and in the whole decade of the 1960's a use of our natural and scientific and technological advances so that in the years to come the 350 million people who will live in the United States in the year 2000 can enjoy a much richer and happier life than we do today. And unless we make the proper decisions today on how we shall use our water and our air, and our land, and our oceans, unless we make the comparable effort, an effort comparable to what Theodore Roosevelt and others made 50 years ago, we are going to waste it.

The fact of the matter is that in the field of conservation, every day that is lost is a valuable opportunity wasted. Every time, particularly in the East, where they have such concentration of population—every time an acre of land disappears into private development or exploitation, an acre of land which could be used for the people, we have lost a chance. We will never get it back. The fact of the matter is that land will rise in value, and unless we set it aside and use it wisely today, in 1970 or 1975 we won't have the chance. As you know, along the Atlantic coast, nearly all of the sea, the beach, is owned by comparatively few people. We were able to set aside, a year ago, Cape Cod Park, which is near to all of the people of New England. We are talking about doing the same now on the Delaware River. We are talking about doing the same in northern Indiana, near Gary. We have to seize these opportunities—we are talking about now doing the same in northern Wisconsin—we have to seize these opportunities to set aside these wilderness areas, these primitive areas, these fresh water areas, these lakes. We have to set them aside for the people who are going to come after us.

And we have to not only set them aside, but we have to develop them. We have to purify our water. We have to make this a richer country in which to live, and it can be done. This State of North Dakota should know it better than any. This State had, 30 years ago, three out of every hundred farms lit by electricity, and now nearly all are. What was 30 years ago a life of affluence, in a sense today is a life of poverty. This country moves ahead. This is a much richer country than it was 15 years ago, but it is so because decisions were made in those days which made it possible for us to live much better today. You cannot live in North Dakota, you cannot fly over this State, without realizing how wise were those who went before us and how necessary it is that we make the proper decision.

Theodore Roosevelt once said that the White House is a great pulpit from which to preach, and I would like to preach not only the vigorous life which he preached for us physically, but also for us in our time, facing entirely different problems, to make the same wise, vigorous decisions which he made for the conservation of our natural resources so that you and your children can enjoy this great and rich country. Nature has been so generous to us that we have mistreated her. Now, when our country is becoming increasingly crowded, when science and technology wastes so much of what we have, we have to realize that time is running out for us.

So we come on this trip to remind the American people of what they have, and to remind the people of what they must do to maintain it. Here, only a few minutes from here, is the Garrison Dam. Just to show you what decisions made by us today can do for the people of North Dakota in the 1970's, that one dam alone will have a water area, manmade, as great as the total water area in North Dakota when this project was begun in 1946. Nature put the lakes there 50 years ago. Now man makes them. And man improves what nature has done. I have strongly supported the Garrison reclamation project, which will use water stored behind the Garrison Dam, and I am confident that it will make a major contribution to the development of America.

This is a matter of concern to all Americans. I think sometimes we read too much about the problems of particular areas, and maybe North Dakota may not be so interested in the beaches along the Atlantic coast or along the gulf, or along the west coast, and people in the East not so much interested in the Garrison project in North Dakota, which is far away, but this country is not far away. It is closer than it has even been before. When you can fly across it in 5 hours, when more importantly than transportation, is the fact that we are one people, living in 50 States and living in hundreds of communities, what happens on the east coast where your children may some day live, what happens in the Middle West, where the children of people in New England may some day live, and what happens on the west coast are of concern to all of us.

Therefore, this impressive chain of dams, which includes Garrison, has been called with some accuracy the Great Lakes of the Missouri, which belong to all of the people. Behind these dams, the "Big Muddy" is turning blue, and soil is being saved, crops are being irrigated, recreation opportunities are growing. And this whole problem of recreation is going to be one of our most promising and important areas of human activity in the next 10 or 15 years.

Automation, which is a technical word, and which brings grief, can also bring a good deal of pleasure. If you realize that we are moving more on the railroads of the United States with half as many people working on them as worked 15 years ago, the question is what has happened to those 50 percent of the people and what are they doing, and how are they spending their time? And what is true on the railroads is true on the farms, where with a steadily diminishing population, we farm more and more.

How are we going to find work for those people? Those of you who are studying here and are concerned with the social sciences, which you must be, must wonder how you are going to find work for the millions of people who are coming into the market every year seeking jobs. I said, in speaking on our tax bill the other night, that we are going to have to find 10 million jobs in 2½ years. How are we going to find them? What individual actions must be taken and what national actions must be taken to find 10 million jobs for your sons and daughters in the short space of 2½ years? What are you going to do with 8 million people coming into the labor market in the rest of this decade and who haven't graduated from high school? How are they going to find work? Fifty years ago, thirty years ago, they might have worked on a farm, or could have done heavy labor. But today what is needed are skills and the uneducated man or woman is left behind. It is as inevitable as nature.

These are the problems which face this great democracy of ours. They cannot be solved by turning away, but can be solved, I believe, by the united, intelligent effort of us all. And what is true of people is true of animals. We have only about half as many cows as we had 30 years ago and they are producing about 25 percent more milk. What is going to happen to all of the people who once did all of the jobs which are not longer needed? By wise national policy, involving monetary and fiscal policy, I believe that we can stimulate this economy of ours to absorb these people. And also, we should make life in this country so beautiful that as the hours of work lessen, and there are now 40 hours and someday they will be less, people will have some place to go and some place to find close to nature to enrich their lives.

So what I am saying now, in a sense, is that we are the heirs of Theodore Roosevelt, and that what we must do today is to prepare for those who are our heirs. The steps we take in conservation and recreation will have very little effect upon all of us here immediately and in this decade. What we are doing in the real sense is preparing for those who come after us.

We are gradually narrowing the difference between the standards of living of our city and rural populations. Parity of farm income is important. But beyond that we are gradually, too slowly but gradually, achieving a parity between urban and rural people in other aspects of life, in their ability to obtain electric service, in their power and resources available for economic development, in their facilities and opportunities for recreation. We are seeking, in short, a true parity of opportunity for all of our people, north and south, east and west. It will not come overnight, but the example of what has been done to light the farms of this State in 30 years shows what can be done when the Government and the people, working closely together, work for the common interest.

When I think what REA has done for this State and all of the fight against it when it was first put into effect, isn't it astonishing to you that this country after the end of World War I, in many ways a much more virgin country, passed through a recession in 1921, 1922, and 1923, a depression, in fact, and a panic, passed through a period of low farm income and depression on the farm through the rest of the 1920's, and then moved through a depression of such staggering dimensions that it existed from 1929 to the outbreak of World War II, and yet from 1945, while we have moved through periods of recession we have almost tripled our wealth in the short space of 18 years. And we have not passed through a period in any way comparable to the early 1920's, or the desperate days of the 1930's. And a lot of that is because of the decisions which the Government and the people made together in the 1930's which makes it possible for us, moving on that base, to determine wise policies in the 1960's.

There is an old saying that things don't happen, they are made to happen. And we in our years have to make the same wise judgments about what policies will insure us a growing prosperity as were made in the years before. The whole experience between two world wars, which was so tragic for this country, should tell us that we cannot leave it to mere chance and accident. It requires the long-range judgment of all of us, the public judgment, not only the pursuit of our private interests but the public judgment of what it takes to keep 180 million people gradually rising. And anyone who thinks it can be done by accident and chance should look back on the history of 1919 to 1939 to know what can happen when we let natural forces operate completely freely.

Five billion dollars were advanced under REA to 1,000 borrowers. More than 1,500,000 miles of powerlines have been built serving 20 million American people. This has been a sound investment. Out of roughly 1,000 borrowers, co-ops, only 1 is delinquent in payment, and the total losses on the $5 billion advanced are less than $50,000. Here in North Dakota, REA-financed rural co-ops serve on the average yearly more than 1 electric meter per mile of line, compared to the average in urban-based utilities systems of 33 meters to each mile of line. These are the things which can make the great difference. What I urge upon those of you who are students here is to make determinations based on life as it is, on facts as they are, not merely here in this community, not merely in North Dakota, not merely in the United States, but in this varied and dangerous world of ours in which we play such a leading and responsible part. Unless the United States can demonstrate a sound and vigorous democratic life, a society which is not torn apart by friction and faction, an economy which is steadily growing; unless it can do all those things we cannot continue to bear the responsibilities of leadership which I think almost alone have prevented this world of ours from being overrun. The fact of the matter is that there are many things happening in the world which should serve to encourage us, as well as discourage us.

If 5 or 6 years ago anyone had ever visualized what has happened behind the Iron Curtain and the Bamboo Curtain they would have been regarded as completely unrealistic. All of the pressures which have been brought to bear on life in the Communist world have been brought to bear in part only because of the inner contradictions of the Communist system itself, but also because the United States chose in 1945 to assume the burdens of maintaining a watch at the gate of freedom when so many other countries, which so long had carried a heavy responsibility around the world were prostrate and defeated. So this country has done a good deal.

I come here today to say it can do a good deal more. And I urge those of you who are students here to recognize the obligation which any educated man or woman must bear to society as a whole. This school was not developed merely to give its graduates an economic advantage in the life struggle. We do not seek merely, I am sure at this school, to graduate lawyers, farmers, or doctors, who may lead their communities in income. What we seek to advance, what we seek to develop in all of our colleges and universities, are educated men and women who can bear the burdens of responsible citizenship, who can make judgments about life as it is, and as it must be, and encourage the people to make those decisions which can bring not only prosperity and security, but happiness to the people of the United States and those who depend upon it.

So in that great effort, I urge you to participate. Nothing will give you more satisfaction. No need is greater. And I hope that all of us, not only in the field of our immediate interest but in the field of our resources, will also make the necessary and immediate decisions.

Marshal Lyautey, who was the great French Marshal in North Africa, was once talking to his gardener and he suggested that he plant a tree, and the gardener said, "well, why plant it? It won't flower for 100 years." And Marshal Lyautey said, "In that case, plant it this afternoon."

I think that is good advice for all of us. Thank you.

Remarks of the President, Yellowstone County Fairgrounds, Billings, Mont., September 25, 1963

Senator Mansfield, Governor, Secretary Udall, Senator Metcalf, Senator McGee, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express our appreciation to you for your welcome, and I appreciate the chance to be introduced by my old friend and colleague, Senator Mansfield. I know that those of you who live in Montana know something of his character and his high standard of public service, but I am not sure that you are completely aware of what a significant role he has played in the last 3 years in passing through the U.S. Senate measure after measure which strengthens this country at home and abroad. And I think the action which the U.S. Senate took by a vote of 80 to 19 yesterday enjoining the United States, under our constitutional procedures, to 102 other countries to bring an end to nuclear tests in the atmosphere, to bring an end, we hope, for all time to the dangers of radioactive fallout on the citizens of the world, and to take a first step toward peace, and our hope for a more secure world—Senator Mansfield, with the able support of Senator Dirksen, the Republican Minority Leader of the Senate, I think were responsible for that overwhelming vote.

I am glad and proud that the word went out yesterday that Members of the Senate in both parties stood up for the long-range interests not only of the United States, but I think of people everywhere. So I am proud to be in his State, and I am proud to be with his colleague, Senator Metcalf, who speaks for Montana, and also speaks for the United States. This State, in the far Northwest, I think, has sent an outstanding delegation to Washington, and I am, therefore, glad to be with you today.

As the problems which occupy our attention in Washington and in the Congress, and really in the country, have become increasingly complex, I am sure that many citizens who, in the early years of this century, understood or had strong feelings about conservation and about the populous movement and about free silver and the two or three other issues which dominated the political debate in this country for 10, 20, and 30 years, I am sure as they look at the complexities and the suddenness with which events pour across the desk of a citizen of the United States, calling upon him to make a decision, I am sure they must wonder where we are going.

I talked the other day to an Ambassador who went to Cuba under the administration of Herbert Hoover, and as he was leaving, President Hoover said to him, "We have two problems in American foreign relations: Our relations with Cuba, our relations with Mexico. Otherwise the United States has no interests abroad." There is no comparable case in the history of the world where a country lived underlined with drawn and isolated existence as we did until 1939, 1940, and 1941, and then suddenly played such a dominant role all around the world. Countries which we had never heard of before, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, and the others; countries which were distant names on our geographies, have now become matters of the greatest concern, where the interests of the United States are vitally involved, and where we have, for example, in Vietnam, over 25,000 of our sons and brothers bearing arms.

So this is a difficult and complex world. I am sure a citizen in this community and in this country must wonder what we are doing. I think what we are trying to do is comparatively simple, and that is, with our own power and might, and the only country which has that power and might, and I believe the long-range perseverance and determination, we are trying to assist the hundred-odd countries which are now independent to maintain their independence. We do that not only because we wish them to be free, but because it serves our own national interest. As long as there are all of these countries separate, free, and independent, and not part of one great monolithic bloc which threatens us, so long we are free and independent.

When it appeared at the end of the fifties that there would be over a billion people organized in the Communist movement, Russia, and China, and Eastern Europe working closely together, that represented a danger to us which could turn the balance of power against us. As there has been a division within the bloc, as there has been a fragmentation behind the Iron Curtain, as the long-range interests of geography and nationalism play a part even behind the Iron Curtain, as it does on this side of the Iron Curtain, we have made progress, not toward an easier existence, but I think toward a chance for a more secure existence.

In 1961 the United States and the Soviet Union came face to face over Berlin. The United States called up more than 150,000 troops. At the meeting in Vienna, of 1961, Mr. Khrushchev informed me that he was going to sign a peace treaty in Berlin by the end of the year, and if the United States continued to supply its forces in Berlin it would be regarded as a possible act of war. In 1962 we came face to face with the same great challenge in Cuba, in October. So we have lived, even in the short space of the last 3 years, on two occasions when we were threatened with a direct military confrontation. We wish to lessen that prospect. We know that the struggle between the Communist system and ourselves will go on. We know it will go on in economics, in productivity, in ideology, in Africa, in Latin America, in the Middle East, and Asia.

But what we hope to do is lessen the chance of a military collision between these two great nuclear powers which together have the power to kill 300 million people in the short space of a day. That is what we are seeking to avoid. That is why I support the test ban treaty. Not because we are going to be easier in our lives, but because we have a chance to avoid being burned.

In addition to that problem abroad, we have a problem here in the United States. The reason why I think it is most important and why I am strongly in support of the action of the House of Representatives today in overwhelmingly passing, in the House, the tax bill, is because I recognize in this country, with our tremendously increasing population, and machines taking the jobs of men, that unless we can stimulate our economy we are going to limp from recession to recession, always coming out of the recession with more unemployed and finally finding ourselves faced with overwhelming economic problems here at home. As I have said before, the United States must find 10 million jobs in the next 2½ years. We had a recession every 40 months since the end of World War II. That 40 months runs out in January 1964. Yet at the same time, when we run into this problem of a possible recession, we have the job of finding 10 million jobs. So these are the problems we face, and what we seek to do in Washington, at home and abroad, is strengthen the United States, strengthen its vital interests, and have it live in greater security. One of the ways that I think we can strengthen its vital interests is to strengthen the resources of the United States. This State of Montana knows better almost than any other State what it means when you develop the water resources and get cheap power. If this States does not have cheap power, how can you possibly compete, having to send your goods by the most expensive transportation route in the United States to eastern markets.

The only way you can make up for that disadvantage is to develop your resources and protect them, water, power and all the rest. And this Congress has done great actions which have gone comparatively unnoticed but which I think can make a significant difference not only for us but for those who come after us. We passed in the last session of the Congress, and no one here at Billings probably ever knew it, three major pieces of legislation providing for the setting aside of more seashore parks in the United States than any Congress in the history of our country. Over 300 miles of coastline on the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific Ocean and the gulf are now available for the public. We have embarked on a long-range acquisition of wetlands. There will be 11 new waterfowl refuges established, more than any period in recent history. We have initiated 10 reclamation projects, including two large-scale projects, and more will be done.

We have, for the first time, made the benefits of our cropland conversion program available to farmers and ranchers throughout the Nation. We have acted to save our woodlands and our wildlife.

This State of Montana which depends on tourists will in 10 years probably find that your number one industry or your number two industry. You must recognize how essential it is, with our exploding population, that we protect our natural resources, our wildernesses, all the things that will attract people to the Northwest.

And we have a lot more to do. We have a chance now to set up a fund which can liquidate itself over a period of years and use it for land and water conservation now, and 10 years from now the price of that same land will have doubled. If we get it now we will have it for our people. If we lose the chance, it will be built upon by private interests and our chance to capture it will be gone. We have a chance to take some of those thousands of boys and girls who are on the city streets, out of work, and put them in our Youth Employment Corps and give them a chance to work on the land, as was done in the 1930's. When you have one out of four of our children out of school and out of work, it is too much.

These are the things that must be done. There is an old saying that we hope for the best and prepare for the worst. I would like to improve that. I think we should work for the best. It may be we have to prepare for the worst. This country, of course, must be strong, but I think that in all these areas of our national life, in education, which is the development of our most precious resources, our children, in education—because there isn't any boy or girl who is going to be sure of a job if they have dropped out of high school, and there are going to be 8 or 9 million of them in the next 7 years unless we do something about it—education of our children, jobs for our people, some security in our older age—these are the things we must do, and I think we can do them.

The potential of this country is unlimited and there is no action which any of us can take in Washington which gives us greater confidence in the future of this country than to leave our city of Washington and come West to Wyoming, Montana, California, and recognize that in this golden area of the United States that a great writer from my own State of Massachusetts, Thoreau, was right when he said, "Eastward I go only by force; westward I go free. I must walk toward Oregon and not toward Europe."

I walk toward Montana. I express my thanks to all of you. And I am confident that when the role of national effort in the 1960's is written, when a judgment is rendered whether this generation of Americans took those steps at home and abroad to make it possible for those who came after us to live in greater security and prosperity, I am confident that history will write that in the 1960's we did our part to maintain our country and make it more beautiful.

Thank you.

Remarks of the President Upon Arrival at Cheyenne Municipal Airport, Cheyenne, Wyo., September 25, 1963

Gale McGee, Mr. Mayor, Secretary Udall, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my thanks to you for a warm welcome. When I asked them, when we were flying, what the weather was, they said 70 degrees, visibility 90 miles. Well, that is why I left Washington, because the weather is somewhat different and the visibility is much less. You see not only further here, but there is something more to see, and I am glad to come all the way from Washington to this community and this State because it is a welcome reminder to fly across the United States and see what a great, rich, prosperous, evergrowing country this is.

Here in this State of Wyoming some of the results of that economic growth have been felt in recent years. This State of Wyoming, which has all of the troubles that all of us have across the country, nevertheless has grown in individual income so that it is now in percentage of growth in the top five States in the United States. This is due to many reasons—the work of the people here, the resources which you have and, I hope, wise national policy on conservation, and resource development, and management of what nature has given us and management of what man has developed from nature.

The fact of the matter is that conservation, which is the primary purpose of our trip across America has changed. Before it was just preserving what the Lord gave us. Now it is using science and technology to find new uses for materials which, a few short years ago, were wasted.

So I come from Washington, D.C., to this community, and I want to tell you that I believe that the strength and influence which our country has, the burdens which it bears around the world are in good measure to the strength and determination and perseverance and hope of the people in this State and the other 49. I appreciate being welcomed here and I know in holding out a hand of greeting you carry on a great tradition of this State. This State was once represented by a Massachusetts man who was smart—Senator O'Mahoney—who came all the way from Chelsea, Mass., and came and represented this State. How many people here today were born in Wyoming? Would you hold up your hands? And how many people were not born in Wyoming?

Well, for one reason or another we all came here, and I am glad. Thank you very much.

Remarks of the President, University of Wyoming Fieldhouse, Laramie, Wyo., September 25, 1963

Thank you very much ladies and gentlemen. Senator McGee, my old colleague in the Senate, Gale McGee, Governor, Mr. President, Senator Mansfield, Senator Metcalf, Secretary Udall, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my appreciation to you for your warm welcome, to you, Governor, the president of the University, to Senator McGee and others. I am particularly glad to come on this conservation trip and have an opportunity to speak at this distinguished university, because what we are attempting to do is to develop the talents in our country which require, of course, education, which will permit us in our time, when the conservation of our resources requires entirely different techniques than were required 50 years ago when the great conservation movement began under Theodore Roosevelt, and these talents, scientific and social talents, must be developed at our universities.

I hope that all of you who are students here will recognize the great opportunity that lies before you in this decade, and in the decades to come, to be of service to our country. The Greeks once defined happiness as full use of your powers along lines of excellence, and I can assure you that there is no area of life where you will have an opportunity to use whatever powers you have, and to use them along more excellent lines, bring ultimately, I think, happiness to you and those whom you serve.

What I think we must realize is that the problems which now face us and their solution are far more complex, far more difficult, far more subtle, require far greater skill and discretion of judgment than any of the problems that this country has faced in its comparatively short history, or any, really, that the world has faced in its long history. The fact is that almost in the last 30 years the world of knowledge has exploded. You remember that Robert Oppenheimer said that 8 or 9 out of 10 of all the scientists who ever lived live today. This last generation has produced nearly all of the scientific breakthroughs, at least relatively, that this world of ours has ever experienced. We are alive, all of us, while this tremendous explosion of knowledge, which has expanded the horizon of our experience, so far has all taken place in the last 30 years.

If you realize that when Queen Victoria sent for Robert Peel to be Prime Minister, he was in Rome, the journey which he took from Rome to London took him the same amount of time to the day that it had taken the Emperor Hadrian to go from Rome to England nearly 1,900 years before. There had been comparatively little progress made in almost 1,900 years in the field of knowledge. Now, suddenly, in the last 100 years, but most particularly in the last 30 years, all that is changed, and all of this knowledge is brought to bear and can be brought to bear in improving our lives and making the life of our people more happy, or destroying them, and that problem is the one, of course, which this generation of Americans and the next must face: how to use that knowledge, how to make a social discipline out of it.

There is really not much use in having science and its knowledge confined to the laboratory unless it comes out into the mainstream of American and world life, and only those who are trained and educated to handle knowledge and the disciplines of knowledge can be expected to play a significant part in the life of their country. So quite obviously this university is not maintained by the people of Wyoming merely to help all of the graduates enjoy a prosperous life. That may come, that may be a byproduct, but the people of Wyoming contribute their taxes to the maintenance of this school in order that the graduates of school may, themselves, return to the society which helped develop them, some of the talents which that society has made available, and what is true in this State is true across the United States.

The reason why, at the height of the Civil War, when the preservation of the Union was in doubt, Abraham Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act, which has built up the most extraordinary educational system in the world, was because he knew that a Nation could not exist and be ignorant and free, and what was true 100 years ago is more true today. So what we have to decide is how we are going to manage the complicated social and economic and world problems which come across our desks, my desk, as President of the United States, the desk of the Senators as representatives of the States, the Members of the House as representatives of the people.

But most importantly, as the final power is held by a majority of the people, how the majority of the people are going to make their judgment on the wise use of our resources, on the correct monetary and fiscal policy, what steps we should take in space, what steps we should take to develop the resources of the ocean, what steps we should take to manage our balance of payments, what we should do in the Congo or Vietnam, or in Latin America. All these areas which come to rest upon the United States as the leading great power of the world, with the determination and the understanding to recognize what is at stake in the world—all these are problems far more complicated than any group of citizens ever had to deal with in the history of the world, or any group of Members of Congress had to deal with.

If you feel that the Members of Congress were more talented 100 years ago, and certainly the Senators in the years before the Civil War included the brightest figures, probably, that ever sat in the Senate—Benton, Clay, Webster, Calhoun, and all the rest—they talked, and at least three of them stayed in the Congress 40 years, they talked for 40 years about four or five things, tariffs and the development of the West, land, the rights of the States to slavery, Mexico. Now we talk about problems in one summer which dwarf in complexity all of those matters, and we must deal with them or we will perish. So I think the chance for an educated graduate of this school to serve his State and country is bright. I can assure you that you are needed. This trip that I have taken is now about 24 hours old, but it is a rewarding 24 hours because there is nothing more encouraging than for those of us to leave the rather artificial city of Washington and come and travel across the United States and realize what is here, the beauty, the diversity, the wealth, and the vigor of the people. Last Friday I spoke to delegates from all over the world at the United Nations. It is an unfortunate fact that nearly every delegate comes to the United States from all around the world and they make a judgment on the United States based upon an experience in New York or Washington, and rarely do they come West beyond the Mississippi and rarely do they go to California or to Hawaii or to Alaska. Therefore, they do not understand the United States, and those of us who stay only in Washington sometimes lose our comprehension of the national problems which require a national solution. This country has become rich because nature was good to us, and because the people who came from Europe predominantly also were among the most vigorous. The basic resources were used skillfully and economically, and because of the wise work done by Theodore Roosevelt and others, significant progress was made in conserving these resources.

The problem, of course, now is that the whole concept of conservation must change in the 1960's if we are going to pass on to the 350 million Americans who will live in this country in 40 years where 180 million Americans now live—if we are going to pass on a country which is even richer.

The fact of the matter is that the management of our national resources, instead of being primarily a problem of conserving them, of saving them, now requires the scientific application of knowledge to develop new resources. We have come to realize to a large extent that resources are not passive. Resources are not merely something that was here, put by nature. Research tells us that previously valueless materials, which 10 years ago were valueless now can be among the most valuable natural resources of the United States. And that is the most significant fact in conservation now since the early 1900's when Theodore Roosevelt started his work. A conservationist's first reaction in those days was to preserve, to hoard, to protect every nonrenewable resource. It was the fear of resource exhaustion which caused the great conservation movement of the 1900's. And this fear was reflected in the speeches and attitudes of our political leaders and their writers.

This is not surprising in the light of the technology of that time, but today that approach is out of date, and I think this is an important fact for the State of Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain States. It is both too pessimistic and too optimistic. We need no longer fear that our resources and energy supplies are a fixed quantity that can be exhausted in accordance with a particular rate of consumption. On the other hand, it is not enough to put barbed wire around a forest or a lake, or put in stockpiles of minerals, or restrictive laws and regulations on the exploitation of resources. That was the old way of doing it.

Our primary task now is to increase our understanding of our environment, to a point where we can enjoy it without defacing it, use its bounty without detracting permanently from its value, and, above all, maintain a living balance between man's actions and nature's reactions, for this Nation's great resource is as elastic and productive as our ingenuity can make it. For example, soda ash is a multimillion-dollar industry in this State. A few years ago there was no use for it. It was wasted. People were unaware of it. Even if it were sought, it could not be found. Not because it wasn't here, but because effective prospecting techniques had not been developed. Now soda ash is a necessary ingredient in the production of glass, steel, and other products. As a result of a series of experiments, of a harnessing of science to the use of man, this great new industry has opened up. In short, conservation is no longer protection and conserving and restricting. The balance between our needs and the availability of our resources, between our aspirations and our environment is constantly changing.

One of the great resources which we are going to find in the next 40 years is not going to be the land; it will be the ocean. We are going to find untold wealth in the oceans of the world which will be used to make a better life for our people. Science is changing all of our natural environment. It can change it for good; it can change it for bad. We are pursuing, for example, new opportunities in coal, which have been largely neglected, examining the feasibility of transporting coal by water through pipelines, of gasification at the mines, of liquefaction of coal into gasoline, and of transmitting electric power directly from the mouth of the mine. The economic feasibility of some of these techniques has not been determined, but it will be in the next decade. At the same time, we are engaged in active research on better means of using low grade coal to meet the tremendous increase in the demand for coal we are going to find in the rest of the century. This is, in effect, using science to increase our supply of a resource of which the people of the United States were totally unaware 50 years ago.

Another research undertaking of special concern to this Nation and this State is the continuing effort to develop practical and feasible techniques of converting oil shale into usable petroleum fuels. The higher grade deposits in Wyoming alone are equivalent to 30 billion barrels of oil, and 200 billion barrels in the case of lower grade development. This could not be used, there was nothing to conserve, and now science is going to make it possible.

Investigation is going on to assure at the same time an adequate water supply so that when we develop this great new industry it will be able to use it and have sufficient water. Resource development, therefore, requires not only the coordination of all branches of science, but it requires the joint effort of scientists, government, State, National, and local, and members of other professional disciplines. For example, we are now examining in the United States today the mixed economic-technical question of whether very large-scale nuclear reactors can produce unexpected savings in a simultaneous desalinization of water and the generation of electricity. We will have, before this decade is out or sooner, a tremendous nuclear reactor which makes electricity and at the same time gets fresh water from salt water at a competitive price. What a difference this can make to the Western United States. And, indeed, not only the United States, but all around the globe where there are so many deserts on the ocean's edge.

It is effort, I think, such as this, where the National Government can play a significant role, where the scale of public investment or the nationwide scope of the problem, the national significance of the results are too great to ignore or which cannot always be carried out by private research. Federal funds and stimulation can help make the most imaginative and productive use of our manpower and facilities. The use of science and technology in these fields has gained understanding and support in the Congress. Senator GALE MCGEE has proposed an energetic study of the technology of electrometallurgy—the words are getting longer as the months go on, and more complicated—an area of considerable importance to the Rocky Mountains. All this, I think, is going to change the life of Wyoming and going to change the life of the United States. What we regard now as relative well-being 30 years from now will be regarded as poverty. When you realize that 30 years ago 1 out of 10 farms had electricity, and yet some farmers thought that they were living reasonably well, now for a farm not to have electricity we regard them as living in the depths of poverty. That is how great a change has come in 30 years. In the short space of 18 years, really, or almost 20 years, the wealth of this country has gone up 300 percent. In 1970, 1980, 1990 this country will be, can be, must be, if we make the proper decisions, if we manage our resources, both human and material, wisely, if we make wise decisions in the Nation, in the State, in the community and individually, if we maintain a vigorous and hopeful pursuit of life and knowledge, the resources of this country are so unlimited and science is expanding them so greatly that all those people who thought 40 years ago that this country would be exhausted in the middle of the century have been proven wrong. It is going to be richer than ever, providing we make the wise decisions and we recognize that the future belongs to those who seize it.

Knowledge is power, a saying 500 years old, but knowledge is power today as never before, not only here in the United States, but the future of the free world depends in the final analysis upon the United States and upon our willingness to reach those decisions on these complicated matters which face us, with courage and clarity. The graduates of this school will, as they have in the past, play their proper role.

I express my thanks to you. This building which 15 years ago was just a matter of conversation is now a reality. So those things which we talk about today, which seem unreal, where so many people doubt that they can be done—the fact of the matter is it has been true all through our history, they will be done, and Wyoming in doing it will play its proper role.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, GREAT FALLS HIGH SCHOOL MEMORIAL STADIUM, GREAT FALLS, MONT., SEPTEMBER 26, 1963

Senator Mansfield, Governor, Secretary Udall, Senator Metcalf, Madam Mayor, Congressman Olsen, ladies, and gentlemen, this journey which started almost by accident has been one of the most impressive experiences of my life. We live in the city of Washington, in a rather artificial atmosphere. Washington was deliberately developed as a Government city in order to remove those who were making the laws from all the pressures of everyday life, and so we live far away.

We talk about the United States, about its problems, its powers, its people, its opportunity, its dangers, its hazards, but we are still talking about life in a somewhat removed way. But to fly, as we have flown, in the short space of 48 hours, from Milford, Pa.; to Ashland, Wis.; to Duluth, Minn.; to North Dakota; to Wyoming; to Montana; back to Wyoming; back to Montana; and then to go to the State of Washington and the State of Utah this evening, shows anyone who makes that journey even in a short period of time what a strong, powerful, and resourceful country this is.

Montana is a long way from Washington, and it is a long way from the Soviet Union, and it is 10,000 miles from Laos. But this particular State, because it has, among other reasons, concentrated within its borders some of the most powerful nuclear missile systems in the world, must be conscious of every danger and must be conscious of how close Montana lives to the firing line which divides the Communist world. We are many thousands of miles from the Soviet Union, but this State, in a very real sense, is only 30 minutes away.

The object of our policy, therefore, must be to protect the United States, to make sure that those over 100 Minuteman missiles which ring this city and this State remain where they are, and that is the object of the foreign policy of the United States under this administration, under the previous administration, and under that of President Truman. One central theme has run through the foreign policy of the United States, and that is, in a dangerous and changing world, it is essential that the 180 million people of the United States throw their weight into the balance in every struggle, in every country on the side of freedom, and so in the last years we have been intimately involved with affairs of countries of which now we never heard 20 years ago, but which now affect the balance of power in the world and, therefore, the security of the United States and, therefore, the chances of war and peace.

I know that there are many of you who sit here and wonder what it is that causes the United States to go so far away, that causes you to wonder why so many of your sons should be stationed so far away from our own territory, who wonder why it is since 1945 that the United States has assisted so many countries. You must wonder when it is all going to end and when we can come back home. Well, it isn't going to end, and this generation of Americans has to make up its mind for our security and for our peace, because what happens in Europe or Latin America or Africa or Asia directly affects the security of the people who live in this city, and particularly those who are coming after.

I make no apologies for the effort that we make to assist these other countries to maintain their freedom, because I know full well that every time a country, regardless of how far away it may be from our own borders—every time that country passes behind the Iron Curtain the security of the United States is thereby endangered. So all those who suggest we withdraw, all those who suggest we should no longer ship our surplus food abroad or assist other countries, I could not disagree with them more. This country is stronger now than it has ever been. Our chances for peace are stronger than they have been in years. The nuclear test ban which was strongly led in the Senate of the United States by Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf is, I believe, a step toward peace and a step toward security, and gives us an additional chance that all of the weapons of Montana will never be fired. That is the object and our policy.

So we need your support. These are complicated problems which face a citizenry. Most of us grew up in a relative period of isolation and neutrality, and unalinement which was our policy from the time of George Washington to the Second World War, and suddenly, in an act almost unknown in the history of the world, we were shoved onto the center of the stage. We are the keystone in the arch of freedom. If the United States were to falter, the whole world, in my opinion, would inevitably begin to move toward the Communist bloc.

It is the United States, this country, your country, which in 15 to 18 years has almost singlehandedly protected the freedom of dozens of countries who, in turn, by being free, protect our freedom. So when you ask why are we in Laos or Vietnam, or the Congo, or why do we support the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, we do so because we believe that our freedom is tied up with theirs, and if we can develop a world in which all the countries are free, then the threat to the security of the United States is lessened. So we have to stay at it. We must not be fatigued.

I do not believe that the test ban treaty means that the competition between the Communist system and ourselves will end. What we hope is that it will not be carried into the sphere of nuclear war. But the competition will go on. Which society is the most productive? Which society educates its children better? Which society maintains a higher rate of economic growth? Which society produces more cultural and intellectual stimulus? Which society, in other words, is the happier?

We believe that ours is, but we should not fool ourselves if the chance of war disappears to some degree.

Other struggles come to the center of the stage. The solution of every problem brings with it other problems. And, therefore, this society of ours is, in a very real sense, in a race, and, therefore, I want to see all of our children as well educated as possible. I want to see us protect our natural resources. I want to see us make our cities better places in which to live. I want this country, as I know you do, to be an ornament to the cause of freedom all around the globe, because as we go so goes the cause of freedom. This is the obligation, therefore, of this generation of Americans. And I think that in the last 18 years, reviewing what we have done, we have every reason to feel a sense of satisfaction, and I look forward to the next decade when the struggle may be in all these other areas. I look forward to that struggle with confidence and hope. But we must recognize the national obligation upon us all. There are 8 to 9 million children in the United States of America in high school or in elementary school who live in families which have $3,000 a year or less. What chance do they have to finish high school? How many of them will go to college? What kind of an income will they have when they go to work? Will their children grow up in a family which is, itself, deprived and so pass on from generation to generation a lag, a fifth of the country which lives near the bottom while the rest of the country booms and prospers?

It is the obligation of government, speaking on the will of the people, that we concern ourselves with this phase of our resource development, our children, 9 million children who are growing up without the opportunity available to yours. And then they drop out of school, and then they lose their chance. So we have a lot to do in this country. We have a lot to do. I am out here to try to get your support in doing it.

One of the things that I think we have to do is worry about this country of ours. I flew over some of the most beautiful parts of the United States this morning from Jackson Hole. I am sure that half of our country, particularly those who live east of the Mississippi River, have no idea what we have in this part of the United States. They are beginning to realize it, and more and more. But all in the east of the Mississippi they live too much in crowded areas, they live along the seashore, which is open to only a few; they live in cities which are becoming more sprawling and more concentrated. And we have here in the Western United States a section of the world richer by far almost than any other. I want them to come out here. And I want the United States to take those measures in this decade which will make the Northwest United States a garden to attract people from all over this country and all over the world.

We go to Jackson Hole and Yellowstone and we are impressed, as all of us are, but what we should remember is that that was due to the work of others, not to us but to those who made the great fight in the last 50 years. Now in the 1960's we have to decide what we are going to do, and I believe that there is a good deal that we can do. We have started on a project, a concentrated project of resource development. More watershed projects have been completed in recent years than ever before in history. Negotiations are underway which should lead and must lead to the final ratification of the Columbia River Treaty with Canada. It has moved into its last stages and it is my hope that work will soon be commenced on the Libby Dam project in northwest Montana which will make this a richer State in which to live. And what you have done here in this section of the United States I want us to do along our coastline. Only 2 percent of our extraordinary coastline, the Atlantic, the Gulf Stream, and the Pacific, only 2 percent is devoted to public use. We have the same fight along our coastlines that we had here in this section of the Northwest 30 and 40 years ago for forests and parks and all the rest—2 percent.

The fact of the matter is we passed in 1 year in 1961 three parks along our seashores which is more than had been done in 1 year in any Congress in history. We have let our seashores go to waste.

So I urge this generation of Americans, who are the fathers and mothers of 350 million Americans who will live in this country in the year 2000, and I want those Americans who live here in 2000 to feel that those of us who had positions of responsibility in the sixties did our part, and those of us who inherited it from Franklin Roosevelt and Theodore Roosevelt will have something to pass on to those who come, and our children, many years from now.

So I hope that we will harness our rivers. I hope we will reclaim our land. I hope we will irrigate it. I hope we can provide, through cooperative effort of the farmers and the Government, the kind of program which will give them a hope for security. I hope, in other words, that we will take this rich country of ours, given to us by God and by nature, and improve it through science and find new uses for our natural resources, to make it possible for us to sustain in this country a steadily increasing standard of living, the highest in the world, and based on that powerful fortress, to move out around the world in the defense of freedom as we have done for 18 years and as we must do in the years to come.

This is the responsibility which this generation of Americans has been given. I do not share with those who feel that this responsibility should be passed on to others. The fact of the matter is that there are no others who can combine our geographic position, our natural wealth, and the determination of our people. And, therefore, until such a people someday arrives, I think the United States should stand guard at the gate. The fact is, we have done it for 18 years. The fact is, the chances for peace may be better now than before. The fact is that our wealth has increased. The fact is there are over 100 countries which are now independent, many of them who owe their independence to the United States.

This is the record which this country has written since 1945, and it is upon this great record that I believe we now must build. This sun and this sky which shines over Montana can be, I believe, the kind of inspiration to us all to recognize what a great single country we have, 50 separate States, but 1 people, living here in the United States, building this country and maintaining the watch around the globe.

This is the opportunity before us as well as the responsibility.

Thank you.

Remarks of the President at Dedication of Flaming Gorge Dam, Salt Lake City Municipal Airport, Salt Lake City, Utah, September 27, 1963

Senator Moss, Secretary Udall, Senator Magnuson from Washington, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my gratification at being able to participate in this ceremony, which has such significance to the people of this State.

As I move through the West, especially in this State and other States where water is short, I realize that nearly all of the standard of living which we enjoy in this part of the United States has been due partly to our own efforts, the generation which is now here, but really even more to the generation that went before, the people who started in the early 1920's, for example, to organize the distribution of water along the basin, the people who began to talk many years ago about what we are now putting into practice. So I think that it is essential that we, in the 1960's, take steps to provide for the kind of country and State that we are going to have 20 years from now, so that what we do for our children, the same thing that was done for us.

This State, this section of the United States, of course, the key is water. Unless we organize every drop to be of service to mankind, this State is going to stand still. You can't possibly grow once the water level remains the same; once the amount of water you have available for irrigation and reclamation and power remains the same, this State stands still. So water is the key, the management of water, I think, is the key that will open a very bright future. You may only perceive it only slightly in the next few years, but those who come after you—they will know it, and they will remember it with appreciation.

I am particularly glad because Senator Moss has preached the doctrine of the wise use of water with more vigor, almost, than any Member of the U.S. Senate. He is chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation. He learned his lesson the hard way, as anyone must who lives here. I come from a section of the country where we waste water, where we seek ways to get rid of it, where we seek to have it flow to the ocean as quickly as possible. It is just the reverse here, and, therefore, those of us who come from a section where water is in surplus, I think it is valuable for us to come and feel that hot sun, and fly over this country and see only on occasion where there are water resources and then realize how important this project is.

But the important thing to remember is for 50 years men have been talking about this project. It is now a reality. What are we going to do now so that 50 years from now the people who live in Utah and the United States will feel in the early sixties we made the proper decision for the management of our resources. So this is going to make a profound difference to this State. It stands in the finest tradition of Federal-State cooperation and public and private coordination. This is going to be a tremendous lake which will be a great recreation attraction which will bring people from all over the State and all over this part of the West, but it is not limited to its power, storage, or recreational use. We must depend upon this kind of action for growth. This great dam, with almost 4 million acre-feet of capacity, will make Salt Lake City grow, even though we are 150 miles from this dam which we now touch.

It was 116 years ago when Brigham Young introduced irrigation to the United States. I am glad that we are following in that great tradition this morning and, therefore, I will now take action which will start the first generator at Flaming Gorge Dam.

Do you want to stand up here, Senator?

I never know when I press these whether it means we are going to blow up Massachusetts, or electricity, or light a fire, but I am going on the assumption that we are going to start the generator.

(The President pressed a buzzer which activated the first generator at Flaming Gorge Dam.)

This gives you an idea of how difficult the life of a President is. We do this all day.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT MORMON TABERNACLE, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, SEPTEMBER 26, 1963

Senator Moss, my old colleague in the U.S. Senate, your distinguished Senator Moss, President McKay, Mr. Brown, Secretary Udall, Governor, Mr. Rawlings, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate your welcome, and I am very proud to be back in this historic building, and have an opportunity to say a few words on some matters which concern me as President and I hope concern you as citizens. The fact is, I take strength and hope in seeing this monument, hearing its story retold by TED MOSS, and recalling how this State was built, and what it started with, and what it has now.

Of all the stories of American pioneers and settlers, none is more inspiring than the Mormon trail. The qualities of the founders of this community are the qualities that we seek in America, the qualities which we like to feel this country has—courage, patience, faith, self-reliance, perseverance, and, above all, an unflagging determination to see the right prevail.

I came on this trip to see the United States, and I can assure you that there is nothing more encouraging for any of us who work in Washington than to have a chance to fly across this United States and drive through it and see what a great country it is, and come to understand somewhat better how this country has been able for so many years to carry so many burdens in so many parts of the world.

The primary reason for my trip was conservation, and I include in conservation first our human resources and then our natural resources, and I think this State can take perhaps its greatest pride and its greatest satisfaction for what it has done not in the field of the conservation and the development of natural resources, but what you have done to educate your children. This State has a higher percentage per capita of population of its boys and girls who finish high school and then go to college.

Of all the waste in the United States in the 1960's, none is worse than to have 8 or 9 million boys and girls who will drop out, statistics tell us, drop out of school before they have finished, come into the labor market unprepared at the very time when machines are taking the place of men and women; 9 million of them. We have a large minority of our population who have not even finished the sixth grade, and here in this richest of all countries, the country which spreads the doctrine of freedom and hope around the globe, we permit our most valuable resource, our young people, their talents to be wasted by leaving their schools.

So I think we have to save them. I think we have to insist that our children be educated to the limit of their talents, not just in your State, or in Massachusetts, but all over the United States. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, who developed the Northwest Ordinance, which put so much emphasis on education—Thomas Jefferson once said that any nation which expected to be ignorant and free hopes for what never was and never will be. So I hope we can conserve this resource.

The other is the natural resource of our country, particularly the land west of the 100th parallel, where the rain comes 15 or 20 inches a year. This State knows that the control of water is the secret of the development of the West, and whether we use it for power or for irrigation or for whatever purpose, no drop of water west of the 100th parallel should flow to the ocean without being used, and to do that requires the dedicated commitment of the people of the States of the West, working with the people of all the United States who have such an important equity in the richness of this part of the country. So that we must do also.

As Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot did it in years past, we must do it in the 1960's and 1970's. We will triple the population of this country in the short space of 60 or 70 years, and we want those who come after us to have the same rich inheritance that we find now in the United States. This is the reason for the trip, but it is not what I wanted to speak about tonight.

I want to speak about the responsibility that I feel the United States has, not in this country, but abroad, and I see the closest interrelationship between the strength of the United States here at home and the strength of the United States around the world. There is one great natural development here in the United States which has had in its own way a greater effect upon the position and influence and prestige of the United States, almost, than any other act we have done. Do you know what it is? It is the Tennessee Valley. Nearly every leader of every new emerging country that comes to the United States wants to go to New York, to Washington, and the Tennessee Valley, because they want to see what we were able to do with the most poverty-ridden section of the United States in the short space of 30 years, by the wise management of our resources.

What happens here in this country affects the security of the United States and the cause of freedom around the globe. If this is a strong, vital, and vigorous society, the cause of freedom will be strong and vital and vigorous.

I know that many of you in this State and other States sometimes wonder where we are going and why the United States should be so involved in so many affairs, in so many countries all around the globe. If our task on occasion seems hopeless, if we despair of ever working our will on the other 94 percent of the world population, then let us remember that the Mormons of a century ago were a persecuted and prosecuted minority, harried from place to place, the victims of violence and occasionally murder, while today, in the short space of 100 years, their faith and works are known and respected the world around, and their voices heard in the highest councils of this country.

As the Mormons succeeded, so America can succeed, if we will not give up or turn back. I realize that the burdens are heavy and I realize that there is a great temptation to urge that we relinquish them, that we have enough to do here in the United States, and we should not be so busy around the globe. The fact of the matter is that we, this generation of Americans, are the first generation of our country ever to be involved in affairs around the globe. From the beginning of this country, from the days of Washington, until the Second World War, this country lived an isolated existence. Through most of our history we were an unalined country, an uncommitted nation, a neutralist nation; we were by status as well as by desire. We had believed that we could live behind our two oceans in safety and prosperity in a comfortable distance from the rest of the world.

The end of isolation consequently meant a wrench with the very lifeblood, the very spine, of the Nation. Yet, as time passed, we came to see that the end of isolation was not such a terrible error or evil after all. We came to see that it was the inevitable result of growth, the economic growth, the military growth, and the cultural growth of the United States. No nation so powerful and so dynamic and as rich as our own could hope to live in isolation from other nations, especially at a time when science and technology was making the world so small.

It took Brigham Young and his followers 108 days to go from Winter Quarters, Nebr., to the valley of the Great Salt Lake. It takes 30 minutes for a missile to go from one continent to another. We did not seek to become a world power. This position was thrust upon us by events. But we became one just the same, and I am proud that we did. I can well understand the attraction of those earlier days. Each one of us has moments of longing for the past, but two world wars have clearly shown us, try as we may, that we cannot turn our back on the world outside. If we do, we jeopardize our economic well-being, we jeopardize our political stability, we jeopardize our physical safety.

To turn away now is to abandon the world to those whose ambition it is to destroy a free society. To yield these burdens up after having carried them for more than 20 years is to surrender the freedom of our country inevitably, for without the United States, the chances of freedom surviving, let alone prevailing around the globe, are nonexistent.

Americans have come a long way in accepting in a short time the necessity of world involvement, but the strain of this involvement remains and we find it all over the country. I see it in the letters that come to my desk every day. We find ourselves entangled with apparently unanswerable problems in unpronounceable places. We discover that our enemy in one decade is our ally the next. We find ourselves committed to governments whose actions we cannot often approve, assisting societies with principles very different from our own.

The burdens of maintaining an immense military establishment with 1 million Americans serving outside our frontiers, of financing a far-flung program of development assistance, of conducting a complex and baffling diplomacy, all weigh heavily upon us and cause some to counsel retreat. The world is full of contradiction and confusion, and our policy seems to have lost the black and white clarity of simpler times when we remembered the Maine and went to war. It is little wonder, then, in this confusion, we look back to the old days with nostalgia. It is little wonder that there is a desire in the country to go back to the time when our Nation lived alone. It is little wonder that we increasingly want an end to entangling alliances, an end to all help to foreign countries, a cessation of diplomatic relations with countries or states whose principles we dislike, that we get the United Nations out of the United States, and the United States out of the United Nations, and that we retreat to our own hemisphere, or even within our own boundaries, to take refuge behind a wall of force.

This is an understandable effort to recover an old feeling of simplicity, yet in world affairs, as in all other aspects of our lives, the days of the quiet past are gone forever. Science and technology are irreversible. We cannot return to the day of the sailing schooner or the covered wagon, even if we wished, and if this Nation is to survive and succeed in the real world of today, we must acknowledge the realities of the world, and it is those realities that I mention now. We must first of all recognize that we cannot remake the world simply by our own command. When we cannot even bring all of our own people into full citizenship without acts of violence, we can understand how much harder it is to control events beyond our borders.

Every nation has its own traditions, its own values, its own aspirations. Our assistance from time to time can help other nations preserve their independence and advance their growth, but we cannot remake them in our own image. We cannot enact their laws, nor can we operate their governments or dictate our policies.

Second, we must recognize that every nation determines its policies in terms of its own interests. No nation, George Washington wrote, is to be trusted further than it is bound by its own interest, and no prudent statesman or politician will depart from it. National interest is more powerful than ideology, and the recent developments within the Communist empire show this very clearly. Friendship, as Palmerston said, may rise or wane, but interests endure.

The United States has rightly determined in the years since 1945 under three different administrations that our interest, our national security, the interest of the United States of America, is best served by preserving and protecting a world of diversity in which no one power or no one combination of powers can threaten the security of the United States. The reason that we moved so far into the world was our fear that at the end of the war, and particularly when China became Communist, that Japan and Germany would collapse, and these two countries which had so long served as a barrier to the Soviet advance and the Russian advance before that would open up a wave of conquest of all of Europe and all of Asia, and then the balance of power turning against us we would finally be isolated and ultimately destroyed. That is what we have been engaged in for 18 years, to prevent that happening, to prevent any one monolithic power having sufficient force to destroy the United States.

For that reason we support the alliances in Latin America; for that reason we support NATO to protect the security of Western Europe; for that reason we joined SEATO to protect the security of Asia, so that neither Russia nor China could control Europe and Asia, and, if they could not control Europe and Asia, then our security was assured. This is what we have been involved in doing, and however dangerous and hazardous it may be, and however close it may take us to the brink on occasion, which it has, and however tired we may get of our involvements with these governments so far away, we have one simple central theme of American foreign policy which all of us must recognize because it is a policy which we must continue to follow. And that is to support the independence of nations so that one bloc cannot gain sufficient power to finally overcome us. There is no mistaking the vital interest of the United States in what goes on around the world. Therefore, accepting what George Washington said here, I realize that what George Washington said about no entangling alliances has been ended by science and technology and danger.

And third, we must recognize that foreign policy in a modern world does not lend itself to easy, simple, black and white solution. If we were to have diplomatic relations only with those countries whose principles we approved of, we would have relations with very few countries in a very short time. If we were to withdraw our assistance from all governments who are run differently from our own, we would relinquish half of the world immediately to our adversaries. If we were to treat foreign policy as merely a medium for delivering self-righteous sermons to supposedly inferior people, we would give up all thought of world influence or world leadership, for the purpose of foreign policy is not to provide an outlet for our own sentiments of hope or indignation; it is to shape real events in a real world. We cannot adopt a policy which says that if something does not happen, or others do not do exactly what we wish, we will return to "Fortress America."

That is the policy in the changing world of retreat, not of strength.

More important, to adopt a black and white, all or nothing policy subordinates our interest to our irritations. Its actual consequences would be fatal to our security. If we were to resign from the United Nations, break off with all countries of whom we disapprove, end foreign aid and assistance to those countries in an attempt to keep them free, call for the resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing, and turn our back on the rest of mankind, we would not only be abandoning America's influence in the world, we would be inviting a Communist expansion which every Communist power would so greatly welcome. And all of the effort of so many Americans for 18 years would be gone with the wind. Our policy under these conditions in this dangerous world would not have much deterrent affect in a world where nations determined to be free could no longer count on the United States.

Such a policy of retreat would be folly if we had our backs to the wall. It is surely even greater folly at a time when more realistic, more responsible, more affirmative policies have wrought such spectacular results. For the most striking thing about our world in 1963 is the extent to which the tide of history has begun to flow in the direction of freedom. To renounce the world of freedom now, to abandon those who share our commitment, and retire into lonely and not-so-splendid isolation, would be to give communism the one hope which in this twilight of disappointment for them might repair their divisions and rekindle their hope, for after some gains in the 1950's the Communist offensive which claimed to be riding the tide of historic inevitability has been thwarted and turned back in recent months. Indeed, the whole theory of historical inevitability, the belief that all roads must lead to communism sooner or later, has been shattered by the determination of those who believe that men and nations will pursue a variety of roads, that each nation will evolve according to its own traditions and its own aspirations, and that the world of the future will have room for a diversity of economic systems, political creeds, religious faiths, united by the respect for others, and loyalty to a world order. Those forces of diversity which served Mr. Washington's national interest—those forces of diversity are in the ascendancy today, even within the Communist empire itself. And our policy at this point should be to give the forces of diversity, as opposed to the forces of uniformity, which our adversaries espouse, every chance, every possible support. That is why our assistance program, so much maligned, of assisting countries to maintain their freedom I believe is important.

This country has seen all of the hardship and the grief that has come to us by the loss of one country in this hemisphere, Cuba. How many other countries must be lost if the United States decides to end the programs that are helping these people, who are getting poorer every year, who have none of the resources of this great country, who look to us for help? But on the other hand cases look to the Communists for example.

That is why I think this program is important. It is a means of assisting those who want to be free, and in the final analysis it serves the United States in a very real sense. That is why the United States is important, not because it can solve all these problems in this imperfect world, but it does give us a means in those great moments of crisis, and in the last two and a half years we have had at least three, when the Soviet Union and the United States were almost face to face on a collision course—it does give us a means of providing, as it has in the Congo, as it now is on the border of the Yemen, as it most recently was in a report of the United Nations at Malaysia—it does give a means to mobilize the opinion of the world to prevent an atomic disaster which would destroy us all wherever we might live.

That is why the test ban treaty is important as a first step, perhaps to be disappointed, perhaps to find ourselves ultimately set back, but at least in 1963 the United States committed itself, and the Senate of the United States, by an overwhelming vote, to one chance to end the radiation and the possibilities of burning.

It may be, as I said, that we may fail, but anyone who bothers to look at the true destructive power of the atom today and what we and the Soviet Union could do to each other and the world in an hour and in a day, and to Western Europe—I passed over yesterday the Little Big Horn where General Custer was slain, a massace which has lived in history, 400 or 500 men. We are talking about 300 million men and women in 24 hours.

I think it is wise to take a first step and lessen the possibility of that happening. And that is why our diplomacy is important, for the forces making for diversity are to be found everywhere where people are, even within the Communist empire. And it is our obligation to encourage those forces wherever they may be found. Hard and discouraging questions remain in Vietnam, in Cuba, in Laos, the Congo, all around the globe. The ordeal of the emerging nations has just begun. The control of nuclear weapons is still incomplete. The areas of potential friction, the chances of collision, still exist.

But in every one of these areas the position of the United States, I believe, is happier and safer when history is going for us rather than when it is going against us. And we have history going for us today, but history is what men make it. The future is what men make it.

We cannot fulfill our vision and our commitment and our interest in a free and diverse future without unceasing vigilance, devotion and, most of all, perseverance, a willingness to stay with it, a willingness to do with fatigue, a willingess not to accept easy answers, but instead, to maintain the burden, as the people of this State have done for 100 years, and as the United States must do the rest of this century until finally we live in a peaceful world.

Therefore, I think this country will continue its commitments to support the world in freedom, for as we discharge that commitment we are heeding the command which Brigham Young heard from the Lord more than a century ago, the command conveyed to his followers, "Go as pioneers to a land of peace."

Remarks of the President at Hanford Electric Generating Plant, Hanford, Wash., September 26, 1963

Senator Jackson, my old colleague, and Senator Magnuson, Governor Rosellini, Stewart Udall, Ted Moss, Congressman Ullman, Chet Holifield, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, this is an extraordinary place to visit as a citizen and as President of the United States, because along this river men have played a significant role in the last 20 years which has changed the entire history of the world and, therefore, to come all the way from Washington and see this river and see these reactors, and recognize their significance in the closing days of the Second World War, and also the role that the men and women who work here have played in the years since the Second World War in maintaining the strength of the United States—I am happy to be here today and express my appreciation to you.

The atomic age is a dreadful age, but we must realize that when we broke the atom apart and released its energy and changed the history of the world, it was essential that the United States in this area of national strength and national vigor should be second to none, and on this river, in these reactors, by your effort, that great objective has been maintained. No one can say what the future will bring, no one can speak with certainty about whether we shall be able to control this deadly weapon, whether we shall be able to maintain our life and our peaceful relations with other countries, I can assure you we do everything we can.

It is for that reason that I so strongly supported, recognizing as I did its limitations, but as a step, as Senator MAGNUSON said, on the long road to peace, that I strongly supported the test ban treaty. But no one can say what will come of all that effort or, indeed, of the whole atomic age. It may well be that man recognizes now that war is so destructive, so annihilating, so incendiary, that it may be possible, out of that awful fact—it may be possible for us, step by step, to so adjust our relations, to so develop a rule of reason and a rule of law, that we may, out of this scientific change—it may be possible for us to find a more peaceful world. That is our intention.

But I want you to know that the effort that you have made and invested, the talents which have been at work here, I think on several occasions have contributed to the security of the United States and, in a very large sense, to the peace of the world.

I am also glad to come here today because we begin work on the largest nuclear power reactor for peaceful purposes in the world, and I take the greatest satisfaction in the United States being second to none. I think this is a good area where we should be first, and we are first. We are first. It is extraordinary how long it took. It is extraordinary what energy, human energy, was required to get this concept accepted. But as "SCOOP" JACKSON said, just as it took a decade to get the Grand Coulee, which of all the extraordinary national assets I have seen in the last 2 days is the most extraordinary, because it not only led to the prosperity of this valley, but led to what has been happening here for 20 years, and now leads to this new breakthrough—from that action which took a decade to accomplish and which will pay for itself many times over, and in a sense already has, we have some idea of how important it is that these fights be won, and this fight was won by the dedicated work of the members of this State working in the Senate and the Congress, and most of all, I think, by the local people, who, when the Congress failed to meet its complete responsibility, took up the slack; and, therefore, this is a partnership in a very real sense between the National Government and the local community for the benefit of our country.

I come from Massachusetts, I come from the other side of the country, but it is a very small country and I take the greatest pride in what we are all doing here.

I wonder how many people who are sitting here today were born in the State of Washington? Would you hold up your hands? Excluding the children.

Now everybody who wasn't born in this State?

That is the important point. When we develop these resources in the Northwest United States, it is just as well that the country realizes that we are not talking about one State or two States or three States; we are talking about the United States. Our people move freely from east to west and even once in a while from west to east, but in any case, the country becomes stronger.

There is an old saying that a rising tide lifts all the boats, and as the Northwest United States rises, so does the entire country, so we are glad.

So, Governor Rosellini, Owen Hurd, Glenn Lee, Don Pugnetti, and the others, I want to tell you that you have fulfilled your responsibilities as citizens, and I think this is going to be an extraordinary development. I look forward to coming back here sometime and seeing this at work because what you are able to do here I think can be done around the world. We are going to show them the way.

There are two points on conservation that have come home to me in the last 2 days. One is the necessity for us to protect what we already have, what nature gave to us, and use it well, not to waste water or land, to set aside land and water, recreation, wilderness, and all the rest now so that it will be available to those who come in the future. That is the traditional concept of conservation, and it still has a major part in the national life of the United States. But the other part of conservation is the newer part, and that is to use science and technology to achieve significant breakthroughs as we are doing today and in that way to conserve the resources which 10 or 20 or 30 years ago may have been wholly unknown. So we use nuclear power for peaceful purposes and power. We use techniques to develop new kinds of coal and oil from shale, and all the rest. We use new techniques that Senator MAGNUSON has pioneered in oceanography so from the bottom of the ocean and the ocean, we get all the resources which are there, and which are going to be mined and harvested. And from the sun we are going to find more and more uses for that energy whose power we are so conscious of today.

All this means that we put science to work in improving our environment and making this country a better place in which to live. I want us to stay ahead. Do you know that in the next 10 years, I hope the people of the United States realize it, we double the need for electric power, every 10 years? We need the equivalent of a new Grand Coulee Dam every 60 days. In the next 20 years, we are going to have to put in the electric industry $125 billion of investment, and when we do that this country will be richer, and our children will enjoy a higher standard of living.

We don't realize that what we regarded as affluence 30 years ago is now way down below. Air conditioning, television, electricity, and all the rest have changed the life of this country, and we are going to find the same extraordinary changes in the next 20 to 30 years.

I think we must do several things. First, we must maintain an aggressive program to use our hydro resources to the fullest. Every drop of water which goes to the ocean without being used for power or used to grow, or being made available on the widest possible basis is a waste, and I hope that we will do everything we can to make sure that nothing runs to the ocean unused and wasted.

Secondly, we can meet our electric power goals by developing new means of making our vast resources of coal more competitive in the generation of electricity. Coal is an old fuel, but we are going to find new techniques for using it, which is going to make it one of the most advanced of all human fuels.

And third, as it well known here at Hanford, we must hasten the development of low-cost atomic power. I think we should lead the world in this. By 1967, 1968, 1970 in the Northeast United States, where power rates are nearly double yours, we are going to find atomic power increasingly competitive, and by the end of this century this is going to be a tremendous source. Our experts estimate that half of all electric energy generated in the United States will come from nuclear sources.

Fourth, we must construct an efficient interconnection between electric systems, public and private, both within regions, as you have done so effectively here in the Northwest, and between regions, as has been proposed by means of a Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie. Maybe we can give some of it to California.

And finally, we must not allow this technology to lead to monopolization, either by the Federal Government or large combines of private utilities. We should realize the economies of size without jeopardizing the rights of our citizens to be served by the type of electric utility they prefer, and also to encourage competition.

These are the things we must do, and many more. This great, rich country of ours has a long, unfinished agenda, but it has always had that agenda in creative times, and this is a creative time in our country and throughout the world. All of the trained and educated men and women who are making our country over, who are building a better standard of living for our people—this is a time when we wish to encourage that release of energy, human energy, which is the most extraordinary of all.

Therefore, I am proud to come here across the United States as President to express our thanks to you, to express my pride in what is being begun here today, which puts the United States, as I said, once more in the lead in a whole new area which can mean so much to people around the world. I think it is very appropriate that we come here where so much has been done to build the military strength of the United States and to find a chance to strike a blow for peace and to find a chance to strike a blow for a better life for our fellow citizens.

This is a great national asset here. I can assure you it will be maintained. And from the work we begin today, I hope the light will spread out, not merely to those who are served by electricity, but to all the world to realize that here in the United States we are moving ahead and providing security for our people and also a hope for a better life in this most beautiful country of ours.

Thank you.

Remarks of the President at Cheney Stadium, Tacoma, Wash., September 27, 1963

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Senator Magnuson, Governor Rosellini, Secretary

Udall, Senator Jackson, Senator Moss, Senator Neuberger, Congressman Tollefson, Mayor Tollefson, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to come here and see the Tollefson brothers. It makes the Kennedys feel a little better when they see what is happening out here.

Mr. Presidents of our two distinguished universities, which are our hosts today, and ladies and gentlemen: Whatever gave Senator MAGNUSON the impression that we in Massachusetts do not have comparable wonders to Mount Ranier? If you see sometimes the blue hills of Boston stretching 300 feet straight up, covered by snow in the middle of the winter, you can know what nature can really do to produce a vigorous race.

We are glad to be here today and see what you have. But in looking at nature, I have been impressed really more by man in my last 3 days, because everything that I have seen, Jackson Hole and all the rest, was given to us by nature, but man did something about it. Whether it is what you have done with these parks here in this State, whether what we saw yesterday where the atom is being harnessed for peaceful use in the most impressive and advanced scientific effort in the world, or whether we go as we did last night to the Mormon Temple and Tabernacle and see built in the most arid part, perhaps, not only of the United States, but of the world, a great civilization, a great temple, a great tabernacle—I am impressed by nature and more impressed by man, and I am glad to be here with the students from these two schools.

This country has placed particular emphasis from its beginning, from the time of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, on educating our children, not merely to help them, but most importantly because we realized that the free, democratic system of government which places more burdens on the individual than any other system, must depend in its final analysis upon an informed citizenry, and here in these schools and colleges of this State, and the others stretching across the United States, we are trying to build and develop men and women who can maintain in a difficult and hazardous and changing world a free system of government.

Winston Churchill once said democracy is the worst form of government except for all the other systems that have been tried. It is the most difficult. It demands more from us.

And here in these schools and colleges, we hope that we are developing those qualities which in other days of change and challenge will permit this country to be guided through. The problems we face today have never been so complex. They cannot possibly be solved in Washington, D.C., unless we have supporting us in our two political parties an informed citizenry. And it is well to remember that this Nation's first great leaders, our founders, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, James, Mason, Bryant, and all the rest, were not only the political leaders of this country, but they were also among the most educated citizens that this country had ever produced. The two outstanding men in the 18th century, outstanding not only in the United States but in the whole Western World, were both Americans, both politicians, and both philosophers and scientists, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin.

So the assignment, it seems to me, in the 1960's, is to produce all of the educated talent that we have, not merely to help them along, not merely to produce outstanding businessmen, although we need them, and lawyers, although we need them, and doctors, although we need them, but also to produce men and women with a sense of the public responsibility, the public duty. This has been an important element in the American life since our beginning. In 1856 the Republican Party sent three great orators around the campaign circuit, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Ralph Waldo Emerson, and on occasions, even Thoreau.

I want to see in 1963 and in 1970 and 1980 the best brains we have meeting the most difficult problems that this country has ever faced. The fact of the matter is that the experts disagree. I remember during the test ban debate when Senator KUCHEL said to a scientist: "One scientist comes here and tells us one thing, another scientist with comparable experience, comparable, comes and tells us something else. Who are we to believe?" The experts disagree. And in the final analysis this country, for its movement forward, on its balance of payments, on its assistance abroad, on its mix of monetary and fiscal policy, on its resource development, on its space effort, and all the rest where we will find the most intense disagreement among those who know the most, in the final analysis the people themselves have to make a judgment, and I think the basic judgment always must be a sense of motion forward. The great movements in this country's history, the great periods of intellectual and social activity, took place in those periods when we looked long range to the future, whether it was in the days of Theodore Roosevelt, when the whole national conservation movement began, and all of the decisions in a much easier period, when we had far fewer people, were made which makes it possible for us to travel throughout the United States and still see green grass and still have some hope for the future.

I want us in 1963 to make the same decisions here in the United States for the use of our manpower, for the use of our natural resources, for the strengthening of the United States, so that the United States can bear the burdens which go with being the most powerful country in the free world, and one of those decisions involves the wise use of what nature gives us and also putting science and technology to work to develop new uses. We see it in the mountain nearby, we see the old concept of conserving our resources. And yesterday afternoon in seeing what use science had done with the atom, we see the new kind of conservation which can mean so much to the people who come after us.

The population of the United States a few years ago was 130 million. Today it is 185 million. By the year 2000 it will be 350 million. What is going to happen to those people? What green grass will they see? What will be the resource position of the United States? We will know that in the year 2000 by what we do today, and what we do the rest of this decade. In the last 2 years we set aside, for example, about 200 miles of oceanfront. If we had not seized, by national decision, the Cape Cod National Park, or the park near San Francisco or on the gulfstream, they would have been gone forever. And the whole Atlantic and Pacific coast and the gulfstream would have been controlled by a few people and the chance for all of the people of our country to look to the ocean on a beach would have been done, and what happens on our oceanfront happens here.

I urge, therefore, that the talents and able people of this State make the judgments on recreation and conservation and wise use of our resources now with a long look forward, not for this decade, but for the next generation. And your two Senators, Senator JACKSON, the head of the Interior Committee, which must make these decisions on how these lands shall be used, and Senator MAGNUSON and, indeed, the congressional delegations of the entire Northwest, have understood that nature was very good to the Northwest, but the Northwest itself must use nature wisely.

So I come on a trip of conservation not to repeat an old doctrine, but to say that we need an opportunity now to recommit ourselves to maintaining the natural advantages that this country has given us. This is a difficult time in the life of the United States, and people look all around the world and wonder whether we are moving forward or backward. Whether the world is more dangerous or easier, I don't think anyone can say. But I think they can say that there is every reason to hope, and there is every reason for us to concentrate our energy in making those decisions here in the United States which will maintain the strength of the United States so that we can in turn meet our responsibilities around the globe.

If this country falls back, if we do not take those steps both in Washington and here in this State and in the other States to find employment for our people, to educate our children, to use our resources both human and material to the maximum, then these great burdens which the United States has carried for 18 years will become too much. I think we can do it. I think our strength has grown, and I think it is up to all of us, not only to look to our private interest, but also look to our obligations to the United States. All of us feel that love of country, but I think we must put it to practical use. I think we must decide what it is that this country must do in 1963 to find jobs for our people and to educate our young.

I said yesterday that there are 9 million children in the United States in high school or in elementary school who live in families which have incomes of less than $3,000 a year, $58 a week, to bring up a family. How many of them will drop out of school and never have a chance again? How many of our children who have talent will not have a chance to use it, will not get to a college or a university? How many of them will graduate or fall out of school and be unable to find work or will live in slums in our large cities?

This rich country of ours must fulfill its promise to all of our citizens, and that can only be done by a national commitment to use all of our energy and all of our talents so that we can produce all of the things that we are capable of doing in order to meet our responsibility to ourselves and to those who look to us for leadership.

So I express my thanks to you for the chance to visit today. I do not think that these trips may do very much for people who come and listen to those of us who are traveling, but I can tell you that they are the best educational 3 or 4 days for anyone who holds high office in the United States, to get out of beautiful Washington and see the rest of this country, to see what it is capable of, to see what it has, to see what it must be.

All through our history, on occasions, these journeys have been taken, and I believe they are of benefit. I ask particularly that those of you who are now in school will prepare yourselves to bear the burden of leadership over the next 40 years here in the United States and make sure that the United States, which I believe almost alone has maintained watch and ward for freedom, that the United States meet its responsibility. That is a wonderful challenge for us as a people. No other generation in history has borne the burdens that the United States has borne in the last 18 years. I want to see us continue to use our talents to the maximum and maintain the reputation of the United States as a citadel of freedom.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT TONGUE POINT, OREG., SEPTEMBER 27, 1963

Senator MORSE, Senator NEUBERGER, Congressman ULLMAN, and Senator MAGNUSON from Washington, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express a warm thanks from a citizen from the other side of the country for your warm welcome today.

I came here as a result of—I will not say consistent prodding, but I will say that on every occasion I have seen Senator MORSE this matter has come up in one way or another, and, therefore, I felt it incumbent upon me, in looking at the natural resources of the United States, I could not return to Washington safely without coming here to Tongue Point. So we are here today, and we are here to take a look at what is a great national asset. I have been looking at great natural assets, Jackson Hole, our mountain valleys and all the rest. So this is a national asset.

There is a good deal of effort, a great deal of money, a good deal of dedication that has gone into building this facility, but I think you can only get an impression of the importance of this facility by coming down and looking at it and standing on it.

Therefore, as a result of the considered judgment of your delegation, and also of the Budget Bureau and the various areas of our executive, I want to announce that the best first step in reactivating this facility appears to be a multipurpose use.

It is, therefore, a pleasure to be able to tell you that both the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard will shortly initiate activities here. Early next year the Department of Defense will establish a Weapons System Acquisition Management School here at Tongue Point. This school will be jointly staffed by the military departments and provide training for senior civilian personnel and senior military officers for all the services and the Defense Department. And shortly after this training activity begins, the Coast Guard will establish a helicopter rescue base here. Both agencies will soon begin their planning in cooperation with the General Services Administration, and we will go ahead in attempting to see what other multipurpose projects can be brought here so that this facility can be used and so that this community can be benefited.

I am glad I came here. I think it is a national asset, and I think the wise use of it, I think, requires us to consider very carefully what services of government can be lodged here, because we do not want all this great asset to really go to waste.

I am glad to be back here, in a sense. I appreciate the warm welcome, and I can tell you that this area of this State, as well as this State, as well as this country, can continue to look forward with a good deal of confidence and hope.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, TONGUE POINT, OREG.

For some time I have been concerned over the failure of the Federal Government to make use of the excellent facilities available at Tongue Point. On the basis of my talks with Senator MORSE and reports by the appropriate officials, I have been convinced that it would be more economical and efficient to use these facilities, and the skills available in the area, than to build new ones elsewhere.

The best first step in reactivating this facility appears to be multipurpose use. It is, therefore, a pleasure to be able to tell you that both the Department of Defense and the Coast Guard will shortly initiate activities here.

Early next year the Department of Defense will establish a weapon system acquisition management school here at Tongue Point. This school will be jointly staffed by our military departments and will provide training for senior civilian personnel and senior military officers for all the services and the Defense Department.

Shortly after this training activity begins, the Coast Guard will establish a helicopter rescue base here.

Both agencies will soon begin their planning in cooperation with the General Services Administration.

I am particularly happy to make this announcement—not only because it will enable the Government to put to effective use part of an excellent facility in which so many millions of dollars have been invested over a period of years—but also because it will bring to Astoria economic benefits your community sorely needs.

The establishment of these activities at Tongue Point is a fortunate concurrence of efficient Federal use of facilities and of local needs. It is in no small way a tribute to the alertness and persistence of your senior Senator, WAYNE MORSE. His deep awareness of the interests of the people of Astoria—and of Oregon—and his strong advocacy of efficient Government operations are, I am sure, well known here in Oregon.

Our long efforts to bring Tongue Point back to life have shown again the necessity for persistent attention to economy in Government. Anyone who has seen Tongue Point—as I have today—knows that it makes little sense to build new facilities for new or expanded Federal activities when existing, but unused, installations can be modified to meet the need.

With this in mind, I have instructed the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to take whatever steps may be necessary to make certain that this kind of choice is made systematically and objectively—with economy and efficiency as the standards.

Again, I want you to know how delighted I am that part of Tongue Point will soon be reactivated, and I can assure you that we shall continue our efforts to take advantage of the full potential of this installation.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT DEDICATION OF WHISKEYTOWN DAM AND RESERVOIR, WHISKEYTOWN, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 28, 1963

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. My old colleague and your distinguished Congressman "Bizz" Johnson, Governor Brown, Senator Regan, Assemblywoman Davis, Secretary Udall, Senator Bible, Mr. Engle, representing Clair, Larry Carr, Judge Carter, ladies and gentlemen, I appreciate the chance to be here in Whiskeytown and to say a few words in this distinguished community.

I was reminded when I read my itinerary of a poem by Stephen Vincent Benet called "American Names," and he started off: "I have fallen in love with American names, the sharp-thought names that never get fat, the snakeskin title of mining claims, the plumed war bonnets of Medicine Hat, Tucson, and Deadwood, and Lost Mule Flat." Then he goes on to talk about some famous American names, not Whiskeytown, but I think he could add it to the roster, because the name of this community tells a good deal about the early beginnings of this State and country.

I have come across the United States in the last 5 days, starting at Milford, Pa., which was the home of Gifford Pinchot, who was, with Theodore Roosevelt, the first great conservationist in this country. Imagine how small their country was, how few the people, and yet how dangerous it was in the early part of this century, how great was that danger, that this great natural inheritance of ours given to us by nature, given to us by God, would be wiped away, the forests ruined, the streams destroyed, wasted for the people, water going to the sea unused, and because of the dedicated work of men actually who did not come from this part of the country, who came from the East, Pinchot, Theodore Roosevelt, and later Franklin Roosevelt, this great national effort was made to realize our resources, to make them useful, and all of you who are here today in the State of California are here because of the wise decisions that were made by those who came before, and the wise decisions that you are making now.

When you support the effort which Governor Brown described to set aside funds for a bond issue for recreation, it may not come before you immediately, but it will make it possible for your children to live better. This country is changing. We had a 58-hour week, a 48-hour week, a 40-hour week. As machines take more and more of the jobs of men, we are going to find the workweek reduced, and we are going to find people wondering what they should do. I want to make it possible, and you do, make it possible for them to see green grass, to travel throughout this great, rich country of ours, not just in other parts of the world, but here in the United States, where I have seen parts of this country which are second to none, to any in the world, and where too many people east of the Mississippi are unaware of what golden resources we have in our own United States. So we should use them. Water should be used, land west of the 100th parallel was never regarded as fertile until some days after the Civil War a few men began to come out here and made determinations of what could be done and we moved ahead, and this project is only the most recent. I am proud of it. It was opposed for many years. Many people wondered whether it would ever pay for itself.

The fact of the matter is, as a general rule, every time we bet on the future of this country we win. The day before yesterday I was at the Grand Coulee Dam. Ten years they fought for the Grand Coulee Dam. Finally it was built. It will pay for itself in another 5 or 6 years. But more important than that, it has meant the development of that whole section of the high Northwest, the development of the atomic reactors, which have played such a significant part in maintaining the security of the United States.

Every time we make a determination to set aside a seashore for the use of future generations, every time we build these great projects, we develop the water resources, we set aside recreational areas, we can be sure they are going to be used. Three hundred and fifty million Americans will live in this country of ours in the short space of less than 40 years, where now there are 180 million. What will they do? What kind of a country will they find? How much recreation will be possible for them? I think if we make the right decisions now they will be as grateful to us as we were and are to Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt for the things they did 45 and 50 years ago.

We witness today the completion of a project which symbolizes the goals to which we are committed. The Whiskeytown Reservoir is not the largest structure on the Trinity River, but its completion is significant because this is the last of the Trinity project dams. The impoundment part of this vast undertaking is now completed, and in that sense this dam stands not only as the work of the men who built it, but of all the men over the years who fought for it and brought it to the attention of the State and Nation. With the Trinity Division completed and the upper reaches of the Sacramento now harnessed, Shasta County and its neighbors are assured of water and power. They can enjoy new chances for recreational use, and new access to open space. And of great importance, the flow of two watersheds can now be regulated for the benefit of the farms and cities in the lower valley. For too long this water ran unused to the sea. For too long surplus water in one area was wasted, while there was a deficit nearby. Now, by diverting these waters to the eastern slope, we can irrigate crops on the fertile plains of the Sacramento Valley and supply water also for municipal and industrial use to the cities to the south. And while running their course, these waters will generate millions of kilowatts of energy and help expand the economy of the fastest growing State in the Nation. In these ways, Whiskeytown Reservoir and the Trinity Division will add to our natural beauty and will show that man can improve on nature, and make it possible for this State to continue to grow. So I congratulate all of you.

I wonder how many people realize in the eastern United States where I come from what a great national asset we have. This is not just California. This is one country, 50 separate States but one country. And people move very freely from east to west and west to east. I wonder how many people here today were born in the State of California. Would they hold up their hands? And how many were not born in California? It shows that what we are doing is we are a mobile, moving country. Our national assets belong to all of us. Children who were born in the East will grow up in the West, and those born in the West will grow up in the East, and we will find by concentrating our energies on our national resources, on conserving them out not merely conserving and saving them but by developing and improving them, the United States will be richer and stronger. We can fulfill our responsibilities to ourselves and those who depend upon us.

I am proud to be here. I am proud to be associated with those who are contributing to this country, who are making it better, not merely right now, today, but who are looking to the long future of those who come after us.

I congratulate you on what you have done. Thank you.

Remarks of the President, at Convention Center, Las Vegas, Nev., September 28, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you. Senator Cannon, Governor Sawyer, Secretary Udall, Senator Bible, Mr. Mayor, members of the clergy, Commander, Commissioner members of the band, ladies and gentlemen; I want to express my appreciation to you for this welcome in the middle of the day. This is the end of a 5-day trip which has taken us to Pennsylvania, to dedicate the home of Gifford Pinchot, to the cause of conservation; to northern Wisconsin, to Duluth, Minn., to North Dakota, to Wyoming, Montana, Washington, Oregon, California, and now we complete that swing here in Nevada.

The purpose of that trip was simple, and that is to see for myself and also, I hope, through my eyes, some of my fellow citizens to see how essential it is that we conserve our natural resources and that we make the best use of them. I can assure you that from my experience of the last days, however useful it may be to sit at a desk in Washington and read statistics about increasing population and about the need for water, there is no better education for a President, a Senator, a Congressman or a citizen than to fly over the West and see where it is green, where water has done its work, and see where it is arid, where there is no water, and then you come to understand the truth of what the Governor and the Senator just said: That water is the key of growth, and its wise use essential to the development of the Western United States.

We live in a very dangerous time in the world, and our policies are quite simple, even though they are difficult to execute. Our object abroad is to protect the security of the United States, the vital interests of the United States, and to maintain the peace. Now, we do that by strengthening the United States. We have in recent years increased, for example, the number of divisions by nearly 60 percent, the number of Polaris missiles by more than that, the number of aircraft on standby by a higher percentage than that, the number of ships on the sea—all the rest, we have attempted to increase the strength of the United States.

One of your distinguished Senators, Senator CANNON, has served on the Armed Services Committee, and we have made a concentrated effort, believing that the United States is the keystone of the arch of freedom, it is essential to the success of freedom that a strong United States must maintain its strength in this difficult and changing world. But behind this shield, behind this increased strength, behind the assurances we have given to dozens of countries through our alliances in Latin America and Western Europe and SEATO and CENTO and our commitments to the United Nations, behind those evidences of our desire to be strong in a free world, we have also attempted to work for peace, and we see nothing inconsistent with being strong and trying to live in peace. In these less than 3 years since I have been President of the United States, on three separate occasions the United States and the Soviet Union approached each other on a collision course, in Laos and Berlin in 1961, and in Cuba in the fall of 1962.

I am quite aware that if, through miscalculation or madness or design the United States and the Soviet Union should finally clash, in what would be the last war of the human race, in a war in which in less than 1 day 300 million people would be killed, and if other sections of the world were brought into it those casualties could double, it is quite obvious that with that ominous prospect on the horizon, these efforts which we make to live at peace in a strong and free world are well worth the while. That is why I am glad that your two U.S. Senators who supported our effort to strengthen this country also voted this week for the test ban treaty in the atmosphere as one step of what may be a long journey, but at least a beginning toward attempting to prevent the ultimate calamity to the human race.

Behind this shield, behind these guarantees is the United States itself, and all of these guarantees, all of these alliances, all of these military buildups, all of these improvements in our defensive strength, all of those are of no use unless the United States, itself, is a prosperous, virile, and growing society. To do that, it seems to me, requires attention to our problems here in the United States.

I read in this morning's paper that our population today is 190 million. At the time of Franklin Roosevelt it was 130 million. By the year 2000 it will be 350 million people, living where 130 million lived, where 80 million lived 60 or 70 years ago. This is a tremendous increase in the population of the United States. We devour, as a result, the resources of our country. Therefore, we have to pay attention to two basic resources: One is our children, to make sure that they are the best educated citizens in the world, not only so that they can develop their own resources, but so that they can develop their own talents to the extent that they have those talents, so that they can make something of themselves.

Nothing distresses me more as a citizen of this country than to realize that before this decade is out, there will be 8 or 9 million American children who will drop out of school before they have graduated, who will go out looking for work with almost no skills to offer at a very time when machines are taking the place of men. What chance does a boy or girl with a sixth, seventh, or eighth, or ninth grade education have? What do they have to offer? Therefore, they will live on the marginal edge of hardship and distress and poverty. They will bring up their children in that atmosphere and their children will be penalized.

So we ought to keep our children in school and we ought to make them work, and we ought to have the best teachers and we ought to try to develop in this country the kind of educational system with hard-working children who will be responsible and constructive adults in this great free society which ornaments the cause of freedom. That is our most important job of conservation and development.

Second is to use what nature has given us and, wherever we can, to improve it. There is no State in the Union where these two twin concepts of conservation, to conserve and to develop, can be more clearly seen than here in the State of Nevada, first by using the water which has been given to you by nature, using it wisely, making sure that no water goes to the ocean unused; and also through the tremendous developments of science which are being developed here in this State which will permit us to go beyond the moon in the 1970's as well as to unlock secrets of the atom which we can only guess at. Here in Nevada we have seen joined together the old concept of conservation, of protecting our basic resources, and also the new concept of using science to unlock nature to provide us with greater wealth. So this State, led by your Governor and your Senators and the citizens of this State, is, no wonder, the fastest growing State, because it symbolizes the old and the new in the best way possible. I want to assure you that the U.S. Government wishes to associate itself, not because a citizen may come from Nevada, but because this and other great natural advantages are resources for all of our people.

We hear a good deal about the rights of States, and they are important. But we should remember how easily and quickly our people move from one State to another. How many people in this audience were born in the State of Nevada? Could they hold up their hands? And how many were not? There you are. I don't know why no one goes to Massachusetts, but—

So you pioneers are going to be followed by others. Everybody seems to move from east to west, for some mysterious reason, but they do come out here, and many more are going to follow you, and we want to be able to provide for them. Therefore, the Lake Mead, Hoover Dam outdoor recreational complex, the most visited area administered by the National Park Service in all of the 50 States—I wish that everyone in the United States, and I hope perhaps next year we can do this, can all concentrate on visiting this country, can come and see Jackson Hole, and Nevada, Las Vegas and all the rest, and then travel to some other places in the world. But here, see the United States first.

But this must be given permanent national park status as proposed by your two Senators.

And, secondly, supplementary water from Lake Mead; this is what is going to govern the growth of Las Vegas, needed to guarantee the future growth of this city and community, it must be provided as proposed in the Interior Department's Pacific Southwest water plan.

And, third, the remaining unspoiled shoreline of Lake Tahoe, the gem of the Sierras, must be preserved for future generations, along with the Great Basin National Park, as proposed by your Senators.

Do you know how much of the Atlantic coast is available for public use purposes? About 8 percent; 92 percent of the whole Atlantic coast, and the figures are the same for the Pacific, are held in the most part by a comparatively few people, and unless we now, before it is too late, take these areas of the country which offer the maximum for recreation for all of our people, unless we set them aside now, it will be too late.

And, fourth, the damaged rangelands of this State must be restored to productivity, and the mineral uses of this State which first brought this State into the Union must be explored and developed. Much of the future of this State, in other words, rests on conservation, and the work must go forward in the 1960's.

This is still a beautiful continent, but we want "America the Beautiful" to be left for those who come after us. Robert Frost, the late poet, once remarks, "What makes a nation in the beginning is a good piece of geography." Our greatness today rests in part on this good piece of geography that is the United States, but what is important is what the people of America do with it. At the turn of the century two great easterners, both Republicans, Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, looked across the horizon and realized how essential it was that here in the West that we save what we have before it is too late, and in the 1960's, in another time of change, I hope we will still make the wise decisions for the future of this country. Franklin Roosevelt made the same wise decisions in all of the agencies which have meant so much to the development of Arizona and California. However, it was Pinchot himself, in the early 1900's, who emphasized that the conservation cause would ultimately fail unless every generation of Americans made the commitment to the future.

There isn't very much that you can do today that will materially alter your life in the next 3 or 4 years, in the field of conservation, but you can build for the future. You can build for the seventies, as those who went ahead of us built for us in this great dam and lake that I flew over today. Our task, the task of propelling a third wave of conservation in the United States following that of Theodore Roosevelt and of Franklin Roosevelt is to make science the servant of conservation, and to devise new programs of land stewardship that will enable us to preserve this green environment which means so much to all of us. Therefore, I reach, after 5 days on this trip, three major conclusions:

That we mount a new campaign to preserve our natural environment in order that those who come after us will find a green and rich country.

Secondly, that we educate our children.

And third, that we use every chance we have to promote the peaceful relations between countries so that we can enjoy what God has given us. This is a great country, and I can tell you that there are no 5 days that I have spent that have been more useful, than in looking at the United States once again and seeing something of the vitality of the country and the vitality of the people. You, as citizens of the United States, can take pride in the fact that for the last 18 years it has been the United States almost alone that has preserved the freedom of so much of the world. Without the United States today, Europe would be enslaved. Without the United States today, Asia would be overrun. Without the United States today, much of this hemisphere which is still free would have fallen.

This is a tremendous burden and responsibility that we bear. We have been fortunate in the country given to us. We have been fortunate in the people who came here. We have been fortunate that we made in the years after the Second World War the proper decision that this country could not be free and secure unless there was a free and secure world. And so we have devoted our energies, our talents. We have 1 million of our sons and brothers who are serving outside of the United States today. No country in history has had so large a proportion of its citizenry serving its country in the cause of peace outside of its own borders. They have had them for war, they have had them for conquest, but we seek a world of diversity, a world of freedom, a world where people can make their own choice, a world in which no group of powers can threaten our security, and to do that, with all of its complexities and all of its difficulties, we have done it, and we have done it for 18 years, and we have done it almost singlehanded. And during the same period, here in the United States we have almost tripled the growth of this great country. So this generation of Americans can take satisfaction in what they have done, and I urge them in the future to meet the same high standards, to make sure that this remains not only the land of the free, but also the home of the brave.

Thank you.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS and **Mr. CLARK** addressed the Chair.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to tell my colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania, who knows I highly respect him, that I have a 30-minute speech to make on East-West trade. Since there is no morning hour, apparently it is a question of obtaining the floor and doing what one must do. I should be glad to yield to the Senator for any brief statement that he wishes to make. I suggest to him also that I have no desire to cut off any Senator. If the Senator, after making his statement, would then accept the customary 3-minute limitation during the morning hour, I am sure the majority leader would cooperate if I asked unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe we ought to accede to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has been most patient, and who has a motion that he wishes to make. I believe he should be allowed the privilege of making it. I believe the Senator from New York would concur.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be brief.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be considered.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, what is the resolution?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I object.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Objection is heard, and the resolution will lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 209) was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to sit while the Senate is in session from October 3, 1963, to November 30, 1963.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a point of order.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. I raise the point of order that under the proceedings of today, the Senate is still in morning business and will remain in morning business until the hour of 2 o'clock.

While at the hour of 1 o'clock any Senator who can obtain the floor may interrupt the regular order for morning business under rule VII, nevertheless any other Senator upon getting the floor can offer a resolution in the order provided for by rule VII. Therefore my request that the resolution be filed does not require unanimous consent. It is filed under paragraph 4 of section 1 of rule VII. Under that rule it must be read.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The morning hour was terminated by the Senate's agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana under the regular order of business. Therefore, at this time unanimous consent of the Senate would be required for the introduction of a petition or a resolution as suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. If that is the case, I inquire what terminated the morning business under rule VII in the face of my request that the order set forth in that rule should be followed, and the provision in rule VIII that at the conclusion of the morning business the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the calendar of bills and resolutions, and continue such consideration until 2 o'clock? Was not the motion made by the majority leader to lay before the Senate the pending business out of order until morning business had been concluded under rule VII?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Morning business has not been terminated. It was suspended by the action of the Senator from Montana. The ruling made was made under rule VII(3), which reads as follows:

> Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, or report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer, unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to inquire whether the resolution that I have sent to the desk has been received at the desk; or must I take it back?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution, under the rule, will lie over 1 day.

Mr. CLARK. At what time tomorrow would it be pertinent? During the morning hour?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** It would be pertinent at some time during the morning hour after adjournment today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in order that Senators may understand what the problem is, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which is only three lines long, be read at this time.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would hope that we could accord the Senator from Pennsylvania that courtesy so that the resolution may be read.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK** read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to sit while the Senate is in session from October 3, 1963, to November 30, 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I be heard on that resolution?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana under the unanimous-consent agreement that I will not lose my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Under the rule, the resolution has gone over 1 day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would still like to be heard on the resolution which has been stated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Georgia without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe there is considerable merit in the Senator's point of order under morning business, but I do not believe there is any merit whatever in his position now. He may not even submit the resolution except by unanimous consent. The Senate is out of the morning hour. Unanimous consent is required to submit it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe there is a good deal of merit in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania. If by chance a resolution of the kind proposed were adopted, it would give a special status to a special subcommittee. If an arrangement of that kind is to be considered, I hope that it will be considered on a senatewide basis. I know the Senator would agree with that. I understand the particular circumstances which impels him—and I think rightly so—to make his request at this time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question. Does not the Senator from Montana agree that with the great pressure of business coming up in the next few months, and with the probability that the Senate will come in early and remain late, some procedure should be devised by the leadership under which committees may continue to meet in order to prepare that part of the legislative program which is not yet ready for floor consideration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is enough of a professional to understand that while the leadership may propose, the Senate disposes.

Mr. CLARK. I was asking the opinion of the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My personal opinion is "Yes."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not desire to pursue the point. It seems to me that if the resolution is to be submitted under these circumstances, it should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. It is in the nature of an amendment to the rules.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield with the same understanding.

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe that is a proper motion to be made at this time. I am sure that the Senator will agree with me.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the Senator has agreed that the resolution has not been regularly submitted. I do not desire to make a point of that. It would require unanimous consent to consider the resolution now. I am perfectly willing that it lie over 1 day under the rule.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to be sure that the Senator from Georgia and I understand each other. My understanding is that the resolution was properly submitted, that it has been ordered to lie over 1 day under the new ruling of the Parliamentarian, that it is not privileged, and that it can be called up tomorrow, at which point the Senator could appropriately make his motion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not intend to make any motion, but, as the majority leader has said, the resolution would set a precedent; and it seems to me that if we are to consider authorizing committee meetings for one committee, it would be well for the Committee on Rules and Administration to consider a general change of the rule, rather than have a veritable cascade of resolutions providing for the meeting of this, that, or the other subcommittee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest that that question be held until tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In all fairness, I think I should inform the Senator from Pennsylvania that there is a strong possibility that the Senate will not meet tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Chair rules that a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration will be in order when the Senate meets on the next legislative day.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is, after an adjournment?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** During the morning hour on the next day the Senate meets, if the resolution should come up, a motion to refer it to the Committee on Rules and Administration would be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. But if the Senate were to recess, and not to adjourn, it would require a motion to lay the resolution before the Senate; the resolution would not come before the Senate automatically under the rule?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** It would not be laid down as a part of the morning business if the Senate were not in the morning hour.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no morning hour unless the Senate adjourns.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If, by unanimous consent, permission were granted for a morning hour, it would be in order to lay it before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Do I correctly understand the Presiding Officer to rule that under the current, standard, stereotyped unanimous consent request for a morning hour with a limitation of 3 minutes on speeches, the resolution would be laid down?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Yes. Not until all Senators had an opportunity, under the 3-minute limitation, to offer their proposals or make their speeches. At that time the resolution could be laid before the Senate, and it would be subject to unlimited debate—until 2 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, does the Presiding Officer then hold that under the 3-minute rule on speeches and morning business, if the 3-minute speeches were concluded prior to 2 o'clock it would be incumbent upon the Presiding Officer, of his own volition, to lay the resolution before the Senate?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** According to the precedents.

Mr. RUSSELL. It will be a considerable time before the Senate has another morning hour by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think we ought to set the record straight. It is my understanding that if the Senate adjourns a morning hour is automatic the next day; is that correct?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If the Senate adjourns, under rule VII there would be a morning hour, under the regular procedure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senate recessed would there be a morning hour?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If the Senate recessed there would not be a morning hour.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Unless it were requested. Usually it is requested under unanimous consent.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. In the colloquy with the Presiding Officer during the last few minutes reference was made to a 3-minute rule. My query is: Is there any such rule? My suggestion is that there is no such thing as a 3-minute rule, except as it is agreed to by unanimous consent, day by day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. If there is a morning hour—and I agree with the majority leader, that if he wishes to prevent it by recessing until adjournment sine die he can prevent it—I shall have the privilege, under rule VII, if I can get my request in before 1 o'clock, to call up the resolution I have filed and have it made the pending business; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; provided the Senate had adjourned and the regular order of procedure under rule VII was followed.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Presiding Officer.

STUDY OF WORLD MONETARY SYSTEM ANNOUNCED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as expected, the first full-scale study of the free world's financial mechanism since 1945 was agreed to and announced yesterday during the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund here in Washington.

The new study, which will be conducted in Paris by high-level officials of the 10 most industrialized members of the free world under the chairmanship of Under Secretary of Treasury Roosa, marks the beginning of major negotiations to see whether the existing system can be improved to accommodate the future needs of the free world for international credit. The first Paris meeting of the 10-nation study group will be in Paris in early November and is expected to be concluded in time for next year's International Monetary Fund meeting in Tokyo.

As a strong advocate of an International Monetary Conference for a thorough examination of this very question I am gratified that this study is about to start. It is vital that the free world begin preparations now to prevent financial chaos that may result from inflexible monetary institutions and a shortage of credit to finance rapidly growing international transactions in the foreseeable future.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article from today's New York Times entitled, "Ten Nations Agree on a World Study of Money System."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ten Nations Agree on a World Study of Money System—Seek Improvements in Plan of International Payments—U.S. Deficit a Topic

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Washington, October 2.—The non-Communist world's 10 most powerful industrial nations announced today that they would start the first major negotiation and study of the world's financial system since the Bretton Woods Conference in New Hampshire 20 years ago.

The Bretton Woods Conference led to the establishment of the present system by which international transactions are conducted. The system has worked well to date, but it has recently shown strains.

The purpose of the new study and negotiation is to see whether the system can be improved and reinforced, with the aim of assuring that world prosperity will not be disrupted by a purely international financial factor as it was in the 1930's.

The 10 nations announced their decision in a communique during the annual meeting here of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The Monetary Fund will conduct an independent study of the problem, but the results of the 10-nation talks will determine the outcome.

PARIS TALKS PLANNED

The talks will be conducted in Paris by high-level officials from the 10 governments, under the chairmanship of Robert V. Roosa, U.S. Under Secretary of the Treasury. The vice chairman will be Emil van Lennep, director general of the Netherlands Finance Ministry.

All ideas for improvement of the present international monetary system and for elimination of its flaws except two will be considered. Those ruled out are any change in the present gold price of $35 an ounce and freely fluctuating exchange rates among currencies.

Douglas Dillon, the Secretary of the Treasury, issued today's communique in his capacity as temporary chairman of the "Group of 10." The chairmanship at the ministerial level will rotate according to rules still to be established, but the United States will have the chairmanship of the actual study.

SPRING REPORT IS TARGET

The first Paris meeting of the study group will be in early November. Mr. Dillon said the target was a preliminary report by next spring and decisions, if possible, in time for next year's World Fund meeting in Tokyo in late September.

The 10 nations hold about 80 percent of the world's reserves of gold and foreign exchange.

Mr. Dillon explained today that their studies would not be limited to changes or improvements in the International Monetary Fund itself, which has 102 members. He said that "sovereign decisions" by governments would also be considered. These would include such matters as how much gold to hold and how to grant credit to nations suffering deficits in their balance of international payments.

The Monetary Fund, one keystone of the present system, was established at the Bretton Woods Conference. The 10 nations in the study group are the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, Canada, and Japan. The main exception among the leading financial nations was Switzerland, but Mr. Dillon indicated that the Swiss would be brought into the study in one way or another.

Switzerland is not a member from the outset only because she does not belong to the International Monetary Fund.

UNDERLYING AIM

The underlying aim of all the members of the study is to prevent the kind of financial chaos that prolonged and deepened the depression of the 1930's.

At that time nations withdrew credits from each other rather than granting them, and nation after nation, virtually devoid of gold, had to impose restrictions on foreign transactions and trade, as well as imposing domestic restraints on economic growth.

No member of the group foresees such a crisis in the near future. But the purpose of the study is to make sure that one could not arise. The members are also agreed, however, that international credit should not be so easy that individual nations could freely pursue inflationary policies at home and disregard their international payments.

Authoritative sources from the various countries involved were unanimous in private conversation in saying that the results of the negotiation were impossible to predict. However, there was also unanimity that any results would be evolutionary rather than revolutionary.

There could be such results as changes in the means of granting international credit and possibly an enlargement of the sources of such credit. There could be more precise rules on the holding of foreign currencies—chiefly the dollar—as part of nations' reserves.

NO BASIC CHANGE SEEN

But the basic international system—by which nations have fixed exchange rates, hold their reserves in gold and foreign exchange and borrow reserves from the International Monetary Fund or from each other if they need to—will not be changed.

The chances of significant results from the negotiations were difficult to predict today. It was clear that the 10 nations would start with views that differ both on problems and on the solutions to be proposed.

For example, the Continental European countries are interested in a more orderly system of granting credit to deficit countries, such as the United States. Britain is urgently concerned with the problem of "international liquidity"—the total of countries' reserves and their access to credit—particularly when the U.S. deficit ceases.

All are agreed, however, that the first priority of business is for the United States to reduce and then eliminate its deficit, meanwhile to assure that the deficit does not disrupt the international system.

Today's formal proceedings at the meeting here were devoted to the affairs of the World Bank, which is not directly involved in the international monetary system. It makes loans for the economic development of poorer countries.

The speeches today generally welcomed the bank's new policy, announced Monday by its president, George D. Woods, of slightly liberalizing lending terms.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to yesterday's announcement by the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee [Mr. Magnuson], carried in the newspapers generally, to the effect that the Commerce Committee will probably complete its work on the bill to ban segregation in hotels, restaurants, and other places of public accommodation today. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] suggested, according to the news article, that he felt the Senate might well use the bill as the vehicle for a general civil rights debate, without waiting for the House to act, and letting the House bill catch up with the debate after it started.

Mr. President, this is the position for which I have been contending all along. There are two principles in this respect which are crystal clear to me. One is that the civil rights bill must take precedence over the tax bill, because the civil rights bill is an answer to a problem of the gravest importance to domestic tranquility of the country, as a review of any daily newspaper will show, with children dying and people being arrested by the hundreds, indeed, by the thousands, because—it seems to me this is at least one of the great causes—we have not made our contribution to trying to resolve this controversy in the courts and in law.

Secondly, we should pick up the Commerce Committee bill and start the debate and let the House bill come in when ready. This would curtail the debating process, in my view, by at least 4 weeks, because a great deal of debate must take place before Senators get to the point of voting for cloture.

The news report states that the majority leader does not agree, and still sticks to his view that the Senate should take up the civil rights question when the House bill comes along. I respectfully disagree.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I was not listening. I was in conversation with another Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry. May I repeat what I said?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was my fault. I should have been listening.

Mr. JAVITS. It was nothing discreditable to the Senator. He and I have debated this question before.

I was stating my position. I am sure the Senator has read the comment at the end of the story in the Times which is headlined "Southerner Blocks House Vote To Extend Civil Rights Panel."

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not read the story.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry. The story states that the Senate Commerce Committee expects to finish its work on the public accommodations bill today. It also states:

> The chairman, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, said the Senate might then use it as the vehicle for a general civil rights debate, without waiting for the House to act.
>
> But the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, threw cold water on this idea. He said taking up civil rights with firm agreement on only one part of the bill would open the way to innumerable amendments and endless debate.
>
> Thus, the prospect still is that the House will act first and that its bill will be intercepted when it reaches the Senate. The outlook is for a Senate civil rights debate that will go on until Christmas Eve—and possibly longer.

The Magnuson approach, as indicated by the article, is what I have long been contending for; and the Senator from Montana has been steadfast in his view that the way to do it is to intercept the House bill. I was giving my opinion that this would cost 4 more weeks in debate than if the Senate took the Commerce Committee bill. I was also referring to the rumor that the White House has adopted the view that the civil rights bill should precede consideration of the tax bill. I agree with that view, and I was giving my reasons, in terms of domestic tranquility, which I think is occasioned by the delay in dealing with the civil rights issue by Congress, why I thought the Magnuson prescription was the right one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Times story states my position accurately; namely, that so far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, it is not his intention to call up the Magnuson proposal for the reasons enumerated. The Senate would spend much more time on civil rights if it operated on that basis than if it awaited a bill from the House.

I have previously stated my position. The Senator from New York and I are unchanging in our position.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the past month or more, he has wanted the Senate to get to work on the proposal in the Commerce Committee, and for the past month or more I have said that it would be my intention, if I had my way, to wait for the House to pass its bill, meet it at the door, place it on the calendar, and then face up, not merely to a part of the civil rights bill, but to the whole, or as much of the whole as possible.

It is the intention of the leadership to consider both a civil rights bill and a tax bill. If by chance the tax bill is available before the civil rights bill from the House is, it would be my intention at the moment to call up the tax bill first. But that is something which only the future will be able to give us a look into. All I want to emphasize is that I am in favor of taking up the civil rights bill as it comes from the House, and that, so far as the tax bill and the civil rights bill are concerned, it is our intention to consider both of them, no matter how long it requires.

The Senator has mentioned Christmas. If it takes to the end of the time for legal adjournment of the first session of the 88th Congress, which is January 1 of next year, we will go that long, if we are not finished, and, if need be, we will continue with the next session immediately.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has correctly stated that our positions have not changed. I feel as strongly as he does; and I think he is making a great mistake. The civil rights debate should be started as soon as it is possible, which is as soon as the Commerce Committee makes its report. Of course, it is possible to offer amendments to other bills, as was done the other day in extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission, but that method does not get much support, understandably, except when it is absolutely essential, and it sometimes is. But I believe the report of the Commerce Committee, which has been promised soon, will be the showdown in this situation.

I understood very well that the majority leader had not changed his view, but I thought it advisable to make it clear, in view of the support of the position I have taken by the chairman of the Commerce Committee, or, at least, which has been implied to be the position of the chairman of the Commerce Committee. Of course, the chairman of the Commerce Committee will speak for himself if he feels the newspaper article gives the wrong implication so far as he is concerned.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska has asked me to yield to him before I make a rather extended speech on East-West trade. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 minutes to him, and I beg my colleague to confine himself to 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection it is so ordered.

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO MONITOR THE CIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished majority leader's attention, because reference is made to him in these remarks with respect to the CIA.

Mr. President, for some time now many of us in the Congress have been gravely concerned about the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. This is the one agency of the Federal Government which operates "on its own" without the customary supervision and control normally exercised over other Federal departments and agencies.

Yesterday, under the headline "Richard Starnes Reveals Arrogant CIA Disobeys Orders in Vietnam," the Washington Daily News apparently confirms the basis for our concern. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Starnes' article be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. This story underlines the remarks made on the floor of the Senate on September 20, 1963, by the able and distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] when he admonished the U.S. agencies in South Vietnam to work in harmony and reminded them that the Ambassador to that country, Mr. Lodge, was in charge of directing all their activities.

The majority leader stated in part:

> Mr. President, if this large contingent of Americans is so to function, there can be in Vietnam only one channel through which direction can flow. The President and the Secretary of State cannot set up headquarters in Saigon; but they do have in that tortured city an eminently qualified man who does speak for them—and is the only man who should speak for them—with their paramount authority in this matter. That is the Ambassador, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, our former colleague, and an outstanding American in every respect.

I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that the pertinent column by Arthur Krock appearing in the New York Times this morning be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Early last year, while on a mission for the Senate Committee on Public Works in Central America, I discussed the CIA situation with our Ambassador to one of these Central American countries. He said there was a well-financed CIA mission in that country which did not keep him informed of its activities, but that he was certain that it was working at cross-purposes with the objectives the Department of State had instructed him to seek in that country. This would appear to be a repetition of the situation in Vietnam.

Some time ago I joined with the able and distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in cosponsoring Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. That concurrent resolution is now before the Senate Committee on Rules, and I do hope that that committee will take prompt action.

I notice present on the floor the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina].

I have spoken and written to Senator SMATHERS previously and suggested that besides representatives from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the House and Senate Committees on the Armed Services, there should be representation from the Senate and House Committees on Government Operations.

He was favorably inclined to this suggestion.

When I first wrote to Senator SMATHERS on February 26, 1963, I expressed belief that:

> The security agencies of this Nation should be under a measure of congressional control.

This has become more apparent daily.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter of February 26, 1963, and Senator SMATHERS' response, be reprinted in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1963.

Hon. GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GEORGE: I agree that the security agencies of this Nation should be under a measure of congressional control and I am pleased to cosponsor your concurrent resolution 23 which would establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

The resolution specifies that there would be six members each from the Senate and the House of Representatives. It further states that these representatives would be selected from the Central Intelligence Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and the Central Intelligence Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services in each body.

I hope you will find acceptable an amendment I intend to offer which would further specify that the membership of the Joint Committee on Central Intelligence include three members each from the Senate and House Committee on Government Operations.

Both have subcommittees which are concerned with our national security. The Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations chaired by Senator JACKSON works directly with the President and with the national security agencies. The recent enlargement of the Senate Government Operations Committee will facilitate its services.

Should you feel that a total membership of 18 would be unwieldy it might be feasible to have two members each from the three committees, rather than three.

With best wishes, I remain

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
February 28, 1963.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR ERNEST: I have your letter of February 26 and am very pleased to have you as a cosponsor of a concurrent resolution introduced by me to establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence.

I have noted your suggested amendment to the proposed resolution and most certainly would have no objection. As a matter of fact, I feel that the amendment would be a good one.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. GRUENING. Accordingly, Mr. President, I am today submitting an amendment to Senate Concurrent Resolution 23 to accomplish that purpose. I ask that this amendment be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks and that it lie at the desk until the close of business on October 10, 1963, to give those of my colleagues who wish to do so an opportunity to join me in cosponsoring this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD and lie on the desk as requested.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

On the first page, line 3, beginning with "six" strike out all through "four" in line 6, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "nine Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the nine Members to be appointed from the Senate three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and three shall be members of the National Security Staffing and Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate. Of the nine Members to be appointed from the House of Representatives three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and three shall be members of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives. Not more than six".

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 2, 1963]

SPOOKS MAKE LIFE MISERABLE FOR AMBASSADOR LODGE—ARROGANT CIA DISOBEYS ORDERS IN VIETNAM

(By Richard Starnes)

SAIGON, October 2.—The story of the Central Intelligence Agency's role in South Vietnam is a dismal chronicle of bureaucratic arrogance, obstinate disregard of orders, and unrestrained thirst for power.

Twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, according to a high U.S. source here.

In one of these instances the CIA frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought with him from Washington, because the Agency disagreed with it.

This led to a dramatic confrontation between Mr. Lodge and John Richardson, chief of the huge CIA apparatus here. Mr. Lodge failed to move Mr. Richardson, and the dispute was bucked back to Washington. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and CIA Chief John A. McCone were unable to resolve the conflict, and the matter is now reported to be awaiting settlement by President Kennedy.

It is one of the developments expected to be covered in Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's report to Mr. Kennedy.

OTHERS CRITICAL, TOO

Other American agencies here are incredibly bitter about the CIA.

"If the United States ever experiences a 'Seven Days in May' it will come from the CIA, and not the Pentagon," one U.S. official commented caustically.

("Seven Days in May" is a fictional account of an attempted military coup to take over the U.S. Government.)

CIA "spooks" (a universal term for secret agents here) have penetrated every branch of the American community in Saigon, until nonspook Americans here almost seem to be suffering a CIA psychosis.

An American field officer with a distinguished combat career speaks angrily about "that man at headquarters in Saigon wearing a colonel's uniform." He means the man is a CIA agent, and he can't understand what he is doing at U.S. military headquarters here, unless it is spying on other Americans.

Another American officer, talking about the CIA, acidly commented: "You'd think they'd have learned something from Cuba but apparently they didn't."

FEW KNOW CIA STRENGTH

Few people other than Mr. Richardson and his close aids know the actual CIA strength here, but a widely used figure is 600. Many are clandestine agents known only to a few of their fellow spooks.

Even Mr. Richardson is a man about whom it is difficult to learn much in Saigon. He is said to be a former OSS officer, and to have served with distinction in the CIA in the Philippines.

A surprising number of the spooks are known to be involved in their ghostly trade and some make no secret of it.

"There are spooks in the U.S. Information Service, in the U.S. operations mission, in every aspect of American official and commercial life here," one official—presumably a nonspook—said.

"They represent a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone," he added.

Coupled with the ubiquitous secret police of Ngo Dinh Nhu, a surfeit of spooks has given Saigon an oppressive police state atmosphere.

The Nhu-Richardson relationship is a subject of lively speculation. The CIA continues to pay the special forces which conducted brutal raids on Buddhist temples last August 21, although in fairness it should be pointed out that the CIA is paying these goons for the war against Communist guerrillas, not Buddhist bonzes (priests).

HANDS OVER MILLIONS

Nevertheless, on the first of every month, the CIA dutifully hands over a quarter million American dollars to pay these special forces.

Whatever else it buys, it doesn't buy any solid information on what the special forces are up to. The August 21 raids caught top U.S. officials here and in Washington flatfooted.

Nhu ordered the special forces to crush the Buddhist priests, but the CIA wasn't let in on the secret. (Some CIA button men now say they warned their superiors what was coming up, but in any event the warning of harsh repression was never passed to top officials here or in Washington.)

Consequently, Washington reacted unsurely to the crisis. Top officials here and at home were outraged at the news the CIA was paying the temple raiders, but the CIA continued the payments.

It may not be a direct subsidy for a religious war against the country's Buddhist majority, but it comes close to that.

And for every State Department aid here who will tell you, "Dammit, the CIA is supposed to gather information, not make policy, but policymaking is what they're doing here," there are military officers who scream over the way the spooks dabble in military operations.

A TYPICAL EXAMPLE

For example, highly trained trail watchers are an important part of the effort to end Vietcong infiltration from across the Lao and Cambodian borders. But if the trail watchers spot incoming Vietcongs, they report it to the CIA in Saigon, and in the fullness of time, the spooks may tell the military.

One very high American official here, a man who has spent much of his life in the service of democracy, likened the CIA's growth to a malignancy, and added he was not sure even the White House could control it any longer.

Unquestionably Mr. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor both got an earful from people who are beginning to fear the CIA is becoming a third force, coequal with President Diem's regime and the U.S. Government—and answerable to neither.

There is naturally the highest interest here as to whether Mr. McNamara will persuade Mr. Kennedy something ought to be done about it.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Oct. 3, 1963.]

IN THE NATION: THE INTRA-ADMINISTRATION WAR IN VIETNAM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 2.—The Central Intelligence Agency is getting a very bad press in dispatches from Vietnam to American newspapers and in articles originating in Washington. Like the Supreme Court when under fire, the CIA cannot defend itself in public retorts to criticisms of its activities as they occur. But, unlike the Supreme Court, the CIA has no open record of its activities on which the public can base a judgment of the validity of the criticisms. Also, the Agency is precluded from using the indirect defensive tactic which is constantly employed by all other Government units under critical fire.

This tactic is to give information to the press, under a seal of confidence, that challenges or refutes the critics. But the CIA cannot father such inspired articles, because to do so would require some disclosure of its activities. And not only does the effectiveness of the Agency depend on the secrecy of its operations. Every President since the CIA was created has protected this secrecy from claimants—Congress or the public through the press, for example—of the right to share any part of it.

WITH HIGH FREQUENCY

This Presidential policy has not, however, always restrained other executive units from going confidentially to the press with attacks on CIA operations in their common field of responsibility. And usually it has been possible to deduce these operational details from the nature of the attacks. But the peak of the practice has recently been reached in Vietnam and in Washington. This is revealed almost everyday now in dispatches from reporters—in close touch with intra-administration critics of the CIA—with excellent reputations for reliability.

One reporter in this category is Richard Starnes of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Today, under a Saigon dateline, he related that, according to a high U.S. source here, twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge * * * (and) in one instance frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought from Washington because the Agency disagreed with it. Among the views attributed to U.S. officials on the scene, including one described as a very high American official * * * who has spent much of his life in the service of democracy * * * are the following:

The CIA's growth was likened to a malignancy which the very high official was not sure even the White House could control * * * any longer. If the United States ever experiences (an attempt at a coup to overthrow the Government) it will come from the CIA and not the Pentagon. The Agency represents a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone.

DISORDERLY GOVERNMENT

Whatever else these passages disclose, they most certainly establish that representatives of other executive branches have expanded their war against the CIA from the inner Government councils to the American people via the press. And published simultaneously are details of the Agency's operations in Vietnam that can come only from the same critical official sources. This is disorderly government. And the longer the President tolerates it—the period already is considerable—the greater will its potentials of hampering the real war against the Vietcong and the impression of a very indecisive administration in Washington.

The CIA may be guilty as charged. Since it cannot, or at any rate will not, openly defend its record in Vietnam, or defend it by the same confidential press briefings employed by its critics, the public is not in a position to judge. Nor is this department, which sought and failed to get even the outlines of the Agency's case in rebuttal. But Mr. Kennedy will have to make a judgment if the spectacle of war within the executive branch is to be ended and the effective functioning he makes this judgment, hopefully he also will make it public, as well as the appraisal of fault on which it is based.

Doubtless recommendations as to what his judgment should be were made to him today by Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Taylor on their return from their factfinding expedition into the embattled official jungle in Saigon.

TWENTY-TWO SENATORS REQUEST ADMINISTRATION FIRMNESS IN NOT COUNTENANCING MILITARY OVERTHROW OF DULY CONSTITUTED GOVERNMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday I joined 21 of my colleagues in sending a telegram to President Kennedy urging him to issue orders withdrawing all U.S. personnel from the diplomatic, military, and AID missions to the Dominican Republic.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the telegram and the names of those who sent it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the point we are making to the President is that so long as our personnel are physically present in the Dominican Republic the statement of the United States that it had broken relations with the illegal military junta which has seized power from the legally constituted government of the Dominican Republic and the stopping of foreign economic assistance are ineffective.

The situation in the Dominican Republic is serious. It threatens the entire Alliance for Progress. If the trend toward the overthrow of duly constituted civilian governments by illegal military juntas is to stop, the time to stop it is now.

Economic development of Latin America cannot be successful in an atmosphere of political unrest. The duly constituted civilian governments cannot carry out economic development plans if they are in constant fear of a military coup. If we condone these military coups we play directly into the hand of the Communists. The Alliance for Progress is tied directly into self-help action by the nations aided in the fields of social and economic reform. If constitutional governments are to be illegally thrown out of office by military coups because they seek to carry out such social and economic reforms, there can be no hope for the success of the Alliance for Progress.

The United States must make this abundantly clear not by words but by actions.

I said on the floor of the Senate this last Monday:

> Because if we do not insist upon the return to constitutional government in the Dominican Republic, then we will be endangering other civilian governments not only in Latin America but in the rest of the world as well. We will be in effect inciting similar military revolts in Venezuela, Columbia, and in other Latin American nations which are trying to establish democratic regimes. We will be playing into the hands of the Communists who will rejoice at the installation of totalitarianism.

This telegram was sent to the President late yesterday afternoon. It was fully reported by radio and TV last night, but it is an interesting fact that it was not considered news by the Washington Post, the New York Times and the New York Herald-Tribune. As an oldtime newspaperman and managing editor of various metropolitan newspapers including one of the three just mentioned, I confess myself puzzled. I would consider that such action by 22 Senators, including three members of the Foreign Relations Committee, to be news. I know that the story was carried in full by the news services, the A.P. and U.P.I. and was therefore available to all dailies in the United States.

The news this morning that the Honduras Government had fallen before a military coup is extremely distressing and serves to make increasingly imperative that the United States make crystal clear that it will not recognize or give financial aid to any illegal military junta or Communist-led revolt which deposes constitutionally elected governments.

Exhibit 1

Text of October 2, 1963, Wire Sent to President Kennedy by 22 Members of the Senate

The President,
The White House:

Success of Alliance for Progress will be enhanced by U.S. action to rebuff illegal military overthrow of civilian Government in Dominican Republic.

Continuance of nonrecognition of military junta and withholding of economic assistance imperative.

To underscore U.S. position and to strengthen remaining Latin American civilian governments, strongly urge issuance immediately with widest publicity, or orders recalling forthwith entire diplomatic, military, and aid missions from Dominican Republic.

Even though assistance has been suspended and announcement of nonrecognition has been made, continued presence in Dominican Republic of missions' personnel is tantamount to giving illegal military junta Government assurances of ultimate recognition and resumption of military and economic aid. All such personnel other than caretaker should be physically withdrawn.

E. L. (Bob) Bartlett, Daniel Brewster, Frank Church, Joseph S. Clark, Paul Douglas, Albert Gore, Ernest Gruening, Philip Hart, Vance Hartke, Daniel Inouye, Jacob Javits, Pat McNamara, Wayne Morse, Frank Moss, Gaylord Nelson, John Pastore, Claiborne Pell, William Proxmire, Jennings Randolph, Harrison Williams, Jr., Ralph Yarborough, and Stephen Young, *U.S. Senators.*

HELPING AMERICA AND HER YOUTH

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on September 25, 1963, the Senate passed S. 1967, which extends the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 for another 3 years. I was proud to coauthor this legislation with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and colleagues in both parties. I think great progress has been made under this legislation, which Congress approved 2 years ago and which allowed the Federal Government, for the first time, to take major action to assist local communities in coping with their delinquency problems.

We all knew then that the great and complex problem of delinquency was not to be solved overnight. The legislation provided for demonstration projects to test new approaches to delinquency prevention and control, approaches that if successful, might provide guides to many other cities.

I have followed this program closely, both on a national level and as it has developed in Los Angeles, one of the communities receiving a grant for a demonstration project. My investigations have convinced me that this is a sound program, one that promises to reap major benefits in the years to come.

Several guidelines have been established by the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the three members of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, for the administration of this program.

First is the realistic belief that we will find no easy answers to delinquency. The problem is too vast. Broken homes, school dropouts, youth unemployment, racial discrimination, social mobility, inadequate health and housing facilities—all of these contribute to the end result of juvenile delinquency. This complex of problems cannot be successfully attacked just with school programs, or just with recreation, or just with social work, or just with job training. There must be all these efforts, and many more, working together, if we are to get at the roots of the problem.

Thus the first criteria for demonstration projects is that they be comprehensive—attacking the total problem—across the board, not just individual pieces. Unfortunately this has not often been the case. All too frequently public and private youth agencies have had little communication or have been hampered by conflicting points of view and rivalries. But today we can no longer afford the luxury of fragmented, overlapping inefficient efforts against delinquency. To meet the increasing problems of youth, we must have a unified effort.

The second criteria follows from the first. In addition to fighting delinquency on a broad front, we must have top-level local support for such a program. Master plans worked out in an ivory tower will do no good. Mayors, judges, civic and religious leaders, heads of business and labor, and all the others who are vital to community life must be involved. We cannot expect the frontline workers to do an effective job unless we provide them with full top-level support. We must make it clear that delinquency is everybody's business.

A third belief is that these demonstration projects must be designed by local leaders to address local problems, and must contribute substantial local funds. The President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency has no master plan to impose on every city. Problems differ as cities differ. New York and Houston both have delinquency problems, but we cannot expect the same solutions to apply in both communities. The Committee asks each city to put its best minds to work to find realistic answers to its specific local problems.

I think that even this brief summary indicates that this is an ambitious program, one that is looking ahead to the youth problems of the years to come. To develop demonstration projects that can have important results, the Committee has required cities to go through a preliminary period in which clear goals are set, facts are gathered, new programs are designed, and community support is mobilized. Grants have been made to support these planning periods, so that demonstration projects will be as solid as they possibly can, and the Federal investment can have the best possible return.

There has been some criticism that this planning period is time consuming, and the need is for immediate action. But the fact is that we have had a great deal of action, by a great many people, for many years, but the problem has continued to grow worse. Perhaps what we need most is to take stock, to see what mistakes we have made, and what we have left undone, so that our future expenditures can be more effective. This has been the belief of the Federal program, and what I have seen in Los Angeles has shown me that it is a wise one. This is nothing more than a belief that we should look before we leap, that before we begin spending millions to fight delinquency, we should figure out the best ways to meet the problem.

Los Angeles has every potential for an explosive delinquency situation. Local officials have been able, in recent years, to keep delinquency rates from rising in proportion to the juvenile population. On the other hand, the city's great teenage population increase means that more and more juveniles are getting into trouble, and straining already overcrowded facilities. For every two teenagers in Los Angeles in 1950, there were four in 1960, and this trend will continue. Between 1960 and 1965 the youth population will increase by 50 percent.

There is no doubt that Los Angeles has great resources to meet these problems. Yet local leaders recognize the need to make better use of those existing resources. Soon after the passage of the Delinquency Act, Ernest E. Debs, chairman of the county board of supervisors, called a meeting of key public and private officials to discuss a new attack on delinquency.

This meeting led to the organization of a planning committee to develop a comprehensive approach to Los Angeles youth problems. The committee included leaders of five major public agencies: the city of Los Angeles, the county of Los Angeles, the city schools, the county schools, and the State employment service. This committee, called the Youth Opportunities Board of Greater Los Angeles, began to draw up a Joint Powers Agreement which under California law, permits agency coalition for joint action to resolve common problems.

In April 1962, the Joint Powers Agreement was signed by Gov. Edmund G. Brown, the heads of the five agencies, and the State director of finance. The agreement set a new precedent in the Los Angeles area as a device for integrating social planning and action on a metropolitan basis. This was the first time State, county, and city agencies in California had set up a structure of such scope to work together on a common problem.

On May 23, 1962, the youth opportunities board received a $252,906 grant from the Juvenile Delinquency Act to plan a broad-based delinquency prevention and control project.

Each of the five joint powers assigned a full-time representative to the youth opportunities board to assist in program development and serve as liaison to the five agencies. Private groups, labor, and business have supported the board since its inception.

I take pride in the fact that California, under the leadership of Gov. Earl Warren, was in the forefront in developing programs for youth. The Los Angeles Youth Opportunities Board is continuing this tradition of public involvement in youth activities. Republicans and Democrats alike have given their support to this comprehensive program of youth services.

Karl Holton, the respected former chief probation officer of Los Angeles County for 15 years and director of the California Youth Authority for 10 years, is executive director of the board. He was one of 31 recipients of the Freedom Medal, the highest civilian honor, given by the President on July 4.

The youth opportunities board has selected two target areas in the city for a concentration of youth services. A number of "satellite" areas were also chosen to test pilot programs in other parts of the county under the overall structure of the board.

One of the target areas is the site of a youth training and employment program that has been funded by the Department of Labor under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This program, which was developed and which will be administered by the youth opportunities board, will provide counseling, testing, training, and job placement for 2,500 unemployed youth from 16 to 22 years of age. The board's role in this job program shows its effectiveness as a coordinating structure for youth programs.

This is the first major program developed by the board. A variety of others are being planned based on the data gathered by the research staff and the ideas of staff, agency personnel, and citizens.

Some of these new ideas include:

A loft studio for youth interested in singing, dancing, and the theater will be established with the help of Hollywood professionals.

Libraries in target area junior and senior high schools will be open after school 4 days a week to offer students an adequate place to study and read.

A special outpost service will be set up to provide a variety of governmental services on the neighborhood level 6 days and evenings a week.

These are but a few of the programs that are being developed by the youth opportunities board. The planning process going on in Los Angeles has stimulated these new ideas and has attracted the interest of many citizens. Housewives, engineers, teachers, and probation officers have volunteered their services to the board. The broad base of community support on which the Los Angeles project rests is one of its greatest accomplishments.

Side by side with these demonstration projects stands the second major part of the Federal delinquency program—the training of youth serving personnel. To meet the desperate shortage of trained professional and volunteer youth workers, grants are being made in 3 categories—to establish university training centers, support curriculum development projects and hold short-term workshops.

In the State of California, eight training grants have been made under the act.

The University of California Center for the Study of Law and Society at Berkeley is preparing training materials for college students, legal agencies, and community organizations working with youth.

The University of Southern California Youth Studies Center in Los Angeles is developing course materials and conducting experimental training programs for probation officers, school guidance counselors, community leaders, correctional administrators, social workers, and members of the youth opportunities board.

The University of California School of Criminology at Berkeley is developing materials for training police, judges, probation officers, and community workers, with the cooperation of local agencies. Teachers from the Oakland-Berkeley area are being helped to make the school more effective in combating delinquency and dropouts.

Similar training efforts are being conducted in other areas of the country to provide communities with a pool of qualified workers for their delinquency control programs.

My observation of the Federal delinquency program in Los Angeles and California leads me to believe that this approach of a comprehensive attack on the many problems of youth is a sound one. As my friend Karl Holton said, "This is the most fascinating project with which I have ever been associated."

Other experienced and respected youth workers have hailed the Federal effort. From their opinions and my own knowledge of the program, I think it deserves the support of all of us.

I have joined in coauthoring S. 1967 providing for a 3-year extension of the program which is now before the House Committee on Education and Labor. This extension is needed to complete what 16 communities across the country have begun to advance youth programs in other localities. I urge the passage by Congress of this needed extension so that this massive attack on juvenile delinquency and this new approach to youth problems will be allowed to prove itself in the near future. The first 2 years of experience fully justifies our faith.

CALIFORNIA AND THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the best-known events of the Civil War are being recalled throughout several States from the Mason-Dixon line to the Mississippi Delta, as our Nation reverently observes the centennial anniversary of this grave and unhappy conflict between our States which, while it lasted, threatened to destroy the Union.

Little remembered even by historians and surely unappreciated by the general public is the contribution which California made to the cause of preservation of the United States of America.

Although several hundred miles from the scene of any of the famous and widely recalled battles, California supplied a naval task force which was prepared to repel any attack by Confederate forces or allies they might enlist upon the Pacific coast.

The centennial observance properly directs attention to this unsung squadron which ranged an ocean front from Alaska to Chile. The small fleet of only six ships helped materially in preventing Napoleon from establishing a hemispheric outpost of his empire in Mexico.

The California Legislature at its 1963 session adopted a resolution of tribute to the men and ships of this force which regrettably has attracted scant attention in the romantic novels, motion pictures, and school textbooks recounting events of the Civil War. I was privileged to send the Department of Defense a specially illuminated copy of that resolution as a token of my State's remembrance.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the resolution and of letters which were written by officials of the Navy attesting to the significant role played by the Naval Squadron of the Pacific 1861–67.

There being no objection, the resolution and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 44—RELATIVE TO THE CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Whereas the years 1861–67 were fraught with the greatest significance to the United States of America and to the State of California in connection with momentous events including the great American Civil War which raged from 1861 into 1865; and

Whereas during these critical years 1861–67, the neighboring Republic of Mexico was invaded by European powers and a devastating civil war prevailed in that nation; and

Whereas the U.S. Navy was faced from 1861–67 with the formidable task of protecting national interests linked to the Pacific coast, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic coast adjoining U.S. territory; and

Whereas the U.S. naval squadron of the Pacific in 1861 is reported to have comprised 6 small vessels or sloops mounting 100 guns total and manned by less than 1,000 officers and men, and yet the Pacific Squadron undertook to patrol a vast area extending from Alaskan waters southward to Chile and thence westward to the Kingdom of Hawaii and beyond to the lands of Asia and to the South Seas; and

Whereas despite a scarcity of ships and men, under the superior leadership of Adm. John B. Montgomery and later Adm. Charles H. Bell the Pacific Squadron personnel achieved an outstanding record of accomplishment in protecting American interests in the face of great danger and distress and, as expressed in the language of a contemporary writer:

"The Squadron of the Pacific contributed much to the safety of the long Pacific coastline and by a close cooperation with the Army of the Pacific maintained peace on the western shore"; and

Whereas the Civil War Centennial Commission of California is currently engaged in the commemoration in California of the great American War Between the States 1861–65 which as an epochal event in history is associated in part with the praiseworthy record of the Squadron of the Pacific: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, the Senate thereof concurring, That the Civil War Centennial Commission is urged to observe and commemorate by all proper means the preeminent role performed by the U.S. Naval Squadron of the Pacific during the years 1861–67, and to this end the agencies of the State are urged to permit the use of their facilities by the commission; and the commission is requested to work in cooperation with any U.S. agencies and with the U.S. Armed Forces and any branch and Reserve component thereof, and to cooperate with the Civil War Centennial Commissions in other States and the District of Columbia and with the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That private universities, institutions, individuals, and historical and veterans' societies within or without the State of California are urged to permit the use of their facilities by the California Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit suitably prepared copies of this resolution to the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California, and to the executive secretary of the Civil War Centennial Commission of California, and to the Executive Director of the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission, and to the Secretary of Defense.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of May 13 and the splendid illuminated copy of the State of California's resolution of March 19, 1963, commemorating the brave actions of the Naval Squadron of the Pacific in preserving our Union during the Civil War and in the years immediately following.

As you so well state, conditions of communications with the nascent State of California a century ago were at best difficult. With our sophisticated means of communications we tend to forget difficult problems faced by our ancestors. It is well for us to recall and learn to appreciate more fully the tireless efforts of our forebears in overcoming obstacles. Their courage, perseverance, and seemingly limitless energies, forged our great American tradition. It is this positive spirit which must be instilled in our younger generations for many frontiers remain to be explored and conquered.

Therefore, it is with great pride that I accept in behalf of the Department of the Navy this official document recognizing as it does some of the Navy's contributions to our country's rich heritage. We will frame and exhibit it with pride.

Also, please extend my appreciation to the State Legislature of California and to the California Civil War Centennial Commission for their recognition of the Naval Squadron of the Pacific from 1861 to 1867.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

FRED KORTH.

COMMANDER IN CHIEF,
U.S. PACIFIC FLEET,
June 13, 1963.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SHAW,
Executive Secretary, California Civil War Centennial Commission, Sacramento, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. SHAW: The Secretary of the Navy has recently forwarded to me an illuminated copy of a resolution by the California Legislature citing the U.S. Naval Squadron of the Pacific for its exemplary record of service during the years 1861–67. The framed resolution will be prominently displayed with other significant naval historical mementos at the Headquarters of the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

I extend to the California Civil War Centennial Commission the profound gratitude of the U.S. Navy and of the U.S. Pacific Fleet for this cherished reminder of the accomplishments and contributions of our naval predecessors. The commendation will serve as a source of constant inspiration to me and to each succeeding Pacific Fleet Commander, recalling for us the glorious history of our Navy and reminding us of the responsibilities entrusted to the Pacific Fleet as its share in the national effort to safeguard our country's freedom.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. SIDES,
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE ANALYZES ARMS CONTROL ACT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the September issue of the American Legion magazine contains a comprehensive, competent, and excellent article entitled "Can the Arms Control Act Disarm Us?"

My mail indicates that thousands and thousands of Californians remain firmly wedded to the following fantastic fairy tales:

That the Arms Control Agency can and will disarm the United States of America.

That the law establishing the Agency constitutes treason.

That the United States proposes unilaterally to turn over its Armed Forces to the United Nations.

That this act will place a Russian, the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs at the United Nations, in command of our forces and a world peace force.

Indeed, an unhappily large segment of Californians remains utterly convinced in the great water moccasin hoax—the fright that an extremely valuable, truly anti-Communist, U.S. Army training operation in counterguerrilla warfare is really a disguised United Nations plot to take over the United States.

In the American Legion magazine article, Earl H. Voss, highly distinguished and respected Washington Star reporter, forcefully debunks each and every one of these scares once again.

Regarding the Arms Control Agency's alleged power to disarm the United States, Mr. Voss writes:

> The responsibility for the defense of the United States and the exercise of power either to assure or to undo our security rests today exactly where it did before the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (which created the Agency) was adopted in 1961.

Regarding the hoax that the United States proposes unilaterally to turn over its Armed Forces to the United Nations, Mr. Voss writes:

> American disarmament proposals do not call for turning over all U.S. armaments to any U.N. peace force, nor is there any contemplation of one-sided disarmament.

And regarding the aging but still omnipresent fright that the Russian Under Secretary is the United Nations military commander, Mr. Voss writes:

> This post has no military function.

As my colleagues will recall, I dealt fully with these very same hoaxes in a long Senate speech on May 2 and with specific organizations and people who were trading in them.

Yet, sad to relate, these same organizations and people, my mailbag shows, are not giving them up in the least. As Mr. Voss concludes:

> The circulation of groundless rumors about (the Arms Control Agency) and about the law under which it operates does no good. It could have the dangerous result, for our national safety, of causing objective spokesmen for adequate defense to be tarred with the same brush as the spreader of wild tales. That could be a disaster.

The editor of the American Legion magazine, Robert B. Pitkin, adds these further words, in the same issue, in his Editor's Corner column:

> The American Legion magazine and many other Americans, including Mr. Earl H. Voss, of the Washington Star, take a strong stand against any disarmament agreement that isn't 100 percent foolproof. We have good and sufficient reason for our position. But in recent months others, who feel exactly the same, have spread fantastic stories in the land about what can be done and is being done through the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961, and the Agency of the same name. Maybe you heard of the armed U.N. cannibals who were rumored to be marching through Georgia? What good can such stories do except to tend to discredit everyone who warns against unsound disarmament?

Mr. President, as an American and as a proud member of the American Legion, I associate myself completely with Mr. Voss' and Mr. Pitkin's warnings.

I ask unanimous consent that the American Legion magazine article, "Can the Arms Control Act Disarm Us?" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask consent that resolution 303 adopted at the 45th annual national convention of the American Legion which supports ratification of the test ban treaty recently approved, 80 to 19, by the Senate also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN THE ARMS CONTROL ACT DISARM US?

(By Earl H. Voss)

Senators and Representatives on Capitol Hill have been getting bags of mail from alarmed constituents warning that disarmament legislation recently passed by Congress gives President Kennedy authority to transfer the U.S. military forces to the control of the United Nations.

If Members of Congress had voted for a bill they hadn't read it wouldn't be the first time. But the Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961, cause of the disturbance, was not presented as a vehicle for subversion of the Armed Forces, and, whatever it is, it does not denude us of adequate defense under our own sovereignty.

Nevertheless, apprehension has become so widespread on Capitol Hill that both Secretary of State Rusk and Defense Secretary McNamara have been asked by Congressmen for comment on their constituents' worries.

Despite denials, it appears that fears are spreading that the United Nations can somehow subvert the sovereignty of the United States through this act.

Specifically, the focal point of suspicion in this 1963 scare has been the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, Public Law 87–297, passed by the 87th Congress in September 1961. It established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency as a separate, independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, presently headed by William C. Foster.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, appearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was confronted with the following question on March 11, 1963, from Republican Senator Frank Carlson, of Kansas:

"Mr. Secretary, I receive a great deal of mail from citizens in my State—and I assume other Members do from their States—who are concerned that the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, Public Law 87–297, gives the President the power to turn over the defense of the United States to the United Nations. I wish you would discuss that a little bit."

Secretary McNamara, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, was asked by Committee Chairman Richard Russell, of Georgia, about the reciprocal problem, that the United Nations was about to "occupy" Georgia:

"I have just had a series of telegrams and letters from outside the State, Louisiana and Texas, about military activities in Georgia, and I want to read one of the letters and one of the telegrams that is typical, and get your comment on it.

"This letter is from Shreveport, La. The man gives his address and street number: 'I have just heard that the U.S. Engineers in Georgia had leased some 2,500 square miles of south Georgia land to train United Nations troops on. I also heard that 3,500 United Nations troops were to arrive there on March 4 to train to March 27, and that in June some 17,000 Congolese troops of the United Nations would be coming in for an indefinite stay and training.

"'I want to know if this is true, since my mother lives in south Georgia. I would also like to know where such land was rented and if we are actually going to let the Congolese troops train there and what you intend to do about it. Please let me have your answer by return mail as I am very much concerned about this piece of news that has evidently been kept well guarded.

"'P.S.—If such news is true, what can we do about it?'"

Senator Russell then produced another telegram from a gentleman in Houston, Tex.: "Understand U Thant of the United Nations is establishing a command post in Georgia bringing United Nations Congolese troops from Africa to protect the United States from Cuban attack. Movement known as Operation Water Moccasin. Is this information true? If so, by what right and whose authority is the United States subservient to the United Nations?"

Democratic Representative John E. Moss, of California, asked the State Department about a letter he received last May from a couple in Sacramento. The couple warned him that the President is authorized by the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to transfer the Navy, Army, and Air Force to the command of the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, a post usually held by a Soviet official.

California's Republican Senator Thomas Kuchel finally cried out in despair in a long Senate speech on May 2, complaining he had received an avalanche of what he called "fright mail" about African Negro troops, possibly even cannibals, being stationed in Georgia by the U.N.

He quoted one letter from Hollywood, Calif., asking: "It is unconstitutional to quarter American troops in American homes, so how come these pagan, ruthless, brutal, godless savages? Yes, we know of U.N. plans to place Mongolian and Congolese troops over our dear United States (the same kind of troops which ravished Katanga). If the U.N. can swing their damnable world police force plan, so undoubtedly these moccasin troops are to be the same."

From Berkeley, Calif., Senator Kuchel received this report: "The news has just broken, although there had been rumors for a week or more, that Georgia is the place for 16,000 African soldiers being trained by the U.N. for guerrilla warfare, complete with nose and ear rings. This time, the U.N. and our State Department have gone too far."

Senator Kuchel also reported he had received more than 2,000 letters demanding abolition of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency because of misunderstandings of its powers.

These are all serious charges and the number of letters received in various Washington offices on each point suggests an organized system of alarm.

What are the facts?

The Arms Control and Disarmament Act of 1961 does not authorize the President of the United States to transfer American Armed Forces to the jurisdiction of the United Nations, nor does it authorize him to disarm the Nation or limit its Armed Forces without the approval of Congress.

Section II of the act, stating the purpose of the law, says:

"Arms control and disarmament policy, being an important aspect of foreign policy, must be consistent with national security policy as a whole. The formulation and implementation of the U.S. arms control and disarmament policy in a manner which will promote the national security can best be insured by a central organization charged by statute with primary responsibility for this field."

The purpose of the Agency was stated in these terms:

"This organization must have the capacity to provide the essential scientific, economic, political, military, psychological, and technical information upon which realistic arms control and disarmament policy must be based. It must be able to carry out the following primary functions:

"(a) The conduct, support, and coordination of research for arms control and disarmament policy formulation;

"(b) The preparation for and management of the United States participation in international negotiations in the arms control and disarmament field;

"(c) The dissemination and coordination of public information concerning arms control and disarmament; and

"(d) The preparation for, operation of, or as appropriate, direction of United States participation in such control systems as may become part of the United States arms control and disarmament activities."

Thus the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is basically a study and informational body. It could not take over operation of American disarmament programs until they were approved by the entire Government, which we shall see includes both executive and legislative branches. Whatever danger of that exists, the law in question does not permit it.

Section 33 of the same act, Public Law 87–297, specifically prevents the President from acting without the consent of Congress in the disarmament field. It provides:

"The Director (of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency) is authorized and directed to prepare for the President, the Secretary of State, and the heads of such other Government agencies, as the President may determine, recommendations concerning the United States arms control and disarmament policy: *Provided, however,* That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or the armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Neither President Kennedy nor any other future President, therefore, can enter into a disarmament agreement or obligate the United States to disarm unless he is authorized to do so by a subsequent law or treaty. If any danger of that exists, it exists outside the terms of the Arms Control Act.

The above language of section 33 goes further. By requiring legislation to cover disarmament moves not taken in the form of a treaty, section 33 prevents the President from concluding executive agreements. These are not subject to Senate ratification as treaties.

Executive agreements are, in effect, second-class treaties with foreign powers covering minor matters which the President can sign without congressional action. They have the force of treaties and have been a frequent cause of friction with Congress, particularly the Senate.

Any U.S. action in the disarmament field, section 33 provides, must either be handled as a full-fledged treaty, and therefore subject to two-thirds approving vote of the Senate, or be authorized by legislation, meaning that a majority of both the House and Senate must approve it. To that extent, the act has slightly weakened the prospect of a President disarming us without congressional approval.

It is, of course, possible that both the executive and legislative branches would agree on some disarmament policy of which many citizens would strongly disapprove. This possibility lies outside the Arms Control Act, which, in summary, has created no new powers to disarm us.

The United Nations Charter contains no provision which could be interpreted as authorizing the President to turn over the defense of the United States to the United Nations. Article 43 of the Charter states:

"1. All members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

"2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

"3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and members or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes."

The U.S. Congress, in other words, must approve any move the President may wish to take in making American Armed Forces available for United Nations actions.

The Congress, ever zealous to protect its powers, was careful to reserve a veto power over any Presidential moves in this direction. In the United Nations Participation Act of December 20, 1945, there is this provision:

"The President is authorized to negotiate a special agreement or agreements with the Security Council which shall be subject to the approval of the Congress by appropriate act or joint resolution, providing for the numbers and types of armed forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of facilities and assistance, including rights of passage, to be made available to the Security Council on its call for the purpose of maintaining national peace and security in accordance with article 43 of said charter. The President shall not be deemed to require the authorization of the Congress to make available to the Security Council on its call in order to take action under article 42 [1] of said charter and pursuant to such special agreement or agreements the armed forces, facilities or assistance provided therein: *Provided,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed as an authorization to the President by the Congress to make available to the Security Council for such purposes armed forces, facilities or assistance in addition to the forces, facilities, and assistance provided for in such special agreements."

Congress, it would appear, thought of everything. Both the lawmakers of the time, subsequent Congresses, and each succeeding President have considered the congressional control over Presidential authority to be strict. The United Nations, as well, has apparently gone unaware of any power provided by the Charter to appropriate American military power to its internationalist purposes.

Congress has other enormous powers which would be sufficient in themselves to frustrate any straying President. It controls the purse strings. It lays and collects taxes for the common defense; it creates armies and maintains navies which the President only directs once they are in being; it can pledge the public credit, declare war, regulate foreign commerce.

Furthermore, it has the power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper" for carrying into execution not only its own powers but all the powers "of the Government of the United States and of any department or officer thereof," according to the Constitution.

Moreover the laws made by Congress "in pursuance" of these powers are the "supreme law of the land" and the President is bound constitutionally to "take care that" they "be faithfully executed."

Thus both American law and the United Nations Charter protect the U.S. Armed Forces from "subversion" or nonsubversive transfer to international authority without the consent of both the Congress and the President. Neither the President nor the Congress can act unilaterally, as carefully provided in the checks and balances of the Constitution. This field is untouched by either the Arms Control and Disarmament Act or the U.N. Charter.

The United States being a government of laws and men, however, it could be that some President would have the intention of circumventing the law and the United Nations Charter. Both Secretary of State Rusk and Defense Secretary McNamara sought to reassure the Nation that President Kennedy's intentions, at least, are honorable.

In March 11 hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Democratic Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, led Secretary Rusk through this series of questions:

"Senator HUMPHREY. Just to clarify this record again, Mr. Secretary, I am very familiar with the provisions of the Arms Control Act. Do you find anything within that act which bestows power upon the President of the United States to demobilize the forces of the United States without the consent of the Congress?

"Secretary RUSK. No, sir, I do not.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Do you find anything in the Arms Control Act which would place jurisdiction over the command of the U.S. Armed Forecs in the hands of the United Nations?

"Secretary RUSK. No, sir.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Do you find anything in the Arms Control Act which would in any way dilute the authority of the President of the United States to be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States?

"Secretary RUSK. No, sir.

"Senator HUMPHREY. Or do you find anything that would dilute the constitutional authority of the Congress of the United States on treatymaking powers insofar as the Senate is concerned?"

"Secretary RUSK. I do not, sir.

"Senator HUMPHREY. And you do not find anything that would dilute the appropriation powers of the Congress of the United States?

"Secretary RUSK. That is correct, sir.

"Senator HUMPHREY. I think that pretty well ties down the response to this kind of emotional appeal that has spread across the land."

Georgia Senator RICHARD RUSSELL's inquiries about Congolese troops and other United Nations forces training in Georgia were met first with a quip by Secretary McNamara.

"It is another serious leak from the Pentagon," Mr. McNamara declared, as a ripple of laughter passed through the hearing room.

"Does this happen to be a true leak or an untrue leak?" Chairman RUSSELL persisted.

"Someone has a sense of humor, I am delighted to see," Secretary McNamara replied.

"Honestly, I had 10 or 15 inquiries that all came in yesterday and today from Louisiana, and Houston, Tex., all to that effect," Chairman RUSSELL informed the Secretary.

Republican Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine, suggested: "It must have been the story of a columnist."

Secretary McNamara then gave a serious answer: "Needless to say, I never heard of any such plan."

"Fine," Chairman RUSSELL replied. "I can advise the man then that he need not move his mother. Thank you."

In view of the grave fears held by some Americans, perhaps this exchange was too lighthearted. But Senator RUSSELL is a Georgian who would scarcely be lighthearted if he had any doubt of the truth.

There was a military exercise in Georgia called Operation Water Moccasin. If people were frightened that it was an invasion of thousands of "U.N. troops"—Mongolians, Congolese, cannibals, etc., as part of a "three-point disarmament program," it was not entirely their fault. A constituent in California wrote Senator KUCHEL that such things were said on a local radio broadcast. Others cited a speaker from South Carolina who had traveled about the country making such statements in speeches.

But the editor of the weekly Claxton Enterprise, in the Georgia area where Operation Water Moccasin was held, was so sickened by letters he had received from all over the country that he lost patience with the real fear expressed and wrote an editorial calling the writers of them insane. Senator KUCHEL put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that Operation Water Moccasin was "a U.S. Army troop exercise instructing our soldiers in counterguerrilla warfare, witnessed * * * by 124, not 15,000, foreign military officers." And the editor of the Claxton Enterprise said of his personal observation of Operation Water Moccasin: "Our experience with the people involved directly in the operation left us with the feeling that we were taking part in some important training that may one day aid our Nation in its struggle for world peace against a foe that uses all sorts of unorthodox tactics. We are glad to know that we have people in our Armed Forces with the ability and training that these showed during our observation of this operation."

Congressman Moss, chairman of the watchdog committee which keeps an eye on the information policies of the Government, asked the State Department for advice when he received word from the Sacramento couple that President Kennedy now has the power to transfer the Navy, Army and Air Force to the command of the U.N. Secretariat's leading Soviet official, the Undersecretary for Political and Security Council Affairs.

Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton, a fellow Californian who had formerly been a close associate of Gov. Pat Brown, advised Representative Moss in a formal letter that "it is simply not true. * * * The Constitution forbids it, the law (Public Law 87-297) establishing the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency does not authorize it, our disarmament proposals do not provide for it, the administration has never considered it, and the people of the United States would not tolerate it."

The same Sacramento couple suggested that a Russian is always in charge of the United Nations Military Secretariat. Actually there is no military secretariat. There is a Military Staff Committee, whose chairmanship rotates monthly among the five permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations: the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China and the Soviet Union. Thus the Soviet Union is nominally the chairman of the Military Staff Committee 1 month out of 5.

But article 43 of the United Nations Charter, quoted above, never has been put into effect. The United Nations has no permanent standby force over which the Military Staff Committee can rule. The Military Staff Committee does not function. Its monthly meetings are a matter of form.

Whatever troops have been provided for the United Nations have been provided on an ad hoc basis, not under article 43.

In the Korean war, the Security Council named the United States to direct the unified command which operated against Communist forces. The United States named the commander in chiefs of the United Nations force and each of them took orders from the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, who got their orders from the President. There was no opportunity for American troops to fall under the operational control of a Soviet general in United Nations uniform.

Reports to the United Nations on the conduct of the fighting in Korea contained no battle plans which could be sent to the Soviet Union, an enemy in the Korean war.

Current U.S. disarmament proposals, it is true, do envision establishment of a United Nations Peace Force. The State Department says that "neither the military staff committee nor the Undersecretary for Political and Security Council Affairs (of the U.N.) would be a part of the United Nations Peace Force envisaged in the U.S. disarmament proposals."

Assistant Secretary Dutton, however, did not treat lightly the concern of the Sacramento couple for the national security. He wrote Congressman Moss: "The Department appreciates the patriotism and responsibility shown by Mr. and Mrs. ———, who, coming into possession of such grave allegations as those contained in the statement, have addressed themselves to their elected representatives in the Congress of the United States. I hope that the foregoing exposition and the material enclosed will serve to reassure them as to the facts in the matter."

In recent months the State Department has dealt with other charges of irregularities in the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

It is perfectly true, as some apprehensive correspondents have pointed out, that a Russian usually holds the post of the United Nations Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs. Since the founding of the United Nations a Russian has held the post consistently except for one term, when it was held by a Communist Yugoslav.

This post has no military function. The Secretary General has authority over all the under secretaries. He operates largely by consensus with the whole array of under secretaries. The United States and its allies have usually held 13 of the 19 under secretaryships. The Soviet bloc holds two.

---

[1] Article 42 states: "Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations."

The State Department has also denied reports that "hidden funds" have been appropriated to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster has sought an increase in funds, all this has been for research and the requests have been made in open hearings.

In the 1963 fiscal year there was a $10 million ceiling on spending by the Agency for disarmament research. Congress had under consideration raising that ceiling this summer, but appeared reluctant to remove the ceiling completely, as Director Foster requested.

Another charge has been made that Director Foster is authorized by the act to call out the Armed Forces of the United States. The act provides no such authority for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Director.

Publication of a pamphlet on disarmament, "Freedom From War," caused the State Department to be confronted with various allegations about American disarmament policy: That it planned to eliminate the American Armed Forces; to transfer war material including nuclear weapons to a United Nations Peace Force; to liquidate the United States of America, and to establish a world government.

American disarmament proposals do not call for turning over all U.S. armaments to any U.N. peace force, nor is there any contemplation of one-sided disarmament.

This Nation's present disarmament proposals do, however, contemplate eventual "disbanding of all national Armed Forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever." Specifically excluded from this provision are forces which will be retained "to preserve internal order."

As the Armed Forces would be reduced, the American disarmament proposal requires that effective verification must be provided to assure Washington that other countries are taking the same steps.

At the same time, it requires that international institutions to settle disputes and maintain the peace must be strengthened commensurately.

The U.S. overall disarmament goal is "a free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law."

The State Department contends this does not mean "abandoning all our national sovereignty to a super world government; it does mean our full participation in international bodies established to administer whatever disarmament agreements are reached."

Interpreting what these words mean, of course, is a problem left not to the President alone, but to the President and Congress. So far the Soviet Union has refused to accept the level of verification the United States considers absolutely necessary, making disarmament discussions an habitually boring exercise in futility.

"The U.S. Government views disarmament and arms control as a means of achieving a more secure world, and, therefore, a more secure United States," the State Department says. "It does not look on disarmament as an end in itself. Consequently, it will not disarm unilaterally on the assumption that such action might secure peace. Its firm purpose is to obtain international agreements which, while they promote peace, do not lessen national security. It believes that every disarmament agreement undertaken should be effectively verified so that no party might secretly evade its obligations. The United States sees no contradiction between its peaceful objectives and the national determination to maintain a strong defense force sufficient to deter or meet aggression."

Others, like the American Legion, have seen contradictions and opposed U.S. disarmament measures as a consequence.

Instead of providing for the United States to arm the United Nations with nuclear weapons, as some Americans fear, the U.S. disarmament proposal calls for the gradual and progressive destruction of nuclear arms under effective international control and the conversion of fissionable materials to peaceful purposes.

The United Nations Peace Force envisaged in the American disarmament program has caused raised eyebrows in many quarters, including the Pentagon. This peace force would not come into being until the second stage of the three-stage American program. While it is true the Peace Force would be equipped with agreed types and quantities of arms, this would occur only after numerous disarmament measures had been taken in the first stage. Stage one presupposes that appropriate and effective control will have been effected among the states, so that no single state can "gain" an advantage.

Defense Secretary McNamara interprets this to mean the United States can keep whatever advantage it has at the outset and has vowed to oppose any disarmament measure which does not preserve the American advantage. If this makes the United States disarmament program an empty shell, Mr. McNamara is undisturbed.

So far no time schedule has been set for the United States to make troops available to the United Nations. This time schedule would be established as a part of stage one of the American disarmament proposal, but the Soviet Union has not yet agreed to accept the American disarmament proposal as a basis for negotiation.

Even if the Soviet Union were to become suddenly sweet and reasonable, the Arms Control and Disarmament Act still provides: "that no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treaty-making power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

As mentioned earlier, the treaty-making power of the President is subject to a two-thirds ratification by the Senate. Legislation requires a majority vote in both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

After the State Department tabled its draft treaty on general disarmament at the Geneva Disarmament Conference in April 1962, a circular appeared in this country branding the draft as a "treason treaty."

The circular charged that the U.S. disarmament program would place this country under the authority of the United Nations military dictatorship. It suggested that the United States would agree to an arrangement under which the Soviet Union and its satellites would have effective control over a greatly strengthened United Nations. (The State Department labeled this charge "preposterous.")

The "treason treaty" circular focused its attack on disarmament proposals providing for a general strengthening of international peacekeeping machinery within the framework of the United Nations when and if progress is made in disarmament negotiations.

The State Department has pointed out that the United Nations Peace Force would not be established until all nations had agreed upon the details of the control, purpose, composition and strength of the force. "The United States would not agree to the creation of such a force," the State Department says, "unless and until it was certain that the provisions for its command and control were consistent with the security of the United States and with the proper use of force for maintaining peace in a disarmed world."

As for the charge that American disarmament proposals would establish a world government or reduce the authority of the U.S. Supreme Court, the State Department points out that "the statute of the International Court of Justice itself precludes any such thing. Article 34 of the Court's statute states that 'Only states may be parties in cases before the Court.' In other words, the Court may only exercise its functions, under the provisions of the statute, with respect to contentious cases between governments, not between individuals."

The State Department says: "The American people are assured that any general agreement on arms control or disarmament which might be agreed to by the United States will, before going into effect, be subject to the scrutiny and approval of their elected representatives. Any treaty concluded as a result of disarmament negotiations would require the approval of a two-thirds majority of the Senate. Any agreement in a form other than a treaty would require additional legislation passed by a majority of both Houses of the Congress before its execution."

All this does not mean, of course, that it is impossible for the United States to be subverted. It merely means that if the country is subverted there will have to be a broad acceptance by the executive and legislative branches or, possibly, a massive deception which leads the entire American Government into a trap.

With the vigilance of its citizens and the continued caution of the Congress and the executive branch, the possibility that the United States could be persuaded to transfer its nuclear weapons and manpower to the control of an unreliable world power or, more specifically, to the Soviet Union, does not appear to be imminent.

The possibility, however, that well-intentioned servants can hamper or even cripple the military development in this country is still very real. The willingness of many Americans to accept a nuclear test ban, for instance, without effective safeguards against Soviet cheating and the willingness to halt American nuclear-weapons development without assurance that the Soviet Union is doing the same, perhaps is the basis on which many other Americans build their misgivings.

In the case of a nuclear test ban treaty, however, as in the case of other disarmament measures mentioned in this article, it rests with the Congress—more specifically with the Senate—to approve or disapprove any treaty which the executive department negotiates.

It is then that the American Legion and other powerful citizens' organizations deserve a full hearing in Congress.

Meanwhile, the Legion and many other organized groups are stating their misgivings about "general and complete disarmament."

The goal, they say, is unrealistic and endorsing it borders on deception.

Enough nuclear weapons to cripple a nation or group of nations could easily be hidden in any country. Science knows no method of detecting properly shielded hidden stocks even if sensors pass within a few feet of the stockpile. Each nuclear power, therefore, must retain sufficient stocks of nuclear weapons to retaliate devastatingly—and thus deter any unscrupulous power which might withhold nuclear arms during the disarmament process.

"Complete" disarmament is thus a fraud, inconceivable for any power to accept until science devises an all-seeing eye to find all hidden nuclear stockpiles, without error, without distraction by false signals. No scientist believes this all-seeing eye can be created soon.

The American Legion's opposition to the U.S. program for "general and complete disarmament" in resolution 180, passed at the 1962 convention in Las Vegas, is understandable on this count alone.

As the resolution noted, there are other grounds for misgivings about U.S. disarmament policy, particularly the inadequately explained proposal that, at some point, the United Nations would be given the strength to impose on us the will of any unpredictable majority of nations.

Few would suggest that any President would deliberately endanger the United States national security. It is reasonable to be concerned, however, that someday a President may unwittingly or unintentionally endanger the national security. Presidents have been naive before.

The Constitution has provided the additional safeguard that Congress should ratify all such Presidential decisions. Backstopping the Congress as it judges Presidential policy are not only organizations like the American Legion, but individuals like some of the petitioners of the House and Senate.

In short, the responsibility for the defense of the United States and the exercise of power either to assure or to undo our security rests today exactly where it did before the Arms Control and Disarmament Act was adopted in 1961.

There may be dangers in what people acting in the name of the Agency propose. Their proposals will bear watching.

But the circulation of groundless rumors about that Agency and about the law under which it operates does no good. It could have the dangerous result, for our national safety, of causing objective spokesmen for adequate defense to be tarred with the same brush as the spreaders of wild tales. That could be a disaster.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE 45TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., SEPTEMBER 10–12, 1963

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have seen fit to negotiate with the Soviet Union a limited test ban treaty; and

Whereas the treaty is now before the Senate of the United States for determination as to whether or not that body will advise and consent to ratification of the treaty on the part of the United States; and

Whereas the American Legion has in the past supported all actions by our Government which offer the hope of an honorable peace and which at the same time are consistent with strong national security; and

Whereas past experience has evidenced that the Soviet Union enters into only those agreements which are for its own best interests; and

Whereas the American Legion finds reason for concern as to their motives since this could be a method of improving the position of the Communists economically, politically, and militarily, as was demonstrated by our previous voluntary suspension of testing in which the Soviets completed all the preparations for elaborate and comprehensive nuclear testing while the United States slept, thus permitting them to drastically reduce our lead in the nuclear field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 45th Annual National Convention of the American Legion, assembled in Miami Beach, Fla., September 10–12, 1963, That the American Legion urges the Senate to assure the American people—

1. That this test ban treaty shall not in any way be considered as a step toward disarmament of the United States;

2. That this test ban treaty shall not in any way be considered a step toward the surrender of our national sovereignty (including but not limited to U.S. control of our own military forces and defense developments);

3. That this test ban treaty shall in no way curtail lawful nuclear testing or development or readiness for immediate resumption of atmospheric testing in the event of a violation of the treaty; and be it further

Resolved, That if the foregoing safeguards have been met, the American Legion supports the test ban treaty.

THE PROMISE AND FULFILLMENT OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY—ADDRESS BY J. MARTIN KLOTSCHE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on September 23, 1963, at Madison, Wis., Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, provost of the University of Wisconsin, and a distinguished scholar and educator, delivered a speech at the Governors' Conference on Human Rights. Dr. Klotsche's speech is a scholarly, perceptive analysis of the situation as it affects civil rights. It is a clear expression of the philosophy of the individual rights of man. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Klotsche's address be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PROMISE AND FULFILLMENT OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

(Address by J. Martin Klotsche)

Let me begin by stating some basic propositions to which we, as a people, are committed. These are the ideals that give us a moral base on which we can build. They are our frame of reference—without which we cannot operate effectively. The philosopher Whitehead once said "that vigorous societies harbor a certain extravagance of objectives so that men wander beyond the safe provision of personal gratifications." He further suggested that a civilized society must cultivate a "widespread sense that high aims are worthwhile."

What are these extravagant objectives? These high aims? Our beliefs and commitments have been so frequently expressed that they are self-evident in the sense that they need no further proof or evidence to support them. Yet while they may be self-evident, they are not self-explanatory, nor are they self-enforcing. Nor do we realize them simply because we have given expression to them. But this does not invalidate them nor does it deny the value of periodically restating them. When Jefferson expressed the views that were eventually incorporated into the Declaration of Independence, these were not his views alone. They were shared by many of his colleagues. They represented a consensus. One writer has even described Jefferson as having "plagiarized the atmosphere." These truths expressed in the Declaration of Independence were subsequently reaffirmed and enlarged upon. They were incorporated into the Preamble to the Constitution and into the Bill of Rights, were stated in the Emancipation Proclamation and are to be found in some of the most contagious prose and poetry written in this country.

They have also become universal in their appeal, with the result that the ideas associated with our way of life are in complete harmony with the hopes and aspirations of people everywhere. Our ideas have become an integral part of world thinking. When, for example, the Dutch stormed into Sumatra they found on many of the buildings these words from the American Revolution, "Give me liberty or give me death." At the Bandung Conference held in southeast Asia in 1955, a conference which, incidentally, the United States officially ignored, the date of April 19 was deliberately chosen for the opening of the conference to have it coincide with the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord. Thus, such Americans as Jefferson and Lincoln are great not only because they achieved American purposes, but also because they were able to speak for humanity at large and extend their views to include the whole family of man.

The historian, Commager, recently wrote that we have witnessed two major revolutions in the past 1,000 years. The first broke up the medieval world, humanized and secularized thought, shifted the center of gravity from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic and opened up a whole new world. The second was associated with the birth of our own country and with the end of colonization. It marked the emergence of a new nation, the spread of the ideas of self-government, and the use of science and technology to create abundance.

What then is our frame of reference? Stated simply it is the idea that the individual is squarely in the center of things and is of supreme importance. Archibald Mac Leish who has written often on this subject, says that when we speak of man we should speak of man not in the abstract, nor should we speak of all men, or even the majority of men. Rather we should talk about that one single man who, because he is a man, has dignity and worth. Basic to our whole scale of values, then, is our faith in the infinite worth and unlimited possibilities of each person. This is the self-evident truth which is our point of departure.

The rule of thumb under which we should operate is a simple one. We should regard each person as an individual—not as a Catholic, Jew or Protestant; not as a Negro or white; not as a man or a woman, but as a person whom we like or dislike because of his or her intrinsic qualities. Color really doesn't matter. In fact it just isn't relevant.

Now it is a mark of extraordinary maturity to be able to make such judgments. There are some people who are illiterate who have this instinctive recognition of respect for others. Many children set no artificial boundaries in their esteem and love of people. To others this feeling for respect is an intellectual process. But unfortunate is the person who, because of his own limitations, has never fully sensed the significance of each person's intrinsic value and worth.

That there have been conspicuous failures and glaring imperfections in achieving this goal need not be dwelt upon here. Our dilemma is the obvious gap between faith and fact, profession and practice, belief and performance. We have not translated into reality the full meaning of our belief. Our promise has not been fulfilled. Too often we have allowed the phrasemaker and the demagog to prevail. Slogans, even such attractive ones as "freedom" and "equality" can be used to enslave rather than to liberate. There are countless examples of versifiers and penmen who use their skill to give upside-down meanings to all sorts of ideas, which on the surface seem plausible. These are the people that William Blake had in mind when he said, "the general good is the refuge of the flatterer, scoundrel, and hypocrite. He who would do good must do it in minute particulars."

That we have made progress in the human rights field, no one, other than the cynic, could deny. Yet our progress has been spotty, uneven, and in some areas unimpressive. But now we are at the crossroads of a long struggle to win equality for the Negro. We are, in fact, now entering into the final or climactic stage. We must squarely face the fact that modest progress will no longer suffice. It is a fact of history that when people begin to improve, when they are on the way up, when they see some signs of hope and accomplishment, this is when they become impatient and even rebellious. It is when people begin to see a way out that they become militant. It is only when the situation appears hopeless and there seems no avenue of escape that people give up.

Thus, democracy is a quest, a never-ending seeking for better things and presumes a never-slackening pressure for improvement and betterment. Justice Holmes had this in mind when he said that "man's mind once stretched to a new idea never returns to its former dimensions." It is precisely because some progress has been made that Negroes today have achieved a new militancy which has replaced the abject hopelessness of former years with a new aggressiveness and determination.

This has alarmed some persons and caused them to recoil in fear and anger. Yet it serves no purpose to attribute current unrest to agitators or to describe those in the forefront of the civil rights struggle as disturbers of the peace. Those who seek refuge in such an explanation are either unwilling or unable to understand that we are in the midst of a social revolution of dramatic proportions described by one observer in these words: "Nineteen hundred and sixty three is the year that the Negro ran out of patience and got mad at everybody. How mad he will continue to be depends on what changes are made to place him on an equal footing with other Americans."

It was recently reported, as though it were a colossal achievement, that no State school system in the South today remains segregated. This does not really impress the Negro. More relevant is the fact that the majority (over 90 percent in fact) of the Negro children in the South are still in segregated schools, 9 years after the Supreme Court declared such schools unconstitutional. Nor can we cheer too loudly when the admission of two Negroes in the University of Alabama this summer (with an enrollment of 4,100 students) changed the racial composition of the campus from an all-white student body to one 99.95 percent white. And it took the Army, U.S. marshals, the FBI, the National Guard, the Justice Department, the White House staff and even the Chief Executive to accomplish this task.

But, we should hasten to add that the problem is not just a southern one. The 1960 census reported that more than one-half of the American Negroes live outside of the South. Of the cities with the largest Negro population, the first eight are northern or border cities. The city in the solid South with the largest Negro population is Birmingham in ninth place. The implications of these facts were dramatically pointed out by Harry Ashmore in his book "The Other Side of Jordan" in which he suggests that Negroes crossed the River Jordan in search of the Promised Land only to find a repetition of the hostility and persecution that they had left behind. He further concluded that our agrarian past is finished and that the crux of the problem has now shifted to our cities. Here it is that we must seek to come to terms with problems of racial justice and understanding.

There are many places in the North, therefore, where discrimination, though against the law, nevertheless is very real. Often Negroes get the lower paid jobs and many of these are disappearing because automation has reduced opportunities for the unskilled worker. As a result the rate of unemployment for Negroes is twice as great as that among whites. Also Negroes are less able to educate their children, less able to improve their lot, and less able to move out of the slums into better housing.

This seeking the Promised Land, and now for the first time viewing it, even from a distance, is one of the dramatic developments of our time. Sit-ins, freedom rides, desegregation—all of these would have been impossible 15 years ago. There are many factors that have contributed to this change. The experience of the Negro in wartime visibly affected him. James Baldwin has bluntly expressed this view in "The Fire Next Time," in which he states, "You must put yourself in the skin of a man who is wearing the uniform of his country; is a candidate for death in its defense, and who is called a 'nigger' by his comrades in arms and his officers; who is almost always given the hardest, ugliest, and most menial work to do * * * who does not dance at the USO the night the white soldiers dance there, and does not drink in the same bars white soldiers drink in; and who watches German prisoners of war being treated by Americans with more dignity than he has ever received at their hands. And who, at the same time, as a human being, is far freer in a strange land than he has ever been at home. Home. The very word begins to have a despairing and diabolical ring. You must consider what happens to this citizen, after all he has endured, when he returns home: Search, in his shoes, for a job, for a place to live; ride, in his skin, on segregated buses; see, with his eyes, the signs saying 'white' and 'colored,' * * * Look into the eyes of his wife, look into the eyes of his son; listen with his ears, to the political speeches, North and South; imagine yourself being told to wait."

In addition, a whole generation of Negroes since the war have had wider educational opportunity. Many have had a college education; 250,000 are now studying in our colleges and universities. Thus, experience in the armed forces and new insights gained as a result of education now make them spurn the conservatism of their elders and replace it with impatience and a new kind of radicalism. Negroes are understandably seeking a faster realization of their rights. They have seen how other people live. They know what opportunities there now are and they have also learned about and been influenced by what is happening elsewhere in other parts of the world. The number of independent nations has doubled since the war. In 1 year alone, 17 nations achieved independent status in Africa. Many of these nations are now taking their place as parliamentary equals in the council of nations. The revolution has become worldwide with hopes giving way to expectations and expectations yielding to demands.

Thus, to urge caution or to persist in the view that Negro unrest is the result of Communist agitation or the influence of the outsider or to wish that people would stop agreeing with the Negro and tell them to stop demonstrating is unbelievably naive or frightfully dishonest and insincere. We have been dodging and evading our responsibilities too long. The time for decision is now at hand.

Yet it is amazing to see to what lengths unimaginative people will go to oppose progress. It's easy to find so many reasons for not getting things done. How many times have we heard, "Well, this will set a dangerous precedent," "The public is not ready," "I agree with your goal but can't accept your methods," "What's the hurry? Rome wasn't built in a day," and the clincher, "The time isn't ripe." Time seems eternally unripe for change. Actually time is neutral. It can be corrosive but it can also be a force for good in the right hands. Dr. Buell Gallagher, president of City College in New York has expressed it this way: "There is nothing quite as weak as an idea whose time is not yet ripe. Nothing as absurd as an idea whose time is past. Nothing quite as powerful as an idea whose time has come."

We need a new spirit of adventure, for the odds are clearly against the timid. The Brookings Institute has just completed a report in which it has examined some problems of public policy. After 5 years of study by a team consisting of one psychologist and two political scientists, these men have concluded that we are unprepared for adventure at the very time that an adventuresome spirit is essential to preserve our democratic system. These researchers record that in 1789 our experiment was the boldest adventure of its kind ever undertaken by man. But, now we seem to have lost the spirit of adventure—this living successfully with uncertainty and being challenged by it.

Actually the question that confronts us is not when is the time ripe for us to act. But, how do we do it? Where do we begin? What do we do first? Where can our efforts best be concentrated? The battle for human rights is a complex one and needs to be won on many fronts. It is many-faceted and the task is a prodigious one. It involves court decisions, Federal, State and local legislation, persuasion, education, and job training. But, it also poses tasks to be performed by the Negro community. For it is important that Negroes themselves come to grips with the fact that they are underdeveloped people, to use a phrase of Louis Lomax. They will have to work diligently to narrow "the cultural gap" that has resulted from over three centuries of submission and subservience and that has poorly equipped the Negro for the heavy demands that a democracy makes of its people.

If one thing has happened in the last few months it is the growing awareness of the stresses and strains in our society. Our complacency has finally been shattered. For the first time we seem ready to think about these problems rather than to avoid them. But the momentum must not be lost. The international situation demands that we attend to these matters, for our image abroad, upon which the success of our foreign policy depends, is blurred by Little Rock and Birmingham. The realities of our technological society also require it, for increasingly our manpower needs will demand more and more highly trained personnel drawn from every level of our society. We know that talent and virtue exist in all levels of our society and it is a grievous waste of our talents to permit discrimination, poverty and inadequate education to stand in the way of fully developing our human resources.

But, let us hope that our sense of justice and our belief in what we think is right would achieve a breakthrough of conscience that would result in giving to every person those elementary rights with which naturally he has been endowed. For Negroes want only what other people want—respect and dignity and the opportunity to be measured in terms of their individual worth. They are not seeking special favors. They know that men are not all equal in ability, attainments and accomplishments. They just do not want to be victimized by reason of their previous condition of servitude.

We know these matters cannot be resolved today or tomorrow, or this year or the next. For we are dealing not only with problems of education, employment, housing and accommodations, but we are dealing with a state of mind and with man's own estimate of his fellow man. It is hard to know where to take hold, but it is at the community level that each of us can become most relevant. For every city, town and village in America has its human relations problems. The Frenchman de Toqueville put it this way: "It is true that around every man a fatal circle is traced beyond which he cannot pass, but within the range of that circle he is powerful and free."

So the time for decision has now been reached—in Congress—in our legislative halls—in our municipal councils—in our schools, churches, community organizations, in the marketplace and in the minds and hearts of all Americans. All that is being asked is that everyone in our society enjoy the full promise of our democracy and that he not be intimidated or crucified for demanding it.

The real question that remains is whether we can produce a generation of sober and wise men and women with level heads and compassionate hearts who can take us down the path of fulfillment quickly enough so that the promise of American democracy will become a reality and that men and women here as well as elsewhere will be able to say that freedom and justice were not the privilege of a few, but had been extended to everyone on the ground, that our right to be considered a person at all times gave that right to others also.

It has been said that nervous times are ahead of us. The Negro is demanding of us fulfillment of an earlier promise that many of us are not yet prepared to accept. The real question is not whether his claims are justified. They cannot be denied if our moral commitments are worth anything at all. The only question is whether our promises can be fulfilled in such a manner and with sufficient grace and reason that we can soon reestablish the great truth without which there is no hope—that man is by nature endowed with certain rights—that he is a person to be respected at all times and is entitled to whatever opportunity necessary to permit him to find his own level, in his own way, in his search for freedom and justice.

A NEW LOOK AT EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, East-West trade relations have just been projected sharply to the fore by the debate about an impending wheat deal between American grain traders and the U.S.S.R., following the sensational announcement of the $500 million Canadian wheat deal with the U.S.S.R. In discussing this important subject, I emphasize that I speak only of nonstrategic goods. Controls on strategic goods—where we agree on definitions with our allies—are not being challenged.

The recent ratification of the limited nuclear test ban treaty by the U.S. Senate may go down in history as one of the most significant actions taken by this body in recent times. It may very well mark the start of a new phase in Soviet-American relations—or it may not. It is clear, however, that ratification of this treaty will create an atmosphere of expectation in this country and elsewhere in the world. The peoples of the world will want us at least to explore effectively further significant steps to seek to eliminate the risk of atomic war if human ingenuity and the security of freedom will allow.

We know that struggle of ideologists, as between freedom and communism, will continue unabated, and we are determined that freedom shall win. But the easing of tensions is still also one of our aims. One of the most significant steps that could be taken to ease tensions is in the area of United States-Soviet bloc trade in nonstrategic goods, including wheat and other farm products, if this proves to be feasible. The possibility of helping to reduce tensions among nations through mutually beneficial economic relations has been demonstrated over and over again in history.

In short, while we have no illusions as to what will be the results of the atomic test ban treaty, and while we base our greatest hopes upon the avoidance of atomic war, we know that the cold war struggle between freedom and communism will continue. We desire to reduce tensions in that field as much as we can; so the question of East-West trade in nonstrategic goods must be examined to see if any contribution can be made in that realistic framework.

The Senate may recall that after returning from the Soviet Union on a mission for the Joint Economic Committee at the end of 1961, I made a full report on East-West trade relations, pointing out that the Soviet Union was buying in the free world everything it wanted and that the only result of our policy was to shut us out of the business. The Congress in June 1962, included my amendment to the Export Control Act—which was then made permanent—a provision which seeks to harmonize our East-West trade policy with that of our allies. Very little has been done under this provision principally because the United States has negligible trade with the Soviet Union and therefore has little leverage. Under all these circumstances, reconsideration of the whole subject is necessary. I see no reason why the subject should not be dealt with at an international conference, such as Senator MUNDT has suggested. But I recommend that instead of a special international conference, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development—OECD—is a perfectly adequate organization for just this purpose—to concert East-West trade policy. We and the other principal nations concerned are members of OECD or are associated with it.

As to the private grain trade sale allegedy under negotiation between U.S. grain dealers and the U.S.S.R. trade mission in Ottawa, I believe that if it is made at all, it should be a one-shot operation and that whether it shall be consummated or not should be left to the discretion of the President, based on his assessment of what is our Nation's best interest, on balance. From present indications, the President would probably approve the sale, but the important point I wish to make to the Senate and the Nation in this speech is that this transaction should not in itself represent the opening of a new trade relationship between the United States and the Soviet bloc. However, we should undertake negotiations for a new trade relationship based on major agreements which we must require from the Soviet Union as a condition for entering into such a negotiation.

If the major agreements can be obtained, they may well permit a new concept of credit extension in connection with East-West trade. Authority to extend credit to the Soviet bloc should be vested in the President to be utilized if our national interest requires it.

The situation is much too closely upon us for the Congress to be able to give it the kind of considered judgment that the policy deserves.

The Soviet Union has gold and, unquestionably, has dollars. That could be meaningful to us if the trade were extensive. However, it could not be extensive in the absence of agreements on major issues. It probably could not be extensive, beyond that, in the absence of extensions of credit.

As to extensions of credit, I believe authority should be vested in the President, to be utilized only if our national interest requires it, and also—and this is important—the extension of credit would have to depend on credit worthiness on the part of the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc. It seems to me that that would call for a practical lessening of tensions in the cold war trouble spots, including Cuba and Berlin.

The extension of long-term credit by the United States should require political concessions from the bloc, because if we are to extend long-term credit, which is what increased United States-Soviet-bloc trade would come down to, we must be certain that we will not lose the advantage gained therefrom. I am speaking of both public and private credits. The decision would depend upon a political lessening of major tensions in the cold war.

If we cannot bring about a real lessening of tensions, we cannot have any basis for the extension of credits. We should not back into a course of enhanced trade with the Soviet Union in an offhand way, through the currently indicated grain deal, without considered judgment and the agreements which I have specified. If we cannot obtain major agreements we are better off leaving the situation exactly where it is until there is some other development.

So I foresee three stages to increased United States-Soviet-bloc trade: a grain deal, a one-shot operation, which I would leave to the President, because it is immediately upon us, and Congress can do little about it; second, enhanced trade with the Soviet bloc, in which case we need agreements to protect the regularity of that trade—and I will specify those agreements; third, extended short- and long-term credits to make that trade more meaningful and to expand it in a major way. That, in turn, would depend on a lessening of tensions in the cold war, in such trouble spots as Cuba and Berlin, and could not come about without major political decisions. Those are the three elements of the policy which I would urge upon the administration in respect to East-West trade.

I. MAJOR ECONOMIC ISSUES

Mr. President, what are the major economic issues which we must resolve in order to arrive at phase No. 2—that is, to enhance trade, without necessarily extending long-term credits?

In my view, the following are the key economic issues that must be resolved:

First, debts and lend-lease claims; second, patents and copyright protection; third, settlement of commercial disputes; fourth, facilitating access to markets and buyers; fifth, dumping and market disruption; sixth, diversion and displacement; and seventh, most-favored-nation treatment.

First. Debts and lend-lease claims: The United States furnished approximately $11 billion worth of lend-lease assistance to the Soviet Union up to V–J Day. We have asked the Soviet Government to pay only for those civilian type articles which would be useful to them in peacetime. We estimated the value of these items at $2.6 billion. In 1951 and 1952, the U.S. claim was reduced to $800 million. The United States at the time indicated its readiness to further reduce this sum, provided that the Soviet Government increased its offer of $240 million. The Soviet Union increased this offer to $300 million, but it was rejected as inadequate in 1952. At the request of the United States, negotiations were resumed briefly during January 1960, but were terminated without any further progress. The satisfactory settlement of these U.S. claims by the U.S.S.R. is an essential precondition of enhanced trade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a State Department release summarizing the present state of the lend-lease settlement issue.

There being no objection the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE QUESTION OF A LEND-LEASE SETTLEMENT WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

The following information has been prepared in response to many inquiries received about World War II lend-lease to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the efforts the United States has taken to seek a reasonable settlement by the U.S.S.R. of its lend-lease obligation.

Lend-lease was conceived and executed "to promote the defense of the United States," as provided for in the lend-lease law. The program was inaugurated on March 11, 1941, as our peacetime contribution to nations aiding our defense by resisting Axis aggression. After the United States was attacked, lend-lease became an instrument by which we strengthened our allies according to the strategic plans of the allied nations as a whole. Unlike methods used in previous wars, lend-lease focused directly on the aid to be rendered rather than upon the dollar sign to be placed on the war materials and services furnished by the United States. It was not a loan of money nor was it provided for the exclusive benefit of the recipient country. We helped other peoples under lend-lease because at the time their interests coincided with our interests.

In settling the lend-lease accounts with our World War II allies, the United States has not made it a practice to obtain payment for the value of all equipment and services furnished other nations for use during the war. No compensation has been requested for articles and services which were lost, consumed, or destroyed during the war, nor for combat items such as tanks, aircraft, etc. in the custody of the armed forces of our allies at the end of the war. It has been the policy and practice of the United States to require payment for lend-lease goods in the possession of other countries at V–J Day which were of a civilian type useful in the peacetime economy of the recipient country and for lend-lease delivered after V–J Day.

There were two phases of lend-lease with most of our World War II allies: (1) lend-lease requested and delivered to our allies before V–J Day, and (2) lend-lease requested before V–J Day and for which procurement contracts had been placed but which was not produced or delivered to an ally until after V–J Day. When World War II came to an end large quantities of such lend-lease supplies and equipment were in production or storage in the United States. Our Government informed its allies that if they wished to obtain these lend-lease materials they would either have to pay for them or undertake to make payment upon terms to be mutually agreed before the goods would be transferred.

The Soviet Government has agreed to pay for lend-lease delivered after V–J Day. In an agreement signed on October 15, 1945, the U.S.S.R. undertook to pay for undelivered lend-lease articles which were in production or in storage in the United States before V–J Day. The total amount to be paid by the U.S.S.R. for these articles is $222,494,574. This is to be paid in 22 annual installments, with interest at 2⅜ percent per annum. The Soviet Government has been making regular partial payments on this account and as of July 1, 1962, has paid a total of $100,807,451. The United States did not complete deliveries to the U.S.S.R. under this agreement. In making annual payments on account, the Soviet Government deducts certain sums which it claims as compensation or damages resulting from the failure of the United States to complete deliveries under the agreement. In view of these deductions and since the question of the Soviet claims has not been settled, the U.S. accounting records show an arrearage of $51,810,931.[1]

The United States has been unable to reach a settlement with the Soviet Government for lend-lease assistance which was delivered before V–J Day.

The United States furnished approximately $10.8 billion worth of lend-lease assistance to the Soviet Union up to V–J Day. In seeking a settlement of this lend-lease account of the Soviet Government, the United States has followed the basic principles and policies, previously described, which governed lend-lease settlements with other governments. The Soviet Government has been asked to pay the reasonable value of civilian-type lend-lease articles on hand in the Soviet Union at V–J Day which would be useful in peacetime. Since the U.S.S.R. did not provide an inventory of such articles, the United States prepared one which showed the value as $2.6 billion. An additional problem relates to the disposition to be made of 84 lend-lease merchant ships and 49 miscellaneous army and navy watercraft still in Soviet custody, the value of which is not included in the $2.6 billion figure.

During the initial negotiations the United States in 1948 requested the U.S.S.R. to pay $1.3 billion as the first step in the negotiating process. The Soviet Government had offered to pay $170 million. During subsequent negotiations in 1951–52, the U.S. figure was reduced to $800 million. In the interest of obtaining a prompt settlement, the United States indicated its readiness to reduce this sum further provided the Soviet Government increased its offer, which at the time was $240 million, to a sum more nearly reflecting the value of the articles in the peacetime economy of the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. increased its offer to $300 million. The United States did not consider this sum adequate and rejected the offer in 1952. The foregoing sums do not include settlement for any ships since these were to be dealt with as a separate part of the overall negotiations. No further settlement offer has been received from the U.S.S.R.

At the request of the United States, negotiations were resumed on January 11, 1960. The United States proceeded on the understanding that the negotiations were to deal solely with a lend-lease settlement. When the discussions began, however, the Soviet Government insisted that a lend-lease settlement could not be considered as a separate and independent problem. It took the position that any settlement of lend-lease would have to be accompanied by the simultaneous conclusion of a trade agreement giving most-favored-nation treatment to the Soviet Union, and the granting by the United States of long-term credits on terms acceptable to the Soviet Union.

During the negotiations the United States explained why it is not in a position to negotiate on either a bilateral trade agreement or the extension of long-term credits. It was pointed out that existing law prevents the granting of most-favored-nation treatment to the Soviet Union and that other laws and policies have an effect upon Soviet-United States trade. On the question of credits the United States took the position that legal and policy considerations made it impossible for the United States to discuss this matter in the lend-lease negotiations. The Soviet position remained unchanged.

Under these circumstances there was no agreement on the terms of reference of the negotiations and there appeared to be no common ground for continuing the discussions at that time. The last meeting was held on January 27, 1960. The United States informed the Soviet Government that it is prepared to resume negotiations for an overall lend-lease settlement at any time the Soviet Government is ready to negotiate on this as a separate and independent issue.

Mr. JAVITS. The Johnson Act of 1934, as amended in 1945, prohibits U.S. citizens from making loans of any kind to any government or agency which is in default on its obligations to the U.S. Government and which is not a member of the International Monetary Fund or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. At the present time, the prohibition in the act applies to all the countries of the Soviet bloc except Albania and Bulgaria which are not in default on obligations to the U.S. Government.

There have been no U.S. Government loans to the Soviet Union or other Soviet bloc countries since World War II, except for a loan to Poland which was fully drawn in 1948. There have been some more recent credits to Poland related to purchases of American food, raw materials, and related products. These limited credits were extended under the special Executive authority of section 451 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, during the period when that provision made such credits possible.

Apart from the credits described above, the situation today is, that the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951—Battle Act—is interpreted as precluding the granting of credits by the U.S. Government to the Soviet bloc.

Any relaxation of these acts in favor of Soviet bloc credits should be left to the negotiation and determination of the President, on the basis of the national interest.

Second. Patent and copyright protection: Although attempts have been made, no agreement has ever been reached with the Russians over this issue. We must go beyond the recognition of the principle of legal protection of patent rights; including the obligation to pay the owner of the patent a consideration based on the cost of the development of a new product, as well as the cost of installations used in launching industrial production. Such protection should also cover the payment of royalties to the patent holder for the use of patents in the U.S.S.R. Such recognition of accepted practices should include, furthermore, the right of creative writers to compensation for the translation of works covered by copyright.

---

[1] Corrected to reflect payment of $9,712,935 received on July 1, 1963.

Third. Settlement of commercial disputes: There has been continuing doubt in the minds of American businessmen about the reliability of the arbitration tribunals in Communist countries. It would be desirable, therefore, if commercial disputes between Soviet state trading corporations and private U.S. firms be submitted to impartial arbitration. We should also expect that bloc governments will not prevent their commercial agencies from agreeing to neutral arbitration.

Fourth. Facilitating access to markets and buyers: The Soviet bloc countries should agree to allow free world businessmen direct access to the particular enterprise he hopes to serve. Such a right of direct contact, now enjoyed by the bloc countries in the free world, should also be extended to include the right to maintain commercial representatives on the territory of the state trading countries.

Fifth. Dumping and market disruption: Assurances must be obtained from the Soviet Union that it will abide by GATT rules, and would refrain from behavior generally unacceptable in the normal course of trade among Western nations. Soviet disruptive activity in international trade in tin, flax, aluminum, and fuel oil markets is still fresh in the minds of Western businessmen. Soviet adherence to GATT rules of fair competition would therefore go a long way to allay Western fears in this regard, yet would not impose impossible obligations on the U.S.S.R.

Sixth. Diversion and displacement: The United States must protect itself so that any increased trade in permissible goods with the Soviet bloc does not undermine our policy prohibiting even this type of trade with Cuba and Communist China and its Asian satellites. It should be an objective of U.S. negotiators to reach a specific understanding regarding a system of safeguards against the transshipment of U.S. goods to embargoed areas. We obviously cannot prevent the Soviet Union from shipping its own goods to these countries and I am under no illusions that an airtight plan of this character can be worked out. But we certainly can do a good deal about this matter and we must try to do all possible.

Seventh. Most-favored-nation treatment: There is also the question of the dutiability of imports from the Soviet bloc. Section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 prohibits the extension of most-favored-nation treatment to any Communist-controlled country, which means that Soviet bloc merchandise pays U.S. duties at the original high rate of the Tariff Act of 1930. I believe the determination of the duty treatment of imports from the Communist bloc should be left to the discretion of the President, acting in a selective way, on the basis of the national interest.

Should negotiations on these issues prove to be fruitful, the question of the types of goods to be the subject of expanded trade would be a proper subject for discussion between the governments concerned.

Mr. President, these seven items must be negotiated if we are not to proceed with our eyes shut into a trade deal with the Soviet bloc. These are quite apart from the question of long-term credits, which, as I pointed out, must be evaluated in the light of political considerations.

II. ADVANTAGES OF INCREASED UNITED STATES-SOVIET TRADE

I believe that there are compelling reasons for the U.S.S.R. to seriously enter such negotiations—as there are also for us. Soviet agriculture is in dire straits. Its people are clamoring for a better life, demanding consumer goods not available in the Soviet economy today. On the other hand, the expressions of congressional policy against fostering East-West trade—contained in the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1961 and other statutes—means that the administration cannot just back into a new trade policy. Congress must be made a party to any decision on this matter.

Trade between the United States and the Soviet bloc is very small. On the other hand, as I said when I began, the Soviet bloc is able to buy almost anything it desires from the West, because trade between the Soviet bloc and Western Europe and Japan is quite substantial. Western European and Japanese exports to the Communist bloc rose to $2.8 billion in 1962, while their imports from the Communist bloc rose to $2.9 billion. That is an aggregate trade total very close to $6 billion a year. At the same time U.S. exports to the whole Soviet bloc in 1962 were $125 million, and imports were $79 million, or a total of a little over $200 million.

The overall trade of all free world countries, exports plus imports, with the Soviet bloc exceeded $10 billion in 1962. I refer to the whole free world, including Western Europe and Japan. For Western Europe and Japan alone, trade with the bloc was about $6 billion. Soviet bloc trade with the whole world—$10 billion—is an appreciable sum representing in round figures about 5 percent of the exports and the imports of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the trade of Western European countries with the European Soviet bloc, by principal country, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Trade of West European countries with European Soviet bloc, 1960, 1961, and 1962*

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

Country	1960	1961	1962	Country	1960	1961	1962
Total European [1] exports to Soviet bloc	2,408	2,613	2,803	Total European [1] imports from Soviet bloc	2,657	2,749	2,946
MAJOR TRADING PARTNERS				MAJOR TRADING PARTNERS			
Austria	153	176	188	Austria	158	154	171
Belgium-Luxembourg	96	93	87	Belgium-Luxembourg	77	87	102
Finland	187	185	245	Finland	215	218	232
France	220	234	267	France	154	167	197
Germany, Federal Republic of	668	693	718	Germany, Federal Republic of	648	646	701
Italy	172	216	240	Italy	265	309	331
Sweden	110	115	154	Sweden	121	128	140
United Kingdom	270	382	369	United Kingdom	389	436	442

[1] European OECD countries (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and United Kingdom) plus Yugoslavia and Finland.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. JAVITS. The underlying difficulty of bringing about a general agreement on a common allied approach to east-west trade, on the basis of current U.S. policy, and in the absence of meaningful commercial contacts with the Soviet bloc, is therefore clear. The fact is that the Soviet is getting about everything it wants commercially from the industrialized free world now—the only difference is that the United States is left out. Our policy of export control is therefore largely frustrated.

The central questions that we must answer in terms of advantages to the United States are as follows: Does our self-interest, as well as that of the Soviet bloc, dictate the course I suggest? Can a trade agreement be self-enforcing, like the nuclear test ban treaty? If we increase trade, will we be materially helping what we know to be the continued Soviet aim to take over the world for communism?

What are the advantages to be gained by the United States from increased trade if it can be negotiated satisfactorily?

First. We know that our political contest with the Soviet bloc will continue for a long time. It requires a great variety of instruments, procedures, and devices for affecting the course of events. As we stand now, our commerce with the Soviet bloc does not affect the course of events at all. The question is, if we enhance it, will we be able to somewhat better affect the course of events? I believe we will.

The best example is the continuing influence of the German Federal Republic on events in East Germany, because it does a trade of about a half a billion dollars a year with East Germany.

Second. With U.S.-Soviet trade on a more substantial scale our commercial interests in the Soviet bloc would coincide with those of our western European and Japanese allies, making possible an integrated policy on this question which would be of great value to the West.

Third. If the Soviet-bloc countries use more American designs, machinery and production patterns, they will rely upon the United States for future orders for replacements, spare parts or expanded facilities. All things being equal, they appear to prefer to come back to the original supplier for a new order. For many years the Russians made it a practice to buy a plant and then copy it. But the Russians today are buying plants and equipment in the West in commercial quantities. This is clearly evident from trade statistics of Western European-Soviet trade.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the machinery and transport equipment exports of Western Europe compared with that of the United States be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Exports of machinery and transport equipment to Eastern Europe from Western Europe and from the United States

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

Standard international trade classification groups	Western Europe[1]			United States		
	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962
711 Power generating machinery, other than electric	24.4	35.1	27.6	0.18	0.04	0.07
712 Agriculture machinery and implements	5.3	2.2	2.4	.95	.26	.13
714 Office machines	2.8	4.1	5.5	.08	.11	.05
715 Metalworking machinery	42.9	51.5	67.1	.28	1.17	.22
717 Textile and leather machinery	47.2	47.2	46.5	13.56	11.3	.42
718 Machines for special industries	---	105.8	96.2	---	2.3	2.78
719 Machinery and appliances (other than electrical) and machine parts, not elsewhere specified	247.8	254.1	292.3	6.38	4.32	3.29
722 Electric power machinery and switchgear	24.5	46.6	47.2	.03	.30	08
723 Equipment for distributing electricity	---	15.1	19.8	---	.02	---
724 Telecommunications apparatus	---	8.3	7.0	---	.19	.19
725 Domestic electrical equipment	---	.6	.8	---	.07	.01
726 Electric apparatus for medical purposes and radiological apparatus	---	5.2	4.5	---	---	---
729 Other electrical machinery and apparatus	67.5	43.8	48.2	.05	.34	.25
731 Railway vehicles	17.4	10.5	16.4	---	---	---
732 Road motor vehicles	13.1	13.1	15.0	.20	.15	.04
733 Road vehicles other than motor vehicles	.7	.9	1.4	.03	---	---
734 Aircraft	.5	.2	.1	1.67	---	.02
735 Ships and boats	39.9	25.9	58.3	---	.02	.01
Total machinery and transport equipment	534.5	671.3	756.3	23.4	20.5	7.6
Total exports to Eastern Europe	1,727.0	1,910.0	2,087.8	193.3	133.0	124.8
Total exports to all destinations	48,891.2	52,531.0	55,399.1	20,299.9	20,628.3	21,359.0

[1] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development countries in Europe.

Source: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Analytical Abstracts, January-December 1961-62.

Mr. JAVITS. Copying machinery is really a source of weakness to the Soviet economy. It requires the allocation of scarce resources and manpower to produce the Soviet equivalent of a Western machine. And the Soviets have found that while they are busily copying such machines, Western firms are busy making improvements for next year's models.

Fourth. Too little is accomplished by preventing U.S. firms from doing business in agricultural and nonstrategic goods with the Soviet bloc, because other free world businesses have been supplying these very items for years. This does not necessarily mean that we should proceed with such trade, but it is a factor to be considered. A relaxation of U.S. export controls on agricultural products and nonstrategic goods would tend to place the American businessman on a more equal footing with his competitors among the other free world industrial nations.

While we negotiate persistently and on the whole effectively to get other countries to embargo strategic—Cocom—items to the Soviet bloc, it is difficult to see how our national interest, under present conditions, is advanced by denying to the U.S.S.R. American nonstrategic items when other industralized countries are selling the same items in full measure. Again, I repeat, standing in and of itself, this would not be a reason for opening up further trade in agricultural products and nonstrategic goods, but it is one of the reasons which must be considered. Should our trade with the bloc reach sizable proportions, its benefits to domestic employment and to our balance-of-payments situation could be significant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the great variety and quantity of goods traded between Western Europe and the European Soviet bloc compared to that of the United States be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Exports from Western Europe to Eastern Europe

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

Products	From the United States				From Western Europe			
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1959	1960	1961	1962
Total exports	89.1	193.3	133.0	124.8	1,366.6	1,727.0	1,910.0	2,087.8
Food and live animals	35.5	103.9	36.7	50.8	111.3	116.5	127.2	178.9
Beverages and tobacco	1.4	2.8	1.9	1.5	34.1	30.1	34.5	27.4
Crude materials inedible, except fuels	20.8	25.2	32.4	38.1	150.0	160.6	172.9	160.5
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	---	.1	.3	.1	1.1	3.2	3.0	3.6
Animal and vegetable oils and fats	10.7	9.3	24.7	15.8	18.1	14.2	19.4	16.2
Chemicals	4.3	6.2	6.2	4.0	134.6	168.0	183.8	204.8
Manufactured goods classified chiefly by material	3.9	19.1	6.8	2.1	471.0	642.1	634.3	675.5
Machinery and transport equipment	10.3	23.4	20.5	7.6	397.5	534.5	671.3	756.3
Miscellaneous manufactured articles	.7	1.1	1.2	1.5	38.0	47.1	47.2	47.2
Commodities and transactions not classified according to kind	1.1	1.7	1.9	3.5	10.6	10.2	15.8	17.5

Source: "Analytical Abstracts," Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, January-December 1962, series B.

Imports from Eastern Europe into Western Europe

[In millions of U.S. dollars]

Products	Into the United States				Into Western Europe			
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1959	1960	1961	1962
Total imports	78.9	80.2	80.3	78.4	1670.2	1952.0	2095.2	2253.4
Food and live animals	24.7	31.1	30.4	28.3	432.2	464.4	564.8	542.6
Beverages and tobacco	.2	.2	.2	.3	12.2	14.0	15.0	22.6
Crude materials inedible, except fuels	16.9	14.0	16.1	18.7	380.7	499.3	518.4	548.1
Mineral fuels, lubricants and related materials	.3	.2	.2	.2	340.9	399.1	410.1	455.5
Animal and vegetable oil and fats	----	----	----	----	7.3	16.1	16.1	20.5
Chemicals	16.2	11.5	11.0	5.0	97.4	117.0	113.2	108.3
Manufactured goods classified chiefly by material	10.8	11.6	11.3	13.4	251.8	280.3	270.0	358.4
Machinery and transport equipment	4.2	4.1	3.0	3.6	90.7	97.9	112.3	112.4
Miscellaneous manufactured articles	4.8	6.7	7.3	8.5	48.2	58.0	70.1	78.4
Commodities and transactions not classified according to kind	.4	.5	.5	.5	8.3	5.6	4.8	6.8

Source: Analytical Abstracts, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, January-December 1962, series B.

Mr. JAVITS. Fifth. By removing undue trade restrictions, we remove the basic cause of isolation of the Soviet people. We also can better demonstrate to the developing nations the close correlation between the voluntary economic cooperation and the high labor productivity level in the free world, on the one hand, and the coercive cooperation and resultant economic waste and inefficiency in the Communist camp. I can testify on the basis of personal experience to the fact that the Russian people certainly like our products, attractive goods such as shoes, stockings, clothes, automobiles, and about anything we can think of which is a matter of routine to us. We could give them a better understanding of the power and availability of great embellishments to living in the West.

Sixth. Closer commercial ties between the West and the Soviet bloc would help to strengthen existing trends toward the renunciation of war as a means of settling international disputes. People who are receiving advantages from trade are a great deal more reluctant to go to war. It would tend further to isolate the Soviet Union from the bellicose posture of China and more closely solidify her as a complex with which the West might conceivably come to some agreements, as was done on the nuclear test ban treaty.

Seventh. Finally, more active economic conditions may serve as a positive supplement to our military strength in persuading the Soviet leaders that they have more to gain from trade than they have from subversion, infiltration, and coercion against the free world.

III. DISADVANTAGES TO UNITED STATES EXAMINED

During the past few days there have been a number of analyses of the disadvantages which would result from an effort to increase United States-Soviet bloc trade. I would like to take this opportunity to deal with the major points raised.

It is also said that the Soviet Union will use this wheat to continue its economic influence and domination over its satellites. Soviet domination of the Eastern European countries does not depend upon supplying them with grain. It depends rather on more direct forms of pressure and domination, including Soviet troops. In any event, if the supply of grain were used by the Russians as a means of pressure, the Eastern European countries could obtain grain from alternative suppliers in the West and from us through a selective policy as described here. The U.S. supply of grain to Poland after 1956 was an important factor in contributing to Polish ability to lessen its dependence on the U.S.S.R.

This creates no new situation in terms of satellite dependence on the U.S.S.R. since the U.S.S.R. has been a net supplier of grain to other European Soviet bloc countries for many years. Actions by the United States to supply food or other essential commodities to the dominated countries and to permit trade on a most-favored-nation basis with Yugoslavia and Poland would be a more directly effective means of reducing satellite dependence on the U.S.S.R.

The key question, as I see it, is the question of degree. I do not think we can avoid some disadvantages. The question is whether the advantages outweigh the disadvantages, and whether the disadvantages are such as to strongly help the Soviet bloc, or whether they are really not of very great moment. My own feeling is that if we get the agreements which I have described, the help which they would give to the Soviet bloc is not so consequential as to outweigh the advantages to us and to the cause of peace in the world.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to make one further point, and then I shall be glad to yield.

If we do not sell to the Russians, the Russians still can buy elsewhere, and do. They buy from Canada. We all know that they are willing to buy from Australia and from Argentina. Those are real possibilities. The fact that we deny them the grain would make a difference, but I do not think it would make such a material difference as to represent the "yes" or "no" as to whether we ought to adopt that policy.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First I congratulate the Senator from New York for making one of his characteristically responsible and extremely well-documented speeches. It is the most detailed and thoughtful discussion of this entire subject that the Senate has heard in the past several weeks, although there have been a number of speeches on this subject.

I should like to ask the Senator some questions on the latest point he made in his speech.

The Senator indicates that the Soviet Union does not depend on wheat exports to its satellites for any significant measure of its domination. As I am sure the Senator is aware, the Soviet Union is the biggest wheat producer in the world, a much bigger producer than the United States or Canada. I am sure the Senator will also agree that the satellites, including Cuba, depend on shipments of wheat from the Soviet Union.

Is it not true that one element of the Soviet Union's influence and control over its satellites is that the Soviet Union constitutes the breadbasket or the source of wheat which is so important to the existence of the people in the satellite countries?

Mr. JAVITS. I believe that represents a rather fundamental difference of outlook between the Senator from Wisconsin and me. My answer is "No." I will tell the Senator why.

The breadbasket idea follows, and does not precede, control. The control exists, I believe, as a result of military means and propaganda and ideological control of the entire apparatus of the countries and of the minds of the people. The supply follows.

The Soviet Union has a problem. How many soldiers should be used? How much repression should be used? How much force should be used? Obviously, even in terms of a relatively primitive economy, the Soviet Union would wish to use as little as possible. Grain is cheaper than soldiers.

It seems to me that the breadbasket idea becomes with the Soviet Union an aspect of the way in which it controls, but it is not essential to its control. The essentials to its control are the military, the propaganda, and the party machinery, both in the satellite countries and in the Soviet Union, which give it a stranglehold upon those countries.

We have seen demonstrated the fact that even if there were a much lower level of food consumption in those countries, that would not allow them to escape from Soviet control. We also know that a higher level of food consumption does not inhibit freedom fighters, such as those in Hungary, from "taking on" Russian tanks when the people are sufficiently angry.

I respect the view of the Senator from Wisconsin. He sincerely espouses his view, and is joined by other Senators in espousing it. However, it is not my judgment that the control factor is the food supply. Rather, the food supply represents the implementation of domination, which would take place without any question otherwise, and is not what maintains the domination.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that if the satellite countries had to obtain their grain from the United States instead of from the U.S.S.R., this would represent a degree of lessening of the influence of the U.S.S.R. and of increasing the influence of the United States of America.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out to the Senator that the satellites are not free to obtain their grain from the United States. They can do so only with the implicit or explicit agreement of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union would repress such a purchase completely, if it chose to do so, if it thought a satellite country was going beyond what the Soviet Union was willing to permit. They would get by with that, because of their control, which is so complete, as we saw in Hungary.

I am sure the Senator remembers the bloody riots in Poland which preceded some alleviation of the situation between Poland and the Soviet Union.

I point out also that what I am proposing for the handling of this situation would permit the President to use trade as a flexible instrument of policy.

Today the President has his hands very much tied. I wish to free the President's hands to use an enhancement of trade with the Soviet bloc as a tool which might produce some results in the lessening of tensions, particularly in the economic field.

The Senator from Wisconsin is very astute. I mean it. The Senator understands my point completely.

I am not recommending trying to build up trade on the basis of long-term credit. For that I think the Soviet bloc would have to meet the test of credit worthiness; in other words, we should have confidence that there would not be a "blowup" with the Soviet Union for a long time, that they would not turn on us, as has been the situation many times in the past.

I am talking in realistic terms only about enhancing trade, which is possible, within the limits of no long-term credits, provided that the financial and economic issues could be worked out with the Soviet Union.

I would do nothing other than to free the President's hands so that he might deal upon a "most favored nation" basis, with perhaps some flexibility as to the terms of sale, with any part of the Soviet bloc if he believed that it would serve our purposes.

That might very well mean that we would be dealing first with the satellites instead of the Soviet Union. It is precisely that kind of flexibility I wish to give to the President, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I share the Senator's view. But apparently a specific, definite proposal is being considered. It is the one which has been discussed at great length throughout the country during the past week. I refer to our sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R. That would be in violation of the Latta amendment, because the U.S.S.R. was specifically named in the amendment. The satellite countries were not named.

Certainly it would be easier, in conformity with the sense of the Congress, to sell to the satellite countries than to sell to the U.S.S.R.

The point I make is that a sale to the satellite countries possibly would result in a greater degree of influence on our part and a lessening of influence on the part of the U.S.S.R. It seems to me this is a point of distinction, perhaps, between my thinking and what the administration may be contemplating, but not as between what the Senator from New York has been saying and what I would approve.

If we are to have an understanding that the administration is not going to deal directly with Russia but is going to deal with the satellite countries, I agree that that is entirely different from the other situation, and we certainly could give it more sympathetic consideration.

We should not assist Russia to continue to meet its export commitments. All the evidence I have seen indicates that that would be the prime purpose for the purchase of the wheat. It seems to me that would not be in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. On the question of the possible grain deal, it seems to me we really must depend upon the President. It is to be a one-shot operation. It would not feed a country for very long—either the Russians or the satellites or anybody else. It possibly represents, in the President's armory, an opportunity he does not wish to forgo, feeling it would result in the Russians discussing problems with us. It might bear fruit. There are other proposals in the wind which could be consummated which could be of tremendous value to the free world.

I believe Senators could all agree at least with my main thesis. This is my main thesis: We must be sure that if the one grain deal is allowed it will not represent the beginning of a new policy. It could be allowed, for reasons the President considered to be in the national interest. We should be sure that this would be a one-shot transaction, with the President acting as the chief foreign policy negotiator, saying, "Go along with me on this; it is very valuable to the United States; I want to do it." That is really what I am arguing for.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is a part of it. I think we can meet on common ground if we expand that generality a little.

The Senator implied, at least, a concession from the Soviet Union is in the interests of the free world. I agree to that. This should not be a sale of wheat for gold or a sale of wheat for hard currency, but instead the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union at a time when they obviously need it, or they would not begin to talk about making any kind of arrangement, in exchange for some real concessions to freedom and liberty.

Either the Senator from New York or I could list a dozen concessions, any one of which would represent a good quid pro quo, but to bail the Soviet Union out for sterile gold, when they need the wheat so very much, is not a good concession.

This decision should be made within the framework that regardless of our balance of payments, we do not need gold or hard currency as much as Russia needs wheat. We need concessions for the free world. The whole purpose in having a favorable balance of payments and a favorable gold supply is to help the free world. So this kind of deal should be based on concessions which strengthen the free world, and not on the vague generality that we are warming up our relations, and that perhaps the Kremlin will be more friendly toward the free world if we bail them out. A stronger U.S.S.R. is not a friendlier U.S.S.R.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Wisconsin and I are not far apart, but we are apart on this point: I would be for the President's making the deal, if he thought it desirable, provided it would not be the beginning of new trade relations, but that it would be done for this one time under these conditions and in the national interest.

As the Senator from New York has said, we do not need gold that much. I agree. I do not care how pessimistic one may be about our gold stocks or our balance of payments. We have discussed that subject before. I agree with the Senator. But it is also important to note that the Russians do not need the wheat that much. They will get along without it. We have seen them do it before. If they cannot get along without it, they will buy it elsewhere. So I do not think this is the ball game.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] pointed out yesterday, the only surplus wheat left in the world—the only additional wheat available to the U.S.S.R.—is from this country. Canada cannot send Russia any more wheat, and there is some question whether she can send $500 million worth. Russia bought all she could from Australia. Europe had a bad crop this year. There is no significant amount of wheat available anywhere. If Russia is to get more wheat Russia would have to come to us. That may put us in a position in which we could require that a significant price be paid for the wheat.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator cannot say that Russia must come to us. I would back with my life the Senator's agricultural assessment, and his knowledge in that field, and his sincerity, but the Senator cannot tell me that the Soviet must have this wheat. That is not true. I do not think they must have it. They will do without it. They would like to have it, but they can do without it, as they have done before. With the repression in their society, they will get through.

This is the focal point of the discussion: It is not a matter of life or death. Surely, they want the wheat, but it is not a matter of "make or break." We would have to view this as a one-time deal, if we were to get an advantage from it, provided it does not back us into a trade deal, but we should leave it as a unit, single decision for the President to make.

I express the hope that the President would give us that assurance. It would be extremely valuable to the opponents of the one-time deal, and to the proponents. It would be very helpful if the President would say to us, "If I approve the wheat deal, it does not represent anything but a one-time commitment. Our relations with the Soviet Union would remain the same. I am perfectly willing to discuss with them what we will do and what they will do in a trade deal, but this is not it."

Such an assurance would take the "heat" out of the entire problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the basic thrust of the Senator's excellent speech is that there should be a comprehensive discussion of our trade policy vis-a-vis the Soviet bloc. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] made an excellent speech on that subject the other day, in which he indicated that the one-shot approach is perhaps not worthy of us at this time. This decision should be a matter of overall trade policy, in which we decide on our trade policy, and not, on an ad hoc basis, what we should do in this case. It should be decided on the basis of the overall policy as to what is in the interest of the free world. The thrust of the Senator's speech is in that direction.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me appraise that statement so we can determine where the differences are and where we meet. We differ in that I do not believe the one-shot deal is that important. It is important that we not back ourselves into a general trade policy with the Soviet Union on the basis of the proposed wheat sale. I would rather turn everything down if that is what is to happen.

The one narrow point with which I do not agree is that this deal makes or breaks that policy. I would leave the decision in this one case to the President. That is the narrow, sole basis on which it should be done. Other than that, I think we agree on what we must do.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I had an opportunity to read the speech of the Senator from New York, entitled, "A New Look at East-West Trade." I think it is the most comprehensive statement that has been made on this subject in the Senate.

It is not the first initiative that the Senator from New York has taken in this field. I believe I am correct in saying that last year, when the Export Control Act was before the Senate, the Senator from New York obtained recognition of the importance of the coordination of Western policies regarding trade with the Communist bloc by offering an amendment, which was enacted into law.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I think he also made an able initiative by calling for the reform of the monetary system of the free world and an examination of the adequacy of international credit. I notice that it has been followed by a good deal of action of our own Government and recently by discussions which are being held in Washington by bankers and finance ministers from all countries of the world who are here for the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund. So I am impressed by his speech.

To come for a moment to the proposed sale of wheat to Russia, I commented on it briefly yesterday. While I do not think I am going to make the decision, or the Senator from New York is going to make the decision—the President is the one who is going to make the decision—I said I did not favor the sale of wheat to Russia, and I based my judgment on these grounds: I believe it cannot be contradicted that the existing policy of Congress, at least until this time, is that trade with Russia and the Communist-dominated countries is not favored, and in some cases is expressly prohibited.

In the case of wheat, which is a subsidized commodity, there has been an express declaration of Congress that in no circumstances, at least from the standpoint of the policy of Congress, should a subsidized agricultural commodity of any kind be transferred to the U.S.S.R. by any means. I think that is the policy.

I agree that the President, acting on his own judgment, as to what is in the best interest of this country, can permit the issuance of an export license to sell the wheat.

My thought about the subject is that I do not see any reason why we should make the sale based on any ground of great interest to the United States.

I said that if the wheat were to be sold to relieve hunger in Soviet Russia, I did not think there would be much disagreement about the sale, because the relief of hunger is a traditional policy of the United States.

If it should represent an initiative in a new trade policy, it might have some significance, but we were told, in our consultations, it did not do that. So it seemed to me the only reason we would do it would be to secure the money.

We need the money, but it did not seem very much in the tradition of a great country, like the United States, to enter into such an isolated transaction merely to obtain dollars or gold.

If we entered into this transaction, any inhibitions that were held by any country regarding the sale of agricultural commodities to Russia would be removed.

Of course the expressed policy of Congress is that it cannot be sold to any Communist-dominated country. If it is done without any definite change in policy, this could remove some of the inhibitions against the sale or transfer of other products to those countries, strategic or otherwise. Before we begin a change in what is the established policy of Congress—and I must say it has been the established policy of the executive branch, too—the whole subject of East-West trade ought to be considered in consultation with our allies, and if a new policy is to be established, it ought to be clearly defined. I believe there should be consultation with Members of Congress; and on whatever grounds the President moves, they should be clearly defined. I do not like the idea of acting on a transaction-by-transaction basis, and least of all for the purpose of getting our hands on Russian gold. We need the money, of course, but we do not need it that badly.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for his fine contribution. I believe what he has said sharpens the areas of agreement, which are much wider between him and myself, because we have the same attitude toward a broad trade deal, and I have gone to some pains to specify in detail what those conditions should be.

An argument has also been made that trade with the Soviet bloc would help Cuba and that the Canadian sale of wheat to Russia for Cuba involves a very serious breach in U.S. efforts for economic and political isolation of the Castro regime. What the Canadians have done is said to strengthen the Soviet position in Cuba, by allowing the Soviets to take the credit for alleviating the food shortage. Two facts can be noted in connection with this argument: First, our own export controls toward Cuba still permit Cuban purchase of consumable food and medicines, since our objective is not to starve the Cuban people who have to live under the Castro regime, nor to encourage the development of disease and pestilence. Second, the heavy cost of maintaining minimum economic conditions in Cuba still falls on the U.S.S.R. where it should fall, even though they have to buy wheat in Canada. In fact, the cost is considerably greater to the Soviets in gold than it would be if they were able to supply their own grain to Cuba, because they have to spend scarce foreign exchange to buy it.

Then there is the argument that our farmers recognize the inconsistency of a free world policy whereby we alone attempt to blockade the Communist world, but they expect something better than a capitulation to "greedy motives for the quick profit" instead of to plan for the ultimate success and security of freedom.

It cannot be denied that our policy for the past 15 years of placing the morality of our cause above export trade—of denying any possible help to the Communist cause—was sound. The real question, however, is not whether we have been right or wrong up to now, or whether a moral position is better than a profit position.

The essential question is: What policy will best serve our national interest—and the cause of freedom—under present circumstances?

The burden of proof in answering this question is upon those who would increase trade with the Soviet bloc. That is what I am trying to explore in this speech. At the same time I want to set forth the conditions which would add the necessary weight to the balance in favor of a new policy as against our present policy; conditions for negotiation which, if met, would make a change of policy definitely in the national interest.

This is quite apart from the fact that, as a practical matter, we have not really been blockading the Communist world, but only Cuba and Communist China, and I feel this should continue by all means.

It can also be argued that an increased volume of U.S. exports of food and industrial commodities would make it possible for the Soviet Government to modernize its domestic industry and increase the productivity of its capital and labor resources; and that more of its domestic resources and personnel could be diverted toward military production and to stepped up efforts for economic assistance to developing countries. But the importance of such trade to the Soviet economy should not be exaggerated.

In aggregate terms, this trade is not of major significance to the Soviet bloc—except perhaps psychologically. Total imports from nonbloc sources represent less than 1 percent of Soviet gross national product. Imports from the industrialized nonbloc countries, which provide machinery and equipment of principal value to the Soviet economy, represent only one-half of 1 percent of Soviet gross national product.

This trade obviously could not appreciably affect the Soviet Union's military capability or long-term economic growth. Soviet military capability is based on its own advanced weapons technology. The Soviet Union would be no more likely to become dependent upon Western sources for military designs and production than the United States would be inclined to rely on Soviet sources for American military development.

This leaves the question of whether the total denial of western exports to the Soviet Union might appreciably affect Soviet economic growth. It seems highly unlikely that this would be possible, because our allies are now conducting substantial trade with the bloc and Soviet industry is broadly based on domestic materials and resources. As far as its agricultural sector is concerned, Soviet difficulties there are basically the result of institutional defects which are so ingrained in the Communist system that it is difficult to visualize how they could be cured, short of abandoning that system. This, in fact, is what has happened in the Communist countries which have made progress in agriculture. In Poland and Yugoslavia, agricultural production has been placed on an almost completely free and individual basis, and this is a development we certainly should welcome. In the Soviet Union problems of inadequate incentives, ineffective procurement and distribution, and the inefficiencies inherent in collectivized or state farming are the governing factors, rather than specific import requirements from the West.

For these reasons, if a ban were imposed because of serious new East-West tensions, the denial of Western exports to the Soviet Union might at most have a short-term disruptive effect on Soviet economic planning at a given time; but if there was substantial trade which could be cut off, it would have a much more disruptive effect. Trade with the West as a general matter, however, must necessarily be a marginal factor in the performance and potentialities of the Soviet economy.

On balance, therefore, the potential advantages of increased United States-U.S.S.R. trade—on the terms I propose and considering its order of magnitude—would outweigh the disadvantages.

In analyzing the problem of East-West trade from the standpoint of the national interest over the years since this Second World War, the United States has viewed that interest as being involved in four particular areas.

First, the possible strategic contribution of exports to the Soviet bloc; second, the use by the bloc of trade and related long-term credits as a means of penetrating the less-developed countries in ways that may threaten the growth of independent regimes; third, the potential of the bloc to disrupt world markets; and, fourth, the possibility that certain of the Western allies may become unduly dependent upon Soviet bloc supplies or markets.

A variety of actions and programs have been undertaken over the years to minimize these risks. The multilateral Coordinating Committee—Cocom—program has placed restraints on strategic exports and transshipments. The U.S. foreign aid program, in collaboration with the foreign aid programs of other Western countries, has been used as flexibly as possible to counter Soviet penetration in less-developed countries and to augment Western influence.

The new and uncommitted countries have been encouraged to associate themselves with the multilateral trade and financial institutions and the Western system of international trade and payments. Joint Western efforts have been made to deal with such special problems of trade vulnerability as those involving Greece or Turkey. Soviet activities in international commodity markets such as oil or tin have been the subject of Western collaboration. Efforts have been made through international commodity studies or agreements to meet the marketing problems of less-developed countries and reduce their vulnerability to Soviet bilateral trade machinations.

IV. THE BASIS OF UNITED STATES-SOVIET TRADE

At this point I would like to examine the postwar record of United States-Soviet trade and the prospects for its expansion.

THE POSTWAR RECORD IN BRIEF

The movement of goods between the United States and the Soviet Union has been proceeding at a low level during the past 15 years. The main reason for the reduced exchange of merchandise has been, of course, the state of strained political relations between the two countries since the early years of the postwar period. The critical year in our trade relations was 1948, a year in which the Soviet Government engaged in a series of aggressive acts designed to expand the political domain of communism. We responded, in part, with a comprehensive procedure of administrative restrictions over the shipment of strategic commodities to the Soviet Union and its allies.

In the wake of our strategic controls, the dollar value of U.S. merchandise exports to the U.S.S.R. dropped from $149 million in 1947 to $28 million in 1948. One year later, the level of shipments declined still further to $6.6 million. During the following 5 years, 1950 to 1955, U.S. exports to the Soviet Union slumped below the level of $1 million. A steady, if slow, rise began thereafter, which carried the level of exports upward from $3.8 million in 1956 to $42.7 million in 1961. Last year, however, a marked decline took place; Soviet purchases in this market in 1962, for unexplained reasons, dropped to $15.2 million.

As far as our imports from Russia are concerned, the inflow of merchandise also declined with the onset of political tensions between East and West, but not quite as precipitantly. The important restrictive measure taken by the U.S. Congress in this area, enacted in June 1951, was to revoke the most-favored-nation status of the U.S.S.R. This action resulted in raising the customs tariff rates on all dutiable goods arriving from the U.S.S.R. Throughout this period, as a whole, imports from the Soviet Union declined steadily, moving downward from a figure of $86.8 million in 1948 to $16.4 million in 1962.

THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF UNITED STATES-SOVIET TRADE

The Soviet Union, with a volume of exports valued at close to $7 billion in 1962, ranks fifth among the major trading nations. From the standpoint of industrial production, by contrast, the U.S.S.R. is the second largest producer in the world. However, 70 percent of Russia's trade transactions are concentrated within the Soviet bloc. Outside the bloc, on the other hand, Russia currently exports—and imports—at the rate of $2 billion a year, an amount roughly equal to that of a country like Switzerland or Australia.

As far as the United States is concerned, Russia has never been an important factor in our trade. During the best years in our commercial relations, such as 1936 to 1938, shipments to the U.S.S.R. accounted for 1.6 percent of all our merchandise exports. Only during the depression years, 1930 to 1931, which coincided with the first 5-year plan in the

U.S.S.R., did our sales to the Soviet Union reach the proportion of 3 to 4 percent of our total exports. The highest level ever attained in our commodity shipments to the U.S.S.R. came during World War II, when as much as 24.3 percent of all our exported goods went to the U.S.S.R. in support of our common war effort.

It is interesting to note that throughout the period of marked fluctuations in the level of our exports to Russia, up until 1948, imports from that country hovered near 1 percent of our total imports.

The main economic impulse for the exchange of goods between this country and the U.S.S.R. is provided by the very real and continuing Soviet interest in the wide range of equipment produced by the factories and mills of the United States.

In a typical prewar year like 1938, for example, two-thirds of all Soviet procurement in this market consisted of machinery. Metals and chemicals made up most of the balance of their purchases. At the same time, the amount of machinery bought in this country represented 55 percent of the total value of machinery imports into the U.S.S.R., from all sources.

Over the years, too, there has been a continuing, modest interest on the part of the American business community in a number of Soviet commodities. Furs, manganese and chrome ores, platinum, crude drugs and food delicacies have been most prominent among these. In contrast with Western Europe, however, there is little need in the United States for the bulk of Russia's traditional export commodities, which consist largely of farm products, timber, paper, fuels, ores, and other minerals. In normal trading years, therefore, Soviet purchases in this market have tended to exceed their sales by a margin of more than two to one.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks several tables as part of my presentation on this subject.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A.—*U.S. exports and imports by areas, 1956–62, and January–March 1963*

[In millions of dollars]

Country	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	January-March 1963
	Exports including reexports [1]							
Total	17,020	19,001	15,925	15,926	18,892	19,143	19,474	4,684
Canada, including Newfoundland	4,035	3,939	3,439	3,748	3,709	3,643	3,830	881
20 American Republics	3,778	4,579	4,085	3,526	3,478	3,415	3,222	696
Western Europe [2]	5,220	5,755	4,514	4,535	6,318	6,287	6,371	1,598
Eastern Europe and Soviet bloc in Asia	11	86	113	89	194	133	125	21
Western Asia [2]	406	411	423	441	482	515	568	121
Southern, southeastern, and eastern Asia	2,397	2,980	2,235	2,315	3,165	3,597	3,556	962
Africa	688	695	618	691	766	831	980	211
Other free world areas [3]	485	556	498	581	780	722	822	194
	General imports							
Total	12,774	13,255	[4] 13,255	15,627	15,017	14,713	16,396	3,969
Canada, including Newfoundland	2,941	3,042	2,965	3,352	3,153	3,270	3,657	835
20 American Republics	3,639	3,769	3,589	3,602	3,528	3,213	3,386	866
Western Europe [2]	2,890	3,078	3,297	4,523	4,185	4,058	4,542	1,066
Eastern Europe and Soviet bloc in Asia	73	66	68	88	84	85	82	17
Western Asia [2]	307	262	351	345	312	324	298	66
Southern, southeastern, and eastern Asia	1,682	1,718	1,642	2,250	2,406	2,255	2,664	664
Africa	681	693	668	679	627	672	758	190
Other free world areas [3]	533	595	674	768	703	832	984	262
Unclassified [5]	28	32	34	20	19	4	25	3

[1] Figures for 1956–62 exclude "special category" exports which, for security reasons, may not be reported by destination. Data for 1956–60 have been adjusted, however, to include aviation fuel and lubricating oils which were removed from "special category" in 1960.

[2] Turkey is included with Western Europe and excluded from Western Asia.

[3] Includes European possessions in the Western Hemisphere, Canal Zone, Gibraltar, and islands in the Mediterranean, Australia, New Zealand, and other Oceania.

[4] Estimated total which includes adjustments for changes in statistical coverage resulting from the shift to new tabulating procedures during the year. Area figures, only partially adjusted, overstate imports in 1958 by approximately $33,000,000.

[5] Consists mainly of uranium shipments for which country of origin detail are not available for security reasons.

GENERAL NOTE.—Data in this table have been adjusted, for all periods shown, to include imports of uranium ore and export of uranium and other nuclear materials.

Source: "Export Control," 64th quarterly report, U.S. Department of Commerce.

TABLE B.—*U.S. exports to and imports from countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet bloc in Asia, 1956–62, and January–March 1963*

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	January-March 1963
	Exports including reexports [1]							
Soviet bloc countries, total	11,245	86,104	113,130	89,272	193,853	133,331	125,140	21,365
Eastern European countries	11,245	86,095	113,125	89,269	193,853	133,324	125,136	21,365
Albania	----	----	----	----	2	----	----	----
Bulgaria	24	(3)	129	763	72	47	33	85
Czechoslovakia	765	2,004	1,477	2,469	4,473	7,385	7,172	2,111
East Germany	441	265	382	972	4,042	2,775	1,698	559
Estonia	----	----	7	----	----	----	----	----
Hungary	2,006	5,320	1,664	1,119	1,650	1,349	836	1,290
Latvia	----	977	----	----	824	2,911	4,887	2,066
Lithuania	----	----	----	----	----	----	1	323
Poland	3 722	73,059	105,180	74,728	143,090	74,791	94,454	11,883
Rumania	464	966	871	1,820	1,260	1,404	802	220
U.S.S.R.	3,823	3,504	3,415	7,398	38,440	42,662	15,253	2,828
Asian countries	----	[3] 9	[3] 5	[3] 3	----	[3] 7	[3] 4	----
China including Manchuria	----	[3] 9	[3] 5	[3] 3	----	[3] 7	[3] 4	----
Outer Mongolia	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
North Korea	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

See footnotes at end of table.

Table B.—*U.S. exports to and imports from countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet bloc in Asia, 1956–62, and January–March 1963*—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Country	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	January–March 1963
	General imports							
Soviet bloc countries, total	72,754	65,616	68,096	88,154	83,850	84,641	82,380	17,462
Eastern European countries	65,453	61,332	63,499	80,936	80,936	81,069	78,899	17,067
Albania	193	105	94	127	65	74	123	31
Bulgaria	436	459	700	965	781	1,248	1,137	384
Czechoslovakia	5,960	7,911	7,787	11,961	12,214	9,286	9,989	2,380
East Germany	5,455	4,881	6,073	4,137	3,153	2,529	3,096	1,076
Estonia		2	1	(2)		2	(2)	3
Hungary	1,162	729	1,285	2,060	1,809	2,024	1,811	451
Latvia		263	6	13	2	(2)	1	
Lithuania		3	(2)		13	(2)	(2)	
Poland	27,402	30,001	29,683	31,857	38,809	41,316	45,936	10,247
Rumania	377	474	373	1,205	1,461	1,362	626	129
U.S.S.R.	24,468	16,504	17,497	28,611	22,629	23,228	16,180	2,366
Asian countries	7,301	4,284	4,597	7,218	2,914	3,572	3,481	395
China including Manchuria	223	99	142	200	253	447	242	65
Outer Mongolia	7,078	4,185	4,453	7,015	2,658	3,125	3,238	330
North Korea	(2)		2	3	3		1	

---

[1] Exports exclude "special category" classes.

[2] Less than $500.

[3] Figures shown include printed matter under general license and shipments to diplomatic missions of friendly foreign countries.

NOTE.—Exports are shown by country of destination. Imports are credited to the country in which the merchandise was originally produced, not necessarily the country from which purchases and shipments were made. General imports represent merchandise entered immediately upon arrival into merchandising or consumption channels plus commodities entered into bonded customs warehouses for storage.

United States exports to North Korea were embargoed July 1950, and those to Communist China, Manchuria, and Outer Mongolia were embargoed the following December. On Mar. 1, 1951, general export licenses to Eastern European countries were revoked and the requirement of prior approval by license was extended to cover all exports to this area. On July 26, 1954, exports to North Vietnam were embargoed. Since mid-1954 the policy with respect to exports of nonstrategic goods to Eastern European countries has been liberalized to some extent. In particular, a less restrictive policy with respect to Poland has been pursued since August 1957. Pursuant to the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, benefits of trade agreement tariff concessions were withdrawn from the U.S.S.R. and its satellites and an embargo was imposed on the importation of certain furs from China and the U.S.S.R. On Apr. 26, 1956, a general license, GLSA, was established authorizing the exportation without a validated license of certain commodities to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Outer Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, and the U.S.S.R except the Maritime Province.

Controls over imports of Chinese and North Korean merchandise are exercised by the Treasury Department under Foreign Assets Control Regulations issued Dec. 17, 1950. Under these regulations the importation of Chinese goods is prohibited without license by the Treasury Department, and it is contrary to the present policy of that agency to license such imports. Some items of Chinese origin, however, continue to appear in the statistical records of U.S. imports. For example, dutiable Chinese merchandise brought into the United States and stored in bonded customs warehouses prior to the effective date of the import control regulations is counted in import for consumption statistics at the time of withdrawal from warehouse. Duty-free merchandise permitted entry for customs inspection but sebsequently rejected when determined to be of Chinese origin, may also be counted in the statistics. The figures may also include imports licensed to avoid undue hardship to firms and individuals who acquired the Chinese merchandise in good faith and imports, from 3d countries, of Chinese products in which all Chinese interests had ceased by Dec. 17, 1950. In U.S. import statistics, goods of Chinese origin are credited to China regardless of the country from which they came.

Table C.—*U.S. exports to Eastern Europe by principal commodities, 1960, 1961, and 1962*

[Thousands of dollars]

Commodity	Total to Eastern Europe			Eastern Europe, excluding U.S.S.R.[1]			U.S.S.R.		
	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962
Total	193,853	133,324	125,136	155,413	90,662	109,883	38,440	42,662	15,253
Dairy products	828	565	1	828	565				1
Barley, except pearl barley	14,815	3,138	9,873	14,812	3,138	9,873	3	(2)	
Corn, except seed	4,307	481	1,857	4,307	481	1,857			
Grain sorghums	4,872	445	2,973	4,871	445	2,973	1		
Rice, milled			3,003			3,003			
Wheat	74,013	27,768	26,237	74,009	27,768	26,237	4		
Soybean oilcake and meal	548	177		548	177				
Edible vegetable fats and oils	4,350	2,821	3,246	4,350	2,821	3,246			
Hides and skins, raw, except fur	4,315	4,291	1,837	2,517	4,291	5,898	1,798		1,939
Tallow, inedible	3,168	10,062	8,208	3,168	3,940	4,197		15,122	4,011
Rubber, synthetic	485	2,245	3,143	485	782	1,684		1,463	1,459
Soybeans	76	3,360	1,905	76	3,360	1,905			
Flaxseed		1,082			1,082				
Soybean oil, crude, inedible	1,867	2,664	4,304	1,867	2,664	4,304			
Tobacco and manufactures	2,820	1,979	1,457	2,819	1,979	1,413	1		44
Hops	251	326	1,538	251	326	1,538			
Cotton, unmanufactured	15,536	16,635	20,524	15,536	16,635	20,524			
Wool rags and used clothing of wool	1,264	625	563	1,264	625	563			
Synthetic fibers and manufactures	3,847	5,489	2,631	1,044	829	645	2,803	4,660	1,986
Woodpulp	638	141		637	141		1		
Sulfur, crude	768	470	1,012	768	470	1,012			
Iron and steel mill products	15,788	2,255	176	5,055	1,168	176	10,733	1,087	(2)
Aluminum ores and concentrates		1,550	733		1,550	733			
Electrical machinery and apparatus	115	818	382	66	430	318	49	388	64
Construction, excavating, and related machinery	653	3,264	330	241	256	242	412	3,008	88
Metalworking machinery and parts	1,113	2,887	2,128	1,113	1,553	2,128		834	
Textile, sewing, and shoe machinery	13,889	10,174	400	1,168	246	224	12,721	9,928	176
Food and beverage processing machinery and parts	479	522	291	303	329	7	176	193	284
Paper, pulp, and paper processing machinery	775	27	2,196	18	20	27	757	7	2,169
Machinery, industrial, other	3,391	2,456	1,654	1,173	490	504	2,218	1,966	1,150
Agricultural machinery, implements, tractors, and parts	1,014	257	127	184	207	107	830	50	20
Aircraft, parts and accessories	1,676		24	5		24	1,671		
Coal-tar products	658	1,290	380	487	520	70	171	770	310
Medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations	594	1,292	1,884	456	1,177	1,862	138	115	22
Chemical specialties	460	804	336	296	275	171	164	529	165
Chemicals, industrials	3,534	900	730	1,310	307	440	2,224	593	290
Carbon black	544	931	21	140	103	21	404	828	
Scientific and professional instruments, apparatus, and supplies	463	577	298	312	322	196	151	255	102
Private relief shipments	5,658	5,415	7,922	5,656	5,415	7,906	2		16
Other domestic exports	4,219	4,310	4,500	3,220	3,447	3,623	999	863	877
Reexports	62	331	312	53	328	232	9	3	80

---

[1] Includes exports to Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

[2] Less than $500.

NOTE.—Figures exclude "special category" exports which, for security reasons, may not be reported by destination.

TABLE D.—*U.S. imports from Eastern Europe by principal commodities, 1960, 1961, and 1962*

[Thousands of dollars]

Commodity	Total from Eastern Europe			Eastern Europe, excluding U.S.S.R.[1]			U.S.S.R.		
	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962
General imports, total	80,936	81,069	78,899	58,307	57,841	62,719	22,629	23,228	16,180
Imports for consumption, total[2]	80,283	80,388	78,471	57,519	57,602	62,111	22,764	22,786	16,360
Meat and meat products	28,691	26,850	26,269	28,573	26,850	26,238	118		31
Fish and fish products, except shellfish	310	236	173	98	42	32	212	194	141
Vegetables and preparations	445	685	448	415	657	402	30	28	46
Spices	602	1,154	954	592	1,154	954	10		
Molasses, inedible	643	862		643	862				
Beverages	214	207	287	208	201	284	6	6	3
Hides and skins, raw, except fur	610	794	1,385	610	794	1,385			
Pig and hog leather	61	261	642	61	261	642			
Leather manufactures	246	187	412	246	187	412	(3)		
Furs, undressed	9,109	9,063	11,342	3,142	2,301	3,880	5,967	6,762	7,462
Fur manufactures	269	123	220	245	122	215	24	1	5
Bristles	517	649	425	372	342	266	145	307	159
Feathers, crude	1,259	1,165	1,254	1,259	1,165	1,254			
Casein	1,390	2,122	1,399	1,390	2,065	1,399		57	
Rubber, allied gums, and manufactures	247	170	389	247	170	389			
Licorice root	405	287	395				405	287	395
Oilseeds	328	255	269	328	255	269			
Essential or distilled oils	354	295	419	194	214	313	160	81	106
Brooms	209	312	363	209	312	363			
Cotton linters	680	541	597				680	541	597
Cotton manufactures	112	111	530	112	109	489		2	41
Flax, hemp, ramie, and manufactures	506	1,008	1,967	506	1,008	1,967			
Angora rabbit hair	659	256	349	659	256	349			
Artificial fruits and flowers	744	497	274	744	497	274			
Wood manufactures	824	1,562	2,110	819	1,551	2,107	5	11	3
Cement	478	407	280	478	407	280			
Glass, cyliner, crown, and sheet	697	906	1,300	619	474	695	78	432	605
Glass Christmas tree ornaments	852	1,023	1,035	852	1,023	1,035			
Glass and glass products, other	2,172	2,413	2,552	2,172	2,412	2,552		1	
Clay and clay products	385	435	372	385	429	372		6	(3)
Montan wax	225	191	247	225	191	247			
Imitation precious and semiprecious stones	969	739	652	969	739	652		(3)	
Steel-mill products, pig iron and scrap	374	148	688	310	122	687	64	26	1
Chrome ore	162	502	916	2			160	502	916
Platinum	3,013	2,019	1,045	253	136		2,760	1,883	1,045
Palladium	1,552	4,238	1,945	79			1,473	4,238	1,945
Platinum-group metals, other	1,292	131	1,101				1,292	131	1,101
Metalworking machinery and parts	437	346	308	437	346	308			
Typewriters	665	534	556	665	534	556			
Machinery, other	515	382	381	514	381	379	1	1	2
Passenger cars, new, including chassis	785	78	73	775	78	73	10		
Bicycles and parts	1,566	1,494	1,944	1,566	1,494	1,944			
Vehicles and parts, other	258	262	310	257	262	310	1		
Benzene	7,819	4,454	536		783	536	7,819	3,671	
Naphthalene	190	3,116	571	190	1,098	162		2,018	409
Pyridine	196	317	23				196	317	23
Coal-tar products, other	376	172	1,075	373	162	1,072	3	10	3
Chemicals, industrial	272	180	256	272	162	228		18	28
Fertilizers and fertilizer materials	815	690	622	334	288	350	481	402	272
Photographic goods	366	468	356	346	440	339	20	28	17
Dolls, toys, and athletic and sporting goods	357	392	520	356	392	519	1	(3)	1
Books, maps, and other printed matter	928	1,178	1,212	653	929	1,091	275	249	121
Artwork and antiques	273	239	424	263	178	232	10	61	192
Beads and fabrics and articles of beads	741	739	863	741	739	863			
Other imports for consumption[4]	2,119	2,543	3,436	1,761	2,028	2,746	358	515	690

[1] Includes Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

[2] Commodity data are reported on the basis of imports for consumption.

[3] Less than $500.

[4] Includes an estimate of low-value shipments of $250 or less each on informal entry shipments and under $100 each on formal entry shipments.

Mr. JAVITS. This limited economic demand for the standard types of Soviet goods in the U.S. market must be borne in mind as a factor that tends, in the long run, to keep the exchange of goods between these two countries within modest bounds.

In the last 10 years, the trade exchange, imports and exports—between the U.S.S.R. and the rest of the world, including other bloc countries, has grown from slightly more than $3 billion in 1952 to over $10 billion in 1962. Soviet trade with the free world accounts for only about one-third of this trade.

There is, of course, a qualitative factor which enters the equation. The Soviet bloc countries find it cheaper, in some instances, to add to capacity by importing modern plants and technology rather than building all the additional facilities foreseen in their long-range planning.

The fact that East-West trade is of marginal importance in aggregate terms either to the East or to the West does not change the fact that this marginal contribution is viewed as having a certain economic importance by both sides. Resort to imports involves a time-saving factor for the bloc which helps them meet production schedules and realize plan targets. Trade with the West is thus of sufficient importance to the Soviets that they would prefer to continue to rely upon this marginal adjustment mechanism of importing from the industrialized countries if it can conveniently be arranged. For the major trading countries of the West, the record is quite clear that they regard orders from the Soviet bloc as having commercial and political importance from their own standpoint, especially in industries subject to underemployment.

Apart from the economic, the political and psychological importance to the Soviet bloc of Western controls is subtantial. This sensitivity on the part of the Soviet bloc countries to what they regard as discriminatory treatment by the West suggests the usefulness of East-West trade relationships as a possible bargaining area under favorable circumstances.

V. WHAT CAN WE TRADE?

Past history dictates that we should explore this issue with a sense of perspective and realism. Just as an unusually inflexible export control policy is contrary to the U.S. interest at this time, so would be a policy of unlimited liberality or a radical shift away from present U.S. export controls. I am for seeing how to increase trade with the Soviet bloc, but only after we have satisfied ourselves in a tangible manner that the current "spirit of Moscow" represents a genuine Soviet offer to reduce world tension and if we can get the needed reciprocal agreements. Any other way we would be only giving away something of great value to the Communist bloc without gaining something of equal value to us.

Should our negotiations result in meaningful agreements we can explore the question of where increased trade is to come from. The following four areas, in my view, should be explored:

A. AREAS OF FORMER SOVIET PROCUREMENT

It seems fair to assume that Soviet purchasing agencies are still interested in some of the same categories of equipment they bought in large quantities in the United States during the early postwar years. These are, after all, the types of equipment which our producers continually improve on the demands of a highly exacting, industrial community. There is no reason why, under a more favorable climate of commercial relations, that the level of exports to Russia achieved in 1947, in certain types of production equipment, could not be approximated in the future.

If we compare the level of U.S. exports to Russia, in a few prominent commodity groups for the year 1947, with the dollar value of the same groups exported during the past 2 years, we find the following results—in thousands of dollars:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1947	1961	1962
Iron and steel products	15, 246	1	--------
Electrical machinery	19, 992	388	64
Power-generating equipment	5, 504	40	14
Construction, excavating, and mining equipment	27, 837	530	36
Metalworking machinery	23, 428	834	--------
Industrial machinery, unspecified	19, 866	538	819

B. COMMODITIES CITED BY SOVIET SPOKESMEN

There is also good reason to assume that some of the commodity categories frequently cited by Soviet officials, in statements on the U.S. market, reflect a genuine potential demand. In this connection, it may be useful to quote the relevant passages in the well-known letter on United States-Soviet trade written by N. S. Khrushchev to President Eisenhower on June 2, 1958:

> Orders could * * * be placed for refrigerating equipment, air conditioning installations, equipment for the cellulose, paper and woodworking industry, the textile, leather and footwear and food industries, television equipment, equipment for the production of packing materials, automatic packing, sorting, weighing and commercial machines, pumps, and compressors, machinery for the mining industry, machines for the manufacture of building materials and the mechanization of construction work, hoisting, transport, and other equipment.
>
> Besides, large orders could be placed for a number of industrial materials and manufactured goods, including nonferrous metals, piping for the gasification of cities, various kinds of chemical products, medical equipment, and medicines and certain other consumer goods.

Only this August, Premier Khrushchev indicated to Secretary Orville Freeman, in a Kremlin interview, that his specialists are strongly interested in securing whole fertilizer plants in the United States.

C. POSSIBLE SHIFT FROM PROCUREMENT IN WESTERN EUROPE

It is highly probable, too, that in a better commercial climate, in which U.S. export licensing policies would be more or less in line with those of Western Europe, the expected rise in imports from the United States would not have to take place at the expense of imports from Western Europe or Japan. The Russians could choose to purchase in the U.S. market some types of machinery and equipment they are now buying in Europe, but if the Soviet economy continues to expand, there is no reason why its aggregate demand for industrial goods from the West should not increase as well.

D. POSSIBLE CURTAILMENT OF MACHINERY IMPORTS FROM SATELLITES

At present, the Soviet Union imports an incredibly large volume of machinery from East Germany and Czechoslovakia. As a result, East Germany, with a population of 17 million, is now the fifth largest exporter of machinery, most of it—nearly $500 million in 1961—produced for export to the U.S.S.R.

It is quite clear, from a reading of the economic press of Eastern Europe, that first, this heavy rate of imports from the satellites is largely an outgrowth of the uncertainty, over the years, in the procurement of machinery from the West; and second, this massive scale of exporting equipment to Russia works a hardship on the satellites. There are numerous types of machinery and instruments which they have to produce in small batches, i.e., at high cost, but are paid only the usual "world price" established by the more efficient producers in the West.

In a more relaxed international atmosphere, with a better outlook for importing from the West, is is reasonable to expect that the Soviet Union would be interested in relaxing somewhat its pressure on the satellites for the widest possible range of production equipment. Moscow may wish to limit its demand for machinery from the satellites to categories of production in which they have a comparative advantage. At present, more than four-fifths of all equipment imported into the U.S.S.R. comes from the satellites.

There are doubtless several groups of products in the equipment field in which the U.S. industry would be able to provide a wide range of up-to-date models manufactured under more rigorous standards of production than are in effect within the Soviet bloc.

Among such likely exports would be: metal-forming and metal-cutting machinery, equipment for the chemical industry, electronic equipment, transportation vehicles, machinery for food, textile, and leather industries, cement-making equipment, machinery for the medical industry, and specialized equipment for automation. The idea that the satellites could be brought to greater independence by greater privation is contrary to post-World War II experience.

E. THE LIKELIHOOD OF EXPANDED IMPORTS

It is generally agreed among observers that only a modest increase in imports from Russia could be expected to occur under improved commercial conditions between the two countries. As things stand now, imports from the U.S.S.R. are subject to two explicit restrictions:

First. Soviet merchandise in the categories that are subject to import duty have to pay these levies at a higher rate, namely the original high rates of the Tariff Act of 1930. Manganese ore is a prominent casualty of this differential in tariff rates: Soviet ore pays at a rate four times as high as ores coming from countries enjoying M.F.N. status.

Second. Seven types of nonexotic furs are specifically barred from imports into the United States.

It is generally not expected that even the removal of these restrictions would accomplish a great deal in stimulating the inflow of a large volume of Soviet goods into this country. Perhaps the general level would, as a result, rise from the present figure of $16 million to something like $50 million a year; but hardly much more.

Such increase as does come about might be expected to occur in the following prominent import commodities: Furs, dressed and undressed—from $7 million to $15 million; manganese ore—from zero to $10 million; chrome ore—from $0.5 to $5 million; platinum-type metals—from $6 to $10 million.

Other imported materials—chiefly asbestos, naphthelene, flax, essential oils, cotton linters and waste, benzene, food, and tobacco—would probably add up to another $10 to $15 million.

Even if negotiations over increased United States-U.S.S.R. trade progress this far, there still remain such unanswered questions as to how such increased trade is to be financed. Some of this trade can be conducted on a cash basis or by transfer of gold. It is quite obvious that the volume of Soviet sales in this market, even under improved trading conditions, would not be high enough to support a large flow of exports to the U.S.S.R. There would be, therefore, a very real need for some form of private financing to help bring up the level of exports to help approximate the known Soviet demand for American goods; and here conditions and credit worthiness are most important.

VI. UNIFIED WESTERN POLICY NEEDED

Over the long term our best thoughts and energies must be directed to the prime task of reestablishing a multilateral approach toward trading with the Soviet bloc. The economic integration of the free world remains our primary task. The Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, which was made permanent in the 87th Congress, contains a provision proposed by me:

> The Congress further declares that it is the policy of the United States to formulate, reformulate, and apply such controls to the maximum extent possible in cooperation with all nations with which the United States has defense treaty commitments, and to formulate a unified commercial and trading policy to be observed by the non-Communist-dominated nations or areas in their dealings with the Communist-dominated nations.

Such a unified policy, it is well to remind ourselves, served the cause of Western unity most effectively during the critical years 1949–54. It helped to deflect Soviet pressure against the free world, and ultimately, compelled the Kremlin to revise its own commercial policy drastically after the death of Stalin. All that has happened in East-West relations since 1954 has demonstrated time and time again that there is no substitute for a common economic policy within the West.

The first step in formulating such a unified Western economic policy would be an agreement among OECD members on a code which would set forth standards to be sought by market economy countries in their trading relations with the state trading countries of the Soviet bloc. The achievement of agreement on such a code will not be easy.

Without a significant stake in East-West trade the United States cannot expect to have a determining voice in the manner in which trade is carried on by other Western trading countries.

Neverthless, the enormous political value of a common economic policy toward the Soviet bloc dictates that such an effort be undertaken immediately. The ingenuity and steadfastness of our statesmanship will be severely tested in the months and years ahead. Let us utilize the openings provided by the limited nuclear test ban treaty, if there be any, to the lasting benefit of the free world.

I am under no illusions as to how long a negotiation, of the character which I have described, would take or the complexities and difficulties involved. But I point out that these negotiations are no more complex and difficult than those which resulted in the test ban treaty, and that the mutual self-interest of the Soviet Union and the United States may very well be such, at this time, as to speed such negotiations and make them fruitful.

This is a step on the road to normalizing the relations between the Soviet bloc and the free world. It can give focus to the fact that the Soviet Union is traveling a different route from that of Communist China. If this can be done, without, at the same time, compromising our profound determination to win the struggle for freedom, then I see no reason why trade negotiations cannot offer a real chance for a further advance along the road to peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks several recent newspaper articles which form a part of my presentation on this subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1963]

WIDER U.S. TRADE WITH REDS URGED—BUSINESSMEN AT WHITE HOUSE PARLEY ASK REAPPRAISAL

WASHINGTON, September 18.—The White House conference of more than 200 businessmen, called to consider expansion of exports, spontaneously recommended today that the Government reexamine its policy on trade with the Soviet bloc.

The issue was not on the conference agenda, but at least four of the special committees into which the conference was divided took up the question and urged a new look at the trade policy.

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges told a news conference afterward that the Government would now have to decide whether to reappraise its policy. He indicated he favored such a reappraisal.

One of the committees of the conference pointed out that other Western nations were now selling $5 billion worth of goods a year to the Communist bloc but that the United States was getting less than $200 million of this business.

Present U.S. policy bans the export not only of strategic goods but also of any items that would contribute to the strength of the Soviet economy. Under both law and regulations, sales on credit are virtually ruled out. A large portion of the sales of European nations and Japan is made on credit.

Mr. Hodges indicated that a change in the law might be required before the United States could sell on credit to Communist nations. The United States has an elaborate system of granting credit on exports, but only to buyers in non-Communist countries.

Mr. Hodges said he "doubted" that Canada's mammoth sale of wheat to the Soviet Union this week had prompted today's recommendations.

"What these hardheaded businessmen are saying, they wouldn't have said 2 years ago," Mr. Hodges said.

One of the committees specifically cited "changed world conditions" as one of its reasons for advocating a reappraisal of Government policy.

In another spontaneous action, the conference unanimously adopted a resolution declaring "its conviction that continuation of a well-executed foreign aid program is indispensable under present world conditions to U.S. foreign policy goals and to our national security and, further, will contribute to American export expansion."

The recommendation on Soviet bloc trade was a surprise, but the 11 committees of the conference produced several other proposals aimed at increasing exports.

The most controversial was one for a special tax credit based on expert expansion. It called for a deduction from the tax bill of 10 to 15 percent of any increase in export sales achieved by a corporation above current levels.

The committee that recommended this change conceded that it might violate the nonsubsidy rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

But the group said that the tax credit should only stay in effect until the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments was eliminated, and that the credit could also be dropped if the nations of Europe assumed more of the Western World's defense and foreign aid burden.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 25, 1963]

TEST BAN AFTERMATH: WEST SEES MORE STEPS TO THAW COLD WAR, NO EASING OF MAJOR PERILS—CHANCES RISE FOR UNITED STATES-SOVIET TRADE, AIR LINK—UNITED NATIONS WILL WEIGH SPACE COOPERATION—FROZEN CUBA, BERLIN, LAOS

(By Philip Geyelin)

WASHINGTON.—Now that the U.S. Senate has ratified the limited nuclear test ban, American and Allied diplomats foresee a series of possible follow-ups intended to improve East-West relations. Included:

An international space "law" governing such matters as rescue and return of astronauts and cosmonauts and liability for damage from errant space shots.

A New York-Moscow commercial air link.

An East-West exchange of observer teams at seaports, railway hubs and other transportation centers, designed as a largely psychological safeguard against surprise attack.

Agreements to foster a rising tide of trade and traders, tourists and technicians, artists and athletes, both ways across the Iron Curtain.

Those are some of the brighter prospects shaping up, most Western diplomats agree, as this country's agreement to the test ban becomes official and the United States resumes contacts with Russia at various levels. The projected air link is due to come up in New York conversations early next week between Secretary of State Rusk and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko. The space law proposal, among others, will be debated in United Nations Councils.

But the East-West diplomatic docket in the months ahead has its darker side, and this may become apparent shortly when Messrs. Rusk and Gromyko and British Foreign Secretary Lord Home meet to take up the larger cold war issues. Prospects are rated next to nil for accords on such crucial, war-provoking disarmament moves. In short, the outlook is for a curious, even contradictory, East-West relationship, thawing out on the surface but frozen tight below, and presenting both promise and perils for U.S. diplomacy.

SOME SEE A RUSE

"A detente that doesn't reach to Berlin or Cuba doesn't go very far," warns one U.S. diplomat; he reckons that any real easing of the basic Western conflict with communism is probably decades away. Some administration authorities see the Soviet "peace campaign" as a ruse aimed at inducing the West to lower its guard. One skeptic, who believes Russia is using the treaty to turn the East-West balance of power in her favor, says: "They tried to do this on the cheap by slipping missiles into Cuba; now they're simply trying another tack in hopes we'll scale down our armaments."

A few experts even question whether the "spirit of the Treaty of Moscow" (nuclear test ban), as it's being ballyhooed by Russia, will prove much more durable than the short-lived "spirit of Geneva" that followed the 1955 Big Four summit.

But most specialists on Kremlin affairs insist there are powerful pressures propelling Soviet Premier Khrushchev and his cohorts toward further, if limited, accords with the West.

The key points they cite: Russia's fears about its eastern flank, bordering rebellious Red China, call for easing conflict with the West. Last year's nerve-testing Cuban missile clash with the United States has encouraged Mr. Khrushchev to look for ways to reduce the risk of accident or miscalculation erupting into nuclear war. Strains on the Soviet economy, aggravated by a near-calamitous crop failure argue for at least a slowdown in the arms race. A gradual "liberalization" within Russia probably makes it impossible for the Kremlin to renege significantly on economic promises or halt the trend toward greater contact with the outside world. A hankering for world prestige and respectability impels Russia's revolutionary leaders to display their culture and technology as well as boost their world trade.

OVERLAPPING INTERESTS

The result, Kennedy aids claim, is a significant widening of the area where the interests of East and West, for often conflicting reasons, tend to overlap. The Kennedy high command is quite as eager as the Kremlin may be to avoid another Cuba-style test of nerve. The United States would like to promote far wider East-West trade, though more for diplomatic than economic gain. (The Russians are offering little that Yankee importers want, and U.S. sales behind the Iron

Curtain, impeded by regulations banning strategic goods, are but a tiny fraction of total U.S. exports.) The main aim is to encourage wider commercial contact to open up the Soviet Communist world to Western influence. Russia's European satellites are rated especially susceptible to this sort of trade tug from the West.

[Commerce Secretary Hodges yesterday hinted strongly that he favors an expansion of U.S. trade with the Soviet bloc.]

Cultural exchanges have much the same motive, in U.S. eyes. "Everything we can do to encourage the natural evolution of Russia toward nationalism and liberalism and away from the old dogma of world conquest is to the good," declares one strategist.

Space cooperation could serve multiple purposes for both sides. President Kennedy's dramatic offer Friday of a joint United States-Soviet moon probe reflects, at least partly, a U.S. yearning to cut the costs of space competition with the Reds; recent soundings suggest the Russians are feeling the same pinch. The fact that the cold war hasn't yet spread significantly to outer space makes it a more promising area for East-West cooperation. And even modest space collaboration—wider exchange of technical data, or a divvying-up of specific space-probing missions—would promote the broader U.S. goal of easing tension and binding the two major cold war combatants more closely together.

What are the practical prospects for agreement? U.S. officials agree that only hard bargaining will tell. But it's at least possible to predict where the bargaining will likely center and what the stumbling blocks will be.

Air service between Moscow and New York is said to be well up on the list of current Russian commercial aims; Soviet diplomats have let it be known that Mr. Gromyko wants to renew discussions which broke down in 1961 when Berlin was aboil and again last year when the Cuban crisis flared. An agreement in general terms has even been initialed; it would give Aeroflot, the Soviet airline, and Pan American World Airways matching flight rights between New York and Moscow.

NO IMMEDIATE PROFITS

Pan Am officials contend the route would be no moneymaker now, though they cite a growing flood of U.S. tourists to Russia, now calculated at 14,000 a year, as evidence of future potential. Ideally, Pan Am would like to extend the run across Siberia to Japan to provide a more direct route to the Far East. But prospects for this are poor. Reason: The Russians already have hinted they'd like to extend their route to Cuba, among other points in this hemisphere; the United States, busily trying to complicate Soviet and other access to Communist Cuba, is adamantly opposed.

If the Russians put up no new obstacles, officials see a good chance that the New York-Moscow air link may soon be established.

United States-Soviet commercial connections might get a more massive boost if the Russians, as grain traders now are rumoring, decide to follow up their recordbreaking $500 million purchase of Canadian grain with a bid to buy American wheat. So far, the U.S. Government has not even received feelers on the subject, officials insist. But growing evidence of a critically bad Soviet wheat crop this year raises at least the possibility of a request to buy surplus U.S. grain, and Wheat Belt politicos are already pressuring the Government to give any such bid a sympathetic ear.

LEGAL OBSTACLES

There are a lot of legal hitches, however. Without actually enacting a specific ban, Congress has expressed coolness to Government-subsidized exports of wheat to Red countries; without these subsidies, the Soviets would have to pay the domestic U.S. price, which is roughly 30 percent above the world market level. There are legal restraints, too, on credit deals with the Russians of more than 180 days, as long as the U.S.S.R. remains in default on more than $2.5 billion in lend-lease and other U.S. loans dating back to World War II. Some legal experts believe that a law primarily aimed at curbing Government-subsidized exports to non-Red countries trading with the Reds may actually bar such exports to Russia, on the ground that Russia trades with other Communist countries.

Sizable expansion of United States-Soviet commerce in other items is also hemmed in by legal problems, even assuming U.S. businessmen develop an appetite for such trade. Patent and copyright agreements would have to be worked out; some relaxation of U.S. restraints on strategic goods might be needed, and many a lawmaker would protest. Thus most of the U.S. hope for closer East-West commercial connections rests with Western Europe.

Prospects for space collaboration run a wide gamut, from the notion of a joint Russian-United States moon flight, which is frankly seen by one close aid as only a gleam in the President's eye, to much more modest cooperation. In the U.N. committee on the peaceful use of outer space, the United States, Russia, and others have been studying a broad code of conduct for outer space. This might call for the surrender of any national sovereignty in space and for restrictions on the uses communications satellites are put to.

Until lately, the Russians had been blocking progress seeking to rule private enterprise out of all space communications activity, and insisting that no war propaganda be bounced off communication satellites. But lately, officials have detected some Soviet softening. Less difficulty is expected on provisions establishing liability if spacecraft or their fragments stray off course and damage property, and setting up procedures for recovery of space explorers of one nation who accidentally alight on the territory of another.

Arms control measures, it's agreed, present thornier problems. The Russians recently have expressed interest in exchange of static observation posts to keep an eye on troop or ship movements and warn of suspicious buildups. But traditionally Mr. Khrushchev has linked this provision with such measures as the denuclearization of Germany and abandonment of foreign bases and it's not clear whether this link, unacceptable to the West, still remains.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 26, 1963]

Some Companies See Gains If United States Eases Curbs on Soviet Trade—Machine Tool Builders Eager for New Market, Harvester Fears Ire of Shareholders

Expansion of trade between the United States and the Soviet bloc—now getting its most serious consideration in years—could bring important benefits to many U.S. companies and the economy.

But achievement of the expansion faces major obstacles, not the least of which is the belief by many Americans that increased trade would hurt the long-range economic and political interests of the United States.

These are findings of a Wall Street Journal survey of businessmen, Government officials and close observers of the Soviet economy. The possibility of liberalization of U.S. policies covering trade with the Red bloc were raised Tuesday. Commerce Secretary Hodges said such a move is receiving "very definite consideration" in the administration and that he favors "selling goods," which was regarded as a hint that he advocates increased trade with the Red bloc.

Adding further immediacy to the subject are talks in Ottawa between a group of U.S. businessmen and a Russian trade group which a few days ago ordered $500 million worth of wheat from Canada. The group's purpose is to discuss a major sale of U.S. wheat to the Soviet Union.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS

Potential benefits in the United States of a reduction in Soviet trade restrictions include these:

It would likely mean a major new market for producers of machine tools, chemicals and many other products.

It could help ease the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit, particularly if the Russians were forced to pay for U.S. goods in gold, as some economists expect.

It could perhaps help relax cold war tensions.

But among obstacles the move could face are certain opposition from some Members of Congress, likely protests from the Pentagon to the sale of any item that might have strategic value; difficulties confronting Russians in obtaining dollars to buy U.S. goods, and complaints from consumer groups and competing industries about reciprocal purchases of Red products for the U.S. market.

The principal lid on sales by U.S. companies to the Soviet bloc is the Government's power to ban shipment of items that might have military or strategic economic value to Russia. Firms wishing to ship goods to Russia must obtain a license from the Commerce Department. The flow of goods to Russia is largely contingent on how liberally Department officials interpret rules on the strategic value of goods. Since the 1961 Berlin crisis, companies usually have found licenses harder to obtain.

U.S. SALES DROP SHARPLY

In the first quarter this year, U.S. sales to the Soviet bloc plummeted to some $21 million, compared with $45 million a year earlier and over $60 million in the like period in 1961. U.S. imports from the Soviet bloc have hovered around $80 million annually since 1954.

Many U.S. companies have little doubt that they could increase their sales if Commerce Department rules were relaxed.

"It appears that trade with the Soviets could build up quite a volume of business for us," says the president of a New England machine tool firm. "We know that they are buying machine tools from Western European countries and we assume that they would buy from us too if we were allowed to sell to them." Machine tool men note that while U.S. machines are often more costly than the European products, they also often have modern features which are in demand.

In 1961, according to the National Association of Machine Tool Builders in Washington, sales of U.S. machine tools and parts to Russia totaled $810,000; in 1962 and 1963 they were practically nil, as a result of the 1961 clampdown. Many machine tool builders figure that the "strategic" classification on many of their tools is meaningless since similar equipment is available to the Russians elsewhere. Machine tool builders also are eager for a new market because of evidence that West European demand is slowing as producers there catch up with local needs.

General Tire & Rubber Co. in Akron, Ohio, predicts its sales would increase substantially if it were permitted to trade with Russia. "We've been looking forward to liberalization of trade policies with Iron Curtain countries," says an official. "Just 2 months ago Poland sent us an inquiry on possible tire shipments."

An official of another rubber company says liberalized Russian trade probably would boost his company's sales 2 percent to 3 percent, primarily in the synthetic rubber field.

The hopes of American companies are in general similar to those of the Russians themselves. Russian trade sources in London cite a wide range of products they would like to buy from the United States. These include farm machinery and fertilizer to raise badly lagging farm production; chemical plants and processes to boost the Russian chemical industry; equipment for the pharmaceutical industry; special steel sheets for construction work, and food processing equipment.

"We need all types of machinery," says a Russian trade official in London. "We have approached practically every chemical company of any importance in Western Europe seeking to purchase chemical processes and have sounded out American chemical companies, too."

Says a British oil company official: "In the last 10 months they have been trying to buy a fantastic number of processes from us and they won't take no for an answer. They would obviously take anything the Americans could give them in this field. It looks as though they have pilot plants running into trouble and are trying to take shortcuts by importing technology."

Rules on sales of strategic materials to Russia also have been agreed to by America's West European allies but there they usually are interpreted more liberally. From all indications, the volume of exports and imports between West Europe and the Soviet bloc, which amounted to $4.2 billion in 1961, has been climbing while U.S. trade with Russia has fallen. Shipments from West Europe to Russia consist heavily of capital goods. Whereas Soviet bloc trade represents only about four-tenths of 1 percent of U.S. exports and imports, it accounts for 4 percent or more of Western Europe's trade.

SOME URGE CAUTION

Even with eased trading rules and strong Russian demand, many U.S. companies would proceed cautiously, however.

Chicago's International Harvester Co. turned down an opportunity to bid on a Soviet order for about $2 million worth of farm equipment and small tractors, according to Brooks McCormack, executive vice president. Aside from potential U.S. restrictions on the deal, the company had other reasons, Mr. McCormack says.

"First of all, the shareholders of this company might legitimately ask how, living in this country, we can oppose Soviet ideology with one hand and sell them equipment with the other." He also fears the Soviets might copy Harvester machines.

Although a number of Congressmen appear to favor some relaxation of trade rules now that the atomic test ban treaty has thawed the cold war a bit, there are highly vocal opponents. Senators KEATING, Republican, of New York, and PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, have been critical of the Canadian wheat sale, partly because part of the wheat is earmarked for Cuba.

Perhaps an even bigger obstacle to any major increase in U.S. shipments would be the question of how the Russians are to pay for their purchases. "They don't have a whole lot we want," says one high U.S. policymaker. U.S. purchases from the Soviet bloc last year were highly diverse but none could be potentially big earners of dollars for the Soviets.

POPPY SEED, PALLADIUM

Among U.S. purchases from the Soviet bloc in 1962 were poppy seed, Christmas tree ornaments, and vodka. Palladium and chrome ores and furs were the main U.S. imports from Russia in the first quarter.

Soviet bloc products have been attacked both on ideological grounds and for shoddiness. However, Ealing Corp., a Boston import sales company, terms some Soviet optical equipment it bought for school use in 1959 the "best dollar value we have seen."

The problems the Soviets might have in earning dollars give rise to a possibility that might be advantageous to the U.S. trade balance. In recent years, Russia has used gold to finance some purchases in the West because of its shortage of hard currencies. If the Soviets tendered gold for U.S. merchandise this would constitute a direct payment, in effect, and the whole transaction would go on the plus side of the U.S. balance-of-payments ledger. There is little doubt that the possibility of favorable trade balance with Russia is an important consideration with the administration, which is searching avidly for ways to ease the unfavorable U.S. payments situation.

The possibility of U.S. products aiding the Soviet economy to the future detriment of U.S. trade is a real one, however. Some U.S. officials fear sales by Western nations of large-diameter pipeline to the Soviets speeded construction of a Russian pipeline to East European satellite nations which may increase the flow of Soviet oil into Western Europe.

"There's a very definite policy issue here," warns Dr. Holland Hunter, professor of economics at Haverford College and an expert on the Soviet economy. "Should we hand them the goods and save them time, or should we make them work for these products? It's not obvious to me that our security and objectives will be promoted by helping them."

In recent years, the main Russian export to non-Communist countries has been oil and oil products, which by 1962 had jumped to an estimated 560,000 barrels a day from 80,000 barrels a day in 1955.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 27, 1963]

Common Market Will Test Russia on Trade Policy

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, September 26.—The European Economic Community will extend a trade offer to the Soviet Union in the next 24 hours. If accepted, the offer could be a significant move toward improved East-West economic relations.

Dr. Walter Hallstein, President of the Common Market's Executive Commission, said tonight that the Dutch Ambassador in Moscow was expected to deliver the trade offer to the Kremlin "today or tomorrow."

The message, prepared by the Commission, offers a 25-percent reduction in Common Market tariffs on Russian exports of caviar, crabmeat, and vodka. The action was approved Tuesday by the cabinet ministers of the Common Market, which consists of West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

Dr. Hallstein said, "We think this offer will be taken as a symptom of our receptive attitude toward the Russians. We hope it will be received in the same spirit in which it is extended."

He declined to speculate on what the Soviet reaction would be. If the Kremlin accepts the offer, it will constitute de facto recognition of the Common Market's negotiating authority.

SOVIET TRADE BILATERAL

Until now the Soviet Union has refused to acknowledge the Treaty of Rome, the agreement the six member states signed in 1957 to establish the Economic Community. The Kremlin has continued to conduct its trade relations with the six member states on a bilateral basis.

The Dutch Ambassador was selected to deliver the tariff proposal because the Netherlands Foreign Minister, Joseph Luns, was currently the Chairman of the Common Market Council of Ministers, which is the Community's top decisionmaking body.

Other diplomatic sources in Brussels have expressed general agreement that acceptance of the offer could mean a new East-West economic rapprochement was in the making. European nations in the Soviet bloc, such as Poland and Hungary, would be expected to follow the Soviet lead in establishing broader trade relationships with Western Europe.

Embassy observers here believe that such economic ties could lead to a positive rapport that, in the long run, would carry more assurance of East-West amity than the nuclear test ban treaty.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Sept. 27, 1963]

New Sale by Soviet Trims Gold Prices

LONDON, September 26.—The price of gold fell smartly in London today following the Soviet Union's overnight sale of a fairly large amount in Europe.

This followed a substantial sale of Soviet gold in Europe about 3 weeks ago.

Further sales were expected to help pay for the large Soviet purchases of wheat in Canada and Australia and prospectively also in the United States.

As on the previous occasion, the bulk of yesterday's gold sale—believed to have been made in or through Paris—could be expected as usual to be passed on to London, the only market able to handle large quantities.

Yesterday's sale may have been slightly smaller than that on September 3 but only because the size of that sale is now thought to have been larger than was generally known at the time.

The two together may approach a value of $100 million.

As the Soviet wheat purchase in Canada alone amounts to $500 million, it is apparent that she may wish to sell more gold.

This situation has aborted the usual speculation in gold at this time of year in advance of the International Monetary Fund meeting, which starts in Washington next Monday.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am aware that other Senators are waiting to speak. I apologize for detaining them longer. The reason for my earlier interrogation and the interrogation I am now about to make is that the Senator's speech on the East-West trade situation is an outstanding one, exactly the kind of responsible speech that best serves the Senate and the country. Unfortunately, I am focusing on one issue, because it is current. I realize that in the whole context and sweep of the Senator's speech, this point on our possible sale of wheat to the U.S.S.R. is relatively minor. I should like to ask the Senator with reference to the following statement on page 6 of his text:

> This is quite apart from the fact that, as a practical matter, we have not really been blockading the Communist world, but only Cuba and Communist China, and I feel this should continue by all means.

If we sell a substantial part of our surplus wheat to the Soviet Union, and if, as the Senator has said, the Soviet Union does not need the wheat for itself or for future commitment, is it not possible that that would give the Soviet Union great bargaining power with Communist China, especially under present circumstances? Let me read two short paragraphs from Joe Alsop's recent column:

> In brief, doubts are beginning to be expressed about the future stability of the Communist regime in China * * *. Why are doubts expressed today when none were heard before?
>
> The answer is inherent in the cause of the improvement of Chinese living conditions. In brief, like Stalin before him, Mao Tse-tung tried to gain resources for building a great industrial power base by ruthlessly squeezing China's teeming millions of peasants. But unlike Stalin, Mao failed in this grim attempt.
>
> On the brink of catastrophe, Mao recoiled in fear. The squeeze on the peasantry was relaxed. The industrial expansion program was junked. Production from existing industrial plants was allowed to drop, or rather to plunge downward to a level of between 30 and 40 percent of capacity, where it remains today. And since the state was taking less of the produce of the land, the people got more.

In other words, the Chinese great step forward has collapsed. Why did it collapse? Because the agricultural failures of China have greatly impeded its economic power and military power. Because of agricultural crop failure Red China is far less of a military threat or a nuclear threat than she otherwise might be.

If we arrange to sell a huge amount of wheat—and it is not a little; $400 million worth may be involved—to Russia, Russia then may be in a position, in the first place, to prevent a collapse of the Red Chinese Communist regime through a revolution that could possibly result from hunger. In the second place, Russia may with this potent bargaining power of a billion dollars of wheat make the kind of deal with Red China which would end the split that now exists, and thus bring monolithic unity to the two great Communist countries in the world. That would be against the interests of the free world and, of course, our own interest.

We would be running a terrible risk to enter into such a deal, since we have the only large surplus of wheat in the world.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sure there are very great advantages to the United States, and I have tried to discuss them pro and con. I do not believe the Senator's arguments present a great enough disadvantage to outweigh them, for this reason:

First, the amount involved is not enough to make any appreciable dent in the situation of a country having the population and size of Communist China.

Second, if that is all there is to the Sino-Soviet rift, and if it can be cured by several hundred million dollars worth of wheat, even if it were all used for that purpose, I think the rift would have been over long before this. Each of those regimes is, in my opinion, deeply dug in upon this subject. In my judgment, it is not the kind of thing that can be healed—if it exists; and we all have suspicions of that—by what would be involved in this particular wheat trade. Based upon the amount involved and the situation into which it would fit, I do not believe the Soviets would use the wheat as that kind of counter. I would not for a moment say that it is not within the Communist lexicon to try any such deal; but I do not believe it would lend itself to use as this kind of a weapon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We do not know; the Senator is probably correct. He puts the question honestly and well when he says a risk is involved. The risk is what deeply concerns me.

We do not know—no one outside of Russia knows—the extent of the crop failure in Russia this year. We do know that Russia has bought $500 million worth of wheat from Canada and $100 million worth of wheat from Australia. Russia may now be about to buy as much as $400 million worth of wheat from this country. That would be $1 billion worth of wheat. In such a position, it is possible—unlikely but possible—that the Soviet Union may hold the kind of power over Red China that would give Russia the strength to achieve Communist unity, I merely say that this is an added risk, an added reason why we should consider the proposed wheat deal with the greatest care and insist on the most thorough, comprehensive intelligence before we proceed to take that kind of risk.

Again, I salute the Senator from New York on an excellent speech.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. We have fully explored the question involved. As in all such delicate matters, including the nuclear test ban, there must be a balancing of risks. Nonetheless, we may reach different conclusions sincerely. My judgment is that if we can arrive at an adequate deal based on adequate conditions, the benefits will outweigh the risks.

RESOLUTION FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE FOR CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which recognizes the necessity of convening an international conference to initiate an effective cooperative international program of wildlife conservation, possibly through the use of counterpart funds. It calls for the convening of such a conference under U.S. auspices.

I have been concerned with the problems of wildlife conservation for most of my life. As a boy roaming the woods, I felt a longing for the wild species that had once lived there, but were then gone. I have always supported measures for the conservation of American wildlife.

In 1961 while in Africa, I discussed this problem on an international scale with Americans stationed in Africa, and with Africans.

At the 51st meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Brazilia, Brazil, in 1962, I discussed the problem of vanishing wildlife species in Africa, with the representatives of several African nations, who expressed much concern, particularly the representatives from Ethiopia. I suggested this subject there as an appropriate one for future Interparliamentary Union discussion. The possibility of an international program of wildlife conservation has been discussed by me with people with a knowledge of Africa, and in the field of conservation. The problem is immense. Destruction of wildlife is reaching tremendous proportions, and the problem is getting more acute monthly. We are rapidly reaching the point of no return in the needless destruction of wildlife. Entire species are on the verge of extinction; often of great animals. Man has thus far exterminated 200 species of wildlife. Two hundred and fifty more species are threatened with extinction, and about 100 species are now in grave danger. Some species of wild animals are left with a surviving remnant of less than 100 animals; a larger number of species have less than 300 surviving members each, including some of the large Asian and African animals.

Last week, a joint Parks for America Conference was held here in Washington, with three national organizations participating; namely, the American Institute of Park Executives, the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, and the National Conference on State Parks, Inc. In their sessions, a seminar dealt with the great and growing threat of wildlife extinction.

So far as wildlife is concerned, its H-hour has come. Its "atomic explosion" is man's population explosion. It is here now, and it threatens to wipe other animals off the earth, unless they are protected.

If the wildlife of the world is to be preserved, the nations of the world must undertake a cooperative effort to save the world's wildlife, one of its most important and least protected natural resources. Wildlife is threatened with total destruction by the spread of civilization and by the unconscionable, totally unnecessary slaughter of animals by men in their uninhibited quest for unnecessary trophies, and the great profits that unchecked exploitation of wildlife brings those in the business.

Recognizing the plight of the world's wildlife and the urgency of the world's taking corrective steps to prevent the wholesale destruction of one of the world's natural resources, its animals, I introduce this resolution encouraging the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of State, to convene an international conference to initiate action to conserve the world's wildlife. An international program for wildlife conservation is urgently needed. Time is of the essence. An international conference must be convened to begin an effective program for animal conservation. Efforts along this line have been taken in the past, but far too little. We need the active, aggressive, overt support and encouragement by the Government of this effort.

The wildlife of the world has more than aesthetic value. It constitutes a major natural resource for the regions in which it flourishes. Unfortunately, this resource is rapidly being depleted and is seriously threatened in the immediate future. The problem of wldlife depletion and threatened extinction is mainly centered in Africa. This vast continent, once rich in wildlife, is desperately in need of an effective program of conservation to save one of its most important resources, its wildlife. The people of Africa were, not long ago, an integral part of the natural scene. Now, through the introduction of the mores and technology of alien cultures, man has become the dominant species in Africa and has upset the delicate balance of nature which existed previously. The African people have suddenly been overcome with Western culture on a continent which might better realize its own innate dignity by balancing its resources against its human needs in both the long and short runs. Africa is destroying its main natural resource, its wildlife, at the expense of its future.

Few are accustomed to thinking of wildlife as a natural resource. It clearly is. Game provides the main source of meat on a continent where protein scarcity is acute; it provides hides for leather goods and a wide variety of animal byproducts. The potential yield to the food supply of local meat producing game is tremendous when compared with the yield provided by cattle or goats. For example, a square mile of dry woodland in Rhodesia can carry 21,000 pounds of beef cattle. With a great deal of effort in a more productive, better watered area, the weight of beef supported might be raised to 42,000 pounds. But a single square mile in a Rhodesian national park, with no effort at all, can support 139,000 pounds of meat-producing game. However, it is not the number of pounds of meat a given area can produce that is important. Instead, it is how much meat produced annually that is important. Here again it is more advantageous to maintain wildlife than it is to raise cattle. A range cow takes 4 years on the African range to reach a marketable weight and condition. Meat-producing wild antelope reach full-size and marketable condition in a period which varies between 1 and 3 years. Buffalo and eland, which outweigh the African-bred cow, also grow faster and may be marketed sooner. Furthermore, the carcasses of game contain more usable meat than do most cattle. It is safe to generalize that on any African range area, not just marginal lands, some combination of wild game present will produce a larger yield of meat than domesticated cattle introduced by man. While domestic livestock will outproduce any wild animals if stall-fed and hand cared for, stall feeding and hand care are not and cannot be practiced in the wild range country of Africa. To use the wild range economically to produce a large yield of meat, an animal must be able to survive under natural conditions and feed on native vegetation. Various species of wildlife have become adapted to surviving in these areas without direct competition with one another. Each animal occupies his own special niche. The giraffe feeds on the treetops; eland browse high on shrubs and trees; wart hog dig for roots and herbs; impala browse on the lower level of shrubs. The zebra, wildebeest, sable antelope, waterbuck, and buffaloes are primary grazers, but each subsists on different kinds or different parts of grasses or herbs. Thus, in a given area of mixed vegetation, a combination of 16 or more species that normally exists there can make good use of food provided by trees, shrubs, and grasses. Domestic livestock can make use of only a small portion of the food provided by the range. It may be concluded, therefore, that on these African ranges the meat yield from domestic livestock and the total yield of commercially valuable products will be substantially lower than the yield produced by wildlife.

Besides producing more meat on less land than cattle, wildlife does not exert the same pressure on the land as cattle. A much larger number of game may be carried by a given area without damage to the land because game migrate and allow the land to refurbish itself. To replace wildlife with an equal weight of cattle would guarantee destruction of the veld. Game also can overgraze and damage its habitat. But this overgrazing occurs mainly under unnatural conditions that man creates by destroying predators and by not replacing their function with an equivalent amount of cropping. The problem of overgrazing by wildlife after predators have been destroyed is solved by controlled, scientific harvesting of game. This provides an adequate meat supply to meet local demands and also allows vegetation to revert to a more natural balance.

Besides providing meat in a protein starved area, wildlife attracts thousands of tourists to Africa. Revenues in East Africa from tourism in 1962 totaled $23,800,000. Without these tourist revenues, many African countries would have their budgets sorely limited. Wildlife income represents a vast income for the African economy.

Thus, from a purely economic approach the maintenance of wildlife as a natural resource is absolutely essential to the economic well-being of Africa. Wildlife must be thought of as a major natural resource and must be protected as such. Despite this, the trend in Africa continues to be toward game extermination for short term gains at the expense of the African economy in the long run. The problem of overcoming this wholesale slaughter of the mainstay of the African economy is tremendous. The common attitude is one of tempered pessimism. But those active in the field of conservation have adopted an attitude of tempered optimism. They believe that the scale can be tilted in favor of conservation if the available forces are fully utilized and properly brought to bear.

Optimists in the field of conservation are encouraged by two recent facts. The first is the recent increase of interest in nature and wildlife which is exerting enormous pressure to activate effective programs of wildlife conservation. The second is the rapid rise of the science of ecology which has raised conservation above being a subject of purely sentimental or academic interest to a science which can provide the proper approach to the practical problems of conservation.

Ecology is the science of the interrelations of all living beings; it is the study of the balance to be achieved in a system of interesting factors. The ecological problem in Africa is essentially one of balancing resources and human needs. This balance must be made for both long and short terms and must be based on resource use and resource conservation. The ultimate goal is optimum use of the land while conserving the habitat.

The ecological breakdown and need for strong conservation measures have come about within the last half century. The introduction of Western mores, which are juxtaposed to African cultures, produced an alarming acceleration in the process of ecological change. The disastrous effects of man's sudden dominance pointed out the necessity for controlling ecological change through programs of conservation to prevent further and more acute harm. The wildlife of Africa and the world is not doomed. Governments and the public must be taught to follow an ecological approach. In formulating policies, governments must make the same sort of study an ecologist makes of a biological community and should decide what interference with the ecological cycle should be made. Many realize this, but a lack of funds and a lack of international cooperation coupled with a lack of governmental support have, to a large degree, hampered large scale research and implementation of proper conservation measures.

One primary conservation measure which must be undertaken immediately is an effective program to curtail poaching. During the last decade the question of poaching has achieved more prominence than any other aspect of wildlife conservation. Poaching is undertaken consistently and on a vast scale wherever animals are found. Although trapping and snaring of animals has taken place since time immemorial, it is only in recent years that poaching has reached such menacing proportions.

The practice of poaching is totally unnecessary since properly run game management schemes could provide adequate quantities of meat of vastly higher quality and preparation. These game management schemes would also serve to control the ecological cycle by maintaining the balance of nature, as well as providing an ample amount of hides and ivory to satisfy the legitimate trade in these products. Africans would benefit for generations to come by the preservation of their greatest natural resource—next to the land itself—their wildlife. The world would benefit by aiming Africa toward a position of self-sufficiency and by preserving hundreds of threatened species of wildlife for future generations.

The world is becoming increasingly aware of the plight of the world's wildlife. Various international organizations have realized the immediacy of the problem and have undertaken programs of conservation which have been limited by a severe lack of funds. The international organization most immediately concerned with wildlife conservation is the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—IUCN. It was initially sponsored by UNESCO but is now independent of the United Nations and its agencies. Membership is comprised mainly of European and African nations. Thirty-three countries were represented when the organization was founded in Fontainebleau, France, in 1948. The United States does not belong to the IUCN since the Union is not strictly an intergovernmental organization. It is our policy not to join organizations of mixed governmental and nongovernmental natures. However, the United States does participate in an indirect fashion through our nongovernmental conservation agencies which are represented at the IUCN's periodic international conferences. At the seventh meeting of the union held in 1960 in Warsaw, the President noted that the Union's most important activity was promoting their program for wildlife conservation in Africa since time and circumstance made this the last opportunity for the Union to achieve successful results in saving African wildlife from extinction. Thus, the IUCN initiated the African special project with the purpose of the project being to inform and influence African public opinion through African leaders to the effect that the application of conservation practices based on ecological knowledge, is in the best interest of all African countries. The focus of the project is primarily based on preserving the wild habitat, including national parks, faunal reserves, and other areas of wild land which, under wildlife management, are capable of producing crops of animal protein and other animal products on sustained basis. The IUCN objectives are long range in that they are aimed at conserving wildlife, as well as short range in that they provide food to meet immediate protein shortages.

The eighth meeting of the IUCN General Assembly was held this September in Nairobi, Kenya. All available information respecting African wildlife problems specifically and world wildlife problems generally was to be discussed. However, the problem of implementing proposed programs is severe since the budget of the IUCN totals between $90,000 and $100,000 a year. Contributions from its membership serves as the Union's main source of financing. Often conservation programs of highest priority are left undone for lack of funds. The Union is making a gallant effort to conserve the world's wealth of wildlife. Its programs have been extremely successful considering the great financial handicap under which the Union operates.

A second organization, the World Wildlife Fund, was organized in 1961 with the purpose of undertaking a vigorous and decisive program to save the menaced wildlife of the world. The WWF estimates that at least $1,500,000 a year is needed to save the most seriously threatened animals. The Fund estimates that a realistic constructive program for conservation of wildlife on a worldwide scale requires at least $3 million a year. The Fund, which works on a sorely limited budget, has already undertaken more than 20 conservation projects ranging from saving the Hawaiian wild goose from extinction to purchasing land in Tanganyika to save the Ngurdoto Crater National Park. Other organizations such as the Conservation Foundation and the African Wildlife Foundation as well as various U.S. governmental agencies including the State Department's AID and Fulbright programs have begun programs of conservation. Again limited funds have limited the effectiveness of these programs.

These ambitious programs have been successful within the restrictions of their limited funds. However, the challenge has not been met. The wildlife of the world continues to be seriously threatened with systematic extermination. Many species have already been lost to the world forever. Untold numbers will be lost in the immediate future if no corrective action is taken to conserve them. A great natural resource of the world is being depleted. The depletion must be stopped. The United States should move promptly to convene an international conference to initiate action to conserve the world's wildlife, if this natural resource is to be saved for this and succeeding generations of men. Action must be taken today to feed a large part of the world tomorrow. The price is cheap when balanced against the consequences if action is not taken.

If adopted, this resolution will go a long way toward furthering cooperative action to conserve wildlife on an international basis. The resolution proposes the establishment of training schools for wildlife and conservation specialists in areas where wildlife populations are threatened as well as implementation of other programs recommended by the international conference. The resolution also proposes the exploration of the use of counterpart funds to implement international conservation programs. The resolution is somewhat similar to a proposal introduced in the House by the very able Representative Henry Reuss, whose leadership in this field I salute. I hope it may serve as a vehicle by which these ideas can be explored by the committees concerned. The situation involved is critical; early action is needed. A program must be undertaken. I strongly urge consideration of this resolution. It is an important step to saving the wildlife of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) was referred to the Committee on Commerce and, without objection, was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should take all necessary steps to convene an international conference within one year after the adoption of this concurrent resolution for the purpose of initiating cooperative action to further conservation of wild animals on a worldwide basis.

Sec. 2. The conference should consider the following cooperative actions:

(1) Establishment of training schools for wildlife and conservation specialists, and conservation departments in the countries where wildlife populations are threatened; and

(2) Joint action controlling imports of commodities the chief value of which is derived from wild animals threatened with extinction; and

(3) Any other action to promote wild animal conservation.

Sec. 3. The United States shall present to the conference specific proposals for cooperative wildlife conservation programs through the use of local counterpart currencies accruing to the United States through the sales of surplus agricultural commodities under the provisions of Public Law 480 of the Eighty-third Congress.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Threat of Extinction Hangs Over Wildlife in Many Lands Because of Changes in Their Surroundings," published in the New York Times on November 8, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Threat of Extinction Hangs Over Wildlife in Many Lands Because of Changes in Their Surroundings—New Fund Seeks To Save Near-Extinct Species

London, October 20.—What does the giant tortoise of the Galapagos Islands have in common with the Ceylon elephant or the African mountain lion?

Not much in appearance or habitat, conservationists agree. But all are near extinction, along with at least a dozen other animals and birds and several species of plant life.

Conservationists of 17 nations, as a result, have launched the first full-scale international appeal for funds to save the planet's threatened wildlife. The World Wildlife Fund hopes to raise $1,500,000 a year.

Officials of the fund say this amount could save most of the seriously threatened species and the plants on which they feed. Twice that sum could start planned conservation of wildlife on a world scale.

The money would be used to meet such threats to wildlife as drought, assist in financing long-term conservation projects and help recognized conservation bodies win support in the study of ecology, the relationship between animals—including man—and their environments.

Officials of the fund, who include some of the world's leading conservationists, have selected the giant panda as the symbol for the appeal. They point out that the panda owes its survival to a conservation campaign.

Other animals, however, remain in danger of extinction, often because their breeding grounds are threatened. Pollution of the sea, drought, poaching, poison, and inundation from dams are common causes, the experts say.

In Asia, the two-humped camel, a familiar sight at American fairs, is disappearing. The

Arabian oryx, the Javan rhinoceros, the Kashmir stag and the markhor, a wild goat, are also near extinction.

The pigmy hippopotamus and the cheetah are dying out in Africa, while in the Pacific, Steller's albatross and the land iguana of the Galapagos Islands are in danger.

In the United States, the California condor and the Bermuda petrel are fast disappearing, as well as the better known whooping crane. At last count, there were fewer than three dozen whooping cranes surviving.

Conservationists say that since the time of Jesus, about 100 species of mammals and an equal number of birds have become extinct. Almost 70 percent of these losses occurred during the last century, and 38 percent within the last 50 years.

In 1924, for example, more than 2 million koala skins were exported from Australia and in 1 year 600,000 koalas were shot for sport. A few remaining specimens live in a park near Sydney.

The passenger pigeon, once the most common bird in North America, was counted in the thousands of millions. In 1907 the last free passenger pigeon was shot and in 1914 the last survivor died in a cage in the Cincinnati Zoo.

The Wildlife Fund has drawn up a charter and is planning to request endorsement by the United Nations. The charter calls for the protection of wildlife and asks those "whose work has an impact on nature to recognize their responsibility to wildlife."

The appeal was launched here a few weeks ago and a similar move is expected to be made in the United States. Officials say that contributions can be sent to Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Trust, Washington.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Fifty-five Species of Mammals Facing Extinction by Man's Inhumanity," by Howard Simons, published in the Washington Post in August 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fifty-five Species of Mammals Facing Extinction by Man's Inhumanity

(By Howard Simons)

Man's destruction of the nonhuman inhabitants of the earth threatens to extinguish 55 species of mammals, 48 species of birds, and 6 species of reptiles throughout the world.

Moreover, 100 species of fresh water fish in North America alone are also being threatened with extinction.

These were the estimates of wildlife experts attending the International Congress of Zoology meeting here. The protection of these vanishing species was the subject of a news conference and a symposium yesterday.

MAN CHIEFLY TO BLAME

The consensus of eight experts was that in 99.9 percent of the cases where species are disappearing, man is the direct or indirect cause.

Thus, for example, the Mexican grizzly bear was thought to be extinct until 5 years ago when 30 to 40 bears were found "hiding from man" in a remote area of Mexico. Just recently, however, at least three of these animals succumbed to poison spread by a nearby rancher to kill off other predators.

What particularly concerns the wildlife conservationists is the fact that the rate of wildlife extinction is accelerating rapidly. One reason is that man's population explosion, particularly on islands, is literally pushing wild forms of life to extinction. Another reason is the legacy of wars, which is the jeep and the gun, that now make it easier for man to hunt down and destroy wildlife.

But man can save the vanishing breeds, too, the experts emphasized. This, apparently, has been the case in North America where the number of threatened animal species has decreased from 28 in 1942 to 7 today.

The reason suggested for this drastic decrease has been good management of the survivors of threatened species, as well as adequate protection. The seven species still in danger are: the Mexican grizzly; the black-footed ferret; the wood bison; the Key deer; the Pacific white-tail-deer; the red wolf, and the Mexican tapir.

EFFORTS SPURRED

It was apparent from the discussion by the wildlife conservationists yesterday that every attempt will be made to save these and all the world's endangered species.

One such attempt—to save three species of Asian rhinoceros—will require the manufacture of plastic "rhino" horns that can be smuggled into China. Rhino horns, it seems, are greatly treasured by the Chinese as an aphrodisiac. A single horn sells for $2,000.

Though scientific study disclaims such power for the rhino horn, the demand has not diminished. Indeed, three stuffed rhinos in an Indonesian museum lost their natural horns to thieves. Since then thieves have also taken nine plaster horns made up to replace the missing originals.

Why do wildlife biologists want to save animals such as lions and wolves? Canadian scientist Ian McTaggert Cowan gave an answer and it amounted to this:

Men do not own the world. Moreover, they have a responsibility to turn the world over to their children as they found it and preferably in better condition.

Here is a challenge to help some creature fight its last battle to survive. Men must help so they and theirs can marvel at, gain knowledge of and enjoy these creatures.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "To Save Wildlife and Aid Us, Too," by Stewart L. Udall, published in the New York Times magazine on September 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To Save Wildlife and Aid Us, Too—Secretary Udall Describes Man's Stake in the World of Nature

(By Stewart L. Udall)

"The squirrel has leaped to another tree, the hawk has circled farther off, and has now settled upon a new eyrie, but the woodman is preparing to lay his ax to the root of that, also."—Thoreau's Journal (1851).

Twice each year, at migration time, lovers of wildlife await the census count of North America's small band of whooping cranes, which fly between their summer nesting grounds in Northwest Canada and their winter refuge on the gulf coast of Texas.

The whoopers have been poised on the edge of extinction for more than 30 years now. In 1938, at the low point, there were only 14. For a time the flock slowly increased, but after a survey last summer the Canadian wildlife experts reported with alarm that the nesting season was a failure and our whooping crane population had dropped in 1 year from 38 to 28.

The fight for existence of these rare birds symbolizes the plight of vanishing types of birds and animals everywhere. The degree of concern evoked in our minds by the threat to a species is one of the quiet tests of modern civilization. In the end, whether we provide conditions which will allow wildlife to coexist with us on this planet will be as significant a commentary on our progress as any of the feats of rockets and computers. Later this month President Kennedy will visit national parks and seashore and wilderness areas in 10 States across the country, drawing attention to the efforts of the Government to conserve and protect the Nation's natural heritage.

It is estimated by the experts that more than 200 species of birds and mammals have already disappeared from the face of the earth and that nearly 250 species in various parts of the world are now on the danger list. The California condor, the polar bear, the woodland caribou, the manatee, the everglade kite, the Key deer, the sandhill crane are only a few of the imperiled species in our hemisphere.

Manmade threats to a species come from three sources. In too many parts of the world the destroyers are selfish or wanton individuals who ignore the elementary principles of conservation. A news story last year indicated that hunters were using automobiles to corner and kill the few remaining Arabian oryx; in East Africa native poachers are making deep inroads into the finest big-game herds in the world.

"Progress" is the second and more subtle threat. Encroaching civilization daily destroys habitats that are essential for the survival of some species. Wildlife can thrive only when conditions favor reproduction; some creatures face eventual extinction the moment natural conditions are seriously unbalanced by man. Some animals and birds need space; others require solitude or special nesting conditions. But space and solitude are commodities increasingly in short supply in the 20th century. Populations are exploding, and in our haste to exploit resources we have often ignored side effects that are detrimental to the welfare of wildlife.

A final, and new, risk relates to those conquests and miscalculations of man which threaten the life process itself. Pollution of air and water is slowly reducing life expectancies of many forms of wildlife. This insidious process occurs quietly. The permanent loss of a stream or estuary by pollution is too often unnoticed until the damage is irreversible. In her provocative book, "Silent Spring," Rachel Carson called our time "an age of poisons" and urged a thorough evaluation of the use of commercial chemicals and pesticides. The entry of numerous poisons into the chain of life may be a fateful event for wildlife species—and perhaps for some members of the human species as well. Even the controlled killing of plants, insects, and animals often has an unintended impact on nature's delicate balances.

The people of this country have passed through three stages in their treatment of wildlife. The first was the period of waste and slaughter that came to a culmination in the last half of the 19th century. The fate of the passenger pigeon and the buffalo symbolizes that age. Delectable and easy to kill, passenger pigeons were butchered by the millions. By 1915 a bird which once constituted nearly a third of the entire bird population of the United States had been relentlessly pursued to extinction. The vast buffalo herds that once roamed the Great Plains were the wildlife wonder of our continent; their near destruction also marks this savage and shortsighted hour in our history.

The crusade for wildlife protection in the 1880's began a protest against the slaughter and was spearheaded by such organizations as the Audubon Society and the Boone and

Crockett Club, which was founded by Theodore Roosevelt and a group of his friends.

In the last four decades we have developed game management into a science. Hunters "crop" only the annual increase, and public opinion and public budgets support numerous wildlife protection programs. The main threat today arises from the side effects of advancing civilization. The draining of each swamp, the building of each new road, the indiscriminate broadcast of pesticides, the widening circle of pollution, and the destruction of open space on the edges of our cities are now the clear and present danger to wildlife.

The Federal Government has many preservation programs underway, ranging from pesticide research to the purchase of wetlands to save habitat for the ducks and geese that travel the continental flyways. One exciting restoration project concerns the Aleutian Canada goose, a bird which was thought to be extinct. This small goose formerly nested throughout the Aleutians, but hunters made a fatal change in the bird's environment by introducing predatory foxes throughout the islands in an effort to increase the supply of fox pelts. Only 56 Aleutian geese were counted last year.

Last summer a few goslings were captured on Buldir Island and taken to the Monte Vista Wildlife Refuge in Colorado. While this temporarily transplanted flock increases its numbers, foxes will be removed from some of the islands so as to restore the habitat to its previous state. Later a covey of the captive geese will be taken back from Colorado to their ancestral islands and released, and the cycle of restoration will be completed. Through this process it is hoped that another species of wildlife will be rescued from extinction.

A similar project last year involved the nene (nay-nay) goose, Hawaii's State bird. This white-necked goose has largely forsaken swimming and flying for a life on the most improbable habitat imaginable—the barren lava beds of Hawaiian volcanoes. The nene's troubles began when it became prey to the dogs, cats, pigs, goats, rats, and mongooses that had been brought to Hawaii by American settlers. By 1955, there were only 22 wild nene alive. By good fortune, however, some of these geese had been transplanted to the British Isles; a grant from the World Wildlife Fund, a worldwide voluntary organization devoted to saving threatened species, made it possible to ship 30 of these fine birds by air from England back to Maui last July.

Another example of bird restoration is that of the masked bobwhite quail, a bird which disappeared from its Arizona habitat a half century ago. Recently, some specimens were found in northern Mexico. A 640-acre tract was set aside in Arizona near Tucson by the Interior Department's bird experts and three pairs of the Mexican bobwhite quail were "planted" in the area where once their species flourished. If this rare quail reestablishes itself, it will be another last-minute victory for wildlife conservationists.

There is hope that Congress will establish the Land and Water Conservation Fund bill recommended this year by President Kennedy. This historic conservation legislation will provide funds desperately needed for Federal and State Governments to save choice lands for recreation and wildlife protection. It will take an all-out effort at both the State and Federal level, and by voluntary organizations also, to secure such lands for posterity.

However, there are signs of a new awakening on the conservation front. In the last 3 years a few States have established farsighted buy-now, pay-later conservation programs. New Jersey's "Green Acres" plan, New York's $100 million acquisition program and Wisconsin's effort to save its out of doors, show what can be done at the State level if there is the right kind of leadership.

Even more encouraging are the efforts of local organizations to save marshes, seashores, or forest refuges. Five years ago a group organized as "The Philadelphia Conservationists" purchased a 200-acre marsh and presented it to their city as a permanent wildlife sanctuary. In recent months an emergency committee of New Jersey citizens fought off the proposed intrusion of a jet airport by raising several hundred thousand dollars to save New Jersey's Great Swamp. This land, a natural museum piece, was later donated to the people of the United States, and stands as one of the rare instances on the eastern seaboard where wildlife won out over asphalt and concrete. Likewise, conservation commissions established in many Massachusetts communities are providing excellent examples of local initiative that is getting results.

Private philanthropy can also play a pivotal role. In May leaders of Boston's business community, joining together to encourage gifts of land and bequests of money for conservation projects, established a Fund for the Preservation of Wildlife and Natural Areas. Henry Thoreau once advised his New England neighbors that "a town is saved not more by the righteous men in it than by the woods and swamps that surround it." It is heartening that people of his neighborhood are, a century later, taking his advice at face value.

It is inevitable, of course, that the worldly and cynical will propound their usual somewhat questions. "What does wildlife contribute to our abundance, or add to the sum of human happiness?" they will ask in weary tones.

Such queries reveal minds that lack all reverence for the marvels of the natural world. These same individuals, who prate of the wonders of modern life and the new conquests of science, have, in incipient form, the attitudes that lead to what the ancient Greeks called hubris—the deadly arrogance of men who had lost their roots.

The truth is that there is a force at work in the world larger than ourselves, and the natural world is its outer garment. The creatures of nature have a claim to life as valid as our own. We need to accord them respect as much for our own mental and spiritual preservation as for theirs.

MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON'S REPORT ON HER SCANDINAVIAN TRIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, one of the Nation's outstanding ladies, one who has made a host of friends not only at home but in many other countries, Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, was the honor guest the other evening of the American Newspaper Women's Club. The wife of the Vice President in turn honored the members of the club by giving the newswomen and their guests an excellent report on her recent Scandinavian trip. I commend Lady Bird Johnson's report to the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON BEFORE NEWSPAPER WOMEN'S CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 26, 1963

Today I feel as though I have just gotten up from one vast Scandinavian smorgasbord of land, water, and peoples. The centerpiece was the Baltic Sea and both sea and land, wedded together, produce tables heavy with fish, dairy products, and pastries.

The sights are as varied as the foods. They offer snowcapped, jagged mountains that rise high to the sky; fjords cut by glaciers that sink deep like icy fingers of the sea reaching inward to the land; the plains of Denmark—rich with dahlias and pigs—"The best in the world" they tell you. And, in Iceland—hothouse farming by boiling water from the geysers.

Although we landed more than a week ago, mind, like body, remains overstuffed with sights and facts.

I saw a great many of your counterparts wherever I went. I am convinced the sun never sets on Coca-Cola or the press.

The newspaperwomen abroad were just as sharp, just as hep—(only blonder)—and full of questions on everything from dress designers to nuclear test bans. I remember Rose McKee once said two things are basic for being a good reporter: a big breakfast and a pair of comfortable shoes. Her advice paid off for all of us—because there were days when I felt we had walked through Scandinavia. I had wanted to see the farmlands in each country for several reasons.

For one thing, I wanted to get out of the cities and see the story of the country which is often mirrored most clearly in farm people.

So we saw big farms and little farms; the cleanest pigs and pigpens I've ever seen; cattle scrubbed down daily; neat and tidy farmhouses; and we tromped through the forests of Sweden and Finland, picking ligon berries.

What interested me over and over was the strength and resiliency of man's spirit when faced with disaster.

Two examples are vivid. High behind the Arctic Circle was Bodo, Norway, a new, completely rebuilt city only 19 years old. The Germans flattened the town completely when they moved out in 1944. Now every house is new. Somehow, perhaps it's in defiance of bitter cold and long winter nights, the houses are brightly colored: red, yellow, orange, and blue. With balconies and yards ablaze with flowers. People pointed out to me over and over several blocks of houses that were the gift of Sweden.

Another example was in southern Finland. In the final days of the winter war, 450,000 Finns, living on the Karelian Isthmus, had to decide whether to live under communism in their homeland which had been confiscated by Russia, or move. They decided to move. With only 6 days, they carried what they could with them and set out for a new life. Their countrymen who shared jobs and farmlands deserve part of the credit, as well as the Finnish Government that could work it out to everyone's satisfaction.

They must have known what they wanted—which was to stay together.

What do I think the trip accomplished?

1. It was the first time in 180 years of national history that a Vice President or President ever officially visited all or any of the five countries in northern Europe while he was in office, although all Scandinavia has sent their prime ministers, kings, or presidents to our country since 1960.

2. The people of these nations showed much greater friendship to the United States than we ever anticipated. Within 100 miles of the Soviet border, the crowds along the street stood day and night 10 deep to cheer our American flag.

3. They listened carefully and applauded when LYNDON, in country after country, spelled out our foreign policy in simple direct language; that there is not one piece of territory in the world which the United States covets; that our foreign policy is based on the

dignity of the individual, self-determination, freedom to be free.

We have allies but no colonies; friends but no satellites.

We reserve these rights for ourselves and we will shield our friends who join with us in the collective defense.

That we can be strong without being provocative. That we can be hopeful while being cautious.

That trade must replace aid.

4. That space and its peaceful development offer great potentials in which nations can work together, as Norway and Denmark agreed to do during our trip—to join with Sweden and America in a communications satellite program.

I do not think these points fell on deaf ears. Everywhere, I found the Scandinavians, like the United States, greatly heartened by the nuclear test ban.

The point LYNDON drove hard over and over, to these leaders who are running the top of the world, was that the test ban came about only because we had a NATO and a strong defense.

These are some of the things we tried to accomplish as we traveled along this northern anchor of the NATO shield.

None of these nations is large—the 5 only total 20 million—but they are unafraid.

Their position was summed up symbolically on the last evening of our trip. The wise old President of Iceland said, "A small bird chooses to nest by the eagle."

That seemed to summarize the friendly feelings we found as our flag was shown at the top of the world. And we sleep better tonight because of it.

PRESTON COUNTY, W. VA., HAS BUCKWHEAT FESTIVAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last week the 22d annual buckwheat festival was held in Preston County, W. Va. This celebration centers around Kingwood, the Preston County seat, and a town of great historical interest, dating back to 1811.

Kingwood is prominent in the minds of West Virginians this centennial year because it was the site of the first "caucus or meet of men west of the mountains to talk about leaving the Commonwealth of Virginia." This was the first of a series of meetings which eventually led to the formation of the new State of West Virginia 100 years ago.

Preston County has since developed into a fruitful farming region, known far and wide for the excellence of its buckwheat grain, as well as for its fine pork sausage and maple sirup. During the weeklong festival, an estimated 50,000 king-size buckwheat cakes are consumed, along with some 14,000 pounds of whole-hog sausage and 400 gallons of maple sirup. Visitors are also treated to a display of prize horses, cattle, grain, antique cars, and many other attractions. I heartily recommend that my colleagues visit the Preston Buckwheat Festival next year where they and their families can partake of buckwheat cakes, sausage, and maple sirup to their fill.

SALE AND DISTRIBUTION OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the problems connected with the sale and distribution of lewd literature and other forms of pornography are becoming more intricate. Parents are horrified at the literature that is publicly displayed—literature which is considered by our courts to be of enough literary merit to meet the criteria of acceptability. These parents, and many others, are demanding that something be done. They want laws passed or existing laws enforced, so the public can have some protection from the purveyors of filth.

But, what is pornographic? And what is artistic? And what is on the borderline? And where do we stop curbing pornography and begin censorship?

In a carefuly worded editorial, the editors of Life magazine, point out that we are liable to go to either extreme unless some sensible action is taken to draw up guidelines.

In the two previous Congresses, I have introduced legislation which would set up a commission to study the problems in connection with the distribution of noxious materials. I have also reintroduced this bill, S. 180, in this Congress. Such a commission as I have proposed would try to write definitions which would be legally acceptable, and it would also recommend action by Federal, State, and municipal governments for taking legal steps, of a uniform nature, to halt the flow of lewd and salacius literature. In addition, it would attempt to work out a public information and education program which would enlist the aid of private citizens in halting the sale of such materials.

Twice, the Senate Government Operations Committee has reported, and the Senate has passed, this bill. The other body has never acted. It is my hope that in this Congress the House of Representatives will be able to study this legislation, which has been introduced by a number of House Members.

Because it explains, rather well, the problems which the Government and the public face in fighting pornography, I would like to include the editorial from the September 27 issue of Life magazine, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS ANY BOOK LEGALLY OBSCENE ANY MORE?

A first-class book critic, Stanley Edgar Hyman, recently gave his readers in the New Leader a systematic "defense of pornography." Reviewing a couple of books which he found obscene, worthless, and "suppressible under the law," he added that "the law is wrong. Neither book should be banned. In fact, no publication should be banned." He went on to defend pornography for the reason usually held against it; namely, that it induces lascivious thoughts and (possibly) behavior. Even books without literary merit are either "harmless or beneficial" to a society which, said Hyman, suffers from too much guilt about sex.

That's the unorthodox view of a literary man. But a few days later a New York Supreme Court justice, J. Edwin Shapiro, said almost the same thing in an official decision. He had before him a batch of books which he called "profane, offensive, disgusting, and plain unvarnished trash," but refused to call legally obscene. The judge's reasoning should be of interest to parents as well as lawyers and publishers.

In the Roth and Alberts cases (1957) the U.S. Supreme Court gave its first official definition of obscenity. It extended the protection of the first amendment to "all ideas having even the slightest redeeming social importance," the lack of which is one test of obscenity. The other is whether "to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interest." On this test the Court declared the material then before it obscene, although Black and Douglas dissented on the ground that "the test that suppresses a cheap tract today can suppress a literary gem tomorrow." The Shapiro decision turns their apprehension upside down.

Reluctantly, Shapiro felt obliged to read some 25 pieces of lewd trash ("Sex Kitten," "Hill-billy Nympho," etc.) and be their critic "because the law in its present state requires just that." The books all had the same plot (which Shapiro described as "from puberty to prostitution") and no pretense of literary merit. In that respect they differed from Henry Miller's "Tropic of Cancer," which has litigated its way to freedom in several States because critics have persuaded the judges of Miller's "serious purpose." Indeed, the trend of obscenity decisions is such that no work of recognizable literary merit, whatever its lingo or subject, is in much danger of suppression if its publisher is willing to fight for it in court. Now, if the Shapiro view holds, works of no merit are equally safe.

Is obscenity, then, an obsolete concept? Not quite. Even Shapiro made a point of the absence of four-letter words in his bundle of trash (another difference from Miller) and said the books were not "hard-core pornography." But he rejected the "literary merit" argument on the democratic ground that the mean and uneducated who "cannot cope with anything better" than trash are entitled to their "escape from reality." He met the "contemporary community standards" test by deciding that these are pretty low. His decision, obviously, is not going to make them any higher.

The history of literary censorship is not a pretty one. Shelley, Walt Whitman, Shaw, Dreiser, D. H. Lawrence, and Joyce, are just a few of the great writers who have been pronounced unprintable by one official bluenose or another. But Anthony Comstock has been dead since 1915, and the United States, thanks largely to the Supreme Court, is now almost censor free by civilized standards. This widening of freedom has been good for art, letters, and our cultural level.

An ideal society would let anything be printed. But so long as professional pornographers exist, no State is likely to repeal its obscenity statutes. And there is danger that if our courts become too permissive, a public reaction will bring Comstock roaring back from his grave.

Definitions of obscenity—even of "hard-core pornography"—are inherently imprecise and changeable. But besides the lack of "redeeming social importance" there is another test which Warren relied on in the Roth case. It is the motive of the purveyor—what Frankfurter once called "dirt for dirt's sake, or more exactly for money's sake." Although reputable publishers and authors are doubtless guilty of this motive in isolated passages, a discriminating judge should be able to recognize pure dirt from its total lack of other values or motives, and acknowledge that the public has a right to keep it off the street. The Shapiro doctrine is too permissive and should not survive.

EAST-WEST RELATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by a convention of the American Bulgarian League, at Pittsburgh, Pa., August 31–September 2, 1963, relating to East-West relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BULGARIAN LEAGUE FOR THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA RESOLUTION ON EAST-WEST RELATIONS ADOPTED BY THE LEAGUE'S 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, HELD IN PITTSBURGH, PA., ON AUGUST 31–SEPTEMBER 2, 1963

Whereas we, Americans and Canadians of Bulgarian descent organized in the American Bulgarian League for Canada and the United States, look back to events and developments of the past year throughout the world and, particularly, in the area of East-West relations; and

Whereas we note with satisfaction the conclusion by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union of a limited nuclear test ban agreement and a general lessening of tensions among the same powers; and

Whereas we watch with interest the growing tendency among these and other powers to further explore the possibilities for lessening of international tensions by considering proposals for reducing the danger of surprise attacks; for expanding trade, cultural exchanges and individual contacts between the West, on one hand, and the Soviet Union and the so-called People's Democracies, on the other, and even for the conclusion of a nonaggression pact between them; and

Whereas at the same time we see no appreciable change in either the ultimate goal of communism to rule the world—a goal that is irreconcilable with the basic aims of the United States, Canada and their democratic partners—or in the reluctance of the Soviet Union to loosen its grip on the "satellite" countries of Eastern Europe, including Bulgaria, which remain to this day in virtual political, economic and spiritual bondage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

(1) That we continue, individually and through our organization, to keep pointing out that the world is still confronted with a most imperialist and oppressive force—Soviet communism—and that this force is not only continuing to hold 100 million East Europeans in bondage, but, while playing the tune of "peaceful co-existence," already stretches its tentacles—through Cuba—even into the Western Hemisphere;

(2) That while we recognize the desirability of all efforts for the peaceful solution of existing international problems, we find it necessary to observe that, in the light of past experience, there can be no guaranty for freedom and security from the Communist conspiracy except through firm determination, backed by adequate strength;

(3) That we restate our concern over the fact that, while the great movement for the emancipation of former colonial peoples is sweeping the underdeveloped continents with the active help of the United Nations and the free world generally, the plight of the once-free nations of Eastern Europe tends to be overlooked;

(4) That we, therefore, strongly urge our American and Canadian Governments—still the main hope of the Bulgarian and other enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain—never to agree to any step that would tend to freeze the present division of Europe, or could be interpreted as endorsing the Soviet-Communist regimes and domination in the Eastern part of that continent; for hardly anything could better assure the perpetuation of that domination than for the Western powers, particularly the United States, to recognize the status quo in Eastern Europe as permanent and the fate of the people therein as irrevocable;

(5) That, finally—being convinced in the determination of these same governments not to rest until all of Eastern Europe, including Bulgaria, is free again—we also urge them to reopen the question of wartime and postwar agreements with the Allies, and to insist that the Soviet and other Communist governments begin at last to abide both by the letter and the spirit of same agreements. The latter, as is well known, provide, among other things, for withdrawal of all Soviet military, paramilitary and civilian forces from the countries of Eastern Europe, and for carrying out free and secret elections under international supervision. Only thus will it be possible for that part of the world—if not for the entire world—to really relieve its tensions and be launched on the road to just and lasting peace.

RAMPART DAM, LIKE THE COLUMBIA BASIN, SHOULD MEAN MORE DUCKS AND GEESE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have, on a number of occasions, taken the floor of the Senate to call attention to the exciting potential for strengthening the economy of the United States represented by the proposed Rampart Dam on the Yukon River in Alaska. As has been pointed out repeatedly, this great resource of power is of national significance, since its 5-million-kilowatt capacity would give the United States the largest hydroelectric power project in the free world. It would give us belated parity with the Soviet Union in the field of hydroelectric power development. The significance of this, not only to our domestic economy, but to our defense requirements, is apparent.

Not only the dramatic supply of power which would be provided at Rampart, but its low cost—about 2 mills at the damsite; only 3 mills per kilowatt-hour at tidewater—makes this one of the most important power projects—indeed, the greatest one—ever planned in the United States.

Unfortunately, in advance of thorough study of the matter, there have begun to be disparaging comments intended to delay construction of Rampart. These come from individuals and organizations who, I believe, have entirely unfounded fears as to effects of Rampart upon wildlife resources. For example, a recent issue of the Living Wilderness, a publication of the Wilderness Society, cites certain unsubstantiated "facts" concerning wildlife population in Alaska, the implication of the statements being that, somehow, Rampart would cause destruction to wildlife on such a scale that the dam should not be constructed.

Numerous arguments can be made to oppose this hypothesis, and they will be thoroughly presented in the course of obtaining Rampart's authorization.

In this connection, it is of particular interest to note an article, which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer on September 27, commenting on the very interesting increase in supplies of ducks and geese in the Columbia River Basin as a result of the greatest development of water power resources we have, so far, seen in this country. The article points out that, as a result of construction of the great projects on the Columbia River, the nesting environment for fish and waterfowl has been greatly improved. The article states that:

> The dams created impoundments, holding back the water for irrigation, and the impoundments themselves presented an environment for fish and waterfowl. This environment was further extended by raising the water table to create the seep lakes, and by irrigation overflow which created the ever-expanding wasteways.
>
> And with the water, the marshes, and the vegetation, came the ducks.

I believe this article cites a most interesting precedent for the proposition that construction of Rampart Dam will enhance wildlife propagation in Alaska. Far from destroying habitats favorable to producing migratory fowl, and far from reducing fishery resources, there seems to be good reason to think that the enormous reservoir—larger than Lake Erie—that would be created with the construction of Rampart will very likely provide sportsmen with a new paradise and will greatly increase numbers of various species of wildlife which we all wish to preserve and encourage. Likewise, the lake will make possible the creation of a great inland fresh water commercial and sport fishery.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Ducks, Geese Flock to Columbia Basin Impoundments, Seep Lakes," from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of Friday, September 27, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Sept. 27, 1963]

DUCKS, GEESE FLOCK TO COLUMBIA BASIN IMPOUNDMENTS, SEEP LAKES

(By Blaine Freer)

The amazing surge of the Columbia Basin counties as a sportsman's paradise is not confined to pheasants. There are also ducks and geese.

The dams created impoundments, holding back the water for irrigation, and the impoundments themselves presented an environment for fish and waterfowl. This environment was further extended by raising the water table to create the seep lakes, and by irrigation overflow which created the ever-expanding wasteways.

And with the water, the marshes and the vegetation, came the ducks.

A decade ago, with the water just starting to back up behind the first dams, there were virtually none. Last year in Grant County alone 105,000 were harvested. And even this number is not an alltime high. Three years ago the figure was 128,000 during a liberal season, and this year with more resident ducks and more migrating on the Pacific flyway, it should approach the record year.

Fortunately, as the duck potential began to reveal itself in the early 1950's, the game department was able to secure some key property which has become a rich recreational heritage. Much of it was turned over to the department by the Bureau of Reclamation.

At present seven public shooting areas, totaling 125,000 acres, are controlled by the department and affords hunting for both ducks and pheasants. They are the Winchester wasteway south of Ephrata; the

Quincy game range southwest of Quincy; the Gloyd seeps north of Moses Lake; the Potholes game range south of Moses Lake; the Banks Lake game range north of Coulee City; the Stratford and Long Lakes game range north of Stratford off Highway 7 east of Soap Lake, and the Frenchman Hills wasteway west of O'Sullivan Dam.

There is also considerable duck hunting on over 200,000 acres of public land administered by the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as along the various drains and waterways. Duck hunting on private land comprises but a small part of the total as opposed to pheasants.

The duck species available are composed of about 65 percent mallard, 12 to 15 percent green wing teel, around 12 percent widgeon and pintail with the balance made up of gadwall, shoveler, blue wing teal, scaup, ruddy and golden eye, and ringneck.

The most popular area for Seattle goose hunters is the Stratford-Long Lake game range, and the big honkers should just about now be coming in. There is a passshooting area in which the hunter lies in wait until the geese leave the lake to fly out to the nearby fields for feeding, then let 'em have it.

Another method is to discover what field geese continually feed on and then, in the still of the night, to dig a pit about 5 feet deep, haul the dirt away, crawl in, pull some camouflage over your head and then wait for the arrival of the hungry honkers.

But the farmer who owns the field had better be a darn good friend of yours.

There are other birds in the basin, Huns, sharptail grouse, quail, and chukars, but they are pretty much incidental.

Surprisingly there are also a few deer taken, around 250 to 400 each year. They are muleys and are found mostly in the hilly country north of Ephrata toward Grand Coulee.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY BEFORE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATIVE LEADERS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the remarks of the President of the United States before the Fifth Annual Legislative Conference of State Legislative Leaders held in Boston, Mass., September 21, 1963. This brief address, which was relayed to the conference by telephone, provides eloquent testimony of the President's dedication to our traditional system of intergovernmental relations. In emphasizing the need for a joint response to common problems, he highlights the increasing interdependence of relationships between the States and the Federal Government. At the same time, Mr. President, in stressing the cooperative rather than the competitive approach to solving these problems, the President again clearly reaffirms his devotion to our "indestructible union of indestructible States."

I commend this address to all who labor under any misapprehensions concerning this matter.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the President Before the Fifth Annual National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Hotel Statler Hilton, Boston, Mass.

Thank you, Senator Powers, Senator Bidwell, George Smith and Judge Elliott, members of the National Conference of Legislative Leaders.

I am delighted that the facilities of modern communications have made it possible for me to be with you for a few minutes. Each of you plays a very leading part in an important branch of government, and I cannot think of anything more important than that all of you in the State legislatures of our country should gather together and work as closely as possible together.

The indestructible union of indestructible States, created by the Constitution, has been envied and imitated by many other nations. It is the best system yet devised. But we have to make it work. It should have constant attention. And I think this conference permits that kind of attention. This conference permits you to discuss the problems which are common to every State. You can develop coordinated actions and the machinery to achieve results, and you can mobilize public opinion, the opinion of our American citizenry to meet the basic needs of our country. Much that you do affects Federal responsibilities, and many Federal actions have an effect upon your responsibilities. This is one country with 50 States. The problems of Government are becoming more and more complex, and the relationships between State and Federal Government more and more interdependent. We are all engaged, both in the State and Federal levels and the local level, in a common effort to reduce unemployment, and to eliminate poverty among our people; to make our urban centers a better place in which to live; to guarantee equal opportunity in all fields; to conquer mental retardation and mental illness; to keep this country strong; to keep it in a position where it can fulfill its responsibilities to all the free world.

New techniques and new arrangements for coordinating State and Federal efforts to achieve these goals are being considered. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in which Senator Powers and others play a very vital role, is helping develop these devices. The important point is to recognize, I think, that we are allies under the Constitution, that we must work closely together. Too often it is suggested that the Federal Government and the State governments are competitors or in competition. Instead, we must work closely together for the benefit of our country which all of us seek to serve. And in the last analysis we in Washington know that the success of any program or effort depends upon local control and local support. Our system of intergovernmental relations works best when there is complete coordination and cooperation between every level of government. I commend you for your contribution to our common goals.

We will study, I can assure you, the results of your deliberations. And I can promise you that in the months ahead that we will work closely together in the Nation and in the States for the benefit of our country.

I am glad you have come to Boston. I know you are welcome there. And I commend you for what you are doing to serve the United States. Thank you, and good night.

NO MORE NASHVILLE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an informative article by Mitchell Gordon which appeared in the September 4, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal. In this article, entitled "No More Nashville," Mr. Gordon examines in detail a noteworthy experiment in county government that is being conducted in Davidson County, Tenn. Various approaches are being attempted throughout the country to meet the serious challenges of urbanization. The city-county approach is but one of these, and the Nashville-Davidson County case study constitutes one of the most important experiments in this particular approach to solving metropolitan problems. I recommend this article to all students of intergovernmental relations. It furnishes further evidence that much strength exists still at the county and local levels of government in these United States and that local initiative is capable of providing answers to the complexities of mushrooming metropolitan development.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 4, 1963]

No More Nashville: New Tennessee Metro Points Up Ways City-County Mergers Boost Efficiency

(By Mitchell Gordon)

The city of Nashville, Tenn., no longer exists. Neither does Davidson County, in which it was located. Their places have been taken by the metropolitan government of Nashville and Davidson County.

Nashville-Davidson, as it is commonly known, is not the Nation's first metro government. But it is the newest, having come into being only last April 1 following an election in June 1962. More important, it is the most far-reaching experiment of its kind in the United States.

Simply stated, metro stands for a unified government spanning an entire metropolitan area. With the exception of a few cities such as Phoenix which have been able to keep abreast of urban sprawl by pushing their city limits outward through annexation, most metropolitan areas in the Nation today are patchquilts of local governmental units. As such, they're often unable or unwilling to join together to provide more effective and efficient areawide services, such as mass transit or refuse disposal.

The problem of patchquilt local government grows more serious as central cities lose their affluent taxpayers and civic leadership to the suburbs, being saddled instead with deteriorating property values and low-income people in need of costlier schooling, welfare, police, and other services.

There are several ways to equip a metropolitan area with the necessary fiscal and legal authority to cope with at least some of its metropolitanwide problems. One is for a single governmental unit to provide services to other municipalities by a contract, as Los Angeles County does; but that system doesn't tackle the problem of the deteriorating central city and its declining ability to meet its mounting costs.

CREATING A SPECIAL DISTRICT

Another is to create a special district or authority to provide and support a specific areawide service; but special districts tend to multiply as the need for various services increases, thereby adding to the confusion of local government while leaving the basic financial problem of the central city largely unsolved.

Annexation solves much of this jurisdictional problem by permitting the city to encompass the entire metropolitan area as it pushes outward. But most big cities are already surrounded by other jurisdictions or don't have the legal authority to easily swallow outlying areas whose residents object to bearing the city's fiscal burden.

To avoid these obstacles to area wide government, a number of cities around the world have in recent years been turning to one sort of "metro" government or another.

The most famous effort to establish a general "metro" in the United States in recent years has been that of Dade County, Fla., which includes the city of Miami and 26 other independent municipalities. The Dade "metro," however, can only exercise those powers turned over to it by the individual cities.

The result has been a never-ceasing skirmish at the polls and in the courts between Dade's "metro" government and municipalities attempting to strip back its power or prove they never existed in the first place. Though the Dade metro is making some progress in asserting itself, its functions are still largely limited to such relatively noncontroversial areas as operation of the seaport and the control of traffic.

As an outright consolidation of city and county government—the only one involving a metropolis of any size to be effected in a good many years—the metropolitan government of Nashville and Davidson County is the area's sole provider for practically all types of local services ranging from police and fire protection to the provision of education and recreation. The only municipalities that continue to exit within the 553-square-mile area, more than half of whose 400,000 population live in what was once the city of Nashville, are 6 small cities whose size has prevented them from offering many local services.

None of those 6 cities, Belle Meade, Berry Hill, Forest Hills, Goodletsville, Lakewood or Oak Hill—has as many as 6,000 people or covers as much as 10 square miles.

Because it is not having to fight the battles over already existing services that has debilitated the Dade metro from the time it came into being in 1957, Nashville-Davidson is already moving rapidly ahead in streamlining its local government.

REDUCED PUBLIC PAYROLLS

Nashville-Davidson's mustachioed Mayor Clifton Beverly Briley, formerly a county judge, figures consolidation has enabled him to provide the same level of local services with approximately 10,000 employees, including teachers, previously provided by 11,000 to 12,000 separate city and county employees. A new "metropolitan police department," with a gold and blue emblem on its sleeve, for example, now patrols former Nashville and "county" areas with a skeletonized sheriff's department largely confined to probate services. And, although the area continues to grow (from a population of approximately 250,000 20 years ago), the 49-year-old mayor expects to lop off "a good many more employees from the municipal payroll in the next 3 or 4 years, mainly through attrition."

The mayor figures the reductions in government personnel effected since consolidation will save taxpayers over $1 million the first year on a budget of approximately $67 million. "And we're taking care of 4,100 more students in our school system this year, too," he adds.

The Tennessee metro is already extending its civic services. It has started lighting up all its major highways outside the old city area at a cost of approximately $250,000 a year for a total of 85 to 90 miles; that will be 4 to 5 years in the works. It is in the process of extending the municipal water system and placing it on a service charge basis so tax revenues are no longer required to make up deficits. And it is planning an extension of the old city library system. It is also in the process of unifying its many separate school and fire districts.

Though the area's mass transit is provided entirely by privately owned bus companies at present, Mayor Briley figures the new Nashville-Davidson metro opens the way for service improvements through the landing of Government grants ($400,000 was recently obtained for the purpose) to underwrite service improvements. And, if need be, a publicly owned areawide system can be created through the purchase of the private systems much more easily than if the city were to attempt to do so alone, he says.

SOME BUMPS IN ROAD

The Tennessee metro is not, naturally, having smooth going at every corner, and it is bound to run into problems in the future. Its efforts, nevertheless, will be watched with considerable interest both within the State itself—where the climate for consolidation was vastly improved by new enabling legislation in 1957—and outside the State among theorists who've long championed the idea of an unencumbered metro. Indeed, three other Tennessee counties are already having new charters fashioned after that of the Nashville-Davidson metro while a fourth, Montgomery, just west of Nashville-Davidson, is drafting a metro school system.

Voters both inside and outside the central cities involved in these charter changes must approve the new charters before they can take effect. Two of those counties—Shelby, where Memphis is located, and Knox, where Knoxville is, have defeated similar efforts once before; the third county, Hamilton, which includes Chattanooga, has yet to put the proposition to the test. But there are ways of enlisting support, as metro's proponents demonstrated after Davidson County voters defeated the proposition once before, by 19,235 to 13,794 back in 1958.

First of all, the city itself frightened county residents by embarking on a vigorous annexation program immediately after consolidation was defeated: County voters eventually came around to the idea that consolidation might be a lesser evil since it at least gave them a stronger voice in local government than they likely would have had in the city.

Secondly, there was also the fear among county residents that the big city was coming more and more under domination of the Negro: Negro support for consolidation inside the big city, at the same time, was won by arguing that the whole area stood to benefit from areawide taxes and the leadership that could be provided by the suburbs.

"Not a single member of the chamber of commerce of the city of Nashville lived inside the city at the time of consolidation," notes Mayor Briley.

APPORTIONING COSTS

In addition, a device for apportioning municipal services and their costs between urban and suburban areas that has apparently worked reasonably well in the parish (county) of Baton Rouge in bringing metro government to that area some years ago, is also being utilized in the new Nashville-Davidson metro. That device consists of an urban service district corresponding to the 73-square-mile area of the old city and of a so-called general services district, corresponding to the old county area, in which the level of urban services and their costs are provided and borne separately but can be more easily varied as the need changes.

Annexation laws being what they are in some States, where those outside the central city can veto attempted takeovers by the city, and local pride being what it is, it is hardly likely that a spate of city-county consolidations will sweep the Nation's metropolitan areas no matter how successful Nashville-Davidson proves.

An increasing number of States, however, are modifying their annexation laws to favor big city growth. And the rising cost of local government, along with the increasing difficulty of providing more badly needed areawide services, might likewise force a gradual compromise in local pride.

MORAL BASIS FOR CIVIL RIGHTS REAFFIRMED

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations in the District of Columbia recently issued a statement on the subject of civil rights, which deserves the attention of every Member.

The statement refutes very effectively the argument that there is an inherent conflict between property rights and the rights of Negroes to equal opportunity, particularly in the use of public accommodations. The statement reminds those who fear that equal access to public accommodations for all citizens may violate property rights of the extent to which provisions for enforced racial segregation are now being imposed upon property owners by State and local ordinances, often at considerable cost to such owners. In the words of the committee:

> An equal accommodations law is no more an interference with private property rights than an unequal accommodations law.

The chairman of the 46-member Interreligious Committee on Race Relations is the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Catholic Archbishop of Washington. The cochairmen are Episcopal Bishop William F. Creighton, Methodist Bishop John Wesley Lord, Bishop Smallwood Williams of the Bible Way Church Worldwide, and Rabbi Lewis A. Weintraub, president of the Washington Board of Rabbis. Their affirmation of the high moral objectives of pending civil rights legislation underscores the spiritual basis of the struggle for equal justice and equal opportunity in which our Nation is now engaged.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations be printed following my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF INTERRELIGIOUS COMMITTEE ON RACE RELATIONS

The Interreligious Committee on Race Relations in the District of Columbia, consistent with its declared purpose of advancing the right of the American Negro to equal opportunity under the Constitution, welcomes the introduction of the Civil Rights Act of 1963, and endorses the high moral objectives expressed in the President's message of transmittal to the Congress.

While the efforts of the committee have been directed chiefly toward righting century-old wrongs against Negro citizens, it is of course concerned also with maintaining the rights of citizenship guaranteed by the Constitution to all Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed. One of these rights is what has been referred to broadly as property rights.

Some have argued that there is an inherent conflict between property rights and the rights of Negroes to equal opportunity, particularly in the use of public accommodations. It has been assumed by those who hold this view that, because of this alleged conflict, the rights of Negroes to free and equal access to stores, restaurants, and other facilities serving the general public must in some way be compromised.

As individuals who occupy responsible positions in our religious community, we must record our emphatic and united conviction that no such conflict exists. Neither law nor morality sanction the concept of the absolute right of private property. Both insist that the owner must use his property in a socially responsible manner.

Those who fear that equal access to public accommodations for all citizens may violate private property rights should be reminded of the extent to which provisions for enforced racial segregation are now being imposed upon property owners by State and local ordinances, often at considerable cost to such owners. An equal accommodations law is no more an interference with private property rights than an unequal accommodations law.

In many States and cities, discrimination in the use of public accommodations is already prohibited by law. The broadening of such a prohibition by Federal statute is not only logical but an exercise of simple justice.

We recognize the difficulties of drafting legislation which, while seeking to secure the rights of all citizens guaranteed by the Constitution, will, by the persuasiveness of its appeal to human justice and charity, win the acceptance of all men of good will. Without this conviction, rooted in the inherent dignity of man and the precept of true love of neighbor, legislation alone cannot be fully effective.

It is our prayer and our belief that the Congress of the United States will rise to this historymaking challenge to its statesmanship and its high moral principles by enacting at this session the provisions of the civil rights bill of 1963.

WOOL TEXTILE IMPORTS ARE STEADILY INCREASING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the steady growth in imports of woolen textiles is a source of increasing concern to the domestic industry.

A few days ago the Special Textile Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee issued a report calling attention to the rise in imports and the damage done to domestic producers, the closing down of mills and the destruction of jobs in the industry. Data given in the report show that between 1958 and the 12-month period ending last March 30, imports of apparel made of wool increased from 7.5 million pounds, clean fiber equivalent, to 26.6 million pounds, and total imports of all wool textile products increased from 32.3 million pounds to 85.4 million pounds. Imports climbed to the point where they supplied 19 percent of the total domestic market.

Later figures supplied me by the Department of Commerce show still further increases in imports. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, apparel imports amounted to the equivalent of 28.1 million pounds of raw wool, and total imports of wool textile products were 86.1 million pounds. Transshipments of goods through the Virgin Islands into the United States, under an arrangement through which the normal duty may be largely avoided, amounted to 5.9 million pounds during the 12-month period, nearly 7 percent of the total. At the end of my remarks I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted the table on page 9 of Senate Report No. 524, which gives data on imports, and on domestic production and consumption of wool textile products for a number of years back; and also a table supplied to me by the Department of Commerce extending these figures on the same basis to the most recent dates available.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, assurances have been given repeatedly, by President Kennedy and by other administration spokesmen, that increasing imports of wool textile products would not be permitted. These commitments have been not merely in generalities, but in specific terms. For example, in August of 1962, Mr. Myer Feldman, deputy special counsel to President Kennedy said:

> The President, under his seven-point program for textiles * * * has expressed his concern about the importation of all textiles, including those made of wool and manmade fibers, and indicated his determination to take steps to deal effectively with these imports * * *. Limitation of textile imports to prevent market disruption is an essential element of administration policy. We intend to implement this policy with regard to all textiles, and particularly to prevent market disruption such as would result from an increase over current levels of imports.

Despite these words, imports have been permitted to increase substantially over the levels of last year, with no administration action to limit them.

On August 28, 1962, Secretary of Commerce Luther W. Hodges, in a letter to Congressman F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts said:

> We are determined that imports of wool textile products will not be permitted to exceed current levels and we will take all necessary steps to prevent this.

However, no such steps have been taken.

On pages 21 and 22 of the subcommittee hearings, no less than 11 different occasions are listed, from May of 1961 to date, on which commitments in these or similar terms were given by the President or those speaking for him. Still no concrete actions have been taken. Any discussions with foreign countries looking toward an international agreement have apparently been little more than casual conversations and have not been pressed energetically to any conclusion. Imports have continued to rise. And there are no quantitative limitations or other barriers to prevent them from rising still further.

The promises that have been made are direct and the commitments are clearcut. They do not admit of misunderstanding. In my judgment the basic good faith of the administration is at stake. I do not see how that issue can be evaded any longer.

EXHIBIT 1

Wool textile products: Imports, exports, and domestic consumption (in millions of pounds of clean fiber equivalent) and ratios of imports to domestic production and domestic market

1958–62 AND YEARS ENDING JANUARY, FEBRUARY, AND MARCH 1963[1]

	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	Year ending Jan. 31, 1963	Year ending Feb. 28, 1963	Year ending Mar. 30, 1963
Imports:[2]								
Tops and yarns	4.2	10.6	11.2	10.1	16.9	16.5	18.2	18.6
Woven fabric	18.6	25.7	33.6	21.8	30.5	31.4	31.8	32.4
Apparel	7.5	13.4	15.6	15.6	25.8	25.9	26.2	26.6
Other manufactures	2.0	2.4	2.5	4.1	6.4	6.1	6.9	7.8
Total imports	32.3	52.1	62.9	51.6	79.6	79.9	83.1	85.4
Exports	2.5	3.5	3.2	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.8
Domestic production[3]	317.3	369.5	333.1	341.6	365.6	366.4	367.8	367.7
Apparent domestic market[4]	347.1	418.1	392.8	390.6	442.6	443.7	448.2	450.3
Ratio: Imports to domestic production	10.2	14.1	18.9	15.1	21.8	21.8	22.6	23.2
Ratio: Imports to apparent domestic market	9.3	12.5	16.0	13.2	18.0	18.0	18.5	19.0

YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1963, AND JUNE 30, 1963[1]

	May 31, 1963	June 30, 1963
Imports:[2]		
Tops and yarns	18.4	18.5
Woven fabric	[5] 26.9	26.6
Apparel	[5] 27.6	28.1
Other manufactures	7.2	7.0
Transshipments through Virgin Islands	6.9	5.9
Total imports	87.0	86.1
Exports	2.8	2.7
Domestic production[3]	364.7	363.6
Apparent domestic market[4]	448.9	447.0
Ratio: Imports to domestic production	23.9	23.7
Ratio: Imports to apparent domestic market	19.4	19.3

[1] Calculated in accordance with procedures adopted by the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee, Mar. 1, 1963. All fibers used on the woolen and worsted system are taken into account. Import and export data are increased 5 percent to adjust for processing waste and 8 percent further to adjust for use of reprocessed fibers.

[2] Includes transshipments through the Virgin Islands.

[3] Measured in terms of mill consumption of fiber including the following fibers consumed on the woolen and worsted systems: Raw apparel wool; reprocessed wool; reused wool, mohair, alpaca, etc.; cotton; manmade fibers; other fibers. The latter 3 are reduced 50 percent to adjust for nonwool products manufactured on the woolen and worsted systems.

[4] The apparent domestic market is domestic production plus imports less exports.

[5] Revised.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, more than 10,000 visitors viewed the exhibit prepared by the Yivo Institute for Jewish Research commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising during the 10-week period it was on display in New York. More viewed it during its tour of metropolitan areas throughout the country. Seeing this fantastic display of photographs, documents, and portraits one could not help but be moved by the tragic days of the Warsaw ghetto—days of brutal human sacrifice in a hopeless struggle for freedom.

Mr. President, in the last Congress, I was proud to author a resolution which became law requesting that the President designate April 21, 1963, as a day of commemoration for the courage displayed by the Jews against the Nazis. More than 20 years ago 320,000 Jews were brutally massacred in this determined uprising against Nazi tyranny.

Today, this tragic symbol—the Warsaw ghetto—brings back horrifying memories of Nazi cruelty. It remains a lasting reminder of man's struggle for freedom against tyranny. The very tragedy of the Warsaw ghetto should strengthen the United States in its determination to continue the battle against the forces of oppression.

Mr. President, articles appeared in the New York Post, the New York Mirror, and the New York World Telegram which tell the story of this exhibition. I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks here today, the text of these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post]

EXHIBIT BARES GRIM FACTS OF GHETTO REVOLT

(By Sally Hammond)

"The number of Germans killed is not important. More important was the appearance of a psychological turning point. The entire Polish underground was full of praise for us."

So wrote a youth of the Jewish fighters organization in a letter smuggled to a friend outside the Warsaw ghetto. It was January 18, 1943. The ZOB organization had led the first armed resistance to further German mass deportations that had meant death, in 6 months, to some 320,000 ghetto Jews.

The daring buildup of arms and defiance that culminated in the Warsaw uprising on the eve of Passover, April 19, 1943, which stung and astonished the German military, is told in the extraordinary array of photos, letters, and Nazi documents on view beginning Monday at the Yivo Institute for Jewish Research, 86th Street and 5th Avenue.

GRIM STORY FRANKLY TOLD

It takes a strong constitution to see the story in pictures, most of them taken by Nazis. The most harrowing scenes of starving, barefooted children, the sick and dying huddled in doorways, invariably show unconcerned Nazi soldiers looking on, or snapping pictures of misery as though it were a tourist attraction.

The exhibit is expertly laid out in symbolic pattern, beginning on the ground floor with portraits of magnificently bearded Jewish scholars of the prewar years, when Warsaw was 30.1 percent Jewish.

The winding gallery then traces the fall of Warsaw, September 29, 1939, the German occupation, and the herding into the ghetto whose walls were sealed shut November 15, 1940. Here, on a simulated brick wall is inscribed "Halt."

The progressive pauperization of the Jews and the staggering tabulations of death from hunger and disease are relieved by brave scenes of schools, self-help projects, raising potatoes in God knows what plot of earth, and the indomitable cultural programs of music, drama, and religious observances that is the marvel of the ghetto story.

Here, the exhibit moves upstairs to scenes of the uprising.

The exhibit ends with a vast panorama of rubble, a picture of the flattened synagogue and memorial photos of the heroic Jewish fighters, both men and women, whose faces show expressions not seen in any other exhibits. In contrast, the Nazis' faces no longer look jaunty, but haggard.

[From the New York Sunday Mirror]

WARSAW GHETTO EXHIBIT

(By Charles A. Wagner)

You enter the old Vanderbilt mansion on Fifth Avenue and suddenly history plays you a strange trick and you are in the Warsaw ghetto where the Nazis are decimating the Jewish population behind the wall of fate. That's transformation for you.

In this exhibit, the city's most stirring and most meaningful, mazes of rare photos, documents, captured movie film, and a portrait gallery of the real heroes of the uprising spring to life again. For they dared to fight back.

Gathered from Poland, Israel, and other countries, the displays at the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research dramatize some of the darkest chapters in the annals of modern man (1048 Fifth Avenue through May).

[From the New York World Telegram]

EXHIBIT MARKS REVOLT IN WARSAW GHETTO

An exhibit which depicts the persecution of the Jews of Warsaw during World War II will go on view Sunday at the headquarters of the YIVO Institute for Jewish Research in conjunction with the 20th anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising.

The exhibit, which includes pictures, documents, and maps, shows Jewish life in Warsaw before the Nazi persecution began and traces the steps which led to extermination of the city's Jews in 1943. YIVO headquarters is at Fifth Avenue and East 86th Street.

Other events commemorating the ghetto uprising include:

A meeting and memorial service at 1 p.m. Sunday at Manhattan Center. Featured speakers will be Edward Drozniak, Polish Ambassador to the United States, and retired Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester.

A memorial meeting at 8:30 p.m. Sunday at Bronx House, 990 Pelham Parkway, Bronx. Joseph Kutrzeba, who fought in the ghetto uprising and later volunteered for service with the U.S. Army in the Korean fighting, will be the principal speaker.

A commemorative meeting at 8:15 p.m. Monday at the Community Center, 270 West 89th Street. Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, New York, and Haim Zohar, Israeli consul, will be the featured speakers.

A joint commemorative meeting sponsored by 30 national and local Jewish organizations will be held at 1:30 p.m. Sunday at Carnegie Hall. Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, New York, heads the list of speakers, and a dramatic presentation depicting the sacrifices of the ghetto fighters is planned.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS FAVOR VETERANS' COMMITTEE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for years I have urged the creation of a Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the Senate. Earlier this week, I had the privilege of talking with the national commanders of the major veterans' organizations of this country who are beginning to question whether the Senate has forgotten about the creation of such a committee.

Veterans' affairs are today so far-reaching in scope and volume that they urgently require a standing committee with special competence. The heavy burdens of the Finance Committee and of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee no longer leave sufficient time for Senators or staff members to consider legislation affecting veterans in depth.

To postpone consideration of a Veterans' Committee until congressional reform and reorganization is studied would be ill-advised and frustrate a need recognized by a large number of this body. I have previously placed in the RECORD earlier today a number of resolutions approving of the establishment of a Senate Veterans' Committee.

NEBRASKA LEADS NATION IN DURABLE GOODS GROWTH RATE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, while agriculture remains the basic industry of Nebraska, we have long recognized the need for an increased diversification into various fields of manufacture.

Marked success has been made in this effort, principally in the processing of agricultural products.

It is particularly gratifying to note that a recent economic study reveals that Nebraska now leads the Nation in its rate of growth in the production of durable goods.

While our total production in this category is relatively modest, it is encouraging to observe that since the 1957 to 1959 period our State has led all others in terms of growth in hard-goods production.

This fact is a tribute to the many forward-looking citizens and business leaders of Nebraska who have been working to bring industry to the State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Omaha World-Herald which describes this growth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEBRASKA'S HARD-GOODS GROWTH RATE LEADS UNITED STATES

(By Nathan Nielsen)

Nebraska stands first in the Nation in the rate of growth of durable goods production, according to a New York investment counseling and economic consulting firm.

Lionel D. Edie & Co., which conducts studies of economic conditions and trends, charted growth rates by States since 1957–59 and found Nebraska in the lead in the durable goods category.

In total manufacturing growth since 1957–59, the Edie & Co., copyrighted report said Nebraska is now the eighth growth State.

The report referred strictly to growth—not comparisons by States in manufacturing volume. In volume, according to Census Bureau reports, Nebraska stands far down the list.

Durable goods produced in Nebraska, according to Edie & Co., are primary metals and nonelectrical machinery.

Other items classified as durable goods but which the company doesn't list for Nebraska are ordnance and accessories, lumber and wood products, furniture, and fixtures, stone, clay, and glass products, fabricated metal, electrical machinery, transportation equipment, instruments, sporting goods, and jewelry.

The Edie & Co., determination of growth rates is based on the company's own statistical work, said George F. Frey, senior account executive.

"For the last several years we have been in the process of developing a major breakthrough in the uses of indexes of production for each of the continental 48 States," he said.

"The significance of our work is that it enables us to measure economic activity on a State-by-State basis, thus providing a comparison of relative economic growth rates," Mr. Frey said.

The growth rate comparisons appeared in an Edie & Co. banking bulletin which commented:

"It is apparent that many banks are witnessing an outstandingly superior rate of growth in their commercial loans. To the extent that they are in superior growth States, their loan demand should be superior."

John F. Davis, president of the First National Bank of Omaha, said the Edie & Co., report helps explain some of the unusually strong demand the Omaha banks have had for loans the last 2 years.

Edie & Co., supplies speakers for the First National Bank's annual forum of finance.

The latest survey of manufacturers, published by the U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census in January, covered 1961. The survey showed that, in Nebraska:

Total employees in manufacturing in 1961 were 62,074, compared with 58,625 in 1958.

The total payroll for manufacturing employees grew to $319,520,000 in 1961 from $289,198,000 in 1959.

The value added to products through manufacturing—derived by subtracting costs from the value of finished products—rose to $658,836,000 in 1961 from $569,929,000 in 1959.

CIA ACTIVITY IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of today, October 3, 1963. It discusses a report which is highly critical of the CIA and its activity in South Vietnam. This report, to which Mr. Krock refers, likens the CIA to a malignancy and states that twice that Agency has flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Lodge.

As one who has followed the work of the CIA since its inception and closely since the time Allan Dulles and now John McCone have been its Directors, I can testify as to its responsibility, its intelligent activity and loyalty to our Chief Executives and their administrations.

Of course the Agency has made mistakes, but it has never been disloyal to its boss and it is not now in carrying out its activities in South Vietnam. Any report to the contrary will be proved to be without foundation. Of that I am confident.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE INTRA-ADMINISTRATION WAR IN VIETNAM

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, October 2.—The Central Intelligence Agency is getting a very bad press in dispatches from Vietnam to American newspapers and in articles originating in Washington. Like the Supreme Court when under fire, the CIA cannot defend itself in public retorts to criticisms of its activities as they occur. But, unlike the Supreme Court, the CIA has no open record of its activities on which the public can base a judgment of the validity of the criticisms. Also, the Agency is precluded from using the indirect defensive tactic which is constantly employed by all other Government units under critical fire.

This tactic is to give information to the press, under a seal of confidence, that challenges or refutes the critics. But the CIA cannot father such inspired articles, because to do so would require some disclosure of its activities. And not only does the effectiveness of the Agency depend on the secrecy of its operations. Every President since the CIA was created has protected this secrecy from claimants—Congress or the public through the press, for example—of the right to share any part of it.

WITH HIGH FREQUENCY

This Presidential policy has not, however, always restrained other executive units from going confidentially to the press with attacks on CIA operations in their common field of responsibility. And usually it has been possible to deduce these operational details from the nature of the attacks. But the peak of the practice has recently been reached in Vietnam and in Washington. This is revealed almost every day now in dispatches from reporters—in close touch with intra-administration critics of the CIA—with excellent reputations for reliability.

One reporter in this category is Richard Starnes of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. Today, under a Saigon dateline, he related that, "according to a high U.S. source here, twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge * * * [and] in one instance frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought from Washington because the agency disagreed with it." Among the views attributed to U.S. officials on the scene, including one described as a "very high American official * * * who has spent much of his life in the service of democracy * * * are the following:

The CIA's growth was "likened to a malignancy" which the "very high official was not sure even the White House could control * * * any longer." "If the United States ever experiences—an attempt at a coup to overthrow the Government—it will come from the CIA and not the Pentagon." The agency "represents a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone."

DISORDERLY GOVERNMENT

Whatever else these passages disclose, they most certainly establish that representatives of other executive branches have expanded their war against the CIA from the inner government councils to the American people via the press. And published simultaneously are details of the Agency's operations in Vietnam that can come only from the same critical official sources. This is disorderly government. And the longer the President tolerates it—the period already is considerable—the greater will grow its potentials of hampering the real war against the Vietcong and the impression of a very indecisive administration in Washington.

The CIA may be guilty as charged. Since it cannot, or at any rate will not, openly defend its record in Vietnam, or defend it by the same confidential press briefings employed by its critics, the public is not in a position to judge. Nor is this Department, which sought and failed to get even the outlines of the Agency's case in rebuttal. But Mr. Kennedy will have to make a judgment if the spectacle of war within the executive branch is to be ended and the effective functioning of the CIA preserved. And when he makes this judgment, hopefully, he also will make it public, as well as the appraisal of fault on which it is based.

Doubtless recommendations as to what his judgment should be were made to him today by Secretary of Defense McNamara and General Taylor on their return from their fact-finding expedition into the embattled official jungle in Saigon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] for 4 minutes without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

COSTS OF SENATE STAFFING

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, Mr. Felton West, chief of the Washington bureau of the Houston Post, is one of the most astute and determined newsmen covering the Nation's capital.

The Monday, September 22, edition of the Post carried an article about the costs of Senate staffing which attests to Mr. West's skill. Since this so-called hush-hush matter is of considerable consequence to Senators, I commend Mr. West's article to the attention of my colleagues and the general public, and ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATORS' STAFF PAY HUSH-HUSH

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON—One of the most hush-hush subjects on Capitol Hill, it was found last week, is that of how much U.S. Senators can spend to hire their office staffs.

A taxpayer might think he is thoroughly entitled to a frank disclosure and discussion of this from the Senate employees who disburse the money and keep the books. If not from them, at least from any Senator.

After all, it is public money and there is no security question involved—except possibly the security of the Senators and their rather exclusive club.

It would be a cold day in the boiler room when a Senator could not find out how much an executive department agency was allowed to spend for salaries unless national security was involved. The House of Representatives Disbursing Office speaks frankly about the limits on spending for House Members' staffs.

But finding out what limits there are on the Senators' payrolls becomes a major task.

A query about this to the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, which publishes quarterly reports showing how much each Senator actually pays his office employees during each quarter, was referred to the Senate Disbursing Office.

Robert A. Brenkworth, the $18,880-a-year financial clerk in charge of such funds in the Senate Disbursing Office, refused to say what the limits are.

Perhaps, he suggested, the Texas Senators would tell.

Brenkworth said the limits are spelled out in the law in title 2 of the United States Code. But he declined to explain the law and discouraged the reporter even from sitting down in his office and studying it.

"I think you would be a lot more comfortable up in the law library," said Brenkworth, putting his law book away.

The reporter found the law, in the library, quite confusing, in the absence of any explanation from anybody who understood the payroll system.

He failed to find anybody on the staff of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Senate contingent fund, from which office payroll salaries come, who would discuss the payroll limits. Ditto for the Senate Appropriations Committee, where a staff member said the committee has nothing to do with the limits (although the committee is in charge of appropriations for the contingent fund).

So then, Senators RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat of Texas, and JOHN G. TOWER, Republican of Texas.

Senator YARBOROUGH said each Senator has a specific lump sum for staff and purchase of equipment (typewriters, copy machines, etc.) for his office. There is a complicated formula of limits, based on the population of States and thus varying, he said.

For big States like Texas, this allowance is not adequate, he said.

"What is allowed for States like Texas and California is plain murder," he said. "They take a terrible clobbering."

But what the limits are for Senators of the various States—even his own limit—YARBOROUGH refused to reveal.

Asked why they should not be public knowledge, he said, "I don't object to your finding out, but this is the business of the Rules Committee and I'm not going to tell you what isn't my business and have a bunch of Senators jumping on me. I'm not going to meddle in the Rules Committee's business."

When told that the information could not be obtained at the Rules Committee or the disbursing office, YARBOROUGH said he did not know the limits for the other States, anyway.

"I could go over and find out," he said. "But I've got 10 million people to represent and I don't have time to go meddling in things like that."

He called efforts by newspapers to check into Senators' staff expenditures "nit picking" that was bad for the morale and efficiency of Senate employees.

"I refuse to help downgrade the efficiency of the Senate," he said, as further explanation of his refusal to reveal the limits.

YARBOROUGH said the greatest weakness of the Senate is failure to hire enough staff. This is true of Senate committees even more than of individual Senators' offices, he said.

"The legislative branch is constantly losing power to the executive branch," he said. "The executive is voted a budget of $100 billion a year and Congress is not even voted enough money to hire people to answer mail."

Senator TOWER said he would not violate Senate "practice" by discussing the spending limits for Senators in general.

"It would seem to me that the limits should be public knowledge," he granted, "and it would be all right with me if they were all made public. I don't mind telling you mine."

Then he checked up quickly and revealed that there is a base limit of $67,980 for spending by Texas Senators for clerk hire and office equipment.

This limit is a rather indefinite one because it does not precisely determine how much a Senator can spend. Depending on how he handles his fund, a Senator can spend the limit but actually spend more or less than another complying with the same limit.

The base limit is related to the basic salaries of senatorial employees in the extremely complicated and confusing legislative pay system. Base salaries of Senate employees were set many years ago. As the cost of living increased, numerous incremental pay raises have been approved to match raises given classified civil service employees in the executive branch. In figuring actual salaries, these increments are added to the old bases, which have not been changed.

It is only the base salaries that must be counted in determining whether a Senator stays within the base limit for staff salaries—the $67,980 base in Texas case.

But the total of actual salaries resulting can vary considerably depending on the number of employees the Senator hires and the salaries he pays them. There is no set limit on the number he can hire and, except that he can pay no salary higher than $18,880 (and that to only one person) and a maximum salary limit on a few other top employees, the Senator has a free hand as to what he pays them—as long as he does not exceed the base limit.

If he hired a lot of low-paid workers, the amount he could spend for salaries would be greater than what another Senator would spend if he hired fewer employees and paid them more. One employee with a $60 base, for example, grosses $1,020.72 salary, while one employee with a $300 base grosses $1,586.28. Thus five $60-base employees hired in lieu of one $300-base employee would gross $5,103.60.

A Houston Post compilation of actual spending for staff salaries by the Texas Senators in the 1963 fiscal year, ending last June 30, as reported in the quarterly reports of the Secretary of the Senate, shows YARBOROUGH's payroll totaled $149,507.31, while TOWER's totaled $147,042.90. Their expenditures for office equipment are not shown in these reports.

YARBOROUGH currently has 25 employees, including 4 part-time workers, on his staff. TOWER now has 18 employees.

Later, despite the official refusals to furnish the information, the base limits for Senators in other States were learned.

It was learned that Texas is in a category for States with 9 million through 10 million population—a category which also includes Ohio and Illinois.

Although the population of Ohio is about the same as that of Texas, Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat of Ohio, and Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat of Ohio, spent considerably less than YARBOROUGH and TOWER for staffs in fiscal 1963. LAUSCHE spent $110,388.98 and YOUNG $115,174.94.

Illinois Senators, Democrat PAUL DOUGLAS and Republican EVERETT DIRKSEN, spent $160,239.02 and $156,836.93, respectively, although Illinois population is about the same.

The base limits for other categories are: $52,980 for States with less than 3 million people; $55,980 for States with 3 million; $58,980 for States with 4 million; $61,980 for States with 5 million through 6 million; $64,980 for States with 7 million through 8 million; $70,980 for States with 11 million through 12 million; $73,980 for States with 13 million through 14 million; $76,980 for States with 15 million through 16 million, and $79,980 for States with 17 million or more.

Whether this formula is equitable would appear to be questionable.

Under it, for example, Alaska Democratic Senator ERNEST GRUENING spent $123,526.82 in fiscal 1963 for a staff to serve a State which had an estimated population of only 246,000 people in 1962. But TOWER and YARBOROUGH spent a little less than $150,000 for staffs to serve an estimated (1962) population of 10.1 million.

And Republican Senators JAVITS and KENNETH B. KEATING of New York, serving an estimated 17.4 million people in New York, spent $192,804.32 and $181,831.35, respectively for staffs.

Ten million people, or 17 million, can generate a lot more mail, telephone calls and visits to a Senator's office than 246,000. Is about $26,000 more or about $70,000 more, for a Senator's staff salaries enough to cope with serving so many more people?

The inequity, if it exists, may never be remedied if Senators just will not even talk about the figures.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PURCHASE OF BLANKET-BOND INSURANCE FOR WAREHOUSEMEN

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, within recent weeks I have received complaints from small, independent, insurance agents concerning the actions of the Department of Agriculture's Commodity Credit Corporation in purchasing a blanket-bond insurance for warehousemen operating under the Uniform Grain Storage Agreement.

After investigating the matter I feel that I, too, must complain. I must say that the Department's action does nothing to further the concept of free enterprise and competitive business in the United States. In fact, it operates to the disadvantage of both.

Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased a blanket bond, or insurance policy, from a single mutual insurance company, thereby taking business away from thousands of agents throughout the country. The CCC claims that this blanket-bond will make management easier, coverage bigger, and costs cheaper.

I do not doubt that CCC is correct in its analysis of this, as far as the analysis goes. But a look at the overall picture of our economy, and our systems of government and economics, reveals a somewhat different picture. We see here just one more step in big government encouraging big business at the expense of small, independent businessmen, in this case between 8,000 and 10,000 insurance agents.

There can be little doubt that the Department could save money in the short run by dealing with a single agency on insurance. The Defense Department could probably save money, at the expense of free, competitive business, if it placed all its orders with a single, mammoth corporation. But what would this do to the thousands of other, and smaller, businessmen who must pay taxes to support the defense effort.

The CCC action in this regard illustrates once again this administration's drive for a centralization of authority and management, and its almost complete disregard for the system of economics that has made this Nation preeminent in the affairs of the world. I believe time will prove it to be an unwise act, if we are to cling fast to the belief that our future is best served by free, competing citizens in a diverse society.

Mr. President, if this system is continued and extended, the taxpaying insurance agents will lose the hazard insurance now being carried on grain facilities affiliated with the CCC in quite the same way and for the same strained reasons that the bonding business has been jerked from their files.

Far from being good business for the Government, this blanket-bond policy may operate to enable many operators to qualify for increased coverage who otherwise would be unable to do so. This results in unfair competition among warehousemen and prospective warehousemen. It enhances the risk in grain handling by permitting licensing of previously unqualified grain operators. That could increase the risk to the Government.

This compulsory insurance requirement does not restrict only the business rights of the insurance agents. It also deprives the warehouseman of his traditional and correct freedom to purchase his insurance from an agent of his choice. The agent loses business; the warehousemen lose freedom of choice. And the economy loses a little of its vitality.

Mr. President, I call upon the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President to put an immediate end to this discrimination against the insurance agents and warehousemen. I have called upon them to repudiate this elimination of American business and individual freedoms and to shut down this shameful operation immediately.

TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Texas chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates now is completing a very successful retraining session in Fort Worth, Tex.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a resolution passed at that session, commenting upon the leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As all Americans know, Mr. Hoover has been the guiding light of the FBI through many trying years. He has suffered in silence the wrath of the leftwing fringe in this country, so I think it is highly appropriate that we consider these few words of commendation for both Mr. Hoover and for Assistant Director Joseph J. Casper, who attended the retraining session as a personal representative of Mr. Hoover.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the members of the Texas chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates are concluding their 12th annual retraining session in Fort Worth, Tex., which has been exceptionally successful through the presentation of a most informative program and a renewal of their past associations and discussions of their mutual problems; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has, through his creation of the FBI National Academy, made it possible for selected law enforcement officers to receive the finest training available today in the performance of their duties as law enforcement officers and has thereby made a contribution of inestimable value in elevating the ethics and standards of law enforcement to where, as a profession, it has risen to new heights, achieving the respect, confidence, and admiration of the citizenry of this Nation; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has signally honored the members of this association by making it possible for Assistant Director Joseph J. Casper to attend as his personal representative and participate in this training session; and

Whereas Assistant Director Joseph J. Casper has, as a principal speaker on our program, so effectively analyzed the problems confronting law enforcement today and our individual responsibilities as the leaders in that profession through his inspiring address: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Texas chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates in session assembled this 24th day of August 1963, at Fort Worth, Tex., pledge our complete confidence and wholehearted assistance to Mr. Hoover and his associates of the FBI in furthering the advancement of the profession of law enforcement; and therefore, be it further

Resolved, That its members unanimously go on record, this the 24th day of August 1963, in Fort Worth, Tex., as expressing their sincere appreciation to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and Assistant Director Joseph J. Casper for the outstanding contribution made by them to the success of this, their 12th Annual Retraining Session; and therefore, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States; and to the Honorable Senators Ralph W. Yarborough and John Tower of the State of Texas.

N. I. Fisher
President.
J. Herbert Sawyer,
Secretary.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator from Texas for his rapidity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SENATE MUST SAVE "ALIANZA"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was amazed and distressed over the action of the House of Representatives in cutting the appropriation for the Alliance for Progress by 25 percent, or some $150 million. I can only believe that this error will lead Latin Americans to conclude that the United States has repudiated its commitment to the other American governments under the Punta del Este Charter. It is for the Senate to see that this grievous mistake is immediately righted.

After some 2 years of frustration and disillusionment, the Alliance has finally taken hold and is fostering a growing commitment to reform and to the stated goals of the Alliance. Mr. President, it is true that we have established a foothold, but there is still a long way to go toward realizing the reforms envisioned in the charter, and I contend that this would be the worst possible moment to weaken the program monetarily. On the contrary, this is the time to strengthen our support, if need be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from Life magazine of September 27, 1963, which deals with the pitfalls of cutting back the Alliance for Progress appropriation, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Senate Must Save "Alianza"

The U.S. Senate, about to consider the foreign aid bill, has a chance to repair a grave error made last month by the House. In a mood of diffuse hostility to the continuing aid burden on the U.S. taxpayer, the House slashed the administration's request by about a billion dollars, including a 25-percent cut in the Alliance for Progress. Although no foreign aid figure should be thought sacrosanct, this particular cut was a poor idea.

The Alliance for Progress is a long-term U.S. policy based on two-way agreements with Latin American republics. Congress in 1962 endorsed the policy by authorizing $600 million a year for 4 years ahead. Both Washington and the Latin Americans have relied on this endorsement in planning the new schools, housing projects, farm-development loans, mobile medical units, food for peace and numerous other programs which are helping Latin America try to make itself a modern democratic society. If the U.S. share is cut by $150 million, not only must many of these programs be cut back but the stanchest Latin supporters of the Alianza will feel that Congress has welshed on a long-term commitment. Castro's radio gloated over the House action, saying it proved you can't trust the U.S. imperialists.

To Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance, the cut was a particular blow because, after a slow start, he had really begun to make the Latin Americans take their part in the Alliance seriously. They have undertaken tax and land reforms and other self-help programs which do not come easy for them but are beginning to bear fruit. "They've had 400 years of bad practices," says Moscoso. "They need confidence in themselves, in us, in the whole Alliance program. The House action has been a blow to all this."

The Alliance is too well-conceived and strategic a U.S. policy to be toyed with like that. The Senate will, we hope, restore our commitment and the confidence of our hemisphere allies.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two items be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. One is an item from Tony Weitzel's column in the July 12, 1963, issue of the Chicago Daily News, relating the story of successful civil rights action taken 20 years ago by one of this country's leading citizens, Mr. Modie Spiegel, of Chicago, Ill. If more of our citizens had followed Mr. Spiegel's lead, the commendable action taken recently by the Washington Hebrew Congregation, stated in the second item, would not be necessary today. Both are strong testimony that employment policies based on merit, not race or religion, have a moral as well as an economic base.

There being no objection, the excerpt and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From the Chicago Daily News, July 12, 1963

(By Tony Weitzel)

You might find a moral in this story somewhere. It begins with a meeting of prominent businessmen at the Morrison Hotel. Some 10 guests were asked to make brief speeches. One of the speakers was a young Negro attorney, Aaron H. Payne.

At the end of the meeting, one of the VIP's walked up Clark Street with Payne to his office. They chatted of many things. Next day, Attorney Payne's phone rang. The VIP asked Payne if he had time to drop in on a meeting of his company directors.

Payne said he did. He walked a couple of blocks to the meeting and found himself in a very serious discussion the moment he walked in the door.

The company, said his friend of 24 hours, wanted to integrate its personnel. From Payne they wanted suggestions on how to start. Payne asked, "Why are you considering integration?"

Snapped his friend, "Because it's the right thing to do." Payne asked, "What jobs are you considering for persons of color?" The answer, "We shall place them in any jobs for which they're qualified."

Payne was satisfied. "You ought to begin," he said, "by hiring a Negro trained in personnel management. I think I know a woman who can qualify. I met her only once. That was when she dropped into my office to solicit funds for the Urban League. I talked with her some 15 minutes. She has a master's degree in business administration. She's trained for personnel work."

The man at the head of the table said, "Let's get her over here." Payne rounded up the girl in 30 minutes. In another 30 minutes she was hired.

The punch line of the story is this: It happened 20 years ago.

Aaron Payne's VIP friend was, and is, Modie Spiegel, of the mail-order empire, The young woman took on the integration chore was, and is, Mrs. Ora Higgins, still assistant personnel director of Spiegel's. And for the last 20 years Spiegel's has been comfortably and happily job integrated.

As I said, there might be a moral there someplace.

Statement of Washington Hebrew Congregation

AFFIRMATION OF OUR CONGREGATION'S PROGRAM FOR RACIAL JUSTICE

Two and one-half millenia since Moses won the first successful struggle to redeem the slaves, 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation freeing the slaves, and 9 years since the Supreme Court decision declaring segregated schools unconstitutional, millions of our fellow Americans are still living as second-class citizens.

The resolution of America's race problem is not the exclusive responsibility of any single group, of Negroes or whites, or of Christians or Jews. It is the collective responsibility of all Americans. However, we, who every Passover still relive the lash of the taskmaster, and who still recall that the ghetto was invented to segregate Jews, have a special commitment to fulfill the covenants of our Jewish and democratic heritage.

Today we are confronted by a new urgency in the effort to eradicate every semblance of discrimination. We must not be a passive participant in the struggle but must take initiative and assume positions of leadership true to the essence of Judaism that "not the word but the deed is primary."

In order to fulfill our moral responsibilities, we, the rabbis, officers, and board of managers of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, herewith declare that the following principles are the official policy of the congregation:

I. Racial justice in our congregation's administrative policies

1. Our congregation and each of its auxiliaries does not knowingly patronize or sponsor any activity at a place of public accommodation which discriminates against anyone because of race, religious, or ethnic origin.
2. Our congregation pursues a policy of nondiscrimination in all relationships with our employees.
3. Our congregation will require a nondiscrimination employment clause in any contract to build or improve our physical facilities.
4. Our congregation will not be party to any restrictive covenant or gentleman's agreement in the purchase, sale, rental, or use of property.
5. Our congregation tries to avoid any relationship with financial institutions and purveyors of equipment, supplies, and services who are known to have discriminatory employment policies or discriminatory policies of any nature.
6. Our congregation will continue to welcome as members all Jews, regardless of their racial origins.

II. Racial justice in our congregation's education, cultural, and worship programs

We will continue to stress in our temple's worship services, in our schools and other educational activities, and in the programs of our auxiliaries, the great dangers to our democratic institutions of any manifestation of racist or religious bigotry which poisons the minds and hearts of men. These are totally and irrevocably inconsistent with the Jewish religious tradition. To this end we will encourage each of our members to bring the profound influences of the home to reinforce and emphasize the ethical demands of racial justice in every aspect of their day-to-day lives. We will continue to create and participate in temple programs whereby our children and our adult members can develop a sympathetic insight into human beings of varying races, creeds, and cultural traditions.

Implementation of the policy set forth above is the responsibility of the officers, the board of managers, the professional staff of the congregation, each of the operating committees of the board, and the auxiliaries of the congregation.

Approved this 9th day of September 1963.

TREASURY WILLING TO THINK OF REFORM OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY MECHANISMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to what is reported as a change of attitude of the Treasury toward consideration of reform in the international monetary mechanisms. The shift is noted in a current article in Foreign Affairs, by Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury.

There have not been any changes of significance in international monetary agreements since the Bretton Woods agreements of nearly 20 years ago. Massive economic changes have taken place since in the world, requiring more and more improvisations and cooperative arrangements, mostly ad hoc among the major industrial countries of the non-Communist world. These have been necessary to keep the trade expansion so essential to the well-being of that world.

In it all, we know we have incurred a chronic "balance-of-payments deficit" which gives us concern. Mr. Roosa says that regardless of what international monetary reforms ensue, we are going to correct our balance-of-payments deficit.

It may be precisely this which will cause a different kind of problem in the trade situation of the free world. This situation is this: It is our deficit, our gold and dollars added to the reserves of other countries which is sustaining the credits given by them. We are the main banker, the real source of the "liquidity" in international credit arrangements.

When we correct our problem, another is created, or rather an intrinsic one exposed; namely, a shortage of a liquidity necessary to sustain an expansion of international trade. The Treasury appears sensitive now to problems raised in the Salant report by the Brookings Institution, to which I called attention on September 3. I am pleased to see this evidence of intention to look ahead and to be open at least to the evolution of policy at the International Monetary Fund meetings.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a news item and an editorial from the New York Times, which summarize the current Treasury attitude.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 20, 1963]

U.S. Urges Study of World Credit

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Washington, September 18.—The United States, in a major evolution of policy, formally advocated today that the world's leading nations study the problem of the future sufficiency of "international liquidity."

The policy statement came in the form of an article in Foreign Affairs by Robert V. Roosa, the Under Secretary of the Treasury. The article was timed to appear just in advance of next month's annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund, at which the proposal for a study of liquidity will be taken up.

International liquidity is the term used to describe the total of countries' reserves of gold and foreign exchange plus their automatic access to credit. It is the "international money supply."

REFORMS DEBATED

There has been a swelling international debate on the question of whether future liquidity will be sufficient to keep the Western world's economy prospering and world trade expanding and, if not, whether the international monetary system should be reformed.

Until Mr. Roosa's article appeared today, the United States had adopted a largely negative attitude toward the question of reform—an attitude shared by nearly all the nations of continental Europe but not by Britain. Whether the continental nations will accept even the idea of a study remains to be seen, but there is some chance of a decision at next month's meeting.

Mr. Roosa said today, "There is not any reason to presume that daring or revolutionary approaches will in fact emerge for the future. The process of evolution may take us where we want to go.

CONDITIONS ESTABLISHED

"But the needed preconditions have been established for wide-ranging governmental consideration of any possible needs, and of practical operating procedures for accomplishing them, without setting off speculative disturbances based on market apprehensions that there might be grave shortcomings in present arrangements."

After rejecting several radical proposals, such as fluctuating exchange rates or an increase in the price of gold, he suggested that the inquiry would probably look into four possibilities for making sure the world's large trading nations have sufficient reserves in the future:

Continue the present system but "actively enlarge the cooperative credit arrangements that have been recently developed," mainly in connection with the recent difficulties of the United States and Britain in their balance of international payments. These include such devices as borrowing foreign currencies.

Endorse the first move, but also enlarge the resources of the International Monetary Fund for lending to members running low on reserves.

Endorse the first and second proposals but also begin the use of a "new grouping of some of the other leading currencies" as a supplement to the use of the dollar and the pound as "reserve currencies." Reserves now are held almost exclusively in gold plus either dollars or pounds.

With or without the first three moves, "reconstitute the I.M.F. by endowing it with the capacity to create credit and the power to allocate such credit among members." This, the most radical possibility, would amount to the formation of a "world central bank."

Mr. Roosa emphasized today the "sharp separation" between a study of future liquidity needs, which he said would take a long time to bear fruit, and the immediate problem of the United States balance of payments deficit. He said the United States had demonstrated emphatically its determination to correct its own deficit independently of any future reforms in the world monetary system.

Mr. Roosa went further by saying it was a mistaken impression to think that a new world system of credits could soon be created that would free the United States from the balance-of-payments disciplines under which it is presently struggling.

He said no system would provide any more credit than the United States is currently receiving to cover its deficit, and added that the future credit needed until the deficit is eliminated will probably have to be negotiated directly with the various countries whose payments positions are strong.

Mr. Roosa recognized, however, the keystone of the argument of those who have advocated reform—that the real problem of insufficient liquidity would arise when United States deficits cease. These deficits have supplied most of the recent growth in world liquidity by pumping dollars and gold into other nations' reserves.

He said, "It is quite possible, once the flow of new dollars into monetary reserves ceases, that the present excess of dollars will be quickly absorbed and that the prospects of an imminent shortage of international liquidity will appear."

The article stressed that, even if a reform or improvement of present international credit arrangements had not been agreed upon by that time, there would be a way out through the announced United States willingness to purchase foreign currencies for dollars in controlled amounts. This would add to other countries' holdings of dollars.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 19, 1963]

EXAMINING THE MACHINERY

The United States is now prepared to explore new ways to improve and strengthen the world's monetary mechanism.

In an article in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, Under Secretary of the Treasury Robert V. Roosa, chief architect of the administration's battle plan to defend the dollar, now agrees on the need for a searching examination to determine whether there is a sufficient supply of credit to insure a sustained increase in world trade. This represents a shift from Mr. Roosa's position at last year's meeting of the International Monetary Fund, when he took the orthodox view that there was nothing wrong with the mechanism.

There has not been a thorough review of the world's monetary mechanism since the Bretton Woods Conference that set up the International Monetary Fund in 1944. Enormous changes have taken place in the last 20 years, particularly with the advent of convertibility in 1958. The free world has managed to avert crises only through the piecemeal adoption of cooperative facilities created for specific emergencies. It is possible that the present mechanism, with all its ingenious innovations, is adequate, as both Mr. Roosa and the annual report of the International Monetary Fund contend. But they are taking an enlightened approach in demonstrating a willingness to consider improvements.

The recent study on the balance of payments published by the Brookings Institution points out that, under the present system, the U.S. deficit has been the main source of expansion in international liquidity. If the outflow of dollars shrinks, then liquidity—and trade—might be affected. While Mr. Roosa argues that there is no threat of a liquidity shortage, especially as long as the deficit remains so large, it is not at all certain that there will be enough credit to go around. This issue demands attention.

The machinery has been working, but it can be made to work even better. We hope that the forthcoming meeting of the IMF will begin an examination to insure that the machinery will have the flexibility to stimulate an expansion in international trade as well as the ability to cope with crises.

"TEX" THORNTON AND LITTON INDUSTRIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a most significant cover story in the October 4 issue of Time magazine on "Tex" Thornton and Litton Industries. I am glad to see this well-deserved recognition accorded this newly adopted Minnesotan.

As part of the expansion of Litton Industries, chronicled in the Time story, we have witnessed the development of two major plants in Minnesota. These plants are a testimony to the unerring executive judgment of "Tex" Thornton, to the skilled, hard-working labor resources available in my State of Minnesota, and to other factors favorable to industrial growth.

While some industries bemoan taxes and Government policy and look backward with nostalgia to "the good old days," "Tex" Thornton and Litton Industries exemplify the American success story by seeking new opportunities and meeting new challenges. The executive drive and initiative of Thornton, Roy Ash, and others of the Litton executive team is a credit to them, to our system, and to our Nation. They recognize the value of the partnership of business and government. They are also aware that the current rapid rate of change is a dynamic factor which insures our economic growth and is a necessary component of our effort to maintain our free world leadership.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the Time story, "Corporations: An Appetite for the Future."

I commend the reading of this to every Member of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gore in the chair). Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CORPORATIONS: AN APPETITE FOR THE FUTURE

The husky, ruddy-faced man looked like a tough trail boss in a TV western as he mounted his palomino and set off across the rugged mountain country north of Los Angeles. He wore threadbare khaki trousers over his riding boots, a red western shirt and a modified stetson, and packed an automatic pistol to deal with any rattlesnakes, bobcats, or mountain lions he might encounter. For several hours he rode, traversing mountain and valley, following deer trails and nudging his horse skillfully along rocky paths. Occasionally, he crunched out a cigarette on a heavy leather glove worn as a horseback ashtray, or reined his mount to a halt and gazed out over the green valleys below.

This was no performer recreating the Old West, but the boss of a huge and exciting corporation that is dedicated to a relentless pursuit of the future. He is Charles Bates Thornton, 50, the chairman of California-based Litton Industries—and he was busy on horseback at the most important facet of his job: thinking. When "Tex" (he came from a small Texas town) Thornton has a problem to mull over, he finds that he does his best thinking on a solitary 30- or 40-mile ride through the mountains, where he can "look at the world down there, and the world beyond. It is my way of getting away from it all, getting out where I can clear my head of the traffic of everyday business."

Thornton has plenty of traffic to clear. Since he took over Litton just 10 years ago next month, when it was only a tiny microwave-tube company, it has developed into one of the most remarkable growth companies of the age. In that decade, Litton has increased its sales 18,570 percent and its earnings 10,175 percent. It has never had a quarter in the red. In one of the greatest acquisition sprees of all time, it has absorbed some 40 other corporations, now has 71 plants in the United States and 12 other countries.

Litton now ranks as the Nation's 100th biggest corporation, with sales that have already passed the half-billion-dollar mark and will probably reach $750 million this fiscal year. By next year, if this growth continues, its sales should lift through the billion-dollar mark and put it among the top 50 U.S. companies. As for Thornton, the organizer of Ford's celebrated Whiz Kids and onetime boss of such talent as Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and present Ford president Arjay Miller, Litton's success has made him a millionaire 40 times over. It has also made millionaires out of 20 other Litton executives.

BROAD AND AMBITIOUS

For want of a better description, this remarkable company is formally classified as an electronics firm. That is a bit like calling Albert Schweitzer an organist. Litton is really an amorphous giant with interests and appetites as broad as the universe. Its 200 products range from hulking nuclear submarines to tiny electronic tubes that can send radio and TV signals back to earth from millions of miles out in space. Its plants turn out the electronic brains that have transformed business methods and the trading stamps that have conquered the housewife. Litton makes guidance systems that fly planes virtually without human help, devices that generate light beams to burn holes in thick steel plates and gyroscopes that smooth the sickening roll of a *Queen Elizabeth* caught in an ocean storm.

Litton's Monroe Division is one of the leaders in sales of calculating machines. Its Westrex Division ranks first in sales of sound-recording systems, and its Western Geophysical Division first in seismic explorations. Litton is the Nation's third biggest private shipbuilder. Its systems division sells more inertial-guidance systems than anyone else, and its Sweden-based Svenska is the world's second largest maker of cash registers. Across the world, Litton men are mapping underground volcanic activity in Hawaii, searching for oil beneath the North Sea, scouring the jungles of Surinam for precious minerals.

To many businessmen used to working within well-defined industry lines, all this seems more like a potpourri than a company. Almost every time that Litton announces a new product or acquisition—which is almost every week—there is a new flurry of predictions that at last the fast-stepping Texan has gone too far. If Tex Thornton's business philosophy often confuses his critics, it is perhaps because it is so breathtakingly broad and ambitious. He is interested in change, and pursues it wherever he can. Litton's present and future are tied together by a commitment to capitalize on the products, projects, and processes that are growing out of a great new technological revolution.

LIKE A JIGSAW PUZZLE

That revolution is reshaping the comfortable contours of the world's industries. The age of science has not only had a vast impact on society, but has also transformed the world of business more thoroughly than anything since the industrial revolution. Business has always been faced with changing situations, but never has the change been so constant, powerful, and full of hazards. "The flowering of technology goes on faster and faster," says George R. Harrison, MIT's dean of sciences, "because man's understanding of science is like working out a jigsaw puzzle—the more pieces fit together the easier it is to fit more pieces together."

A proliferation of new materials has threatened such well-rooted industries as steel and textiles. Companies searching in their laboratories for new products can hardly get the products to market before someone else has duplicated them—or produced better ones. The whole new space-military complex is devoted to the idea of constant change and advance. Scientists have discovered so many basic new ways of doing and making things that one bright scientist in a lab can sometimes render obsolete the basis of a whole industry. Many companies, particularly those that have long concentrated on a few products, find it increasingly hard to come up with the management know-how and the funds to finance the advanced research needed just to keep up.

Tex Thornton has thought about this revolution perhaps more than any other man. "We are experiencing technological change at by far the fastest rate man has ever known," he says. "In the past 20 years we have seen more technological change than in all recorded history. It took 112 years for photography to go from being discovered to a commercial product, 56 years for the telephone, 35 years for radio, 15 years for radar, 12 years for television. But it took only 6 years for the atom bomb to become an operational reality, and 5 years for transistors to find their way from the laboratory to the market. You might say we are in danger of being engulfed by change."

IN A LOW KEY

Change brings its hazards, of course, but it also brings many unprecedented opportunities—and it is Thornton's job to see that Litton takes advantage of the opportunities. Many men in both business and Government consider Thornton to be the best executive in the United States today. Yet his gifts are not always on display, and in many ways the low-key Texan does not fit the usual conception of a dynamic manager at work in an exciting industry.

Deeply involved in technology, Thornton is neither a professionally trained engineer nor a technician, and, though he is a great believer in running things under tight statistical control, he places little reliance on electronic logic in making management decisions. In a field where speed is a motto, he snaps out no instant decisions, likes to take his time about making up his mind. He overcomes a problem by attacking it with dogged tenacity, painstakingly learning all the facts, then turning them over slowly in his mind many times until they fit together into a decision—a decision that often comes to him on horseback or in his Cessna, which he sometimes uses (with a hired pilot) to get up into the clouds to think.

Thornton is a dreamer and a visionary who talks constantly about the way-out future, yet he is also an intensely practical man who has made realities out of many of his early dreams. Immensely wealthy and forever faced with decisions about spending millions, he is nonetheless a penny pincher who makes waiters and taxi drivers scowl at his meager tips, is indifferent to carrying cash (his secretary presses pocket money on him just before he goes on every trip) and always takes a single room rather than a suite when he is staying in a hotel. He is often shy and inarticulate among strangers, yet he has managed to dazzle some of the Nation's top businessmen with his knowledge and versatility. "Everybody loves Tex," says Buff Chandler, wife of Los Angeles Times President Norman Chandler, "but nobody really knows him."

NO SAFE NICHE

Far from being a lonely decision maker in an isolated executive suite, Thornton shows his true executive quality in the ability to pick good men and give them free rein. He has surrounded himself with an intensely loyal group of managers, who are independent thinkers not afraid to question his judgment or to lunge at opportunities without waiting for his nod. More often than not, Thornton's decision merely sets off a spirited debate that produces a compromise solution that the company finally follows.

To keep the exchange of ideas from bogging down in bureaucracy, Thornton and Litton President Roy Ash, 44, who helped to found the company, have held the staff in their modest Beverly Hills headquarters down to a manageable (and somewhat overworked) group of 114—despite the fact that the firm's total work force has swelled to 43,000. This way, no one has time to write lengthy memos, which Thornton does not like to read. In fact, if Litton's experience is any guide, one of the happiest aspects of the technological revolution may be the death of the kind of organization man who tries to burrow into a safe, obscure niche, far from the dangers of difficult decisions. There are no such niches at Litton.

COKES AND SMOKES

Thornton and Ash have come to work together as smoothly as if they were held on course by one of Litton's inertial-guidance systems. Thornton is the man with the intuition and the flair for the right deal at the right time; Ash is the lively and witty coordinator who keeps a day-to-day watch on Litton's ever-expanding activities. Chain smoking (at least two packs a day) and sipping Cokes, Thornton spends at least 4 hours a day on the telephone talking with managers, investigating mergers, gathering facts and keeping up with the work of Litton's five main divisions. He talks in cello-like tones, never raising his voice.

Vice presidents and executives from out of town are urged to pop in on Thornton and Ash at any time, and headquarters has a freewheeling quality. Thornton and Ash feel that keeping their men well-informed and making their responsibilities clear is the best way to get the most effort from them. "Our system works," says Roy Ash, "only because the individuals and the system work together. If we had a highly institutionalized system, our people would be frustrated; if we had institutional-type people, we as a company would be frustrated." Litton is not noted for paying its executives high salaries but gives them a powerful incentive in a stock option plan whose value can best be seen in the rise of Litton stock from 8½ to 85½ in the past 5 years (allowing for a 2-for-1 stock split).

NO USELESS LEISURE

Tex Thornton himself has few broad interests outside of work. "I can't stand useless leisure," he says. Thornton and Ash take vacations only in alternate years, but after a few days Thornton usually finds himself hankering to get back to work. Thornton lives in a Spanish style ranch house in the fashionable Holmby Hills section of Los Angeles, among such Hollywood names as Walt Disney, Bing Crosby and Claudette Colbert (he bought the house for $250,000 from Frank Sinatra's first wife Nancy). He and his tall, graceful wife Flora live there during the week but usually move on weekends to Thornton's 200-acre ranch 40 minutes away, where he raises a string of prize horses. They have two sons: Charles B. Jr., 21, a Stanford senior, and William Laney, 18, a Harvard freshman.

On workdays, Thornton bounds out of bed at dawn without the aid of an alarm clock, after a glass of orange juice (and occasionally a swim in his pool) begins making phone calls to the east coast, which is 3 hours ahead of California. Before 8 he is off in his 300 horsepower black Ford Galaxie to the office, 10 minutes away. Even on his frequent trips to Washington to consult with Pentagon brass or Government procurement officers, he keeps the same farm-boy hours, sometimes showing up at fellow Whiz Kid McNamara's office as early as 6 a.m. "I often find them there just finishing breakfast when I get in at 7:20 a.m.," says Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric.

FORTY-EIGHT-HOUR LIEUTENANT

Though it often is only retrospect that sees in childhood the signs of future accomplishment, Tex Thornton certainly got early lessons in responsibility. Born in the tiny north-central Texas farm town of Haskell, he never enjoyed a normal family life. His restless, adventurous father, Word Augustus Thornton, ran off soon after Tex was born and built a small fortune (which he lost in the 1929 crash) blowing out oil well fires with nitroglycerin. Tex grew up as the man of the family. He seldom saw his father, who was later murdered by a hitchhiking couple he befriended. Tex's firm mother, determined that he would not travel the same road as his father, stressed the need for responsibility until it enveloped him like a Sunday suit.

When he was 12, his mother encouraged him to buy land and pay for it with money he earned doing odd jobs. He accumulated nearly 40 acres, and by the time he was 14 every store in town would accept his personal check. At 19, he and a chum set up a successful gasoline station and dealership for Plymouth and Chrysler, but Tex left it after a few months to go to Texas Technological College in Lubbock. He switched from engineering to business administration, quit impatiently in his junior year and borrowed $50 to go to Washington, where in 1934 he landed a $1,440-a-year clerk's job at the Department of the Interior and continued his studies at night.

Thornton might have disappeared from sight and fame right there except for a single assignment: the job of writing a report on the financing of low-cost Federal housing.

He showed his ability for boiling down a massive amount of statistics and information into its basic essentials. The report he turned out was a minor masterpiece of clarity and vision that somehow got to the desk of Robert Lovett, Assistant Secretary of War for Air. Deeply impressed, Lovett talked Thornton, then 28, into joining the pre-Pearl Harbor Army as a second lieutenant charged with the unusually heavy responsibility of finding a way to put the Army's air arm on a businesslike basis.

Thornton set some sort of record by remaining a second lieutenant for only 48 hours. After a series of whirlwind weekly promotions, he became one of the youngest full colonels in the Army Air Force. With the war now on, Thornton got to work with a determination that the Pentagon still remembers. He not only established training programs for 1,700 different kinds of specialists, but also devised the first system of statistical control the Armed Forces had ever seen. Thornton calls that "a fancy name for finding out what the hell we had by way of resources and when and where it was going to be required."

At one point, Colonel Thornton had 2,800 officers all over the world under his command. Among them were nine who became particularly expert at Thornton's new concept of statistical control. After V-J day, he talked them into offering themselves as a team—with him as the captain—to apply the knowledge they had acquired to the business world. This was the beginning of the famous "Whiz Kids," who then ranged in age from 26 to 34.

DREAM PROJECT

Hearing that Ford Motor Co. was struggling with the task of resurrecting itself into a modern corporation, Thornton fired off a cocky telegram to Henry Ford II, offering to use the "10's" ability to bring the sprawling, money-losing company under control. Ford checked with Lovett, invited Thornton to Detroit. There Thornton negotiated salaries ranging from $8,000 a year for the least experienced of the group up to $16,000 for himself. It was quite a deal for Ford; in one package, it got two future presidents and four divisional bosses.

Ford was a dream project for the hot-shot young Air Force team, bent on applying its service-learned management-control methods to industry. The 10 began a department-by-department survey of the company, asked so many questions that they were dubbed the "Quiz Kids" by resentful Ford oldtimers. When they swung into action, the name was derisively changed to Whiz Kids. They switched Ford's capital, long left fallow, into interest-bearing accounts that promptly began earning Ford $4,500,000 a year, analyzed everything from assembly lines to suppliers' carburetors to learn how to trim costs, and set up the modern management techniques that are still used at Ford today.

Thornton liked being the top man, and he chafed at being held back by Executive Vice President Ernest R. Breech, who had come to Ford from General Motors, after the Whiz Kids arrived. In 1948, after 2 busy years with Ford, Thornton quit to take a job with eccentric industrialist Howard Hughes, who made him vice president and general manager of Hughes Aircraft. Thornton convinced Hughes that not enough companies were working full time on developing the advanced weapons technology the Nation was sure to need. He reorganized Hughes Aircraft, building its sales from $1,500,000 to $200 million in 5 years, and prepared it to be practically the first company to get into missile work. But Hughes' cost-conscious advisers balked at spending the extra money needed to keep up the pact. Thornton decided to quit to form his own company.

A PACKAGE OF WEALTH

Roy Ash, whom Thornton had lured to Hughes from a post as top statistician at the Bank of America, and Hughes Engineer Hugh W. Jamieson agreed to join Thornton in his new venture. Thornton at one point approached Joe Kennedy about the project, but finally turned for capital to Lehman Bros., Wall Street's prestigious investment house. "I told them," he says, "that I wanted to start a company that would become a strong blue chip in the scientific and technological environment of the future. It would be a balanced company—not just engineering, not just manufacturing, not just financial. You can't win a ball game with only a pitcher and a catcher, and you can't have a strong company unless it's balanced."

Thornton wound up his sales pitch by bashly outlining how he would achieve $100 million in sales in 5 years. The Lehman partners gasped; his ideas were good, but the sales projection made him sound like a windy promoter. Nonetheless, they agreed to back a $1,500,000 financing to be raised by selling investors a package of stocks and bonds worth $29,200 each. Thornton made his sales boast good in only 3 years—and each package is now worth $3,200,000. Any prescient investor who put $1,000 into Litton at the start would have an investment worth $85,000 today. Coming full circle, Thornton earlier this year was elected a member of Lehman's board of directors.

BUYING TIME

To get a base to build on, Thornton, Ash, and Jamieson had selected a microwave-tube company (annual sales: $3 million) bearing the name of its engineer-owner, Charles Litton. Litton suspiciously refused to take stock in the new company, instead demanded $1 million in cash; the stock, of course, would now be worth $85 million. With stock, cash, credit, and persuasive argument, Thornton and his friends began buying up a series of little-known outfits that made printed circuits, computers, servomechanisms, communications, and navigation equipment. Thornton felt that Litton had to grow big and muscular in a hurry to survive the jolt of changing technology—but he had a reason behind every move. "We have never acquired companies as such," he says. "We have bought time, a market, a product line, a plant, a research team, a sales force. It would take us years to duplicate all this from scratch."

Litton's biggest acquisition came in 1958, when it took over Monroe Calculating Machine (sales: $40 million a year) after a fervent courtship of many months. The business-machine field was changing rapidly, but Litton needed a well-known name and ready facilities to take advantage of the change. To tie in with Monroe, it then picked up a succession of outfits: a Swedish cash register maker, a maker of tickets and labels, a company that now prints more trading stamps than the U.S. Government does postage stamps. When Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp. of Pascaguola, Miss., was first offered for sale in 1961, Thornton was totally uninterested. But he brooded over the possibilities for weeks, finally concluded that the nuclear submarines that Ingalls was building were really just a collection of electronic machines and devices packed into a hull, and therefore an excellent destination for the products of Litton's expanding electronics complex. He bought Ingalls.

DEAD RECKONING

While collecting a spate of companies and a crack managing team, Thornton and Ash (Jamieson left in 1958 to found his own electronics company) have made surprisingly few mistakes. Nowadays Litton gets an average of 10 merger offers a week and turns most of them down. But once it does acquire a company, it usually lets the old management function freely. Ingalls Boss Fred Mayo had the shipyard in the black within 90 days after Litton took over and untied his hands to make necessary changes. Fred R. Sullivan runs Monroe Calculating as if it were his own company.

Despite numerous acquisitions, more than half of Litton's sales growth has been generated from inside by a scramble for new business and new products. The growth has been so fast that profits have not kept up; Litton's after-tax profit on sales is only 4 percent. "That is hardly a terrific achievement," says Thornton, "but we hope to do better." He believes strongly in plowing back profits into the company to finance growth, and Litton has never paid a cash dividend, though it has paid five stock dividends.

Perhaps Thornton's greatest contribution to the company is his superb sense of timing—an intuitive dead reckoning that tells him when to move with a product and when to hold back. While other defense companies were vying for contracts to produce whole missile systems, Litton backed off and concentrated on providing the highly complex components for the space vehicles. This gave the company more customers to sell to and the opportunity to get financing for invaluable research in a wide range of products. When transistors were industry's glamour product, Thornton held back and saved Litton the agony of the shakeout period that transistor makers are now going through.

Other firms rushed into making inertial-guidance systems for missiles, but Litton devised lightweight models for airplanes—correctly guessing that planes would need more machine guidance as speeds went farther over the sound barrier. Litton now has more than 90 percent of this market. Rather than join other computer makers in challenging IBM with big models, Thornton went after small models; recently Monroe introduced the Monorobot XI, which is the smallest business computer on the market (price: $25,000).

EYES ON THE SEA

Litton has its share of space projects; it made the first space chamber and spacesuit, is making a relief map of the moon so that astronauts will know what they are in for, has created a wind tunnel that simulates the problems of reentry by speeding up gases. But Thornton is convinced that there isn't room in space for all the companies trying to get there, has turned the company's eyes downward into the sea. Ingalls has five contracts worth $145 million to build the Navy's new nuclear-powered attack submarines, which may be the destroyers of the future. Litton's Western Geophysical Co., with its fleet of 20 ships, is the world's largest explorer of the ocean depths for minerals. It is currently searching the oceans for the best site for Project Mohole, a much-delayed attempt to bore deeper than ever before into the earth's crust; Western won the contract to test at four sites after other companies made an initial boring off lower California to test equipment. "Oceanography[1] is as challenging as space," argues Thornton, "and it may have even greater potential."

Litton is making plenty of other bets on the future. It is at least 2 years ahead of the field in making portable command and control systems that can be airlifted by helicopters to act as battlefield operations centers. It is working on a device to control the weather, on an electronic retrieval system for libraries, and on quick-cooking microwave ovens—Litton's first real consumer product—for the potentially big electronic cooking field. Though Litton is now selling thousands of electronic and computer projects individually, it is quietly gearing up for a massive entry into complete electronic systems that will make a business as fully automated as its owners want it to be.

---

[1] A word that the professionals in the field now consider inexact. With the in-deep set, the word is oceanology.

Such technological changes worry many economists and sociologists. They fear that the unskilled worker, the artisan, and the officeworker will more and more find their jobs disappearing or changing radically. They see extra leisure for workers as at least a partial answer to the problem, but then they worry about how people will be able to use that extra leisure creatively. Almost everyone agrees that the United States is entering what University of California President Clark Kerr calls the age of the knowledge industry, when men and women of all ages will have to be continuously educated through their lifetimes to adjust to continued technological changes.

SCIENCE FACT

The men at Litton are aware of the problems, but they are optimistic about the long-range effects of technological revolution, believing that great new industries will arise to create even more employment. Thornton sees technology as eventually "freeing man's intellect for decisionmaking, and freeing his creative powers for the contemplation, theorizing and development of yet newer technologies that can put into use the great abundance of energy available to mankind." For a man like Thornton, who wants to build and keep building, the exciting possibilities ahead far outweigh any possible hazards.

Thornton believes that atomic energy will be used to melt icecaps, explore space, turn the wheels of industry, and even change the weather so that citrus trees can grow in Central Park and the smog problem in Los Angeles can be solved. Newspapers and magazines will be transmitted by radio and either stored on tape or printed on receivers right in the living room. Pocket-sized communications devices will keep everyone in instant touch, and physical ailments will be diagnosed by computer and cured in many cases by replacing worn-out parts with factory-made ones. Money may be eliminated; customers will merely present their thumbs to an electronic scanner that will automatically deduct the purchase price from their distant bank accounts.

Many of these possibilities seem as far off as present technological advances did only a few years ago, but Litton is already working in many areas that could lead to them (the company is studying, for example, submarine cargo ships that could cruise serenely beneath the surface, ignoring the turbulent weather above). "These things are going to happen," says Roy Ash. "We have already crossed the technical boundary. It is only the economic boundary that has to be crossed. So it is no longer science fiction, but science fact and economic fiction."

"During the next 10 years," adds Tex Thornton, "there should be more scientific and technological advancement than in all history—more than double that of the past 20 years." This means no letup for a company devoted to profiting by change. Litton's confident executives do not expect growth to level off until the company reaches at least $2 billion in sales—a point that could be reached within 4 years at the company's present growth rate, and that would rank it fifth among U.S. corporations. "There's really no place to stop," says Tex Thornton. "We will never reach our destination."

The onrush of technology has caught up thousands of people in its path and given man mastery over areas that he never dreamed of conquering. It has also created a few problems that never existed before, of course, but Tex Thornton and Litton Industries are confident that man will be able to solve them. Recently, for example, the automatic garbage-disposal unit in Thornton's home broke down. He called a repairman to fix the intricate device, but the man had no success. So Thornton did the job himself in a Thornton-like way. He gave the problem some thought, then simply got an empty Coke bottle and dropped it smack into the maw of the machine, which came to life immediately and chewed the bottle to bits.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin for his characteristic generosity.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota, who once was quoted as saying, when he was told he would have 12 minutes to make a speech, that the last time he took 12 minutes to talk was to say "hello" to his mother.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator showed, only a minute ago, that he can make a great deal of sense in 2 minutes.

TAX CUT FURTHER SETBACK FOR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on October 1 the Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, spoke to the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund which is currently taking place in Washington. There is much in this speech with which I am in agreement. Secretary Dillon emphasizes that the United States should not "view possible improvements in the methods of supplying international liquidity as relieving it of the compelling and immediate task of reducing its own payments deficit." Certainly the United States has a significant problem in its balance of payments and domestic actions must be taken to meet this problem. Secretary Dillon recognizes this when he states that:

> In shaping domestic policies and choosing from the various tools available for us, their varying impact upon our external accounts, and upon those of our trading partners, must be taken fully into account.

The Secretary then in his speech mentions a number of the proposals recommended by this administration for making adjustments in our balance of payments. In general, I believe that these specific policies are desirable and I laud the administration for making such proposals.

ADMINISTRATION OVERSELLS TAX CUT

However, Secretary Dillon then goes on to make what seems to me to be a completely contradictory argument. We all know that the administration is pushing as hard as it can for enactment of its tax bill. This drive for enactment sometimes places members of the administration team in the anomalous position of tying tax reduction to other problems for which tax reduction is either irrelevant or completely inappropriate. A classic example is represented in Secretary Dillon's speech. In order to get additional support for the tax bill, Secretary Dillon states that tax reduction will aid our balance-of-payments position. Nothing could be further from the truth, as almost all economists know.

The Secretary's strained reasoning is summarized in the following paragraph. According to the Secretary:

> The tax bill will provide an impetus to the domestic economy in a manner consistent with our international position. It will give increased flexibility to our monetary authorities in meeting balance-of-payments requirements. The added incentives for use of capital in the United States will enhance the relative attractiveness of investment here for Americans and foreigners alike. At the same time, the increased productivity associated with rising investment, together with greater incentives to develop and market new products and to apply more rapidly the fruits of our vast research capabilities, will reinforce the efforts we are making to increase our exports.

Just about everything is wrong with this line of reasoning. First, it assumes that the tax cut will significantly stimulate the domestic economy. There are many reasons, as I have indicated on prior occasions, why this seems doubtful. Much of the tax reduction is being given to potential savers rather than to consumers; many consumers will not change their consumption patterns as a result of increased after tax incomes; investments will probably not be stimulated because of present excess capacity; it will be necessary for the Federal Government to depress the economy by borrowing from individuals in order to meet the increased deficits occurring as a result of the tax cut, and so forth.

TAX CUT UNLIKELY TO STIMULATE INVESTMENT

Let us assume, however—although I do not think it is true—with Secretary Dillon that the economy is stimulated as a result of the tax cut. Almost the entire concentration in the Secretary's address is placed upon the effects of this alleged stimulus upon the capital accounts in our balance of payments, that is, upon foreign and domestic investments. Yet it seems highly doubtful that, even assuming a stimulus in the economy, additional foreign investment will be attracted to our shores and less domestic investment will be lured overseas. In the first place, sufficient excess capacity both of physical and financial capital exists, so that even with a fairly significant stimulus in the economy, net rates of return on investments within the United States will probably not vary much. Thus, there will probably not be much change in the present relationships between interest rates here and overseas. Yet this is the only circumstance—I repeat, the only circumstance—under which flows of investment funds would be altered.

This is the entire case for improving our balance of payments by a tax cut—that the tax cut would encourage people overseas to invest in this country. That is the whole case.

Let us assume, however, that Secretary Dillon is also correct in his case that interest rates will rise in this country. This assumption, while it may be consistent with the conclusion that some additional foreign investment will be induced to come to this country, is completely inconsistent wih his earlier assumption that the economy will be stimulated by tax reduction. All economists tend to agree that a rise in interest rates will discourage investment generally and therefore will be depressive upon the economy rather than stimulative. Thus, the very mechanism which Secretary Dillon is relying upon to adjust our balance of payments is also a mechanism by which the domestic economy will be repressed.

LAST YEAR'S INVESTMENT TAX CUTS WORSENED BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

One of the inconsistencies in Secretary Dillon's statement can be seen by interrelating two points which he makes. He points out quite correctly that we already, last year, provided a substantial amount of tax reduction directly for investors. This was done through the investment tax credit and the accelerated depreciation methods. These two tax reductions amounted to over $2 billion in revenue loss for the Government and increased after-tax profits for corporations and other businesses. This is exactly the sort of policy which Secretary Dillon is urging in order to rectify our balance-of-payments position. Yet look at what has happened to our balance of payments since these tax reductions were initiated.

We are fortunate that we have a case in experience—not a distant, hypothetical case, but an actual, practical case that occurred last year.

In 1962 our net balance-of-payments deficit was $2.2 billion. In the first quarter of 1963 it was at an annual rate of $3.4 billion. This was after the tax reductions were made.

In the second quarter of 1963 the preliminary figures indicate that the deficit is running at an annual rate of over $5 billion. In other words, precisely the policies which Secretary Dillon recommends have been associated in the immediate past with a very significantly worsening in our balance-of-payments position.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator will recall that vast assertions were made as to the stimulation of investment which enactment of investment credit would bring. Do not the facts show that a very large portion of investment credit—which was only another name for tax reduction of a special form—went not into investment, but into either savings or larger corporate dividends?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I think the statistics are very compelling on this score. I recall that McGraw-Hill made estimates of what the investments would be. The estimates, which have been consistently good in the past, were based on the assumption that no investment credit legislation would pass. But the investment credit did pass, and what has been the level of investment? About the same McGraw-Hill estimated with no investment credit. So the statistics indicate that investment credit went into either savings or dividends, and did not go, as the Senator from Tennessee has suggested, into a substantial or visible increase in investment.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator agree that the real stimulus for investment is not liquidity of position or availability of cash, but the expectation of making a profit?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator could not be more correct. No businessman is going to make an investment unless he has a market, unless he has a profitable opportunity. He is then going to invest, and he is going to invest under those circumstances even if it is difficult to obtain capital. But before the investment credit, we had the largest amount of cash flow or cash available for investment by our corporations, in our history. It was enormous.

Mr. GORE. Is there any scarcity of investment capital?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no shortage of investment capital. The great corporations are having trouble knowing what to do with their cash. They are putting it in Treasury bills and short term Treasury obligations. They cannot make attractive investments within their own corporate areas.

Mr. GORE. If a corporation or partnership or entirely privately owned business is convinced of the profitability of an investment, this investment is likely to be made whether the funds must be borrowed or drawn from reserves. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. On the other hand, it matters not how much cash is in the coffer. Unless an attractive investment, with the hope and expectation of profit appears, an investment is not likely to be made. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. So the argument of the Secretary of the Treasury that any tax cut which makes more capital available will result in heavier investment simply does not stand up; and certainly it does not stand up with regard to the assertion that funds from abroad would be attracted by investment in this country.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I find it particularly interesting, as the Senator has, that the Secretary of the Treasury would say on the one hand that the proposed tax reduction is going to help balance of payments because it will stimulate the economy and because it will increase interest rates. I should like to ask the Senator if he is aware that when the tax bill is carefully analyzed, the amount of tax reduction in the first fiscal year is found to be relatively small.

If that be true, how would the Senator compare the magnitude of the repressive influence on our economy with an increase in interest rate on a $5 billion economy, which moves in large part on credit?

Mr. PROXMIRE. In my judgment, there is no question that higher interest rates will have a far more repressive effect, and will far more than counterbalance any stimulating effect from the tax cut. Statistics, again, are overwhelming on this score. They show that even with a full tax cut, even if it were concentrated and all spent, the increased income from the tax cut would, after 2 full years, be about $11 billion per year in a $600 billion economy, or less than 2 percent. As the Senator from Tennessee has indicated, in the first fiscal year the effect would be less than 1 percent. The effort to stimulate the economy with that kind of influence does not work. We have had a wealth of experience with it. We had it all during the depression, when we ran deficits of 4 percent of the gross national product for 10 consecutive years. What was the result? Fourteen percent of our work force was out of work.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. At one time, when I was not a very good athlete, the coach pulled me out of the game one day and said, "You are trying too hard." That may have been an unusual thing to have said to one. However, I remembered that statement as I listened to the speech of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I wondered if the Secretary was not trying a little too hard to pass a tax bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I could not agree more completely with the Senator from Tennessee. It seems to me that there may be a good argument made for a tax cut—although I am opposed to it, as the Senator knows—but certainly one argument in favor of it is not that it will improve our international balance-of-payment position. It is bound to worsen it, and significantly worsen it.

For further evidence on this score, let us look at what happened as the economy moved from the low recession period of 1961 into the recovery period of 1962.

What I am trying to say in the next few paragraphs is that as the economy improves—and there are many benefits from an expanding economy—one of the problems in an improving economy is that there is an unfavorable effect on the balance of payments for a myriad of reasons. As the economy worsens, there is a favorable effect on the balance of payments, for many reasons. Let us look at the experience we have had in this field.

In the first half of 1961 the current trade balance was at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of $6 billion in our favor. At the same time, private capital flows were running at the rate of $3.1 billion against us. In 1962, after the economy was well into the recovery period, our net current trade balance had diminished from the $6 billion rate to a rate of only $4.3 billion, largely due to increased imports. At the same time, private capital flows had actually worsened, going from a negative 3.1 to a negative 4.1. Surely there is no evidence here that a stimulus to the economy is associated with an improvement in our balance of payments.

The old classical argument, which was sound in this respect, showed that what happens is that as a country moves into a depression people in that country tend to buy less from abroad, their prices drop, and they sell more abroad, and the balance-of-payment situation improves.

This is true, however sorrowful it may be.

One of the factors explaining this worsening position is in the investment area. In 1962 our long-term portfolio of U.S. private capital was in a net negative position of $1.2 billion. In the first quarter of 1963 our net negative position was worsened to an annual rate of $2 billion and the second quarter preliminary figures indicate it has worsened still further to $2.5 billion at an annual rate. Similar figures could also be shown for other investment portions of the balance of payments.

A second, though less important, reason which Secretary Dillon gives for assuming that a tax reduction will aid our balance of payments is that an expanding domestic economy will place us in a better competitive position vis-a-vis foreign countries. At the present level of American industrial production with the exception of a relatively few types of industries, per unit costs tend to rise as production increases. Therefore, if Secretary Dillon's initial premise is correct, that the economy will be stimulated by tax reduction, this expansion of production by individual firms will raise their per unit costs and hence put our domestic firms in a weaker position to compete with foreign firms. Certainly this additional demand would tend to raise domestic prices. There would seem to be no justification for assuming that our firms generally will be in a better competitive position as a result of expanding output.

As income rises in this country, we buy more from abroad. This is well recognized by virtually every economist in the world in the relationship between economic prosperity and recession and balance of payments.

DILLON FORGETS IMPORTS WILL INCREASE

The final and ultimate answer to Secretary Dillon's line of reasoning, however, is to be found in the section of the balance of payments which the Secretary did not mention; namely, the so-called current account. This portion of the balance of payments involves imports and exports of goods and services. Secretary Dillon had good reason for not mentioning this account. If his assumption is correct that the economy will be stimulated by tax reduction, then it must be stimulated in large part through increased consumption. Yet part of our total consumption is consumption of goods and services from abroad. Thus, if total consumption increases, presumably our net consumption of foreign goods and services will increase. The result must be that a stimulus to the economy will result in a worsening of our balance-of-payments position because we will be buying more from foreigners. Increases in our own U.S. prices will presumably discourage some foreigners from buying from us. Thus, our export position will presumably deteriorate somewhat at the same time that our imports are increasing. As a consequence, our net current account in the balance of payments will presumably be substantially worsened as a result of tax reduction.

Our balance-of-payments deficit is now running at a rate of about $5 million a year. This rate will tend to worsen if the tax bill now before the Senate Finance Committee is passed.

SUMMARY

In conclusion, and to sum up:

First. In 1962 we tried an investment tax cut and our balance of payments suffered.

Second. If tax reduction stimulates the domestic economy, the stimulation must be largely in individual consumption. This consumption includes purchases of imported goods. These increased imports will hurt our balance of payments.

Third. Recent history proves that domestic economic improvement worsens even the investment portion of our balance of payments. In the first half of 1961, when the economy was in poor shape, net capital outflows to foreign countries were less than they were during 1962 in a recovery period.

Fourth. Any economic stimulus will result in some increased domestic prices and these will discourage purchases by foreigners from us. This is another way in which our balance of payments will be hurt.

Fifth. If businesses produce more because of tax reduction, unit costs will tend to rise. As a consequence, American firms will be less able to compete with foreign companies. This is still another example of the adverse effects on our balance of payments from tax reduction.

Sixth. Even assuming that the tax bill will stimulate the domestic economy, so much excess capacity of physical and financial capital exists that domestic interest rates should not rise unless the Federal Reserve Board tightens money sharply. Yet, the only reason for assuming improvement in the balance of payments is to attract additional foreign capital to our shores by higher interest rates.

Seventh. Even assuming that domestic interest rates rise, the effect of these increased interest rates will be to repress the domestic economy and therefore negate any benefits obtained from tax reduction.

Mr. President, I think the conclusion is clear. The tax bill now before the Senate Finance Committee will hurt, not help, our balance-of-payments position. When we consider this tax bill on the floor of this Chamber, every Member of the Senate should ask himself whether he is willing to encourage the continuation of our gold outflows and our deteriorating balance-of-payments position by voting for the tax reduction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a release reporting the remarks of Hon. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, before the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES, AND U.S. GOVERNOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1963

At the outset of my remarks, I ask you to join with me in paying tribute to our late, great colleague and good friend, Per Jacobsson. Firmly dedicated throughout his long and distinguished career to the cause of financial stability, he guided the International Monetary Fund with a deep understanding of the needs and realities of his times. The responsibilities of Managing Director have now passed into the capable hands of Pierre-Paul Schweitzer. His willingness to assume these duties provides us with fresh assurance that the Fund, building on its current strength and influence at the center of the international monetary system, will successfully meet the fresh challenges that lie ahead.

It is also a pleasure to welcome to the Fund family an unusually large number of new members, bringing our group to more than 100. The election of a 19th Executive Director who will cast the votes of a group of the many new African members is symbolic of the increasing usefulness of the Fund to the emerging nations.

I am sure that each of these new members will profit from the important assistance the Fund can render to their further development through its expanding program of technical assistance in the areas of central banking and fiscal practices and policies, through its regular consultations, and by providing timely financial support for well-conceived stabilization programs. In addition the new compensatory financing facilities announced last March mark an important and constructive advance in the services available to members heavily dependent upon exports of primary commodities.

These activities in support of balanced, dynamic growth are, of course, complemented by those of the Fund's companion Bretton Woods institution, the World Bank and its affiliates, now under the able direction of George Woods. I should mention particularly at this year's meeting the work of the International Development Association, whose activities in so short a span of time offer so much promise for the future. Action by the part one countries on the proposals for increasing its resources will mark another milestone in the work to which it is dedicated and in which we are all joined together.

The successive annual reports of the International Monetary Fund have expertly traced the evolution of our international monetary system since World War II. They have also made clear that new problems have a way of emerging as older ones are solved. The report for 1963 is no exception. In particular, it deals at some length with the adequacy of existing arrangements for providing international liquidity during the coming years. The authors point out that liquidity is not simply a matter of the aggregate of official holdings of gold or foreign exchange, and they review the progress made in recent years—in considerable part under the auspices of the Fund itself—in supplementing these resources with international credit. But the report also recognizes that the needs of nations for assured means of financing balance-of-payments deficits—either by drawing upon a stock of liquid assets or by means of borrowing—can be expected to increase over time. At the same time, as the deficit in the balance of payments of the United States is narrowed and closed, that deficit will no longer contribute to the liquidity of other nations in the manner and magnitude of the last few years.

The Fund's report has now been supplemented by the thoughtful and important statement of its new Managing Director. Mr. Schweitzer indicated that the Fund expects to study the problem of international liquidity and has expressed the Fund's readiness to cooperate with others in such a study. He points out that studies of this problem are timely even though there is at present no sign of any shortage in international liquidity. He has also given us his view that the Fund should be at the center of whatever strengthening of the international monetary system may prove to be desirable. The United States finds itself in general agreement with all of these thoughts.

But in discussing this matter, I would like to make one point crystal clear: The United States does not view possible improvements in the methods of supplying international liquidity as relieving it of the compelling and immediate task of reducing its own payments deficit. Indeed, it is largely the prospect of the elimination of the United States payments deficit that makes it necessary and advisable to undertake these studies.

Nor can the provision of appropriate facilities for international liquidity relieve nations of their joint responsibilities for effective and timely action to eliminate such imbalances in trade and payments as may arise in the future. In a world of fixed exchange rates and convertible currencies, deficits and surpluses emerge from a wide variety of causes, both domestic and international. The necessity to make cash outlays for defense and aid, shifts in the basic pattern of demand for internationally traded goods, the development of new producers, resources, and production techniques, and developments in capital markets can be just as important as changes in average price levels and aggregate demand within countries.

The adjustments necessary to correct these deficits and surpluses take time if they are to proceed in an orderly fashion, without damaging consequences for either domestic growth and stability or the free flow of trade among nations. That is why, as part of the adjustment process, a country experiencing deficits needs reserves to draw upon, or credit that it can rely upon. That is also why a country receiving the counterpart in surpluses needs assets of assured value, in amounts and forms that will not disrupt its own economy. But in the last analysis without effective adjustments by both deficit and surplus countries, no amount of liquidity will enable us to achieve the mutual benefits of a closely integrated world economy within a framework of steady growth accompanied by monetary stability.

The challenge implicit in this situation is clear. Side by side with our studies of possible liquidity needs, we must consciously seek out means of improving the process of international adjustment itself, while preserving our separate abilities to meet our respective domestic needs.

This is a large order, but one that is well within our capacities. Much has been learned from the experience of recent years. We have come to recognize that in shaping domestic policies and choosing from the various tools available for use, their varying impact upon our external accounts, and upon those of our trading partners, must be taken fully into account. There is greater awareness of the need to identify and eliminate those market rigidities that inhibit the process of adjustment. And we are learning that new techniques can be developed for assisting the process of adjustment that are consistent with domestic goals and competitive markets.

Much of this can be illustrated by analysis of the position of the United States, faced as we are with the twin tasks of achieving more rapid growth at home while simultaneously closing the troublesome gap in our balance of payments. And many of the lessons of this experience, I believe, will prove sooner or later to be more generally applicable to the problems of international adjustment.

Business activity in the United States has continued to expand over the past year at a fairly steady pace. Total output has now reached a rate of over $585 billion a year—in real terms more than 13 percent above the level of early 1961.

Measured against other peacetime expansions of the past 40 years, this performance has been encouraging. All but one of these recovery periods have now been equaled or exceeded in terms of percentage increase in output, and that single exception took place only after the steep declines in production during the early 1930's. Prices of manufactured goods have remained virtually unchanged during the current expansion, extending the period of stability that has existed since 1958. However, unemployment is still excessive. And we are not fully utilizing our available savings of our existing productive plant capacity. True, investment activity has risen in response to increases in demand and to measures introduced a year ago to liberalize the tax treatment of depreciation and provide an investment tax credit. But new investment still remains below the levels required to support a full employment economy and to assure the position of our industry among the leaders in technological progress.

At the same time, our overall balance of payments has responded slowly to the series of measures we have undertaken since 1961. The overall deficit was reduced to $2.2 billion in 1962, from $3.9 billion in 1960, and $2.4 billion in 1961. But the deficit grew markedly larger during the first half of 1963.

When this situation first became apparent, we made a thoroughgoing review of our entire balance-of-payments program, which culminated in a series of decisions announced by the President on July 18. Resulting programs now underway will, by the end of next year, bring a reduction of $1 billion in the annual rate of dollar expenditures abroad for defense, aid, and other Government programs. Savings of similar magnitude are also expected on capital account as a result of the proposed interest equalization tax and the firmer structure of short-term interest rates accompanying the recent one-half percent increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate. We can already see indications that the deterioration in our accounts during the first half of the year is being arrested.

These new actions will complement and reinforce the longer-run measures we have been taking to achieve both external balance and more rapid domestic growth. Basic to our strategy for achieving these twin goals is a broad program of individual and corporate tax reduction totaling $11 billion, which, after passage by our House of Representatives last week, is now before our Senate. It will provide an impetus to the domestic economy in a manner consistent with our international position. It will give increased flexibility to our monetary authorities in meeting balance-of-payments requirements. The added incentives for use of capital in the United States will enhance the relative attractiveness of investment here for Americans and foreigners alike. At the same time, the increased productivity associated with rising investment, together with greater incentives to develop and market new products and to apply more rapidly the fruits of our vast research capabilities, will reinforce the efforts we are making to increase our exports.

Our ability to expand production—which is implicit in our current unemployment, in our rapidly growing labor force, and in our margin of underutilized industrial capacity—provides protection against upward price pressures as the stimulus from the tax program takes hold. Meanwhile, we are continuing successfully to finance our budgetary deficit outside the banking system. For instance, in the year that ended August 31, the latest date for which figures are available, the combined holdings of Government debt in the hands of our Federal Reserve and commercial banks declined by more than $1½ billion. We have also made further progress in improving the maturity structure of our marketable debt. As a result of our latest advance refunding, the average life of that debt exceeded 5¼ years for the first time since 1956. We are not faced, therefore, with the kind of excessive liquidity that could fuel inflationary developments as our economy moves toward fuller employment.

Perhaps most significant of all in terms of the outlook for prices, our manufacturing labor costs per unit of output have declined over the past 3 years—the first time since World War II that this basic measure of our competitive strength has improved for so long a period, or during a time of substantial recovery. And the rate of wage increases in our manufacturing industry is holding within the range of past and anticipated productivity increases.

In this way, we are encouraging basic corrective forces in terms of costs and prices that should provide a firm base for improving our trading position, thus contributing to the orderly adjustment of our entire balance of payments. Highly tentative, but nonetheless encouraging, signs of an improvement in our international competitive position are developing. But it is clear that the contribution that exports can make to overall balance will be heavily dependent upon the adjustment policies of other nations as well. By this I do not, of course, mean to suggest that surplus nations have a responsibility to inflate, any more than it would be consistent with our internal needs to force deflation. Nor, in our particular situation, would it be reasonable to look only—or primarily—to increases in our commercial trade balance as the solution for our payments problem.

But opportunities do exist for surplus nations, in instances where inflationary pressures are evident, to serve the interests both of their own domestic stability and of external balance by reducing or eliminating barriers to imports, including those from the United States. In the search for effective adjustment mechanisms within the context of a convertible currency system, this kind of action, it seems to me, can become, for surplus countries, a modern substitute for the inflationary price adjustments that we must all do everything we can to avoid.

A basic factor in our own deficit position has been the heavy burden we carry for the defense of the free world and for assisting the development of less favored nations. This burden, in a wider context, is an inescapable part of the kind of world we live in. But we are also learning that methods of handling these Government outpayments, and more appropriate distribution of their balance-of-payments impact, can also contribute to the adjustment process without subverting their essential purpose.

Important savings have already been made in this area, reducing net outflows under our defense and aid programs from $3.8 billion in 1960 to $3 billion in 1962. A large portion of this improvement can be traced to the recognition by some European countries of their growing capacity to assume a greater share of the foreign exchange costs of the common defense. As a result, the drain on our payments from maintaining our troops in Germany and Italy is now virtually fully offset by their purchase of military equipment and supplies from the United States—

equipment which, because of the size and flexibility of our defense industry, can be produced more rapidly and more economically in the United States than in their own countries. Thus these arrangements have simultaneously strengthened the free world's military and economic defenses.

In addition, we have adopted a policy of providing the great bulk of our economic aid to developing countries in the form of goods and services, so that it can be brought within the limits of our capacity without impairing its effectiveness. When current commitments are fully reflected in actual disbursements, only some 10 percent of the aid from our various foreign assistance programs will be provided in the form of dollars. At the same time, I believe that we must guard against any tendency to make the "tying" of aid into a subtle new form of protection for home industries. Rather, the logic of our efforts to expand multilateral trade and promote international efficiency through competition among the producers of all nations demands that it be used as a temporary device, reserved for periods of balance-of-payments strains.

With forces of adjustment underway in both our Government and our commercial trade accounts, the most pressing problem in terms of our balance of payments has been the recent acceleration in the outflow of long-term capital. The net outflow of such capital during the first half of this year reached an annual rate of $3.8 billion. This was fully $1.3 billion higher than the already substantial figures for 1962, and nearly double the rate maintained over the years 1959–61. While some of this recent increase stemmed from direct investment, a flood of new foreign borrowings totaling nearly $1 billion in only 6 months was the major factor. This is considerably more than three times the volume we have been accustomed to.

It is entirely consistent with restoration of full equilibrium in international payments that the United States, with its capacity to generate large savings, continues to supply reasonable amounts of capital to aid the development of other nations. But, it is perfectly clear that maintenance of outflows at the recent pace, far from being a constructive force in world payments, would soon put intolerable strains on the international monetary systems as a whole.

As our program of tax reduction takes hold and there are stronger incentives to employ a larger portion of our savings at home, normal market forces will work strongly in the direction of reducing this outflow of long-term capital to more tolerable levels. But the experience of the past year makes clear that we cannot rely on these longer-term forces of adjustment to meet our immediate problem. Nor is it feasible to speed the process of adjustment by artificial attempts to force our entire structure of long-term interest rates sharply and suddenly higher. If possible at all in the face of the huge supply of savings flowing into our markets, this course of action would require so drastic a tightening of credit as to seriously jeopardize the prospects for domestic expansion.

In this situation, we have recommended enactment of a temporary interest equalization tax which will have the effect of raising the costs of portfolio capital in our market by 1 percent for borrowers in the developed countries abroad. This will bring these costs into a rough alinement with those in most other industrialized countries. The purpose is quite simple—to speed the essential redirection of capital flows in a manner comparable to an equivalent, but presently impracticable, rise in our entire structure of interest rates.

We view this tax solely as a necessary—but temporary—expedient to meet a specific situation that has arisen in large part out of a structural imbalance in the capital markets of the free world. Borrowers from deficit and surplus countries alike converge upon the New York market, not only because of our lower structure of long-term interest rates—since equivalent or lower rates can be found in at least two other countries—but because it is still the only source for international capital in whatever size and form desired, freely available to any borrower able to meet the normal market test of creditworthiness, and offering highly efficient distribution facilities with low issuing costs. In contrast, potential alternative markets are in most cases subject to official controls or have difficulty in supplying the needed funds in the volume required. And, with few exceptions, they are characterized by high and rigid rate structures. In the face of this situation, we must temporarily help to redirect the demands pressing on our market through a tax that will increase the costs of long-term borrowing here by foreigners.

The impediments to the development of more adequate European capital markets are currently under close and continuing study within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and progress is beginning to be visible. As efforts to improve European capital markets come to fruition and the remaining controls and restrictions are eliminated—and as our own domestic demands for capital put increased pressures upon our supply of savings—there is every reason to believe that the need for extraordinary action of the kind we are now taking will be eliminated.

When the Fund was established, there was great apprehension that sudden and massive short-term capital movements might again become a disruptive influence as they had in the disturbed climate of the 1930's. Gratifying progress has been made in developing sturdy defenses against such threats to our convertible currency system through the concerted cooperative efforts of the industrialized countries. A chain of new facilities for coping with such pressures is now in place and tested, and there are grounds for confidence that the processes of adjustment can be shielded from perverse speculative flows in the future.

With the restoration of convertibility, however, it has become apparent that a sizable volume of capital is ready to move from country to country in response to relatively small shifts in interest rates. Thus, the stability of exchange rates and freedom of markets toward which we have all worked in the postwar period carries with it the implication that short-term interest rates in the major trading countries must inevitably be kept reasonably well in line with each other.

Both problems and oportunities are implicit in these circumstances. Domestic objectives will sometimes limit the practicable range of fluctuation in interest rates that can be undertaken for facilitating balance-of-payments adjustment. But, since the margin between rate relationships that attract or repel short-term funds is likely to be relatively narrow, it will usually be feasible to encourage small changes in short-term rates in the interest of speeding restoration of international equilibrium without disturbing the domestic economy.

Most promising of all in terms of facilitating the adjustment process is the increasingly close and continuous consultation on these matters that has developed in the forums provided by this institution, by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and by the Bank for International Settlements. This has been particularly evident in the area of short-term capital flows and interest rates. But we are also coming to understand that this same kind of consultation and cooperation is essential in other areas as well. We know that any adjustment demands offsetting changes in the position of deficit and surplus nations. We also know, in the last analysis, that these adjustments must take place, for no workable international monetary system will allow a nation to continue to run a deficit—or for that matter a surplus—for an indefinite period.

The critical question is how the adjustments are to be made. Balance can be—and too often in the past has been—forced by measures that endanger domestic stability or the prospects for growing trade. Those alternatives are not open to us today if the bright promise of all that has been accomplished since Bretton Woods is to be fulfilled. Nor can the industrialized countries afford to undermine the defenses of freedom or to withdraw their support of the developing nations.

The only realistic solution is to find effective ways for reconciling the requirements of a convertible currency system based on fixed exchange rates with the freedom of each nation to pursue domestic growth and stability. No methods will work instantaneously, and one prerequisite to their proper functioning is the availability of adequate liquidity—in the form of international reserves or ready access to credit. The studies now being launched provide fresh assurance that these liquidity needs will be met effectively in the more distant future, just as they are being met effectively today.

But adequate liquidity will not make our machinery of adjustment work automatically, nor can its development be safely put off until emergencies arise. Instead, its effective use will require governments of all nations with a stake in a liberal trading order to work together continuously in many areas: in developing a mix of domestic policies appropriate to external circumstances—in adjusting trade policies—in sharing the burdens of aid and defense—in providing long-term capital—and in eliminating rigidities and inefficiencies in their economies that impede and distort the adjustment process. That willingness, I believe, is now being demonstrated more fully than at any time in the past. This is the real source of my confidence—not only that the United States will restore balance in its own accounts, we intend to carry out that responsibility in any event—but also that a true equilibrium can be restored within a framework of expanding trade, flourishing growth, and monetary stability.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for his helpful participation in the colloquy.

I yield the floor.

SOFT GOODS FOR HARD CURRENCY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, "Soft Goods for Hard Currency" is the five-word precept that should guide our trading relationships with the Communist nations. I encourage our administration to enlarge these relationships. If we can exchange soft consumer goods, no matter what they be, for hard currency or precious metals, we are advancing American national interests.

If we sell some of our surplus wheat, corn, food, or textile products, or other consumer goods such as costume jewelry, and receive in return for these sales hard currency from the Communists, I believe we will have greatly benefited. It does not matter if we extract this hard currency from the Soviet Union, Communist China, or any other nation which we oppose.

By this process we would be mopping up our opponents' supplies of hard currency, so that it would be much more difficult for them to buy capital goods, machinery, arms, or even to engage in subversive activities within the West.

We all know that the financial resources, implied in the words "hard currency," are what provide the sinews of war, and if we can drain our enemies of these particular resources, I believe we—the United States—and the West will have gained.

INTEREST OF LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES IN WATER RESERVOIRS CONSTRUCTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 532, H.R. 1696.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill—H.R. 1696—defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the bill was reported by the committee unanimously. It meets with the approval of the leadership on the minority side and with the members of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 1696 is to make the rights for storage space acquired by States or local interests in reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers available to such agencies as long as the space designated for their purpose may be physically available. The provision would be applicable to all dams and reservoirs which have been or will hereafter be constructed by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army in which local interests have contributed or will hereafter contribute to the Government, or have contracted or will hereafter contract to pay the Government over a specified period of years, money equivalent to the cost of providing space to be used for the storage of water. Under present conditions the customary practice is to make these contracts applicable over a 50-year period. It includes further provisions that the interest of the local interests would be made subject to their fulfillment of the conditions under which they had executed their contractual agreements.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The existing statutory authority under which storage for water supply has been provided to local communities, does not define specifically the rights of local interests after payment of the allocated cost of the water storage has been completed. In the negotiation of past contracts, in many cases local interests have felt very strongly that their rights should be defined, not only for 50 years, which is the maximum payment period of the contracts, but for the physical life of the projects as well.

The bill permits consideration to the effects of the terms of the lease agreement, on reservoir sedimentation and other physical and legal aspects, which might require a review of these terms after the original lease has reached its conclusion. For example, reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers are designed to have sufficient silt storage space for a 50-year accumulation. After the storage space reserved for siltation is filled, the collection of silt will encroach on the live storage capacity allocated to flood control, navigation, hydroelectric powers, water supply, and any other purpose for which storage was to be provided in the reservoir. At such time as the storage capacity is reduced by the accumulation of sediment, adjustments should be made in the storage capacities for all other purposes.

The bill does not change existing requirements as to amounts of payments or reimbursement, but extends the equity of local interests in the reservoir beyond the present scheduled payout period of 50 years.

The Department of the Army believes it desirable to clarify these local rights, and provide uniform treatment of all local interests obtaining storage in Corps of Engineer reservoirs, including those for which the renewal clause was not provided in the original contracts or instruments. H.R. 1696 would also permit continued assessment of annual operation and maintenance costs beyond the payout period, provide for sharing by local interests of any reconstruction or rehabilitation costs necessary to continue project operation, and in the event that the Government concludes that it can no longer usefully and economically maintain and operate the facility, to negotiate a contract with the affected local interest for continued operation of such part of the facility as is necessary for utilization of the storage space allocated to it, under terms which will protect the public interest and absolve the Government from all liability in connection with such operation.

This legislation would apply to all contracts for use of water storage space contracted for by any local agencies in reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers. Although in many cases these agencies are of a State or local public nature, in some cases they are private water companies serving public needs or private concerns having major water requirements.

Section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which applies to storage utilized for irrigation purposes in reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers, would not be affected or modified by the provisions of H.R. 1696.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee is of the opinion that enactment of H.R. 1696 will remedy an inequitable situation that now exists. Under the provisions of the Water Supply Act of 1958, water supply storage for municipal and industrial purposes may be included in reservoir projects, with the cost of such storage repaid within the life of the project, but in no event to exceed 50 years after the project is first used for the storage of water for water supply purposes. Normally the useful life of a project would extend 50 years beyond the time the project is completed, and in some instances the effects of sedimentation may become a factor after that period. When the use of water based on the future demand commences, which may be sometime after completion of the project, the cost of the storage must still be paid out within 50 years. Although the act establishes a maximum payout period of 50 years for the water supply storage, it does not define the non-Federal right at the end of that period.

The committee believes that agencies which have contracted for storage space in reservoirs of the Corps of Engineers to meet water supply needs should not be faced with the uncertainty of losing their rights to the water or lack of recognition of their interests at the end of an arbitrary period expiring in 50 years. The physical life of these projects normally extends far beyond this period of time, and active storage space in the reservoir for designed purposes will not begin to be depleted until after 50 years have passed.

The committee further believes that any local interests should have ample assurance that their rights will be continued at the end of the contract period, and that any existing contract may be revised to indicate the conversion of such rights if deemed advisable, subject to certain continued obligations in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

The bill would define the equity of local interests in water supply storage in reservoir projects after the payout period; encourage participation and local contributions in the multiple use of such reservoirs, facilitate passage of local bond issues to provide payment for water supply storage, and add to the development of the water resources of the country. Accordingly, the committee recommends enactment of H.R. 1696.

ESTIMATED FEDERAL COST

Enactment of H.R. 1696 would result in no additional cost to the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 1696) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DEDUCTIBILITY OF ACCRUED VACATION PAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 472, H.R. 6246.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill—H.R. 6246—relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that the same reasoning applies to this bill as to the previous one. I make a similar request.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I. SUMMARY OF BILL

H.R. 6246 provides that a deduction for accrued vacation pay is not to de denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1965, solely because the liability for it to a specific person has not been fixed or because the liability for it to each individual cannot be computed with reasonable accuracy. However, for the corporation to obtain the deduction, the employee must have performed the qualifying service necessary under a plan or policy which provides for vacations with pay to qualified employees and the liability must be reasonably determinable with respect to the group of employees involved. This is a continuation for 2 more years of the treatment which has been available for taxable years ending before January 1, 1963.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT

Under the 1939 code (sec. 43), the period of time for taking deductions was stated to be the taxable year in which the expenses were "paid or accrued" or "paid or incurred," depending upon the method of accounting, "unless in order to clearly reflect the income, the deductions or credits should be taken as of a different period." Under this provision, it was held that vacation pay for the next year could be accrued as of the close of the taxable year in which the qualifying services were rendered. However, under the employment contract, all of the events necessary to fix the liability of the taxpayer for the vacation pay must have occurred by the close of the taxable year. In determining whether the events necessary to fix the liability of the taxpayer for vacation had occurred, the fact that the employee's rights to a vacation (or payment in lieu of vacation) in the following year might be terminated if his employment ended before the scheduled period was not regarded as making the liability a contingent one (rather than a fixed one). It was held that the liability was not contingent since the employer could expect the employees as a group to receive the vacation pay and, therefore, that only the specific amount of the liability with respect to individuals remained uncertain at the close of the year (GCM 25261, C.B. 1947-2, 44; I.T. 3956, C.B. 1949-1, 78).

In 1954, Congress enacted section 462 of the 1954 code which provided for the deduction of additions to reserves for certain estimated expenses. With this provision in the Internal Revenue Code, it was thought that reserves for vacation pay generally would be covered and, therefore, that it was no longer necessary to maintain the liberal administrative position described above with respect to vacation pay. As a result, in Revenue Ruling 54-608 (C.B. 1954-2, 8), the Internal Revenue Service revised its position on the deductibility of vacation pay. In this ruling, it held that no accrual of vacation pay could occur until the fact of liability with respect to specific employees was clearly established and the amount of the liability to each individual employee was capable of computation with reasonable accuracy. It was thought that taxpayers accruing vacation pay under plans which did not meet the requirements of the strict accrual rule set forth in this ruling would utilize section 462 of the 1954 code. This ruling was initially made applicable to taxable years ending on or after June 30, 1955.

Because section 462 of the code was repealed, the Treasury Department in a series of actions continued to postpone the effective date of Revenue Ruling 54-608 until January 1, 1959 (the last of these postponements was made in Revenue Ruling 57-325, C.B. 1597-2, 302, July 8, 1957). It stated that Revenue Ruling 54-608 was to be inapplicable to taxable years ending before January 1, 1959, and also that in cases involving an agreement with a labor union which was in effect on June 30, 1957, which expired after December 31, 1958, the ruling was to be applicable for the first time to taxable years ending on or after the 90th day following the date the labor agreement expired.

Congress, in the Technical Amendments Act of 1958, further postponed the effective date of Revenue Ruling 54-608 for 2 more years, making it inapplicable to taxable years ending before January 1, 1961. Subsequently, Congress in Public Law 86-496 still further postponed the effective date of Revenue Ruling 54-608. This law provided that this ruling was not to become effective with respect to deductions for accrued vacation pay for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1963.

This bill postpones for 2 more years the effective date of Revenue Ruling 54-608. As a result, deductions for accrued vacation pay will not be denied for any taxable year ending before January 1, 1965, solely by reason of the fact that the liability for the vacation pay to a specific person has not been clearly established or that the amount of the liability to each individual is not capable of computation with reasonable accuracy. This additional time is provided by this bill so Congress will have an opportunity to consider the problem of the deduction of accrued vacation pay and other similar accrual-type deductions prior to the application of this Revenue Ruling 54-608 which provides stringent rules in this area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6246) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO WAR RISK INSURANCE UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 502, S. 927.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 927) to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 2, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "February 1, 1962" and insert "the date of enactment"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1209(a)(2) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking out all beginning with *"Provided, however"* through *"Provided further"* and inserting in lieu thereof *"Provided"*; and

(2) in the second sentence by striking out all beginning with *"Provided, however"* through *"And provided further"* and insert in lieu thereof *"Provided"*.

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable to war risk insurance coverage attaching after the date of enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business tonight, it take a recess until Monday, at 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION ON MONDAY OF SENATE BILLS 927 AND 1172, AMENDING THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the convening of the Senate on Monday, it proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 502, Senate bill 927, to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title, and that half an hour be available on each amendment and 1½ hours on the bill; that, immediately thereafter, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 450, Senate bill 1172, to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518, and that half an hour be available on each amendment, and 1 hour on the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, October 7, 1963, the Senate, upon its convening, proceed to the consideration and disposition, in order, of the following bills, under the unanimous-consent agreement hereafter indicated: S. 927 (Calendar No. 502), a bill to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title, and S. 1172 (Calendar No. 450), a bill to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518.

Ordered further, That on each of the two bills debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one-half hour each, and that on the question of final passage of S. 927 debate shall be limited to 1½ hours, and that on final passage of the bill S. 1172 debate shall be limited to 1 hour, and that the provisions of the usual unanimous-consent agreement form be deemed to be effective in the consideration of the two said bills.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that those two bills will be the first two orders of business for consideration on Monday; it is the intention to have the Senate then commence the consideration of Calendar 531, House bill quality of vocational education and to 4955, to strengthen and improve the expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation. This announcement is made for the information of the Senate. It is a little unusual, I realize; but in this instance I believe it is understood.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. So that there will be no mistake, let me state that I understand that under the agreement, half an hour will be available on each amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In connection with the two bills to be considered on Monday, let me state hearings were held by the distinguished Senator from Alaska, who is familiar with these bills, and also by other members of the committee. The chairman was not at the hearings on these maritime bills, because he was engaged in other committee work. One of them is a very complicated bill, but I am sure there will be no objection to it when it is presented to the Senate. It will take care of a readjustment in the way the recapture of these vessels is handled. Congress has passed a bill changing the life of the ships; it was approved by the Comptroller General and others.

But if on Monday it appears that there is a great deal of opposition to these two bills, I might have to suggest that we postpone the final vote on at least one of them until the Senator from Alaska is present. I am sure he will return by Tuesday or Wednesday. Probably there will be no controversy; but if there were to be much opposition, I would not feel particularly qualified to handle the bills in the absence of the Senator from Alaska, who can explain in great detail the one very complicated bill.

In his absence, and in the event of considerable controversy, it might be that on yea-and-nay votes, the bills might not be passed. However, I am sure that when all Senators understand the complicated bill, there will be little or no opposition to it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, that is understood; and I am sure that at that time, every consideration will be given to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield again to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. In view of the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether he anticipates that any yea-and-nay votes will be taken today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no yea-and-nay votes this afternoon. If any are requested, we shall postpone them until Monday. However, I do not anticipate any.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the able Senator.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LAND IN CITY OF DETROIT, MICH., FOR A LOW-RENT HOUSING PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 772) to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business is H.R. 772, to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield? I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana, provided it is agreed that in doing so, I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well, Mr. President; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unaimous consent that the order for the quoroum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill that has been called up relates to the transfer of urban renewal property in the city of Detroit. The report of the Committee on Banking and Currency—Report No. 508—is rather brief. I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would require the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner to consent to the transfer by the city of Detroit of all real property, except the administration building and appurtenant land, from its low-rent housing project numbered Michigan 1-11 to its Elmwood Park urban renewal project, Michigan R-40. The requirement that consent be given is subject to certain conditions to be met by the city. Payment must be made by the city to the Public Housing Administration of the sum of $1,246,987.31 plus interest, from September 9, 1960, to the date of payment; at 2⅞ percent—this being the rate specified in the annual contributions contract between the city and the Public Housing Administration. This amount is to be applied against the city's obligations in connection with the low-rent housing project numbered Michigan 1-11, and included in the gross project cost of the Elmwood Park urban renewal project.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The committee is advised that the land involved was blighted property acquired by the Detroit Housing Commission in the early 1950's for a low-rent housing project, Michigan 1-11, which was to consist of approximately 3,800 units. The commission demolished the slum buildings on the property and made plans for the construction of the low-rent housing project. The committee is further told that conditions in the neighborhood and in the housing market in Detroit were undergoing a rapid change, and the project was postponed and reduced in size a number of times. The committee is advised that it has now been determined that the low-rent project is not needed.

The property proposed to be transferred is a four-block area comprising approximately 10 acres of land entirely within the Elmwood Park urban renewal project. The administration building and appurtenant land which will not be transferred covers an area of approximately 2¼ acres, and is located on land outside of and not contiguous to the land proposed to be transferred.

Under Michigan statutes, the local authorities which undertake low-rent housing and urban renewal projects are both agencies of the city.

The city of Detroit would, therefore, continue to have title to the property proposed to be transferred, but for urban renewal rather than low-rent housing purposes.

The committee understands that the sum of $1,246,987.31, required to be paid by the city to the Public Housing Administration, represents the cost of acquiring and clearing the land proposed to be transferred including interest costs up to September 9, 1960. This was the effective date of the advance loan note evidencing the indebtedness of the city to the Public Housing Administration with respect to the project as of that date. The sum of $1,246,987.31 does not include low-rent housing architectural or planning costs, nor any costs attributable to the administration building and appurtenant land. The sum thus represents the types of costs which would have been incurred had the area been acquired and cleared for urban renewal purposes. As the area was originally blighted, it would have been eligible for inclusion in the urban renewal project had it not been acquired and cleared for the low-rent housing project.

By letter dated September 9, 1963, to the Chairman from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the committee is advised that the administration has no objection to the enactment of this bill.

Under these circumstances, and because the interests of the Federal Government are not adversely affected, the committee recommends favorable action by the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is always a pleasure to serve under the genial and able Senator from Alabama, who for many years has been chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. He is a great public servant. He always has the broad interests of the community at heart. He has an unruffled temperament, which bears him through the storms of life and parliamentary difficulties. It is always a great pleasure to serve with him. I wish to make it clear that I do not object to the substance of these bills H.R. 772 and H.R. 4842.

I believe that it is important to clarify for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and not merely for the official minutes of the executive sessions of the Committee on Banking and Currency, some of the procedures which were followed in reporting these bills, and which, in my judgment, are in complete harmony with the rules of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

First, do I correctly understand that the bill—H.R. 4842—was automatically referred to the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, and that the bill—H.R. 772—was automatically referred to the Subcommittee on Housing, and that no subcommittee action was taken on either of those bills, no hearings were held, and the subcommittee did not meet in executive session to consider the bills?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. They were automatically referred to the respective subcommittees that were named, and neither subcommittee considered either bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I further correctly understand that on September 10 the full Committee on Banking and Currency met in executive session, and at that time motions were made to discharge the respective subcommittees from any further consideration of the two bills, and that those motions were carried?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. If my memory serves me correctly, the Senator from Illinois is the one who made the motion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

I now ask unanimous consent that the rules of the Committee on Banking and Currency, agreed to on January 14, 1955, and contained in the Committee print dated August 1, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the rules were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(Agreed to Jan. 14, 1955)

1. A subcommittee of the committee may be authorized only by the action of a majority of the full committe.

2. Unless the committee otherwise provides, one member shall constitute a quorum for the receipt of evidence, the swearing of witnesses and the taking of testimony, and the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may issue subpenas.

3. No investigation shall be initiated unless the Senate or the full committee has specifically authorized such investigation.

4. No hearing of the committee or a subcommittee shall be scheduled outside of the District of Columbia except by the majority vote of the committee or subcommittee.

5. No confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented at an executive hearing of the committee or a subcommittee or any report of the proceedings of such an executive hearing shall be made public, either in whole or in part or by way of summary, unless authorized by the committee or subcommittee.

6. Any witness subpenaed to a public or executive hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his own choosing who shall be permitted, while the witness is testifying, to advise him of his legal rights.

7. If the committee or a subcommittee is unable to meet because of the failure or inability of its chairman to call a meeting or for any other reason, the next senior majority member of the committee or the subcommittee, who is able to act, shall call a meeting of the committee or the subcommittee within 15 days after the receipt by the Secretary of the Senate of a written request, stating the purpose of such a meeting, from a majority of the members of the committee or the subcommittee.

8. Committee or subcommittee interrogation of witnesses shall be conducted only by members and staff personnel authorized by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I further correctly understand that the procedure in the Committee on Banking and Currency which was followed on these bills is entirely consistent with the committee rules and the rules of the Senate? There is nothing in those rules to prevent the full committee from taking a bill away from a subcommittee?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in reply to that question, I should like to say that the meeting was a meeting of the full Committee on Banking and Currency. The chairman of the committee was unavoidably absent and asked me to preside over the meeting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ruled to the effect that the Senator from Illinois pointed out. I ruled that where the committee's rules did not cover a given situation, the committee was governed by the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it correct that I asked the clerk of the committee if the procedure we were contemplating was in accordance with the rules of the committee, and that I was told that there was no rule to the contrary?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If I remember correctly, the Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. President, I believe this case establishes a very valuable record. These bills have received full consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency. They ought to be passed by the Senate. I merely wish to make sure that there could be no possible parliamentary objection to the procedure that was followed by the committee in reporting these bills to the Senate. I believe that both bills ought to be passed by the Senate. I have no further objection to consideration of them at this time.

Perhaps I should add that this is the same basic procedure by which, in 1958, we dealt with what was called the depressed areas bill. At that time I believe the subcommittee was opposed to the depressed areas bill. By a vote of the full committee, and over the objection of the chairman, I was able to keep the bill from being assigned to the subcommittee and instead had it considered by the full committee; that motion was carried in the full committee by a vote of 8 to 5.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, when the Senator refers to "chairman," he means the chairman of the full committee and not the acting chairman, because I voted for the area redevelopment bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. A precedent has been reaffirmed, namely, that in the absence of a rule to the contrary the Committee on Banking and Currency can take bills from a subcommittee and report them to the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My rulings in connection with the bills now before the Senate were based upon what I believe to be a sound principle, and that is that the full committee has control of itself at all times and has control over its subcommittees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate that. And I appreciate very much the help which the Senator from Alabama gave me in that historic struggle in 1958, which, in my judgment, saved the depressed areas bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, we shall not go over old matters.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But the Senator will remember that in a report which, as chairman of the subcommittee, I made back in about 1951 I recommended an area redevelopment program for rural counties.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator's proposal applied to the entire area.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has also helped to straighten out the parliamentary procedures inside the Committee on Banking and Currency, which are now burnished bright and perhaps ready for use on another occasion. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 772) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL CREDIT UNION ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 488, H.R. 4842.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (H.R. 4842) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meeting and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the report from the Committee on Banking and Currency on the bill is rather brief, and sets forth fully the arguments in favor of the bill, which was recommended by the departments of Government having jurisdiction over the subject. I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from the report printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

H.R. 4842 would extend the time during which a Federal credit union may hold the annual meeting of the membership to January, February, or March, instead of confining the meeting to the month of January, as the law now requires.

H.R. 4842 also would make it optional with the individual credit union whether the treasurer should serve as the general manager. At present both positions must be filled by the same individual.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

At annual meetings of Federal credit unions, directors are elected, financial reports presented on the previous year's operations, and policy decisions voted for the coming year.

The advance preparations required for annual meetings must come at a time when the workload on credit union personnel represents a major administrative burden. At the end of each year, dividend payments and interest refunds must be computed and posted, the corporate books must be closed and audited, and financial statements prepared and transmitted to members. Still another administrative chore was added, beginning in 1964, with enactment of the recent law requiring reporting to the U.S. Treasury and to the individual member of dividends paid of $10 or more.

Extending the time during which the credit union annual meeting may be held over a 3-month period will lessen or eliminate most of these problems.

As a credit union grows and moves to a full-time operation with one or more employees, it is sometimes impractical for the person who is elected treasurer to also serve as the general manager. Often someone is employed by the board of directors to fill the managerial position with the treasurer remaining as an elected part-time official. But under the present law such an employee cannot be given the title of general manager, even though this title accurately describes his position and responsibilities.

Separation of these positions within the discretion of the individual credit union would assist in properly identifying and allocating responsibilities.

H.R. 4842 should be enacted promptly if Federal credit unions are to be able to take advantage of the opportunity which would be provided by H.R. 4842 to select a date later than January for their 1964 annual meetings.

The bill is supported by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A copy of the Department's letter is attached.

Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare,
September 16, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This letter is in response to your request of August 21, 1963, for a report on H.R. 4842, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes.

The bill would permit the annual meetings of members of Federal credit unions to be held during January, February, or March, instead of confining such meetings to the month of January, as presently required; and would make it optional with each Federal credit union as to whether the treasurer shall serve as general manager.

Since Federal credit unions are membership organizations, maximum participation by the members is most desirable. The annual meeting of the members provides the opportunity for the election of the members of the board of directors and the credit committee and affords the members with a full report of the credit union's activities. These meetings also permit the members the opportunity to express themselves with regard to policies or management decisions and to instruct the board on any matters of general interest. Since experience has indicated that inclement weather and the press of the ordinary occupational responsibilities of the officials and members have often limited participation at membership meetings held during the month of January, it is appropriate that additional leeway in the scheduling of this important meeting be provided.

Those Federal credit unions conducting full-time operations with paid employees often find that the person who is elected as treasurer may not be able to devote sufficient time to operations to properly discharge the statutory requirement of also being the general manager. In such cases a separate individual cannot be assigned either the title or the responsibility of a full-time manager, and the treasurer, who must retain legal responsibility, is too far removed from actual operations to properly discharge that responsibility. We believe that it would be desirable to permit each Federal credit union to determine its needs with respect to a general manager, and to separate his duties and responsibilities from those of the treasurer if it feels this would be advantageous from the standpoint of efficient operation and accountability.

We therefore favor the enactment of H.R. 4842, and suggest that prompt action would be especially advantageous to Federal credit unions in scheduling their 1964 annual meeting other than in the month of January, when they will be heavily involved in the dividend reporting now required by law. The two amendments to the Federal Credit Union Act proposed by H.R. 4842, together with the four amendments to the act embodied in this Department's draft bill (submitted to the Senate on September 12, 1963), would provide greater flexibility and otherwise improve the operation of Federal credit unions.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

Wilbur J. Cohen,
Assistant Secretary.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

Sections 11 and 13 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1760–1761a)

MEMBERS' MEETINGS

Sec. 11. The fiscal year of all Federal credit unions shall end December 31. The annual meeting of each Federal credit union shall be held at such time [during the month of the following January] *during the following January, February, or March* and at such place as its bylaws shall prescribe. Special meetings may be held in the manner indicated in the bylaws. No member shall be entitled to vote by proxy, but a member other than a natural person may vote through an agent designated for the purpose. Irrespective of the number of shares held by him, no member shall have more than one vote.

* * * * *

OFFICERS

Sec. 13. At their first meeting after the annual meeting of the members, the directors shall elect from their number a president, one or more vice presidents, a secretary, and a treasurer, who shall be the executive officers of the corporation. No executive officer, except the treasurer, shall be compensated as such. The offices of secretary and treasurer may be held by the same person. The duties of the officers shall be as determined by the bylaw [, except that the treasurer shall be the general manager of the corporation]. Before the treasurer shall enter upon his duties he shall give bond with good and sufficient surety, in an amount and character to be determined by the board of directors in compliance with regulations prescribed from time to time by the Director, conditioned upon the faithful performance of his trust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4842) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 531, H.R. 4955, which is to be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Declaration of purpose

Section 1. It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.

Authorization of appropriations

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $108,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $153,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $198,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter $243,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

Allotments to States

Sec. 3. (a) Eighty-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective

States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

(1) An amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(2) An amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(3) An amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under such subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d)(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this part. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

(3) The term "per capita income" for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

Uses of Federal funds

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415), the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87–27), or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794)) who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities, but not more than 10 per centum of a State's allotment for any year may be used for the construction of facilities for a high school department, division, or other unit described in section 8(2)(B);

(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership, including periodic evaluation of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

(b) At least 40 per centum of each State's allotment for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968, and at least 25 per centum of each State's allotment for any subsequent fiscal year shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) or (5), or both, of subsection (a), and at least 3 per centum of each State's allotment may be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of subsection (a), except that the Commissioner may, upon request of a State permit such State to use a smaller percentage of its allotment for any year for the purposes specified above if he determines that such smaller percentage will adequately meet such purposes in such State.

(c) Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to colleges and universities, to State boards, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to local educational agencies, to pay part of the cost of research and leadership training programs and of experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such institutions, boards, or agencies, and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities, who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs, and of communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

(d) For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, there are also authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and such sums as the Congress may determine for each of the next four fiscal years, for grants by the Commissioner to State boards, to colleges and universities, and to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In making such grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed and shall seek to attain, as nearly as practicable in the light of the purposes of this subsection, an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

State plans

SEC. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this part shall submit through its State board to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies; and, if such State board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes, or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training meeting the definition of vocational education in section 8(1) of this Act, provides for the designation or creation of a State advisory council which shall include such persons, to consult with the State board in carrying out the State plan;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 4(a) so that all persons in all communities of the State will as soon as possible have ready access to vocational training suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit therefrom, and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

(4) provides for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State, approved by the State board and by the State head of such system, looking toward such offices making available to the State board and local

educational agencies occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere, and toward consideration of such information by such board and agencies in providing vocational guidance and counseling to students and prospective students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained; and looking toward guidance and counseling personnel of the State board and local educational agencies making available to public employment offices information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons leaving or completing vocational education courses or schools, and toward consideration of such information by such offices in the occupational guidance and placement of such persons;

(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this part;

(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part; and

(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this part (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(d) A State board which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b) or (c) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

Payments to States

SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5 or the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or both, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Act.

(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

Labor standards

SEC. 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this part shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this part—

(1) The term "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance and counseling in connection with such training, instruction related to the occupation for which the student is being trained or necessary for him to benefit from such training, the training of persons engaged as, or preparing to become vocational education teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

(2) The term "area vocational education school" means—

(A) a specialized high school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(B) the department, division, or other unit of a high school providing vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(C) a technical or vocational school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(D) the department, division, or other unit of a junior college or community college or university which provides vocational education, under the supervision of the State Board, leading to immediate employment but not leading to a baccalaureate degree,

if it is available to all residents of the State or an area of the State designated and approved by the State Board, and if, in the case of a school, department, division, or other unit described in (C) or (D) it admits as regular students both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school.

(3) The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(4) The term "construction" includes construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and includes site grading and improvement and architect fees.

(5) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(6) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(7) The term "State board" means the State board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28)) to secure to the State the benefits of that Act.

(8) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public

educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

(9) The term "high school" does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

(10) The term "Vocational Education Act of 1946" means title I, II, and III of the Act of June 18, 1936, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg).

(11) The term "supplementary vocational education Acts" means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam).

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education

SEC. 9. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational educational needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public, and not more than six of such members shall be professional educators. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 5 and the approval of projects under section 4 (c) and (d).

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts

Sec. 10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in title I, II, or III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), or in the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)), or in supplementary vocational education Acts—

(a) any portion of any amount allotted (or apportioned) to any State for any purpose under such titles, Act, or Acts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for any fiscal year thereafter, may be transferred to and combined with one or more of the other allotments (or apportionments) of such State for such fiscal year under such titles, Act, or Acts, or under section 3 of this part and used for the purposes for which, and subject to the conditions under which, such other allotment (or apportionment) may be used, if the State board requests, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that such portion be transferred and shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that transfer of such portion in the manner requested will promote the purpose of this part;

(b) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm;

(c) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects;

(d) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for distributive occupations may be used for vocational education for any person over fourteen years of age who has entered upon or is preparing to enter upon such an occupation, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools;

(e) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for trade and industrial occupations may be used for preemployment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment in such occupations persons over fourteen years of age who are in school, and operated for less than nine months per year and less than thirty hours per week and without the requirement that a minimum of 50 per centum of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, if such preemployment schools and classes are for single-skilled or semi-skilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature; and less than one-third of any amounts so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

Extension of practical nurse training and area vocational educational programs

SEC. 11. (a)(1) Section 201 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa) is amended by striking out "of the next eight fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(2) Subsection (c) of section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "of the next seven fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(b) Section 301 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out "of the five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

Periodic review of vocational education programs and laws

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and other vocational education Acts and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such vocational educational programs and the Acts under which funds are so appropriated.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this part and other vocational education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1968, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress.

(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

Work-study programs for vocational education students

SEC. 13. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next four fiscal years such sums as may be necessary, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this section.

(b)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated under subsection (a) for such year as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all the States in such preceding year.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under subsection (c) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

(c) To be eligible to participate in this section, a State must have in effect a plan approved under section 5 and must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a supplement to such plan (hereinafter referred to as a "supplementary plan"), in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the supplementary plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (b) will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of subsection (d), except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, may be used to pay the cost of developing the State's supplementary plan and the cost of administering such supplementary plan after its approval under this section;

(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give preference to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this section;

(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(d) For the purposes of this section, a work-study program shall—

(1) be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency for vocational education programs assisted under the preceding sections of this part, or in the case of a student already enrolled in such a program, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (B) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program, and (C) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in his vocational education program while employed under the work-study program;

(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, or for compensation which exceeds $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year or its equivalent, unless the student is attending a school which is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home, in which case his compensation may not exceed $60 in any month or $500 in any academic year or its equivalent;

(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this section) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this section) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this section is approved.

(e) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 5 (pertaining to the approval of State plans, the withholding of Federal payments in case of nonconformity after approval, and judicial review of the Commissioner's final actions in disapproving a State plan or withholding payments) shall be applicable to the Commissioner's actions with respect to supplementary plans under this section.

(f) From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (b) for such fiscal year.

(g) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under subsection (b).

(h) Students employed in work-study programs under this section shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

Federal control

SEC. 14. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Short title

SEC. 15. This part may be cited as the "Vocational Education Act of 1963".

PART B—EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Amendment to title I—General provisions

SEC. 21. (a) Section 103(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time it appears therein.

(b) Subsections (g) and (h) of such section 103 are amended by inserting "or, if such school is not in any State, as determined by the Commissioner" after the words "as determined under State law" wherever such words appear in such subsections.

(c) Subsection (i) of such section 103 is amended by striking out "does not include" and inserting in lieu thereof "includes" and by inserting before the period ", except that no such school or institution shall be eligible to receive any grant, loan, or other payment under this Act".

(d) Subsection (k) of such section 103 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", or any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school".

Amendments to title II—Loans to students in institutions of higher education

SEC. 22. (a) The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1964, to continue or complete their education" and inserting in lieu thereof "$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the next fiscal year, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $145,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1967, to continue or complete their education".

(b) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "1964" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1967".

(c) Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, section 203 (b) of such Act is amended by striking out "$250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$800,000".

(d)(1) Subparagraph (2)(A)(i) of subsection (b) of section 205 of such Act is amended by inserting "or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner" after "at an institution of higher education".

(2) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection is amended by inserting "or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States" after "State".

(3) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (2) of this subsection shall apply with respect to service as a teacher (described in such section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

(e) Section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out "1968" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

Amendments to title III—financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction

SEC. 23. (a) Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(b) (1) The second sentence of subsection (a) (2) of section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out "as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "between July 1 and August 31 of each odd-numbered year". The third sentence of such subsection is amended to read as follows: "Each such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation, except that the allotment ratios promulgated in 1959 shall be conclusive for each of the four fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1964."

(2) Effective with respect to allotments under section 302 or section 305 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 302 is further amended by striking out subsection (a)(4) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and section 305(a), respectively, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), as the case may be, for such year."

(c) Section 303(a)(1)(A) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting "and published" after "printed", and (2) by inserting "of test grading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and" after "or both, and".

(d) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out "four succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years".

Amendments to title IV—National Defense Fellowships

SEC. 24. (a) Section 402 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(b) Such section is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 402.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine."

(c) Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition."

Amendments to title V—Guidance, counseling, and testing

SEC. 25. (a) Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the three succeeding fiscal years".

(b) (1) Effective with respect to allotments under section 502 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, the third sentence of such section is amended by striking out "$20,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000".

(2) Effective with respect to allotments under such section 502 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 502 is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 502." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 501 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year."

(c) (1) Subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 503 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) a program for testing students who are not below grade 7 in the public elementary or secondary schools of such State, and if authorized by law in corresponding grades in other elementary or secondary schools in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program: *Provided,* That no such program shall provide for the conduct of any test, or the asking of any question in connection therewith, which is designed to elicit information dealing with the personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, or sociological or psychological problems of the pupil tested; and".

(2) Subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) of such section 503 is amended by striking out "public secondary schools" and inserting in lieu thereof "public elementary or secondary schools", and by inserting "who are not below grade 7" after "students" in clause (A) thereof.

(d) (1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of such Act is amended by striking out "four succeeding fiscal years", and inserting in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years", and by inserting before the semicolon ", including amounts expended under the State plan for State supervisory or related services in public elementary or secondary schools in the fields of guidance, counseling, and testing, and for administration of the State plan".

(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section 504 is amended by striking out "the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools", and inserting in lieu thereof "the cost of testing students, who are not below grade 7, in any one or more elementary or secondary schools", and by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(e) (1) Section 511 of such Act is amended to strike out "five succeeding fiscal years" and to insert in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(2) Such section is further amended to insert "who are not below grade 7 in elementary or" after "students", and to insert "elementary or" after "counseling or guidance in a public".

Amendments to title VI—Language development

SEC. 26. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "1964" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1967".

(b) Section 611 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "As used in this section 'modern foreign language' includes English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language.".

Amendments to title VII—Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes

SEC. 27. (a) Section 701 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," and after "auditory aids,".

(b) Section 731 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," wherever appearing therein.

(c) Section 761 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," wherever appearing therein.

(d) Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

Amendments to title X—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 28. (a) Section 1008 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam,".

(b) Section 1009(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

PART C—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

Amendments to Public Law 815

SEC. 31. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(2) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out "1963" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(3) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1960–1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963–1964".

(b) Section 15(13) of such Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "Guam,".

Amendments to Public Law 874

SEC. 32. (a) Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out "1963" each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(b) Section 9(8) of such Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "Guam,".

Effective dates

SEC. 33. The amendments made by sections 31 and 32 shall be effective July 1, 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of placing H.R. 4955 before the Senate is to bring home to the Senate the fact that, even though it will be the unfinished business on Monday next when the Senate meets under the unanimous consent agreement which has been entered into, it will be displaced temporarily by S. 927, to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title, and also by S. 1172, to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518; and that on completion of the time limitations attached to those proposals the Senate will once again return to consideration of the vocational education bill.

PRIVATE VERSUS PUBLIC SHIPYARD WORK

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President although the recent action on the Defense appropriations bill, H.R. 7179, did not drastically change the so-called 35/65 formula for private versus public shipyard work, I would still like to go on record as requesting a continuing study of the problem. Many of us in the State of Hawaii feel that insufficient attention has been paid to some of the following arguments.

In recent months, the release of the Andersen report dealing with the difference between U.S. Navy shipbuilding costs at naval and private shipyards has generated in many circles the alarming and misleading conclusion that the operations of private shipyards are vastly more efficient and economical than naval shipyards. This has led to a clamor that we sharply curtail the operations of naval shipyards and even that we close several or all of our naval shipyards.

As a result, I sincerely feel that these erroneous conclusions, which have an immediate and direct bearing on the allocation of Navy repair, alteration, and conversion work to privately owned shipyards, should be promptly exposed lest they form the basis for future legislative decisions which will seriously jeopardize the security of our Nation and the free world.

The dangers to our democracy are multifarious and often difficult to recognize. They can originate from outside the geographic boundaries of our United States but just as often, they can emanate from within the boundaries of our States. They can be of a military nature involving missiles and men, or they can be of an economic nature involving the outflow of gold or undesirable subsidies. They can take the form of subversion and espionage or they can take the form of internal strife and disorder. They can be formulated by the forces of communism bent upon burying our democratic form of Government, or they can be unwittingly fostered by loyal Americans unaware of the detrimental impact of their goals and objectives on the security and welfare of our Nation.

To a large extent, I speak to these loyal Americans, whose relentless and concerted campaign to obtain the bulk of Navy repair, alteration, and conversion work has blinded them and their advocates to national considerations more vital than profits and purported Government competition. I am of the opinion that if these Americans are presented with the true picture and the overriding reasons for the accomplishment of repair, alteration, and conversion work in naval shipyards, they too will come to appreciate the merits of the present balance of naval versus private shipwork allocation and, as dedicated citizens, support the continuation of such work by naval shipyards.

The major arguments advanced by those who propose that all or most of our naval ship building and repair work be accomplished by private shipyards are; first, that naval shipyards should not compete with private shipyards and, second, that private shipyards can do naval shipwork faster and cheaper than naval shipyards. Let us examine each of these contentions in its proper perspective so that we can determine its validity and propriety.

With regard to the oft repeated accusation that naval shipyards are in competition with private shipyards, I contend that if the primary objective of private shipyards is to function as an integral part of our naval service, then I am ready fully to acknowledge that naval shipyards are indeed in competition with private shipyards. However, as we are all well aware, this is a distorted relationship. Merchant ships and private shipyards are instruments of commerce and our free enterprise system. Warships and naval shipyards are instruments to preserve the freedom of the seas and the security and sovereignty of our Nation. When it has been proven to be in the best interest of the Nation to allocate shipwork to private shipyards for the purpose of establishing a sound mobilization base, the Navy has taken the initiative to channel such work to private industry. For example, it should be acknowledged that a preponderance of new naval construction has been allocated to private shipyards. In January 1961, a naval ship construction and conversion program having a total cost of over $4 billion was under contract with private yards. Approximately 31 private shipbuilding firms throughout the country participated in this program. In addition, substantial amounts of Navy business have been awarded to private industry other than private shipyards in continuous recognition and support of the producers of materials used in Navy ships. Finally, since World War II, a substantial dollar value of certain types of ship repair work also has been allocated to private shipyards. As a result, insofar as employment is concerned, private shipyard employment on Navy work increased from 26,069 in 1957 to 41,743 in 1960, almost doubling the workforce of private yards engaged in Navy work. Thus, it can be readily seen that the Navy not only fully recognizes the mobilization potential of private industry but is also a firm advocate and vigorous supporter of private enterprise. On the other hand, when the safety of the fleet and the security of the Nation is at stake, such work has been retained in the naval shipyards in order to preserve the proven structure of our Navy's fighting organization.

To truly appreciate the fact that naval shipyards are not in competition with private shipyards, please permit me to provide a better picture of the significant role of our naval shipyards and their great importance to our Navy.

Naval shipyards were created as an integral part of our naval service and their long and illustrious existence attests to their vital and significant role in the Navy's organization. From the year 1797 when the Naval Committee of the House of Representatives recommended that a sum be apportioned for a proper site for a Navy yard, naval shipyards have functioned as an important and indispensable arm of our Navy. Throughout our glorious American history, from wooden ships to nuclear submarines, shipyards have sustained the ships and sailors of our Navy.

Nowhere is the mission of shipyards to our Navy's fighting ships more aptly described than by the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard's stirring slogan "We keep them fit to fight." In these times of cold war and hot tensions, our naval shipyards more than ever form a vitally essential component of our Navy's time-tested organization as they strive to keep our warships "fit to fight."

Our naval shipyards are as inseparable a part of our operating forces afloat as the mighty warships which protect and control the waterways of the seas. Controlling the seas and supporting our forces overseas is at best a dangerous, unpredictable, intricately complicated mission, especially in this age of missile warfare and continual international unrest. With intercontinental ballistic missiles, Polaris missiles, and swift manned aircraft, the world is measured by hours and minutes instead of hundreds of thousands of miles. Never before in the history of warfare have our military commanders felt an infinitely greater need for maximum control of their logistics forces. For the parallel and simultaneous use of these ever ready and responsive logistics forces, whether they be supply ships or naval shipyards, can mean victory or defeat—democracy or communism.

Deny our naval commanders at sea the free and flexible use of our naval shipyards in the sacrosanct name of free enterprise and non-Government competition and we may well contribute to spelling the doom of that very economy. For freedom, whether it be free enterprise or free speech, is a costly commodity which demands considerable restraint and great sacrifice. In this uneasy world of international strife and turmoil, we cannot afford to make mistakes. Let us at least not make the grave mistake of hindering our naval commanders and endangering our fine naval organization by weakening or eliminating our responsive naval shipyard support system.

Our naval shipyards are an integral part of our Navy's shore establishment which exists to provide optimum material and operational readiness support to our forces afloat. As essential links in the naval chain of command, naval shipyards function as military-industrial organizations whose operations are closely tied in to the military requirements of our naval commanders ashore or at sea. They are designed, staffed, and equipped to fulfill this primary purpose and thereby serve to enhance the posture of our naval strike forces which are positioned in various parts of the world. Thus, when a warship enters a naval shipyard for repairs or overhaul, it is still an active ship ready to be shifted or shuffled at any moment's notice by our naval commanders to meet the various exigencies which may arise. This is especially true of naval warships which are part of a fleet deployment but have returned to the naval shipyard for repair and work to insure optimum operational readiness.

Closely communicating with other activities of the shore establishment team and smoothly integrated with the operational schedules and plans of the numerous naval shipyards and activities, the efforts of naval shipyards coincide with and contribute to the overall long-range objectives of our Navy tactical planners.

On the other hand, private shipyards are motivated essentially by profits. They are in many instances limited by staff, facilities, and equipment deficiencies. They must weigh profit against loss and select only that work which will yield the greatest gain. In nearly every instance, the margin of profit will determine when, where and how quickly a ship can be returned to a state of readiness. Under such conditions, it can be readily seen that the potential strength of our forces afloat would be seriously weakened unless private shipyards could be organized or oriented to provide the same degree of responsiveness and capability offered by our naval shipyards.

As integral units of the shore establishment organization, our naval shipyards are an indivisible part of our Navy's strategically dispersed naval base complex. When a ship visits port or is scheduled for repairs at the naval shipyard, the naval base provides training, medical, recreational, and other community facilities for our Navy men who spend much of their lives on the lonely sea. The naval base also provides a focal point for naval communities so that these men can also look forward to being with their loved ones for relatively brief periods of time and enjoying family life which most of us take for granted. Increase the amount of work performed by private shipyards or eliminate the naval shipyards and our Navy men, who already suffer considerable privation, will be deprived the facilities of a naval base and even more important, will be unable to see their families and their loved ones for unbearable periods. It is not often that a low bidder is located in the immediate vicinity of a naval base or a naval community.

Without the assurance of necessary naval facilities and some periods of family life, I can almost predict an alarming turnover in naval personnel. In a survey of enlisted men being separated at Norfolk, Va., almost one quarter of the personnel stated that family separation was their most important reason for not reenlisting. So we can see that the desire of families to be together is deepseated and universal. In the interest of minimizing turnover of our highly trained and skilled naval personnel who are so desperately needed to operate the intricate warships and complex weapons systems of our modern Navy, it is not only necessary but essential that we insure the continuation of naval shipwork at naval shipyards.

Naval shipyards are geared to the numerous military, technological, and scientific changes that continuously evolve throughout our Navy organization. Almost daily, new discoveries are being made to produce a dynamic, hard-hitting, versatile type of seapower which will enhance the defense posture of our Nation. But with the introduction of long-range, deep-diving nuclear powered vessels, deadly combat weapons systems, sensitive navigational devices, and a host of other marvelous technological innovations come the rigid requirements of quality workmanship and rigid inspection to assure the safety and integrity of our naval warships. The experience of our Navy demonstrates that the successful operation of nuclear powerplants, combat weapons systems, as well as the multitude of intricate devices on board a ship, depends on the reliability of the sum total of all the parts and components of a warship. Experience has also shown that lack of or inattention to quality control measures has almost invariably ended in unnecessary cost and even tragedy. Too much is at stake, and too many lives are involved to accept merely satisfactory standards of industrial workmanship. What is needed and indeed required of every naval shipyard performing work on naval warships are highly trained and experienced journeymen, supervisors, engineers, inspectors, and technical personnel who have a complete understanding of every phase of work on a warship, the manufacturing and inspection process, the technical or trade processes and the high standards of quality required to insure the integrity of the weapons system or the ship. The cost of recruiting the most competent and dependable type of personnel, training these personnel, establishing effective quality control procedures, and inspecting to insure rigid adherence to specifications, is exceedingly great. The cost of maintaining a large supervisory force to insure implementation of effective quality assurance procedures is also extremely heavy. The cost of additional equipment, tools, and facilities to verify the soundness of work performance is also high. And finally, the cost of a reduced productive pace or delays to insure quality workmanship is also a great burden. But to our Navy and our naval commanders, these costs are as necessary as the cost of national defense. They are costs which private shipyards are not generally in a position to bear because of the intense competition which presently prevails in the shipbuilding industry. Thus, were private shipyards to undertake the entire spectrum of work on naval warships, I dare say that the price would determine the quality of work since the lowest bidder is almost always awarded the contract. Under such circumstances, were the bulk of naval shipwork allocated to private shipbuilders, we would be guilty of trifling with the lives of men who have dedicated themselves to our defense. On the other hand, if private shipbuilders were to establish quality assurance organizations and implement quality control procedures equal to that of the naval shipyards, it is probable that their overhead would rise considerably, thereby reflecting a truer comparison of ship repair costs with naval shipyards.

Naval shipyards are complete entities designed and developed to fulfill military as well as industrial needs, peacetime as well as wartime needs, and specialized as well as general needs. They cover large areas and contain a diversity of material, equipment, facilities and structures. They are forever confronted with ever-changing types of work and are continually pressed to keep pace with the rapid advance of technology and science. They are staffed with highly skilled artisans, technicians, engineers, scientists, administrators and managers to enable our naval shipyard to effectively handle every phase and every requirement of our progressive Navy. They conduct experimental and developmental work and complete work which private shipyards are not equipped or staffed to accomplish. In short, naval shipyards serve not only the current military needs of our naval forces but are also staffed, equipped and maintained to immediately cope with any emergency or mobilization needs. Thus, in the Korean incident, the Lebanon landing, and the Cuban crisis, our naval shipyards were swiftly mobilized to the extent necessary to cope with the expanded requirements of each emergency. Despite the additional cost of maintaining naval shipyards as firstline mobilization bases, both our Navy and our Nation have good reason to appreciate their investment, for the naval shipyard system has proven many times over its worth in terms of national prestige and power. Private shipyards can ill afford to staff, operate and equip their plants to meet the multitudinous needs of our Navy. Such profit-type organizations of necessity must limit their operations or specialize in certain areas of shipwork. This in turn poses considerable problems for our Navy in the attainment of quality work in the time allotted. Therefore, the allocation of the bulk or all of naval shipwork would almost certainly disrupt fleet operational schedules and require enormous amounts of costly planning, coordination, progressing and inspection effort which would increase private shipbuilding costs greatly.

The attainment of optimum operational and material readiness are watchwords to our Navy, and especially to the fleet commanders. No other condition, I believe, stands out so paramount in all activities and at all levels of our naval organization. The retention and control of naval shipwork in naval shipyards assures our naval commanders of the ready and responsive logistics support of our warships at any time and any condition. This is not true in private shipyards where the right to strike can and has been rightfully exercised. Were the bulk of naval ship repair work to be accomplished by private shipyards, the chances are indeed great that labor unions would exercise their right to strike to attain their objectives. The monetary cost of these strikes would be enormous but an even greater cost to our country would be the reduced operational and material readiness of our fighting forces. This potential problem should loom very large in the minds of those who advocate the curtailment or elimination of naval shipyards for it can cause serious and detrimental harm to the security and welfare of our country.

I have gone to great lengths to demonstrate the great value and significance of naval shipyards to our Navy. I have attempted to show that as indispensable instruments of defense, naval shipyards provide responsive, adaptable, versatile, and reliable support to our naval forces and their continued retention at maximum operating capacity is in the best interest of our public welfare.

On the other side of the coin, I have tried to demonstrate that private shipyards are primarily instruments of commerce and that they operate under severe restrictions and handicaps as instruments of defense. Thus, the great differences in their nature, their purpose, and their objectives do not support the contention that naval shipyards are in competition with private shipyards. Rather, it can be said that private shipyards in their legitimate and mobilization role complement the efforts of naval shipyards to provide responsive, adaptable, versatile, and reliable support to our Navy's operating forces. If those who seek to reduce the workload of or eliminate naval shipyards entirely could understand the proper role and relationship of both naval and private shipyards, I am confident they will revise their thinking in the interest of our Nation's security and welfare.

And now, let us analyze the second popular notion that private shipyards can do naval shipwork faster and cheaper than naval shipyards.

Since the Andersen report has been heralded by many detractors of the naval shipyard system as the tablet of truth which proves the superior performance of private shipyards over naval shipyards, I shall use this report to show an equally comparable performance on the part of naval shipyards. Before proceeding, I would like to emphasize that the Andersen report was sponsored by the Department of Defense and the Navy's Bureau of Ships in a genuine effort to learn more about the comparative costs of private and naval shipyards in accomplishing naval shipwork. To my mind, such a step on the part of a Government agency in sponsoring an unbiased study which may be subject to cosiderable public scrutiny and criticism is indeed commendable. The report, together with other programs, plans, and procedures, exemplifies the sincere and determined effort of our Navy to make every cent in the dollar count for the American taxpayer while at the same time provide for the strongest defense of our country.

Although the Andersen report is considered by many to be the most complete and comprehensive study of costs between private shipyards and naval shipyards and has revealed certain potential areas for improvement in the naval shipyard system, I do not consider that it has proven that private shipyards can perform naval shipwork cheaper than naval shipyards.

The general conclusions of the Andersen report are as follows:

First. Certain private shipyards perform new construction work at less cost to the Department of Defense.

Second. Conversion, repair and alteration costs are roughly equal.

Third. The two principal factors contributing to higher overhead costs in naval shipyards are higher fringe benefits and more indirect salary or wage personnel per nonsupervisory hourly worker in production shops.

The Andersen report, however, shows that ships in the repair category were completed 3 days faster in naval shipyards than in private shipyards. Further, in a sample of 175 ships, it was found that ships overhauled by naval shipyards operated 21.3 months before being overhauled again while those overhauled by private shipyards operated only 20.1 months. The difference of 1.1 percent in operating time means that our Navy would have to have at least 2 more ships in order to have an equal number available to our forces afloat if all 175 were overhauled at private yards. This greater longevity of naval shipyard overhauls must surely indicate the greater emphasis and attention placed on high caliber and high quality workmanship by our Navy. The value of placing warships in the most durable and lasting condition can only be fully appreciated by the men who sail these ships and whose lives depend upon how effectively they function.

Now that we have disposed of the claim that private shipyards can do naval shipwork faster than naval shipyards, let us evaluate whether they can do naval shipwork cheaper. At the outset, I would like to emphasize that in considering the question of cost, the Andersen report makes absolutely no allowance for the various costly, intangible, but highly essential elements involved in maintaining naval shipyards in a constant state of readiness as an indispensable arm of our naval service. The neglect of these all-important elements which I enumerated in my discussion on the alleged competition of naval shipyards obviates the validity of any conclusions contained in the Andersen report since the foundation of the study is based only on comparability of work but ignores comparability of purpose and objectives. Even in the area of comparability of work, the Andersen report admits great difficulty in developing samples of comparable work and in the ship repair area was unable to do so at all. In order to present my analysis in an orderly and logical manner I will develop this important point in its proper context later.

In taking issue with the conclusions of the Andersen report, that private shipyards can perform work cheaper than naval shipyards when taken as an average, I would like to point out that other experts have noted:

First. An extremely large depreciation allowance was added to new construction and conversion costs for naval shipyards. Since the practice of accruals for depreciation is not followed by naval shipyards, it is incorrect to charge on the basis of overstated expenditures more than was actually provided. Furthermore, funds to partially allay actual depreciation in many instances are included in normal shipyard operating costs. This is borne out by the fact that naval shipyards expended, during the period of the study, 12 cents more per productive hour for plant maintenance than private shipyards.

Second. The cost of doing business with private shipyards in new construction and conversion work was not included in the adjustment of charges while similar functions performed by military personnel at naval shipyards were charged. Additional costs in preparing commercial procurement requests, holding bidder conferences, auditing prospective contractors' financial condition, and awarding of negotiating contracts were some of the charges excluded.

Third. The deductions from private shipyards' new construction and conversion cost for Federal income tax were based on profit and losses on specific ships included in the study sample. This is completely unrealistic since taxes are based on the overall annual profits and losses—as well as deductions and other "tax shelters"—of the private shipyard and not on a specific ship or group of ships.

Fourth. An inordinate charge was added to the cost of naval shipyards for interest on invested capital without taking into account the fair market value of our naval shipyards and without considering whether they will ever be disposed of.

While it is difficult to establish a valid basis for recomputing all of the adjustments which have been contested, we consider it fair and reasonable to reduce depreciation charges to 27 percent of the amount used in the Andersen report and to eliminate the interest on invested capital.

Taking just these two factors into consideration, there are naval experts who find that the private shipyards purported cost advantage for new construction work has been whittled down as follows:

First. For the 598 class of nuclear attack submarines from 15.2 percent to 10.9 percent.

Second. For the 598 class of Polaris submarines from 20.3 percent to 16.9 percent.

Third. For the DLG–9 *Coontz* class guided-missile frigate from 18.7 to 13.6 percent.

Fourth. And for the CVA–59 class of supercarrier from 29 to 24.2 percent.

Let us now consider another area of adjustment which I feel will bring the costs of private shipyards and naval shipyards into closer and sharper focus. As repeatedly emphasized in the Andersen report, the fringe benefits paid by naval shipyards constitute a significantly large overhead burden. Such benefits as annual leave, sick leave, holidays, jury duty and military leave boost naval shipyard costs, based on overall averages, to $1.29 per direct labor hour as compared to $0.84 for private shipyards; a big difference of $0.45 per direct labor hour. For new construction work the difference is $0.57 per hour, which, in the construction of a Polaris submarine, penalizes naval shipyards by over $3 million.

If we again make an adjustment for fringe benefits to reflect a truer and more accurate statistical picture by combining this fringe benefit adjustment with the adjustments for depreciation and interest on invested capital, naval experts find that the cost advantage of private shipyards have been pared as follows:

First. For the 598 class of nuclear attack submarines from 15.2 to 4.5 percent.

Second. For the 598 class of Polaris submarines from 20.3 to 10.8 percent.

Third. For the DLG–9 *Coontz* class guided-missile frigate from 18.7 to 8.2 percent.

Fourth. And for the CVA–59 class of supercarrier from 29 to 17.2 percent.

At this point, I would like to note that naval shipyard fringe and other personnel measures and benefits are the result of legislation which you and I have supported in the past. These fringe benefits, as well as other measures which we have enacted into law, represent additional costs to our Federal agencies. But I know full well that we knew within our conscience why we made these laws and what their price would be. We knew that any advancement of human welfare, human dignity and human rights was well worth the price and that as the Nation's largest employer, we should and must establish a shining example for the Nation's industries to follow. And we also knew that what we strive for is not work accomplished at the cheapest price through the exploitation of people, the endangering of lives, and the neglect of human rights, but the safeguarding and enhancement of our Nation's welfare through the effective use and motivation of the American workingman. I hope we will continue to motivate greater worker productivity and satisfaction with such incentives as fringe benefits but I also hope that we will realize that the higher cost of naval shipyard operations are due in some degree to our actions.

And now, let us turn to the contention I previously made: That the Andersen report makes no allowance for the various costly, intangible, but highly essential elements involved in maintaining naval shipyards in a constant state of readiness as an indispensable arm of our naval service. I do not propose to make any further statistical adjustments based on the above factor to the cost advantages provided by the Andersen report to private shipyards because I feel the pendulum of cost advantage would swing so far in favor of naval shipyards that it would precipitate another lengthy debate. However, to refresh our memories, please permit me to summarize again the reasons why naval shipyards are vitally essential to the military effort of our Navy.

First. Naval yards are inseparably a part of our naval forces afloat and like the warships of our fleet must respond immediately and completely to the needs of our naval commanders—and the late experience of Lebanon, Taiwan, and Cuba clearly show they do.

Second. They form an integral part of our Navy's Shore Establishment organization which is tightly knitted and coordinated with other naval activities to provide our naval forces with optimum logistics support.

Third. They are an essential part of our strategically dispersed naval base complex which provides facilities and a community focal point for our men of the sea.

Fourth. They are staffed with highly experienced and hard to recruit artisans, engineers, technicians, and administrators who are trained and inculcated with the need for quality and precision work to ensure the integrity of our warships and safety of our sailors.

Fifth. They are fully developed, equipped, staffed and stocked to fulfill the wide range of complicated technical requirements of our forces afloat from development to new construction to repair and overhaul of warships. As such they form our Navy's primary mobilization base which can expand overnight with a minimum of effort and difficulty.

Sixth. They are spared the crippling blow of labor strikes but recognize the need for increased worker satisfaction and productivity through excellent fringe benefits, enlightened personnel practices, and so forth.

Thus, in all ways, our naval shipyards are oriented and directed to the vital considerations of safety and preparedness—to our Nation, to our ships, to our sailors and to our shipyard civilians. Unlike that of private shipyards whose basic motivation is profit, their incentive is that of serving the fleet and keeping it fit to fight. Place private shipyards in the position of serving the fleet and keeping it fit to fight, make shipyards follow the same rules and regulations required of naval shipyards; devise a truly comparable military-industrial organizational complex and you will find private shipbuilding costs soar much higher than their present claims.

In all seriousness, and in conclusion, I would like to stress that I, too, am a firm and stanch believer in the time-tested concept that government should not compete with private industry. Likewise, I am equally firm in my belief that private industry should not compete with government in those areas wherein the public security and welfare will be threatened or jeopardized. This is the case where private shipyards are vigorously and relentlessly attempting to secure a majority of naval shipwork and to curtail or eliminate the operations of our naval shipyards. If private shipyards are successful in obtaining the lion's share of naval shipwork, then I assure you that we are spelling the beginning of the doom of the crucial and successful naval shipyard system. Can we afford to take this chance in this era of nuclear and missile warfare when we may have only one chance and only one fleeting moment of time to deter any act of aggression? I fervently maintain we cannot for if we do so, we are remiss in our duty and we stand guilty of gambling with the security and welfare of our free Nation. Cut off our naval shipyards as an indispensable arm of our naval service and you destroy to a large extent the effectiveness, the efficiency, and the strength of a well balanced, dynamic, fighting organization. Replace naval shipyards with private shipyards and you substitute something which can never feel or be totally responsive to the manifold needs of our fighting Navy.

Today, as in the past, "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance." Let us have the wisdom, the foresight and the moral determination to know fully within our hearts and conscience that the price we pay for the perpetuation of the naval shipyard system is eternal vigilance which can never be reduced to accounting and statistical comparisons of costs.

Mr. President, in closing I wish to pay a tribute to my many friends of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard. The preparation of the foregoing remarks would not have been possible were it not for the many hours spent by the men at Pearl Harbor in assisting me in the preparation of the speech. I wish to pay special tribute to a very dear friend, Mr. Philip T. S. Ho, a valued member of the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard staff, who took a special leave of absence to assist me in the compilation of the facts and figures. I wish to take this opportunity of extending to them my special and very sincere salute.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I wish to warmly commend my good friend, the able and distinguished junior Senator from Hawaii for what I consider to be one of the most well-prepared and convincing arguments in defense of our naval shipyards I have yet heard.

For some years now, wealthy and powerful interests have been trying to undermine the image of this Nation's naval shipyards. Their intent is the gradual downgrading of the naval shipyards, with a long-range objective of having the public shipyards completely shut down.

Mr. President, I say we cannot let this happen. The naval shipyards have been intimately involved in the security of America since the first man-of-war to carry this country's flag, the *Ranger*, slid down the ways at the Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard.

Like many other phases of our security system, naval shipyards are taken for granted in time of peace. But, Mr. President, let us not forget that in times of conflict—when the dollar sign is forgotten and the cry is "Give us ships!"—the naval shipyards are ready and able to give us ships. They have proven this time and again, and, God forbid, should another great conflict break upon us, we must have these installations ready—just as we must have our Armed Forces and our weaponry ready.

We hear over and over about the cost differential on construction, conversion, repair and alterations between ships at naval and private shipyards. From my studies, there is little, if any, substantiation to the charges of a wide disparity in cost. Figures can be made to tell many different stories. Let us look again at the Andersen report, of which the junior Senator from Hawaii spoke earlier.

In the field of new construction, the report compared 14 ships built at five private shipyards with 10 constructed at naval yards. Of the 14 ships built by the private yards, 5 were constructed at a loss. And, now, I quote from the report:

> If the Navy had paid for three of these ships on the basis of contractor's costs, the average cost to the Department of Defense would have been practically the same as the average for two ships of the same class built at a naval shipyard.

Now, Mr. President, I do not mean to imply that these ships were built at a loss intentionally to bring down the average cost for the public yards, but I do want to emphasize the fact that naval yards cannot build a ship at a loss. They are built at contractor's costs. I submit this is a perfect case of trying to compare apples with oranges—you may be dealing with equal numbers, but you just cannot compare them.

As to conversions, the Andersen report went to the guided missile carrier program, the only one involving both private and naval yards during the period of the study. The differential in cost was a mere 1.2 percent, based on cost to the Department of Defense. Again to quote the report:

> Since the percentage differentials are small and the adjustments required to establish comparability were both large and unusual, we can reach no conclusion with respect to the relative costs of these conversions.

In the field of ship repairs, the report concluded:

> We found in our study that it was not possible to establish reasonably comparable work performed on specific ships for either a total ship overhaul or specific work items.

So the report used for comparison a group of work items on underwater hull overhaul, admitting:

> The costs of the group of items are not reasonably comparable on a ship-by-ship basis.

But even using this incomplete method of comparison, the report indicated the costs to the Department of Defense at private yards was only 3.4 percent lower than at naval shipyards.

Here is what the Andersen report said about ship alterations:

> Based on comparisons for 149 occurrences of 28 different ship alterations, it appears that there were no significant differences between naval and private shipyard costs.

The report concludes that what differential in costs does exist is due to higher overhead costs at naval shipyards. And the two principal factors leading to this are indirect salaries and wages—including military pay and allowances—and fringe benefits to naval shipyard workers. These factors can hardly be blamed upon poor management practices or lack of ability among the workers at the naval shipyards.

Mr. President, there is indeed a differential built into the operation of our naval shipyards. This differential is the security and well-being of the people of the United States of America. The naval shipyards are there, keeping the "eternal vigilance" of which the Senator from Hawaii spoke.

If our security is to be maintained, the naval shipyards must be kept in a state of readiness—always.

I wish to associate myself with the able and well-reasoned remarks of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] and at the same time to congratulate him for his fine and timely speech.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his valuable contribution to the discussion. I express my gratitude to him for his kind remarks.

POSSIBLE SALE OF SURPLUS WHEAT TO IRON CURTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, another burning issue has now come before the people of our country. Following so closely on the heels of ratification of the test ban treaty, it might appear that there was some connection. Actually, there is none; and there should not be any. The situation in the Soviet Union which produced the shortage of bread, flour, and wheat predated the negotiation and signing of the treaty. The possible sale by the United States of surplus wheat to Iron Curtain countries would have come up regardless of the outcome of the test ban treaty.

What puzzles many Americans is the manner in which this issue has arisen: by its suddenness, following the return of the Secretary of Agriculture from his trip behind the Iron Curtain and his statement that there was no apparent interest there in purchasing our excess agricultural commodities; the Canadian wheat sale to Russia amounting to $500 million; the publicity releases about grain brokers from the United States talking with Soviet Union traders in Ottawa; the news about a certain gentleman from Minneapolis, having the right political connections but no knowledge of the grain business, trying to arrange a fee for setting up the talks; and then a statement by the head of the Soviet wheat delegation yesterday to the effect that Russia is not interested in buying U.S. surplus wheat.

Meanwhile, all sorts of conjectures have arisen in Washington. The Secretary of Commerce says that he has the power to change our policy regarding trade with Iron Curtain countries in the matter of surplus wheat. But because of a congressional declaration of policy appearing in a preamble to the Food and Agricultural Act of 1961, the administration is trying to obtain an informal consensus from key committees of Congress of what modification of our policy there should be. The President is reported to have been on the point of making a decision within 72 hours. Now the reports are that the decision is indefinitely postponed.

All of this indecision by the administration has played havoc with the grain market—not only wheat futures but feed grains and soybeans, as well. I am advised that one of the large grain brokers dropped its bid on soybeans by 4 cents a bushel yesterday immediately following the statement by the Soviet wheat negotiator. Some people have made a lot of money; others have lost a lot of money. One wonders whether there is any connection between the news and publicity releases and the profits that have been made. I think this should be investigated.

This confusing picture was best summed up in the New York Times of October 3. It noted—and I quote:

> The administration's difficulty in deciding whether to sell wheat to the Soviet Union was matched tonight by the Russians' difficulty in deciding whether they really want it. A flurry of statements from all sides left the impression that the Russians were probably still in the market—but not necessarily—and that President Kennedy would probably approve the sale—but not necessarily.

Regardless, the proposed sale—variously estimated at 110 million bushels for $250 million—at first sight seems to provide simple answers, hardly worthy of a controversy: It would, so it is said, help with our growing balance-of-payments deficit; it would help reduce our 1.2 billion-bushel surplus stockpile of wheat.

But let there be no mistake about it, Mr. President, there is more involved here than that alone. Like a pebble tossed into a still pond, the swirling ripples of this proposal spread far beyond the pebbled dollar figure.

In his remarks appearing on page 18545 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] placed his finger on the crux of the matter.

He said:

> There may be good and sufficient reasons for a change in our total trade policies with respect to Russia and the Communist-dominated countries. I can see from such information that I have that some changes could be made. It may be that limited trade would be helpful to the economy of our country and not in derogation of our national security. But if that is correct, I believe the administration would be on firmer ground if, before embarking on a new course, it would review our entire trade

> policy and that of our allies with the Soviet Union, and present its conclusions to the appropriate committees of Congress. If the Congress should indicate its approval of a change in trade policy, it would be very helpful to the executive branch, and to a definition of our trade policy and its effect upon our domestic and foreign policy. Even if the Congress did not concur wholly, the President, unless actually prohibited, would have the authority to make such decisions as he might consider to be in the national interest, and he would be buttressed by the fact that he had presented to the Congress and to the Nation the reasons which he felt demanded a change in our trade policy.

Mr. President, therein lies the grain of the problem. The mere fact that this sale proposal has entered the public domain through the columns of space devoted to it in the newspapers and magazines and the hundreds of thousands of words on television and radio, clearly underscores the possibility that the direction of our foreign policy could be changing. The discussions will leave their imprints on this policy for some time. Masked beneath is the effect on our farm program.

The mere fact that we are willing to enter into trade negotiations with the Soviet Union indicates that a new front has been opened in our thinking. But we must avoid the euphoria of falling into the belief that such a sale portends vast new vistas of trade with the Soviet Union. This is not true. The Soviets will trade only when it serves a purpose; this proposal, it must be emphasized, probably is only a one-shot deal since the Soviet Union's serious crop failure has placed it, as Premier Khrushchev said, in a "difficult position."

It cannot be overlooked that Khrushchev has obtained Canadian wheat to offset his shortage at home. The Washington Post of October 3 reported that West Germany has agreed to sell 300,000 tons of flour to the Soviet Union; that Italy will sell 40,000 tons; and that France has signed an agreement to sell 80,000 tons.

However, so much attention has been and is being centered on the new trade avenues with Russia that we are overlooking the most obvious markets of the free world.

It is time that we regrasped the initiative in setting the pace and direction for expanded trade with the free world; all the factors appear to be in our favor at this moment. All we need to do is to awaken to where we want to go; at this crossroad in our economic life, it need not necessarily be in the direction of the Soviet Union.

The issue is no longer theoretical; it is an actuality, born of a wheat sale which can be summed up as a policy in search of a direction.

Because this new situation is more than the sum of its specific parts, we must reexamine our agricultural philosophy in order to forge our many economic interests into one common policy. The only way to preserve our economic advantage is to have this commonness of purpose; if we do not, we will find ourselves in an oasis of mirages in the years to come.

The New York Times, in an editorial published on September 18, at the time of the Canadian transaction, very ably pointed the way. It said:

> But Washington can make constructive use of the sale of wheat by Canada. We will directly benefit from Russian sales of gold, which will mean less pressure on our own gold stock. The indirect benefits, however, are incalculable.
>
> With Western Europe short of grain, the United States is now in a position to dispose of a major part of our own surplus, which has been so expensive and seemingly so permanent a burden. Our aim should not be to make a quick killing simply to improve our balance of payments. Rather, we now have the bargaining power to persuade the European Economic Community to abandon its effort to achieve self-sufficiency in agriculture by increasing its protectionist policies.
>
> To accomplish this end, the United States must be prepared to turn away from our own artificially high agricultural price supports. The support program has given the Common Market an excuse to reject the American demand for a more liberal European attitude. Moreover, our huge and continuing surpluses have served as a deterrent against change, for there seemed no rational way to reduce them. But the administration now has an opportunity to adopt more flexible policies, geared to the new conditions, that will encourage an expansion in foreign trade.

The Times went on to say:

> If persistent agricultural failure is the Achilles' heel of the Soviet economy, the United States has never been able to exploit the Herculean strength of our own capacity to produce on the farms.

Eliot Janeway, of the Chicago Tribune-New York News Syndicate, in a perceptive article appearing in the Evening Star of September 30, was probably a little more blunt. Speaking of the Canadian wheat deal, Mr. Janeway commented:

> Economically, it's adding up to a bailout for Canada, and to a bonanza for the grain and shipping markets. But, politically, it looks more like a coup for Russia. In terms of guidelines and peril points for national policy, the United States needs the bailout and wants the bonanza, and there's a very specific reason why we should be able to trade it out for ourselves without inviting Russia to score another political coup at our expense.

He went on to say:

> The reason is that the entire European land mass seems to have suffered a wheat crop failure this year, while nature has been bountiful on this side of the Atlantic. Theorizing apart, no one knows how severe the failure may have been within Russia itself; how much of a reserve she may have; or how much of her present purchases are really scheduled not for her own internal use but instead for resale throughout free Europe and for rationing and political bribery among the satellites.

Then followed the heart of the entire question:

> We don't need Russia to get in between us and our allies and friends in free Europe, and to resell our premium commodities to them for their good money when they are our creditors. It is to the mutual interest of all in the Atlantic community for us to earn more by direct sales to Europe. No doubt about it, free Europe needs wheat, and it has the money to pay for it. True, Russia will offer to pay us in gold, which we badly need, but so will Europe.

There, Mr. President, is the path to pursue. We can act now to channel wheat and other grain to Europe and other free world nations, and thus better our position in the years to come. A one-shot deal with Russia will not do this, and should only be used after the possibility of increased wheat sales to Western Europe and our other allies has been exhausted.

We hold the aces. Let us see why.

The U.S. wheat supply, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the beginning of the 1963–64 marketing season was estimated at 2,328 million bushels, 4 percent below the 1962–63 supply. Canada's supply is placed at 1,185 million bushels, an alltime record. This provides about 800 million bushels above needs for domestic use and for carryover. Australia's mid-year wheat stocks were estimated at 150 million bushels.

Argentina was the only one of the four major producing countries to show reduced wheat stocks—85 million bushels. Although slightly above the total a year earlier, stocks were well below average on July 1.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, wheat import requirements are showing up unexpectedly large. The Soviet Union's poor crop is reflected in the commitments to buy large quantities in both Canada and Australia. The 239-million-bushel purchase from Canada by Russia will deplete Canada's stocks and will fairly well put her out of competition in world markets for this year, at least. Another contract has been agreed upon, between the Soviet Union and Australia, for wheat and flour totaling at least 58 million bushels, with an option to buy an additional 6 million. In view of Australia's continued commitments to mainland China, she is fairly well out of the picture.

The New York Times, in an article published on September 17, reported that Canada has notified some customers that she cannot fulfill all her wheat commitments.

So with the three major competitors sorely pressed to meet their own commitments, other nations must turn to the United States.

Instead of the May wheat referendum defeat's contributing to "chaos in world markets," as Mr. Freeman forecast earlier this year, the United States has been placed in a position of strength. And since overplanting is not to be the case, also despite predictions from officials, we have a golden opportunity to rid ourselves of much of our surplus.

The economic research service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture noted, in the September issue of the Farm Index, that—

> The 1963 wheat crop totals 1,151 million bushels. * * * Beginning carryover for the

> current marketing year was 1,189 million bushels. Total supply in 1963-64 is down substantially from the high level in 1960-61, and heavy disappearance is expected * * * so carryover next July 1 probably will be reduced for the third consecutive year. These conditions point to strong prices for wheat during most of 1963-64 * * * toward end of year, however, prices will weaken with substantially reduced loan rate on 1964 wheat.

In its 1964 Outlook issue of August on the wheat situation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture noted that—

> Increase in exports to the estimated 675 million bushels, compared with 639 million in 1962-63, is likely to be primarily reflected in Hard Winter and Soft Red Winter wheats based on current availabilities. * * *Disappearance of wheat in 1963-64 is expected to again be heavy, totaling as much as 1,290 million bushels.

How does this stack up with Mr. Freeman's comment, according to a New York Times article of September 23, that farmers should not rely on having stronger farm wheat prices result from Canada's decision to sell $500 million worth of wheat and flour to Russia? I suggest that the wheat farmer is going to be in an even better position.

A nation's actions abroad mirror the economic aggressive policies adopted at home. And this is our opportunity.

The Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture pointed out in its September 1963 statistical report on "World Agricultural Production and Trade," that wheat production in Western Europe is tentatively forecast to be some 300 million bushels below the record crop in 1962. Both acreage and yields are smaller; the reduced acreage is due mainly to heavy winter damage and subsequent shift of wheat acreage to other grains. France, a continental competitor of ours in certain wheat areas, was the country most affected, and the acreage harvested there was down 2 million acres. After a late start in the spring, the outlook for Europe's crop was good, until prolonged rains interrupted harvesting. This caused very high moisture content and sprouting of grain still in the fields. Total production in Western Europe is expected to drop from the 1,615 million bushels recorded in 1962 to 1,305 million bushels in 1963. Only one country in Europe—West Germany—is expected to produce more in 1963 than the production in 1962. France has been importing bread wheat, in addition to usual requirements for imported Durum. Syria's crop has been reduced by almost half, and exports will be small. Spain's crop is about 5 percent smaller, and the country is expected to be on a net import basis again, this year. Production in Italy is down more than 5 percent, requiring net imports. Damage to Sweden's grain crop appears to have been heavy, and import requirements will be larger than expected.

The report estimates that Eastern Europe's wheat production probably will reach 645 million bushels, about 5 percent above the 1962 total. But this is only a guess, and the situation in Russia could well be repeated elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain.

Together, Eastern and Western Europe production will sink from 2,225 million bushels of 1962 to 1,950 million bushels this year.

Although wheat production is estimated at an alltime high in Asia, unfavorable growing conditions in Japan have reduced the crop there from an expected 56 million bushels to 33 million. This, therefore, increases import requirements; and the USDA's current estimates put imports at about 110 million bushels, an increase of 20 percent over the 1962-63 season.

In addition, Australian and New Zealand wheat production is expected to decline from 316,440,000 bushels to 285 million this year.

The estimated world total is placed at 8,325 million bushels, much below the 8,730 million of 1962.

A regional breakdown by U.S. Department of Agriculture of July 1 stocks of wheat shows U.S. total wheat stocks of 1,189 million bushels accounting for most of the total 1,944 million bushel stock of the principal exporting countries.

Many of our best customers are crying for closer trade relations.

I should like to quote from an advertisement which appeared in the August issue of Fortune magazine. This is Masayoshi Ohira, Minister for Foreign Affairs for Japan, speaking:

> Interdependence is the word that best characterizes the present relationship between Japan and the United States. Nothing more eloquently testifies to this fact than our relations in the field of trade, representing in 1962 an exchange totaling $3.2 billion—$1.8 billion in Japanese imports from and $1.4 billion in exports to the United States. The United States is Japan's best customer and Japan is the United States second best after Canada. And this trade is growing. By 1970 when the current Japanese program to double the national income in the decade of the sixties comes to an end, it is forecast that Japanese imports from the United States will have increased by as much as 300 percent. Since trade is a two-way street, we expect that the United States will receive, in corresponding measure, the varied products of our growing industries. While it is in our mutual interest and profit to expand our bilateral trade, our countries have a vital role in liberalizing and expanding trade among all nations. Here is an area where close cooperation between us can help to promote the greater prosperity of the world on which our own depends.

Wheat is the focusing spotlight for our entire agricultural trade. If we act with determination, our agricultural exports of fiscal year 1962-63 of $5,084 million can be topped. Of this total, dollar sales totaled an estimated $3,545 million.

The areas of exploitation are there. USDA reports that nearly half of the record $5.1 billion of agricultural exports in fiscal year 1961-62—the last year for which a breakdown is available—went to Europe, while Asia accounted for one-fourth. The sharp upsurge in foreign demand for U.S. farm products, including wheat, since the mid-1950's reflects largely the rapid growth of industrialized countries of Western Europe and Japan, the new effective demand resulting from stepped-up economic development in newly developing countries. A significant change in the pattern of U.S. trade is the steady rise in farm exports to Africa, from only $88 million in 1956-57 to $380 million in 1961-62.

All that is needed is a more aggressive U.S. export promotion program plus the basic initiative of the American trade to capture more markets.

In any discussion of this nature, the external financial positions of foreign countries must be considered. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, in its July-August issue of "Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States" focuses some attention on this; it looks at considerations involved in analyzing factors determining a foreign country's financial condition to establish a classification intended to approximate its estimated relative ability to pay dollars for imports.

Let me repeat that analyzing factors determining a foreign country's financial condition to establish a classification intended to approximate its estimated relative ability to pay dollars for imports.

In other words, the countries best able or least likely to pay dollars for our agricultural commodities. A concentrated push could well result in more of these dollars flowing to the United States.

U.S. Department of Agriculture classifies countries into four categories: Excellent, good, fair, and poor.

Here is the definition of these categories:

> Excellent: large foreign exchange holdings more than ample to pay for usual imports; balance-of-payments situation satisfactory or favorable; outlook favorable.
>
> Good: Exchange holdings, if prudently managed, adequate to meet current import needs without difficulty; balance-of-payments situation stabilized; outlook either favorable or stable and without major adverse elements.
>
> Fair: Experiencing payments difficulties which limit the ability to import freely; reserves either (a) barely sufficient to maintain essential import needs, with the outlook tolerable to favorable, or (b) currently adequate but deteriorating, with no indications of reversal of the trend; balance-of-payments situation either basically weak, or shifting to unfavorable.
>
> Poor: Exchange holdings low or being depleted; balance-of-payments situation unfavorable and earnings insufficient for import needs; deficit financed by drawing down on reserves and/or foreign borrowing and assistance; import capability severely limited; foreign indebtedness often large; outlook uncertain or unfavorable.

Most of those countries are in our trade circle now. Fourteen of them are rated as in excellent financial position, 22 are rated as good, 21 fair, and 36 are listed as poor.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture declares that such a listing can usefully serve for general guidance to those whose decisions rest partly on appraising financial abilities of foreign nations to effect dollar repayment for goods—either on a cash or deferred-payment basis, to accept the burden of additional debt servicing, or to adopt internal monetary policies—which may be the necessary adjunct to a program of external aid.

Mr. President, I feel our course has been well plotted; all we have to do is to act.

I ask unanimous consent that tables and newspaper articles bearing on the wheat situation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND TRADE, SEPTEMBER 1963, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Wheat: Acreage, yield per acre, and production in specified countries, year of harvest, average, 1955–59, annual, 1961–63 [1]

Continent and country	Acreage [2]				Yield per acre [3]				Production			
	Average, 1955–59	1961	1962	1963 [4]	Average, 1955–59	1961	1962	1963 [4]	Average, 1955–59	1961	1962	1963 [4]
	1,000 acres	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*
North America:												
Canada	22,730	25,316	26,817	27,566	20.4	11.2	21.1	25.2	465,618	283,394	565,554	694,331
United States	49,128	51,551	43,576	44,501	22.3	24.0	25.1	25.5	1,095,357	1,234,743	1,092,562	1,134,051
Mexico	2,214	2,016	1,818	2,051	20.2	25.5	29.0	28.1	44,615	51,500	52,650	57,690
Estimated total [5]	74,160	78,970	72,300	74,200	21.7	19.9	23.7	25.4	1,606,000	1,571,000	1,712,000	1,887,000
Europe:												
Austria	634	682	668	600	32.8	38.3	38.8	39.4	20,802	26,150	25,950	23,630
Belgium	498	510	516	495	53.6	52.0	57.2	56.4	26,672	26,540	29,520	27,900
Denmark	179	260	381	321	58.8	61.3	62.1	59.5	10,521	15,950	23,660	19,100
Finland	314	586	706	--------	23.9	28.9	21.9	--------	7,514	16,930	15,490	--------
France	10,432	9,876	11,294	9,262	34.3	35.6	45.7	36.7	358,210	351,800	516,380	340,000
Germany, West	3,045	3,435	3,245	3,380	45.5	43.1	51.8	52.7	138,676	148,000	168,000	178,000
Greece	2,704	2,637	2,697	2,312	21.4	22.2	24.1	22.9	57,762	58,560	65,017	52,850
Ireland	361	345	319	229	42.3	50.0	50.6	51.4	15,279	17,250	16,130	11,760
Italy	12,145	10,738	11,257	11,011	27.2	28.4	31.1	26.7	329,880	305,000	349,830	293,950
Netherlands	250	304	328	312	57.2	58.2	67.6	--------	14,294	17,700	22,160	--------
Norway	35	24	24	25	32.4	41.7	31.2	36.0	1,134	1,000	750	900
Portugal	2,009	1,631	1,631	1,483	12.1	9.7	12.5	12.1	24,286	15,800	20,360	18,000
Spain	10,728	9,610	10,507	10,030	15.4	13.1	16.8	16.8	165,400	126,100	176,700	169,000
Sweden	831	679	776	619	33.7	43.9	41.3	41.2	28,030	29,840	32,030	25,500
Switzerland	243	272	268	274	44.7	40.1	56.5	36.5	10,860	10,900	15,140	10,000
United Kingdom	2,098	1,827	2,256	1,926	48.5	52.6	60.1	52.3	101,720	96,100	135,560	100,800
Estimated total, Western Europe [5]	46,560	43,470	46,930	42,990	28.2	29.1	34.4	30.4	1,313,000	1,265,000	1,615,000	1,305,000
Bulgaria	3,466	3,212	3,015	--------	19.6	19.5	19.9	--------	68,100	62,500	60,000	--------
Czechoslovakia	1,818	1,589	1,658	--------	30.0	37.8	36.4	--------	54,500	60,000	60,400	--------
Germany, East	1,026	932	1,045	--------	41.1	41.0	44.0	--------	42,160	38,200	46,000	--------
Hungary	3,112	2,505	2,706	--------	22.0	28.4	26.6	--------	68,500	71,100	72,000	--------
Poland	3,581	3,462	3,442	--------	23.4	29.6	28.7	--------	83,900	102,500	98,700	--------
Rumania	7,302	7,337	7,518	--------	16.2	19.8	19.8	--------	118,600	145,000	148,940	--------
Yugoslavia	4,750	4,843	5,090	--------	21.5	24.1	23.6	--------	102,000	116,500	120,000	--------
Estimated total, Eastern Europe [5]	25,310	24,130	24,720	25,180	21.4	24.9	24.7	25.6	542,000	600,000	610,000	645,000
Estimated total, all Europe [5]	71,870	67,600	71,650	68,170	25.8	27.6	31.1	28.6	1,855,000	1,865,000	2,225,000	1,950,000
U.S.S.R. (Europe and Asia) [6]	159,000	155,000	166,545	--------	12.0	12.3	12.0	--------	1,910,000	1,900,000	2,000,000	--------
Asia:												
Iran	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	95,950	103,000	99,200	102,880
Iraq	2,540	3,200	3,931	--------	10.7	9.4	10.1	--------	27,118	30,000	39,885	--------
Israel	137	118	--------	--------	17.6	19.0	--------	--------	2,418	1,900	--------	--------
Jordan	638	675	704	--------	8.6	7.6	5.8	--------	5,458	5,100	4,115	--------
Lebanon	162	143	146	138	10.4	9.0	12.6	12.0	1,682	1,290	1,840	1,650
Syria	2,540	3,249	3,314	--------	10.2	5.1	12.9	--------	25,942	16,500	42,880	22,000
Turkey	16,990	15,500	16,000	--------	13.4	14.5	15.7	--------	228,000	225,000	250,000	285,000
China, mainland	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	900,000	--------	--------	--------
India	30,393	32,047	33,240	33,500	10.9	12.6	13.1	13.7	329,926	403,900	433,830	459,290
Japan	1,551	1,603	1,585	1,436	32.5	40.8	37.8	23.1	50,482	65,440	59,890	33,180
Korea, Republic of	317	310	330	--------	14.1	20.0	18.2	--------	4,469	6,200	6,000	--------
Pakistan	11,496	11,603	12,571	12,140	11.6	12.2	12.1	12.3	133,192	141,340	151,720	149,330
Estimated total [5]	141,960	139,320	144,970	144,080	13.3	13.4	13.7	14.1	1,890,000	1,865,000	1,985,000	2,035,000
Africa:												
Algeria	4,658	4,622	4,522	--------	10.0	5.2	--------	--------	46,364	24,200	--------	--------
Egypt	1,561	1,436	1,515	1,634	34.4	36.8	38.9	38.6	53,778	52,800	58,970	63,000
Morocco	3,888	3,845	3,677	4,085	9.2	6.1	12.5	12.5	35,723	23,300	45,800	51,200
Tunisia	2,908	2,000	2,100	--------	6.1	4.5	6.9	--------	17,798	9,000	14,500	--------
South Africa, Republic of [7]	2,906	3,100	2,921	--------	9.5	10.5	8.7	--------	27,554	32,500	25,360	--------
Estimated total [5]	17,610	16,850	16,570	17,790	11.1	9.5	12.7	12.1	195,000	160,000	210,000	215,000
South America:												
Argentina	11,598	10,374	--------	--------	19.5	18.3	--------	--------	225,676	190,000	190,000	--------
Brazil	2,386	--------	--------	--------	10.3	--------	--------	--------	24,460	7,500	--------	--------
Chile	2,030	2,097	2,082	--------	20.0	18.8	22.4	--------	40,597	39,370	46,600	--------
Colombia	412	395	408	--------	12.8	13.2	14.6	--------	5,288	5,220	5,950	--------
Peru	365	379	390	371	14.2	14.9	14.8	--------	5,166	5,640	5,770	--------
Uruguay	1,604	1,077	990	1,075	11.8	12.7	16.8	--------	18,950	13,650	16,610	--------
Estimated total [5]	18,680	16,040	15,590	16,650	17.3	16.5	18.0	18.0	323,000	265,000	280,000	300,000
Oceania:												
Australia	9,629	14,723	16,171	16,500	17.5	16.7	19.0	--------	168,320	246,000	307,200	--------
New Zealand	103	186	210	--------	46.7	42.1	44.0	--------	4,814	7,835	9,240	--------
Total, Oceania	9,732	14,909	16,381	16,700	17.8	17.0	19.3	17.1	173,134	253,835	316,440	285,000
Estimated world total [5]	493,010	488,690	504,010	503,150	16.1	16.1	17.3	16.5	7,955,000	7,880,000	8,730,000	8,325,000

---

[1] Years shown refer to years of harvest in the Northern Hemisphere. Harvests of Northern Hemisphere countries are combined with those of the Southern Hemisphere which immediately follows; thus, the crop harvested in the Northern Hemisphere in 1963 is combined with preliminary forecasts for the Southern Hemisphere harvests which will begin late in 1963 and end early in 1964.

[2] Figures refer to harvested areas as far as possible.

[3] Yield per acre calculated from acreage and production data shown.

[4] Preliminary estimates for Northern Hemisphere countries; for Southern Hemisphere, preliminary forecasts based largely on acreage and weather conditions to date.

[5] Estimated totals, which in the case of production are rounded to millions, include allowances for any missing data for countries shown and for other producing countries not shown.

[6] Tentative unofficial estimates for production.

[7] Production on European holdings only.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Service. Prepared or estimated on the basis of official statistics of foreign governments, other foreign source material, reports of U.S. agricultural attachés and Foreign Service officers, results of office research, and related information.

TABLE 20.—*Wheat, including flour (grain equivalent): Total exports and Government exports by programs, United States, average 1954–58, annual 1954–62*

[In thousands of bushels]

Item	Year beginning July—									
	Average, 1954–58	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962 [1]
Total exports	402, 324	273, 634	345, 564	548, 558	401, 762	442, 101	509, 024	660, 882	717, 815	637, 500
Under Government programs:										
Quantity	264, 734	158, 027	240, 693	375, 119	246, 826	303, 002	374, 552	457, 720	491, 072	482, 280
Percentage of total	65. 8	57. 7	69. 7	68. 4	61. 4	68. 5	73. 6	69. 3	68. 4	75. 7
For dollars:										
Quantity	137, 590	115, 607	104, 871	173, 439	154, 936	139, 099	134, 472	203, 162	226, 743	155, 220
Percentage of total	34. 2	42. 3	30. 3	31. 6	38. 6	31. 5	26. 4	30. 7	31. 6	23. 4
Government exports by programs, Public Law 480: [2]										
Title I	145, 124	23, 802	94, 347	200, 536	179, 023	227, 914	300, 648	327, 214	379, 110	407, 315
Title II	13, 039	15, 991	11, 864	12, 188	14, 290	10, 861	10, 722	30, 490	25, 702	30, 971
Title III:										
Barter	46, 026	46, 459	66, 716	87, 086	9, 807	20, 062	25, 662	34, 090	41, 337	8, 848
Donations	10, 740	[3] 963	2, 788	11, 735	17, 993	20, 219	24, 256	30, 358	35, 098	28, 825
Title IV	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	7, 286	4, 976
AID [4]	49, 805	70, 812	64, 978	63, 574	25, 713	23, 946	13, 264	35, 568	2, 539	1, 345
Total	264, 734	158, 027	240, 693	375, 119	246, 826	303, 002	374, 552	457, 720	491, 072	482, 280

[1] Preliminary.

[2] The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

[3] Army civilian supply program shipments for civilian feeding in occupied areas. This is included in the average shown for donations under title III.

[4] Agency for International Development (sec. 402, Public Law 480, as amended). In earlier years this program was known as the Marshall plan, Economic Cooperation Administration, and International Cooperation Administration.

Source: "1964 Outlook Issue of Wheat Situation," Economic Research Service, USDA, August 1963.

TABLE 18.—*Wheat: Supplies available for export and carryover in the United States, Canada, Argentina, and Australia, July 1, 1951–63*

[In million bushels]

Item	United States	Canada	Argentina	Australia	Total
Total season supplies: [1]					
1950–51	1, 456	579	228	228	2, 491
1951–52	1, 420	743	97	179	2, 439
1952–53	1, 584	919	285	212	3, 000
1953–54	1, 784	1, 018	300	236	3, 338
1954–55	1, 922	951	343	264	3, 480
1955–56	1, 983	1, 056	281	291	3, 611
1956–57	2, 047	1, 153	317	222	3, 739
1957–58	1, 875	1, 126	283	141	3, 425
1958–59	2, 347	1, 047	315	233	3, 942
1959–60	2, 424	1, 033	275	266	3, 998
1960–61	2, 679	1, 118	210	338	4, 345
1961–62	2, 652	891	225	275	4, 043
1962–63 [2]	2, 420	949	203	329	3, 901
Domestic disappearance for 12 months:					
1950–51	600	149	113	80	1, 032
1951–52	689	170	88	81	1, 028
1952–53	661	150	131	72	1, 014
1953–54	634	144	128	77	983
1954–55	611	162	122	68	963
1955–56	603	164	129	77	973
1956–57	588	155	148	71	962
1957–58	591	159	138	71	959
1958–59	608	164	156	66	994
1959–60	600	156	127	77	960
1960–61	606	157	135	79	977
1961–62	611	142	135	75	963
1962–63 [2]	592	150	130	78	950
Exports beginning of season to June 30: [3]					
1950–51	366	209	68	74	717
1951–52	475	313	4	47	839
1952–53	318	341	29	64	752
1953–54	217	234	58	35	544
1954–55	275	232	78	62	647
1955–56	346	281	60	65	752
1956–57	550	239	61	63	913
1957–58	403	295	39	25	762
1958–59	443	275	67	49	834
1959–60	510	260	48	75	893
1960–61	662	324	30	128	1, 144
1961–62	719	336	77	125	1, 257
1962–63 [2]	639	312	45	134	1, 130
Balance on July 1 for export and carryover:					
1951	400	221	47	74	742
1952	256	260	5	51	572
1953	605	428	125	76	1, 234
1954	933	640	114	124	1, 811
1955	1, 036	557	143	134	1, 870
1956	1, 034	611	92	149	1, 886
1957	909	759	108	88	1, 864
1958	881	672	106	45	1, 704
1958	1, 296	608	92	118	2, 114
1960	1, 314	617	100	114	2, 145
1961	1, 411	637	45	131	2, 224
1962	1, 322	413	13	75	1, 823
1963 [2]	1, 189	487	28	117	1, 821

[1] Carryover stocks and production, except for United States which includes imports.

[2] Preliminary.

[3] Season begins July 1 for United States, Aug. 1 for Canada, and Dec. 1 for Argentina and Australia. U.S. exports include flour and other products in wheat equivalent.

Source: "1964 Outlook Issue of Wheat Situation," Economic Research Service, USDA, August 1963.

TABLE 16.—*Wheat: Supply and disappearance, United States, annual, 1955–63, and July–December and January–June periods, 1958–63*

[In thousands of bushels]

Year beginning July	Supply				Disappearance								
					Continental United States					Military procurement [4]	Exports [5]	Shipments [6]	Total
	Carryover	Production	Imports [1]	Total	Civilian food [2]	Seed	Industrial	Feed [3]	Total				
Annual·													
1955	1, 036, 178	937, 094	9, 933	1, 983, 205	469, 437	68, 056	678	53, 143	591, 314	8, 213	346, 273	3, 918	949, 718
1956	1, 033, 487	1, 005, 397	7, 783	2, 046, 667	469, 736	57, 995	497	47, 397	575, 625	8, 636	549, 536	4, 040	1, 137, 837
1957	908, 830	955, 740	10, 947	1, 875, 517	474, 529	62, 960	276	41, 978	579, 743	7, 605	402, 918	3, 878	994, 144
1958	881, 373	1, 457, 435	7, 769	2, 346, 577	485, 653	64, 287	114	46, 861	596, 915	7, 372	443, 294	3, 930	1, 051, 511
1959	1, 295, 066	1, 121, 118	7, 410	2, 423, 594	487, 297	62, 864	86	40, 545	590, 792	6, 525	510, 239	2, 520	1, 110, 076
1960	1, 313, 518	1, 357, 272	8, 232	2, 679, 022	487, 339	63, 963	83	45, 721	597, 106	6, 433	661, 945	2, 360	1, 267, 844
1961 [7]	1, 411, 178	1, 234, 743	5, 885	2, 651, 806	491, 640	55, 968	64	54, 395	602, 067	6, 855	718, 694	2, 320	1, 329, 936
1962 [7]	1, 321, 870	1, 092, 562	5, 556	2, 419, 988	492, 866	60, 737	69	29, 147	582, 819	6, 500	639, 103	2, 160	1, 230, 582
1963 [7]	1, 189, 406	1, 150, 527	5, 000	2, 345, 000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 16.—*Wheat: Supply and disappearance, United States, annual, 1955–63, and July–December and January–June periods, 1958–63*—Continued

[In thousands of bushels]

Year beginning July	Supply				Disappearance								
	Carry-over	Production	Imports [1]	Total	Continental United States					Military procurement [4]	Exports [5]	Shipments [6]	Total
					Civilian food [2]	Seed	Industrial	Feed [3]	Total				
Half years:													
1958:													
July–December	881,373	1,457,435	3,047	2,341,855	249,348	48,215	58	13,139	310,760	3,749	204,815	2,100	521,424
January–June	1,820,431	--------	4,722	1,825,153	236,305	16,072	56	33,722	286,155	3,623	238,479	1,830	530,087
1959:													
July–December	1,295,066	1,121,118	2,857	2,419,041	250,304	47,148	39	36,470	333,961	3,110	205,941	1,335	544,347
January–June	1,874,694	--------	4,553	1,879,247	236,993	15,716	47	4,075	256,831	3,415	304,298	1,185	565,729
1960:													
July–December	1,313,518	1,357,272	2,906	2,673,696	251,146	48,700	39	2,298	302,183	3,359	298,930	1,205	605,677
January–June	2,068,019	--------	5,326	2,073,345	236,193	15,263	44	43,423	294,923	3,074	363,015	1,155	662,167
1961: [7]													
July–December	1,411,178	1,234,743	2,031	2,647,952	257,599	42,553	28	[8] −7,053	293,127	3,241	367,801	1,220	665,389
January–June	1,982,563	--------	3,854	1,986,417	234,047	13,415	36	61,448	308,940	3,614	350,893	1,100	664,547
1962: [7]													
July–December	1,321,870	1,092,562	1,485	2,415,917	254,472	46,645	34	14,726	315,877	3,000	278,449	1,065	598,411
January–June	1,817,506	--------	4,071	1,821,577	238,394	14,092	[9] 35	14,421	266,942	3,500	360,654	1,075	632,171
1963: [7]													
July–December	1,189,406	1,150,527	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
January–June	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

[1] Imports include full-duty wheat, wheat imported for feed, and dutiable flour and other wheat products in terms of wheat. They exclude wheat imported for milling in bond and export as flour, also flour free for export.

[2] Excludes shipments to U.S. territories, Hawaii, and Alaska and wheat for military food use at home and abroad.

[3] This is the residual figure, after all other disappearance has been taken into account; feed for 1961 appears to be larger than it should be.

[4] Takings for military food use at home and abroad.

[5] Exports are of wheat, including flour wholly from U.S. wheat and other wheat products in terms of wheat. They include exports for relief or charity by individuals and private agencies.

[6] Shipments are to U.S. territories, Hawaii, and Alaska.

[7] Preliminary.

[8] For the period July–December 1961, known disappearance from the July 1 supply, without an allowance for quantities fed, is about 7,000,000 bushels larger than that indicated by Jan. 1 stocks. This discrepancy may be accounted for by possible inexactness in data, including some duplication in stocks reported in the various positions by different agencies.

[9] Estimated quantity.

Source: "1964 Outlook Issue of Wheat Situation," Economic Research Service, USDA, August 1963.

Countries of the world classified according to external financial position[1]

[Country designations as shown in U.S. foreign trade statistics]

Current rating, June 1963	Previous ratings [2]	
	February 1962	March 1961
I. Excellent financial position:		
Australia	E	E
Austria	E	E
Bahrein, State of	E	E
Belgium-Luxembourg	E	E
France	E	E
Germany, Federal Republic of	E	E
Italy	E	E
Kuwait	E	E
Netherlands	E	E
Panama	E	E
Saudi Arabia	E	G
Sweden	E	G
Switzerland	E	E
United Kingdom	E	E
II. Good financial position:		
Canada	E	E
Denmark	G	G
El Salvador	G	G
Ireland	G	G
Israel	F	P
Japan	G	E
Lebanon	G	G
Libya	F	P
Malaya, Federation of	G	G
Mexico	G	G
Netherlands Antilles [1]	G	G
New Zealand and Western Samoa	F	G
Nigeria	G	G
Norway	G	G
Portugal	G	E
Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Federation of	G	F
South Africa, Republic of	F	F
Spain	G	P
Sudan	G	F
Surinam (Netherlands Guiana)[1]	G	G
Thailand	G	G
Venezuela	G	G
III. Fair financial position:		
Afghanistan	F	F
Algeria	--------	--------
Burma	F	F
Costa Rica	F	F
Dominican Republic	P	F
Ecuador	F	G
Ethiopia	F	F
Finland	F	F
Free Territory of Trieste, Palestine, and Arabia Peninsula States [3]	F	F
Ghana	G	G
Greece	P	P
Guatemala	F	F
Honduras	F	F
Iran	F	F
Iraq	F	F
Liberia	G	G
Nicaragua	F	F
Peru	F	F
Philippines, Republic of	F	F
Tanganyika	--------	--------
Uganda	--------	--------
IV. Poor financial position:		
Argentina	F	P
Bolivia	P	P
Brazil	P	P
Burundi	--------	--------
Cambodia	P	P
Ceylon	P	P
Chile	P	P
China (Taiwan)	P	P
Colombia	P	P
Congo (Léopoldville)	P	P
Cuba	P	P
Cyprus	P	P
Guinea	P	P
Haiti	P	P
Iceland	P	P
India	P	P
IV. Poor financial position—Con.		
Indonesia, Republic of	P	P
Jamaica	--------	--------
Jordan	P	P
Korea, Republic of	P	P
Laos	P	P
Mali	--------	--------
Morocco	P	P
Nepal	P	P
Pakistan	P	P
Paraguay	P	P
Rwanda	--------	--------
Sierra Leone	P	
Somali Republic	P	P
Syrian Arab Republic	P	P
Tunisia	P	P
Turkey	P	P
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	P	P
Uruguay	P	P
Vietnam, South	P	P
Yugoslavia	P	P
Former French African territories: [4]		
Cameroon	--------	
Malagasy Republic (Madagascar)	--------	
Western Africa, n.e.c.: [5]		
Dahomey	--------	
Ivory Coast	--------	
Mauritania	--------	
Niger	--------	
Senegal	--------	
Togo	--------	
Upper Volta	--------	
Western Equatorial Africa, n.e.c.: [5]		
Central African Republic	--------	
Chad	--------	
Congo (Brazzaville)	--------	
Gabon	--------	

[1] With 2 exceptions, dependent oversea territories and departments, including trust territories and the Canal Zone, are considered as in the same category as the mother country. The exceptions are Netherlands Antilles and Surinam, which hold their foreign exchange separately from the mother country and exercise a high degree of independence in its utilization.

[2] Key:
E—Excellent.
G—Good.
F—Fair.
P—Poor.

[3] The Arabia Peninsula States, on which very little information is available, comprise Yemen, Oman, Qatar, and trucial shiekdoms.

[4] Foreign exchange assets of these newly independent states are held centrally in Paris under joint control with France. Data on the amounts of such assets are not available. Balance-of-payments information is fragmentary. Dollars and other nonfranc exchange are freely obtainable from the central pool within the limits of current nonfranc earnings; exchange beyond these limits is obtainable only under special arrangements requiring French agreement. In view of (a) these pay-as-you-go exchange arrangements, (b) generally limited and potentially vulnerable exchange earnings, and (c) potentially large requirements for economic development, these countries may as a practical matter be considered as in a poor or fair external financial position.

[5] Not elsewhere classified.

Source: Foreign Agricultural Trade of the United States, Economic Research Service, USDA, July–August 1963.

TABLE 11.—*U.S. agricultural exports under specified Government-financed programs, exports outside specified Government-financed programs, and total agricultural exports: Value by commodity, calendar year 1962*

[In millions of dollars]

Commodity	Public Law 480					Public Law 87-195, sec. 402, sales for foreign currency and economic aid [3]	Total agricultural exports		
	Title I	Title II	Title III		Title IV				
	Sales for foreign currency	Famine and other emergency relief	Foreign donations [1]	Barter [2]	Long-term supply and dollar credit sales		Under specified Government programs	Outside specified Government programs [4]	Total
Wheat	527.3	60.1	2.2	35.4	16.6	3.3	644.9	296.4	941.3
Wheat flour	51.2	23.6	52.6	2.4	.1	.8	130.7	61.9	192.6
Rye				.3			.3	20.1	20.4
Corn, except seed	24.6	37.0	1.6	42.7		2.0	107.9	419.9	527.8
Grain sorghums	2.6	1.4		21.8			25.8	96.3	122.1
Barley	18.2	1.1		2.3		.3	21.9	95.1	117.0
Cornmeal		.9	16.7				17.6	4.0	21.6
Wheat cereal foods to be cooked		[5] .6	[5] 8.4				9.0	.3	[6] 9.3
Rice, milled	77.1	3.8			1.3	4.0	86.2	66.5	152.7
Cotton	135.8				15.3	2.0	153.1	374.8	527.9
Tobacco, unmanufactured	22.1			31.0	.4	.3	53.8	319.6	373.4
Soybeans					2.8	7.2	10.0	396.1	406.1
Tallow, edible and inedible	14.9					2.8	17.7	74.6	92.3
Soybean oil	58.6	2.3	[7] 11.0		3.0	1.0	75.9	69.0	[6] 144.9
Cottonseed oil	27.2	.9	[7] 7.4				35.5	23.2	[6] 58.7
Shortening, 100-percent vegetable oil		.1	20.1				20.2	1.7	[6] 21.9
Oilcake and meal					2.1	2.5	4.6	86.4	91.0
Feeds and fodders, except oilcake and meal					.2	.3	.5	49.1	49.6
Essential oils						.1	.1	15.1	15.2
Milk:									
Evaporated and condensed	6.5					4.5	11.0	10.3	21.3
Whole dried	1.1					.1	1.2	6.4	7.6
Nonfat dry	.7	8.8	43.2	1.0			53.7	21.4	75.1
Cheese			4.0				4.0	2.3	6.3
Butter			1.4	.5			1.9	1.5	[6] 3.4
Anhydrous milk fat	(8)		5.0				5.0	4.1	[6] 9.1
Infants' and dietetic foods						.7	.7	9.3	10.0
Eggs, dried	(8)						(8)	4.3	4.3
Poultry, fresh or frozen	1.1						1.1	71.9	73.0
Hides and skins						2.7	2.7	80.2	82.9
Beans, dry edible, except seed	.2	2.6	4.7				7.5	13.2	20.7
Fruits and juices, fresh, frozen, and canned	.3						.3	238.1	238.4
Crude rubber and allied gums						.1	.1	.3	.4
Other agricultural commodities								593.1	593.1
Total agricultural exports	969.5	143.2	178.3	137.4	41.8	34.7	1,504.9	3,526.5	5,031.4

[1] Foreign donations are authorized under sec. 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and sec. 302, title III, Public Law 480.

[2] The barter program is authorized under the Charter Act of the Commodity Credit Corporation; sec. 303, title III, Public Law 480; and other legislation.

[3] Agency for International Development (AID) programs, principally sales for foreign currency.

[4] Total agricultural exports outside specified Government-financed programs (sales for dollars) include, in addition to unassisted commercial transactions, shipments of some commodities with governmental assistance in the form of (1) extension of credit for relatively short periods, (2) sales of Government-owned commodities at less than domestic market prices, and (3) export payments in cash or in kind.

[5] Bulgur wheat under title II; $8,100,000 for bulgur wheat and $300,000 for rolled wheat under title III donations.

[6] The value shown for total agricultural exports of wheat cereal foods to be cooked, soybean oil, cottonseed oil, and shortening, 100-percent vegetable oil, butter, and anhydrous milk fat includes value reported by Bureau of the Census, plus the value shown as foreign donations under title III. Relief shipments of the commodities are not separately reported by the Bureau of the Census.

[7] Reported as soybean and cottonseed oil. Breakdown between the 2 oils estimated.

[8] Less than $50,000.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1963]

UNITED STATES HOPES TO GAIN FROM WHEAT SALE—CANADIAN-SOVIET DEAL SAID TO OPEN WORLD MARKET

WASHINGTON, September 16.—U.S. agricultural officials speculated cautiously today that Canada's $500-million sale of wheat to the Soviet Union might benefit American producers.

Any benefit, it was said, would come from Canada's leaving open some world markets and from the United States filling demands with dollar sales. Some officials said the United States could increase its wheat sales by more than 200 million bushels in the next year as a replacement for Canadian wheat. This could raise U.S. wheat exports to a record.

While farm officials speculated on possible benefits, officials at the State Department said the Soviet plan to send Canadian wheat to Cuba posed no issue between the United States and Canada.

The State Department officials said that wheat was in the category of food and that Washington had never prohibited the shipment of food and drugs to Cuba under Premier Fidel Castro. Traditionally, they said, the United States has acted on humanitarian grounds—even toward Communist China.

POLICY UNDER STUDY

Washington also wonders whether the Soviet purchase will spur the United States to open its surplus agricultural products to the Soviet Union and to other Communist countries.

There is no legal prohibition of government-to-government sales with the Soviet Union, provided that commercial exporters obtain export licenses from the Department of Commerce. The policy, however, has been to rule out trade in farm products with Communist countries other than Poland and Yugoslavia.

This issue has agitated Congress for several years. Congress has prohibited aid to any country known to be dominated by communism or Marxism. But it has permitted sales and gifts of surplus farm products where the President finds them in the national interest.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Democratic whip, asserted today that the United States must change its "outdated" export policies if it was to share in world markets.

Wheat is not a war material, he told the Senate in commenting on the Canadian-Russian agreement. Canada, he said, is getting dollars for its wheat at a time when the United States needs gold to help its dollar balance.

HODGES FAVORS EXPANSION

There was no official indication that the Soviet purchase had stimulated a reexamination of the U.S. policy. Earlier today Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges said he had planned to suggest to President Kennedy that the United States might expand trade with Communist countries in the wake of the easing of tensions and the treaty for a limited ban on nuclear tests.

Mr. Hodges spoke on the television program "Today" over the National Broadcasting Co. network before Canada announced the Soviet agreement. He did not specifically include farm products. The Secretary said, "We ought to follow somewhat more what our allies have been for the last several years; namely, to sell goods."

The Department of Commerce will hold a White House conference tomorrow on promoting exports. President Kennedy will speak, and Mr. Hodges said he planned to carry his plea to the President then.

Analysts of Soviet agriculture and the Department of Agriculture commented that the Canadian sale might indicate that the Russian grain shortage was worse than had been believed. But they had no definite word.

Agriculture officials indicated that if the United States could add to its exports, wheat prices would generally be strengthened. But they pointed out, this applied to the current wheat crop and would have no effect on the 1964 crop.

PRICE DROP EXPECTED

Official predictions are that wheat prices will drop sharply next year. This is based on producers' rejection of the administration's tough new wheat-output control proposal earlier this year. That program would have guaranteed producers $2 a bushel compared with the predicted 1964 price of about $1.30.

One cause for worry, officials said, is that with the Canadian sale opening sales for U.S. wheat, and with a resultant stiffening of prices, producers may be induced to plant more. Winter wheat, the bulk of the U.S. crop, is going into the ground now for harvest next year.

One reason for caution by farm officials is that Canada has had two successive bumper wheat crops. The 1962 production was 550 million bushels; this year's yield, estimated at 706 million, could amount to 750 million.

Canada could easily handle the 550 million bushels for domestic and export needs, the officials said, but this year's crop provided her with a 200 million bushel surplus to be drained off by the Soviet Union. At the same time, they noted, Canada has notified some customers that she cannot fulfill all her commitments.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 18, 1963]

Opportunity in Wheat

The significance of the huge Russian purchases of Canadian wheat goes far beyond the immediate economic consequences to both countries. It reflects serious internal difficulties for the Soviet Union, already beset by its intense ideological struggle with China. It affords an opportunity for the West, particularly for the United States, to carry out our objective of expanding world trade.

Ten years ago this month Nikita Khrushchev won the center of the stage in post-Stalin Russia for the first time by delivering a slashing speech exposing Soviet agricultural weaknesses and proposing radical reforms. Since then Soviet farming has constantly been his main domestic concern. Now Premier Khrushchev has had to take the radical—and for him personally humiliating—step of buying $500 million worth of wheat and wheat flour from Canada after all his torrent of words about the superiority of Socialist agriculture.

The money Moscow is spending for this wheat will be unavailable to buy the Western machinery needed for Premier Khrushchev's ambitious industrialization goals. Consequently, there may well have to be some cutbacks in the new 2-year plan for 1964–65 now in preparation. Furthermore, the impact of this defeat upon the political structure of Soviet Russia raises intriguing possibilities. Every Soviet citizen knows how many panaceas for Russia's agricultural ills Khrushchev has offered this past decade. He has spent immense sums to open up the virgin lands of Kazakhstan and Siberia, promising that oceans of wheat would be grown there. He has wiped out the old machine tractor station, raised the prices paid to farmers, overhauled the agricultural administrative apparatus time and again, and introduced new systems of crop rotation wholesale.

But in 1963, after all this, he has had to turn to Canada for the grain the Soviet Union's Socialist agriculture could not grow. We may be sure that the Chinese Communists will use his failure to undermine Khrushchev's authority as the final arbiter of Communist policy. It will be surprising if there are not ambitious men in the Kremlin who will try to do the same.

The United States cannot take an active part in the fight behind the Kremlin's walls. But Washington can make constructive use of the sale of wheat by Canada. We will directly benefit from Russian sales of gold, which will mean less pressure on our own gold stock. The indirect benefits, however, are incalculable.

With Western Europe short of grain, the United States is now in a position to dispose of a major part of our own surplus, which has been so expensive and seemingly so permanent a burden. Our aim should not be to make a quick killing simply to improve our balance of payments. Rather, we now have the bargaining power to persuade the European Economic Community to abandon its effort to achieve self-sufficiency in agriculture by increasing its protectionist policies.

To accomplish this end, the United States must be prepared to turn away from our own artificially high agricultural price supports. The support program has given the Common Market an excuse to reject the American demand for a more liberal European attitude. Moreover, our huge and continuing surpluses have served as a deterrent against change, for there seemed no rational way to reduce them. But the administration now has an opportunity to adopt more flexible policies, geared to the new conditions, that will encourage an expansion in foreign trade.

If persistent agricultural failure is the Achilles' heel of the Soviet economy, the United States has never been able to exploit the Herculean strength of our own capacity to produce on the farms. The Canadian-Russian deal offers a chance to move out of the rut created by rigid adherence to artificial prices and by European countermeasures.

The path to trade expansion and greater integration in industry and agriculture is now open. We should not hesitate to undertake new policies that will hasten progress toward these objectives.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 3, 1963]

Confusion Rising Over Wheat Deal—Soviet Negotiations Indicate Uncertainty on Bid to United States

(By Max Frankel)

Washington, October 2.—The administration's difficulty in deciding whether to sell wheat to the Soviet Union was matched tonight by the Russians' difficulty in deciding whether they really want it.

A flurry of statements from all sides left the impression that the Russians were probably still in the market—but not necessarily—and that President Kennedy would probably approve the sale—but not necessarily.

In any case, the plot was thickening on all phases of the deal, diplomatic, political, and economic.

In Winnipeg, Leonid Matveyeu, the head of the Soviet Grain Board, told the Associated Press that his delegation had now bought wheat to tide his country over until next season "without having to buy any from the United States this year."

Mr. Matveyev appeared to be saying what Premier Khrushchev said a week ago, in remarks published in Moscow yesteray. Further examination, however, developed that the Soviet official was repeating his Premier's statement without knowing what it meant.

"Have you seen the Khrushchev statement?" he asked a questioner who reached him by telephone. He meant the Premier's remark that if Russians used bread economically, "the resources we now have will be sufficient for the normal supply of the population."

"Well," Mr. Matveyev continued in Russian with some agitation, "what do you want me to say? What can I say except what the Premier says? It means they know better in Moscow than I do here."

Apparently the Khrushchev statement overtook Mr. Matveyev's negotiating instruction and he was awaiting clarification. He was heard to be arguing with some of his colleagues near the telephone.

SEEKS GOP SUPPORT

U.S. officials decided that Mr. Khrushchev's remark did not rule out a deal with the United States. Russians had reiterated their interest in buying after they completed agreements to buy wheat and flour from Canada and Australia last month. They seemed to be waiting for an unofficial invitation to make a formal offer.

Whether to tender that invitation has been the administration's problem and high officials insisted tonight that no decision had been reached. Their studies of the different ways in which a deal could be handled are not completed, they said. What is more, their certainty that the Russians are also interested seems to have been slightly shaken.

Above all, President Kennedy was represented as eager to obtain more forthright Republican support for the deal, presumably to head off a partisan controversy during next year's presidential election.

Leading Republicans, especially those from Middle Western farm States, have shown neither enthusiasm nor opposition. They appear to be balancing the views of farmers eager to sell their surpluses and conservative forces opposed to trading with Communist countries.

But the outright opposition in Congress is weak and unorganized, so supporters of the deal are predicting a favorable Presidential decision within a few days. That view, however, was voiced before the Russians indicated their own confusion.

BID TO EISENHOWER REPORTED

Most administration leaders favor a sale of wheat, flour, and corn that would bring this country at least $200 million. They became convinced that the Russians wanted to make a firm offer if only they had a sign from Washington that they would not be rebuffed.

The President's strategy was to solicit expressions of support from the Congress and the country, to test public sentiment about a reversal of past trade policies, to disarm the political opposition and to gain time to study the best way of handling the sale.

He was particularly eager to obtain the backing of the Republican leaders in Congress. Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois, and Representative Charles A. Halleck of Indiana.

Some reports said Mr. Kennedy had also solicited the views of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, but this has not been confirmed.

Senator Dirksen was still reserving judgment, but his colleagues said he had not helped to organize any formal opposition. Representative Halleck has also avoided the issue so far, asking only that the President indicate whether he could prevent resale of the wheat to Cuba or North Vietnam and whether American taxpayers would have to subsidize only wheat that was sold.

Privately, administration officials have already indicated they could not control Soviet export policies. But they have also warned that other Western countries, such as France and West Germany, would make the sales if the United States did not.

Subsidies are paid on every bushel of wheat sold for export, because the domestic price is higher than the world market price.

Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, came out against the sale, arguing that the United States ought to be more deliberate and systematic if it now wished to change its trade policies toward the Communist bloc. Since Russians are not going hungry, he said, the only reason for a trade was to "secure the purchase price in dollars or gold." He said he did not think the country should be chasing after Russian gold in a "grubby manner."

Most Senators, however, remained noncommittal. And Senator Cooper said he was not impressed by the size or organization of the opposition.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, the Democratic whip, a strong supporter of the deal, predicted that President Kennedy would decide the issue within 2 days. Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges said he expected a decision late this week or early next week.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1963]

Wheat Sale to Soviet Faces Delay

(By Frank C. Porter)

Political chaff from the congressional mill is apparently delaying a Presidential decision on wheat sales to the Soviet Union.

By contrast, it was learned yesterday, West Germany, France and Italy have all made commitments to sell flour to the grain-hungry Russians.

News of the Bonn deal came ironically at the very time Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Democrat of Montana, took to the Senate floor to blast West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer for criticizing wheat sales to the Soviet Union by other Western countries.

Meanwhile, the urgency of the Soviet wheat shortage was further underscored in reports by Reuters that bread rationing has been started in Moscow. This development tended to discount a statement by Russian Grain Board Chief Leonid Matveyeu, reported by the Associated Press from Winnipeg, that his country no longer has need of American wheat.

DEAL ALREADY DISCUSSED

President Kennedy has been reported on the verge of reversing Government policy to permit a huge wheat deal already discussed by Soviet emissaries and private American traders in Ottawa. The total value has been variously estimated from $150 to $300 million.

However, the President was said to be doubtful that this is the time to change American policy, and would not do so without the backing of Republican leaders in Congress.

This support has not yet materialized. House Minority Leader Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, yesterday called on the President to answer publicly a number of knotty policy questions before approving the deal. In particular, Halleck wanted to know what guarantees have been devised to prevent the Soviet Union from reselling the wheat to such countries as Cuba or Vietnam.

A day earlier, Senate Minority Leader Everett M. Dirksen, of Illinois, said he had not made up his mind on the issue. He said Congress should be consulted about such a change and suggested that the United States might obtain concessions such as the removal of Russians from Cuba in exchange for the wheat.

LONG DELAY POSSIBLE

Against this background of Republican coolness, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges emerged from a White House conference and denied earlier reports that a tentative decision to permit the shipments had been made.

In contrast with a Tuesday statement by Senate Majority Whip Hubert H. Humphrey that he expected a decision in 72 hours, Hodges told reporters it may not be forthcoming until next week.

And Walt W. Rostow, key Presidential adviser and Chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, told United Press International in New Orleans that the decision may be a long time in coming.

An Agriculture Department source confirmed that West Germany has agreed to sell 300,000 tons of flour to the Soviet Union. He also said it is reliably reported that Italy will sell 40,000 tons.

Paris trade sources said France has signed an agreement to sell 80,000 tons to the U.S.S.R.

NINETEEN MILLION BUSHELS TOTAL

These shipments combined would be the equivalent of about 19 million bushels of wheat—a small order compared with the more than 240 million bushels the Soviet is buying from Canada and the 110 million reportedly sought from the United States.

But the new agreements are expected to give impetus to the argument that the United States should cash in on this lucrative trade currently enjoyed by her allies. The point is also made that such sales would not only substantially reduce the 1.2 billion-bushel American wheat surplus but would also materially cut this Nation's critical balance-of-payments deficit.

Although a majority of Congress is reported to favor this view, resistance by a minority has continued to harden. In the Senate, for example, the wheat sale has been publicly opposed by Senators Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut; William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin; Frank J. Lausche, Democrat, of Ohio; Strom Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina; and Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois.

LEGION AMONG OPPONENTS

Off Capitol Hill, such a deal has recently been attacked by the American Legion, former Agriculture Secretary, Ezra Taft Benson, and the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Charles B. Shuman.

Chancellor Adenauer Tuesday night came out against any aid to the Soviet without assurances of peaceful intentions from Moscow. After pointedly referring to sales of wheat to Russia by other Western nations, Adenauer suggested that "every Western country that is ready to put Soviet Russia in a position to be a really dangerous enemy to us is acting unwisely and making a great mistake."

Mansfield acidly observed in his floor speech that "there is in this comment of the German chancellor something of a hypocritical preachment: 'Do as I say but not as I do.' "

West German trade with Russia alone amounted to $400 million in 1961, Mansfield continued, "roughly equal to all of our trade with Eastern Europe in that year."

Figures furnished the Washington Post by the Agriculture Department showed that the United States exported 450,000 metric tons of wheat to West Germany in the 1961–62 season. The same year Bonn sold the flour equivalent of 604,000 metric tons to Communist countries, including 385,000 to Red China and 83,000 to North Korea. The Soviet Union was a net exporter of wheat at the time.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 1963]

Wheat Plan Sows Amity for Big Three—Soviet Cash Offer Expected at U.N. To Spur Accord

(By Warren Unna)

United Nations, N.Y., September 30.—The give and take of East-West relations took shape here tonight as Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko, and British Foreign Secretary Lord Home met with United Nations Secretary General U Thant for a harmonious dinner.

And the biggest note of harmony, according to American officials, may arise from wheat. The Americans think the Soviets not only want to buy perhaps some $250 million worth of U.S. wheat, corn and oats, but are prepared to do so pretty much on a cash basis.

At least the Soviets, in their feelers to private U.S. grain dealers last week, gave no indication that they were going to quibble over credit terms in their desire to obtain more grain to supplant their current crop shortage.

SUBSIDY CURES DISCOUNTED

And official American sources, for their part, indicated that they are not too impressed with Congress' restrictions against selling subsidized grain to unfriendly nations since the subsidized price of 40 to 50 cents a bushel goes to the American wheat farmer, not the wheat purchaser.

These highly authoritative sources also indicated that the subsidy money already has been paid out, to the tune of some 30 million tons of surplus wheat now piled up in storage.

And they noted that the United States, which currently is battling for buyers for this wheat in world markets, might find it very difficult to pass up a hard offer from the Soviet Union.

But the hard offer has yet to be made to the U.S. Government. American officials here said that the current discussions between the Kennedy administration and Congress are designed to clear the deck for action within the next 2 days in order to be ready for the Soviet Union when it comes up with that hard offer.

CUBA SEEN TOP ISSUE

Another important development in the current East-West discussions here involves Cuba.

Official American sources think the Soviet Union now is persuaded that Cuba currently stands out as the one major stumbling block to improved Soviet-U.S. relations.

They also think that Cuban Premier Fidel Castro may have a point when he suspects that his country may be given the heave-ho by the Soviets if they are determined to improve their American relations.

The United States has made it plain to the Soviets that it has two preconditions regarding Cuba:

An end to Soviet military and political connections there.

An end to Cuban involvement and penetration in the rest of the American Hemisphere.

U.S. sources do not see how Castro could permit these two changes in his national policy and still be able to survive politically. So, by extending this logic, a Soviet change of heart regarding Cuba would mean a Soviet change of heart regarding Castro personally.

The United States, it was learned here, also has made it plain to the Soviets that if a wheat deal is concluded the terms must include a restriction against transshipment of grain to Cuba.

Another outcome of the current East-West discussions here, within and without the United Nations, is what has been termed the Soviet preoccupation with Communist China.

Major Soviet issues with the West reportedly have been simply pushed to the back burner because of Moscow's challenge from Peking and, perhaps secondarily, Moscow's concern to obtain wheat to keep its people fed.

Gromyko, it was learned, surprised Rusk by not even bringing up the subject of a nonaggression pact between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Soviet satellites at the Big Three foreign ministers' first conference last Saturday. Neither, surprisingly, were Berlin and West Germany, two traditional Soviet concerns, introduced into the Big Three agenda.

Official American sources also are said to be impressed with the way the Soviet's European satellites have been "clearing the decks of unnecessary harassments" during the past few months in an obvious attempt to improve their relations with the West.

Bulgaria's Foreign Minister Ivan Bashev reemphasized this impression when he saw Rusk today. He, like his Czech counterpart last week, put out a feeler that the satellites, as well as the Soviet Union itself, are interested in buying American wheat to help out this year's poor harvest.

Note also was made here that settlement of back debts—a major barrier to U.S. trade with the satellites—now has been worked out with Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria and is in the process of being worked out with Czechoslovakia.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 30, 1963]

RUSSIAN WHEAT DEAL HOLDS SURPLUS BENEFIT, SOME PERIL

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK.—Even before the test ban treaty was signed, it was clear what the next step in good relations with Russia was going to be. Trade was certain to follow diplomacy. And it is. Russia has turned up with at least a partial answer to our No. 1 farm problem—what to do with our perennial wheat surplus?

This is a particularly pressing problem this year, farm spending standing as an obstacle in the way of a tax cut, the wheatgrowers having voted down the Kennedy administration's plan to limit production, the United States needing more export income, and U.S. wheat exports needing subsidies Washington can no longer afford to pay. Russia's answer to this ominous array of problems is that she wants to buy some of our surplus wheat—for cash.

This proposition follows on the heels of Russia's purchase of wheat in Canada, which strengthened grain prices and shipping rates all over the world.

Like it or not, the question is not whether the United States is going to do more business with Russia, but on what basis—beginning with the basis on which we let her ease our wheat problem. Russia's wheat-buying binge is producing one of those political switches for which American history is famous.

The unions are suspicious of any trade dealings with Russia, while the conservative-drifting farm belt will obviously welcome it. In all probability, business—worried about the dollar, hoping for a tax cut but fearful of farm spending as an obstacle—will welcome it, too. In any case, legislation will be needed, and so the question becomes one of national policy.

The way Russia played her hand in Canada suggests guidelines and peril points. The Canadian Government has been so worried about its financial situation in general, and its wheat surplus in particular, that it apparently did not dare stop to ask any questions (especially as the present opposition has its political base in the western wheat provinces). But hungry though the United States is for wheat customers, any new trade deal with Russia is certain to be subjected to searching scrutiny and debate.

Before Russia cleaned out the Canadian wheat surplus, no outsider knew how much she was short for her own domestic requirements; and no one knows even yet. All that anyone knows is that some of the wheat she bought will be resold to Cuba; that China, which needs Canadian wheat and has been buying a great deal of it, is temporarily frozen out of the Canadian market; and that Russia's satellites in Eastern Europe will share a ration with Cuba.

Economically, it's adding up to a bailout for Canada, and to a bonanza for the grain and shipping markets. But, politically, it looks more like a coup for Russia. In terms of guidelines and period points for national policy, the United States needs the bailout and wants the bonanza, and there's a very specific reason why we should be able to trade it out for ourselves without inviting Russia to score another political coup at our expense.

The reason is that the entire European land mass seems to have suffered a wheat crop failure this year, while nature has been bountiful on this side of the Atlantic. Theorizing apart, no one knows how severe the failure may have been within Russia herself; how much of a reserve she may have; or how much of her present purchases are really scheduled not for her own internal use but instead for resale throughout free Europe and for rationing and political bribery among satellites.

We don't need Russia to get in between us and our allies and friends in free Europe, and to resell our premium commodities to them for their good money when they are our creditors. It is to the mutual interest of all in the Atlantic community for us to earn more by direct sales to Europe. No doubt about it, free Europe needs wheat, and it has the money to pay for it. True, Russia will offer to pay us in gold, which we badly need, but so will Europe.

The satellites need our wheat even more, and this is a time for us to trade out a tangible political return on all that we have been giving to Poland and to Yugoslavia, as well as for us to look for our own back in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 23, 1963]

UNITED STATES SEES WHEAT EXCESS BELOW EARLIER ESTIMATE

(By William M. Blair)

HANNIBAL, MO., September 22.—Early estimates of winter wheat plantings now underway in the Midwest indicate that overplanting may be less than had been feared after farmers rejected a new production-control program earlier this year.

If this is borne out, Federal officials said today, the anticipated runaway wheat situation may not develop, although a sizable increase in surplus output is still expected.

The officials believe that wheat producers, fearful of a predicted sharp drop in prices and the loss of a Federal price guarantee, will plant 5 million fewer acres than had been expected. This would represent half the 10 million acres of overplanting predicted when farmers turned down the administration's control plan in a national referendum last May.

The decreases would mean that instead of a harvest of as much as 1.5 billion bushels, the crop may be closer to 1.2 to 1.3 billion bushels.

Nevertheless, there would still be a surplus of 200 million bushels.

This year's wheat crop was about 1,100 million bushels, 7 percent below the 1957–61 average but still 4-percent above.

Winter wheat, which makes up the bulk of the wheat crop, is going into the ground now for harvest next spring.

Overplanting is the amount of wheat sown above Federal allotments made to producers. By staying within these allotments farmers are guaranteed a Federal price support of $1.25 a bushel, beginning next year. There is no price guarantee for producers who do not stay within their acreage allotments.

When farmers rejected the control plan, the Federal allotment restrictions remained in farm law but the price support dropped from $2 a bushel to $1.25. The control program would have guaranteed $2 a bushel.

The prospects of a $1.25-a-bushel support was expected to produce heavy overplanting as farmers fought to maintain income. The overall income loss to wheat producers has been figured at about $700 million for next year.

AMENDMENT'S INFLUENCE

An amendment to the wheat law appears to be a major factor in slowing down overplanting. It was enacted by Congress in 1958 and is named for former Representative Victor L. Anfuso of Brooklyn, now a State judge.

The Anfuso amendment provides that a farmer who overplants his Federal allotment will lose history should he decide to get back under the Government program in later years. Loss of history means that he would lose a percentage of allowable or allotted acres. This loss could run as high as 8 percent of the acres allotted to wheat.

In brief, the Government would cut a farmer's allotment if he overplanted this year and stayed out of the Federal program, then decided that next year he wanted to get back in.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman heard pleas for suspension of the amendment during a tour of the Midwest last week. However, he was adamant about retaining it.

To suspend it, he said, would not be fair to farmers who stayed within their acreage restrictions.

A House agriculture subcommittee has supported Mr. Freeman's stand.

The Secretary took another vote last night of farmers on the question of selling surplus wheat to the Soviet Union. The result was 3 to 1 in favor of such sales if the Russians paid in dollars.

The show of hands at a packed meeting in the Hannibal High School, however, represented about one-fourth of the 1,500 persons.

RUSSIANS SALES CAUTIONED

Mr. Freeman, who sounded out sentiment in Iowa, Kansas, Illinois, and Missouri, too, again cautioned that any decision to sell surplus foodstuffs to Russia would be made only after careful study.

He told the farmers they should not rely on stronger farm wheat prices to result from Canada's decision to sell $500 million worth of wheat and flour to Russia.

Mr. Freeman's visit here was another in the series of 13 "report and review" sessions he is holding throughout the country to answer farmers' questions and listen to their problems.

Overplanting of wheat appears much greater in the western end of the Great Plains States where wheat ranches run to sections of 640 acres. In the central and eastern areas, where farms are smaller, officials report that producers seem to be staying within their Federal allotments.

It was noted, however, that the western wheat men traditionally overplant because the weather is a risk in the area.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 17, 1963]

HUGE WHEAT SALE CLOSED IN CANADA—SOVIET TO PAY HALF A BILLION FOR 198 MILLION BUSHELS—CUBA TO GET PART

(By Raymond Daniell)

OTTAWA, September 16.—Canada closed an agreement today to sell the Soviet Union nearly $500 million worth of wheat, the largest sale of grain for delivery in 1 year ever transacted.

Cuba was a direct beneficiary. Of the total 198 million bushels in the agreement, 16.5 million bushels of wheat and flour worth $33 million are for delivery by the Soviet Union to Cuba.

The only transaction comparable in size is a $580 million foreign aid sale of U.S. wheat to India. That agreement, to expire June 30, 1964, covered a 3-year period.

The agreement, the third between the two countries, calls for deliveries five times as large as those provided for under any previous agreement with the Soviet Union. The Soviet purchase is also larger by about 40 million bushels than the recent long-term purchase by Communist China of 187 million bushels.

UNITED STATES INFORMED

Mitchell Sharp, Minister of Trade and Commerce, who negotiated the agreement for Canada, said the United States had been informed that part of the wheat was to be delivered to Cuba and had offered no objections. The Soviet Union will be responsible for transporting the wheat, he said.

Recently, the Ontario Wheat-Marketing Board, acting on its own, sold 1.8 million bushels of wheat to a foreign buyer and it was reported that it was destined for Cuba.

Canada has been selling skimmed-milk powder to Cuba directly for some time.

Under the terms of the agreement signed today, Canada will deliver at its ports 5.3 million long tons or 198 million bushels of wheat and 575 long tons or 29.5 million bushels of wheat flour by July 1954. From the ports, the Soviet Union has the responsibility of transporting the grain.

The agreement was signed by Mr. Sharp, and S. A. Borisov, Soviet First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, who has been here as head of a Soviet trade delegation for the last 2 weeks to negotiate the purchase.

The agreement provides for short-term, Government-guaranteed credit through July 1964. The Soviet Union has agreed to buy 500,000 long tons or 18.7 million bushels more wheat or flour in 1965. This would be worth about $36 million, a relatively small amount, which it was said might be increased if the Soviet Union needs to supplement its own crop further.

It is understood that the Soviet Union is acting as an intermediary for Cuba because Havana lacks the dollars to buy wheat directly. The Soviet Union is understood to have accrued the necessary dollars through recent gold sales. Mr. Sharp noted that Canada insists on payment in dollars.

VOLUME SURPRISING

What is most surprising about the agreement is the volume of deliveries. Fulfillment of the commitment within a year will pose serious logistical problems, tax the capacity of Canadian flour mills and lower the reserve in Canadian graneries to about the safety level of less than 500,000 bushels.

Mr. Sharp said at a news conference that the agreement, coming after Canada's sale this summer of 187 million bushels of wheat to Communist China over a 3-year period, would not interfere with commitments to supply major markets in Britain, Europe, Japan, Asia and elsewhere under the International Wheat Agreement.

It might, however, prevent Canada from carrying out her planned expansion of foreign aid to underdeveloped countries in the form of gifts of grain.

Canada, Mr. Sharp said, will not try to sell any more wheat this year. However, it is reported that a Polish delegation is coming to try to make additional purchase. Poland has bought Canadian wheat for several years.

Mr. Sharp said the Soviet delegation had made no secret of its intention to distribute some of the huge grain purchase among its satellites in Eastern Europe as well as in Cuba.

Mr. Borisov said in a statement, read in Russian and translated, that weather in the Soviet Union had adversely affected the Soviet wheat crop, forcing his country to buy from other countries. The Soviet Government has also bought substantial quantities of wheat from Australia.

Future purchases of wheat from Canada for delivery to Soviet ports near Canada could be "economically justified and proper," Mr. Borisov said. He declared that this would "depend on how much Canada is able to enlarge its purchases of Soviet goods." Because the economies of Canada and the Soviet Union are somewhat similar, any great expansion of Russian exports to this country is regarded as unlikely.

The wheat sale was made possible by the Export Credit Insurance Corporation, a Government body, which agreed to provide guarantees to a maximum of $200 million at any one time. The sale was for 25 percent cash for each shipment, with one-third of the balance payable after 6, 12 and 18 months from the date of shipment.

The agreement is expected to set a record for wheat export in a single year. The Canadian Wheat Board, whose chairman, W. C. McNamara, took part in the negotiations, estimated that total exports this year would amount to 550-million bushels, against 386-million bushels in 1952–53, the best postwar year. Sales of 550-million bushels would represent foreign-exchange earnings of more than $1 billion.

Wheat sales to Communist China and the Soviet Union will go a long way toward enabling Canada to cover its chronic imbalance of trade with the United States, running at the rate of about $1 billion a year.

The wheat and flour purchased by the Soviet Union for delivery this year, including purchases outside the agreement, amount to 239 million bushels.

Because of the immense volume of grain movements to the ports in so short a time, N. R. Crump and Donald Gordon, presidents of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National Railways, were consulted on the ability of their lines to handle the traffic. They expressed confidence that they could do so, although it would mean doubling the traffic.

Arrangements have been made, Mr. Sharp said, to speed the movement of grain carriers through the St. Lawrence Seaway for the time left in the ice-free season and from the time it reopens next spring.

Even if Canada is able to get the required amount of grain from the prairies to the ports on her east and west coasts, it was suggested that the Soviet Union might find trouble in getting ships to carry the cargoes to its own ports.

HARVEST FAILURE FORCES BUYING

Moscow, September 16.—Disappointing grain harvests and widespread waste of bread in the Soviet Union apparently forced the Kremlin to make its huge purchase of wheat from Canada today. The trade agreement comes after what amounted to a form of bread rationing in the Soviet Union.

CHARGES AGAINST OTTO F. OTEPKA, STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICE OF SECURITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I was not pleased to read in the September 27 issue of the Washington Evening Star an article entitled "Storm Brews on Charges Facing State Security Aid"; in the Des Moines Register of the same date an article entitled "Seek To Oust Official Who Defied 'Gag' "; and in the September 29 issue of the Washington Evening Star an article entitled "Don't Talk to Senators, Officers at State Told."

The sum and substance of these articles is that a State Department official by the name of Otto F. Otepka, a 48-year-old lawyer and long-time official of the State Department, apparently has been ousted because of what is alleged to have been a breach of the security regulations in the State Department. The articles indicate that the case is not quite as simple as the allegations would seem to make it.

The problem arises over an effort on the part of one of the committees of the U.S. Senate to obtain from the State Department information deemed vital to our security interests and the cooperation of Mr. Otepka with the committee and the lack of cooperation and resistance on the part of some of his colleagues in the office concerned.

I understand that continued efforts will be made by the committee of the Senate to obtain all information necessary to discharge its responsibilities. I trust that efforts will also be made to see to it that officials who have reprimanded and ousted Mr. Otepka, who sought to cooperate with the committee of the Senate, are appropriately disciplined.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these articles may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 27, 1963]

STORM BREWS ON CHARGES FACING STATE SECURITY AID

A storm seems to be brewing over administrative charges filed against Otto F. Otepka, Chief of the Division of Evaluation in the State Department's Office of Security.

A department spokesman said the 48-year-old Otepka had until October 3 to reply to charges which could lead to his discharge. He refused to say what the charges are.

Robert Morris, former chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, said in Dallas last night that he had heard that the essence of the charges is that Mr. Otepka collaborated with the present chief counsel of the Internal Security Subcommittee, J. G. Sourwine.

WON'T HOLD WATER

Mr. Sourwine said that if that is the basis "then the charge won't hold water."

Mr. Morris said he had heard that Mr. Otepka had been accused of disclosing secret information to the Senate.

Mr. Morris said the charges brought against Mr. Otepka "include giving 'Confidential' and 'For Official Use Only' information to the chief counsel. Both of these classifications are relatively low and in fact were inserted on the information by Mr. Otepka himself."

Early in the year, Mr. Otepka and other State Department security officers testified before the subcommittee during an investigation of William A. Wieland, a career diplomat and desk officer on Cuban affairs during Fidel Castro's rise to power.

Mr. Morris called the charges "a travesty of justice."

"If Mr. Otepka collaborated with Sourwine, he collaborated with the U.S. Senate itself," he said. "This should not be considered a crime."

Mr. Morris said that "Mr. Otepka's burn-basket was ransacked, his desk searched, and he himself subjected to extensive investigation. Thus today's offense seems to be collaboration not with Communists but with dutiful security officers who are trying to keep their appointed rounds in traditional fashion."

Mr. Morris now is president of the Defenders of American Liberty, a Dallas-based organization.

REFLECT DIRECTION

He said the charges against Mr. Otepka "reflect the direction in which our Nation is moving today in the face of growing Soviet power * * *. For being reasonably cooperative with this sacred arm of Congress, he (Mr. Otepka) is now up on charges that could lead to his dismissal from service."

Senator EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the subcommittee, said the group would look into the situation.

Senator KEATING, Republican, of New York, a subcommittee member, said he didn't know what the charges were but would think the subcommittee would like to find out.

"If he's charged with misuse of documents affecting the security of our country, that's one thing," Senator KEATING said. "But if it involves documents that reflect on other officials of the Department, that's another thing.

"If it is the latter, the committee would certainly want to look into it further. But I don't know."

GIVEN TWO SPECIAL JOBS

Mr. Phillips said Mr. Otepka remains chief of the division of evaluation in the Office of Security, but since June 27 has been detailed to two special projects. These are updating of the Office of Security Handbook and preparation of guidelines for the security evaluation of personnel.

State Department officials said that there is no question of a conflict existing between the State Department and congressional committees in testimony given in response to committee questions.

There were indications, however, that the Department considered the volunteering of unauthorized information to congressional investigators to be a breach of the right of executive privilege that amounts to insubordination.

Under executive privilege, a Federal agency can withhold certain information from Congress if it feels that the disclosure of such information would hamper the executive from carrying out his duties.

In refusing to make public the charges against Mr. Otepka, the State Department said this is considered a personal action between an employer and an employee.

The employee has a right not to be tried in public by press release unless he chooses to make public the charges against him himself, the Department said.

[From the Des Moines Register, Sept. 27, 1963]

Seek To Oust Official Who Defied Gag

Washington, D.C.—State Department officials are seeking to oust a top security investigator for producing documents for a congressional committee that is said to contradict testimony of three high State Department officials.

Otto F. Otepka, a 48-year-old lawyer, has been served with a notice of charges that he provided State Department information to unauthorized persons. He was chief of the evaluation division of the State Department security section.

It is contended that Otepka produced the State Department records for Jay Sourwine, chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Committee, in violation of State Department policy to refuse to produce such records.

SERIES OF JOBS

Otepka, a native of Chicago, Ill., has been a Government employee since 1936. He has served in the Agriculture Department and the Internal Revenue Service, and was an employee of the Civil Service Commission before being moved to the State Department in 1953 under the Eisenhower administration to be an assistant chief in the evaluation division of the security program.

In 1958, Otepka received the State Department's Meritorious Service Award.

He is reported to have been at odds with some of his superiors in the Kennedy administration over decisions to clear persons he regarded as having questionable records.

CONTRADICTORY DATA

The Senate Internal Security Committee questioned Otepka on a number of cases, including that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

Asked if he had documentary evidence to support his testimony, he said he did.

Later, several of Otepka's superiors were questioned on the same cases. They gave testimony that was said to contradict his.

Otepka, called again, produced documents which committee members said indicated some of his superiors had given inaccurate testimony.

TO NEW JOB

Although Otepka was allowed to retain his title as chief of the evaluation division and his $16,965-a-year salary, on June 27 he was removed from his office and from access to his records.

He was given a "special project" job, which included the assembly of a Department handbook on security matters.

For several weeks the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has sought to question Secretary of State Dean Rusk, but he has been reported to be too busy with major international problems to appear.

In bringing the charges, the legal section of the State Department is relying upon an order drafted in 1948 by the Truman administration to bar a congressional committee from records of the security case of William Remington, who had been held to be a security risk.

The congressional committee sought to establish responsibility for the hiring and promotions of Remington, but the administration barred the inquiry.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 29, 1963]

Don't Talk to Senators, Officers at State Told

(By Earl H. Voss)

The State Department has forbidden its security officers and some other personnel to talk to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee or members of its staff without permission.

This has effectively cut off all contact with Congress by the Department's Security and Consular Affairs Division, officials say.

The threatened firing of security officer Otto Otepka on a charge of furnishing information to the U.S. Senate and its investigative bodies is believed to have precipitated the order.

TEXT OF MEMO

Abba P. Schwartz, administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the State Department, sent the following order to all bureau employes August 15:

"Subject: Appearance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

"You are hereby instructed that henceforth all (all is underlined) personnel of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs are not to appear before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee unless the requested appearance has been cleared in advance with me personally or Mr. Mace (deputy administrator).

"This includes contact or interviews with any members of the staff of the subcommittee.

"Mr. Mace or I should be notified of any requested interview or appearance by the subcommittee or members of the staff."

John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, issued similar instructions to members of his staff, including Mr. Otepka.

The order has been interpreted by most employees to mean that they should no longer maintain social contacts with Congressmen or members of their staff.

The instructions, some officials say, are contrary to title V, section 52, of the United States Code which states that the right of any member of the classified civil service to furnish information to any Member of Congress shall not be denied. This law was passed by Congress in 1948.

Congress, by concurrent resolutions of the House and Senate in 1958, declared that:

"Any person in Government service should put loyalty to highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department."

The congressional resolution is becoming the focus of the argument in the Otepka case. The State Department has instituted proceedings for his discharge.

KEEP SILENCE

State Department officials refuse to discuss the case. They are understood to charge him with passing the Senate information about possible security risks among Kennedy administration appointees.

Officials resentful of the new Schwartz order are complaining that they are being required to place "institutional loyalty," meaning loyalty to State Department leaders, above other loyalties.

Mr. Otepka has been notified he has until Thursday to answer the charge that he furnished information to the U.S. Senate contrary to an Executive order issued in 1948 by President Truman.

The order provided that records on the loyalty of Government employees should be kept in confidence in the executive branch.

CONFLICTING RESOLUTION

The congressional resolution in 1958 encouraged employees of the executive branch to furnish information to Members of Congress.

The question now is whether a Government employee can be penalized for testifying under oath if his testimony contradicts policy of the administration in power.

Mr. Otepka is due to be suspended without pay October 23.

The Kennedy administration has been having its troubles with the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs since the administration came to power. There have been seven chiefs of the Bureau in the last 8 years.

President Kennedy's first appointee to the office, Salvatore Bontampo, of New Jersey, retired under fire because of opposition from the late Representative Francis Walter of Pennsylvania.

THE FATE OF MARXISM

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, Dr. Mary Benyamin, a member of the department of public law and government at Columbia University, has written an incisive article on the nature and potential of the Communist philosophy which is deserving of the attention of every Senator.

It is entitled "The Fate of Marxism," and was first printed, at the request of Costa Rica's President Figueres, in the fall 1962 issue of Combate. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, Dr. Benyamin eloquently points out that the United States is not the country—in attitudes or in theory—that it was when Karl Marx produced his Manifesto. Nor do the terms "communism" and "capitalism" connote what they did a century ago. We must assume the task of keeping up to date on communism. We must see that the world is aware that communism in theory and communism in practice are two very different things. And we must understand the nuances of the Communist system as well as we understand our own republican pattern.

Mr. President, I suggest that Dr. Benyamin's article goes a long way toward illuminating this entire subject and I wholeheartedly recommend it to my colleagues.

Though I cannot say I agree with every paragraph in the article, it is interesting and enlightening, and surely

provocative and challenging. It is good adult education.

EXHIBIT 1

THE FATE OF MARXISM

A faith may be mortal. It can die because it loses its followers or it can be killed by those who profess to be its followers. The latter fate has befallen Marxism. It was from the first a faith beset by contradictions and limitations. Conceived by a man of a dogmatic nature, who was embittered by the established order because of its social discriminations and its economic injustices, the Marxist faith promised the inauguration of a utopian society where oppression and exploitation would cease to exist. Marx professed to demonstrate that by the very nature of society and the inexorable laws of history, the doom of "capitalism," followed by the triumph of communism, was destined to happen. His creed was brought to the test in the sequel of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, and Marxism suffered the fate inherent in its own success. Its triumph became the proof of its unrealism.

Yet its triumph has convulsed the 20th century. Under its banner communism holds one half of the irreconcilably divided world. Having consolidated Soviet Russia, it went on to win China and is sweeping onward through the Orient and into the islands of the Pacific. It works openly or under ground in all other lands. It is creeping into the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. It threatens the system of Western Europe.

Communist countries may go on to vaster strength, but never any more will they be animated by the faith of Marx. Communism may make new gains, as it has been making them since the Bolshevik Revolution. But the Communist movement is not Marxism. The movement goes on but the creed is dead. The goal envisaged by Marx is no longer its objective.

The revolutionary ardor that swept Marxist communism into power over giant Russia did not cool into the same kind of retreat and partial reversal that has characterized other ideological revolutions. When a great revolution subsides there is usually a period of reaction. But in Soviet Russia no new government replaced the revolutionary government. In the language of the Marxists there was no "Thermidor." What happened was not reaction from the Communist system but the maturation and revelation of the inherent character of the system itself. The revolutionary party did not lose political power—on the contrary, it continuously increased this power. It kept on proclaiming the tenets of the faith, but the doctrine it really held and the persuasive strength it still possessed ceased to be Marxist except in name.

It is the object of this article to point out how the idealistic element in the Marxist creed, the vision of freedom, equality, and brotherhood, has been denuded of significance in the evolution of a system of state socialism.

First, let us briefly review the essential tenets of Marxism. It is a strange but fascinating ideology. At its birth there were sown, to use an expression of which Marx himself was fond, the seeds of its own decay—and doom.

I

Marx built up a system of socialism in which society moved "by dialectical necessity" to an inevitable consummation. He conceived the final outcome to be a society without class and without coercion, one in which men were awarded according to need and worked according to ability. The new system was "scientific," Marx said, because it obeyed immutable laws, and especially the "law," which Marx himself "discovered," of the inevitable decay and fall of "capitalism," when the "proletariat" took possession of political power and in turn prepared for its own abolition, to be followed by the classless and stateless society. The "law" was infallible and irresistible. It was not supported by any evidence but solely by a group of dogmas held by Marx to be eternal truths.

The underlying dogma was that "material" forces determined human history. Processes, relations, values, goals, every element within society, including modes of thought, were "rooted in the material conditions of life." This proposition in its fragmentary exposition was assumed to be self-evident. "Material" sometimes seemed to refer to "matter" in a philosophical sense; sometimes it seemed to mean "economic," sometimes "technological," sometimes "social," sometimes, more narrowly but not more clearly, it meant whatever determined the processes and forms of production. In any case, these forces would control history until society harnessed them, at which point man would gain his "spiritual" emancipation. His teacher Hegel had declared that "spirit" or "mind" determined the material world, Marx declared instead that the "material," or "social," environment determined the spiritual. In his introduction to the "Critique of Political Economy," Marx wrote: "It is not the consciousness of man that determines their existence but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness."

The second major dogma, expounded in "Das Kapital" and in other works, was that history is a continuous process in which an ascendant system generates an opposite system (thesis and antithesis), inevitably culminating in a higher unity (synthesis) that ends the whole progression. Marx borrowed this concept of continuously evolving processes—the dialectic system—from Hegel, but while Hegel's procession of stages culminated in the apotheosis of the world state, Marx's procession of stages ended in the disappearance of the state itself. He explained that at any given time some social order, with its privileged class and corresponding ideology and institutions, is dominant. At the same time the dialectical forces of change accumulate against it, to upturn it in the end—not just to modify it or gradually transform it but finally to overthrow it. This dialectical pattern continues throughout the course of history until it is finally resolved when the driving force, the class struggle, ends in the Communist Revolution with its abolition of class altogether. The followers of Marx have endlessly expounded his "dialectical materialism," but no exposition makes it any more clear—or any more true. History offers no simple, no universal pattern of change. Systems change and grow and merge and pass in countless ways. The dogmatic mind postulates one way alone. The violent mind insists that it be revolutionary.

Having adapted the philosophical dialectic to the evolution of classes in precommunistic societies, Marx devoted his special attention to the study of class conflict within the industrial society of capitalism—a doctrine embodied in the formidable "Communist Manifesto." He showed that the exploiting capitalist class (bourgeoisie) strive to keep the working class (proletariat) in subjection, living on the fruits of their toil and lulling them with an ideology, including a religion. The "proletariat" at length revolts and is predestinated to victory in the war of classes. The "dictatorship of the proletariat," which follows victory, would be merely a temporary instrument, constituting "the transition to the abolition of all classes and to a society without classes." It would crush all elements of the military-capitalistic system, socialize the means of production and make other structural changes. With the completion of the revolutionary transformation, the "dialectic" would cease eternally, since the clash between the proletarian and capitalist classes represents the final stage of social conflict.

The particular way in which the capitalistic system would be overthrown is through the operation of "surplus value." The price of labor power was the value of the necessities of life required to sustain the laborer, but labor produced more than it was necessary for the subsistence of the laborer, therefore more than his wage. The balance (surplus value) which was kept by the owner of the means of production, was the source of profits and wealth of the "parasitic" capitalist class. Because of the accretion of surplus value, the capitalist system establishes an accumulation of wealth in the hands of an ever decreasing number of capitalists, corresponding with an accumulation of misery among an ever increasing proletariat. The growing proletariat eventually becomes numerous enough to overturn the system and this is the revolution.

Here another major dogma came in. It was the particular contribution of Engels. To him and to Marx the state was nothing but a special apparatus of coercion and exploitation in the hands of the ruling class. It was a symbol of irreconciliable class antagonism generated in the presocialized economy; it was the most oppressive organ in the history of mankind. Naturally, then, when the proletariat emerged triumphant with its revolutionary goals achieved, there would no longer be a need for any such organ. According to the dogma, however, the state would not be abolished but would somehow, to use Engels' own expression, "cease of itself" or "wither away," wither out of history, and as it withered the classless society would come to its own, to abide forever.

Engels explains: "The proletariat seizes the state power and transforms the means of production in the first instance into state property. But in doing this, it puts an end to itself as the proletariat, it puts an end to all class differences and class antagonisms, it puts an end also to the state as the state * * *. As soon as there is no longer any class of society to be held in subjection; as soon as, along with class domination and the struggle for individual existence based on the former anarchy of production, the collisions and excesses arising from these have also been abolished, there is nothing more to be repressed, which would make a special repressive force, a state, necessary. The first act in which the state really comes forward as the representative of society as a whole—this taking possession of the means of production in the name of society—is at the same time its last independent act as a state. The interference of the state power in social relations becomes superfluous in one sphere after another, and then ceases of itself. The state is not 'abolished,' it withers away—Anti-Duhring."

Even the most devout Marxist found the doctrine of stateless society and the withering away process somewhat disconcerting. An endless variety of interpretations was produced in the controversy over the exact meaning of this dramatic outcome in the dialectic—but it could not be cut out of the sacred text. In "The State and Revolution," the great disciple Lenin argued that it was not "good form" to ponder over what Engels meant by the end of the state "as the state." What Engels was trying to get across, according to Lenin, was the distinction between the "abolition" of the bourgeois state by the proletarian revolution and the "withering away" of the proletarian state or "semistate" after the Socialist revolution. Lenin offered yet another explanation, declaring: "We all know that the political form of the 'state' at that time (after the Socialist revolution)[1] is complete democracy. But it never enters the head of any of the opportunists who shamelessly distort Marxism that Engels here speaks of democracy 'withering away,' or 'ceasing of itself.'" Here we are introduced to a new kind of state, "complete democracy," which seems to emerge out of the dictatorship. But why "complete democracy" emerges or why it should wither away, or what the words could possibly mean in this setting, remains a mystery. In his report to the Communist International (Mar. 4, 1919), Lenin spoke of "proletarian democracy" progressively leading to "true democracy," that is, "the complete dying away of any kind of state." Lenin is struggling like a theologian who is "interpreting" a sacred text he cannot literally believe so that he tries to explain away its obvious meaning.

---

[1] We have supplied the words in parentheses.

Another line of argument taken was that when the fathers spoke of the end of the state they meant the end of the state as such. This was good Hegelian gospel. When you spoke of a thing as such you could safely say anything you like. The state as such was nothing but an "instrument of class exploitation," or as Engels preached, a "special repressive force," a "definition" that Lenin called "splendid and extremely profound." Naturally there would be no more of that. Ergo, there would be no more state. Of course the thing that ordinary men call the state did something else besides "exploit"—it governed. And after all we need a name for this thing that governs, and the only name we have is "state." The state as such passes away but the state (not as such) endures. This explanation, as anyone can see, was somewhat awkward and had awkward consequences.

So long as man lives in society—unless he descends again to the primitive condition of the cavedweller—there will always be some form of government. For order is a necessity of social existence, and no order can be secured, sustained, or developed without the central agency of government. On this point Engels himself had advanced a curious line of exposition. After the process of withering away had put an end to the state as the state, there would have to be administration in the classless society. For the government of persons there would be substituted the administration of things and the direction of the process of production. Lenin took great satisfaction in this explanation, declaring that most state functions could be reduced to registration, checking, and filing, simple innocent tasks that any worker could perform. It sounded dreamlike, but unfortunately no one has ever thought out any way in which you can administer things without also administering men or vice versa.

This then was the system that in the fullness of the time Lenin took over and sharpened into his own revolutionary sword.

II

Marxism soon became a movement. Its handbook was "The Communist Manifesto" and later the turgid "Capital" became its Bible. Its function was to foment revolution, to stir discontent and frustration into aggressive action. It won adherents in the ranks of unskilled labor, where its indictment of capitalistic exploitation had a very natural appeal. It had an attraction for those who suffered discrimination and social persecution. It appealed to the youthful idealist who believed in its prophetic promises. Its leaders were not "proletarian" but "burgeois" intellectuals, some suffering deep revulsion from things as they were, and others genuinely moved by compassion and sympathy for human suffering. Marxism promised them all a brave new world. When communism took over there would be no more poverty, no more bosses, no more class differences. Instead a wonderful and universal equality would reign, the realm of liberty for all. There would be peace and prosperity for always. So long as Marxism remained a dream, in shining contrast to the troubles and insecurities of the everyday world, it could make its gospel heard and, here and there, win credence for its offer of deliverance.

The advances of communism, however, did not follow the Marxist line. Marxism had taught that capitalism everywhere was doomed to decay and to be superseded by communism. In Western Europe and in the United States, where capitalism was most developed, the coming of communism was proclaimed to be imminent. But the laboring masses failed to respond to the appeals and demands of the cause of international revolution. Their standard of living, contrary to the prediction of Marx, was rising, in spite of occasional setbacks. The power of labor organizations was increasing. The middle class was growing, not decaying. Though the revolutionary forces gained considerable strength in the ranks of Italian and French labor, they lost momentum whenever a degree of economic prosperity returned. Though the "internationals" made big gestures, they split and dissipated. The only major party that professed to be Marxist, the German Social Democrats, was so only in name. Its actual program was left-wing liberal or at most right-wing Socialist. The failure of the Marxist forecasts stimulated tendencies to "revisionism" in Marxist circles. There was controversy, dissension, doubt. Only the coming of Marxism to power could save the movement.

Marxism did come to power, for one brief moment, for one of the most portentous moments in human history. The suffering and prostration created in Europe by the First World War gave it the opportunity. Its triumph in a country containing a large majority of peasants was an event of climactic importance. A series of amazing accidents enabled the "man of destiny" to seize the moment. Marxism came to power and immediately disproved itself. It came to power and from that moment ceased to be Marxism. But in that moment it changed the world.

In coming to power Marxism met its own reality, and it met all the other realities it had ignored. In the shock of that meeting it found its historical fate. In the achievement of communism in feudalistic Russia, it disproved the theory that communism comes after a capitalistic system had ripened into decay. And ironically Marxism had been proven wrong by the very disciple who professed to be its most faithful follower.

III

The man of destiny was "N. Lenin." His gospel, Marxism: "Marx's theory is the objective truth"—"Materialism and Empiro-Criticism." His goal, worldwide communism: "Now, struggling for the socialist system in Russia, we are struggling for the socialism of the whole world." (Speeches, 1928.) His tactics, the fomenting of violent revolution: "The substitution of the proletarian state for the bourgeois state is impossible without a violent revolution."—"The State and Revolution." His ethics, the proletarian class-struggle justifies all means: "For us morality is subordinated to the interests of the proletarian class-struggle." (Collected Articles on Religion, 1935.)

It is very characteristic of Marxism that its description of "reality" is often wholly irrelevant to the situation of the believer while its program of action wholly satisfies his emotional need. It was so with Lenin. The earlier revolutionary movement against the czarist regime was not Marxist. It was the sheer uprising of the oppressed from which all the great revolutions of the past, including the French Revolution, have stemmed. Czarist Russia was largely an agricultural feudal state, just bodering the edge of industrial development. There was practically no proletariat in the Marxist sense. The peasants accounted for at least 85 percent of the population at the time of the revolution. Lenin conveniently discovered that the class interest of the peasants and the "workers" were one and the same and that a revolutionary alliance between the two classes was the principal means of overthrowing the bourgeoisie. The "workers" were the "vanguard" in the peasants' struggle for liberation. This explanation was quite at odds with the Marxist gospel. The law of history required the passage of peasant feudalism into industrial capitalism before the age of communism could arrive. When capitalism was fully developed it would breed its opposite, communism. It would do so very simply, because the vast majority of the people would have become exploited proletarians suffering from increasing misery. The revolution would take place without any great convulsion. For Lenin, however, violent revolution was the only means by which the "proletarian" state could supersede the "bourgeois" state. In his "State and Revolution," he even went so far as to declare that violent revolution was "at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' doctrine." And the disciples who disagreed with this interpretation were denounced as "falsifiers" and "philistines" who were deliberately "omitting" and "distorting" the revolutionary side of Marxism.

Lenin, professing himself the orthodox follower of Marx, "reinterpreted" the master as the occasion demanded. Soviet communism, in the name of Marxism, was victorious in Russia. Though Marx had said the revolution must be on a worldwide scale, Lenin contended that the arrival of the imperialist stage of capitalism somehow made the triumph of socialism in a single country possible. While the first stage according to Marx was to be the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin's ruling elite was composed not of proletarians but only "revolutionary intellectuals" and "professional revolutionists." There was, in Lenin's opinion, "absolutely no contradiction" between democracy and the exercise of dictatorial powers during the transitional period from capitalism to socialism.

From the beginning Lenin showed himself a master strategist. He insisted on iron discipline. His first problem was to defeat the antirevolutionary elements and the foreign contingents that so unwisely were dispatched against the Revolution by Russia's war allies. Next, he had to subdue the surge of revolutionary emotionalism and restrain the elements of irrationality that emerged from it. Without awaiting the action of the Constituent Assembly, the new comrades had gone ahead on their own and seized land, machinery, and business enterprises. When in the aftermath of the mismanagement and economic prostration that followed these seizures, accompanied by civil war and chaos, Lenin faced the threat of complete economic collapse, he turned about and introduced the New Economic Policy (March 1921). He was ready to restore an element of private capital in order to salvage the situation, but only as a respite prior to new advances to full socialism. But he still asserted his assurance that socialism itself was only a transition stage to the Communist classless utopia of Marx.

IV

With Stalin's accession to power the deidealization of what remained of Marxism became complete. The cause of international revolution was identified with the survival and interests of the first socialist state. The process of the withering away of the state was postponed because of the danger of capitalist encirclement. While Lenin had hoped, as suggested in his report of March 4, 1919, to increase the participation of the toilers in the Government on a gradual basis, a step which he regarded as preparing the way for the abolition of the state, Stalin claimed that the socialist state must retain its full strength, within a dictatorial framework, until the world triumph of communism abrogated the need for power.

The idea of classlessness also became more dimly remote during the Stalin regime. Under a series of 5-year plans, necessary for the purpose of speeding up the development of heavy industry and the collectivization of agriculture, Soviet Russia turned into a vast economic machine and its socialization process reached its completion. This economic transformation greatly expanded the ranks of the managerial and executive groups who together with the party elite constituted the hierarchy of a graded bureaucratic state.

Most destructive of the Marxist dream was the reign of terror that became more intense throughout Stalin's later years. The cruel party purges sent thousands to summary death and filled the prisons and concentration camps. As Khrushchev himself acknowledged in his famous secret speech, Lenin used extreme measures only against actual class enemies at a time when the regime was still struggling for survival, whereas Stalin, when the regime was strengthened and the class enemies liquidated, did away with his own personal enemies and everybody he feared as a potential rival, including practically all of the old Bolsheviks. Lenin was devoted to Marxism after his fashion. Stalin made it the mere engine of his power. Lenin compromised, as in his NEP, only to consolidate revolutionary gains, or as he himself expressed it, he took "one step backward" in order to advance "two steps forward" toward communism. Stalin compromised doctrinal demands, exploiting the fear of capitalist aggression, in order to consolidate his own personal dictatorship as a challenge to the non-Soviet world. In sum, he "abandoned the method of ideological struggle for that of administrative violence, mass repressions, and terror."

V

After Stalin's death, especially since 1956, Nikita Khrushchev appeared in the role of a liberator who would restore the true Marxism-Leninism Stalin had perverted. He promised an end of terrorism, a remission of legal and political constraints, a resumption of "collective leadership," and more initiative for the lower echelons. There was to be a "complete suppression" of the "cult of the individual" and the "total liquidation of its consequences." This was the burden of the address Khrushchev delivered before the 20th Party Congress in February 1956.

Certain significant changes followed. At the top level there was more room for discussion of policies, and even when a Stalinist group sought to displace the leader and failed, they were not liquidated as they would have been under Stalin. On the economic front reforms were carried out to reduce the rigidity of the centralized control consolidated during the last days of Stalin, which had deprived the working groups of the freedom of expression and action essential to productive efficiency. New economic councils were set up giving a larger measure of initiative to local industrial groups, and the farmers were given greater incentive to expand their collective operations. Not only were these reforms intended to bridge the division between management and workers, but to liquidate the extreme discrepancies between large and small incomes. And some enthusiasts have seen in a factory experiment promoted by Khrushchev, the Baku foundry—a small-scale affair in which the role of management was reduced, while the workers were encouraged to devise programs—an advance step toward this direction. Most significant of all changes however have been the recent measures taken to increase participation in the management of national affairs. Certain State functions have already been transferred to "public organizations"—but observe that these so-called public organizations are still strictly under party control—and this move has been described by Khrushchev as a step in the process of "the withering away of the state."

Khrushchev's conception of the withering away of the state and of the establishment of public organizations amounted to a rejection of Stalin's theory that the disappearance of the state would come about only after the achievement of full-blown communism. Khrushchev has stated that the process would not be an all-at-once affair, not like "the falling of leaves in autumn, when the trees are left bare," but would develop slowly and progressively, even prior to the triumph of communism.

Meanwhile with the vast strides made by Soviet technology so signally illustrated by its present leaderships in intercontinental missiles and in the exploration of space and with a concomitant upbuilding of its military power, Khrushchev has become sufficiently confident not only that no outside powers can successfully overthrow the Soviet system but also that it can outmatch the West in economic productivity and prosperity. Consequently Khrushchev has reverted to the Marxist position, abandoned by Lenin, that world communism could come—and was well on its way—without a military death-struggle between communism and capitalism. He places his hopes on the competitive inability of capitalism to keep pace with the economic productivity of socialism, and it is on this ground, and not on the internal "contradiction" of capitalism, that he asserts the world triumph of the Soviet system.

Khrushchev's acceptance of "peaceful coexistence" with the capitalist world and his belief that communism could triumph without resort to the incredible destructiveness of nuclear war brought him into dispute with Mao Tze-tung. The Chinese leader has taken the stand that war—even nuclear war—was inevitable in the struggle with capitalism and that only with the complete victory of communism could war cease to be inevitable. There were, moreover, certain Nationalist issues that threatened division between the two great Communist powers. China was now feeling its strength and was not going to have its policy dictated by Russia. While these disputes do not necessarily imply a rupture in political ties, they already indicate a wide gulf between Marx's vision of communistic countries united in brotherly love and the grim realities of the role of power in a totally nationalized economy.

VI

The Soviet system is unique in the history of mankind in the speed with which it turned a feudal peasant civilization into a technically efficient industrial order. It was a revolution in the educational system, in the practical abolition of illiteracy, in the productivity and power of the empire. This in the longer run is the substance of the Soviet revolution.

The horizons envisaged by Marx have disappeared in the mists of entrenched materialism. The dynamics of socialistic industrialization and modernization determine the prospects of Soviet communism. This is not the dialectic materialism of Marx, but the materialism of productive technology. Khrushchev himself has stated that the lofty ideal is to produce more and more of the good things of life. And he has predicted the materialistic (or economic) ascendancy of communism over capitalism. This is the meaning of the Soviet challenge to the West envisaged in peaceful coexistence.

The Marxist means remain but the Marxist values are dead in the Soviet world. The Marxist slogans are reiterated: the collectivist apparatus, the incitement to revolution, the subversive underground activities, the dogmatic assurance of world triumph, are all Marxist. But every single value Marx proclaimed is nullified within the system. For the abolition of class we have a new stratification headed by an elite hierarchy; for international brotherhood we have rampant nationalism; for the dictatorship of the proletariat we have the dictatorship of a party; for the graduate disappearance of the state itself, an adamant power system.

The Communist appeal is no longer directed in the main to the workers of the world, the industrial proletariat, but instead to the earth's population still living in wretched poverty, in Asia, in Africa, in Latin America. The peoples in this category are only now emerging from the inferiority and the discrimination of their colonial existence. The appeal to these people is double-edged. On the one hand communism offers liberation from capitalistic exploitation and oppression, on the other hand it promises a system of full employment, lifelong economic and social security, and leisure time for all. It is an appeal that the impoverished find all too attractive, for economic welfare must come before political freedom to those who lack both. It is an appeal that is not only enhanced by the vitality and efficiency of Soviet economy and technology, but also by the even more rapid progress of industrialization in Red China.

We do not adequately realize the strength of this appeal. We do not sufficiently appreciate the needs and the consequent attitudes of the peoples affected by it. We have made our offers of economic aid too limited. too little geared to the ways of the less developed peoples, too closely annexed to political objectives. Nor have we learned to convey to them the way in which individual liberties can be combined with economic securities. We must abolish the false presentation of ourselves as capitalist, which is so powerful a weapon of Soviet propaganda. Our system is not capitalism in the sense the Communists attach to the term. It is an ever-developing combination of freedom of enterprise with social welfare legislation. We must avoid giving support to tyranny or domination in any land. We must cease discriminating against groups and peoples—whether in our own midst or in the outside world.

An obvious conclusion is that we waste our energies in attacks on Marx and Marxism. The issue is no longer one of opposing ideologies. Nor is it any longer capitalism versus socialism. That versus belongs to the 19th century. What matters is the positive assertion of our own values, and beyond that the effective meeting of the Soviet challenge of competitive help to raise the living standard of underdeveloped countries. This we can do by giving these peoples friendly aid, intelligently directed to their needs, in a spirit of understanding. The final appeal is to the minds and hearts of men, and no matter how great our countering military might it will not bring us security unless our policies and our attitudes attest in the service of mankind to the work and the working of the fundamental liberties.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, later I will ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a number of editorials which were published recently on a subject which has been discussed at some length in the Senate, at times heatedly; namely, whether this Government should change its policy with regard to the sale of agricultural supplies, in this instance wheat, to the Soviet Union and to the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

I wish to make it clear that my advocacy of a change in policy; namely, the Department of Commerce's issuance of export licenses to private individuals, corporations, and grain trading firms is a suggestion that the Government of the United States merely permit American business institutions in the field of grains, in this instance wheat, to do business with the Soviet Union and with other countries in Eastern Europe exactly as they do business with Western European countries.

I also have made it quite clear that the sales should be for cash or for gold bullion or, at the most, on very short-term credit along the lines of the Canadian sales; and that we should not extend any long-term credit.

I am not recommending any particular program relating to other trade with Eastern European countries, though I believe this subject requires complete reevaluation and reexamination in the light of existing circumstances.

Last year non-Communist countries, most of them in Western Europe, sold $5 billion worth of goods to the Communist world. At the head of the list was the Federal Republic of Germany. Second was Great Britain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table indicating the amount of business carried on by non-Communist countries with the Communist bloc be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Million
West Germany	$750
United Kingdom	393
France	320
Italy	261
Japan	213
Finland	200
Canada	175
Sweden	145
Austria	145
Egypt	135
India	130
Australia	130
United States	125

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week I stated that there is an increasing possibility of a constructive change in policy with respect to the sale of agricultural products to Soviet bloc nations. As we all know, there have been discussions on Capitol Hill between Members of Congress and certain administration officials. I gather that no firm decision has been made.

It is understandable that many questions should be raised and many points of view expressed, because this is a subject filled with all sorts of uncertainties and political pitfalls, difficulties, and controversies.

I have a feeling that the announcement by Canada of the sale of $500 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union has caused some additional thinking in many circles in the United States about our present policy.

I have looked upon wheat not as something to shoot at people but as something designed to give life, to be available for a more peaceful world. It is my view that improvement in trade relations has a tendency to improve political climate.

I never have heard of a people who have become more placid, more pliable, or more reasonable because they were hungry. I suggest that if the Soviet Union should find itself facing severe food problems this year the Soviet tone of talk and conduct in international conferences will become more belligerent, instead of less. She will then have to find something outside the Soviet Union toward which to direct her fury and her political leadership, to arouse her own people and to maintain support for the regime within the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, we would be deluding ourselves if we believed for a single moment that a mere shortage of food in the Soviet Union would destroy the system. There have been food shortages previously. Perhaps there will be more of them. Instead of the system being destroyed, it has become more tyrannical. It has become hardened.

I cannot see much consistency or logic in the policy which we now are pursuing. I repeat what I have said to some reporters: If we do not permit the sale of this wheat directly, if the Soviet Union wishes to buy it and that, of course, is open to some question every Member of this body knows we will sell it indirectly.

We will sell it to the English, the French, the Dutch, the Scandinavians, the Germans—anybody that will buy it—and there is no regulation that provides they cannot sell it to the Soviet Union. So what it will mean is that we will have closed our eyes to the ultimate destination of the wheat in order to satisfy some political demagogery and some political considerations back home.

For example, American wheat now is being processed in Western European countries, and the flour is being sold to the Soviet Union. American wheat is being processed into flour, which flour is being subsidized out of the import levies on American wheat.

As the Secretary of Agriculture reported to us, flour has been laid down in Leningrad at prices far lower than flour could possibly be placed in the Soviet Union by the United States, and it has been manufactured from American wheat in German flour mills.

There are flour mills in this country that are not working to capacity. There are flour mill workers who are unemployed. There are hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat in surplus. The taxpayers of this country are paying hundreds of millions of dollars every year for the storage of surplus commodities. The budget of the Department of Agriculture continues to grow. The taxpayer continues to pay the bills. The balance-of-payments deficit continues to grow. The outflow of gold from this country continues.

There may yet be a possibility that we will take an honest, good look at the possibility of being able to reduce the surpluses of wheat and reduce the cost of its storage, because we will sell wheat rather than store it; reduce the cost of the wheat program to the taxpayers, because there will be fewer bushels of wheat, and improve our balance of payments by obtaining gold bullion or hard currency for the sale of our products. All this will be done for the benefit of people in the United States of America. It also will improve opportunities for workers in our mills and the opportunity for our farmers to produce, rather than be placed under more restrictions each year in the form of acreage and production controls.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall yield very shortly to the Senator from Iowa.

I know full well that the Soviet Union will in a sense benefit from a wheat purchase, but the Soviet Union has only so many dollars and so much gold bullion. The question is, Do we want it to be used for guns and for strategic materials that produce weapons, or do we want it to be used for soft goods and wheat? Wheat kernels cannot be used to shoot people.

The Soviet Union is not coming to us to buy missiles or nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union makes those weapons, and sells missiles to other countries. The Soviet Union has representatives in this hemisphere trying to buy more wheat.

A prominent banker told me a few days ago:

> I visited the Soviet Union. I found there the same problems we have. They need capital, and have to find ways to allocate the use of it. They have problems of prices and inflation.

If they have to spend money for food, that much less they will be able to spend on weapons; and if they spend money for food in this country, we will have a little more left over to do something to improve conditions in our country in connection with our schools and other needs.

I yield now to the Senator from Iowa. I appreciate his remaining in the Chamber to participate in this discussion.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Let me say, lest there be any misunderstanding, that I have already publicly made some of the statements the Senator from Minnesota has made with regard to a possible trade deal with the Soviet Union.

I think I ought to emphasize that my statement was on the premise that this was a one-shot transaction with the Soviet Union, meaning very clearly that we can be sure that the Soviet Union, if it has any kind of favorable weather conditions, will restore its wheat supply.

Perhaps it would be in the nature of euphoria for the people of the United States to get the idea that a one-shot sale of wheat to the Soviet Union—assuming it ever takes place—can take care of the balance-of-payments deficit problem and many other problems. I grant that alleviating some of those problems has some importance, but only on a very short and immediate one-shot-deal basis.

I hope the Senator from Minnesota will also indicate, when he has been criticizing the policy of the Congress, as set forth in the preamble of the Agricultural Act of 1961, regarding disposal of subsidized agricultural commodities to other than friendly nations, that he would recommend—and I think this would be well for the administration, too—that any change in policy should actually take place in the form of a resolution passed by both Houses of Congress, upon a proper placing, before the committees concerned, of evidence indicating that events have taken place in the last couple of years which warrant a change in policy.

I hope that the Senator from Minnesota, in his position of leadership, will try to prevail upon the White House to take this action.

I am advised that some administration spokesmen believe they have the technical power to make a change in our policy. However, I understand that some contacts have been made with key Members of Congress and key committees. But I hope it will go beyond that, because I think there is some potential, so far as long-range possibilities are concerned, quite beyond the matter of wheat. If there is to be a change in our policy with respect to the Soviet Union and Iron Curtain countries, I think that change ought to be in the nature of a mutual decision on the part of the Congress and the administration.

I hope the Senator may respond to that point, because I think we may be on the verge of a change for the better in our trade policies. I dread to think that by hasty action, improper coordination, and the hard feeling that would go along with it, we might yet be moving in the wrong direction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I am well aware of his interest in these matters. He has made a helpful statement.

If there is to be any basic change in the trade policy between the United States and the so-called Eastern European countries—the Soviet bloc—it is something that must be done in cooperation with the Congress. Congress has taken such affirmative action on it that, it seems to me, we could not change the basic policy without serious repercussions which would end up not only in partisan strife, but in criticisms by individual Members of Congress and their being worried and concerned unless the Congress were brought into the matter for appropriate action.

Mr. MILLER. The question is, What does the Senator mean by cooperation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I mean by legislative action, or a resolution or a sense-of-Congress statement.

I agree with the Senator that the present proposal should be looked upon not as a palliative—if we make the sale—for our immediate problem of balance of payments or taxes, or anything else. It would be foolish to make this assumption.

Of course, it would be helpful if we could get $200 million in gold for some of our wheat. This would not hurt. It would help. I would rather have the cash than the surplus of wheat. But in the long term, this is no answer.

I point out that in the past years the Soviet Union has been an exporter of wheat. I understand that the Soviet Union has exported 300 million to 400 million bushels of wheat a year. So if weather conditions improve, and if the Soviet Union succeeds in placing her agriculture on a more efficient basis, we can expect that she will be a competitor in the wheat market, rather than a buyer.

For the present, however, I feel we may have missed the boat—if we ever wanted to take the ride. The Soviet Union may be making other arrangements elsewhere. I have some evidence that the Soviet Union may be arranging to buy wheat elsewhere. After all, it was quite an admission of defeat on the part of the Russians to have to come to the so-called capitalistic countries and say, "We are prepared to pay cash for wheat. We had a crop failure." It was not merely a crop failure. As Mr. Khrushchev pointed out, their system has not worked so well.

Their fertilizer program is inadequate. They have little or no irrigation. They are faced with many problems. I do not believe this is a matter which we should rush into without knowing what we are doing. Congress has a role to play. I am sure that in the long run, if any basic change in policy is to be made, there must be action by Congress. I do not mean that members of the administration should merely come and visit with us. A "sense" resolution by Congress would be helpful. It may even require the passage of a joint resolution. It may require legislative enactment, with signature by the President.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's response. There is one angle to this problem that ought to be emphasized. I cannot blame the American people for being confused about this situation. I am sure the Senator has received telephone calls, letters, and telegrams, as I have, indicating a state of confusion. I am sure the Senator is concerned about the fact that the grain futures market has been acting up.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. It would be a healthy thing, not only for the grain market but also in alleviating the concern, if there could be an expression either from the White House or perhaps from the leadership in the two Houses of Congress, indicating that there will not be a deal with Russia or the Communist bloc of nations until this program has been considered by Congress and until the evidence has been placed before the appropriate committees of Congress.

Of course, this represents a change in policy; and I believe that until a resolution is passed by both Houses of Congress the situation will not change. If that were done, I would suggest that immediately all the speculation on the grain markets would quiet down. This is not something that has happened overnight. There have been speculators in the grain market. As I said earlier, a great deal of money is being made in the market, and no doubt some money has been lost, too.

Some press releases that have come from Canada seem to indicate that. If I were trying to do some maneuvering in the grain market, I could not do a better job than was done by those news releases. It would not be a bad idea to have them investigated to see whether there was any tie-in. I hope that the Senator, with his influence, will try to obtain some kind of statement on the point on which he apparently agrees with me, that there will not be any shift in policy. Perhaps it would be desirable to have a shift. However, I want to be sure that if there is to be, it will be on a sound ground, after the kind of consideration that characterized the deliberations on the test ban treaty, for example.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I point out that in the export trade by non-Communist countries with Communist bloc countries the important items of export to the Soviet Union—amounting to about 40 percent—were in manufactured products, ranging from steel sheets to synthetic yarns. Machinery amounted to 20 percent, followed by chemicals, raw materials, and foodstuffs. It should be noted that 12 Western nations sold more to the Red bloc than did the United States. Last year the United States sold for cash, that is, hard currency, only $125 million worth of products to the entire Communist bloc. The major items of export to the Soviet Union by the United States were industrial wax, paper, synthetic fibers, hides, and skins.

According to my information, thus far this year France and the United Kingdom each have sold 750,000 tons of flour to the Soviet Union. West Germany and Italy each have sold 300,000 tons of flour to the Soviet Union. These sales of flour to Russia indirectly involve the United States, since those countries are getting from the United States much of the wheat to make the flour. The difference is that they reap the benefits.

I want the American people to know what is going on, so we do not go parading around as paragons of political virtue, in and out of Congress, and in and out of the administration. While we have in existence a congressional admonition pertaining to the sale of wheat to the Russians, we do not have this with regard to the sale of wheat to Western Europe. We presently do not allow anyone in the United States to make any money by selling wheat to the Russians. We do not allow American firms to do business directly. We do not allow American labor to be used for the milling of wheat into flour. At the same time, however, there is no doubt that some U.S. wheat which is sold to Western European countries is being milled by them and sold as flour to the Soviet Union and other Eastern-bloc countries.

I advocate—and I have spoken about this before—sales of agricultural products to the Soviet Union and Soviet-bloc countries by the private trade in the United States for hard currency, that is, dollars or gold. I believe these sales should be made under the program known in the trade as GR 345. This is the payment-in-kind, competitive bidding program. It works. No one knows better how to export than our American firms. I see no reason for the Government to become involved.

Many people have said that a change in policy will mean the Government will have to do many different things. All the Government has to do is issue export licenses. There are individuals in the United States who know more about export sales than the Government ever will know. There is no reason for the Government becoming involved in ideological or economic disputes. After all, the Government issues export licenses for the sale of skins and hides and industrial wax and paper, as well as tallow. People say we should not issue export licenses for wheat, because it is different, in their opinion. Is not tallow also food? We send other items abroad, including synthetic fibers. These items have been sold to Communist-bloc countries. We should let the free enterprise system do the negotiating, and let private industry make its own arrangements. Let the price be negotiated, as is done in other instances. In that case we will have less trouble, less cost, less administrating fumbling, and more results. It might be a good thing to let the Russians run into some capitalist competition, negotiation, and salesmanship.

I am pleased to note that a number of newspapers of the country have expressed their point of view on this subject.

For example, I have before me the Des Moines Register of Thursday, September 26. It is one of the great newspapers of the Middle West. In its lead editorial, it states:

> There is no law preventing the sale of agricultural products to the Soviet Union. U.S. law bars trade in "strategic materials" to the Communist countries.
>
> However, there is a U.S. law which prohibits sale of U.S. farm surpluses under subsidy to Communist countries. The subsidy programs permit export of U.S. farm products at world price levels, even though U.S. prices are pegged above those levels as a means of supporting farm income.
>
> Export under subsidy was devised as a benefit to U.S. agriculture and U.S. exporters, rather than as a donation to other countries, We are talking here of commercial exports under subsidy and not about the food-for-peace program, which is a form of foreign aid.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I are quite familiar with the export program, since we had something to do with implementing it in Congress and making a legislative history for it some years ago. The subsidy payment that many newspapers write about is not a subsidy to the Russians; it is a subsidy to American farmers. It is a subsidy, indirectly, to the farmers through the exporter. The export company that would sell wheat to the Soviet Union at the world price, or whatever price is negotiated, gets back from the Commodity Credit Corporation a sufficient number of bushels of wheat to make up the difference between the price in the American market and the price in the world market. This is a way to compensate him so he does not go broke, since the American exporter has to get wheat in the American market at American domestic prices.

This program has been working, and we know what it does and how it works. There has been no real problem with it. The editorial in the Register states the case for it very well. It goes on to say:

> At present, it would seem to be advisable to offer to sell Russia farm products for cash or gold, even if this involved subsidy to U.S. exporters in some instances, in order to permit competition with the Canadians and other farm exporters. This is good business and also good foreign policy. We do not advocate charity to the Soviet regime but hard bargaining on a trade deal of advantage to the United States.

I agree. That is an excellent statement of the case. I am delighted to see this fine editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Sept. 26, 1963]

TRADE WITH RUSSIA

A combination of recent foreign developments has caused talk in Congress about reexamination of U.S. trade relationships with the Soviet Union. Such trade is almost nil now.

The nuclear test ban treaty has produced a better climate for Soviet-American relations in general. As President Kennedy said in his United Nations address, it has resulted in a "pause" in the cold war.

The intensifying "cold war" between the Soviet Union and China creates opportunities for diplomatic initiative in the West. The concept of world communism as a monolithic movement must be revised.

The sale by Canada of about $500 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union whets the appetite of U.S. grain exporters, including the Federal Government. There have been signs of interest by the Soviet Union in buying wheat from the United States. U.S. private grain traders have been discussing a wheat sale with Soviet representatives.

The Soviet Union has been a large exporter of wheat in the past. The current imports (including an order from Australia, as well as Canada) are a consequence of severe drought. Grain production in the Soviet Union this year is forecast at around 115 million tons, compared with 125 million tons in 1958, a good crop year. Production was even lower in 1959 and 1960, and the series of short crops finally forced Russia to import, both for its own needs and to supply other Communist countries, including Cuba.

The off-the-cuff reaction of many Americans is that the United States ought to refuse to sell wheat to Russia. Why help Premier Khrushchev out of his farm trouble?

Iowa's state secretary of agriculture, L. B. Liddy, reflects this view. He sent a telegram to U.S. Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, objecting to sale of wheat to Russia "at any price." He asked whether we had reached such a level that it was necessary to place a "price tag on our principles." Then Liddy sent wires to other State secretaries of agriculture suggesting that they join him in protest. Freeman, in an earlier statement, had indicated that he would be willing to sell wheat to Russia for cash.

We believe Freeman is right on this and Liddy wrong. If the United States refused to sell wheat to Russia, some people might get righteous satisfaction out of it, but it would not injure the Soviet Union, since there is plenty of surplus wheat in Canada, Australia and elsewhere to supply the Soviet Union's needs. U.S. farmers will benefit indirectly from this new claim on world grain reserves even if the Russians do not buy American wheat.

The automatic reaction of people like Liddy against trade with the Soviet Union may come from a failure to consider the broader issues of foreign policy. Something that is good for the Soviet Union is not necessarily bad for the United States.

This may be an opportunity, not only to export surplus wheat for gold or hard currency (which the United States badly needs to correct its foreign payments deficit), but also to demonstrate a willingness for cooperation with the Russian people. The Russian people know what is going on in this wheat deal, we may be sure, despite limited announcements in the Soviet press. Soviet agricultural trouble is a tense political issue inside Russia.

This might be the opening wedge toward trade deals in other areas, including farm machinery, fertilizer plants and other things that Khrushchev says he wants to import for Soviet agriculture.

There is no law preventing the sale of agricultural products to the Soviet Union. U.S. law bars trade in "strategic materials" to the Communist countries.

However, there is a U.S. law which prohibits sale of U.S. farm surpluses under subsidy to Communist countries. The subsidy programs permit export of U.S. farm products at world price levels, even though U.S. prices are pegged above those levels as a means of supporting farm income.

Export under subsidy was devised as a benefit to U.S. agriculture and U.S. exporters, rather than as a donation to other countries. We are talking here of commercial exports under subsidy and not about the food-for-peace program, which is a form of foreign aid.

At present, it would seem to be advisable to offer to sell Russian farm products for cash or gold, even if this involved subsidy to U.S. exporters in some instances, in order to permit competition with the Canadians and other farm exporters. This is good business and also good foreign policy. We do not advocate charity to the Soviet regime but hard bargaining on a trade deal of advantage to the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On September 18, 1963, the Minneapolis Star published an editorial entitled "Wheat to Soviet Union." That editorial also endorses the proposal. It reads, in part:

> The transaction may lead to a reexamination of U.S. policy. Trade with Red China is prohibited by law. U.S. trade with Russia excludes strategic materials and grain seems, by someone's definition, to be banned. But there is some feeling in Congress for greater trade relations with the Soviet Union.
>
> In the meantime, the new market for Canadian wheat is likely to keep U.S. wheat above the Government price support level for some time to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star, Sept. 18, 1963]

WHEAT TO SOVIET UNION

Wheat prices are up at the Minneapolis and other grain exchanges on the strength of Canada's $500 million deal with the Soviet Union. The 3-year pact calls for delivering 239 million bushels of wheat, or the flour equivalent, by the end of July 1964. Canada also is shipping vast quantities of wheat to Red China.

Wheat exports in the current crop year are expected to give Canada $1 billion in foreign exchange earnings. That's a big boost to a rather hard-pressed Canadian economy. The deals also are expected to have some indirect effects in the upper Midwest. For Canada is selling mainly hard spring wheat, the kind that also is raised in Montana, the Dakotas, and Minnesota. With so much of Canada's production going to Communist nations, some new markets elsewhere should be opened to U.S. spring wheat.

American officials seemed less than enthusiastic when Canada first began selling grain to Red China. But the new deal with Russia had drawn favorable comment from Agriculture Secretary Freeman. Nobody seems greatly disturbed that Russia will deliver some of the Canadian wheat to Cuba.

The transaction may lead to a reexamination of U.S. policy. Trade with Red China is prohibited by law. U.S. trade with Russia excludes strategic materials and grain seems, by someone's definition, to be so banned. But there is some feeling in Congress for greater trade relations with the Soviet Union.

In the meantime, the new market for Canadian wheat is likely to keep U.S. wheat above the Government price support level for some time to come.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published two editorials, one on September 19, entitled "The U.S., the U.S.S.R., and Wheat"; the other, published on September 28, entitled "Why Not Ship Wheat?" Both editorials endorse the suggestion or the proposal that we change our regulations to permit American traders to engage in business with the Soviet Union through a hardheaded type of bargaining, if they can get customers in the Soviet Union.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 19, 1963]

THE UNITED STATES, THE U.S.S.R., AND WHEAT

Canada's sale of half a billion dollars' worth of grain and flour to the Soviet Union for delivery in the next 10 months is apt to sit less than well with some Members of Congress, particularly as a portion is destined for Cuba. But Cuba has never been embargoed from food and drugs, on humanitarian grounds, and the sale is unusual only in its precedent-shattering size; Russia has been buying wheat from Canada for the past several years, as has China also. There are in fact decided advantages which the United States as well as Canada may anticipate.

For Canada's part, its wheat surplus will be reduced to safe limits; its unfavorable balance of trade, running to some $1 billion a year with the United States, will be alleviated; unemployment will be diminished and national income raised. As concerns the United States, it may expect to benefit from the enhancement of Canada's dollar supply available for trade with this country; from the possible opening up to our producers of export markets which Canada cannot supply while filling the Soviet order; from firming wheat prices; and from assuagement of frictions over wheat and trade imbalance.

The United States may itself in fact be impelled by this dramatic maneuver in grain to reexamine policies of trade with the Communist countries which have become more and more unrealistic with the advent of our own overall unfavorable balance of payments. Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Democratic whip, has since the Canadian sale called for policy updating to increase the U.S. share of world markets. Secretary of Commerce Hodges has favored expansion of trade with Communist countries. A White House conference of more than 200 businessmen has recommended reexamination of the Government's policies toward trade with the Soviet bloc.

Already representatives of the Soviet Union, evidently hard hit by crop failures, are reported approaching private sources in the United States for wheat, with a formal Government-to-Government effort said to be prospective. Russia's contract for another $100 million worth of wheat and flour from Australia even after the huge Canadian purchase is indication that its need, the size of which is not known, may still be unfilled. With warehouses bulging and prices low, policymakers may find it hard to justify to American farmers the rejection of a major demand if it is offered.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

WHY NOT SHIP WHEAT?

The swing toward support of changes in American export policy, to allow wheat sales to Communist nations, is clearly based on the fact that such sales would help the United States. Remaining opposition to a policy change is less clearly founded on the assumption that wheat sales would help Russia, and that anything that helps Russia must be bad.

No doubt the joint meetings of the House Foreign Affairs and Agriculture Committees, requested by President Kennedy, will study both arguments and permit some clarification of the second. The question is: Just how would American wheat help Russia?

Official export policy bars shipment of strategic goods to Communist countries, but omits food from the list of such goods. Nevertheless, policy also forbids wheat shipments. The contradiction is obvious. Wheat is not strategic goods in present circumstances. Shipment of it to Russia will help Russia generally, but it will not help Russia build up hostile military power. And failing to ship it will not injure Russia strategically, and it will not injure the Soviet Government. What it may do is cause some belt-tightening for the Russian people, despite Moscow's $500 million wheat deal with Canada.

These circumstances ought to be balanced against the obvious advantages to the United States of selling some of its surplus wheat, now valued at close to $4 billion, and of improving its serious losses in the balance of payments. A wheat sale of 200 million bushels offers major advantages in both.

No doubt that is why the prospect has drawn support from Republicans, particularly in the wheat belt. Since farmers this year voted down production controls on next year's wheat crop, support prices will be set at about $1.25 a bushel, compared to the existing rate of $1.82. The former figure is lower than the present world price of $1.30. Western Congressmen fear lack of controls may lead to overproduction and lower prices, which is one reason they find Russian overtures hard to resist.

The wheat belt's reaction to such a deal is as self-interested as the opposition is emotional. The main consideration for Congress is, simply, whether a wheat sale to the Communist bloc would help the national interest. The fact that peoples under communism would eat it seems irrelevant to the issue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday, the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Let Us Sell Wheat." The editorial states, in part:

> The free world is not going to triumph over communism in Europe, in China, or in Cuba by trying to make people go hungry. This is a case where good morals, good politics and good business go together. We have immense quantities of surplus wheat. The Russians will pay in hard currency, and the presumption is they will pay the world market. It has been rising steadily and was $1.80 yesterday.
>
> By any calculation, the spectacle of capitalistic, "imperialistic," America and Canada selling huge quantities of surplus wheat to the Communists is not going to do the cause of democracy any harm. A refusal to sell would.

That editorial goes to the heart of the question again: A refusal to sell would do some harm to us. To sell it would do no damage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1963]

LET US SELL WHEAT

If President Kennedy was really looking for advice on whether or not to sell U.S. Government surplus wheat to the Soviet Union, he has only to heed his own Democratic Party leaders. They told him yesterday morning to go ahead and sell. There is nothing unique in sending wheat to Communist countries; we have been exporting it to Poland for a long time.

The free world is not going to triumph over communism in Europe, in China, or in Cuba by trying to make people go hungry. This is a case where good morals, good politics, and good business go together. We have immense quantities of surplus wheat. The Russians will pay in hard currency, and the presumption is they will pay the world market price. It has been rising steadily and was $1.80 yesterday.

By any calculation, the spectacle of capitalistic, imperialistic, America and Canada selling huge quantities of surplus wheat to the Communists is not going to do the cause of democracy any harm. A refusal to sell would.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Russians will not become any less belligerent or any less powerful because they are short of wheat. They will not become any less belligerent or any less powerful because of the existing circumstances that affect their economy relating to wheat. If we sell wheat to the Russians, they are not going to become more powerful and more belligerent. They have ways to tighten the screws of their economy so their military establishment will receive first priority. I feel, however, that in the long run some of the suggestions that have been made by Senators make a great deal of sense. I recall that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has said:

> I do not recall any instance in history in which any people have been starved into democracy. They have been starved into totalitarianism, but not into democracy.

So when we look over the situation, the sale of wheat by the United States could do much good. It could open up new opportunities for business and for private trade. We could reduce our stocks of wheat and thus the cost to the taxpayers for storing that wheat, at least this year. We could improve, at least modestly, our balance-of-payments situation and improve the price received by wheat producers through an improved supply and demand situation. Those are some of the benefits which could accrue to us.

I recognize that criticism can be made that anything done now to provide wheat to the Soviet Union will only strengthen her. Mr. President, we have not been able to boycott the Soviet Union. A one-nation boycott of the Soviet Union is ineffective, if other countries are not going to join with us. If our policy was to get all countries to close off trade with the Soviet Union and the Soviet bloc, and if that policy could be effectuated and made operative, that would be one thing. Then we could say, "No, no, no; a thousand times no. We will not sell any wheat to the Soviet Union, because we do not want to break any policy."

But the United States is the only country that has such a policy. Not only that, it is a hypocritical policy. We merely tell people we have a policy. We are telling that to people who are not, apparently, supposed to look behind the scenes. This has been going on not only in this administration but in the previous one, as well.

When the British and French can each produce and sell in 1 year 750,000 tons of flour to the Soviet Union, much of it made out of American wheat, why should anyone in this country think for a moment that we have a policy of boycotting the Soviet Union or placing an embargo on the sale of wheat, when every bushel of that wheat had an export subsidy attached to it.

When the Germans and Italians can each produce and sell in 1 year 300,000 tons of flour to the Soviet Union, flour milled out of American wheat, how can we say we are not selling wheat to Russia?

What we are really doing by this policy is denying American workers jobs. We are denying American businessmen the opportunity to make a fair profit—and I believe in the profit system. I think we can make the profit system more profitable, make it effective in stopping the onrush of communism. I believe American enterprise ought to be permitted to compete in those markets.

More importantly, let us come clean on the situation. Many arguments will be made against such a proposal. I have listened to speeches in Congress to the effect that we had better take a look; we may be helping Russia. What we are doing now is hurting ourselves, because the Russians will get the wheat.

Mr. Khrushchev said the other day he may not need any wheat at all from the United States. He is a sharp fellow. He was not born yesterday. He knows all the tricks of the game. He knows where to get wheat.

He is getting it from England, Italy, France, and Germany; and yet the Germans lecture us about our being soft on communism. Still, the Germans continue to sell wheat to the Soviet Union. Khrushchev goes to Belgium and other countries throughout the world. Soviet trade missions are active everywhere. But the good old American wheat is processed in other people's flour mills, taking jobs away from our flour industry. American subsidized wheat is supplied to foreign mills. Yet we go around saying we do not sell to Communists; we do not do business with Communists. Is that so? What we try to do is "sanitize" the wheat. Sometimes we hold executive sessions of committees of Congress and talk about "sanitizing" the hearings. We want to eliminate any security information. We let the Pentagon go through the record before it gets to the public.

But in this instance, we cannot fool the people. Trade with Russia has been going on for a long time.

If we want to have a policy which provides we will not sell 1 pound of butter or 1 pound of edible oil or 1 kernel of corn or 1 bushel of wheat to the Soviet Union, then we had better make whoever buys those products from us sign an affidavit, making them subject to the death penalty, if they violate it, that they will not sell into the Communist bloc one bit of that which they buy from us.

Of course, everyone in his right mind knows no country will do that. Every Senator knows full well our Canadian friends sell to Communist China and to Communist Russia. Canada is our good ally. I like Canada. The friendship of the United States with Canada is more important than all the wheat sales put together. But the Canadians feel they have to live too. They produce wheat. The Canadian Government tells Canadian wheat farmers to produce; we tell our wheat farmers to cut back their production. We impose on our wheat farmers regulations, restrictions, supply controls, management controls, and so forth.

Mr. President, consider the situation in the vicinity of the United States-Canada border along the northern boundary of the State of North Dakota.

To the wheat farmers on the U.S. side of the border, the Government of the United States says, "We do not want to do any business with the Communists, so you must make a 20-percent decrease in your production of wheat." But to the wheat farmers right across the border, in Canada—where our forces participate with the Canadians in the North American Command, and where our good friends, the Canadians, and the Americans work together for the common defense against the Communist menace—the Government of Canada says to the Canadian farmers, "Go ahead and plant more wheat; we have a customer."

So long as we let everyone else have the customer, our farmers will have less income and more restrictions and more acreage limitations, more of our flour mills will shut down, our workers will be without jobs, our taxes will become higher and more onerous—all for the privilege of saying, "We did not offer to do business with the Communists."

Mr. President, I believe it is time to clear up the record a little. I agree that the proposal to sell wheat to Russia should receive the most careful scrutiny of the appropriate committees in Congress; and as a loyal American and a friend of this administration, I say a decision is needed.

A decision is needed in order to prevent speculation, to prevent the kind of ups and downs we have seen in wheat futures, because that can lead to disastrous results in the grain market.

So I say, in most nonpartisan fashion, to my friends and to the administration, let us have a decision one way or the other. Let us eliminate the doubt. If we do that, at least there will again be some sense in the market, whereas today it is a hunting ground for every speculator in the world, not merely those in the United States.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Minnesota has been discussing the problem of the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union to the satellite countries?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have.

Mr. CLARK. I understand the Senator has been engaged in colloquy with the Senator from Iowa on this subject?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to suggest a point of view to the Senator from Minnesota, and ask him whether he finds himself in agreement with it or not. I have been given to understand that the administration is anxious to have some views from Members of Congress, particularly from Senators, as to whether they would look with favor upon a sale of wheat to the Soviet Union, possibly to Czechoslovakia, perhaps to Poland and other countries——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Bulgaria, and Hungary.

Mr. CLARK. And to other countries behind the Iron Curtain. For myself, I would wholeheartedly support the administration if it decided to go ahead with such negotiations, assuming, first, that the sale was for hard currency, with relatively short-term credit, and that feasible precautions would be taken to assure that none of the grain we sent out of our country would go to Cuba.

It seems to me that this is a wise policy for the following reasons:

First, it would make a substantial contribution to bringing into balance our international balance of payments, which our top financial experts told the members of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the other international financiers gathered in Washington this week that we would endeavor to do.

I have been a congressional observer at this international banking meeting, where the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, and other international agencies and their leaders have been gathered. I also have the honor to be chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance, of the Banking and Currency Committee. However, solely from the domestic point of view, I believe such a sale of wheat would be good for our country, even though little wheat is grown in Pennsylvania. I know a good deal of wheat is grown in Minnesota, and I know much more is grown in the States west of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Actually, neither Iowa nor Minnesota produces much wheat. Some is produced in the northwest corner of Minnesota. At one time, more wheat was produced there, but so little is produced there now that it is not even considered much of a cash crop. But to the west, vast amounts of wheat are grown.

The Twin Cities—Minneapolis and St. Paul—constitute one of the largest milling areas in the Nation and one of the largest grain trading centers in the country. Therefore, obviously I have been informed by the citizens of Minnesota about all these problems and the rules and regulations on trade. Surely there is no better way to find out what goes on than to get the information from those who earn their livelihood there.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Minnesota is well known in this body as one who considers the overall national interest, rather than to confine his interest to what sometime seems to be the narrow interests of one's own State. I am sure the Senator from Iowa is also prepared to rise above the parochial interests of the State of Iowa. I believe that when we look at the national picture, there can be no doubt that such a sale of wheat would make a substantial contribution to the reduction of the amount of wheat which has to be stored at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, because of the great oversupply. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; at least for 1 year. I believe the Senator from Iowa and I both agree that this would be only a palliative for 1 year, not a permanent remedy.

No small sum of money is involved. Sales amounting to several hundred million dollars certainly should be viewed by Members of Congress as constituting a worthy project.

Mr. CLARK. One would hope that over a period of time the wise counsel of the administration with respect to the handling of our wheat surplus would have a great deal more impact on the farmers of the country and would be of more aid to them than any of the administration's present activities. At least, by means of this "shot in the arm" we could decrease substantially our present surplus; and that would be a good thing.

My final reason—and, to my way of thinking, the most important one of all—for advocating the proposed sale of wheat is that it lends itself to a further decrease of the tensions of the cold war and provides one more area in which we can cooperate with the Soviet Union. There was much belligerent talk in the Senate when the test ban treaty was being considered. A good many Senators voted for the test ban treaty with very real personal reservations. They had the feeling that the cold war would go on forever, that one can never trust the Russians about anything, and that we were heading into a situation in which the arms race must be accelerated and we must move ahead in that field.

I do not share that view at all; and I know the Senator from Minnesota does not, either—although I realize that we must keep our guard up; we must negotiate from strength; we must be careful not to be tricked.

We should consider whether the facts of international political life have changed drastically in the last 6 months or in the last year, and whether there is now a real possibility that the self-interests of both the Soviet Union and our country are tending to bring them together in an area of constantly increasing agreement in which tensions will be relaxed, so that perhaps we can look forward to a day when general and complete disarmament will no longer be a pious dream or a hope in the sky, but will be a program which the Senator from Minnesota—who has worked so ably and so long in the hope of achieving it—and I may see come into effect before we pass from the political scene.

I wonder whether he agrees that all these factors should be considered in connection with the proposed sale of wheat?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Furthermore, let us consider the potential results or "fallout"—a word we often heard during the debate on the test ban treaty. The social and political fallout from a good trade arrangement would have very, very helpful effects in the months and years ahead. I know of no better way to build respect and understanding than by establishing a sound economic base. With a mutuality of economic interest, people get along surprisingly well and find ways and means to use brainpower, rather than a mailed fist.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that in connection with this effort, we must be sure that the necessary legalities are observed. I understand that there is substantial legal opinion to the effect that the President already has ample authority to consummate this proposal, and that the enactment of a new law by Congress will not be necessary.

It is my understanding that there is substantial and able legal opinion that he has that authority. If he has it, I hope he will use it, rather than come back to the Congress for a long wrangle, another bill that we must pass, and all of the frightening problems which arise whenever an effort is made to overcome apathy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If we get into a basic change of trade policy between the United States and the Soviet-bloc countries, it is something that will require a complete examination by the Congress.

Mr. CLARK. I quite agree.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have been speaking of what might be called a one-shot deal, which is a possibility. I wish to caution Senators that I am not sure the possibility is even here any longer. There is such a thing as too much delay. This great capitalistic businessman's Nation has been acting like it has paralysis of the mind, the body, and the business instinct. We have been floundering around. We are more bungling than the world's greatest bureaucracy. We are supposed to be capitalists and businessmen. When we see an opportunity to make a good deal, we are suppose to come out like a trout from a stream in Minnesota after the bait.

If our trout were no more alive than the attitude of our Government and our economic community on the question about which we have been speaking, the fishing in Minnesota would be extinct. Fishing is good in Minnesota. It is very good in the fall, by the way.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to point out that the trout fishing in Minnesota is far inferior to the fishing in the Pocono Mountains of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I knew that I could get the Senator from Pennsylvania to digress.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that the Senator will come up there in this magnificent fall weather, while the leaves are changing and the streams are flowing with bright water, and let us show him what great fishing is like.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania on the subject are like an introductory chapter to a travelogue that ultimately takes one into the great garden of ecstasy, delight, purity, and out of doors of Minnesota. It is like coming to the point when one anticipates a great experience, and then there are always a few additional chapters to tell him what it might be like when he arrives. The Senator from Pennsylvania has been giving us a limited version of some of the lesser pleasures in the great out of doors in the State of Pennsylvania. When he comes to Minnesota, there he will see all the wonders of nature. I welcome the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I might comment?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I do not wish to leave the colloquy on wheat in any fuzzy position so far as my own attitude is concerned. I believe, of course, if we are going to drastically change foreign trade policy with respect to trade with the satellite nations in the Soviet Union, and possibly even with China, it should be the subject of a very great debate in which the Congress of the United States must obviously participate, and as to which legislation would be needed. But I feel we should take this one shot now and talk about it afterwards.

I would hate to follow the advice of my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and have a great big congressional hassle on proposed legislation. Let us sell the wheat now and talk about it later.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The authority for the President to act surely is in the law. The present law gives admonition but not prohibition. However, it seems to me there ought to be a decision made as to which way we are going to go. Either we are going to ask the Congress for a sense-of-Congress resolution or we will take the action after consultations with Congress on this immediate possibility. I say "possibility" because I think the probability is more remote. On this immediate possibility I believe the administration could act after it has made its proper consultations, and I have so recommended. But on any major change of policy I think we need a very careful dialog between the Congress and the executive branch, and then some legislative action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release I issued September 26 on this subject be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Humphrey Sees Increased Chance for Change in East-West Trade Policy

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, said yesterday that there is an "increasing possibility for a constructive change in American policy on sale of agricultural products to Soviet bloc countries."

Humphrey reported that he based his conclusion on personal discussions with "many administration officials and members of Congress."

He said that he will continue to press the administration and Congress "to end the antiquated and costly policy which makes it impossible to trade wheat and other farm products to the Soviet Union and its satellites."

Humphrey was one of the first national leaders to urge a "reexamination and overhaul" of U.S. policy on trade with the Soviet Union. He made his proposals both before and after the recent announcement of Canada's sale of $500 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union.

"Let us let American farmers be Americans," Humphrey said, "instead of stifling them with controls. Let them produce what is needed, seek the customers that are available, and sell when they can.

"Our American farmers developed a magnificent productive capacity through the spirit of free enterprise. They should be able to market their products in the same spirit of American free enterprise."

Humphrey reported that he has stressed four key points in his discussions with administration and congressional leaders:

1. The United States has agricultural products to sell, in both quantity and quality.

2. There are ready markets for those products in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Our products can be sold to them for cash, for gold and for short-term credits.

3. The sale of wheat and other agricultural products and surplus can reduce costs to taxpayers for storage and other expenses and reduce the budget.

4. The sale of wheat and other commodities for dollars will relieve the severe balance-of payments situation.

Humphrey said that the sale of wheat and other farm products to the Soviet Union "will not adversely affect our security.

"Food will not feed the furnaces of destruction," he said. "It can help build a better world. Food is an instrument of peace, not a weapon of war."

The Senate majority whip added that increased East-West trade, "at least in agricultural products," can tend to "improve the political relationships between nations by providing a sound economic basis for cooperation."

He concluded: "Sale of wheat and other farm products means cash for our economy, jobs for our farmers and mill workers and strength for our Nation."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield to the Senator from Iowa. I should like to ask him if he is going to brag about Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. My friend, the Senator from Minnesota, has yielded to me after all the discussion about fishing has taken place. However, I did think I ought to make the point that, granted the beauty of the trout streams and the wonder of the sky-blue waters in Minnesota; I deeply regret that the best information that I have is that by the time we get out of here this year, there will be no free-flowing waters, and the Senator might just as well come down to my State and do some ice fishing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a mighty kind offer and I will give it serious consideration. But since the Senator from Iowa has brought up the subject of ice fishing, I would like him to know that in Minnesota we provide all the comforts of home for ice fishing. We provide those fine little huts that we put out in the lake. We chop a hole through the ice and we can see those nice walleyed pike and all the other fine and wonderful fish we have. Of course, if one should fall in, as occasionally happens, it requires a certain amount of therapeutic treatment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The trouble is that it is so cold in the State of the Senator, and the ice is so thick, one is worn out by the time he chops the hole.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not at all. We in Minnesota are a vigorous people.

Mr. MILLER. The cold air gets through those huts very quickly. Why not come to Iowa and be more comfortable?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his invitation. I presume everything will be taken care of.

Mr. MILLER. It is a standing invitation.

CIA IN VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington's Daily News appears a lead editorial entitled "What's Wrong in South Vietnam?" There also appeared a very excellent article on page 3 entitled "'Arrogant' CIA Disobeys Orders in Vietnam." The sum and substance of these items is that certain officials in the CIA and South Vietnam have apparently refused to follow the instructions of the American Ambassador to South Vietnam.

It is well known that in a foreign country the Ambassador is in the shoes of the President, and why such action should take place in, of all countries, South Vietnam, is difficult to understand. I hope that upon the return of Mr. McNamara and General Taylor appropriate disciplinary action will be taken against the CIA officials who have seen fit not to follow protocol in that respect. Furthermore, I hope that it will be made very clear to the Director of CIA that what has occurred is not about to take place in any other embassy of the United States in the world.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 2, 1963]

What's Wrong in South Vietnam?

It is a brutally messed-up state of affairs that our man, Richard Starnes, reports from South Vietnam in his article on page 3 today.

And the mess he has found isn't Vietnamese. It is American, involving bitter strife among U.S. agencies—which may help explain the vast cost and lack of satisfactory progress in this operation to contain Communist aggression.

The whole situation, as described by Mr. Starnes, must be shocking to Americans who believe we are engaged in a selfless crusade to protect democracy in this far-off land.

He has been told that:

The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency —CIA—has flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, frustrating a plan of action he took from Washington.

Secret agents, or "spooks," from CIA "have penetrated every branch of the American community in Saigon."

Who are we fighting there anyhow? The Communists, or our own people?

The CIA agents represent a tremendous power and are totally unaccountable to anyone. They dabble and interfere in military operations, to the frustration of our military officials.

The bitterness of other American agencies in Saigon toward the CIA, Starnes found, is "almost unbelievable."

On the basis of this last statement alone, there is something terribly wrong with our system out there.

Defense Secretary McNamara just has finished his investigation on the ground in Vietnam and is preparing to report to the President. Mr. McNamara is a tough man of decisive action. It may be assumed he now is in a position to assess the blame for this quarreling and backbiting inside the American family—whether it falls on the CIA or other agencies which accuse the CIA.

One way or the other, some official heads should roll.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 2, 1963]

"Spooks" Make Life Miserable for Ambassador Lodge—"Arrogant" CIA Disobeys Orders in Vietnam

(By Richard Starnes)

Saigon, October 2.—The story of the Central Intelligence Agency's role in South Vietnam is a dismal chronicle of bureaucratic arrogance, obstinate disregard of orders, and unrestrained thirst for power.

Twice the CIA flatly refused to carry out instructions from Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, according to a high U.S. source here.

In one of these instances the CIA frustrated a plan of action Mr. Lodge brought with him from Washington, because the agency disagreed with it.

This led to a dramatic confrontation between Mr. Lodge and John Richardson, chief of the huge CIA apparatus here. Mr. Lodge failed to move Mr. Richardson, and the dispute was bucked back to Washington. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and CIA Chief John A. McCone were unable to resolve the conflict, and the matter is now reported to be awaiting settlement by President Kennedy.

It is one of the developments expected to be covered in Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's report to Mr. Kennedy.

OTHERS CRITICAL, TOO

Other American agencies here are incredibly bitter about the CIA.

"If the United States ever experiences a 'Seven Days in May' it will come from the CIA, and not the Pentagon," one U.S. official commented caustically.

("Seven Days in May" is a fictional account of an attempted military coup to take over the U.S. Government.)

CIA "spooks" (a universal term for secret agents here) have penetrated every branch of the American community in Saigon, until nonspook Americans here almost seem to be suffering a CIA psychosis.

An American field officer with a distinguished combat career speaks angrily about "that man at headquarters in Saigon wearing a colonel's uniform." He means the man is a CIA agent, and he can't understand what he is doing at U.S. military headquarters here, unless it is spying on other Americans.

Another American officer, talking about the CIA, acidly commented: "You'd think they'd have learned something from Cuba but apparently they didn't."

FEW KNOW CIA STRENGTH

Few people other than Mr. Richardson and his close aids know the actual CIA strength here, but a widely used figure is 600. Many are clandestine agents known only to a few of their fellow spooks.

Even Mr. Richardson is a man about whom it is difficult to learn much in Saigon. He is said to be a former OSS officer, and to have served with distinction in the CIA in the Philippines.

A surprising number of the spooks are known to be involved in their ghostly trade and some make no secret of it.

"There are spooks in the U.S. Information Service, in the U.S. Operations mission, in every aspect of American official and commercial life here," one official—presumably a nonspook—said.

"They represent a tremendous power and total unaccountability to anyone," he added.

Coupled with the ubiquitous secret police of Ngo Dinh Nhu, a surfeit of spooks has given Saigon an oppressive police state atmosphere.

The Nhu-Richardson relationship is a subject of lively speculation. The CIA continues to pay the special forces with conducted brutal raids on Buddhist temples last August 21, although in fairness it should be pointed out that the CIA is paying these goons for the war against Communist guerrillas, not Buddhist bonzes (priests).

HANDS OVER MILLIONS

Nevertheless, on the first of every month, the CIA dutifully hands over a quarter million American dollars to pay these special forces.

Whatever else it buys, it doesn't buy any solid information on what the special forces are up to. The August 21 raids caught top U.S. officials here and in Washington flatfooted.

Nhu ordered the special forces to crush the Buddhist priests, but the CIA wasn't let in on the secret. (Some CIA button men now say they warned their superiors what was coming up, but in any event the warning of harsh repression was never passed to top officials here or in Washington.)

Consequently, Washington reacted unsurely to the crisis. Top officials here and at home were outraged at the news the CIA was paying the temple raiders, but the CIA continued the payments.

It may not be a direct subsidy for a religious war against the country's Buddhist majority, but it comes close to that.

And for every State Department aid here who will tell you, "Dammit, the CIA is supposed to gather information, not make policy, but policymaking is what they're doing here," there are military officers who scream over the way the spooks dabble in military operations.

A TYPICAL EXAMPLE

For example, highly trained trail watchers are an important part of the effort to end Vietcong infiltration from across the Laos and Cambodia borders. But if the trail watchers spot incoming Vietcongs, they report it to the CIA in Saigon, and in the fullness of time, the spooks may tell the military.

One very high American official here, a man who has spent much of his life in the service of democracy, likened the CIA's growth to a malignancy, and added he was not sure even the White House could control it any longer.

Unquestionably Mr. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor both got an earful from people who are beginning to fear the CIA is becoming a third force, coequal with President Diem's regime and the U.S. Government—and answerable to neither.

There is naturally the highest interest here as to whether Mr. McNamara will persuade Mr. Kennedy something ought to be done about it.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. **TALMADGE**, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1588. A bill to remove the $10 million limitation on programs carried out under section 16(e) (7) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for 1964 and subsequent calendar years (Rept. No. 555).

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **HUMPHREY**:

S. 2209. A bill for the relief of Dr. Exequiel R. Bravo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CONSERVATION OF WILD ANIMALS

Mr. **YARBOROUGH** submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 60) to recommend an International Conference on Conservation of Wild Animals, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Yarborough, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT AND MANPOWER OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO SIT FOR A CERTAIN PERIOD WHILE SENATE IS IN SESSION

Mr. **CLARK** submitted a resolution (S. Res. 209) authorizing the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to sit for a certain period while the Senate is in session, which was ordered to lie over under the rule.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Clark, which appears under a separate heading.)

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. **MUSKIE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may be permitted to file a report, including minority views, on the bill (S. 649) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes, during the recess or adjournment of the Senate.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 209)

Mrs. **NEUBERGER**. Mr. President, President Kennedy in his tax message to Congress on January 24, 1963, recommended a meaningful tax deduction for child care expenses for working mothers. The President in his message stated:

> 2. A MORE LIBERAL CHILD CARE DEDUCTION
>
> Employed women, widowers, and divorced men are now allowed a deduction of up to $600 per year for expenses incurred for the care of children and other dependents who are unable to care for themselves. In its present form this provision falls far short of fulfilling its objective of providing tax relief to those who must—in order to work—meet extra expenses for the care of dependents.
>
> I recommend increasing the maximum amount that may be deducted from the present $600 to $1,000 where three or more children must be cared for. I also recommend three further steps: raising from $4,500 to $7,000 the amount of income that families with working wives can have and still remain fully eligible; increasing the age limit of children who qualify from 11 to 12; and extending the deduction to certain taxpayers who now do not qualify—such as a married man whose wife is confined to an institution.
>
> The revenue cost of these changes in the child care deduction would be $20 million per year, most of which would benefit taxpayers with incomes of less than $7,000.

On September 25 the House of Representatives passed tax legislation to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, in the form of H.R. 8363. I regret to report that most of the important recommendations made by President Kennedy for child care deduction are not a part of the bill.

The House-passed tax bill provides no meaningful child care deductions for working mothers. Under present law the maximum deduction of $600 is available to a married working mother only if she and her husband together have a combined income of less than $5,100. However, for every dollar they earn over $4,500 they must subtract a dollar from the maximum $600 allowance.

Under the House bill married working women remain limited to a $600 deduction. The $4,500 limitation is retained. One liberalization the House would make is to allow a $900 deduction for two or more dependents for widows, widowers, and single women; but not for married women. The House also provided an increase in the age limit of children who qualify from 11 to 12, and the deduction for a married man whose wife is confined to an institution.

It seems obvious that if the child care deduction should be increased for some categories it should be increased for all. The $4,500 income limitation was adopted as a part of the 1954 tax code, and since that time wages and the cost of living have risen considerably.

Mr. President, the joint husband-wife income limitation is so low in terms of present levels of income that the deduction is not available to most married women who have to work to supplement their husband's income. In the report of the Senate Finance Committee in 1954 in connection with the child care deduction, the committee stated:

> Moreover, it is recognized that in many low-income families, the earnings of the mother are essential for the maintenance of minimum living standards even where the father is also employed, and that in such situations the requirement for providing child care may be just as pressing as in the case of a widowed or divorced mother.

At present income levels, few families with working wives get any benefit from the child care deduction. Only 244,000 taxable returns claimed the deduction in 1960, of which 117,000 were joint returns of married couples. The median income of husbands who have wives in the labor force is $4,761, and in 1961 figures reported by the Department of Labor indicate that the median income of husband-wife families in which the wife worked at any time during the year was $7,050. For families in which the wife worked full time it was $8,517. Thus it is obvious that the present child care tax deduction has little meaning in terms of today's income.

Mr. President, the question is not whether women and mothers would be encouraged to work through the child care tax deduction. Twenty-four million women are presently employed in our working force, and I think it desirable to accept facts as they are. One worker in three in the United States today is a woman. By 1970 it is forecast that the work force will contain 30 million women. Their contribution to our society is enormous. Earlier this year recognizing this the Congress enacted the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to provide equal pay for equal work.

Mr. President, I am submitting an amendment to H.R. 8363 to carry out President Kennedy's tax recommendations with respect to child care deduction expenses for working wives. I request unanimous consent that my amendment be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

> On page 64, strike out lines 18 through 24, and insert the following:
>
> "(B) The $600 limit of subparagraph (A)—
>
> "(i) shall be increased (to an amount not above $900) by the amount of expenses incurred by the taxpayer for any period during which the taxpayer had 2 dependents, and
>
> "(ii) shall be increased (to an amount not above $1,000) by the amount of expenses incurred by the taxpayer for any period during which the taxpayer had 3 or more dependents."
>
> On page 65, line 7, strike out "$4,500" and insert "$7,000."

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 211)

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, through a variety of successive organizations, dating back to the International Union of American Republics formed in 1890, and by means of many imaginative programs, the most recent of which is the Alliance for Progress, the United States has striven earnestly and unselfishly to better the economy, to strengthen the security and to advance the society of the many nations in our Western Hemisphere.

The underlying thought behind all of these agencies and efforts has been that the various nations of the Americas can and should work and live in comity, pooling their resources and their talents for mutual benefit and advancement.

The spirit of neighborliness and mutual respect unfortunately has been strained frequently—far too often, in recent years—by unilateral actions which one nation or another believes are essential to preserve its nationalistic character, to protect its resources, or to benefit its economy. These actions have been especially exasperating in one field—the high seas fisheries. Our Nation has become embroiled in a "wet war" in our own hemisphere.

Time after time since I began my service in this body, now more than a decade ago, peaceful, law-abiding residents of my native State of California have been victims of flagrant breaches of the spirit of neighborliness when patrol boats, even armed warships, of different Latin American countries employed force to prevent them from engaging in an honorable pursuit, catching fish in waters which—according to concepts formerly recognized almost universally—long have been considered the high seas.

Repeatedly, tuna boats sailing from San Diego and San Pedro have been boarded or otherwise taken into custody, compelled to put into a foreign port, and penalized for violating self-proclaimed territorial limits or for failing to obtain licenses and permits to operate in areas we maintain are open to all nations. Heavy fines have been levied against captains or owners. My office files contain literally scores of radio, cable, and telegraph messages relating incident upon incident, involving country after country.

In some instances, our Latin American neighbors maintain they have sovereignty out to an almost unbelievable distance of 200 miles. Others are more modest, but many contend they have the right to bar American-flag fishermen from operating within areas considerably greater than the 3-mile limit. A number insist they can compel the obtaining of a costly license to fish in prescribed sections of the adjacent seas.

This issue is not new. It began in 1954. Since that date, close to 50 American-flag tuna boats have been seized or harassed in international waters.

The United States has been long-suffering. In fact, we seem often to have turned the other cheek. I feel that after a decade of such conduct the time has arrived when we must take stern measures to assert our own rights and to protect our own interests. Discussions between countries have been largely unavailing. Negotiations in most cases appear futile. But in the light of history and in view of the increasing frequency of such instances, we cannot sweep this problem under the rug.

Such aggravations must be ended and the most effective means I can conceive for ending them is to invoke sanctions. This is a more modest and moderate course than some of the boatowners, skippers, and crews would have us take. They have messaged me frantically on many occasions asking for naval escorts and for forcible steps by warships or aircraft to obtain their release.

We have at hand one sanction which can be applied quickly and I believe meaningfully. We are extending financial and other aid generously under our mutual security programs to several of the countries which in effect show no hesitation about biting the hand which feeds them. I propose that we serve notice such assistance will be cut off if they continue to interfere with American fishermen, if they persist in trying to blackmail our boatowners and skippers. We must let these people we like to regard as good neighbors know the United States no longer will take such unneighborly treatment lying down.

The occasion to assert ourselves is in passing our annual mutual security legislation. Accordingly, on behalf of my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself, I am submitting an amendment, which would spell out clearly a basic condition we believe should govern future extensions of financial assistance to these nations which have scant respect for the ideal of amity and comity in our hemisphere, which arrogate authority they use as a pretext for harassing and mistreating American citizens, and which at the same moment appeal fervently for American financial support, technical help, military supplies, and other assistance.

Our amendment, if adopted, would prohibit the furnishing of any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to any country which has extended, or hereafter extends, its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond 3 miles from its coastline and which imposes a penalty or sanction against any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such an area beyond the 3-mile limit. The provisions of this amendment would not be applicable if such an extension of jurisdiction was made pursuant to an international agreement, arrangement, or understanding to which the United States was a party.

Mr. President, the time to end what might be termed the "wet war" in our hemisphere is now. The American tuna fleet, which carries on hazardous activities in a highly competitive industry, deserves stanch support and all the protection of which its government is capable. I trust that at the appropriate time the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate will agree to our amendment barring the provision of future assistance to those who flaunt the previously cherished doctrine of freedom of the seas.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have today submitted reads as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Kuchel (for himself and Mr. Engle) to the bill (S. 1276) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes: On page 8, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

"Sec. 302. Section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to prohibitions against furnishing assistance to certain countries, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"'(l) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act to any country which (1) has extended, or hereafter extends, its jurisdiction for fishing purposes over any area of the high seas beyond three miles from the coastline of such country, and (2) hereafter imposes any penalty or sanction against any United States fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in such area. The provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable in any case in which the extension of jurisdiction is made pursuant to international agreement to which the United States is a party.'"

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may lie on the table through Friday, October 11, 1963, to be brought up during the debate on the mutual security bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ELIMINATION OF DISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS AFFECTING INTERSTATE COMMERCE—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 212)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, upon behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], I send to the desk our amendment to S. 1732, the public accommodations bill, introduced upon behalf of the administration. On May 23, several weeks before the administration submitted its civil rights bill, Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, and I introduced a public accommodations bill which 30 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle joined in cosponsoring.

Our bill is based on the proposition that discrimination in places of business held out for public use falls within the terms of the "equal protection" clause of the 14th amendment—when such businesses are licensed or operated under the authority of a State or subdivision thereof, or subject to its regulations as a condition of carrying on its public business. For, in thus establishing conditions for the operation of a business held out to public use, it is our contention that the State has to a "significant extent, * * * become involved" in the discrimination practiced by the business held out to public use. "Involvement to a significant extent" has been determined by the Supreme Court in several cases, to be the test which brings what would otherwise be private discrimination within the terms of the 14th amendment.

Both Senator Dodd and I became cosponsors of the administration's bill based on the interstate commerce clause because it is our position that the approach is constitutional and presents one method of meeting the issue.

Nevertheless, I continue to believe that our bill, S. 1591, based on the 14th amendment, presents a more direct, and comprehensive approach to the problem, that it would be fairer to the citizens whose equal rights it is designed to protect and to businesses as well, that it would avoid the litigation that the administration bill is bound to provoke, and that it would not require the promulgation of regulations by some agency of the Government which we will certainly see if only the interstate commerce approach is the basis of the legislation enacted. And finally, we hold that the 14th amendment with its emphasis on the protection of equal rights of all citizens is a loftier concept than the administration bill which is based on the thesis that discrimination is a burden on interstate commerce.

Witnesses for the administration have contended that their bill includes the 14th amendment approach, but I do not believe this to be correct. It does refer to the 14th amendment in its preamble and findings, but there is nothing in the operative sections of the bill which would give relief to any person, or provide a basis for the presentation to a court, of the question whether the right to use public accommodations is one guaranteed by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment. I would prefer that the entire bill be based upon the 14th amendment approach, but because of the opposition of the administration to such an approach, I am convinced that the commerce committee would not report such a bill. I do think it very important, however, that any public accommodations bill reported by the commerce committee should include in one of its sections the provisions of the bill which Senator Dodd and I offered. I am therefore offering our bill which we have changed in several particulars, but not in substance, as an amendment to the administration bill, S. 1732. I am informed that the Senate Commerce Committee is now engaged in determining the substance of the bill that it will report to the Senate. I submit this amendment on behalf of myself and Senator Dodd to again call to the attention of the committee the bill which we had formerly introduced and to emphasize the importance of including in any bill reported to the Senate, an approach to the issue of public accommodations based on the 14th amendment.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be appropriately referred and that it be printed in the body of the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Between line 24 on page 4, and line 1 on page 5, insert the following new section, and renumber the subsequent sections of the bill accordingly:

"RIGHT TO NONDISCRIMINATION IN PUBLIC ESTABLISHMENT

"Sec. 3. (a) All persons shall be entitled, without discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, religion, or national origin, to the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of any public establishment which is operated under State authority.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'public establishment' means any place of business which holds itself out as offering to the public goods, services, facilities, or accommodations for sale, use, rent, or hire, including but not limited to the following:

"(1) any hotel, motel, or other place of business engaged in furnishing lodging;

"(2) any motion picture house, theater, sports arena, stadium, exhibition hall, amusement park, or other place of business engaged in offering amusement or entertainment; and

"(3) any retail shop, department store, market, drugstore, gasoline station, or other place of business which keeps goods for sale; any restaurant, lunchroom, lunch counter, soda fountain, or other place of business engaged in selling food for consumption on the premises; and any other place of business where goods, services, facilities, or accommodations are held out to the public for sale, use, rent, or hire.

"(c) For purposes of subsection (a), a public establishment is operated under State authority if the State in any of its manifestations becomes involved to some significant extent in its operation or regulation, as where such establishment is operated, or the business of such establishment is conducted—

"(1) under a State license, or

"(2) subject to conditions, regulations, or requirements imposed for the protection of the public by or under a State law which imposes civil or criminal penalties for failure to comply with such conditions, regulations, or requirements.

For purposes of this subsection, the term State license includes, with respect to any public establishment, any license (by whatever name designated) which is required, under the laws of the State in which such public establishment is located or under rules or regulations of any agency or instrumentality of such State, as a condition for operating such establishment or conducting the business of such establishment.

"(d) For purposes of this section, the term State includes the District of Columbia and the political subdivisions of a State.

"(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to a bona fide private club or other establishment not open to the public."

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES AND LOCAL UNITS OF GOVERNMENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2114) to provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid to State and to local units of government, and that his name be included at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT NO. 174

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the able and distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be added as a cosponsor of my amendment 174 to S. 1276, to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and resolution:

Authority of September 25, 1963:

S. 2176. A bill to extend Federal meat inspection and to permit cooperation with State meat inspection services, and for other purposes: Mr. LONG of Missouri.

S. 2180. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs: Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HART, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. RIBICOFF.

Authorities of September 24 and 25, 1963:

S. Res. 202. Resolution to provide a suitable electrical public address system in the Senate Chamber: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. SYMINGTON.

HEARINGS ON RESEARCH ON PESTICIDES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations will resume its hearings on the use of pesticides on October 7–9, in room 3302. The hearings are scheduled for 9:30 a.m. each day.

Our current inquiry will be devoted to the question of research in the field of pesticides.

Our hearings to date have highlighted the essential fact that while a great deal is known about pesticides, at the same time there is a tremendous gap in our knowledge concerning these products. As was pointed out in the Wiesner report:

> The benefits of the substances are apparent. We are now beginning to evaluate some of their less obvious effects.

This is the role of research—to help us find the answers to some of the problems brought about by the use of pesticides—the problem of persistence of residual action, the problem of resistance, the problem of accumulation of pesticides in soil, and contamination of water, the problem of potentiation, the problem of protecting beneficial insects and fish and wildlife. These are just a few of the problems that have been presented to our subcommittee to date, to which there are not adequate answers. Until we find the answers, we will continue to ask our people to weigh known benefits against unknown risks. As was pointed out recently by the Commissioner of the New York State Department of Health, Hollis S. Ingraham, M.D., in a statement defending the use of pesticides:

> We have noted that pesticides can be devastatingly harmful to man when they are used in the wrong way—that evidence indicates existing pesticides are relatively safe to man when used properly—but that we use them with some risk because our knowledge is not—and cannot be—complete.

It is our hope that our hearings next week will add to our present knowledge, and that efforts to reduce the risk inherent in the use of any poison can be advanced.

We are fortunate to have a distinguished panel of scientific experts from government, the academic world, and industry to help us in our quest.

The witness list is as follows:

WITNESS LIST

OCTOBER 7, 1963—GOVERNMENT

Dr. John L. Buckley, staff specialist, pesticides, Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Md.

Dr. Edward F. Knipling, Director of Entomology Research Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Plant Industry Station, Beltsville, Md.

Dr. Arnold Lehman, Jr., Director, Division of Pharmacology, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Burroughs Mider, Director of Laboratories and Clinics, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

OCTOBER 8, 1963—UNIVERSITIES

Dr. Jene J. Dubos, Rockefeller Institute, York Avenue and 67th Street, New York, N.Y.

Dr. Alexander Hollaender, Biology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Dr. R. L. Metcalf, chairman, department of entomology, University of California, Riverside, Calif.

Dr. E. O. Wilson, biological laboratory, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

OCTOBER 9, 1963—INDUSTRY

Dr. John P. Frawley, chief toxicologist, Agricultural Research Division, Hercules Powder Co., 910 Market Street, Wilmington, Del.

Dr. Ernest G. Jaworski, senior scientist, Monsanto Chemical Co., 800 North Lindbergh Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

Dr. Julius E. Johnson, manager, bioproducts department, the Dow Chemical Co., Abbott Road Buildings, Midland, Mich.

Dr. E. F. Feichtmeir, manager, product application, Shell Development Co., Agricultural Research Division, Post Office Box 3011, Modesto, Calif.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 7, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 3, 1963:

IN THE COAST GUARD

To be captains

The following named persons to be captains in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Russell A. Serenberg, Jr.
James C. Waters
Walter Curwen, Jr.
David M. Alger
Arnold E. Carlson
Gene R. Gislason
Lemuel C. Sansbury

To be commanders

The following named persons to be commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Hugh E. McCullough
Hugh J. LeBlanc
Thurston L. Willis
David T. Haislip
Stanley L. Waitzfelder
Harold D. Muth
Jack E. Stewart
James C. Boteler
Richard L. Huxtable
Norman P. Weinert
Rubin E. Young, Jr.
Wesley J. Quamme
William C. Akers
Donald D. Davison
Ivan C. McLean
Edward C. Taylor
Franklin F. Bohlk
John W. Cherry
Vincent J. Wernig
Franklin J. Miller
James G. Norman
Russell W. Lentner
Harold A. French

To be lieutenant commanders

The following named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Charles E. Martin
Robert C. Pittman
Calvin R. Crouch
Harry J. Oldford
William E. Smith
Rudolph V. Cassani
Anthony A. Alloggio
Marshall K. Phillips
Kenneth M. Lumsden
Gordon R. Campbell
Martin F. Groff
Ronald McClellan
Ernest L. Murdock
Paul Nichiporuk
James E. Thompson
Robert E. Gardner
Clayton W. Collins, Jr.
Ralph G. Isacson
Eugene P. Baumann
Louis H. Mense
Richard D. Mellette

To be lieutenants

The following named persons to be lieutenants in the U.S. Coast Guard:

Thomas N. Morrow, Jr.
Robert Reynard
Richard W. Folker
Lawrence E. Meyer
Walter S. Rich
James G. Heydenreich
Robert F. Melsheimer
John W. Klotz
Jason M. Bowen
Joel D. Sipes
Paul A. Welling
James E. Foels
Frank J. Ropiak, Jr.
Clarence C. Atkins, Jr.
William N. Schobert
James A. Chappell
Leroy W. Peterson
Philip M. Lebet
Harry D. Smith
Paul J. Bouchard
Daniel C. Mania
Richard H. Hicks
Marvin N. Bromen
Bruce G. Lauther
Robert E. Potts
Robert E. Diller
Harold E. Stanley
Billy R. Mull
Carl W. Snyder, Jr.
Edward A. Walsh

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statement in Opposition to Federal Communication Commission Proposed Rule on Broadcasters' Time Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1963, the Federal Communications Commission adopted a Notice of Proposed Rule Making inviting comments on a proposal to incorporate the National Association of Broadcasters' time standards in its rules and regulations. This part of the NAB's codes of good practices limits the amount of commercial time which may be included in radio and television programs of various lengths. For instance, 1-hour radio programs with participating commercial announcements may include a weekly average of 14 minutes of commercial time and a maximum of 18 minutes of advertising. Only 7 minutes of advertising time plus station breaks are permitted on hour-long radio programs having a single sponsor, and 30-minute prime time television programs may include only 4 minutes of commercial time plus a 70-second station break.

As part of the NAB's codes of good practices these time standards represent an admirable industry effort to prevent overcommercialism. As part of the Federal Communications Commission's rules these same standards would place the entire broadcasting industry under unwarranted Federal regulation and would create economic hardship for a great number of broadcasting stations. The adoption of these rules cannot be justified on the grounds that they were formulated by the broadcasting industry. Their operation as a code of self-regulation by the industry and as a Federal rule are two entirely different matters.

In the first place, restriction of the amount of broadcasting time available for advertising is not a proper subject for Federal regulation. It is well recognized that the broadcasting industry should be subject to Government regulation, but the industry is not a public utility. Yet this regulation, by limiting the amount of advertising time, is in effect a form of ratesetting. Limitation of commercial time cannot help but affect the advertising rates charged, especially since advertising is the only source of revenue for most broadcasting stations. The establishment of the proposed regulations would be an unjustifiable intrusion by the Federal Government into the economic operations of the broadcasting industry. It is essential in a democracy such as ours that our communications media be subject to the minimum amount of Federal control consistent with the public interest.

This encroachment of the Federal Government into what is and should remain the business of private enterprise is all the more uncalled for because the industry itself is taking measures to correct the abuses at which the Federal regulation is directed. If its attempt to regulate itself is rewarded by the imposition of further Federal control, there is certainly no encouragement to future industrial efforts at self-regulation.

The proposed FCC rule not only would transfer enforcement of commercial time standards from the broadcasting industry to the Federal Government, but also would make these limitations mandatory instead of voluntary. This means that every one of the 3,860 AM radio stations, the 1,120 commercial FM stations, and the 575 commercial television stations on the air—as of July 1, 1963—would be forced to follow these limitations. Yet, the differences among these stations are almost too great to catalog. Some serve wealthy metropolitan areas; others serve sparsely settled rural market areas. Some AM stations have a power of 50 kilowatts; other AM stations have a power of 100 watts. Some stations operate 24 hours a day; other stations operate only during daytime hours, with their operating time decreasing during the winter. Some broadcasting stations serve stable economic markets; other stations serve summer or winter resort communities or industrial markets subject to seasonal or cyclical fluctuations. Some broadcasting stations are in a strong financial position; other stations face strong competition. Yet, these limitations would apply to each station, each hour, each day.

It seems to be generally understood that a number of broadcasting stations have not subscribed to the NAB Codes of Good Practices because it would be economically disastrous for them to abide by the time standards. What is a reasonable standard of good practice for most of the broadcasting industry is an impossible ideal for many stations providing valuable services to their listeners. Would it be in the public interest for these stations to go out of business or to become relay stations for the networks as a result of adopting these mandatory time standards? The economic consequences of Federal time standards would be extremely serious for the broadcasting industry.

It is stated as justification for adoption of this Federal regulation that the efforts of the broadcasting industry to regulate itself "have not met with success." Nineteen subscribers who refused to abide by the code review board's ruling had their membership in the code canceled. In May 1963, the National Association of Broadcasters entered into a contract with Air Check Services to monitor code subscribers' programing. NAB monitoring will cover all television code subscribers and 60 percent of radio code subscribers in 1963. By both refusing to modify time standards and by close enforcement of the code, the Codes of Good Practices have more meaning to advertising agencies as well as prospective members, who had not previously subscribed because they felt the codes had no teeth and were therefore largely worthless.

In view of these recent efforts of the broadcasting industry to improve its self-regulation and in view of the economic hardship which the proposed FCC rule would create, I wish to record my strong opposition to this proposed Federal regulation.

Reply to Gambling Figures in New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with interest the critique of my remarks on gambling in New Mexico placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, September 23, 1963, by the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman MONTOYA. It seems to me that the "refutation" made by the gentleman from New Mexico, embodying as it does several misconceptions and errors, constitutes fair reason for further comment.

As Mr. MONTOYA mentioned in his remarks, Mr. John Scarne of Fairview, N.J., America's leading gambling expert, testified before the McClellan Committee that $16.50 is wagered nationally off-track for each dollar legally placed in parimutuel betting. I have utilized Mr. Scarne's well-researched figures in my statements pertaining to illegal gambling in many of our States. Taking Mr. Scarne's estimate that $16.50 is bet illegally on the horses throughout the Nation for every dollar legally wagered on the tracks, Congressman MONTOYA asserts that I should have concluded that off-track betting in New Mexico is $610,500,000—New Mexico's parimutuel turnover of $37 million multiplied by $16.50. Does the gentleman from New Mexico think that off-track betting occurs only in States with parimutuel betting? His statistics indicate that he has been thus misled; witness his assertion that in each State with parimutuel betting, off-track betting is calculated by multiplying the parimutuel turnover by $16.50. Clearly, Mr. Scarne's position is that $16.50 is bet off-track nationally for every dollar bet legally in the 24 parimutuel States. It is ludicrous to allege that off-track betting does not occur in Pennsylvania or Texas, but only in those 24 States where parimutuel betting has been introduced.

My figures for off-track betting have been arrived at by taking Mr. Scarne's national off-track betting figure and apportioning it among the States on the basis of population as indicated by the 1960 census. I feel that this is the best way to allocate Mr. Scarne's carefully assessed total of off-track betting's national subsidy to crime. By my computations, New Mexico's share of crime's national off-track betting bankroll is as I have stated—$265 million.

Mr. MONTOYA does not directly deal with the veracity of the above figure, save by the argument that I should have used instead the incorrect figure he so carefully, but erroneously, derived. Having put words into my mouth—having by misapplication of mathematics constructed an off-track betting figure with which he might safely joust, the gentlemen from New Mexico nevertheless wobbles somewhat as he rides to battle. Citing his self-conceived $610,500,000 figure as an astronomical one, Congressman MONTOYA states that to reach it, "it would be necessary for every man, woman, child and baby in New Mexico to illegally gamble approximately $650,000 annually." I can only conclude a premise that the State Mr. MONTOYA so ably represents contains a population of somewhat less than 1,000 persons—unless the figure was not intended.

I wish that more people would dwell on the real financial worth to crime of the great gambling turnover in America—that worth is a product of gambling's illegal status. I believe that much of this unhappy state of affairs is susceptible of rectification on our part with but little effort, and to that end I have attempted, and shall continue to attempt, to elucidate the full magnitude and meaning of gambling in America. The illegality of gambling in America is in reality no boon to America—it is a Trojan horse within the walls of our society. I urge the Members of this House to consider, compute and reason in the manner I have tried to bring to their attention—and to work for social and fiscal sanity.

Our Puzzling Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH F. BEERMANN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that our foreign policy bewilders me. The more I see of it, the less I comprehend it. If I were alone in this lack of comprehension I would conclude that the ways of high diplomacy and the State Department simply are too much for a countryman from Nebraska. But I find that my confusion is shared by many of my able colleagues and by others whose views I respect. Even some of my liberal friends, who follow and support our serpentine foreign policy, cannot explain it to their own satisfaction, much less mine.

Let us get down to cases. Tito, the Yugoslav dictator, soon is to visit the United States. We will roll out the proverbial red carpet for him and he will be greeted genially and warmly. Offhand, one would suppose that a real friend and ally had arrived. Yet Tito is not only a dictator, and an absolute dictator, but he is a Communist. As a Communist, he is dedicated to the destruction of our system; in short, to our destruction.

Some years back, Tito broke with Stalin, who wanted to dictate to all Communists and all Communist countries. Our Government hailed this development enthusiastically, and hastened to press aid on Yugoslavia. Not too long before, the dictator's airmen had, without provocation, shot down American planes which were flying near Yugoslavia's borders. Some of our airmen were killed in cold blood. Our Government and people were indignant and upset. But all this seemed to be forgotten when the two Communist dictators fell out.

Over the years, Tito has maintained his independence of Russia, but relations between the two countries have improved and are very close. Not long ago, Khrushchev, Russia's boss, visited Tito. They hugged each other fraternally and left no doubt that any rift between the two countries, if one existed before the meeting, had been closed. Nor is there any doubt that Yugoslavia would be on the Communist side in the event of a general war. I cannot then for the life of me see why we consider it such a blessed privilege to take money from the pockets of our taxpayers to give to the Communist dictator.

In the Washington Post of September 23, Roscoe Drummond wrote glowingly about the high standard of living in Yugoslavia. He said in some areas it is higher than in the Soviet Union itself. He explained that the Yugoslav system is considerably closer to capitalism than the Soviet economy. However, there may be another explanation for Yugoslavia's comparative prosperity. Since 1945, we have given Tito around $2.5 billion, which is no inconsiderable sum even in these days. This $2.5 billion has helped the Yugoslav economy in many ways. We have underwritten communism in Yugoslavia and have underwritten dictatorship. From all indications, we will continue to do so.

In all probability, everything will go smoothly during Tito's visit here. The atmosphere will be cordial. Our liberal newspapers and spokesmen will go out of their way to discover and detail the virtues of the Communist ruler. We have a habit of feting Communist dictators and neutralists here. We even had Khrushchev himself here a few years back and gave him a most hearty reception. Nehru was greeted here with reverence. Afterwards, he launched a savage attack on Portugese Goa and the gloss rubbed off his saintliness. We have held out our arms to Sukarno, the Indonesian tyrant, and to Ben Bella, friend of Castro, who is busy turning Algeria into a socialist state.

Our fawning and truckling before Tito is disgraceful. Our invitation to him is shameful. It all adds up to a policy of appeasement which goes much further than anything which has happened since World War II. The way things are going I would not be surprised to find the White House advocating an aid program for Russia running into the billions.

Very few rightwing dictators get the opportunity to visit this country. If an invitation were extended to Franco, of Spain, he would be greeted, undoubtedly, by a loud and vociferous crowd of hecklers. The Communists would have their bands out. They would be joined by their dupes, the liberals. The Spanish dictator would have a rough trip, I am afraid. He is stanchly anti-Communist, but this would be held against him. In any event, I do not foresee any invitation to Franco any time soon.

Salazar in Portugal is called a dictator but his regime is democratic compared to that of Tito. There would be demonstrations against him all over the place. But if the Portuguese Premier visited us today, he too would have rough going. Nor are we likely to invite Salazar. We are displeased with him. Our State Department thinks he is a colonialist, a very dirty word. He refuses to give up the Portuguese Provinces of Angola and Mozambique to terrorists from the outside. Portugal says that these two Provinces are as much a part of Portugal as Hawaii and Alaska are part of the United States. We do not pay any attention. We have pressured our European Allies to give up their possessions in Africa. Thirty new states have been created in Africa since the end of World War II. Many of these new countries simply have not the resources necessary for statehood. Others are torn by tribal feuds which have erupted with the end of European rule. The continent of Africa has gone backward as an aftermath of the freedom wave. The new rules do not have the experience necessary to govern. They lack the technicians and administrators formerly supplied by the colonial powers. Moreover, they seem more concerned with their own perquisites and privileges than they are in the welfare of their masses. They live in luxurious fashion while their subjects get poorer and poorer. They would be in a bad way indeed if it were not for the money and help which Britain, France, and Belgium continue to give them.

Some African areas gained independence before they were ready for it, notably the Belgian Congo. The Belgians say we almost literally pushed them out of their former colony. In any case, chaos followed. There have been rape, riots, murder, chaos, and deterioration of the entire economy. Finally, the U.N., that organization founded to keep world peace, made war on Tshombe, the Katangan leader, and forced him to submit to Cyrille Adoula, the Congo Premier. We backed the U.N. and Adoula and now we are saddled with the bill. Already, we have spent more than $200 million to prevent the former Belgian territory from going completely to pieces. We will spend a good deal more, for things are not getting any better. The well-known African geographer, George H. T. Kimble, says it will take many years to get the Congo back to where it was before it was given the blessing of independence. To all intents and purposes, the Congo is occupied territory. U.N. troops have to stay there to keep any semblance of order. American taxpayers, in addition to paying millions to the Adoula government, will bear most of the cost of the U.N. occupation.

Our stand against colonialism is described as a matter of principle. Even so there are aspects of our policy which puzzle me. Let me cite the case of the Papuans, who live in what used to be Dutch New Guinea, which lies between Indonesia and Australia. The area was a Dutch colony, but we wanted the Dutch to leave, pursuing steadfastly our allegedly noble opposition to colonialism. The Dutch agreed to give up their colony, suggesting that it be made a U.N. ward. About that time Sukarno, also a dictator but leftist, decided he wanted the former Dutch New Guinea. The Papuans are not related to the Indonesians, in any way whatever and there are no economic ties. It seemed plain that Sukarno wanted to make Dutch New Guinea his own colony. Did we stand steadfast and tell the Indonesian dictator that this violated our hallowed principles? Did we tell him that we had labored since World War II to end colonialism and were not about to be any part of a deal which included such a horrendous and immoral arrangement?

To answer my questions briefly, we did not. We helped work out an arrangement which turned the Papuans, who did not have anything to say about the matter, over to Sukarno. Our liberals had a ready and smug explanation. It saved, they said, trouble.

In the New York Times of Sunday, September 22, the respected columnist Arthur Krock, had this to say:

> The fate of the administration's experiment of trying to buy peace in southeast Asia by paying his blackmail price to President Sukarno of Indonesia is, however, no longer in doubt. Once the administration, in concert with Secretary General U Thant of the U.N., condoned and promoted Sukarno's use of force to annex Dutch New Guinea, in clear violation of the U.N. Charter, the usual effects of surrender to illegal violence were not long in coming. First, Sukarno found too slow the timetable for the award to Indonesia of territory for which it had neither ethnic nor historical claim. Then he became, if possible, cozier than before with the national agents of world communism definitely including Communist China. Most recently, after attempting and failing to frighten former British possessions from adhering to the peaceful new nation of Malaysia, his troops and police stood by in Jakarta while the mob the Indonesian Government had incited destroyed the British Embassy and endangered the lives of the ambassador and his staff.
>
> "These are the merited and prophesied results of an immoral United States and United Nations policy by which a loyal ally of this country and a people faithful to the Charter were denied even the transport of their own facilities to protect their territory from seizure by military aggression.

Incidentally, we have given Sukarno around a billion dollars and we are gently threatening a cutback in blackmail pay unless he stops being such a bad boy.

Our definition of colonialism seems to be a situation where whites rule a colored race. The world's foremost colonial power is Soviet Russia. But we sat supinely while the Russians shot down the Hungarian revolutionists and we seem about to resume cordial relationship with the Russian regime in Hungary. The State Department explains that things have changed and the Russian rule in Hungary is not as burdensome as it used to be. Nor do we seem bothered any longer about Red China's seizure of Tibet.

Bluntly speaking, our anticolonial policy is fraudulent and hypocritical. When it suits the devious ways of our devious and mysterious foreign policies, we not only condone colonialism, we help bring it about. A former U.S. Ambassador to Argentina, Ellsworth Bunker, was one of the principal architects of the Papuan sellout. As for Russian and Red Chinese colonialism, the administration wants nothing said about it. Nor does it want the people in slavery to rebel. That might reveal, as the Hungarian revolution did, that we will do nothing whatever to free the people under the Communist colonial yoke. But we will—and have—worked assiduously to end any semblance of colonialism on the part of our allies. In so doing, we have just about wrecked the continent of Africa, but that seems to make little difference. We are bent on wrecking it completely.

When a country falls into the hands of the Communists, we seem to give it up for dead. The people are ruled by a dictator. They may be oppressed in many ways. There may be a veritable reign of terror, but we do nothing about it, and say very little. The State Department calls for no reappraisal of policies, nor for liberalization of conditions. If there is the slightest sign that the ruler in the particular state has any freedom whatever, we rush forward with money and help. Two examples are Yugoslavia and Poland. We go much further for we are paying blackmail to Castro's admirer, Ben Bella, in Algeria, and Sukarno, also the "neutralist" Nehru.

We cannot even do anything about Cuba, which in effect is a Russian colony off our shores. Actually, we seem more concerned right now with overthrowing the anti-Communist regime in South Vietnam than in getting rid of Castro.

The explanation for our tribute to outright Communist countries is that we might wean them away from communism if we give them enough money. Just how, I do not quite see, since we make no attempt whatever to overthrow the Communist rulers and since our money props up their rule. Tito remains devoutly, stanchly Communist, but we seem to feel we have gained a great victory in our relationship with this Communist toughie. We want to congratulate him personally on letting us subsidize him, which makes things easier for the entire Soviet bloc. This sort of thing is sickening.

But in the case of rightwing dictators things are different. We never let up on them. Batista was anti-Communist but he was a bad man, our liberals said. Undoubtedly they were right, but do they think the Communist Castro is a saint? The attacks on Salazar and Franco go on and on. These rulers are anti-Communist. If they are overthrown, which they may well be, due to our State Department, then we would rush in to subsidize their leftist successors. That is what happened with Ben Bella, the far left Algerian dictator.

Why? Well, judging from the past, the excuse would be that they then would be not quite so communistic, even though they are dictators. But Salazar, Franco, and some other rightists already are anti-Communist. Surely their misgovernment, if it exists, is not any worse than the misgovernment of the communistic dictators. Why do we not try to keep them in power instead of concentrating on their faults? In this connection, a couple of columns by Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post of September 23 and 24 raises some very pertinent questions about the situation in Vietnam. They should be read and reread.

My version of the events in Vietnam is that the Communists were beginning to lose the war. They, as they frequently do, decided upon a propaganda diversion. At once, our liberals fell for the ruse and we are upset over the alleged abuses on the part of Vietnam's rulers. For the life of me I cannot understand why our liberals accept Communist misrule and dictatorship so complacently and simply go to pieces when they consider the derelictions of the rightwingers.

To me, it is very significant that Communist organs like the Worker and all the far leftists are not after the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem. They are baying like dogs on a warm scent. I am sorry to say that they seem to have deluded some ordinarily sensible persons.

The Reverend Donald S. Harrington is secretary to a so-called Ministers Vietnam Committee. This outfit has taken full page advertisements in the New York Times and the Washington Post denouncing Diem. I am profoundly suspicious of anything with which the Reverend Harrington is connected. He is executive board chairman of the American Committee on Africa, which apparently wants all the whites run out of Africa and the Portuguese in particular. I think Communist or Communist sympathizers have infiltrated the committee. The Reverend Harrington, himself, has played footsie in the past with Communist causes and is following the Communist party line on Africa. Incredibly enough, some of the Africa Committee's members are advisers to our State Department on African policy. But this is just another in the list which adds up to the fact that much of our foreign policy is incredible.

We are rapidly approaching the point where Khrushchev, who not long ago put missiles in Cuba, will be portrayed to our public as a friendly benevolent gentleman, who wants to end the cold war. We should know better. He is out to bury us. If he signs the nuclear test ban, he doesn't do it to help us. He does it for his own reasons. Tito also would like to pat the shovel in our face, for he is a dedicated Communist. We cannot bribe such men as Sukarno. The overthrow of a rightist dictator and the substitution of a leftist does not solve our problems. This is a dangerous world, test ban treaty or no. Only strength and wariness will save us. If the framers of our foreign policies will only keep some fundamentals in mind, including the fact that we must help our friends, and oppose our enemies, perhaps in time we will have a policy which the average American and I can understand.

I, like any sensible person, want peace. The consequences of nuclear war are horrible to contemplate. But, as I see it, American strength is our only guarantee of peace. We are not the aggressors and the reason for world tension is not atomic weapons but Communist designs for world conquest. If he wanted to, Khrushchev could remove most of the threat of world war tomorrow. He could pull out of Cuba, end the Berlin and West German controversies and many other rows which could at any time, flare into major conflict. While the Red Chinese are active and belligerent, they do not have atomic weapons. They are not the real source of martial peril.

The test ban treaty is taken by the United States on faith, and faith is a poor platform from which to deal with the Communists. We restrict the development of weapons which may be necessary to save us from slavery, or destruction. The Russians know this, in my opinion, and know the treaty gives them an advantage. Otherwise, they would not sign it.

The danger of fallout from testing in the atmosphere has been exaggerated until it befuddles our people and paralyzes our capacity for vigorous and constructive action. In signing the test ban treaty, we have risked a lot; insofar as we know the Russians have risked nothing. Now, let us wait for the next move. Once again, I am afraid, we will be asked to take the risk. The argument has been made that to continue the development of nuclear weapons means atomic war. If this is true nothing less than total disarmament will save us, and in the face of the Communist challenge this is not only asinine, it is impossible. Let me repeat, the only hope for peace lies in our strength.

No. 12—Rhode Island: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Rhode Island—the Nation's littlest State—about gambling in that State.

For its size, Rhode Island has quite a large parimutuel turnover each year. As a matter of fact it ranks 11th in parimutuel betting. In 1962, over $95 million was bet on the tracks. But illegal gambling is far more important.

According to the figures presented to the McClellan Committee, Rhode Island's share of the annual off-track betting came to almost one quarter of a billion dollars in 1962.

In a State the size of Rhode Island, the neighborhood bookie is never far away. Not that off-track betting accounts for all of the illegal gambling in that State. By generally accepted figures, off-track betting constitutes less than one-half of the illegal gambling total. Therefore, it is safe to report that illegal gambling in Rhode Island is about a $500 million a year business.

About 10 percent of the total turnover is skimmed off as profit by the gambling syndicates. After payoffs for protection and operation, there is more than enough left to provide a fat checkbook for the gangsters who feed on gambling profits. Little Rhode Island is a pocket-size playground of crime syndicate operations.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that this country faced reality and put an end to a system whereby official hypocrisy is hand in hand with the tentacles of organized crime. So long as Rhode Island persists in refusing to recognize and control the humane urge to gamble, it will, by its sins of omission, remain a vital silent partner in the vast activities of the underworld.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the congressional delegation from the State of Rhode Island join with me in smashing the handcuffs of hypocrisy—by establishing a national lottery.

Address of Hon. Douglas Dillon Before the Annual Meeting of the International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., October 1, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address of our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, before the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund here in Washington on October 1. Secretary Dillon is the U.S. Governor of the Fund and directs his remarks toward the U.S. balance-of-payments situation, the steps we are taking to establish a more favorable balance, and our relationship to the other member nations of the Fund.

Secretary Dillon's address follows:

Remarks of the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund, Before the Annual Meeting of the International Monetary Fund, Tuesday, October 1, 1963

At the outset of my remarks, I ask you to join with me in paying tribute to our late, great colleague and good friend, Per Jacobsson. Firmly dedicated throughout his long and distinguished career to the cause of financial stability, he guided the International Monetary Fund with a deep understanding of the needs and realities of his times. The responsibilities of managing director have now passed into the capable hands of Pierre-Paul Schweitzer. His willingness to assume these duties provides us with fresh assurance that the Fund, building on its current strength and influence at the center of the international monetary system, will successfully meet the fresh challenges that lie ahead.

It is also a pleasure to welcome to the Fund family an unusually large number of new members, bringing our group to more than 100. The election of a 19th executive director who will cast the votes of a group of the many new African members is symbolic of the increasing usefulness of the Fund to the emerging nations.

I am sure that each of these new members will profit from the important assistance the Fund can render to their further development through its expanding program of technical assistance in the areas of central banking and fiscal practices and policies, through its regular consultations, and by providing timely financial support for well conceived stabilization programs. In addition, the new compensatory financing facilities announced last March mark an important and constructive advance in the services aavilable to members heavily dependent upon exports of primary commodities.

These activities in support of balanced, dynamic growth are, of course, complemented by those of the Fund's companion Bretton Woods institution, the World Bank and its affiliates, now under the able direction of George Woods. I should mention particularly at this year's meeting the work of the International Development Association, whose activities in so short a span of time offer so much promise for the future. Action by the Part One countries on the proposals for increasing its resources will mark another milestone in the work to which it is dedicated and in which we are all joined together.

The successive annual reports of the International Monetary Fund have expertly traced the evolution of our international monetary system since World War II. They have also made clear that new problems have a way of emerging as older ones are solved. The report for 1963 is no exception. In particular, it deals at some length with the adequacy of existing arrangements for providing international liquidity during the coming years. The authors point out that liquidity is not simply a matter of the aggregate of official holdings of gold or foreign exchange, and they review the progress made in recent years—in considerable part under the auspices of the Fund itself—in supplementing these resources with international credit. But the report also recognizes that the needs of nations for assured means of financing balance-of-payments deficits—either by drawing upon a stock of liquid assets or by means of borrowing—can be expected to increase over time. At the same time, as the deficit in the balance of payments of the United States is narrowed and closed, that deficit will no longer contribute to the liquidity of other nations in the manner and magnitude of the last few years.

The Fund's report has now been supplemented by the thoughtful and important statement of its new managing director. Mr. Schweitzer indicated that the Fund expects to study the problem of international liquidity and has expressed the Fund's readiness to cooperate with others in such a study. He points out that studies of this problem are timely even though there is at present no sign of any shortage in international liquidity. He has also given us his view that the Fund should be at the center of whatever strengthening of the international monetary system may prove to be desirable. The United States finds itself in general agreement with all of these thoughts.

But in discussing this matter, I would like to make one point crystal clear: The United States does not view possible improvements in the methods of supplying international liquidity as relieving it of the compelling and immediate task of reducing its own payments deficit. Indeed, it is largely the prospect of the elimination of the U.S. payments deficit that makes it necessary and advisable to undertake these studies.

Nor can the provision of appropriate facilities for international liquidity relieve nations of their joint responsibilities for effective and timely action to eliminate such imbalances in trade and payments as may arise in the future. In a world of fixed exchange rates and convertible currencies, deficits and surpluses emerge from a wide variety of causes, both domestic and international. The necessity to make cash outlays for defense and aid, shifts in the basic pattern of demand for internationally traded goods, the development of new products, resources and production techniques, and developments in capital markets can be just as important as changes in average price levels and aggregate demand within countries.

The adjustments necessary to correct these deficits and surpluses take time if they are to proceed in an orderly fashion, without damaging consequences for either domestic growth and stability or the free flow of trade among nations. That is why, as part of the adjustment process, a country experiencing deficits needs reserves to draw upon, or credit that it can rely upon. That is also why a country receiving the counterpart in surpluses needs assets of assured value, in amounts and forms that will not disrupt its own economy. But in the last analysis without effective adjustments by both deficit and surplus countries, no amount of liquidity will enable us to achieve the mutual benefits of a closely integrated world economy within a framework of steady growth accompanied by monetary stability.

The challenge implicit in this situation is clear. Side by side with our studies of possible liquidity needs, we must consciously seek out means of improving the process of international adjustment itself, while preserving our separate abilities to meet our respective domestic needs.

This is a large order, but one that is well within our capacities. Much has been learned from the experience of recent years. We have come to recognize that in shaping domestic policies and choosing from the various tools available for use, their varying impact upon our external accounts, and upon those of our trading partners, must be taken fully into account. There is greater awareness of the need to identify and eliminate those market rigidities that inhibit the process of adjustment. And we are learning that new techniques can be developed for assisting the process of adjustment that are consistent with domestic goals and competitive markets.

Much of this can be illustrated by analysis of the position of the United States, faced as we are with the twin tasks of achieving more rapid growth at home while simultaneously closing the troublesome gap in our balance of payments. And many of the lessons of this experience, I believe, will prove sooner or later to be more generally applicable to the problems of international adjustment.

Business activity in the United States has continued to expand over the past year at a fairly steady pace. Total output has now reached a rate of over $585 billion a year—in real terms more than 13 percent above the level of early 1961.

Measured against other peacetime expansions of the past 40 years, this performance has been encouraging. All but one of these recovery periods have now been equaled or exceeded in terms of percentage increase in output, and that single exception took place only after the steep declines in production during the early 1930's. Prices of manufactured goods have remained virtually unchanged during the current expansion, extending the period of stability that has existed since 1958. However, unemployment is still excessive. And we are not fully utilizing our available savings of our existing productive plant capacity. True, investment activity has risen in response to increases in demand and to measures introduced a year ago to liberalize the tax treatment of depreciation and provide an investment tax credit. But new investment still remains below the levels required to support a full employment economy and to assure the position of our industry among the leaders in technological progress.

At the same time, our overall balance of payments has responded slowly to the series of measures we have undertaken since 1961. The overall deficit was reduced to $2.2 billion in 1962, from $3.9 billion in 1960, and $2.4 billion in 1961. But the deficit grew markedly larger during the first half of 1963.

When this situation first became apparent, we made a thorough-going review of our entire balance-of-payments program, which culminated in a series of decisions announced by the President on July 18. Resulting programs now underway will, by the end of next year, bring a reduction of $1 billion in the annual rate of dollar expenditures abroad for defense, aid, and other Government programs. Savings of similar magnitude are also expected on capital account as a result of the proposed interest equalization tax and the firmer structure of short-term interest rates accompanying the recent one-half percent increase in the Federal Reserve discount rate. We can already see indications that the deterioration in our accounts during the first half of the year is being arrested.

These new actions will complement and reinforce the longer run measures we have been taking to achieve both external balance and more rapid domestic growth. Basic to our strategy for achieving these twin goals is a broad program of individual and corporate tax reduction totaling $11 billion, which, after passage by our House of Representatives last week, is now before our Senate. It will provide an impetus to the domestic economy in a manner consistent with our international position. It will give increased flexibility to our monetary authorities in meeting balance of payments requirements. The added incentives for use of capital in the United States will enhance the relative attractiveness of investment here for Americans and foreigners alike. At the same time, the increased productivity associated with rising investment, together with greater incentives to develop and market new products and to apply more rapidly the fruits of our vast research capabilities, will reinforce the efforts we are making to increase our exports.

Our ability to expand production—which is implicit in our current unemployment, in our rapidly growing labor force, and in our margin of underutilized industrial capacity—provides protection against upward price pressures as the stimulus from the tax program takes hold. Meanwhile, we are continuing successfully to finance our budgetary deficit outside the banking system. For instance, in the year that ended August 31, the latest date for which figures are available, the combined holdings of Government debt in the hands of our Federal Reserve and commercial banks declined by more than $1½ billion. We have also made further progress in improving the maturity structure of our marketable debt. As a result of our latest advance refunding, the average life of that debt exceeded 5¼ years for the first time since 1956. We are not faced, therefore, with the kind of excessive liquidity that could fuel inflationary developments as our economy moves toward fuller employment.

Perhaps most significant of all in terms of the outlook for prices, our manufacturing labor costs per unit of output have declined over the past 3 years—the first time since World War II that this basic measure of our competitive strength has improved for so long a period, or during a time of substantial recovery. And the rate of wage increases in our manufacturing industry is holding within the range of past and anticipated productivity increases.

In this way, we are encouraging basic corrective forces in terms of costs and prices that should provide a firm base for improving our trading position, thus contributing to the orderly adjustment of our entire balance of payments. Highly tentative, but nonetheless encouraging, signs of an improvement in our international competitive position are developing. But it is clear that the contribution that exports can make to overall balance will be heavily dependent upon the adjustment policies of other nations as well. By this I do not, of course, mean to suggest that surplus nations have a responsibility to inflate, any more than it would be consistent with our internal needs to force deflation. Nor, in our particular situation, would it be reasonable to look only—or primarily—to increases in our commercial trade balance as the solution for our payments problem.

But opportunities do exist for surplus nations, in instances where inflationary pressures are evident, to serve the interests both of their own domestic stability and of external balance by reducing or eliminating barriers to imports, including those from the United States. In the search for effective adjustment mechanisms within the context of a convertible currency system, this kind of action, it seems to me, can become, for surplus countries, a modern substitute for the inflationary price adjustments that we must all do everything we can to avoid.

A basic factor in our own deficit position has been the heavy burden we carry for the defense of the free world and for assisting the development of less favored nations. This burden, in a wider context, is an inescapable part of the kind of world we live in. But we are also learning that methods of handling these Government outpayments, and more appropriate distribution of their balances-of-payments impact, can also contribute to the adjustment process without subverting their essential purpose.

Important savings have already been made in this area, reducing net outflows under our defense and aid programs from $3.8 billion in 1960 to $3 billion in 1962. A large portion of this improvement can be traced to the recognition by some European countries of their growing capacity to assume a greater share of the foreign exchange costs of the common defense. As a result, the drain on our payments from maintaining our troops in Germany and Italy is now virtually fully offset by their purchase of military equipment and supplies from the United States—equipment which, because of the size and flexibility of our defense industry, can be produced more rapidly and more economically in the United States than in their own countries. Thus these arrangements have simultaneously strengthened the free world's military and economic defenses.

In addition, we have adopted a policy of providing the great bulk of our economic aid to developing countries in the form of goods and services, so that it can be brought within the limits of our capacity without impairing its effectiveness. When current commitments are fully reflected in actual disbursements, only some 10 percent of the aid from our various foreign assistance programs will be provided in the form of dollars. At the same time, I believe that we must guard against any tendency to make the "tying" of aid into a subtle new form of protection for home industries. Rather, the logic of our efforts to expand multilateral trade and promote international efficiency through competition among the producers of all nations demands that it be used as a temporary device, reserved for periods of balance-of-payments strains.

With forces of adjustment underway in both our Government and our commercial trade accounts, the most pressing problem in terms of our balance of payments has been the recent acceleration in the outflow of long-term capital. The net outflow of such capital during the first half of this year reached an annual rate of $3.8 billion. This was fully $1.3 billion higher than the already substantial figures for 1962, and nearly double the rate maintained over the years 1959–1961. While some of this recent increase stemmed from direct investment, a flood of new foreign borrowings totaling nearly $1 billion in only 6 months was the major factor. This is considerably more than three times the volume we have been accustomed to.

It is entirely consistent with restoration of full equilibrium in international payments that the United States, with its capacity to generate large savings, continues to supply reasonable amounts of capital to aid the development of other nations. But, it is perfectly clear that maintenance of outflows at the recent pace, far from being a constructive force in world payments, would soon put intolerable strains on the international monetary systems as a whole.

As our program of tax reduction takes hold and there are stronger incentives to employ a larger portion of our savings at home, normal market forces will work strongly in the direction of reducing this outflow of long-term capital to more tolerable levels. But the experience of the past year makes clear that we cannot rely on these longer-term forces of adjustment to meet our immediate problem. Nor is it feasible to speed the process of adjustment by artificial attempts to force our entire structure of long-term interest rates sharply and suddenly higher. If possible at all in the face of the huge supply of savings flowing into our markets, this course of action would require so drastic a tightening of credit as to seriously jeopardize the prospects for domestic expansion.

In this situation, we have recommended enactment of a temporary interest equalization tax which will have the effect of raising the costs of portfolio capital in our market by 1 percent for borrowers in the developed countries abroad. This will bring these costs into a rough alinement with those in most other industrialized countries. The purpose is quite simple—to speed the essential redirection of capital flows in a manner comparable to an equivalent, but presently impracticable, rise in our entire structure of interest rates.

We view this tax solely as a necessary—but temporary—expedient to meet a specific situation that has arisen in large part out of a structural imbalance in the capital markets of the free world. Borrowers from deficit and surplus countries alike converge upon the New York market, not only because of our lower structure of long-term interest rates—since equivalent or lower rates can be found in at least two other countries—but because it is still the only source for international capital in whatever size and form desired, freely available to any borrower able to meet the normal market test of creditworthiness, and offering highly efficient distribution facilities with low issuing costs. In contrast, potential alternative markets are in most cases subject to official controls or have difficulty in supplying the needed funds in the volume required. And, with few exceptions, they are characterized by high and rigid rate structures. In the face of this situation, we must temporarily help to redirect the demands pressing on our market through a tax that will increase the costs of long-term borrowing here by foreigners.

The impediments to the development of more adequate European capital markets are currently under close and continuing study within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and progress is beginning to be visible. As efforts to improve European capital markets come to fruition and the remaining controls and restrictions are eliminated—and as our own domestic demands for capital put increased pressures upon our supply of savings—there is every reason to believe that the need for extraordinary action of the kind we are now taking will be eliminated.

When the Fund was established, there was great apprehension that sudden and massive short-term capital movements might again become a disruptive influence as they had in the disturbed climate of the 1930's. Gratifying progress has been made in developing sturdy defenses against such threats to our convertible currency system through the concerted cooperative efforts of the industrialized countries. A chain of new facilities for coping with such pressures is now in place and tested, and there are grounds for confidence that the processes of adjustment can be shielded from perverse speculative flows in the future.

With the restoration of convertibility, however, it has become apparent that a sizable volume of capital is ready to move from country to country in response to relatively small shifts in interest rates. Thus, the stability of exchange rates and freedom of markets toward which we have all worked in the postwar period carries with it the implication that short-term interest rates in the major trading countries must inevitably be kept reasonably well in line with each other.

Both problems and opportunities are implicit in these circumstances. Domestic objectives will sometimes limit the practicable range of fluctuation in interest rates that can be undertaken for facilitating balance-of-payments adjustment. But, since the margin between rate relationships that attract or repel short-term funds is likely to be relatively narrow, it will usually be feasible to encourage small changes in short-term rates in the interest of speeding restoration of international equilibrium without disturbing the domestic economy.

Most promising of all in terms of facilitating the adjustment process is the increasingly close and continuous consultation on these matters that has developed in the forums provided by this institution, by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and by the Bank for International Settlements. This has been particularly evident in the area of short-term capital flows and interest rates. But we are also coming to understand that this same kind of consultation and cooperation is essential in other areas as well. We know that any adjustment demands offsetting changes in the position of deficit and surplus nations. We also know, in the last analysis, that these adjustments must take place, for no workable international monetary system will allow a nation to continue to run a deficit—or for that matter a surplus—for an indefinite period.

The critical question is how the adjustments are to be made. Balance can be—and too often in the past has been—forced by measures that endanger domestic stability or the prospects for growing trade. Those alternatives are not open to us today if the bright promise of all that has been accomplished since Bretton Woods is to be fulfilled. Nor can the industrialized countries afford to undermine the defenses of freedom or to withdraw their support of the developing nations.

The only realistic solution is to find effective ways for reconciling the requirements of a convertible currency system based on fixed exchange rates with the freedom of each nation to pursue domestic growth and stability. No methods will work instantaneously, and one prerequisite to their proper functioning is the availability of adequate liquidity—in the form of international reserves or ready access to credit. The studies now being launched provide fresh assurance that these liquidity needs will be met effectively in the more distant future, just as they are being met effectively today.

But adequate liquidity will not make our machinery of adjustment work automatically, nor can its development be safely put off until emergencies arise. Instead, its effective use will require governments of all nations with a stake in a liberal trading order to work together continuously in many areas; in developing a mix of domestic policies appropriate to external circumstances, in adjusting trade policies, in sharing the burdens of aid and defense, in providing long-term capital, and in eliminating rigidities and inefficiencies in their economies that impede and distort the adjustment process. That willingness, I believe, is now being demonstrated more fully than at any time in the past. This is the real source of my confidence—not only that the United States will restore balance in its own accounts, we intend to carry out that responsibility in any event—but also that a true equilibrium can be restored within a framework of expanding trade, flourishing growth, and monetary stability.

Address of Hon. William G. Bray, of Indiana, at the Old Country Festival, by Mutual Aid Association of the New Polish Immigration of Chicago—Chicago, Ill., September 8, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 3, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Indiana, Bill Bray, recently addressed the Mutual Aid Association of the New Polish Immigration of Chicago, at its annual Old Country Festival.

His remarks indicate his thorough knowledge and understanding of the plight of the captive nations of Eastern Europe and Asia, and give added evidence of the need for the establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. I insert his speech into the Record at this point, for the attention of the Members:

Address of Hon. William G. Bray, of Indiana, at the Old Country Festival, by Mutual Aid Association of the New Polish Immigration of Chicago—Chicago, Ill., September 8, 1963

The greatness of America lies in the fact that races throughout the world have sent their pioneers to our shores—each bringing a bit of their heritage with them. You who came from Poland brought with you a religious zeal and a love of individual freedom and dignity that has been exceeded nowhere; and I am happy and proud that that tradition of freedom has become a part of our national structure.

In addition to these spiritual qualities you have brought a desire for economic stability and a culture that is rich in fine art, music, science; you brought a strong physical vigor that is the pride of football teams from coast to coast.

You brought with you a heritage of courage in battle. There is not a combat battalion in the American wars that did not carry Polish names. It was Sgt. Alexander Drabik, who earned the Distinguished Service Cross at Remagen Bridge. There were two Polish-Americans on the raft with Rickenbacker. Col. Francis Gabryszewski was one of the greatest aces of World War II. I could go on with this list for hours.

I do want to point out that heroic Polish blood mixed with the colonial blood in the Revolutionary War. Two great heroes who fought for Polish independence also were outstanding leaders in the fight for American independence. Pulaski and Kosciusko are so revered for their contributions to our national independence that two counties in my native State of Indiana are named for these great Polish heroes.

In speaking of Polish heroes, one can never forget the name of John Sobieski, who defeated the great Turkish wave of invasion at the gates of Vienna and saved Central and Northern Europe for Christendom. Neither can one forget that it was the heroic leadership of Joseph Pilaudski that defeated the Communist army in 1920 after Poland had obtained their freedom from Russia 2 years earlier, after 143 years of foreign occupation.

Russia's unfortunate proximity to Poland has caused untold suffering and debasement to Poland. Back in 1763 Tsarina Catherine of Russia had planned a partitioning of Poland. Following a typical Russian pattern, she interfered as the protector of the Russian Orthodox Church (as against the Roman Catholic Church of Poland). Russia also participated in the partitioning of Poland in 1783 and 1795.

Poland revolted against her oppressors many times and despite armed suppression first by the tsars and now by the Soviets, has remained dedicated to Polish nationalism and freedom. Poland steadfastly refused to accept communism and prospered far more than her Russian neighbor during her period of freedom in the 1920's and 1930's. Although having been jammed between Germany and Russia by the misfortune of geography, Poland maintained a friendly relation with each.

The end of this freedom for Poland came in 1939 when Soviet diplomats encouraged Hitler to wage war against Poland while at the same time encouraging Polish resistance to Germany by promising Russian assistance. Germany attacked Poland on September 1, 1939, with 87 divisions. Seventeen days later, 100 Russian divisions moved across the Polish eastern frontier while Polish troops were fighting the Germans on the other frontier.

Russia never intended that there should be a free Poland. She intended that Poland should remain a controlled, regimented satellite under Russia. Since Teheran it has been apparent that Russia has intended to keep military control of East Germany. To accomplish this it was necessary for her to keep control of Poland—Poland was on Russia's road to the West.

RUSSIA INTENDED TO KEEP POLISH PEOPLE IN SUBJUGATION

The postwar bitterness of the Polish people has demonstrated that only the presence of Russian armed forces will keep these countries in the Russian orbit. Russian strategy was directed toward only one goal, the enslavement of Poland.

Though there are many instances which emphasize the point that Russia intends to keep Poland under subjugation, I should like to recall two of the most infamous. In April of 1943, an episode occurred in Russo-Poland relations which still plagues Russia and is especially embarrassing to her "parlor pink" friends in the Western world. Thousands of Polish officers, the elite of the educated young men of Poland, were missing, presumably killed in the war. However, evidence began to point out the fact that Russia had murdered them en masse. In 1952 a Select Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, after thorough investigation and a well-documented report, "The Katyn Forest Massacre" (H. Rept. No. 2505) found that: "beyond any question of reasonable doubt, the Soviet NKVD committed the mass murder of the Polish officers and intellectual leaders in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, Russia."

Because Stalin didn't intend that there should ever be a free Poland, he had these 15,000 officers, together with other leading Polish citizens, murdered in the Katyn Forest.

The second incident occurred as the Russians were advancing toward the capture of Warsaw. The Polish underground that had been bitterly and effectively fighting Germany was making preparations for a mass revolt to assist the oncoming Russian army. At 8:15 p.m. on July 24, 1944, a radio station in Moscow named "Kosciuszko" called upon the Polish people to arise and assist in expelling the Germans. "Poles, the time of liberation is at hand. Poles, to arms. There is not a moment to lose." Two days later the Polish people in Warsaw arose and fought valiantly; but the Russian army stopped its advance toward Warsaw in order to allow the German Army to massacre the poorly armed Poles.

Many thousands of Poles were killed and Warsaw was destroyed while the Russian army encamped 6 miles away. This tragic battle of the Polish people for freedom will go down in history as one of the great epics in courage of our age.

In the fall of 1961, I stood where the Soviet army had been encamped in 1944, and looked across the Vistula River where I could plainly see Warsaw. It was evident that the Russian army could have assisted the Polish underground as promised if they had chosen to do so.

POLISH PEOPLE RESIST COMMUNISM

While on my visit to Poland in 1961, I was much impressed with the manner in which the farms are being operated. The fence rows are clean; the livestock are well kept. In spite of the constant government pressure, more than 85 percent of the farms are individually owned and operated. They are producing better than the state-owned farms. The Soviets are attempting to furnish mechanical equipment which would subject the farmer to Russian control and would ultimately mean that the Communists could take over the farms. The Poles stubbornly resist and still use fine horses.

Perhaps the strongest factor in resisting the Communist takeover is the Catholic Church. Cathedral and church spires still dominate the skylines of Polish cities and villages; and those churches are not empty or abandoned. They were built by the sacrifices of the people and they are now being repaired and maintained by sacrifices.

If the Polish people were given the opportunity for a truly free election, I am certain that the vote would be 20 to 1 for freedom and against communism. From my observations, I know that all of the Soviet massacres, regimentation, and armed might have not eliminated the stubborn love of freedom that exists in the Polish people.

In America the destruction of Polish freedom perhaps has aroused more bitterness than any other single act of Russian tyranny. Our large Polish population and your unrelenting zeal for freedom have gained the respect of the American people.

Here in America we so much need to have your Polish understanding of Russia and Russian tactics incorporated into our national thinking. Your people have a wealth of such understanding.

If you will pardon a personal example, in research for my recent book "Russian Frontiers: From Muscovy to Khrushchev," I found a book written by Wlodzmierz Baczkowski, "Toward an Understanding of Russia." He is a most learned Polish scholar and authority on Russian behavior, and fought against Russia in World War II. This book was written before he came to America. There are only a few copies, but I found it gave a better understanding of Russia than any other single publication I have ever seen. It should be required reading for all members of our State Department. I regret to say that they are not following the warnings of Baczkowski.

UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE OFFENSIVE

Our country is failing to utilize our greatest and strongest weapon in the cold war. For too long we have allowed the Soviets to take the initiative, to keep on the offensive. For too long we have merely tried to answer their false charges, to repair the damage made by the Soviet blasts against the dike of freedom. Our leadership apparently believes that if we yield and give enough to the Russians, the Kremlin will change.

We do have a weapon that will throw the Soviets on the defensive in the cold war if we have the courage to use it to the fullest. This weapon is the demand that Russia give to the captive nations a freedom of choice—allow these peoples to vote for the kind of government they want and to elect the officials they want.

Russia is constantly demanding that we negotiate with her. Our leaders apparently refuse to recognize that negotiations with the Kremlin mean that Russia will keep what she has and negotiate for what we have.

When Russia wants to negotiate, let's give her a strong answer. Yes, we will negotiate; let's negotiate as to when she will give freedom to Poland and the other captive nations. When will she allow them the right to vote? When will she allow them the rights guaranteed in the Atlantic Charter and the Yalta Declaration, both of which Russia accepted?

We should demand that Poland and the captive nations have their freedom. This demand should not be stated just once; it must be repeated a million times—in the legislative forums of the free world, from the rostrum of the United Nations, by the press, radio, and television throughout the world. It should be beamed hourly to the captive nations. If we will publicize the truth with the same vigor that Russia publicizes her lies, truth will win.

The demand for free elections is one that Russia cannot openly refuse and yet one which she knows she can never accept and still keep the people of these captive nations under her dictatorship. Russia well knows that if freedom of choice were given the people of these nations that they would vote overwhelmingly for freedom. The demand that Russia allow her captive peoples the right of free choice will put her on the defensive as nothing else will.

Let us lead from our strength to Russia's weakness. Our greatest strength, the strength that has made America what it is today, is the recognition of the freedom and dignity of man. It is the recognition of freedom and dignity that has made America so strong economically that our problems are those of surplus while the Communists' problems are those of continuing scarcities. Our freedom has been so successful that we must regulate the number of those who would come to America, while Russian communism must erect walls of stone and barbed wire backed up by bayonets to keep her people within.

RUSSIAN EMPIRE ATTEMPTS TO COMBINE MANY NATIONALITIES

This Russian empire, held together by force, is the last conglomerate empire, composed of peoples with no racial, geographic, or linguistic reasons for their association. What Russia is really attempting to do is to teach 46 nationalities who speak 61 different languages that they should be happy children under the "one mother, great Russia," and accept the guidance of the "elder brother," the Russians. Millions have been murdered, millions starved or banished to alien areas; millions enslaved, all to make subject people grateful to be the children of "mother Russia" and live under the direction of the "elder brother."

Will Russia ever change? We have indications that the Russian people are changing as they become aware, through education and contacts, of a better and happier life among the people of the free nations. But the rulers of the Kremlin, operating an empire to satisfy their own greed and lust for power, will not change until the people, both Russian and captive, demand a government responsive to their own needs instead of one which exists for the gain and glory of the new class, the commissars.

The so-called Rostow paper is a study by Walt W. Rostow, Special Deputy Assistant to the President on Security Affairs, which reputedly arrives at the conclusion that the United States should work toward the removal of tensions, oppositions and troubles confronting Khrushchev with the captive peoples.

Aside from those with a line directly into our State Department, no one knows exactly what is included in the Rostow paper. I called our State Department and asked for a copy but was told that it was secret and was, in effect, for departmental use only. While we cannot as yet learn the exact content of the Rostow paper, from a study of his philosophy and from his other writings, we have reason to believe that it suggests a softer attitude toward Russia.

Will the Rostow approach succeed in bettering our interests and those of the freedom-loving peoples of the world? Such yielding to Russia in the past has not brought better conditions or economic or political gain for those who adopted such an approach.

For the last 2 years various Members of Congress have been attempting to establish a Captive Nations Committee, to study, document, and publicize the continued Russian subjection of peoples of the captive nations. Our State Department has strongly opposed and so far has blocked the formation of such a committee. I would like to point out and pay tribute to a Congressman, the Honorable EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, from this city, of Polish descent, who has been the most vigilant fighter for the formation of this important "Captive Nations Committee."

Another shameful example of our yielding to Russia was the action taken on December 20, 1962. On that day the U.S. delegation to the United Nations made a motion to eliminate the reports of Sir Leslie Munro in the future. Russia had maneuvered for more than 3 years to eliminate these reports because they were well-documented reports of the continuing Soviet persecution of the Hungarian people.

The U.N. had appointed Sir Leslie Munro of Australia to make this investigation. Each year he had presented documented information that proved Hungary is not a free country but is controlled by the Kremlin through a heavy concentration of Russian armed forces.

These reports kept before the people of the captive nations as well as the free world the fact that, despite sweet talk and promises, Hungary is still a Russian police state.

A somewhat similar line of thinking is shown in a study that was made for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and was recently filed by President Kennedy in the second annual report of this agency to the Congress of the United States. While this statement has not been announced an approved policy, its philosophy is startlingly similar to a line of thinking all too prevalent in the State Department today. I quote from that report:

"Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over 200 million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for world order than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918."

If the peoples of the world would forsake their liberty to give absolute obedience to one master, then we might have world order; but we certainly would be slaves. Is that the kind of world that we want today? I know that it is not the goal that I want, and I know it is not the goal of the Polish people.

I know that it would not be the answer of the 15,000 Polish patriots who were murdered by the Russians at Katyn. I know that it would not be the answer given by the untold millions who have died to achieve and to maintain freedom from the tyrants, the "men on horseback," through the centuries.

FREEDOM MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

Freedom is the most priceless heritage of man and it is also the most expensive. In every age there have been those who through force of arms or honeyed promises or treachery would take away the freedom of man.

You from Poland know from centuries of experience that the Russian Government cannot be trusted. You know that the commissars of today are following the same ruthless greed for territory and power that was followed by the tsars of the Rurik and Romanoff dynasties for centuries before them. The Polish people know that the Kremlin respects only two things—strength and determination. You of Polish ancestry need to make all in America aware of the tragic experiences of Poland in dealing with Russia.

Unless we understand and face up to the cold war challenge of this reactionary, imperialistic power of Russia; unless we expose in detail the atrocities toward and the subjugation of the whole family of captive nations from the Danube to the Pacific, and even Cuba; unless we develop a strategy to assist all the captive nations on the principle of indivisible freedom, we will not only have to answer the question "Who will be next on the long list of captive nations?" but we also will have to prepare more than ever for the increasing possibility of a hot global war.

Yes, the challenge ahead of us is great, but the goal is worth the price.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1963

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 3, 1963)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who in former times didst lead our fathers forth into this land, grant Thy grace to us, their children, in these days of destiny as we follow in their train.

As we serve the present age, may we prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and eager to be the instruments of Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure religion. Save the inner life of the Nation from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way.

Imbue with the spirit of wisdom those who, in these crucial times, have been trusted with public responsibilities and authority. For the preservation of liberty, for the defeat of all tyranny, for the opportunity still to be free souls, for the redemption of democracy from its flaws and failures, for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in all the world, we lift our hearts to Thee, O God of our salvation, as in the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO WAR RISK INSURANCE UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of Thursday, last, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 927) to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title. Under the order, the debate is limited and the time is controlled.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute on the bill; and I ask unanimous consent that reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 3, 1963, be dispensed with, and that it be considered as read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available under the limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes under the bill to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

MADAME NHU "TOO BIG FOR HER BRITCHES"

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the visit of Madame Nhu to the United States at this time not only is in bad taste but also is an affront to all Americans, specially to the mothers, fathers, wives, and children of the fine American soldiers who lost their lives in helping to defend South Vietnam from Communist aggression and infiltration, and to the thousands of other American soldiers who presently are engaged in that task.

The Government of South Vietnam, headed by Madame Nhu's brother-in-law, persists in the religious persecution of the Buddhists, who comprise four-fifths of the population of that small country, and the desecration of their temples. This outrageous oppression has been conducted under the direction of Madame Nhu and her husband, with the approval of her brother-in-law, President Diem. It has offended the conscience of the American people. After all, our Government was founded by men and women in search or religious freedom.

Today we learn that another Buddhist priest committed suicide by fire in Saigon. The outrageous, horrifying, ghastly persecution of Buddhists is reminiscent of Nero's Rome, when Christian martyrs walked hand in hand into Roman arenas, to be attacked by wild beasts. It is evident, from all reports, that Madame Nhu is viciously anti-American; but it is equally obvious that her aversion to things American does not extend to the U.S. dollar. Although she and all other members of the ruling clique have benefited throughout the Eisenhower administration, and since then, by economic and military aid from our country, they have manifested ingratitude and ill will.

On numerous occasions this arrogant lady has spoken disparagingly of the United States and of Americans. On September 22, in an interview in Rome, Italy, she stated:

> Certain junior officials in the American services are behaving like little soldiers of fortune. They cannot understand what is going on around them. By their irresponsible behavior, they have pushed their superiors into following a confused policy.

On September 26, the Associated Press reported her as saying:

> It is normal that the United States, with a population of hundreds of millions, and maybe a looser control, can find certain adventurers and saboteurs among their junior officials who do not hesitate to betray the official policy of their Government.

Of course, she offered no proof whatever for these serious accusations; and the reason is simple—there is none to be found.

On other occasions, she has publicly stated that our President does not understand the real situation in South Vietnam. On September 4, Madame Nhu told newsmen that President Kennedy is incorrect if he assumes that the Diem government has lost touch with the people. She said she did not want to believe that President Kennedy made such a statement but that if "President Kennedy really said that, it is very serious because it shows that the American Government is absolutely misinformed."

On September 11, she further stated:

> We consider that President Kennedy is a politician. When he hears a lot of opinions spoken in a certain way, he always tries to appease it somehow. Our view is that if that opinion is misinformed, the solution is not to bow to it, but the solution should be to inform.

These are a few examples of her vicious and poisonous anti-American utterances, at a time when almost 15,000 American soldiers and additional hundreds of civilian officials are in South Vietnam, to help keep that country from falling behind the Bamboo Curtain. Sixty American officers and enlisted men have been killed in South Vietnam, while trying to help this lady's brother-in-law, President Diem, repel Communist aggression and infiltration into his country. One million five hundred thousands dollars of American taxpayers' money is being spent there every day in economic and military assistance.

Mr. President, this haughty woman brings to mind a poem by William Watson, with which I am familiar, and which is most apropos to her. It is entitled "The Woman With the Serpent's Tongue," and was written about another lady whose husband occupied a position of power.

It reads as follows:

> She is not old, she is not young,
> The woman with the serpent's tongue,
> The haggard cheek, the hungering eye,
> The poisoned words that wildly fly,
> The famished face, the fevered hand—
> Who slights the worthiest in the land,
> Sneers at the just, condemns the brave,
> And blackens goodness in its grave.
> In truthful numbers be she sung,
> The woman with the serpent's tongue;
> Ambitious from her natal hour,
> And scheming all her life for power;
> With little left of seemly pride;
> With venomed fangs she cannot hide;
> Burnt up within by that strange soul
> She cannot shake or yet control:
> Malignant-lipped, unkind, unsweet;
> Past all example indiscreet;
> Hectic, and always overstrung—
> The woman with the serpent's tongue.
> To think that such as she can mar
> Names that among the noblest are.
> That hands like hers can touch the strings
> That move who knows what men and things?
> That on her will their fates have hung.
> The woman with the serpent's tongue.

Mr. President, it appears to me that Madame Nhu is "too big for her britches," as we say in Ohio. Now she inflicts herself in our midst. Unfortunately, it is too late for our officials to bar her entry. However, it is not too late to cancel her visa and to urgently request her brother-in-law, President Diem, to recall her to South Vietnam. Her country's loss will be this Nation's gain. President Diem should be informed by appropriate officials of the executive branch of our Government that she is persona non grata. This lady has been traveling around the world on an expense account provided by American taxpayers.

Let us bring her vaudeville tour to an end; and, hereafter, when she is pictured spending money in Paris on expensive wardrobes, let us hope it will not be with any more of our taxpayers' money.

Her visa should be canceled, and she should be compelled to leave the country. Let her slander us from her native land or any other country, but not on our own soil.

Under President Eisenhower, and to date under President Kennedy, most Americans have favored aid to this small nation which is struggling against Communist subversion. It is important to aid governments in southeast Asia which are struggling to uphold their independence against the spread of communism. However, there is a limit to our toleration. South Vietnam might be lost to communism if we withdraw; but it is also true that it may be lost to communism while we remain, if the regime continues its atrocious policies and is incapable of mobilizing the country in its behalf.

Therefore, along with 22 of my colleagues, I have sponsored a Senate resolution calling for an immediate end to military and economic assistance to South Vietnam, unless its Government—Madame Nhu and her family—abandons its policies of repression against its own people, and makes a determined and effective effort to regain their support.

Mr. President, if Madame Nhu has any intention of helping to bring about such reforms and of truly helping her country, rather than herself, she should be at home, working toward that end. I urge that officials of our State Department arrange for her speedy departure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] 5 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

MARITIME LABOR DISPUTE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the dispute between two labor unions which has caused the beaching of the ship *America* still goes on. The *America* has twice been prevented from leaving its port. As I have previously mentioned, on the first occasion 956 passengers were on board waiting for that ship to set sail on the Atlantic Ocean. Two unions were fighting and arguing. The cause for the argument which was given was that there was a segregationist employee of one of the unions working on the ship. That was a mere pretense. The fact is that a fight between two unions was in progress, and those two unions—one especially—without regard to the rights of the owner of the ship and the privileges and rights of the passengers, decided that that ship would not leave port. The passengers were waiting for the ship to set sail. They finally were informed over the loudspeaker that the ship would be beached, that it would not leave port, and that they had to disembark.

The second sailing, which was scheduled last week, was also stopped.

Now a third sailing, which is in process, has been declared to be stopped.

If that were the abuse alone it would be bad. But these same unions are responsible for the beaching of the $90 million nuclear-propelled ship *Savannah*, built by the taxpayers of America.

The *Savannah* is a part of our country, so far as nuclear-propelled vessels carrying passengers and cargoes are concerned. Because of the demands of one segment of the union, which could not be met without abominable flouting of obligations, the *Savannah* was beached. That dispute started 3 months ago at least. It is still in progress.

The U.S. Government and the taxpayers anticipated that the *Savannah*, massive in size and beautiful in appearance, would make visits to various ports of foreign nations. There, in a measure, we would exhibit the achievement of our country—$90 million of taxpayers' money was invested in that leviathan of the seas. But the *Savannah* lies in port, "dead as a doornail," unable to leave because the maritime unions have a power far greater than the United States in determining what shall be done by American citizens, American business and American taxpayers. To me, it is incomprehensible that two labor unions are able to paralyze our Government.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the *Savannah*. I have mentioned the *America*. I now wish to mention the 35-day strike imposed upon the ships carrying the U.S. flag on the east coast and the Gulf of Mexico. Every American ship carrying our flag was immoble in port for 35 days. Industry in the interior States and on the coast was paralyzed. No one was able to do anything about it.

An 80-day moratorium was called by the President. In those 80 days nothing was achieved. Then the strike went on for 35 days. Finally, alleged negotiators or mediators were appointed who acted as arbitrators for the unions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader if I may have 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio 3 additional minutes under the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The unions succeeded quite well in gaining their objectives. I point out that in the past 6 months there was the 35-day paralysis of the sailing of all ships from the east coast and the gulf coast; the stoppage of the sailing of the *Savannah;* and the stoppage of the sailing of the *America*.

But that still is not the end. In every interior port on our Great Lakes assaults are being made upon employees, and sabotage is indulged in. Yet the Government is not able to do a thing about it.

I think it is wrong. It is a shame. It is a confession of impotency on the part of the Government and the American people.

I contemplate introducing a bill tomorrow. I had hoped to have it ready several days ago, but I did not get it drafted. I hope that the bill will cure the situation. I call upon Senators, especially those who represent States in the coastal regions, to awaken to the threat I have mentioned and begin to try to devise some method which would make the Government supreme and enable the American public, which must pay the tax bill, to be recognized in their dignity and their just position in this dispute.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

ALLEGED HIDDEN MICROPHONE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post there appeared a certain article. I should like to read two paragraphs from that article:

> Williams began his informal one-man inquiry last week by calling into his office at least three persons who allegedly have had close commercial dealings with Baker recently.
>
> The interviews, it was learned, lasted from a half hour to an hour and the Senator had a secretary taking notes in an adjoining room equipped with a direct microphone arrangement into his office.

I quote again the last part of that statement:

> The Senator had a secretary taking notes in an adjoining room with a direct microphone arrangement into his office.

Mr. President, there is no basis for that statement. The reporter who wrote it did not talk with me or with anyone in my office that I know of. I know he did not talk with me. I have been a Member of the Senate for 17 years, and there has never been a hidden microphone in my office and never will be as long as I am in the Senate. Anyone who has ever visited my office and wished to discuss any matter has discussed it with me in strict confidence, as intended, and if I wanted any notes taken, a secretary would be called into the office with the knowledge of the visitor, and he would be sitting in the secretary's presence.

I do not know why this story was put into the newspaper in that manner—whether it was merely an irresponsible piece of reporting or whether it was to frighten away somebody who might wish to come to my office and talk over some matter. I wish to make sure it does not serve its purpose. I emphatically deny that there is any truth whatsoever to it. Furthermore, the reporter who wrote it knows it is untrue.

I regret that such a report was ever made, however, since it has been made I want to set the record straight.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time which is under the control of the majority leader be under the control of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, who is in charge of the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] has control of the time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield such time as the Senator wishes.

Mr. GRUENING. Five minutes will be sufficient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes.

SENATE SHOULD PASS SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 23 TO MONITOR THE CIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last Thursday I addressed the Senate, urging that it was time for Congress to monitor the CIA. While it is supposed to be a factfinding Agency, in which role it has been notably unsuccessful, as in Cuba and now in Honduras, it has been more than evident, from the information that trickles through, that it is far more than that. It is also an undercover cloak and dagger organization, making its own policies, following its own bent, subject to no control by the Congress, a respect in which it is unique. That uniqueness is undesirable in our democracy.

As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate a year ago last January, when I was in Central America on a mission for the Public Works Committee, inspecting the Inter-American Highway, the head of the U.S. mission in one of the Central American countries told me that the CIA was active there, that it had a lot of money to spend, that it was promoting candidacies of individuals which were not in accord with the instructions and policies which our mission was receiving from the State Department.

It has been more than evident in Vietnam that the CIA there has been in conflict with the policies of the State Department and the efforts of our new Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge.

It is high time we sought to prevent such intragovernmental conflict. I referred in my remarks to the pertinent criticism of that situation voiced in the Senate on September 20 by the distinguished majority leader the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield].

My proposal would slightly amend concurrent resolution 23 offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], that a watchdog committee over the CIA, consisting of both House and Senate Members, and composed of three each from the Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Government Operations Committees of the Senate as well as from corresponding committees of the House, be enacted.

I note with interest that the New York Times yesterday, October 6, editorially endorsed such a policy. In an editorial entitled "State Within a State?" it says that the CIA "has gone too long without adequate congressional responsibility" and it urges "that a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society."

I ask unanimous consent that the Times editorial, "State Within a State?" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State Within a State?

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantive corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to "make" policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence; it operates saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programed, controlled, and directed—tend willy-nilly to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of king-makers.

Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us eons away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only code-breaking organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.

But the CIA, like the FBI, has gone too long without adequate congressional accountability. A Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. MORSE. I join the Senator from Alaska in the comments he is making critical of the CIA. I particularly commend the New York Times for the penetrating editorial which the Senator has placed in the Record.

As the Senator from Alaska knows, I also have been disturbed for a long time about the unchecked powers of the CIA. I have said on the floor of the Senate many times—and I repeat today—that it is not safe in a democracy to have any segment of government exercising unchecked powers. When I speak of unchecked powers, I mean powers unchecked by the legislative branch of the Government, because we cannot operate this system of government in keeping with its constitutional intent and purpose if we take away from the Legislature the power to check any segment of the Government.

I am disturbed by what I hear from members of the Appropriations Committee, to the effect that after all, the Appropriations Committee has some sort of check on the CIA. There are members of the Appropriations Committee who tell me that is not a check of any substance.

I repeat: The Congress is ducking its responsibilities in respect to the CIA. The Congress owes to the American people the placing of a clear legislative check on the CIA. The only way we can check it is to set up a congressional watchdog committee with authority and power to require from the CIA every bit of intelligence information the Congress thinks it ought to have in order to protect the operation of this system of government by checks and balances, because the alternative is the development of a creeping police state within the Government of the United States. That is developing. One cannot explain on governmental theory the unchecked power of the CIA except on the basis of the fact—and it is an ugly fact—that there is a creeping police state power developing within this democracy. It is a cancer which must be removed. The only way we can remove it is for the Congress to assume its clear constitutional duties as well as powers in respect to the CIA.

Mr. GRUENING. I could not agree more with my friend the senior Senator from Oregon. The CIA, operating in secret, as the Senator properly says, performing wholly contrary to our American traditions and our professions, is supposed to be a fact-finding Agency. It has been notably unsuccessful as a fact-finding Agency. It was wrong on Cuba. It misled us grieviously with the result that Cuba has Castro and his Communist tyranny. It certainly contributed to the Bay of Pigs fiasco. It was apparently wrong on Honduras. Only 24 hours before the revolt the State Department let it be known—and presumably the State Department had access to the CIA's information—that no revolt was coming. Yet it "popped."

In addition to that, we know the CIA is far more than a fact-finding Agency. An article in the New Republic, a responsible publication, about a year ago, stated flatly that the CIA was responsible for an assassination in a Caribbean country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 5 minutes for which the Senator was recognized have expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute more.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate operating under controlled time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] yielded such time as he wished to the Senator from Alaska, within his time limitation.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall need only 1 minute more.

I do not know whether that charge was true. The mere fact that a responsible publication could make the charge that the CIA was responsible for the assassination of a political leader in a Caribbean republic should have been enough to bring about a congressional investigation and the kind of action I urge, which the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] has proposed, and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] so heartily and correctly endorses.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield me a minute?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, how much time have I under my control on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has 25 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if it is inconvenient for the Senator to yield, I am authorized to use time on this side.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why not use 5 minutes of the time under the control of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York yields himself 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time is there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington has 25 minutes. The Senator from New York yields himself 5 minutes. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Chair.

RADIO ASTRONOMY SERVICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last Friday the Federal Communications Commission completed action in a rulemaking proceeding of widespread public interest involving the future of the radio astronomy service. Its decision, I am heartened to report, was that channel 37, an optimum radio astronomy frequency, would be retained in the frequency allocation but would not be licensed for commercial purposes for a period of 10 years, that is, until at least January 1, 1974.

Mr. President, radio astronomy research is a vital part of our national scientific effort to uncover some of the dark secrets of outer space, with great present and potential practical value for the U.S. space program. Around the country, indeed around the world, both publicly and privately supported radio astronomy facilities have an intense stake in an exclusive frequency which will be protected on a longrun basis from any and all manmade interference. Any erosion of the protection afforded such a frequency as channel 37 would be extremely detrimental to the future progress of radio astronomy and wasteful of the sizable investment in facilities which has so far been made; and it may well be that the 10-year protection just ordered by the FCC will not prove to be a sufficient guaranty of protection for the long-range needs of the program.

Nevertheless, the FCC is to be commended for its recognition of the broad public interest inherent in the radio astronomy service. I know that the institutions and companies in New York State which now maintain radio astronomy facilities or which are planning to install them in the future together with the thousands employed by them—to mention only several, Cornell University, the Hayden Planetarium, and the General Electric Co.—will welcome the FCC decision of last week.

It is my intention, however, to seek out scientific opinion in order to determine whether the action that was taken stopped short of fulfilling the permanent objectives of the program, and I will certainly want to make sure, if further protection should be necessary, that it will be afforded at the proper time.

KINGS COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, each year the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans are hosts to hospitalized veterans at Yankee Stadium. For a day, the council provides activities and amusements for these veterans—many of whom rarely see the outside of hospital walls.

Mr. President, the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans—in fact, all Americans—have not forgotten their obligation to their war veterans—men who have given so much in the name of America and freedom. Because of my admiration for the activities of the Jewish War Veterans of America, I have introduced legislation in this Congress which would incorporate this group. If enacted, this legislation would grant Federal recognition to this organization. It is my hope that my bill will be favorably acted upon in the near future.

Mr. President, I salute the Kings County Council of the Jewish War Veterans for brightening the day for many of our hospitalized veterans. Their unselfish gesture deserves the gratitude of the entire Nation.

SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in an unprecedented move, South Vietnam's Ambassador to the United States, Tran Van Chuong, resigned his post in opposition to the policies of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record an interesting interview by Jock Laurence with Ambassador Chuong which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington World.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vietnam's Resigned U.S. Ambassador Hopes for Moral Revival To End Crisis

(By Jock Laurence)

In distant Saigon, where the dictators of Vietnam seem to treat the population, even the freedom of that nation, as hostages in their showdown with the United States over the regime's brutal suppression of Buddhist critics, strongman Ngo Dinh Nhu shrewdly gave orders to pull in the claws of his tigerish special forces and release the lesser of imprisoned demonstrators.

At that approximate moment in Washington, Tran Van Chuong, President Ngo Dinh Diem's former envoy to the United States and father of Vietnam's beautiful but acid-tongued "first lady," Madam Nhu, touched my notes with a tiny finger and added: "The dictators of Vietnam may be well-intentioned—at least President Ngo Dinh Diem may be—but they have the minds of medieval inquisitors."

(Editor's Note.—There are reports the Vietnam Government is transferring gold out of the embattled country.)

That appraisal of the Ngo family by the author of a thundering resignation message that rocked the palace foundation at Saigon August 22 succinctly describes the dilemma the U.S. Government cautiously seeks to resolve. And the diminutive speaker may be the persona grata the administration is searching for to weld together the many elements of the opposition should Diem and his brother bring the palace walls down upon themselves.

In an interview at a small house in Chevy Chase, Md., where he is going to live, Chuong listed the errors of the regime and gently stressed the alternatives, firmly removing himself from a starring role: "I have never been a candidate for power."

ALTERNATIVES STIFLED

"The inefficiency of the present regime is due to the fact that most freedom-loving Vietnamese have been forced into exile, or have been silenced or reduced to impotence in Vietnam," he said. "The alternatives are there, but they cannot reveal themselves in a country where there is no freedom of expression."

Chuong's resignation was not an abrupt decision. The raiding of the pagodas and the atrocities against the bronzes—priests—and nuns were final straws.

On the subject of his possible return to Vietnam: "I would be put in a gold cage, maintained comfortably, but isolated. If I go back, I cannot believe that I would be harmed, but I would be cut off from the rest of the world. I will be more useful here. I am going to choose freedom and stay in the United States. The people of Vietnam would not understand if I did otherwise.

REVOLT A MORAL ISSUE

"I am absolutely sure," he told me, "that unless this regime absolutely changes, there is no possibility of victory over the Communists at all. The recent events in Saigon are a revolt of the national conscience of the Vietnamese against injustice and unfairness. This is much more a moral issue than a religious issue. And we have to count with these moral, spiritual forces. You do not realize the strength of them. They alone can cause a chain of reaction that would paralyze the Government."

It is this grave consequence that the Kennedy administration would prefer postponed, if it is inevitable. And there is no real thought of suspending funds, except as a last resort.

If the United States did take the extreme measure of abruptly cutting off all aid it could bring down everything in Vietnam. Should Diem and his brother be swept from power, the United States would probably support whomever came out of it. Right now the policy is to support Diem personally, but not his policies.

U.S. INFLUENCE POTENT

When we discussed the leverage of foreign aid, a twinkle came to Chuong's eyes for the first time: "I should not suggest an abrupt cutoff of aid, because it would mean the loss of Vietnam to the Communists, but I imagine that when someone gives another something like a million dollars a day, the donor always has a way of having some influence on him."

This is Chuong's analysis of the crisis:

"The situation seems very difficult, indeed—almost insoluble, because the present dictators have direct control of all material forces in Vietnam: The police and the special forces that have been used to raid the pagodas and to round up the bronzes and students, and most units of the army.

"A similar situation prevailed in Vietnam in 1955 when President Ngo Dinh Diem had against him all the material forces and behind him only the moral support of the Vietnamese people—because he represented at that time all that the Vietnamese craved. That was, real national independence.

It's conceivable, therefore, that similar moral forces eventually may triumph over the police and special forces of the present regime."

Chuong's personal aspirations are to travel leisurely about the United States, he says, and see the country he loves. But what about his first love—Vietnam? He speaks with pained voice of his 86-year-old mother living in Vietnam, declines now to discuss his daughter, Madam Nhu; proudly cherishes his long career before coming to Washington as ambassador, a respected attorney, and a jurist with service on the Franco-Vietnamese equivalent of the U.S. Supreme Court. He never has belonged to a political party—and certainly not Diem's.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] such time as he may desire.

INDEBTEDNESS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the morning newspapers quote the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury as favoring the exchange of American wheat for Russian gold on the ground that Russian gold will help our balance of payments. By the same token, the payment of Russian gold on the debt that Russia has owed us since the end of World War I would help our balance of payments even more because that debt, plus accrued interest, now amounts to $621,420,405.56.

When our foreign aid program was first started in 1947 our foreign trade shiboleth was "close the dollar gap." We not only closed that gap but, through an unprecedented program of dollar gifts, dollar loans, the maintenance of military establishments in 52 foreign nations, a $500 free import allowance for tourists plus business investments abroad, we so overclosed it that now one of our most serious financial problems is how to meet the demand upon our diminished gold supply by foreign dollar holdings. Those holdings now total $25.5 billion; and above the $12.2 billion of gold required to back our own currency, we have less than $3.5 billion with which to meet potential demand of the foreign holders of $25.5 billion.

Quite naturally, therefore, the Secretary of the Treasury is concerned by the fact that in a little more than 10 years the foreign situation has turned from a dollar shortage to a deficit in balance of payments for us that aggregates $26 billion and now constitutes a grave threat to the soundness of the dollar both here and abroad. Under those circumstances, instead of advocating the sale of wheat to Russia and Russia's satellites at a price below what it would be sold to an American citizen and would be used to strengthen the economy of Communist leaders still bent upon the destruction of the free world, why is it that our State Department finds it so much more pleasant to give money away, asking this year, for instance, that we increase our gifts and loans by a billion dollars over the current all time high of the last fiscal year, than to ask foreign nations to pay the debts that are now due and unpaid? The statement of those debts, with interest due and unpaid as of July 30, 1963, amounted to over $13 billion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point part I of the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury on the indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States arising from World War I. That statement shows a total, including unmatured debts of $20,045,657,134.07. It will be noted that that amount is exclusive of the unsettled lend-lease items of World War II, under which Russia owes us a very large sum and it excludes the billions that we have loaned in recent years under our foreign aid program.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Part I. Indebtedness of Foreign Governments

Indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States arising from World War I, and payments thereon as of June 30, 1963

	Indebtedness as of June 30, 1963				Cumulative payments since inception				
	Principal		Interest due and unpaid	Total	Principal		Interest		Total
	Due and unpaid [1]	Unmatured			Funded debts	Unfunded debts	Funded debts	Unfunded debts	
Armenia	$11,959,917.49		$26,195,087.50	$38,155,004.99					
Austria [2]	21,567,349.11	$4,413,131.55	44,058.93	26,024,539.59	$862,668.00				$862,668.00
Belgium	173,500,000.00	227,180,000.00	252,587,077.60	653,267,077.60	17,100,000.00	$2,057,630.37	$14,490,000.00	$18,543,642.87	52,191,273.24
Cuba						10,000,000.00		2,286,751.58	12,286,751.58
Czechoslovakia	70,791,108.90	94,450,000.00	92,405,971.80	257,647,080.70	19,829,914.17			304,178.09	20,134,092.26
Estonia	6,110,012.87	10,356,000.00	18,331,227.94	34,797,240.81			1,246,990.19	1,441.88	1,248,432.07
Finland		5,425,096.97	[3] 49,299.57	5,474,396.54	[4] 3,574,903.00		10,145,710.08	572,246.31	[5] 14,292,859.39
France	1,840,647,213.87	2,023,002,786.13	2,476,514,589.32	6,340,164,589.32	161,350,000.00	64,689,588.18	38,650,000.00	221,386,302.82	486,075,891.00
Great Britain	1,582,000,000.00	2,786,000,000.00	4,781,859,301.93	9,149,859,301.93	232,000,000.00	202,181,641.56	1,232,775,999.07	357,896,657.11	2,024,854,297.74
Greece	22,066,000.00	9,450,000.00	13,202,655.10	44,718,655.10	981,000.00	2,922.67	1,983,980.00	1,159,153.34	4,127,056.01
Hungary [6]	660,695.00	1,247,865.00	2,027,040.90	3,935,600.90	73,995.50		482,171.22	753.04	556,919.76
Italy	686,500,000.00	1,318,400,000.00	216,692,909.34	2,221,592,909.34	37,100,000.00	364,319.28	5,766,708.26	57,598,852.62	100,829,880.16
Latvia	2,515,564.20	4,363,900.00	7,541,439.84	14,420,904.04	9,200.00		621,520.12	130,828.95	761,549.07
Liberia						26,000.00		10,471.56	36,471.56
Lithuania	2,222,245.00	3,975,437.00	6,746,671.22	12,944,353.22	234,783.00		1,001,626.61	1,456.97	1,237,956.58
Nicaragua [7]						141,950.36		26,625.48	168,575.84
Poland	73,700,000.00	132,357,000.00	229,421,984.20	435,478,984.20	[8] 1,287,297.37		19,310,775.90	2,048,224.28	22,646,297.55
Rumania	27,792,560.43	36,068,000.00	43,708,811.02	107,569,371.45	2,700,000.00	1,798,632.02	29,061.46	263,313.74	[9] 4,791,007.22
Russia	192,601,297.37		428,819,108.19	621,420,405.56				8,750,311.88	[10] 8,750,311.88
Yugoslavia [11]	21,640,000.00	39,985,000.00	16,561,718.78	78,186,718.78	1,225,000.00	727,712.55		636,059.14	2,588,771.69
Total	4,736,273,964.24	6,696,674,216.65	8,612,708,953.18	20,045,657,134.07	478,328,761.04	281,990,396.99	1,326,504,542.91	671,617,361.66	2,758,441,062.60

---

[1] Includes amounts postponed under moratorium agreements.

[2] The German Government was notified on Apr. 1, 1938, that the Government of the United States would look to the German Government for the discharge of the indebtedness of the Government of Austria to the Government of the United States. A letter dated Mar. 6, 1951, from Chancellor Adenauer to the Allied High Commission for Germany stated that Germany acknowledged liability for interest and similar charges on Austrian securities falling due between Mar. 12, 1938, and May 8, 1945. Art. 28 (1) of the Austrian State Treaty of May 15, 1955, recognized that these charges constitute a claim on Germany and not on Austria.

[3] Represents payments deferred.

[4] Includes payments of renewed principal on bonds.

[5] Payments through June 30, 1963, totaling $5,589,878.72, were made available for education and training of Finnish citizens in the United States, and of United States citizens in Finland pursuant to the act of Aug. 24, 1949.

[6] Although agreements provide for payment in U.S. dollars, interest payments due from Dec. 15, 1932, to June 15, 1937, were deposited in pengo equivalent, with the Hungarian National Bank.

[7] Obligations held by the United States, and interest thereon, were canceled pursuant to the agreement of Apr. 14, 1938, between the United States and Nicaragua.

[8] Excludes claim allowance of $1,813,428.69, dated Dec. 15, 1929.

[9] Excludes payment of $100,000 on June 15, 1940, as token of good faith pending negotiation of new agreement.

[10] Consists principally of proceeds from liquidation of Russian assets in the United States.

[11] This government has not accepted the moratorium provisions.

REMOVAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO WAR RISK INSURANCE UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 927) to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending business before the Senate is S. 927. There is a committee amendment at the desk which changes the enactment clause or the date of enactment. May the amendment be read?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk. It is proposed, on page 2, line 3, to strike out "February 1, 1962" and insert in lieu thereof "the date of enactment."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself such time on the amendment as may be necessary. At the outset, let me say that S. 927 is a bill which deals with the problem of war risk insurance for the American merchant marine. The real reason why the matter is before the Senate is that no private company would in any time of emergency accept war risk insurance on ships. Therefore, in time of war or emergency all countries must assume insurance obligations on ships. This is because of the danger of sinking of ships by submarines and the other vicissitudes and risk of war.

The Senate Commerce Committee held lengthy hearings on S. 927. The hearings were publicized. We gave notice to every member of the committee, much in advance, that we would hold hearings on this subject. It was a matter which was also before the committee on other occasions. I suppose, if one examined the archives of the committee, he would find that the subject was of concern prior to World War I.

Insurance is not a new subject or something that has come out of the air. It has been before the Congress for a long time.

Legislation has always been necessary because private insurance companies cannot afford to write war risk insurance. The premiums would be prohibitive. So the Government insures ships in time of emergency. This has been done during time of emergency by countries all over the world.

Hearings were held on the bill. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] happens to be in Tokyo today, being a delegate to the International Fisheries Treaty Conference which has been in session in Tokyo for the last 2 weeks, but he is on his way back. He was in charge of the hearings and is much more knowledgeable about the bill. It is somewhat complex, as bills of this nature and legislation of this type always are. The Senator from Alaska will be present tomorrow. I understand he will arrive here tonight. He may want the opportunity of making a further explanation of the bill.

The committee discussed the bill at length and decided to report the bill. An identical bill—and I underline the word "identical," S. 2829—dealing with this problem was passed by the Senate last year.

Whether the threat of emergency, conflict, or war has lessened since that time, I am not one to judge. Nevertheless, it is a matter to which the committee has given a great amount of time. There are some differences of opinion in the Department. Amendments and modifications were considered. The committee decided to report the bill to the Senate. It is the same bill the Senate passed last year after going through the same procedure.

Certain Senators have some doubts about the bill. They may have had very good reasons not to be at the hearings, but the committee had lengthy discussions of the subject. It is a complex bill. The problem is one that should be taken care of in the interest of our highly prized and somewhat inadequate American merchant marine.

What does the bill provide? I am reading from an objective analysis of the bill. It is practically the same analysis and the same interpretation of the bill that the Senate passed last year.

S. 927 would accord to U.S. citizen-owners of vessels built in U.S. shipyards with construction subsidy the same rights with respect to war risk insurance coverage of their vessels as now are accorded to American and foreign owners of unsubsidized vessels.

This, therefore, refers to subsidized vessels. Not all American merchant marine vessels are subsidized. Sometimes, when one hears debate on the floor of the Senate, he is led to believe that every ship that plies the seas and flies the American flag is a subsidized vessel. In truth, only a relatively small portion of the American merchant marine is subsidized. Certain vessels are subsidized under the 1936 act, for a very good reason. In order to obtain the subsidy they assume certain obligations; they are limited to certain routes; and they must maintain certain schedules. In other words, they are like common carriers on land. They assume many obligations in order to qualify for the subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us why it is impossible to get American ship operators to haul grain from Great Lakes ports to Montreal for ultimate use in northern New England?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. They absolutely refuse to do it. They should realize that they have an obligation to U.S. users. I know it makes them feel good to load a ship and go half way around the world with it. Nevertheless, I know of an instance where 37 navigation companies of U.S. registry were asked to quote a rate on transporting almost half a million bushels of grain from Milwaukee to Montreal, where we in Vermont could get it to use for our livestock. Not one of the companies would do it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. Of course, subsidized lines would be required to take the cargo if their trade routes were in that area. It may be that the trade routes of these lines are not in that area. The unsubsidized ships flying the American flag, of course, are free to collect and discharge cargo wherever they wish. In some cases, they believe the business is not profitable, and in many cases they take what we call the cream of the cargo. They are called tramp ships. They do not assume the obligations that subsidized ship operators assume, and, of course, they do not get the subsidy, because they will not assume the obligations of the so-called common carrier subsidized American flag lines.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that when all American shipowners refuse to perform a service for the American people, the Secretary of Commerce should be given authority to make an exception and permit the shippers to use foreign bottoms.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is a matter which the Senator from Vermont and I have discussed before. I am quite familiar with the subject. I will have the subcommittee look into the matter for the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not knowledgeable enough to discuss it, because I do not know the reasons at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. He has said exactly what I hoped he would say, that his committee would look into the situation. I believe that in one way or another we shall probably be able to do something about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee held lengthy hearings and discussed the subject, not only on this occasion, but on other occasions. The members of the committee submitted a complete and detailed report, which I am sure explains all aspects of the subject. The report contains comments from the Comptroller General, the Department of Justice, the Office of Emergency Planning, and other departments. I believe the Department of Commerce had some suggestions and amendments, and they were discussed in connection with the bill.

The bill merely accords to U.S. citizen-owners of vessels built in U.S. shipyards with construction subsidy the same rights with respect to war risk insurance coverage of their vessels as now are accorded to American and foreign owners of unsubsidized vessels. In other words, we equalize the war risk insurance to the lines that we are taking care of.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have only 15 minutes. I will yield later.

Existing statutes deny to American owners of subsidized vessels this equality of war risk coverage, despite the fact that the owners of such U.S. vessels are required by the Maritime Administrator—because we do have control over them when they are subsidized—to carry insurance in peacetime to the full commercial value of their vessels, as determined by the Administrator.

This anomalous situation stems from the Government's policy of claiming to have added something to the value of these vessels because of the subsidy payments made to the shipyards when the vessels were built.

The fact is that the vessels could have been built abroad at the same or less cost than the owners paid. Because of the restrictions laid upon these vessels, they usually are worth less in the world market than similar vessels built abroad for half their cost or less. It seems only reasonable, the committee feels, and quite in keeping with the parity concept of the 1936 act, that owners of vessels built with construction subsidy be permitted to purchase from the Government war risk insurance on a basis equivalent to the just compensation basis available to owners of nonsubsidized vessels and vessels registered under foreign flags.

There are literally hundreds of cases in which war risk insurance would take effect when, because of war or threat of war involving one of the five world powers, commercial maritime insurance would be unavailable.

Nearly 1,000 vessels, large and small, would be covered, including several hundred freighters and tankers under the Panamanian and Liberian flags.

War risk insurance would continue in effect until a vessel was requisitioned by our Government, either for use or title. Insurance rates would be set on the basis of losses suffered.

The Government netted an $8 million profit on its war risk insurance in World War II. It lost $10 million on insurance of vessels—that is what we call hull insurance—because of vessels sunk by enemy action, but collected $18 million on insurance of cargoes and seamen's insurance. In any event, U.S. shipowners are now in the midst of a $2 billion vessel replacement program. This is $2 billion which they have to pay out of their own funds.

They should not be shortchanged because the Government asked them to have their ships built in the United States instead of in a foreign country. They should be put on exactly the same basis with respect to insurance coverage, in the form of war risk insurance, as the owners of foreign unsubsidized vessels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the bill.

A few specific examples of the workings of present statutes dealing with the requisition of vessels are illuminating. These are some illustrations that the committee looked into, among many. For example, a new Mariner-type of vessel, delivered in 1963, at a cost of $10 million—with 50-percent Government participation—and with a current domestic market value of approximately the owner's cost, $5 million, could be insured today for only $2,500,000 under U.S. war risk insurance.

Again, under present law, the Government could requisition for use, at its residual value of $81,000, a C-3 type vessel on which the Maritime Administration, in General Order No. 75 as revised, has determined that the current domestic market value is $850,000. A classic example of current policy with regard to war risk coverage of subsidized vessels is the S.S. America, a passenger liner, now operating past its original 20-year life span. This ship operates on a certain subsidized run. It is now laid up, but we use it as an example because it deals with a passenger liner that has operated over a long life. The Maritime Administration requires its owner-operator, United States Lines, to insure it commercially at $6,400,000, but under present war risk insurance statutes her owners can purchase insurance only up to $4,556,000—almost $2 million less—prior to requisition for title or use, and only up to $437,000 after requisition for use. Thus the owner's compensation for the loss of the vessel could not exceed its residual value of $437 thousand.

An offer for the vessel, showing its value, has been reported in the press to be $11 million. So this is an attempt on the part of the Committee on Commerce and its able and excellent Subcommittee on Merchant Marine to provide suitable war risk insurance for the owners of these vessels.

I again state that the committee held long hearings on the bill. Invitations were offered to all persons concerned to come before the committee. But those who oppose the bill did not appear. This is a complicated subject. Representatives of some of the departments appeared.

Again, I say that this bill is identical with the bill the Senate passed last year. It provides that a subsidized line may obtain war risk insurance in the amount of the value of the vessel as computed by the Maritime Administration.

These vessels are important to the Nation in time of war. If one were sunk, it would immediately have to be replaced, because of the need for a merchant marine. Actually, the merchant marine is our fourth arm of defense. If anyone does not believe that, I again cite the fact that the American merchant marine during World War II carried 95.2 percent of our people overseas. That is how important the merchant marine would become in the scheme of things if a war should again occur.

Some of our vessels were sunk, and the Goverment paid out to the owners large sums of money because the ships were subsidized. We paid hull insurance during World War II on all the vessels that were sunk in the Atlantic and Pacific. At the end of World War II, the Government had a loss of $10 million on the hulls. But we also insured, besides the hulls, the cargoes and the seamen and their effects, because they were not included in the actual combat forces. In that case, on the premiums paid on them the Government made $18 million. So at the end of World War II, the Government ended with a net profit of $8 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on my time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have finished. I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Who yields time to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, either I or the Senator from Ohio has charge of the time in opposition. I yield all my time to the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield himself 10 minutes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Which department of the Federal Government, if any, has recommended the passage of this bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think any department sent the bill to Congress. It is not a department bill, which a chairman of a committee always, as a matter of courtesy, introduces by request.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At whose request did the chairman of the Committee on Commerce introduce the bill? Was it by request of the Government or by request of the shipowners?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I recall, the request originally came from the shipowners, who believed they might find themselves in a position, if some disaster occurred, in which they would not be able to obtain war risk insurance to the real value of the vessels.

As a perfunctory matter, bills not passed by a previous Congress are reintroduced in the succeeding Congress, so that they may be considered again, unless there is some good reason why they should not be reintroduced.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question is: What taxpayer, what department of Government, what member of the present administration asked for the passage of this bill, besides the companies that are to be benefited by it scandalously? Will the Senator answer that question? What taxpayer or what member of our Government asked for the passage of this bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator asking me a question or making a speech?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall do both.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All right; ask a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who in the Government recommended the passage of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No one in the Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What taxpayer recommended the passage of the bill, besides the owners who are to receive a profit from it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think there is any profit from it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is not an answer to my question .

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose shipowners are taxpayers. They pay large sums in taxes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the fact is that the shipowners, who are to be the beneficiaries, are the ones who asked the chairman of the Committee on Commerce to introduce the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No one asked the chairman to do anything. If the Senator is seeking to impute that someone asked the chairman to introduce the bill, my response is that I have never discussed the bill with the shipowners.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How did the chairman decide to introduce the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill has been introduced on several occasions. It was reintroduced at this session, because it passed the Senate at the last session.

I have never discussed this subject with any shipowner. When the Senator speaks of shipowners, representatives of the industry have spoken about the bill.

Like those in any other industry, the representatives of the shipping industry are worried about their ships being sunk in time of war. On several occasions when similar bills were before the committee, representatives of the maritime industry expressed concern about war risk insurance. Many times the chairman of the committee—and the Senator from Ohio has been present—has asked, "Why the rush? Why not wait until a war takes place?" But we have always had pointed out to us what happened in World War II, when the Government was confronted with some problems until the War Powers Act was passed, an act which provided for war risk insurance. So the shipowners wanted to be ready in case an emergency developed. Perhaps nothing will happen for years; until it did, the bill would not take effect.

The Senator from Ohio does not have to stand on the floor of the Senate and suggest that some shipowner talked with me about the bill. This has been an industry bill for years.

I have not discussed the situation with anybody. Actually, I am substituting today for the chairman of the subcommittee. However, I am aware of the situation, because it has come before the committee before. The departments are aware of it. As a matter of courtesy—as does the chairman of any committee of the Senate, as I understand—I introduced the bill. The bill passed the Senate last year; it was reintroduced at the beginning of this session. Several other bills were reintroduced by request, for the information of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To me, it is rather anomalous that no one representing the general public at any time initiated the thought that a special war risk insurance privilege should be given to those who operate subsidized vessels. The Federal Government, through the administrations of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, opposed this proposal; no taxpayer asked for it; and no segment of the industry asked for it. The only one who asked for passage of the bill was the interest that was to be the beneficiary. I submit that is an anomalous situation.

If this bill were in the general interest of the public, if it were in the interest of the security of the U.S. Government, do not we have the right to infer that there would be a public demand for its enactment; and that if the security of the Nation were involved, the President, the Secretary of Commerce, the State Department, and the Defense Department would ask for its passage? But not one word about it is heard from anyone except the subsidized shipowners. They are the ones whom, for a number of years, have been pounding for passage of this bill.

Mr. President, in each instance the administration has opposed it. The present administration opposes it and a reading of the testimony will show it has good grounds for opposing it. There has been much circuitous talk and obfuscation in regard to the hearings, not about the bill. We have been told, "Everybody knew about that." But that point does not get to the heart of the issue before us.

I respectfully submit that if this bill is passed, then—and if the advice of the Secretary of Commerce and his advisers is followed—the President of the United States should veto the bill the moment it comes to his office.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will find on the first page of the report the following:

> As the war risk insurance program is operated on a mutual basis, the increased coverage sought would not entail any government costs.

I do not understand that sentence.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The shipowners have argued that in the last war, under the war risk insurance, the Government made a profit. The chairman of the committee argued that point. The Department of Commerce answers it forcefully. The Second World War lasted a considerable length of time. As soon as the submarine menace was eliminated, a profit was made. The Secretary of Commerce says that in a rapid, quick-moving, destructive war, the war risk insurance fund cannot and should not be required to carry this obligation.

For the information of the Senator from Massachusetts, I point out that since 1936 one type of coverage has been given to shipping companies that fully paid for their ships. A lesser type of coverage was given to companies that received a 50-percent subsidy in the building of the ships. That arrangement was well thought out in 1936. The reasons for differentiating were considered; and it was then concluded by Congress that the rule applicable to shipping company "X" that pays completely for its ship should be different from the one applicable to shipping company "Y" that pays only 50 percent of the cost of building its ship.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a further question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is saying that when there is a Federal subsidy of 50 percent, the shipowner has only a 50 percent interest in it, whereas if he has a 100 percent interest, he will receive a larger payment; is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not say that; but that is, in part, the principle.

The law as written in 1936, in effect, says:

> Mr. X, you want a ship to travel on the high seas, and you want the Government to pay 50 percent of the cost to the shipbuilding company of building the ship. In other words, you want an indirect 50-percent subsidy.

The Federal Government says, under the law, "We will do that for you, Mr. X. But if we get into a war we reserve the right to requisition the use of that ship; and we will insure you only in the amount of the depreciated value of the ship at the time its use is requisitioned." Of course, there was justification for that differential. One operator paid fully for his ship; the other operator paid only 50 percent of the cost of his ship.

What is sought to be done now is to place the subsidized owner in the same position as that of the unsubsidized owner, so that a shipowner who paid $6 million for his ship would be treated in the same way that a shipowner who paid only $3 million of the $6 million cost of his ship would be treated.

Mr. President, as was stated last week, there are constant demands by the merchant marine industry for additional subsidies. Since I have been here, the limitation on such subsidies has been raised from 50 to 55 percent. Congress passed a law declaring drydocks to be part of the merchant marine of this country, and providing that they shall be subsidized. Congress also passed a law subsidizing the construction of fishing vessels. Now, in all probability, we shall pass this bill eliminating the just differential, and putting—unjustly—on the same basis two categories of shipping interests serving the public on the high seas. But that will not be all. Two more bills will come before the Senate; and I simply cannot subscribe to the effort of the merchant marine to have the taxpayers subsidize it each year, in one way or another, with increased amounts and in increased fields.

Last week, we were told that someone "dreamed up" these proposals. Yes, Mr. President, they have been dreamed up. But it is odd that the dream never ended in a manner that would serve the taxpayers. Instead, the dream always demanded special service, privilege, and subsidy for the merchant marine operators. I do not know when it will come to an end.

Mr. President, coming to the Capitol this morning I said to myself, "It is futile to argue. Senators will not be present in the Chamber. They do not know what the issue will be. And, of course, the bill will pass." But, Mr. President, it is another black smear upon what I call good conduct. It cannot be justified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is there time remaining on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is attempting to determine that question now. The proponents have 17 minutes remaining on the bill; the opponents have 38 minutes remaining on the bill.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much time would be available for debate on a motion to recommit the bill to the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifteen minutes on each side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has yielded 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, J. W. Gulick, the Deputy Administrator of the Maritime Administration, testified on the bill. His testimony was so clear and so concise that I should like to read all of it, but, of course, time will not permit. On page 3 of the report Mr. Gulick stated:

> The existing law limits the amount of Government war risk insurance that can be granted with respect to a vessel, and in establishing this limit the existing law takes into consideration any burden in the way of restrictions on the title to the vessel to be insured, because any such burden affects the value of the vessel. The burden that is of chief importance in regard to these Government war risk insurance values is the right of the United States to requisition such vessels for title during a national emergency and the price at which such vessels can be requisitioned.

That paragraph is the core of the reason why the Administration opposes passage of the bill. That paragraph specifically states that in determining the value at which a vessel shall be insured, it is necessary to consider the burden on the sale which the vessel carries. The question is, What is the burden? Under the law, in case of war, the Federal Government has the right to requisition the use of ships covered by the act. The law specifically states that when a ship is subsidized, its value shall be not more than the depreciated value on the books of the corporation.

The vessel owner entered into an agreement in compliance with that law. In effect, he said, "Uncle Sam, if you ever intend to requisition this ship, we will allow you to do so. We will carry insurance equal up to its depreciated value on the books of the company."

On the same page of the hearing Mr. Gulick's testimony was:

> If construction-differential subsidy was granted to aid in the construction of a vessel,

> however, the purchase or requisition price of the vessel (as provided in sec. 802 of the act) is its current domestic market value, but not exceeding its depreciated cost to the owner.

He illustrated that situation by pointing out the situation of the steamship *America*. He said:

> If the current domestic market value of a vessel that was not built with the aid of construction-differential subsidy is $6 million (though its depreciated book value is only $500,000) and the vessel is requisitioned during a war emergency, the requisition price is the $6 million.

That is a ship that is paid for completely by the owner. Continuing to read from the testimony—

> If, however, there is an identical ship which was built at the same time, but with the aid of construction-differential subsidy, its requisition price is the depreciated book value, namely $500,000.

The difference in the rule available to the subsidized, as distinguished from nonsubsidized vessels lies in the cold fact that in the one instance the vessel owner paid for his ship alone. In the other instance the vessel owner was subsidized in an amount equal to 50 percent of the cost of the ship. It is that differential that the navigating companies have sought to eliminate for the last 15 years. It is that differential that the administrations have opposed being eliminated. The present administration likewise opposes the elimination of the difference in treatment.

On page 4 of the hearings Mr. Gulick stated further:

> We understand that the intention is to provide that the stated valuation of construction subsidy ships shall be their current domestic market value determined without recognizing the section 802 burden on the vessels.

In those words Gulick spoke for the President. He said further:

> We are opposed to this change in the law because we believe that the only realistic way of valuing ships is to recognize the burdens on them.

He added that for the reasons thereafter stated, the depreciated value must be the amount considered.

Mr. President, on pages 6 and 7 of the report, Mr. Gulick, the representative of the administration, answers the three arguments advanced by the vessel owners for the change in the law. He answers them effectively and he demonstrates that the law ought not to be changed.

Mr. President, I am not so naive as to believe that I can win this argument. I shall lose, on the basis of the vote. But I shall win the argument on the basis of the morality involved in what is sought to be done. I may be beaten when the votes are cast, as I leave the Senate floor, but from the standpoint of justice, morality, and integrity I shall leave the Senate floor victorious on this measure.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Ohio, made a misstatement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield himself time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio referred to the hearings on the bill, rather than to the report.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Gulick also said, on page 5:

> We believe, however, that for the period prior to requisition for title or use the owner should be assured of at least the section 802 value. Existing law does not provide this floor value.

Mr. Gulick also said:

> In conclusion, we believe that, with the amendment we have proposed, war risk insurance values for construction subsidy ships under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, would be equitable both to the shipowners and to the United States.

An amendment was proposed. The committee, as I understand it, did not accept the amendment, for a good reason.

The Senator from Ohio has pointed out several times that the shipowners, under the 1936 act, on the construction subsidy get the benefit of the subsidy. The truth is that the subsidy goes to the shipbuilder. The owner is by law required to accept the ship and to operate it under certain conditions. So it is not the shipowner but the shipbuilder who gets the construction subsidy. I believe that should be clear.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator recognize that Mr. Gulick dealt with that subject, and said that that argument was not sound? I know he did.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That it went to the ship operator instead of the owner?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. Gulick said it went to the shipbuilder and not to the shipowner.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. Gulick said the net result was the same. The shipowner got a ship which would cost $6 million for $3 million, so it made no difference whether the subsidy went to him or went to the shipbuilding company.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is an argument. The shipowner has to take the ship which the Maritime Administration says he has to take. The ship must have a certain speed, and certain other features. That is what involves the cost. So the shipowner takes the ship. In some cases technically, I suppose, he gets a better ship. But if he were to build the ship himself, free and clear, and if he could do so, he might not build that type of ship but might build one which was more economical.

One of the difficulties with respect to our passenger ships is that the Maritime Administration has required a great deal to be added, which makes them uneconomical to run, so that the owner never would have built all those things into the ship in the first place.

The problem rests in the fact that a ship might cost $10 million to build, and might involve a 50-percent construction subsidy or might not. It might be 42 percent. It might be 44 percent, or it might be 48 percent. As to recently built ships, it has been 51 percent, or even 52 percent.

If we assume the ship cost $10 million, the same ship could be built in a foreign yard for one-half the cost. Therefore, on the world market, it would be worth only $5 million—or perhaps more, or less, according to whether the market on hulls was tight or not. But the ship could be replaced for $5 million.

Once the ship is delivered to the operator, he must take it. Of course, under no circumstances would he be given insurance over and above what he put into the ship himself. What the Government put in would not be involved. That would naturally be deducted.

If the Senator from Delaware will listen for a moment, I have a suggestion to make. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is in the Chamber, and so is the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

At the outset I said to the Senate that this was a matter involving the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Hearings were held at some length. Many witnesses were heard.

The chairman of the committee was holding hearings on the railroad strike at that time. The committee was quite busy.

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] of course is anxious to explain why he and the subcommittee favor the bill.

There have been some implications which I think should not be left in the record—that this is some sort of a bill that is going to give a shipowner something.

In the first place, the law would not take effect unless a war broke out.

Second, I hope it will never take effect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 5 minutes the Senator yielded have expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the third place, we are trying to allow a subsidized operator to have adequate war risk insurance. This is in our national interest. We will wish to replace the ships if something happens to them, as we did in World War II.

There has been an implication that there is something else involved in this program. I should like to have it fully discussed in the Senate, as it was in the committee. I could say many things today about the implications, because I would have to say them to protect against any such feeling that might be held.

The Senator from Alaska and other members of the subcommittee, who worked long and hard on this bill, think it is fair and right.

There has been some implication as to some taxpayer who asked that the bill be introduced. The merchant marine industry is a large industry. It is a multibillion dollar industry. Naturally, this industry, like all other industries, suggests legislation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the Senator about to suggest?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to have the RECORD clear as to why I am going to make the suggestion, if the Senator will bear with me for a minute.

Because of the implications, I should like to have this subject discussed a bit further. I thought perhaps we might be able to put the bill over until some appropriate day next week, so that the Senator from Alaska and other members of the subcommittee might have an opportunity to discuss it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not send the bill back to the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. To send it back to the committee would serve no purpose. The subcommittee would unanimously report it again. It is only a technical point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator said that he was very much engrossed with the railroad problem and other problems.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has always supported merchant shipping, I personally would hope the Senator would be willing to send the bill back to the committee and to discuss it further.

I have a high regard for the Senator from Alaska and what he has done for the merchant marine, and I have supported the Senator from Alaska in the past. I believe the other bill which is on the calendar ought to be passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. There is no problem on the other bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope that the chairman of the committee, who is always considerate of merchant marine affairs and very well informed on them, will allow himself an opportunity to discuss the bill in the full committee, and perhaps to report the bill again without prejudice. The bill could be returned to the committee at this time, since there is a very distinct difference of opinion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have the privilege of discussing this with the members of the subcommittee, and especially the Senator from Alaska, rather than sending the bill back to the committee. I believe they would resist that proposal. They have worked hard and long, and they believe that it is a good bill. I believe they would want an opportunity to present all the facts.

The majority leader has suggested to me privately that I ask unanimous consent to temporarily lay the bill aside, to postpone it indefinitely, so that in the future the Senator from Alaska can be present for its consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With the understanding that there will be adequate notice for the benefit of Senators interested in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have no objection to carrying out that desire. I hope it will never be brought up again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that, if the committee feels as we do about it, it will be brought up again, and there will be all the rollcalls on it that are necessary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if this proposal could be agreed to, I think the Senator from Alaska would have adequate notice of what he could anticipate, without question, when the pending business was again brought up. In view of the circumstances that have developed at this time, primarily because of the fact that the Senator from Alaska is absent on official business, I think it would be well if this measure could be returned to the calendar, and postponed indefinitely, with no date certain for bringing it up again, with the assurance that when and if it is brought up again adequate notice will be given to all concerned.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I must say there is no real rush for the bill, because it would be effective only if a war occurred. I must agree with the Senator from Delaware in the hope that the use of the bill will never occur, but I do not agree there is no need to have the bill passed.

The Senator from Alaska unexpectedly was asked by the chairman, the State Department, and others, to go to Tokyo on last Tuesday night in connection with the very important Japanese-North Pacific fish treaties. That conference was concluded as of today, which is Tuesday in Tokyo. The Senator from Alaska is on his way back. I want the RECORD to be clear as to why he is not here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I ask—and I put it in the form of a unanimous-consent request—that S. 927, Calendar No. 502, the pending business, be indefinitely postponed——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana mean to include that in his request——

Mr. MANSFIELD. And returned to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that that has the effect of killing the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How about a unanimous-consent request that it be returned to the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can be done. It would vitiate the unanimous-consent agreement that is now in effect. Perhaps the Senator wants to have the bill put on the calendar with the understanding that when it is taken up, the unanimous-consent agreement now in effect will apply.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. It will be taken up from scratch.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request that the bill be returned to the calendar? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJUSTMENT OF SUBSIDY REFUND BASE FOR DOMESTIC OPERATIONS OF CERTAIN OLDER SUBSIDIZED VESSELS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1172.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1172) to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 7, to strike out:

> SEC. 2. Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1156), is hereby further amended so as to add the following sentence after the first sentence thereof: "Such annual payments shall terminate at the end of the vessel's useful life for depreciation purposes as provided in section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Any contract between the owner and the United States which was entered into prior to the date of enactment of this Act and which would be affected if the provisions of the amendment made by this Act were applicable thereto, may, at the request of the owner be revised to be in accordance with the law as amended by this Act, with respect to such of the vessels covered thereby as may be designated by the applicant."

So as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 8(c) of Public Law 86-518 is amended by adding the following to the end thereof: "Provisions in such contracts affecting vessels covered by this Act providing for refund of construction-differential subsidy for domestic operations under section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and costs of national defense features for commercial use shall be amended so that for such refund payments made for the period after December 31, 1959, the base upon which such refund payments are computed annually thereafter shall be the undepreciated amount of subsidy or the national defense feature, as the case may be, as at December 31, 1959, divided by the years of life of the vessels as provided under this Act, remaining after December 31, 1959."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the next bill (S. 1172), is not now before the Senate, I will move its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is on the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is before the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is the same agreement on that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator want it to go back on the calendar, or does the Senator want to have S. 1172 considered now?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We want to have it considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is before the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The chairman of the committee will give a brief explanation of the bill. S. 1172 relates to section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, provides that when a vessel, operating under subsidy, temporarily operates in the domestic trade, the owner must pay back to the Government a percentage of the construction subsidy chargeable to that year, which now is one-twenty-fifth of the total subsidy.

It is based on a 25-year life for a ship.

Likewise, if such a vessel utilizes the higher rate of speed, or makes use of a heavy lift boom, built into the ship as a cost of national defense, the owner must pay back to the Government a percentage of the original cost of such installation.

The method of computation of such payment is rather complex, and this complexity was further compounded when Public Law 86–518 was enacted, effective January 1, 1960, to extend the lives of vessels delivered on or after January 1, 1946, from 20 to 25 years. Suffice it to say that some ship operators have been required, during the period from January 1, 1960, to the present time, to pay back to the Government for domestic operation, or for use of national defense features, a greater percentage of their construction subsidy or national defense costs than is equitable considering the additional 5 years during which such repayment will be required.

The subcommittee has obtained from the Maritime Administrator a statement as to what adjustments would be required if S. 1172 is enacted, and the resultant credits to the shipowners. The Administrator had testified at the hearing on the bill—as shown in pages 2 and 3 of the committee report—that, in his opinion, the bill provides the correct way of computing the construction subsidy recapture, and the recapture of national defense costs, for the period after December 31, 1959, with respect to vessels whose lines were extended under Public Law 86–518.

Let me say further that the report language on page 3 as to the elimination of section 2 of the bill has reference to the fact that the committee understands that the formula prescribed in section 1 of the bill would by its application complete the statutory life cycle of the vessel and there would be no more refunds of construction subsidy for domestic operation after that cycle is completed.

Reference was made in the committee report to costs of the bill. This, too, needs some explanation. Actually the amounts at issue represent credits to the operators for overpayments they had made to the Government since January 1, 1960, for operation in domestic trade, and/or for use of the higher speed or heavier booms which had been built into the operators' vessels at Government insistence, and cost, as insurance against possible wartime needs.

Each payment made by the operators for use of these emergency features is a gain, not a cost, to the Government, which thereby recoups some part of the moneys paid for installation of these facilities in the operators' vessels.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Department of Commerce, dated September 18, 1963, with an enclosure.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., September 18, 1963.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: This is in response to your oral request for an estimate of the amount that will be refunded to vessel operators if S. 1172, as reported by your committee, is enacted, and for the names of the companies involved.

Public Law 86–518, effective January 1, 1960, extended the lives of vessels (except liquid bulk carriers) that were delivered by the shipbuilder on or after January 1, 1946, from 20 years to 25 years. The amendment Public Law 86–518 made to section 506 of the act (which section provided for annual repayment to the Government for use of construction subsidy vessels in domestic trade on the basis of one-twentieth of the construction subsidy) was to strike out "one-twentieth" and insert "one twenty-fifth" in lieu thereof. As we explained in our testimony on S. 1172, this exposed the operators to repayment on the basis of more than the whole amount of construction-differential subsidy paid by the Government. The contracts of all operators were amended to provide for repayment for use of construction subsidy vessels in domestic trade as provided by Public Law 86–518. S. 1172, as reported, would amend Public Law 86–518 so as to provide for such repayment on the basis of only the whole amount of construction subsidy paid for construction of the vessels, and this would require recomputation of amounts due for the period after January 1, 1960. The amounts by which S. 1172 would reduce obligations to pay under section 506 for the period January 1, 1960, to the present time would not be recouped by the Government in later years because the reduction would be caused by elimination of the excess basis of computation.

We have information as to the amount of obligations operators of construction subsidy ships incurred during 1960 and 1961 for operation of their vessels in domestic trade, and all of these amounts have been collected. Attached is an exhibit which gives this information by company and which shows the reduction in these amounts that S. 1172 would cause. We do not have such figures as yet for the years 1962 and 1963 and no collections have as yet been made for these years. Assuming, however, that construction subsidy vessels operated in domestic trade to the same extent in 1962 and 1963 as they did in 1960 and 1961, and that all other factors remained the same, enactment of S. 1172 would not cause any refunds to be made because the amount that has thus far been collected ($589,331.54) is less than the amount that would be due for this period if S. 1172 is enacted ($829,000). Enactment of S. 1172, however, would reduce the amount that would ultimately be collected for this period by about $75,000 per year, and this amount would not be recouped in later years because the reduction would be caused by eliminating the excess basis of computation.

The provisions of contracts which provide for repayment annually to the Government of part of the cost of national defense features, if such features are used commercially by the operator, could also, after enactment of Public Law 86–518, at the operator's option, be amended so as to place such repayment on a 25-year basis instead of a 20-year basis. Two operators are involved, Pacific Far East Lines, Inc., and American President Lines, Ltd.

Pacific Far East Lines, Inc., elected to have its contract amended with respect to repayment for use of national defense features after enactment of Public Law 86–518, but American President Lines, Ltd., elected not to do so.

The amendment that was made to Pacific Far East Lines' contract to place it on a 25-year basis with respect to annual repayments for use of national defense features was similar to the amendments made with respect to section 506, and it therefore provided more than the cost of the national defense features as a basis for computation of the annual repayments. S. 1172 would amend Public Law 86–518 so as to provide for such repayment on the basis of only the whole amount of the cost of the national defense features.

On the basis of the existing provisions of their contract, Pacific Far East Lines incurred estimated obligations for repayment for use of national defense features from January 1, 1960, to September 30, 1963, in the amount of $142,860.16. Of this amount, $99,858.29 has been collected. If S. 1172 is enacted, the estimated obligations of the company for use of national defense features for the foregoing period would be reduced to $135,018.39. Since the amount that has been collected ($99,858.29), is less than $135,018.39, no refund would be owing to the company if S. 1172 is enacted, but the Government would ultimately collect $7,814.77 less for this period than it would collect under the existing provisions of the contract. The Government would not recoup this $7,841.77 in later years, because this reduction would be caused by elimination of the excess basis of computation.

American President Lines, Ltd., did not exercise its option to have the basis of computation for repayment for use of national defense features on its ships changed from 20 to 25 years. Its obligations for this purpose for the period from January 1, 1960, to the present time, under its contract, are computed on the basis of a 20-year life. Our understanding, however, is that S. 1172 is intended to give them the option of having their contract amended to provide for computation of such repayments for the period after January 1, 1960, on the basis of 25 years, taking into consideration only the whole cost of the national defense features.

On the basis of the existing provisions of their contract, American President Lines incurred estimated obligations for use of national defense features for the period from January 1, 1960, to September 30, 1963, in the amount of $243,432.15. Of this amount, $114,975.45 has been collected. If S. 1172 is enacted and American President Lines elects to have their contract amended to place it on a 25-year basis, their estimated obligations for this period would be $182,574.00. Since this amount ($182,574.00) is more than they have paid ($114,975.45), no refund would be due American President Lines for this period if S. 1172 is enacted, but the Government would ultimately collect for this period (January 1, 1960, to September 30, 1963) $60,858.15 less than it would collect under the existing provisions of the contract. However, if the national defense features are continued to be used to the same extent as they have been during the 1960–63 period, the $60,858.15 would be recouped over the vessel's remaining years of a useful life of 25 years. Accordingly, it may not be concluded that the $60,858.15 would represent a loss to the Government as a result of the enactment of S. 1172.

We estimate that if S. 1172 is enacted, the Government would ultimately collect about $94,000 per year less for the period from January 1, 1960, to September 30, 1963, than would be collected under provisions of existing law. This estimate includes amounts with regard to American President Lines that would be recouped in future years.

We hope this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. Gulick,
Acting Maritime Administrator.

Amounts due and collected under existing law for the years 1960 and 1961 for the use of construction subsidy ships in domestic trade, and amounts by which the foregoing would be reduced if S. 1172 is enacted

1960

Company	Amounts due and collected	Reduction that would be caused by S. 1172
States Steamship Co.	$54,825.52	$13,980.51
Oceanic Steamship Co.	38,513.51	9,820.95
Pacific Far East Lines	14,665.81	3,739.78
United States Lines	137,696.83	35,112.68
American President Lines	53,561.49	13,658.18
Total	299,263.16	76,312.10

1961

Company	Amounts due and collected	Reduction that would be caused by S. 1172
States Steamship Co.	$86,273.48	$21,999.74
Oceanic Steamship Co.	38,543.89	9,828.69
United States Lines	136,371.46	34,774.72
American President Lines	28,879.55	7,364.29
Total	290,068.38	73,967.44

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

HARRY McPHERSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last week Harry McPherson left his position as general counsel of the Democratic policy committee to become Deputy Under Secretary of the Army for International Affairs. Harry, as he was known to most of us, had been an employee of the Senate for almost 8 years and had been counsel of the committee since 1961. The Army's gain is our distinct loss. Harry's cheerful and helpful manner made him many friends. His knowledge of the Senate rules, Senate procedure, and Senate tradition were of invaluable help to all who asked him for it. His comprehension of complex legislation was of inestimable assistance to the Democratic policy committee members, and to others who sought his counsel. His loyalty, his integrity, his devotion to the traditions of the Democratic Party, and for that matter to the traditions of the Senate as a whole, were, however, his greatest qualities. I know that I am joined by many of my colleagues in wishing this capable and likeable young man well.

I personally will miss him very much, because his work for the Senate has been outstanding.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as a member of the minority I would like to join the distinguished majority leader. Harry McPherson has always been cooperative and helpful to those of us on our side of the aisle. Time and again he has shown his interest in the country rather than strictly in one political party. Although a loyal Democrat, he is a person whom we all respect. Republicans as well as Democrats have enjoyed our association with him and I wish him the very best in his new assignment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the Senator's remarks, because I look upon the loss of Harry McPherson's services as a personal loss.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I, too, would like to express my regret on Harry McPherson's leaving the Senate staff for other fields. I first became associated with him when I became a member of the Calendar Committee on coming to the Senate.

He has outstanding legal ability, and he has always been helpful in working with me and in solving many of the problems that confronted the calendar committee. He has been equally helpful in other respects. His outstanding ability portends well for his future.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I, too, associate myself, with what the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Nevada have said in commenting on the services of Harry McPherson in the Senate. We shall miss him. He possesses a keen mind and a balance of judgment which are so vital in the legislative process.

The work that Harry McPherson performed was the work of a truly gifted and talented young man, dedicated to the public service. The Army has gained a wonderful public servant, a man who will be an outstanding administrator. I am particularly pleased that he is moving into the area of international relations with the Army, because of his broad knowledge of the world in which we live and his sense of good judgment and understanding of the critical problems affecting all of us.

I join my colleagues in wishing him well and expressing regret at his departure.

ADJUSTMENT OF SUBSIDY REFUND BASE FOR DOMESTIC OPERATION OF CERTAIN OLDER SUBSIDIZED VESSELS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1172) to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, all remaining time is yielded back. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H.R. 4955.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, despite the fact that the hour of 1 o'clock has not arrived, am I to understand that H.R. 4955 is now the pending business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There has been no morning hour today, and the bill normally comes before the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of October 3, 1963,

Mr. MUSKIE, from the Committee on Public Works, reported favorably, with amendments, on October 4, 1963, the bill (S. 649) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 556) thereon, together with the individual views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], which was printed.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the

House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 772. An act to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.;

H.R. 1191. An act for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker;

H.R. 1192. An act for the relief of William C. Doyle;

H.R. 1281. An act for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin;

H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Kathryn Marshall;

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown;

H.R. 1696. An act defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies;

H.R. 1709. An act to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island;

H.R. 1726. An act for the relief of William H. Woodhouse;

H.R. 2256. An act for the relief of José Domenech;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1929, as amended;

H.R. 2751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White;

H.R. 2770. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf;

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 3219. An act to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett;

H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason;

H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.;

H.R. 3843. An act for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr;

H.R. 4842. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings and for other purposes;

H.R. 4965. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States;

H.R. 5307. An act for the relief of Edward T. Hughes;

H.R. 5811. An act for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son;

H.R. 5812. An act for the relief of Quality Seafood Inc.;

H.R. 6246. An act relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay;

H.R. 6373. An act for the relief of Robert L. Nolan; and

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction, Air Force Reserve, for fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program—equipment and facilities, for the quarter ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS—PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Federal contributions—personnel and administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CHANGE OF REQUIREMENTS FOR ANNUAL MEETING DATE FOR NATIONAL BANKS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PRACTICE OF MAKING AVAILABLE FOR EXPENDITURE CERTAIN FUNDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the practice of making available for expenditure in the current fiscal year uncommitted grants of funds arising from prior fiscal year appropriations, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, dated September 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON INADEQUATE CONTROLS FOR DETERMINING COMPLIANCE BY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS WITH RESTRICTIONS PLACED ON DISPOSITION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate controls for determining compliance by foreign governments with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture, June 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON OVERSTATEMENT OF NEEDS AND ILLEGAL USE OF COMMERCIAL-TYPE VEHICLES BY THE KANTO BASE COMMAND, JAPAN, 6100TH SUPPORT WING, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the overstatement of needs and illegal use of commercial-type vehicles by the Kanto Base Command, Japan, 6100th Support Wing, Department of the Air Force, dated September 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN NAVAL RESERVE OFFICERS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on payments to Naval Reserve officers on annual active duty training for unnecessary days of travel and for days in which no training or travel is performed, Department of the Navy, dated September 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TERENCE J. O'DONNELL, THOMAS P. WILCOX, AND CLIFFORD M. SPRINGBERG

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford Mr. Springberg (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOHN T. COX

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John T. Cox (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL AND MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 557)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions, and I submit a report thereon, together with the individual views of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the minority views of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual and minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON "ORGANIZED CRIME AND ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations not to exceed 4,000 additional copies of all parts of the hearings held by its Permanent Investigating Subcommittee during the current session on Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Acting Archivist of the United States, dated September 26, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

As in executive session,

The following favorable executive reports of the Committee on Foreign Relations were submitted:

Executive D, 88th Congress, 1st session. A Protocol dated at Rome September 15, 1962, to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation, done at Chicago on December 7, 1944 (Exec. Rept. No. 4);

Executive E, 87th Congress, 2d session. A Convention on Extradition between the United States of America and Sweden, together with a related protocol, signed at Washington on October 24, 1961 (Exec. Rept. No. 5);

Executive F, 87th Congress, 2d session. An Additional Protocol to the Treaty of Extradition of January 13, 1961, between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, which Additional Protocol was signed at Rio De Janeiro on June 18, 1962 (Exec. Rept. No. 5); and

Executive E, 88th Congress, 1st session. A Convention on Extradition between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel, signed at Washington, December 10, 1962 (Exec. Rept. No. 5).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN) (by request):

S. 2210. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands within the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2211. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; and

S. 2212. A bill to amend the U.S. Warehouse Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 2213. A bill to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency; and

S. 2214. A bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2215. A bill for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2216. A bill for the relief of See Fong Szeto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2217. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of grain when U.S. carriers are not reasonably available; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALTERS:

S. 2218. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., for purposes of the Foothills Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2219. A bill for the relief of Helen Marghitsa Georgalas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON "ORGANIZED CRIME AND ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS"

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics" of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PROVIDE CERTAIN BASIC AUTHORITY FOR THE U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Director of the U.S. Information Agency and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill along with a letter from the Director of the U.S. Information Agency, dated September 17, 1963, and also an explanation of the draft legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2213) to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Director of the United States Information Agency (hereinafter referred to as the "Director" and the "Agency", respectively) may—

(a) employ, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, aliens abroad for services in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General). Such persons may be admitted to the United States, if otherwise qualified, as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)) for such time and under such conditions and procedures as may be established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General;

(b) pay travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States and their dependents to and from the United States;

(c) incur expenses for entertainment within the United States within such amounts as may be provided for in appropriation Acts;

(d) obtain insurance on official motor vehicles operated by the Agency in foreign countries, and pay the expenses incident thereto;

(e) pay claims to any persons, in amounts not to exceed $15,000 each in the manner authorized in section 2734, as amended, of title 10, of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries, as though the Director were the Secretary of a military department and as though officers and emloyees of the Agency were commissioned officers and members of the Armed Forces;

(f) advance funds within the meaning of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

(g) employ aliens by contract for services abroad;

(h) provide ice and drinking water abroad;

(i) pay excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad;

(j) pay the actual expense of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in Agency activities;

(k) rent or lease, for periods of less than ten years, offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for persons engaged in Agency activities abroad;

(l) maintain, improve, and repair properties used for information activities in foreign countries;

(m) furnish fuel, water and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad;

(n) pay travel expenses of employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835–842), but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State.

SEC. 2. Appropriated funds made available to the Agency for any fiscal year for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel shall be available for all such expenses in connection with travel or transportation which begins in that fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed until the following fiscal year.

SEC. 3. In any contracts for the use of international radio stations and facilities, the Director may, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), include agreement on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be thereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities.

SEC. 4. The Director may appoint or assign Foreign Service Reserve Officers for service with the Agency for such periods as he may determine, without regard to the provisions of section 522 of the Act of August 13, 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 922).

SEC. 5. Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purposes of this Act and such appropriations may be made without fiscal year limitation.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY,
September 17, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Vice President of the United States.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit to the Senate for its consideration a draft of a proposed bill "to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency," and an explanation thereof. The draft bill has also been submitted to the House of Representatives.

The proposed draft legislation is, in effect, a "point of order bill" to provide basic authority to support items traditionally included in annual Agency appropriations. In general, the proposals are identical with the language regularly included in such appropriation acts and do not enlarge the authority of the Agency.

Certain provisions of the proposed legislation, however, do result in changes in the Agency's statutory authority. These provisions are:

1. Section 1(e) authorizing payment of meritorious claims against the Agency arising abroad not in excess of $15,000.

2. Section 1(k) authorizes the Agency to lease property abroad for periods of less than 10 years and permits lease of living quarters for persons engaged in Agency activities abroad who are not employees of the Agency.

3. Section 5 authorizing the Director to appoint Foreign Service Reserve officers for indefinite periods without regard to statutory limitations on tenure contained in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

Enactment of the above proposals would conform the Agency's basic authority to its annual appropriation language and would provide additional authority to meet administrative requirements.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,
EDWARD R. MURROW,
Director.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

BACKGROUND

Annual appropriations acts of the Agency have, each year since 1953, included items which were not authorized in substantive legislation and which were, in effect, general legislation for the ensuing fiscal year. Both the Standing Rules of the Senate and the Rules of the House of Representatives make such substantive legislation in an appropriation act subject to a point of order (Rule XVI-2 of the Standing Rules of the Senate and Rule XXI-2 of the Rules of the House of Representatives).

Therefore, the proposed legislation is, for the most part, a codification in basic legislation of authority to support items traditionally included in annual Agency appropriations. In general, the proposals are identical with the language regularly included in such appropriation acts and do not enlarge the authority of the Agency.

Certain provisions of the proposed legislation, however, do result in changes in the Agency's statutory authority. These provisions, discussed more fully below, are:

1. Section 1(e) authorizes payment of meritorious claims against the Agency arising abroad not in excess of $15,000;

2. Section 1(k) authorizes Agency leases abroad for periods not in excess of 10 years and the leasing of living quarters for persons engaged in Agency activities abroad who are not employees of the Agency;

3. Section 4 authorizes the Director to appoint Foreign Service Reserve officers for indefinite periods without regard to statutory limitations on tenure contained in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

In addition to the above legislative changes, the Agency anticipates that future appropriation acts will not include the following language which heretofore has appeared in such acts:

"Radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script writing, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries."

This language recites in specific terms certain broad authorities which are included in the more comprehensive provisions of the Agency's basic statutes such as the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and other provisions of law available to it. We believe that the deletion of the above-quoted language will in no way result in a diminution of Agency legal authority and that all activities heretofore carried on under the quoted provision can be carried on under the more general provisions of the Agency's basic statutes.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1(a): This subsection, described below, is similar to that included in Agency appropriation acts since the establishment of the Agency in 1953 and does not constitute any enlargement of existing Agency authority.

The language authorizes the Agency to employ aliens abroad for service as a narrator or translator. For example, it may not be possible to find in the United States announcers who have the proper accent or who are familiar with the up-to-date idiom of certain exotic languages or dialects. In such instances the Agency can recruit and employ qualified narrators and translators directly from abroad.

No new authority.

Section 1(b): This subsection is complementary to subsection 1(a) and simply authorizes the Agency to pay travel expenses of alien narrators and translators and their dependents employed abroad to and from the United States and their country of residence.

No new authority.

Section 1(c): Agency appropriation acts have regularly included authority similar to that proposed in subsection 1(c) for entertainment within the United States. Under the proposed language, expenditures for entertainment are authorized only when provided in an appropriation act.

No new authority.

Section 1(d): This subsection authorizes the Agency to secure liability insurance on official vehicles operated abroad. It is common practice for Embassy vehicles, both State Department and USIA, to carry liability insurance. In many foreign countries such insurance coverage is mandatory under local law.

No new authority.

Section 1(e): This subsection differs from tort claims settlement authority regularly included in Agency appropriation acts in that the proposed language authorizes settlement of meritorious claims.

It is an integral part of the Agency's function to promote and maintain friendly relations with peoples abroad. It is essential in such regard to be able to make prompt settlement of meritorious oversea claims, when the damage, injury, etc., is caused by activities of the Agency. Our past authority—in appropriation acts—has been limited to "payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries"; the cited section contains the administrative settlement authority of the domestic Tort Claims Act. Because of the inappropriate nature of the cited law, and because its application imposes on the Agency the unrealistic and virtually impossible requirement of claims settlement "in accordance with the laws of the place where the act or omission occurred," the proposed language would relate the Agency's foreign claims authority to the Military Foreign Claims Act (10 U.S.C. 2734) which was specifically drafted for use by the armed services in connection with noncombatant operations in foreign countries—its language begins, "To promote and maintain friendly relations through the prompt settlement of meritorious claims * * *." Also, the proposed authority would authorize the settlement of claims up to $15,000 as in the Military Claims Act.

Section 1(f): This subsection, which is similar to authority regularly contained in Agency appropriation acts, permits advance of funds to grantees, contractors and others engaged in activities which further the basic purposes of the Agency program.

No new authority.

Section 1(g): This subsection, which is similar to authority regularly contained in Agency appropriation acts, permits the Agency to contract with aliens abroad. The nature of the Agency's program involving such varied activities as exhibits, lectures, periodical distribution, etc., requires the use of local contractual services.

No new authority.

Section 1(h): The Comptroller General has ruled (3 Comp. Gen. 828), that in the absence of specific statutory authority, appropriated funds cannot be used to purchase ice or drinking water. Agency appropriation acts have regularly contained such authority.

No new authority.

Section 1(i): The Comptroller General has held (19 Comp. Gen. 625), that in the absence of specific statutory authority therefor, appropriated funds are not available for payment of excise taxes on checks drawn on U.S. Government deposits in foreign banks. Agency appropriation acts have regularly included such authority.

No new authority.

Section 1(j): Statutory authority exists for the transportation of remains of employees from abroad to the United States. The remains of persons serving abroad under grant or contract in Agency activities are not covered by existing statutory authority.

The proposed subsection is similar to authority regularly included in Agency appropriation acts to permit the transportation to the United States of remains of persons engaged in Agency activities abroad who are not U.S. Government employees.

No new authority.

Sections (k), (l), and (m): These subsections are similar to authority regularly included in Agency appropriation acts for rental and maintenance of office and residential quarters. At present, however, the language of the Appropriation Act authorizes leases for a maximum of 5 years and does not specifically authorize leases of living quarters for persons engaged in Agency programs abroad who are not Government employees.

The proposed subsection (k) would enlarge Agency leasing authority for a maximum period of 10 years and would authorize the rental and maintenance of living quarters not only for Government employees as presently, but also for grantees and Agency contractor personnel engaged in Agency activities abroad.

It is believed that 10-year leases may result in lower rents for the longer period. Oftentimes landlords are interested in a fixed return over the longest period of time. Also, authority for 10-year leases places the Agency in the same position as the Department of State and AID who have such authority enabling the three agencies to standardize their leasing practices thus reducing the possibility of costly competition between them.

Subsection (k) would also authorize the Agency to provide housing for grantees and Agency contractor personnel engaged in Agency activities abroad. In Africa, for example, housing is available only on payment of several years' rent in advance, and in many cases only on extensive renovation of quarters. Employees of Agency contractors engaged in the English teaching program in Central Africa have been unable to secure, or could not afford to rent, living quarters directly. The proposed legislation would authorize the Agency to lease and maintain quarters on behalf of such persons engaged in Agency activities when circumstances require. In such cases no quarters allowance will be paid to individuals who are provided with Government quarters.

No new authority in section (l) and (m).

Section (n): This subsection is similar to authority included in recurring Agency appropriation acts. Under this authority, Agency personnel attending international conferences abroad can be paid travel expenses and per diem at the rates established by the Secretary of State for the particular conference without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

No new authority.

Section 2: This section, which is repetitive of technical language in recurring Agency appropriation acts, permits the Agency to charge the appropriation for the fiscal year in which travel begins for all expenses of such travel even though not concluded until sometime in the succeeding fiscal year.

No new authority.

Section 3: This section is similar to language included each year in Agency appropriation acts. It permits the Agency to agree, in contracts for the use of international radio stations and facilities, to indemnify owners and operators of such radio stations and facilities against claims arising out of broadcasting operations. The words "short wave" are deleted from the proposed legislation since Agency broadcasts are not limited to short wave.

No new authority.

Section 4: This section departs from authority regularly included in Agency appropriation acts for appointments to the Foreign Service Reserve.

At present, the Agency is authorized to appoint persons to the Foreign Service Reserve and the Foreign Service Staff Corps—it is not authorized to make appointments to the Foreign Service Officer Corps which is the career officer category of the Foreign Service system. Pursuant to section 522 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 922) Foreign Service Reserve appointments are limited to two 5-year periods or a maximum tenure of 10 years. Accordingly, Agency appropriation acts have regularly included language authorizing the extension for an additional year of appointments which expire in the course of the fiscal year.

Under the proposed section, the Director of the Agency is authorized to appoint or reappoint Foreign Service Reserve officers without regard to the 10-year statutory limitation on tenure. This will relieve the Agency of the administrative burden of periodic reappointment actions.

Section 5: This section is a technical provision which authorizes Agency appropriations to be available until expended when the language of an appropriation specifically so provides.

ESTIMATE OF INCREASED ANNUAL COST

The increased annual cost of the proposed legislation is estimated at $5,000 resulting from anticipated payments of meritorious claims under section 1(e). No increased costs are expected to result from the enactment of any other sections of the proposed bill.

TO AMEND THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE UNITED STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN AN INCREASE IN THE RESOURCES OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, along with a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated September 13, 1963, be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2214) to amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the International Development Association Act (22 U.S.C. 284e) is amended by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d) and by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The U.S. Governor is hereby authorized (1) to vote for an increase in the resources of the Association and (2) to agree on behalf of the United States to contribute to the Association the sum of $312 million, both as recommended by the Executive Directors, in a report dated September 9, 1963, to the Board of Governors of the Association. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, $312 million to provide the United States share of the increase in the resources of the Association."

Sec. 2. Redesignated subsection (c) of section 7 of the International Development Association Act is amended by striking from the first sentence the words ", after paying the requisite part of the subscription of the United States in the Association required to be made under the articles," and by striking from the third sentence the words "of the subscription of the United States".

The letter presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, September 13, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the International Development Association Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the International Development Association." The proposed legislation would (a) authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Development Association (IDA) to vote for a $750-million increase in the resources of IDA, (b) authorize the U.S. Governor on behalf of the United States to agree to pay to the association the United States' share of the increased resources and (c) authorize the appropriation of $312 million as the United States' share of the increased resources. The draft legislation would also delete certain language from the present IDA act in order to make it clear that non-interest bearing notes may be substituted for the amounts payable as part of our proposed participation in the increased resources until those amounts are called by the Association. The vote of the Board of Governors is to be completed by December 31, 1963, so that legislative authority for the U.S. Governor to vote would be required prior to that date unless extended by the Executive Directors of IDA.

Action by Congress is required now to assure the orderly replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association, an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. At the annual meeting of the Association in September last year, its Board of Governors adopted a resolution requesting the Executive Directors to consider this problem. The Executive Directors have now submitted their report to the Board of Governors. Unless IDA can be assured of new resources in the near future it will have to cease making commitments. It is vital that the countries in a position to contribute to IDA act to sustain the momentum of this valuable institution. It is essential to the interest of the United States and the free world generally that we play our proper role in this action.

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems has prepared a special report on this matter, and recommends U.S. participation in the proposed increase in resources. A copy of the Council's report is also enclosed. The report of the Council gives emphasis to three important aspects of the IDA proposal. First, IDA performs a uniquely valuable function by drawing a larger proportion of its funds for development from the other advanced countries than from the United States. It thus helps to assure that these other economically advanced nations of the free world share with the United States the financial burden of development. Second, IDA provides funds on terms which create very little burden on the balance of payments of a developing country. Many developing nations can no longer prudently borrow on conventional terms all the external funds they require to supplement their domestic resources. IDA staff studies indicate that the external debt of the developing nations more than doubled during the period 1955-61. Financing on favorable terms is, therefore, essential if development is to proceed on a sound basis. Third, the present proposal is designed to permit IDA to continue to make commitments at a satisfactory rate in the immediate future. Although agreement to the present proposal is thus required now, no need for cash payments to IDA will exist until late 1965, after the present subscription payments have been completed, hence no appropriation of U.S. funds will be required until fiscal year 1966.

The International Development Association is now a tested institution. In its 3 years of operation it has established itself as an indispensable part of the multilateral institutional framework providing financing for the development of the less developed nations of the free world. In this relatively short span of time it has proven its worth and has gained the confidence of both the contributing and receiving countries.

The proposal put forth in the report of the Executive Directors for the replenishment of IDA's resources provides for an additional $750 million in IDA resources over a 3-year period, with actual payments commencing in late 1965. By being assured now that these funds would be available then, IDA can continue the pace of its soundly conceived lending activities. The need is for freely usable convertible currencies and this is the form in which the $750 million is to be provided by the part I members—those economically more advanced—as a group. This amount is about equal to the freely usable resources subscribed to IDA at its inception—but because IDA is now a going organization, it would be paid in over 3 rather than 5 years. This would mean new annual contributions aggregating $250 million a year from the part I members as a group, an increase of about two-thirds over the present annual rate.

Of the total increased resources proposed by the Executive Directors, the United States share would be $104 million per annum for 3 years, with actual payments commencing in fiscal year 1966. Thus, the United States would be subscribing 41.6 percent of the additional resources, and other countries the balance of 58.4 percent. The U.S. share represents some reduction from its 43 percent share in the initial resources provided by the part I membership countries. The Executive Directors' proposal calls for substantial increases over the original share of participation by Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Sweden, and Japan, while there would be substantial decreases in the shares of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and South Africa. The voting rights of the United States as well as the other members of IDA will remain the same as they are now (although there will be a slight increase in the total number of votes).

Belgium and Luxembourg are expected to join IDA as new part I members concurrently with the increase in resources. Accordingly, one-half of their participation in the increased resources will be considered as their initial membership subscriptions and will carry the usual voting rights, while the other half of their participation will be attributed to the additional resources, and therefore will not carry voting rights. The other rights and obligations of the part I members and of IDA would be the same as those governing the initial subscriptions under the Articles of Agreement. Each participating member's obligation to contribute would be contingent upon at least 12 members whose shares aggregate not less than $600 million having advised the Association of their agreement to make the contribution, and, of course, upon the favorable action of the Governors by December 31, 1963, to authorize the Association to accept the new resources.

The Clay Committee, in its report to the President earlier this year stated that, "to the extent that the United States and its partners can agree to increase the use of IDA as a common channel for aid funds, we will have achieved many of our common objectives—a fairer sharing of the burden and the effective and coordinated use of the assistance provided on terms both appropriate to the needs of the recipient countries and impartial as among the commercial interests of the contributing nations."

The Congress has demonstrated its conviction of the importance of IDA as an institution for channeling resources into economic development, not only by its adoption of Senate Resolution 264 of July 23, 1958, which requested a study of the prospects for the establishment of this institution, but on several significant occasions since then.

I feel strongly that this multilateral institution deserves our wholehearted support. In order to continue its vital activities, IDA must be assured before the end of this year that the increased resources will be firmly committed by the participants. I, therefore, respectfully urge the favorable consideration of the draft legislation at the earliest possible time.

A comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill is attached.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that the enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 213)

Mr. GRUENING submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1276) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he submitted the above amendment, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXPANSION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 214)

Mr. BAYH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONVENTION WITH UNITED MEXICAN STATES FOR THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF THE CHAMIZAL—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States has transmitted to the Senate today Executive N, 88th Congress, 1st session, a Convention Between the United States and the United Mexican States for the Solution of the Problem of the Chamizal, signed at Mexico City on August 29, 1963. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the convention, that the convention and message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Convention between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the Solution of the Problem of the Chamizal, signed at Mexico City on August 29, 1963. This Convention represents what I believe to be as fair a settlement as can be negotiated of this boundary dispute which goes back almost a hundred years, and which for more than 50 years has seriously disturbed relations with our neighbor to the south.

The provisions of the Convention are explained in the report of the Secretary of State transmitted herewith. Under the Convention the two Governments would relocate the Rio Grande in the vicinity of El Paso. The center line of the relocated river channel would be the international boundary. This results in the transfer from the north to the south of the river of a tract of 823.5 acres. Taking into account that Mexico now has under its jurisdiction 386.32 acres north of the river, the net area transferred to Mexico would be 437.18 acres. The present Mexican territory north of the river, known as Cordova Island, is an enclave jutting into El Paso contiguous to and downstream from the disputed Chamizal zone, and the enclave would be eliminated by the relocation of the river. The net 437.18 acres transferred to Mexico is the amount of the Chamizal zone now concluded to have been awarded to Mexico by the 1911 international arbitration commission. In order to disturb as little as possible the community of El Paso which has, of course, gradually expanded into the disputed zone, only 366 acres of the net amount being transferred to Mexico would be taken out of the Chamizal zone. The remaining 71.18 acres of the net amount transferred would come from an area contiguous to and downstream from Cordova Island. In the relocation of the river the United States would receive from Mexico 193.16 acres of Cordova Island, for which the United States would transfer to Mexico an equal area also from the lands just below Cordova Island. Looking downstream then, the 823.5 acres would consist of 366 acres of the Chamizal zone, 193.16 acres in the southerly part of Cordova Island already belonging to Mexico, and 264.34 acres to the east of the island. The lands to be transferred from U.S. jurisdiction would pass free of private title or encumbrances of any kind. The river boundary would thus be restored in the vicinity of El Paso, and the 1911 award would thus be given effect in today's circumstances.

The settlement is fair to the United States. The United States would in effect implement the award as it obligated itself to do in the 1910 arbitral convention. At the same time this Government at the time of signing the present convention reserved its juridical position with respect to the 1911 award. The settlement is also fair to the United States in that the net area transferred does not all come from the Chamizal zone. The new boundary would be drawn to exclude as much highly developed land as practical and to inconvenience as few people as possible. One-third of the lands transferred to Mexican jurisdiction are still agricultural or stockyards. Actually, the net number of acres involved is small in comparison with the thousands of acres already transferred between the two countries as a consequence of river movements.

The new line also seems to be fair to the Government of Mexico. While it does not receive all the awarded area from the Chamizal zone, it receives all the area in one cut from the city of El Paso. It does not receive all the acreage that has at times been claimed, but it does receive the amount awarded to Mexico, so far as engineers of both countries could reasonably determine based on the best data available.

In addition to removing a very real cause of irritation in relations between the two countries, the settlement offers advantages to El Paso, to Texas, and to our whole country.

The people of El Paso will now know where the boundary is going to be, and titles to the lands in the Chamizal zone remaining in the United States will be clarified.

The channelized river itself will present an aspect of orderliness and beauty that should enhance the nearby area.

The development of El Paso, especially so far as traffic circulation and the location of public utilities are concerned, will be improved with the incorporation into El Paso of a part of Mexico's Cordova Island.

Settlement of the dispute will at last permit execution of international flood control measures indispensable for the proper protection of this rapidly growing city.

The international bridges at El Paso are to be replaced with structures in fuller harmony with the needs of the over 600,000 people who live in the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez area.

Of the four States of the United States bordering Mexico, the State of Texas has the longest portion of boundary and the most extensive system of commercial, cultural, and other relations with Mexico. Amiable relations with Mexico and economic and political stability and growth in Mexico are of paramount importance to Texas. Texas will be a principal beneficiary of the improved attitude in Mexico resulting from a satisfactory settlement.

For the country as a whole, the Chamizal dispute as an emotional issue in Mexico, which distorts what otherwise might be a favorable view of the United States, would be resolved.

All this must not obscure the advantage of an example to the entire world of a large country settling a significant territorial dispute with a smaller country in a spirit of the sincerest good will.

I would not wish to appear to underestimate the cost of this settlement. More than 3,000 people in El Paso will have to be moved from their homes and businesses with attendant economic and social problems. In the end it may cost more than $20 million, depending on the decisions the Congress makes on several major domestic aspects of the proposal. In the several attempts at settlement in recent years, each successive proposal would have involved more people and have cost more money than the previous proposal. Any further attempts must be expected to follow this pattern. This is the first time the Government of Mexico has agreed to terms that this Government could accept. I believe we should incur this cost, because the charge against us for not having abided by the award is grave, and the settlement proposed is fair both to our neighbor and to ourselves.

I strongly recommended that the Senate of the United States advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention as promptly as practicable and in the course of this year if at all possible.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 7, 1963.*

AUTHORITY FOR PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR TO STAFF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE DURING CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the course of Senate consideration of (H.R. 4955) an act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, that all professional staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, both majority and minority, be permitted on the floor for the purpose of aiding Senators participating in the debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERSECUTION BY SOVIET UNION OF PERSONS BECAUSE OF THEIR RELIGION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 25, 1963, the names of Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCGEE, and Mr. MILLER were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 204) condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion, submitted by Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself and other Senators) on September 25, 1963.

REMOVAL OF LIMITATIONS ON DEDUCTIONS FOR EXPLORATION EXPENDITURES BY MINING INDUSTRY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 1, 1963, the name of Mr. MCGOVERN was added as an additional cosponsor of amendment No. 204, intended to be proposed to the bill (H.R. 8363) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes, to make certain structural changes with respect to the income tax, and for other purposes; submitted by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators) on October 1, 1963.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS BY SENATE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE ARTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, with great pleasure I wish to announce to the Senate that from Monday, October 28, through Thursday, October 31, hearings will be held by the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts, which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has just reconstituted under my chairmanship.

The subcommittee will consider S. 1316, sponsored by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and S. 165, sponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

At this time I would like to pay special tribute to both Senators; for I believe that this legislation is the most significant and meaningful in the arts field which the Senate has ever had the opportunity of considering.

In view of the importance to our Nation of our cultural resources, I look forward to these hearings as a means of enabling us to increase our awareness and understanding of the appropriateness of legislation to enhance the growth and development of artistic achievement in the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.;

S. 453. An act to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala.

S. 743. An act to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of this 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 812. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America;

S. 814. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1125. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood;

S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906; and

S. 1994. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of certain waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 242) to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Column entitled "Shall American Taxpayers Subsidize Communism?", written by Thurman Sensing; and newsletter dated October 7, 1963, published by Senator THURMOND, entitled "Two Wrongs Don't Make a Right."

PROGRESS IN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 18 school semesters have passed since the Supreme Court ruled that racial segregation in public schools is illegal and a denial of rights guaranteed by the Constitution. According to the report of the Southern Education Reporting Service quoted in a Saturday Review article, slightly more than a third of the biracial school districts that had previously been segregated have now been desegregated. Two-thirds remain segregated, 9 years later. This is a discouraging use of time. It is an even more discouraging use of the educational process which we know to be so vital to the health and growth of our Nation. It is a strong argument for the need by this Congress to pass legislation that will speed up this wasteful delay. At the rate we are now going, it may be two or three generations before we will have a truly democratic public school system. There is, however, Mr. President, some small encouragement in this report; we should all be thankful for it; 119 of the 140 districts that desegregated this fall did so voluntarily. Perhaps more important, the report notes that in those schools that have previously desegregated, more Negro students are in attendance, indicating a decline in token actions by the local boards. All of these local boards that are now moving ahead on their own are to be commended and supported. They hasten the day when we shall have this problem behind us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the September 21, 1963, issue of the Saturday Review be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE SCHOOL KEEPS

School desegregation in the South moved a trifle faster this fall as 140 school districts dropped racial barriers for the first time. This is the largest number to desegregate in any year since 1956, according to the Southern School News, official publication of the Southern Education Reporting Service. The pace of change is still slow, but appears more clearly inexorable even to the most reluctant southerner. Districts were desegregated in Alabama and South Carolina for the first time—leaving Mississippi as the only State with its public elementary and secondary schools wholly segregated. And, in other States, desegregation is moving into "hard core" areas of racial sentiment without apparent difficulty.

There are 6,197 school districts in the 17-State Southern and border-State region. Of these, about half (3,053) are biracial—having both Negro and white pupils. About 37 percent of the biracial districts (1,119) have desegregated. But a far smaller percentage of Negro children in these districts is actually in schools with white children.

It may be encouraging that 119 of the 140 districts that desegregated this fall did so voluntarily; only 21 were under court order.

Voluntary desegregation does not mean, of course, that a community is willing to drop racial bars any further than necessary. As court cases have gradually eliminated the possibilities for evasion of the Supreme Court's 1954 decision, the more sophisticated opponents of desegregation have recognized that change is inevitable. They have also seen that communities that indulged in an emotional, last-ditch massive resistance fight to avoid integration finally had to submit to a court-ordered desegregation plan that often went further and faster than court-approved plans developed by the communities themselves. Therefore, voluntary desegregation has become one means by which local communities can control the pace of change and limit the degree to which racial barriers are lowered.

An instructive analysis of the means that have been proposed to control and limit desegregation is contained in a 28-page pamphlet published jointly by the Southern Regional Council (5 Forsyth Street, N.W., Atlanta 3, Ga.) and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N.Y.). Titled "Token Desegregation and Beyond," by J. Kenneth Morland, professor of sociology, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va., the pamphlet describes the various methods used to slow desegregation, the developing attitudes of Federal courts toward these methods, the costs of desegregation, and one point of view on what the future holds. Copies are available from either of the sponsoring organizations for 50 cents.

Desegregation poses enormous problems—both educational and social—for Negroes and whites alike. And each State is meeting the challenge of change in its own way, within its own cultural traditions. Alabama and Mississippi have been the scenes of bitter violence in the course of the last year as Negroes sought to achieve, in fact, the equality of opportunity that was so dearly won in theory a hundred years ago. But South Carolina, despite its Deep South traditions, has quietly enrolled 11 Negro children in the elementary and secondary schools of Charleston, just as it last year enrolled the first Negro in the State college at Clemson. The men who influence State policy there will allow desegregation to proceed not one whit faster than necessity demands. But neither are they likely to countenance the barbarism of violence.

Change is bound to be slow in many parts of the South. But it may be hopeful that voluntary desegregation is becoming the rule rather than the exception in some areas of the South, whatever the motivation for it, because in almost every case to date, once Negroes have been admitted to white schools, the number admitted has increased year by year.

Status of southern school desegregation as of Sept. 1, 1963

State	Total districts	Number biracial	Desegregating this fall			Previously desegregated	Total desegregated
			Number of districts	Voluntary	Court ordered		
Alabama	114	114	4	0	4	0	4
Arkansas	416	228	1	1	0	12	13
Delaware	87	87	0	0	0	87	87
District of Columbia	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Florida	67	67	5	3	2	10	15
Georgia	198	182	3	2	1	1	4
Kentucky	205	166	16	14	2	149	165
Louisiana	67	67	1	0	1	1	2
Maryland	24	23	0	0	0	23	23
Mississippi	150	150	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri	1,607	213	0	0	0	[1] 203	[1] 203
North Carolina	173	173	21	21	0	18	39
Oklahoma	1,180	241	0	0	0	196	196
South Carolina	108	108	1	0	1	0	1
Tennessee	154	143	10	10	0	26	36
Texas	1,461	919	55	46	9	177	232
Virginia	130	128	23	22	1	32	55
West Virginia	55	43	0	0	0	43	43
Total	6,197	3,053	140	119	21	979	1,119

[1] Estimated.

Source: Southern Education Reporting Service.

THE SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the past week I received a letter from the president of the Minnesota Farmers Union, Mr. Edwin Christianson. He had called me on the telephone to discuss some matters of legislation pending before us on the calendar, such as the dairy bill and the extension of the soil bank provision. He also discussed with me the pending decision on the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain countries. That is a decision which has not yet been made, but which I hope will be made, and which I recommend and encourage to be made.

The letter I have received reads, in part, as follows:

> In line with our telephone conversation this morning, I am enclosing a copy of the statement by the Farmers Union presidents of the Northwest States relative to the sale of wheat to Russia.
>
> As you suggested, I mailed a copy of the statement to the Senators of the Northwest States, to Secretary Freeman, and to Assistant Secretary Fred Dutton.
>
> We feel that the U.S. trade with Communist-bloc nations deserves to be reexamined in the light of the fact that Russia is now a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement.
>
> Soviet Russia has usually been an exporting nation and, at some time in the future, may again be exporting wheat. Perhaps this factor should be considered in the negotiations with Russia at the present time.
>
> I am mailing you the memorandum on the other item I mentioned to you, under separate cover.

The statement reads as follows:

Statement Regarding Wheat Sales to Communist Bloc Nations Made Jointly by the Five Northwest State Farmers Union Presidents, Edwin Smith of North Dakota, Leonard Kenfield of Montana, Edwin Christianson of Minnesota, Ben Radcliffe of South Dakota, and Gilbert J. Rohde of Wisconsin, October 1, 1963

> We believe that since Soviet Russia has become a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement beginning with the 1963 crop year, that it is reasonable to explore the possibilities of a sale of American wheat for dollars or for gold.
>
> The International Wheat Agreement has been in force since 1949 and, up to this time, Soviet Russia had been outside the agreement and has normally been an exporting rather than an importing nation.
>
> We would be favorable to an authorization making it possible for the United States to deal with any nation that is a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement. We consider it a good sign that more and more nations are joining in the orderly marketing of wheat in international trade.
>
> Farmers Union has historically taken the position that as long as there is hunger somewhere in the world, we should seek every way to make our abundant production available to the people.

Mr. President, the presidents of the Farmers Union of the five Northwest States have given us a very thoughtful and constructive statement. Their support of the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union is based upon the fact that the Soviet Union is now, in 1963, a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement. Under the terms of that agreement, there is a responsibility for orderly marketing and for the doing of business in a normal, orthodox manner.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has made available to the Senate the statement issued by the leaders of the Farmers Union from the northwestern States. I agree with the sentiment of that statement, and I am pleased to associate myself with the leadership that the Senator from Minnesota is providing on this important subject.

I am especially pleased to know that among the signatories of the statement is Mr. Ben Radcliffe, of South Dakota, who is not only one of our ablest farm spokesmen, but has also been a longtime member of the South Dakota Legislature. He is a highly respected able man.

I wholeheartedly endorse the sentiment expressed by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I noticed in this morning's Washington Post a front page article entitled "Red Wheat Deal Gets Dillon Nod, Secretary Sees Salutary Effects on Gold Position."

The article, written by Frank Cormier, states, in part:

> Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon gave a flat endorsement yesterday to the idea of selling American wheat to the grain-short Soviet bloc.

The article continues:

> The Treasury Secretary said grain sales to the Soviet Union and Eastern European satellites might add $200 million to $300 million—perhaps more—to American exports.
>
> He said that from a balance-of-payments standpoint, this would offset "One-third or more of the dollar cost of the foreign aid program."
>
> In referring to the dollar cost of aid, Dillon meant that fraction of aid outlays actually spent abroad. The bulk of foreign aid money is spent in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article relating to Secretary Dillon's statement concerning the sale of wheat to Soviet bloc countries be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Red Wheat Deal Gets Dillon Nod—Secretary Sees Salutary Effects on Gold Position

(By Frank Cormier)

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon gave a flat endorsement yesterday to the idea of selling American wheat to the grain-short Soviet bloc.

The Treasury chief told a newsman:

"I want to emphasize the importance we attach to the possibility of sales of wheat and other grains to the Soviet bloc as a means of assisting us in the handling our our balance-of-payments problem."

Dillon said he spoke for the Treasury and not for the Kennedy administration. He said he could not predict what position the President might take, or when a decision might come.

WOULD BOOST EXPORTS

The Treasury Secretary said grain sales to the Soviet Union and Eastern European satellites might add $200 to $300 million—perhaps more—to American exports.

He said that from a balance-of-payments standpoint, this would offset "one-third or more of the dollar cost of the foreign aid program."

In referring to the dollar cost of aid, Dillon meant that fraction of aid outlays actually spent abroad. The bulk of foreign aid money is spent in the United States.

Every dollar of exports helps to reduce the worrisome and persistent payments deficit, currently running at an annual rate of about $2.5 billion. The deficit represents the difference between the amount that Americans spend, lend and give away abroad, and the lesser amount received from foreign sources.

Dillon said large wheat sales also "would be very helpful in a direct way" in bolstering the dwindling U.S. gold supply, which supports the stability and international acceptability of the dollar.

MUST SELL GOLD

The only way the Soviets can raise ready cash to buy grain, Dillon said, is through sales of Russian gold on the London bullion market. Since the United States belongs to a multination pool that supports the London market, it picks up a share of any large shipment of gold sold in the market.

Dillon said that besides helping to ease the gold-dollar problem, American sales would help curb Federal spending by reducing outlays for the storage of surplus farm commodities.

Dillon was asked if he thought large wheat transactions this year might lead to a shift in international markets, with the United States becoming a steady supplier of Communist bloc grain needs.

The Treasury chief said he regards current grain negotiations as "primarily a one-shot operation." But he said the bloc "has had a series of not-too-good crops" and might, in fact, become a regular customer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I encourage the administration to make a decision one way or another on this question. I hope it will be a decision that will permit trade—private trade, not Government trade—to carry on a normal export business in the sale of wheat and cereal grains, not only to friendly countries in the Western World, but also to Soviet-bloc countries in Eastern Europe and to the Soviet Union. I believe that this will be in our national interest.

For the life of me, I cannot see how we can continue to justify the piling and storing of vast quantities of wheat supplies when there is an opportunity to sell it for cash or for gold, and when we know that if we do not sell it, somebody else will, and that in the meantime we shall have to continue to store it, pay the bill, and in a real sense depress the free market price.

This Nation needs exports. We are having difficulty with our balance of payments. The Nation has a vast supply of wheat and cereal grains. These supplies are not bullets; they are not missiles; they are not guns. They represent food, and food represents life. It seems to me that the least we can do is to regularize our business transactions in this area of our agricultural production, so that we can conduct this business and, at the same time, fill a great human need.

WATER AND AIR POLLUTION—THE PROBLEMS NATIONALLY AND IN MONTANA

I. WATER POLLUTION—THE NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in past years, pollution control was largely a public health problem. While this problem is greater than ever before there is also recognition that we must protect our natural heritage of fish, aquatic life, and wildlife; make possible water-based recreation; and satisfy the needs of our cities and national economy.

Statistics on future national growth and water consumption give a sobering picture. According to a Senate Public Works Committee report, by 1980, the total dependable fresh water supply available in the United States will be about 515 billion gallons a day. The most the Nation can ever hope to have available as a result of engineering works is about 650 billion gallons a day. That is the extent of the resource. As for use, we are now consuming 355 billion gallons of this water a day. But at the present rate, by the time we achieve the fresh water supply of 515 billion gallons a day, our requirements will have climbed to over 600 billion. In short, demand is outrunning supply—and by the year 2000, our water requirements will be more than 1,000 billion gallons a day. The only way out of this dilemma is to use the same water over and over, thereby necessitating the use of the latest techniques and equipment to clean water and keep it clean.

Construction projects to control pollution are lagging. The years of World War II were critical in our struggle against pollution. The war greatly accelerated the transition to a metropolitan and industrial nation, prevented the construction of municipal or industrial waste treatment works and produced an avalanche of new contaminants, such as synthetic chemicals and radioactive materials. The trend has continued. Today, an average of 22 billion gallons of water are used in cities and carried away in sewers after use. The total for industry is infinitely greater—totaling more than 12,000 billion—billion—gallons.

There have been many refinements in municipal treatment works in the past 20 years. However, the basic process—a half century old—has not changed. Dirty water is allowed to stand for several hours in large tanks until the heavy particles have settled. The partially cleansed water is filtered, the organic waste decomposed and the remaining water is disinfected. However, most plants can decompose only 80 to 90 percent of the organic waste. Chicago, for example, still returns wastes—the undecomposed 10 percent—equal to nearly 1 million persons to the Illinois River. All of this points to the need for research to combat the as yet indissoluble solids like chlorides, nitrates and phosphates; elements such as sodium, boron, and fluorides; radioactivity; and the final residue of organic pollution which remains after sewage treatment. One of the greatest boons, of course, would be for industry to trap most of these decontaminants, making their isolation in later waste treatment unnecessary.

Despite claims that States and municipalities should have sole responsibility, the problem worsened. Congress was forced to act, and in 1956, passed the Water Pollution Control Act. It authorized the Federal Government to share the cost of municipal waste treatment with cities. This help totaled $50 million a year and spurred construction worth $350 million by 1960.

In 1961, Congress upped the Federal share to $80 million for the first year, $90 million for 1962, and $90 million for each year thereafter until 1967. For every Federal dollar of aid, local communities have spent about $5. City spending now totals over $600 million a year. In addition to providing needed sewage treatment, this construction has put many thousands of men to work.

Summing up, the Federal Government has been active in these four areas:

First. Construction: Cities now spend $600 million a year in sewage treatment. The Federal share can go as high as 30 percent. In addition, under the new Accelerated Public Works Program, communities in labor surplus areas may get up to 50 percent of project costs.

Second. Enforcement: Federal enforcement actions have now involved more than 5,500 miles of rivers, streams, and bays, plus 300 cities and a like number of industries.

Third. Research: Five separate laboratories are being built and four more are planned to meet water quality problems.

Fourth. River Basin Planning: Federal projects in seven major river basins are working to preserve water quality there.

Legislation stepping up the campaign against water pollution is before Congress. Typical is S. 649, by Senator MUSKIE, which has been agreed to by the Senate Public Works Committee. In addition to increasing Federal grants to communities, his bill would—

First. Set up within HEW a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Second. Require the HEW Secretary to set standards of quality to be applicable to interstate or navigable water.

Third. Require the HEW Secretary to issue regulations specifying the type, volume, or strength of matter permitted to be discharged directly into such waters.

Fourth. Give the Secretary authority to bring legal proceedings against violators.

II. WATER POLLUTION—MONTANA

Being a sparsely populated, less industrial State with abundant water, Montana does not have the urgent water pollution problem confronting many parts of the Nation. The picture is changing, however, as cities grow and industries move in. Thus, the State has a unique opportunity to plan ahead and avoid the errors of other regions. And this is being done.

With the aid of the 1956 and 1961 Federal Water Pollution Control Acts and the Accelerated Public Works Acts, 69 projects in 59 different Montana communities have been undertaken. The Federal Government's share has been nearly $3.8 million. The cities have put up nearly $13.5 million. The ratio of local dollars to Federal dollars is 3.5 to 1.

Top expenditures by Montana cities include:

Missoula: $2,269,368—$680,810 Federal share.

Great Falls: $1,620,011—$250,000 Federal share.

Billings: $1,316,115—$398,306 Federal share.

Butte: $1,118,877—$250,000 Federal share.

Helena: $708,309—$212,492 Federal share.

Livingston: $436,128—$130,838 Federal share.

Miles City: $248,540—$74,561 Federal share.

Bozeman: $182,299—$54,689 Federal share.

In addition to the 69 projects already approved, applications for grants from 8 more communities, totaling $181,500, are now being processed by HEW. Including the communities' share, the total for these projects is $605,000.

Finally, a great request for $147,200 from Libby is being considered by the Accelerated Public Works Administration. Libby's share for the water pollution control project would come to $220,874.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two charts showing the extent and nature of Federal assistance to the State of Montana for the construction of water pollution control facilities, along with certain explanatory notes.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Montana

Location	Estimated project cost	Grant requested
Water pollution control applications in regional office:		
Bozeman	$243,400	$73,020
Sweet Grass	33,100	9,930
Total	276,500	82,950
Water pollution control applications in State agencies [1]		
Applications reported to be in preparation:		
Scobey	65,000	19,500
Saco	70,000	21,000
Wiboux	50,000	15,000
Superior	150,000	45,000
Thompson Falls	150,000	45,000
Fairview	50,000	15,000
Terry	50,000	15,000
Ekalaka	20,000	6,000
Total	605,000	181,500
Accelerated public works application: Libby	368,074	147,200

[1] None.

Grant offers made	69
Water pollution control applications in regional office	2
Water pollution control applications reported to be in preparation	8
Accelerated public works applications under review	1

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Status

Status of projects is indicated as follows:

1. Project approved (grant offer made).
2. Project under construction.
3. Project completed.

Name of applicant

As listed in the project application. In multimunicipal projects, participating communities are indented under main applicant. Accelerated public works grants (APW) are similarly indented, as are water pollution control grants (WPC) where projects have grants under both programs.

Population code

Federal grants made on a basis of population:

1. Less than 2,500.
2. 2,500 to 5,000.
3. 5,001 to 10,000.
4. 10,001 to 25,000.

5. 25,001 to 50,000.
6. 50,001 to 125,000.
7. 125,001 to 250,000.
8. 250,001 to 500,000.
9. 500,001 and over.

Description

Description of the project as outlined in project application:

1. Treatment plant.
2. Outfall sewer.
3. Intercepting sewer.
4. Other.
5. Treatment plant, outfall sewer and intercepting sewer.
6. Treatment plant and outfall sewer.
7. Treatment plant and intercepting sewer.
8. Outfall sewer and intercepting sewer.
9. Waste stabilization ponds with appurtenances.

Type construction

Type of construction as described in the application:

1. New.
2. Extension or addition.
3. Remodeling and alteration.
4. New, extension, and remodeling.
5. New and extension.
6. New and remodeling.
7. Extension and remodeling.

Estimated cost of project

Estimated project cost in which Federal grant funds are participating.

Federal grant offer

Amount(s) of the Federal grant(s) offered to the applicant. Accelerated public works grants are always identified. Water pollution control grants are identified as such only when a project has also received an APW grant.

Project approved

Month and year in which the project was approved and the offer of a grant was made to the applicant.

Grant offers made

Status	Location	Applicant	Population code	Description	Type of construction	Eligible cost	Grant offer	Date of offer
	MONTANA							
1	Belt	City of Belt	1	9	1	$160,856	$48,256.87	May 1962.
3	Big Timber	City of Big Timber	1	9	1	53,893	16,167.89	January 1958.
1	Bigfork	Flathead County Board of County Commissioners.	1	5	1	217,191	38,571.43	July 1962.
3	Billings	City of Billings	5	3	1	338,157	101,447.24	March 1957.
3	do	do	5	3	1	567,958	170,387.38	May 1961.
2	do	do	6	1	2	410,000	123,000.00	March 1963.
3	Boulder	Montana State Training School	1	9	1	87,740	26,322.03	October 1958.
3	Box Elder	County of Hill	1	9	1	31,792	9,537.55	January 1960.
3	Bozeman	City of Bozeman	4	1	7	34,373	10,311.96	October 1960.
2	do	do	4	3	2	85,681	25,704.22	June 1962.
2	do	do	4	3	2	62,245	18,673.46	October 1962.
3	Bridger	Town of Bridger	1	9	1	25,574	7,672.27	April 1960.
1	Butte	Metropolitan Sanitary Storm Sewer District No. 1.	6	3	1	1,118,877	250,000.00	November 1957.
3	Cascade	Town of Cascade	1	9	1	50,248	15,074.40	April 1961.
3	Columbus	Town of Columbus	1	1	1	105,748	31,724.32	September 1961.
3	Culbertson	Town of Culbertson	1	9	1	46,062	13,818.60	May 1957.
3	Cut Bank	City of Cut Bank	2	9	1	200,971	60,291.20	August 1957.
3	Deer Lodge	City of Deer Lodge	2	9	1	212,492	63,747.60	July 1958.
3	Dodson	Town of Dodson	1	9	1	25,440	7,632.00	August 1957.
3	Drummond	Town of Drummond	1	9	1	43,272	12,981.49	April 1960.
3	Eureka	Town of Eureka	1	6	1	68,687	20,606.22	October 1959.
3	Fort Benton	City of Fort Benton	1	9	1	129,057	38,717.22	Do.
3	Fromberg	Town of Fromberg	1	9	1	42,996	12,898.77	April 1960.
3	Geraldine	Town of Geraldine	1	9	1	12,546	3,763.99	March 1957.
	Froid	Town of Froid				13,200	3,960.00	September 1963.
3	Glasgow	City of Glasgow	2	9	4	145,167	43,550.02	October 1958
3	do	Valley County Improvement District 2	3	9	1	14,972	4,491.43	April 1962.
3	Glendive	Rural Improvement District 1	1	9	1	83,163	24,948.80	May 1958.
3	do	City of Glendive	3	9	1	428,046	128,413.71	February 1959.
3	Great Falls	City of Great Falls	5	5	1	1,620,011	250,000.00	October 1958.
3	Harlowton	City of Harlowton	1	9	1	47,949	14,384.61	April 1958.
3	Helena	City of Helena	4	5	1	542,000	162,600.00	April 1958.
3	do	Vocational school girls	1	9	1	40,309	12,092.68	October 1959.
1	do	City of Helena	1	3	2	126,000	37,800.00	April 1963.
2	Hingham	Town of Hingham	1	9	2	5,500	1,650.00	November 1962.
3	Joplin	City of Joplin	1	9	1	41,110	12,333.00	January 1962.
3	Kalispell	City of Kalispell	3	1	7	217,070	65,120.95	August 1958.
1	Kevin	Town of Kevin	1	9	1	61,293	18,387.77	April 1960.
3	Laurel	City of Laurel	2	7	4	451,058	135,317.37	October 1960.
1	Libby	Lincoln County Sewer Improvement District	3	5	5	736,248	220,874.40	February 1963.
3	Livingston	City of Livingston	3	5	1	436,128	130,838.37	October 1959.
3	Malta	City of Malta	1	9	1	131,360	39,408.07	September 1957.
3	Manhattan	Town of Manhattan	1	9	1	50,790	15,236.97	April 1960.
3	Miles City	City of Miles City	3	9	1	248,540	74,561.91	October 1960.
2	Missoula	City of Missoula	5	1	1	1,183,976	355,193.05	March 1962.
2	do	do	5	8	5	1,085,392	325,617.60	Do.
2	Philipsburg	Town of Philipsburg	1	1	1	87,520	26,255.80	September 1961.
3	Plevna	Town of Plevna	1	9	1	19,973	5,992.14	July 1957.
2	Polson	City of Polson	1	9	1	243,000	72,900.00	January 1960.
2	Poplar	City of Poplar	1	9	1	54,760	16,428.00	May 1962.
3	Richey	Town of Richey	1	9	1	29,685	8,905.64	March 1957.
3	Roberts	Carbon County Board of Commissioners Improvement District 3.	1	9	1	34,151	10,245.35	February 1962.
1	Ronan	City of Ronan	1	9	1	192,000		
		Water pollution control					57,600.00	January 1963.
		Accelerated public works					38,400.00	July 1963.
3	Shelby	City of Shelby	2	9	1	91,137	27,341.21	May 1958.
3	Sheridan	Town of Sheridan	1	9	1	70,326	21,097.84	April 1958.
3	Sidney	City of Sidney	2	9	1	127,054	38,116.17	March 1959.
3	Stanford	Town of Stanford	1	9	1	16,383	4,900.14	November 1962.
3	Stevensville	Town of Stevensville	1	9	1	32,779	9,833.61	November 1959.
3	Three Forks	Town of Three Forks	1	9	5	65,296	19,588.68	July 1960.
3	Townsend	Town of Townsend	1	9	4	48,851	14,655.12	May 1958.
3	Twin Bridges	Montana State Children's Home	1	9	1	40,871	12,261.30	September 1957.
1	do	Town of Twin Bridges	1	9	1	91,511	27,453.29	July 1962.
3	Valier	Town of Valier	1	9	1	35,254	10,576.20	August 1959.
3	Warm Springs	Montana State Hospital	2	5	1	128,897	38,669.10	August 1959.
3	White Sulphur Springs	Town of White Sulphur Springs	1	9	1	64,540	19,362.05	September 1957.
3	Whitefish	City of Whitefish	2	5	1	256,585	76,975.58	October 1960.
3	Whitehall	City of Whitehall	1	9	1	79,425	23,827.46	November 1959.
3	Winifred	Town of Winifred	1	9	1	26,565	7,969.61	January 1960.
3	Wolf Point	City of Wolf Point	2	5	1	78,954	23,686.29	May 1958.
	Total					13,486,655	3,778,743.26	

III. AIR POLLUTION—THE NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because the problem of air pollution is a comparatively recent one, considerably less progress has been made in combating it than there has been against water pollution.

Put simply, air pollutants result from the failure to burn completely the fuels which make our civilization run. This is true whether the fuel be coal in a large factory or gasoline in a car. Because of the complexity of the chemical properties of air pollutants, scientists have only begun to isolate them and set tolerance levels for them.

Simply identifying the chemicals present in the air is not enough, however. The task is enormously complicated by the continued chemical interaction of the pollutants once they are in the air. For the most part, this interaction is caused by sunlight, and the result is "photochemical" smog.

"Photochemical" smog is a new type peculiar to areas of the United States and differs from that produced by coal burning in London, Pennsylvania, and so forth. The hydrocarbons and nitrous oxides given off by the combustion of petroleum in urban areas—particularly Los Angeles—are neither visible nor irritating by themselves. But after being exposed for an hour or so to sunlight, they undergo important chemical changes, yielding ozone and other reactive compounds, which irritate the eyes. As they undergo further chemical change, some of them produce the characteristic haze which one associates with smog. The problem becomes especially acute in areas like Los Angeles when cool air coming in off the ocean becomes trapped under a warm upper layer and hovers over the city for days.

In the order of their contribution, the major sources of pollution are automobiles, industrial plants, households—heating and trash burning—and municipal installations.

A great deal of basic research is needed in air pollution control. To show how far they have to go, scientists are nowhere near agreement on which pollutants are harmful to the human body, let alone how to remove them from the atmosphere. Top priority must be given to the establishment of emission standards. Without this, it will be difficult to answer opponents' arguments as to just what constitutes "an air pollution problem." Likewise, the standard must be geared to some reasonably defined perception of the air quality desired in a given community.

Typical of legislation designed to attack the air pollution problem is S. 432, the "clean air bill," introduced by Senator RIBICOFF and cosponsored by me. It appears, however, that the House-passed bill, H.R. 6518—Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama—will be the main bill in the Senate this session. Committee hearings have been held on it. This bill, the "Clean Air Act," authorizes $25 million over a 5-year period in grants to air pollution control agencies. Such grants would be limited to two-thirds of the cost of the programs, and would be allocated on the basis of population, air problem, and need. In addition, it would permit interstate compacts, and would establish a national research and development program. As with the Water Pollution Control Act, this bill would put the burden of initiation and responsibility for carry-through on State and local agencies.

IV. AIR POLLUTION—MONTANA

The principal areas of air pollution in Montana are in the western part of the State. The UPI in March of 1963 quoted the State board of health as saying that Missoula and Libby have severe air pollution problems, and that Anaconda, Butte, and Billings have less serious, but nevertheless significant smog problems.

The board of health report was based on air pollution studies completed in 7 Montana cities. It showed that Missoula had more suspended particles in the air than San Francisco, Portland, and New York. Measured in micrograms per cubic meter of air, the total suspended particle count for Missoula was 158. Libby was a relatively close second with 128, and Butte had 125.

Other Montana communities, in the order of their air pollution problem, were: Billings, 99; Anaconda, 89; Helena, 72; and Great Falls, 58.

What can the State do to combat this growing problem? First, it can enact control legislation. Thirty-three States, according to a report by the Senate Public Works Committee, have some type of air pollution control laws. Montana is one of these, but its legislation is clearly inadequate. A special HEW booklet sums up Montana's air pollution control legislation:

> It is lawful for any county or incorporated city or town where injurious and unhealthy smoke and fumes exist, upon petition signed by at least 100 of the resident taxpayers of the county, city or town, to make contracts with such persons or corporations as will, in the opinion of the board of county commissioners or city council, best accomplish the purposes, for the abatement thereof and to issue and dispose of bonds for that purpose, subject to the limitations and conditions hereinafter provided. (ss 11-2501, 2502).
>
> An election, held upon proper notice, wherein the electors approve or disapprove the contract negotiated by the county, city or town and the bond issue necessary to carry it out is required. (ss 11-2504, 2505).

It is my understanding that three bills which would have strengthened Montana's air pollution control laws were killed in the 1963 State legislature.

In the absence of States and communities to meet this clear responsibility and need, Congress is being forced to move to meet the problem. The House of Representatives has passed H.R. 6518, the "clean air bill." It would provide $25 million a year over a 5-year period in grants to State and air pollution control agencies. Such grants would be limited to two-thirds of the cost of the programs, and would be allocated on the basis of population, air problem and need. Senate subcommittee hearings have been held on this bill and on S. 432, a similar bill introduced by Senator RIBICOFF and cosponsored by me.

The proposed Federal air pollution control law would be based on the same principle as the Water Pollution Control Act which was passed in 1956 and expanded in 1961. Federal grants would stimulate the investment of State and local dollars. Montana's history with the water pollution control legislation shows that localities have matched each Federal dollar with $3.50 of their own. The air pollution control legislation could reasonably be expected to generate a similar ratio.

DEDICATION OF GOULD ACADEMY AUDITORIUM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this past Saturday an event of considerable significance took place in Bethel, Maine. It was the dedication of the splendid auditorium of Gould Academy.

This came from the generosity of Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, one of the most illustrious stateswomen in the history of our country. The auditorium was named Bingham Hall after the brother of Representative BOLTON. Her brother is William Bingham II and through the years it has been his generosity that set Gould Academy apart from its sister institutions.

The Portland (Maine) Press-Herald had an appropriate editorial on the event and I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOULD ACADEMY SETS A MILESTONE IN SCHOOL'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

> So much is said and written about public education of all kinds that we are often inclined to ignore the quiet but vital part played in the educational process by the private schools.
>
> But we are being reminded of their role in today's dedication by Gould Academy, in Bethel, of its Bingham Hall, a splendid auditorium containing all the facilities required by the performing and visual arts.
>
> There are some unusual features about this 127-year-old institution, which started out in life in the same fashion as scores of other "academies" in New England more than a century ago. It is coeducational, in contrast with most of the famous prep schools that dot the six States, it serves as Bethel's secondary school—and how fortunate for the town's boys and girls—and in 1911 it drew the attention of a wealthy Ohioan by the name of William Bingham II, who came to Bethel, and remained there, at the invitation of the noted Dr. Gehring.
>
> Mr. Bingham's generosity set Gould Academy apart from its sister institutions, although most of the money given to build Bingham Hall came from his sisters, while one of them, U.S. Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, of Ohio, will be today's principal speaker.
>
> All of this is known to the alumni and friends of Gould, but we mention it in noting the significant place prep schools have had in New England education, and in congratulating the academy, and all who hold a warm affection for it, upon the occasion of today's dedication.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS, 1963—U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the 1963 Report of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY—1963 REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

1. APPOINTMENT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS

The Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy was appointed under the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 9355.

2. COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD

Appointed by the President

Three years effective 1961: Hon. James H. Douglas, former Deputy Secretary of Defense, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.

Three years effective 1962: Dr. Fred H. Harrington, president University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Dr. Payson S. Wild, dean of faculties, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Three years effective 1963: Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, retired, former Chief of Staff, Washington, D.C.; Mr. John Lawrence, chairman of the board, Dresser Industries, Inc., Dallas, Tex.

Appointed by the Vice President

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER; Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND; Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Appointed by the Speaker of the House

Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Third District of Colorado; Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., Fourth District of Georgia; Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Seventh District of Wisconsin; Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, First District of Colorado.

Ex-officio members of the Board [1]

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee; Representative CARL VINSON, Sixth District of Georgia, chairman, House Armed Services Committee.

3. STATUTORY PROVISIONS CREATING THE BOARD

The Board's jurisdiction is prescribed by the provisions of Section (e) of 10 U.S.C. 9355.

This section provides as follows: "(e) The Board shall inquire into the morale and discipline, the curriculum, instruction, physical equipment, fiscal affairs, academic methods, and other matters relating to the Academy which the Board decides to consider."

Convening of the Board

The Board convened at 8:30 a.m., May 1, 1963, and completed its inspection at 4:40 p.m., May 3, 1963.

Chairman of the Board

The Board elected Gen. Thomas D. White, U.S. Air Force, Retired, as its Chairman.

Procedure

The Board listened to briefings by the Academy staff, inspected Academy facilities, attended cadet classes, and interviewed a cross section of the cadets.

Comments of the Board

Cadet Legislation—4,500

The Board examined the provisions of the legislative proposal to increase the Air Force Academy cadet strength to approximately 4,500. The Board strongly recommends early enactment of this legislation. An increase in the number of graduates would help satisfy the Air Force's need for more Regular officers with an educational background adequate to enable them to cope with the technological challenges of the aerospace age. Academy graduates establish a pattern for reaching and maintaining the highest professional standards. They have a beneficial influence upon the officer corps and thereby upon the entire Air Force. Acadamy graduates constitute only 3.5 percent of the total officer force or 8.4 percent of the Regular officers in the Air Force. The forthcoming increase in the number of high school graduates resulting from our increasing population will make enough good candidates available to enable the Academy to expand without a deterioration in the quality of its cadets. The Board noted the imbalance in the number of Service Academy graduates in relation to the officer strengths of the three services. As of November 30, 1962 the officer strengths of the services, excluding warrant officers, are: U.S. Navy and Marine Corps, 90,273; U.S. Army, 108,458; U.S. Air Force, 133,739. The authorized midshipman strength of the U.S. Naval Academy is about 4,400. The authorized cadet strength of the U.S. Military Academy is 2,505; the U.S. Air Force Academy, 2,505. Thus, the U.S. Navy with a planned fiscal year 1964 officer strength of only 67 percent of that of the Air Force and 82 percent of that of the Army has an authorized Academy strength about 75 percent higher than that of the Air Force and Army.

Airfield and Flying Training

The Board believes that the implementation of a light plane flying indoctrination program at the Academy would have a beneficial effect on cadet morale and would provide an added degree of motivation toward a military career. A program of 10 flying hours for all cadets with provisions for additional flying hours as necessary for those cadets who wish to qualify for a private pilot's license is deemed desirable. The Board believes that a runway of not less than 5,000 feet, constructed according to Air Force specification, and auxiliary items consisting of a parking strip, access apron, and hangar will be adequate for this flying program. It is recommended that the Air Force take appropriate action to obtain authorization for early construction of this airfield. Two thousand five hundred cadets are being educated to be Air Force officers and almost to a man they cannot understand why they have no facilities for flying training.

Cadet Athletic Program

The Board noted with approval the extensive program of physical conditioning, intramural sports, and intercollegiate athletics. It was recognized that although the existing cadet athletic facilities are of superior quality there is an urgent requirement for a fieldhouse which will permit a more effective year-round athletic program. During the fall and winter months many physical training programs and athletic practices are missed because of inclement weather. The experience of the other Service Academies has shown that a fieldhouse is indispensable. Until a fieldhouse is provided, the Academy will not be able to develop its physical training programs and intercollegiate teams to their fullest capability. The Academy considers a fieldhouse its first priority construction item, although some members of the Board believe an airfield comes first. The Board recommends immediate action be taken by the Air Force to obtain authorization for the construction of a facility which would contain an indoor playing field, running track, locker space, storage area, and visiting team facilities.

Academic Program

The Board believes that the academic curriculum which is evenly divided between the basic sciences and applied sciences on the one hand and humanities and social sciences on the other, provides ideal preparation for career military officers. The continued success of the enrichment program, under which cadets are encouraged to progress academically as far and as fast as they can, is evidenced by the outstanding achievements of the cadets on the graduate record examinations and by their success in the competition for postgraduate scholarships. It is particularly noteworthy that of the approximately 1,450 cadets that will have graduated when the fifth class graduates on June 5, 1963, 6 have won Rhodes Scholarships. Additionally, because many of the cadets earn nearly enough credits for a master's degree, the Academy has been able to establish a program with Georgetown and Purdue Universities in which selected cadets can earn a master's degree in 7 months following graduation from the Academy. Fifteen cadets in the class which will graduate on June 5, 1963 are scheduled to attend Georgetown University to study for a master's degree in international affairs; 14 are scheduled to attend Purdue University to study for a master's degree in astronautics. Although the Board was very favorably impressed with the academic program and considers the overall curriculum properly balanced between academic and military training, it believes that the academic program should be continually reviewed to insure that it is not allowed to overshadow the disciplinary and military aspects of the cadet program.

Faculty

The Board was pleased to note the high quality of the all-military faculty and was impressed by the fact that virtually all faculty members have advanced degrees. The Board believes that academically qualified military officers are more suitable and better able to prepare cadets for a military career than are civilian instructors. Since approximately 75 percent of the cadet's supervised time is spent in the academic program, the instructors have considerable influence on the attitudes the cadets develop toward military life. The Board recognized that the high quality of the faculty has been achieved and is being maintained largely because of the great number of applicants from which the Academy has authority to select and because an inefficient faculty member can be relieved at the Academy's discretion. The tour of duty for faculty members is 5 years. The Board believes that longer tours for selected members would be beneficial.

Airmanship training

The Board noted with approval that progress is being made in the reduction of unproductive harassing practices in the fourth class system and agrees with the Academy's goal of a hard, fair system that respects individual dignity and serves a constructive purpose. The Board agrees with the Academy decision to allow fourth-class cadets to go home during Christmas leave and believes that earlier recognition of the fourth class is desirable if it can be implemented in an evolutionary manner. From discussions with cadets, Board members concluded that those aspects of the airmanship training program that provide the cadets with a knowledge and appreciation of the Air Force and their responsibilities to it should be given more emphasis. The cadets believe they do not have much knowledge of such subjects as squadron duties; the promotion system of the Air Force; career planning; duties associated with assignments in personnel, operations, and finance; regulations, tech orders, and other Air Force publications; and what is expected of them in their first assignment after graduation. A general review of the airmanship program aimed at improving the cadet's knowledge of these and similar subjects which are important to them as they begin their careers as Air Force officers is recommended.

---

[1] The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or designees, are, by law, ex-officio members of the Board. Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL designated Senator HOWARD W. CANNON and Representative CARL VINSON designated Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS to attend in their behalf. Because of unexpected commitments, Senator Holland, Senator Humphrey, Representative Laird, and Dr. Wild were unable to attend.

Cadet Selection and Admissions Program

The Board was favorably impressed with the Academy policy of selecting cadets for appointment on the basis of composite scores derived from an evaluation of accomplishments and activities which denote physical, moral, and leadership qualities as well as academic achievements. These factors appear to be well balanced in the Academy selection procedures. The improvement in the quality of the entering cadets in recent years is indicative of the progress being made in cadet selection and admissions procedures.

U.S. Air Force Academy Preparatory School

The Board showed special interest in the operation of the Preparatory School which provides an opportunity for enlisted members of the Air Force and Army to prepare for entrance into the Air Force Academy. The Preparatory School is operated with standards of academic excellence similar to those of the Academy. Students have an opportunity to earn U.S. Armed Forces Institute college credits which they may transfer if they enter the Academy or other colleges and universities.

Cadet Religious Program

The Board noted the achievements of the chaplains' programs and was very favorably impressed with the wide voluntary participation of the cadets in religious activities. The following statistics concerning these activities are considered significant:

Discussion groups: Limited to 60 cadets per week—385 from the class of 1966 signed up.

Retreats: 3 chapel sponsored, 6 church sponsored—over 400 cadets signed up.

Ushers and acolytes: 20 needed—115 from class of 1966 signed up.

Choir: 40 needed—277 from class of 1966 signed up.

Date for the Visit of the 1964 Board of Visitors

The Board set the dates March 4–6, 1964, for next year's visit.

Remarks: The Board noted with approval the success of the Superintendent's efforts to reduce the cost of cadet training through good management. The cost per cadet for fiscal year 1963 approximates that of the U.S. Military Academy which has an identical cadet strength authorization. Reductions in the cost of cadet training have been made without compromising the quality of the cadet training program. The Board commends the Superintendent and his entire staff for outstanding performance in directing the Academy.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas D. White, General U.S. Air Force, retired; J. Edgar Chenoweth, House of Representatives; L. Mendel Rivers, House of Representatives; Barry Goldwater, Senator from Arizona; John J. Flynt, House of Representatives; Howard C. Cannon, Senator from Nevada; Byron C. Rogers, House of Representatives; James H. Douglas, former Secretary of the Air Force; Dr. Fred Harrington, President for Academic Affairs, University of Wisconsin; Dr. Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University; John Lawrence, Chairman of the Board, Dresser Industries, Dallas, Tex.

FREE ENTERPRISE DAY

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, today, October 7, is Free Enterprise Day in the United States.

One year ago, the first Free Enterprise Day in America was celebrated when a small group of businessmen met in Falmouth, Mass. Their idea took root, and today many of the Nation's villages, towns, and cities are observing Free Enterprise Day and are commemorating the economic system which has made this country strong.

Our free enterprise system applies to almost every aspect of our society and our economy. The magnificent achievements of American agriculture are based on the principle of free enterprise. The growth and achievements of American business—big and small—stem from the system of free enterprise.

Until now, Americans have had no specific day during which they could unite to give thanks for the economic freedoms which have made this Nation's standard of living second to none.

I am pleased that Free Enterprise Day has been established, and I am proud to join in this salute to the principles of free enterprise.

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, America has grown to greatness in the world because of cur unique system of free enterprise, where competition in the business community produces better goods and services for sale in the marketplace at attractive prices. The incentive is to compete and thus serve the American public, and indeed all who desire to trade with us, better.

Today, Monday, October 7, 1963, hundreds of thousands of Americans are celebrating Free Enterprise Day, a day set aside to commemorate our great American economic system. Twenty Governors have issued proclamations setting aside this day. Many more mayors and local governing bodies have done likewise.

It is, of course, most fitting that 1 day be set aside which will call to all American's attention the wonders and glories that are our peoples as a result of a private, free, competitive enterprise system which is in the public interest. Under this system the United States of America has become a world leader. Under this system more of our people are relatively better off than those in other lands across the globe. Under this system and the abundance which it produces, our people have an unparalleled opportunity to meet the needs of our fellow men, not only here at home but also abroad. But this system, we must remember, is more than merely materialism. It has a deep philosophical content as well. For with a strong private economic system, government—whether it be local, State, or National—also more ably serves the people. Americans, thus cannot only fulfill their economic wants but also have a system which permits and furthers individual freedom and economic and political liberty for all our people.

Webster's defines free enterprise as "the freedom of private business to organize and operate for profit in a competitive system without interference by the Government beyond regulations necessary for keeping the national economy in balance."

Sometimes it takes a recent American to recognize fully the great values of this country which all of us who are born here all too often take for granted. Thus it is that a short time ago an immigrant citizen to our shores in Falmouth, Mass., led a small group of independent businessmen to hold a free enterprise celebration. This immigrant citizen was the owner of a Rexall drugstore. He had come to this country penniless and had risen to be a successful and respected businessman in his own community. He and his colleagues wanted the people of America to set aside 1 day each year in recognition of our system. Thus, it was that in Falmouth the first Free Enterprise Day was held in our country. They picked the first Monday in October.

Their idea has caught on in many cities throughout America and has been endorsed by businessmen throughout our country. It is a commendable idea which should have the enthusiastic support of those in business, labor, and civic organizations generally. I salute all who have worked so hard to call attention to this day.

ADMISSIONS POLICY OF NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Congress of the United States has voted to help finance in a relatively small way the oncoming New York World's Fair, I ask unanimous consent to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two brief statements by the Honorable Robert Moses, relative to some financial problems relating to ticket admission price policies. Mr. Moses is a dedicated public servant and we can all be sure that fair policies will be followed by him in connection with financial matters that will arise from time to time in operating the fair.

I certainly am not qualified to pass final judgment on the issue of schoolchildren admissions to the New York World's Fair, but I do know that Robert Moses deserves our trust and confidence in his administration of the fair.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, 1964–65, ON FREE ADMISSION OF CHILDREN

I note that a city education officer, two candidates for the city council and other assorted Santa Clauses have attempted to make an issue of free or drastically reduced rate admissions to the fair for New York City schoolchildren. They did not make the slightest effort to get at the facts and have been content to distort what little they knew.

The reasons why the fair cannot give away free tickets have been fully stated. Reduced advance sale rates have already produced over a million dollars in needed revenues to avoid further borrowing.

These are the indisputable facts:

1. The fair is a nonprofit private enterprise on public land which will be improved and turned back to the city as a magnificent park.

2. The fair is a business enterprise which must meet its obligations. These include first of all, repayment in full to noteholders. The 1939–40 fair, which was good natured about favors and economies, paid its bondholders only 32 cents on a dollar. This record was our greatest handicap in financing the 1964–65 fair. Our second obligation is to return $24 million advanced by the city

for permanent improvements. Our third obligation is to restore surface areas, at a cost of $6 million, and our fourth to earn about $11 million to finish Flushing Meadows Park for the permanent enjoyment of all ages. The last fair left Flushing Meadows largely a barren waste.

3. We have had, as might be expected, all sorts of pressures for handouts, favors, and special privileges. Among the many reasons why we could not join the so-called Bureau of International Expositions were that they insisted that foreign nations pay no rent and that the fair run only 1 year. This would have meant a bankrupt fair. In fact, it could not have been financed at all.

4. The matter of admission charges was determined, not by the president of the fair, but by its executive, finance, and other committees. The directors were informed. Every official of the fair knew all about it. The advance sale reduced rates were the subject of the fullest discussion.

5. Further reductions for children would involve all children in all grade and high schools, parochial schools, etc., not only in New York City but from every other community. The fair is a World's Fair. It is nationwide. It is not heavily subsidized by the city. The city is largely on the receiving, not on the giving end. The city is the beneficiary and residuary legatee. It has no more right to free or reduced rates for its children than has any other community. Actually the U.S. Government has put more nonreturnable money into the fair, notably for roads, marina, etc. than has the city. The State of New York has put in as much.

6. Assuming several visits by schoolchildren, and it is to be borne in mind that the fair cannot possibly be seen in a day, the fair would lose some $9 million in entrance fees if all children were admitted free, and could not meet its obligations. The advance ticket charges for children are very low—below those for any remotely comparable educational exhibits and entertainments.

7. Admission to most of the exhibits in the fair is free, but there are some, including various international, State, and amusement features which could only have been financed by low additional charges. If entrance admissions for children are to be free or at greatly reduced rates, charges for some of the admission rates within the fair would have to be lowered. This could not be done under our contracts and agreements. Moreover, there would be an immediate demand for free or reduced transportation to and within the fair.

8. If exceptions were made for schoolchildren, many other influential and persuasive groups would demand lower rates. We have already heard from them.

9. The fair will present extraordinary advantages to New York. They are worth a little sacrifice.

We pledged at the fair prudent, honest, courageous, and nonpolitical management, free from patronage, and that is what the people of the city as hosts and ultimate beneficiaries will get.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT MOSES, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR 1964–65, RELATING TO CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION PROPOSING REDUCED WORLD'S FAIR RATES FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

It is inconceivable that any member of so important a body as the New York City Council could be so confused about basic facts in connection with free or drastic cutrate admissions for schoolchildren. The facts have already been stated in our statement of October 2, another copy of which is attached.

Queens Councilmen Seymour Boyers and Edward Sadowsky have argued, as a basis for their resolution, that:

1. The city is spending about $120 million to build and improve "a network of express highways and scenic parkways leading to the site from all parts of the city."

The fact: The city is not spending 1 cent on the $120 million network these councilmen talk about. The Federal Government is providing 90 percent of the $120 million and the State 10 percent, except in one instance where it is 50 percent Federal and 50 percent State.

2. The city is spending $24 million for improvements related to the fair.

The fact: The city loaned the $24 million for permanent improvements under conditions which require full reimbursement. The $24 million in permanent improvements is a contribution by the fair and its exhibitors to the city, not the other way around. Despite this, the city will be repaid the $24 million from fair revenues if they are earned.

3. The $3 million Hall of Science that the city is building on the fairgrounds is for the fair.

The fact: The Hall of Science is permanent and is a part of the postfair city park. It is desirable but not essential to the success of the fair. All of the exhibits are furnished by the U.S. Space Agency and private corporations, none by the city.

4. The city has provided funds for "the promotion and development of the world's fair."

The fact: The World's Fair 1964–65 Corp. and its exhibitors and supporters have provided all funds for the promotion and development of the world's fair.

For the information of all the councilmen, and the candidates for public office who are seeking headlines whenever they can get them, the city of New York will receive a much greater benefit from the fair than from those paying moderate admission charges. The fair is an important revenue source for the city. Comptroller Abraham Beame has estimated that the city will receive around $100 million a year in revenue. It will also have a magnificent permanent park after 1965 if the fair is prudently managed.

Any free admission or drastic reduction in entrance charges for children would have to apply to parochial as well as public schools, to high schools, to all schools in the suburbs and in other States and to scores of associations and groups who want to get in free or for next to nothing.

It might be well for members of the council to speak to the city's hotel associations and the restaurant groups, the city merchants and a host of other taxpayers, and find out what they will get from the fair. The city's economic welfare is closely tied to the fair. If the fair's present sound fiscal policies, pledged to those who have financed it, are countinued, all New York will benefit economically.

TRIBUTE TO ESTES KEFAUVER

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most fervent and yet richly deserved tributes offered to our late beloved colleague, Senator Kefauver, is from the pen of Mr. Clarence Streit. Mr. Streit as editor of "Freedom and Union"—the official organ of Federal Union, Inc.—offers an eloquent and entirely justified tribute to the Senator from Tennessee for his longtime leadership in the cause of Atlantic union.

On June 5, 1948, he said to his fellow townsmen in Madisonville, Tenn.:

> I am convinced that the one real way that we can have peace in the world is to join in a kind of federation with the other freedom-loving peoples.

Throughout his senatorial career, Estes Kefauver never wavered in that conviction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tribute by Mr. Streit appearing in the September 1963 issue of "Freedom and Union," and a second tribute by Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, appearing in the same journal, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Freedom & Union magazine, September 1963]

SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, TRAIL BLAZER OF ATLANTIC UNION, 1903–63

"The answer of the State Department to every proposal for peace, Mr. President, is that it needs time to consider the proposal. My Heaven, Mr. President * * * we need to utilize the brief time that we have * * * to quit drifting and start moving. The State Department evidently does not realize that we cannot kill time; it is time which kills us. And that was never more true than it is at this very moment."

POIGNANT TIMELY REMINDER

Thus spoke Senator Estes Kefauver in his speech, "Atlantic Union: The Way to Peace—Reply to the State Department." in answer to its opposition to the Atlantic Union resolution he had introduced July 28, 1949. He spoke on the Senate floor March 13, 1950—3 months before communism suddenly launched its attack on South Korea.

All that speech repays rereading now, but the paragraph quoted speaks most eloquently just today to all his generation, and most movingly to us Atlantic Unionists who know how priceless was his pioneering for federation of the free. No one in the prime of life can be reminded too often or too poignantly that, however much we act as though we had time to kill, all the while time is killing us. Estes speaks to us, and to all, with new authority on this subject now. He did not kill time, he crowded great good into his years, and wisely did he do so, for now time has killed him, when only 60, at the peak of his powers.

The cause of Atlantic Federal Union suffered a truly tragic loss when his heart abruptly gave way on August 10. He had gone from the Senate floor, where he was opposing private monopoly of communication satellites, to the hospital, thinking he had only indigestion. There his heart—until then a kind heart and a stout one in every way—suddenly gave in.

WHAT OTHER SENATOR?

Nature gave Estes great gifts; hard work developed them, and what he had already done with them promised even finer contributions to his fellow man, had he been allowed even the Biblical three score and ten. He was not a member of the Senate's famed inner "club," but those who are, and all the 99 Senators, may well ask themselves: "The death of what Senator among us would have the nationwide, Atlanticwide impact Senator Kefauver's has had—measured not only in frontpage headlines and editorial tributes but in a deep sense of personal loss felt by so many whose devoted loyalty he had won, for so many reasons, in so many places and fields of life?"

Estes was much more than one Senator in a hundred; he was one man in a myriad. He needs a Shakespeare to do him justice—and for him Shakespeare did write a eulogy. It is the tribute to Brutus which Antony paid on the battlefield where he perished. One need but omit—as I do here—its second and third lines to make even its "He * * * made one of them" refer no longer to Brutus and the conspirators, but (like all the rest) to Estes and his work to unite the free:

"This was the noblest Roman of them all."

* * * * *

"He only, in a general honest thought
And common good to all, made one of them.
His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, 'This was a man!' "

THE GENTLE WARRIOR

Estes Kefauver's life was gentle in the sense that he was a born gentleman, the soul of kindness. He did not learn consideration for others from a course on how to make friends. Consideration for each person he encountered, however humble, was in him second nature—nay, true nature. He carried it to a friendly fault that has made his ready handshake legendary, and overshadowed for the public better proofs of his thoughtfulness that thousands treasure.

His life was far from gentle, however, in the sense of drifting with the current or following the way of least resistance as so many do, avoiding hard decisions, conflict. Estes was forever paddling his canoe upstream, even up rapids that daunted other explorers. Increasingly through his 10 years in the House and 15 in the Senate, his public life was devoted to heroic conflict. His battles were both negative and positive.

He fought against dragons as powerful as war, democratic disunion or anarchy, race prejudice, organized crime, monopoly and profiteering in steel, medicine, the high heavens of Telstars. Birth involves conflict too, and Estes fought for creation of the Federation of the Free, for a more effective "20th Century Congress"—the title of his first book—for more democratic elections (through abolishing the poll tax, reforming the presidential electoral college, etc.).

In politics as in engineering, there are two kinds of men, the kind that construct and the kind that operate. Estes was of the rarer constructive type. His passion for building better government first showed itself at the county level when he came home from Yale to practice law. Before he died he had contributed to the creation of better government at all the other existing levels, municipal, State, and Federal—and above all to the constitution of democratic government where it does not yet exist, in Atlantica. His championship of Federal Government on this international scale contributed to his election to the Senate in 1948 despite Boss Crump in Memphis—and thereby resulted in replacing his machine with an independent government in that city, and freeing the State government from bossism. But this is a story in itself—for a later issue.

A GIANT'S STRENGTH

Estes had a giant's strength, without the fault that Shakespeare found in this:

"O, it is excellent
To have a giant's strength; but it is tyrannous
To use it like a giant."

I wish Shakespeare had gone on to tell us how excellent it is to use such strength for noble ends—not to exploit the weaknesses of others for one's own profit but to find satisfactions in making the weak stronger, the fearful braver, and in freeing one's fellows from the walls of anarchy, war, and moral cowardice that hem man in, and the chains of oppression, prejudice, and ignorance that hold him down. Estes had a giant's strength in at least two senses, physical and moral. He was weak as a speaker—he moved men by his character much more than by his speech. He was not a seminal thinker—but he had an independent mind. He was open to the ideas of others and not too proud to work for those he judged to be sound as if they were his own. And his judgment not only of ideas but even more of political situations and strategy was very good. To return to the two strengths mentioned.

MR. COURAGE

Physically, Estes stood head and broad shoulders above most of us. His stamina carried him through three killing campaigns for his Senate seat, and the multitude of presidential primaries that he won in 1952 and 1956. Morally, his strength was even rarer.

I think of him often as "Mr. Courage," for throughout the 15 years I knew him intimately he was the most consistently and outstandingly courageous man in legislative office I have yet known. Nor does my prize for courage go to him only because of the degree of it he showed in the leadership he gave Atlantic Union in Congress, as some may assume.

It has never seemed to me to take the highest courage for those who laud the commonsense of the common people, as all politicians do, to ask the voters to back the case for Atlantic Union, which is commonsense itself, to me at least. But the record shows that they do think this requires high courage, and so I concede the point—the more readily because such courage is indeed required to continue in this course as long as Estes did. The eulogies and editorials I have read have nearly all stressed his courage, but—with significant exceptions in Tennessee where he was best known—none even mentioned his work for Atlantic Union. This shows at least that there was plenty of other proof of it; this other evidence has most impressed me, too.

83-TO-1 ESTES

The ignorance, prejudice and misguided emotions that Atlantic Union runs counter to and that so many politicians have feared to face do not seem to me so hard to overcome or so explosive as the ignorance, bigotry, and misguided emotions roused by other issues, most directly in one's own constituency. Most politicians seem to share this evaluation, judging from their fear of even irking their constituents on matters that touch them to the quick. Yet through these minefields sown with boobytraps Estes marched as calmly as others on a safe highway—even more serenely, if anything, than he did on the Atlantic Union road. For example, on racial issue votes, he stood out among all the Southern Senators, conservatives and liberals, often alone until ALBERT GORE joined him as the junior Senator from the State already famed for Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson.

The vote that most impressed me allowed one to test Estes against the whole field. It came when "northern Democratic liberals," with whom Estes often voted, sought during the McCarthy fever to outfox those who charged that they were soft on communism, by sponsoring a bill to outlaw the Communist Party. No one was under worse attack then as a "pink" than Estes in Tennessee by those who sought his seat. The Senate approved the bill 83 to 1—and the 1 was Senator Kefauver. The immediate result was an astonishing victory he won singlehanded, which began the next day when two Senators were brave enough to confess on the floor their consciences had kept them awake all night because they should have voted as he did. In a later issue we shall publish an article by his then administrative assistant, Richard Wallace, now Executive Director of the Atlantic Council of the United States, telling this whole heartwarming story. This demonstration of Senator Kefauver's courage and wisdom deserves a much more spacious monument than we can give it now.

NOT RECKLESS COURAGE

The courage that characterized Senator Kefauver was not blind or even reckless or flamboyant. It was no less deliberate than determined, as aware of the dangers as it was quiet, a courage fathered by deeply rooted values and mothered by firm faith in his fellow man.

"His critics in the Senate called him 'Estes the Martyr,' the 'Frontiersman,' and the 'Scourge of Sin.' " The New York Times said: "They accounted him a canny politician bent on building up a personal following." Frontiersman he was indeed in spirit, but there was in him nothing of Jeremiah, still less of the martyr or fanatic. His courage came from no such sources. True, he was a shrewd politician—as I have had much more occasion to welcome than to criticize—but Congress swarms with canny politicians who seek to build up a personal following * * * by anything but the course that Estes took. Two of many examples in my personal knowledge may show that seeking his own advantage was not his major motive.

TWO STEPS BACK FROM FAME

When Estes gained national renown by his crime investigation I was disturbed, because I feared it would divert him too much from Atlantic Union. I expressed to him more than once my anxiety, and my belief that Federation of the Free was more worthy of his mettle. It is now forgotten that at the height of the fame his Crime Investigation Committee had brought him, he resigned as its chairman. He tied this to his responsibility as sponsor of the Atlantic Union resolution, in a statement on March 24, 1951. The Korean war was then on, and he explained to his constituents: "Tennessee boys are dying on foreign battlefields and I believe this plan I proposed may provide the answer we pray for. I consider it my bounden duty to turn my efforts and time from local and national crime to international crime."

Freedom & Union featured this on its May 1951 cover, but the mass media gave it scant if any attention. The cause to which he turned has brought Senator Kefauver so little publicity, thus far, that, as has been noted, outside Tennessee, his obituaries rarely mentioned his Atlantic Union role. Such was this canny politician bent on building up a personal following.

The second example I would cite came in 1959. The outlook for congressional approval of the Atlantic Convention proposed—which Foster Dulles had blocked when he became Secretary of State—had improved enough to make its supporters, including Senator Kefauver, believe it might win, and therefore should be reintroduced. Far from seeking to cash in on his early work, he advised the resolution's supporters that, because of hostility he had roused on other issues and the fact that he was not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, it would be wiser to get a member of that committee to introduce it.

In the interest of the resolution, he stepped aside for Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who became its chief sponsor, and Senator FRANK CHURCH, who became its floor manager. Estes continued to work as hard for it in the ranks as when he was out in front. Without him it would not have passed the Senate as it did in 1960—and I happen to know that it was his influence behind the scenes that gave it the Republican support it needed to clear the Rules Committee and reach the floor of the House, where its victory was clinched. Such was the character of Estes Kefauver.

WHERE WE DIFFERED

Devotion to principle did not blind him to the values of compromise. In my view he was too ready, after the failure of the first years of head-on onslaught for the Atlantic Union resolution, to follow those who urged that the way to get it through was to water it down. At times I differed strongly with him on strategy. We agreed on the need to accept some compromises to get action while insisting on enough of the essential to make the action worthwhile. We differed only on the degree this involved. I was readier than he to risk losing the battle than to win it in a way I thought risked losing the war.

There was truth in both views: The resolution did win approval, as he hoped, in the weakened form that he found safe—and that in the end I supported, partly from respect for his judgment and partly from necessity. But, as I feared, the resulting Convention held in January 1962 fell woefully short of what we both had sought. Though Estes would go further than I in such compromising, I know his willingness came from no weakening of his devotion to Atlantic Union.

STARTING KEFAUVER SERIES

The story of Senator Kefauver's work for Atlantic Union is too great to be told now, and too impressive, inspiring and filled with human interest not to be told later. And so, in succeeding issues, we shall tell more of it. We shall accompany the series with documents, beginning now, on page 21 where we give the text of his first major Senate speech on Atlantic Union. Only 11 days after his death, The New York Times found occasion to note: "The loss of Senator Kefauver seems greater today than it did when death struck him down." As the true story of his work for Atlantic Federation becomes better known, that comment will swell into a chorus, and his stature will loom even greater.

HIS 1948 COMMITMENT

In his hometown, Madisonville, Tenn., named for the "Father of the Federal Constitution," where Estes was buried, he made on June 5, 1948 his first public commitment to Atlantic Union. Announcing his candidacy for the Senate, he said:

"I have studied the matter very closely. I am convinced that the one real way that we can have peace in the world is to join in a kind of federation with the other freedom-loving peoples. * * * I feel that the statesmen of these democracies should work toward this program, just as the statesmen of our Nation worked toward building 13 States into the federation which grew into the great United States of America. * * * It is going to take work, a lot of prayerful thinking, and moral and religious regeneration. But it is not only possible. It must be done."

FINAL TESTIMONIAL

Fifteen years later, I would testify in the words of Timothy: He fought a good fight, he finished his course, he kept the faith. And I would add these words with which the Associated Press ended its report of the burial of Senator Kefauver on August 13:

"As thunder rolled, the coffin was removed by an Air Force honor guard to the graveside. Lightning flashed as the casket was lowered and when the family turned from the grave, a heavy downpour began."

In a way that would have seemed fitting to the ancients, the noblest Roman of them all passed, into history.

[From Freedom & Union magazine, September 1963]

Kefauver Will Be Best Remembered for Pioneering Atlantic Union

(By Edward J. Meeman, Editor Emeritus, Memphis Press-Scimitar)

A great heart snapped because it tried to do too much.

Though he seemed to do it all easily, there must have been a strain which did not show on the surface.

I was one of many whom Estes Kefauver took inside that big heart, and I feel that I learned to know it well.

I first met him when he was Representative from Chattanooga. What he talked about, and earnestly, was the need of reforming the procedures in Congress, ideas which he expressed in his book, "20th Century Congress."

Then and there I decided he was a statesman, for there were few votes to be gained by reforming the rules of Congress.

So when he told me he was going to run for the Senate, and asked me to get some Memphis people together to meet him, I was glad to do so.

He said he would fight Ed Crump, the political boss and dictator of Memphis.

"Don't do that," I advised. "One candidate after another has made Crump the issue and that negative policy has failed.

"Just come to Shelby County and present yourself and your program, appeal to the people for their votes as you have a right to do. Don't fight Crump, but if Crump fights you, as I think he will, fight back."

Crump did blast Estes Kefauver, and the candidate fought back. Crump likened him to a pet coon, that goes rummaging in the bureau when you are not looking.

"I may be a pet coon," Estes rejoined, "but I am not Mr. Crump's pet coon."

The battle was on.

I learned Estes was about to put on a coonskin cap.

"Don't do that," I pleaded. Such showmanship was distasteful to me.

He ignored my advice, and the whole world knows how effective the stunt was.

Estes Kefauver won. The Crump dictatorship which had ruled Memphis with an iron hand, and had handpicked Governors and Senators, was smashed, though Crump continued to be a political leader of prestige until his death.

A statesman, they say, must first prove to be a politician who can get elected.

But once elected Senator Kefauver proved he was at heart a statesman.

To get the essential support of Edmund Orgill, Memphis wholesale hardware merchant, Senator Kefauver had to convince Mr. Orgill he was for Atlantic Union, for it was only to advance this cause that Mr. Orgill was willing to enter politics.

Senator Kefauver did pledge himself to advocate Atlantic Union.

But, if he had been merely a politician, how easy it would have been for him to make one speech, introduce a resolution for it, say, "I'm sorry but you see the time is not ripe," and abandon the effort.

But Estes had become convinced that organic union of free democratic nations of North America and Western Europe was necessary to overcome communism.

He worked for it, fought for it. When, in campaigns, demagogs attacked him for it, he did not flinch.

He was a speaker in demand throughout the country. He could choose his own subject, and often, he chose to speak in behalf of the Atlantic Union.

He was the principal architect and the leading American figure in organizing the NATO Parliamentarians Conference which has been meeting every year since 1955, the Atlantic Congress of 1959, and the Paris Conference of 1961.

There is an Atlantic Council at work today, with all three living ex-Presidents as its honorary chairmen, and Senator Kefauver gets the credit.

The "Parliament of Man" he achieved before his death. The federation of the free should come soon from causes he set in motion, and be his monument.

Senator Kefauver's exposure of gangsters and his fight on monopoly were spectacular.

But I will wager that he will have a great place in history as the statesman who, more than any other, pioneered in behalf of the federation of the free.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Kefauver's first major speech in the Senate on Atlantic Union, July 11, 1949, as reproduced in the September 1963, issue of Freedom & Union—a speech in which the Senator served notice of the Atlantic Union resolution which he introduced 2 weeks later on July 26, 1949—be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Freedom & Union magazine, September 1963]

Kefauver in 1949 Foresaw Present Doubts of Allies—Urged Atlantic Federation

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, providence has so arranged it that we are considering ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty in the historic Chamber where the Senate met in the early years of the Republic, when this great Federal Union of ours was an experiment whose testing had begun. When the Senate came to this city, it had only 32 Members. My own State of Tennessee was the youngest of the 16 States that then formed the Union, and "We the people of the United States" were only a little more than 5 million strong.

"God works in a mysterious way His wonders to perform." He has blessed His Federal Union beyond the dreams of its founders; He has brought it to the highest pinnacle of both power and freedom that any people ever knew; He has faced it now with one of the decisive turning periods in history; and He has brought us now back to this hallowed historic Hall to make the decisions on which this epoch will turn, for good or for ill. I find it altogether fitting that this should be. No surroundings could be more conducive to wisdom than these. They bring us all more intimately together to counsel one another. They evoke inspiringly the human principles that created this Federal Union and the great progress to which their practice has already led. I stand here in no little awe.

I have given the North Atlantic Treaty the most earnest consideration of which I am capable. I have come to this conclusion:

I shall vote for its ratification, without reservation, but I consent to it only because I see it as a necessary interim measure, a measure that will gain the time needed to explore in peace a far more promising prospect—the possibility of eventually uniting the democracies of the North Atlantic by our own basic Federal principles into a great Atlantic union of the free.

WHAT IS OUR PRIME POLICY?

My approach to this treaty may be summed up as follows: First, what should be the prime purpose of our foreign policy? Second, will ratification of this treaty achieve or serve that purpose?

My answer to my first question is that the prime purpose of our foreign policy should be to secure our free way of life without having to fight a recurring world war every generation to do so. Twice in our lifetime we have sought to gain this.

I doubt that any of us would disagree that this should be our basic purpose. But policymakers are so absorbed by day-to-day problems that they tend to forget this purpose, and the peculiar responsibility it places on all of us here. To overcome dictatorship and would-be world conquerors without war has proved to be a far harder thing than to vanquish it by war. It requires wisdom, vision, boldness, sacrifice even more than does victory by war. And it requires them of us, the older men and women; the parents, not the children; the statesmen, not the youngsters. If we fail, then their turn comes, and the only thing that can save our freedom thereafter is their sacrifice and their daring.

Twice in our lifetime we have sought to secure our freedom without war. Twice we have failed. Twice the boys have had to save the day, make up for their elders' lack of vision, wisdom, self-sacrifice, and courage. And twice we have seen that merely to win by war is no enduring answer, even though the surrender be unconditional and we occupy Tokyo and Berlin. Twice we have seen that all the sacrifices of our youth cannot secure our freedom without another war if their elders remain unwilling to sacrifice dangerous narrow, selfish views, disastrously outmoded concepts, fail to tackle the problem with the vision and courage that success requires. Twice we have failed to achieve our prime purpose, and we dare not fail again. But to succeed we must keep always in mind, not only what our purpose is, but the special responsibility it places on each of us here in the Senate.

In this spirit I would approach the second question: Will ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty achieve or serve this prime purpose? The question is involved, and the answer can only be reached after considerable weighing of the lessons of history. In the end the answer, in my opinion, must be definitely in the affirmative.

Unquestionably this treaty represents a profound change in the policy of this Republic. We cannot be unmindful of that, in this hall which takes us back to the days of Jefferson's first inaugural, when he laid down the policy of "entangling alliances with none." But this small chamber reminds us too of the vast changes that have since occurred, not only in the power and status of this Union in the world, but also in science and technology, in the means of communication, and of destruction.

When Senator Andrew Jackson came to represent my own State of Tennessee in this hall in 1823, he had to make the trip of 860 miles on horseback, all except the last leg of it, which he made by ship, and even that short leg took him 5 days. Now I can make that trip from Tennessee in fewer hours than it took Andrew Jackson weeks.

Wisdom counsels us to cling to policies that have long served us well. We have, until recent years, clung tightly to the Jefferson policy. We ought to achieve our prime purpose, of securing our free way of life without World War, by neutrality in 1914, when the airplane was in its infancy, and we failed. We clung to it still, rejected the Wilsonian guaranty of France and the Covenant of the League of Nations as entangling alliances, and relied on neutrality to achieve our purpose. Again we failed and much more disastrously than before. In 1941, the airplane was only in its childhood, yet it proved capable of destroying overnight the control of the Pacific on which we had spent billions. At the time of the Pearl Harbor disaster, the airplane had not yet burst through the sound barriers to speeds that seem fabulous now, but it will no doubt seem slow in 1960 or 1970. Neutrality and isolationism failed dismally to save us when the guided missile and the atomic bomb were still unborn. Save at the cost of still worse catastrophe, we cannot continue to cling to such policies while these fearful weapons are growing by jumps and by jets.

If wisdom counsels us not to abandon lightly policies that have long proved good, it tells us too, not to cling to them blindly when they are producing worse and worse disasters. It reminds us that policies that worked in one set of conditions may fail in others, and that when they do we must adapt ourselves to the world we live in or we will perish.

The fact that this treaty marks a decided change from the Jeffersonian policy is, therefore, no longer an argument against it; it is rather an argument for it, since safety compels us to make some decided changes. We cannot be more entangled by a treaty than we already are by the facts of modern life, and it behooves us to remember that these conditions of life tend to entangle us more and more every year, not less and less.

That the Senate and the people of the United States have already recognized this is proved by their overwhelming acceptance of the Charter of the United Nations. That represents no little change, but unhappily it is only too evident that, with all the good that the United Nations does, and that more than justifies our continued support of it, the U.N. is not strong enough, as it stands, to achieve our purpose. It must be greatly strengthened, but it is evident that it must be strengthened in some way that cannot be vetoed by a potential aggressor. Consequently, it must be strengthened in some way that involves no amendment of the charter.

The North Atlantic Treaty meets this first test; it requires no change in the charter. It is made under the permission which the charter expressly grants. Does it, however, strengthen the forces of peace enough to achieve our prime purpose? I sympathize fully with the misgivings that many have in this regard.

THE DILEMMA WE FACE

Certainly the result has been to make clearer a basic dilemma that lies at the heart of this treaty. As was said by the Senator from Utah, Mr. Watkins, in the Senate June 1, many believe that by this treaty we can give positive assurance of our help to our European allies and at the same time preserve freedom of action by Congress. The dilemma is that the more positive assurance of help we give, the less we can preserve our freedom of action, and the more we preserve it, the less certain is our aid to our allies. The treaty's carefully worded text seeks to balance on both horns of this dilemma, and does this, in my judgment, about as well as can be done.

If we strengthened the treaty's positive assurance to our allies to the point where the alliance was automatic, we would not only be disregarding constitutional processes which we are bound to maintain, but we would be incurring the danger of handing a blank check to nations who would remain free to follow policies that could lead to war. They would each retain their independent sovereignty not only as regards policy but as regards their armed forces; and the more automatic our guaranty to come to their aid if they got into war, no matter what they did, the more ineffective would be the voice we had in shaping their peacetime policies.

On the other horn of the dilemma, if we seek by reservations to emphasize our constitutional processes and our freedom of action more than the treaty already does, we fall into the danger of encouraging the potential aggressor to attack in the belief that we will not come to the aid of our allies, or will come too slowly or too late. There is no safety in this course either.

The question is, Does this treaty strengthen the forces of peace enough to achieve our prime purpose? The more we try to keep from being entangled by the treaty, the weaker it becomes. What good are such efforts to pull away from the full implications of the treaty, especially since the situation is such that we are bound to be entangled in any major war, treaty or no treaty and no matter what reservations are made to it.

The chief objection to the treaty, it seems to me, is rather that at best it cannot be relied on to strengthen the side of peace enough to achieve our prime purpose. Alliances are notoriously unreliable, even the most automatic ones. Back in 1788, Alexander Hamilton pointed out in No. 15 of the Federalist:

"In the early part of the present century there was an epidemical rage in Europe for this species of compacts, from which the politicians of the times fondly hoped for benefits which were never realized. With a view to establishing the equilibrium of power and the peace of that part of the world, all the resources of negotiation were exhausted and triple and quadruple alliances were formed; but they were scarcely formed before they were broken, giving an instructive but afflicting lesson to mankind: how little dependence is to be placed on treaties which have no other sanction than the obligations of good faith."

The lesson was not learned, and the afflictions have continued. Consider merely the record in our own time. Can any Senator name a single alliance in this tumultuous period that achieved the purpose for which it was made? I hope there is at least one exception—though that would only help prove the rule—but I have looked in vain for it.

Just as this alliance was negotiated as a means of achieving our purpose without war, so every alliance was made to achieve without war the ends of its signers. Yet Germany, Austria, and Italy did not avoid World War I through the dual and triple alliances. Nor did France, Britain, and Russia avoid war through the Entente Cordiale and the Triple Entente and the Franco-Russian Alliance. The Locarno Treaty of mutual guaranty; the Little Entente; the Franco-Polish, the Franco-Czech, the Franco-Yugoslav, the Franco-Rumanian, the Franco-Soviet, and the Franco-British Alliances; the Axis Alliances; none of these served to gain the purpose of any ally of winning without World War II.

A worse record could hardly be imagined, but the record is, in fact, still worse. Not only did all these alliances fail to save a single ally from war; they did not even suffice to win the war for any of them. The Triple Entente did not win World War I; it broke down with the Russian revolution in 1917. The Franco-British alliance did not win World War II; it broke down even earlier, less than a year after the war began. Both wars were won only after the United States was drawn into them.

THE GREAT WEAKNESS IN ALLIANCES

The great weakness in the alliance method which is responsible for this sorry record is the uncertainty that lies at the heart of any such treaty. However unequivocal its text may seem, the fact remains that each ally retains his sovereign power to interpret the terms of the treaty to suit his own interests. This is inherent in the very nature of an alliance in the fact that it is an agreement between sovereign states, in contradistinction, for example, to a federal union constitution, which is an agreement made by sovereign citizens. It is this uncertainty about whether an alliance will function or not at the showdown that leads to their failure. It encourages the adversary to hope that he can contrive to split the allies apart, and it makes each ally continually fear that he will be left in the lurch by the others just when he is most in need of aid. I have heard not a few Americans express doubt that we could depend on certain of our allies under this treaty in the event of war, particularly if we were attacked in the Far East. I understand there are Europeans who express the same doubt about our coming to their aid if they are attacked.

(Note.—By 1963 these fears had grown to a De Gaulle crescendo, which Washington's reassurances have not allayed.)

How far our constitutional rights are already safeguarded in this treaty was brought out by that eminent jurist, Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. On May 6 he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in favor of ratification of the treaty as a step toward the formation of an Atlantic Federal Union, a fact that greatly encourages me in taking the same stand. On page 556 of the report of these committee hearings, I find this passage:

"Mr. ROBERTS. I suppose you realize that although this treaty is a 20-year treaty, the body of which you are a member could revoke it in 2 years, under our present Constitution.

"Senator DONNELL. You do not mean the Senate could do it?

"Mr. ROBERTS. I mean Congress could do it.

"Senator DONNELL. Under what provision do you mean? The provision in regard to 2 years beyond which provisions for war cannot be——

"Mr. ROBERTS. No. I mean the treaties of the United States are on the same parity with law.

"I think you are familiar with the fact that a law passed by Congress inconsistent with the treaty repeals the treaty.

"Senator DONNELL. That is correct. But I understood you to say something about 2 years.

"Mr. ROBERTS. I say 2 years, 5 years, or 10 years.'"

We may feel confident that once this treaty is ratified, Congress will not exercise this power to revoke it in whole or in part. But I submit that the issue does not turn only on our own certainty as to what we shall do. The value of this treaty in achieving our prime purpose of securing freedom without war turns also on whether all our allies will share this confidence that we shall never exercise this power. It turns even more on whether the master of the Kremlin believes in our good faith as we do, and in that of our allies as they do. Does anyone think that he holds this high opinion of any of us?

Surely, the more the Kremlin doubts that this treaty will be carried out, the less it will be discouraged from aggression and the less we are likely to achieve by this treaty our prime purpose of securing freedom without war. So the treaty does not prevent us from being exposed to this danger.

Since an alliance is usually an unreliable means of preventing war, it may well be asked why we should ratify this treaty.

My answer is that we should ratify it because of certain practical considerations. However poor a reed we may consider this treaty, it has already been signed. Refusal to ratify it now, because it fails to remove entirely the uncertainty that makes for war, would not lessen that uncertainty, but increase it to the highest degree. We should not forget, much as we should deplore, that the memory of the Senate's rejection of the League of Nations covenant after President Wilson had signed it, and of the revised World Court protocol after that great Republican statesman, Elihu Root, negotiated it at Geneva in 1929, already makes many Europeans regard the United States as a very uncertain quantity. Nothing could strengthen this feeling more than our refusal now to ratify this treaty. Only the potential aggressor could gain by such an upset—and what encouragement he would gain.

Moreover, our Government in negotiating this treaty was dealing with an urgent situation. The blockade of Berlin, we should not forget, was at its height when these negotiations began.

Although the treaty is too uncertain an instrument to be trusted permanently to achieve our prime purpose, it can be very useful as a means of gaining the time we need to work out the instrument that will do that job. Although alliances may not suffice to prevent war very long, they have served to defer war. The trouble has been that their supporters have failed to use this time wisely, failed to use it promptly to replace the alliance with something much more reliable. That something is, in my judgment, our own U.S. federal union system. The recent formation of the Atlantic Union Committee and the support it is receiving greatly encourages me to believe that if we ratify this treaty the time we gain by it will be thus wisely employed. This Committee proposes that first we ratify this treaty and next we pass a resolution inviting its sponsors to meet with our delegates in a convention to explore the possibilities of uniting them, within the framework of the United Nations, in a federal union, limited though it might be. Admittedly it would have to be a limited federation to begin with, but a start can and should be made. All three of the Committee's leading officers testified before the Foreign Relations Committee in support of this policy and I would earnestly commend their testimony to the study of my fellow Senators.

It will be evident that this policy has already passed a very careful scrutiny by men of the highest level of experience, whose judgment we all respect, when I say that these three leaders of the Atlantic Union Committee are: President, former Justice Owen J. Roberts of the U.S. Supreme Court; Vice Presidents, Robert P. Patterson, former Secretary of War; and Will L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

FEDERAL UNION WOULD ACHIEVE OUR PURPOSE

What is this proposal of Atlantic Union? In essence, it means that we would rely for the achievement of our prime purpose not merely on the preservation of our constitutional processes, but on the extension of these constitutional processes to govern our relations in this field with the other democracies of the North Atlantic.

Much has been said of the U.S. Constitution in the discussion of this treaty, but it seems to have been forgotten that our Constitution is itself a foreign policy. It originated as a basic foreign policy to govern the relations of sovereign States with each other, and with all the rest of the world. It began as an answer to the kind of problem we and the other Atlantic democracies now face, how to secure our liberty without another war. It began when an attempt to solve this problem by an alliance—the Articles of Confederation, in some respects much closer and stronger than the treaty before us—had failed to work even among 13 States whose people had more bonds in common than the 12 signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Faced with the dangers of war, depression, unemployment, inflation despite their Articles of Confederation, the delegates of the earliest Atlantic democracies met in a convention at Philadelphia in 1787—met, to quote one of them, William Paterson of New Jersey, "as the deputies of 13 independent, soverign States." There they worked out our Federal Constitution as the solution to their common problem in foreign policy, as the basis of their relations with each other.

They adopted it, as its preamble states: "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

How much we are reminded of this preamble by these objectives listed in the preamble of the treaty now before us:

"To safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law * * * to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area * * * to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security."

The objectives are basically the same, now as then, but how different the policy for achieving these objectives. The North Atlantic Treaty, like the Articles of Confederation, forms a mere alliance of governments; the Constitution of the United States formed a Federal Union of their people, with powers divided between their new common Government and their separate State governments with a view to securing thereby the freedom, prosperity, and peace of all their citizens, and keeping government obedient to them.

With this Federal Union man-to-man instead of government-to-government policy toward each other, the people of the 13 States peacefully settled 11 territorial disputes in which their governments were engaged under the Articles of Confederation—disputes that in some bases threatened peace. They quickly put the dollar—then "not worth a continental"— on a firm foundation, changed bankruptcy to boom, converted depression into the greatest and most enduring prosperity the world has ever known.

THE CONSTITUTION—OUR FORGOTTEN FOREIGN POLICY

The history of the United States since the establishment of the Constitution down to our times has been the extension of this foreign policy of federating with men instead of merely allying with states. This policy of Federal Union which once governed the relations of only 13 States and hardly 3 million free people now governs the relations of 48 States and 143 million free people of all creeds, colors, and nationalities. It has not been perfect, but it has secured unprecedented liberty, prosperity, and peace to the citizens of every State that adopted it.

With one exception every generation of our people has gone on extending to more and more States and more and more men this policy of a common free government, a common defense force, a common currency, a common postage stamp, a common market, a common bill of rights, a common guarantee of the independent right of the people of each State in the Union, large or small, to govern themselves as they see fit in every field which they have not transferred to the Federal Union.

The one exception, the one generation that has not gone on extending the area governed by this great foreign policy that converts foreign relations into domestic relations—is our own generation. We have mistaken the Constitution for a purely domestic or national policy. Both our great parties and all their administrations have forgotten, through all the problem-crowded years since 1914, that the Constitution began as a foreign policy, and has proved ever since the best foreign policy that any free people can practice toward other free peoples. During this period they and the great institutions that specialize in international relations and peace have been exploring and propagating all kinds of solutions to our foreign problem—all, that is, but the one which the Federal Constitution itself represents. The result is that we have gone from one world war to another world war, from one league to another. We have gone from conflict with one aggressive autocrat to a still more menacing one. For all our plans and policies, and for all our poured-out treasure and blood, we find ourselves with recovery receding and bankruptcy threatening part of the free. And we face a formidable dictatorship whose knout rules from Berlin to the Sea of Japan, whose lieutenants have only recently overrun China and whose fifth columnists are to be found in every nation.

It is high time, I say, that our Federal Union Constitution ceased to be the forgotten foreign policy of the United States.

SEVEN REASONS FOR EXPLORING UNION

Consider for a moment the great and immediate advantages we would gain if we followed up the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty by calling in our time another Federal convention merely to explore, with the other sponsors of this pact, the possibilities of achieving our prime purpose—and theirs—by applying the principles of our Constitution to form another, though limited, a great Atlantic union of the free. Let me mention only seven of the advantages to be gained merely by attempting to work out a similar constitution with them:

First. By promptly following up the pact with the convocation of this federal convention, we give—and get—a much stronger guarantee than we do by the present treaty. The potential aggressor then will know for certain that if he attacks any of the democracies of the convention all the others will spring to its rescue. No one can doubt that every signatory of the pact would thus react if another member were attacked while sitting in a constitutional convention with it. The best guarantee is thus given each democracy by all—the kind of guarantee that is needed to impress all the world and Moscow most of all—and yet it involves no further legal commitment.

Second. The Kremlin would know that a federal convention meant that we were working on something far more formidable than the best staff agreements that can be made under an alliance—that the democracies were aiming to create a federal defense force.

WOULD CUT COST OF DEFENSE

Third. By the same token the Kremlin would also know that the democracies were on the road toward securing much stronger armed power at much less cost—thus freeing more production for civilian recovery, and ending the Soviet hope of economic disaster delivering Europe to communism without a battle.

Fourth. The Kremlin would be thrown at once into this dilemma: The more hostile it was toward the convention, the more it would thereby hasten the last thing the Kremlin could want—agreement by the Atlantic democracies on a federal constitution.

Fifth. The calling of the convention would not interfere with the work of the ECA or with the creation of the council which the North Atlantic Treaty calls for, or its implementation in other respects, or the rearmament of Western Europe. It would allow us to supplement these first-aid measures by tackling simultaneously the three major questions—economic, monetary, and military—which we are now trying to handle only piecemeal. The fact is that they are so closely interrelated that the best hope of solving them lies in wrapping them up in one package—as was done in the Federal Convention which framed our Constitution in 1787.

Psychology plays an important role in business affairs. Merely by rousing the hope of ending such problems as the dollar shortage, through the creation of a common currency, and the immense stimulus to production that federation brings, the calling of the convention would help prevent the present recession from developing disastrously.

TAKES DICTATOR BY SURPRISE

Sixth. The psychological side is no less important as regards the cold war. To overcome dictatorship by the other kind of war the young, as I said earlier, have to be bold. The achievement of our prime purpose of decisively turning the tide against dictatorship without war requires boldness, too, but not in the boys—it requires it of us, here in this hall and in the executive branch. It requires us to "get there fustest with the mostest," to take the aging revolutionists in the Kremlin by surprise, to rock them off their balance by swiftly following ratification of this North Atlantic Treaty with the calling of an Atlantic Federal Convention. Our ratification of this treaty will surprise no one, and certainly not the Kremlin. But for us to call this constitutional convention will do more than make dictators feel weak in the knees. It will come as a great and pleasant surprise to many Americans. It will give all our citizens, and free men and women everywhere, the unbeatable feeling that comes when your free institutions surpass your fondest hopes just when you feared they were failing.

Seventh. By merely calling this convention, we get all these advantages, and this added one, too: We gain all this with no commitment except the obligation to explore as earnestly and carefully and honestly as we can the possibility of federating with other democracies on the basis of our own constitutional principles. Impressive as the term, "Constitutional Convention," rightly is, yet such a convention cannot possibly commit those who call or attend it to anything more than a serious attempt to work out a better system of governing their relations than the one that exists. To stress this point is not to finagle, or deprive the convention of its psychological effect. Democracy itself forbids any democracy to commit its people to any constitution before they have seen it.

Democracy requires us and every democracy to reserve to the people the right to ratify or reject any constitution a convention may draft. We can lose nothing by calling this convention—and we stand to gain more than anyone can imagine.

The question naturally arises as to what support this proposal for a convention to explore the possibilities of a North Atlantic federation has among the people of this country and all the other Atlantic union nations. I have a definite feeling that the people are far ahead of us Members of Congress in their thinking on means and methods of maintaining peace. All the polls show that the people definitely want our country to take the lead in this regard.

In the State of Tennessee, in the last election, I made the proposal for a limited federal union of the North Atlantic democracies an issue in the campaign and the proposal met a hearty response from the people of the "volunteer" State. Other Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives from other States have told me that they had similar experiences in their campaigns. The people unquestionably want Congress to take those steps that may be best calculated to preserve peace and avoid a third and devastating world war.

The people of the other nations involved have the same attitude, in my opinion. I have had the opportunity of talking with a number of members of some of the legislative bodies of the various countries included in the Atlantic Pact and with private citizens of those countries. They agree that the treaty is a useful and necessary interim measure but that we can never have a real unification of the armed forces of the nations involved or a common foreign policy or a necessary economic cooperation until we have a limited federation. The attitude of most statesmen of other North Atlantic democracies with whom I have talked is very well summed up by an expression of Jean Monnet who is a distinguished French leader and statesman. In the Chicago Sun of June 11, 1949, Monsieur Monnet is quoted as saying:

"Now it seems quite certain to me that, if left to ourselves, we of Western Europe will organize nothing that matters. We will talk a lot and make some little arrangements between countries that actually don't count very much.

"We will have all kinds of treaties, pacts, alliances, unions, councils, leagues. But no one European country will give up anything it considers important for the sake of the larger unity. France and Britain won't get together, as they must, and decide what must be done with the Germans.

"There is one big hope at present, but I am rather inclined to think it is only a hope. If your Government in Washington were willing to offer free Europe an Atlantic federation, an Atlantic society, it might awaken us to the revolutionary possibilities of our age."

GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK SUPPORTED BY DALLAS NEWS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, those of us who have been supporting the creation of a new national park in the Guadalupe Mountains of west Texas for a considerable period of time have been greatly encouraged by the widespread community endorsement of this proposal. An editorial in the Dallas Morning News of October 7 describes the advantages and attractions of a national park located on Texas highest mountain.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New National Park

Longer vacations and the big increase in the number of retired persons who like to travel have given a new push to national and State parks. Success of Big Bend National Park in attracting tourists to Texas has brought a movement to establish a second national park in the State. This one would embrace Guadalupe Peak and nearby McKittrick Canyon in far west Texas.

The National Park Service has just made a survey of this area and its report, due in November, is expected to be favorable. The proposed park would attract many who like great open spaces, impressive mountain skylines and the cool nights of relatively high altitudes. The Guadalupe region also is a good area for studying rock formations and plant and animal life. It has plenty of room for developing cabin, trailer, and camp areas.

The park site would have the further advantage in taking only low-priced land that is not put to much, if any, use. It would be within easy motor reach of populous cities in Texas and New Mexico, yet would give the vacationist who so desires that welcome feeling of restful remoteness.

THE EL PASO TIMES COMMENTS ON SALE OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, while many people are quibbling about whether or not the United States should sell surplus wheat to the Soviet Union, the El Paso Times in an editorial Friday, October 4, 1963, has taken a practical approach to the matter.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial captioned "Wheat or Not?" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wheat or Not?

It looks as though someone somewhere along the line has his wires crossed in all this talk about the Soviet Union possibly buying wheat from the United States.

In Winnipeg, the head of the Soviet Grain Board, Leonid Matveey, said the Soviet Union is unlikely to buy any wheat from the United States this year. He said he believed the Russians had purchased a sufficient quantity of wheat without having to buy any from the United States this year.

In Washington, it was said that President Kennedy has tentatively decided to permit the sale of American wheat to Russia but wants Republican leadership approval of the move before acting.

We say again that if Soviet Russia wants to buy some of our surplus wheat, let's sell it to them, but for gold—not credit.

THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT OF 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on Friday, October 4, 1963, the Senate Committee on Public Works reported out an amended version of S. 649, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. This legislation was introduced on January 31, 1963. Hearings were held by the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution on June 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, and 26, 1963. Since the close of the hearings the members of the subcommittee and the full committee and their staffs have been working hard to perfect the original proposal: to make substantial improvements in the basic act without imposing unnecessary burdens on industry and supplementing rather than supplanting State and local efforts to improve water pollution control programs.

The bill, as reported, is a result of our labors. It represents a meeting of minds. Not every member of the committee agrees with every item in the bill, but there is a consensus. It is, I think a reasonable bill, a good bill.

I appreciate the cooperation and good will from members of both parties in the committee which made this achievement possible.

Today, Mr. President, I received a letter from Mr. Charles M. Parker, vice president for research and technology of the American Iron & Steel Institute. In his letter Mr. Parker advised me that the institute is offering its support of S. 649, as reported. This is an endorsement by a responsible and significant segment of American industry which deserves the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Parker be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN IRON & STEEL INSTITUTE,
New York, N.Y., October 2, 1963.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Chairman, Special Subcommittee on Air and Stream Pollution, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The American Iron & Steel Institute has a sincere concern with legislation on air and water pollution control under consideration by your subcommittee. For this reason we have been diligently following the proceedings of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.

S. 649 as reported by the Senate Public Works Committee has been reviewed by our committee on air and water pollution abatement. The American Iron & Steel Institute wishes to offer our support of this bill. Although we are not qualified to comment on section 12 "synthetic detergents" we believe the remainder of S. 649 represents a positive step toward a sound program of stream pollution control for U.S. waters.

We compliment the committee and its staff on a job well done.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES M. PARKER,
Vice President, Research and Technology.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the endorsement of S. 649 by the Iron & Steel Institute is significant for two reasons: First, it confirms the feeling of the Committee on Public Works that this is a reasonable bill; and second, it illustrates a growing awareness that clean water is important for economic health as well as physical health.

S. 649 has clarified the purpose of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by stating that:

> The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution.

The provisions of S. 649 advance these objectives, which are so important to our Nation as we try to gain maximum use of our limited supply of water for public water supplies, recreation, agriculture, industry, fish and wildlife, and other legitimate uses. I urge my colleagues to study S. 649 as reported by the Public Works Committee, and to give careful attention to the report of the committee—Senate Report No. 556.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S VISIT TO UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, there has been considerable speculation recently in the press and among political pundits about a so-called "wave of conservatism" which is said to be sweeping the West, and particularly the Rocky Mountain States. These States, including my State of Utah, are held to be vigorously opposed to President Kennedy and his policies, and it has been stated openly and publicly that the President himself is personally unpopular.

I wish those who profess to believe such nonsense could have been in Salt Lake City the end of September when the President visited Utah and spoke there in our great Mormon Tabernacle. Some 175,000 people lined the route from L. C. Romney Field into Salt Lake City just to catch a glimpse of the President. It was a warm and friendly crowd—a crowd which cheered the President again and again, and called out words of encouragement and praise. Not one critical sign or placard appeared. There were no hecklers. Reporters for Utah newspapers, and other experienced crowd-counters, said frankly it was far and away the largest crowd which had ever turned out to greet any visitor in the history of the State. Certainly it was the greatest public acclaim that I ever saw in my native Utah.

When the President reached Temple Square where he was to make his address he found more than 30,000 people wedged inside the tabernacle grounds trying to get into the 8,000 seats in the tabernacle, or the overflow seats in the assembly hall, while thousands of others milled about in the streets outside. Although the speech was broadcast over every TV station, and rebroadcast an hour later, many people lingered on in Temple Square to stand through it, and to try again to catch just one glimpse of the President as he left.

Nor was there any disappointment in the eloquent and moving speech which he chose to make in Utah. It was his major foreign policy statement of his Western trip, and Utahans realized the subtle compliment he paid to the high level of reason and intellect which prevails in our State, and the wise recognition of Utah as a seat of thought in the Nation.

Utah people rose enthusiastically to the challenge of the visit and to the obvious truth of both the domestic and the foreign policy principles which President Kennedy spelled out. As I stated afterward, the visit and the speech combined to give the people a real lift, and their effects will linger on just as surely as will the resounding echo of the tremendously moving tabernacle choir performance of "The Star Spangled Banner" and "America the Beautiful" before the speech and the swelling climax of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic," which followed the speech.

I ask unanimous consent that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD carry a series of editorials which appeared in Utah newspapers both before and after the President's speech, together with a brief news story which summarizes some of the effects of the visit and speech.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Sept. 26, 1963]

WELCOME, MR. PRESIDENT

Regardless of whether it's political or, as billed, nonpolitical, the Western States trip that brings President Kennedy to Utah Thursday is a welcome one.

The President of the United States gets out this way all too seldom. That's understandable considering the onerous burdens of his office.

But as the only elected representative of all the people, the President should try to maintain as much direct contact as possible with the people to whom he is responsible.

This trip should provide an opportunity for just that. It should give President Kennedy a chance to see Utah—and Utah a chance to see President Kennedy, which should be advantageous to both.

It should provide both a chance to exchange viewpoints, ideas, and information on topics of mutual concern. This makes the trip, really, a two-way affair.

Certainly there are any number of subjects on which Utah will want to make its wants and needs known. Since the ostensible purpose of the trip is to inspect conservation and reclamation projects and areas, that's right down Utah's alley. We're vitally concerned about obtaining congressional approval for Canyonlands National Park in southern Utah. We're now in the process of laying long-range plans for the fullest possible developemnt of Great Salt Lake, in which Congress is showing some interest. Moreover, being an extremely arid State, we take a good deal more than just a passive interest in obtaining more water—for without more water our State cannot achieve its fullest potential.

But President Kennedy will find that Utah's interests are not confined just to a single, narrow field. This is a delusion under which some Easterners seem to labor just because Utah is located in the so-called hinterlands.

If it once was true that Utah's interests were limited by its geographical location, that's no longer the case. The world has changed drastically—and Utah has changed along with it.

Utah can boast of being the uranium capital of the world and a vital part of the Nation's general mining industry. It's also an important hub of the missile industry. Defense plays a major role in our economy.

Anything that affects these also affects us. And the influences on defense, missiles, and strategic minerals are literally worldwide.

Utah, then, has a big stake on what goes on in the world at large. So naturally we're eagerly looking forward to the chance to get together with the man whose decisions, more than those of any other single individual, shape those events—one John Fitzgerald Kennedy, President of the United States.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Sept. 26, 1963]

Kennedy Tour Can Boost Conservation

The Salt Lake Tribune joins in expressing a hearty welcome to President Kennedy on this, the Intermountain West section, of his 11-State tour on behalf of conservation.

Mr. Kennedy, the 11th President in 88 years to visit Salt Lake City, arrives at the Salt Lake Airport about 5:50 p.m. today and will speak at the tabernacle at 8:20. His subject has been billed as conservation and reclamation.

The noticeable limp of the President last week, when he addressed the United Nations General Assembly, caused speculation that his ailing back was giving him more than usual trouble. In light of his arduous schedule for the 5-day cross-country tour, we wish it were practicable for the Chief Executive to hole up for some rest and relaxation in some of the scenic country he will view from the air.

The amiable nonpolitical trip fiction, practiced by Presidents for years, has been demolished repeatedly at stops on the way west. But there is no question about Mr. Kennedy's concern for conservation and the urgent need for rehabilitation and sound management of land and water resources.

Democratic officeholders will be served as well as parks and wild areas, however.

Ten of the eleven States the President will visit will hold senatorial elections next year, with nine of the seats currently held by Democrats. Should the pattern of the 1960 presidential election be repeated in 1964, Mr. Kennedy would lose 82 of the 124 electoral votes of the 11 States. The shadow of Republican Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, looms large over several sparsely populated Western States and conservative elements have aggressive campaigns underway.

Democratic lawmakers are not solidly behind the Kennedy-Udall wilderness-park-conservation program, however. Two top priority administration proposals, the wilderness bill and a conservation reserve fund measure, are tied up for the rest of this year, anyway, in the House Interior Committee, headed by Congressman Aspinall, Colorado Democrat.

The Senate has twice passed the wilderness bill but the conservation fund proposal, to establish a system of user fees to help finance State and local outdoor recreation programs, is bottled up in both House and Senate committees. Significantly, Mr. Aspinall's own bill for a public land policy study—considered by old hands in the conservation fight as a means of stalling other related legislation—has been reported out by the Aspinall committee.

Conservation means different things to different individuals and groups, of course, Mr. Kennedy will view a broad range of conservation projects (or the raw material for them) including some reclamation dams. At the Salt Lake Airport Friday morning he will press a button to activate (ceremoniously, anyway) by remote control a power generator at Flaming Gorge Reclamation Dam in northeastern Utah.

This is a key part of the vital Upper Colorado project.

The New York Times which speaks often for the wilderness preservation bloc, plaintively asked this week, "Where are the park projects, the wilderness projects which have been advocated in official statements by the Kennedy administration?"

Well, the presidential party flew over Apostle Islands off Wisconsin in Lake Superior, Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming, among others, and Oregon Dunes, Lassen Volcanic National Park and other park projects are on his itinerary.

The Times complains that Mr. Kennedy is "missing a great opportunity to focus attention on some really significant issues," such as Bridge and Marble Canyon, the redwoods of California and the Northern Cascades wilderness.

This will be much more true if the presidential party does not given official attention to the many hundreds of thousands of acres of severely eroded range and watershed land of the West, badly in need of rehabilitation and better stewardship.

Sound conservation includes protecting wilderness and scenic grandeur, but it also includes sound management of other less spectacular land and water resources.

We hope this fact also is emphasized by the Kennedy tour.

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, Sept. 27, 1963]

J. F. K.: "Days of Quiet Past Gone"

It was a somber President of the United States who stood in the hallowed Salt Lake Tabernacle Thursday night to explain to the people of Utah the "realities" of the world that exists today.

John F. Kennedy obviously realized that the tabernacle was no place for a political address on this, the highlight appearance of his current rapid tour of the West.

He had been expected to talk on reclamation—and defend the New Frontier's record in this area.

Instead, the Democratic President mentioned reclamation only briefly, then turned to global problems—and particularly their relationship to the United States.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out that more than a century ago "It took Brigham Young and his brave followers 108 days to go from Winter Quarters, Nebr., to the valley of the Great Salt Lake; it takes 30 minutes for a missile to go from one continent to another today."

None of the throng jammed into the tabernacle, nor the thousands packing Temple Square's beautiful grounds, could disagree with the young Chief Executive when he pointed out: "We did not seek to become a world power. This position was thrust upon us by events. But we became one just the same. And I'm proud that we did."

We agree, too, with the President in his feeling that America "cannot turn our back on the world outside" because "if we do, we jeopardize our economic prosperity * * * our political stability * * * our physical safety."

That John F. Kennedy well realizes his responsibilities in foreign affairs is illustrated by his declaration that "Americans have come a long way in a short time in accepting the somber necessity of our world involvement."

There were sympathetic smiles on the faces of many in the audience when the President explained that "the strain of this involvement remains * * *. We find ourselves entangled with apparently unanswerable problems in apparently unpronounceable places * * *. We discover that our enemy in one decade is our ally in the next * * *. We find ourselves committed to governments whose actions we often cannot approve, assisting societies with principles very different from our own."

It's a tough job, being President of the United States at a time like this.

But the President knows, as one must admit when he is realistic, that "in world affairs as in all other aspects of life, the days of the quiet past are gone forever * * *. We cannot return to the day of the sailing schooner and the covered wagon, even if we wished."

As to realities of the world, Mr. Kennedy's Utah summation was mighty clear. He listed these major points:

1. We must recognize we cannot remake the world simply by our own command.
2. We must recognize that every nation determines its policy in terms of its own interest.
3. We must recognize that foreign policy in the modern world does not lend itself to simple black-and-white choices of good or evil.

With this reasoning in mind, it is easier to understand why the President is all for the nuclear test ban treaty as "the first step on a long journey toward a world free from the threats and tensions of war." It helps explain his foreign aid policy and many diplomatic maneuverings of recent years.

We join with President Kennedy in the feeling that "we have history going for us today" and that the Nation should be realistic and increase its "vigilance, devotion and, most of all, its perseverance—perseverance like the people of Utah have shown for 100 years."

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Sept. 28, 1963]

Mr. Kennedy on Foreign Policy

As the strains of the "Battle Hymn of the Republic" faded away Thursday evening, Utahans could justifiably have come away from the Salt Lake Tabernacle feeling they also had heard a new kind of "Battle Hymn of the Republic" from the President of the United States.

That's what President Kennedy's speech amounted to. And in its own way, the hymn the President spoke was uplifting and challenging as was the one the tabernacle choir sang.

"As He died to make men holy, let us live to make men free," was the message of the song. Making men free—and the difficult road we must travel to reach that goal—was also the message of the President.

In his message, Mr. Kennedy demonstrated that an important function of the Presidency, in addition to its executive responsibility, is to act at times as an educator. That he did when he uttered some valuable lessons on American foreign policy, lessons that were spelled out in terms we all should be able to understand and appreciate.

If any one theme was woven through his message it was the theme of national self-interest.

"National interest is more powerful than ideology," Mr. Kennedy pointed out, quoting Palmerston to the effect that "Friendships may rise or wane, but interest endures."

That's why we support the United Nations—because it's in our own interest to have an international forum where the statesmen of the world can assemble to air their views, to mobilize world opinion, and to strive through mutual endeavor to keep the peace.

That's why we have sought to halt atmospheric nuclear testing—because it's in our own interest to stop spewing radioactivity into the air we breathe.

That's why we provide foreign aid—because it's in our own interest to help maintain stability elsewhere in order to preserve it at home.

That's why we sometimes support nations whose actions we deplore—we cannot shape others in our own exact image, but it's in our own interest to enlist their assistance in combating the spread of communism, which is a threat to all of us.

This may sound selfish of us but it's not, really. In many respects our interests are identical with those of free men everywhere—and in serving our interests we also serve mankind.

The fresh perspective on world problems thus offered by President Kennedy should do much to clarify the Nation's thinking on our ambitions and responsibilities abroad.

A desire for clearer thinking also was behind the President's injunction to beware of looking at the modern world in terms of black-and-white simplicity. It is on this one point that exception might be taken to the President's message. His declaration that the Communist offensive "has been thwarted and turned back in the past 2 years," is too pat, too simple. Actually, the major corner in stemming the advance of communism was turned under a previous Democratic administration when the Truman and Marshall plans were inaugurated. The same policy was continued under the Eisenhower administration and is being maintained today under the leadership of President Kennedy.

Even so, the President's address here provided some guidelines that should help this Republic in waging the modern battle called the cold war. One such guideline is that isolationism has long ago ceased to be practical because America's influence has been pushed beyond its own borders by its economic, military, and cultural growth that cannot be turned back. Another is that world leadership has been thrust upon us and we cannot turn our backs on the challenge except at our own peril.

If world peace is to be attained, however, one final point needs to be added to the President's remarks: No genuine, enduring peace—whether on a personal basis or on an international basis—can be won until men learn to live righteously in accordance with God's commandments.

The "Battle Hymn of the Republic" for our times may then well be: While we're living to make men free let's also live to make men holy—since the two concepts are, in the final analysis, inseparable.

AND ON HUMAN RESOURCES

In their consideration of President Kennedy's persuasive discourse on foreign relations, we hope Utahans did not miss the impact of the speech he might have given but didn't.

Nor should they miss the subtle compliment he paid to Utah and its people.

As the White House had advertised, this swing West was primarily intended to look at and talk about conservation problems and projects. This has been the theme of almost all his addresses along the way.

That he chose to give his major foreign policy address—his first since the ratification of the test ban treaty and his most comprehensive reply to the rightwing critics of America's policy—in the Salt Lake Tabernacle is a tribute to the audience he expected here.

But equally significant were his few words about the real heart of conservation in America—the conservation of human resources.

Utah has been through some trying times with its educational crisis of recent months. Adverse publicity, unjustified but nonetheless real, has spread across the country. It was good to hear the President of the United States tell the Nation that Utah leads America in the percentage of its youth who finish high school and go on to college.

One would hope that the deeper import of this fact was not lost on President Kennedy. He should understand that Utah, despite its economic problems, has managed this record on its own. It has shown that a State with the will and the ideals that he so graciously described as stemming from the first pioneers in these valleys can do the job without Federal help.

But if a sense of complacent satisfaction was all Utahans got from the President's remarks on youth conservation, his effort would have been wasted. Certainly with this recognition of quantitative success we must accept the challenge of achieving far greater qualitative success.

It is not enough merely to send our youngsters to school longer. We must also send them to better schools, under better teachers, with better parental understanding and community support of the problems educators face.

Thanks, Mr. President, for your kind words about Utah. Utahans now face the challenge to make ourselves more worthy of this kind of national recognition.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune, Sept. 28, 1963]

Learning To Live in a Perilous World

President Kennedy lived up to the promise that he would deliver a major address of his western tour in Salt Lake City. While the address did not follow the advance billing of a conservation theme, the broad foreign policy subject had a wider national and even international significance.

It was a good speech, thoughtful and thought provoking. And it was nonpolitical.

Mr. Kennedy's basic theme in his Tabernacle address was the need for Americans to face the realities of a world in which we have responsibilities we cannot dodge, burdens we cannot shirk, and a world in which we must deal with problems so complex and baffling as to defy quick and easy solutions.

It is understandable, the President said, that many Americans should look back with nostalgia to simpler times when we lived in safety and prosperity at a comfortable distance from the rest of the world.

But it is a simple fact, as Mr. Kennedy said, that today "we cannot turn our back on the world outside."

Like it or not, we are part of the world—and in this age of supersonic planes, missiles that can cross the ocean in minutes, weapons that can erase whole cities, and deadly radioactive clouds that can encircle the globe—there is just no such thing as isolation for the United States.

The concept of a fortress America is as dead as the dodo.

The question then is how to face the realities of a world in which we are inevitably deeply involved.

Mr. Kennedy said one answer is to realize that we cannot by command remake the world in our own image. We must recognize that each nation is bound to act in terms of its own interest. We must accept the fact there are many complex and baffling problems which defy pat solution—that, as he said, "to adopt a black-and-white, all-or-nothing policy subordinates our interests to our irritations."

We must in fact have a policy of flexibility. While being ever vigilant to protect American security against any threat, we must be ever ready to take steps which lead toward a more peaceful and stable world.

This does not mean appeasement. But it also does not mean mere belligerence. It means strength, but it also means reasonableness and responsibility.

Fundamentally this is the policy this Nation has been following ever since World War II, under three different administrations, both Democratic and Republican.

It is a policy we must continue to follow, with broad American public understanding and support.

This is a perilous world. We cannot isolate ourselves from it. We can only live in it if we are prepared to face its complex and baffling problems, realistically and with the kind of rational understanding for which Mr. Kennedy so effectively appealed.

[From the Provo Herald, September 29, 1963]

Utahans Get Lift From Kennedy Visit

In his concise remarks following President Kennedy's Utah address at the Mormon Tabernacle Thursday night, Senator Frank E. Moss told the Chief Executive: "you have given us a real lift tonight."

The comment seemed to pretty well fit the situation. The more than 8,000 persons who jammed the Salt Lake Tabernacle showed by the expressions on their faces that they did indeed get a "lift" from the President's appearance and his address.

There were other thousands outside the tabernacle who lingered to hear the speech as it was broadcast over the Temple Square and who struggled in the crowd for a glimpse of the President.

Crowds swarmed at the airport and hotel for a good look and the route of Mr. Kennedy's motorcade was a sea of faces as men, women and children strained for a good look. Many Central Utahans traveled to Salt Lake City for an "in person" view of the President.

But perhaps the people who received the biggest lift of all were the leaders of the Democratic Party in Utah who were walking on air and felt that the Demo stock went up several notches as a result of the President's visit. The 1964 election will provide an accurate gage on this. In 1960 all of Utah's electoral votes went to Richard Nixon, Mr. Kennedy's Republican opponent.

President Kennedy and his party, from all reports, were highly pleased with the Utah appearance and felt the warm reception and huge crowds capped anything else up to this point on the President's 11-State tour.

The visitors themselves couldn't help being impressed with a couple of observations during their memorable night at the Mormon Tabernacle. One was the respect Utahans have for their own President David O. McKay, who received as long a standing ovation as did President Kennedy; and the other was the tremendously moving performance of the Tabernacle Choir which sang "America the Beautiful," "The Star Spangled Banner," and "The Battle Hymn of the Republic," as these selections are seldom sung. The performance drew loud praise from the corps of newsmen accompanying the President.

Yes, the President's visit was a great occasion, from many standpoints. It provided a lift, all right—one which will be long remembered.

WHEAT SALES TO COMMUNIST-BLOC NATIONS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a resolution adopted by the five Northwest State Farmers Union presidents, Edwin Smith, of North Dakota; Leonard Kenfield, of Montana; Edwin Christianson, of Minnesota; Ben Radcliffe, of South Dakota; and Gilbert J. Rohde, of Wisconsin. I am in full accord with the position taken in this resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We believe that since Soviet Russia has become a signatory to the international wheat agreement beginning with the 1963 crop year, that it is reasonable to explore the possibilities of a sale of American wheat for dollars or for gold.

The International Wheat Agreement has been in force since 1949 and up to this time, Soviet Russia had been outside the agreement and has normally been an exporting rather than an importing nation.

We would be favorable to an authorization making it possible for the United States to deal with any nation that is a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement. We consider it a good sign that more and more nations are joining in the orderly marketing of wheat in international trade.

Farmers Union has historically taken the position that as long as there is hunger somewhere in the world, we should seek every way to make our abundant production available to the people.

PLOT TO GET OTEPKA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, for a long time, the American public has been demanding a thorough investigation of the State Department. Newspapers and private citizens have joined in demanding that this bureaucratic nightmare be cleared out. In effect, there is widespread sentiment that the State Department is in bad need of a purge.

It now appears that a purge of personnel in the State Department is being attempted. Unfortunately, it is the very opposite of what the critics of the State Department had in mind, for it is, in effect, an attempted purge of patriots.

Reports in the press relate that the State Department has filed charges against Mr. Otto Otepka, Chief of the Security Evaluation Division. It seems clear that these charges are based primarily on the offense committed by Mr. Otepka in candidly telling the truth to a Senate committee. In addition, the State Department is reported to have issued directions that employees of the State Department are forbidden any contact with the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee or its staff.

This matter raises the most serious and fundamental questions. In the first place, it appears to be a clear-cut case of retaliation against a Government employee for cooperating with a Senate committee. Congress should tolerate no such retaliation, for this is an offense not just against the individual, but also against the Congress; and if such action does not now constitute contempt of the Senate which is punishable by imprisonment, it is the business of the Senate to close any loopholes, so that retaliation against any witness before a congressional committee will constitute a criminal offense with an appropriate penalty.

This matter also brings into issue the so-called issue of executive privilege. From what appears in the press, it seems clear that not even the broadest definition of this often misused doctrine could apply in the Otepka case, for no one contends that the so-called privilege can be claimed by other than the President himself. In this instance, it appears that the directive to State Department employees prohibiting contact with the Senate committee did not emanate from the President, but rather from a bureaucrat within the State Department itself.

Mr. President, there are but two aspects of this very serious matter. There are many other serious implications in this case, not the least of which is the security practices, or the lack of them, in the State Department.

I sincerely hope that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate will press its continuing investigation of this matter with vigor and resolve. The entire Senate should support this investigation. State Department's attempted purge of patriots must not be tolerated, and this very attempt is further evidence that a thorough investigation of the entire State Department is in order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the following:

A newspaper article from the Des Moines Sunday Register of October 6, entitled "How Security Clash Led to Aid's Ouster," over the byline of Mr. Clark Mollenhoff.

A newspaper article from the Chicago Tribune of September 29, entitled "Clash Set Off by State Department's Officer Firing," over the byline of Mr. Willard Edwards.

A newspaper article from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of October 2, entitled "State Department Official Said His Superiors Lied," over the byline of Mr. Edward O'Brien.

A newspaper article from the Washington Evening Star of October 4, 1963, entitled "Otepka Row Widens as Senate Calls Rusk," over the byline of Mr. Earl Voss.

An editorial from the Charleston News and Courier of October 4, entitled "The Otepka Case."

An editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "State Department Coverup."

And an editorial from the St. Louis Globe Democrat of October 3, entitled "Plot To Get Otepka."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Oct. 6, 1963]

HOW SECURITY CLASH LED TO AID'S OUSTER—OTEPKA QUESTIONED QUICK CLEARANCE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Last June, six security officers walked into the office of State Department Security Evaluator Otto Otepka, seized his records, and the contents of his safe and ousted him from his office.

Otepka, 48, Chief of the Security Evaluation Division, was surprised and shaken by the ordeal of being unceremoniously removed from his responsibilities as a key figure in the State Department security program.

In 1958, the veteran lawyer and career civil servant had received the State Department's meritorious service award.

FALLEN FROM FAVOR

In May 1962 Otepka was given the opportunity for advanced executive training at the National War College.

Why had an official with an outstanding record, and with tremendous responsibility in the administration of the State Department security program, fallen so far from favor with his superiors?

There were no allegations that Otepka was a security risk, or that he had anything in his background to question his fitness to hold the $16,965-a-year job.

Otepka said last week that he asked John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Security, for an explanation.

Otepka said Reilly refused to give him a reason.

On June 27, Otepka was called to Reilly's office, where Reilly informed him that he would have a new special assignment—preparing a handbook on security matters.

Otepka was informed that he would be moved from his office, room 3333 in the State Department Building, to a small office, and that he would be provided with secretarial services only upon request through Reilly's office.

ENTERED OFFICE

As Otepka and Reilly walked from Reilly's office to Otepka's office, six security officers joined them and entered Otepka's office. Otepka was asked for the combinations to his safes, and access to all other material in his office.

Reilly and the six officials combed through the records in the office and arranged to change the combinations on Otepka's 14 safes.

After about 20 minutes, Otepka was permitted to leave for a luncheon engagement. When he returned, Otepka found he was barred from his own office.

He went to Reilly's office, asked for an explanation, and requested that he be given access to information in his office that he would need for carrying out the new assignment in writing the security handbook.

Otepka said Reilly declined to discuss the reasons for the action.

Otepka said that Reilly lectured him briefly on "institutional loyalty" to the State Department. Otepka said he replied that "loyalty to country should be first and paramount."

Although Otepka was surprised at the method of removing him from his duties, the sharp friction had been apparent for several months.

In fact, Otepka did not attend the National War College because his own investigation indicated that the move was an effort to get rid of him.

The source of the friction was obvious. Otepka was transferred in 1953 from the Civil Service Commission to the State Department Security Division in the regime of the late R. W. Scott McLeod.

To many Democrats and within some foreign service circles at the State Department, there was a sharp antagonism to any person regarded as having been a part of the McLeod organization.

Otepka, a Government employee since 1936, served as deputy to McLeod, and was part of a small team that had been responsible for instituting tighter security regulations and procedures under the Eisenhower administration. Otepka continued as deputy after McLeod became Ambassador to Ireland, and it was long after McLeod left that Otepka received his meritorious service award.

When the Kennedy administration came into power in 1961, Otepka was dropped from his deputy job to that of chief security evaluator. This was a slight drop in status, although his civil service rating and salary remained on the same level.

The New Frontier had some new views on how the State Department security procedures should be handled. The tighter rules and regulations instituted under the Eisenhower administration were regarded as unreasonably tight. Some officials attacked the preemployment investigations of some personnel as insulting.

Otepka took issue with those who sought to change the security rules. He had a face-to-face disagreement with the Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland.

He also disagreed with Cleveland on several individuals who were named to a panel that was to study security program operations.

Otepka held that the security files of several persons being named to the panel disclosed such questionable activity that they should be given a full FBI investigation, and some should be rejected even before an FBI report.

Cleveland and some other high State Department officials insisted that these men should be named to the panel and Otepka was overridden.

Otepka objected to the State Department's frequent use of emergency security clearance for officials being appointed.

ONLY FIVE TIMES

The law provided for emergency security clearance by the Secretary of State for purposes of speeding through an appointment, and when the Secretary of State wished to take personal responsibility for the naming of some person who was regarded as doubtful by the security division.

In the Eisenhower administration, the emergency security clearance was used only five times in unusual cases, but Secretary of State Dean Rusk has used emergency clearance more than 150 times.

Many of these people were hired without the knowledge of Otepka.

Otepka testified freely on his views before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Called before the Internal Security Committee, he also testified frankly on his views on such widely publicized cases as those of William Wieland and John Steward Service.

He testified that he had opposed the continued employment of both Wieland and Service as unsuitable for employment. He had never made a finding that either was disloyal.

SLATED FOR POST

Otepka's work in back files of the State Department produced much of the information on Wieland's role in Cuba and Wieland's strong support of Cuban Premier Fidel Castro.

When the Kennedy administration came into power, the State Department personnel office had slated Wieland for assignment to a highly sensitive post in Germany.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who had strong feelings about the Wieland case, went to Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Attorney General Kennedy intervened to block the assignment of Wieland to any post considered as sensitive.

Although Wieland has continued in the Department, he has been assigned to paper shuffling jobs. Otepka has been of the opinion that Wieland should be forced to retire.

In his testimony, Otepka has been critical of the decisions of superiors.

He also has found himself at odds with some of the higher officials of the State Department as to facts, and this indicated that errors or perjury were involved in the testimony of Otepka or those who gave contradictory testimony.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee asked Otepka if he could support his testimony with documents. Otepka produced memorandums and other information from State Department files to support his story.

SUBCOMMITTEE ENRAGED

The barring of Otepka from his office in what appeared to be retaliation for cooperating with the subcommittee resulted in a congressional effort to question Rusk.

Many subcommitee members—Democrats and Republicans—were enraged with the lack of cooperation from the State Department and the evidence indicating retaliation. However, they said they did not believe Rusk was aware of the details of the problem.

Since early July, Senator Thomas Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, has been seeking to arrange a hearing with Rusk.

On September 23, Reilly filed notice of charges against Otepka. He charged that Otepka had given State Department information to unauthorized persons, and named the person as Jay Sourwine, chief counsel for the Internal Security Committee.

BILL OF PARTICULARS

Dodd went to New York last Wednesday to serve a bill of particulars on Rusk and to ask for an explanation. Rusk has indicated he will make himself available for questioning this week in a case that has the potential for political explosiveness that would rank it with the Alger Hiss prejury case.

The bill of particulars sent to Rusk charged that there has been a coverup of laxity in the security operations at the State Department, and specifically alleges perjury by some State Department officials.

Also at issue will be the recently issued State Department orders that will require that all State Department officials refuse to talk to Congressmen or the staff members of congressional committees unless there has been notice and approval by the State Department.

This is being lashed in Congress as "an outrageous" interference with the right of Congress to investigate as well as an interference with the right of free speech.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 29, 1963]

Clash Set Off by State Department Officer Firing—Ouster Blamed on Aid to Senate Inquiry

(By Willard Edwards)

Washington, September 28.—The charges against a State Department security officer who was notified that he is to be removed from office include an allegation that he revealed a "confidential" report which had been sent to McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Kennedy.

This was learned today as developments indicated a head-on clash between the State Department and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee headed by Senator James O. Eastland, Democrat, of Mississippi.

COOPERATED WITH COMMITTEE

Otto F. Otepka, 48, Chief of the Division of Evaluations in the Department's office of security, is the central figure in this controversy. Charges against him were filed September 23. He was given until October 3 to answer but his attorney, Roger Robb, today obtained a 10-day extension.

Eastland noted that the main burden of the charges against Otepka was that he cooperated with the Senate subcommittee investigating operations of the State Department's security office.

"The powers of Congress are at stake," Eastland said, "and I intend to protect Mr. Otepka, by every means at my command, against accusations which complain, in effect, that he told the truth when asked to do so by a Senate subcommittee."

"BURN BAG" SEARCHED

The subcommittee will meet early next week to consider procedures to follow in a conflict reminiscent of those of a decade ago when Congress was defied by the executive department in investigations of the loyalty of Federal employees.

The State Department admitted Thursday that a letter of charges had been filed against Otepka. It refused to disclose the nature of the charges and its reluctance was explainable when a reporter obtained a copy of them today.

Much of the evidence, upon which the charges are based, came from surreptitious examination of Otepka's "burn bag," in which he placed security material for destruction.

John F. Reilly, the Department's Assistant Secretary of Security, one of the officials questioned by the subcommittee in its investigation, ordered this classified trash bag secretly searched. It was marked with a red X when taken to the State Department's mail room and turned over to Reilly, who put the little bag in his brief case .

ALL DISCARDS STUDIED

Torn pieces of paper were pasted together. All carbons were studied. One-time typewriter ribbons were examined. On the basis of what was found John Ordway, chief of the personnel operations division, accused Otepka of conduct unbecoming an officer of the State Department.

Last June 18, the charges stated a confidential report to Bundy at the White House, written by William H. Brubeck, Special Assistant to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Executive Secretary of the State Department, was found in Otepka's burn bag. It was not the original but a duplicator copy and the tops and bottoms of pages of the aforementioned document had been cut off, removing the confidential notation.

OTHER CHARGES LODGED

This declassification and mutilation of a classified document was in violation of law. Otepka was informed. There was no disclosure of the contents of the report to Bundy but it presumably referred to security conditions in the State Department, the subject of the Senate inquiry.

Otepka was also charged:

1. With furnishing a copy of a classified memorandum concerning eight State Department employes to J. G. Sourwine, chief counsel of the Senate Subcommittee. The memorandum dealt with the loyalty of the employees and its disclosure was a breach of the standard of conduct expected of a State Department officer.

2. With furnishing a copy of a classified memorandum concerning the processing of the appointments of members of the Advisory Committee on International Organizations to a person outside the Department. This was stated to be a violation of former President Truman's 1948 directive holding all records relative to the loyalty of Government employees to be confidential.

3. Declassification of a confidential document addressed to the Security Department from John Noonan, supervisory security specialist on the subject of a security meeting in the Department.

FIND QUESTIONS HE WROTE

4. Declassification of a confidential memorandum addressed to Otepka from Frederick W. Traband, supervisor of personnel security, on the subject: "Security evaluative services" of two department branches.

5. Declassification of a memorandum to J. M. Barta, international relations officer, concerning procedures for reviewing and disposing of adverse information on employees of international organizations dealing with inter-American affairs.

A carbon found in the burn bag, the letter of charges stated, revealed questions prepared by Otepka to be used by Sourwine, the subcommittee counsel, in the interrogation of Reilly, the deputy assistant secretary for security, when he appeared before the subcommittee. Sourwine asked these questions of Reilly, it was stated.

On June 10, a typewriter ribbon in the bag disclosed a set of 24 questions phrased by Otepka to be used in questioning another State Department official. Sourwine asked 15 of these questions.

EVIDENCE CALLED DYNAMITE

The Otepka case has been a subject of whispered comment in Washington for months. Otepka is regarded as a highly respected veteran of the Security Department, responsible for exposing a number of disloyalty cases in his 10 years in the State Department.

The Senate inquiry on conditions in the Department's security office was instigated months ago. Otepka testified for 6 days in secret hearings and one listening Senator described his evidence as "political dynamite."

Secretary of State Rusk was summoned to testify but put off an appearance by pleading the pressure of other affairs. He finally agreed to appear August 30 but, for reasons not made public, was given an indefinite stay shortly before he was to have testified.

Otepka meanwhile had been put under close surveillance. He retained his title as Chief of the Security Evaluations Office, a $16,000 post, but was transferred from his office to a cubbyhole. This office was "bugged" and his phone was tapped. The Federal Bureau of Investigation was called in to interrogate him.

A number of State Department officials were questioned by the subcommittee. But others were forbidden by the State Department to testify.

The State Department was reportedly alarmed lest the Senate subcommittee's disclosures should be made public before or during Senate debate on the treaty of Moscow, banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere and underwater.

The letter of charges against Otepka was given to him on the day before the Senate ratified the treaty. He engaged Robb, a Washington attorney, and asserted his determination to fight what he regarded as harassment for performance of his duty.

A congressional statute declares that all civil service employees have the right to give information to Congress and may not be restrained in that right. The Truman directive, issued in the year that the Alger Hiss perjury-espionage case was exposed, appears to conflict with that statute.

The claim of "executive privilege," the right of the President to withhold any information about Government employees in the public interest, has been invoked by the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 2, 1963]

STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL SAYS HIS SUPERIORS LIED—OTEPKA DENIES GIVING SECRET DATA TO SENATE—FORMER CUBAN POLICY ADVISER'S RECORD INVOLVED

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Otto F. Otepka, State Department security official who has been threatened with dismissal, charged Tuesday that "my superiors" in the Department gave "untrue" testimony about the handling of certain personnel cases to a Senate subcommittee.

Mr. Otepka, who for 10 years held a key position in granting security clearances to State Department officers and employees, said the current charges against him stem from the fact that he had sought to refute the allegedly false statements he felt reflected on his performance.

DENIES CHARGES

In an exclusive interview, Mr. Otepka denied he ever had furnished classified documents or other restricted information to any unauthorized person.

He said he had answered certain questions by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, but only after the subcommittee had initiated its own investigation of State Department security procedures.

He said he had declined to "name names" in the individual personnel cases under study by the subcommittee, but since he was under oath, "I could not and did not deny I had official knowledge of these cases."

The State Department filed 13 charges against Mr. Otepka on September 23 as a preliminary to forcing his dismissal from the Government.

Friends of Mr. Otepka have said the charges amount to an allegation that he cooperated with the Senate subcommittee, which long has been keeping State Department personnel security procedures under review.

In the interview, Mr. Otepka said he intends to fight the charges through Civil Service Commission channels. Several Members of Congress have come to his support, saying the real issue is whether Congress can obtain information from executive departments without inviting reprisals against Government witnesses.

A Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report on October 16, 1962, gave high praise to Mr. Otepka as a personnel security officer.

The report stated that his unfavorable recommendations against William Wieland, a top-ranking State Department official in deciding policy toward Fidel Castro during Castro's rise to power in Cuba, had brought harm to Mr. Otepka's State Department career.

It became evident Tuesday that Mr. Otepka's new troubles arose out of the subcommittee's continued interest in the Wieland and other controversial State Department security cases.

Early this year, the subcommittee began delving into additional State Department personnel cases. As Deputy Security Director and Chief Security Evaluator for the Department, Mr. Otepka was summoned to testify in executive session.

He said Tuesday the three main charges against him now are that he gave classified information to Subcommittee Counsel J. G. Sourwine in violation of a 1948 Presidential order restricting the flow of information to congressional committees.

Mr. Otepka told this newspaper he "did not run to Mr. Sourwine." Upon being asked to testify, he said, "I did so, as I always have, with the Department's permission and guidance and with the knowledge of my superiors."

When Mr. Sourwine's questions got into an area where I had knowledge, Mr. Otepka said, he could not and did not give substantive information on the individual cases.

Later, he said, his superiors in the Department, whom he did not name, also testified, telling the subcommittee that the individual cases in question had never been called to their attention by Mr. Otepka.

TESTIMONY CONFLICTS

"This put their testimony in conflict with mine and with my official knowledge. Their testimony was untrue," Mr. Otepka said.

Since his superiors had used the subcommittee forum to make their statements, Mr. Otepka said, he felt entitled to rebut their statements and present the true facts.

He said the best evidence he could present was documentation which I myself had classified in the first place. He said these documents proved that he brought the disputed cases to his superiors' notice and that they had acknowledged the notices in their own handwrting.

"I have a right to defend myself," he said. "I'm not going to run to my superiors and seek permission to rebut their testimony. That would be a lot of nonsense.

"I'm charged with violating an order when all I did was to defend myself."

For his second subcommittee appearance, Mr. Otepka said, he had dictated to his secretary a rough draft of the points he wished to cover. To this, he attached the documents "which I myself had classified and which I wished to place in the subcommittee record."

He said he gave one copy to Mr. Sourwine and put the other copy in his office safe.

The State Department's charges relate, he said, that the typewritter ribbon which was used by his secretary, was picked out of his "burn bag" for office debris and reconstructed by his superiors. This led to several of the specific counts against him in the charges, he said.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 4, 1963]

OTEPKA ROW WIDENS AS SENATE CALLS RUSK

(By Earl H. Voss)

The Senate Judiciary Committee has sent Secretary of State Rusk a strongly worded demand to produce witnesses, including Mr. Rusk himself, to discuss security procedures in the State Department.

Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, vice chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Internal Security, made a special trip to New York Wednesday to deliver personally a 10-page memorandum to Mr. Rusk.

The memorandum and covering letter signed by Judiciary Committee Chairman EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, was approved by the committee's members.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and brother of the President, did not dissent from the Judiciary Committee's decision to send the memorandum to Mr. Rusk, according to congressional sources.

MAJOR FLAP BREWING

The personal approach by Senator DODD to Mr. Rusk followed the State Department's announcement last Friday of charges filed against its chief security evaluator, Otto F. Otepka, which could result in his discharge.

Mr. Otepka is accused of passing classified information on loyalty and security cases in the State Department to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in violation of a 1948 Executive order.

The subcommittee believed it had obtained a commitment from the State Department that there would be no reprisals against employees testifying before the committee.

The Department, according to the understanding of congressional sources, claims its action against Mr. Otepka is not in reprisal for his testimony but a consequence of improper actions, among them mutilating and improperly declassifying information on State Department employees loyalty.

Mr. Otepka intends to fight the charges through civil service channels and into the courts, if necessary.

The Judiciary Committee has asked Mr. Rusk for a full report on the Otepka case from qualified State Department officials as well as other information on security procedures in the Department.

The Senate subcommittee has heard testimony leading it to believe the State Department has been lax in protecting the national security.

A recent subcommittee report indicates, for instance, that Mr. Rusk approved more than 150 waivers of security clearances of new employees by mid-1962. One-fourth of these waivers were backdated, the subcommittee was told.

Senators on the Internal Security Subcommittee are also said to be concerned about cases of possible perjury by State Department witnesses who have come before them.

RUSK BREAKS DATES

Secretary Rusk decided several weeks ago that only he himself should testify for the State Department before the committee.

On August 15 members of the State Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs and the Office of Security, where Mr. Otepka has been working, were forbidden to contact the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee without permission.

Mr. Rusk has broken several dates to appear before the subcommittee because of the press of other business. One intervening event was his trip to Moscow in August to sign the partial nuclear test-ban treaty.

Since he received the Judiciary Committee's memorandum, however, Mr. Rusk now is reported by Department officials to have decided other State Department employees may testify before the subcommittee. He still intends to appear himself later, it is reported.

[From the Charleston News and Courier, Oct. 4, 1963]

THE OTEPKA CASE

The persecution of Otto Otepka, Chief of the Evaluation Division of the Office of Security in the U.S. State Department, cries out for public attention.

Determined efforts are being made to drive Mr. Otepka from Government service, apparently because he discussed State Department security risks with the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The subcommittee is reported to have heard testimony that Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs, is appointing persons with questionable security backgrounds. The grave allegation was made that Mr. Cleveland inquired as to whether Alger Hiss, convicted perjurer and symbol of disloyalty to the United States, could be brought back into the State Department.

In view of the fact that persons of proven disloyalty have held high posts in the State Department in years past, the subcommittee has a duty to dig deeply into the new charges.

The immediate task is for Mr. Otepka to be protected against vindictive persons in the State Department. We understand there are portions of the United States Code which clearly assert the right and duty of executive branch officials to confer and exchange information with officials of the legislative branch. A precedent must not be established whereby leftwingers in the State Department can silence or punish loyal Americans who have information of disloyal activities.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, is the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He has participated in many investigations of security problems. We hope that Senator JOHNSTON will devote his attention to the case of Otto Otepka, and will investigate the grave charge that security risks are being eased back into the State Department.

[From the Chicago Tribune]

THE STATE DEPARTMENT COVERUP

The Senate Judiciary Committee has taken the unprecedented action of dispatching a U.S. Senator to deliver by hand to Secretary of State Rusk a letter from the full committee. The letter is described as commanding the Secretary to cease obstructing an investigation of frightening breaches of security within the Department or accept the consequences of public exposure.

The letter was carried to New York City, where Rusk is conferring with the Soviet and British Foreign Ministers, by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Mr. DODD was accompanied by the subcommittee counsel. The Senator also delivered a covering letter from Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, informing Secretary Rusk that the committee intended to meet the challenge posed by a State Department order forbidding employees to testify.

The Department has brought charges against one officer who did testify before the subcommittee. The witness, Otto F. Otepka, Chief of the Division of Evaluations in the Department's Office of Security, is accused of disclosing to the subcommittee Department reports which were classified as confidential. It is understood that he detailed evidence of suspected disloyalty which appalled Senators.

The Judiciary Committee has notified Secretary Rusk that it will defend Otepka's right to testify under provisions of the United States Code and in conformity with concurrent resolutions of the House and Senate adopted in 1958. Mr. Rusk has responded that he will appear before the committee and present his Department's view.

In its letter to the Secretary, the committee has charged that a high official of the Department gave false testimony to the subcommittee under oath. The whole pattern of interference with the subcommittee's inquiry suggests that the State Department knows that it is culpable and is trying to suppress a scandal which could rock the administration.

This is not the first time that an attempt has been made to push Otepka out of the Department. Two years ago the administration announced that 25 trained security agents were to be hacked out of the Department's Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs for reasons of "economy." Their two chiefs, Otepka and Elmer Hipsley, were to be ditched with them. Because of an uproar in Congress, Otepka was permitted to keep his title, but his duties were limited.

It might be thought that the administration would be eager to expose security risks, to get rid of them, and perhaps to prosecute them. But it is not. The reason for this strange attitude is that President Kennedy, Attorney General Kennedy, and other leaders of the New Frontier are on record as having said that there was little or no danger of internal subversion. In their view, communism was strictly a menace from outside, although these days they are not even acting as if they believed that.

So it is embarrassing to have public servants challenging the official thesis by turning up instances of disloyalty within the administration and imparting the information to a Senate body which has been zealous in exposing subversive infiltration of the Government. What would become of the argument that there is nothing to investigate if another Alger Hiss scandal were brought to light?

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 3, 1963]

PLOT TO GET OTEPKA?

Now it begins to appear there is more behind the effort to oust Otto F. Otepka, State Department security official, than was first suspected when he was accused of giving Department secrets to Congress—as though that could jeopardize the security of the Nation.

Suspicion is strong in Washington that the plot against him goes even beyond the State Department—that the character moving in on Otepka is a more powerful figure in our Government than the Secretary of State—none other than the President's brother, Attorney General Bobby Kennedy.

What's it all about?

It's not so much that Mr. Otepka told a Senate subcommittee some things the State Department didn't want Congress to know—especially about William Wieland, a top-ranking State official who did nothing to stop Castro's rise to power in Cuba.

It's more because Mr. Otepka is a career man in Government service of unquestioned loyalty who thinks Congress is entitled to know what's going on, who wants real security methods carried out in every Federal agency.

In his security post, his signature was required on all appointments to the State Department, except for the very top posts filled by the White House.

And Mr. Otepka had been exercising this authority to maintain the security reforms instituted under the Eisenhower administration.

In other words, Mr. Otepka has been a hard-line, anti-Communist State Department official—just like Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, who has been in constant hot water with her superiors for the same reason.

He has tried to keep strange and curious people out of jobs in the Department for whose security he was responsible.

That is how he has run afoul not only of his own superiors but also of that even higher power who operates in the Justice Department. It's not national secrets apparently but personnel matters that have got him into trouble.

With Bobby Kennedy trying to move Kennedy people to run things the administration way, Mr. Otepka drew the line at some characters he considered dubious.

The flimsy charges about what he told the Senate subcommittee are reported incidental to getting rid of the State Department security official who guarded the door.

It is not Mr. Otepka and his activities which need investigation. It is the plot of those who have been spying on him and snooping around his "burn bag" and doing other petty things in their efforts to oust him.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which gave him high praise as a personnel security officer only a year ago, should launch such a probe.

PORK BARREL OR ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, periodically throughout the history of our country, the charge has been made that the Federal Government runs a public works pork barrel, squandering millions of dollars on foolish projects.

Most recently Life magazine has done a major, widely circulated "expose" of the Federal public works "pork barrel."

Generally these attacks are pursued with more zeal than knowledge, with more innuendo than facts, and sometimes with more political motivation than concern.

Life magazine punctured its recent pork barrel argument when it attempted to contrast good and bad public works. The article closed with a description of the $60 million Toledo Bend Dam built by the States of Texas and Louisiana as a huge and economically viable addition to the productive facilities of their States.

The article continued that by building this fine dam themselves, the States saved the people of the United States from another costly raid on their Treasury.

It is, of course, unreasonable to contend that a project financed by the First State Bank is an economically viable addition to the productive facilities of a community but that the same project, financed by the First National Bank, is a raid on the Treasury.

Yet this strange thesis was the basis of the article.

Texas and Louisiana are to be congratulated for moving ahead with the Toledo Bend Dam. Progressive State administrations are increasingly coming to understand that public works projects trigger economic development and that they can return many times their cost in primary and secondary benefits.

We need more State projects—more State participation in development efforts—to speed our economic growth rate and meet the needs of a growing population, including more business opportunities and employment.

We are moving to make State participation possible in the water and related resources field. The Interior and Insular

Affairs Committee has just held hearings on a bill, S. 1111 by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, to provide aid to the States for water resources planning and to speed cooperative Federal-State planning of major river basins. As the planning job is completed, units of coordinated river basin plans can be undertaken by either or both partners to the planning, without interfering with the final optimum development of the water resource.

But Federal public works projects cannot be halted because someone argues—as Life magazine did—that what is non-Federal is wonderful but if it is Federal it is a wasteful pork barrel raid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a brief extract from the Life article, which is the basis of my comment.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpt From Life Magazine

While the pork barrel rolls along distributing money by the billion, the States of Texas and Louisiana are trying out a unique experiment in homegrown economy. Both States have taken their shares of Federal pork in the past and may well do so in the future. But at Toledo Bend on the Sabine River that separates the States they are building a $60 million dam with their own money.

An aura of healthy self-interest and anti-big-Government sentiment surrounds the project. "We retain local control and we are not contributing to larger and larger government." Simmons said recently. "I don't believe in this sitting back and waiting. Too often we have waited so long the Federal Government came in and filled a void that should have been handled by the States. It was our own fault."

In the end, creating a huge and economically viable addition to the productive facilities of their States, the people of Louisiana and Texas felt their breasts swelling with the pride of independence.

"Toledo Bend," said Louisiana Gov. Jimmie Davis at the ground breaking ceremony, "is a testimonial to the efficiency and workability of the principle of States' rights."

It also saved the people of the United States from another costly raid on their Treasury.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, sometimes I believe that these periodic attacks on Federal public works are beneficial. They remind those of us who realize the positive values of Federal public works investments that it is not enough to understand their worth, and their key role in economic growth, ourselves. They remind us that the good these great programs do must be told to the public, and told repeatedly, if the truth is to prevail over the sensationalism of detractors.

This has a special urgency for those of us from the Upper Missouri River basin, and indeed for all the Western States. Our economic future is tied to proposed large scale water, timber, recreation, and highway programs, and particularly to the completion of water programs which are essential to agricultural, municipal, and industrial growth.

In my own State, at the present stage of water resource development, tens of thousands of acres of our best agricultural lands have been inundated or committed to reservoirs without compensating reclamation of other lands. Uninformed attacks on the Federal public works programs, can defeat or delay construction at a critical midpoint for the whole upper Missouri Basin, leaving us with reduced rather than expanded economic opportunities and with a static economy, rather than the expansion which the next stages of development would bring.

Great dams to impound water have been constructed or are nearing completion. The next step is to make the water available for beneficial uses. The word "beneficial" is used thoughtfully for, as I shall show out of our past experience, water provided to agriculture in South Dakota expands crops now in short supply and livestock production, where increases in production are needed, and not the production of crops already in surplus.

First, however, I think we should reexamine American policy and experience in relation to Federal public works, and see if they have not had a great deal to do with the spectacular rise of our country from a primitive wilderness to the world's most productive nation in less than two centuries.

WASHINGTON SIGNED FIRST PUBLIC WORKS BILL; SURVEYED ROUTE TO THE WEST

If George Washington were alive today and active in public life, I have no doubt that some American journals would refer to him as the "father of the pork barrel" rather than the "Father of his Country."

The first Congress of the United States in August 1789 passed a law which made the establishment and maintenance of lighthouses, buoys, beacons, and public piers to assist navigation a Federal responsibility. President George Washington signed it on August 27, 1789. It became 1 Stat. 53—the 53d law of the new United States of America.

Discussion started at about the same time of a canal linking the Potomac River with the Ohio, to open up the new western territory for development. Shortly after he left the Presidency, Mr. Washington identified himself professionally with those who believed in Federal projects to speed the development of the Nation by surveying the route for a canal from Cumberland, Md., to the Ohio River near Wheeling, W. Va. A road instead of a canal was authorized on this route in 1806. It was constructed during one of the earliest congressional debates over Federal responsibility for internal improvements.

If Life magazine had been around at that time, it undoubtedly would have opposed these "pork barrel" projects—the road to the western territory as well as Federal assumption of responsibility for aids to navigation. There was opposition, but the road was completed in the 1830's to Vandalia, Ill., at a final total cost of $7 million.

In this early 19th century period, Congress passed and President John Quincy Adams approved the first "omnibus" rivers and harbors bill and appropriated nearly $2 million for the Chesapeake and Ohio, the Chesapeake and Delaware, the Louisville and Portland, and the Dismal Swamp Canals.

In 1826 and 1827 the Corps of Engineers were allowed to make surveys for railroads under the General Surveys Act of 1824, although the act mentioned only roads and canals. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad got such assistance from 1827 to 1830. Other roads continued to receive such assistance until 1838, when it was discontinued for a decade. In the 10 years preceding the Civil War, the survey work was renewed and the Army Engineers were called upon for surveys of rail routes to the Pacific Ocean which ultimately became the basis for the construction of four transcontinental railroad lines.

Construction of the railroads was not direct Federal public works, with construction by Federal agencies. But so much of the original survey work and financing of the construction was Federal that they clearly have to be considered products of the Federal "pork barrel," if that term is to be attached to works projects supported by the U.S. Government.

A study by the Library of Congress shows that 130,401,606 acres of Federal public lands were granted to the railroads to help them finance construction. In addition, under the Pacific Railway Act of 1862, the Federal Government issued bonds to provide cash loans for railroad construction at the rate of $16,000 per mile for level track, $32,000 per mile for track in hilly areas, and $48,000 per mile for track in mountainous terrain. The railroads repaid the principal and a part of the interest on these loans. A Board of Investigation and Research in 1945 fixed the Government's final cost of this financial aid to the railroads at $74 million.

There was opposition, of course, at the time these aids to the railroads were being voted, but no one can today deny that the speedy development of transcontinental railroad transportation expedited development of the Nation and that the areas opened by the railroads have repaid the Federal investment a thousand times over.

The Federal Government has invested more than $2.6 billion in the development of water transportation in the Nation dating back to the Act of 1789.

Since there is always the implied or direct charge made in connection with attacks on public works that such projects are ladled out on a basis of political favoritism, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record table, prepared by the Library of Congress, showing expenditures for navigation facilities by States since the inception of the program.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Table III.—*Ranking by States of construction appropriations through fiscal year 1960 for new work on existing navigation projects under civil works program of Corps of Engineers*

[Millions]

1. Illinois	$214.1
2. Missouri	202.2
3. Michigan	193.2
4. New York	181.8
5. Ohio	141.5
6. Texas	120.7
7. California	120.5
8. Kentucky	115.9
9. Louisiana	115.6

TABLE III.—*Ranking by States of construction appropriations through fiscal year 1960 for new work on existing navigation projects under civil works program of Corps of Engineers*—Continued

[Millions]

10. Pennsylvania	$104.5
11. West Virginia	99.6
12. Iowa	92.8
13. New Jersey	91.9
14. Florida	87.2
15. Alabama	83.4
16. Massachusetts	79.6
17. Minnesota	55.5
18. Nebraska	52.9
19. Virginia	49.8
20. Indiana	48.2
21. Washington	41.1
22. Arkansas	35.3
23. Oregon	34.9
24. Delaware	30.0
25. Kansas	29.5
26. North Carolina	24.4
27. Hawaii	24.1
28. Maryland	20.5
29. South Carolina	19.7
30. Alaska	14.5
31. Wisconsin	14.1
32. Connecticut	13.8
33. Maine	12.2
34. Georgia	12.0
35. Mississippi	8.9
36. Rhode Island	7.7
37. Tennessee	6.8
38. Oklahoma	6.6
39. District of Columbia	2.4
40. New Hampshire	1.3
41. Vermont	0.9
42. Idaho	0.2
43. Arizona	0.01
Total	2,611.8

No appropriations have been made for navigation projects in the States of Colorado, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

NOTE 1.—This tabulation is limited to appropriations for new work under existing projects specifically authorized by Congress. It excludes appropriations for superseded and abandoned projects.

NOTE 2.—In the table on "Multiple-purpose projects including power," total appropriations include about $343 million allocable to the navigation function. Thus, of total appropriations of $9,337.2 million for new work on existing projects under the authorized civil works program, about $3,220 million is allocable to navigation.

Source: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I shall offer one or two more tables and I invite attention to the proof they offer that, over the years, expenditures have been related to need. Charges of favoritism in public works program obviously arise because, in a single Congress, or in the decade when a major project is in progress, some one State or some one area appears to receive a disproportionate share of funds. Over a longer span of years, however, the needs which have been built into each area by nature have largely determined Federal expenditures and will necessarily continue to do so. A gifted or especially influential Member of Congress may speed works meeting the needs of his State or area by a few years, but for the most part nature dictates the areas of expenditure.

A table of expenditures for flood control compiled by the Legislative Reference Service underlines this point. It reflects heaviest expenditures in the States where flood damage is heaviest and need is greatest.

I ask unanimous consent, to place the table of flood control expenditures through 1960 by States in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE. IV.—*Ranking by States of construction appropriations through fiscal year 1960 for new work on existing flood control projects under civil works program of Corps of Engineers*

[Millions]

1. California	$501.2
2. Louisiana	451.8
3. Mississippi	280.6
4. Arkansas	277.2
5. Pennsylvania	184.1
6. Texas	178.1
7. Kansas	174.0
8. Kentucky	143.5
9. Missouri	123.4
10. Oklahoma	123.3
11. Illinois	120.8
12. Ohio	103.0
13. New York	92.7
14. West Virginia	84.9
15. Tennessee	75.8
16. Massachusetts	64.8
17. Florida	58.9
18. Washington	51.8
19. Iowa	51.1
20. Indiana	43.8
21. Oregon	41.2
22. Nebraska	39.8
23. Vermont	35.5
24. Colorado	31.8
25. Connecticut	31.5
26. New Mexico	30.2
27. New Hampshire	25.7
28. Arizona	21.3
29. Idaho	20.8
30. South Dakota	18.0
31. North Dakota	17.4
32. Maryland	12.3
33. Minnesota	9.6
34. Virginia	8.7
35. Michigan	7.3
36. Georgia	4.8
37. Rhode Island	4.8
38. District of Columbia	3.0
39. Wyoming	2.7
40. Utah	2.5
41. Montana	2.0
42. Nevada	2.0
43. Alaska	1.3
44. North Carolina	1.3
45. Alabama	.8
46. Hawaii	.4
47. New Jersey	.3
48. Wisconsin	.7
Total	3,561.9

No appropriations have been made for flood control projects in the States of Delaware, Maine, and South Carolina.

NOTE 1.—This tabulation excludes appropriations for superseded and abandoned projects and for flood control projects not specifically authorized by Congress but accomplished under special continuing authorizations.

NOTE 2.—The total appropriations shown above for "flood control projects" include about $265 million under the "flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries" project allocable to the navigation function. In the table on multiple-purpose projects including power, about $557 million allocable to flood control is shown. Thus, of total appropriations of $9,337.2 million for new work on existing projects authorized under the civil works program, about $3,854 million is allocable to flood control.

Source: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the final table I offer, breaking down Bureau of Reclamation construction appropriations by States, is taken from the Statistical Report of the Commissioner of Reclamation for 1960. It is supplemented by a table of rank by States prepared by the Legislative Reference Service. The table of rank by States represents an attempt to allocate benefits from interstate projects to the separate States.

I ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE V.—*Construction appropriations by States through fiscal year 1960, Bureau of Reclamation programs*

[Millions]

Alaska	$29.7
Arizona	88.1
Arizona-California	17.1
Arizona-California-Nevada	364.4
Arizona-Utah	127.6
California	725.4
Colorado	206.6
Colorado-Kansas	13.3
Hawaii	----
Idaho	12.8
Idaho-Oregon	73.1
Idaho-Wyoming	98.0
Kansas	49.5
Montana	201.8
Montana-North Dakota	19.5
Montana-Wyoming	3.0
Nebraska	77.2
Nebraska-Kansas	37.8
Nevada	1.4
Nevada-California	14.6
New Mexico	56.6
New Mexico-Colorado	20.3
New Mexico-Texas	28.9
North Dakota	12.5
Oklahoma	32.6
Oregon	56.0
Oregon-California	17.8
Oregon-Idaho	21.1
South Dakota	36.5
Texas	30.8
Utah	98.2
Utah-Wyoming	29.0
Washington	617.3
Wyoming	171.0
Wyoming-Montana	25.2
Wyoming-Nebraska	25.0
Work in various States	257.4
Total	3,697.1

Source: Statistical Appendix to Report of the Commissioner of Reclamation, 1960.

TABLE VI.—*Ranking by States of construction appropriations through fiscal year 1960, Bureau of Reclamation projects*

[Millions]

California	$860.0
Washington	617.3
Arizona	381.4
Montana	224.2
Colorado	219.9
Wyoming	196.2
Idaho	183.8
Nebraska	140.0
Utah	127.2
New Mexico	105.8
Nevada	97.2
Oregon	94.9
Kansas	49.5
South Dakota	36.5
Oklahoma	32.6
Texas	30.8
Alaska	29.7
North Dakota	12.5
Total	3,439.6

This table does not include $257.4 million of construction funds used for investigations, planning, and transmission lines, which could not easily be assigned to any one State.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, none of these tables include all of the $2,082 billion which the Tennessee Valley has been appropriated, the biggest single public works program Uncle Sam has yet financed to completion.

It is too bad that critics have not made honest, objective appraisals of what the Nation has received from some of these public investments.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is a good place to start.

WATER PROJECTS REPAY COST MANY TIMES

In 1933, residents of the Tennessee Valley counties paid 3.4 percent of all Federal personal income taxes collected by the United States.

Last year they paid 6.8 percent of all personal income taxes collected by the U.S. Treasury. This was twice the 1933 share of the tax burden shouldered by the valley's citizens.

The dollar amount of personal income taxes paid by citizens of the valley counties in 1962 was $4.2 billion. The increase—half of that $4.2 billion—was $2.1 billion. Thus, the increased share of Federal income taxes from the valley in just 1 year, a quarter century after the investment was started, offset the investment.

The TVA has repaid its cost to the Nation over and over and over many times. Orders for equipment, supplies, appliances, and the ordinary requirements of living have flowed out to enterprises outside the valley and boosted the economy of every State in the Nation. TVA's ability to produce and expand its electrical energy output and its great chemical plants made it an arsenal of democracy in World War II. TVA and the Bonneville Power Administration, another great Public Works project, provided the power for the atomic developments which brought early victory in the war.

Our investments in TVA and Bonneville, which are being repaid in the usual sense, fade into insignificance when measured against the tremendous economic gains they have brought about. Our investments in the Central Valley project in California, and in navigation facilities in that great State, were basic to California's growth into the most populous State in the Nation, and one of our largest taxpayers.

The economic record of western reclamation projects parallels the results of TVA and other productive works projects. I will cite an example from South Dakota only because I am familiar with it. There are many others throughout the West which are equally illustrative.

The Belle Fourche irrigation project in western South Dakota was one of the first reclamation projects authorized. Since 1908, when the first irrigation water became available, the project has produced crops with a cumulative gross value of nearly $69 million, or roughly 14 times the $5 million construction costs of the project. The Belle Fourche project provides a livelihood for about 1,000 families in Butte County, on and off the project. Federal tax collections from the area served now exceed $360,000 annually, which means that the project citizens are paying for it in taxes every 14 years, without considering the annual Treasury revenues of $38,700 from the water users, in repayment of reimbursable construction costs, or the secondary tax collections and economic gains it supports.

The economic benefits of this half-century-old project are reflected in a comparison of the irrigated project area with surrounding areas of dryland farm acreage. The livestock operations made possible by the project, which produces chiefly feed and forage crops, results in the sale in Butte County of 80 percent more livestock per acre than in the adjoining counties. Harvested crop yields on the irrigation project are 3 times, and the value of irrigated pasture is 20 times the production under dryland farming conditions. Butte County supports a population 34 percent greater than that of surrounding counties, and the total value of real estate and personal property is 51 percent higher per unit of land.

An additional half million dollars worth of crops annually is produced on the small Angustora unit and Rapid Valley projects. The latter project also delivers more than 300 billion gallons of water annually to Rapid City, S. Dak., serving an area of about 44,000 population. In the years ahead, this project and many other irrigation projects will increasingly become the sources of municipal and industrial water supply. This has occurred already at the Salt River project in Arizona and California and at numerous other irrigation projects.

As a rule of thumb, industry requires about the same amounts of water per acre of plant site as agriculture. There are many instances where irrigated farms have been transformed into industrial locations in the West. Agricultural land and water rights are sold to industries which bring greater economic returns to the operator, the community and the Nation. This is an irrigation "crop" of often overlooked significance.

In the past 10 years, 300 industries have located in the area provided with water by the Salt River project in Arizona. These include Motorola, the computer production facilities of a General Electric Co., a Reynolds Aluminum company plant, Goodyear, U.S. Steel, Sperry Rand, and Air Research Corp. All are sizable operations which would not have gone into the area except for the availability of water through the long-established reclamation facility.

There has been nearly a tenfold growth in population served with municipal and industrial water from Federal reclamation projects since 1956, when the Bureau of Reclamation started keeping records on the matter.

In 1956, 1,071,000 persons used 165,360 acre-feet of the Bureau's "M & I" water. Last year 10,120,000 persons used 1,455,124 acre-feet. The increase between 1961 and 1962 was 12 percent in population served.

Irrigation farming, like George Washington's road to the west, opens new lands and new country for diversified economic activity to the benefit of those who people the project, the community, the region, and the whole Nation. It is a roadway to economic growth.

IRRIGATION PRODUCES NEEDED CROPS, NOT SURPLUSES

Contrary to the widely held view that irrigation projects add to the Nation's surplus agricultural production, they produce very little of the commodities which compose our surplus stocks.

About 90 percent of the production of the Belle Fourche project in South Dakota, which I have just discussed, goes to market as beef and mutton. In 1959, the last agricultural census year, 72 percent of the Belle Fourche's harvested acres were in hay and other forage crops, 16 percent in feed grains, 9 percent in sugarbeets and seed crops, and only 2.3 percent in wheat. The feed, forage, and sugarbeet tops and pulp almost entirely went into cattle and sheep on project farms or adjacent ranches. That pattern has not changed.

Counties adjacent to Butte County, in which the Belle Fourche project is located, have a proportion of land in wheat four times as large as in Butte County. In this instance, and I believe generally, irrigation has swung production away from the products in surplus—the one-crop wheat pattern of many Great Plains farms—because it has made possible growing of other crops, support of a livestock enterprise, and more diversified agriculture. In the upper Missouri Basin it has been toward production of hay and forage fed to meat animals.

A study of irrigation agriculture's output made by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress showed that half of all irrigated land in the United States is devoted to forage, including about one-fourth to alfalfa hay, about 20 percent to feed grains and cereals, and the remainder in fruits, vegetables, seeds, nuts, sugarbeets, and other field crops.

Vegetables, seeds, and fruits contribute two-fifths of the gross crop value from Federal reclamation projects. Western irrigated farms, including both Federal and non-Federal irrigation, produce virtually all of the Nation's apricots, almonds, dates, walnuts, lemons, figs, prunes, and olives; they supply 95 percent of the grapes, 90 percent of the lettuce, 75 percent of the avocados, peas, and cantaloupes, 50 percent of the peaches, and more than 50 percent of the commercial truck crops.

The Legislative Reference Service concluded:

> Many of the products, whether because of the high quota of sunshine, special soil qualities, or the controlled availability of water, must be in some degree unique as to color, flavor, or size; at least the market accords them a special place. Though they compete generally and often successfully for a share of the consumers' dollar, it would appear that in a large degree they are not in competition with the products of humid agricultural areas.
>
> That U.S. agricultural production is presently in surplus is undoubted, yet surpluses are largely confined to a few products, only a minor number of which are in any considerable degree a product of reclamation projects. More than that, with production

on reclamation projects concentrated on livestock and livestock products and on fruits and vegetables, it would appear that they are in admirable position to serve the newer trends in the U.S. market. Present indications are that the largest increases in production which will be required by 1975 are in those very products which are specialties of irrigated areas. Moreover, projections of probable foreign purchases suggest that exports of several fruits are likely to be among the items showing the largest increases by 1975.

MEETING OUR NEED FOR INCREASED MEAT PRODUCTION

I have been greatly interested in recent discussion of how the Nation is going to meet its need for increased meat production in the years ahead.

Early in August, the reliable Washington Farmletter went into the problem from the agricultural point of view and concluded:

> Looking ahead 10 to 25 years, the investment required to furnish the grass to increase cattle numbers enough to produce beef in line with population growth won't be made at the present level of cattle prices.

The Farmletter pointed out that for a decade after World War II, increased beef production was made possible by grass released from the support of horses and mules as power farming swept the country. All of this grassland went to beef cattle herds. The numbers of dairy cattle has declined. Dairymen have done a phenomenal job of increasing milk production by careful breeding and herd selection. Milk production, as the Agriculture Committee well knows, has climbed steadily in spite of a decline in the number of cows being milked.

The displacement of horses and mules has now been completed. The added meat production from the newly available pasturelands has been absorbed, and there has been a further spectacular increase in beef output as a result of increase in cattle feeding. Nearly two out of three beef animals on the market today has been put through a feedlot and fed to optimum weights.

Further increases in volume of beef production through feeding is limited. The experts tell us that probably not more than 70 percent of cattle marketed—5 or 6 percent more than at present—can be fed since it is impractical to feed dairy cows, bulls, stags, and scrubs.

Yet we will need an increase in beef supply not only for domestic consumption by a growing and more prosperous population, but also for a prospective jump in export markets.

The Department of Agriculture advises that by 1970 we should have 99.5 million head of beef cattle compared to 74.3 million head now. This means an increase of 5 percent per year in numbers, compared to a 4 percent increase during the past 3 years, just to meet the growing domestic demand.

The prediction that there will also be a world beef shortage in the early seventies is based on two studies of world demand made for Argentina recently. The studies showed demand for beef increasing in Great Britain, Western Europe, and such Asian countries as Japan as a result of increasing population, rising per capita demand and inability of those crowded countries to achieve significant increases in their own production.

Whether or not the United States shares in this productive new world market with Argentina, Australia, Canada, and other meat exporting countries, thereby improving our balance of payments and domestic farm situations, depends in some measure on whether we make the investment in public reclamation works, necessary to expand the western breeding herds which are basic to expansion of beef production.

The Department of Agriculture has estimated need for additional grass to meet requirements of beef production to 1970 at the equivalent of 14 million acres of grassland per year. Much of this additional grass must come from increased production from lands now in use. Much of it must come in the form of hay, forage, beet tops—the animal foods produced on irrigation projects like the Belle Fourche in South Dakota.

CROPLAND REDUCTION DEPENDS ON NEW IRRIGATION

Nearly 2 years ago, Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture released a study which indicated that the United States would need 51 million acres less cropland in 1980 than was under cultivation in 1960. This estimate was based on the assumption that agricultural productivity will continue to rise as it has in the past and would be 56 percent per acre greater in 1980 than it was in 1960. It did not foresee the increased meat exports which I have just discussed.

What many people overlooked when that study came out was that the Department had provided in its projection for an increase of 9.4 million acres in irrigation in the sixties and seventies. That irrigation, much of it necessarily dependent on Federal public works projects—reclamation projects in this instance—accounted for a substantial share of the increased productivity which was foreseen. It is essential to the land use adjustments contemplated and it is made even more essential by the rising demand for meat at home and abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of letters exchanged by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, then chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in February of last year on this subject.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS BY SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON AND SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE FREEMAN

FEBRUARY 5, 1962.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Statements made recently in connection with your Conference on Land and People and in connection with the President's farm message to the effect that there will be a net reduction of 50 to 51 million acres in land required to meet our food and fiber needs in 1980 are being misinterpreted in some quarters to mean that there is no need for further irrigation of land in the United States, at least until some time after the year 1980.

I say "misinterpreted" because my reading of the preliminary report of your Land and Water Policy Committee and the other documents on which the figure is based indicate that the irrigation of additional lands will be very important in making it possible to meet our food and fiber requirements in 1980 with a smaller total acreage of crop land.

I observe that on page 205 of the preliminary report your committee anticipates that there will be an increase of 4.7 million acres of irrigation in the West and 2.5 million acres for the East, increasing to 11.2 million for the West and 4.7 million for the East by the year 2000 in response to population pressures.

On page 106 of the preliminary report, in table 28 on shifts in land use, I observe that the net change of 51 million acres in cropland in 1980 is expected to result from the shift of 68 million acres out of cropland and the shift of 17 million acres, presumably including some irrigation acreage, from other uses to cropland.

As the preliminary report states on page 95, increases in crop yields resulting from many improved technologies and production practices will make it possible to meet our domestic and foreign food and fiber requirements in the years just ahead. Obviously some people fail to appreciate the fact that one of the great factors of improvement in our production techniques and practices is the application of water in quantities and at times which assure maximum production.

Because of the potential injury to the Nation's irrigation and reclamation program which might be caused by misinterpretation of the Department's land requirement estimates for 1980, I would appreciate a letter from you setting out the facts.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The interpretations made in your letter of February 5, of statements presented at the Conference on Land and People, and the material contained in the preliminary report prepared by the Department's Land and Water Policy Committee are substantially correct. It is the view of this Department that resource policy should provide for the orderly improvement of cropland through carefully selected irrigation, drainage, flood protection, watershed and other conservation measures along with adjustment activities as needed for reducing the total acreage devoted to crop production.

As observed in your letter, the preliminary report envisions the development of 17 million acres of new cropland by 1980 through private efforts and under public programs. The acreage under irrigation is expected to increase by 9.4 million acres over the same period. Although irrigation development would bring in some new cropland, most such development would involve the provision of water to existing cropland. Based upon current rates of use of water per acre, the total amount of water withdrawn for irrigation would be up by 28 percent by 1980. This increase in use could largely be offset by improvements in efficiency of water use if we intensified our efforts to get farmers to adopt better irrigation practices.

The expected continuation of land and water development and improvement is reflected in the yield estimates contained in the preliminary report. The projected yield per harvested acre for 1980 is 56 percent above 1959. In the absence of such improvements, expected yields would have been

> lower and projected acreage requirements correspondingly higher.
>
> Throughout the preliminary report on land and water policy, emphasis is placed on the need for programs to encourage the conservation, development, and management of land and water resources in order to realize continuing maximum benefits from the use of these resources. Both resource development and resource adjustment are needed to achieve the various objectives of a comprenhensive land and water resource program.
>
> The objectives of land and water development include reduction in the risk of flood and drought hazards, provision of opportunities for establishing efficient family farms, promotion of rural area development and regional economic growth, an increase in the output, variety and flexibility of crop and livestock enterprises and the reduction of production costs.
>
> In arriving at a decision as to how much development we should have at a given time, the need for additional farm products is only one of the factors to be considered. River basins and watersheds are best developed as whole entities, with the water and related land resources developed so as to serve most effectively a variety of purposes—including flood prevention, domestic and industrial water supply, power, navigation, irrigation, recreation, fish and wildlife, and others. For such purposes as flood prevention, there is almost bound to be some land enhancement even though the primary objective was flood damage reduction. If the economically justifiable irrigation potential of a river is not provided for when the water resources are being developed, future irrigation use may be precluded or made more expensive.
>
> To meet our ever-increasing needs for the varied products of land and water we need a continuing program of land and water development, but we should maintain a balance between programs that enhance production of farm products and programs of land use adjustment.
>
> I trust that this statement will serve to clarify the Department's position on a balanced program of land and water resource development, improvement and adjustment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, within a year or two, the great Oahe irrigation project in South Dakota will be ready for authorization. It involves water for 482,000 acres of land.

It is probably inevitable that the pork barrel charge will be leveled at it by those who refuse to see or admit the economic value of Federal public works, and those who have not taken a careful look at our agricultural production problems and opportunities.

But the Oahe irrigation projects in reality is a timely opportunity to build needed productive capacity and strengthen the economy of one of our States with a desirable impact on the Nation as a whole.

South Dakota State College has been one of the major sources of support and information on this proposed development. The college has said:

> The proper water resources development would stabilize the State's agricultural production and minimize the effects of drought.
>
> Data covering 88 years in this, and the immediately adjacent area, show that during 28 percent of these years the crops produced ranged from total failure to such low yields as to bring some degree of want and privation to farmers.
>
> It has been estimated that with irrigation in the proposed Oahe project stabilization will come, not only to the 500,000 or more acres to be irrigated, but also to an additional 3 million acres, broken down about as follows: 1,500,000 acres directly integrated with the irrigated lands, 250,000 acres producing some supplemental feeds in normal years, and 1,250,000 acres which will have a feed supply in drought years. This will occur because the Oahe lands are surrounded by hundreds of thousands of acres producing feeder livestock and these livestock will flow to the project lands for feeding and maintenance and some feeds from the project will go out to the surrounding areas.
>
> The crops coming off of land receiving water from the development will be mainly livestock feed, such as alfalfa, grass, pasture, and corn.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In addition to the stability that will come to agriculture, full water development will also:
>
> 1. Furnish adequate water supplies for an increasing State population.
>
> 2. It will open up opportunities for people and will keep people in the State for all purposes.

At the time this evaluation of the particular irrigation project's worth to the area and the Nation was prepared, there was no clear recognition of the prospective need for increased livestock production which I have just discussed.

The upper Missouri Basin project, which will do so much to diversify the agriculture of this area, now heavily dependent on wheat—one of our surplus farm commodities—could not possibly have been undertaken and cannot be completed by either private enterprise or by the States. Its cost will be close to $5 billion, more than the States or any private enterprise could finance. It is an example of the pioneering role of Federal public works which have, and will continue, to stimulate sound regional development and growth.

This Nation has been fortunate that it has had, since George Washington signed the first aid-to-navigation bill in 1789, national administrations which understand the essential role of the Federal Government in economic development.

President Kennedy has recently toured the West, seeing first-hand opportunities for further economic advances through imaginative public investment. He has been a stout supporter of sound public works projects, despite the unthinking, scattergun "pork barrel" attacks which have been made upon nearly every investment in resource development.

Nor has reclamation been a partisan venture. Two of the greatest Republican statesmen of the 20th century, President Theodore Roosevelt and Senator George Norris, have achieved a high place in reclamation history. Outstanding, conservative Republican leaders have also understood the role of Federal public works investments and supported them.

Former President Herbert Hoover, who, to my knowledge, has never been accused of pork barreling, was a sponsor of Federal public works projects and an eloquent proponent of reclamation.

In a letter to a Western Governors Conference at Salt Lake City, Utah, in June 1930, the former President wrote:

> The undertaking (reclamation) has been of great benefit to this region (the West) and has been the cause of adding much wealth to the Nation.
>
> If the fundamental facts are properly appraised, it seems certain that the arguments of opponents of Federal reclamation will find satisfactory answer and that they will no longer countenance the misleading information that is now being broadcast through different agencies.
>
> Only 1 percent of the farm commodities raised in the United States are produced on Federal reclamation projects, and 90 percent of the quantity so produced is locally consumed.
>
> The projects themselves furnish extensive markets for manufactured goods as well as for farm products not raised under irrigation, and thus seem to afford material benefits, rather than detriment, to other sections. It may be further said that crops raised under irrigation are generally supplemental to rather than competitive with, the products of other farms.
>
> No valid arguments appear to oppose this constructive Federal undertaking. Rather, support should be given in the light of the contribution to the Nation's good.

There are sometimes legitimate criticisms made of some of our public works projects. There have been some which I have regarded as unwise, and not the best use of Federal investment funds. But in a great majority of cases, the pork barrel charge is raised against Federal public works projects by people who are unable to grasp the value of works outside their own section or field of interest.

Life magazine is no exception.

In the September 20 daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the senior Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, inserted a double-page editorial from Life entitled, "$2.3 Billion Should Go Into the Ocean."

The magazine is very much in favor of the $2.3 billion, 10-year program espoused by the administration and the able Senator from the Pacific Northwest, to explore the ocean for minerals, for its food potentials and in the interest of national defense.

Interestingly, Life argues our need for additional protein food in 1980 as one justification for Uncle Sam's expenditure of the $2.3 billion, suggesting the development of "fish farms" along the Continental Shelf.

While I eat fish, I prefer beefsteak.

And I would like to suggest to the editors of Life that there is just as much pork connected with their fish project as there is with South Dakota's "Project Beefsteak."

I am in favor of an expanded program of ocean research. We need to look for growth opportunities and new resources wherever they may exist.

We should continue to travel down the road George Washington and his associates laid out—to continuously develop our resource potentialities and increase our level of economic activity in the years ahead, or we will be plagued with shortages, unemployment and stagnation.

In contrast with military expenditures, which I attempted to pare a little recently, public works are not an end product to be stored away like nuclear weapons. They stimulate and contribute to the economy. They repay their costs many times over and provide capital for continuing steps ahead.

LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to have the attention of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] for a moment. He and I had a conference earlier this morning on another subject matter. A statement on it has gone to the press gallery. I shall digress from the discussion of the education bill long enough to read four pages of a statement on this subject, in answer to what I consider to be the very unsound position taken by one of the chief spokesmen for the State Department.

Yesterday in the Washington Post and the New York Herald Tribune, there was published an article on our Latin American policy. The article was written by the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, Edwin Martin. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America, I believe Mr. Martin has performed a disservice to American objectives in that part of the world. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Martin's article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARTIN'S STATEMENT ON POLICY FOR LATIN AMERICA

(NOTE.—U.S. policy in Latin America is under sharp attack. The top State Department official in the conduct of this policy is Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. The following statement by Martin, written for the New York Herald Tribune, is being circulated to diplomatic posts in Latin America.)

(By Edwin M. Martin)

By tradition and conviction as well as a matter of policy, the United States opposes the overthrow of constitutional and popular democratic governments anywhere.

This is especially true in Latin America, with whose people we have such close historical ties and whose aspirations for political and economic freedom we support wholeheartedly. Moreover, under the Charter of Punta del Este, the people of the Western Hemisphere have bound themselves in a joint effort for political and socioeconomic development—the Alliance for Progress—within a framework of free and democratic institutions.

The deviations from these principles which we have observed in the 2 years since Punta del Este have caused some to question the validity of the principles of the charter and some impatient cynics to ignore the progress which has been made.

Both the impatient idealists and the defeatist cynics ignore the realities of rising nationalism; the anxieties caused by social revolution the challenge posed by the Alliance for Progress to old value systems; the threat to the established order brought on by the new, and finally the strain which rapid social and economic change places on fragile political institutions.

In short, there is a temptation to measure current events not against historical reality and substantive progress, but against somewhat theoretical notions of the manner in which men should and do operate in a complex world.

UNDETERRED BY FROWN

We all have respect for motherhood and abhor sin. We may observe, however, that while motherhood has prospered, so has sin. In an increasingly nationalistic world of sovereign states, a U.S. frown doesn't deter others from committing what we consider to be political sins. And as we are pretty nationalistic ourselves and rightfully proud of our great successes, we sometimes find this fact frustrating.

Our task has only begun when we have stated our position. The real issue is how, under the conditions of the present-day world, we can assist the peoples of other sovereign nations to develop stable political institutions and help them strengthen their beliefs in these institutions so as to make them effective against brute force.

In Latin America there are very few who would argue as a matter of principle for violent overthrow of constitutional regimes. Most of those who support or accept coups d'etat would simply maintain that their particular case was surrounded by unique circumstances. This is "yes, but" argument.

Genuine concern with an overturn of the established order, fear of left-wing extremism, frustration with incompetence in an area of great and rising expectations and a sheer desire for power are all formidable obstacles to staple, constitutional government—especially in countries where the traditional method of transferring political power has been by revolution or coup d'etat. In most of Latin America there is so little experience with the benefits of political legitimacy that there is an insufficient body of opinion, civil or military, which has any reason to know its value and hence defend it.

No two countries are alike, but in general we feel that in order to enlarge their experience of legitimacy, and thus their respect for it, we must strengthen in each society the power of the educated middle class with a stake in the country, and hence in peace and order and democracy for all the people. This is in fact what the Alliance for Progress is all about—it is as much a sociopolitical revolution as it is an economic one.

As societies come to have more respect for constitutional civilian governments with wide popular support, these governments will no longer be easy targets for military coups. But to tip the balance even more in favor of established civilian governments, we also must assist the military to assume the more constructive peacetime role of maintaining internal security and working on civic action programs. The latter are especially valuable in identifying them with the problems and goals of the civilian population.

CAN'T EXCLUDE MILITARY

Even in the United States we argue about the areas of national policy in which the military have a rightful voice. In Latin America we cannot aim to reduce them to impotence in the national life—rather it is a problem of acceptance of a mission in support of legitimate governments against subversion from extremists of both right and left, whose threat of force must be met by force. There must be military participation in the formulation of some national policies; they cannot be excluded altogether.

I should not wish this emphasis on the need for the military to acquire a new and somewhat more limited role in political life to be read as a downgrading of the real contribution they have made to political freedom and stability in many countries. Peron in Argentina, Perez Jimenez in Venezuela, and Rojas Pinilla in Colombia were all military dictators who were thrown out with the help of their own military in the 1950's. And the two worst dictators today in Latin America, it should be noted, are not military men and were able to consolidate their power by reducing the regular military forces to impotence.

Nor are the military universal supporters of those who oppose change as represented by the programs of the Alliance. Governments controlled by the military have overseen the election to power this year in Argentina and Peru of two of the most progressive regimes either country has ever had. This year in Ecuador and Guatemala, military regimes have announced reform programs of substantial importance.

Nevertheless, the fundamental facts remain—military coups thwart the will of the people, destroy political stability and the growth of the tradition of respect for democratic institutions and nurture Communist opposition to their tyranny. Moreover the military often show little capacity for effective government, which is a political rather than military job.

Apart from our and the Alliance's vigorous long-term efforts to eliminate the political vacuums on the civilian side which invite military action, as well as our efforts to train the military in their most valuable role, what can the United States do in the case of specific threats or coups which nevertheless come?

INTERVENTION OPPOSED

Unless there is intervention from outside the hemisphere by the international Communist conspiracy, the use of military force involving the probability of U.S. soldiers killing the citizens of another country is not to be ordered lightly.

Nor can we, as a practical matter, create effective democracy by keeping a man in office through use of economic pressure or even military force when his own people are not willing to fight to defend him. A democracy dependent on outside physical support of this kind is a hollow shell which has no future. The people had better start all over again. Moreover, once outside military support is used it may prove hard to withdraw. We have seen in this country—in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua—how politically unproductive military occupations are, even when carried out with the best of intentions.

We must use our leverage to keep these new regimes as liberal and considerate of the welfare of the people as possible. In addition, we must support and strengthen the civilian components against military influence and press for new elections as soon as possible so that these countries once again may experience the benefits of democratic legitimacy. Depending upon the circumstances, our leverage is sometimes great, sometimes small.

One should not underestimate what has been accomplished by the United States and Alliance policies I have described. They are accomplishments that have truly enhanced the long-term prospects of the Alliance.

In Argentina, the military walked up the hill a number of times to look at the green pastures of full military control and the power and prerequisites that would go with it. Each time a combination of wiser heads in the military, along with more and more confident civilian leaders who were strongly buttressed by U.S. diplomatic support and aid programs, turned them back. The elections were held on schedule.

In Peru, the 1-year rule of the junta was about the most respectful of civil liberties, most progressive in its policies, and quickest to give up its power peacefully in the history of Latin American military regimes. Here again the strong stand taken by the United States prior to recognition helped to secure public commitments on, and follow through from, the junta to pursue liberal policies—liberal of course only for a military dictatorship.

NO REPRESSION IN ECUADOR

A similar story can be told of the Ecuadorian junta, which is governing through an able and representative civilian cabinet and generally without repression of civil liberties.

In every case mentioned there has been a novel and notable absence of reprisals against the leaders of the ousted regimes. The firing squads or prison guards, so characteristic of earlier political upheavals in Latin America, have been eschewed. This restraint can be credited to the progress

> Latin America has been making under the Alliance and to U.S. influence brought to bear through all the means open to us, to produce moderation and a prompt return to constitutional and democratic regimes.
>
> I fear there are some who will accuse me of having written an apologia for coups. I have not. They are to be fought with all the means we have available. Rather I would protest that I am urging the rejection of the thesis of the French philosophers that democracy can be legislated—established by constitutional fiat.
>
> I am insisting on the Anglo-Saxon notion that democracy is a living thing which must have time and soil and sunlight in which to grow. We must do all we can to create these favorable conditions, and we can do and have done much.
>
> But we cannot simply create the plant and give it to them; it must spring from seeds planted in indigenous soil.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Assistant Secretary of State Martin has unfortunately done just what he denied he was doing—delivered an apology for military coups and "strong man" rule in Latin America. It is even more unfortunate that despite the lipservice Mr. Martin pays to the Alliance for Progress, the rationale he offers for the military in Latin America undercuts and destroys the entire premise of the Alliance.

One can only assume that Mr. Martin has laid down the typical diplomatic smokescreen of shoulder-shrugging preliminary to recognition and aid to the new dictatorships of the Dominican Republic and Honduras. If that proves to be the case, then Mr. Martin and the militarists to the south will, once and for all, have killed the Alliance for Progress.

More important, they will have brought the politics of the Western Hemisphere full turn back to where we were in 1957, when U.S. support of Fascist governments caused millions of Latin Americans to look to Fidel Castro, instead of to the United States, for deliverance from poverty and violent repression, and led to the stoning and egging of the Vice President of the United States when he ventured into one of these countries. Then, too, we gave lipservice, as Mr. Martin did, to popular democracy and constitutional government. Then, too, we piously said we support the aspirations of these people for political and economic freedom. Then, too, we said the forces of nationalism were strong, and that the fears of the old order brought on by the new, and the strain of rapid social and economic changes must be taken into consideration. Then, too, we said that, like motherhood, sin was a fact, and that we must deal with it, however repulsive it might be to us.

The Assistant Secretary makes the weakest case of all for military governments when he tries to whitewash their role in specific countries. Even in the best of cases—Peru and Argentina—the results are far from in. In Peru, the military seized power when a candidate they opposed was elected President. They seized power by driving U.S. Sherman tanks through the palace gates, manned by officers who were trained in American military training programs. Is it any wonder that so many in Latin America question the purpose of American military aid?

When new elections were allowed in Peru, the winner was a supporter of the military coup, and, in turn, he had the blessing of the junta. As in Argentina, these Presidents, who serve only with the consent of the military, are able to carry out their programs only with the consent of the military.

In Guatemala, no election even appears to be in sight, nor does it appear that a return to constitutional processes is in sight in Ecuador.

The best case the Secretary was able to make for military governments is only that they may not always be bad, and in some circumstances they have presided over orderly transitions from one President they have deposed to another. But these are the exceptions, and Mr. Martin does not mention the general rule.

Yet even the more evil ex-dictatorships cited as having been deposed by the military, came from the military in the first place. Stroessner in Paraguay and the Somoza regime in Nicaragua today also emerged originally from military sources. It is a game of military leapfrog in Latin America. They just leap over one military dictator to the next. The sad and ugly fact is that the U.S. Department of State, through both Republican and Democratic administrations, has condoned it, and has given further military aid to assure further suppression of freedom in Latin America. And yet we wonder why the Latin American image of the United States is not a pretty one.

Mr. President, in my judgment we are belying our professings about the objectives of the Alliance for Progress program. We cannot square our professings about the Alliance for Progress program with any diplomatic recognition by the United States, or with any further aid, economic or military, to any military junta, anywhere in Latin America, that overthrows a constitutional, democratic form of government. That is the issue, Mr. President; and Mr. Martin in his article yesterday did a "snow job" on that issue; he ducked that one; he ran to cover on that one.

Let there be no doubt about that as the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I disassociate myself from that program of the Assistant Secretary of State; and today I ask the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, to let me know whether that is his position. If it is, let me forewarn the State Department that I shall disassociate myself from the entire State Department on this policy.

In due course of time, I shall find out whether it is President Kennedy's policy; and if it is, I shall dissociate myself from the administration's policy at the White House level; because, Mr. President, this program, outlined in the article of yesterday by the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, spells the doom of American influence in Latin America, if we seek to implement the clear innuendoes and implications of the policy enunciated by the Assistant Secretary in the article published yesterday in the Washington Post and also in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to associate myself fully, completely, and thoroughly with the remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon. I, too, was shocked when I read Assistant Secretary Martin's statement. I found it difficult to believe my eyes when I read that, at the very time when the President of the United States had ordered the withdrawal of recognition and of economic aid from the two countries whose democratically established governments were overthrown by military juntas, the Assistant Secretary of State—the man presumably responsible for policy in Latin America—had come out in praise of juntas, and doing so in contravention of the declared policy of the President. Such a statement offers every encouragement and stimulation to similar junta military coups all throughout Latin America. I consider it a grave betrayal of the Alliance for Progress. I think it is a betrayal of the administration. I agree fully with the Senator from Oregon that if that policy is not repudiated, the Alliance for Progress is dead, and should be dead. Our funds should not be used to support the military overthrowers of constituted government.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator will see from the remaining portions of my speech, I stress the identical views.

As I have said, the best case the Secretary was able to make for military governments is only that they may not always be bad.

But these are the exceptions, and Mr. Martin does not mention the general rule.

As a matter of practice, the more common result of a military coup—justified at the time as the only alternative to communism—has been that the longer it stayed in power, the more rigid it became, and the more cynical. Such governments, as in Venezuela, made for instability rather than stability because they came down to dealing with whatever groups would keep them in power, including the Communists. They produced stronger Communist Parties. They also contributed to instability because they allowed no means for reflecting the rapid economic and social changes taking place.

If these coups are intended to allow for reasonable, orderly, reflection of change, then why are they staged at all? Latin American countries have constitutions that provide for removing Presidents by prescribed means, just as ours does, by impeachment or some other procedure.

We do not need a military crew to get rid of a President that could be removed on the basis of a bad record by constitutional processes.

The military castes have stood above the constitutions. That is the crux of the problem. The crux of the problem in Latin American country after Latin American country is that the military juntas refuse to abide by the constitutional process. That is what happened in the Dominican Republic. That is what happened in Honduras, and in

Guatemala. Wessin y Wessin and other military leaders in the Dominican Republic knew that Bosch under the constitution was the commander in chief—the civilian commander in chief, as under the Constitution of the United States. The President of the United States has the same power. When they saw that Bosch was going to exercise his civilian constitutional processes and power, and when they realized that he was going to hale Wessin y Wessin before the Congress of the Dominican Republic for a thorough investigation leading to his removal, as they had that segment of the Dominican Republic, they staged a coup, for in Latin-American country after Latin-American country the military considers itself to be above the constitution.

If the United States of America continues to recognize and aid such military coups, then it is guilty of great hypocrisy in its professing to seek to establish constitutional democracies in Latin America or aid in the development. We have said that that is the primary objective of the Alliance for Progress program.

Honduras is the same story. In Honduras the head of the military did not want a man who was about to be elected president, as far as everyone believed, on October 13—just around the corner datewise. They did not want him elected president. Why? Because he was campaigning all over Honduras making perfectly clear that, elected President, he intended to bring the military under further civilian control, which is the power of the President of Honduras. So this military leader proceeded to stage a coup and overthrow him. All the news coming out of Honduras late this morning into our committee shows that there is serious trouble still ahead in Honduras.

One of the most shocking proposals or suggestions made by Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Martin, in his article yesterday was his comment that the population did not come to the assistance of Bosch. Why did he not display the record? The record is that Bosch made a plea to the people of the Dominican Republic not to resort to direct action.

He made a plea to follow the peaceful procedures of the constitution. He made a plea that they stay off the streets. He made a plea that they not engage in physical resistance to the military coup. He pleaded that they wait the passage of time until the constitutional processes would at least have a chance of operating.

Now we have the Assistant Secretary of State of the United States of America writing an article indicating that one of the reasons apparently that we must take at least a somewhat neutral look at this military junta is that the people did not rally around Bosch. The people did not engage in armed rebellion in opposition to the military junta. Bosch should get great credit for his statesmanship. He should get support from the U.S. State Department, not this kind of indirect rug-pulling out from under him that the Martin article of yesterday commits.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Then there is the further fact that had the people demonstrated as they might have liked to, they would have been shot down.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, they did not have guns.

Mr. GRUENING. The very weapons which the United States furnished the junta—the tanks and the machineguns supplied by the United States under our military assistance program, allegedly to protect the Dominican people from attack were used to overthrow that legally elected and constituted Government of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MORSE. It has been a form of suicide for thousands of them.

Mr. President, the military castes have stood above the constitutions. In Mr. Martin's examples they have allowed constitutional governments to exist, but for how long we do not know.

Just why constitutional governments should serve only with permission from the military does not seem to occupy Mr. Martin's attention at all. He accepts it as the way of life in Latin America. Yet if its acceptance is to be the policy of the United States, then there is no justification at all for our huge aid programs there, especially military aid.

None of these military establishments exists for purposes of national defense against another country. They exist to control internal politics. The idea that we should build them up to maintain internal stability is almost a contradiction in terms. But we have built them up on that basis, and we are reaping the harvest of coup after coup which is destroying constitutional government in Latin America.

I respectfully suggest that it is Mr. Martin's statement that does not measure current events against historical perspective.

I remind him that we went through all this 5 to 10 years ago. When the policy of dealing with Latin America dictators threatened to throw the masses of people into the lap of communism, we changed that policy into the Alliance for Progress.

Its purpose, its basic premise, was that the United States would make financial aid available to nations of the hemisphere as they undertook social and economic reform as a middle course between the communism represented by Castro and the rightwing military dictatorships. If the people of Latin America who entered into the Act of Bogotá and the Alliance for Progress with us no longer wish to follow the middle road between right and left, then I share Mr. Martin's view that it is their decision and one the United States must not overturn by military intervention of our own.

But if they revert back to military dictatorship, then the United States no longer has any business sending them economic or military aid. The Assistant Secretary seems to imply in his statement that this country is willing to accept whatever government comes to power as the one with which we shall do business. That is the usual practice of diplomacy. But the Alliance for Progress is not a usual practice. It is not a traditional policy. It is an unusual policy, designed to meet urgent and critical circumstances in Latin America. The preamble to the Act of Bogotá recognized that the preservation and strengthening of free and democratic institutions in the American republics requires the acceleration of social and economic progress in Latin America adequate to meet th legitimate aspirations of the peoples of the Americas for a better life and to provide them the fullest opportunity to improve their status. The preservation and strengthening of democratic institutions is the basic premise of the act and of the Alliance.

It was made the premise because the nations of the hemisphere and the United States had come to a recognition in 1959, 1960, and 1961, that military governments were failing to meet the challenge of communism in Latin America.

Apparently some of these signatories of the act have reverted back to the same old theories that so clearly failed in the past. If so, that is their business. But Mr. Martin does a disservice when he implies, as his statement does, that American aid will continue, anyway.

It should not. We should have it clearly understood from the officials in charge of Latin American affairs that the military faction that seizes power in Latin America is, in the same stroke, taking its country out of the Alliance for Progress, so far as U.S. economic and military aid are concerned.

Until we have a clear statement of that policy, and unswerving enforcement of it, we are going to have more coups in Latin America by military leaders who are encouraged by Mr. Martin's statement to think that the United States only intends to pay lipservice to the principles and objectives of the Alliance for Progress.

Mr. President, there was published recently a letter to the editor of the New York Times written by the constitutional President of Guatemala, a President of Guatemala who was overthrown by a military coup. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Miguel Ydigoras-Fuentes may be printed in the Record at this point, because its thesis and major premise is identical with the thesis and major premise I have expressed on the floor of the Senate this afternoon in my criticism of the article of the Assistant Secretary of State, Edward Martin, that appeared in the Washington Post and New York Herald Tribune yesterday.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Use of Military Coups: Dangers Cited in Totalitarianisms of the Right

To the Editor of the New York Times:

Twice in your editorial of September 26 "The Coup in Santo Domingo" was Guatemala mentioned and the military coup of March 30–31 of this year implied. I would like to comment briefly on military coups in general and on the present Guatemalan melodrama in particular, because I have also read with interest the news article, "Guatemalan Editor Silenced, but Writes Anyway" of September 27.

As the Times correctly points out, modern military takeovers are usually explained by the reactionary clique that usurps power on the ground that the legitimate government overthrown was "pro-Communist, inept and corrupt." Those are the reasons given by the enemies of democracy, without realizing perhaps—with their dinosaur mentality—that they are dealing a fatal blow to democratic institutions and the end result will have to be a popular rebellion with the unfortunate sequence of shedding of blood.

The totalitarians of the right believe that the existence of several political parties, the separation of the branches of government, freedom of elections, the rights of the underprivileged to a better life, freedom of expression, habeas corpus, the system of constitutional succession, the consent of the governed and the pursuit of happiness (as your own Constitution reads) are divisive elements which inevitably lead to communism.

SIMILAR AIMS

In their absurdity and ignorance they fail to see that there is a fraternal alliance between themselves and Castro communism, in that both extremes wish democracy to fail and that both tend to flourish when either can point to the other as the sole alternative. This is what Hitler and Stalin said two decades ago, ruthlessly suppressing, in the meantime, the fundamental rights and freedoms of their respective peoples.

The reactionary clique in Guatemala that overthrew my government also accused my administration and myself of being inept and corrupt, and had the audacity to imply that I was really a pro-Communist in disguise. They suspended the Constitution; abolished congress; imprisoned hundreds of Guatemalans, mistreating and exiling them; eliminated the liberties enjoyed under my administration, and ended the social progress under the provisions of the Charter of Punta del Este—which created the Alliance for Progress.

This is the melodramatic situation in Guatemala today. It is a terrible police state, just as brutal, tenebrous, calculating, vicious, and somber as that of Dictator Manuel Estrada Cabrera in Guatemala (1898–1920). I am sure, though, that it will not last long, because the people and the more liberal-minded military will not permit it.

In struggling against communism, we should not forget the other totalitarianisms that always crush the fundamental freedoms of the people.

MIGUEL YDIGORAS-FUENTES,
Constitutional President of Guatemala.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, today, I have also received a personal letter from President Ydigoras. In it, he expands on the same points he made in his letter to the Times. I particularly call attention to his suggestion that:

> If a group of colonels believes that the legitimate Government, freely elected by the people, is conducting its business in an ill-mannered fashion, the thing for its members to do is to resign from the armed forces and enter politics, observing—as anyone else—the rules of the game.

I ask unanimous consent to have all of President Ydigoras' letter to me printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN MARCO ISLAND, MIAMI, FLA.,
5 de Octubre de 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator from Oregon, Chairman, Latin American Subcommittee, the Senate of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Since our last conversation in the middle of the summer, when we exchanged points of view regarding the military coup in Guatemala which ousted the legitimate government I had the honor of presiding, in accordance with the mandate of the majority of Guatemalans expressed in the free elections of January 1958, other military takeovers have occurred in Latin America and the social-political situation in Guatemala has gravely deteriorated.

My own struggle against communism is, I believe, well known in the United States and in Latin America. It is, I am sure, recognized by the political leaders in your country and by many Latin Americans who have the responsibility of government. It is stated in my book: "My War With Communism," Prentice-Hall (July 1963).

I say this because the American Continent must, on the one hand, repudiate the imperialist and aggressive policies and purposes of the international Communist movement, and, on the other, condemn in no uncertain terms the objectives and the methods of the right extremists, since they are intrinsically antagonistic to the democratic aspirations of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere and destructive to their free institutions.

As it happens with any human society, on occasions legitimate and democratic governments commit errors in procedure which, unfortunately, are greatly exaggerated in press dispatches. The Guatemalan press has been under censorship prior to 1958. The parties opposing my government and defeated at the polls, began, by means of the freedom of the press I imposed, a vicious campaign against my government, never seen before. One thing is to correct the mistakes that might be committed in a democracy, and quite another to take advantage of the freedoms of democracy to destroy it.

During the past two years, the Inter-American community has come to realize that "political" and "social" democracies must go hand in hand, because they mutually complement each other. This realization has received great impetus, in my opinion, thanks to the courageous and dynamic leadership of President John F. Kennedy. I am referring specifically to the Alliance for Progress, that gigantic and multilateral effort destined to raise, in the social and economic fields, the standard of living of millions of Latin Americans. You may recall my own efforts, initiated during the first semester of my term in 1958, to accelerate the economic integration of the Central American Republics; and President Kubitscheck's vast plan which he entitled "Operation Pan America," of the same year. But it is also true that without President Kennedy's understanding of the problem and without his complete support, the Alliance for Progress would not have been established at Punta del Este, on August 17, 1961.

The Alliance is a most ambitious program, but it must be implemented, as the "Declaration of the Peoples of the Americas" reads, in a free climate, with free institutions, always respectful of human rights. If it were otherwise, as the Communist claim to be doing in the enslaved island of Cuba, the joint effort would make a mockery out of representative democracy and, in the end, it would be completely useless.

The military that overthrow legitimate, constitutional and democratic regimes in Latin America do so ostensibly on many grounds, but in fact because they abhor the democratic way of life, free and constructive dialogue, and the right to dissent from the philosophy that guides any government or the means used to achieve the ends sought. To them the multiplicity of political parties, the establishment of labor unions and the free expression of opinion, for example, are characteristic of "decadent" societies, and roads which inevitably lead to chaos and anarchy. This is the outlook—very primitive indeed—of the extremists of the right, of the totalitarians a la Hitler and Mussolini. In other words, their outlook is completely negative and obstructionist; and, what is worse, they form a close and fraternal alliance with every other bitter enemy of democracy in that they wish democracy to fail. They pretend to stay in power by pointing out, falsely of course, that the sole alternative to Communist rule is military misrule and oligarchic reaction.

Some have advocated that dictatorships and de facto governments should be excluded from participating in the Inter-American System. A year ago, at the Organization of American States, several Latin American democratic countries introduced a resolution to have a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs discuss that possibility. Although my Government was naturally sympathetic to the initiative, it instructed its Permanent Mission not to vote affirmatively because (1) it was uncertain as to the effectiveness of the step proposed and (2) it believed that other measures (joint breaking of diplomatic relations and collective economic sanctions, for example) could be taken outside the Inter-American System, in a less formal but more effective manner. What my Government had in mind, my dear friend, was to consult with other legitimate governments as to the possibility of "continentalizing" Article II of the Central American Treaty of Peace and Friendship, signed in Washington on February 7, 1923, through which de facto and unconstitutional regimes would not be recognized diplomatically.

What the Latin American community needs, in my opinion, is to intensify its economic development and to greatly accelerate social justice, before it is too late, but certainly preserving—in the process—the fundamental rights of man. It is intolerable to have any part of the population pass dogmatic judgment on the desires and needs of the majority; and much worse if any popular sector denies, through undemocratic means, the wishes of other popular sectors. If a group of Colonels believes that the legitimate government, freely elected by the people, is conducting its business in an ill-mannered fashion, the thing for its members to do is to resign from the Armed Forces and enter politics, observing—as any one else—the rules of the game. When they usurp power and oust a democratic and constitutional government, no matter what pretext they might advance for their action, the international community should react with energy, vigor and indignation—sanctioning their ill-conceived and ill-executed performance.

In normal times, the international family of nations suffers immensely when a democratic regime is decapitated. In this atomic era, when years are reduced to weeks and months to minutes, any democratic setback is much more dangerous to the community because it affords its enemies an excellent opportunity to give the West a major setback in international politics.

As to the present situation in Guatemala, the de facto and dictatorial regime has openly and defiantly violated the Charter of the United Nations, the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man, the Declaration of Santiago de Chile of 1959 and most of the instruments pertaining to the rule of law and the protection of fundamental freedoms. It has converted the country into a terrible police state.

Colonel Enrique Peralta and his associates in crime have ruthlessly suppressed the freedoms fully enjoyed by the Guatemalan people under my administration. Monstrous laws have been decreed. Congress has been abolished. Habeas corpus has been eliminated. An indefinite state of siege exists in the country. Military tribunals judge ordinary offenses (called, by the ruling and reactionary clique, seditious, and subversive). Hundreds have been jailed, and many mistreated before being sent into exile in foreign but friendly lands. There is a growing list of Guatemalans being summarily shot. The paredon as in Cuba, is becoming a national institution. Freedom of expression is not only a myth: it is admittedly nonexistent. High schools have been militarized. Social progress has come to a complete stop.

I denounced all these terrible violations to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, in late August, and requested that body to investigate the charges and take appropriate measures. In statements and letters to the press I have warned that repressive measures are on the increase and that the hatred of the Guatemalan people for the present regime is growing. Guatemalans, from every walk of life, are responding to the situation with greater acts of bravery, and even with terrorist acts and increased guerrilla activities, because there is no solution in sight.

Not a word has been said officially about general elections. And even if they were convoked, there is absolutely no guarantee that they would be free. As a matter of fact, they could not be, unless a new government took over and conducted itself fairly, restoring the fundamental freedoms which have been trampled over by the military boot.

Colonel Peralta's regime has not only defied the sovereign will of the Guatemalan people, but—with incredible audacity and impunity—has defied all the American Continent. Its contempt for the opinion of democratic leaders of the Americas has no bounds.

Should you wish, my dear Senator Morse, to distribute copies of this letter to your distinguished colleagues in the Latin American Subcommittee of the Senate of the United States and, particularly, to my good friend Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa, you may do so without any hesitancy. If, however, you desire to include it in the Congressional Record, feel free to do so.

With every good wish, I remain affectionately yours,

Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes,
Constitutional President of Guatemala.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter to the Times by Ronald Hilton, the editor of the Hispanic-American Report, Stanford University.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report on Santo Domingo: Latin-American Specialist Outlines Events Leading to Coup

(Note.—The writer of the following is editor of the Hispanic-American Report, Stanford University.)

To the Editor of the New York Times:

With what may be an all-too-common lack of prescience, the American press did not have a single representative in Santo Domingo at the time of the coup which overthrew President Juan Bosch.

There were well-founded rumors that a coup was being prepared to defend the old order, the pretext being an alleged Communist threat; the only doubt was when the coup would be launched and whether the president would be able to devise some means of meeting brute military force. The observations of one who witnessed the coup may be of some interest.

The visitor to the Dominican Republic was immediately struck by the fact that the military-cum-police was still intact, and virtually unchanged. It should be remembered that the military who assassinated Trujillo did so not out of love of freedom and democracy but because the tyrant had become an embarrassment and threatened the privileged position the military had built up. Under the Bosch regime, the military police state continued to live side by side with the relatively powerless civilian regime. The cat was simply waiting to pounce on the spirited mouse.

SHAMELESS CONTRIVANCE

The coup was contrived with a shamelessness which was scarcely credible. The merchants' association called a strike, which was a miserable failure even though the small shopkeepers were bribed to participate. Three radio stations and one TV station incited the people to revolt in a clearly subversive fashion.

President Bosch used his constitutional powers to close them down; the anti-Bosch elements who were inciting the crowd to overthrow the Government denounced this as an infringement on popular rights. The army staged a coup and immediately forced all the radio stations in the republic simply to rebroadcast all day long the junta propaganda. It would be hard to conceive of a grosser non sequitur.

The merchants' strike was sparked largely by local Spanish interests. Conversations with business leaders, both Dominican and foreign (including German), revealed that by and large they were delighted with the coup. It was asssumed that the new military regime (with civilians as a fig leaf) should make life easier for business.

They denounced Bosch as a Communist, and when asked for details provided facts which were carefully checked with well-informed diplomatic observers. Almost without exception, the facts were clearly unfounded; sometimes the charges were clearly inspired by resentment that the Government had refused to give the company a contract or had awarded it to a competitor.

The elections which brought Bosch to power were witnessed by Organization of American States observers, and Bosch's enemies were therefore unable to claim they had been fraudulent. The rightist minority revealed that inability, all too frequent in Latin America, to understand the nature of democratic elections. If you can't win in the elections, some other way must be sought to grab power. The successful candidate must be denounced as personally incompetent or corrupt.

ACCUSED OF CORRUPTION

Bosch was described as both. It was strange to hear Bosch, who dismissed the one adviser suspected of corruption, being accused of corruption by people who clearly have no general objection to it. It may well be that Bosch, an author who had for years lived outside the Dominican Republic, lacked both the technical skills and the personal knowledge of present-day Dominican affairs to be an ideal President, but his opponents are in general scarcely more attractive.

Bosch was regarded by sober American observers as sufficiently attractive to be worth widespread support. The United States and the Alliance for Progress had a much wider commitment to support the Bosch regime than is generally realized. The planning of the country was largely in the hands of CIDES (Centro de Investigaciones de Desarrollo Económico y Social), supported by the Ford and Parvin Foundations and by the Agency for International Development; its director, Sacha Volman, a U.S. citizen, is one of the bétes noires of the new regime. He took refuge in the U.S. Embassy while the army searched his home.

Former Vice President Wallace was in the Dominican Republic at the time of the coup; he had a project to develop appropriate strains of hybrid maize to increase the corn production. This is just one of many projects with which the United States was attempting to get the economy off the ground. Incidentally, Ambassador Martin and his staff deserve high commendation.

It may be that no regime can save the Dominican Republic. A ride across the country bears graphic evidence of what we know from vital statistics. There is no country in the world where one sees such a high proportion of children, most illegitimate, for whom there is no prospect of education, training, and jobs. Perhaps the example of Puerto Rico offers some hope. Otherwise within 50 years the Dominican Republic will be another Haiti.

Ronald Hilton.

Miami, Fla.

SHOULD AMERICAN WHEAT STRENGTHEN COMMUNISM?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, over the past weekend and the few days previous, much additional information has been forthcoming concerning the proposed sale of American wheat to Red Russia for its exportation to satellite countries and to other areas where it has made grain-shipping commitments.

On Thursday, September 26 I expressed to the Senate at some length my own personal views on this proposed major shift in American foreign and commercial policy toward communism. For those interested, my views can be found beginning on page 18260 of the Congressional Record.

WHAT IS NEEDED IS AN AMERICAN POLICY RATHER THAN A SALE

On September 26, I stated that it is my conviction that President Kennedy should call a "trade-aid" conference of the major exporting nations of the free world in order to give our American leadership, if it is still strong enough to be effective, an opportunity to develop with our free world associates a consistent and cooperative program of both trade and aid insofar as our side of the cold war is concerned.

Obviously, acting alone, the United States can neither operate an effective program of economic pressures against Russia, Cuba, and Red China nor can we provide sufficient foreign economic and military aid to protect the undeveloped countries, our friends overseas, and neutral areas against the expanded cold war pressures which the Russians and their Communist associates can bring to bear upon them, especially if we add our American food supplies and other products to the Russian capacity to wage a successful economic war against the free world. What we need, Mr. President, is a consistent and understandable American policy in these areas rather than a hastily conceived sale of wheat to Russia which may become the forerunner of a new trade-aid policy which is inadequately planned and illy prepared. Thus, I renew my suggestion of September 26 for the calling of a free world trade-aid conference.

Mr. President, I also reaffirm my conviction that this decision which involves the wisdom or the undesirability of abandoning an American trade-aid policy which has served us well for more than 15 years in favor of a sale of wheat which could be the "first step on a long journey" of which no one knows the destination should be a decision made by the Congress and not one handed down from the top by administrative action.

I am happy to observe the many indications of support for deferring a decision on the wheat deal until all of the implications, information, and ramifications have been considered by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to include two editorials from South Dakota newspapers supporting this position.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Rapid City Daily Journal, Oct. 3, 1963]

Let's Take a Logical Look

It's really no sin to have a surplus. Therefore it's also prudent to survey the situation seriously before unloading wheat surpluses to Russia—just because the Canadian Government sees fit to do so.

Senator Karl Mundt, of South Dakota, has asked the administration to call a conference in Washington among the major exporting agricultural and industrial nations of the free world. He proposed the meeting to analyze and formulate a workable and consistent pattern of trade with the Communist bloc countries and to determine the impact that a program of expanded trade with Russia, Cuba, and Red China and other Communist countries would have upon the mutual assistance and foreign aid programs to which the United States is today by far the most significant and sizable contributor.

Mundt pointed up that many advocate we sell whatever we have in surplus to any alien government which can purchase our supplies with cash, credit, or barter exchange.

Mundt contends that the most logical and constructive procedure is a conference for a close, new look at the whole world picture of trade, aid, and cold war differences and techniques.

The senior Senator from South Dakota says this should be tried before any changes are made in the trade policies.

Mundt recognizes that the United States cannot effectively blockade the Communist world if the associates in the free world insist on selling all they can for either cash or credit.

The Senator wants the conference before the Congress is called upon to act upon this year's foreign aid bill.

"We should know what foreign policy we propose to implement before being called upon to appropriate more billions for programs which might run head-on into conflict with a free world of economic and military assistance to the Communist bloc through trade negotiations, cash or credit sales or outright barter," Mundt says.

The Senator insists that Russia should not be permitted to buy U.S. grain with a subsidy being paid by the American taxpayer. Also, that a substantial change in our foreign policy be made and approved by Congress, instead of being written by a nonelected official of one of the branches of the executive offices in Washington.

The Canadian Government has been selling grains to the Russians for years. But, it took the major sale of $500 million worth of wheat in one sale to push the panic button and cause a clamor for like sales by this country.

[From the Daily Leader, Madison, S. Dak., Sept. 30, 1963]

A Sound Approach

Senator Karl E. Mundt has a logical approach to our Nation's problem of exports and foreign aid.

He proposes that President Kennedy should call a free world conference to plan a workable agreement on trade with the Soviet Union and other Iron Curtain countries, so that our national interest may be protected and that the free world can act in unison on this perplexing problem.

He points to two different views on the best course for the United States to pursue: That we abandon our policy on restriction of trade, a policy which we are pursuing almost all alone; or that we sell agricultural and manufactured surplus for cash or quick credit, and close out our foreign aid program.

Senator Mundt does not favor either solution. He believes that our Nation can only act successfully in this sort of problem with the complete cooperation of other free world nations.

This is indeed a sound approach to the problem of disposing of our wheat surplus, and should get high-level attention from the administration, which surely can use some good advice on foreign relations, which have been fumbled so frequently.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the Congressional Record at this point editorials on this subject from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., and from the Journal-American published in New York City.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn.]

Appeasement by Wheat

There are compelling pressures to commit United States grain for sale to Russia, but there is urgent necessity to remember what this will do to our cold war against the world conspiracy of communism.

Pushing Americans into possible wheat deals with the Soviet Union are a number of things:

Our allies, including Canada, are selling grain to Moscow. The U.S. Government has not been able to prevent this trade.

American grain sales at this moment could be made for dollars and gold, thus helping us boost our dwindling gold reserve and improve our balance-of-payments situation.

Wheat exports could reduce our immense and costly surpluses, created by Government subsidy.

And by no means least, American grain dealers hate to see markets of this size getting away from them.

That's their side of the argument for dealing with Russia. It's high time, however, that someone argued the case for the other side.

It must be evident that when we help the Soviet Union feed its people, its satellites, and in particular Cuba, we are increasing our own burden in fighting communism. How can this Nation engage in a fight against the Communist bloc with every possible risk of national obliteration, and then turn around and assist our enemy?

Maybe Soviet need for wheat is a way of forcing it to drain off its gold reserves and bolster those of America and other free world nations, and maybe it's nice to note that the boasting Kremlin leaders have had to swallow their claims of agricultural and economic advancement. But there is no doubt that when an enemy is on his knees, begging, that is no time to relax and let him stand up.

Russia is normally a wheat exporter and it has commitments. American wheat, if it joins that from Canada, will be sold by the Soviet, in turn, to East European Communist satellites, and to Fidel Castro's Cuba. It is entirely possible that ships will leave gulf coast ports and head directly to Havana.

What kind of world is that? If these deals by American grain brokers go through, every businessman who has railed against the dangers of socialism and communism might as well keep his silence.

Barron's Financial Weekly, on September 23, urged that Americans not be naively deceived by the "glittering prospects" of "quick dollars." Said Barron's: "If the United States decides to come to the aid of its enemies, it should at least be hardheaded enough to exact a heavy political price. In the global struggle between freedom and slavery, gold dollars are inadequate coin. * * * If this country wants to do business with the Communists, in grain or in any other commodity, it should insist on getting something of value in return—the razing of the Berlin wall, for example, or the evacuation of Red troops from Cuba."

Appeasement based on dollar hunger won't help subdue communism. And there is no excuse for mighty America to be lured into meek imitation of Canada.

As Senator Karl Mundt, Republican of South Dakota, has said of this panic to deal with Russia: "Our farmers * * * expect the United States to lead the world rather than to follow every wrong policy practiced by our associates."

[From the Journal-American, New York, N.Y., Sept. 26, 1963]

Grain of Sense

To our neighbor Canada a dollar is a dollar and nobody is fussy about the source. That is, as long as the amount of dollars is big enough. Thus we have the spectacle of a member of the Western Alliance selling a half billion dollars' worth of wheat to the Soviet Union, part of which was known in advance to be earmarked for Castro's Cuba.

As a result of this deal, the largest ever for 1 year, U.S. wheat farmers, their congressional Representatives and the "Let's-not-be-beastly-to-the-Communists" school have been whooping it up for relaxing our rules against selling to the Soviet.

We think selling wheat to the Soviet is a sacrifice of principle and a help to a foe who has sworn "to bury" us.

It would be far better to sell all the wheat possible to the Western European countries.

Western Europe, restored to prosperity by U.S. help, needs no charity and can pay the top price. These countries mostly have been trading with the Communists as they can, despite the fact that it helps.

THE COMMON FOE

In so doing they have—ironically—acquired a lot of U.S. gold dollars which this country needs to balance our payments deficit.

The United States is a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement which prevents us from dumping our surplus wheat on the world market at this point. Since that pact makes it possible for the Canadians and such to trade with the enemy without punitive action by us, it seems logical that the United States should reconsider it when it comes up for renewal.

Not the least important aspect of the wheat deal is the proof that Soviet crop failures are much more catastrophic than the Russians admit because farmers won't produce adequately under the Communist system.

This may be the only way the Russian people can get back at their Communist masters. It makes no sense for the United States to help the tyrants off the hook.

Mr. MUNDT. I urge those who are concerned about the possibility of our stumbling into new concepts of trade and aid without a careful consideration of all the facts to study, as well, recent statements on the Senate floor from Senators DODD of Connecticut; MORSE of Oregon; JAVITS of New York, LAUSCHE of Ohio, COOPER of Kentucky and PROXMIRE of Wisconsin.

Finally, Mr. President, I am disturbed by a widely distributed United Press report published late last week which reports on the alleged activities behind the scenes of Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in connection with the trip to Canada of one Burton Joseph of Minnesota and the efforts to induce the Russian wheat committee to request American wheat. I have never seen a reply from Secretary Freeman to this United Press report and I believe it should either be confirmed or repudiated. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEMAN CHALLENGED TO MAKE STATEMENT ON WHEAT SALE TALKS

ST. PAUL, MINN.—Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman has been accused of "administrative bungling" of United States-Russian wheat talks, and challenged to make "a clear statement concerning the background of these negotiations."

Minnesota Republican Chairman Robert Forsythe also asked Freeman to "tell the people exactly when the deal got started and what role he has played."

Forsythe said during the weekend that Freeman, while in Duluth, Minn., with President Kennedy last Tuesday, said he was not personally involved in the negotiations.

But in a television appearance, Forsythe said, Freeman admitted being in the background for the past 2 weeks.

The chairman asked Freeman to clarify why he had Burton Joseph, husband of Minnesota's Democratic national committeewoman, head the negotiations with the Russions "when there are many other persons available with far more skill and experience."

Why, Forsythe asked, was Joseph placed directly at the head of a corporation to handle the trade instead of running it through regular export channels through the Department of Commerce.

"The American people must wonder why U.S. businessmen must go to Ottawa, Canada, to negotiate a trade of wheat with the Government of Soviet Russia," Forsythe said.

And why, Forsythe asked, were two Department of Agriculture employees—Robert Lewis and Clifford Pulbermacher—sent to Ottawa to observe the transactions under assumed names.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate recesses today, it recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment is a complete substitute for the bill. Under the precedents of the Senate, the committee amendment will be considered as original text, for the purpose of amendment.

The committee amendment is now open to amendment.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education, and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in opening Senate debate on H.R. 4955, which contains the administration's recommendations on strengthening and improving the quality of vocational education—to which, as it was reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, there have been added; first, a 3-year extension and amendment of the various titles of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and, second, a 3-year extension of the impacted area laws, Public Laws 814 and 874, modified only by the inclusion under those statutes of the District of Columbia—I propose to speak briefly at this time.

I shall discuss in short compass the general subject of educational legislation during the 88th Congress. Thereafter, in somewhat greater detail, I shall speak to the various provisions of the reported bill. I make this announcement at this time, in order that Senators may know that I anticipate, in this opening statement to address the Senate for about 40 minutes.

During this part of the debate, I am constrained to indicate that I shall not yield the floor for questions. This is done in order that the continuity of presentation, so essential to an understanding of this major legislation—a most desirable objective—may be preserved. At the conclusion of my opening statement, I shall be delighted to engage in colloquy with any of my colleagues on any point or matter affecting the bill.

Mr. President, while the majority leader is still present, I should like to raise a procedural question. I was asked this morning as to the plan for handling the bill today. It is my understanding that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has an amendment which he may wish to submit to the bill, but that he may not be able to return to the Senate until late this afternoon. I also believe that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] may have an amendment which he may wish to consider submitting, although it may not become necessary for him to do so. I understand that he is being called back to discuss it. May I say to the majority leader that if it develops that it will not be possible to reach a final vote on the bill today, it is perfectly agreeable to me, as the Senator in charge of the bill, to consider with favor a unanimous-consent agreement—after we have had a little more time to see how the parliamentary situation develops—whereby we would limit ourselves on tomorrow to, let us say, 30 minutes to a side on amendments and an hour to a side on the bill, and have the final votes on the bill taken tomorrow. I make that announcement now, so that Senators will understand my frame of mind in regard to trying to arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement applicable tomorrow, and leaving today and whatever time we wish to devote to the bill tonight, if necessary, to full debate on the bill itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As always, the Senator from Oregon is most gracious and considerate. He knows that at least one Senator, and possibly two Senators, have been delayed, through no fault of their own, in reaching Washington, and that they have amendments which they would like to submit. In view of the gracious suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, I would hope that this afternoon the leadership on both sides and the Senators who are most interested in the bill could get together for the purpose of offering, later today, a unanimous-consent agreement along the lines suggested by the Senator from Oregon. Again I thank him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of any other amendments by any other Senator which might be in order?

Mr. MORSE. It may be that the Senator from Arizona will submit an amendment or two, but I have not received official final notice in regard to that situation.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION PROPOSED TO THE 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. President, on January 29, 1963, President Kennedy sent to the Congress a most eloquent message on the state of American education. In so doing, he brought to the attention of the Congress, 24 major areas of education in which he felt legislation was needed.

These recommendations were embodied in S. 580, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, which I had the honor to sponsor, and in which action I was joined by Senators McNAMARA, YARBOROUGH, CLARK, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, BURDICK, PELL, MANSFIELD, and HUMPHREY.

Hearings on these 24 proposals, as contained in S. 580, were undertaken on April 29 by the Education Subcommittee. These hearings were concluded on June 25, after 17 days in which administration witnesses and public witnesses were heard. These hearings, together with much informational material, have been printed in seven volumes, and are available to all Senators who desire to consult them. These seven volumes are, in my judgment, witnesses to the comprehensive and inclusive study made by my colleagues on the subcommittee.

At this point I wish to pay high tribute to all the Senators on the subcommittee, on both sides of the aisle, for their faithful attendance, their diligent study, and the sound advice with which they have supported me in our joint effort to enact the pending legislation. To each of them, I owe a debt of gratitude far greater than I can possibly pay.

Legislation in the field of vocational education and in the other areas covered by the reported bill represents but the first installment of educational legislation which the committee intends to present to the Senate during the life of this Congress. As Chairman of the Education Subcommittee, it is my fervent intention to permit the Senators on the committee and also Senators on the floor of the Senate to have an opportunity, through their votes, to work the will of the Senate on each of the President's recommendations. As an earnest of this intention, I point out that the vocational bill now before us is but one of four measures reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the course of its executive session on September 25. One of these, H.R. 6143, the higher education facilities bill, will shortly be before the Senate. In fact, earlier today I filed a report together with minority views; and it will be printed, and should be made available to Senators within the next day or two.

It is as major a step in meeting the needs of the higher education segment of American education, as is H.R. 4955 in the area of vocational education. In the opening days of our hearings on S. 580, I indicated, as did many other members of the committee, that our concern would be with the enactment of sound educational legislation, as the overriding objective. The particular tactic or legislative strategy may change from time to time, but, for my part, I am more concerned with the substance of what can be done than I am within the legislative wrapping paper in which the essential substance is contained.

I know that some members of the committee, for whom I have the highest regard, have indicated by their individual views, which accompanied the committee report, that they would have greatly preferred a version of H.R. 4955 much broader in scope and content. I have the highest admiration and respect for these distinguished Senators. I assure them that we do not differ with them in principle or in objective. Our differences are procedural only. The bill before the Senate represents the best judgment of the majority of the committee. As the Senator in charge of the bill, I have a responsibility to my committee and to the President of the United States to bring forth a bill which contains, in our combined judgment, the best which can be accomplished at this time.

I have no apologies to make for the course of action the committee has adopted. This first educational bill, this first installment on the President's program, reaches a vital need in our economy for today, for next year, and for the years ahead. Two out of every three children and youths now in school, unless this bill becomes law, will enter the labor force of our country without any college education and without any vocational training.

A general high school diploma may be sufficient as a prework basis for many of these youngsters, but I am vitally concerned that a large proportion of them will be seriously hampered in finding and holding jobs. President Kennedy has reminded us that—

> Education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education.

Our effort in the 88th Congress will be to meet, as best we can, these interlocked needs. Legislation brought before the Senate on H.R. 4955 in its three constituent parts was designed, first, to greatly strengthen and improve our vocational education programs; second, provide urgently needed amendment and extension of the National Defense Education Act; and third, continue the authorization for the major Federal program which provides both construction assistance and the financing of the operation and maintenance of a large segment of our public elementary and secondary school systems.

The higher education facilities bill, H.R. 6143, which I hope will be considered on the floor in the very near future, if enacted, will go far in meeting the pressing construction needs of higher education.

So it seems to me that by the approach we have adopted the committee is recognizing its responsibilities to the President and to the American people in the field of education.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND THE FEDERAL POLICY

Mr. President, I turn now to H.R. 4955 and in particular to part A of that bill relating to vocational education.

In our hearings, at page 4317, we have included a study made by Dr. Sar A. Levitan, research professor of labor economics at George Washington University, published in May 1963. In the course of his study Dr. Levitan discussed the expanding interest of the Federal Government in vocational education from 1914 to the present date. I am indebted to his study for much of what follows with respect to the historical background.

It should be recalled that President Woodrow Wilson, a great educator and a great President, almost a half century ago appointed a commission pursuant to a congressional resolution to examine the need for Federal support to aid vocational education. The findings of that report were that most young people "tend to enter all sorts of low-grade skilled and unskilled industries, affording little or no opportunity for better wages or for promotion to a desirable life work. The few adolescents who rise to success as wage earners, whether by accident, rule of thumb, or sheer force of native qualities, acquire their skill and insight in ways that are wasteful to them and to business."

It was true then and it is even more true now. President Wilson's commission thought that one way to reduce this waste was to provide vocational education as an integral part of the educational system. It was unrealistic, the commission thought, for our educational system to concentrate on preparing students for a college education, when the vast majority would never go to higher education; therefore it recommended Federal grants to help develop a vocational educational program. The interstate character of labor mobility and the national flow of industrial products justified such Federal grants. It noted:

> A man may be born in Indiana, trained as a worker in Massachusetts, and spend his days as a machinist in California. A State cannot be expected to devote large sums from her public revenues to the making of good workmen for the benefit of other States. Only out of a common fund like the National Treasury can the burden be equalized and adjusted so that each State may, in justice, be expected to meet the obligation resting upon its schools. Industries are so interrelated that every State is interested commercially in the quality of the workmanship in every other State * * * Iron is rolled in Pennsylvania or Alabama, made into plows in Wisconsin, and in Oregon. * * *

These words could be repeated over and over again today. If anything the only addition we could make would be to point out that the National Defense and space efforts to which we are dedicated have emphasized the national interest in education.

From their report there came the landmark Smith-Hughes bill which was signed into law in February of 1917. The next major expansion in the Federal interest in vocational education took place in 1946 with the passage of the George-Barden Act. It provided an additional $29 million annually over and above the $7.5 million of the Smith-Hughes Act for the support of agricultural training, trade, industrial and home economics education and teacher training. In doing so, it added the further category of the distributive occupations.

In 1956 the Congress added two additional areas of federally aided vocational training by authorizing an annual expenditure of $5 million for instruction in practical nurse training and $375,000 for training in the fisheries trades and industries.

In 1958, through amendments made by title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, $15 million was authorized annually to train highly skilled technicians in occupations necessary to the national defense.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HILL

I digress at this point to pay my very high regards and respects to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his leadership as chairman of the full committee, on which I have the honor of serving as chairman of the education subcommittee. I have the additional privilege of having the chairman of the full committee serve as one of my bulwarks on the subcommittee itself. I wish the record to show that through the years of recent history in the development of national education programs, in my judgment, no Senator has made a greater contribution to the effectuation of the recommendations that various administrations have made in the educational field than the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

This year, my task as chairman of the subcommittee would have been an almost impossible one, and I would not be standing before the Senate today urging passage of a vocational educational training bill that received the overwhelming majority vote of the full committee had it not been for the wonderful cooperation and assistance I received from the Senator from Alabama, the chairman of the full committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF PRESIDENTIAL PANEL OF CONSULTANTS

It is becoming increasingly apparent that much more yet remains to be done. Although, as was reported to the Congress in 1961 by the President, the basic purpose of our vocational education proposals is sound, the technological changes which have occurred in all occupations call for a review and a reevaluation of these statutes with a view toward bringing them into conformity with the vocational education needs of business, of industry, and of our young people. A panel of consultants on vocational education was appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to the 1961 message. The panel consisted of representatives from the educational profession, labor, industry, agriculture, and the public.

The findings of the panel which were published in its report are the basis of the bill before the Senate.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR RIBICOFF AND SECRETARY CELEBREZZE

I digress further. I think the Senator has left the Chamber for a moment. But speaking about the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I wish to express my thanks to two Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare.

First I thank the now Senator from Connecticut but until this session of Congress the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare [Mr. RIBICOFF]. During the past 2 years, as we have worked long and hard in the committee to try to bring forth a meaningful, sound program in this field, I have always had the cooperation and gracious help of the previous Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I want the RECORD to show my deep thanks for the great help he has been to me.

Since the appointment of the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, I am privileged to announce to the Senate, we have had the same cooperation. We have had the able assistance from every head of the Department. The Secretary has made available to the staff of my subcommittee at all times whatever professional assistance we requested.

It is difficult to give due credit to all those who deserve due credit for the product which the committee has brought to the Senate today in legislative form, but certainly the two Secretaries of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are deserving of the high praise I have bestowed upon them in the remarks just made.

FINDINGS OF THE PANEL OF CONSULTANTS

Let us turn to the findings of the panel which was appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to the President's 1961 message to review and evaluate vocational education.

What were the findings? Among them are these:

By 1970, 87 million persons will be working full time. Fifty-eight million of these, now employed, will need training to keep pace with new methods, new materials, new opportunities. Some 26 million young workers will enter the labor force by 1970. Their aptitudes, skills, and education must match the needs of a changing economy. Approximately 3 million women will switch from housework to jobs by 1970. They will need marketable skills requiring training.

Today's vocational education programs benefit 4 million young people and adults in about two-thirds of the Nation's high schools and in many community colleges. Local communities invest $117 million, States $89 million, and the Federal Government $48 million. Each State has a vocational education board to set policy.

But the numbers to be trained must be increased to meet the Nation's trained manpower needs today and in the years ahead. At least 80,000 highly skilled technicians must be trained each year to meet employment needs.

That is a vital statistic, Mr. President. I would have not a single Senator overlook it during the course of the consideration of this bill. I repeat it: At least 80,000 highly skilled technicians must be trained each year to meet employment needs.

We are graduating only 15,000 at present. About 5 million additional skilled craftsmen will need to be trained by 1970 for work in industry. Old jobs are disappearing. New jobs require special skills. Training and retraining are constantly needed to keep workers abreast of the change.

More than half of the Nation's privately employed workers are in service industries—largely sales and marketing—but only a small percentage of high schools offer training in these fields through distributive education. More than 10 million of those employed today are in office occupations, but no Federal funds are provided under the vocational education acts to aid office occupations training. For the one-third of all American women of working age employed and the growing number of young married women there is an urgent need for training, not now provided, in the dual responsibilities of homemaking and wage earning. Only 1 in every 35 employed workers is receiving training to upgrade his skills through evening extension programs.

After a careful review of vocational education, the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education recommended a minimum Federal expenditure in 1964 of $400 million. The Federal contribution to vocational education, exclusive of the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act, is now approximately $57 million a year.

The amount of Federal expenditure recommended by the panel takes into account the tremendous needs for vocational training over the next decade, which may be summarized as follows:

First. Vocational training opportunities must be available for the 22 million noncollege graduates who will enter the labor market in the 1960's.

Second. Vocational training, or retraining, must be provided for the millions of workers whose skills and technical knowledge must be updated, as well as those whose jobs will disappear due to automation or economic change.

Third. Vocational education must help to meet the critical national needs for highly skilled craftsmen and technicians providing vocational education and training beyond the high school.

Fourth. Vocational and technical training programs must prepare persons for many new and emerging occupations.

Fifth. Equipment and facilities of a specialized nature must be made available in order that vocational programs may be of high quality and in order that vocational opportunities be made available to more people.

Sixth. Teacher training programs, instructional materials, occupational information and guidance services, and research in vocational and technical education—all necessary to quality training programs, must be expanded and improved.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Mr. President, on pages 2 and 3 of the committee report there is set forth the history of the legislation of part A of H.R. 4955, which describes the course taken in both House and Senate of the President's recommendation. I ask

unanimous consent that this section of the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 29, 1963, President Kennedy sent to the Congress his message on education, to which was attached draft legislation designed to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation.

Identical bills H.R. 3000 and S. 580, were introduced that day in both House and Senate. Hearings on H.R. 3000 were held by the Education and Labor Committee of the House of Representatives during February of 1963.

In March 1963, title V–A of H.R. 3000, which related to vocational education was further heard by the general Subcommittee on Education under the chairmanship of Representative PERKINS. On March 18, 1963, Mr. PERKINS introduced H.R. 4955. This bill, on June 6, 1963, was ordered reported to the House with amendments. On August 6, 1963, it passed the House of Representatives, as reported by a vote of 377 to 21. H.R. 4955 was received in the Senate on August 7, 1963, and was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Hearings before the Education Subcommittee on S. 580, title V–A, of which concerned vocational education, began April 29 and were completed after 17 days of testimony, on June 25, 1963. During the course of these hearings testimony relating to vocational education was taken from Federal and State officials and from representatives of education organizations, as well as national organizations having an interest in expanding and improving this important area of education in the national interest.

On September 10 and 11, in executive session, the Education Subcommittee considered both H.R. 4955 and S. 580, in the light of the message to the Congress sent by the President on June 19, 1963, wherein he stated:

(C) That the pending vocational education amendments, which would greatly update and expand this program of teaching job skills to those in school, be strengthened by the appropriation of additional funds, with some of the added money earmarked for those areas with a high incidence of school dropouts and youth unemployment, and by the addition of a new program of demonstration youth training projects to be conducted in these areas;

(D) That the vocational education program be further amended to provide a work-study program for youth of high school age, with Federal funds helping their school or other local public agency employ them part time in order to enable and encourage them to complete their training.

The vocational education recommendations in this Presidential message were introduced in the Senate as an amendment to title V–A of S. 580 on July 18, 1963, by Senator MORSE for himself and Senators CLARK, FONG, HUMPHREY, INOUYE, JAVITS, MANSFIELD, PELL, RANDOLPH, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The Education Subcommittee on September 11, 1963, recommended that H.R. 4955 be amended by striking the text of the bill as it passed the House of Representatives and substituting therefor, four new parts, as follows:

Part A—the text, with minor modifications, of the July 18, 1963, amendment of title V–A of S. 580, incorporating the expanded vocational education recommendations of the President;

Part B—the extension and amendment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, discussed elsewhere in this report;

Part C—the extension and amendment of Public Laws 815 and 874 discussed elsewhere in this report; and

Part D—the extension and expansion of the Library Services Act, originally title VI–C of S. 580; and that the bill, as amended, be reported favorably to the full committee.

On September 25, 1963, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in executive session considered H.R. 4955 as reported from the Education Subcommittee, amended it by deleting part D (which was ordered to be reported as an original bill), adopted a number of technical amendments, and ordered reported H.R. 4955 favorably to the Senate as thus amended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this point, I should like to pay my compliments to Representative PERKINS of the House Committee on Education and Labor, from whose subcommittee jurisdiction there came H.R. 4955.

Although in many details of the bill—in terms of the formulas employed, the cost, the definitions involved—there are differences, I believe it can be said that it was the careful work and study of the Perkins subcommittee which is primarily responsible for improvements made since the introduction of the bill last January. The credit for the very format of the legislation we are now considering should be given to the very able work of Representative PERKINS and his colleagues. The administration was so persuaded by the logic of his presentation that it adopted it for its own in the June 19 message from the President on equal employment opportunities which brought with it the draft language which is now part A of H.R. 4955 in the Senate version.

COMPARISON OF SENATE AND HOUSE VERSIONS OF THE BILL

Mr. President, the major changes made by the Senate committee to the bill as received from the House are these:

A. In accordance with the Presidential request, we have increased the authorization for the financing of the expanded program of grants to the States for vocational education in each year of its operation by $63 million.

B. We have raised from 5 to 15 percent of the amounts appropriated, the funding of research grants, leadership training, and pilot or developmental programs, all of which as a major purpose are directed toward meeting the pressing problems of urban school dropout and youth unemployment.

C. We have changed the formula for the distribution of the allotments to the States. The major differences here are that the Senate version contains a per capita income factor designed to assure an equalization of amounts available to the States. Under the Senate version of the bill, 30 States would receive a larger allotment than is provided in the House version. A chart which appears on page 6 of the committee report sets forth a comparison of the estimated distribution of the Senate funds authorization under the House and Senate formulas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the table on page 7, which illustrates the equalization factor I have referred to.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of estimated distribution of amounts for grants to States in proposed Vocational Education Act of 1963 by (1) Senate formula, and (2) by House formula, fiscal year 1964

	Senate formula	House formula
Aggregate, United States	$91, 800, 000	$91, 800, 000
50 States and District of Columbia	89, 518, 466	90, 247, 758
Alabama	2, 369, 366	1, 800, 788
Alaska	105, 404	134, 463
Arizona	732, 335	683, 408
Arkansas	1, 288, 920	951, 145
California	5, 878, 775	7, 775, 676
Colorado	845, 613	895, 994
Connecticut	841, 582	1, 188, 263
Delaware	137, 085	214, 667
Florida	2, 602, 072	2, 379, 015
Georgia	2, 746, 246	2, 195, 571
Hawaii	355, 823	373, 404
Idaho	412, 976	352, 863
Illinois	3, 866, 629	4, 830, 116
Indiana	2, 353, 934	2, 348, 472
Iowa	1, 434, 152	1, 353, 302
Kansas	1, 133, 255	1, 079, 963
Kentucky	2, 101, 657	1, 651, 563
Louisiana	2, 150, 374	1, 723, 399
Maine	572, 954	498, 362
Maryland	1, 403, 004	1, 559, 497
Massachusetts	2, 124, 585	2, 500, 469
Michigan	3, 652, 770	3, 832, 260
Minnesota	1, 757, 679	1, 678, 844
Mississippi	1, 757, 249	1, 222, 602
Missouri	2, 088, 248	2, 116, 536
Montana	365, 287	337, 672
Nebraska	709, 405	686, 435
Nevada	98, 770	141, 007
New Hampshire	313, 634	299, 615
New Jersey	2, 209, 485	2, 807, 328
New Mexico	597, 786	515, 338
New York	5, 733, 310	7, 850, 966
North Carolina	3, 355, 694	2, 646, 105
North Dakota	415, 333	334, 457
Ohio	4, 403, 250	4, 699, 029
Oklahoma	1, 410, 078	1, 226, 479
Oregon	845, 302	868, 318
Pennsylvania	5, 318, 556	5, 473, 354
Rhode Island	434, 835	438, 788
South Carolina	1, 938, 814	1, 435, 581
South Dakota	405, 990	341, 572
Tennessee	2, 489, 261	1, 950, 461
Texas	5, 563, 187	5, 050, 714
Utah	548, 246	493, 963
Vermont	232, 206	203, 919
Virginia	2, 522, 743	2, 207, 920
Washington	1, 339, 655	1, 428, 804
West Virginia	1, 217, 405	993, 793
Wisconsin	1, 931, 393	1, 918, 518
Wyoming	159, 323	165, 785
District of Columbia	246, 831	391, 195
American Samoa	18, 699	12, 731
Canal Zone	-----------	-----------
Guam	56, 690	38, 489
Puerto Rico	2, 178, 955	1, 482, 533
Virgin Islands	27, 192	18, 489

Distribution based on the product of (1) the Federal percentages (based on per capita income) and (2) the State population (a) aged 15 to 19, (b) aged 20 to 24, (c) aged 25 to 64, with a minimum State amount of $10,000.

Distribution based on the State population (a) aged 15 to 19, (b) aged 20 to 24, (c) aged 25 to 64, with a minimum State amount of $10,000.

NOTE.—$108,000,000 is authorized for fiscal year 1964 under Senate amendment. $91,800,000 or 85 percent of this is distributed to the States. The remainder is for grants by the Commissioner of Education.

Equalization factor providing 3-to-1 range from lowest per capita income state to highest—Per capita personal income, 1961

1. Delaware	$3, 013
2. Nevada	3, 003
3. Connecticut	2, 895
4. New York	2, 848
5. California	2, 780
6. New Jersey	2, 714
7. Alaska	2, 692
8. Illinois	2, 672
9. Massachusetttts	2, 598
10. Maryland	2, 472
11. Colorado	2, 421
12. Hawaii	2, 407

Equalization factor providing 3-to-1 range from lowest per capita income state to highest—Per capita personal income, 1961—Continued

13. Washington	$2,381
14. Ohio	2,330
15. Oregon	2,273
16. Wyoming	2,272
17. Michigan	2,270
18. Pennsylvania	2,261
19. Missouri	2,254
20. Rhode Island	2,250
21. Indiana	2,213
22. Wisconsin	2,194
23. Nebraska	2,168
24. Minnesota	2,149
25. Kansas	2,139
26. New Hampshire	2,130
27. Iowa	2,124
28. Arizona	2,074
29. Texas	1,993
30. Utah	1,989
31. Florida	1,965
32. Montana	1,963
33. New Mexico	1,908
34. Virginia	1,908
35. Vermont	1,899
36. Oklahoma	1,889
37. South Dakota	1,875
38. Maine	1,843
39. Idaho	1,807
40. West Virginia	1,690
41. Georgia	1,649
42. North Carolina	1,642
43. Louisiana	1,626
44. Kentucky	1,625
45. Tennessee	1,605
46. North Dakota	1,562
47. Alabama	1,492
48. Arkansas	1,446
49. South Carolina	1,433
50. Mississippi	1,229
United States	2,263

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer not to yield at this time?

Mr. MORSE. I prefer, if the Senator does not mind, to make my explanation of the bill. Then, as I said, I will open myself up to questions. I feel that these remarks, in explanation of the bill, are going to be the terms of reference to which Senators will want to return when we continue the debate. In this speech I am seeking to fully explain the committee's point of view on various sections of the bill. But I assure the Senator from Kentucky there is no one I would want to take questions from more than from him. I well remember our associations together on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee for the many years the Senator served on it. He and I joined time and time again in seeing what we could do in getting legislation through the Senate that would be of assistance, so sorely needed, to the youth of our country.

Mr. President, in his message of June 19, President Kennedy proposed the addition of two new programs in vocational education. The first authorizes $15 million for fiscal year 1964 and such sums as the Congress determines for the next 4 fiscal years for Federal grants to establish and operate residential schools to provide vocational education to youths of high school age who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit from vocational training. The language of the bill encourages the Commissioner to give special consideration in making these grants to colleges and universities and to State and local public educational organizations, to give special consideration to the needs of our large urban areas which have substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of high school and are unemployed.

The success of any educational program is largely dependent upon factors other than the quality of formal instruction itself. The environment in which the school is located, the cleanliness, the attractiveness, the safety of passage through the neighborhood—all strongly influence the student's desire to attend school, his respect for education, and his willingness to accept the goals and purposes for which the school exists. The pressures on the student against educational achievement—scorn for schools among his neighborhood gang, hunger from inadequate diet, hostility or lack of concern for study at home, necessity of earning subsistence—these and other basic factors may so detract from any attempts at education that successful formal schooling is impossible.

The proposal for a 5-year program demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of the residential vocational education school is an important approach to solving these problems. Under this program, residential schools could be constructed, equipped, and operated so as to provide education in an atmosphere conducive to constructive learning, with an absence of such personal pressures as would detract from concentration and incentive in the home environment. The program is directed at, but not limited to, youth in large urban areas who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

The second addition by the President recommended to the vocational education program was the establishment of a work-study program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph on pages 11 and 12 of the committee report referring to this recommendation be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the table showing the estimated distribution of amounts of grants to the States for this needed purpose.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

The Senate amendment adds a new section authorizing $50 million for fiscal 1964 and necessary sums for each of the next 4 years for grants to States to enable local educational agencies (defined to include any public agency or institution providing a vocational education program) to give work assistance to students in full-time attendance in vocational education courses. The purpose of this section is to encourage and enable youths between the ages of 15 and 20—who otherwise would probably drop out of high school or discontinue their education after completing high school and be unable to find jobs—to continue in school in order to take the vocational training they need to equip them for gainful employment. These programs would provide part-time employment, of not more than 15 hours a week, in public schools or other public agencies. Monthly and annual earnings could not exceed $45 and $350, respectively, unless the student attended a school away from home, in which case the limits would be $60 per month and $500 per academic year. Youths would be selected for work assistance on the basis of their need for financial aid and their need for vocational education.

Annual appropriations would be allotted to the States on the basis of their populations aged 15 to 20 inclusive. States having plans approved under the preceding sections of the bill previously described would submit supplementary plans to participate in this program.

Estimated distribution of amounts (fiscal year 1964) for grants to States for work-study program

Alabama	$1,031,263
Alaska	70,807
Arizona	374,794
Arkansas	517,545
California	4,118,970
Colorado	489,265
Connecticut	625,805
Delaware	112,980
Florida	1,264,506
Georgia	1,235,668
Hawaii	212,374
Idaho	201,463
Illinois	2,544,965
Indiana	1,283,484
Iowa	749,423
Kansas	587,477
Kentucky	938,729
Louisiana	972,073
Maine	278,451
Maryland	837,752
Massachusetts	1,346,138
Michigan	2,073,618
Minnesota	926,910
Mississippi	724,056
Missouri	1,144,071
Montana	187,590
Nebraska	373,214
Nevada	72,199
New Hampshire	164,612
New Jersey	1,455,185
New Mexico	285,544
New York	4,059,446
North Carolina	1,522,846
North Dakota	190,752
Ohio	2,511,356
Oklahoma	683,182
Oregon	477,611
Pennsylvania	2,942,077
Rhode Island	241,584
South Carolina	847,835
South Dakota	192,472
Tennessee	1,102,500
Texas	2,780,839
Utah	281,910
Vermont	116,674
Virginia	1,227,400
Washington	775,248
West Virginia	568,788
Wisconsin	1,045,196
Wyoming	90,406
District of Columbia	194,826
American Samoa	8,029
Guam	21,319
Puerto Rico	905,846
Virgin Islands	10,927
Aggregate, United States	$50,000,000
50 States and the District of Columbia	49,053,879

NOTE.—Distribution is based on the State population aged 15 to 20.

PART B—EXTENSION AND AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in bringing this legislation to the floor the committee was mindful of the urgent need to increase the student loan authorizations in title II of the National Defense Education Act. This is the program under which talented young people may borrow money needed to obtain collegiate and graduate education. The urgent need for an expansion of this program was amply demonstrated in our hearings. As shown in the tables in the committee report on pages 13 through 17, the student loan program is now limited in two ways. First, there are requests for this fiscal year of $35 million over and above the present $90 million authorization which cannot now be met, and, second, there are 121 colleges and universities in the United States whose need for additional loan funds transcends the $250,000 limitation now in the statute.

Part B of H.R. 4955 would increase the authorization for this fiscal year to $125 million and would increase the institutional ceiling to $800,000, thus resolving both of these problems.

The committee took the opportunity thus afforded to make a number of amendments to most of the titles of the National Defense Education Act. Although in some instances these are minor, nevertheless adoption of these amendments will facilitate the administration of the act through removing many problems which have been encountered. Since these amendments are described fully in the report, I shall not dwell on them at length. I would point out only that the extension of 3 years of all titles is necessary for a very practical reason. School boards, college administrators, and State authorities in the internal operations of their programs labor under a handicap which is just as great to them as the handicaps faced by corporations and businesses. Budgets must be prepared, staff must be engaged, forecasts of activity must be prepared. The budget official of a college reviewing the requests of the deans and the administrative officials in charge of the loan programs need to have as much leadtime as possible if their decisions are to be soundly based. NDEA authority will expire on June 30, 1964, some 9 months from now. By extending the act at this time, we can help all of these educators take the steps which will result in decisions designed to stretch to the utmost for educational uses every dollar they receive.

I cannot stress too much the importance of the 3-year extension proposal in this bill from the standpoint of economizing on the educational dollar in college after college and school after school. It is wasteful not to give these college and school administrators the leadtime they need for making a wise expenditure of the money that is to be made available to them under the various titles of the National Defense Education Act program. If we wait until the 11th hour, we shall confront them with a situation in which they will be unable to make the sound judgments to which I have just alluded.

Mr. President, the result will be costly waste, or at the least, not the degree of economy and wise expenditure of education dollars which would be accomplished if the leadtime had been granted.

When we take a look at the educational needs of the country and of the inadequacy of the amount of money that is to be made available even under the best program we feel we can offer the Senate, we know we cannot justify wasting a single education dollar.

I stress to my colleagues in the Senate both the substantive importance of the recommendations the committee is making on this point and the procedural soundness of it. I sincerely hope I can receive from the Senate uniform support for this matter, for I plead in behalf of the committee.

We have labored hard, and have become saturated with evidence on this point by a long and careful study of the expert testimony and the research information which has been made available to us. It would be a great mistake if the Senate did not see fit to support its committee on this matter. So I say, unless the leadtime is given, the pressure upon such schools occasioned by last minute changes and adjustments can cause costly and wasteful results. It is just good, sound business sense for this act to be extended now.

PART C—IMPACTED AREAS LEGISLATION

Mr. President, all that has just been said concerning the necessity for a 3-year extension of National Defense Education Act applies with equal force to the school district superintendents in our federally impacted areas, with but one difference. These devoted public servants have already engaged in an act of faith in the Congress. Their legislation expired last June 30. I think the point need not be labored that an extension of these two laws at this time is vitally necessary if we are to avoid wholesale fiscal disruptions of the school districts involved.

I speak with some confidence on this matter, because I suspect that there is not even one Senator who has not already received a heavy volume of mail from school superintendents, members of school boards, community leaders, and parents in every school-impacted area in the country whose funds expired last June 30.

Of course, they are going ahead with the program, because some of us have gotten ourselves out on a limb—although I think safely so, and I do not believe it will break off under us—because we have said there is no doubt about Congress extending impacted area legislation. I believe we can take judicial notice of that.

However, that does not justify the concern that we have been causing these school superintendents and local school authorities. Therefore, I believe we should get on with the job today or tomorrow in extending the act, because we all know that public school districts educating one-third of the schoolchildren of America are the beneficiaries of impacted area legislation. We know what would happen in community after community if this specialized form of Federal aid to education should be cut off.

I have said in past debates over the years that it is always a matter of interest to me that we find so much opposition in some quarters to Federal aid to education, and apparently an oblivious ignorance on the part of many of our citizens that we have been engaged in Federal aid to education to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars for many years. We are now giving Federal aid, and have for years, to school districts educating a third of the schoolchildren of America. I am also at a loss to understand the lack of fairness on the part of critics of Federal aid to education in respect to school districts educating the other two-thirds.

Why should they be set aside and told that their educational needs can receive no assistance from the Federal Government, when the evidence is irrefutable that in many school districts the educational system is much more seriously and much more gravely impacted with students and with money problems so far as the public welfare is concerned, than the so-called impacted area districts?

Be that as it may, I shall continue to do everything I can to see to it that the Public Laws 815 and 874 aid that has been extended is continued. I hope that, before we are through legislating, we shall provide at least the same aid for the school districts educating the remaining two-thirds of our boys and girls as well.

Some of us have had reservations concerning some aspects of the impacted area legislation in times past. I think the breathing space which the 3-year extension will give us will allow us sufficient time to subject these laws to the type of study which can result in modifications which may be necessary in the public interest. Because we extend this legislation at this time does not mean that we have foreclosed ourselves from considering legislation in this area during the intervening period.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I may have spoken at somewhat greater length than I had originally intended, but at this time I urge my colleagues to help American boys and girls of all ages to obtain, all the areas covered by the bill, educational objectives suited to their individual talents and abilities. In my judgment, this can be done at this time through support of this first installment of educational legislation in the 88th Congress, without amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF rose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Connecticut desire to make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. RIBICOFF. First I wish to praise the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I wish to praise the Senator for the speech he has made and the work he has done on this important piece of legislation.

Having been interested in education myself, particularly as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I wish to state publicly on the floor of the Senate that no other man in this country has done as much or has shown as much interest in the entire field of education as the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I know that what he is seeking to have the Senate do today will earn him the gratitude of not only the young people of this generation, but of future generations as well.

The Senator may recall that soon after I became Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare I appointed a distinguished panel of people in all walks of life to review the entire field of vocational education, under the chairmanship of Dr. Benjamin Willis, the able and imaginative general superintendent of schools in Chicago.

The recommendation of that panel would be carried out to a great extent by the legislation which the Senator from Oregon has introduced. This is landmark legislation. It is badly needed. It would be a tragedy for the country if the Senate failed to adopt the legislation proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. Our country has grown rapidly. We have more and more youngsters, and must provide them with opportunities.

Furthermore, over the past decades there has been a retrogression in vocational education, instead of a progression. What we seek to do—and what the Senator has accomplished in his bill—is to build up these opportunities in the fields that require the most education and training—in the professions, technical fields, modern industry, and modern science.

Therefore, I consider it a real honor to come to the floor of the Senate today, following the distinguished Senator from Oregon, to place in the RECORD the praise that the Senator deserves for his continued interest in legislation for education and his loyalty to the cause of such legislation. There may be some educational bills in the days ahead as to which I may disagree with the Senator from Oregon; but on this piece of proposed legislation, I am with the Senator 100 percent. I express my personal gratitude; and I believe the country owes him a vote of thanks for the outstanding work he has done.

Mr. MORSE. I am exceedingly grateful to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who was formerly Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the very pleasant things he has said. It always makes one feel good to hear such words, undeserved though they may be. Nevertheless, I know of the sincerity of the Senator from Connecticut.

I did not realize that the Senator had stepped out of the Chamber momentarily a half hour or so ago. I was in the midst of my speech before I realized that he had stepped out of the Chamber but I knew he would read my remarks in the RECORD tomorrow. I discussed in his absence the wonderful work he did as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I referred to the appointment of the national panel of experts and consultants that prepared the report from which I quoted extensively in my explanatory speech today. I announced that much of the work of our committee is based upon the recommendations of that panel; in fact, I read many of their recommendations, word for word.

The Senator from Connecticut, both in his capacity as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and now as Senator from Connecticut, has built for himself one monument after another of public service which will go down in the history of American education. I believe that we would not have made the progress we have made in the Senate in the past 2 years on the subject of education had it not been for the help and cooperation we received from the Senator from Connecticut when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

We took through the Senate two parts of President Kennedy's educational program of the 87th Congress without suffering a single crippling amendment. Although we lost the bills either in the House or in conference, we were able to take those programs through the Senate, in no small measure, because of the great professional assistance we received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare himself.

It is quite well known in the Senate that in those days my subcommittee spent many hours with the present Senator from Connecticut, as we hammered out the various compromises that we thought were unnecessary in order to insure passage of the proposed legislation, but still keep it in such form that it would accomplish the objectives we all had in mind.

I again thank the Senator from Connecticut for his great contribution.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Often little is understood about what has to go into legislation. People sit in the galleries and see a handful of Senators in the Chamber. The question is often raised as to whether the Senate is accomplishing its objectives. However, little is known about how much work Senators do that is not seen on the floor of the Senate.

I recall the mornings, afternoons, and nights that the distinguished Senator from Oregon spent in trying to prepare legislation in the field of education. One of the outstanding memories that will remain with me as long as I am in public life, and after that in private life, is the understanding, the knowledge, and integrity that are always displayed by the Senator from Oregon in the field of educational legislation. His heart was never faint when it came to educational legislation. The going is always tough in the field of education; it will still be tough to try to get meaningful educational legislation through Congress, the States, and localities. But if educational legislation is to be accomplished, it will be done only because men like the distinguished Senator from Oregon are sticking to this most important task.

The Nation must understand that in the years ahead one of our greatest assets, if not our greatest, will be education. Education is power; it is opportunity; it is happiness. As a nation we err if we do not realize that the future of our country depends upon meaningful educational legislation.

Education has many faces. Some people are interested in education at the college level; others are interested in vocational education; some are concerned about medical and dental schools; others are interested in elementary and high school education. But all education is a continuous process. If the educational crisis in America is to be solved, serious attention will have to be given to every phase of education. That is why I am so pleased that educational legislation in the Senate is in the capable hands of the Senator from Oregon. I wanted to be on the floor of the Senate to pay this deserved tribute to the Senator from Oregon, because I know what he has done in the past in the entire field of education.

Mr. MORSE. I am grateful, and humbled by the gracious remarks of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, H.R. 4955, will help to provide job opportunities. It will greatly expand and improve vocational education in our country. It will train youngsters—and adults—for jobs that need to be done. It will give them the skills and training needed to make a living in our increasingly complex economy.

I am especially pleased to support this legislation, a landmark in the field of education, which the Senator from Oregon has, with his usual competence and skill, presented to us. When I first took office as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I was very much aware of the need to update and upgrade the vocational education programs operated in our Nation since 1917.

Under these programs, vocational courses are taught in all the 50 States and territories, in a variety of institutions—comprehensive high schools, specialized vocational high schools, area vocational schools, community and junior colleges, and 4-year colleges. These courses range all the way from nurses aid to marine technology.

But in the 44 years between the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 and the start of a new administration in 1961, our Nation changed dramatically. The needs of our people changed—there are more of them, they move about more frequently and they are being educated and trained in a different sort of society. Obviously as we move into an age of advanced technology and increased industrialization and automation, our manpower needs must be fully satisfied and our young people fully prepared.

For these reasons, I asked an advisory group of 25 outstanding experts concerned with manpower needs and vocational education to advise me on the conditions of vocational education in America and make recommendations for its improvement and redirection. I asked Dr. Benjamin Willis, the able and imaginative general superintendent of schools in Chicago, to chair this panel. It was our hope that its recommendations would be ready for submission to the 88th Congress in 1963.

The timetable was met. Dr. Willis' panel visited schools in several cities, commissioned several research studies, and gathered information from experts and all points of view. The panel's recommendations are essentially embodied in the legislation now before us.

In these 2 years we have gathered additional and ample evidence that technological change, shifts in market demands, and other recent economic changes have had their adverse effects upon people seeking employment. We find that job opportunities are most often found in work requiring good educational background plus good specialized skills. However, we are not yet reaching enough of the unemployables—those with insufficient education to be trainable.

Mr. President, it would be a tragedy for the country if this legislation is not enacted. Its underlying purpose is to improve our vocational education system so that all people, whatever their age or level of academic achievement, may have an opportunity to acquire the education and training necessary to make them employable. In today's world, there is no place for unskilled hands or for undisciplined intellect. The job opportunities of today and tomorrow are in the fields that require the most education and training—in the professions, technical fields, in managament, clerical and saleswork, skilled and semiskilled work, and in the service field. Only about 5 percent of all the many jobs that people will hold will be classified as no skill required.

The bill now before us is based on two basic propositions. The first is that the occupational categories in the present statutes are no longer adequate to meet the needs of our rapidly changing labor market. The second is that the appropriation levels authorized by the present statutes are insufficient in view of our rising population and school costs.

Under H.R. 4955, such restrictions would be lifted, and States would be able to determine what portion of their respective Federal allotments would be assigned to which types of programs. We would have much more flexibility. Vocational education directors of local school systems could shift gears to meet changing employment opportunities and there would be enough funds to do the vocational education job right. The emphasis would be put where it belongs—on the kinds of people who need to be served and the special facilities and services needed to do the job.

A State's allotment could be used in accordance with an approved State plan to provide vocational education for youth attending high school—for those who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market—for persons who need vocational training to learn new jobs or to advance in their present jobs—and for persons who need special attention because of inability to succeed in regular vocational education programs.

What is more, funds could be used for construction of area vocational-technical schools, that is, schools that enroll students from an entire city or from several neighboring school districts. Every State has plans for expansion of such area schools and many of them have constructed new schools in the past few years. But the greatest construction needs in vocational education remain for area schools that cross district lines—serving large numbers of people and offering a range of curriculum that reaches out to adults as well as youth.

Technical education would continue to grow under the new act; Federal funds could be used for teacher training and supervision, for State administration, and other auxiliary services.

And the multiple problems of big city vocational programs would be helped, in part at least. Fifteen percent of the Federal appropriation would be set aside for special demonstration and experimental projects aimed particularly at problems of out-of-school, unemployed youth in large cities, and youth with academic and other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational programs—the social dynamite of our society.

I urge the passage of the bill and the prompt appropriation of funds for implementing this legislation. It is in keeping with the American tradition that the many tasks of the world of work are equally important—that the man who works with his hands be just as well trained—have just as many opportunities—be just as respected—as the man who works at a desk. It is also in keeping with the democratic ideal that every man and every woman should have access to the education and training needed to develop to his highest potential.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon for bringing up this bill. The legislation that is included in H.R. 4955 is not only timely but, I believe, is most important to the future education of our youth.

I am particularly pleased that the Senator has dealt with vocational education. It is my own opinion that we have failed to stress nationally the importance of the vocational phase of our educational program. Not only am I pleased with this part of the bill; I think we need to devote more attention to vocational education as we consider the difficulties that arise from the unemployment problem in this Nation. We should devote considerably more time and money to it and stress it more.

We need to elevate the standing of the vocational students and graduates of our schools. We stress the importance of getting all kinds of degrees—and they are important; but we need to begin to stress, as do many foreign countries, vocational education as a part of our educational training program.

I deeply appreciate the action of the Senator from Oregon today.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas. It is not flattery, but a statement of fact, to say that time and time again the Senator from Kansas has been of great assistance to me as we have sought to take educational legislation through the Senate. I thank him sincerely.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield? I merely wish to continue the commendations which we have heard from two of our colleagues.

Mr. MORSE. It is very tempting to yield for that purpose; so I will yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I shall be brief, although I could wax eloquent and could speak at great length on the subject, because I have observed through the years that no man in public life has done more for the cause of education than has the senior Senator from Oregon; in fact, he has been an educator all his life. He was an educator before he came to the Senate, and he has been an educator not merely in the field of education, but in many other fields, as well, since that time.

Many questions of priority are before Congress. There are problems of defense, national security, unemployment, taxation, resource development, and civil rights—all of them important and all needing attention. But I know of no subject which is more paramount or more vital to the strength and perpetuation of our people's vitality and progress to maintain and enhance everything, we, as Americans, believe in and stand for than education—education on every level—primary, secondary, university, vocational, and professional.

No one has shown a keener interest or displayed a greater knowledge and persistence in trying to achieve these worthy goals than has the senior Senator from Oregon. I am happy to voice this commendation. I limit my remarks now only because of his desire to proceed with the bill. I could otherwise make a long speech, dealing with the outstanding record of devoted service in the field of education which the distinguished Senator from Oregon has made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska has been one of my teachers for many years. He was one of my teachers when he was one of the great journalists of America. He was one of my teachers in the meaning of constitutional liberalism. He was one of my teachers in his writings, time and time again, in which he pointed out to the American people that one of the primary purposes of our form of self-government is to promote the general welfare, not of a few people, but of all of them.

All he and I are seeking to do now, as we join forces—I as a student, and he as a teacher—is to fight for the enactment of legislation so essential to promotion of the general welfare of all the people, for unless we do a better job than we have been doing in connection with the schools of America, this country will go downhill. Its greatest asset—and also its greatest defense weapon—is the brain potential of the people of the country. Unless we keep that potential fully developed we are bound to weaken the security of our country, and we are also bound to weaken what I have been heard to say is one of the great defense weapons of our country, one which is more important than missiles, more important than tanks, and more important than nuclear bombs—the economy.

The Senator from Alaska, the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Kansas, and other Senators who join me in the fight for the passage of this education legislation, are seeking to have the Senate do this in order to strengthen the security of America and also to carry out the great teaching of the Senator from Alaska, who in his many writings and speeches has emphasized the importance of our keeping faith with the primary objective of our system of self-government; namely, always to do the things which must be done in order to promote the general welfare of all the people. So I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Alaska, and I thank him.

Mr. President, for transitional purposes, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly willing not to have a quorum call at all, if the Senate is ready to proceed with consideration of the education bill.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PROUTY obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator From Vermont yields to the Senator from Montana with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have two purposes in mind. First, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum for a brief quorum call; and, second, in conjunction with the distinguished minority leader, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the understanding of the leadership that an amendment will be offered this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. It is our further understanding that tomorrow an amendment will be offered by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and perhaps an amendment will be offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. Other amendments may be offered.

As of now, to the best of our knowledge, it appears that, in addition to some excellent speeches prepared by members of the committee and other Senators, only one amendment will be offered this afternoon; so, exclusive of that proposal, I ask unanimous consent that beginning with the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow 30 minutes be allocated for each amendment, including an amendment to be offered by the Senator from New York, and that there be 1 hour on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I do not know whether I shall offer as a substitute the President's program, as encompassed in S. 580. It is a very comprehensive measure. If I do offer that, I should like to have an hour on that amendment, which would allow only a half hour for each side. Since it would be a comprehensive amendment, I do not think we could do justice to it in 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I change my request to 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With the regular provisions?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do any of the amendments which the Senator mentioned relate to the extensions in part C of the bill of the two school impact measures?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not be surprised if they did. That is the reason why I mentioned the Javits amendment by name. We have no information except that he intends tc offer an amendment. I assume it would be the usual amendment. I think the best way to handle a matter of this sort is to face it. I see present in the Chamber the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. Perhaps he can answer the question.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I did not hear the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. My question was whether or not either of the amendments mentioned by the Senator related to part C, which, as I understand, is the part of the bill that relates to federally impacted areas.

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Goldwater amendment does not.

Mr. KEATING. The Javits amendment does relate to that section, as I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the amendment been prepared?

Mr. KEATING. So far as I know, it has not. I am sure the Senator would have no objection to a time limit, so far as that amendment is concerned.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the comment of the Senator from Florida, I intend to offer an amendment on the impacted areas provision, but it would be to reduce the time from 3 years to 1. It would have nothing to do with the civil rights issue. Therefore, I am prepared to consent to the half-hour time limitation which the Senator requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I have no disinclination to follow the course suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania as to the time limit. I wondered what the suggestion of the Senator from New York was on that point.

Mr. KEATING. I believe my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] would have no objection to a limitation of time. He asked me to try to be sure that it did not come up this evening. I am quite sure he would agree to any reasonable limitation of time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection, subject to the understanding that has been reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana want the usual provisions in the unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; except for the Javits amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as later reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, October 8, 1963, upon the convening of the Senate, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received, except the amendment by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) which shall be in order.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, first I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Education for the courtesies which he has extended to members of the minority on that subcommittee. He has never been one to try to rush legislation through the subcommittee merely because he has the votes. He has at all times been helpful and cooperative, and I am most appreciative for his efforts and attitude toward the minority members of the committee.

Mr. President, unless Congress can reverse present trends, some 30 to 40 percent of the children now in the fifth grade will probably not be graduated from high school.

They will have to go out in the world and look for work without a high school diploma.

Mr. President, do you know what this means in terms of their future welfare?

It means higher unemployment. It means higher welfare costs. It means a great waste of youth and opportunity.

One of every 10 workers who fail to finish grammar school is unemployed today, as compared to 1 out of 50 college graduates.

A survey taken this spring showed persons of 18 years and older who had not finished high school made up 46 percent of the total labor force; yet such persons constituted 64 percent of the unemployed.

There is no wiser investment than education and no loss greater than the loss of youthful opportunity.

We must give our youngsters a chance to acquire at least the fundamentals of some skill or trade.

I am not talking simply about the 30 to 40 percent who will not complete high school. I am talking about the others as well. About half of the 60 percent who finish school very much need vocational education. They must go to work, or keep house, or both, when they graduate.

In short, less than 20 percent of the Nation's fifth graders will enter college. The other 80 percent must find their place in the businesses, on the farms, or in the factories of America. They must have the schooling to help them commence their working life.

It has been said that the loss of 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the cost of 12 years of education through high school; and if this cost is added to public welfare and other social costs, it is clear that if we fail to act now, we will pay the consequences later.

Our manpower requirements are changing daily, and employers ask one key question: "How much education have you had?"

The boy or girl who leaves school has been referred to in the past as a "dropout." Soon he or she will be termed a "left-out," because the face of America is changing.

Jobs filled by high school graduates rose 30 percent in the past decade, while jobs for those without secondary education decreased 25 percent.

The bill before us will help the States to maintain, extend, and update their programs of vocational education. The bill encourages the use of additional funds for the construction of area vocational schools.

In the form that it passed the House, Vermont would have received no help in setting up its area vocational institutions. This is true because the House defined an area school as one which is principally used for the provision of vocational education.

Vermont plans to make use of its regular high schools and set up area programs within these high schools.

At my request, the committee redefined the term "area vocational education school." Now the term includes as well a department, division, or other unit of a high school providing vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market. This change will be of great benefit to Vermont and other smaller States that wish to utilize existing facilities in setting up their area vocational programs.

Another significant alteration made in the House-passed bill affects the allotment formula.

The House formula is based solely on population, and does not take into account State per capita income. I suggested to the Senate Labor Committee that the formula be amended to include the ability-to-pay factor, and the committee accepted the idea.

I support the vocational education provisions of the committee-reported bill because I believe they will reduce the incidence of school dropouts, increase youth employment by assisting young men and women to develop marketable job skills, and consequently place within their reach the fruits of a dynamic society.

I support as well the extension of all titles of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The National Defense Education Act student loan program is helping hundreds of bright Vermonters from low- and moderate-income families obtain their college education.

The bill not only extends the loan title but increases the present $90 million authorization to $125 million for this fiscal year, thus adding an additional $35 million for student loans. Vermont colleges welcome this change because some have only 60 percent of the loan money they need to aid worthy students.

The Senate committee adopted an amendment which raises the maximum amount of loan funds a college or university can receive. Under present law no college may receive in excess of $250,000 in loan money in a given year. The University of Vermont actually requested nearly $279,000.

There was some discussion in committee of eliminating altogether the institutional loan ceiling but I asked that it be raised to not more than $800,000 and the committee acceded to my request.

We do not want the large colleges and universities to swallow up all the student loan funds and thereby deprive the smaller schools of a chance to help needy undergraduates.

The National Defense Education Act is one of the finest statutes ever passed by Congress and I am delighted that the committee has voted to extend it for a 3-year period. Without this program Vermont and other States would be lacking science, mathematics, and modern foreign language equipment. Under the program we have made great strides in these fields.

The guidance counseling and testing programs authorized by the National Defense Education Act are of increasing significance as we strive to alleviate the school dropout problem. These are now limited to secondary schools and do not apply to the seventh and eighth grades.

The bill would extend the testing program to these grades and the local schools will be able to spot sooner the potential dropout who can be assisted.

Under existing law there is a minimum allotment to each State of $20,000. This minimum would be raised by the committee bill to $50,000, to allow a more adequate basic program in States, such as Vermont, that have a small population. On the whole, the bill is good for Vermont and good for the country and I urge its adoption.

In closing may I say that when the manpower development and training bills were before the Senate I urged that their consideration be deferred until such time as the legislation for institutional vocational education had been reported.

It was my thought that if all the programs were seen, discussed, and acted upon together, we would be able to eliminate overlapping and duplicating functions. Under such an operation we could have reconciled what appear to be conflicting objectives.

A problem in point is the fact that under the manpower bills we pay youngsters up to $20 a week if they drop out of school and seek vocational training. Under the pending legislation we give youngsters an opportunity to earn up to $45 a month, and in exceptional cases $60, so that they will stay in school. We want to make certain that we are not acting at cross-purposes.

Since the manpower bills have already passed the Senate it is, of course, not possible to revise them at this moment so that they will be in conformance with the pending legislation. I do believe, however, that the money allocations in the manpower bills are out of line and in some cases provide authorization which far exceeds the amounts that can be effectively utilized.

Fortunately, there will be two further opportunities to help make certain that the manpower program and institutional vocational education are working in tandem. There will be Senate-House conferences on both programs and later the Appropriation Committees of the Congress will place them under scrutiny.

I expect to be a conferee with respect to both measures and I will certainly do what I can to straighten out a situation that could have been avoided had all vocational education measures been considered together.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Senators will note that attached to the committee report on the pending bill is a short statement of individual views signed by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and myself.

We joined with the committee in reporting the bill, but we believe that the committee should, instead, have reported the complete text of the President's omnibus education bill, S. 580, as expanded in accordance with subsequent administration requests and augmented by the inclusion of part C of the committee's bill, relating to aid to federally impacted areas.

Speaking for myself only, and not for the Senator from Rhode Island, I deplore the provision in the committee bill which would extend the impacted area provisions of the present law by 3 years.

One of the real inequities in our present Federal aid to education legislation, in my opinion, is the impacted area situation. Two years ago some of us in the Senate tried to go along with the President in eliminating impacted area legislation and calling for a study, to determine what kind of legislation, if any, was needed to give Federal assistance to school districts which were seriously suffering because of an additional impact on their schools of children of Federal employees. That effort failed, and a 2-year extension was passed.

The President again, in his education message this year, tried to phase out the impacted area legislation, but this effort was rejected by the commitee, and a 3-year extension was written into the bill which the committee has reported to the Senate.

My objection to impacted area legislation is that it is wholly inequitable, in that it rewards inadequately school districts which should have more help, and rewards overgenerously school districts which do not need and should not get any help. It has become pretty close to a public scandal because of its inequity.

I would have been willing to extend the impacted area provision of the bill for another year, if it were coupled with a provision for a prompt study, which would be reported to Congress next year, as to what kind of impacted area legislation, if any, should be passed. We made no serious effort in committee to find out. It has been thought—and I tell no secrets out of school—that if we sweetened the pending bill with a 3-year continuation of the present impacted areas legislation, this would gain some votes for the bill which might not otherwise be forthcoming.

I would have preferred to meet the problem head on, and tomorrow I may offer an amendment to reduce that portion of the bill which deals with impacted areas, to provide for a 1-year extension, instead of a 3-year extension, and to couple it with the kind of study which, in my opinion, would be desirable.

Returning to the individual views filed by the Senator from Rhode Island and myself—and I emphasize again that what I have said about impacted areas is my own view and not that of the Senator from Rhode Island—we note with great reluctance that we find ourselves obliged to differ with our colleagues on the committee, and we wish to make it plain that the three parts included in the present bill, dealing with vocational education, amendment of the National Defense Education Act, and aid to federally impacted areas, with the qualification I have noted, have our warm support. We feel that the other portions of the omnibus bill submitted by the President are no less deserving of consideration by the Senate, and we regret their omission from the present bill.

I have had in mind proposing, as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill, the provisions of S. 580, the President's program. As I speak, I do not know whether, tomorrow, I shall do this or not. If to do so would result in a vote on the merits, to determine how many Senators prefer what the President sent to Congress to the present version, I would do so. I am fearful that it would be found, first, that the administration itself has already pulled the rug out from under its own recommendations earlier this year and would be advising Senators that it does not really desire the President's bill because the administration has concluded it is politically unfeasible. I have no doubt, because they have told me so, that Senators in charge of the bill would say, with deep regret, that while they personally might favor this approach, yet we must legislate on the floor of the Senate under the shadow of the House Rules Committee, under the views of the Members of the House who do not want the President's program, and that if we were to pass the President's program, the House Rules Committee might refuse to grant a rule to go to conference. Therefore, they will urge Senators, reluctantly to be sure, to support those in charge of the bill and the committee, and vote against such a motion. The end result might well be to discourage the President's program, because of the small vote which would be brought forward in support of it; and that is the last thing in the world that I would want to do. Therefore, it may well be that tomorrow I shall propose no such amendment, and that no other Senator will, either.

Again, I stress that what I have just said represents my own views as to motivation, and not the views of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], except so far as we aim at the same result.

Returning to our joint views, we noted that our national educational needs have passed now into the crisis stage where piecemeal legislation is no longer sufficient. The onrush of automation and what has come to be known as cybernetics—which might be defined as the marriage of the computer to the assembly line—is placing grave stress on our existing educational resources. We feel strongly that we must contemplate further rapid expansion of the need for highly skilled workers to man the increasingly sophisticated machinery upon which our very survival as a nation depends.

Both the Senator from Rhode Island and I are members of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the committee which reported the bill now before the Senate. We have been taking detailed, specific testimony ever since early in May on the question of the overlapping implications of our educational system with respect to the quite serious and continuing unemployment from which a substantial percentage of our labor force is suffering. One of the witnesses before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment said:

> Human history has been described as a race between education and catastrophe. In the past dozen years, education has been falling behind in that race.

We believe this statement to be true. We believe also that unless a broad program of aid to education is enacted, adequate to our needs, catastrophe will be the winner.

Mr. President, we are not about to enact such a broad program. We are dealing with the problem piecemeal. We have departed from the principle advocated by the President when he sent his omnibus education bill to Congress on January 29, almost 9 months ago. In that message, he said:

> From every point of view, education is of paramount concern to the national interest as well as to each individual. Today we need a new standard of excellence in education, matched by the fullest possible access to educational opportunities, enabling each citizen to develop his talents to the maximum extent possible.

As evidence of how terrifying the grave educational crisis has become, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Automation Called Major Cause In Loss of 40,000 Jobs a Week," written under byline of John D. Pomfret and published in the New York Times of October 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Automation Called Major Cause In Loss of 40,000 Jobs a Week

(By John D. Pomfret)

Washington, October 3.—A manufacturer of automation equipment told Congress today that automation was a major factor in eliminating more than 40,000 jobs a week.

John I. Snyder, Jr., chairman and president of U.S. Industries, Inc., said the contention that automation would not eliminate many jobs was "the most seductive of [the] myths" about automation.

"Too many people are willing to accept too many myths about what is going on around us in our factories and offices," Mr. Snyder told a Senate Labor Subcommittee. "Too few people accept the very truthful facts which are being turned up by real experience and intelligent study."

Mr. Snyder directly disputed a Labor Department estimate given to the subcommittee last Thursday. That estimate said rising productivity, in which automation and other technological advances played a major part, was eliminating a minimum of nearly 200,000 factory jobs each year.

"Personally, I think this is a gross underestimate of the real situation and that automation is a major factor in eliminating jobs in the United States at the rate of more than 40,000 a week," Mr. Snyder said.

"We must also keep in mind that automation is not only displacing people directly, but also indirectly through what are called 'silent firings' in reference to workers who would have been hired for jobs eliminated by automation," he went on.

The industrialist declared that equipment was being developed that works miracles. However, he continued, "as is too often the case in this age of the widening gap between scientific progress and man's ability to cope with it, we have failed to keep pace."

SEES PUBLIC TRANQUILIZED

Mr. Snyder attributed much of the failure to wide acceptance of myths about automation. This acceptance, he said, has had "a deep tranquilizing effect on many of those who otherwise might make effective contributions toward solutions to the human problems created by automation."

Mr. Snyder said another myth was that automation would create jobs for workers, not only in running the machines but also in maintaining and building them.

"The hard truth," he said, "is that modern automated equipment requires very little maintenance. If it did not, it would not pay to operate it; and if the equivalent number of workers replaced by automation were required to build the machines and systems, there would be no point in automating."

Mr. Snyder continued:

"A third myth that needs to be laid to rest is the belief that those who lose their jobs to automation can be retrained and put into other jobs requiring higher skills and paying more money. As studies have shown, automation is more likely to reduce rather than increase the demands for skills and aptitudes and, besides, many workers are just not retrainable, due to their levels of intelligence, education, and age."

CALLS RELOCATION UNLIKELY

Mr. Snyder said another myth was the contention that workers replaced by automation could find jobs in other areas of the country.

"The truth is that the workers thrown out of jobs are usually just those who are least able to move," he said. "They are the lower paid, the older, the unskilled. Either they cannot afford to move from an economic standpoint or they are psychologically incapable of beginning a new life in a strange area."

"In the coming months and years, if we are to survive as a nation, we will need new sociological and economic ideas to solve the problems we face in this area," he said.

Mr. Snyder described the work of the American Foundation on Automation and Employment, which was established by his company and the International Association of Machinists to study the impact of automation. A foundation study on the shorter workweek to be issued soon will indicate that a reduction in working hours is necessary, Mr. Snyder said.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article refers to testimony given before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment by John I. Snyder, Jr., president of U.S. Industries, Inc. U.S. Industries, Inc., is a manufacturer of automation equipment. Mr. Snyder referred to the myths that people are ready to accept about what is going on around us in our factories and offices. He said:

> Too few people accept the very few truthful facts which are being turned up by real experience and intelligent study.

He went on to say that the estimates of a number of individuals who are losing their jobs because of automation and the advance of computors into the assembly lines are, in his opinion, substantially understated. He felt that the loss of jobs was running at the rate of about 40,000 a week. The result is that jobs are no longer available to those who do not have a high educational level, and that jobs are practically unavailable for what used to be called that part of the labor force which is characterized by a strong back and a weak mind.

Two other New York Times articles are, I believe, pertinent to the argument I am now making. They have to do with the defects in NASA contracts pointed out just the other day by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and by the General Accounting Office.

NASA, delivering its epilog for Project Mercury, gave a detailed indictment of poor workmanship provided by American industries for the Nation's first step in manned space flight. The General Accounting Office said that "bungled management in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and in private industry had cost the taxpayers more than $100 million."

In both articles, the point is made that workmen on the projects do not have the necessary technical skill to complete them, in many instances, without the defects which resulted not only in serious failures of the end product, but also in running up a substantial expense to the Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Project Mercury Defects Laid to Private Industry—Contractors Cited for an Average of 10 Failures on Each Space Trip

(By John W. Finney)

Houston, October 3.—The National Aeronautics and Space Administration delivered today its epilog for Project Mercury. Mingled through the customary praise was a detailed indictment of poor workmanship provided by American industry for the Nation's first step in manned space flight.

Project Mercury contractors, NASA said, delivered spare parts that were 50 percent defective, capsules with more than 500 defects, batteries with holes in them, electronic parts improperly soldered, valves improperly installed, gas-pressure regulators that were not clean, and breathing oxygen and water for the astronauts that was contaminated.

On each of the 6 manned space flights in the Mercury capsule, it was reported, there was an average of 10 malfunctions or failures in components of the spacecraft.

The only reason that equipment breakdowns did not result in potentially fatal failures, NASA declared, was because of backup systems and the effectiveness that astronauts exhibited in taking over when the automatic equipment broke down.

A 440-PAGE SUMMARY

The remarkably harsh indictment of American industry ran through a 440-page book summarizing the results of Project Mercury that were climaxed in the 22-orbit, 34-hour flight by Maj. L. Gordon Cooper, Jr., last May.

The book, similar to reports issued after each earlier space flight, was made public at a 2-day "Report to the Nation" conference on Project Mercury that opened here today.

The book did not specify company names. Engaged in Project Mercury were 11 prime contractors, 75 major subcontractors and about 7,200 vendors.

The report was unusual in its candor and criticism. It disclosed details that until now had kept secret.

As long as the project was continuing, space agency officials tended to dismiss delays as inevitable, to describe failures as successes in an experimental program and to minimize reports that the project was bedeviled by defective parts. The emphasis was always upon the progress being made by the "NASA-industry team."

Now that the $384 million project is over, the space agency has apparently decided to talk candidly about some of the problems encountered, particularly with the industrial contractors. It did so in terms remarkably similar to those used by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover in his criticism of the "lack of excellence" shown by American industry in the nuclear submarine program.

A 22-MONTH SLIPPAGE

The report disclosed that a schedule developed early in 1959, shortly after the project was initiated, called for the first manned orbital flight to be made as early as April 1960. This would have permitted the United States to beat the Soviet Union to the achievement of the first manned orbital flight—the three-orbit flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., did not occur until February 1962, after flights by two Soviet astronauts.

The 22-month "slippage," NASA said, reflected to a large extent the lack of experience and appreciation of the magnitude of technological problems to be solved when the original schedule was drafted.

* * * * *

Mr. Williams said there were problems repeatedly with "mismated or misconnected parts" that ruined components or gave false indications of trouble.

There was "continual difficulty," he declared, with "contamination that ruined metering orifices, check valves, pressure regulators, release valves, reducers, compressors, and other mechanical equipment as well as electrical and electronic equipment."

A LESSON LEARNED

One of the most important lessons to come out of Project Mercury, he continued, is that "certain standards that have been used for years in the aircraft industry must be revised and tightened to make them satisfactory for applications for aerospace equipment."

In support of this general indictment, the report presented the following citations of poor workmanship and defective parts:

During an early unmanned flight, motion pictures showed the interior of the capsule cluttered with washers, wirecuttings, bolts and alligator clips.

Thousands of man-hours were expended in testing assembly and installation of hardware "that later failed to meet performance specification."

During 1962 and 1963 about 50 percent of the spare components for the capsule had to be rejected after testing.

In the inspection of the escape-tower wiring for the primary and backup spacecrafts for the flight of Colonel Glenn, it was discovered that the electrical connectors had improperly soldered joints.

On the backup spacecraft for Major Cooper, a total of 720 system or component "discrepancies" were recorded, 526 of which were "directly attributed to a lack of satisfactory quality of workmanship."

In preparation for the flight of Comdr. Walter M. Schirra, Jr., 14 storage batteries were rejected because of leakage.

On the Schirra spacecraft, a valve in the altitude-control system was discovered to have been installed out of alinement.

On the Cooper flight, the umbilical cords holding the retrorocket package to the capsule failed to separate because the explosive squibs "were not loaded with the appropriate charge."

The cooling system on the Schirra capsule was "partially blocked by solidified lubricant," with the result that the astronaut had considerable difficulty achieving the proper temperature in his pressure suit.

On the Cooper flight, a condensate system designed to accumulate moisture and perspiration became clogged with metal shavings from a pump shaft.

Companies Also Accused With NASA of Waste in Lunar Program

Washington, October 3.—The General Accounting Office says bungled management in the National Aeronautic and Space Administration and in private industry has cost the taxpayers more than $100 million.

The hitherto secret report to Congress, dated March 29, was made public today. It says that as a result of mismanagement, the lunar exploration program has been delayed 2 years and an entire project involving a communications satellite has had to be redirected at a loss of $76 million.

The investigation was undertaken as a direct result of findings by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, headed by Representative George P. Miller, Democrat, of California, in June 1962.

Comptroller General Joseph Campbell reported:

"The findings are consistent with the conclusion reached by * * * [the] subcommittee on space sciences * * * that Government and contractor management of the Centaur program was less than adequate."

On May 8, 1962, the first flight test of the Atlas missile, using the hydrogen-oxygen fueled Centaur as a second stage, blew up 54 seconds after launching.

The failure was directly attributable to technical faults in the Centaur, the General Accounting Office said. These, it said, should have been known to the contractor, the Astronautics Division of the General Dynamics Corporation as early as 1960.

VARIED USES PLANNED

The Centaur was to be used as an upper-stage in the lunar exploration program, in the placing of the Advent communications satellite in a fixed position orbit, in the exploration of the space between Venus and Mars and in other space exploration missions.

As of October 31, 1962, about $274.5 million had been spent on Centaur out of a total development cost estimated at $537 million. All of the expenditure, however, will not be lost since the program is continuing, the office noted.

It also noted the loss of $1.2 million to the Government through the explosions on the engine test stands at the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division's Florida installation.

These explosions, the office said, could have been prevented by the installation of automatic shutdown equipment in wide use in industry.

Plans for the Centaur now call for its use with the Atlas booster, and, ultimately, with the moon-exploring Saturn.

"Although the Air Force contracts with the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation, Inc., to provide field service support to all users of the Atlas," the report found, "NASA contracted with General Dynamics for estimated costs of $110,000 and a fee of $7,150 to provide such services for Atlas Centaur through a subcontract with Rocketdyne."

"In our opinion," it said, "the services should be provided under the existing Air Force contract."

As of October 31, 1962, NASA estimated it would require an additional $262.6 million to carry the Centaur program through to its planned completion in 1967.

PROGRAM COSTS RISE

Beyond this, the over-all costs of the Centaur-Saturn program were increased by $15 million after a program for development of an engine known as the 17.5K was canceled.

Up to this point all the Saturn boosters to be built by the Boeing Aircraft Co., had been designed around the Centaur upperstage 17.5K engine.

Additionally, another change in plans—to make some Centaur tests at NASA's Tullahoma, Tenn., facility—were canceled at a cost to the Government of $1.1 million.

In connection with the redirection of the Advent satellite program, the General Accounting Office said the Department of Defense was using one set of figures as a payload capacity and General Dynamics another.

"We found no evidence of official communication showing that NASA cautioned the Department of Defense as to errors in the Atlas-Centaur payload computations," its report declared. "In fact, in a letter to the Department dated August 3, 1961, NASA affirmed the payload as 618 pounds, as computed by General Dynamics."

"NASA stated also in that letter," it continued, "that an agreement had been reached for a Centaur improvement program whereby a reasonable probability would exist for a 1,110-pound payload."

Ultimately the payload capability was reduced to 513 pounds and, the office said, "the reduction in basic payload was attributed primarily to computational errors made by General Dynamics-Astronautics."

CONCERNS DECLINE COMMENT

A spokesman for the General Dynamics Corp. declined to comment here yesterday on the General Accounting Office's criticisms of the Centaur program. The spokesman explained that the responsible officers in the company had not yet seen the report.

A spokesman for the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of the United Aircraft Corp. in East Hartford, Conn., also declined comment. He said the company was not prepared to say whether automatic shutdown equipment would have prevented the explosions at the engine test stand in Florida.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I return to the need for a far more comprehensive Federal aid to education bill than the Senate is considering today. I have mentioned the piecemeal approach which a majority of the committee felt it necessary to take. This piecemeal approach suggests to me an underestimate of the critical role of education in our society and of the impending crisis in the educational system. Education has many goals and responsibilities, all of which are vital to a free society. But my comments today are confined to only one—the development of human resources through the educational system.

Repeatedly during the past spring and summer, and into the fall, witnesses at our hearings on the Nation's manpower situation have turned our attention to the educational system as the most important single longrun solution of the problem of unemployment in the United States. Secretary of Labor Wirtz gave the initial testimony in this regard at our hearings in May. He pointed out the correlation between education and employment. He testified that the unemployment rate among adult males in the age group between 25 and 54 having less than an eighth grade education is 9 percent, while among those who went on to high school but did not finish, the unemployment rate is nearly 7 percent. The rate for high school graduates is well below 4 percent. For those having some college education, the unemployment rate is practically nonexistent, as a practical matter. It is only 2 percent. This is less than the frictional unemployment one always finds in any area where individuals seek employment opportunities, or, after leaving their old jobs are looking for new ones. Those with college education find even a briefer period of unemployment necessary after graduation or in changing jobs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables submitted by Secretary Wirtz at the subcommittee hearings.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 7.—*Unemployment rates for males 18 years old and over, by years of school completed, October 1952 and March 1957, 1959, and 1962*

[Percent of civilian labor force]

Years of school completed	October 1952	March 1957	March 1959	March 1962
Total males, 18 years and over	1.5	4.1	6.3	6.0
Elementary:				
Less than 5 years [1]	2.1	8.0	9.9	10.4
5 to 7 years	2.4	6.2	9.7	8.5
8 years	1.4	4.4	7.3	7.5
High school:				
1 to 3 years	1.6	4.7	8.1	7.8
4 years	1.1	3.0	4.9	4.8
College:				
1 to 3 years	1.1	2.7	3.3	4.0
4 years or more	.4	.6	1.4	1.4

[1] Includes males reporting no school years completed.

Source: Bureau of the Census, "Current Population Reports," series P-50, No. 49 (1952) and 78 (1957); Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Special Labor Force Report," No. 1 (1959) and 30 (1962).

TABLE 8.—*Percent distribution of employed persons 18 years old and over by years of school completed, October 1952 and March 1962*

Major occupation group	Years of school completed					
	Less than 4 years of high school [1]		4 years of high school		1 year of college or more	
	October 1952	March 1962	October 1952	March 1962	October 1952	March 1962
Total employed, 18 years old and over:						
Number in thousands	33,318	28,920	15,876	20,688	9,716	14,331
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White-collar occupations	18.7	22.2	53.1	53.8	80.8	83.2
Professional, technical, and kindred	1.1	2.0	5.2	6.7	40.8	43.1
Managers, proprietors, and kindred	8.0	8.7	13.0	12.4	15.7	17.2
Clerical and sales workers	9.6	11.5	34.8	34.8	24.3	22.9
All other occupations	81.3	77.8	46.9	46.2	19.2	16.8
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred	17.4	16.2	15.2	13.7	6.5	5.0
Operatives and kindred	27.2	26.3	16.0	14.8	4.6	4.0
Service workers, including private household	13.4	17.5	7.3	10.4	3.8	5.2
Laborers, except farm and mine	8.1	7.6	2.8	3.0	.9	.9
Farmers and farm foremen and laborers	15.3	10.2	5.7	4.2	3.3	1.9

[1] Includes persons reporting no school years completed.

NOTE.—Because of rounding, these percentages may not add to 100.

Source: Bureau of the Census, "Current Population Reports," series P-50, No. 49 (for 1952); Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Educational Attainment of Workers, March 1962," unpublished tabulations (for 1962).

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Secretary Wirtz suggested the economy of expenditures on education from an income standpoint, by pointing out that the average high school graduate receives a lifetime income of about $100,000 more than the man with less than an eighth-grade education, while the difference in lifetime income between a high school graduate and a college graduate is close to $140,000.

During July and August the subcommittee recessed its exploratory hearings, to consider important proposed legislation referred by the leadership and committee chairman to the subcommittee. Again, witness after witness reiterated the role of education as a longrun solution to each of these social and economic problems. Hearings concerning the functioning of the manpower development and training program revealed that public employment officers were screening eight unemployed persons for every one they were able to place in training. It was necessary to screen 500 women in order to get 30 with the necessary basic educational background to undertake training as practical nurses. Two hundred and eighty-seven persons were screened in order to find 20 who could profit from training as a hotel and restaurant cook. Even programs for training service station attendants met the obstacles of the functional illiterate who cannot read sufficiently to be able to handle credit cards. Training programs for domestic servants and building maintenance workers turned up large numbers who could not read sufficiently to differentiate between a box of rat poison and a box of detergent. It was as a result of these revelations that the subcommittee recommended, and the Senate passed, amendments expanding the Manpower Development and Training Act to allow basic training in reading and writing skills as a prerequisite for the skill training provided under the original act.

As the subcommittee moved into the area of equal employment opportunity, it became apparent that deprived educational backgrounds were almost as important a problem to the minority group worker as was racial discrimination.

For example, in 1961, one of every five adult nonwhites had less than 5 years of education—a rate of functional illiteracy five times higher than that for adult white workers. Certainly it is more than an accident that the first milestone of the accelerating racial unrest of the past few years was a Supreme Court decision in the area of education. Again, as the subcommittee held hearings concerning the increasingly serious problems of juvenile delinquency, we were confronted with the fact that juvenile delinquency, while not unknown among the better educated, is overwhelmingly concentrated among youth of low educational opportunities and attainments.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a brief comment?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe the Senator is rendering a great service in calling attention to the economic aspects and the economic benefits of education in this field. Most people think of education as something highly desirable, but with a distinctly abstract connotation. Here you are stressing the practical aspects of the program which will bear fruit in employment. Here is a program to make it possible to secure employment for the unemployed which is not available for those who are not adequately trained. Also it will help in stopping crime and juvenile delinquency. I believe the Senator is making a valuable contribution by emphasizing that point. I hope his wisdom in connection with this matter will be translated into further action.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Alaska for his kind comments. I can only point out that if the Senator from Alaska has been privileged to hear, day after day after day, the testimony about the causes of our massive employment and about what Congress and the Nation should do to remedy it, I am sure he would feel even more strongly than he does at present about the interlocking or the overlapping needs for education in order to avoid unemployment.

A better educational system would not solve all of our unemployment difficulties; but it would have a much stronger impact on them than anything else we could do. This is why I deplore the jealousies between the House and the Senate, the attitude of the House Rules Committee, and the point of view of many Senators on the racial and religious issues. Furthermore, the failure of the administration to fight for the passage of its own bill is resulting in our dealing in this piece-meal manner with the existing educational problems. I do not say that, on balance, these bills are bad. They are not; they are good bills. The point is that they deal with only a segment of a much wider situation which is screaming for action.

I repeat that in many ways we are engaged in a race between education and catastrophe; at present catastrophe is winning, because there is no sense of urgency in the White House, in the Senate, in the House, or, I regret to say, among the American people. We come out with fine words; we receive wonderful messages; we make splendid speeches; and we hear excellent testimony. But—to use an analogy which I have used before on the floor of the Senate—then, like Ferdinand the bull, we sit down under a tree, smell the beautiful flowers, and let the rest of the world go by.

The purpose of my remarks today is to arouse people to the seriousness of this crisis. For that reason, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Alaska for his interjection.

Mr. President, as a result of the testimony the subcommittee heard, it voted to broaden the Juvenile Delinquency Act. I am glad to be able to say that the position it took with respect to that act received such favorable response in the Senate that the bill was passed during consideration of the Consent Calendar, and I hazard the guess that many Senators do not even know that it was passed.

As a result of the testimony we heard, we have reported favorably to the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare a very comprehensive fair employment practices bill. The chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has been asked to schedule an executive session of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee so that the views of the members of that committee, if any there be, which do not coincide with the views of the members of the subcommittee, can be adequately ironed out and discussed in executive session before the omnibus civil rights bill comes here from the House.

The social consequences of these educational deficiencies are of primary concern; but it would be impracticable—as the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has suggested—not to look at the economic consequences. On the other end of the occupational scale, despite a level of unemployment which has averaged 5½ percent of the labor force for the past 6 years, the subcommittee was troubled by evidence of growing shortages of the very high talent and highly educated manpower upon which technological development, economic growth, and social progress must be based. Just as one example, I point out that the Department of Labor estimates that in 1970 the supply of engineers will fall 239,000 short of the projected total requirements of 690,000 engineers. According to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, "Shortages of higher talent manpower undoubtedly present impediments to growth and aggravate the balance-of-payments problem."

How far afield we get from the area of primary education and secondary education when we see the almost irrefutable logical implications of our failure adequately to upgrade our educational system.

The question which remains is whether our present educational system can meet these demands. When asked this question by subcommittee members, Mr. Ivan Nestigen, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, answered:

> Evidence is obtainable from many sources which indicates that the resources of higher education in this country are not adequate to produce the high talent manpower needed for increasing our economic growth rate substantially.

Mr. President, I appreciate that the pending bill deals only in a peripheral way with the needs of higher education. It has incorporated in it a certain watered-down version of the President's omnibus bill provisions dealing with National Defense Education Act amendments. There has been reported to the calendar—and I have every reason to believe that it will be taken up promptly—a higher education bill which strikes out everything after the enacting clause of the House bill on higher education and substitutes what I consider to be the very sound proposals in the area of higher education which came from the conference between the House and the Senate, on which committee I had the privilege to serve last year.

I hope that that bill can be taken up and passed after the present bill, which deals primarily with vocational education, with impacted areas, and with certain of the National Defense Education Act amendments, has been disposed of.

Another bill on the Calendar which I hope will receive early and prompt consideration has to do with Federal assistance for libraries. One of the key areas in which educational assistance from the Federal Government level is badly needed is our library system. We should upgrade, refurbish, and improve the libraries of our country. Senators will recall the old cliche about a gentleman who said that if he wanted to get a really good education, he would like to sit on one end of a log with Mark Hopkins as an instructor at the other end.

I suggest that an almost equally good education could be obtained by one who learns from books. If one does not have a decent library from which books can come to assist him in obtaining his education, he really has two strikes against him.

Considering the returns available, it is difficult to understand our reluctance in this country to invest adequately in education. Economists at the University of Chicago and elsewhere have concluded on the basis of careful investigation that the contribution to economic growth of investment in human capital, leaving aside all individual and social advantages, is greater than the contribution of investment in capital resources.

Mayor Walsh of Syracuse, a Republican, in discussing juvenile delinquency with the subcommittee reported that it was cheaper to maintain one's son for a year at Harvard or any other good Ivy League school than to maintain an uneducated, unskilled, unemployed high school drop-out in a State institution after his idleness had brought him into conflict with the law.

Think of that, Mr. President. It requires more money to keep a juvenile delinquent in a reform school than it does to send him through Harvard, Yale, the University of Oregon, the University of Alaska, or any of our other great educational institutions.

Can this investment be left to State and local resources? Not according to the Secretary of Commerce. He told the subcommittee:

> It will be unsound to leave the development of our manpower resources solely to efforts possible without augmentation of Federal programs.
>
> The President's immediate plans for aid to education are only the beginning steps needed to develop such a program. Our international and domestic responsibilities will not wait for us to bicker and delay in solving our educational problems.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the entire reply of Under Secretary Nestigen of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, when asked the question to which I referred earlier.

There being no objection, the question and answer were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Question. Can the present American educational system meet the responsibilities which will be placed upon it by the threatening manpower revolution?
>
> Answer. The threatening manpower revolution places some heavy responsibilities on the present American educational system. Our educational system must provide for advance in knowledge on which the technological changes necessary for longrun economic growth depends. It must provide the highly trained manpower necessary to effect these technological changes and to operate the kind of economy these changes produce. It must provide a flexible work force which can adapt to these changes. It must provide for those who are dislocated by these changes who do not have the occupational flexibility to move to other work. It must provide for the unskilled and undereducated who are plagued with unemployment and/or low wages.
>
> Our educational system has responsibilities for coping with these problems in both the short and long run. It must develop the manpower needed for higher economic output in the immediate future as well as in the longer run future. It must contribute to the efforts to deal with unemployment now, as well as take steps to prevent unnecessary unemployment from arising in the distant future.
>
> At the same time our educational system must not diminish the intensity of its commitments to other goals of our society: the informed, critical, responsible, and compassionate citizenry vital to effective functioning of our democracy; and a nation of individuals who have developed far enough culturally and emotionally to enjoy the life around them.
>
> Part and parcel of these manpower and other responsibilities is the role of education in meeting the awesome challenges of international cooperation and competition.
>
> Is our educational system up to these challenges? To put it bluntly, unless we step up sharply our efforts to assume these responsibilities, we are putting this Nation's—and the world's—future on the block. We are auctioning off the chance of our children for a decent, happy, and prosperous life to the lowest bidder. We will leave them with an overwhelming burden which, for lack of foresight and character, we refused to assume.
>
> There is too much embarrassing evidence around us to say that our educational system is meeting its responsibilities: a large proportion of our youth dropping out of high school before completion, a large proportion of our able youth not entering and/or completing college, 23 million adults who have not completed the eighth grade, to mention only a few of the distressing facts.
>
> Our educational system can meet the responsibilities which will be placed on it by the threatening manpower revolution as well as those placed on it by the aspirations and needs of our society. The question is whether it will.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the uneducated and unskilled worker is not only an underprivileged individual. He is also an underproducer, an underconsumer, and a low taxpayer. He is a debit rather than a credit to the economic system.

Considering on one hand the serious domestic and international challenges facing our Nation and on the other the obligation of education to create a labor force flexible enough to meet every shift in technology or consumption patterns, produce highly trained manpower of great imagination and initiative, develop a citizenry aware of the world's problems and devoted to perpetuation of a free society and finally and more crassly with the demonstrated ability of investment in education to make a greater contribution to economic growth than investment in capital equipment, the reluctance of the Congress of the United States to face up to our educational problems and meet them adequately must remain a mystery.

Mr. President, I close as I began. We are engaged in a race between education and catastrophe. We are losing that race. The proposed legislation, admirable though it is, will make little progress in enabling us to catch up and run even.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania in that I would have preferred the President's omnibus bill. But I am delighted with the bill that has been reported to the Senate, and am very pleased indeed to support wholeheartedly that portion extending for 3 years aid to federally impacted areas.

THE NEW LOOK OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, there appeared in the August 1963 edition of the Honolulu Beacon an article entitled "Uncle Sam Says 'Welcome'" written by Karl Detzer. This very factual and interesting report was written about the impressions that aliens and others receive when they arrive in Honolulu, Idlewild, and other ports of immigration.

I am very pleased to note that Mr. Detzer lavishly praises the new look of our Immigration and Naturalization Service, along with other Government agencies. In fact, much of the credit for the current policies of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which have won such favor both here and abroad, belongs to Commissioner Raymond F. Farrell who has made every effort to streamline the entire department.

Mr. President, in the article Commissioner Farrell is quoted as saying:

> Congress intended the immigration laws to protect the innocent and be enforced with human kindness.

This I believe is a most humane and thoughtful approach to the administration of our present immigration laws.

At the time that Commissioner Farrell's nomination was before this body, I expressed the hope and the belief that his administration would be a humane one. I commend him now, for this has obviously been the case. Furthermore, I congratulate him for the good will and efficiency that is symbolic of the Immigration and Naturalization Service since his appointment as Commissioner by President Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed the aforementioned article in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Uncle Sam Says "Welcome"

(By Karl Detzer)

> The big jet plane slowly descended from the blue of Hawaii's skies to an easy landing at the Honolulu International Airport, bringing a human cargo of Chinese, Japanese, several Thai, a party of American schoolteachers, and half dozen international businessmen.
>
> On the east coast a similar scene took place. A plane, slipping through the clouds

into New York's International Airport at Idlewild, brought 97 passengers. It was a typical planeload, such as lands at Idlewild on an average of once every 20 minutes. Every day of the year 4,500 passengers arrive from abroad, half of them noncitizens.

Off this plane came a dozen British, Swedish, and Belgian businessmen and a score of European tourists ready to marvel at New York's skyline or the Grand Canyon. Seeking permanent residence in the United States were a few uneasy immigrants from Norway and the Netherlands, a handful of East German refugees, and one little Austrian orphan bound for his grandparents' home in New Jersey.

From the Middle East were six exchange students coming for the fall school term. An African in tribal robe emerged, followed by a thin, dark woman in a sari. There were American tourists, students, teachers, business people. American or foreigner, each had to pass muster by inspectors of the U.S. Immigration, Public Health, and Customs Services.

As the passengers swarmed off the plane, one old woman stood confused, clutching an Italian passport. She turned, startled, when a pretty young girl in a trim blue uniform touched her arm.

"Welcome to the United States, signora," the young woman said in rapid Italian. "Per favore, may I see your papers? Thank you, signora. Don't worry, they are in good order. If you will please follow me? My name is Angela."

The old lady looked anxiously about, did not move. "My son, he was to meet me," she quavered.

"He's probably up on the balcony," the young woman replied, pointing. "Oh, you see him already? And grandchildren—how nice. We will hurry to them, signora. Come inside first, please—it will take only a few minutes."

The Public Health officer spent less than 15 seconds examining the woman's health certificate. The Immigration inspector at his high desk stamped her passport quickly and in Italian curdled by a Brooklyn accent, said "You may go to Customs next, signora. The signorina will guide you."

Under Idlewild's new experimental system the forms to fill out are much shorter, the approach friendlier, and it took customs and Agriculture inspectors only a minute or two to assure themselves that the two bulging bags contained nothing dutiable or proscribed. That was all; the Italian grandmother was "in." Chatting amiably, the girl in blue led her to the door, and there was her son. Only 8 minutes after this frightened woman met the health officer, she was hugging her grandchildren in front of the terminal.

The young woman who had greeted her, dark-haired Angela Aiello, was one of Idlewild's 10 port receptionists, a small elite corps established 7 years ago by the Immigration Service. These smiling young ladies meet most oversea arrivals at our major airports. They serve as interpreters, help with crying babies, tired children, or confusing documents, allay strangers' fears and tensions, guide them to inspectors who speak their language; in short, create good will.

There are 410 points of legal entry into the United States—284 on the Canadian and Mexican borders, 126 on the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts. In the past year 175 million inspections were made at these points. Forty receptionists serve in seven ports, including Honolulu. To qualify, a girl must be able to deal with the public in situations requiring sympathetic understanding, and be proficient in at least one foreign language. More than half of the present receptionists speak French, Spanish, or German. Others are at home in Italian, Swedish, Norwegian, with smatterings of other tongues. In Miami, the six busy receptionists are fluent in Spanish, and a few also speak Portuguese.

Workers at Honolulu must speak Japanese or Chinese. Timid Hong Kong refugees arrive here in large groups and only a good receptionist can ease their anxieties. Elinor Ho, the Honolulu supervisor, one of the original three port receptionists, has as assistants May Fong and Elva Hamamoto. The work these girls must do, and the way they do it, gives Honolulu the same important role as Idlewild, Washington officials say.

The port receptionist project and Uncle Sam's other efforts to meet the stranger with a smile are part of the "Welcome to America" campaign designed to help reverse the outward flow of dollars. Authorities believed that to substitute a smooth red carpet for snarls of redtape at our major entry points might encourage tourism here. At the port of arrival, each visitor is handed a welcome opening with President Kennedy's words: "No one who sets foot in the United States need do so as a stranger." Visitors for pleasure in 1962 numbered 852,000, up 11 percent in a year; from Europe alone the increase was 28 percent.

When the President dedicated the Dulles International Airport outside Washington, D.C., he said, "I hope that all the men and women who work at our airports and piers will show our best face to the world, realizing that the people who arrive here make a judgment of our country, and we want it to be the best."

The Immigration Service responded. Its new "Handbook for Inspectors" incorporates the President's words, emphasizing that the good officer "affects the lives and well-being of many people," and therefore "tempers his judgment with sympathy"—in short, he shows the best face of America.

Commissioner Raymond F. Farrell, appointed by President Kennedy in January 1962, is a mild-mannered but tough-minded career official of 55. He got his first Government job while he was a Georgetown University student, and has been with Immigration since 1941. Farrell slams the door relentlessly on aliens he calls "bad ones," but wants the "good ones" to be treated with sympathy and courtesy.

The laws for inspection of every arrival, alien or citizen, are unchanged, but the new Commissioner has simplified procedure, given his inspectors and supervisors freedom to make on-the-spot decisions.

He admits that at New York City's 540 miles of piers, most of which were designed for cargo rather than passengers, and at airports where international terminals are unfinished, tieups still occur. But at completed jet-age ports, experienced officers with the help of women receptionists can make the average check in half a minute.

The Commissioner is also doing all the law allows to ease arrival for those unfortunates whose only mistake has been to lose a paper or sign it improperly. He is convinced that no one ever loses a paper purposely, so if one is missing, it is up to his men to find it fast or get a substitute. He explains: "Congress intended the immigration laws to protect the innocent and be enforced with human kindness."

Another timesaver is preinspection by U.S. officials at foreign airports. This system, which uses the often-wasted hour between the time an international passenger confirms his ticket and the plane takes off, is now in force for flights from Canada, the Bahamas, and Bermuda, and soon may include Mexico. Preinspection officers also ride certain trains from Canada and most ships from Far Eastern ports to Honolulu.

When the Netherlands flagship SS *Zuiderkruis* arrived in Honolulu late for its stopover, it was Hawaii's district director who saved the Dutch captain's face by speeding clearances so that no one missed a day's sightseeing.

"Welcome to the United States" a card in their own language greets those passengers who have been inspected. "Upon arrival at your entry port, you may proceed to your destination without further inspection."

On Montreal's International Airport recently, U.S. Immigration officials handling the preinspection of two Canadian brothers noticed that something seemed seriously wrong with the younger one. He was suffering from a mental disease, it was disclosed, and his brother was accompanying him to Boston for treatment.

American laws bar any alien with a disabling mental illness from entering the United States. But the inspector, using what Commissioner Farrell calls a "reasonable approach," worked out with the U.S. Public Health officer a parole, under which the healthy brother and a Boston doctor would be responsible for the invalid. The brothers caught their plane.

Immigration's policy of helping where you can falls directly on 37 district directors, career officers in cities in the States and in Frankfurt, Manila, Mexico City, and Rome. It is their privilege to snip redtape and clear a passenger in doubletime.

Three days before last Christmas, Maria Socorro Compos-Valencia, a Mexican woman crossing into the States each day to work, brought the guards at San Ysidro a scorched piece of her alien resident card, damaged the night before when her house in Tijuana burned. Worse, the documents necessary to get her 5-year-old child a similar card had been destroyed. When officers routinely advised her, "You will need new photographs. Come back in a week or two," a supervisor interrupted:

"Why wait till after Christmas?"

The woman returned next day. Her own papers were ready, along with a 2-month "parole" for her child and a gift from Immigration employees of a $20 bill.

The Immigration Service's Schools are now all at Port Isabel, Tex. In 1962 at the Officer Development Center, 795 officers attended classes in a dozen areas of study; additional hundreds participated in extension courses in such subjects as elementary criminal evidence, nationality and immigration laws, and rules of arrest. A course in "public relations," Associate Commissioner Mario Noto explains, deals with "how to make friends among all races and conditions of men."

Last Christmas the New York district director received a letter from a Latvian woman his agents had just helped. She wrote:

"Sir, it is the happiest day since I left my mother country. I am far from Latvia but the feeling that I am welcome in your brightest and most beautiful United States makes me very happy. I will with my duties be like a native citizen. Lina Elvins."

She was a foreigner and needed help. But the young Indiana high school student who went to Europe last summer with 50 others was just as pleased with her reception when she returned. Back home, she wrote:

"One of my warmest memories is of the officials at Idlewild who were so friendly. Each one said something like, 'Did you have a nice trip, Stephanie? Did you spend all your money?' (How did he know?) 'Does it feel good to be back? Welcome home.' "

THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND PASS THROUGH HONOLULU

Thousands of aliens approaching the United States via Honolulu receive their first impression of the American people from a pretty Chinese girl named Elinor Ho. It's a very good impression.

Elinor is one of the Nation's original three port receptionists and she has been assisting elderly women, young mothers with babies, the confused and the abused since October 1956.

"Burping babies is just a standard part of my job," she says.

More than 300,000 people go through Honolulu's Immigration Service each year, making it the second busiest port of entry in the country. Idlewild is first.

It's an amazing collection of sizes, shapes and nationalities that gaze upon the "Aloha Welcome U.S.A." sign that decorates the new terminal. There are Japanese who refuse to talk Japanese, preferring to try out their sparse English. There are Chinese from Hong Kong who speak with a British accent. There are Samoans, still decked with leis made of shells or Van Camp tuna labels.

"But some of the most interesting are our own returning U.S. citizens," says Elinor. "You'd be amazed how many of them express surprise that I can speak English."

Immigration gives a fast inspection of papers, averaging 66 seconds per passenger. There were 26,000 people processed in June, 10,000 of them aliens and 16,000 U.S. citizens.

Agriculture inspection of arrivals is strict. Elinor recalls this incident:

An elderly Chinese woman was told that she would have to surrender an orange she had brought from Hong Kong.

"You mean I can't take this orange with me to San Francisco?" she blinked.

"That's right," said Elinor.

So the elderly Chinese woman took a small knife from her purse, pared the orange, and ate it on the spot.

THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOURO SYNAGOGUE AT NEWPORT, R.I.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I take great pleasure in calling attention to a recent editorial in the Newport Daily News regarding the bill I have introduced to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Touro Synagogue in my home city of Newport, R.I.

The editorial emphasizes the historic significance of a commemorative coin which would not only depict the synagogue itself, but would also demonstrate the relationship between the synagogue and our Nation's first President, George Washington, who addressed to the Newport congregation these meaningful words, "To bigotry no sanction."

In addition, the editorial stresses that, because the Touro Synagogue has been designated as a national shrine, the legislation I have introduced would be most appropriate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed the editorial I have mentioned at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COIN FOR THE SYNAGOGUE

Down through the years, commemorative stamps and coins have been issued by the U.S. Government to commemorate important events in our country's history, and particularly anniversaries of consequence.

What could be more appropriate at this time than the minting of a 50-cent coin to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the dedication of Touro Synagogue? Senator CLAIBORNE PELL believes in the appropriateness of the idea and so he introduced a bill to provide for the coin. Not only that, he has Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, and Senators KENNETH B. KEATING and JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, as cosponsors.

Senator PELL proposes that only 25,000 of the coins be minted. With that limit, there would be no general circulation. But the piece would be sought not only by friends of Touro Synagogue as a memento of the anniversary but by that circle of numismatists who specialize in commemoratives.

The profile of George Washington, who visited the synagogue, would be on one side, and a likeness of the synagogue on the other, with the words of Washington, "To bigotry no sanction," taken from a letter he wrote to the congregation in 1763.

Although considerable opposition is voiced in certain Government circles over the issue of commemorative coins, it does seem as if this 200th anniversary of Touro Synagogue, standing as it does as a symbol of religious liberty is of such importance, that the Federal Government might mark it in this way, as it has marked the synagogue itself as a national shrine.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. McNAMARA. I wish to direct a question to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon a question which I hope he will answer for the RECORD.

Do I assume correctly that the words "initial equipment" as used in paragraph (3) of section 8 would include necessary instructional equipment, such as projectors and other audio-visual equipment, teaching machines, test grading machines, and the like? I believe it is the intent of the committee to define equipment in this way, but I simply wanted to make sure that this is the Senator's intent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan for raising the question. There seems to be some doubt about the intent of the bill; and I think the statement that I shall now make for the RECORD ought to leave no room for doubt. I wish to make crystal clear in the RECORD that it is the intent of the committee that items such as those which the Senator from Michigan has named will be included in the equipment definition. As I said in the hearings, I believe we should plan and legislate now for the kind of education that we are to have tomorrow, and I am sure that that will involve a much wider use of modern teaching tools. I do not believe we can meet the problems of education in the 20th century with the horse and buggy methods which are all too frequently still used in our schools. The type of equipment mentioned by the Senator from Michigan and additional equipment that will be developed from time to time can fall under the definition of the bill.

Mr. McNAMARA. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his very clear answers.

REPORT ON U.S. AID PROGRAM IN 10 MIDDLE EAST COUNTRIES—AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961 (AMENDMENT NO. 213)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have filed with the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations a report of a study I made after the close of the last Congress and earlier this year of the U.S. foreign aid program in Turkey, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Greece, Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt. I ask unanimous consent that the findings and recommendations contained in that report, as well as the press release issued with respect to that report, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in my report I deal extensively with the confusion in our program for aid to education abroad. These findings in my report were underscored by remarks made last week by Dr. Leona Baumgartner, Assistant Administrator, Agency for International Development, and Frank H. Bowles, president of the College Entrance Examination Board, before the American Council on Education.

According to the report in the Washington Post and Times Herald for October 6, 1963:

> Both speakers outlined a situation in which American universities:
>
> Frantically try to outdo each other in securing prestigious contracts to assist foreign universities.
>
> Conduct raids on other American colleges and universities in a desperate search to find enough faculty members to send abroad.
>
> Export a crazy quilt piecemeal pattern of isolated facilities—a library school here, an agricultural institute there.
>
> Try to transplant made-in-America programs that look good but cannot survive because they do not fit into the native culture.

I ask unanimous consent that the news item concerning the chaotic condition of U.S. university aid overseas and headlined "U.S. University Aid Overseas Called Chaotic," be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. UNIVERSITY AID OVERSEAS CALLED CHAOTIC

American universities have rushed eagerly abroad to help higher education in underdeveloped countries, but the results sometimes have bordered on the chaotic.

This was pointed out here last week by Leona Baumgartner, Assistant Administrator, Agency for International Development. She spoke before the American Council on Education.

Frank H. Bowles, president of the College Entrance Examination Board, made simliar criticism in a speech before the council.

Both speakers outlined a situation in which American universities:

Frantically try to outdo each other in securing prestigious contracts to assist foreign universities.

Conduct raids on other American colleges and universities in a desperate search to find enough faculty members to send abroad.

Export a crazy quilt piecemeal pattern of isolated facilities—a library school here, an agricultural institute there.

Try to transplant made-in-America programs that look good but cannot survive because they do not fit into the native culture.

Dr. Baumgartner insisted that much must be done to improve the system in which American universities receive contracts from her Agency to carry out specific assignments overseas.

"Some U.S. universities in their eagerness for contracts, send their representatives to developing countries in search of contracts," she said. "Not infrequently, a U.S. university will visit foreign universities, discover a 'felt need,' then press AID to write a contract in support of the new relationship.

"I'm told that in at least one country a U.S. university deliberately sought to displace another university contractor. No surer way to confuse and antagonize a foreign university could be imagined.

"Both AID and the universities must insist on more rigorous technical and personal standards in selecting (oversea) faculty members," Dr. Baumgartner said.

Both speakers emphasized the importance of continuing assistance to oversea universities. "But the academic community is very lax in clarifying this need for the American people and for the Congress," Dr. Baumgartner stated.

"Some universities seem to be more interested in competing with one another for the prize of an AID contract than in pressing the case for greater investment in education as a key to national development."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in my report of my study of foreign aid in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries, I cite two examples of how that chaos works out in specific terms.

I ask unanimous consent that the two examples cited in the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the examples were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXAMPLE A

Thus consider Technical Assistance Project No. 77–211 in Turkey. This project had as its purpose the establishment of a new university in eastern Turkey to be known as Ataturk University patterned after our own land-grant colleges.

To that end, a contract was entered into on August 23, 1954, between the United States and the University of Nebraska. Under the terms of that contract the university would provide a delegation of Turkish educators an opportunity to study land-grant colleges in the United States and would send a team of six to eight members of the university's staff to Turkey to do an intensive study of the need for a new university in eastern Turkey.

The contract called for the reimbursement to the University of Nebraska of salaries, travel expenses, etc. In addition, the University of Nebraska was to receive indirect costs of 10 percent of off-campus salaries of personnel assigned directly to contract work and 25 percent of the salaries of on-campus personnel. A maximum of $17,000 was set aside on the contract in addition to the equivalent of $12,500 to be provided in local currency by the Turkish Government.

The University of Nebraska's study of conditions in Turkey, of course, recommended the establishment of a new university there.

The contract was then amended to provide for the University of Nebraska to assist in establishing and manning a new university in Turkey. The amount to be spent under the contract was increased from time to time until on June 27, 1962, it was again amended to extend it to June 30, 1964—10 years after the original contract—with the maximum amount to be spent on the entire project (from its inception) raised to $2,919,000. The contract authorizes the University of Nebraska to send 26 people to Turkey for the calendar year 1958, 21 in 1959, and 19 in 1960 and thereafter.

For the fiscal year 1964, the sum of $146,434 is provided in the revised contract for salaries. Travel and indirect costs are also provided for in the revised contract making a total provided for in the contract for that fiscal year of $286,000. The original contract in 1954 was for a maximum of $17,000.

EXAMPLE B

Project 265–11–009 in Iran was initiated on June 26, 1951, when the TCA signed an agreement with the Utah State Agricultural College reciting that the Government of Iran had requested assistance in the development of the agricultural economy of that nation and agreeing that the Utah Agricultural College would provide that technical assistance. The contract had a terminal date of December 31, 1951, and a maximum limit of $100,000. It was extraordinarily deficient as to terms and conditions. (See exhibit V–A.) It was amended February 27, 1952—2 months after it had expired—to increase the maximum amount by $266,300 to $366,300, to give the Utah College 8 percent of whatever was expended as administrative expenses, and to extend the term of the contract to June 30, 1952.

On June 16, 1952, the TCA signed a project agreement with the Agriculture Minister of Iran and Karaj Agriculture College in Iran under which $130,000 was made available for the purchase of farm machinery in the United States and an additional $125,000 for the purchase of farm machinery in or out of the United States. Technical assistance to the college was also to be provided. The Ministry of Agriculture of Iran agreed to grant the college 17,875,000 Iranian Rials to renovate and expand buildings. This agreement was amended on November 26, to permit the local currencies to be used for training personnel. It was further amended on July 8, 1953, to allot 5 million additional Rials out of a jointly controlled trust fund for the purpose of paying the costs of installing the machinery purchased.

Meanwhile the contract with Utah Agricultural College had been amended on January 23, 1953, to increase the total amount by $204,772 to a grand total of $681,072 and to extend its concluding date to June 30, 1953. And the agency was still working under the simplest form of contract.

On September 11, 1953, the project agreement with the Iranian Government was amended to grant the Karaj Agricultural College the sum of $26,000 for the construction of a heating plant; $15,000 of this sum came from technical assistance funds and $11,000 from special economic assistance funds.

On November 18, 1953, the Iranian contract was again amended to grant an additional $65,500.

The contract with the Utah Agricultural College had been amended on July 31, 1953—a month after it had expired—to grant the college an additional $15,000.

New contracts and amendments were entered into between the ICA and its successor, Agency for International Development, and Utah Agricultural College until the latest amendment, dated December 11, 1962, to extend the contract termination date to July 31, 1964, and to increase the total dollar expenditure to $967,078.

And what had the agency been telling the Congress about this project?

In its presentation to the Congress for the fiscal year 1959, the agency told the Congress:

"2. Duration of project—Cost to United States after 1959: Project was initiated in 1952 and is planned for completion in 1960. No additional funds are contemplated for this project beyond fiscal year 1959."

Yet, in its presentation to the Congress for fiscal year 1963 the agency had this to say about the work to be done:

"Work remaining to be done includes:

"(a) Completion of the second phase of the construction program which will include buildings for biological and agricultural sciences, dairy industry and food technology, another dormitory, and 18 faculty residences.

"(b) Completion curriculum revision and integration to produce an effective and balanced program.

"(c) Further development of a practical training program to give students better training in practical problem solving.

"(d) Establishment of an office of Extension Education and greater participation in the inservice extension training program in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture.

"(e) Strengthening of the research program."

Thus, 12 years after the first informal contract with the Utah Agricultural College was signed, it has been extended into 1964 with ever increasingly ambitious plans for the years ahead.

Perhaps prophetically the presentation to the Congress for fiscal year 1963 was at variance with the project agreement concluded January 6, 1962. In addition to the above, mention was made in that agreement under the same heading of "Work To Be Done" of the following:

"Three urgent needs not included in the second phase of construction are housing for women students, a home economics building, and cafeteria facilities for an expanded student body.

"Future curriculum should include a home economics training program for women.

"Preparation of subject matter outlines and improving teaching methods for various new courses added in the new curriculum.

"Recruiting, reassignment, training, and taking other steps prerequisite to establishment of a complete staff of full-time faculty members. Participant training grants are necessary to provide specialized training for selected faculty members."

Exhibit V–A—Agreement Between the United States of America and Utah State Agricultural College

Whereas the Government of Iran has indicated the desire to cooperate with the Government of the United States in improving and developing the agricultural economy of its people; and

Whereas the Government of the United States, through the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State and the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the Department of Agriculture, recognize the need for technical knowledge and skill in developing a progressive economy in Iran; and

Whereas the problems of education, sanitation, and sound agricultural practices require the services of technicians, specialists, instructors, and administrators in the particular agricultural fields; and

Whereas the Utah State Agricultural College has the staff and facilities necessary to assist in furthering the efforts of the United States of America in the fields of agriculture in Iran; and

Whereas the Utah State Agricultural College desires to participate in cooperative agricultural program undertaken in Iran;

Now, therefore, the determination has been made that a project identified as "Iranian Rural Improvement Program" will further the policy of the United States declared in the Act for International Development. In execution of this determination the Utah State Agricultural College, a nonprofit organization (hereinafter called the "College"), and the Government of the United States of America, by the Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State and by the Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the Department of Agriculture, mutually agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Section 1. The College will make available in Iran qualified persons in the various fields of agricultural development, education, re-

search, and extension such as agronomy, forestry and range management, horticulture, irrigation, animal, dairy and poultry industry, agricultural engineering and mechanic arts, agricultural economics and related social sciences, and home economics as may be required in connection with plans of work approved under the provisions of Article I, Section 3, of this Agreement.

Sec. 2. The College shall be exclusively responsible for the payment of all expenses incident to fulfilling its obligations under Section 1.

Sec. 3. The College shall make available such qualified persons as may be required under plans of work agreed to by the College and the Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the United States Department of Agriculture and approved by the Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration of the United States Department of State.

Sec. 4. The College will submit to the Administrator, Technical Cooperation Administration, through the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, such reports as may be required by the Government, including the obligation and expenditure of funds connected with the project.

Sec. 5. The College will render such additional assistance as may be mutually agreed upon.

ARTICLE II

Section 1. The Government of the United States, through the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State approves a grant, subject to the applicable terms and conditions of this agreement, to the College of $100,000, to assist in the financing of the project.

Sec. 2. The Administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration upon approval of a plan of work shall advance to the College such part of the Grant referred to in Section 1 of this Article as he deems appropriate, taking into account the estimated cost of all services to be performed by the College pursuant to this Agreement.

ARTICLE III

Section 1. The Government of the United States will cooperate with the College and such other agencies as may be deemed necessary in the preparation of plans of work.

Sec. 2. The Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations will be responsible for technical supervision and assistance in executing the approved plans of work. The performance of services by the College under this Agreement will be subject to technical guidance of the office of the Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

ARTICLE IV

This agreement shall enter force when signed by the appropriate representatives of the College and the Government of the United States of America. It shall remain in force until December 31, 1951, or until prior termination by the College or the Government provided that such termination shall be effective 60 days after receipt by one party of the other's notice of intention to terminate. On or before March 31, 1952, the College will submit to the TCA an account setting forth all expenses incurred by it in carrying out the activities outlined in Article I hereof. Upon expiration or termination of the agreement the College shall return, on or before March 31, 1952, to the Administrator of the TCA any balance of funds received under this agreement which is not obligated by the College in execution of this agreement, provided that the College may retain such portion of the balance of the funds as may be required to prepare reports which may be requested by the Government.

ARTICLE V

No member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract or to any benefit that may arise therefrom, unless it be made with a corporation for its general benefit.

For the Utah State Agricultural College:
Louis L. Madsen,
President.
June 23, 1951.
Russell E. Brontson,
Executive Secretary-Treasurer.
For the United States of America:
Henry G. Bennett,
Administrator, Technical Cooperation Administration.
June 26, 1951.
R. E. Moore,
Director, OFAR, USDA
June 26, 1951.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as is stated in the report, these two examples are illustrative only and many more could have been cited.

The foreign aid authorization bill, now before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, contains the following provision relating to educational assistance abroad:

> Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other education institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I may provide for the payment of the reimbursable indirect costs of said university, college, or other educational institution on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred.

No limitation is placed on the amount which may be charged for overhead. And yet, with respect to similar types of contracts here at home, the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare places a ceiling of 20 percent on the charge for overhead. It seems to me that our foreign educational program should operate under the same restrictions as our domestic program.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to limit overhead costs in our foreign educational program to 20 percent. I ask unanimous consent that this amendment be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and that it lie at the desk until the close of business on October 15, 1963, in order to give those of my colleagues who desire to join me in cosponsoring this amendment an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record and will lie at the desk, as requested.

The amendment (No. 213) will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

> On page 10, strike out lines 9 through 16, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "(k) Any cost-type contract or agreement (including grants) entered into with a university, college, or other educational institution for the purpose of carrying out programs authorized by part I shall not contain any provision authorizing the payment of an amount for indirect expenses actually incurred in connection with such contract or agreement (or grant) in excess of 20 per centum of the direct costs."

Exhibit 1

II. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The continuance of our foreign economic assistance program on an adequate basis is of prime importance to the United States and to the nations of the free world.

However, this should not mean that those of us who subscribe to this belief should be barred from voicing our criticisms of how the program has been and is being administered or how the program objectives are sought to be attained. For far too long this program has been shielded from public scrutiny and criticism by those of its advocates who voiced the fear that any such scrutiny and criticism would give aid and comfort to those who are unalterably opposed to any foreign aid program at all.

Such an ostrich-like posture, in the long run, serves only to harm any public program, which should at all times be subjected to searching public scrutiny, especially by the Congress. Today the foreign aid program is reaping the consequences of the years of suppressed criticism. With criticism on the part of its most ardent supporters muted, the program administrators through the years have been able to dismiss criticisms of how they were administering the program with the cavalier statement that those voicing the criticisms were against all foreign aid anyway.

The time has come for those of us who are in favor of the foreign economic assistance program to voice our criticisms of the program—as it has been administered, as it is being administered, and unless reformed, as it is likely to continue to be administered—loudly and publicly, but with the utmost objectivity, in an attempt to bring about needed reforms. Perhaps the administrators of the program will then give heed. For the sake of the program itself it is hoped that this result will take place—promptly.

It is in this spirit that this report has been prepared and these findings and recommendations have been made. Thus, while it is recommended that programs in certain countries be eliminated, at the same time it is recommended that the programs in other countries be maintained or increased and intensified.

On the basis of the facts presented in this report as a result of my study of our foreign economic assistance program in the 10 Middle East and African countries visited, the following findings and recommendations are made.

A. Criteria for determining which nations should receive U.S. foreign economic assistance

Findings

There is and has been far too great a tendency on the part of AID Administrators to proceed on the assumption that any nation in the free world not only should, but is entitled to, receive U.S. foreign economic aid. This assumption operates regardless of internal situation of the country aided, its political stability, the sincerity of its desire and earnestness to raise the living standards of and grant civil and political freedom to its people, or the state of its economic development.

Not all nations of the free world are equally entitled to receive foreign economic assistance. There is no mandate, or obligation, to give to any and all. Indeed to do so—which has been the general inclination of our foreign aid administrators—is the height of folly.

This indiscriminate selection of nations to receive U.S. foreign economic assistance means a waste of U.S. dollars and hurts our image in the world. Recipient nations have therefore come to accept, and even to demand, U.S. foreign economic assistance not only matter-of-factly but, in some instances, even as a matter of right, rather than in a spirit of being and continuing to be worthy of its receipt, and of being willing and able to utilize such aid wisely, efficiently, and honestly and take such steps as may be required to insure attainment of the objectives of the assistance program.

In consequence our programs have been cheapened in the eyes of the rest of the world.

In most of the countries aided, carrying out needed reforms on behalf of the people results in many economic and political dislocations and requires sincere determination on the part of the nation's leaders. The United States plays directly into the hands of those protesting the dislocations and weakens the determination of the nation's leaders when they see a neighboring country continue to receive U.S. economic assistance without instituting needed reforms and without disturbing the status quo.

What is desperately needed in the AID program is a set of criteria for determining which nations in the free world are worthy of receiving U.S. foreign economic assistance. These criteria shoud be widely published. And, even more important, they should be rigidly adhered to. (See ch. XII.)

It is therefore recommended that the following criteria be adopted for determining which nation needing and requesting economic assistance from the United States should receive such assistance:

(a) There is a reliable, stable, and reasonably efficient system of government and a basic cadre of trained and experienced public administrators;

(b) There is a force of trained managerial personnel to administer intelligently any aided economic developments;

(c) There is a genuine desire for economic development, a realization of the obligations entailed in such economic development, and a readiness to sacrifice in the present for future economic growth;

(d) The budget of the country is austere and its income is not being spent on frills or on the import of luxury goods;

(e) The laborers in factory and in field—the skilled and unskilled workers and farmers—will receive a just share of the benefits accruing from economic development;

(f) There is no flight of private capital from the country;

(g) The country is not engaged in unprovoked military attack on its neighbors or in an unnecessary arms buildup for that purpose;

(h) The country is not committed to an economic system dedicated to the ultimate liquidation of private enterprise and investment;

(i) There has been formulated a well-conceived, not overambitious, long-range economic development plan;

(j) Needed equitable tax and land reforms have been adopted or are in the process of adoption.

B. Too many spigots dispensing foreign assistance

Findings

Through the years the United States has established or assisted in establishing many—too many—spigots for dispensing foreign assistance. Some are operated and financed entirely by the United States. Some are international organizations in which the United States pays a large portion of the costs. In addition, the United States contributes a goodly share to the assistance programs operated by the United Nations. Under the umbrella of the Department of State there is the AID spigot, the Development Loan Fund spigot, and the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs spigot. Acting independently, there is the Department of Defense spigot with its civic affairs projects for public works in various countries under the heading of "Military Assistance." Also acting independently is the Export-Import Bank spigot.

Through the United Nations there is the United Nations Technical Assistance program and the United Nations Special Fund.

Then there is the IBRD (the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), the IFC (the International Finance Corporation), the IDA (the Inter-American Development Association), and the IDB (the International Development Bank).

In addition, in some countries, the Department of State has operated educational grant programs through CARE via USIA. In Latin America, the Department of State has also been providing educational grants through a private organization called the Inter-American Schools Services.

Additional spigots are also created through the various annual acts appropriating funds for our domestic departments and agencies. The funds appropriated are to be used to purchase local currencies generated by Public Law 480 sales.

There is the spigot of the Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For fiscal year 1964, $1,200,000 requested.

There is the spigot of the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For fiscal year 1964, $800,000 requested.

There is the spigot of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For fiscal year 1964, $3 million requested.

There is the spigot of the National Institutes of Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For fiscal year 1964, $9,673,000 requested.

There is the spigot of the Agricultural and Forestry Research Service in the Department of Agriculture. For fiscal year 1964, $2,500,000 requested.

There is the spigot of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior. For fiscal year 1964, $300,000 requested.

In fiscal year 1964, $17,473,000 will flow through these six additional spigots. These are in addition to the funds flowing through the other spigots and are not funneled through AID.

Two additional spigots were created through special acts, one relating to India and the other to Finland. Through these two spigots flow U.S. dollars for the purchase of books and scientific equipment for these two countries. Through the spigot marked "India" have flowed 3,134,277.24 U.S. dollars. Through the other spigot marked "Finland" have flowed 943,249.86 U.S. dollars.

It is therefore recommended that there be a thorough review of each of the spigots mentioned above to determine whether there is a clear definition of purpose, method and operation of each spigot, whether it can be consolidated with another spigot or eliminated, and to preclude the practice of foreign governments of shopping for funds from spigot to spigot.

C. Interest rates on development loans should be no less than those paid by the United States to borrow money

Findings

Every time the United States makes a Development Loan at an interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent repayable in 40 years, often with no repayment of principal and interest for the first 10 years, it is at the same time making an outright grant of from 50 to 75 percent of the face value of the loan. It costs the United States about 4 percent to borrow that money. It is a deception practiced upon the U.S. taxpayers to tell them the program is being changed over to one of loans repayable in dollars when in fact the low interest rates charged means that the grant program is continued. (See ch. VI.)

It is therefore recommended that Development Loans become loans in fact as well as in name and that interest rates on such loans be raised to the interest rate paid by the United States to borrow money.

D. Future uses of U.S.-owned local currencies present serious problems

Findings

The United States has outstanding many loans to many countries which call for their repayment in the future in local currencies. As the money is repaid, it, together with the interest it earns, is to be reloaned by the United States for projects designed to aid the economic development of the country repaying the loans. In the 10 countries studied, loans repayable in local currencies of $1.109 billion had been made as of December 31, 1962. Because of interest payments, the local currency fund in those 10 countries is increasing at the rate of $26.2 million each year.

Someone will have to administer these funds.

Our AID program in Israel is at an end and the AID mission withdrawn. However, during the next 10 years, our Embassy in Israel will be called upon to negotiate new loans in Israeli pounds in the amount of $250 million. Our total AID program to Israel in the 10 years, 1953–62 was $392 million.

The problem in Greece, where our program is also ending, will likewise be great. It is a disturbing thought that in the year 2003 (when the last loan already will be repaid in local currency) our Embassy in Athens will be passing on loan applications from the Greek Government. Will not the interference of the United States in the local economic development of a nation be resented so long after the original loan has been made and when we are loaning not dollars but local currencies? This problem faces the United States in the future to an ever greater extent as its formal AID programs come to "an end." Unless Congress lays down guidelines as to how such local currencies should be spent in the future, the United States will never be able to get off the treadmill, will never be able to end its aid program in any country, and will be forced to maintain, at the expense of the U.S. taxpayers, staffs to administer these funds of local currencies which will be constantly increasing. (See ch. VII.)

It is therefore recommended that (a) loan agreements calling for repayment in local currencies be renegotiated, wherever possible, with great inducements for their repayment in dollars; (b) consideration be given to the establishment of educational trust funds, jointly administered by our Ambassador and the Education Minister, into which fund local currencies can be repaid as the loans are paid. (See ch. VII.)

E. Inability to account for foreign aid expenditures

Findings

In calling for a breakdown of grants for education in foreign nations, it was shocking to find that AID and USIA were not in a position to reply readily due to their manner of keeping accounts. In fact, the reply from USIA stated that it destroyed its records after only 3 years. (See ch. VIII.)

It is therefore recommended that AID revise its accounting system and that USIA discontinue destroying its basic records so that they can be in a position to advise the Congress and the public on what U.S. aid dollars have been spent.

F. Clearer definitions needed of purposes of various aid categories

Findings

An example of the interchangeability of the various categories of AID was found in the situation in Iran where a loan from

"Supporting Assistance" was made to the government organization responsible for economic development while a loan to Israel for the same purpose was made from Development Loan Funds. (See ch. VI.)

It is therefore recommended that clear limitations be placed on the uses of "Supporting Assistance" so that it can no longer be used at the whim of the AID Administrator for unlimited, undefined purposes.

G. End use controls needed to prevent waste of aid dollars

Findings

AID dollars are loaned or granted to aid in a particular country's economic development. To prevent those dollars from being diverted into meeting that country's budget deficit or for the importation of luxury goods, it is essential that firm controls be exercised by AID to "follow the dollar" and see to it that it is in fact being used for the economic development of the country to which it is loaned or granted. This study indicated that such firm controls are not being exercised. (See ch. IV.)

It is therefore recommended that AID, with the assistance of the Comptroller General, immediately adopt proper controls over commodities purchased with U.S. AID dollars.

H. Closer integration of development loan program with remainder of aid program urgently needed

Findings

The Development Loan Fund program was originally administered by an independent agency. In 1961 it was placed in the Department of State and subjected to the supervision of the AID Administrator. The integration of the DLF program with the remainder of the AID program is still only on paper and is not a fact. DLF administrators in Washington make all the decisions as to which country will get what loans and on what terms, even though similar decisions for similar projects in the remainder of the AID program are made, at least in the first instance, by the AID mission in the country. (See ch. VI.)

It is therefore recommended that the Development Loan Fund program be decentralized—at least to a regional level—and that ways be found to bring AID personnel into closer affinity with the DLF program personnel.

I. The cloak of security has been needlessly thrown over too much of the aid program

Findings

In scrutinizing many of the AID presentations to the Congress in support of its authorizations and appropriations, it is obvious that the program has been hiding behind the cloak of secrecy far too long. Many documents classified for security reasons contained information already in the public domain. Through the years this cloak of secrecy has hurt the program because it has prevented U.S. citizens from obtaining an accurate picture of how their dollars were being expended in the total program. Secrecy begets suspicion so that the bringing to light of faultily conceived and executed projects casts a shadow on the entire program. (See ch. XI.)

It is therefore recommended that a serious effort be made to avoid classifying documents presented to the Congress for security reasons; that any documents so classified bear on its face an automatic declassification date unless the AID Administrator personally certifies that declassification automatically at any date in the future would be dangerous to the security of the United States; that authority to classify documents be confined to a small number of individuals; and that the authority to classify documents for security reasons with a declassification date more than 5 years later should be vested only in the Administrator of AID, or the Ambassador to the country aided.

J. Aid contract practices need reexamination

Findings

Instances were found in which contracts made by AID either on their face or through the process of renegotiating the contract provided for a fee fixed as a certain percentage of the cost of the project. The more the project ultimately costs, the higher the fee. Under such a practice there is a natural tendency to incur mounting costs.

In addition, the amounts allowed in contracts for the contractor's overhead appeared very large. (See ch. X.)

It is therefore recommended that AID contract practices be reexamined to avoid contractors' fees being fixed, directly or indirectly, as a percentage of the total cost of the project, and that the amount allowed for overhead costs be brought in line with the amounts allowed for domestic projects.

K. The country aided should not be permitted to levy customs duties on goods purchased in the United States with AID dollars

Findings

Examples were discovered, in examining some of the basic AID documents, that some of the project agreements did not provide that the goods purchased with the proceeds of the loan or grant in the United States would be admitted into the recipient country without the payment of customs duties. Other project agreements examined did contain such provisions. Where no such provision was contained in a project agreement, it meant that part of the U.S. dollars granted or loaned went to pay for the general upkeep of the country aided, and for purposes not provided for in the AID program or approved by the Congress. (See ch. X.)

It is therefore recommended that a standard provision be written into every AID contract and agreement for a grant or a loan that merchandise purchased with the proceeds of the grant or loan must be admitted duty free into the country receiving the money.

L. Technical assistance spread too thin

Findings

In the 10 countries studied, in the fiscal year 1962, there were 218 separate technical assistance projects on an almost unlimited number of subjects. There were in addition projects for which development loans were made, as well as local currency loans. Since they involve so many diverse subjects, it is a physical impossibility to make certain that their execution is efficiently carried out. We are thus scattering our aid as though from a shotgun rather than concentrating more effort on the fewer projects that need more aid now. (See ch. V.)

It is therefore recommended that all projects for which technical assistance is provided be immediately reexamined to cut back drastically on the number underway in any one country, with a view to bringing about more cohesiveness and direction in our technical assistance program and to weed out those projects which have been continued too long and which the host country should long before this have taken over.

M. Privileges and allowances of U.S. personnel stationed abroad should be uniform in each location in each country

Findings

The lack of uniformity of privileges and allowances accorded to U.S. personnel stationed abroad in the same country is disruptive of morale and efficiency. For example, State Department personnel stationed in a particular country may be given an allowance to enable them to send their children out of the country to school while military personnel, working at the next desk, are not given such allowances. At the same time, the military personnel may be given APO privileges while the State Department personnel stationed in the same place are denied such privileges. These discriminations without meaning were the single major criticism most often voiced by U.S. personnel abroad during the entire study. (See ch. X.)

It is therefore recommended that an interdepartmental committee be established to study the allowances and privileges of U.S. personnel stationed abroad and to make recommendations for changes to insure that U.S. personnel stationed in the same location in the same country abroad be accorded the same privileges and allowances.

N. The United States should exercise immediate leadership in and out of the United Nations to turn the Arab refugees into useful, productive citizens

Findings

Forty percent of the Arab refugees were not born in what is now Israel. Fifty percent of the total 1.1 million refugees are under the age of 18. Of the total of $38.5 million received by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency from governments in calendar year 1962, the United States contributed $24.7 million or over 70 percent. These are the basic three positive factors working in favor of a practical solution of the Arab refugee problem and of making them productive useful citizens.

There are two negative factors working against such a solution. The first is the fact that many Arab leaders want to continue to use the Arab refugees as pawns in their continuing fight against the existence of Israel. The second factor mitigating against a practical solution of the problem is that of the total of 11,651 personnel employed by UNWRA, 11,469—over 99 percent—are locally recruited persons who are themselves Arab refugees. Therefore, even if during all these years of its operation UNRWA had been in its top leadership dedicated to the concept of training the Arab refugees and settling them in Arab countries or other countries as useful, productive citizens, the vast majority of its employees were not and could not, because of their backgrounds, be dedicated to carrying out such a policy. These refugees have been placed in charge of teaching the young and therefore have been inculcating in them the belief that any resettlement in to the community will lessen the chances of their "return" to what they have been taught is their homeland, even though they have never been there. Such teachings cannot but continue to engender hate, unrest, and idleness.

A new approach must be found so that these Arab refugees will no longer be a thorn in the flesh of the world but will lead useful, productive lives. (See ch. X.)

It is therefore recommended that the United States should exercise immediate leadership in and out of the United Nations, offering, if necessary, to pay the total cost, but making every effort to have the cost shared, in proposing the following program:

(a) The establishment of a United Nations Middle East Peace Corps, along the line of our own Peace Corps, composed of volunteers from countries other than the countries involved, to work with the refugees in a well-financed program to educate and train the refugees, to help them obtain employment in the Arab countries or elsewhere, to assist financially in their resettlement in their places of employment, including resettlement grants and the granting of Cooley loans and loans and grants from Public Law 480 proceeds;

(b) Present local-hired employees of UNRWA should be replaced by Peace Corps employees, who should be international public servants, as soon as these local-hired employees of UNRWA can be retrained and placed in jobs elsewhere, being given training and resettlement grants, financial assistance in resettling their families, purchasing homes, etc. (See ch. IX.)

O. U.S. financial aid to Turkey should continue with certain conditions

Findings

The U.S. financial aid program to Turkey has not been as successful as it might have been if the United States had not been as profligate with its money, if it had insisted on tighter control of the money granted and loaned, and if it had insisted that the Turkish Government place its political house in order. Turkey is a valuable ally of the United States and is deserving of financial aid from the United States but only to the extent that its own economy can absorb such aid in a program of orderly and realistic economic development. (See ch. III–A.)

It is therefore recommended that the U.S. economic assistance program to Turkey be continued but that it be immediately reviewed with a view toward reducing its level, dropping many of the all too many technical assistance projects and insisting that the officials in Turkey bring about the political stability so necessary for economic development as a condition to the continued receipt of even a reduced level of assistance, and that Turkey's NATO commitments be carefully reviewed in the light of the present military situation to see whether her defense commitments are excessive and whether some of the military expenditures can now be diverted to the economic development of Turkey.

P. U.S. financial aid to Iran should continue but on a more concentrated basis

Findings

Under the dedicated leadership of the Shah, needed reforms are being instituted in the face of tremendous opposition. These reforms have been too long delayed while our financial aid program continued on a very scattered basis. Now that the Shah has begun to move in the correct direction to assist in the economic development of Iran, he needs U.S. economic assistance more than ever. (See ch. III–B.)

It is therefore recommended that the U.S. economic assistance program for Iran be continued and that it should be concentrated on a lesser number of projects which will be of more immediate import in supporting the Shah's reforms without attempting to do everything at once. While there has been substantial improvement under the guidance of able Ambassador Julius Holmes, who vetoed the previously granted budget support, the program could be further tightened.

Q. U.S. financial aid to Syria should stop

Findings

The political situation in Syria has been and is too unstable to expect it to provide a climate in which economic development can take place. (See ch. III–C.)

It is therefore recommended that except for keeping commitments previously made, the U.S. economic assistance program for Syria should be stopped.

R. U.S. financial aid to Jordan should be continued at the same or higher level

Findings

Under the enthusiastic leadership of King Hussein, Jordan is making progress on the road to becoming a viable nation. Its leaders have the will to do so and should be given every encouragement by the United States in achieving their goal. The excellent leadership of our able Ambassador, William Macomber, who believes this desirable objective might be achieved in a decade, is really making the country team approach work in Jordan. (See ch. III–E.)

It is therefore recommended that the U.S. economic assistance program for Jordan be continued at the same or higher level, with a review of our technical assistance projects to concentrate more upon projects of a more immediately beneficial nature to Jordan's economic development.

S. U.S. financial aid to Libya should stop

Findings

Libya's oil revenues are continually increasing and that country is well able to afford to bring about its own economic development if it uses its revenues wisely. (See ch. III–I.)

It is therefore recommended that the U.S. economic assistance program in Libya stop, and, if technical guidance by U.S. experts is desired by the Libyan authorities, it be supplied by contract on a reimbursable basis.

T. U.S. financial aid to Tunisia should be continued at the same or higher rate

Findings

Tunisia, under the vigorous leadership of President Bourguiba, and with the wise guidance of Ambassador Francis H. Russell, offers a favorable and stable political climate, progressive in outlook and purpose in which to bring about economic development. With its leadership dedicated to that end there is a real opportunity to make economic progress. (See ch. III–H.)

It is therefore recommended that the U.S. economic assistance program for Tunisia be continued at the same level, or, if it is determined that it would not encourage Tunisia to overextend itself, at a higher level.

U. U.S. financial aid to Egypt should stop unless certain conditions are met

Findings

While professing to be genuinely devoted to the economic development of his country, President Nasser of Egypt has involved his country in a costly war in Yemen at a time when his own country faced no threat at all from events taking place in Yemen. Egypt committed approximately 28,000 troops to that war in Yemen in September 1962 at an estimated annual cost of $150 million. Our AID program for fiscal year 1962 was $224.1 million. The United States is pouring its dollars into Egypt to help its economy while Egypt is pouring it out in foreign war.

In addition, Egypt is spending untold millions in preaching, through all possible propaganda media, the violent overthrow of the Governments of Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

Egypt is also spending additional untold millions on arms, including the development of missiles, for the publicly avowed purpose of waging an aggressive war against Israel, which has made no such threats but which, because of the Egyptian arms buildup, has been forced to divert much-needed resources from its own economic development.

While Nasser has been a past master at playing off the East against the West, his close relationship with the Soviet Union while continuing to receive U.S. economic assistance runs counter to U.S. policy elsewhere. He is wholly dependent on the Soviets for arms and welcomes Soviet technicians as well.

It can rightly be said that U.S. dollars are enabling Egypt to wage war in Yemen, to foment trouble in Jordan and Saudi Arabia, and to arm to attack Israel just as surely as though they were spent directly for that purpose.

U.S. AID dollars are being used to build a police state with the Government owning and operating everything through nationalization of industries and businesses. U.S. AID dollars are therefore being used to prove that such totally Socialist type of police state can work economically. (See ch. III–J.)

It is therefore recommended that the continuance of the U.S. financial aid program to Egypt be conditioned upon:

(1) Egypt's prompt compliance with the terms of the United Nations settlement of the Yemen dispute;

(2) Egypt's reversal of her present armament policy so as to cease production of missiles, warplanes, submarines, and other implements of war clearly designed for aggressive purposes.

Twenty-one Recommendations for Changes in Foreign Aid Programs Made in Report on 10 Middle East and African Countries

A detailed, lengthy report on the study of the U.S. foreign aid program in 10 Middle Eastern and African countries made by Senator Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska, for the Senate Committee on Government Operations was made public today.

Senator Gruening studied the foreign aid programs in Turkey, Iran, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Israel, Greece, Tunisia, Libya, and Egypt late last year and early this year.

The Gruening report on foreign assistance contained 21 recommendations for changes in the administration of the U.S. program both at home and abroad.

In recommending 10 criteria to judge whether a country should receive foreign aid, the Gruening report stated that the program has been cheapened in the eyes of the world because we have not insisted that the nations receiving our assistance carry out programs of reform.

"What is desperately needed in the AID program is a set of criteria for determining which nations in the free world are worthy of receiving U.S. foreign economic assistance. These criteria should be widely published. And even more important, they should be rigidly adhered to."

There are at least 22 separate spigots from which U.S. dollars flow into foreign countries for their assistance. The Gruening report recommended that to the extent possible these spigots be consolidated so as to "preclude the practice of foreign governments of shopping for funds from spigot to spigot."

The report by Senator Gruening pointed out that on loans made, for example, at three-fourths of 1 percent interest for 40 years, it is as though we also gave the recipient country a grant of 50 to 75 percent extra since the United States has to pay about 4 percent per annum to borrow the money to make the loan. The report recommended that "development loans become loans in fact as well as name and that interest rates on such loans be raised to the interest rate paid by the United States to borrow money (about 4 percent)." Since Senator Gruening made this suggestion on the floor of the Senate, the House of Representatives voted to amend the Foreign Assistance Act to raise the minimum interest rates on development loans to 2 percent. Senator Gruening has introduced an amendment to the Senate version of that bill to raise the interest rate to that recommended in his report.

The Gruening report called attention to a dangerous situation developing which will grow as the years pass. Loans to many countries are repayable in local currencies which in turn are mostly to be loaned for the economic development of the aided country. Because the loans are repayable with interest, the fund of local currencies available is constantly increasing. An example cited in the report was Israel:

"Our AID program in Israel is at an end and the AID mission withdrawn. However, during the next 10 years, our Embassy in Israel will be called upon to negotiate new loans in Israeli pounds in the amount of $250 million. Our total AID program to

Israel in the 10 years, 1953–62, was $392 million.

"The problem in Greece, where our program is also ending, will likewise be great. It is a disturbing thought that in the year 2003 (when the last loan already made will be repaid in local currency) our Embassy in Athens will be passing on loan applications from the Greek Government."

The report raised the question concerning these growing balances of foreign currencies:

"Will not the interference of the United States in the local economic development of a nation be resented so long after the original loan has been made and when we are loaning not dollars but local currencies?"

"The United States will never be able to get off the treadmill," the report stated, "unless Congress lays down some ground rules as to how such local currencies should be spent in the future."

The report suggests renegotiating the loan agreements wherever possible, offering great inducements for repayment in dollars. A second suggestion was the establishment of an education trust fund in those countries where our AID program is at an end and loans repayable in local currencies are outstanding.

The report also found that the administration of the Development Loan Fund was still from Washington and recommended closer integration of the administration of that fund with the remainder of the AID program by decentralization at least to the regional level.

Criticizing sharply the cloak of secrecy thrown around the presentations annually made to Congress in support of the AID program, the Gruening report recommended that every document presented to the Congress in AID's annual presentations, if classified for security reasons, bear the name of the person classifying the document and an automatic declassification date. The report cites the incident of Senator GRUENING coming across one sheet in an annual presentation where a few words were classified "secret." When Senator GRUENING requested that the words be declassified, he received a reply declassifying the words, but the letter of declassification was marked "confidential."

Pointing out that over 99 percent of the employees of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency were themselves Arab refugees, the Gruening report stated that these employees had been given the task of rehabilitating the Arab refugees, an objective contrary to beliefs of the Arab refugee employees. Senator GRUENING recommended the formation of a Middle East Peace Corps to replace the Arab refugee employees (who would be assisted in their own resettlement) and to help rehabilitate as many as possible of the Arab refugees into useful, productive citizens. The report stressed the fact that over 50 percent of the Arab refugees were not born in Palestine.

The Gruening report recommended that economic aid to Jordan and Tunisia be continued at the same or at a higher rate in view of the economic progress being made and the dedication of the leaders to the talk of bringing about reforms needed for the greatest economic development of their countries.

Aid would be continued to Turkey and Iran, under the recommendations of the report, under certain changed conditions designed to make the program more effective and efficient.

The report recommended the discontinuance of economic aid to Libya (which does not need it since its oil income is constantly increasing) and to Syria (because of the political chaos in that country).

With respect to Egypt, the report found that that country was engaged in a war of aggression in Yemen at a cost of $150 million so far (our AID in 1962 was $224.1 million). In effect, therefore, the United States is financing Egypt's war in Yemen. The report recommended that continuance of aid to Egypt be conditioned on its carrying out the terms of the U.N. settlement of the Yemen dispute and "Egypt's reversal of her present armament policy so as to cease production of missiles, warplanes, submarines, and other implements of war clearly designed for aggressive purposes." The report pointed out that because Egypt was acting in an aggressive way it was forcing Jordan to increase its armaments and, since we are furnishing economic aid to Jordan, Egypt's engaging in an arms race was costing the U.S. taxpayers money.

Among other recommendations in the Gruening report were those for tightening up AID's contracting practices, for reviewing accounting practices so that both AID and USIA would account accurate and speedily for funds spent, for doing away with the practice of an aided country levying customs duties on imports purchased with U.S. dollars, for the establishment of an interdepartmental committee to make uniform the allowance given personnel stationed abroad in the same city in the same country, and for revising end use controls to prevent the waste and misuse of U.S. AID dollars.

SOME INCONSISTENCIES IN OUR LATIN AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last week, after the Dominican coup and the overthrow of a duly elected, constitutionally installed government by a military junta, I suggested that the United States request the junta to turn back the boat on which the deposed President, Juan Bosch, was being taken into exile and return him to his capital, and if the request were not obeyed, that the United States take him back.

This proposal was criticized editorially in both the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Daily News.

The impression seemed to have been gained, as exhibited in these editorials, that I was requesting a return to the discredited gunboat diplomacy of the earlier days of this century, when the United States intervened and sent our Navy and our Marines into Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua, and other smaller countries to the south of us when we bombarded and seized Vera Cruz in 1914, killing a score of young Mexicans and when we sent the Pershing expedition into northern Mexico in an effort to capture Pancho Villa.

Both as a magazine and newspaper editor I fought against these policies and indeed I was one of the first American journalists to denounce them. They were still in existence at the outset of the Roosevelt administration in 1933. As the adviser to the U.S. delegation to the Seventh Inter-American Conference in Montevideo in the late fall of 1933, to which I was appointed by Secretary Hull, I used my every effort to persuade the delegation to champion the abandonment of these policies. It was done. Unilateral armed intervention, the gunboat diplomacy of the previous third of a century, went into the discard. I considered then, and have not changed my view, that it was a substantial achievement.

Those interventions, which we then, fortunately, abjured, not only were unilateral, following no request from the countries invaded and wholly contrary to the wishes of their people and their governments, but also were motivated invariably by a special interest in the United States and not of the country invaded. We sent our Marines into Haiti to rescue the interests of the National City Bank, into the Dominican Republic to collect the debts of foreign creditors, and in Central America to protect the operations of the United Fruit Co., and other private U.S. investments. It was both gunboat diplomacy and dollar diplomacy.

Our purposes today are, happily, entirely different. The Good Neighbor policy initiated by President Roosevelt in 1933 has been further amplified by President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress, which adds to a declaration of intent and purpose of good-neighborliness large sums of money to be expended in a variety of aids. Under this Alliance we offer freely and give educational aid, health aid, technical aid, economic aid, financial aid, and military aid. The military aid has been a gross failure because the military aid has gone to support the very juntas which have overthrown the democratically constituted governments when and where they were either established or sought to be established.

That is what has happened in the last 2 weeks in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras and happened earlier in other Latin American countries, Guatemala and Ecuador. In short, we are intervening economically and militarily for the benefit of these countries through our Alliance for Progress. What then is wrong about having the constituted government of a country seeking to establish and maintain democratic forms ask for our military aid, not against dangers which do not exist, but against real dangers and when its overthrow is threatened or accomplished? We now give the Latin American countries military missions which have not been successful in instilling democratic ways into their military, or in protecting their governments against outside aggression because there has been no outside aggression. But there is now no protection for the inside aggression of the type we have witnessed in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras and elsewhere and which will certainly recur again in other Latin American countries unless we change our policy.

There is a strange inconsistency about our national policies in this area. Five years ago, in response to a request from the President of Lebanon, who was not overthrown but merely feared overthrow, we sent the powerful Sixth Fleet to the shore of Lebanon and landed 6,000 Marines to protect him against this feared overthrow. When the danger had subsided, we withdrew our military forces. If that was done in distant Lebanon, why is a similar action on a much smaller scale not correct in nearby Central America and the Caribbean when the heads of these freely elected and constitutionally organized governments request such military aid.

We have been and are heavily engaged in Vietnam to the extent of 12,000 "advisers." They are supposedly "technicians," but of course they are troops and it is sheer hypocrisy to pretend that they are anything else. It is only costing us a million dollars a day, but far more serious, it has cost us the lives of 100 American young men.

Presumably we are there at the request of and with the consent of the Diem government, but there seems to be serious question as to just what our relationship to the Diem government really is. It is certainly not a friendly and cooperative relationship.

Yet there, way across the world, in an area as remote from us as any that can be found on earth, we are thus heavily engaged—financially, economically, and militarily. But, at our very doorstep, in the Caribbean and Central America, we apparently hesitate to act similarly on the ground that we must not intervene militarily.

I submit that these inconsistencies are hard to follow.

The situation has been further confused by an almost incredible statement given out yesterday, and published in full in the Washington Post, by Edward M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Martin's statement, according to the Post, was written for the New York Herald-Tribune at its request and is being circulated to diplomatic posts in Latin America. Mr. Martin now finds that there is much that is desirable, attractive, and praiseworthy in the performance of these military juntas. Does this indicate that while on the one hand President Kennedy is pursuing a policy of withdrawing recognition from the junta-seized Dominican Republic and Honduras and withdrawing our aid mission to show our disapproval of the overthrow of the democratically constituted governments there and our disapproval of such military takeovers, the Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American affairs is paving the way for a different policy? If this is a trial balloon, it should promptly be shot down.

I think that the Congress and the public are entitled to an explanation of this strange dichotomy within our administration.

Last week 22 Senators wired the President, pointing out that the mere severance of diplomatic relations and the announcement of canceling aid, while a highly desirable step, was insufficient if we left the personnel of our various missions in the countries where such action has been taken. Based on our past performance, where, after announcing a similar policy, we yielded weakly, a week or two later, reestablished diplomatic relations and restored foreign aid, the continued presence of the personnel would be an indication to the usurping junta that our declared intentions were not to be taken seriously. In response to this, the President quite properly announced the withdrawal of the aid and military personnel from the Dominican Republic, and he is to be commended for it.

But this is not quite enough. All personnel except a caretaker should be withdrawn, which includes our diplomatic mission and personnel of the Peace Corps. In addition to that, the President will have an even more effective weapon if he announces the cancellation of the Dominican sugar quota. The basic quota for the Dominican Republic is 190,000 tons. This was written into the law—quite unwisely—and cannot be touched. However, in addition, under the so-called honey bee amendment, the President has allocated 130,000 tons of the 150,000 tons available to the Dominican Republic. Also, the President has allocated 198,000 tons of the global quota to the Dominican Republic. In addition, the President allocated to the Dominican Republic 71,000 tons of the deficit quota (the amount of the quota the other Latin American countries could not meet).

Thus, under this bonanza policy we are buying 589,000 tons of sugar from the Dominican Republic. All but the 190,000 of this which cannot be withdrawn should be promptly canceled. In those circumstances, I am quite confident the Dominican junta will be prepared to reestablish the constitutional government which it so ruthlessly and illegally overthrew. Corresponding action should be taken in Honduras so that the election scheduled within a few days shall take place.

An excellent article, by Dan Kurzman, on the tragic new developments appeared in Sunday's Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that it and the statement by Assistant Secretary Martin be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Latin Coups Herald New Age of Tyranny

(By Dan Kurzman)

Democracy in Latin America is in danger of being snuffed out by the coup d'etat in a pathetic reassertion of history.

Latin America has found it no simple matter to cultivate democracy in the crusty soil of an authoritarian Spanish heritage. The United States has had equal difficulty in reconciling its obligations under the Alliance for Progress with a profound sense of guilt for past imperialistic sins in this hemisphere.

Relatively democratic regimes have sporadically come to power in Latin nations ever since the Spanish were ousted in the early part of the 19th century. Mexico has known democracy since its revolution in 1912. But in general, only in the last decade or so has there been anything resembling a democratic breakthrough. Now, it appears, an era of retrogression has begun.

The democratic government of Dominican President Juan Bosch was overthrown 2 weeks ago. The military overthrew the democratic government in Honduras on Thursday. Constitutional rule is also threatened in Venezuela, Colombia, and El Salvador.

Earlier this year, constitutional regimes fell in Guatemala and Ecuador. And countries that never have been democratic—Haiti and Paraguay—continue to stagnate under one-man dictatorships.

LESS HARSH TYRANTS

The picture is not entirely black. Only a few years ago, almost all of the 20 Latin American countries were under the totalitarian heel. Moreover, the new dictatorships are generally far less harsh than the traditional ones. For they are led not by individual tyrants but in many cases by paternalistic commanders of national armed forces with at least some feeling of responsibility toward the people.

As for Argentina and Peru, where constitutional regimes were ousted last year, the military rulers actually permitted at least partially free elections which were won by men acceptable to them. Many modern officers are more interested in maintaining their privileges than in wielding political power.

But if despite the deterioration, the current situation in Latin America represents a considerable improvement over conditions in the past, the Alliance for Progress is nevertheless threatened by the chain reaction of coups now unsettling the continent, particularly Central America.

Political democracy is one of the principal aims of the Alliance. For only within a democratic system, both American and Latin leaders believe, can the other chief aims—social and economic reform—be fully realized.

This is, in fact, more nearly true for Latin America than for other underdeveloped areas because dictators in this region have traditionally exploited rather than helped the people. No Turkish Ataturks have ruled in Latin America.

Unlike the situation in the Afro-Asian world, where indigenous nationalists are in control, the Latin American ruling classes are composed largely of the descendants of the Spanish (Portuguese in Brazil's case) colonialists who ruled the continent with an iron hand.

These colonialists thus left a legacy of feudal authoritarianism with those sons who decided not to return to Spain when the Latin American nations won independence. That legacy is today at the root of the region's troubles.

The independent oligarchies that developed allied themselves with ambitious middle class military officers who discovered that profitable business opportunities, social prestige and important privileges could flow from such arrangements. Today this alliance is still operating.

POLITICAL APATHY PREVAILS

With such power alined against the exploited Latin peoples, apathy has generally characterized their political attitude. Only after World War II did they begin to comprehend their strength and exert sufficient pressure on their rulers to cause them to give way to democratic or pseudodemocratic forces for prolonged periods.

This pressure substantially increased with the establishment of the continent's first Communist government in Cuba. For Fidel Castro, though supported by only a small minority of Latins, succeeded before openly entering the Communist camp in awakening many of them—through propaganda if not action—to the fact that the masses have the power to direct their own destiny.

The Alliance for Progress, in still further nurturing this realization, if for different purposes, has thus become a source of increasing fear among the privileged. Some of the more realistic members of the oligarchies and armed forces have come to realize that social and economic reform is inevitable and that such reform will hurt them less under a democratic than under a Communist system.

But many other traditionalists are clinging to their feudal ways, rationalizing that the people are not ready for democracy yet but doing little to prepare them for such a system.

The ouster of Bosch in the Dominican Republic has dramatized the fears and ambitions of the militarists and extreme rightists with brutal clarity. Bosch was by no means an ideal political leader. He was a poor administrator. He would not take the advice of friendly, more experienced leaders.

His impetuosity and directness antagonized the very people he had to influence, including the business community, the church, and the army, all of which feared his reforms.

Nevertheless, Bosch chalked up some impressive achievements in his 7 months in power. He cut Government expenditures, eliminated corruption, balanced the budget, paid back foreign debts before repayment was due and vastly increased dollar reserves. Nor is it likely that any other leader would have been a much better administrator, considering the fact that all experienced men had been purged for their services to dictator Rafael Trujillo.

Far more important, Bosch, a true idealist, however naive, created a democratic precedent after 30 years of tyranny. No one was sent to jail for opposing him. The people luxuriated in a freedom they had never known before and social reforms, however tangled in redtape, promised them a bright future.

Only for the rightists and militarists did the future look bleak—by their reckoning. Democracy and social reform would mean for the oligarchs that they could no longer hoard the national wealth but would have to use some of it to improve the lives of the people. Democracy and social reform would mean for the military a reduction in privileges and political influence.

Members of the rightist alliance were not overly concerned with Bosch's administrative abilities. Nor is it likely they believed, as they charged, that Bosch had led the country to the brink of communism. They had made up their minds the moment Bosch won the presidential election last year that, one way or another, he would have to go. And they took full advantage of Bosch's shortcomings in justifying his ouster.

The reversion of the Dominican Republic to dictatorship has unquestionably been the worst blow yet to the Alliance for Progress. For the United States had, in a sense, treated that country, emerging in full innocence after 30 years of suppression, as a mother would treat an infant.

The infant has now succumbed to the terrible forces of history. And, compounding this tragedy, so has the United States in the sense that history has generated an extreme reaction to itself. For decades, this country shamelessly intervened in Latin America—economically, politically, and militarily—in its own selfish interests.

President Roosevelt finally reversed this policy and a new era of inter-American multilateralism began, in which the principle that no American State had the right to interfere in the affairs of another became the keystone.

To some extent, the Alliance for Progress, approved by all Latin nations except, of course, Cuba, has given the United States the right to use the bait of economic aid to encourage these countries to institute necessary reforms. But taking action to keep a particular government in power, democratic or not, is another thing—at least in the minds of U.S. leaders who shrink before the possibility of being accused again of "imperialism."

Moreover, to the potent blend of fear and conscience was added the embarrassment derived from the U.S. "hard" attitude toward the Peruvian junta when it took power last year. Once the junta announced it would hold new elections, the United States, under pressure, particularly from American businessmen in Peru, normalized relations with that country.

Strangely, the United States does not appear to realize that its initial hard attitude toward the Peruvian junta was largely responsible for the return of democracy to the country and should be a model for other similar situations.

In any event, the United States, although knowing well in advance that a coup in the Dominican Republic was imminent, confined efforts to save its infant to "please don't" talks with the military, as it did in Honduras.

Thus does history threaten to triumph over the peaceful revolution called for by the Alliance for Progress.

MARTIN'S STATEMENT ON POLICY FOR LATIN AMERICA

(U.S. policy in Latin America is under sharp attack. The top State Department official in the conduct of this policy is Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. The following statement by Martin, written for the New York Herald Tribune, is being circulated to diplomatic posts in Latin America.)

(By Edwin M. Martin)

By tradition and conviction as well as a matter of policy, the United States opposes the overthrow of constitutional and popular democratic governments anywhere.

This is especially true in Latin America, with whose people we have such close historical ties and whose aspirations for political and economic freedom we support wholeheartedly. Moreover, under the Charter of Punta del Este, the people of the Western Hemisphere have bound themselves in a joint effort for political and socioeconomic development—the Alliance for Progress—within a framework of free and democratic institutions.

The deviations from these principles which we have observed in the 2 years since Punta del Este have caused some to question the validity of the principles of the charter and some impatient cynics to ignore the progress which has been made.

Both the impatient idealists and the defeatist cynics ignore the realities of rising nationalism; the anxieties caused by social revolution; the challenge posed by the Alliance for Progress to old value systems; the threat to the established order brought on by the new, and finally the strain which rapid social and economic change places on fragile political institutions.

In short, there is a temptation to measure current events not against historical reality and substantive progress, but against somewhat theoretical notions of the manner in which men should and do operate in a complex world.

UNDETERRED BY FROWN

We all have respect for motherhood and abhor sin. We may observe, however, that while motherhood has prospered, so has sin. In an increasingly nationalistic world of sovereign states, a U.S. frown doesn't deter others from committing what we consider to be political sins. And as we are pretty nationalistic ourselves and rightfully proud of our great successes, we sometimes find this fact frustrating.

Our task has only begun when we have stated our position. The real issue is how, under the conditions of the present-day world, we can assist the peoples of other sovereign nations to develop stable political institutions and help them strengthen their beliefs in these institutions so as to make them effective against brute force.

In Latin America there are very few who would argue as a matter of principle for violent overthrow of constitutional regimes. Most of those who support or accept coups d'etat would simply maintain that their particular case was surrounded by unique circumstances. This is "yes, but" argument.

Genuine concern with an overturn of the established order, fear of leftwing extremism, frustration with incompetence in an area of great and rising expectations, and a sheer desire for power are all formidable obstacles to stable, constitutional government—especially in countries where the traditional method of transferring political power has been by revolution or coup d'etat. In most of Latin America there is so little experience with the benefits of political legitimacy that there is an insufficient body of opinion, civil or military, which has any reason to know its value and hence defend it.

No two countries are alike, but in general we feel that in order to enlarge their experience of legitimacy, and thus their respect for it, we must strengthen in each society the power of the educated middle class with a stake in the country, and hence in peace and order and democracy for all the people. This is in fact what the Alliance for Progress is all about—it is as much a sociopolitical revolution as it is an economic one.

As societies come to have more respect for constitutional civilian governments with wide popular support, these governments will no longer be easy targets for military coups. But to tip the balance even more in favor of established civilian governments, we also must assist the military to assume the more constructive peacetime role of maintaining internal security and working on civic action programs. The latter are especially valuable in identifying them with the problems and goals of the civilian population.

CAN'T EXCLUDE MILITARY

Even in the United States we argue about the areas of national policy in which the military have a rightful voice. In Latin America we cannot aim to reduce them to impotence in the national life—rather it is a problem of acceptance of a mission in support of legitimate governments against subversion from extremists of both right and left, whose threat of force must be met by force. There must be military participation in the formulation of some national policies; they cannot be excluded altogether.

I should not wish this emphasis on the need for the military to acquire a new and somewhat more limited role in political life to be read as a downgrading of the real contribution they have made to political freedom and stability in many countries. Peron in Argentina, Perez Jimenez in Venezuela and Rojas Pinilla in Colombia were all military dictators who were thrown out with the help of their own military in the 1950's. And the two worst dictators today in Latin America, it should be noted, are not military men and were able to consolidate their power by reducing the regular military forces to impotence.

Nor are the military universal supporters of those who oppose change as represented by the programs of the Alliance. Governments controlled by the military have overseen the election to power this year in Argentina and Peru of two of the most progressive regimes either country has ever had. This year in Ecuador and Guatemala, military regimes have announced reform programs of substantial importance.

Nevertheless, the fundamental facts remain—military coups thwart the will of the people, destroy political stability and the growth of the tradition of respect for democratic institutions and nurture Communist opposition to their tyranny. Moreover the military often show little capacity for effective government, which is a political rather than military job.

Apart from our and the Alliance's vigorous long-term efforts to eliminate the political vacuums on the civilian side which invite military action, as well as our efforts to train the military in their most valuable role, what can the United States do in the case of specific threats or coups which nevertheless come?

INTERVENTION OPPOSED

Unless there is intervention from outside the hemisphere by the international Communist conspiracy, the use of military force involving the probability of U.S. soldiers killing the citizens of another country is not to be ordered lightly.

Nor can we, as a practical matter, create effective democracy by keeping a man in office through use of economic pressure or even military force when his own people are not willing to fight to defend him. A democracy dependent on outside physical support of this kind is a hollow shell which has no future. The people had better start all over again. Moreover, once outside military support is used it may prove hard to withdraw. We have seen in this century—in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and Nicaragua—how politically unproductive military occupations are, even when carried out with the best of intentions.

We must use our leverage to keep these new regimes as liberal and considerate of the welfare of the people as possible. In addition, we must support and strengthen the civilian component against military influence and press for new elections as soon as possible so that these countries once again may experience the benefits of democratic legitimacy. Depending upon the circumstances, our leverage is sometimes great, sometimes small.

One should not underestimate what has been accomplished by the United States and Alliance policies I have described. They are accomplishments that have truly enhanced the long-term prospects of the Alliance.

In Argentina, the military walked up the hill a number of times to look at the green pastures of full military control and the power and prerequisites that would go with it. Each time a combination of wiser heads in the military, along with more and more confident civilian leaders who were strongly buttressed by U.S. diplomatic support and aid programs, turned them back. The elections were held on schedule.

In Peru, the 1-year rule of the junta was about the most respectful of civil liberties most progressive in its policies, and quickest to give up its power peacefully in the history of Latin American military regimes. Here again the strong stand taken by the United States prior to recognition helped to secure public commitments on, and follow-through from, the junta to pursue liberal policies—liberal of course only for a military dictatorship.

NO REPRESSION IN ECUADOR

A similar story can be told of the Ecuadorian junta, which is governing through an able and representative civilian cabinet and generally without repression of civil liberties.

In every case mentioned there has been a novel and notable absence of reprisals against the leaders of the ousted regimes. The firing squads or prison guards, so characteristic of earlier political upheavels in Latin America, have been eschewed. This restraint can be credited to the progress Latin America has been making under the Alliance and to U.S. influence brought to bear through all the means open to us, to produce moderation and a prompt return to constitutional and democratic regimes.

I fear there are some who will accuse me of having written an apologia for coups. I have not. They are to be fought with all the means we have available. Rather I would protest that I am urging the rejection of the thesis of the French philosophers that democracy can be legislated—established by constitutional fiat.

I am insisting on the Anglo-Saxon notion that democracy is a living thing which must have time and soil and sunlight in which to grow. We must do all we can to create these favorable conditions, and we can do and have done much.

But we cannot simply create the plant and give it to them; it must spring from seeds planted in indigenous soil.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT NEED TO BE EXPANDED, AND IMPACTED SCHOOL AID CONTINUED

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of the original National Defense Education Act of 1958, I am greatly pleased that the Senate is acting today to extend the life of my favorite legislative effort in my some 6 years in the Senate. In its 5 years of life, the NDEA has done more for American education than any other legislation ever passed by Congress or a State legislature, with the possible exception of the Morrill Land Grant College Act of 1862, or the World War II GI bill. Today the initials "NDEA" are as familiar a part of the educational scene as the initials "Ph. D."

The NDEA is a great program; it has benefited hundreds of thousands of students and teachers in the few years since its enactment. It was an attempt by Congress to insure that our national education effort was at a par with that of other industrialized countries of the world. It made a good start toward that goal. There are other education programs which many of us have also sought to add to our national effort. Some have been added in limited measure, but we have not yet been successful on all of them or the most extended versions of some of them. These other education programs will be added in time—all of them—one reason being that the undoubted success of the NDEA illustrates the wisdom of congressional action to correct national deficiencies in our educational system and to stimulate our national effort in education.

Part B of the bill under consideration today, H.R. 4955, extends the National Defense Education Act for another 3 years, and makes some modest improvements in the various programs. Perhaps the most needed improvement is the increased authorization provided for the student loan funds.

The student loan fund, title II of the NDEA of 1958, is the most widely known and praised of the provisions of that act. Through loans made by the colleges from capital contributions authorized in 1958, about 180,000 students each year are able to continue their college education. Many more are unable to obtain NDEA loans because the funds are exhausted too soon. The new bill will correct this in part by raising the annual authorization from $90 to $125 million the first year, and by raising the ceiling for individual institutions from $250,000 to $800,000. It is very important that the larger colleges be able to provide loans in proportion to the size of their student bodies.

If we do not raise that limitation, a student who goes to a larger college is discriminated against and does not have as fair an opportunity to obtain a loan as one who goes to a smaller college.

Students at three of the larger universities in my own State of Texas already require far more funds than can be made available due to this institutional ceiling. It should be raised. Extension of the loan program as a whole is of very great importance to the students at the 77 Texas colleges and universities taking part. In a survey made of Texas student borrowers, 94 percent reported that they could not have begun or continued their college studies without this assistance.

I wish to interpolate a point that is not shown in the statistics, but which I have learned from my personal observations in traveling to different colleges.

With $90 million a year for loans, it is estimated that the average student loan is $500. That fund keeps 180,000 students in college annually. That is the average size of a National Defense Education Act loan ($500) but I am of the opinion that these loans are keeping many more than that number (180,000) of students in college, for this reason: I have been told by presidents of several of the smaller colleges in Texas that if, for example, they have one student who needs a loan of $500 and five students who need a loan only $100 each, they funnel the $500 loan into the National Defense Education Act program in order to save paperwork, and then lend the other five students $100 each from local funds. Many colleges have local loan funds, to provide some student loans. So by placing the larger loans under the National Defense Education Act program, they provide funds to a larger number of students who need smaller loans each, out of the funds the college has for that purpose.

The president of Sam Houston State Teachers College, with an enrollment of more than 5,000 students, which is next to the oldest tax supported institute of higher learning in my State, told me that often, with a loan of $100, or a loan of as low as $50, a student can be kept in school for a year.

He said—

> If a boy comes here, and we can get him a $100 loan, or sometimes a $50 loan, that will be enough to have him registered, and he can then be given a job sweeping out dormitories, or perhaps he can wait on tables.

The smaller loans of $50 or $100 are not funneled into the National Defense Education Act. Therefore, we are keeping in school far more than the 180,000 students who borrow under the National Defense Education Act program each year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks, as a footnote to my remarks, the list of colleges and universities in Texas which have received funds under the National Defense Education Act for student loans, and the amount each year since the institution of the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Other sections of the National Defense Education Act are vital to our modern educational needs: Graduate fellowships, strengthening the teaching of science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages, improving the educational uses of communications media, expanding the guidance, counseling, and testing of students, and strengthening educational statistical services.

Graduate fellowships are awarded to those working in new or expanded graduate programs.

This provides for $1,500 for fellowships, as distinguished from loans. It is an attempt to insure adequate graduate programs in all parts of the Nation, and would avoid any undesirable concentration of graduate study at a few institutions or in one section of the country. It is already far concentrated. This has meant nearly 300 graduate fellows have pursued their studies in Texas who might have been attracted to other States. It has been a great help in building Texas brainpower resources to match our natural resources.

A major purpose of the authors of the National Defense Education Act was to increase the knowledge of foreign languages to match our worldwide responsibilities and commerce. In 1958 there were only 46 modern "language laboratories" in U.S. public high schools. The year of the passage of National Defense Education Act was 1958. Five years ago there were only 40 modern language laboratories in U.S. public high schools. At the end of the 1963 fiscal year, there were some 6,000 such modern facilities for language instruction.

This is only one of many possible illustrations of why I say, with the possible exception of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862 or the G.I. Education Act at the end of World War II, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is the most far-reaching and beneficial educational proposal passed by a State legislature, by the Congress, or even by any colonial assembly, in the history of the American people.

In Texas, the foreign language program has had many beneficial results. In the field of foreign language laboratories in public high schools, electronic equipment is used to teach foreign languages. A junior high school in my city of Austin, Tex., teaching the German language, has not only the required electronic equipment, and the individual booths, in which the students can listen to their own voices and to the voices of others speaking German, without a teacher being present, but in addition there are also established foreign language libraries with books in German and in English. That is only one illustration.

Nearly 370 elementary and secondary school language teachers will have attended seven modern language institutes held at three Texas institutions by the end of the 1963–64 academic year. Over $530,000 has been obligated during the 5 years for this activity, including $112,686 for two institutes conducted during the summer of 1963, one at Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, and one at Texas Technological College, enrolling over 80.

Language and area centers: Three centers supporting studies of South Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America, have been established at the University of Texas, Austin. These centers offer instruction in seven languages, namely, Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, Hebrew, Persian, Hindi, and Telugu. A total of about $266,000 has been obligated for this program, of which $88,000 is for 1963–64 activity.

Some 85 fellowships have been awarded over the past 5 years for the study of languages of critical importance, at the University of Texas. Obligations for this program total about $263,000 over the 5 years, including $124,000 for 41 awards for study in 1963–64. The 1963–64 awards include 13 special postdoctoral fellowships for the study of Portuguese.

Language research and studies: Approximately $27,000 has been obligated for two language research projects in Texas. Contracts have been awarded to A. & M. College of Texas for the production of a Bengali-English, English-Bengali dictionary and to the University of Texas for the preparation of a college textbook of spoken Egyptian—Cairo—Arabic.

In addition, during the 5-year period, about $7.6 million in Federal funds has been paid to Texas on a 50–50 matching basis for strengthening instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in public elementary and high schools. Loans totaling approximately $63,000 have been made to private elementary and secondary schools.

Texas now employs seven supervisors in these subjects at the State agency level as contrasted with only four before the act was passed.

In guidance and testing, Federal grants to Texas totaling approximately $3 million for local guidance programs helped make possible an increase in the total of full-time school counselors. The number has risen from 800 in 1958, to an estimated 1,050 in 1963. During this same period, from 1959 through 1962, 2.8 million scholastic aptitude and achievement tests were given, with the help of Federal funds, to public secondary school students.

When the Texas picture is thus seen, one can realize what an impact the National Defense Education Act has had in the Nation as a whole. I regard this 3-year extension of the act as one of the most constructive steps that the Senate will take this year. Our action to better the educational system of the Nation goes to the root of wise action to improve the quality of American life. There is no sounder governmental program.

Extension of Public Laws 815 and 874, aid for schools in the federally impacted areas, is also of great importance to Texas. The 3-year extension of the program proposed by part C of H.R. 4955 will be of great benefit to school budget planning in the 249 Texas school districts which have been affected by Federal activities. This is a very equitable program which sends some $17 million yearly to Texas school districts to maintain a quality education program for the children of Federal employees.

I am very much pleased to see this bill before the Senate. I have mentioned 1 State; other Senators can speak of the other 49 States and discuss the impact of the proposed legislation over the Nation as a whole.

Vocational education is a field in which Congress wisely has been active for many years. However, it is time for us to turn our attention to revising the vocational educational program to meet the needs of modern business and industry. It is necessary to extend it into other fields. Part A of H.R. 4955 as passed by the House and modified by the Senate is a good step in this direction. We need to provide the funds by which students can be trained in the many new vocations that are created as new technologies spring up.

The bill as reported will provide an expanded educational program for high school students. It will also provide funds for vocational training for the high school dropout, and the post high school youth preparing to enter the labor market, as well as those who have entered the labor market but need further training to achieve job stability. An expansion of the vocational training program into other fields is urgently needed.

Special attention will be directed to youths having academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that impede their progress in regular vocational education programs. Recognition is given to the area vocational education schools, which are proving of increasing importance as the centers in which an area's needs for skilled technical workers can be supplied.

Texas has matched the existing Federal vocational education funds almost 10 to 1 with State and local funds.

I am glad to give these facts, because it is often said that some States do not do their part, but wait for the Federal Government to put up the money. This is not a correct statement. Federal funds are a stimulus; they provide the start. Once the program has been started, and the States and local school districts understand their value, the program multiplies, as is shown in my State of Texas, where State and the local districts are matching the Federal Government's contributions with their own funds in a ratio of 10 to 1.

In 1962, combined expenditures in Texas of over $24 million provided training for nearly 400,000 persons. As under the proposed bill the Texas entitlement would rise to $5.5 million, matching State and local funds in the same proportions would result a needed expansion of vocational training to provide my State with an adequate supply of workers with space age skills. All the aspects of this program, in its improved form, will be of great benefit to the economy of my State, to our people and our industry, and I urge its passage by the Senate.

My State is only a mirror of conditions as they exist in the 50 States, as shown by a recent survey of education, published in Parents magazine.

Mr. President, in recent years some attacks have been made on vocational agricultural training. It is said that because of the mechanization of agriculture, such training is no longer needed. Texas has some 300,000 farm families. In my opinion, vocational agricultural training is needed as badly now as it ever was. Agricultural training is now provided in the schools of many of the larger States of the South, the West, and the Midwest. Agriculture and business are lumped together and are called agrabusiness. Many persons trained in vocational agriculture enter programs related to agriculture, such as the chemistry of pesticides, insecticides, fertilizer, and the processing of agricultural products.

In Texas, of all the people who work in manufacturing industries, more work in agricultural manufacturing than in any other kind. They are engaged in the processing of food from the fields, of chickens and turkeys that come from the brooders, and of the beef produced on the ranges. Many persons receive vocational agricultural training and then go on to college, then into businesses related to agriculture.

I have before me a letter which illustrates this point. The letter is from John E. Hutchison, director, cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics, Texas A. & M. College System and U.S. Department of Agriculture Cooperating, College Station, Tex. The letter reads:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS, TEXAS A. & M. COLLEGE SYSTEM AND U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATING,
College Station, Tex., September 23, 1963.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I appreciated very much your letter of September 13 transmitting a copy of the Senate Appropriation Committee's report. This is indeed good news, and as I have discussed with you personally, the increase is badly needed to adjust salaries of Texas Agricultural Extension staff members. For example, during the biennium ending August 31, 1963, we lost 63 county agricultural agents and assistant county agricultural agents who left our service for positions in other agencies and industries which pay considerably higher salaries. I hope very much that the House will concur and adopt the Senate bill.

Your continued interest and assistance is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. HUTCHISON,
Director.

These county agricultural agents and assistant agents were trained in the vocational agricultural programs. There is a great demand for them in the agricultural industry and in the Government service. They will be found at all our embassies throughout the world.

The people of most of the countries of the world are hungry. Many of those countries could produce a food supply sufficient to keep their people from starving, if only they had the agricultural knowledge to do so.

Our trained agricultural personnel provide some of the least expensive assistance in our aid program, considering the service they render. It should be remembered that of the almost 3 billion people in the world, more than half go to bed hungry every night, get up hungry in the morning, and are hungry all day. They have not the ability to produce the quantity of food needed in their country that we have in ours. They do not have the agricultural know-how that this country has to produce the food necessary for their people.

We should not cripple this program at home, where there is an opportunity to produce so much with so few dollars.

The help given to children by this training is exemplified in the report entitled "Education for a Changing World of Work," a report of the panel of consultants on vocational education. This panel made a special report on whether agricultural vocational education was outmoded. The programs were being studied to see whether the money could better be spent in some other line of endeavor. I read two paragraphs from page 99 of the report:

High school graduates who have completed 3 or more years of vocational agriculture hold a significant economic advantange over farm-reared high school graduates who have not had such training. An Iowa study of 1943–54 graduates who were farming in 1955 showed that 89 percent of those with training in vocational agriculture were above hired-hand status, 57 percent farmed 161 acres or more, and vocational agriculture graduates realized in 1955 a mean of $7,720 in total gross sales from farming. Of the graduates who did not have vocational agriculture training, 79 percent were above hired-hand status, 48 percent farmed 161 acres or more, and all those with farms realized a mean of $5,788 in total gross products. Thus, vocational agriculture graduates realized an average of $1,932 more in 1955 than other graduates who worked on farms.

A study of the effectiveness of vocational agriculture was conducted in Mississippi in 1959 to find out what effect vocational education had, over a period of 30 or more years, on farming and on other aspects of the lives of the people in the community. Of the 1,090 farmers surveyed, 21 percent (232) had taken vocational agriculture in high school, 48 percent had participated in adult farmer classes, and 16 percent had received all day adult farmer instruction. Those who received organized instruction in vocational agriculture lived in better homes, achieved a higher rate of production, and participated in more community activities than others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain remarks by Dr. Miles Peterson, president of the American Vocational Association, and professor of the Agricultural Education Department of the University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn., beginning in volume 4, of the hearings, at page 2070. They show the great benefits received from the very few dollars invested in this program.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Permit me to review briefly the assistance to vocational programs in the several States presently provided under existing laws.

Under the Smith-Hughes (Public Law 347, 64th Cong.) and George-Barden (Public Law 586, 79th Cong.) Acts are provided total appropriations and authorizations of $57 million.

The total Federal assistance under Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts amounts to about: $3.5 million for distributive occupations; $8.9 million for home economics; $31 million for trade and industrial programs (includes $5 million for practical nurse training and $15 million under title VIII of NDEA for training highly-skilled technicians); and $13 million for agricultural education (the $13 million for agricultural education may be compared with the more than $70 million of Federal funds being made available annually to the Agricultural Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture).

Existing vocational education acts are just as sound today as they were when enacted into law. They should not be repealed or replaced. They have charted the way for more equitable educational opportunity and created a framework and foundation for the future.

Under existing legislation the States have built a system of teamwork and cooperation that has stood the test of time. Vocational educators have developed an esprit de corps and morale unmatched elsewhere in education. High standards of teacher education and certification requirements reflecting the essential specialized competence; State leadership through the establishment and support of supervisors in the various fields of services; travel and subsistence for teachers enabling them to more readily participate in professional improvement; stability and status in State departments of education—all these and other benefits to those dependent on vocational education of a high order have been made possible through congressional action.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement of Miss Catherine T. Dennis, State supervisor of home economics education, of the State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, N.C., beginning with the last paragraph on page 2126, volume 4, of the hearings on educational legislation, 1963, and continuing through the conclusion of her statement on page 2128. Her statement shows the need for vocational education in home economics.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MISS CATHERINE T. DENNIS, STATE SUPERVISOR OF HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION, STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, RALEIGH, N.C.

Mr. Chairman, I am Catherine T. Dennis, State supervisor of home economics education, Division of Vocational Education, State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, N.C. I represent the American Vocational Association and am speaking for the home economics membership of this association in behalf of Federal appropriations for vocational home economics.

We believe in the vocational education program and we believe in Federal support of it. Millions of American families have benefited by this program since its beginning under the Smith-Hughes and subsequent acts. We are indebted to the U.S. Congress for its vision in establishing and maintaining the home economics program through these acts and we sincerely urge you to continue the appropriation for it as a part of vocational education. With certain modifications in the wording of the existing and subsequent acts, further expansion in the education of youth, especially girls and women, for gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects will be possible.

A BRIEF OF JUSTIFICATION

The value of vocational home economics during the preceding years cannot be estimated in dollars. Statistics from the States, as compiled by the U.S. Office of Education for the year 1960–61, show an enrollment of 1,610,334 in vocational home economics programs, 629,225 being women and men enrolled in adult classes. In fact, 42 percent of the total enrollment in vocational education is in this field with the primary emphasis placed upon strengthening home and family living. The ultimate goal of women is marriage and motherhood. Never in the history of the United States have so many women married and at so early an age. One out of every two marriages is contracted by a girl under 20 years of age and one out of every three babies is born to a mother of this age group. Preparation for the most important goal of life can no longer be left to "learning at mother's knee," because mother is apt to be working away from the family 8 to 9 hours daily. Mobility will probably affect the lives of the young homemakers, forcing them to live far from parental guidance, so that decisions related to family life will have to be made in terms of previous training or lack of training. Home economics is the only subject in the high school program centered around the aspects of daily living. Values related to family living in a democratic society form the core of the program—the how and importance of child rearing, the strengths of the individual as developed through living in an atmosphere of love and consideration, the use of the economic resources of the family for satisfying shelter and surroundings, the wise consumption of income to meet individual needs, the well-being of each family as influenced by the emotional, physical, and spiritual surroundings so essential to individual security. Thousands of home economics teachers and families view this training as essential to the welfare of our Nation. If the funds are not continued, many schools will be without this program or the amount of instruction offered greatly curtailed. This curtailment will be largely in the innumerable small high schools where it is now the only vocational program offered to girls and adult women.

The Department of Labor recently stated that in 1960 there were 24.2 million women workers in the labor market. Of this number, only 5 percent were college graduates. During that same year, however, approximately 80,000 home economists, every one of whom held at least one college degree, were in the labor market. They are the teachers, extension agents, college professors, dietitians, nutritionists, research workers, specialists, and women economists in business. Research from many States prove that today's professional home economist was influenced during her high school experience, almost 100 percent, to enter this professional field. This is but another evidence of the importance of vocational home economics at the high school level in contributing to the educational leadership so greatly needed in our society.

The mores of this country have habituated us to the philosophy that a mother's place is in the home, while in actuality the pressures from the labor market for more workers, the less-than-average U.S. income for 50 percent of our families, and the desire on the part of families for more of the goods and services in an affluent society, indicate that more women will enter the labor market and remain in it for a longer period of time. The reports from the National Manpower Council in 1951 and 1960 concur with the need for women workers. "Women constitute not only an essential but also a distinctive part of our manpower resources. They are essential because without their presence in the labor force we could neither produce and distribute the goods nor provide the educational, health, and other social services which characterize American society. They constitute a distinctive manpower resource because the structure and the substance of the lives of most women are fundamentally determined by their functions as wives, mothers, and homemakers."

THE EXPANDING CONTRIBUTION OF VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS

With some modification in the wording of the existing acts and any subsequent act, the program can be greatly expanded to include training for competency in wage-earning occupations.

Many occupations fall within the purview of the skills and knowledge of home economics. These occupations have increasing significance in view of many changes that are taking place in homes and communities and particularly because of the increasing numbers of women who find it necessary to become wage earners.

According to information from leading U.S. economists, the greatest expansion in growth of our economy lies in the areas of distribution and service. "The Occupational Outlook Handbook" states that the service industry will grow faster than any other in spite of mechanization and automation. These are tasks which machines cannot do. In 1961 "service" expenditures constituted 42 percent of the total consumer outlay. Many of these services are jobs that serve families and homes. It is in this last category that home economics will be able to make a great contribution in training for expanding fields of employment. Service occupations which use home economics knowledge and skills include those that have both a community and home focus. Included in these occupations are such positions as household managers, homemaker assistants, food service managers, caterers, lunchroom managers, lunchroom workers, dressmakers and home tailors, alterers, hospital aids, hotel housekeepers, hospital housekeepers, child care personnel, cooks and chefs, and personnel for services to the aged.

If history is to serve as a guide, we must conclude that man rarely becomes aware of significant trends until they overwhelm him. This is perhaps the state in which we find ourselves today, but if the Congress will continue the home economics appropriation, leave the responsibility of allocation to the State boards of education approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, we can and will expand the vocational home economics program to meet the challenge of our changing society.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, from the Senate committee's report on the bill, report No. 553, certain paragraphs on page 10.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 553) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946 (GEORGE-BARDEN) AND SMITH-HUGHES ACT

Both versions would continue these acts but with the following modifications to freely permit interchange of funds between all the existing categories and from the existing programs to the new program, and to broaden the occupations and groups for whom training can be provided under the principal George-Barden and Smith-Hughes categories. Thus—

1. Any State would be permitted to combine any portion of any of its allotments under existing laws with any other allotments under these laws, as well as with its above-described allotment under the new law.
2. Any State could use funds earmarked for vocational education in agriculture for any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, such as forestry, soil conservation, landscaping, horticulture, etc., whether or not involving work on the farm or work projects involving practice on a farm.
3. Home economics funds (now limited to training for work in the home) could be used for vocational education in any gainful occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects, such as home companions for aged and disabled, day care center workers, nursing home assistants, hotel and motel housekeepers, home cleaning services, etc. Beginning with fiscal 1966, at least 25 percent of these funds must be used for training for gainful occupations in the House but not the Senate version.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, home economics education now is limited to training for work in the home. However, under a broadened program of home economics education, it would be possible to provide vocational education in many gainful occupations and in connection with many allied subjects, such as training to be companions in the homes for the aged and the disabled; training for work in day care centers; training for work as nursing home assistants; training for work as hotel and motel housekeepers; training for work in connection with housecleaning services; and so forth. But beginning with the fiscal year 1968, under the House version, at least 25 percent of these funds must be used for training in gainful occupations. In other words, at least 25 percent of the home economics funds would then have to be used to train for work in nurseries, motels, homes for the aged, and similar work. Such a provision does not appear in the Senate version of the bill, because it is clear that training in basic home economics is definitely needed.

Furthermore, as has been pointed out, many of those who take home economics training are qualified, at the end of their schooling, to be hired as schoolteachers, as day care center workers, or as dietitians. Therefore, and particularly in view of the population explosion, an arbitrary requirement that those trained under this home economics program be trained only for gainful occupations would be a backward step, because it is clear that an expansion of the homemaking program, as well as in these areas, is needed.

The Senate committee version eliminates the House provision that at least 25 percent of the funds for home economics training must be used to train for employment in gainful occupations outside the home. The Senate version would leave that matter optional with the States, while the House version would arbitrarily impose the "at least 25-percent provision" on the States. The House provision would constitute Federal interference, at least to some extent.

We believe that each State should be allowed to decide for itself what part of the funds should be used for training in basic home economics and what part should be used for training in gainful occupations.

In short, Mr. President, we believe that the State authorities, knowing their own conditions in their own States, should have the power to decide what portion of these funds should be used, under their own State laws, for training in home economics for the home and what portion for training in gainful occupations outside the home. That power is given the States under the Senate version.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

Institution	Funds received fiscal year—						
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	Total
Texas	$1, 722, 486	$1, 897, 142	$2, 824, 936	$3, 850, 428	$4, 641, 512	$5, 338, 383	$20, 274, 887
Abilene Christian College, Abilene	85, 925	55, 397	112, 014	182, 700	189, 350	234, 850	860, 236
Amarillo College, Amarillo [1]	1, 506						1, 506
Arlington State College, Arlington	5, 639	24, 374	58, 500	35, 333	59, 559	58, 405	241, 810
Austin College, Sherman				28, 800	36, 814	52, 631	118, 245
Baylor University, Waco	78, 315	172, 152	250, 000	250, 000	250, 000	250, 000	1, 250, 467
Bishop College, Dallas	19, 476	22, 350	36, 000	100, 510	134, 187	217, 811	530, 334
Blinn College, Brenham				24, 681	24, 741	23, 568	72, 990
Butler College, Tyler			8, 100	6, 827	10, 327	13, 451	38, 705
Cisco Junior College, Cisco	9, 097	6, 169		5, 389	14, 835	13, 613	49, 103
Clarendon Junior College, Clarendon					13, 500		13, 500
Del Mar College, Corpus Christi	20, 622				6, 950	15, 223	42, 795
East Texas Baptist College, Marshall	21, 544	25, 000	33, 750	44, 213	45, 377	55, 709	225, 593
East Texas State College, Commerce			43, 200	53, 943	60, 934	64, 946	223, 023
Fort Worth Chrisitan College, Fort Worth						21, 508	21, 508
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene	50, 116	77, 520	126, 000	172, 283	204, 300	219, 569	849, 788
Henderson County Junior College, Athens	18, 070	9, 578	9, 900	21, 398	22, 267	30, 300	111, 513
Hill Junior College, Hillsboro						6, 431	6, 431
Howard County Junior College, Big Spring		8, 750	9, 499	3, 730	5, 006	5, 601	32, 586
Howard Payne College, Brownwood	44, 327	42, 550	67, 500	90, 676	103, 500	114, 175	462, 728
Huston-Tillotson College, Austin	16, 374	8, 077	8, 676	38. 631	53, 576	67, 627	192, 961
Incarnate Word College, San Antonio			45, 000	58, 430	75, 254	78, 114	256, 798
Jacksonville College, Jacksonville	4, 193	4, 130	10, 116	9. 263	13, 714	10, 539	51. 955
Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins	9, 097	13, 793	31, 500	107, 640	224, 280	241, 195	627, 505
Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont	18, 796	38, 165	75, 600	86, 400	83, 700	92, 860	395, 521
Lee College, Baytown	15, 663	8, 677	10, 420	10, 839	24, 559	9, 208	79, 366
Le Tourneau College, Longview					13, 500	23, 421	36, 921
Lon Morris College, Jacksonville	11, 040	9, 625	14, 566	16, 196	18, 186	14, 052	83, 665
Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock				36, 381	38, 365	56, 209	130, 955
Mary Allen College, Crockett	3, 722	2, 512	2, 200	2, 204			10, 638
Mary Hardin-Baylor College, Belton	13, 317	18, 700	27, 000	35, 285	38, 295	57, 307	189, 904
McMurray College, Abilene	25, 373	27, 720	57, 375	66, 150	22, 270	72, 018	270, 906
Midwestern University, Wichita Falls	7, 518	14, 400	23, 760	27, 000	27, 879	30, 125	130, 682
Navarro Junior College, Corsicana	10, 802				13, 161	7, 904	31, 867
North Texas State University, Denton	156, 628	128, 003	28, 683	80, 883	63, 900	43, 914	502, 011
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio	17, 987	18, 635	32, 400	61, 065	66, 253	81, 679	278, 019
Pan American College, Edinburg	8, 677	14, 977	18, 180	31, 929	40, 484	30, 103	144, 350
Paris Junior College, Paris	10, 024	720	10, 610	12, 627	5, 420		39, 401
Paul Quinn College, Waco	12, 415	2, 250	18, 000	26, 933	19, 861	23, 356	102, 815
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Parairie View	15, 663	26, 433	42, 435	53, 249	52, 303	44, 017	234, 100
Ranger Junior College, Ranger	13, 398	10, 970	3, 795	8, 180	21, 763	22, 291	80, 397
Rice University, Houston					100, 800	100, 299	201, 099
Sacred Heart Dominican College, Houston	10, 379	9, 900	13, 680	20, 823	17, 586	24. 553	96, 921
St. Edward's University, Austin	14, 059	10, 800	9, 900	27, 450	30, 558	33, 989	126, 756
St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio	28, 757	45, 900	80, 325	55, 350	102, 060	109, 345	421, 737
Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville			85, 050	101, 832	121, 306	167, 179	475, 367
San Angelo College, San Angelo	12, 530	2, 991	14, 961	20, 408	14, 833	16, 159	81, 882
San Antonio College, San Antonio	38, 855			5, 400	15, 147	19, 498	78, 900
San Jacinto Junior College, Pasadena					12, 000	6, 886	18, 886
South Plains College, Levelland	7, 319	7, 542	29, 001	39, 686	42, 515	43, 562	169, 625
Southern Methodist University, Dallas	92, 512	63, 734	86, 796	124, 020	150, 397	177, 111	694, 570
Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos			34, 650	37, 464	58, 751	59, 288	190, 153
Southwestern Assemblies of God College, Waxahachie		7, 200	7, 200	12, 990	10, 411	12, 735	50, 536
Southwestern Union College, Keene						5, 855	5, 855
Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches			36, 000	41, 400	38, 250	40, 401	156, 051
Sul Ross State College, Alpine			27, 216	31, 298	37, 715	39, 511	135, 740
Tarleton State College, Stephenville	5, 639	8, 056	15, 000	24, 185	36, 211	43, 035	132, 126
Texarkana College, Texarkana	10, 176		8, 100	14, 760	16, 643	17, 429	67, 108
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University, College Station	93, 977	90, 611	108, 000	108, 000	115, 200	151, 286	667, 074
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth	144, 027	84, 078	85, 500	72, 900	157, 379	149, 306	693, 190
Texas College, Tyler	16, 334	22, 345	31, 500	46, 112	96, 811	106, 177	319, 279
Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville	45, 100	25, 785	45, 900	48, 150	39, 295	54, 453	258, 692
Texas Lutheran College, Seguin		11, 700	11, 700	23, 400	25, 235	29, 422	101, 457
Texas Southern University, Houston		22, 500	32, 175	45, 000	24, 886	74, 521	199, 082
Texas Southmost College, Brownsville	5, 242		1, 440	2, 498	4, 298	4, 532	18, 010
Texas Technological College, Lubbock	43, 855	135, 000	99, 479	47, 250	98, 646	150, 184	574, 414
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth	29, 760	36, 925	21, 294	58, 379	13, 364	36, 273	195, 995
Texas Western College, El Paso	16, 352	16, 240	40, 500	50, 580	48, 460	60, 503	232, 635
Texas Women's University, Denton	34, 458	72, 124	31, 021	110, 659	131, 324	121, 202	500. 788
Trinity University, San Antonio	39, 158	30, 926	38, 360	88, 088	89, 183	126, 398	412, 113
Tyler Junior College, Tyler		8, 214					8, 214
University of Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi	22, 103	19, 920	42, 000	64, 450	68, 162	96, 178	312, 813
University of Dallas, Dallas	10. 089	14, 416	30, 800	45, 902	70, 508	81, 846	253, 561
University of Houston, Houston	93, 977	147, 738	250, 000	250, 000	250, 000	250, 000	1, 241, 715
University of St. Thomas, Houston	9, 397	7, 380	9, 450	14, 400	15, 123	16, 182	71, 932
University of Texas:							
Austin	124, 400	147, 579	193, 310	250, 000	249, 975	243, 966	1, 209, 230
Dental branch, Houston	6, 400	7, 500	6, 986	16, 908	17, 929	18, 122	73, 845
Medical branch, Galveston	15, 900	12, 321	40, 500	45, 225	43, 457	57, 121	214, 524
Southwestern Medical School, Dallas	3, 100	7, 200	7, 965	10, 800	11, 785	14, 931	55, 781
Wayland Baptist College, Plainview				15, 939	17, 253	20, 639	53, 831
Wharton County Junior College, Wharton	2, 664						2, 664
Wiley College, Marshall	20, 634	28, 890	34, 398	88, 954	149, 686	154, 576	477, 138

[1] Withdrawn from program but retained funds representing loans made.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On pages 25 and 26, it is proposed to strike out all of section 2, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $45,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $90,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $135,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter $180,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

On page 32, beginning in line 1, strike out everything down through line 20, as follows:

(d) For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, there are also authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and such sums as the Congress may determine for each of the next four fiscal years, for grants by the Commissioner to State boards, to colleges and universities, and to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In making such grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed and shall seek to attain, as nearly as practicable in the light of the purposes of this subsection, an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

On page 51, beginning on line 1 strike out all of section 13, as follows:

WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION STUDENTS

SEC. 13. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next four fiscal years such sums as may be necessary, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this section.

(b)(1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated under subsection (a) for such year as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all the States in such preceding year.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under subsection (c) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly realloted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

(c) To be eligible to participate in this section, a State must have in effect a plan approved under section 5 and must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a supplement to such plan (hereinafter referred to as a "supplementary plan"), in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the supplementary plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (b) will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of subsection (d), except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, may be used to pay the cost of developing the State's supplementary plan and the cost of administering such supplementary plan after its approval under this section;

(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give preference to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this section;

(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(d) For the purposes of this section, a work-study program shall—

(1) be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency for vocational education programs assisted under the preceding sections of this part, or in the case of a student already enrolled in such a program, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (B) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program, and (C) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in his vocational education program while employed under the work-study program;

(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, or for compensation which exceeds $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year or its equivalent, unless the student is attending a school which is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home, in which case his compensation may not exceed $60 in any month or $500 in any academic year or its equivalent;

(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this section) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this section) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this section is approved.

(e) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 5 (pertaining to the approval of State plans, the withholding of Federal payments in case of nonconformity after approval, and judicial review of the Commissioner's final actions in disapproving a State plan or withholding payments) shall be applicable to the Commissioner's actions with respect to supplementary plans under this section.

(f) From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (b) for such fiscal year.

(g) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under subsection (b).

(h) Students employed in work-study programs under this section shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall not be long in explaining my amendment.

The purpose of my amendment is to substitute the money authorization of H.R. 4955, as passed by the House, for the amount provided by the Senate committee approved bill. As passed by the House, H.R. 4955 would have authorized a total of $630 million for the first 5 years for grants to States for strengthening and expanding vocational education. In contrast, H.R. 4955 as approved by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee would authorize grants amounting to $945 million for the first 5 years. In addition, $180 million would be allowed for the construction of residential vocational schools, not provided for in the House version. A work study program not authorized by the House version would add $310 million to the cost.

My amendment would strike out the language that would provide for the work study program. It is not what one would think from reading its title. It would enable a young man or student to work, and to be paid for his work, and at the same time to study. In all, the Senate committee version would cost $1,435 million, as compared to the House version cost of $630 million, a more than 100-percent increase in the amount approved by the House.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that I do not oppose vocational training. I believe the program, ever since its inception in 1917, has been one of the better programs engaged in by the Federal Government. It has been operated in an orderly fashion. It has not involved the expenditure of overly large sums by the Federal Government; and I believe that, on the whole, the States have done an exceedingly good job in managing the programs.

My whole objection to the bill as it now stands is that it would be much too costly; it would cost too much money. No need has actually been shown for this great increase—which is 15 times greater, I may say, than what the President originally asked for, early this year, in his first message to Congress on this subject. In short, there is no demonstrable need for this costly addition. On January 29 of this year, President Kennedy submitted to Congress a proposed program for education to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunity in the Nation.

Accompanying this Presidential request was a draft bill providing for $5.3 billion in Federal funds to carry out the program. The President's education message, a document of 13 pages, contained a mere 4 paragraphs devoted to vocational and special education. And title V of S. 580—introduced on behalf of the administration—authorized an additional $23 million a year for 4 years for an expanded vocational education program.

So what we are talking about at the outset this year in the President's first proposals is a $92 million 4-year program.

Less than 5 months later, President Kennedy sent still another message to the Congress, this time dealing with the subject of civil rights. Included in the requests contained in this message were proposals for greatly increasing vocational education funds authorized in the administration's education bill, S. 580, and provision for a work-study program for youth of high school age. Thereupon, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, offered an amendment in the Senate to S. 580, carrying out the Presidential requests on vocational education contained in the civil rights message. In the interim, the House had passed a vocational education bill, H.R. 4955, which increased the authorization requested by the President. The committee, during the consideration of the House-passed bill, struck out the House language and substituted for it the Morse amendment.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that in the President's message to the Congress on civil rights he devoted very little attention to this field. In this field—the President's civil rights program—I find myself in agreement. I should like to be able to vote for a program that was not so costly as to be out of all consideration, and one which would provide more vocational education, not merely for Negroes alone, but for all people in our country who have to acquire greater skill. One of the deficiencies in our educational system today is that across the country we have dropped the manual training type or the industrial type of high school—the high schools that I knew as a boy. The school dropout rate was higher than it is today. A young man could take many types of manual training or vocational training to acquire a skill.

In no way wishing to call it to anyone's attention, my brother and I gave to the high school system a farm which we owned near Phoenix, Ariz., so that an agricultural school could be started at the high school level. It has been very successful. It is the type of education which I think we should be stressing as much, if not more, than so-called higher education, because many young men know, when they enter high school, that they will not finish. Many girls know they will not finish. So why fill their minds with information that they will not be able to use profitably as they find themselves searching for jobs?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to be interrupted?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that the amount recommended by the President in his original message was $92 million for a 4-year period, and that the House bill, which is now being considered, provided for $630 million for a 5-year period?

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill that is now before the Senate is for a 5-year period and would cost $1,400 million, as opposed to a cost of $630 million over a 5-year period as provided in the bill passed by the House. Are those figures correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What additional objectives are in the bill that has been reported by the Senate committee as opposed to the House bill? Does the House bill provide for all the requests of the President? I understand that my question is double-barreled.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to read the specific requests of the President, which I believe will answer the second part of the Senator's question. Then I will answer the first part of the question, because it will tie in better that way. After reciting the need, the President went to two specifics. He said:

> (C) That the pending vocational education amendments, which would greatly update and expand this program of teaching job skills to those in school, be strengthened by the appropriation of additional funds, with some of the added money earmarked for those areas with a high incidence of school dropouts and youth unemployment, and by the addition of a new program of demonstration youth training projects to be conducted in these areas;

In the next paragraph he said:

> (D) That the vocational education program be further amended to provide a work-study program for youth of high school age, with Federal funds helping their school or other local public agency employ them part time in order to enable and encourage them to complete their training;

That is the answer to the Senator's specific question as to what the President requested. That is the extent of his request.

In the House bill no mention was made of the grants for residential vocational schools or grants for work study. The Senate inserted both those provisions. The residential vocational school program in a 5-year stretchout would cost $180 million. The grants for work study in a 5-year stretchout would cost $310 million. In my amendment, both of those provisions would be stricken. My amendment would restore to the bill the amounts authorized by the House bill, and would not include the language proposed by the committee. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe it does. In other words, in the Senate bill are two additional recommendations that were not contained in either the House bill or the President's message.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. I do not wish to leave that impression, because the President asked that there be a work study program. But I can find nothing in his message to indicate that he asked for residential vocational schools to be authorized. That provision was put in by the Senate committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A residential vocational school is a school in which a person will reside and learn a trade?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It could be interpreted in that way. It could also be a boarding type of school. The school could be built in a person's home. The teaching would be done there and the student would live there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the issue before the Senate at the present time between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Arizona is whether or not the Senate should include those two additional objectives.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is a part of the difference. The rest of the difference lies in the fact that, in my opinion, the cost is too high. In my mind, the greatly increased cost cannot be justified. The House authorized the sum of $630 million. I believe that amount goes far beyond what is needed.

The President asked for a 4-year program, which would cost $92 million in 4 years. That was 5 months before he sent forward his civil rights message, in which he suggested that some of the things provided for in the Senate bill be done. There has been no justification on either the President's part or the committee's part, for going even as high as $630 million. In my judgment $450 to $480 million could probably be justified. But $630 million is what the House provided. I would be perfectly willing to accept those figures, but I naturally would prefer that the President either be specific in his requests for funds or ask us for a lesser amount to start with.

I shall not take the trouble to read the President's message on civil rights, but in my mind he has pointed out very well and very completely the problem with respect to both white people and Negroes who have not had an opportunity to be educated properly. Let us call them Americans. They are unfortunate Americans who, either by their own choice or through other circumstances, have not received proper schooling.

I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the President's message on civil rights entitled section III(2) be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> (2) More education and training to raise the level of skills: A distressing number of unemployed Negroes are illiterate and unskilled, refugees from farm automation, unable to do simple computations or even to read a help-wanted advertisement. Too many are equipped to work only in those occupations where technology and other changes have reduced the need for manpower—as farm labor or manual labor, in mining or construction. Too many have attended segregated schools that were so lacking to adequate funds and faculty as to be unable to produce qualified job applicants. And too many who have attended nonsegregated schools dropped out for lack of incentive, guidance, or progress. The unemployment rate for those adults with less than 5 years of schooling is around 10 percent; it has consistently been double the prevailing rate for high school graduates; and studies of public welfare recipients show a shockingly high proportion of parents with less than a primary school education.
>
> Although the proportion of Negroes without adequate education and training is far higher than the proportion of whites, none of these problems is restricted to Negroes alone. This Nation is in critical need of a massive upgrading in its education and training effort for all citizens. In an age of rapidly changing technology, that effort today is failing millions of our youth. It is especially failing Negro youth in segregated schools and crowded slums. If we are ever to lift them from the morass of social and economic degradation, it will be through the strengthening of our education and training services—by improving the quality of instruction; by enabling our schools to cope with rapidly expanding enrollments; and by increasing opportunities and incentives for all individuals to complete their education and to continue their self-development during adulthood.
>
> I have therefore requested of the Congress and request again today the enactment of legislation to assist education at every level from grade school through graduate school.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as I mentioned earlier, in contrast to the President's initial request of $92 million over a 4-year period for an expanded vocational education program and the increased figure approved by the House, H.R. 4955 as amended by the Morse amendment, embodying the President's latest request, will cost the taxpayers of this country a staggering $1,435 million in the first 5 years alone.

Such a fantastic increase in proposed expenditures, more than 15 times the amount originally requested, would, of necessity, have to be justified by a radical change in the factors and circumstances giving rise to the vocational education proposals of January 29. But the civil rights message of June 19 offers no proof of such change to warrant the Congress enacting a program which eventually will cost billions of dollars and add still another burden to our already colossal Federal debt.

The civil rights message speaks of the high rate of unemployment among our young people due to the declining demand for unskilled workers and to the continuing problem of high school dropouts. Granted that these two factors offer sufficient incentive to upgrade and expand our vocational education programs throughout the country, there has been no dramatic change in either school dropouts or youth unemployment since the beginning of this year which should compel the Congress to accede to the President's excessive fiscal demands—and what I consider to be the excessive fiscal demands of the House, and certainly the overly excessive demands of the Senate committee.

To sum this up, for nearly 3 years the administration has talked economy and practiced extravagance. Each year of the present administration has been a rise in expenditures and a consequent mounting of Federal deficits. By the end of fiscal 1965, it is estimated, its financial policies will have added approximately $25 billion to the Government's spending level and $35 billion to the public debt.

The New York Times of Sunday, September 29, 1963, contains a very informative article concerning the debate on the tax bill in the House of Representatives. Stating that the close vote on rejection of the Republican proviso to make tax relief contingent on a reduction of budgeted Federal expenditures reflects the mood of the Congress to check the trend to increase expenditures, the writer further points out that in order to win the House battle on the tax bill, President Kennedy promised to maintain "an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need."

We stand ready to take the President at his word and offer him every possible assistance in pulling in the reins on galloping Federal expenditures. We believe that the President can begin at once to carry out his promise to cut down on unnecessary Federal programs by instructing his supporters in the Senate to abandon the committee-approved bill and reinstate his original vocational education proposal.

I am willing to go a step further and suggest that the House language be accepted, which would provide $630 million. I believe that is more than adequate to meet the problem. It is presumptuous for anybody to so state, but I believe this amount would be a little difficult of expenditure even by such experts as there are in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is more than six times what the President originally asked. The Senate version would provide 15 times the amount the President originally requested. I do not believe the problem is 6 times greater or 15 times greater. If it is greater at all, it is greater by a small percentage point.

I cannot recall any testimony in my experience on the subcommittee to indicate that any American has been denied vocational training. There may be cases which have not come to my attention.

I do not wish to belabor the Senate on this point at any greater length. I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment, if a sufficient number of Senators are present to order it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a breakdown of the expenditures as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 4955 as reported by Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee

[By fiscal years]

Sec. 2—Grants to the States for vocational education:	
1965	$108,000,000
1964	153,000,000
1966	198,000,000
1967	243,000,000
1968	243,000,000
Permanent program with annual authorization of $243,000,000; 1st 5 years	945,000,000
Sec. 4(c)—Grants for construction of vocational schools (residential):	
1964	15,000,000
1965 (estimate)	75,000,000
1966 (estimate)	30,000,000
1967 (estimate)	30,000,000
1968 (estimate)	30,000,000
Open-end appropriation 1st year, 5-year program	180,000,000
Sec. 13—Grants for work study; programs for vocational education students:	
1964	50,000,000
1965 (estimate)	60,000,000
1966 (estimate)	60,000,000
1967 (estimate)	65,000,000
1968 (estimate)	75,000,000
Open-end appropriation after 1st year, 5-year program	310,000,000
Total cost of vocational education program for 1st 5 years	1,435,000,000
Sec. 22(a) title II—Student loan program, National Defense Education Act:	
1964	35,000,000
1965	45,000,000
1966	55,000,000
1967	60,000,000
4-year program	195,000,000
Sec. 25(a) title V—Guidance counseling and testing, National Defense Education Act:	
1964	2,500,000
1965	2,500,000
1966	2,500,000
1967	2,500,000
4-year program	10,000,000
Total cost H.R. 4955:	
Vocational education	1,435,000,000
National Defense Education Act amendments	205,000,000
Total	1,640,000,000

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to urge the Senate to reject the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

This entire problem was considered quite thoroughly in committee; and the committee, by an overwhelming vote, reported the pending bill to the Senate. I make these comments for the RECORD in opposition to the Senator's amendment.

INCREASED FUNDS FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The President's June 19 message on equal employment opportunities and the accompanying legislative program gave particular note to the impact of the proposed educational program upon our No. 1 domestic problem—equal rights and equal opportunities for all our citizens. As the President pointed out, the enjoyment of civil rights is largely a function of employment opportunities while the availability of employment opportunities is largely a function of educational attainment:

> There is little value in a Negro's obtaining the right to be admitted to hotels and restaurants if he has no cash in his pocket and no job.

The exceedingly high rates of Negro unemployment—more than twice that of white workers—cannot be substantially reduced until Negro educational opportunities are massively expanded and Negro manpower skills are drastically upgraded to meet modern technological requirements.

As the President said:

> Although the proportion of Negroes without adequate education and training is far higher than the proportion of whites, none of these problems is restricted to Negroes alone.

I stress that, because in my judgment, an attempt will be made to overemphasize the fact that this will provide equal employment opportunities. I favor that. The point to remember is that many thousands of white youths in this country are becoming unemployable—not unemployed, but unemployable—because until they are trained or retrained, or until they can have the benefits of vocational programs which we are stressing, they cannot hold down jobs. No one will hire them. That is one of the results of the great problem of automation. From time to time in the Senate we hear a great deal about automation. The committee is striking a blow against the bad social effects of automation by the proposal for vocational training this afternoon.

I continue with the quotation from the President:

> This Nation is in critical need of a massive upgrading in its education and training effort for all citizens. In an age of rapidly changing technology, that effort is failing millions of our youth.

The Commissioner of Education has focused attention on the need for greatly increased expenditures with the following description:

> Under present trends some 30 to 40 percent of the youngsters now in the fifth grade will probably not be graduated from high school unless we undertake vigorous reforms. They will go to work—or vainly look for work—without a high school diploma. They should have the opportunity, during their too brief period of schooling, to acquire at least the rudiments of some skill or trade. This applies also to most of the other 60 percent who, we now estimate, will complete high school only. About half of these boys and girls will go to work or keep house, or both, after graduation. The others will enter college or some posthigh school educational institution, but less than half will acquire a college degree. To put it another way, less than 20 percent of today's fifth graders will become college graduates—the physicians, scientists, lawyers, and teachers of tomorrow. A large number of those who do not complete college will join our nonprofessional working population—in business, in the trades, in industry, in the service occupations and on the farms. Their schooling should prepare them to start their working life.

The training to be supported under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 would be focused upon the needs of high school students, persons who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, adults now employed but in need of upgrading in their skills or of learning new skills, and young men and women with special educational handicaps. The proposal also calls for the construction and equipping of urgently required area vocational education school facilities and for increased emphasis on services to improve the quality of vocational education programs, including inservice teacher training, teacher supervision, program evaluation, demonstration, development of instructional materials and administration.

Let me point out that an unemployed person does not pay taxes. I want to rest the proposal of the committee on a hard, cold, economic foundation. The bill being considered this afternoon is, in a very real sense, a loan bill. It is, in a very real sense, a loan by the taxpayers of the United States to the young people of this country dropping out of schools, those who have given up their formal education, those who are out looking for jobs without the skills to obtain jobs.

This expenditure will pay for itself over and over again, as the years go by, in the form of increased taxes the recipients will be able to pay, which they could not possibly have paid if they had been unemployable or had been able to work at the menial jobs at the salaries they would have been paid if they had not had the advantages of the provisions of this bill.

I urge passage of the bill on that basis.

Estimated expenditures for all of public elementary and secondary education by all levels of government in 1962–63 were $19.5 billion. Of that total, approximately $300 million or 1½ percent were expended in federally supported vocational education programs. Present Federal expenditures for vocational education are $57 million per year. The proposed increase of $108 million—rather than $45 million as in the proposed amendment—while desperately needed to provide additional programs and facilities would advance the share of total expenditures devoted to federally supported vocational education to approximately 2 percent.

Surely, this is a modest proposal, considering that 8 of 10 youngsters stop their education before graduation from college, many being totally reliant on vocational training for their occupational future.

WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

The amendment of the senior Senator from Arizona would also kill two proposed new programs in vocational education, two programs which hold considerable promise of coping with the national tragedies of school dropout and youth unemployment. To accept this amendment is to accept the shortsighted view that funds not spent today are funds saved. Actually, what the proposed amendment would do is to cut off an experimental approach to solving the scandalous and costly national problems of school dropouts and youth unemployment, problems which would be met, in part, by the new vocational education bill.

When the President asked on June 19 for increased opportunities for all of our citizens to achieve the educational excellence required if they are to achieve and maintain stable employment, he also asked for a work-study program for high school age students enrolled in full-time vocational education programs. He wished the country to encourage and assist its youths who might otherwise drop out of school so that these youths might continue their education and equip themselves for gainful employment.

Thus, H.R. 4955 proposes a 5-year demonstration program, authorizing the modest sum of $50 million in fiscal year 1964, to enable the States to assist local educational agencies to give part-time employment opportunities to vocational education students in need of such employment if they are to continue with their studies. The proposed program would provide employment of not more than 15 hours a week, in public schools or other public agencies. Monthly earnings would not exceed $45 nor annual earnings of $350 unless the student attended a school away from his home, in which case the limits would be raised to $60 per month and $500 per academic year. In other words, adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona would mean that at least 14,000 students would be denied the opportunity to continue their vocational education studies in the coming school year just at a time in history when we have almost a million school dropouts each year, just at a time in history when it is coming to be recognized that education is not an expenditure but the only true investment the Nation can make if it is to have national security, full employment and, hence, continuing economic health. The amendment, in short, is not really economical at all, but actually is careless of our national resources and thoughtless of our national future and the future of our young people.

Another effect of the proposed amendment is to do away with the $15 million which the President has proposed be invested to determine the feasibility of coping with the problems of school dropout and youth unemployment through the establishment of pilot residential schools providing vocational education to youths of high school age who could benefit from full-time study on a residential basis. In establishing these schools, special consideration would be given to the needs of large urban areas where there are substantial numbers of young people who have dropped out of high school and who are, consequently, unemployed.

The success of any educational program is largely dependent upon factors other than the quality of formal instruction itself. The environment in which the school is located, the cleanliness, the attractiveness, the safety of passage through the neighborhood—all strongly influence the student's desire to attend school, his respect for education, and his willingness to accept the goals and purposes for which the school exists. The pressures on the student against educational achievements—scorn for schools among his neighborhood gang, hunger from inadequate diet, hostility or lack of concern for study at home, necessity of earning subsistence—these and other basic factors may so detract from any attempts at education that successful formal schooling is impossible.

The proposal for a 5-year program demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of the residential vocational education school is an important approach to solving these problems. Under this program, residential schools could be constructed, equipped, and operated so as to provide education in an atmosphere conducive to constructive learning with absence of such personal pressures as would detract from concentration and incentive in the home environment. The program is directed at, but not limited to, youth in large urban areas who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

In conclusion, I think the country can afford the experimental approach invested in this proposal for residential vocational schools. It can afford the President's modest suggestion of a work-study program and it can afford the level of appropriation in grants to States authorized by H.R. 4955. What the Nation cannot afford is the posture of economizing which, in reality, spells inadequate investment for the growing vocational needs of a growing people.

Let me summarize very quickly. This is the expanded program that was made available after the House committee ordered reported the bill H.R. 4955. In my judgment there are many Members of the House who want the bill as we reported it because they want the expanded program that has been developed. They want it, not only as a result of the June 19 message the President sent to the Congress in regard to this program, but also, I would hope, as a result of hearings we conducted on June 25 and the expert testimony and evidence that was then put into our hearings.

I am asking for a frontal attack on the social problems of automation, which are the No. 1 domestic economic issue facing the country. If we do not do something about the economic disjointures being caused by automation, in the not too distant future we shall find ourselves with a serious unemployment crisis. To prevent it, we must train people so that they can hold jobs.

Mr. President, in conclusion I think it is interesting to take a look at the statement of the Senate Republican Policy Committee under date of March 4, 1963, on the subject of "The Forgotten Youth."

In that statement the Senate Republican policy committee assessed the need for greater attention to problems of vocational education. Commenting on the Federal role, the committee paper referred to the President's Panel of consultants on Vocational Education. I quote from their statement:

> The experts (panel) agreed there is a deep-seated need for added vocational and technical courses and that the need will increase during the years ahead. They recommended an immediate start and set a price tag of $400 million.
>
> Yet, in its school message the administration came up with the figure of $73 million.

That was the first message I delivered last January.

Continuing with the quotation:

> A study of the complex problems facing young people today—and the society into which they must fit—indicates that perhaps the experts, not the administration, were on the right track.

The experts were right, and the administration was wrong in the first instance. When it took a second look at the problem in June of 1963, it sent the second message. The Senator from Arizona is correct. I used that as the basis for part A of the bill. It was presented to the committee. Hearings were held on it, and the committee, by a huge vote, recommended it to the Senate. This is a sound bill on vocational education. I urge its passage.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I think I made my position very clear on this point during my earlier recitation. I subscribe to the position of the Republican Policy Committee which the Senator from Oregon read. I think the figures I used, of between $450 million and $480 million, would be more in keeping with the need than $630 million. However, I am perfectly willing, in my amendment, to go to $630 million.

I said before that when the President first submitted his message on the subject, it called for $23 million a year for 4 years, which is $92 million. The House proposes a figure a little in excess of six times that amount. The Senator is talking about a figure 15 times that amount. If the need were for either 6 or 15 times the amount, there would be no need for the amendment, but no need has been shown for any increase in the bill other than the President's figure. Even so, he was not specific as to amount. I want to give the President an opportunity to live up to his promise to help the taxpayers by cutting down on expenditures.

If any Senator is so inclined to express himself to his constituency, I feel he can do so by voting on my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I oppose any move to cut the funds provided for vocational education. The United States is today in a 20th-century, space-age world. It is no longer enough for our youngsters to learn the three R's. Unless they learn a trade or profession, they may find themselves filling unemployment forms instead of filling a worthwhile job.

Vocational training is certainly one of the first steps to reduce the continuing, disturbingly high rate of unemployment. High school dropouts, frequently depressed by an education that seems to have little relevance, can look forward to a life of sporadic and low-paid employment at best. This is not only bad for our youth. It is bad for the country.

In fact, it is clear that, with increased science programs and heavy emphasis on technological skills, the country cannot afford to neglect any talent.

This bill would provide four different types of aid in the field of vocational education: a permanent aid program to the States to maintain, extend, and improve vocational education; development of new programs through research grants and pilot programs; establishment of grant-aid to States for residential educational institutions near urban areas; and finally, part-time employment opportunities in public agencies for needy youth. In short, not one but a number of different avenues will be pursued in the pursuit of adequate training for all our young people.

I have for sometime been deeply concerned about the high unemployment among minority groups. Nearly three times as many Negroes are without jobs as whites. Economic rights are as important as civil rights in the 20th century. There is no better way to promote economic gain among minority groups than to provide adequate vocational training for all those who seek it.

For that reason, I regret that there is no specific language in the vocational training section that prohibits discrimination, segregation, or unequal treatment of minority groups. This is all the more disturbing to me insofar as the formula for State allotments approved by the Senate substantially reduces the proportion of funds available for New York and other urban States. Heavy increases are evident for some States, which are rich in resources yet niggardly insofar as State taxation is concerned. Had the Senate committee not increased the funds actually authorized, New York would be receiving $2 million less under the Senate formula. Southern States would receive up to $700,000 more.

Under these circumstances, it is important that the program be administered with full regard to the equal rights and the need for equal opportunities, on the part of all U.S. citizens—most especially so in a field like vocational training which is particularly designed to assist those who stand in need of additional training and under employment opportunities.

Nevertheless, I cannot support this amendment, offered by Senator GOLDWATER, to reduce the funds available by approximately $800,000 and to eliminate both residential institutions and pilot experimental projects. Funds spent for vocational training are a direct investment in our future—in increased employment and in more advanced technological skills. In my view, it is at least as important to reach the disadvantaged youth and presently unemployable sector of our economy with training for jobs and income as it is to reach the moon. This bill is a constructive measure. The funds recommended by the Senate committee will be repaid many times over in reduced welfare costs and increased tax returns from those who will benefit therefrom. Nothing could be more constructive, or more strongly in the interests of the entire Nation than an effective vocational educational program, as is proposed in this legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question now arises on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. Towers]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis and Mr. Hruska] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 184 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Allott
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
McClellan
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—52

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Douglas
Edmondson
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McIntyre
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—25

Bartlett
Case
Cotton
Curtis
Dodd
Eastland
Engle
Fong
Hartke
Hruska
Javits
Johnston
Kennedy
Lausche
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Randolph
Ribicoff
Sparkman
Symington
Tower
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Goldwater's amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while so large a number of Senators are in the Chamber, I think it would be helpful if the Chair would announce the unanimous-consent agreement entered into for tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. Brewster in the chair]. The Chair instructs the clerk to read the unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, October 8, 1963, upon the convening of the Senate, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received except the amendment by the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] which shall be in order.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to announce, with the full approval of the majority leader and the minority leader, that, because some Senators have engagements tonight and did not expect votes today, and because two or three Senators who desire to offer amendments have not yet returned to Washington, there will be no more votes tonight. There may be further debate, but there will be no more votes tonight.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I realize that the Senator from Oregon cannot give his judgment with precision, but could he estimate the number of votes that may be taken tomorrow?

Mr. MORSE. It is difficult to determine the number of yea-and-nay votes that will be asked for, but my guess is that there will be three or four. It is my hope that consideration of the bill can be concluded by late afternoon tomorrow.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFENSE SPENDING IMPACT ON UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today I wish to comment on the report of the Select Committee on Small Business, the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution and Marketing Practices, relating to the Government's program policies as they relate to the use of procurement in redeveloping distressed areas. Also, I have included in this report, as chairman of the subcommittee, a compilation of policy directives, statutes, and regulations, relating to procurement in distressed areas.

This report has been released and published under date of August 19, 1963, and as I have indicated is a report from the subcommittee to the full committee.

Mr. President, for over a dozen years a clearly stated national policy has been to encourage defense spending in areas of persistent and substantial labor surplus. Through the administrations of three Presidents—President Truman, President Eisenhower and President Kennedy—we have aimed to help our distressed areas by placing contracts, particularly defense contracts, where there was economic need and underemployment.

However, a report made today to the Select Committee on Small Business by its Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution and Marketing Practices, on which I have the privilege to serve as chairman indicates we have essentially failed in encouraging defense spending in areas of persistent and substantial labor surplus.

Only 4 percent of all the defense contracts are let in these areas. Over 50 percent of research and development work done in the university and research institutions goes into two States, and prime contracts often follow the research and development work into these same areas.

As a result of this and old fixed habits of procurement, new suppliers operating in the distressed areas find it difficult to find contracts. Our present device for placing contracts in distressed areas, the partial set-asides, has been less than successful, since it has placed less than one-quarter of 1 percent of defense moneys in these areas.

I call the attention of Senators to the fact that the defense budget is a substantial part of the total gross national product, and therefore the use of defense funds, the manner in which these funds are allocated in terms of services, of personnel, or the procurement of supplies and equipment, is of vital importance to the economic well-being of the Nation.

Mr. President, our policy, or at least our asserted policy, of encouraging defense spending in areas of substantial labor surplus has been an expensive failure, not only economically, but socially, creating on the one hand public strains on housing, schools, and other municipal facilities, where there is a very large amount of defense spending going on in a limited area, and on the other hand, Government programs and unemployment with its companion miseries where we have substantial unemployment or underemployment.

We have tried to overload our cities with boom economies where contracts have been placed—a despairing people and a sick economy where contracts have not been placed. But it is hoped much can be done. Even now, the impact of defense spending does not necessarily have to create such social and economic problems. The expenditure of these funds can bring more strength to our chronically distressed areas and to their people. At least, Mr. President, a determined effort to have a better allocation of these funds could be of some help.

I should like, therefore, to call attention to the subcommittee's recommendations, and I stress the point that these are but the subcommittee's recommendations—the full committee as yet has not acted.

First. We have recommended that the Defense Appropriation Act be amended to allow total set-asides to distressed areas.

Second. We believe that a greater proportion of military facilities and bases should be placed in distressed areas. I would qualify that with some of the documentation in the hearings, by saying that these installations could and should be placed in distressed areas, provided it does in no way impede, jeopardize or weaken our national security. It is quite obvious that certain military installations have to be placed in the proper area regardless of the economic consequences.

Third. There should be more equitable distribution of research and develop contracts because of their importance in determining where subsequent production prime contracts are placed.

Fourth. More effective programs must be adopted to insure the placement of subcontracts in distressed areas.

Fifth. Greater use should be made of existing programs of retraining, facilities assistance, loans, and other programs, to increase the capabilities of firms in distressed areas.

Sixth. To insure that the economic consequences of defense purchasing, of procurement, are considered. Offices of Economic Utilization Policy should be established in all appropriate agencies and departments, with their directors at the level of Assistant Secretary.

Seventh. Government procurement contracts should provide for purchase at the point of origin, so that firms located in distressed areas will be competitive with firms located near the point of delivery.

Eighth. The responsibility of the Office of Emergency Planning should be expanded to include the preparation studies and suggestions to improve the long-range health of the economy.

Mr. President, if these recommendations—or recommendations within the spirit of the suggestions—are carried out, then it is my view that defense spending can and will have a favorable impact on our economically distressed areas. In those locations where there should be found a surplus of labor, we will approach the national policy goal of use of defense spending in a way which does not create economic distress which the subcommittee discovered in so many areas of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to the study that we have released today be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Humphrey Reports on Defense Spending Impact on Unemployment Areas

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, said today that shifts in defense spending in recent years have been responsible for the creation of many economically distressed areas in the country.

In a statement prepared for the Senate, Humphrey said that the "avowed national policy" to help distressed areas with defense contracts has been a "complete failure."

Humphrey based his conclusions on a Senate subcommittee report, released today, titled "Impact of Defense Spending on Labor Surplus Areas."

"Congress, President Kennedy, and President Eisenhower all have supported a policy of channeling a reasonable share of defense contracts to areas of high unemployment," he said.

"Contrary to this policy, the impact of defense spending has not helped our distressed areas. It has created new ones."

Humphrey noted the following points from the report released today by the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices:

1. More than 12 percent of the Nation's population lives in areas of persistent and substantial unemployment, but only 4 percent of all defense contracts is awarded to firms in those areas.

2. From the Korean war years to 1961, purchases of weapons, ammunition, and tank-automotive equipment declined from more than 50 percent to less than 13 percent of all contracts. In the same period, missile and electronics defense purchases increased from less than 12 percent to more than 51 percent.

3. Because of this shift—and the Western States' headstart in missile and electronics capability and the Midwest's specialization in the traditional defense equipment—the East North Central States' share of defense contracts declined from 27.4 to 11.8 percent. The share of the Mountain and Pacific Coast States increased from 18.6 to 32.6 percent.

4. As a result, the East North Central States (Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin) have lost $6.1 billion per year in defense contracts since the end of the Korean war.

"This loss," Humphrey concluded, "meant the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs and the growth of new distressed areas.

"The uncoordinated shift of defense spending in the 1950's has resulted in unbalanced economies in different areas of the country.

"Cities and areas which received large increases in defense spending often experienced an overload on their public facilities, housing, and labor supplies. Areas which lost major portions of defense contracting encountered exactly the opposite problems—labor surplus, housing surplus, and decreased public facilities and services through loss of tax revenues."

The Humphrey subcommittee report, based on hearings and staff studies conducted this summer, stated: "By anticipating shifts in defense spending and other factors in our economy and acting accordingly, industry and Government—working cooperatively—could have prevented many distressed areas."

The subcommittee report concludes with a series of recommendations for steps to balance the patterns of defense spending and soften the impact of major changes in defense spending:

1. Amending the Defense Appropriations Act to allow all of the work for a particular defense contract to be set aside for distressed areas. At present, the "set-aside" program allows only part of a defense contract to be awarded to a firm in a distressed area.

2. Establishing an Office of Economic Utilization in all appropriate agencies, to assure that economic problems are considered in the award of contracts. The Director of each Office would hold the rank of Assistant Secretary and would be responsible for advising procurement officers of distressed area problems.

3. Adopting programs to equalize the distribution of research and development contracts. This would include task forces which would be sent to universities to help them qualify for and obtain Government research contracts.

4. Placing more defense subcontracts in distressed areas, through a requirement for prime contractors to report the names and location of firms to which they have let subcontracts.

5. Locating more military bases and other Government projects and facilities in distressed areas by requiring clearance for new facilities to be placed outside distressed areas.

6. Providing in Government contracts for purchase of materials at the point of origin to give firms in distressed areas a competitive opportunity with firms located near points of delivery.

7. Expanding responsibility of the Office of Emergency Planning to include preparation of studies and suggestions to improve the long-range health of the economy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to add that I am fully aware of the fact that research and development contracts must be placed in the industries, universities, and research laboratories that have the competence to be able to fulfill the requirements of the research and development needs.

However, it is also to be noted when a research and development contract is given, or is let, to a particular university, industry or research establishment, that said industry, or university, or research establishment, tends to develop and to grow and to recruit the manpower that is necessary to fulfill the requirements of the contract.

It is well known that in the postwar years, there has been some distortion in our economy through defense spending, primarily because of the change in the technology of weapons or in what we call weapons technology. We have had during the war years of World War II the Detroit-Cleveland-Chicago complex, so to speak, of the automotive industry area booming and expanding because of the mechanical equipment, the vehicles, the tanks, and at that time the planes that were constructed in the area. But in the postwar period where we have come into the missile age and into rocketry and into the sophisticated electronics development and fast supersonic aircraft, we have witnessed much of the defense research and development dollar going to the west coast or the east coast in selected areas and without due consideration, it appears to me, to the proper geographical distribution.

No part of this country has a monopoly on brainpower; nor does any part of the country have a monopoly on technological know-how. In fact I believe it is fair to say that we are a very fortunate nation in having a wide distribution of the university facilities, technical and vocational schools, and industrial research facilities.

Many such facilities are found in every section of our country. Therefore, speaking now for myself and not reading the language of the committee report, it is my view that by more careful attention on the part of the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Atomic Energy Commission and any other agency of the Government that receives substantial funds—we could very well substantially eliminate the unemployment problem in many of the distressed areas.

Of course this concern should include a more careful program of subcontracting such as the test procedures now being used by the Department of Defense.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished assistant minority leader for the statement he has made. The fact is that there has been an unfortunate distribution of defense and space contracts which has generally overlooked the Midwest. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that, the universities of the Midwest graduate approximately one-third of the Ph. D.'s in the Nation.

In the past 10 years the University of Wisconsin has led the country in the number of Ph. D.'s graduated. The number graduated from the University of Minnesota is also very high. The University of Michigan also rates high on the Ph. D. level.

However, though the schools of the Midwest graduate more Ph. D.'s than schools in any other area of the country, fewer Ph. D.'s, in terms of population, actually work in our area than work in other parts of the country. The Ph. D.'s in the Midwest graduate and go to either the east coast or the west coast. They do not remain at home. The point I wish to make is that it is clear that we have the intellectual resources, the university resources, and excellent faculties. Our people pay heavily in taxation to provide that kind of education. Somehow, in some way, and somewhere we lose those people when opportunities come to put them to work in research and development within our Midwest area. Many of those people would prefer to live in areas where their roots are. They leave because opportunities arise elsewhere.

I ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that, unless we obtain greater opportunities as a result of Government encouragement and Government recognition of the value to our country in dispersing defense contracts to some extent we shall lose a great national asset in having a region of our country which has done more than its share in producing intellectual capacity not having an opportunity to share in the fruits of that development.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator. My remarks should not be interpreted as critical of any particular area of the country. What I am saying—and I recognize that it is easier to make a statement than to carry out a program—is that there should be a better geographical distribution of the research and development contracts and the procurements for the Department of Defense and other Government agencies; consideration should be given to areas of persistent and substantial labor surplus and critical economic distress.

I recognize that my suggestion poses some administrative difficulties. But for all the administrative difficulties involved, the economic distress and human misery that accrues because of failure properly to distribute and utilize Federal funds in some of the areas of persistent unemployment continues to mount. What I am asking for is a more carefully considered policy that will be effectuated by action.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Along that line, I recall when the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who is present in the Chamber, was interested in an accelerator—atom smasher—for Stanford University. The University of Wisconsin and the Midwest University Research Association supported and favored that proposal. It was said to be a good thing for the whole Nation. It was good from the standpoint of science.

Now, in the Midwest, there is need to have located near Madison, Wis., a similar device, which would serve the areas of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and other States. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and others have joined me in asking that consideration be given to an accelerator for that region. I am happy to say that the University of California scientists have supported the Midwest proposal enthusiastically, recognizing that it would be in the interest of science.

If that proposal can be given real consideration, largely and basically on its merits, but also in terms of what it would do for the Midwest community in making research opportunities more widely available and enabling scientists to remain in the area and work, and also giving business a basis for attracting scientists directly to work right in the Midwest, it seems to the Senator from Wisconsin that it would be a way of fulfilling the kind of specific action which the Senator from Minnesota has so properly and wisely called for.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. Perhaps a statement made during the hearings would be of some interest to Senators. It is a statement of the representative of the Department of Labor. Mr. Wolfbein, the labor economist and statistician, said:

> One of the most dramatic indications of the changing geography of American industry is seen by the simple fact that one out of every six jobs in the United States is located in just three States—California, Texas and Florida.

The report states that Mr. Wolfbein contends that the result of the shift is that the Great Lakes area has suffered; in fact, States like Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio increased their employment less than the national average.

Then Mr. Wolfbein pointed out:

> It is interesting to note that the Department of Labor recites the U.S. Government as one of the primary causes for this shift in employment. The reason given is increased spending for research and development and the great increase in spending for modern weapons systems. In fact, it was learned that 42 percent of all manufacturing in the Los Angeles area was defense connected.

Mr. President, the report is very interesting, and I commend it to Senators. I commend it also to the attention of every businessman and every worker in the United States, because substantial information is to be found in the hearings. I have before me only a condensation of the hearings as contained in the report of the subcommittee. I quote from the report:

> The third shift is a change in the type of goods being purchased by the Defense Department, as highlighted by the fact that in 1953 missile purchases accounted for only 0.5 percent of the hard goods delivered in that year, while in 1961 they had taken up 33.6 percent. There has also been a significant increase in the proportion of electronic equipment being purchased. Perhaps one of the most significant shifts in Government purchases is in the field of tank-automotive, weapons, ammunition, and production equipment, which has gone from 50.09 percent of the goods delivered in 1953 down to 12.4 percent of the goods delivered in 1961.

I mention that point to the Senator from Michigan because it was in his area that the tank-automotive type of equipment had its center of operations, so to speak, in production.

> Also highly significant is the increase in contracts for research, development, testing, and evaluation (R.D.T. & E.). In 1961 these contracts totaled $6 billion and constituted about one-fourth of all prime contracts awarded in the United States. These facts make it clear that this shift in spending by the U.S. Government has caused the second shift relating to engineering employment.

Then we see in the report the following statement:

> It is startling to learn that the Mountain and Pacific States during World War II received only 13.5 percent of the prime contract awards, but by 1961 this had increased to 32.6 percent. The geographical locations of R.D.T. & E. contracts—

That is what we call research, development, training, and education contracts—

> were even more closely concentrated than the contracts for hard goods. California alone accounted for 41.3 percent of such contracts let by the Defense Department. A report issued by the Department of Labor, Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, entitled Manpower Report No. 1, states that California in 1961 received a total of $2.5 billion in R.D.T. & E. contracts from the U.S. Government, which constituted two-fifths of this budget. Some interesting comments in connection with these shifts are to be found in a document entitled "The Changing Patterns of Defense Procurement," issued by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, June 1962, concerning the geographical shift in contract awards.

My colleagues will be interested to know that more than 12 percent of the people of the Nation live in areas of persistent and substantial unemployment, but only 4 percent of our defense contracts are awarded to firms in those areas.

The situation with regard to research and development contracts is perhaps the most serious because the consequences have far-reaching effect on follow-on production.

The final point I wish to make is that I have heard the Department of Defense give rejoinder to the criticisms of present policy. They say, "We are trying to get the most for our dollar, Senator. We find that giving a research and development contract to a certain area which already has expert knowledge, where the people are acquainted with Government procurement patterns, produces the most for the dollar."

When one talks about set-asides for Government purchases of defense materials in areas of labor surplus or unemployment, the Department of Defense says, "Yes, but it may cost us more, Senator, to get some electronic equipment there or to get a missile there."

The point I tried to make in the hearings is that this is one Government, one country. It is not the government of the Department of Defense, as if that were a member of the United Nations with national sovereignty. The Department of Defense gets its money from the same bucket that the unemployment compensation group gets its money, namely, the taxpayers' bucket.

The taxpayers of America pay the bills. The taxpayers pay for food for the needy. The taxpayers pay for the relief assistance we must give in some communities. The taxpayers pay for accelerated public works. The taxpayers pay for area redevelopment. If we added the cost of food stamps, distribution of surplus food, extended unemployment compensation, relief checks, accelerated public works and all the rest—which are all public expenditures—to the cost of items procured, we would see that some of the items which it is said are bought cheaply on competitive bidding become rather expensive. Had some of the items been available to be purchased in the areas of unemployment, the workers would have been at work. Unemployment compensation would have been unnecessary. Relief checks would have been unnecessary. Surplus food distribution to the needy would have been unnecessary. In other words, all the social costs could have been eliminated, thereby reducing the total cost to the taxpayer of what I call the socially and economically expensive policy followed today, when there is not a proper distribution of defense, NASA, and other contracts to the areas of persistent unemployment and chronic labor surplus.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Would it oversimplify the situation to a point of inaccuracy if I suggested that the Senator from Minnesota would agree that if the factors he described—unemployment insurance, aid to the needy, and so on—were tallied into the total cost, not only would there be a decreased dollar cost, but also we would be a stronger Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is quite correct. We would be a stronger Nation, with a healthier and more satisfied people. Our people would be participating in the economic growth of the Nation, rather than being recipients of the kinds of assistance we hand out in the form of emergency assistance.

Mr. HART. We are talking about defense expenditures, mostly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are indeed.

Mr. HART. Those moneys are spent to make us strong and secure?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HART. Therefore, it is quite consistent that we urge the Department of Defense to consider not alone a bookkeeper's answer as to which is the lowest bid but also the historian's verdict as to what will make us a stronger Nation. That is their responsibility, as it is mine and that of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly. I have tried to make it clear that sometimes, when we consider only the cost of an item, as the Defense Department does, we ignore the social costs which result from many factors, such as unemployment and the frustration that comes with it, and the lack of economic growth. If we added all the other things—unemployment compensation, public works, relief assistance—we would learn that the policy of letting the contract in what seems to be the cheapest area actually turns out to be the most expensive, because this is one country.

Mr. HART. As did the Senator from Wisconsin, I thank the Senator from Minnestota for making available to all of us—and the Defense Department, also—this analysis. This is a subject which has concerned me and many others. It is not easy to feel a certainty with respect to one's own judgment as to precisely how we should handle it. Clearly it is a subject which needs objective analysis and study.

There is a feeling that when a region we represent obtains a defense contract that is because it deserves it; and when some other region gets a contract, that is the result of politics. This situation does not do the Nation or the Defense Establishment a bit of good. There should be some clarity as to the factors which can be built into the decision as to where the contract shall be placed.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished—and in this area, to the extent anyone would suggest that politics is a factor, extremely effective—Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. I believe even the Senator from California would agree that if the bookkeeper approach happened to produce all the defense procurement in California and California had an earthquake, someone would be screaming, "How stupid was the Defense Department. How silly to follow the bookkeeper."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, if the Senator will permit, I should like to make an insertion in the RECORD. Then I shall be happy to yield to my good friend from California who, I know, is anxiously waiting to discuss the present geographic concentration of defense spending.

Mr. KUCHEL. I merely wish to try, if he will give me an opportunity to do so, to let Members of the Senate understand exactly and precisely and with consummate accuracy what the report seeks to accomplish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is quite helpful. I doubt that he intends to be in this instance, but he is helpful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the group VI, Recommendations, starting on page 14 of the report, and concluding on page 24 with item 32, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

National policy considerations and emphasis

1. Direct more forcibly Government agencies to carry out the Nation's avowed policy of encouraging the placement of contracts in labor-surplus areas.

It is quite clear from the President's statements of February 2, 1961, and February 27, 1962, the continuance in effect of the policy set forth in the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. app. 2062), the issuance of an amended Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 on July 6, 1960, the enacting of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–27 of May 1, 1961), the Manpower and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415 of March 15, 1962), these hearings and acknowledgments of legislative and executive action on the part of agency heads, that there is a national policy (inclusive of Defense policy, Commerce policy, Labor policy, Office of Emergency Planning policy, and other agencies).

This national policy is to encourage the placement of contracts and facilities in areas of persistent and substantial labor surplus, and to assist such areas in making the best use of their available resources to achieve the objectives of—

(a) Preserving management and employee skills necessary to the fulfillment of Government contracts;

(b) Maintaining productive facilities;

(c) Improving utilization of the Nation's total manpower potential by making use of the manpower resources of each area;

(d) Assuring timely delivery of required goods and services and promoting readiness for expanded effort by locating procurement where the needed manpower and facilities are fully available.

Much remains to be done in the implementation of this policy to overcome what appears to be negative and halfhearted compliance on the part of the Government agencies and departments. It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that emphasis and reemphasis be given to this national policy by immediate and affirmative action on the part of all Government departments and agencies to implement this policy. This will require clear enunciation of departmental policy, objectives, organization, goals, and reports of activities in the conduct of the overall national policy to enable retention and conservation of our Nation's manpower, productive capacity, and resources.

Legislative action

2. Section 523 of the Defense Appropriations Act should be amended by altering parts which hinder the Department of Defense in implementing DMP No. 4.

The subcommittee was told all too often of the negative aspects of legislative provisions in the application of the national policy.

These negative provisions seem to be the basis for grounding of departmental policy against rather than in consonance with the national policy. The subcommittee is not unmindful of the provisions in the Defense Appropriations Act, section 523 of Public Law 87–577, precluding a price differential to relieve economic dislocation, but believes that this provision has been utilized far too often to forbid actions entirely appropriate under exceptions to the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, and other authorities.

The subcommittee recommends removal of this provision or, in the alternative, such clarification through appropriate hearings and reports that "economic dislocation," as utilized in this or similar actions, does not relate to actions within the policy, purposes, and scope of defense manpower policy No. 4. The recommendation for removal, if carried out by the Congress, will make the Defense Appropriations Act consistent with that of other agencies of the Government, such as NASA, AEC, Commerce, GSA, and like agencies whose appropriations do not contain such provisions.

On the affirmative side, the subcommittee recommends enactment of a provision authorizing total set-asides of a procurement for labor surplus areas where it is determined by the agency head or his designee that such total set-asides would be in the interest of maintaining and mobilizing the Nation's full manpower and other resources and productive capacity or in the interests of national defense programs in assuring a national (all States and territories) industrial and mobilization base.

Executive action—policy formulation

3. Revise defense manpower policy No. 4 so that it will reflect new laws and recently created agencies.

The subcommittee further recommends that defense manpower policy No. 4 be rejuvenated and updated to better reflect the national policy in all regards. The Surplus Manpower Committee provided for therein is outmoded. The national policy set forth in defense manpower policy No. 4 should clearly set forth the requirement that departmental policy shall not be initiated or interpreted to overrule national policy objectives. Defense manpower policy No. 4 should, and the subcommittee recommends that it be, updated to give recognition to the purposes and objectives of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, the Manpower and Training Act of 1962, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended by the addition of section 502(f) of Public Law 84–805, the Defense Production Act of 1950, and like legislation. The emergence of NASA and other agencies such as GSA, whose activities have an impact on the national policy, should also be considered in such updating.

4. Revise part 8 of section I of the armed services procurement regulations to reflect more clearly the national policy.

Part 8 of section I of the armed services procurement regulations sets forth the procurement procedures in relation to labor surplus areas. Part 8 should be revised to spell out more clearly the national policy and the duties of procurement officers in carrying it out.

Executive action—interagency relationship

5. Abolish the Surplus Manpower Committee and create an Economic Utilization Board with representatives from interested departments.

The subcommittee was made fully aware of the interrelationships required in the conduct of the national policy between Defense, Commerce, Labor, OEP, NASA, GSA, and other agencies of the Government. An interagency counsel representative of the major agencies and departments should be established whose function it would be to coordinate the interagency relationships including those covering the presently inactive and obsolete Surplus Manpower Committee (DMP No. 4, par. 4(e)). It is suggested that in this regard it would be more appropriate to designate a committee of this type as an economic utilization committee or board with representation from all agencies having major procurement and other policy activities. The character of the representation should be changed from one that is procurement-oriented to one that is oriented to the national policy implications and considerations.

Executive action—organization and personnel

6. Create an Office of Economic Utilization Policy with responsibility to improve agency performance in all appropriate agencies.

7. Place the Directors of Offices of Economic Utilization Policy at the level of Assistant Secretary. Such offices must be staffed adequately so that they are able to make appropriate studies, work with potential bidders, State governments and local units.

The implementation of a successful labor surplus area national policy requires departmental organization and personnel sufficiently geared and oriented to carry out the national policy requirements. Every agency with major procurement responsibilities should establish an Office of Economic Utilization Policy with responsibility to improve agency performance. Exceptionally well-qualified men of supergrade capability should direct these offices. They should be placed high in the organization of the departments, first, to indicate the importance placed upon the program, and, secondly, to cut across existing organizational lines and departments. In an agency such as the Department of Defense, where areas of policy control and operations cut across subagency units such as the research and development, the production end of procurement, the operation and maintenance, the construction and foreign assistance programs, and involve the Defense Supply Agency, Army, Navy, and Air Force activities, this is essential. The Director of the Office could well be an Assistant Secretary of Defense. NASA, GSA, FAA, and like agencies should have directors reporting to the agency head.

The Offices of Economic Utilization Policy should be adequately staffed with competent personnel at all necessary levels of action, so that the national policy can be carried out at all major procurement locations. The committee particularly feels that attention should be given and studies made on the effects of critical unemployment in any given area, with reports being given to a legislative branch of the Government as well as to the executive.

Offices of Economic Utilization Policy should be equipped and maintained with all of the necessary data to assist various agencies of the Government as well as the State and local community groups which are calling on the Government for assistance. Personnel should be trained to present the procurement opportunities, programs, and procedures of their department in all aspects such as facilities assistance, financing, interpretation of regulations, relief under extraordinary circumstances, and like activities.

8. Offices of Economic Utilization Policy should continuously encourage prime contractors to establish new facilities in distressed areas.

Offices of Economic Utilization Policy and ARA should systematically encourage firms to establish new facilities in distressed areas by pointing out the Government procurement and other advantages of these areas.

Executive action—contracting and subcontracting procedure

9. Devise and adopt programs which would create a wider geographical distribution of R. & D. contracts.

Agencies, with particular emphasis on the Department of Defense, should be more concerned with the development, maintenance, and retention of the industrial, scientific, and mobilization base in their awarding of research and development and like contracts. There should be a national spread and a planting of the seed corn of R. & D. which will lead to production contracts in all sections of the country. The excellent institutions of learning in all States have research capabilities which could and should fulfill basic and applied research contract and grant needs. Each area of the country has R. & D. capabilities within its scientific and industrial groupings which could and should be given the opportunity to take on development and design activities. It is not enough to say that concentration in certain areas of the country, on the basis of Nobel Prize winners, is the only answer in the achievement of national policy objectives in R. & D. and supply procurement programs.

10. Adopt the program now being experimented with which requires 25 percent of selected contracts to be produced in distressed areas and devise a more liberal and exact interpretation of labor surplus area set-aside policy. Contracting officers from all agencies, on procurements over a certain size, should report on why a set-aside under DMP No. 4 was not utilized.

The set-aside programs of the DOD should be stepped up with recognition given to other types in addition to those set forth in ASPR 1–800. There should be set forth liberal interpretation of "economic production run or reasonable lot" to assist procurement and contracting personnel. The program now successfully underway in the Defense Department, which requests a specific percentage of selected contracts lending themselves to subcontracting to be produced or subcontracted in a labor surplus area, should be encouraged and utilized in other Government agencies. The percentage factors to be utilized in such contract actions should be flexible to enact contract placement under varying situations to as many prime contractors as possible.

11. Adopt new programs under which more subcontracts are awarded in labor surplus areas.

12. Institute a reporting system by which prime contractors with awards above $100,000 must report subcontracts.

Greater emphasis must be given to the problem of subcontracting by prime contractors to firms in labor surplus areas. This will require missionary work in the conduct of the national policy with such contractors and it is for this reason that personnel at all levels of procurement should be entirely familiar with the national policy requirements. The "best efforts" clause (ASPR 1–805.3) and its meaning and purpose should be stressed in contract negotiations and coupled in interest with the requirements of ASPR 3–501 on preparation of requests for proposals and quotations. The subcommittee recognizes that many of the labor surplus areas lack large defense-oriented industrial complexes to qualify as prime contractors and that much of the capacity in such areas falls within the small business categories. These small businesses must be assisted in obtaining small Government contracts, as well as subcontracts. The use of breakout would assist such small contractors. The make-or-buy section of contract proposals should be carefully reviewed by procurement personnel to be sure that the national policy is being carried out. Pertinent statistics and other data should be available to all procurement personnel to assist them and prime contractors in the placement of contracts in labor surplus areas. An award program giving recognition to good work on the part of procurement personnel and contractors should be established.

13. Government procurement contracts should provide for purchase at point of origin so that firms located in distressed areas will be competitive with firms that are located near points of delivery.

There seems to be no reason why production should be encouraged near points of delivery, yet freight costs are lower for firms adjacent to points of delivery and thus they are more competitive. Firms in distressed areas should be entitled to produce for the U.S. Government, regardless of their location. Competition may be so keen that for many of the common products purchased by the Nation, the difference in freight charges alone may be the prime factor in keeping firms in distressed areas from securing Government contracts.

14. ARA and the Office of Economic Utilization policy should study the feasibility of having a factor covering public costs occasioned by economic dislocation included in the determination of costs in placing contracts.

One of the functions of the Government contract under the national policy set forth in DMP No. 4 is to encourage full utilization of existing production facilities and workers in preference to creating new plants or moving workers, thus assisting in the maintenance of economic balance and employment stability. Where unemployment develops in certain areas, unemployment compensation costs increase, and plants, tools, and worker skills remain idle, and are unable to contribute to our defense program.

Therefore, the subcommittee recommends that a study be made of including in the determination of costs for purposes of evaluation in the placement of contracts a factor covering other public costs which would be occasioned by the pullout of contracts in a persistent and substantial labor surplus area and the impact (money and otherwise) on other Government agencies.

15. Prevent further concentration of defense industry by permitting negotiation of contracts under 10 U.S.C. 2304.

The subcommittee believes that among the tools available to the Department of Defense which would facilitate the national defense in its retention of the industrial base and manpower resources, and which could be utilized in labor surplus areas, are the provisions set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2304, providing for exceptions under which contracts could be negotiated. These exceptions could and should be utilized to preclude undue concentration, allow dispersal, utilization of investments in facilities, authorize research and development activities, and like contract actions in labor surplus areas.

16. Allow modifications of contracts under authority of Public Law 85–804 and Executive Order 10789 in cases where such action would maintain productive facilities for national defense.

Another avenue for action would be to utilize the powers set forth in the Contract Adjustment Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–804, and contained in 72 Stat. 972), and Executive Order 10789 of November 14, 1958 (23 F.R. 8897), which would authorize amendments and modifications to contracts under certain situations, including hardship relief, and which actions would facilitate the national defense in the retention of skills, capabilities, protection of Government investment, protection of Government facilities, and like activities in surplus labor area cases.

Executive action—establishment of facilities

17. Place new Government facilities wherever possible in labor-surplus areas by requiring clearance for the placement of such facilities outside of labor-surplus areas.

The testimony dealt mostly with procurement and the impact of Federal contracts made with private firms. The Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 requirement concerning the location of Federal and defense facilities, while not discussed in detail, is important. Each year Federal officials plan and propose numerous projects from temporary buildings to multistory permanent ones. Typically, these facilities have been concentrated in a few localities, some where the unemployment is relatively low. Agencies in the Federal Government which contemplates establishment of facilities in the amount of an excess of $50,000 should be required to clear such facility action and to explain placement of such facility in other than a distressed or labor surplus area, or to point out the reasons why this mandate in Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 has not been complied with.

Executive action—assistance to sources

18. Implement the policy of maintaining the mobilization base.

The subcommittee is aware of the fact that all Government agencies want responsive and responsible contractor sources. The subcommittee further recognizes that the source finding, selection, and maintenance of source data are integral parts of the procurement activity. The sum total of these sources is the industrial, scientific, and mobilization base of the Nation and all areas of the country should be an active part of this base. The retention of this entire industrial, scientific, and mobilization base is a national defense objective and should be so recognized.

The subcommittee recommends that the Department of Defense exercise the use of the exceptions set forth in 10 U.S.C. 2304 and the policy dictates of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as implemented in its Directive 3005.3 to maintain an all-State and territory industrial and mobilization base. Economic impact situation reports covering active sources where immediate help is needed should be prepared at the economic utilization headquarters in the agencies and sent out to all procurement activities to the end that immediate steps could be taken to retain and conserve the resources.

19. Make more readily available federally owned production equipment for the use of firms in labor-surplus areas.

One of the major areas to be harnessed for utilization in labor surplus areas is in the form of facilities assistance. The experience of the United States in the oversea mutual defense assistance programs, which included facility assistance, bespeaks this fact. The provisions set forth in ASPR XIII covering acquisition and utilization of tooling and other forms of facilities should be liberalized to recognize and authorize labor surplus area contract acquisition and utilization. Procedures should be devised to permit prompt execution of arrangements with contractors, allowing use of Government facilities on commercial as well as defense work where there are community impact situations involving closing down by reason of stretchout, cutback, or termination of Government business. If high-level approval of actions is to be acquired, then immediate steps should be developed to process such cases in an expedient way. The Department of Defense, OEP, and other agencies working on policy and other aspects should develop better procedures for this purpose. The DOD should immediately undertake studies with respect to its authorities to utilize Public Law 883, 80th Congress, and 50 U.S.C. 451, in training activities. Its industrial reserve should be made available to labor surplus contractors under liberal terms to assist them in getting contracts and to enable them to better perform a variety of prime and subcontracts. Programs should be initiated to indicate the "how and where" such facilities might be acquired and utilized in the conduct of defense and other agency contracts.

20. Render financial assistance to firms where it tends to encourage dispersal of defense industry.

Another possible avenue for utilization which affords guidance to the DOD is contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C., app. sec. 2062, et seq.). The policy section of this statute, which is still in effect, calls upon the agencies of the Government, including the Department of Defense, to insure productive capacity by encouragement of geographical dispersal of industrial facilities and by the discouragement of concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographical areas. This policy also requires, where practicable and consistent with existing law, to render financial assistance for construction, expansion and improvement of industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services.

21. Lend, lease, transfer, or sell machine equipment to nonprofit institutions who will use it in programs which will materially contribute to national defense.

Another provision in law, the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C., sec. 451), declares it to be the intent of Congress to provide for the future safety and defense of the United States by assuring an essential nucleus of Government and industrial plants, and a national reserve of machine tooling and industrial manufacturing equipment. Under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948, there is within the power of the Secretary of Defense authority, when he deems such action to be in the interest of national security, to establish policies respecting such property, to direct transfers, to direct leasing, to authorize dispositions by sale or otherwise, and to authorize and regulate lending to nonprofit educational institutions or training schools upon determinations that the programs of such schools for the use of property will contribute materially to national defense.

Under foregoing authorities, the subcommittee believes and recommends actions by the DOD which would more effectively correlate its procurement, construction, and other activities with the national policies respecting labor surplus areas. The subcommittee recommends studies by the DOD that will enable the foregoing authorities to be utilized in this regard.

22. Render technical assistance directly to contractors and subcontractors in labor surplus areas and indirectly to subcontractors through prime contractors.

The subcommittee further recommends that the DOD determine the feasibility of providing to contractors in labor surplus areas technical assistance both to primes and to their subcontractors where conditions are such as to warrant such action. It is recognized that while administratively it is not the responsibility of the DOD to perform a contractor's contract for him, the fact does remain that interpretation and assistance in understanding the design disclosure package data of a contract and other forms of technical aid can be given such prime and subcontractors and will enable their performance of the contract in a more satisfactory way.

A study should also be initiated with respect to determining the feasibility of assistance by prime contractors to their subcontractors in this same regard.

Executive action—source selection and dissemination of requirements

23. Facilitate source finding through the use of electronic data processing methods.

Many sources, particularly those in labor-surplus areas, are untapped, unrecognized, and thus not utilized. They are, in most cases, ready, willing, and able to participate in furnishing national manpower and facility resources which should be utilized. To better use these sources, the subcommittee believes and recommends augmented activities by Defense and other agencies in the development of electronic and other capabilities for source finding, determination of capability, and utilization to meet national policies and objectives. The Area Redevelopment Administration's program for the development of source data should be clearly understood in all departments and utilized. Much missionary work with respect to source development and utilization will be done without expense to the Government departments by State and local development commissions, by labor unions, chambers of commerce, and like civic groups.

24. Make requirements of proposed procurements more readily available.

The subcommittee recommends that agencies such as DOD, NASA, AEC, and GSA take immediate steps to better develop and utilize all labor surplus sources. This may require, in cases, additional time for procurements, better publicity, more utilization of the daily synopses prepared by the Department of Commerce and like media, educational meetings, and like activities. Methods and procedures for source selection, dissemination of requirements, preparation of requests for proposals, determinations and findings, and like procurement matters should be made available to industry associations (AIA, NSIA, EIA, AOA, and others) and to the aforementioned groups, as well as to requesting contractors. The evaluation techniques utilized in source selection should be carefully spelled out.

Executive action—training activities

25. Organize task forces to meet with officials of educational institutions, scientific, and industrial groups in all States to help them participate in R. & D. contracts.

Defense, NASA, AEC, and like task forces should be organized to visit and meet with officials of educational institutions, scientific, and industry groups within each of the States to help them establish relationships with the U.S. Government in those regards. The Department of Defense should establish programs for this purpose.

26. Increase the efforts to educate potential bidders as to bidding procedures and criteria used in bid evaluation.

The subcommittee is aware of and commends the DOD in its activities covering discussions of procurement regulations, technical meetings, and like training activities to afford science and industry knowledge as to the ways and means whereby Government contracts are programed, funded, executed, and performed. The subcommittee believes and recommends that much more can be done in this regard. It is our understanding that many of the industrial associations have agreed to and would work with the DOD in the conduct of meetings and in activities which would bring into effect the national policy considerations in labor surplus areas. In the same regard, the State and local governments have asked for such meetings. It is believed that they should be arranged in all labor surplus areas of the country. Such conferences could be sponsored by the DOD, NASA, GSA, and other agencies and should solicit the participation of prime contractors, subcontractors, and other interested elements of the community. As a part of such conferences, field trips should be undertaken through distressed areas, so that procurement representatives could meet on the spot with firms and civic leaders interested in Defense activities.

27. Indoctrinate procurement officers as to the President's national policy and its implications of assisting distressed areas through Government contracts.

There appears, also, to be a need for definite indoctrination of Defense, NASA, GSA, and other personnel engaged in procurement activities bringing to their attention the national policy implications and considerations, and affording them sufficient guidance as to the relationship of procurement to such policies. This, in turn, will require educational activities by the agencies with their own personnel.

Executive action—research and studies

28. Investigate the relationship between the letting of R. & D. contracts and the placement of pursuant prime contracts.

Such a study should include a case-by-case study to determine the frequency with which R. & D. contractors received follow-on prime contract awards. It would also be useful to determine to what extent procurement officers investigate the possibility of placing prime contracts with firms who have not done the R. & D. work.

29. Publish statistics relative to productive potential in labor surplus areas useful to firms considering placing new facilities in labor surplus areas.

The Commerce Department should find and publish statistics on each area as to such factors as work force, numbers and capability, resource advantages, and such economic factors as average number of days lost due to sickness, labor problems, and average rates of production.

30. Issue complete reports on agencies' implementation of DMP No. 4.

NASA and GSA should issue a quarterly report similar to the reports that are now issued by the Department of Defense, entitled, "Military Prime Contract Awards Placed in Areas of Substantial Unemployment." This report should include a complete breakdown of contracts awarded in substantial and persistent labor surplus areas as well as the number of contracts which are set aside under DMP No. 4. In this connection, the report issued semiannually by the Department of Defense should include all these statistics.

31. Expand the responsibility of the Office of Emergency Planning to include preparation of studies and suggestions to improve the long-range health of the economy.

A thorough consideration should be given to expanding the function of the Office of Emergency Planning to include making studies and recommendations to increase the economic strength of our Nation. DMP No. 4 recognizes the tremendous necessity of maintaining a healthy and growing economy as seen in its opening statement:

"Success of the defense program depends upon efficient use of all our resources, including manpower and facilities, which are preserved through practice of the skills of both management and workers."

No persuasion should be necessary to convince the Congress that an expanding unemployment rate makes us as vulnerable to ultimate defeat as if we were to fall behind the Communist bloc in military technology.

One of the most significant findings of these hearings is that a lack of coordination and planning may be responsible for some of the Nation's worst economic problems, including the existence of persistent and substantial labor surplus areas. It may well be that by anticipating shifts in defense spending and other factors in our economy and acting accordingly, industry and Government, working cooperatively, could have prevented distressed areas. Such a study should include the possibility of expanding the Office of Emergency Planning to perform the following functions:

(*a*) Collecting suggestions and projections of future U.S. Government activity affecting the economy.

(*b*) Making a survey of all leading industries and other productive areas of the economy to determine their long-range plans and potential problems.

This information, properly formulated, could be used cooperatively by Government and industry in making long-range economic plans and projections.

Executive action—assistance to small businesses

32. Continue active and increasing effective implementation of governmental policy regarding small business participation in Government procurement.

The subcommittee has consistently supported a strong governmental policy to assure small concerns a fair opportunity to compete for Government contracts. Because of the interest of this and other congressional committees, an active and effective program of assistance to small concerns exists within the various procurement activities. In addition, Congress has authorized a program of procurement set-asides for small business. This subcommittee has supported this program and continues to do so. It hopes that the scope of the set-aside program will be broadened to make an even greater percentage of Government procurement available to small concerns in those cases where sufficient competition among small bidders can assure competitive prices.

The small and independent American businessman is the first to suffer in depressed areas. Accordingly, this subcommittee strongly urges that existing programs and those recommended in this report to assist depressed areas be pursued vigorously along with all other established programs of assistance to small concerns. Such an effective governmental program fully supported at all levels will serve to strengthen the American small business community and the entire national economy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the defense manpower policy as outlined, from page 7, to the bottom of page 10, be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

III. DEFENSE MANPOWER POLICY

The sole effort of the Department of Defense to utilize defense contracts to alleviate unemployment in substantial and persistent labor surplus areas is found in Defense Manpower Policy No. 4. This policy was adopted in 1951, and was issued by the Director of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization under Executive Order 10480 and Executive Order 10773.

The latest revision of this document is dated July 6, 1960, and may be found in volume 25 of the Federal Register, page 5283. This remarkable document proclaims unequivocally:

"It is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage the placing of contracts and facilities in areas of persistent or substantial labor surplus, with first preference being given to areas of persistent labor surplus, and to assist such areas in making the best use of their available resources in order to achieve the following objectives:

"(a) To preserve management and employee skills necessary to the fulfillment of Government contracts and purchases;

"(b) To maintain productive facilities;

"(c) To improve utilization of the Nation's total manpower potential by making use of the manpower resources of each area;

"(d) To help assure timely delivery of required goods and services and to promote readiness for expanded effort by locating procurement where the needed manpower and facilities are fully available."[1]

This policy has been adopted because of the fact that the defense program depends upon efficient use of all our resources. It is further frankly recognized that:

"The words 'substantial labor-surplus areas' and 'persistent labor-surplus areas' are used in both the Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 and the Area Redevelopment Act, 75 Stat. 48, sec. 5(a). The Department of Labor classifies unemployment areas according to these two documents as either 'substantial labor-surplus area' or 'persistent labor-surplus area.' The same criteria is used by the Department of Labor to make this classification under both documents so that if an area is a substantial and persistent area which would qualify as a distressed area in 5(a) of the Area Redevelopment Act, it would also qualify for set-asides of Government procurement contracts under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4.

"When large numbers of workers move to already tight areas, heavy burdens are placed on community facilities—schools, hospitals, housing, transportation, utilities, etc. On the other hand, when unemployment develops in certain areas, unemployment compensation costs increase and plants, tools, and workers' skills remain idle and unable to contribute to our defense program."[2]

In general, the policies of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 are implemented by directives to the Department of Labor, Government procurement agencies, the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, the Surplus Manpower Committee of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, regional directors of OCDM, and all Federal departments and agencies planning sites for Government facilities expansion. The three most important provisions of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 are ones that direct the procurement agencies to award negotiated procurement contracts to the contractors who will perform a substantial proportion of the production within labor-surplus areas. It urges procurement agencies to set aside portions of procurements exclusively with firms which will perform a substantial proportion of the production within labor-surplus areas. The directive which seems to have been least implemented is the one which states that all Federal departments and agencies shall give consideration to labor-surplus areas, particularly to persistent labor-surplus areas, in the selection of sites for Government-financed facilities expansion, to the extent that such consideration is not inconsistent with essential economic and strategic factors that must also be taken into account.

The President himself, in a memorandum to the Cabinet and principal agencies, dated February 27, 1962, stated his personal concern for using the weight of the Federal Government to give preference to redevelopment areas in the awarding of contracts. In view of this, the question arises why so few contracts are placed in substantial and persistent labor-surplus areas. The answer lies partly in an amendment attached to the Defense Appropriations Act of 1957. This amendment has been placed in every appropriation act since 1953, and in the current act (sec. 523, Public Law 87–577) reads as follows:

"*Provided further,* That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations."

This amendment has turned out to be disastrous for a successful implementation of Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, because of the interpretation placed upon it by the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States in opinion B–145136, dated March 3, 1961. In this opinion the Comptroller General stated:

"On the record we must construe the limitation in question as precluding the expenditure by the Defense Establishment of appropriated funds under any contract awarded on the basis of a labor surplus area situation at a price in excess of the lowest obtainable on an unrestricted solicitation of bids or proposals."

Because of this opinion, a program has had to be devised which has been set forth in part 8 of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation (ASPR) and subpart 1–18 of the Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) respectively.[3] Detailed explanation of these regulations may be found in the statement of James E. Welch, Deputy General Counsel, General Accounting Office.[4]

Explained briefly, the program works as follows:[5] Where a Government procurement is severable into two or more economic production runs, and where one or more labor-surplus-area concerns are expected to have the technical competency and productive capacity to furnish a severable portion of the procurement at a reasonable price, such portion or portions may be reserved; i.e., set aside for exclusive award to labor-surplus-area concerns. Such set-asides enjoy preference over small business set-asides. Furthermore, in case of a tie bid, a firm located in a labor-surplus area is given preference, even though the procurement may not have been set aside for labor-surplus firms.

In awarding a contract for a procurement set aside for a labor-surplus area, negotiations are conducted only with responsible labor-surplus-area concerns (and small business concerns to the extent indicated below) which had submitted responsive bids on the non-set-aside portion at a unit price within 120 percent of the highest award made on the non-set-aside portion, in the following order of priority and under the following conditions:

Group 1. Persistent labor-surplus-area concerns which are also small business concerns.

Group 2. Other persistent labor-surplus-area concerns.

Group 3. Substantial labor-surplus-area concerns which are also small business concerns.

Group 4. Other substantial labor-surplus-area concerns.

Group 5. Small business concerns which are not labor-surplus-area concerns.

Within each of the above groups, negotiations with such concerns are conducted in the order of their bids or proposals on the non-set-aside portion, beginning with the lowest responsive bid. The set-aside quantities are awarded at the highest unit price awarded for the non-set-aside portion, adjusted to reflect transportation and other cost factors which were considered in evaluating bids on the non-set-aside portion. The sole responsibility for implementing this program rests on the contracting officer, and the absolute ineffectiveness of this program is well explained by Mr. Linton, when he states:

"The partial set-aside which currently is used requires that the total quantity of goods to be bought must be divisable into two or more economic production runs. The variation in quantity requirements is such that the percentage which can be divided will never be large enough to make this system a technique of major significance."[6]

Certainly something should be done to make this program work more effectively. In 1960, less than 1 percent of the defense contracts were set aside under this program. As clumsy as it is, however, it would seem that a better showing than 1 percent could be made.

IV. ADDITIONAL ACTIVITY

The hearings brought out the fact that many Government agencies are engaged in or contemplating programs which will more adequately utilize Government procurement to alleviate conditions in areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus. The following is a compilation of these activities, by Department:

Department of Defense

1. At the direction of the President, created the Office of Economic Utilization Policy. It is the function of this Office to advise the Defense Department of the economic impact of their proposed action. Under the Director

---

[1] Hearings, app. I, p. 157.

[2] Hearings, app. I, p. 157.

[3] Hearings, p. 93.

[4] Hearings, pp. 93 and 94.

[5] Hearings, pp. 136 and 137.

[6] Hearings, p. 70.

of Economic Utilization Policy, there is an Adviser of Economic Utilization Policy in each of the services—Army, Navy, and Air Force—as well as the Defense Supply Agency. The functions of this Office are as follows:

(a) Maintains and disseminates to appropriate units of the organization current information on areas, industries, and specific facilities which are, or may become, economically distressed, and which have a significant potential to participate in defense procurement and logistics programs.

(b) Provides information in connection with specific major procurements and other logistics actions to those responsible for final decision, in order to assure that there is full awareness of underutilized economic resources and that this is taken into consideration in making such decision.

(c) Cooperates with State, regional, local, and industry leaders, upon request, in informing the appropriate Department of Defense officials of the capabilities of underutilized plants and other resources which can be employed in support of defense procurement and logistics programs.

(d) Continuously studies procurement policies and practices in order to recommend revisions in policies, and to identify opportunities for more effective implementation of the armed services procurement regulations relating to labor surplus.

(e) Assists contracting offices to assure full application of the Department's labor-surplus area policies by increasing the sources on bidders' lists, by reviewing potential procurements to increase the number of set-asides, and by working with prime contractors on their subcontracting planning.

(f) Works with the aerospace industry to form a committee which would voluntarily make an effort to subcontract with firms in labor-surplus areas.

2. Is experimenting with a new program which may provide a partial answer. This program, instead of dividing the requirement between two firms, would result in one firm either producing a certain percentage in a labor-surplus area or subcontracting a certain percentage to firms in labor-surplus areas.

Specifically, the program requires first that the procurement agencies select those items which lend themselves to subcontracting. The percentage of subcontracting is arbitrary at this time. It requires that the item to be procured lend itself to at least 50 percent subcontracting. When such a forthcoming contract is identified, the request for proposal (which is in the form of an invitation to bid) contains a clause requiring the low bidder either to perform 50 percent of the contract value in the labor-surplus area or to subcontract that amount in such an area. If the contractor fails to agree, then the next low bidder who is within 120 percent of that bid and qualifies as a small business in a labor-surplus area will be given an opportunity to meet the price. If there is no such small business, then any business next in line which is within 120 percent of the low bid and is also willing to produce or subcontract 50 percent in a labor-surplus area will be given an opportunity to meet the low bid. If no contractor can be found to meet the qualifications of subcontracting or performance in a labor-surplus area, the original low bidder will receive the contract.

3. Is considering a further proposal with promise which arises from the fact that most of the capacity in distressed areas is in the form of small business. The proposal would utilize the small business set-aside through cooperation with the Small Business Administration. A study of labor-surplus areas shows that for the most part they do not contain large defense-oriented industries, but do contain substantial numbers of small businesses which could participate in the defense effort. Thus, the Small Business Administration would seek to have partial labor-surplus set-asides placed in contracts that are set aside 100 percent for small business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This particular section outlines the existing defense policy. The policy has much to commend it. What is needed is the proper effectuation and activation of the policy.

I await the rejoinder of my esteemed and beloved friend from California, who renders valuable service to his State, and undoubtedly will point out again that all that has happened is just as it ought to be.

I say to the Senator from California that I think the world of his State. It is a beautiful State. It is a marvelous State. It has a great economy, wonderful people, a fine Governor, and great Senators. Many people from Minnesota have gone to California because they like the climate. They like many of the economic opportunities there through many of the research and development contracts. I want to bring a few of them back home to good old Minnesota and the Middle West, and the Great Lakes States; and to do so not only through the powers of rhetorical persuasion, but also because of economic opportunity.

I now yield the floor, and I shall await the response of my distinguished friend.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I want to say to my friend that it may well be, from the standpoint of the people of Minnesota, that they would like to have the people in California who were born in Minnesota return to their homeland, and perhaps that may be a laudable purpose for my colleague from Minnesota, but not for me, to announce as a goal. I am sure, however, that he would do me the honor of making at least one exception, and that is Mrs. Kuchel. She is happy to be a Californian. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota would not want her now permanently to return to her native State, against her will.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the reasons why the Senator from Minnesota has been so determined to see a better distribution of some of the research and development contracts is the quality of our people. I speak now particularly of the State of Minnesota. I know of no better witness to the fine quality, characteristics, intelligence, and charm of the people of Minnesota— and particularly of the feminine sex—than the decision of the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from California, when he selected his bride from Minnesota.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes, the Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Sleepy Eye, Minn. We are very much honored that the Senator from California found his lovely lady in our State. We are very proud of that fact. Even though it would be wonderful to have her back with us, I think the Senator is entitled to the best, and he has the best.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. The honor is the other way around. It is my honor. I am highly pleased that my wife is a Minnesotan.

Mr. President, I am about to ask the Senator from Minnesota some questions relative to the several recommendations that the subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business has made today to the Senate as they appear in the news release. I think it is a commendable thing that each of us in this Chamber, representing as best we can the State from which he comes, seeks to place the problem of his constituents constantly in his mind—but in the last analysis, all of us are, first, Americans. This is the United States of America. The responsibility of the Federal Government runs to all of us, whether we live in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Pennsylvania, California, or elsewhere; and the responsibility to maintain free America and to maintain a defense posture, to deter aggression, or, if necessary, successfully to combat it, is a Federal responsibility that knows no State lines.

I turn now to the news release which my able friend from Minnesota alluded to in his earlier remarks. I turn particularly to the recommendations set forth in the news release. The first recommendation reads as follows:

> Amending the Defense Appropriation Act to allow all of the work for a particular defense contract to be set aside for distressed areas.

I want to understand what that means. It appears to be rather vague. Is the able assistant majority leader saying that the law of this land, in his judgment and in the judgment of the subcommittee, should be amended so as to require the Secretary of Defense, in awarding any defense contract, to allocate all of it to distressed economic areas, exclusively?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. What we recommend is to permit the Secretary to make that allowance.

I have lost my copy of the report.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will give my able friend the copy which he so graciously furnished me earlier.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator may recall that I offered this amendment, without too much success, I regret to say, in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KUCHEL. I recall it with great pleasure. The committee was correct in disposing of the amendment in that fashion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator opposed it with effective and devastating results, for which I shall forgive him momentarily.

Mr. KUCHEL. Very well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What I am suggesting is that under the defense appropriations a portion or all of a particular defense contract be set aside for a distressed area. However, this could only be done if the Defense Department found that there were sufficient firms in labor surplus areas to insure that competitive bidding would bring fair and reasonable prices. This is done at the present time under the small business set-aside program. I must remind the Senator that even now 85 percent of defense procurement is done by negotiation and not by formal advertised bidding. Therefore by demanding sufficient firms under the proposal in the report to assure fair and reasonable prices more competition would be realized as is the case in the small business set-aside program than is now realized in most defense procurement.

We are suggesting that where there are areas of critical and persistent unemployment, the Secretary of Defense shall be permitted, under an amendment to the Appropriation Act, to set aside a portion or all of a particular contract, if it can be fulfilled, and if there is some competition within the labor surplus areas, so that there is bidding and a competitive practice or procedure. It is spelled out in some detail in the printed report.

Mr. KUCHEL. While the Senator is obtaining a copy of the report, let me see whether I understand him, for the comments he has just made add considerably to recommendation No. 1. My colleague is aware, of course, that for the past decade, and more, the Federal law has required the Department of Defense to award contracts, on the basis of the lowest available price, to any bidder otherwise qualified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I disagree with that statement. They are not all awarded on the basis of competitive bidding. There are many negotiated contracts.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct; but is the Senator, in his recommendation No. 1, talking in terms of allowing the Secretary of Defense to negotiate contracts for weapons systems, also, in defense operations? Is that what the Senator is contending for?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the price range is competitive; in other words, if it does not put an undue burden on the Federal Treasury when the costs in the area which are involved in what we call social costs are taken into consideration.

I do not believe we can ignore the fact that frequently through a Government policy we upset an area to the point where we place upon the area undue burdens of unemployment, which are met by Federal-State expenditures in order to take care of human needs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Where is the Senator reading from?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I read from page 14 of the subcommittee report, as follows:

> The subcommittee was told all too often of the negative aspects of legislative provisions in the application of the national policy.

That has reference to the defense manpower policy which is a part of the law. It is the policy that these contracts, wherever possible, should be let in areas of unemployment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I deny that statement, but I will not interrupt the Senator in his answer, because I wish to pursue the basic reasons which sponsor recommendation No. 1 in the report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The basic reason is quite simple. It is that the Defense Department has the money, and the unemployment areas have the unemployed people. If the unemployment area has the facilities, if there is competition within the area, if skilled workers are available within the area, and if it has the equipment the Government needs, a policy decision should be made to provide that either all of the contract or a portion of it shall be filled in that area, to provide employment; provided that the equipment is of the required standard and meets specifications, and provided, further, that the delivery dates and all other factors relating to the Government's requirements, are fulfilled.

Mr. KUCHEL. So recommendation No. 1 asks for a change in the law, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to allocate an entire defense contract by negotiation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or by bid.

Mr. KUCHEL. Or by bid. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. Exclusively to so-called economically distressed areas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It might be for a particular commodity, or for a particular contract. It does not mean all contracts. It may be for a particular item with respect to which the equipment, facility, management, technology, and the skilled workers are available in the area, and where the price is not unreasonable in terms of competitive bidding and in negotiated contracts.

Mr. KUCHEL. What is the Senator's understanding as to the availability to the Secretary of Defense of the right to award contracts with respect to distressed areas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He does very little about it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is it not a fact that for 10 years Congress has required him, on a bid-contract, to award the contract to the——

Mr. HUMPHREY. The lowest bidder.

Mr. KUCHEL. The lowest responsible bidder?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. There is no doubt about it. However let me make it clear that under the proposal in the report no set-aside could take place unless it was first found that there were a sufficient number of firms eligible to bid to provide competition. This is essentially the way the small business set-aside program works and Assistant Secretary Thomas Morris testified before a House committee that this method does not increase the cost to the Defense Department. I must also point out that even if Assistant Secretary Morris was wrong and there was a slight increase in cost to the Defense Department the total savings to the American taxpayer would be tremendous and I will not detail again the high cost to the taxpayer to maintain labor surplus areas.

What the Senator from Minnesota is trying to state is that the Defense Department is a part of the National Government. It gets its money from all the taxpayers, just as the Interstate Commerce Commission, for example, gets its money from all the taxpayers. In this connection I would also venture an opinion that no high-ranking officer in our defense establishment could defend in terms of national security the geographic concentration of defense spending that has occurred in this country.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator has been a leader in the Senate with respect to the alleviation of many social problems which plague the American people. I have followed him in the Senate with respect to extending unemployment compensation. The Senator will recall that fact. Unemployment is a matter of deep and serious concern to all of us, and we need continually to face that problem.

However, would not the Senator agree that the only reason why the Pentagon was built, and the only reason why there is an office called the Office of the Secretary of Defense, is to supply the American people with a measure of security which the American people need in this melancholy world? Is that not correct? Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that. The answer to the Senator's earlier question—and I know what he is about to point out to me, namely, that the job of the Defense Department is to defend the Nation——

Mr. KUCHEL. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

However, the Defense Department could not defend itself in a paper bag if it did not have people. People are to be found all over the country. The Nation is as strong as the Pentagon, and the Pentagon is as strong as the Nation. The Pentagon is nothing more nor less than the visible evidence of the basic strength of the Nation. If there are areas of distress and economic dislocation throughout the Nation, then the Nation has a weak spot. I would also say again to your question that geographic concentration of defense spending does not make the country easier to defend.

I think this Government recognized this in 1953 when it adopted DMP 4. I quote from that document as it now reads:

> It is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage the placing of contracts and facilities in areas of persistent or substantial labor surplus, with first preference being given to areas of persistent labor surplus, and to assist such areas in making the best use of their available resources in order to achieve the following objectives:
>
> (a) To preserve management and employee skills necessary to the fulfillment of Government contracts and purchases;
>
> (b) To maintain productive facilities;
>
> (c) To improve utilization of the Nation's total manpower potential by making use of the manpower resources of each area;
>
> (d) To help assure timely delivery of required goods and services and to promote readiness for expanded effort by locating procurement where the needed manpower and facilities are fully available.

The latest revision of this document is dated July 6, 1960, and may be found in volume 25 of the Federal Register, page 5283. It was issued by the Director of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization under Executive Order 10480 and Executive Order 10773.

Then we continue, as the report shows, to the language which I believe is the heart of the problem:

> The directive which seems to have been least implemented is the one which states that all Federal departments and agencies shall give consideration to labor-surplus areas, particularly to persistent labor-surplus areas, in the selection of sites for Government-financed facilities expansion, to the extent that such consideration is not inconsistent with essential economic and strategic

factors that must also be taken into account.

Mr. KUCHEL. What has the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, done with that directive?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then we come to the language which vitiates part of that program. We say, as stated in the report:

> The President himself, in a memorandum to the Cabinet and principal agencies, dated February 27, 1962, stated his personal concern for using the weight of the Federal Government to give preference to redevelopment areas in the awarding of contracts. In view of this, the question arises why so few contracts are placed in substantial and persistent labor-surplus areas. The answer lies partly in an amendment attached to the Defense Appropriations Act of 1957. This amendment has been placed in every appropriation act since 1953, and in the current act (sec. 523, Public Law 87–577) reads as follows:
>
> "*Provided further*, That no funds herein appropriated shall be used for the payment of a price differential on contracts hereafter made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations."
>
> This amendment has turned out to be disastrous for a successful implementation of DMP No. 4, because of the interpretation placed upon it by the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States in opinion B–145136, dated March 3, 1961. In this opinion the Comptroller General stated:
>
> "On the record we must construe the limitation in question as precluding the expenditure by the Defense Establishment of appropriated funds under any contract awarded on the basis of a labor surplus area situation at a price in excess of the lowest obtainable on an unrestricted solicitation of bids or proposals."

Mr. President, what it really boils down to is that the Federal Government, on the one hand, says, "Take care of the labor distressed areas. Take care of the areas of unemployment. Do a better job in the use of research and development contracts which are not competitive, but which are negotiated."

The Government gives approximately $6 billion of those contracts to the State of California. I can well understand why the Senator from California is battling here. Bless his heart. He is doing an outstanding job with the help of the Department of Defense. That does not require any competitive bidding. Contracts for research and development are given to California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator from Minnesota suggest that there is any favoritism or politics or fraud in the activities of the Department of Defense?

Mr. HUMPHREY. None whatsoever. I suggest that it is a habit. For example, I suggest that the great University of California today has a substantial part of its entire budget in Federal contracts. Naturally, it follows that the University of California having done good work, having done a remarkable job, the Department of Defense finds it easy to give the University of California another contract. They have the personnel, so they get another research and development contract. Then they get more good people. See where the Nobel Prize winners are to be found today. The great University of California is an excellent, marvelous institution. I would be the last one to say anything derogatory about it, because it is one of the great universities of the world. It becomes greater and greater and greater every time Uncle Sam puts another $100 million into it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Why does Uncle Sam put hundreds of millions into it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. All I say is that the work ought to be spread around a little. That is all. If it were spread around a little more, it might be possible to find a labor distressed area where some of the money could do some good.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Minnesota has suggested that in 1957 Congress took action in the appropriation act to require that the Secretary of Defense award military contracts to the bidder offering the lowest price. The Senator is correct. We did it before 1957; we have done it every year following 1957. We did it in the Senate Chamber less than a month ago. It is the law of the land. It ought to be the law of the land, because one reason why this country faces internal problems today is the prodigious sum of money we are required each year to expend for the Military Establishment. I am afraid we shall be compelled to continue to expend prodigious sums of money for the defense of the American people in the future.

The American people, whether they live in Sleepy Eye, Minn., or Anaheim, Calif., are interested in having their Government conduct its business in as economical a fashion as possible. That is the reason why Congress, every year for more than a decade, has ordered the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State, where bids are made available, to accept the bid that represents the lowest cost to the American taxpayer.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. I will yield in a few minutes. On my time, I asked the able Senator from Minnesota a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. See what an answer the Senator from California got.

Mr. KUCHEL. Now I want to do a little talking on my own time. I have said on the floor of the Senate before, and I repeat it now—as I recall, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] was in the chair the last time there was a similar colloquy, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] was speaking—the Secretary of Defense has an important and grave duty, which is to provide for the defense of the American people. In my judgment, he is performing an excellent, honorable service. The Secretary of Defense is a dedicated man. I do not want the Secretary of Defense, no matter who he may be, to be saddled with additional responsibilities in the field of social legislation. Neither does Congress, including this particular Congress, which passed judgment once again when it passed the Defense Appropriation Act a few weeks ago.

My grandfather was an immigrant from across the sea. He came to Pennsylvania a century and a half ago, more or less. He went across the Plains. He went to California. People have continued to go west; and today I suppose it is true that California is the most populous State in the Union. Each year some 600,000 more people come to California. Among them must be many Ph. D.'s, some of whom have graduated from the University of Minnesota, the University of Wisconsin, and elsewhere. I want to help the University of Wisconsin when I can, and I want to help the University of Minnesota when I can, for I am an American. What helps one part of the country will help another part of the country.

However, I am appalled at these recommendations. I will not say I am shocked, because some of them have been made before. But I am appalled at the recommendations. I am appalled that Senators should demand that the law be changed so that in given instances entire contracts for the defense of our country be awarded not to supply weapons for defense, but, rather, to provide jobs in economically distressed areas of the country. Bring on the proposed legislation for that purpose, and let me help to supply jobs, if I have to, in economically distressed areas. But do not make me saddle upon the back of the Secretary of Defense a responsibility in addition to that which he has today.

The second recommendation which the able Senator makes from the Subcommittee on Small Business suggests that there be established "an Office of Economic Utilization in all appropriate agencies, to assure that economic problems are considered in the award of contracts."

Congress has already disposed of that problem. As the able Senator has said, the Senate Committee on Appropriations disposed of the problem in committee. They disposed of it by continuing to do exactly what each Senate Committee on Appropriations has done for many years: they recommended a continuance of the provision in the law which would require, in the interest of the American taxpayer, that the lowest responsible bidder do the work for America's defense. Once again, several weeks ago, the Senate approved that recommendation.

Third, it is recommended that there be adopted "programs to equalize the distribution of research and development contracts."

If the equalization and distribution of research and development contracts means requiring some kind of geographical distribution of research and development contracts across this country by the Department of Defense, I am sure the opposition that I feel to such a recommendation will be reflected in the position of the Secretary of Defense, the President, and an overwhelming majority of Members of Congress. There is only one basis on which a research and development contract ought to be awarded to anybody and that is on the basis that the Department of Defense, acting through its professional people and its civilian heads, determines that it is in the interest of the security of the American people to award that contract to X, Y, or Z.

Recommendation No. 4 suggests that more defense subcontracts be placed in distressed areas. On the theory that the whole contains all the parts involved, this is simply a kind of addendum to recommendation No. 1, which states the entire contract should go to a distressed area.

Mr. President, now listen to recommendation No. 5. I preface my comments by saying again that the Senator from Minnesota is my friend, and is a fine Senator, but will the Senator listen to his recommendation No. 5.

> Locating more military bases and other Government projects and facilities in distressed areas by requiring clearance for new facilities to be placed outside distressed areas.

If I understand what that means, Mr. President, it is that this subcommittee recommends the enactment of legislation under which military installations would be placed in distressed areas, without regard to whether their placement there would help the defense of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from California yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield, and I hope the Senator will say to me that in this instance my apprehension is unnecessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is unnecessary, ill-founded, and unwarranted, and no basis for it even exists.

Mr. KUCHEL. I hope the Senator will tell me more.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I said earlier today, with reference to the paper the Senator now holds in his hand, which is an abbreviated excerpt from the report, it would not apply to the point where it would in any way minimize, jeopardize, or inhibit our fulfillment of our defense needs or interfere with the proper location of our defense facilities. All we were doing there was reciting what is already a part of the defense manpower policy; but I thought it would be nice to remind the Defense Department that it would be possible for it to give thoughtful consideration to Defense and Manpower Policy Directive No. 4; that if it could locate military installations or facilities in an area of economic distress or of persistent unemployment, without jeopardizing the defense structure of the United States or the strength of our Defense Establishment, the Department should do it, and that it would be helpful to do so.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then what I have just read from the subcommittee's report about "locating more military bases and other Government projects and facilities in distressed areas," is not exactly what the subcommittee means?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; it is exactly what the subcommittee means, and it is exactly what the Defense and Manpower Policy Directive No. 4 already provides. But it is exactly what the Defense Department is not doing; and I wanted to remind the Defense Department to "get on with the job"; that is all.

Mr. KUCHEL. Then I regret to say that I continue to be shocked, because I do not want the Secretary of Defense to be compelled to place a military installation at any place on any basis except one: Is this in the interest of the security of the American people?

Will not the distinguished Senator from Minnesota agree with me on that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, of course I would say that. But let me say to the distinguished Senator from California that sometimes it is possible, in evaluating the location of a defense installation, to give consideration to unused equipment, unused facilities, vacant land, or areas where some social benefits might be derived from the construction of a defense establishment. There is nothing wrong with that. If it is possible to help people at the same time that provision for the defense of the country is made, I see no reason why the Defense Department should express any opposition.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not believe the Department would, either. But has the Senator talked to the members of the staff of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly have, and I have the highest regard for them.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do they approve of this subcommittee recommendation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe they do approve of that version of it; but even though a thing may be approved, sometimes nothing is done about it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Have they said they approve it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is that statement in writing?

Mr. HUMPHREY. They testified they are all for it. I just want them to "get on with it"; that is all.

Mr. KUCHEL. Can the Senator indicate at what page in the hearings one can find the Department's approval of these recommendations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, under DMP 4 this is the official policy of the executive branch of this Government and certainly concurred in by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. KUCHEL. No, I mean the recommendations set forth in the news release of today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. All I am pointing out to the Senator from California is the fact that we are quoting the law. We are simply saying, "This is the law, please do something about it."

Of course, we cannot make the Department of Defense do anything, because the Senator from California will not let me; but we can suggest to the Department that it follow the manpower policy directive laid down in Directive No. 4:

> It is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage the placing of contracts and facilities in areas of persistent or substantial labor surplus, with first preference being given to areas of persistent labor surplus, and to assist such areas in making the best use of their available resources. * * *

Then in Defense Manpower Directive No. 4 we find this:

> 2. Purpose. It is the purpose of this Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 to direct attention to the potentialities of areas of persistent or substantial labor surplus, hereafter referred to as labor surplus areas, for the placement of procurement contracts or the location of new plants or facilities, and to assign responsibilities to specified departments and agencies of the Government to carry out the policy stated below.

Let me say to the Senator from California that at our hearings, members of the Defense Department said they thought that was a good idea.

Mr. KUCHEL. Let me say, Mr. President, that if—heaven forbid—the subcommittee's recommendations were to be approved by the full Committee on Small Business, and if thereafter there were to result a piece of legislation purporting to write into the law the recommendations to which I have just referred, there is not the slightest doubt that the Secretary of Defense himself or high ranking personnel on his staff would testify before us in opposition to such legislation. There can be no question at all about that. Let the record show clearly that the Secretary of Defense has not approved the recommendations of the subcommittee; and let the record also show clearly that when, in the past, some individual Senators have attempted to make a gigantic WPA out of defense procurement, the Secretary of Defense has urged the Members of Congress to refuse to pass such proposed legislation.

I should like to refer briefly to the other two recommendations the subcommittee made:

> No. 6. Providing in Government contracts for purchase of materials at the "point of origin" to give firms in distressed areas a competitive opportunity with firms located near points of delivery.

In the present instance I shall not raise the question of jurisdiction, though I must honestly say that before anyone could pass judgment on the validity of any part of recommendation No. 6, the entire subject ought to be threshed out by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. It is something the effect of which on the American economy would not be classified on the basis of how big or how little the business might be with which the Government was contracting.

No. 7 recommendation is as follows:

> Expanding responsibility of the Office of Emergency Planning to include preparation of studies and suggestions to improve the "long-range health of the economy."

Since my comments on the present occasion are directed against recommendations that have to do with a change in the present law with respect to defense procurement, I shall make no comment at this time on recommendation No. 7.

I have no doubt that I speak for every Senator and every citizen in our land when I say that all of us desire that the Department of Defense, in contracting with any American businessman, give consideration to the competence of a businessman to do a job. I believe I represent the feeling of the American people and a great majority of our colleagues when I say that the American people desire the Secretary of Defense to perform efficiently and economically.

Thus they would approve our continuing in the law a guideline which provides that that kind of basis be followed.

My able friend from Minnesota has suggested that we need "a better allocation"—his words—of defense contracts. Mr. President, I believe that allocation of defense contracts for any social purpose, however valid they might be otherwise, would not be in the interest of the defense and security of the American people. Therefore, I believe that the allocation of defense contracts must continue to remain in the honorable, decent, and sound discretion of the Secretary of Defense and his staff in the Pentagon.

More than a year ago, Robert McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, wrote a letter to a Member of the House of Representatives. The entire text of the letter appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 2, page 2140. I wish to read most of the letter, skipping the introduction:

> It is, indeed the policy of this Department to award defense contracts with full recognition to the priorities involving considerations of merit. Capability of performance, quality, and price are primary factors in our determinations. We are currently engaged in intensive efforts to strengthen incentives for outstanding performance.
>
> As I stated before the Armed Services Committee, we recognize that changes in military programs create very difficult problems for the businesses, communities, and individuals affected. Therefore, we have taken such reasonable measures as lie within the capabilities of the Government to alleviate hardships. Within the Defense Department itself we have established a special office to deal with problems stemming from such dislocations. We shall continue these efforts in the future but we cannot compromise the basic principle that the defense programs must be guided primarily by national security requirements.

The letter was signed by Secretary McNamara. It was addressed to Representative HARRY R. SHEPPARD.

In my judgment, the Secretary's comment in that letter represents precisely the comment that he ought to make and precisely the concept of his duty that I have. We ought not to hamstring the Department of Defense. We ought not to punish, prod, or push the Department of Defense into assuming any greater responsibility than that which it has today.

Under those circumstances I desired to voice my vigorous objection to the proposals of the Senate subcommittee and to say that, in my judgment, they would not serve the public interest if they were to be adopted, as I hope and pray they will not be adopted.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. In concluding, the Senator from California stated his conviction that the Secretary of Defense was correct in the excerpt read from the letter, that national security considerations should be the factor which determines the decision of the Department of Defense. I renew my question: What if the low bids were to put all the work in California, and California should have an earthquake? Are there not factors other than the low bid that relate to the national security decision? That is my point.

Mr. KUCHEL. I remember that a number of years ago the policy in the Defense Department, by Executive order, was one of dispersal. I think some people called it dispersion. I never knew whether there was such a word. At any rate, there was a policy of dispersal. I remember on one occasion when one of our colleagues who still serves in the Senate hurriedly prepared and offered as an amendment to a defense bill a provision to carry out dispersal by mandate of Congress rather than merely by authority of the executive. The amendment was adopted. It became the law. It remained in the law. There was some question as to interpretation, for it was hurriedly drawn. I participated in some discussions as to what it meant. As I recall, in the subsequent development of new weapon systems, offensive and defensive, the problem raised by a dispersal program was eliminated, for it was felt, I take it, that with modern weapons and modern means of delivery, a policy of dispersal would not promote, to the same extent that might previously have been the case, any security with respect to military hardware or weapon system production.

Today, as the Senator well knows, military hardware and weapon systems are being manufactured all across our land—on the east coast, in the South, in the central part of the country, in the great Southwest, in the semiarid areas of Western America, and in the great Northwest region.

To answer the Senator's question, it is my judgment that today, whether necessary or not, there is an actual dispersal of work all across the country. In past colloquies on this subject I have placed in the RECORD statistical information which I do not have available at the moment, to demonstrate how, through subcontracting, a prime contract is spread to the four corners of the United States.

Mr. HART. I believe the Senator understood my question. I am suggesting that if—as a result of the operation of the economics for which, apparently, the Senator argues; namely, that low bidders shall get all the contracts—the day should arrive when, instead of Los Angeles having 42 percent of its manufacturing employment based on defense, it should be 100 percent, and 100 percent of the hardware was being turned out there, and an actual disaster occurred, somebody would wonder how stupid we were and we would have been stupid.

The reason I urged this point is to suggest that at some stage the Department of Defense has an obligation to make a judgment other than a bookkeeper's judgment. We should face the fact that we have not yet developed a blueprint which will guide as prudently as we should the decisions as to how we shall regulate the several competing factors.

That is the reason why I am delighted that the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, has put before the Senate again a paper which will compel us to ask ourselves the question, "Are we operating as prudently as we can the disbursement of moneys which in total have an economic implication which perhaps few economists would wish to say with absolute conviction they understand?" That is the reason why I believe the arrival of the subcommittee report is a good thing.

As a parenthetical footnote, if anyone who reads the RECORD for the past hour should want to support the old bromide that the Communists preach about us—that we cannot afford disarmament, and we are the threat to the peace—he probably would find a useful chapter. This is the tragedy of it all.

If Los Angeles, for its manufacturing employment, depends 42 percent on defense tools, disarmament would have a very gritty sound even if circumstances should permit us to move in that direction, unless we developed a blueprint which would persuade those who work on the tools that we can indeed afford disarmament. This is one aspect of the parochial debate which rarely is voiced, and really should concern us more.

Mr. KUCHEL. Going back to the first part of the question the Senator asked, I thought he was asking me about the possibility of an earthquake in jest, or at least in semijest, for I very much doubt that anyone would seriously contend that the hazard of earthquakes ought to be taken into consideration in the production of any kind of goods or services for the Government. I quickly add that when nuclear installations have been undertaken or sought to be undertaken in California, appropriate scientific studies have been made to determine whether there were any great hazards along those lines. The decisions have been made on the accumulation of the evidence.

I hope my good friend from Michigan will not advance seriously an argument in favor of these regrettable recommendations from the Select Committee on Small Business on the theory that earthquakes have something to do with the subject.

Mr. HART. I shall clarify the question.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is a distressing thing.

Mr. HART. I used earthquakes as an example of a factor which ought to give pause to the argument that we should ask the accountants where all the work should go. It could as well have been a question phrased to begin: "If awarding production to the low bidders so concentrated defense procurement that every labor area of the Nation suddenly was found to be dried up, with skills disappeared, and all skills had been concentrated in another place—" and so forth.

I was merely using earthquakes as an example, as I use the disappearance of labor pools across the country as illustrations of the fact that there must be factors relating to national security that one does not get from the accounting department. That is exactly what I mean.

This is hard music to play to a taxpayer, who delights when anyone gets up to pound the table about low cost.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an opportunity to yield to my able friend the acting majority leader, although it is interrupting a colloquy between the Senator from Michigan and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will be a pleasant interruption.

First, I would comment on the statement of the Senator from California that there is no policy to disperse facilities. This has in fact been the law of the land since 1950. So that this will be further called to the attention of the Secretary of Defense and the Senator from California, I quote from page 33 of the report which contains section 2062 of the Defense Production Act. In particular, I call attention to the last clause of the next to the last sentence:

Defense Production Act of 1950, Public Law 81–774, 64 Stat. 798, 50 App. U.S.C. § 2061 et seq.

§ 2062. Declaration of policy

In view of the present international situation and in order to provide for the national defense and national security, our mobilization effort continues to require some diversion of certain materials and facilities from civilian use to military and related purposes. It also requires the development of preparedness programs and the expansion of productive capacity and supply beyond the levels needed to meet the civilian demand, in order to reduce the time required for full mobilization in the event of an attack on the United States.

In order to insure productive capacity in the event of such an attack on the United States, it is the policy of the Congress to encourage the geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of the national defense, and to discourage the concentration of such productive facilities within limited geographical areas which are vulnerable to attack by an enemy of the United States. In the construction of any Government-owned industrial facilities, in the rendition of any Government financial assistance for the construction, expansion, or improvement of any industrial facilities, and in the procurement of goods and services, under this or any other Act, each department and agency of the executive branch shall apply, under the coordination of the Office of Defense Mobilization, when practicable and consistent with existing law and the desirability for maintaining a sound economy, the principle of the geographical dispersal of such facilities in the interest of national defense. Nothing contained in this paragraph shall preclude the use of existing industrial facilities.

Next, I point out that the point being made by the Senator from Michigan is made very evident by Cape Canaveral. I do not know whether it is cheaper to have a missile site at Cape Canaveral or cheaper to have it in Arizona, Minnesota, Michigan, Alabama, or in any other State. I do know why the missile launching is at Cape Canaveral. It is because of climate, because of accessibility, because of certain factors relating to tracking stations, and so on. There are many factors which are totally unrelated to the dollar sign.

This is perfectly true as to the Minuteman missile. Why is the Minuteman missile placed in some areas and not in others? I have a problem explaining this to the people of Minnesota. Finally I tell them, "It relates to the topography. It relates to the geological structure of the soil."

It is not a question of whether it is cheaper to put the missiles in North Dakota than in Minnesota, or cheaper to put them in Minnesota than in Montana. It relates to certain factors of national security.

The same can be said of many other things, especially in the field of atomic energy. Sometimes we must place a plant near a source of water supply, or away from an urban area.

The hour is growing late, but I wish to add that our good friend from California is slightly too defensive. The report does not give four or five recommendations, and the Senator has concentrated his attention upon one recommendation. The only reason for the recommendation for removing certain language from the Defense Department Appropriation Act was that the Defense Manpower Policy Statement No. 4, according to the testimony of the Department of Defense, has been difficult to administer. The Department of Defense has tried to administer it.

I am not here to attempt to criticize Mr. McNamara. I think he is a distinguished citizen, a great administrator, and an outstanding Secretary of Defense. I merely say that if the defense dollar is to continue to be as big as it is in the total economy, and if there are problems of unemployment and economic dislocation because of Government policy, we should try to take into consideration the use of the defense dollar to relieve some of the conditions created by Government policy.

There are 32 recommendations in the report—not 6, not 7, not 8, but 32. The one which has been concentrated upon today as the "chamber of horrors" is the fact that the defense manpower policy—which specifically provides that it shall be the policy to encourage the placement of contracts and facilities in areas of persistent and substantial labor surplus—is not being implemented because of language that the Congress placed in the Defense Department Appropriation Act.

We are making a suggestion that possibly there could be some modification of that language. That is on one item. There are 31 other recommendations. Let me say to the Senator from California that $2½ billion worth of research and development contracts from the Defense Department going into his State in 1961 represented about 41½ percent of the total amount of research and development contracts. In 1961 a total of $6 billion of research and development contracts from the DOD, and $2½ billion worth of them goes to the State of California. That is about 41 to 42 percent.

Those are not competitive bid contracts. They are negotiated contracts.

It is a fact of economic life that that the hardware, the production of the tools and the equipment, follows research and development. Research and development can be spread across the country. The Defense Department itself made this statement in our hearings. This statement appears on page 6 of the report:

It must be recognized that the Midwest, with its great university resources, and with its heavy annual production of Ph. D.'s and other professionals, did not in fiscal year 1961 obtain a share of defense prime contract awards, either for production, for general R.D.T. & E., or for nonprofit research proportional to its share of the Nation's scientific and technical skills. Conversely, considerable R.D.T. & E. and some basic research, is being conducted in areas where local institutions of higher learning fall far short of producing a comparable flow of trained professional and scientific manpower.

We are not arguing that one part of the country be torn down. We are arguing—and the committee gave its attention to this particular facet or part of the problem—against economic dislocation; namely, that in the granting of Government contracts, particularly in the field of research and development, greater consideration should be given to a proper geographic distribution, on the basis that has been stated by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]—national security. For example, national security today requires a second source. Taking the example of procurement of axles for Army trucks, the axle contracts are not given only to one company. There must be a second source, even if the second source costs more than the first source. The entire contract for the purchase is not given to the lowest bidder. The Department is required to have a second source, even though the second source charges more for the same axle than the first source charges. Why? Because a second source is needed for the security of our country.

There is need to have the security of the country considered in terms of the economic well-being of the Nation. I think we need to consider the proper use of our manpower, facilities and equipment, and not have a great deal of idle plants while others are overworked and overused. The American Government is spending billions of dollars in certain parts of the country to keep people from starving, while in other parts of the country it is spending hundreds of millions of dollars trying to provide streets, sewers, or water, because there is a congestion of people. It is not sensible economic policy.

It seems to me that if there were some effort on the part of the Congress and the executive branch to meet these problems, we could alleviate some of them.

I remind my friend from California and any other Senator that even if a contract is awarded in a distressed area, any business that obtains a Government contract first must be approved by the Defense Department as to its facilities. It is not merely a question of saying, "You are a poor fellow. Here is a contract." The business firm that gets the contract must meet the standards set by the Defense Department as to the serviceability and adequacy of the facilities. It must also be able to meet the standards of competency, capacity to produce, quality of goods, quantity of goods, and the ability to produce on time.

Furthermore, our recommendations provide that there must be competition, so there is not a stacked price. But we do provide—and the Government has said this since 1953—that where there is persistent and chronic unemployment, there should be an attempt to bring into that area, if it does not jeopardize the security needs of the Nation, defense contracts for procurement of goods and services and the location of facilities. This is not something the Small Business Committee recommends. It has been the manpower policy of the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States through two administrations. But one of the troubles is that if there can be no price differential at all, a proper application of the defense manpower policy is frequently inhibited. President Kennedy said, for example:

> Economists tell us that an unemployment rate of 6 percent is the danger signal. When a community passes that point it is officially regarded as an area of "substantial labor surplus." If it remains there it is entitled to special Government help through defense procurement and other programs.

The President says we ought to do something about it. The Secretary of Defense says we ought to do something about it. But the Congress in the Appropriation Act says these things can be done provided it does not cost anything.

What we are really saying is that we are supposed to relieve unemployment, assist surplus labor areas, provide new jobs and new production, but we do not do it in a certain area if it costs 10 cents more than it does in the most productive area of the country to produce a similar kind of product. In the meantime the cost of unemployment is ignored. So is unused plant capacity. Skilled workers become rusty in their skills. Human misery is ignored. The cost of unemployment compensation is ignored, as are relief, the cost of surplus food, mortgage foreclosures, and general economic distress.

All we are saying in the report—which I think makes good sense—is that with the huge amounts of Federal funds available, we should try to give effective consideration to the use of funds to relieve distress, provided that in so doing security is not jeopardized or an undue burden is not placed on the American taxpayer.

I charge, on the floor of the Senate, that the present policy costs us much more in dollars and much more in human frustration and agony than the program recommended in the report. The program calls for proper utilization of our resources and effective and economic utilization of those resources. There were 32 recommendations, as a result of extensive hearings, recommendations with which Mr. Linton, of the Defense Department, is in substantial agreement, but on which he asks the Congress of the United States to give him a helping hand.

THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRESS ON MOVING ECONOMY, CUTTING SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the most recently available figures now indicate that the Federal deficit will be nearly $5 billion less than forecast in the January budget.

This revised estimate, based on new receipt and expenditure figures, is good news for the American people. The estimate proves that the President meant what he said when he promised to hold down Federal expenditures and to get the economy moving again. The administration is to be complimented on the results to date.

These figures, prepared at my request by the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, indicate that Federal expenditures in fiscal 1964 should be down more than a billion dollars from the level estimated by the administration in January.

As the same time Federal receipts will probably be more than $3.5 billion above the January estimates. This higher level is due in part to the delay in enacting tax reduction. However, it is also associated with a vigorous economy that is growing more rapidly than expected.

As a result of these various factors, the Federal deficit will be nearly $5 billion less than anticipated. This means savings to the American public. We are rapidly approaching a time when we will be able to pay all our Government's bills from tax income. This is fiscal responsibility at its best.

Mr. President, this suggests to me that tax reduction should be further delayed. The argument has been advanced that tax reduction is the fastest way to reach a balanced budget yet these estimates clearly prove that we are now well on the way to balancing our budget. We should not impede this progress by tax reduction now which will obviously deepen our deficit and perhaps prevent ultimate balance in our Federal budget.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a table giving the breakdown of the revised estimates on Federal receipts and expenditures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Estimated administrative budget receipts and expenditures for fiscal 1964 [1]

[In billions of dollars]

	January 1963 budget estimates	Current estimates	Difference
Receipts:			
Individual income tax	45.8	50.8	+5.0
Corporate income tax	23.8	22.7	−1.1
Excise taxes	10.4	10.3	−.1
Miscellaneous receipts	4.0	3.7	−.3
All other	3.6	3.7	+.1
Interfund transactions	−.7	−.7	
Total	86.9	90.5	+3.6
Expenditures:			
Funds appropriated to the President	4.4	4.4	
Agriculture Department	6.6	6.0	−.6
Defense Department	52.2	52.2	
HEW	5.7	5.5	−.2
Interior	1.2	1.2	
Labor	.4	.3	−.1
Treasury	11.2	11.6	+.4
AEC	2.8	2.8	
HHFA	.7	.5	−.2
NASA	4.2	4.4	+.2
VA	5.5	5.2	−.3
Eximbank	−.6	−.7	−.1
Other	5.2	5.0	−.2
Interfund transactions	−.7	−.7	
Total	98.8	97.7	−1.1
Deficit	−11.9	−7.2	4.7

[1] Estimates developed in part by the Joint Economic Committee staff.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out that the cuts by the administration in expenditures include a $600 million reduction for the Department of Agriculture, $200 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, $100 million for the Department of Labor, $200 million for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and $300 million for the Veterans' Administration.

NEW BUDGET ESTIMATES

The President has repeatedly indicated that he intends to hold down Federal expenditures as much as possible consistent with our national obligations. The President has stated this on at least two occasions to Congressman Wilbur Mills in connection with the tax reduction bill.

Many of us in Congress have felt that machinery should be available by which we in Congress, and the public generally, could be more effectively informed concerning the current rates of Federal expenditures. The Statistics Subcommittee—of which I am chairman—of the Joint Economic Committee felt this need so strongly that it has this as one of its major recommendations in its recent report on the Federal budget. The entire Joint Economic Committee unanimously endorsed this recommendation.

The Joint Economic Committee also took a pioneering step during the last fiscal year. The committee staff drew together and published its own set of budgetary predictions. The purpose of this release of budgetary estimates was twofold: first, to show trends in expenditures and receipts, and, second, to emphasize the importance of the publication of such data. Obviously, the Joint Economic Committee staff is not equipped to do a complete job of reporting current budgetary developments. However, the attempt last year was a useful first step and the committee staff received a considerable amount of favorable response from the Congress, the press, and the public generally.

Mr. President, a member of the staff of the Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Gregory Guroff, gave me technical assistance in making comparable the estimates where I have not put in the Record about the trends in Federal receipts and expenditures for the current fiscal year, which is now about one-fourth over. Updated estimates have now been developed, and I believe they represent a useful source of information to the Members of the Senate and to the public generally.

A related set of figures has recently been provided by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] in his report from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures. These figures show that in July of this year total civilian personnel in the executive branch numbered 2,518,857. In August the comparable number was 2,515,008, or a decrease of almost 4,000 employees.

The important question for us as Senators concerns the significance of these figures for public policy. I think the first conclusion that should be drawn is that we have saved the taxpayer money by our delay in enacting a tax cut, paradoxical as that seems. The President's original forecast for receipts in fiscal 1964 contemplated tax reduction to take effect in July 1963. That tax reduction has not occurred. As a consequence, the Federal Government is in a stronger position to pay its bills. Thus, the amount of our deficit is less, which means in turn that we need to borrow less and increase our national debt by a lesser amount. Since we must pay interest on this national debt, the savings of the American people will be in the form of a lower total interest cost in the future. This situation is the same as an individual who decides to pay off his existing debts before he incurs new obligations. This is exactly what we are doing when we defer tax reduction.

This kind of policy might not be wise in a period of recession, if the economy were contracting instead of expanding. My point is that in a period of economic expansion, when business is going well, we should not deliberately deepen the deficit and unbalance the budget further.

A second policy conclusion that must be drawn from these budgetary predictions is that our present tax rates are not, contrary to what the administration contends, repressive upon the economy. The best evidence of this fact is that the economy is growing and receipts are rising more rapidly than Federal expenditures.

It has been argued by this administration that the most rapid way to balance our Federal budget is to enact tax reduction. Yet the evidence from these projections is that we are well on the road toward balancing our Federal budget now. Tax reduction may very well stymie the progress we are presently making toward a balanced budget.

DON'T SELL WHEAT TO RUSSIA AT SUBSIDIZED PRICE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times there appeared a letter from Mr. Robert Strausz-Hupe, who is active as the director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. He writes a very interesting analysis, questioning the wisdom of the proposal to sell wheat to the Soviet Union. He writes:

> Whatever might be the purpose of American policy, it should not be to help the Communists to gloss over their spectacular failure. Communist leadership has directed Soviet capital investment into space spectaculars and the creation of nuclear power, designed to coerce the West into retreat and appeasement. The Soviet machine for war and blackmail has been built at the expense of the welfare of the Russian people.
>
> The United States should not only not assist Communist leadership in passing the buck for these pernicious investment policies, but should also point out vigorously to world opinion the true cause of the Soviet economic debacle. All they have to do is shift funds now spent on military-technological "firsts," including 100-megaton nuclear tests, into tractors, fertilizers, and agricultural research and Soviet food rations per capita would be more than ample to insure a healthful diet.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to the editor may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wheat for Russia

To the Editor of the New York Times:

Not a few of the most tragic mistakes in national conduct are made in small installments. The risks we incur in concluding a wheat deal with the Soviet Union, which according to the Times of October 2 is now favored by the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, seem to be smaller than those inherent in the conclusion of the nuclear test ban treaty. Yet, like the nuclear test-ban treaty, it signifies the abandonment of heretofore strongly held policy positions. Hence, the wheat deal which the administration is now ready to make should be submitted to the widest and most searching deliberation rather than be consummated in a precipitate and offhand way.

With proper management, the Soviet Union could be the largest grain producer on earth. Her cultivable acreage is larger than ours; and the soil of the Ukraine is more fertile than any comparable wheatlands in this country. Before World War I Russia was one of the major wheat exporters in the world market; before World War II the East European countries now under Communist rule supplied a large part of Western Europe's food requirements.

FAILURE OF SYSTEM

If the Communist system, 46 years after its establishment, has not licked the problem of agricultural production, then it follows that it is a rotten economic system. The most highly planned socialist system upon earth fails to satisfy the dietary needs of the population—and this in the face of its alleged record achievements in science and technology and the vast potential wealth of the arable land.

Whatever might be the purpose of American policy, it should not be to help the Communists to gloss over their spectacular failure. Communist leadership has directed Soviet capital investment into space spectaculars and the creation of nuclear power, designed to coerce the West into retreat and appeasement. The Soviet machine for war and blackmail has been built at the expense of the welfare of the Russian people.

The United States should not only not assist Communist leadership in "passing the buck" for these pernicious investment policies, but should also point out vigorously to world opinion the true cause of the Soviet economic debacle. All they have to do is shift funds now spent on military-technological "firsts," including 100-megaton nuclear tests, into tractors, fertilizers, and agricultural research and Soviet food rations per capita would be more than ample to insure a healthful diet.

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEM

The advocates of the wheat deal point out the advantages to be derived from selling part of our gigantic wheat surplus against "hard cash." The "hard cash" which we are likely to receive will be Soviet gold, mined by slave labor in eastern Siberia. This unpalatable fact might not weigh heavily in the minds of those concerned with solving the problem of our agricultural surpluses by expanding our export markets. Yet the simplest calculation should reveal that the real problem of American agriculture and the world market for agricultural products is not insufficient demand but the fantastic price support and quota policies pursued by major Western countries.

The remedy for the ills of American agriculture will not be found in selling a parcel of our wheat surplus to the Soviets but in the adoption of rational and equitable domestic agricultural policies and in a long overdue agreement among the free world's major agricultural exporters. These steps will have to be taken before "Atlantic partnership" will develop into something more tangible than pious declarations.

The wheat deal with the Soviet Union might help us to evade for a while the need for coming to grips with the problem of our domestic agriculture. This might not be the least of its many unfortunate implications.

Robert Strausz-Hupe.

Philadelphia, *October 2, 1963.*

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL ATTACKS DOUBLE STANDARD IN DISCRIMINATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal published an excellent editorial in its issue of Friday, October 4, 1963. It is entitled "Double Standard."

The Milwaukee Journal points out that distinguished southern Members of Congress have been voting with enthusiasm for the bracero bill, which prohibits discrimination against Mexican laborers who are in this country.

I point out that the bill for which these southerners are voting is not an empty statement on discrimination. Under its terms, the editorial points out, "the Mexican Government can identify communities in the United States that allegedly discriminate against the Mexican braceros and their families."

This provision has been used, and 10 Texas communities have been put off limits by the Mexican Government. The provision has been enforced by the Labor Department.

The question arises if it is right for the Mexican Government to prohibit discrimination against Mexican citizens in this country in places of public accommodation, why is it all wrong for our own Government to ban discrimination for American citizens also.

I ask further consent that the editorial may be printed in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Double Standard

The Senate has been pointedly reminded that efforts to assure civil rights for Negro citizens in general and Negro servicemen in particular follow a pattern endorsed by Congress on five occasions in the last dozen years. In fact, southern Congressmen who object so strenuously now have been strong supporters of the Mexican migrant labor law of which the nondiscrimination agreement is a part.

The agreement is not just a pious statement. Under its terms the Mexican Government can identify communities in the United States that allegedly discriminate against the Mexican "braceros" and their families. If upon investigation our Secretary of Labor agrees, no braceros may be assigned to or remain in the discriminating area. If the Secretary doesn't agree, the Mexican Government may bypass him and get pledges directly from officials of the communities involved to take appropriate action.

The agreement has been used. As of September 1962, no fewer than 10 Texas communities were "off limits." The Labor Department threat of imposing sanctions has also opened a Texas public swimming pool, a movie house and beauty parlors to braceros. In one New Mexico community it won a promise from officials that the police and a city judge would stop dealing unfairly with Mexicans.

Nobody, least of all the southern Congressmen, objected when the agreement was enforced in behalf of Mexican citizens. They like cheap labor for constituents. Why shouldn't the same power be put back of the drive to give our own Negro citizens their rights? It should. As Senator Maurine Neuberger, Democrat, of Oregon, says, the migrant labor agreement has established "an irrefutable precedent for the President's civil rights legislation."

KEATING ASKS: "WHY HELP REDS WIN?"

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article written by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] entitled "Why Help the Reds Win the Cold War?" published in a recent issue of the Reader's Digest, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Help the Reds Win the Cold War?

(By Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senator from New York)

"You'd better get over here fast," the voice on the telephone barked at Joe Drago one bleak December morning in 1961. "They've got us making machines for Russia. The guys are hopping mad, and there's talk of a wildcat strike."

Drago, president of Machinists Local 898 on Long Island, hurried to the Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp. plant at West Babylon. "Look at this" said Frank Chimera, a partly paralyzed Korean veteran. He handed Drago one of the Russian-language instruction plates the men had been told to rivet to nine complex differential transmissions that the plant was building. The machines were for a papermill being assembled by the Beloit, Wis., Iron Works for shipment to Russia.

Later, in Washington, a union delegation explained why the Soviets shouldn't have this machinery. The Russians could use the transmission to rotate military radar and radiotelescopes. Or, by copying them, the Russians could free technological brains for space and military projects.

But the union's protests were in vain; the entire transaction had been approved by the U.S. Government.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has piled up evidence of dozens of similar cases and come to this conclusions: The United States and its allies are openly and willfully helping Communist nations strengthen themselves for both economic and military advances in the cold war. Here is how:

We've allowed Russia to use the West's vast merchant marine to sustain its empire. Cuba has been able to endure only because Russia has made use of free-world ships to keep its outpost supplied with the necessities of life, thereby freeing Communist vessels to ferry troops, missiles, and munitions. Yet when AFL–CIO longshoremen refused to load vessels taking part in Cuban trade, the State Department applied pressure to halt their action. During the first 6 months of this year, free-world ships made some 175 trips to Cuba.

We've allowed economic aid to go to Communist nations even when they are waging a shooting war against Americans. In the last 2 years, while North Vietnamese Communist guerrillas were killing Americans in South Vietnam, France sent railway locomotives, rolling stock, and essential motor vehicle parts to North Vietnam. Our Government didn't even protest.

We knowingly send U.S. products to other Western nations, to replace comparable items they are shipping to the Communist bloc. For instance, U.S. policy maintains an embargo on trade with Communist China; yet over the last 2 years we have shipped 19 million bushels of wheat to West Germany, enabling the Germans to grind 19 million bushels of wheat into flour for Red China. We did nothing to stop this deal—although diplomatic sources report that the flour went not to the starving Chinese people but to the elite police state functionaries and 2,500,000-man army who keep them in bondage. Moreover, our Government has defended the shipping of Canadian and Australian wheat to Red China—14 million tons in the past 3 years and more on the way—on the flimsy ground that the Chinese will have to use their skimpy gold reserves to pay for it.

Most important, we are helping to strengthen the Soviet Union's basic industries. As late as 1961, Russian industry was still so backward that two-thirds of all automobiles in the country, one-fourth of all construction machinery and one-third of all metal-cutting tools had been idled by shoddy components and lack of spare parts. What happened next? The Western nations stepped up their exports to the Soviet bloc. These now top $4 billion a year, with technologically advanced machinery, even entire factories, accounting for more than half the total.

There is no lack of awareness among the American people and Congress as to the foolhardiness of nourishing a self-declared enemy—nuclear test ban notwithstanding—so that he can succeed in his announced determination to destroy us. Soviet leaders from Lenin to Khrushchev have frankly stated that they would buy, copy or steal the latest achievements of Western technology. This brazen policy lay behind Khrushchev's boast in 1958 that Russia could build new enterprises without wasting time on the creation of designs and the mastering of production processes for new types of equipment.

By taking advantage of existing trade channels our enemy grows stronger daily. Yet our allies refuse to recognize that trade is a crucial weapon in the cold war, and the executive branch of our own Government is reluctant to use laws that Congress has already passed to prevent that weapon from being used against us.

For example, in 1949 Congress passed the Export Control Act to limit shipments that would aid the Communists. Long lists of embargoed strategic goods were compiled. The NATO nations and Japan the next year set up an independent committee (called COCOM) in Paris to coordinate similar allied controls. Nevertheless, during the Korean war millions of tons of Western-made supplies reached Communist China. European industrialists, major recipients of Marshall plan aid, filled Communist orders for everything from radar sets to airplane propellers. Bitter GI's captured enemy units whose shoes, trucks, tires, surgical instruments and communications equipment were manufactured in the West, some of it stamped "Made in U.S.A."

An outraged Congress in 1951 passed the Battle Act, which orders termination of all U.S. economic and military assistance to any nation that ships embargoed items to hostile nations, specifically the Soviet bloc. However, except for arms and implements of war, a loophole allows the White House to ignore the act if unusual circumstances should make it detrimental to U.S. security to cut off aid. Nineteen aid-receiving governments have ignored the Battle Act some 33 times, and in every case the State Department has persuaded the White House that unusual circumstances were involved.

Furthermore, our Government has done little to resist the steady erosion of the COCOM embargo list. Consider copper. When copper in all forms was embargoed in 1952, the Soviet military buildup was seriously delayed. Only by laboriously contrived methods was the Soviet bloc each year able to bootleg an estimated 75,000 tons. But in 1954 other NATO members talked the United States into removing copper wire from the embargo list, and the Reds began filling their copper needs by purchasing and melting down the wire. Instead of reimposing the embargo, U.S. negotiators soon agreed to delete all copper from the COCOM list. As a result, the Soviet bloc now imports 250,000 tons per year of this critical item.

In Western Europe, businessmen are competing fiercely to sell the most technologically advanced machinery to the Soviet bloc. And, incredibly, NATO member governments are even extending $200 million annually in credit guarantees to finance Soviet purchases. Britains' Glacier Metal Co. is building a million-dollar plant near Gorki to manufacture ultra-hard metal-alloy crankshaft bearings for auto and truck engines, a feat the Soviets have never mastered. British firms are furnishing several complete plastics plants, and are building the Russian synthetic-fiber industry, a chronically troubled field for Moscow. Britain's Vickers company will deliver to Red China this year six Viscount jet-prop planes loaded with radar and navigation equipment on COCOM's embargo list. Such planes can be used in transporting troops.

Britain's trade with the Soviet bloc has increased 50 percent since 1959. France's has been stepped up almost the same amount. Italy's exports to the Soviets virtually doubled from 1959 to 1961, and are still zooming. They include complete plants and processes to produce chemicals, paper pulp, tire cord, automation equipment, ball bearings and ships for the Soviet oil tanker fleet. The Fiat Motor Group of Turin has been negotiating to build a huge $168 million plant in Russia capable of turning out 120,000 tractors a year—vastly easing the Soviet agricultural crisis.

West German trade with the Red bloc in 1961 amounted to $476 million—the highest in the free world—and nearly 90 percent of it consisted of vitally needed chemicals, machinery, transport equipment, and manufactured goods. Shipments to Russia include a polyethylene plant, precision machine tools, and other strategic items. Contracts have been signed for two chemical plants, a pulp-and-paper factory, and a tubing mill for making large oil pipe.

Not only has the U.S. Government made little effort to halt this allied trade; our officials have been loath to keep our own businessmen out of it. Three years ago, Henry B. Patterson, a young research engineer, became concerned because the Government had told his employer, the Bryant Chucking Grinder Co. of Springfield, Vt., to go ahead and sell Russia 45 highly strategic machines for making precision ball bearings. Such machines "are obviously a component of armaments," Patterson wrote Senator Winston Prouty, of Vermont.

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, began an inquiry. Shipment of the machines, he found, had been okayed by the Commerce and State Departments despite strenuous objections from the Department of Defense and despite the fact that, in our own space programs, the machines had dramatically reduced the size of satellite equipment. "It has taken us 20 years to give the United States unquestioned superiority in this field," testified the president of a New Hampshire company that helped develop the machine. "This sale will give Russia a tremendous advantage."

Only after the full findings of this investigation were published did the Commerce Department halt the loading of six machines aboard a Soviet freighter at a Boston dock. It was too late, however, to stop the shipment of vital instruction books and drawings.

This case shocked me and many other Members of Congress who had assumed that our export control laws were being effectively administered. A worried House of Representatives set up a special committee to learn if there were other cases. Despite efforts to keep it from looking at pertinent Government documents, the committee found "glaring instances where we have economically strengthened the Soviet bloc countries." Sample:

In May 1960 the Commerce and State Departments overrode strong protests from Defense Department experts and approved a Soviet order of $5,300,000 for two automated machine-tool production lines. "I would rather send them a gun than a machine tool," one Defense official said later. "A machine tool can be used over and over to make guns, missiles, tanks, and other weapons."

By law, U.S. officials are supposed to crack down on foreign traders who secretly reship U.S. made strategic items to the Communist bloc. Yet the Commerce Department made only 20 checks on the 130,000 licensed American shipments to free world nations during 1961. As a result, a delegation of French machine-tool executives who toured eight Russian factories that year found that 80 percent of the new machines bore U.S. trademarks.

In an effort to halt these trade abuses, Congress last year brushed aside State Department opposition and voted to impose strict controls on shipments to the Soviet bloc of any goods that contribute substantially to Communist economic or industrial power. But the new regulations have been interpreted so loosely that they are virtually meaningless. During just one 9-week period this year, for example, the Commerce Department licensed 81 shipments to Communist countries of electronic computers, information processing machines, electronic testing and inspecting machines, electron tubes and related equipment.

We must stop helping the Communists in their drive for world domination. Trade can be a powerful asset for the free world. At present it is a Soviet asset. The balance should be tipped the other way, and at once. In self-defense we must take these all-important steps:

1. Stop selling strategically important goods to the Communist bloc. There are laws on the books against selling anything that will build upon the Reds' basic industries and economic power. These laws must be enforced.

2. Persuade our allies that it is against their own self-interest to trade with the enemy. (Last November, when the administration finally put pressure on West Germany and Italy to stop selling the Russians large steel pipe, needed for an oil offensive against the free world, those countries canceled large Soviet orders. The British, however, moved to try to fill them, although the pipeline Russia is building will vastly increase Soviet power in East Europe and Berlin.)

3. Establish a free-world trade organization with the power to regulate trade with the Communist bloc, to devise and carry out a unified Western trade strategy, and to come to the aid of any ally whose economy is disrupted in this struggle. To permit sound coordination of military and economic strategy, this organization should be an integral part of NATO.

The NATO countries, plus Japan and Australia, control two-thirds of the world's industrial capacity. They have the economic force to put communism on the defensive. The United States and its allies must make use of this force.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last week, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I had the pleasure of attending, as a congressional observer, some of the sessions of the annual meeting of the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Development Association.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have already placed in the RECORD a number of the more pertinent speeches made at these most interesting meetings.

The meetings were opened by President Kennedy, who spoke to the Directors of these four agencies, gathered in Washington from 102 countries all over the world. As the President said, the purpose of such international institutions is to "permit capital to be deployed around the world in the most effective and efficient manner."

The Soviet Union, the European countries behind the Iron Curtain—with the exception of Yugoslavia—Switzerland, and Communist China, are the only countries in the world which are not now members of one or another of these international financial institutions. The Bank itself acquired 20 new members this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as an example of this worldwide membership there may be printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the members of the International Monetary Fund. The list shows the equities of each country and the votes which each country is entitled to cast on matters which come before the Fund for decision.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members, quotas, and voting power as of Sept. 30, 1963

Member	Quota		Votes	
	Amount	Percent of total	Number [1]	Percent of total
	Millions			
1. Afghanistan	$22.50	0.14	475	0.26
2. Algeria	60.00	.39	850	.47
3. Argentina	280.00	1.80	3.050	1.69
4. Australia	400.00	2.57	4,250	2.35
5. Austria	75.00	.48	1,000	.55
6. Belgium	337.50	2.17	3,625	2.00
7. Bolivia	22.50	.14	475	.26
8. Brazil	280.00	1.80	3,050	1.69
9. Burma	30.00	.19	550	.30
10. Burundi	11.25	.07	362	.20
11. Cameroon	15.00	.10	400	.22
12. Canada	550.00	3.54	5,750	3.18
13. Central African Republic	7.50	.05	325	.18
14. Ceylon	45.00	.29	700	.39
15. Chad	7.50	.05	325	.18
16. Chile	100.00	.64	1,250	.69
17. China	550.00	3.54	5,750	3.18
18. Colombia	100.00	.64	1,250	.69
19. Congo (Brazzaville)	7.50	.05	325	.18
20. Congo (Leopoldville)	45.00	.29	700	.39
21. Costa Rica	15.00	.10	400	.22
22. Cuba	50.00	.32	750	.41
23. Cyprus	11.25	.07	362	.20
24. Dahomey	7.50	.05	325	.18
25. Denmark	130.00	.84	1,550	.86
26. Dominican Republic	15.00	.10	400	.22
27. Ecuador	15.00	.10	400	.22
28. El Salvador	11.25	.07	362	.20
29. Ethiopia	15.00	.10	400	.22
30. Finland	57.00	.37	820	.45
31. France	787.50	5.07	8,125	4.49
32. Gabon	7.50	.05	325	.18
33. Germany, Federal Republic of	787.50	5.07	8,125	4.49
34. Ghana	35.00	.23	600	.33
35. Greece	60.00	.39	850	.47
36. Guatemala	15.00	.10	400	.22
37. Guinea	15.00	.10	400	.22
38. Haiti	11.25	.07	362	.20
39. Honduras	$11.25	.07	362	.20
40. Iceland	11.25	.07	362	.20
41. India	600.00	3.86	6,250	3.45
42. Indonesia	165.00	1.06	1,900	1.05
43. Iran	70.00	.45	950	.53
44. Iraq	15.00	.10	400	.22
45. Ireland	45.00	.29	700	.39
46. Israel	25.00	.16	500	.28
47. Italy	270.00	1.74	2,950	1.63
48. Ivory Coast	15.00	.10	400	.22
49. Jamaica	20.00	.13	450	.25
50. Japan	500.00	3.22	5,250	2.90
51. Jordan	9.60	.06	346	.19
52. Korea	18.75	.12	437	.24
53. Kuwait	50.00	.32	750	.41
54. Laos	7.50	.05	325	.18
55. Lebanon	6.75	.04	317	.18
56. Liberia	11.25	.07	362	.20
57. Libya	15. 0	.10	400	.22
58. Luxembourg	14.00	.09	390	.22
59. Malagasy Republic	15.00	.10	400	.22
60. Malaysia	35.00	.23	600	.33
61. Mali	13.00	.08	380	.21
62. Mauritania	7.50	.05	325	.18
63. Mexico	180.00	1.16	2,050	1.13
64. Morocco	52.50	.34	775	.43
65. Nepal	7.50	.05	325	.18
66. Netherlands	412.50	2.65	4,375	2.42
67. New Zealand	125.00	.80	1,500	.83
68. Nicaragua	11.25	.07	362	.20
69. Niger	7.50	.05	325	.18
70. Nigeria	50.00	.32	750	.41
71. Norway	100.00	.64	1,250	.69
72. Pakistan	150.00	.97	1,750	.97
73. Panama	.50	.01	255	.14
74. Paraguay	11.25	.07	362	.20
75. Peru	37.50	.24	625	.35
76. Philippines	75.00	.48	1,000	.55
77. Portugal	60.00	.39	850	.47

See footnotes at end of table.

Members, quotas, and voting power as of Sept. 30, 1963—Continued

Member	Quota		Votes	
	Amount	Percent of total	Number [1]	Percent of total
	Millions			
78. Rwanda	$11.25	.07	362	.20
79. Saudi Arabia	55.00	.35	800	.44
80. Senegal	25.00	.16	500	.28
81. Sierra Leone	11.25	.07	362	.20
82. Somalia	11.25	.07	362	.20
83. South Africa	150.00	.97	1,750	.97
84. Spain	150.00	.97	1,750	.97
85. Sudan	15.00	.10	400	.22
86. Sweden	150.00	.97	1,750	.97
87. Syrian Arab Republic	15.00	.10	400	.22
88. Tanganyika	25.00	.16	500	.28
89. Thailand	45.00	.29	700	.39
90. Togo	11.25	.07	362	.20
91. Trinidad and Tobago	20.00	.13	450	.25
	Millions			
92. Tunisia	$20.40	.13	454	.25
93. Turkey	86.00	.55	1,110	.61
94. Uganda	25.00	.16	500	.28
95. United Arab Republic	90.00	.58	1,150	.64
96. United Kingdom	1,950.00	12.55	19,750	10.92
97. United States	4,125.00	26.54	41,500	22.94
98. Upper Volta	7.50	.05	325	.18
99. Uruguay	30.00	.19	550	.30
100. Venezuela	150.00	.97	1,750	.97
101. Vietnam	20.50	.13	455	.25
102. Yugoslavia	120.00	.77	1,450	.80
Total	15,542.75	[2] 100.00	180,925	[2] 100.00

[1] Voting power varies on certain matters with use by members of the Fund's resources.
[2] These figures do not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Mr. CLARK. As the President remarked, the Fund was able to weather, in good order, the Cuban crisis, the run on sterling early in 1963, and the continuing balance-of-payments deficits of the United States. The President also stated:

> There is a sharp distinction between long-term questions of international liquidity and the current problems of international imbalance. We do not intend to neglect the latter while pursuing the former.

His comments had reference to our international balance-of-payments situation. He stated his conviction and determination that the United States should maintain the present price of gold at $35 an ounce. He said also that as our international balance of payments improves, a strain will be placed on the reserves of dollars in other countries, where reserves will come to the United States from those countries, and perhaps test the necessary liquidity of the banking systems of those other countries. We must be sure that the movement to improve our own balance of payments does not deprive foreign capital markets of adequate liquidity.

The goal of economic health for all nations, fostered by the banking fund, said the President, is second only in urgency to the quest for peace.

I have mentioned the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund. But a word must be said about the International Development Association, an agency created in large part because of the strong and fine support it received from the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] a number of years ago, when he served on the Committee on Banking and Currency. IDA, as the International Development Association is known, has been making loans around the world—50-year loans with a 10-year grace period before any repayment need be made, with no interest, and with a service charge of only three-fourths of 1 percent.

Those loans have been of valuable assistance in helping underdeveloped countries of the world to begin to bring their economies into balance and to move forward with an adequate gross national product.

At the meeting last week, 17 countries indicated that they were prepared to increase the capitalization of IDA by an additional $750,000 of new capital in order to assure its continued activity. There was a good deal of conversation—which I hope will end in action—to the effect that the World Bank, whose enormous surplus and earnings, which are mounting every day, should in due course transfer some of the surplus to IDA, in order to provide it with even greater capital resources to continue with its development loans.

One question—and a serious question it is—which arises as a result of the consideration last week of our international balance-of-payments problem is, Do the commitments of the United States exceed our resources? If they do, we must either increase our resources or reduce our commitments. I believe the question to be an open one. That our resources could be substantially increased must be clear.

We have at the moment almost 4 million unemployed. We have much unused capital resources. We have been unable to get our economy running at full speed, although since President Kennedy took office in January 1961 the situation has substantially improved. However, we need to take further drastic steps to reduce our unemployment and to increase our gross national product through a better utilization of our existing capital structure.

Turning to our commitments, they include, first, the defense of the free world; second, providing resources for underdeveloped countries; third, providing the principal capital market for the free world. As Under Secretary of State George Ball said, in a fine speech he made at the meeting: "the outward and visible manifestation of the vast effort my country is making for the benefit of free men everywhere" is just what the United States must be cautious in continuing, unless we can assure that our resources are increased to the extent necessary to balance our payments. The program for balancing our international accounts, which was advanced some time ago by the President, received commendation at the meetings last week. We can hope that, in due course, that program will be successful.

We also know, as we think in terms of international finance, how important it would be for other solvent nations to increase their contributions to world development, instead of relying to the extent they presently do on the United States. It should be noted, however, that real strides have been made in spreading more evenly the work of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It was developed at the meetings that more than half of the Bank's bonded indebtedness is now held outside the United States. This means that other creditor countries are cooperating to a substantially greater extent than hitherto in financing the work of the Bank and in helping to make capital funds available to underdeveloped countries all across the world.

Another interesting fact is that as a result of our own efforts, only 10 percent of our present foreign assistance program is being rendered in dollars. The remaining 90 percent is being furnished in goods and services. This was brought out in a fine address made by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon.

It is now nearly 20 years since the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development were established at the Breton Woods Conference of 1944. The world has changed a great deal in the past two decades. With the recovery of Europe from the massive devastation of World War II, and the return of convertibility among the currencies of most major industrial countries in early 1959, new international economic patterns have emerged.

Our difficulties with the "balance-of-payments problem have called forth a welter of restrictive measures, all of them involving the sacrifice of other American goals in the interest of halting and correcting our payments imbalance. I am not here calling into question either the need to take such steps or their expected efficacy, although I appreciate that others have done so. But I believe that it is only fair to point out that measures such as the proposed interest equalization tax on foreign investments, in creases in domestic interest rates, the practice, of "tying" foreign aid with buy American clauses, and the abandonment of local procurement—at cheaper prices—by our oversea establishments in order to save dollars are plainly inconsistent with American policy objectives and interests outside the balance-of-payments field.

Nevertheless, although our deficits have produced problems at home, they have brought benefits elsewhere. The dollars which we have paid out in such large amounts over the past 5 years have supplied the free world with the monetary liquidity which is essential to its economic health. Not only are we the architects of the post-World War II economic revival; we have been, and we continue to be, banker to the world. We have financed the free world's economic growth with our own dollar deficits.

But what will happen to international liquidity if the measures we are taking to reduce our deficits succeed? The answer, according to the Brookings Institution study group which reported to the Joint Economic Committee on July 28, 1963, is that world monetary reserves will shrink in relation to the level of international transactions, and the free world will find itself without adequate reserves for continued economic growth. The Brookings group felt that in order to avert this result—and I quote here from the statement of Walter S. Salant, who directed the study:

> The United States should immediately begin to press for an agreement to strengthen international liquidity.

It is interesting to note that this report of the Brookings Institution, which was written by Mr. Salant, fell on rather deaf ears, so far as the U.S. Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank were concerned. By means of the papers which were circulated to the congressional observers and to other advisers who attended the meetings last week, there was an obvious effort to downgrade the recommendations of the Brookings Institution. This, I believe, was because those recommendations went further, in suggesting action by the United States, to be followed by action by the other creditor countries of the world, than at one point some of those in the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board were prepared to go.

However, I am happy to note that as a result of the conversations last week an excellent article written by Under Secretary of the Treasury Roosa, the way was opened for an important study of additional measures felt to be necessary to improve international liquidity.

The article written by Under Secretary Roosa was published in the current issue of the quarterly magazine, Foreign Affairs, and it has already been placed in the RECORD.

The pertinent part of the article is:

> The stage has clearly been reached both in terms of facilities and mutual understanding, when governments can in prudence examine together two profound questions: Does a reasonable projection of the present course of the growth of monetary reserves point toward a possible inadequacy of international liquidity over the years ahead? And if such inadequacy should appear possible, what steps can usefully be considered now, to provide for the nature and dimensions of future needs that can be foreseen or foreshadowed?

I suggest, Mr. President, that Mr. Roosa's article, and certainly the additional action taken at the meeting last week, might provide the basis for the eventual determination by the creditor nations of the world that what is needed is a world federal reserve system or a world central bank, not unlike our own Federal Reserve System, and along the lines of the one recommended by Professor Triffin, of Yale University, whose writings and speeches in this regard have called forth a great deal of comment, both favorable and unfavorable. Professor Triffin would like to see the International Monetary Fund transformed into an international central bank empowered to create international credit in amounts determined by international agreement. As I stated, it would constitute, in effect, a world federal reserve system, standing in relation to the central banks of the member countries roughly in the way the U.S. Federal Reserve banks stand in relation to commercial banks in this country.

There is a vast gulf between the Triffin view and orthodox economic theory; but I am pleased to note that at least in one particular that gulf shows signs of shrinking. Until quite recently, the official view, both here and in Europe, had been that the danger of there not being adequate liquidity at some time in the future was so remote as not to warrant any attention at present. I believe I can safely say that as a result of the article written by Under Secretary Roosa and the position taken by our delegates at last week's meetings, that view has now been abandoned, for we joined the other creditor countries of the world in announcing sponsorship of a 10-nation survey of the problem of future international liquidity. Those 10 include the United States, the United Kingdom, West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Japan. These nations are the principal creditor nations, and are the ones primarily interested in seeing to it that the elimination of their balance-of-payments problem in the United States will not cause any undue disruption of liquidity abroad, and that the mechanisms of a national nature which are created will make it possible to cope with what we hope will be a constantly increasing world trade.

It is important that instrumentalities of this sort be brought into being in the foreseeable future, because it is clear that the present gold standard will not be adequate to enable us to continue to have the credit necessary to finance an expanded world trade.

I am particularly pleased to have been granted the privilege of sitting in on last week's meetings as a congressional observer; but of equal, or greater, interest will be the study these 10 nations are making and the complimentary study which the president, Pierre Paul Schweitzer, who is the new Director of the International Monetary Fund, will make.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Schweitzer, a French citizen, is a nephew of the distinguished French scientist, doctor, musician, theologian, and clergyman, Albert Schweitzer, whose work in the jungles of Africa and whose wonderful writings are known to all.

For myself, Mr. President, I close on this note: Just as in the future we shall achieve world peace, we shall have to think in terms of eventually yielding some part of our national sovereignty. So if we are going to have adequate international financing institutions able to deal with the intensely complex problems of finance and world trade and the maintenance of adequate liquidity, and if we are not to find ourselves again in the situation we were in during the 1930's when the whole international mechanism of finances, monetary systems, and world trade broke down, we must be imaginative and must look ahead.

This subject will be considered very seriously by Mr. Schweitzer's group. For myself, I would be prepared to relinquish such sovereignty as might be necessary, if a carefully prepared plan which would protect the vital interests of the United States of America could be submitted to us for approval.

We on the International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee will follow very closely the study which the 10 are making, and will also look very carefully at which the Director of the International Monetary Fund does.

I hope the Joint Economic Committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, will hold another series of hearings which will develop what took place last week at these international meetings.

Congress has an important interest in exercising both its legislative functions and its oversight functions in assuring that the international monetary and lending policies which are adopted will serve our national interests.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the testimony given by Mr. Walter S. Salant, of Brookings Institution, who is mainly responsible for the Brookings report. He gave the testimony on July 29, 1963, before the Joint Economic Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLOOK FOR WORLD TRADE AND RESERVES

> Our projections lead us to believe that the dollar value of international transactions will grow by at least 35 percent between 1961 and 1968. If U.S. deficits continue in 1963 and 1964 but diminish to zero between 1965 and 1968—I am now talking about total deficits, not basic deficits—and if monetary gold stocks grow at the same rate as they did between 1947 and 1961, gold and dollar reserves will rise by about 12 percent between 1961 and 1968. This compares with the 35 percent increase in international transactions. World monetary reserves would thus shrink in relation to the level of international transactions.
>
> Whether this relative decline would create a problem of liquidity depends, of course, on whether liquidity is adequate now and how

much the need for liquidity grows in relation to the growth of the value of world transactions. So far as the need for liquidity is concerned, we think that imbalances in total international payments will increase in relation to total payments. The major countries are likely to be faced with persistent imbalances arising not so much from deficiencies or excess of aggregate demand but from structural factors, such as changes in technology, in competitive positions, or in the structure of world demand for their products. Imbalances arising from such causes cannot be eliminated quickly without jeopardizing domestic economic growth, price stability, or other vital objectives. To avoid jeopardizing these objectives, equilibrium must be reached gradually. The existing monetary mechanism will not provide enough liquidity to finance deficits over periods long enough to permit such gradual adjustment. Without the means of financing deficits over such periods, preoccupation with balances of payments is likely to override considerations that are fundamentally more important. The deficit countries will be placed under increasing constraints. Such a situation might well induce actions that would restrain their rates of growth unduly.

Indeed, these restraints could prevent the forces making for improvement in the U.S. balance of payments from materializing fully. If a U.S. balance-of-payments surplus should begin to develop, some other countries would begin to move toward deficit positions and might take restrictive measures to stop this movement. In that event, the forces making for improvement of the U.S. payments position would merely have caused the world to exchange one problem for another. Thus, there is a dilemma: A strengthening U.S. balance of payments would leave the world as a whole—and the United States, too—little if any better off than does a U.S. deficit. This suggests that the fundamental problem may not be the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit but the world's monetary system.

It is often said that maintenance of balance in international payments, if not an ultimate end of policy, is a means of restraining countries from pursuing undesirable economic policies. Balance-of-payments discipline, however—like any other discipline—is desirable only as a means to ends that are desirable. It is not desirable if it requires the subordination of higher priority objectives.

The U.S. Government has not, on the whole, compromised its basic foreign policy and defense objectives because of balance-of-payments considerations. These considerations, however, have played an important role in failure to achieve maximum production and employment. The additional slack in using productive capacity at a level associated with unemployment of 6 percent instead of, say, 4 percent of the labor force involves losing output estimated at about $30 to $40 billion every year.

Policies tying economic aid to procurement in the United States and requiring military expenditures to be made in the United States rather than abroad add considerable cost to the taxpayer. They also arouse resentment in the rest of the free world, protect high-cost U.S. industries from the spur of foreign competition and foster poor allocation of resources. Moreover, there is increasing pressure to compromise the objectives of foreign aid for balance-of-payments reasons. It is clearly in the interest of the United States to develop an international monetary mechanism that will permit adjustments to take place without compromising other goals.

THE NEED TO IMPROVE THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY MECHANISM

The present international monetary system is essentially a system of quasi-fixed exchange rates with international reserves held in gold and national currencies (principally dollars and sterling). The price of gold in terms of dollars is fixed, and other currencies are pegged to the dollar, thereby providing a fixed structure of exchange rates among various currencies. The pegs are adjustable, however. Adjustments have been made often enough to keep the possibilities of further changes alive in the minds of central banks and private owners of capital.

In our view, fixity of exchange rates is a virtue. By removing much of the uncertainty of international transactions, it tends to increase the volume of trade and productive international investment, thus contributing to efficient use of world resources. The more certain it is that the rates will be maintained, the greater are these advantages. We believe, therefore, that the present system of fixed exchange rates should be strengthened so as to preserve and enhance its advantages and mitigate its disadvantages.

The main disadvantage of the present fixed rate system is that it requires countries whose payments are not in balance to restore balance more rapidly than may be consistent with important domestic and international objectives. Deflationary measures, the classical means of improving the balance of payments, cut employment and real incomes—effects which are neither politically feasible nor economically desirable in a modern industrial country. In the United States, large absolute reductions in real income cause only small decreases in imports, and these decreases are partly offset by decreases in exports, so that very substantial declines in total production and income are necessary to induce relatively small improvements in the net balance of payments. Furthermore, higher interest rates, while discouraging domestic investment, may not be effective in attracting capital to a currency when stronger currencies are available.

Rapid adjustment is especially difficult if exchange rates that are normally fixed may be changed when an imbalance in payments is judged to be fundamental. The prospect that a weak currency may be devalued discourages stabilizing capital movements and fosters destabilizing movements. This reinforces the basic factors originally responsible for the currency's weakness. Moreover, when the authorities decide to devalue or are forced to do so, they usually make the devaluation so great that no one will doubt that the new rate can be maintained. As a result, currencies which have been overvalued before their parities are altered are likely to be undervalued afterward.

If an international payments system is to provide the benefits of fixed parities without these disadvantages, it must generate confidence in the fixity of the parities. Given greater liquidity, this confidence would probably develop, because it would gradually be recognized that payments adjustment at fixed parities is possible if enough time is available.

ACTIONS NEEDED IN THE NEXT FEW YEARS

The United States should immediately begin to press for an agreement to strengthen international liquidity. Since the study and negotiations needed to obtain agreement on a new mechanism for international liquidity may take a long time, however, the United States will be obliged to deal with its balance-of-payments problems within the framework of the present mechanism.

Measures to finance the deficit

Even if the projections of this report are realized, there probably will be deficits in the U.S. balance of payments for the next several years. However, U.S. reserves are so large, compared to likely levels of the deficit, that we see no reason for concern about financing these deficits while working to improve the international monetary system. Despite the substantial reduction in U.S. monetary reserves and the large increases in liquid dollar claims of foreigners, U.S. reserves and other resources for meeting continuing deficits remain very great. The U.S. Government should make clear that it regards its reserves as existing to be used for these purposes.

The statutory requirement of a gold reserve against Federal Reserve notes and deposit liabilities long ago ceased to serve any useful purpose. It should be abolished. Its abolition would make clear that the reserves are available to the full and at all times, not merely in emergencies, to serve their only useful function.

The United States should also draw on the IMF—as it now proposes to do—to finance some of its future deficit. Such drawings would help to promote the idea that use of the Fund's resources is not an act of last resort; more willingness of IMF members to draw on it would increase effective liquidity.

Such steps would establish that the United States is willing to use its reserves and credit facilities to support the dollar.

Measures to improve the balance of payments

We do not recommend that the Government at this time take any steps to improve the balance of payments other than measures which seem desirable in themselves. Actions already taken, such as tying aid and restricting certain types of military expenditures abroad, should be regarded as temporary. Further restrictive measures of this type would be of negligible benefit, if not positively harmful. To cut aid or military expenditures for balance-of-payments reasons would be an unwise and unnecessary sacrifice of more important objectives.

As the balance-of-payments deficit declines, foreign aid expenditures should gradually be untied.

We have stressed that measures which might endanger U.S. economic growth and the restoration of high employment levels should not be adopted for balance-of-payments reasons. This means that it is inadvisable to raise interest rates in an attempt to affect international flows of capital, unless the adverse domestic effects of higher rates can be fully offset by fiscal expansion. The balance of payments and other goals will be served, however, by wage and price restraint during the course of recovery to high employment. Restraint on wage and price increases will benefit the U.S. competitive position without retarding domestic growth. The Government's efforts in this direction should be stepped up as the country moves toward full employment.

Devaluation of the dollar also should be rejected. Devaluation might actually weaken, rather than strengthen, the dollar. If other countries—especially those in the European Economic Community (EEC)—devalued their currencies in line with the dollar, the U.S. deficit would not be reduced, but the future willingness of foreigners to accumulate dollar assets would be curtailed. Even if other major currencies were not devalued, however, devaluation of the dollar should be rejected. Devaluation is appropriate only when a balance-of-payments deficit is clearly caused by a fundamental disequilibrium that is not likely to diminish in the future. Our projections suggest substantial future improvement at the current exchange rate. Devaluation, therefore, might throw the United States into substantial surplus and other countries into deficit.

The United States should bargain vigorously with the EEC for trade liberalization in the coming negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and insist on some minimum concessions. A satisfactory agreement should preserve and enlarge foreign markets for Temperate Zone agricultural products, liberalize EEC imports of manufactured goods, especially those from Japan and underdeveloped countries, and reduce discrimination against tropical products of Latin America and other non-EEC countries. Agreement should not be sought at any price.

Measures to improve arrangements for international liquidity

The U.S. Government should make a major effort to establish with other countries an adequate international liquidity mechanism. The immediate task is to formulate a plan which meets the criteria for a satisfactory system. The next task is to seek international agreement on such a plan.

We propose four requirements of a satisfactory system:

1. It must provide enough liquidity at the outset to finance substantial imbalances while adjustments are taking place, and it must provide for increases in liquidity as the need for liquidity grows.
2. Additional liquidity which takes the form of credit should be available readily and promptly, and for a period long enough to permit elimination of the deficit. Substantial amounts should be obtainable automatically by deficit countries. By agreement, additional amounts should be made available to countries with particularly intractable balance-of-payments problems if appropriate measures for dealing with these problems are being taken.
3. The possibility of shifting reserves from weak to strong currencies must be prevented. These problems would be avoided if industrial countries committed themselves to hold a substantial fraction of their reserves in an international institution, with creditor countries accumulating credits in an international unit of account and debtor countries accumulating similarly denominated debits or reducing previously acquired credits.
4. For such a system to work it is probably necessary that the principal financial and industrial countries consult fully and frequently and coordinate policies that have substantial effects on international payments.

As to getting an agreement, Western European countries are not likely to be receptive to U.S. proposals which seem only to ask them to commit themselves more irrevocably and firmly to propping up the present dollar exchange standard. If the United States wishes to gain European support for an expanded international liquidity arrangement, therefore, it must consider the possibility that the dollar's role as a reserve currency would be curtailed.

It is sometimes said that full maintenance of the dollar's postwar role as a reserve currency is essential to U.S. national power or prestige. We think this view mistaken. The economic power and prestige of the United States come primarily from its high productive potential and its success in using that potential. Reduction of the reserve currency role of the dollar would have far less effect on U.S. prestige than continuation of the present failure to operate the U.S. economy at or near capacity. To return to my earlier analogy, a merchant may get some prestige in being known as not only the biggest merchant but also a banker in his community. His banking role may justify him in making some sacrifices to maintain the more liquid position that he needs since he has opened himself to withdrawals by depositors. But if he has to scrimp on the more important foundations of his prestige—reduce his efficiency by not maintaining up-to-date equipment in his major business or injure the long-term prospects for his business by not sending his sons to college or both—then it is time he asked himself how much the additional prestige of his banking role is really worth. If beyond that, he has to beg his depositors to keep their funds with him, the question is still easier to answer.

Beyond this, which is mainly a question for the United States to answer for itself, is the question whether other countries will agree to a system providing greater liquidity while the United States is in a deficit position. Perhaps agreement will prove to be difficult to reach in this situation. But we shall not know until we try. The Government should not defer beginning discussions merely because there is a deficit. If agreement does prove difficult to reach, it may become easier to reach as the deficit declines and the surpluses of other countries diminish. Hope of agreement should not be given up, therefore, while there is a prospect that the U.S. deficit will disappear. And the United States itself should resist any tendency to lose interest as its payments position improves.

An alternative international monetary mechanism

If it becomes clear that agreement on a satisfactory liquidity mechanism cannot be obtained, the United States must seek an alternative. The best alternative, in our view, would be a modified system of flexible exchange rates consisting of a dollar-sterling bloc and an EEC bloc, with fixed rates within each bloc and flexible rates between them. Within Western Europe, the logic of economic integration demands that fixed parities be maintained among the members of the European Economic Community, a fixity which they could easily effectuate. Countries whose economies are closely alined to the major members of each bloc would presumably wish to tie their currencies to that bloc. The only significant fluctuations, therefore, would be in the rates between the dollar-sterling bloc, on the one hand, and the Western European bloc on the other. Violent changes in these exchange rates would be prevented by intervention of the stabilization authorities in the foreign exchange markets. In practice, we would expect the range of these fluctuations to be limited.

This modified flexible exchange rate system would allow the United States greater national autonomy in the use of fiscal policy, since the external consequences of such policies would be offset by movements in the exchange rate. The fluctuations in themselves would correct basic imbalances between currency blocs without imposing general deflation in deficit countries or general inflation in surplus countries. Such a system would also reduce the need for international reserves.

Nevertheless, there are some true costs in adopting our second-best, two-bloc proposal. The volume of international trade and capital movements between the members of the two blocs would probably be smaller than under a system of fixed parities with adequate provision for international liquidity. The unity and cohesion of the free world would probably be better served by a system of fixed parities with provision for adequate liquidity. That is why we regard the two-bloc system as inferior to such a system. We believe its shortcomings to be less serious, however, than those of any alternative that would be available if the improved fixed parity system could not be attained. It would eliminate the deflationary bias inherent in fixed rates with inadequate liquidity. Since it would contribute to more rapid economic growth, world trade might be larger than under the present system, despite the impediment of rate flexibility. It would be the least harmful means of obtaining international balance if it were not possible to develop a fixed exchange rate system with adequate provision for liquidity.

We repeat, however, that in our view it is only a second-best proposal. Our decisive preference is for a system of fixed rates with an adequate liquidity mechanism. More important than the choice of mechanism is our major policy thesis: That the United States seek agreement on an international payments mechanism that permits adjusting national balances of payments without compromising the important goals of national and international policy.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SALES OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent days I have been advocating that U.S. grain firms be authorized to sell wheat to the Soviet Union and to other countries in the Eastern bloc. What I have been suggesting is that these firms be authorized to sell wheat in the same manner as they do in their sales to the West European countries and other areas of the world.

I repeat that what I have been recommending is that these be commercial sales, preferably for hard currency or gold, and, at most, on very short-term credit.

I emphasize that it is essential that action be taken now. An announcement by this administration in support of such sales will be of great assistance in helping to correct the balance-of-payments deficit, and also will be a master stroke in terms of foreign policy.

Such a sale would be good business. This would be a case of mutual hard bargaining of mutual advantage. Victory over communism will not come from denying them wheat. Victory over communism can come from a demonstration of our superiority—and certainly agriculture is one area where we can outproduce the Communists per person by 5 to 1.

Mr. President, I want to make it fundamentally clear that trade in agricultural commodities to the Soviet bloc presently is going on under the supervision of the Department of Commerce.

The United States is not subsidizing any country, because we offer wheat and flour on the basis of the world market price in competition with other wheat and flour exporters. Our export subsidy on cotton is about 8½ cents a pound. This payment of $42.50 per bale does not subsidize a country. What it actually means is that we are moving commodities out of this country and subsidizing our own cotton producers.

The Soviet-bloc countries can buy wheat or flour from any one of a half dozen other exporting countries in the world, and those other exporting countries may or may not have an export subsidy on that wheat or flour. Wheat and flour are freely available in the world market, and the only way we can sell on competitive terms is for us to have an export subsidy on them in order to meet the prices of the other competing exporting countries. The reason for this is, as is well known, that our price support system is holding our domestic market price above the world market price. There is no advantage one way or another from the standpoint of the Soviet bloc for them to get a subsidized commodity from the United States, if they can get it somewhere else.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT

Mr. President, I also wish to call the attention of this body to some other fundamental facts regarding the enforcement of the Export Control Act. This law originally was passed as an emergency measure, prompted in part by domestic shortages and threats of inflation created by abnormal foreign demand. It also plainly recognized the important relationship between exports and our foreign policy and national security. It conferred on the President very broad general powers to restrict and control export trade. The act permits the President to delegate the authority thus conferred upon him. This delegation was made to the Secretary of Commerce who operates this program with the advice and counsel of other interested agencies of Government.

The Export Control Act of 1949, which authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail exports from the United States, contains in section 3 the following language:

> (c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

There is a specific congressional exclusion from export controls of agricultural commodities deemed to be in surplus with the specified exception that it be used to the extent necessary to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities and to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

In the report of the Select Committee on Export Controls of the House of Representatives issued May 25, 1962, the following paragraph appears, and again I quote:

> As a matter of policy, agricultural commodities outside of price supports (those commodities which are not under the export payment system) could be sent to Russia and the bloc under the authority of a general license.
>
> On June 22, 1961, a change in policy on export controls were effected and a regulation issued by the Department of Commerce which generally permitted licensing of subsidized surplus agricultural commodities to the European Soviet bloc, if sold for dollars or convertible currency. Prior to export of such commodities a commitment would have to be obtained from the importing agency in the Soviet-bloc country that the commodity would not be reexported to another country without approval from the U.S. Government.
>
> The select committee was advised that there was widespread misunderstanding of this regulation and objections to the same. Such opposition led to an amendment of the agriculture bill to declare it the congressional policy not to sell subsidized surplus agricultural commodities to the bloc.

Former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, John Duncan, testified in October of 1961 before the House Select Committee on Export Control that inquiries had been received prior to June 1961 with respect to the possible export of 500,000 tons of U.S. wheat to the Soviet Union. Mr. Duncan further testified that upon receipt of the inquiry there was no approved procedure for authorizing such licenses.

In June of 1961 the Department of Commerce announced the procedure for licensing of subsidized commodities had been approved. However, apparently the time lag between the inquiry and the approval of procedure resulted in our loss of this substantial volume of export business.

Mr. President, in view of the entire legislative and economic history of the Export Control Act, I feel that fundamentally the Department of Commerce should place all surplus agricultural commodities, except those for which an export subsidy is being paid, under general license. This would assist our farmers in the movement of feed grains, oilseeds, fats and oils, dry edible beans, and many other commodities. The Department of Commerce can supervise any possible reexport of these commodities in exactly the same manner it now does with respect to Poland and Yugoslavia.

I am not recommending in any way that any of these exports be made on any concessional terms. We should be realistic and utilize the profit motive as a means of showing the Communist world what our agriculture can accomplish. Our export firms can assist in the commercial marketing of these essential commodities.

This would not involve a change in policy but only a change in the method of doing business. In today's competitive world we should not put anchors on the ability of our farmers, our workers, or our businessmen to export essential commodities into world channels.

Sales of wheat and flour to the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries can be helpful to the United States in that this will reduce our Government costs of storage, which in 3 years will cost more than the amount of any export subsidy. It also would be of benefit in our balance of payments—and in view of the 1964 wheat referendum—it will be of great benefit to our wheatgrowers.

The future markets already reflect this potential benefit.

Mr. President, somehow or other the world will make this wheat available to Mr. Khrushchev for his hard currency. We should not put our farmers in the position of being the residual supplier after everyone else has made all possible sales. We should not put our flour mills in the position of being residual suppliers and denying work to thousands of workers in our flour mills.

I urge that a decision be made as rapidly as possible.

I have continued to make that recommendation day after day, and I am hopeful that today, tomorrow, or this week the affirmative decision will be made.

DRUG RESEARCH AND OUR FOOD AND DRUG LAWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the case of the indicted Maryland physician a complete rarity? Is it so unusual, so exceptional, that no generalizations whatsoever can be drawn from it? Or is it perhaps part of a larger pattern which requires therefore the closest scrutiny?

Final answers cannot be given at this point. It can, however, be stated that—

First. The Senate Government Operations Subcommitte of which I am chairman, has heard from physicians of the Bureau of Medicine of the Food and Drug Administration that there have been several such cases, as bad or almost as bad as the one involving this particular Maryland physician. Furthermore, it is our understanding that Food and Drug Administration is now investigating several such cases.

Second. There has never been any question in my mind but that the overwhelming mass of drug testing in the United States is absolutely honest.

The sins of one individual, or of a small number, should not be allowed to tarnish the excellent name of the medical profession and of the American pharmaceutical industry.

The case of the Maryland physician should not, therefore, be either overstated or understated, underestimated or overestimated.

BACKGROUND OF MARYLAND CASE

It will be recalled that the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations had heard testimony on this particular case as far back as March of this year. Our witness was John O. Nestor, M.D., a pediatric cardiologist, employed then, as now, as a medical reviewer in the New Drug Division of the Bureau of Medicine of the Food and Drug Administration. His testimony may be found in Part 3 of our publication series, "Interagency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation."

On page 784, Dr. Nestor described how his suspicions had been aroused by this case. On pages 792–796, the subcommittee reprinted as exhibit 122 an outstanding article on the case by Miriam Ottenberg, of the Washington Star, on what she called, "The Case of Dr. Z."

On page 815, we reprinted, as part of exhibit 126, Dr. Nestor's memorandum to his superiors as far back as August 1961, suggesting that steps be taken against repetition of what Dr. Nestor regarded as the "fraud" in this case.

The Department of Justice release of October 3, 1963, was necessarily short. It did not indicate that it was Dr. Nestor who first spotted what he regarded as the impossible test results, reported by the Maryland physician. It should be noted that this was months after the new drug application had already been approved by the Food and Drug Administration. The only reason why Dr. Nestor entered the case was that two serious reactions in infants had been reported. Dr. Nestor had never previously handled the case. It was given to him because he is a trained pediatrician. He traced down the necessary facts.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS ARISING OUT OF MARYLAND CASE

But certain serious questions now arise. Let me list half a dozen such questions:

First. If Dr. Nestor found that the Maryland doctor's results were "impossible," why did not the drug companies which received the reports in the first place so find? Are not they as diligent as the Food and Drug Administration in making certain that test results which they submit meet minimal acceptable standards? In most instances, I am sure the drug companies do try to be as diligent as the Food and Drug Administration. Certainly, in the one instance of the infant diarrhea drug, the company was not. Yet, the health of the most vulnerable of all human beings—infants and children—was involved.

LACK OF SPECIALIST IN THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Second. Why did not the Food and Drug Administration spot the "improbable nature" of the test results before it approved the new drug application on Entoquel, rather than only afterward, when Dr. Nestor was given the case?

Was it because a nonspecialist, a nonpediatrician, handled the original case? If so, why was not a specialist available to advise on the pediatric aspects of the drug? The use of specialists' counsel is a policy which I, for one, have urged for over a year, as regards all major medical specialties.

But perhaps even a nonspecialist could have detected that the physicians' results were "too perfect to be credible."

Whatever the facts are, they should be brought into the open.

One fact we do know is that we cannot expect the impossible from a chronically understaffed, underpaid, undersupported agency, the Food and Drug Administration.

Third. Dr. Nestor stated—as shown on page 815—that eight drug companies used this physician as a clinical investigator. Several of these companies are among the Nation's most outstanding drug enterprises. Perhaps they are all the helpless victims of this physician. But were all of them, however, completely unaware that the "inexperienced and untrained" physician had, according to the testimony of Dr. Nestor on page 815—

> In the short period of a few months, written several articles on a variety of highly specialized subjects.

Is it impossible for the companies to keep informed of the background of their clinical investigators?

Dr. Nestor found relatively rapidly that this physician had a very questionable personal background. Were the companies uninterested in such facts? Did such facts ever come to their attention—by design or by accident? If so, did they discontinue using "Dr. Z," as Miss Ottenberg called him? Or were the companies so desperate for testers that they ignored his background, if they did know of it?

I may say that the subcommittee has heard that at least one company did know before using "Dr. Z" that his background was suspicious.

ACCEPTANCE OF "DR. Z'S" ARTICLES BY JOURNALS

Fourth. What does this case tell us of the standards of medical journals in accepting papers? Dr. Nestor's memorandum, on page 815, states that several of "Dr. Z's" papers had been accepted for publication, two had been rejected in their present form, and "no action has been taken on others."

THE COMPLEX PROBLEM OF TESTING FEES

Fifth. It will be recalled that the Department of Justice had indicated that the indicted Maryland physician received a total of as much as $13,000 in 1 year for drug testing. It will be vital to learn the details of these payments.

Were the payments made on the basis of so much "per head"—that is, the more patients reported, the higher the payment? What kind of incentive is that for quality and thoroughness in testing?

Were the payments designed to cover actual expenses only? What were the actual expenses?

These questions are not submitted casually. For years, conscientious physicians have questioned the propriety of what are often regarded as excessive payments by some drug companies for some private tests. Some medical institutions refuse to allow investigators associated with them to accept any fees whatsoever for drug testing. There is, in some quarters, a feeling that direct payments may endanger objectivity, or, at least, the reputation for objectivity.

In an article published last year in the distinguished magazine Fortune—which certainly cannot be accused of being anti-industry—the situation as regards payments was referred to as an "uneasy muddle."

Fortune mentioned that payments are made "under the table." There is no valid reason why this should be so. A private physician who incurs expenses for supplies and equipment in performing drug tests for a company is certainly entitled to reimbursement.

In any event, almost everyone realizes that fees, expenses, and honoraria constitute an issue of the type which the medical and allied professions must solve for themselves. I wish I could say there are many signs that a solution is being discussed. That, unfortunately, is not the case. There is little sign that a solution is even being discussed, much less considered, within the profession.

Where in the literature can anyone cite detailed expositions of the medical propriety of accepting fees and honoraria for drug testing? Why should not this situation be faced frankly and openly, so that the shadows which now hover over some drug testing can be removed? This is one of the most difficult issues, but it is hardly insoluble.

SCARCITY OF DRUG TESTERS

Sixth. Is it not a fact that the Maryland physician probably never would have been used as a clinical investigator if there were not such a critical scarcity of drug testers?

Even with such scarcity, rigged research is probably relatively rare. What is infinitely more prevalent, according to numerous experts, is mediocre and substandard research. In 1962, an excellent report by the New York Academy of Medicine noted that clinical testing is often inferior or even unscientific, because so few scientists are trained in what some people term clinical pharmacology and in related disciplines. The Academy said:

> If testing by untrained, inexperienced or otherwise incompetent clinical investigators seems impossible, fantastic and incredible.—

One had only to look at the absence of professional standards to find the cause of this condition.

The time is overdue for the American healing arts—the greatest in the world—to launch voluntary, broad-scale reforms which can do far more than what any law can do—strengthen scientific excellence.

The U.S. Government is spending as much as $70 million a year for support of drug research and drug-related research. This expenditure has often yielded magnificent results. The Federal organization which is the most deeply involved in drug research, and which has achieved some of the finest results, is the National Institutes of Health.

Unfortunately, the NIH have not adequately fulfilled their broad responsibilities to increase the overall supply of skilled manpower for drug testing and evaluation.

Two of the Institutes—the National Institute for Mental Health and the National Cancer Institute—have made particularly outstanding records with respect to the pharmaceutical sciences.

TRIBUTE TO PSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY SERVICE CENTER

I know of no single program—public or private—which has done more to facilitate and expedite the evaluation of drugs and to keep such evaluation at the highest possible professional level than the Psychopharmacology Service Center, of the National Institute for Mental Health.

By contrast, most of the other categorical Institutes, such as the Arthritis Institute, seemed in previous years to have been half asleep as regards realization of the imperative need to elevate the overall standards of drug testing and evaluation.

I look, therefore, to all the Institutes and to the Division of Research Grants to cease taking what too often has been a passive attitude toward the haphazard standards of drug testing and evaluation. Wherever the American taxpayers' money is used, it must be used to promote excellence in drug testing and evaluation. We are not naive about the "numbers game" of hundreds of tests reported in the literature, with quantity too often substituted for quality.

The NIH cannot by themselves handle the many professional problems which I have mentioned; their role is limited. But they can do far more than they have done—without in any way exceeding the proper bounds of Federal jurisdiction.

It has been proposed, for example, that the Institutes provide unrestricted funds to leading teaching hospitals, so that clinical pharmacologists and other drug testers would not be dependent upon drug companies for financial support.

On an overall basis, let us note that there is no reason for alarm on the part of the American people. They can, by and large, remain confident in the overall standards of the pharmaceutical sciences. They can be even more confident, however, if the professions voluntarily act to deal in a forthright and prompt manner, with problems of the type I have mentioned.

NEW LAW AND REGULATIONS SERVE TO MINIMIZE FRAUD

Fortunately, the Kefauver-Harris law, passed unanimously by Congress in October 1962, tightens up on the filing of information about researchers who test new drugs. In addition, strong new regulations by the Food and Drug Administration help to minimize the future possibility of fraudulent action of the type attributed to the Maryland physician.

Let this fact be noted, however: There are alarming signs that certain reactionary forces are now trying to sabotage the new law and regulations, even before there has been an opportunity for the reforms to be given a fair trial.

The new law and regulations are probably far from perfect. They can be changed if a need for change is proven. If there is undue interference with drug research, if excessive administrative burdens are imposed, if investigators are discouraged, instead of encouraged, from entering into drug research, then certainly the regulation and, if need be, the law can and should be amended.

EFFORTS AGAINST NEEDLESS OFFICIAL SECRECY

I, for one, urged a year ago that the medical and allied professions be more broadly consulted by the Food and Drug Administration before the final version of the new regulations was approved. I had urged, as had the subcommittee staff, at my direction, that the strong objections filed by the National Institutes of Health against the original Food and Drug Administration regulations, as announced in August 1962, be made public by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Unfortunately, the Department chose not to do so. This is one more instance, I may say, of needless secrecy, against which we have fought, and will continue to fight, so as to protect the public interest and the public's right to know.

But sound amendment of the law and the regulations is one thing; sabotage of their spirit and intent is something else. I do not propose to see the will of the Congress—as unanimously expressed in October 1962—sabotaged.

There are disturbing signs of efforts to turn back the hands of the clock to prethalidomide days.

EFFORTS TO TRANQUILIZE THE CONGRESS

The American people should not forget that efforts were made to tranquilize the Congress into a false sense of security before the new drug law was enacted. Two months before Congress passed the law, the House Commerce Committee was told that drug companies use "extraordinary care in selecting highly trained clinical investigators."

Most drug companies may try to exercise such care most of the time. But a fact which has been generally ignored is that the companies themselves know that often they are confronted with a shortage of skilled drug testers.

The physician who tried to reassure the Congress in the above manner spoke, I am sure, in perfect good faith; his credentials are of the finest.

But a more accurate account of the regrettable situation in drug testing was given by the New York Academy of Medicine, in the report by his Committee on Public Health. It tended to call a spade a spade. Let us continue to do so. Let us seek the judgment of the healing arts; but let that judgment be broadly representative—not one-sided or artificially generated by thousands of letters poured out by some company in its own self-interest. And let not the judgment be based, for example, on the work of some "stacked" lopsided scientific committee representing the opponents of the drug law and regulations.

What did the law's opponents do—in terms of actions, not mere words—to follow up the worthy efforts of the American Medical Association Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry—as far back as 1946—to improve drug testing?

Let us, therefore, judge men by the actual record of their action to protect the public interest, the interest of science, the interest of medicine, the interest of safe, efficacious drugs of the type on which American industry has so fine a record in many respects.

This subcommittee will continue to do its part in the public interest. Most of its work, as heretofore, will be done with a minimum of public comment. It should be noted that the subcommittee had held information about the Maryland case for more than a year. The subcommittee had contacted the Montgomery County Maryland Medical Society, as well as other sources. Public comment was, however, avoided by the subcommittee, in order not to interfere in any way with the Federal grand jury. The only reference which we made was through Dr. Nestor's generalized comments at our March hearing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following two documents printed in the RECORD: The Attorney General's release of October 3, 1963, on the indictment; and a helpful write-up of that statement by the distinguished science writer, Robert Toth, as published in the New York Times of October 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the release and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Dr. Bennett A. Robin, a Silver Spring, Md., physician, was charged today with submitting false clinical test reports on five new drugs even though he conducted no such tests.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy said the indictment, returned by a Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia, followed an 11-month investigation by the Food and Drug Administration.

The indictment charged Dr. Robin, 34, with willfully causing the manufacturers of the five drugs to file false case studies with the FDA in support of their applications for FDA approval of the drugs.

As one stage in the development of new drugs, manufacturers ask various physicians to test the drugs on patients and to report back the results.

The grand jury said Dr. Robin made reports on fictitious tests of these drugs:

Tigan Hydrochloride, used to prevent nausea, manufactured by Hoffman-La Roche, Inc., Nutley, N.J.;

Entoquel with Neomycin Syrup, used against diarrhea, manufactured by White Laboratories, Inc., Kenilworth, N.J.;

Rynadyne, a cold medicine, made by Irwin, Neissler and Co., Decatur, Ill.;

Naquival, also known as CMR-807, a diuretic, made by the Schering Corp., Bloomfield, N.J.; and

Linodil, also known as WIN-9154, used in treatment of circulatory diseases, made by Winthrop Laboratories, New York City.

Mr. Kennedy said Rynadyne and Linodil were not approved by the FDA; Tigan Hydrochloride was approved for prescription use only; Naquival was approved on the basis of other reports; Entoquel with Neomycin Syrup was approved but the drug was later withdrawn from the market.

Maximum penalty would be 5 years in prison and $10,000 in fines on each of the five counts.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 1963]

FALSE DRUG TESTS LAID TO PHYSICIAN—CAPITAL INDICTMENT ACCUSES A MARYLAND PRACTITIONER OVER FIVE PREPARATIONS—COMPANIES ARE CLEARED—U.S. AGENCY GOT THE DATA IN LICENSING APPLICATIONS FOR USE BY THE PUBLIC

(By Robert C. Toth)

WASHINGTON, October 3.—A Maryland physician was indicted today by a Federal grand jury for falsifying results of tests on five new drugs.

One drug, licensed largely on his data, later caused two infants to be hospitalized in critical condition. The product was removed from the market.

Dr. Bennett A. Robin, 34 years old, of nearby Silver Spring, was charged with inventing results without conducting any tests and submitting them to the makers of the drugs. Usually he was paid for his work.

The companies used his data to seek licenses from the Food and Drug Administration for the producer.

The Government action was believed to be the first against "rigged research" by a physician. Officials have become increasingly worried about suspected "graphite data," their name for results that flow from a sharp pencil rather than from experiments.

RESULTS WERE SUSPECT

Dr. Robin became suspect, officials said, because his results were too regular.

"Our doctors didn't believe a real test could produce such uniform results," one said.

An investigation revealed that Dr. Robin had been in Miami when his reports indicated he was conducting tests, a Government source said.

Dr. Robin was charged with falsifying the records on five drugs, but it was understood that he has submitted data on about a dozen products. One year he made $13,000 from his reports, according to a Government source.

The drug companies often pay physicians to conduct clinical trials on new drugs on their patients. Usually the money is provided to underwrite the cost to the doctor, according to an industry spokesman.

The companies involved did not know of Dr. Robin's practices, the spokesman said, and cooperated in the investigation and later action by the Department of Justice before the grand jury here.

The Government case was presented by Jerry H. Opack.

COULD GET 25-YEAR TERM

Dr. Robin was indicted on five counts, one for each drug. He can receive, if convicted, up to 5 years and a $10,000 fine on each count and undoubtedly would lose his license to practice medicine.

Dr. Robin could not be reached for comment. The Montgomery County Medical Society also did not respond to a query on what action it might take and when.

Of the five drugs mentioned in the indictment, two never reached the market because the manufacturers' applications were rejected as incomplete. They were Rynadyne, a cold remedy prepared by Irwin, Neissler, and Co.; and Linodil, also known as WIN-9154, for peripheral circulatory diseases, from Winthrop Laboratories.

RECESS

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 8, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 7 (legislative day of October 3), 1963:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

LaVern R. Dilweg, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term of 1 year from October 22, 1963. (Reappointment)

Theodore Jaffe, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term of 2 years from October 22, 1963. (Reappointment)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general for a period of 4 years from the first day of January 1964, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5201.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 5: 9: *Wherefore we labour that we may be accepted of God.*

Almighty God, whose divine sovereignty we cannot deny or disobey, inspire us during this week with a clear and commanding vision of the helpful service we may render together for the welfare of our country and all mankind.

Grant that Thy servants, who have been entrusted with positions of leadership in the affairs of state, may be wise in directing our Nation in the ways of righteousness and peace.

In these times of crisis and confusion may we understand that it is our sacred privilege and highest wisdom to commend and commit ourselves to the light and leading of Thy spirit.

May we be assured that when we avail ourselves of Thy counsel and companionship, which Thou hast placed at our disposal, then no task will be too difficult and no responsibility too heavy.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 3, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 772. An act to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.;

H.R. 1696. An act defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies;

H.R. 4842. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6246. An act relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON

Mr. **CELLER**. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 541.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 3369) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. Is a second demanded?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, if no one else does, to assure some debate on this subject.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **COLMER**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 164]

Arends
Ashley
Baker
Baring
Barry
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boggs
Bromwell
Broomfield
Buckley
Burton
Cameron
Casey
Chenoweth
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Collier
Corbett
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Diggs
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hall
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hoffman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Lankford
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mills
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pepper
Pilcher
Powell
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Roudebush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Shelley
Sheppard
Sibal
Sickles
Siler
Staebler
Staggers
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tupper
Ullman
Van Pelt
Vinson
Whalley
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Willis
Zablocki

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 323 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. MASON

The **SPEAKER**. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. **CELLER**. Mr. Speaker, there came over from the other body a private bill passed by the other body to which was attached an amendment which in effect extends the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year to September 30, 1964. Then under existing law it would have 60 days to terminate its affairs.

Let us admit that we find it not too comfortable to deny the existence of a difficult problem. We live in the illusion if we ignore its existence it will go away. Thus it has been, for decade upon decade, with the deprivation of civil rights to a large segment of our society. We, the people of the United States, have made our declaration in the Declaration of Independence, in the Bill of Rights, in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution, and appear to deem that sufficient. But the problem would not go away; instead, problem begat problem and our resistance to meeting the problem head-on—resistance, both passive and active, fed upon our own ignorance, indifference, misconstruction, and intolerance.

Now before us we have the 1963 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Like the other reports we have had from the Commission, since it was established in 1957, this report is like unto the ringing of a bell to shake the torpor of the American conscience. That Commission says:

> The present conflict has created the danger that white and Negro Americans may be driven even further apart and left again with a legacy of fear and distrust. * * * Many communities are bewildered by the magnitude of their civil rights problems.

Every society, to grow and to mature, must ask itself what are the wrongs and, having found these wrongs, must seek the remedies. Unless we know what they are, how can we seek to remove them? We want the facts based upon examination. We want to know the conditions that exist. Where and how is discrimination practiced? If we, the representatives of our people, are to legislate effectively, we must have these facts before us. If the people of our constituencies ask us to legislate to redress grievances, they must have the facts, and for these purposes the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in my opinion, is indispensable. Because of the work of the Civil Rights Commission we have been able to work more intelligently on civil rights legislation. Those who have read the reports of the Commission must be shocked by the extent of the denial of the equal protection of our laws to a portion of our citizenry. We can no longer, because of these reports, pretend to ignore how deep a flaw in our society is the denial of equality of opportunity to some 20 million of our citizens. Whether it be information on housing, in job discrimination, whether it be on equal conditions in the Armed Forces, whether it be in the denial of voting rights, whether it be in the unequal opportunities of hospital facilities and services, we learn from the Commission what the wrongs are, how wide they extend, and are given, moreover, the suggested remedies we can study and build upon. Because the remedies lie not only in enactment of law but also in the practices and attitudes of our people.

We cannot say that the need for the Commission ends with the President's signature on a bill. The Commission examines, appraises, and informs on a condition in our society which, as we must all acknowledge, will not be resolved easily or quickly. Without the work of the Commission, we can work only in the realm of emotion, and emotion distorts the vision. The Commission has shown us that discrimination de facto is widespread throughout the North, and dispelled the notion that only regional interests are involved.

The Commission gives us reality and this reality holds us fast to our duties and to our responsibilities. It defines the challenges and helps us to find direction.

The Commission cannot make law. It cannot enforce the law. It is a searchlight which focuses on the festering sore so that the people, together with the three branches of Government, can do whatever it can do to remove this sore from the body politic.

Our Committee on the Judiciary has relied upon facts uncovered by the Commission. The President has found its compilations useful. Congress needs its periodic reports. Indeed, without the Commission and its work, our work on civil rights would be as valueless as a scabbard without a sword.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives will consider in executive session the bill, H.R. 7152, an omnibus civil rights bill which contains a provision making the Civil Rights Commission permanent.

It seems strange that here we are on the 7th day of October, the time for the Commission's life having already expired on the 30th of September, considering interim legislation to continue the Civil Rights Commission while the Congress can work its will on the omnibus civil rights bill.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] on January 31, 1963, introduced H.R. 3139, the first title of which provides for making the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency.

Subsequently, some of the minority members of the House Committee on the Judiciary on June 3, 1963, introduced a public accommodations title, notably the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] who introduced H.R. 6720. It was not until June 20, 1963, that H.R. 7152 was introduced pursuant to the President's message.

Nevertheless, the Committee on the Judiciary on May 8, 1963, commenced public hearings on civil rights legislation which continued until August 2; and one of the remarkable things was when the Attorney General appeared before our committee as a witness, he testified that he had not even read the bills introduced by the Republican members of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Our hearings comprise three volumes of something like 2,500 printed pages. We heard 100 witnesses and had 22 days of hearings. Our subcommittee No. 5 went through this bill carefully in 17 days of executive sessions. If we had acted promptly and diligently on the McCulloch bill this question could have been disposed of long before the term of the Civil Rights Commission expired.

I favor the resolution offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] because it seems to me that the Civil Rights Commission should remain in status quo until the House can work its will on the omnibus civil rights bill. It is perfectly obvious to me that it may be several weeks, if not longer, before that bill can be brought before the House of Representatives for action.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support the gentleman's motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution providing for a 1-year extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I think it is unfortunate that this bill comes before us again in 1963 in a manner similar to the way it came before us in 1961, that is, not as a bill acted upon by this body, where this body has an opportunity to consider amendments and act its own will on it, but instead has to accept a straight extension as provided by the other body, having tied it onto a bill that has no relevancy to it, as a rider to that bill.

I am today concerned about the fact that we do not have the opportunity to consider amendments, to adequately debate the issues, or to work our will, just as I was concerned in 1961. I have the report in my hand of the Civil Rights Extension Act, H.R. 6596, of 1961, in which the Committee on the Judiciary did work its will and did add an amendment which I introduced to the Civil Rights Commission that gave that body the power it should have and must have to investigate all vote frauds and vote stealing—vote frauds with regard to all of the people where vote stealing takes place—and describes what can be done to prevent it. In order to avoid consideration by this House of that much needed amendment to prevent vote frauds with regard to all of the people in America and to protect everybody's civil rights and give them the right to vote and have their vote counted in that year, the Congress avoided the consideration of it by the Senate tying the Civil Rights Commission extension on as a rider to the Justice appropriation bill. This year the same thing is being done. I hope, Members of the House, that we will have the right and the opportunity to consider a needed amendment that was voted out of the Committee on the Judiciary previously to give the House the chance to work its will on a proper amendment so as to consider vote stealing that is related to all citizens of America—it having been estimated that over 1 million votes were stolen in the 1960 elections.

I have introduced a bill to give the Commission this duty—to protect the right to vote of all our citizens which is H.R. 7115.

In approving my amendment in 1961, the House Judiciary Committee in its report No. 995 had this to say about my vote fraud amendment after stating the amendment.

> Amendment No. 2: At the end of the bill add the following new section to read as follows:
>
> "SEC. 2. Section 104(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c(a), 71 Stat. 635), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:
>
> " '(4) investigate allegations in writing, under oath or affirmation, that certain citizens of the United States are being unlawfully accorded or denied the right to vote, or to have that vote counted (in any election involving Federal officials), for presidential electors, members of the United States Senate or the House of Representatives, as a result of any pattern or practice of fraud or discrimination relating to the conduct of such election.' "
>
> PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENTS
>
> The second amendment, which adds a new paragraph (4) to section 104(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 635) provides for the further protection of the right to vote by adding to the duties of the Commission on Civil Rights the investigation of cases where the franchise is unlawfully accorded or denied anyone as a result of a pattern or practice of fraud or discrimination in an election for presidential electors, Members of the U.S. Senate or the House of Representatives. The committee believes that the work of the Commission in this new sphere can contribute substantially toward insuring that all qualified Americans shall have the right to vote and to have that vote properly counted.
>
> EXPLANATION OF SECOND AMENDMENT
>
> The right to vote is the cornerstone of representative self-government in America. As such, it is imperative that the franchise of every qualified citizen be adequately and effectively safeguarded and protected.
>
> Congress, in 1957, concerned with extensive allegations that certain qualified citizens were being arbitrarily denied the right

to vote, or to have their vote properly counted, established the Commission on Civil Rights to investigate charges that the franchise of minorities was being abused. This duty of the Commission was set forth in section 104(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c(a)):

> The Commission shall—
>
> (1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain persons are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based.

In 1956, Mr. Herbert Brownell, then the Attorney General, described the proposed operation of the Commission in an executive communication to the Speaker (see p. 14, H. Rept. 291, 85th Cong., 1st sess.):

> Where there are charges that by one means or another the vote is being denied, we must find out all of the facts—the extent, the methods, the results. * * *
>
> The need for a full scale public study as requested by the President is manifest. The executive branch of the Federal Government has no general investigative power of the scope required to undertake such a study. The study should be objective and free from partisanship. It should be broad and at the same time thorough.

Since its creation, the Commission has been most vigorous in pursuing these objectives. Its numerous investigations of alleged franchise deprivations have been widely hailed.

President John F. Kennedy, in a recent letter to Chairman CELLER urging extension of the Commission, observed, however, that the Commission has not yet fully realized its "constructive potential." This is certainly true. Limited as it is in jurisdiction to the protection of minority interests, it is presently powerless to investigate franchise abuses not based upon "color, race, religion, or national origin."

Yet, as Mr. Byron R. White, Deputy Attorney General, recently observed in a communication to your committee, dated August 7, 1961:

> Apart from the Commission there is no Federal executive agency charged with a continuing responsibility for gathering information calculated to assist in the guaranteeing of the protection of constitutional rights * * *.

If it is true that the denial of freedom to any American is a diminution of freedom to all Americans, then we cannot tolerate restrictions on the franchise from any quarter—for any cause. If the constitutional right to vote is worth protecting through a Federal agency for any Americans, it is worth protecting through such agency for all Americans. The time is past, if ever there was such a time, when constitutional protections can be administered in a discriminatory or segregated manner. It is with this conviction, it is to embrace within the ambit of the Civil Rights Commission's operations the job of safeguarding everyone's right to vote, the most fundamental civil right under the Constitution, that paragraph (4) is offered.

The proposed amendment would broaden the functions of the Commission to cover all citizens seeking franchise protection. If the Commission, in the past, performed a useful function, and our action in extending its life would indicate it has, then filling the present civil rights gap in its responsibilities under the proposed amendment should provide it with an even greater challenge and opportunity for service.

It should be noted well that the new investigative power granted the Commission does not extend to any case involving a purely State or local election.

As with its original authorization to initiate Commission action, allegations must be submitted in writing, under oath, or affirmation. It is not permitted to act on mere hearsay or rumor. Unlawfully according the franchise, as well as its denial, is made a ground for Commission action. And, as is already the case, primary elections, as well as general elections, are embraced within the scope of its broadened responsibilities.

The proposed amendment is not directed at any locality, party or election. Rather it is responsive to a long felt general need. Charges of voting irregularities have probably been made in every election since the founding of the Republic. For the most part, such allegations have been without foundation. But occasionally in our history chicanery has occurred and, because of the lack of effective machinery charged with the responsibility to investigate, has gone unpunished and unexposed to the public view.

Belief in, and respect for, the integrity of the methods by which our leadership is chosen must be maintained. If ever that belief and respect are lost, our freedoms will likewise be lost.

The committee is convinced that the proposed amendment will go a long way toward insuring the preservation of the integrity of the ballot in this country.

Attached hereto and made a part of this report is a letter dated August 7, 1961, from the President to the chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, a letter dated July 20, 1961, from the Department of Justice, and a letter dated May 12, 1961, from the Commission on Civil Rights.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is another of those unusual legislative proceedings we are encountering with more and more frequency in the House of Representatives. We are dealing here and now with a minor claims bill to which the Senate has attached a rider providing for an extension of the Civil Rights Commission. Yet you cannot find a copy of this bill, as amended, to include the extension of the Civil Rights Commission, here at the desk. What is equally important, you cannot find a report or a copy of the hearing on this amended bill available on the House floor. Why this kind of legislative proceeding? Why should we not know how much the Civil Rights Commission is costing and what is proposed to be spent on it for another year? Why should we not know, for instance, how many complaints have been filed with the Civil Rights Commission; where those complaints originated, and how they have been dealt with? What is wrong with giving the House of Representatives information it is entitled to and should have in extending the life of this Commission for another year? We have absolutely nothing before us here today, unless something is being held out on me. Where, I ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is the information that the House ought to have to vote intelligently on this proposition?

Mr. CELLER. This is only a temporary measure to extend the life of this Commission. Very shortly I hope the House will work its will on an omnibus civil rights bill which contains a full title on the subject of the Civil Rights Commission. At that time I am sure the gentleman will be given a great deal of information and more than is being given today.

Mr. GROSS. But you are asking me, and all other Members of the House, to vote today to continue an expensive Commission and I have no knowledge of how it has been performing; what it has been doing, if anything. I do not even know whether there has been any justification for continuing the life of this Commission.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I did not particularly desire to address the House on this subject. I merely wanted to ask my distinguished friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] who made some very pertinent remarks and asked, as usual, some very sound questions, to yield to me so that I might ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary a question in line with what he has just said.

Is the House to understand from the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that if we pass this bill today providing an extension for 1 year, he will then insist upon its becoming a permanent Commission in the bill which he hopes to pass at a later date?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I will state with reference to the bill that I offered, the so-called administration bill, the life of the Civil Rights Commission was to be extended for a period of 4 years. But in the subcommittee an amendment was offered to make the Commission permanent. That is not final. The subcommittee's report will go to the full committee and the committee will work its will. What the committee will do, whether accept a permanent status for the Civil Rights Commission or limit it, I cannot indicate at this moment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's reply but I am still not very much wiser than I was before.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, of course, the distinguished gentleman from New York recognizes, as we all do, that he is sitting in the driver's seat when the bills are being considered, that he has the whip hand, that the Commission will be extended either for 1 year as a result of this legislation, if it passes, or it will become permanent, as the gentleman desires. What I wanted to know, and what I thought I asked the gentleman is, What is his position going to be as chairman of this committee?

Mr. CELLER. I will accept the verdict of the full committee. If they make it permanent I will accept that. As I said, we had an amendment offered to make it 4 years. Four years would be agreeable to me. But if the committee wants to make it permanent, I shall accept that.

Mr. COLMER. Then the gentleman is perfectly willing to sit by and let the committee work its will and he is not going to try to influence it by making this Commission permanent?

Mr. CELLER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. COLMER. Then may I have the gentleman's assurance further that he will follow that course with reference to the whole bill?

Mr. CELLER. No, I cannot do that.

Mr. COLMER. It might be a very healthy thing if the gentleman did. I think we all recognize—the gentleman from New York and every Member on this floor—that the country is in a worse situation today than we were when this Civil Wrongs Commission was first set up. The good Lord only knows, because we have no information on this matter, how much it has cost the taxpayers of this country, which is something, of course, that really should not be mentioned here because, after all, we do not seem to be too much concerned about that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the 3 minutes yielded to me by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. Speaker, the conditions under which this legislation, or this motion, is before the House is regrettable, indeed. I am pleased to say to the Members of the House, particularly the Members on our side of the aisle, I am in favor of suspending the rules and adopting the resolution, because time is now of the essence.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to name for the record the outstanding members of the Civil Rights Commission, some of whom were named by President Eisenhower, and some of whom were named by President Kennedy.

John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, is the Chairman of the Commission. Robert G. Storey, head of the Southwestern Law Center, former dean of Southern Methodist University Law School, and past president of the American Bar Association, is Vice Chairman. Erwin N. Griswold, dean of Harvard University Law School, is a member of the Commission. The Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, is a member of the Commission. Robert S. Rankin is chairman of the department of political science of Duke University, and is a member of the Commission. Spottswood W. Robinson III, who has just been nominated for the Federal bench, is a member of the Commission as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no logical answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa of why we are bringing this resolution to the floor of the House under these conditions. There is no excuse for it.

Mr. Speaker, legislation to extend the life of, or make permanent, the Civil Rights Commission, has been before the House for 8 or more months. The Congress should have long since acted upon it. But we did not. The time has come when we must extend the life of the Commission which expired on October 1. Later on, I hope, we shall have plenty of time to discuss the necessity for making the Commission a permanent one.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure no single Member of the House thinks that this problem has been resolved or will be resolved in 1 year or 4 years or even 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of the Members who are objectively interested in the most important, the most serious, the most emotional domestic problem of our time to support the motion to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I hope that all Members will have read, and if they have not read, will put on their agendas to read, the 1963 report of the Civil Rights Commission. It is comprehensive in scope, covers a great many areas involving civil rights in the United States, North, South, East, and West, and is well organized. This report was submitted by the distinguished persons who are members of the Commission, just referred to by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch]. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] would know about what is going on in this area were he in his usual, diligent way to examine this report as well as the past reports of the Civil Rights Commission.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I too regret that this stopgap measure has to come to the floor of the House in this fashion. I think it is shameful that here we are, after the expiration date of the Civil Rights Commission, with less than 60 days to go when it must wind up its affairs, passing stopgap legislation to extend the life of the Commission for 1 year. I think it is regrettable for a great many reasons because, chiefly, it could have been avoided. It might have been avoided if the administration had submitted civil rights legislation to the Congress long before the time that it did submit such legislation.

Even then it might have been avoided if the Congress had moved with greater speed. Tomorrow, October 8, 10 months after the 88th Congress opened, and almost 3 years after this administration took office, will be the first time the full House Judiciary Committee will have considered civil rights legislation.

I do not wish to place blame on anyone. At this point it would serve no useful purpose. All I am saying is that it is unfortunate that this bill has to come to us in this fashion. The life of the Commission has already terminated. There have been wholesale resignations of good men from the Civil Rights Commission because of the Commission's impermanent nature and the cavalier way in which it has been treated by the administration. On my side of the aisle we recognize that the Commission should be made a permanent body. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio has just referred to our position on this point. The subcommittee has reported to the full committee a bill which recommends that the Civil Rights Commission be made permanent. No one makes out a plausible case that the problem of civil rights is going to be cured in our great country within the next 2, 4, 10, 20, or 40 years. We know perfectly well it will be with us in our lifetime.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia 2 additional minutes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, when I heard my splendid friend, the gentleman from Ohio, call the roll of the Members on the Civil Rights Commission, I could not help but think of the story of when they wheeled a patient into the operating room. Everywhere he turned there were doctors standing around with knives. He said "My stars, gentlemen, am I the only one in here without a knife?"

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is not any surprise and it never has been that there is only one on that Commission remotely familiar with the section of the country that this legislation is designed against. That is par for the course, however, when civil rights are being considered.

Mr. Speaker, in the very nature of things we ought to talk a little about this legislation. Do you know what this legislation is? This legislation is a House bill awarding compensation to the widow of a veteran, with the Senate attaching this Civil Rights Commission thereon and bless Heaven, the widow's rights are not even mentioned on the floor in this debate. I wonder if we are, in the excitement civil rights generate, going to forget all about this widow and her claim?

It is a little amusing to me to hear them talk about extensions of this Commission. I was a member of the Committee on the Judiciary at the time this Commission came into being and I tell you, and I challenge anyone to dispute me, that not one of the proponents ever advocated making this Commission permanent. On the other hand, they said it was extremely temporary and certainly would not be needed after a length of time. Now it has become one of the most immortal pieces of legislation ever spread upon the books.

I just wonder what on earth happened to this great country of ours before we had this Civil Rights Commission. I just wonder how much this country has been improved on account of this Civil Rights Commission. If anything, I think we got along better. And, do you know, I want to get along with you. I do not want the Civil Rights Commission to decide all matters for us. I am only 5 feet 3, and I believe in the courts settling all legal matters.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Has the Committee on the Judiciary received any testimony on further investigations and recommendations in the field of civil rights that this Commission might make? It has already made recommendations on schools, public facilities, voting, withholding of Federal funds, jobs, housing, and other recommendations even to the reduction in the number of Congressmen in Southern States. Is there anything left? Was there any testimony before the committee as to what else it might investigate and make recommendations on?

Mr. FORRESTER. Of course, they have not investigated into that, but your Civil Rights Commission has recommended speedy and harsh legislation in all the fields you refer to.

Mr. ABERNETHY. They also have the authority, do they not, to make investigations in the field of religious discrimination? Have they made any recommendations in that field that the gentleman knows of?

Mr. FORRESTER. None that I know of.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Have they made any investigation of discrimination because of national origin?

Mr. FORRESTER. To tell the truth, I do not know what the phrase means, but they have made investigations in that field.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then what do they intend to do for another year besides drawing pay and fomenting trouble?

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not know what they intend to do, but the Civil Rights Commission has made recommendations in this 1963 report that are startling. If the gentleman will let me proceed, I would like to talk to him a little about that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I thank the gentleman. I had not even cranked up. But this is a bad bill, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, this legislation is completely immortal. It has never been nonpartisan. It has always been political, and it has always been interested in the development of a strong, centralized Federal power, completely oblivious to any of the rights of the sovereign States.

One of its favorite recommendations is that if you do not dance to the whims and the fancies of someone who has issued an executive order or an administrative order, all Federal funds shall be cut off from that community or that State.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But the privilege and requirement of them to pay taxes will be continued.

Mr. FORRESTER. Oh, yes, you pay your taxes, but not one penny do you get back. You know, they have not even realized they are punishing the people no matter what their belief is. They punish their friends as well as their enemies in their haste to do something which certainly cannot react to good.

If the recommendations made by this Commission have ever been needed, and I do not think they have been, they are not needed now, because these unwarranted and highly questionable and dangerous powers are now being exercised by every department of our Government, including our courts, public housing, education, lending agencies, and even the military.

I could cite numerous instances regarding the dangerous and unjustified recommendations made by this Commission. On page 124 of their 1963 report is a recommendation that the Federal Government make grants for the purpose of increasing the professional quality of the police forces of the States and local governments. This can only mean that this Commission does not approve of the police forces in our States, counties, and cities. Just what is wrong with these local police forces, I do not know. I am satisfied with ours, and I hope the other Congressmen are satisfied with theirs.

On page 125 of the report is a recommendation that would permit removal by the defendant of a State civil action or criminal prosecution to a district court of the United States in cases where the defendant "cannot secure his civil rights because of the written or decisional laws of the State." This recommendation can only stem from a hatred on the part of this Commission against our local and State trial and appellate courts. Any Commission who would make this kind of recommendation should be abolished. It is an agency we can certainly spare because there are many politicians that you and I could name who would gladly make these foolish suggestions for free.

Mr. FLYNT Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the suspension of the rules and passage of H.R. 3369 as amended, because of the substance of the amendment and because of the procedure under which consideration of this bill comes to the House of Representatives.

It has been aptly stated that this involves a bad amendment to an otherwise good bill. As originally introduced and passed by the House of Representatives, H.R. 3369 was a private bill for the relief of a Mrs. Mason. It was then a meritorious bill placed on the private calendar and passed by unanimous consent. When returned to the House from the other body it contained an extraneous amendment not germane to the original bill, which amendment extended the life of the so-called Civil Rights Commission.

Let there be no mistake about it, the creation of the Civil Rights Commission and its extension are both aimed at the South. In all likelihood, this bill will be passed. It should not be passed in its present form. The Civil Rights Commission should not be extended and legislation designed to extend it should not be brought up under this procedure without opportunity to offer amendments and practically no opportunity to debate the issue which is here involved.

Since the Civil Rights Commission was created, race relations, not only in the South but elsewhere, have deteriorated. I do not say that the Civil Rights Commission is solely responsible for this deterioration, but I do know that it has been a contributing factor to a breakdown in communications between men of good will of both races and that it has substituted disregard and disrespect for law where respect for law and order previously existed.

In many instances and in many localities genuine friendship between the races and most especially between the leaders of both races has been destroyed and, tragically, suspicion, bad feelings, physical violence, and hatred have often been substituted.

Force and violence do not contain the answer to the many facets of this now nationwide problem. Biased and prejudiced individuals on the Commission itself and on the staff of the Commission are in large part responsible for the explosive and volatile conditions which exist in many parts of the United States.

The best interests of the United States and the best approach to a successful resolution of this problem demand the defeat of this bill as amended so that the Civil Rights Commission would expire.

Under no circumstances should an issue as important as this one is, and as deserving of full debate, be brought to the House under the unusual procedure of suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, because of the substance of the amendment to this bill and because of the procedure used today, I urge the defeat of the pending motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the emotional web weaved by racial agitators, we find the House today acting on legislation which has not been considered or reported by a committee. No hearings are available; no facts on which to vote intelligently. As if that were not enough, the House is also being asked to vote under a parliamentary gimmick which stifles debate. All of this is a radical and novel departure from accepted legislative processes.

Mr. Speaker, I will not dwell at length on the Civil Rights Commission, its prejudices, and its slanders against a free and patriotic people.

Others in this debate have pointed up the obvious fact that there exists more racial strife now than 6 years ago when the Commission was created. As a matter of fact, the tempo of racial tension has increased yearly since the Commission has been in operation.

The reports issued by the Civil Rights Commission over the years have been rife with unconcealable bias. The hearings held have been dominated by the NAACP, CORE, and other special interest political racketeers. So-called findings of fact are nothing more than unfounded and preconceived expressions of a prejudiced Commission staff intent upon doing a hatchet job on the white people of the Southern States.

The Commission has not made one honest effort to improve racial relations in this country; instead, its energies have been directed toward agitation, vilification and political assassination of one area of this country.

If the Commission had its way, every white southerner would be legally straitjacketed while the Negro would continue to have unlimited license to abuse the privileges of citizenship.

As an example of the impractical and downright ridiculous recommendations of the Commission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment briefly on those under the heading "Justice" in the 1963 report. Legislation is recommended to empower the Attorney General "to intervene in or to initiate civil proceedings to prevent denials to persons of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured to them by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, that asinine proposal would give carte blanche authority for Robert Kennedy to act as personal attorney for every disgruntled sorehead in the country—provided, of course, he happens to be a member of a minority race.

Secondly, the Commission would set up a grant-in-aid program to subsidize—and therefore control—State, county, and city police departments. This one must have originated in Moscow.

The third recommendation would make local governments jointly liable, along with its employees, to alleged victims of such employee's misconduct. This is such an outrageous departure from our governmental system that it deserves no comment.

Their fourth recommendation presupposes that a fair and impartial trial can only be held in a Federal Court.

Mr. Speaker, these fantastic recommendations are typical of those made throughout the history of the Civil Rights Commission. They stand as proper testimonials to a bureaucratic parasite which should be buried now, and without ceremony.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's Civil Rights Commission was created and sold to some people as a step toward understanding, a move toward better race relationships, and even of solution of race problems.

After years of operation the Commission, always partisan, never objective, has proven itself to be just opposite to what had been hoped. We see turmoil, racial strife and bloodshed in every direction, much of it in my opinion contributed to if not initiated by this Commission.

Hon. John C. Satterfield, a personal friend and former president of the American Bar Association, in a speech earlier this year said the Commission's report for 1961:

> Is startling to the casual reader, alarming to the careful student, and frightening to those who believe in the maintenance of the system of government created by the Constitution.

A serious student and outstanding lawyer, Mr. Satterfield concluded his analysis of the 1961 report by saying:

> Although the 1961 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights contains 37 controversial recommendations, it raises one paramount issue to which the people of the United States must be alerted and which they must face squarely and courageously. The Federal Government expends directly $90 billion per year through its budget; it supervises and controls private and semipublic financial institutions with assets of $890 billion (see p. 65 of the report) through 70 grant-in-aid programs; it dictates the use of approximately one-fourth of the taxes collected and expended by all of the States. As of November 20, 1962, the first major step was taken to pervert this vast financial power to political purposes through Executive Order 11063.

He also said:

> The burning issue in the field of civil rights today, is whether the American people will permit the executive branch of the Federal Government to pervert to political purposes this vast power in the Federal financing of homes, schools, corporations, and individuals' businesses (and eventually the subsidizing of persons by social security, unemployment compensation, veterans' and pension benefits) to bring about the political and sociological ends desired by the political parties then in power. Reasonable business conditions placed upon financing related to the purposes thereof are proper and necessary. Once the people of the United States permit the executive head of the political party then in power to pervert and misuse this financial power for political purposes, all those things which go to make up what we still fondly call our free enterprise system will become subject to despotic action of Federal personnel.
>
> After careful consideration and a full study of all six volumes of the 1961 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights report, I charge that this report was prepared and distributed to the people of the United States for the purpose of deliberately deceiving them by using the pretense of an objective study to present only those facts favorable to the desires of the political party and the pressure groups supporting this program. It was planned to conceal from the people of the United States all facts which do not support the political positions thus espoused.

Mr. Speaker, though the people of all the States pay Federal taxes, this partisan Commission advocated that the President withhold all Federal funds from my State of Mississippi until such time as that State subscribed to the Commission's racial views, an action which the President himself, said was not authorized by the Constitution. Of course, that was financial blackmail—full and complete.

This Commission is the leadoff pitch for the "ominous" civil rights bill, leaders of the NAACP have boastfully declared that if Congress shall block the "ominous" civil rights bill they will organize another march on Washington, including the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this Commission has been the instrument of stirring up racial strife. It has served as the agent of the Executive Department to promote the use of marches, boycotts, sit-ins, and block-outs, which in turn have led to mob violence, death and destruction.

To enlist the pressure of the mob to have one's way is not new. It was used in ancient Rome. It has been the frequent means used for governmental overthrow in many South and Central American countries in recent years. It is shameful that this Nation is in the process of importing these practices to our own country, teaching our youth that hard work, individual improvement is too slow. Put the pressure on, force the use of troops, make them divide now what others have worked so hard for, seems to be the policy of the day. Use the bayonets to go into the other fellow's business, which he worked to develop, they say.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day which is upon us and this Commission has helped to make it that way; instead of healing, it has divided. Instead of solving, it has created new problems. Truly it would be of great help to all our Nation if this Commission were to remain dead.

From observing the membership here today I doubt that you will do that; but years from now all will wish this Commission had never been created, for it will continue to create problems rather than solve them, will generate hostility rather than promote peace. My colleagues, it is up to you.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker. The Commission on Civil Rights has disqualified itself as an instrumentality of free government and democratic institutions. By its own words recorded in its own report, it has disgraced and condemned itself.

It does not deserve to be extended any more than it needs to be extended.

We would do well to expedite its 70-odd employees on their separate-but-equal ways toward some productive employment. We would be wise to redirect its million dollar budget into more useful channels. To accomplish these ends requires no positive or laborious action on the part of Congress—we have merely to refrain from extending the life of the Commission.

The Report of the Civil Rights Commission dated September 30, 1963—its terminal report, we might say, inasmuch as the Commission expired at midnight on that day—is an infamous document reeking of racism and totally disrespectful of constitutionally guaranteed rights and liberties. Every paragraph, every recommendation of the report is an indictment of the Commission and good and sufficient ground for permitting it to rest in peace. Not even the most avid "civil righter" need apologize to his constituency for voting to confirm its expiration.

Due to time limitations under the rules of the House, I shall address myself to but one of the recommendations of the Commission. This is the proposal that affirmative steps be taken by the Federal Government to insure that employment, directly or indirectly generated by Federal loan, grant, or aid programs, will be "racially balanced," to use a term popular with the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, with a few lumps of sugar a horse can be trained to dance the rhumba. Throw a seal enough fish and the poor creature can be induced to blow "God Bless America" on tin horns. But it is somehow depressing to see the Civil Rights Commission recommend the same techniques for the Federal Government to use in dealing with American businessmen to coerce them into hiring "racially balanced" work crews.

If the Commission's proposal is adopted, Government contracts will go only to employers who agree to hire a "balanced" staff.

A moderate man might argue that the Commission's recommendation would do no such thing but would merely require that the employer agree not to discriminate on account of race, color, religion, or national origin. But we are not dealing with a moderate Civil Rights Commission. One has but to read an earlier report of this intemperate agency to realize that the people who would enforce such a law would be extreme in their evaluations. The Commission's report of 1961, employment, part 3 shows that for them discrimination is a numbers game.

The Commission made a head count in four Federal agencies in nine cities to ascertain the distribution of minority group employment. Among the observations made about the results of this head count were that Negroes were employed in substantial proportions in wage board, or blue collar jobs, and that there was a wide variation among the percentages of Classification Act positions—white collar jobs—filled by Negroes in the cities studied.

Now let me read from page 36 of the report one of the conclusions drawn from the head count. It sounds like gobbledegook, but its significance is appallingly clear. I read as follows:

> (6) There appear to be some significant variations in employment practices as between different agencies. Thus, agency 1 employed considerably more Negroes in Classification Act positions in every city surveyed except Washington. Agency 4 employed considerably more Negroes in Washington, but relatively few in the eight other cities.
>
> Agency 1 is apparently one in which a real effort has been made to communicate its policy of nondiscriminatory employment to its field establishments. Agency 4—despite its excellent implementation of the policy in Washington—has apparently failed to implement the policy in its field offices.

Mr. Speaker, such an academic effort in abstract reasoning as that which I have just read is unworthy of serious consideration and I do not believe that it will be seriously considered. But it is typical of the work of the Commission on Civil Rights.

And what if by some chance the Commission's recommendation should be enacted into law? Do you see how this numbers game would operate against the businessman who successfully bids on a Government contract? The nondiscrimination enforcers come into his plant, take a head count and if they do not find the right distribution of minority groups the employer has failed to implement the nondiscrimination policy. He will have to develop a more aggressive minority recruiting policy.

If this fails to turn up enough qualified candidates of the right color, the only way for him to qualify for a government contract in the face of the perverted logic of the numbers game is to hire unqualified workers. Just as long as he has a "racially balanced" personnel file he will be in good shape. If his product turns out to be more expensive or does not last as long, that is a secondary matter—secondary to the racial matter.

Mr. Speaker, I have touched on but one phase of the Report of the Commission on Civil Rights, and one of its recommendations. Its significance is self-evident. It alone is enough to condemn the Commission to the gentle death that it suffered at midnight Monday, September 30, 1963. I say, let it rest in peace.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, since I come from the Southland, no doubt mine will be a voice crying in the wilderness for I am sure the minds of many of you will be closed to a southerner concerning this tremendously important matter.

Let me say, as the distinguished gentlemen who preceded me, the gentleman from Georgia and likewise the gentleman from Mississippi, that we have seen more racial unrest, animosity and turmoil since the creation of this Civil Rights Commission than we saw and have seen since the War Between the States. What is wrong?

Let the proponents of this measure, if they can, point out the good that has been accomplished as a result of the creation of this Civil Rights Commission. They cite the fact that we have demonstrations in the streets, that we have discrimination in employment and and things such as that, and they cite that as a reason for the continuation of this Commission. Let me say that those particular problems rather than being the basis and the reason for the creation or even the continuation of this Commission are the very things that this Commission has caused. Did we have such mass demonstrations in Washington? Did we have demonstrations in Brooklyn? Did we have the threat, even such as we have now, by these people out in Utah to demonstrate against the Mormon Church? Did we have all of these things prior to the creation of this Commission? No, we did not. So submit the very things that they cite are not actually the basis for the continuation of the Commission but rather they are the basis for the discontinuance of this Civil Rights Commission.

Let me repeat to my colleagues in this House that this Commission has done more to create unrest, dissension and animosity than anything that this Congress has ever passed. It has replaced love with hate; concern with contempt and progress with promises. It has made law-defying citizens out of law-abiding citizens. It has harassed the businessman. It has caused disturbances in all communities throughout the Nation. I submit with all the agitation and all the problems we have today, this Congress would be doing a great service to the Nation to put an end to this Commission—a commission which has only aggravated the racial problem in every phase of our life.

Mr. Speaker, in opposing the extension of the Civil Rights Commission I am not doing so only for the sake of the South, but for the sake of the Nation. It is high time that we put an end to this Commission which was conceived, created and operated with but one purpose and that is to harass the South.

Our Nation is today engulfed in a raging tide of racial unrest primarily because of the activities of this Commission and similar organizations designed to engender unrest, animosity and hatred among our people. Any reasonable man must conclude that we have had more dissension and unrest since the creation of this Commission than has existed since the War Between the States.

The agitation of this Commission has put men in the streets rather than putting them in jobs, young people in jails rather than in schools, made law defying citizens out of law-abiding people; and it has replaced love with hate, interest with indifference, and concern with contempt. It is high time that we put an end to such commissions of agitation and consider the rights of the majority of this great Nation.

If this Commission were genuinely interested in the civil rights of all citizens, then why has it not spoken up for the rights of the poor white man needing an education and job in order to support his family? Why has it not spoken up for the rights of our many other minority groups, who are working in the traditional American way to improve their lot in life, instead of aiding and abetting those who are operating in the streets, harassing businessmen, disrupting religious services and conducting mass demonstrations throughout the Nation?

This Commission is totally unnecessary and actually renders a disservice to the Nation. Certainly, the Government should not sponsor and finance such a commission when almost every community in America is presently plagued with agitation by such organizations as the NAACP, CORE, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, American Civil Liberties Union and the like.

Additionally, the proponents of this Commission should be aware of the fact that the administration and the Supreme Court are dedicated to the protection of civil rights, even at the expense of law-abiding citizens and businessmen.

Let me repeat, this Civil Rights Commission has done nothing but create animosity, hatred and unrest and I hope that the Members of this body will have the courage to stand up and vote against its continuation.

So I appeal to you, regardless of where I happen to come from—and I am proud of my heritage as a southerner and likewise proud to be an American—I appeal to you to rise above pressure politics, to rise above sectionalism and rise above partisanship and put an end to this Commission whose only fruits have been agitation, turmoil, unrest and dissension throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, today Members must revive for 1 year, or lay to rest, the now-expired Civil Rights Commission. It needs no repeating that many recommendations of that body are controversial. Some are unsound. Some, in the name of preferment for few, would deny opportunity to all.

But my disagreement with part of its past will not justify destruction of its potential. As a factfinding body, the Commission can, and should, impartially gather and interpret information for leaders and lawmakers. As a factfinding body, it can, and should, suggest reasonable means of broadening opportunity for all.

Mr. Speaker, my vote to continue the Commission is not likely to be popular. Yet popularity is a poor substitute for facing fact. Like all southerners, I grew up to the tune of "Dixieland." But we in Dixie cannot "look away" forever—nor can the rest of the Nation, too lately acknowledging its own paradox of prejudice and pride.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, when there is a denial of a citizen's civil rights there is nothing more vital than the existence of a forum to which the citizen may apply. The only forum presently available in the Federal Government is the Civil Rights Commission—and the authority of this Commission should be extended as provided in H.R. 3369.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the establishment of the original Civil Rights Commission in 1957 and also the 2-year extension in 1959; likewise the extension of another 2-year term in 1961. When this unwise legislation was first presented to Congress I, at that time, stated that this was just an effort to get the "foot in the door," so to speak, or another old saying which is as true, and that is to just "get the camel's nose under the tent." Subsequent events have proven me to be correct. Here today we have the spectacle of the 1-year extension which has been brought to the House floor with an amendment by the other body to a House-passed relief bill which prohibits us from a full discussion and without the benefit of congressional hearings. We, of course, understand that this is only stopgap legislation and that legislation will be before the House soon asking that it be made permanent when the President has only asked for a 4-year extension.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly against any extension. The Commission is now dead. Let it die in peace. Let us not pump life into it for 1 year and in the interim make it permanent. Why am I opposed to this obnoxious legislation? It has more than served its purpose. Some seem to think that the remedy for every so-called ill is to set up a Commission. Commissions have a way of growing and growing, and certainly this one is no exception. Not only has it intruded into the personal life of everyone but there seems to be a feeling among some of its Members that they are endowed with divine authority. In the words of Cassius "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed, that he is grown so great?"

Many suggestions have been made by the Commission as to what the President himself should do even without additional legislation by Congress, and he has replied that he does not have the authority. One of the latest recommendations to the Congress is that the South's representation in Congress be reduced. Time does not permit going into detail; however, I may state that this Commission has gone far afield. Perhaps the next recommendation will be that the South be denied any representation or even Congress itself abolished.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise my colleagues in the House of Representatives that I support the resolution agreeing to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3369, which will extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year.

I view the proposal before us today as an interim step to keep the Civil Rights Commission in existence. At present the House Committee on the Judiciary is considering a number of measures relative to the powers of the Commission and to extend the life of the Commission. A number of these proposals call for making the Commission a permanent one.

On May 6, 1963, I introduced H.R. 6089 which would extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government.

My bill calls for broadening the scope of the duties and powers of the Commission as presently constituted.

It is my conviction, Mr. Speaker, that the Commission should be extended for at least 4 years or that it should be made a permanent agency of the Federal Government. I have observed closely the operation of the Commission. I feel it is virtually impossible to retain the highly qualified staff members said Commission needs unless there is breath breathed into the Commission for a period of longer than 1 year. It is virtually impossible for efficient operation of the Commission unless plans can be made over a period of years.

I wish to take this occasion, Mr. Speaker, to call for legislation to give to the Commission at least the following duties; to investigate allegations that certain citizens are deprived of their right to vote; to study and collect information regarding the denial of equal protection guarantees of the Constitution; to appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to said equal protection guarantees; and, to serve as a national clearinghouse for information and provide information to Government agencies, communities, and so forth, in respect to equal protection of the laws including the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly opposed the creation of a Civil Rights Commission which was provided in the Civil Rights Act of 1957. I opposed the 2-year extension of this Commission which was approved in 1959 and I fought another 2-year extension of it in 1961.

Today Congress can make a real economy in Government. We can save the taxpayers a million dollars a year by abolishing this operation which is getting bigger and busier all the time and which has an absolutely indefensible record. This Commission was not intended to continue forever when it was created but today it is on its way toward becoming another mammoth bureaucracy in a short time.

In 1958 the Commission had 16 employees and a budget of $200,000. Today it has 76 employees and the estimated budget for 1964 is $985,000.

Over $5 million has now gone to support an outfit which achieved its greatest notoriety last spring on a proposal to withhold all Federal funds from States which did not accept its political and racial recommendations.

I have never heard anyone argue that this Commission was supposed to make policy, yet the September 30 report which it has issued proposes nothing but policy, constitutional or otherwise.

I hope that Congress will not be blackmailed into prolonging the life of this Commission. The methods and purposes as proclaimed in the Commission's latest report do not justify its continuation and I believe that there are many projects more worthy of a million dollars than this very questionable operation.

Mr. Speaker, finally I submit that if this outfit gets another lease on life it will be here to stay for undoubtedly efforts will be made to confer upon it the powers proposed in title 5 of the omnibus civil rights bill, which would also raise the pay of these tireless meddlers to $75 per day. I do not believe Congress should subsidize such a propaganda program for another minute and I am confident that a large majority of the American people share my views.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret that illness prevents me from attending today's session. However, I urge all my colleagues to vote for the continuation of the Civil Rights Commission.

The Civil Rights Commission was established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957. Under that act the Commission was empowered to:

Investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of their race, color, religion, or national origin;

Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution;

Appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection of the laws; and

Submit interim reports and a final and comprehensive report of its activities, findings, and recommendations to the President and the Congress.

The life of the Commission was extended for 2 years in 1959 and again in 1961. We are now once again faced with the issues of extending the Commission. It is clear that the record of this organization is outstanding. Its contribution toward the realization of equality and the establishment of constitutional guarantees for all our citizens is inestimable. During its 6-year existence the Commission has issued the most comprehensive reports ever compiled in the area of civil rights. The Commission has conducted painstaking investigations and issued reports concerning discrimination in almost every area of our national life. These reports are invaluable and constitute much of the information upon which to base vitally needed legislation. In addition to its reports, the Commission has throughout the years sent legislative recommendations to the President and the Congress. The Commission is the one body within the Government which is concerned with civil rights in every field. It has investigated discriminatory practices in the fields of voting, education, employment, housing, the administration of justice, Government programs, and the armed services.

Mr. Speaker, not to extend the Civil Rights Commission would be a giant step backward. The Commission's experience, competence, and ability to encompass the entire civil rights field are needed today more than ever before. In fact, the Commission should be made permanent and its powers extended. The temporary status of the Commission has damaged its morale and, as this period of uncertainty has proved, because of its status it is difficult to retain able members of its staff. The powers of the Commission should be extended. The Commission should be given powers of enforcement as well as its present mandate to report and recommend. We should have learned from the American labor experience that a single governmental body, armed with the ability to obtain court enforcible orders, is the most effective method to insure constitutional rights for our citizens. On May 2 of this year I introduced H.R. 6028 which would establish the Civil Rights Commission as a permanent agency with the power to issue court enforcible cease-and-desist orders where it found unfair discriminatory practices in the areas of employment, labor organizations, housing, public accommodations, financial institutions, and other economic areas. In addition, the Commission would be empowered to deal with discrimination in voting procedures.

The Civil Rights Commission has proved by its record that it is an indispensable weapon in the fight to eradicate racial discrimination and to guarantee constitutional rights for all our citizens. As a first step toward establishing the Commission on a more secure basis, the bill before the House today should be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the temporary 1-year extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission. It is unfortunate that we are forced to resort to this indirect means, and that the extension period is so short, but it seems to be the best we can get without difficulty, and it will suffice to prevent the Commission from closing up shop until we can do the job properly in the omnibus civil rights bill.

The Commission has done a great deal of useful work in calling attention to the extent of the denial of equal opportunities in our Nation, and in recommending methods of correcting this situation. It is important that we act quickly so that the Commission will not lose any more of its capable staff, and may resume its work with as little interruption as possible.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the House resolution extending the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year deserves the support of all Members who believe in fair play for Americans, regardless of race, color or creed.

Although the House resolution will permit the Civil Rights Commission to carry on its important work, many Members on both sides of the aisle would support stronger legislation making the Commission permanent. In two successive Congresses, I have introduced a bill to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency. I will support the resolution before the House today on the grounds that half a loaf is better than no loaf at all.

As long as some Americans are denied the right to vote, the right of equal opportunity for jobs, and the right to use public accommodations, the Civil Rights Commission will be needed, however, it is doubtful that all existing evils in the civil rights field will be dealt with in 1 year. For this reason the Civil Rights Commission should be made a permanent agency. Most of us who will vote in favor of the 1-year extension do so with feeling that this is good if inadequate measure given the graveness of the civil rights crisis facing America.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, we are called upon in ill-considered haste to vote upon extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission. This matter is being rushed before the House without benefit of the normal study which is given by the House to its business.

On any other subject, many of my colleagues would agree with me that it is ill advised to rush through legislation which has such bearing on our national life. What have been the accomplishments of the Civil Rights Commission? What has been done by this body to build better relations?

In my opinion, the actions of the Civil Rights Commission have been such that it should be allowed to expire as was set forth in the original legislation setting it up. As you know, the Commission was first created in 1957 for a 2-year period, and has twice been extended for additional 2-year periods in 1959 and 1961.

I submit that the Commission has outlived its usefulness, that its reports have been so biased and prejudiced as to develop problems, rather than solve them. I submit that this agency is simply wasteful in that it duplicates the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, and this in itself should be reason enough to allow it to expire. If we are really to practice economy in Government, as we hear so often expounded on this floor, then we should be eliminating those agencies which have the exact duplicate of responsibilities as other agencies.

I sincerely believe that the reports of this Commission have been so biased that their recommendations are an assault on the spirit and intent of the Constitution.

The Commission's membership is now so constituted that we find that a full discussion of the problems is not possible, a completely biased viewpoint comes forth which gives no consideration for the problems which are involved, and the solutions expounded violate the concept of our Republic. They suggest measures which are thoroughly against existing law.

While for some it may seem to be politically expedient to vote for this extension, in doing so they are not making any constructive contribution. This agency's activities are of no further constructive value, its reports are so one-sided and unfair that I cannot believe that they can add any constructive recommendations to this problem.

I therefore hope that we will not vote to extend the life of this wastefully expensive duplicate agency.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, in 1957 I stood among the relatively few Members of Congress who actively opposed the birth of the Civil Rights Act providing for the establishment and functioning of the Civil Rights Commission. In 1959 I strongly urged opposition to the 2-year extension of the Commission.

Again in 1961 I confronted my colleagues and reemphasized the destructive nature of the Commission. Now the House is once more challenged, this time with two amendments to H.R. 3369, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason.

Hiding behind the coattails of a woman, one amendment proposes to make permanent the Civil Rights Commission and to greatly increase its auspices as a concrete part of the executive branch of the Government. The other amendment would extend its life for 1 year without any change in the powers or duty.

I am unequivocally opposed to both of these amendments.

It is mandatory that this very day we must most seriously consider the direction that the Commission has been carrying us and the precipice over which its reenactment can plunge us headlong.

If my colleagues will look with me for a moment beyond the scarred and smoke filled battlefield of the so-called civil rights issue; if we will peer for just a second above the quagmire of political expediency—we will see the immense dangers of our direction. We will see how the continuation of the life of the Commission is an undue, unwarranted, and malicious extension of Federal power and authority into every area of human relationship in the life of individual citizens of our Nation.

We are fast approachng the day when the so-called protective cloak of Federal power is becoming a shroud which smothers and entombs us.

When we look at the original language that instigated the Commission, it appeared docile enough. I quote as follows the original purpose of the body:

First. Investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based.

Second. Study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Third. Appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

From this original purpose, seemingly restricted to the area of voting rights, the Commission, in the manner of all bureaucratic operations, has grown to frightening proportions and extends a meddling finger into virtually every aspect of life as we Americans know it.

When taken out of context of political pressure and intrigues, the Commission's recommendations would be ludicrous to an impartial reader. With its zealous cause of "social reform," the Commission would blithely and blindly overlook our traditional governmental forms and would create a limitless Central Government that would restrict and destroy individual liberties and would make State and local governments either redundant or vestigial political forms.

Under the Commission's guiding hand, a Federal agency would be created to supervise administration of all schools supported by Federal funds. Every local board of school trustees would have to file reports with the agency.

The administration of justice at the State and local level would be totally usurped by the Central Government. Included in that usurpation would, of course, be such "trivial" things as voter qualifications, registration of voters, counting of votes, and the creation of voting districts.

The Commission further recommends that Central Government take over the relationship between employer and employee. And also it would have the Federal Government flaunting authority and pillaging the field of housing and home building—the area that has so preciously belonged to homeowers, realtors, loan associations, banks and other financial organizations.

For these apparent reasons and for the numerous reasons that my mind's eye can see for this dangerous and unpredictable future of the Commission, I stand, without reservation, opposed to an extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we are asked to approve the extension of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year, without the printed resolution, without a report or hearings explaining the activities of the Commission, and asking us to suspend the rules of the House.

Why such procedure? Why such haste? Here it is October and we have had all year to do this. Further, if the civil rights bill contains a provision on the Commission, why this stop-gap procedure.

How can we responsibly take this action without further deliberation? Once again civil rights is a political football with Members apparently taking positions without knowledge of the Civil Rights Commission's activities.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the greatest single step this House could take for peace, harmony and brotherhood between the races would be to reject entirely this Civil Rights Commission. The opportunity to do so is now.

This is no time to continue the existence of a controversial commission. We need desperately to remove all sources of friction. We all know that this Commission was politically designed and instigated.

The country needs a breathing spell. We need a rest period from agitation, demonstrations, violence, hatred, and disrespect for law and order. By rejecting this Commission, this House will serve notice to all the people of the Nation that we are not going to promote sectionalism or favoritism in behalf of select groups of highly organized pressure groups. By rejecting this Commission, this House will be taking a stand of fairness and impartiality. If we vote to continue this Civil Rights Commission, we will simply and purely be taking a stand which would encourage more demonstrations, disrespect for law and order and will be sewing the seeds for revolution and the overthrow of constitutional government.

We need a truce in these critical times. We need a rest period. We need time for thoughtful, patriotic and dedicated people to resolve our race differences. The Federal Government has made a shamble of our race relations and held this Nation up to the world for ridicule. No race problem in the history of the world has ever been solved by strong centralized power.

The Civil Rights Commission is an instrumentality of Federal meddling, of Federal intervention, of Federal political expediency. We should reject this Commission and we should do it today.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the Senate amendment to H.R. 3369, extending the life of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for 1 year. The Commission's authority lapsed on October 1, 1963.

The Civil Rights Commission has been engaged in important work in the broad fields of voting, employment, housing, justice, health facilities, services, and urban areas; the Negro in the Armed Forces; and with State advisory committees.

It should have an opportunity to continue; and I hope that the pending civil rights bill now before the House Judiciary Committee, when reported out, will call for a permanent U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure to continue the Commission on Civil Rights.

During the 6 years since its formation, the Commission has made a major contribution to our understanding of the civil rights problem. Its studies have provided us a vast chronicle of human abuse and denial—of a gap between American promise and performance—and its reports can continue to be of tremendous assistance in helping us to overcome these injustices. The third biennial report issued just this last week, as a matter of fact, is compelling evidence of the Commission's worth and importance.

There can be no question that progress in the difficult field of civil rights has been made during the last few years. But more, much more, remains to be done and the Commission has a vital role to play in its achievement.

There can be no question either that during its existence we have treated the Commission like a poor stepchild. Who among us could run his office or business effectively if he were continually confronted with termination and then saved by brief, periodic extensions? Who could hire or retain topflight staff, and who could maintain morale?

That the Commission has done as well as it has—and I believe its work has been outstanding—is a tribute to the dedication of its members and staff. But the time has come for us to do better. The time has come for us to adopt legislation, such as I along with others have introduced, to put the Commission on a permanent basis; for us to demonstrate our continued willingness to explore and understand our civil rights problems, and to do our best to find just solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation before us today as a first step, and I urge that it be followed, before years end, with an effective, meaningful civil rights bill which will take us further along the road of true equality for all Americans.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in urging the temporary extension of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year. Obviously several weeks will elapse before debate can be heard on the omnibus civil rights bill which I hope will include the permanent establishment of the Commission. Unless this bill is passed, the country will be deprived of the moral force of the Commission together with the investigation and reports of complaints dealing with the deprivation of voting by a segment of our citizenry.

All men of good will, those who believe in fair play for Americans irrespective of their race, creed, or color, will vote for this bill. For so long as there are Americans who are deprived of their right to vote, of equal opportunity for economic advancement, and the right of all to the use of public accommodations, just so long must there be maintained a body that will keep the country advised of conditions adversely affecting the rights of some of our citizenry and recommend remedies. During its life the Commission has made a major contribution to our knowledge and understanding of the civil rights problem. It must be permitted to continue to do so.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote in favor of the resolution extending the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year, as it is most important that this Commission be permitted to remain in operation and to continue its great work. This was an emergency action required of the Congress.

I introduced a bill to extend the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for 4 years; this provision was contained in the administration bill on civil rights which is now under consideration by the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member. When the subcommittee in charge of the bill took action, an amendment was offered to make the Commission permanent. At this point, I cannot predict what action our full committee will take regarding the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. I would like to see it become a permanent body, and shall vote accordingly in committee when the opportunity presents itself.

The Civil Rights Commission performs invaluable services for us. The 1963 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights once again shows us the true picture of the deprivation of civil rights suffered by millions of our citizens. The report proves that discrimination is rampant in all parts of our country; it shows us where and what evils exist and what action must be taken to correct injustices and to protect those denied their rights guaranteed by our Constitution. The Commission furnishes us with the information we need in order to legislate effectively and intelligently. The Committee on the Judiciary relies upon the information furnished by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

In this time of grave crisis in the matter of civil rights, it behooves us to take all possible, effective action in behalf of Negroes and members of other minority groups, at every opportunity. I, for one, shall continue my best efforts in this regard.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to add my voice to those who have spoken so eloquently in support for the extension of the Civil Rights Commission. The importance of this Commission in focusing our attention on the racial troubles that beset us and analyzing them constructively is obvious. The racial crisis of today makes the work of the Commission more crucial, and its continuation more necessary.

I am confident that there is strong support throughout the Nation for extending the life of the Commission. Certainly this is the case in Hawaii, even though we are fortunate to have avoided the racial strife found in other areas. The citizens of Hawaii are concerned, however, not only for the life of the Civil Rights Commission, but also with the total civil rights program. This concern is so clearly exemplified by the correspondence I have been receiving from church members in the Aloha State. I am happy to include herewith some examples:

St. Timothy's Church,
Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii, September 29, 1963.

Hon. Thomas P. Gill,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: The death of six young Americans in Birmingham on Sunday, September 15, in an incident of senselessly evil violence, has moved this congregation to show our concern for the conscience of the Nation and for our own responsibility during our regular Sunday worship services.

We agree with those national religious leaders of many faiths who gathered in Washington September 18 to register with Congress and the President, through the Attorney General, their conviction that this kind of incident must not occur again. We agree that every citizen of this Republic must have full protection of the laws of the United States as he exercises his rights and privileges as a citizen.

Following a period of silent mourning and prayer for the dead children, for their bereaved families, and all others besieged by sanctioned forms of discrimination and prejudice, we are writing this letter to let you know of our action, of our concern lest our mourning be empty. It is our deep hope that the Legislature of the United States will initiate and carry through to completion laws to insure that out of such dark violence social and racial justice can arise.

Signed:

Mary Kirchhoffer, Mrs. Robert E. Ritchie, Thomas D. Ritchie, Seep Lau, Edith Steele, Ellen C. Hughes, Lucius E. Eckles, M.D., Virginia T. Davis, Laura G. Morrison, Shirley A. Williamson, Edythe Turner, Kirby V. Anderson, M.D., R. K. Hoefener, Jocelyn Wong, Mildred Ozaki, Joe Mook, Marlene Wilcox, C. H. Heard, Jr., Robert Williamson, John Barry Grahovac, Mrs. Murray Johnson, Mary Anderson, Lt. (j.g.) and Mrs. Perry A. Beem, James A. Bartlett, Mary M. Yeager, Lt. Comdr. and Mrs. James A. Burgess, Mrs. Betsy Lei Pablo, Robert T. W. Wong, Angel C. Pablo, Mr. and Mrs. L. Barney McNeil, Jr., CMS and Mrs. Frank J. Pickard, Archie L. Stevens, Patricia E. Kirchoffer, Diana De Lano, George B. De Lano, Patricia L. Grahovac, Richard Kirchhoffer, Craig Grahovac, and Lou Grahovac, members of St. Timothy's Parish; Richard A. Kirchhoffer, Jr., Vicar, St. Timothy's Episcopal Church.

In Support of Civil Rights

Representative Tom Gill,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The members of Calvary Lutheran Church in Honolulu are deeply concerned about the passage of a strong civil rights bill.

We thank you for your personal support and leadership in Congress and urge you to continue to do all that you can to bring about the enactment of meaningful legislation as expressed in the Civil Rights Act of 1963, H.R. 7152.

We write this as Christians who believe that a vital faith demands strong action in the area of civil rights.

Mrs. Mary Dedman, Mrs. Elizabeth Ramey, Mrs. Francis E. Clark, Mrs. James A. Bergquist, Mrs. Rudolph S. Ruud, Miss Yoshiko Kondo, Mrs. Henry C. Halboth, Mrs. Wilbur Harris, Miss Betty Pederson, Gloria Berry, Mrs. R. Kim, Mrs. Dwane R. Collins, Mrs. W. Liljegren, Lillian Spengler, Ruth Aishe, Mrs. James W. Bernard, Mrs. Norman Rian, Mrs. Gloria Hunt, and Mrs. Thomas L. Bowers.

St. Patrick School,
September 29, 1963.

Dear Sir: I know it is hard to pass a bill out without help from the people of America. We from St. Patrick are eager to help you pass this out. Perhaps if schools in every State could participate in this act we can convince the South to treat Negroes in equality to us. I think judgment of race and color is absolutely unjust.

What I mean is that we are on your side to abide by the Declaration of Independence and convince ourselves that all men are equal and that other Americans should convince themselves likewise.

Mr. Gill we are with you all the way.

Mahalo,

Gerard Cypriano,
Student of St. Patrick School, Honolulu, Hawaii.

P.S.—The Fathers of St. Patrick are also with you.

G. C.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3669, and particularly the Senate amendment to extend the Civil Rights Commission for an additional year. I supported the original legislation to establish the Civil Rights Commission, as well as all of the appropriations required for it to carry out its assigned duties. Its most important and primary purpose is to investigate complaints about discrimination in registration and in voting. It is vital that such discrimination be eliminated as rapidly as possible. Discrimination in voting and registration procedures on the ground of race, color, or creed cannot be justified and should not be tolerated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I support this Senate Civil Rights Commission amendment to my private bill which previously was approved by the House of Representatives.

Having supported legislation that brought into being the Civil Rights Commission, I believe there is justification for extending the life of this Commission 1 year beyond the date scheduled for its expiration. Such an extension would permit a further appraisal of the Commission's value, thereby contributing to a determination as to whether or not any further extensions are warranted.

Support of this legislative item would have the effect of detaching one phase of civil rights from the big civil rights package; hence, whatever the fate of civil rights legislation in general, this civil rights provision would be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that both of these legislative aspects have merit, and I seriously and sincerely hope that the House of Representatives will extend them its approval.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. I rise in support of this resolution and trust that it will receive a resounding vote of approval.

My one regret is that it is necessary to enact stopgap legislation in order to keep the Commission alive, to keep it from going out of existence which is just what would happen if the House does not approve this resolution today.

It is ridiculous if not tragic that we should find ourselves in these circumstances. This business of extending the life of the Commission on a year-to-year basis is irresponsible and it is high time that we gave the body the permanent status that it should and must have. Therefore, I fervently hope that the House in its wisdom will act accordingly when it takes up the forthcoming civil rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is an entire branch in the study of political science which deals with the role of Government agencies, commissions, and departments. One of the major lessons that this science teaches us that a commission or agency is rarely effective unless it feels secure of its own position. An outstanding example of this was the Federal Radio Commission which was transformed in 1934 into the Federal Communications Commission. When first established in 1927 under the Radio Act, the Commission was given only a year's lifespan. Faced with the necessity of a yearly fight for extension of its life, the FRC naturally was fearful of stepping on the toes of any group which held influence with the Congress. Well, for 3 years, the FRC managed to avoid stepping on anyone's toes and it was renewed in 1927, 1928, and 1929. But during that time it also managed to avoid doing anything of significance in the then jumbled field of radio broadcasting in this country. Only after it received permanent status in 1930 did the Commission start taking effective steps toward unraveling the difficulties in licensing and frequency assignments that were plaguing the industry. We face similar dangers today with the Civil Rights Commission. I am not contending that the Commission has not done fine work in the short years of its existence. It certainly has—in fact a good deal of its work has been excellent. What I am contending is that it could be far more decisive in its work if it did have permanent status. It would not have to fear certain pressures which are undoubtedly now hampering it in the carrying out of its duties; it would not have to fear becoming a "political football."

A 4-year extension as originally proposed by the administration would not allay fears of the Commission, and it is quite naive to assume that we are going to solve our racial problems by 1967. What is more I feel the importance of civil rights to all Americans for all time would be recognized by giving appropriate significance in the executive branch to this body. We need the Civil Rights Commission as a meaningful and vital arm of our Government, and we should give it our fullest support.

I trust that an overwhelming vote for this resolution will be the first step toward the realization of the permanence of the Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in opposing the extension of the President's Civil Rights Commission for even 1 day. Those who have preceded me have reviewed in detail the actions of this Commission, the nature of its members and the facts concerning its being stacked.

I not only oppose the extension today but when the Civil Rights Act of 1957 which created this Commission was enacted, I made known my firm opposition to it. Likewise, I have unalterably and strongly opposed every extension of life granted the Commission.

I know whereof I speak for my State of Mississippi in particular and the Southern States in general, have been the main "whipping boys" of this biased Commission. Despite the fact that this Commission has subjected the people of my State to harassment, meddling and interference by their actions, we have continued to grow and develop. We shall continue to control our own political, economic, and social affairs no matter what future action the Commission may take toward us.

The entire history of this Commission has been that of fostering and advocating recommendations calculated to attain the political support of minority groups. Since the enactment of the Commission, the overwhelming majority of its members have been persons whose philosophy on the race question parallel that of the NAACP and other agitating groups. There is little wonder that many of the recommendations made by the Commission have been variously described as "partisan," "ridiculous," "unconstitutional," "biased," "radical," and "extreme."

Instead of recommending practical and peaceful solutions to our race problems, the Commission, in many instances, has advocated corrective measures so extreme and absurd that they only served to increase agitation between the races. In my opinion, this Commission's radical recommendations have supplied much of the impetus to the wave of so-called civil disobedience now running rampant throughout this country. There is no doubt in my mind that these ridiculous recommendations have influenced the leaders of the Negro agitating groups to make even more ridiculous demands of the President and the Congress.

One of these demands made of the President is that he forthwith issue an Executive order abolishing all forms of segregation of the races. These Negro leaders made this demand knowing that such an order would be patently unconstitutional. Other unreasonable demands that have been made by Negro leaders are for so-called "compensatory payment" and "special privileges."

The Commission would grant special privileges to minority groups at the expense of sacrificing the constitutional rights of the vast majority of our citizens.

The Commission has adopted the philosophy of government which subscribes to the theory that the end justifies the means. In other words, it evidently believes that our Constitution should be bypassed if by so doing special privileges may be more expeditiously granted to minority groups. Personally, I reject this theory.

I sincerely urge the Members of this body to vote against this legislation and thereby withdraw this Commission's license to cause further agitation between the races.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill, H.R. 3669, and I do so without reservation. I protest vigorously the manner in which it is being considered today. To those of you whose minds are open and who paid attention to what the gentleman from South Carolina had to say, I do not think you can help but agree if you know anything at all about the work of this Commission that the creation and the operation of this Civil Rights Commission has been responsible to some extent for the demonstrations and the disturbances that have been going on throughout this Nation in recent weeks, months, and years. I know full well that many people in the United States have been looking down their noses at an intangible circumstance which supposedly existed only in the South in recent years. But the chickens have come home to roost. You who have looked with scorn at the South have thought that the problem of segregation and the problem of integration was one peculiar only to the South. That is all this Commission is actually concerned with. They do not care what happens to anyone as long as preferential treatment is accorded the American Negro. You have not been interested because you thought it was someone elses problem.

But that is no longer the case. I am telling you that the agitators have created for this Nation a civil rights binge and you had better wake up before it is too late. I am telling you that the white people of this country are concerned and are opposed to this legislation and I am telling you that the white people constitute about 90 percent of this country's population. If you have been home lately you know I am right. I am telling you that you are giving overemphasis to the supposedly professed desires of some 10 percent of the people. I am telling you that you do not know anything about the problems of segregation and integration if you have not lived with these people.

The State I come from has more Negroes in its population than 28 other States in these United States combined plus an additional 48,000 to apply toward the Negro population of the District of Columbia. I think I know something about the Negro. For a long time you thought this was our problem in the South, but we of the South have said that some day it would be yours, and it is yours today and you are worried about it or else some of the civil rights advocates from the East, West, and North would not be sitting idly by during this debate under these circumstances with legislation of this importance here today. You are sitting idly by because you realize that the white people in your districts are waking up to what is going on in this country. I am opposed to this legislation and this legislation must be defeated because it is causing trouble for the people in these United States by tearing us apart, and you are having a hand in it if you continue this Commission.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would like to ask the gentleman, have you had the benefit of reading the 1963 report of this present Civil Rights Commission?

Mr. WAGGONNER. No, sir; I have not had the pleasure of reading that report. That report is not available, and much other information surrounding this legislation is not available. I call the attention of the House to the fact that on June 18 of this year this House appropriated $985,000 supposedly to extend for a full year the life of this Civil Rights Commission, and we were told at that time it would be extended before it expired. It has not happened and it should not happen. Where are the economy minded Members of this body now?

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me say this. In the present Civil Rights Commission report there is a recommendation that the Federal Government give grants to to the local communities for the purpose of improving the quality of their police force.

Mr. WAGGONNER. There is not any doubt about that. This Commission is designed to investigate, study, and report and be a clearinghouse for information concerning civil rights and the problem of segregation. It comes up at the same time that H.R. 7152 is being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is not anything but a trouble-making, house-dividing plan to divide Americans as the Communists want us to be divided. Its continuance spells trouble and further division.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this measure.

Mr. Speaker, we are asked to follow here a most unusual procedure. We are asked to extend, under suspension of the rules with 40 minutes of debate, the life of a Commission of the U.S. Government. There is before us no report; no published hearings; nothing to substantiate such an action. This is not action which can properly be consummated in 40 minutes. There are too many questions to be asked. There is too little evidence of justification for the continuation of this Commission. The bill comes to us from the Senate as an amendment to a private claim bill. This too is an unusual procedure. It would indicate first of all, that there is no justification for the continuation of the Commission and that no suitable case can be made to support it. It would indicate that first the Senate and now the House has been asked to vote for this proposal on faith.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is going to happen. This Commission is going to be extended on faith—blind faith. And, some of the people who here today vote for this bill are going to come to a rude awakening in the next election. The people of the Nation are tired of the hue and cry about civil rights; tired of riots and demonstrations; tired of abuse; tired of demands for "everything now"; tired of stories of discrimination—not against Negroes, but against whites by the agencies of Government. All of this will come into focus next year. But, not in the way that the proponents of this measure have anticipated.

The Civil Rights Commission has been notorious in its failure to make constructive or reasonable suggestions. Its only accomplishment has been to spend money and to meddle. Now, in a desperate effort to make a bigger noise, and to attract attention to itself as deserving the support of the extremists, it has rushed into print a set of proposals which demonstrate more conclusively than ever the fact that there is no justification for the existence of the Commission and no reason for its extension. With a total disregard of the problems, other than in its target area, the South, the Civil Rights Commission now recommends reduction of representation in the House of Representatives for those States where discrimination in voting allegedly occurs; enactment of a fair employment practices law with enforcement powers in the hands of a Federal appointee; refusal of impacted area funds for school districts which have not integrated. None of these are deserving of consideration. All are intended to incite racial disturbances.

There is no place in the Nation for commissions or committees which seek to divide rather than unite; which are unable to comprehend the necessity for approaching racial problems through voluntary cooperation rather than through administrative decree or the enactment of laws.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have long ago ceased to discuss civil rights. I do not think civil rights are at stake in the work of this Commission or in the proposed civil rights laws. Every citizen of this country has civil rights. The controversy is over social rights and it is social rights which some now try to establish through edict or through legislation. Social rights must be earned by the individual. They can be acquired in no other way.

Whatever money is spent on this Commission is money wasted. I deplore the unseemly haste with which my colleagues scramble to vote this Commission new tenure of life.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

I just want to say that I listened with interest to the remarks by my friend from Louisiana and the remarks made earlier by the gentleman from South Carolina. Demonstrations and unrest have not been because of the Civil Rights Commission; they have been in spite of the Civil Rights Commission. The fact of the matter is that the creation of the Commission was a part of some very moderate legislation that was passed by the U.S. Congress in 1957 and in 1960. Were it not for the fact that we had that moderate package of legislation the Negro revolution that is taking place in the country today would be 10 times as powerful, the unrest would be 10 times as great, and the demonstrations that the gentleman has referred to would be 10 times as abrasive as they have been thus far.

Let us get this clear: This is a problem of the North, South, East, and West, and I assure you my friends it will not go away. Unless we in the Congress take it upon our shoulders to do our part to create the solutions for it as we are commanded to do by the Constitution, then we will not be living up to our obligations to the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and agree to House Resolution 541?

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 265, nays 80, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 165]

YEAS—265

Abele
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baldwin
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Betts
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Conte
Corman
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Finnegan
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn

Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Hagen. Calif.
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hays
Healey
Hechler
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Madden
Martin, Nebr.
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Multer
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers. Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stinson
Stratton
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tollefson
Udall
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Wallhauser
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger

NAYS—80

Abbitt
Abernethy
Alger
Andrews
Ashmore
Baring
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bonner
Brock
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burleson
Colmer
Cooley
Cramer
Davis, Ga.
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Flynt
Forrester
Fountain
Fuqua
Gary
Gathings
Grant
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Harris
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Huddleston
Jarman
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kornegay
Landrum
Lennon
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Matthews
Murray
Passman
Patman
Poage
Poff
Pool
Purcell
Quillen
Rains
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Smith, Va.
Stephens
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Waggonner
Watson
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Winstead

NOT VOTING—88

Arends
Baker
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boggs
Broomfield
Buckley
Burton
Cameron
Casey
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Collier
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Dulski
Ellsworth
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hall
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hoffman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Mo.
Kilburn
Kluczynski
Lankford
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Michel
Mills
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Pilcher
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schenck
Shelley
Sheppard
Sibal
Siler
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tupper
Ullman
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Willis
Zablocki

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Lankford and Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Mr. Buckley and Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Fisher against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania and Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Cameron and Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Zablocki and Mr. Murphy of Illinois for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Arends and Mr. Watts for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Mr. St Germain and Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. Mills against.

Mr. Ryan of New York and Mr. McFall for, with Mr. Thompson of Louisiana against.

Mr. Moss and Mr. White for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Cohelan and Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Schenck.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Berry of South Dakota.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Collier.

Mr. MacDonald with Mr. Hall.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Baker.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Corbett with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Tupper with Mr. Martin, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Foreman with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Sibal with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Norblad with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Harvey of Michigan with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Lloyd with Mr. Martin of California.

Mr. Burton with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Fino with Mr. Derwinski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill, 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG reserved all points of order on the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. MAHON submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. I believe the Consent Calendar has been scheduled for consideration. I am wondering if we can follow along with the Consent Calendar now, because on our side some of the objectors necessarily will have to be absent later on this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair intended to recognize Members for unanimous-consent requests and then proceed to the Consent Calendar.

WAIVER OF INDEBTEDNESS BY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 242) to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than December 31 of each year, a written report concerning each case in which a waiver of indebtedness has been made under the authority of the amendment made by the first section of this Act. Such report shall include, together with such other information as the Administrator deems appropriate, the name and address of each person with respect to which a waiver of indebtedness has been made and the total amount of such waiver."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 242, as passed by the House, provided that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs could provide a waiver of indebtedness in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

I introduced the bill at the request of the Veterans' Administration and it is still sought by that agency. It has now been passed by the Senate with an amendment which requires the Administrator to submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate not later than December 31 of each year a written report concerning each case on which a waiver of indebtedness is made pursuant to this proposal.

Enactment of this bill in its amended form would not result in any additional cost.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DAVID D. TERRY OF LITTLE ROCK, FORMER REPRESENTATIVE OF ARKANSAS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I announce to the House the passing yesterday of our former colleague, the Honorable David D. Terry, of Little Rock. Our distinguished colleague and dean of our delegation, the gentleman from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS, who is at home in his district, called this morning and reported to us the death of Mr. Terry. Otherwise he would have been here and made the announcement. Mr. MILLS now represents most of the district that Mr. Terry served so long, so well, and so ably.

Many of our colleagues who served in this House with Dave Terry remember him as one of the finest, most capable, hard working, and dedicated Members of this body. He was held in high esteem by all of his colleagues. He left a lasting imprint in the record by his service to his district, to our State and country which he loved so much and to which he was so devoted.

Dave as we affectionately called him was born in Mississippi on January 31, 1881. He went to Arkansas as a very young lad with his father where attended public schools and grew to manhood.

He graduated from the University of Arkansas Law School in 1903. He later attended the University of Virginia Law School and also a year in the law school of Chicago University.

He was well known in our State. He had a long history of civic, professional, and political life. He practiced law with his father for many years. He actively supported his community with their problems and contributed throughout the years so much to the civic life of Little Rock in the early days which has meant so much to its progress and general welfare.

In 1933 Hartsell Reagan, who had served the district for several years became Federal judge. At a special election held December 19, 1933, David D. Terry was elected to the House of Representatives to succeed Judge Reagan. He served continuously through 1942 retiring from the House to make an unsuccessful race for the Senate. Two years later in 1944 he was a candidate for Governor of our State and though not elected he made a very impressive campaign and as a result received great credit for the contribution he made to the welfare of our State.

During the years he served in this House he was a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I have the honor of serving as chairman. He later became a member of the House Appropriations Committee where he also made an outstanding record. He served on the Armed Services Subcommittee. He was exceedingly active and contributed a lot to the development of the Arkansas River Basin to which he devoted so many years of his life. He worked so hard for his State in many ways. As an example he contributed to the establishment of Camp Robinson in his home county. He worked with our beloved and departed Bill Norrell in locating the Pine Bluff Arsenal which also contributed so much to World War II. I know he worked with us unceasingly in establishing the Ozark Chemical Plant in my hometown. He was tireless in his efforts at all times in his service to his country and in his efforts on behalf of his own people.

He did not even hesitate or let up for one moment. When he concluded his political career he became a member of the Flood Control Commission of our State and was a director of it. He was active in this work as long as his health would permit.

He was active in the Boys Club. He was a national director of the Boys Club of America and in 1961 he received a meritorous award for the contribution he made in this, a tremendously important program.

And so it was, Mr. Speaker, with the life, character, and service of David Terry, a man of tremendous energy, great integrity, and strength of character, one of the great men, a giant of our State. His life and service will be long remembered. He will be missed.

He is survived by Mrs. Terry, well known to so many of you and so well known in her contribution to the progress and welfare of our State. He is also survived by two sons, Wm. L. Terry, of Little Rock; Joseph A. Terry, of Memphis; and two daughters—Miss Mary Fletcher Terry and Mrs. Sallie Plummer, both of Little Rock, and several grandchildren. He was a devoted husband and father, always thinking of them and their welfare.

I know Mr. Speaker you would want to join me in extending to Mrs. Terry and all the family our deep sympathy.

The funeral will be held today at 4 o'clock.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] in his tribute to one of the grandest men I have ever known. He was a gentleman in every sense of that great word. He was a true friend.

He lived a fine and useful life and the world is better for his having lived in it.

My deepest sympathy to Mrs. Terry and their children.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Hon. David D. Terry who represented the Fifth Congressional District of Arkansas with great honor and distinction. The news of his passing was most distressing to me and the members of my family. I served with Dave Terry for a number of years in this House and can attest full well to his dedication and devotion to duty exemplified by him in the service of his district, State, and Nation.

He was a calm and composed legislator. He was, however, outspoken and zealous in behalf of proposals affecting his particular district and State. He will be remembered by his colleagues for the contributions he made in behalf of defense; the Arkansas River Basin, and the development of the water resources of the Nation. He was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations for a long time, moving up to one of the highest places of seniority.

Shortly after my arrival as a new Member of the House of Representatives, Dave Terry became the dean of the Arkansas delegation in the House. He was most considerate of new Members and gave of his time and talents to be of every assistance. His counsel was timely and sound.

I would like to extend condolence to his companion and the members of his family.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I was very saddened to hear of the death of David Dickson Terry. Dave Terry was a Member of this House when I first came to Congress, and he was also dean of the Arkansas delegation. I owe much to him for his very valuable guidance and assistance in my early days here. He gave unstintingly of his time and he was very, very patient in advising me as a newcomer to the Congress.

He served his State both locally and on a statewide basis as an unselfish, public-spirited citizen in addition to his service of 10 years in the Congress. He was one of those rare individuals who put public service above self-interest. Our State and our Nation are the winners in having such a man who was so devoted to his State and country. I, like many others, had the good fortune to have him help shape my career in the Congress. He will be sorely missed by all of us who knew him.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mr. Terry's family in their bereavement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the passing of our former colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, DELESSEPS S. MORRISON, HONORED

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, last September 12, former U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, deLesseps S. Morrison, was the recipient of the annual Thomas F. Cunningham Award of the New Orleans International House.

The award is given each year for "outstanding service in the betterment of Inter-American relations." Past recipients include such distinguished Americans as Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Gen. Thomas Wood, and J. Peter Grace.

I would like to commend International House for its outstanding choice for this year's award. Ambassador Morrison has served his country well for the past 26 months in a most difficult position. As the U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States, he traveled more than 1 million miles throughout the United States and Latin America in an effort to promote better understanding throughout the Western Hemisphere. As an adviser to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Mr. Morrison was instrumental in achieving hemispheric sanctions against the Communist regime in Cuba and in the Organization of American States expulsion of the Castro government from the inter-American system.

I had the opportunity, as chairman of the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, of working closely with Ambassador Morrison on frequent occasions on matters of importance to the nations of the Western Hemisphere. His counsel was invaluable, his energy limitless, and his successes vitally important to our country.

No one in this country has been such a tireless and effective standard bearer for the United States reawakened interests in our 200 million good neighbors in Latin America.

Mr. Morrison carried President Kennedy's hopes and aspirations under the Alliance for Progress to each of the 19 OAS member nations. On political, economic, and social fronts, he carried this message southward.

Ambassador Morrison was highly regarded by his colleagues in the Organization of American States, and his presence as a member of that body will be missed greatly.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES IN SQUARE 758, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OF SECTIONS 671 AND 672 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO THE CLERK AND MARSHAL OF THE SUPREME COURT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7235) to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Clerk and Marshal of the Supreme Court.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I may say that I am in favor of the purpose of this bill which is to appropriate out of the general funds of the Treasury the money with which to pay the employees of the Supreme Court of the United States. Up to this time and as of now these employees are paid out of fees collected by the Court. As I understand it, this now operates in the nature of something of a restriction on the salaries that can be paid.

Mr. Speaker, if this bill goes through it means that the Clerk of the Court—I believe that is the method of procedure—fixes the salaries, subject to approval by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman will recall, I spoke to him about this matter some days ago. I have looked into it quite carefully and I have had some conversation with the people who would carry the large measure of responsibility if this should become law. I am absolutely convinced there would be no runaway operation with respect to the pay to be determined. As a matter of fact, will the gentleman agree with me, if we go through the appropriation process, which it is obvious we will have to do because the money is not available out of the fees that are to be collected, ultimately we would have through the appropriation process a complete control of the money to be paid?

Furthermore, I have been assured, as I say, there will be no effort and no action taken that will get the pay out of line with other people employed in the Government service.

I just express the hope that the gentleman would not object to this bill. As a matter of fact, if anything in the nature of pay should be resorted to, certainly the Congress of the United States could move in quickly to correct the situation, if that should occur.

Mr. GROSS. In response to the distinguished minority leader, let me say the defect in his argument is that the Congress is then handing to the Committee on Appropriations authority to fix salaries in an agency or division of the Government. If that is the way we want to do it, and perhaps this is a proper way, it bypasses the House Committee on Civil Service in the matter of having any jurisdiction over salaries paid to employees of the Supreme Court.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that these employees of the Court should be brought under the Classification Act rather than rest their salaries with the Clerk of the Court and the Chief Justice. It is my opinion this bill ought to be amended to bring them under the Classification Act in accordance with salaries fixed by the Congress for other employees.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. There are some 21 clerks in the office of the Supreme Court. The Chief Justice in allocating salaries out of the fees follows the classifications of the civil service. All the categories and all the standards of the civil service are followed by the Court in the appropriation of moneys for the salaries of these clerks, even to the extent of retirement and other emoluments provided by the Civil Service Act. They follow them with exactitude.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask a question of the gentleman from New York? If we permit this bill to go through will the gentleman be opposed to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee putting these employees under the Classification Act in the matter of salaries?

Mr. CELLER. No, indeed. As a matter of fact, I would be very happy to cooperate with the Supreme Court officials in drafting a bill that would do just exactly what the gentleman suggests. Meanwhile, we hope there will be no delay on this matter.

Mr. GROSS. With the assurance of the gentleman from New York and the assurance of the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that this will be worked out if it is found the salary structure fixed by the Court is excessive or substandard, whatever it may be, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (c) and (d) of section 671 of title 28, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(c) The clerk may appoint and fix the compensation of necessary assistants and messengers with the approval of the Chief Justice of the United States.

"(d) The clerk shall pay into the Treasury all fees, costs, and other moneys collected by him. He shall make annual returns thereof to the Court under regulations prescribed by it."

SEC. 2. (a) The sixth paragraph of subsection (c) of section 672 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(6) Pay the salaries of the Chief Justice, Associate Justices, and all officers and employees of the Court and disburse other funds appropriated for disbursement, under the direction of the Chief Justice;".

(b) Section 672(c) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) Pay the expenses of printing briefs and travel expenses of attorneys in behalf of persons whose motions to appear in forma pauperis in the Supreme Court have been approved and when counsel have been appointed by the Supreme Court."

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. The amendments proposed in this Act shall become effective only when funds have been appropriated and are available to pay the salaries and other expenses of the clerk's office.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, strike the period and insert ", upon vouchers certified by the clerk of the Court."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7155) to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 491) vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the American Battle Monuments Commission is responsible for the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands.

SEC. 2. This Act takes effect on the next July 1 after the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WRIGHT BROTHERS DAY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 335) designating the 17th day of December of each year as Wright Brothers Day.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the 17th day of December of each year is hereby designated as "Wright Brothers Day", in commemoration of the first successful flights in a heavier than air, mechanically propelled airplane, which were made by Orville and Wilbur Wright on December 17, 1903, near Kitty Hawk, North Carolina. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the author of this joint resolution, for extending further honor to the Wright Brothers by designating as Wright Brothers Day the day of the historic flight at Kitty Hawk in 1903. It happens that this is the second time Congress has had occasion to bestow honor upon these intrepid men—the Wrights. In the other body I was approached one day by Mr. Orville Wright with the suggestion that August 19, his birthday, be designated as National Aviation Day. The bill I introduced for Mr. Wright was passed by the other body and by this body and proclaimed by the President, and is the law today. I hope this joint resolution will pass, because we can hardly heap too much esteem upon these two great Americans who gave America the leadership of the air age, which has now become the space age, in which we hope America will continue to lead the world.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEARL HARBOR DAY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 475) to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN WATERFOWL FEATHERS AND DOWN FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1994) to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to provide for the immediate disposition of certain waterfowl feathers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not propose to object, I should like to ask the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts a question in connection with this bill. I have no particular concern about the waterfowl feathers and down but I do have concern, a continuing one, about the precedent set in this field with regard to the disposal of strategic metals and minerals. I should like to have an assurance from the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is no intention to adopt a wholesale policy of waiving this 6 months' notice as to other materials, and that each material will be considered on its own merits as these cases come along.

Mr. PHILBIN. I would say to my very distinguished friend that there is no intent to create any precedent here at all.

Each measure will be considered on its own merits separately as the subject matter may be presented to the committee. There is, therefore, no precedent involved here, and there is nothing in this particular bill that indicates that action is going to be taken under the procedures of this bill with respect to any other commodities that may be disposed of from the stockpile under legislation emanating from the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. There is one further point I would like to ask about. As the gentleman well knows, while the objectives of the stockpile have been recalculated on the basis of conventional war requirements, insofar as the requirements necessary in the event of nuclear war, there have been no new objectives established on the basis of postnuclear attack requirements. I am just wondering if the gentleman's committee is taking that matter into account to review the stockpile needs of the country because I have the feeling that if we did have some nuclear attacks, there would be a very different situation prevailing as to the stockpile requirements for recovery after attack.

Mr. PHILBIN. The committee has that problem very much in mind, and the gentleman may be sure that the committee will continue to give most careful consideration to the matters to which he has referred.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Is the committee presently simply taking the objectives for conventional war as the objectives or are you going to recognize the nuclear and postnuclear attack requirements?

Mr. PHILBIN. The committee considers the recommendations that come to us from the departments concerned. We are considering the entire picture referred to by my very able friend, both as to conventional war, and also as to nuclear war and that will be our policy in the future.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman. I do hope the committee will expedite the OEP's decisions as to this postnuclear attack requirement because, it seems to me, we are certainly flying blind when we start making wholesale disposals from the stockpile without having made any determinations as to what the postnuclear attack requirements would be. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank my distinguished colleague.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this sale of 5,800,000 pounds of feathers ought to make the feather merchants rather happy especially when since the selling will be on a down market.

Does this mean it is necessary to release these feathers in order to get some sleeping bags for the military services—does this mean in view of the low market on feathers that we are going to get bargain prices on these sleeping bags?

Mr. PHILBIN. That is one of the objectives and, of course, the objective also is to take care of the stockpile and bring it down to the amount that is estimated to be proper.

Mr. GROSS. I am going to be interested in ascertaining what the services pay for these sleeping bags because this should have some effect on the feather market in this country.

Mr. PHILBIN. I am sure the gentleman will keep in touch with that matter as he does in respect to other matters as we go along.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

PROVIDING FOR THE RELEASE OF RESTRICTIONS AND RESERVATIONS ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY HERETOFORE CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF ARKANSAS BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 812) to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey, quitclaim, or release to the State of Arkansas, all rights, reservations, restrictions, and exceptions reserved by the United States in and over that part of Camp Joseph T. Robinson which was conveyed to the State of Arkansas by deed executed by the Secretary of the Army on August 25, 1950, pursuant to the Act approved June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 310), insofar as these rights, reservations, restrictions, and exceptions pertain to that parcel of land in Pulaski County, Arkansas, described in a lease-purchase agreement dated February 10, 1959, entered into between the Arkansas National Guard and the State board of education, State of Arkansas, containing nine and eight-tenths acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. The first section of this Act shall take effect upon the payment by the State of Arkansas to the Secretary of the Army of the fair market value of the fee simple title of the property described therein (but not including any buildings or other permanent improvements placed on such property by the Arkansas State Board of Education), as such value is determined by the Secretary after appraisal.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT IN HIGHEST GRADE SATISFACTORILY HELD IN ANY ARMED FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 384) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will some member of the committee enlighten us on the need and the general requirements for this legislation?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, title 10, section 1377, among other things states that any member of an armed service is entitled to retire from the permanent rank he has held or from the highest temporary rank he has satisfactorily held in that service. When we created the Air Force, a very large group of Army officers and men were transferred into the Air Force.

In good faith the Air Force, when the time came for retirement, retired these people with the service they had in the Army as though it were part and parcel of the Air Force. For some unknown reason, the General Accounting Office came up with a decision and said that they could not count that service had in the Army as prior service in that branch of the service and then served notice on them that they would have to pay this.

Mr. FORD. May I ask the gentleman this question: If these individuals stayed in the Army and retired, they would have retired at the higher rank?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I was coming to that. That is right. How they came to this conclusion nobody knows. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], tried to right this very ridiculous decision when we passed this same bill last year. We brought it up again, and the vote here is unanimous. What we do here is make them all the same.

Mr. FORD. This bill will simply, then, put people who have been in the Army and are retired from the Air Force on an equal footing with their contemporaries in the Army?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. With all of the services.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 69 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) By adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 1377. Highest grade satisfactorily held

"(a) For the purpose of the provisions of this title and title 14 relating to retired grade, retired pay, and disability severance pay, active service by a member in any grade, permanent or temporary, in any armed force is considered active service in the equivalent temporary grade in the armed force from which he retired or is separated.

"(b) The Secretary have jurisdiction over the armed force in which a member performed active service determines whether that service, or any period of that service, was satisfactory."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"1377. Highest grade satisfactorily held."

Sec. 2. (a) Except for persons covered by section 3, a retired member or person to whom retired pay has been granted, who would have been eligible to be retired in a higher grade or advanced to a higher grade on a retired list if the amendments made by section 1 of this Act had been in effect at the time of his retirement, or at the time he was granted retired pay, shall, if he applies within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, be advanced on the applicable retired list to that higher grade and, if otherwise entitled to retired pay under any law, be entitled to retired pay on and after the date of enactment of this Act at the rate prescribed by law for that grade, except that a member of the armed forces who is advanced to a higher retired grade under this Act may elect to receive the retired pay to which he was entitled on the day before the enactment of this Act.

(b) Except for persons covered by section 3, this Act does not entitle any person to advancement on the retired list, or to an increase in retired or retirement pay, for any period before the date of enactment of this Act. No person who was separated for physical disability before the date of enactment of this Act is entitled to any increase in disability severance pay because of this Act.

Sec. 3. (a) Notwithstanding section 1377 (b) of title 10, United States Code, any member of the Air Force who retired before the date of enactment of this Act, and who held a temporary grade in the Army that was higher than the highest temporary grade in which he served satisfactorily in the Air Force, is entitled to be advanced on the retired list to that higher grade if his service while in that grade was satisfactory, as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force and in the case of service in a commissioned grade if such service was for at least six months.

(b) This section becomes effective for all purposes as of June 29, 1948.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of sections 8963(a) and 8964 of title 10, United States Code, a member of the Air Force who was transferred to the Department of the Air Force under section 208 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (63 Stat. 591), shall be treated as if his service in the Army was performed in the Air Force.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 13, strike out the words "section 1", and insert in lieu thereof the words "sections 1 and 5".

On page 4, add a new section 5 as follows:

"Sec. 5. Section 6151(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the word 'officer' and the words 'under a temporary appointment'."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANDS WITHIN THE IOWA ORDNANCE PLANT RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8265) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Iowa Ordnance Plant Reservation, Iowa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army may, at such times as he may deem desirable, relinquish to the State of Iowa all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for relinquishment, of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over any land within the Iowa Ordnance Plant Reservation, Burlington, Iowa, reserving to the United States such concurrent or partial jurisdiction as he may deem necessary. Relinquishment of jurisdiction under the authority of this Act may be made by filing with the Governor of the State of Iowa a notice of such relinquishment, which shall take effect upon acceptance hereof by the State of Iowa in such manner as its laws may prescribe.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 4, strike out the word "hereof" and substitute the word "thereof". The purpose of the amendment is simply to correct a typographical error.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF TRANSPORTATION OF PRIVATE VEHICLES—ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1959) to authorize the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of Government employees assigned to duty in Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alaska a few questions regarding this bill. At the outset, are we giving preferential treatment here to a Federal employee simply because he is assigned to Alaska, in the same manner that we give preferential treatment now to civilian employees assigned to Hawaii?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me——

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I will tell the gentleman that the Federal employees recruited in the 48 States and assigned to Alaska are in some respects in the same position as those who are in the civil service in Hawaii. As respects the transportation of their personally owned automobiles, under existing law, there is a difference. Alaska is on the continent, but nevertheless it is noncontiguous so, in my opinion, Federal employees assigned to Alaska should, at Government expense, be allowed to take their vehicles with them. Under existing law when they are assigned to Hawaii, the Government pays the cost of their vehicles being transported there. This bill would put the civil servant in the same position when he is assigned to Alaska.

Mr. CONTE. One thing that disturbs me in regard to this situation is this: Let us consider a postal employee who is working in Hawaii. I believe this is true also in Alaska where employees receive a percentage of pay over and above the postal employees assigned to the other 48 States because of hardship. I can agree with this in some parts of Alaska, because you might have some hardships in some places but not in others such as Anchorage or Juneau or some of the larger cities. The same situation is also true in Hawaii. I cannot see why they receive preferential treatment, because they have things a lot better there than the employees do in many of the colder regions of the United States.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. May I say to the gentleman that extra money paid to civil servants in Alaska and Hawaii is not a differential based on hardship conditions but is a 25 percent cost-of-living allowance. In Hawaii it amounts to 10 percent, I believe. A cost-of-living allowance is all it is, which has nothing to do with hardship conditions. When a civil servant goes to Alaska he receives a 25-percent allowance on top of his regular pay to cover the higher cost of living in Alaska, but this has nothing to do with hardship.

Mr. CONTE. I wanted to elaborate on that and clarify it. I highly oppose the 25 percent additional pay that a civil servant receives for hardship. I have been to Alaska and to Hawaii, and I do not see where these employees have any greater hardship than employees in the United States. In some cases, as I suggested, they are much better off. Indeed, many employees greatly desire work in either State.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I deny there is any hardship. It is a pleasure to live in Alaska, but the cost of living is high up there.

Mr. CONTE. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alaska this question. Are military personnel who are transferred to Alaska permitted to send an automobile there, as is suggested by this legislation?

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. As I understand it, the military may pay the cost of transporting vehicles for certain of their military personnel to Alaska, when the appropriate authority deems it necessary or advisable. Passage of this bill would authorize the same benefit to civilian civil servants assigned from the contiguous States to Alaska.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think until we can clarify this particular point I would not want this to establish a precedent, because the cost for civilian employees would be small compared to the cost for military personnel who were sent to Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked to reserve the right to object and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice until this point is clearly and unequivocally satisfied. Two more weeks will not make a significant difference.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I might be able to clarify the point the gentleman has in mind. When the Department of Defense testified before the subcommittee they said that it was their intention that this provision would apply only to civilian employees. The fact is that in 1963, when only about 20 or 22 such employees were recruited in the United States, it was intended to apply only to those. It was not intended to apply on a mass scale to military personnel.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is saying that military personnel under existing law may not have their cars shipped to Alaska?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The Department of Defense's representative suggested that within their own budgetary limitations they may ship some cars. That is not the intention of this legislation.

Mr. FORD. I know that is not the intent of this legislation. But if this legislation is passed, it could be applied to the military, which would be a considerably more costly operation, with many more thousands of people involved.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR STUDENT TRAINEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4460) to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will we be setting some kind of precedent in this legislation, if adopted—for the payment of travel expenses for student trainees?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is not the case because in the 86th Congress we passed a law permitting travel expenses for student trainees. The law at that time said that they shall receive these travel expenses when they are promoted upon completion of their college work. Some of these trainees were promoted during the intervening time, and before they graduated from college. This is merely a correction of that legislation. It is not a broadening of it. The Bureau of the Budget testified that there would be no additional cost through the passage of this legislation. This merely corrects a defect in the previous legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 808, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 73b–3(b)) is amended by deleting the word "promoted" wherever it appears and substituting the word "assigned", and by deleting the word "promotion" wherever it appears and substituting the word "assignment".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 814, an identical bill, and that it be considered in lieu of the bill H.R. 4460.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 808, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 73b–3(b)) is amended by deleting the word "promoted" wherever it appears and substituting the word "assigned", and by deleting the word "promotion" wherever it appears and substituting the word "assignment".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4460) was laid on the table.

INDIANA STATEHOOD SESQUICENTENNIAL MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3488) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana into the Union of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Indiana Sesquicentennial Commission not more than one hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Indiana Sesquicentennial Commission, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the commission in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1966.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

(b) Upon authorization from the Indiana Sesquicentennial Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates of such medals to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor).

SEC. 3. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Indiana Susquicentennial Commission.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ILGWU HEALTH CENTER 50TH ANNIVERSARY MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7193) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in commemoration of the founding in 1914 by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union of the first health center ever operated by a trade union in the United States, thus creating a new conception of medical care for the worker which has been followed by many other unions and socially minded institutions, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike an appropriate silver medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to coin and furnish to the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union not more than two thousand copies in bronze of such medal of such size or sizes as shall be determined by the Secretary in consultation with the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the organization in quantities of not less than one thousand but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1965. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such association.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "organization" and insert in lieu thereof "union".

Page 2, line 25, strike out "assocation" and insert in lieu thereof "union".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have known the good hearts and been an admiring observer of the good deeds of the Ladies' Garment Workers for more than half a century, and I am filled with joy at this recognition by the Congress of the United States of the 50 years of dedicated service in the field of health by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. I can think of no recognition of an outstanding and unselfish service to humanity that has been more completely deserved.

The story of how a handful of garment workers, laboring under conditions of contagion, and the unspeakable sweatshops, difficult for this generation to visualize, from this meager means founded the first union health center and initiated a program that today is bringing comfort and health and hope in immeasurable measure to hundreds of thousands throughout our land, is a classic epic in Americanism. The union health center of the Ladies' Garment Workers in Chicago, and those in other cities from coast to coast, all springing from that humble start in New York a half century ago, are monuments to the nobility of purpose and accomplishment of organized labor as well as a tribute, as so eloquently stressed by the beloved Congressman Celler, to our American free enterprise system and free collective bargaining. God bless the Ladies' Garment Workers.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of H.R. 7193, to provide for the striking of one appropriate silver medal, and not more than 2,000 copies in bronze, in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union took the first giant step to meet the health problems of the working men and women when it established the first union health center in the United States in New York City. This was a new conception of medical care for thousands of workers who could afford little or no medical attention. This 1913 health center employed one or two physicians and occupied two rooms. The idea expanded to the point where today the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union has 13 health centers throughout the United States and other trade unions have hundreds of these centers to benefit the working men and women of the country.

Mr. Speaker, the development of these medical centers is certainly a great tribute to our free enterprise system and free collective bargaining. The International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union is to be commended for its pioneering in this field. This union has always been progressive, not only in the establishment of medical centers for its workers, but in fostering good and sound social legislation, civil rights, and by conducting seminars for the membership so that they may be informed on the great issues facing their respective States and the Nation. I have had the pleasure of addressing these seminars and participating in panel discussions sponsored by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in the western Massachusetts area at the invitation of my good friend, John F. Albano, the ILGWU manager in the Springfield office. I am completely familiar with the ILGWU sound and progressive programs, and know of Jack Albano's zeal in promoting them.

The striking of this medal is an important item in a program that the ILGWU hopes will be of great educational value. This program will take the form of a conference running several days devoted to the current and future medical problems confronting the members of all trade unions and similar social organizations. Mrs. Evelyn Dubrow, legislative representative of the ILHWU, has testified before the Banking and Currency Committee that leaders in the field from the United States, England, the Scandinavian countries, Austria and other free countries are being invited. The possibility of sending one of the ILGWU "health centers on wheels" as a sort of Peace Corps project to the newly emerging African and Asian democracies is being considered, Mrs. Dubrow said, and I think this certainly has merit. The design of the medal will become the art symbol for all these other activities.

PADRE JUNIPERO SERRA 250TH ANNIVERSARY MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 743) to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of this 250th anniversary of his birth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Padre Junipero Serra, who was born in Majorca, Spain, on November 24, 1713, and came to the west coast in 1769 where he founded the first ten missions, which became the nucleus of civilization in what is now California, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association not more than three hundred thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made and delivered at such times as may be required by the association in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1964. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes and of such metals as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such association.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the entire California delegation joins in support of this measure, which has already passed the Senate. Padre Junipero Serra was one of the greatest men ever to set foot in what is now California, for he brought civilization and culture and agriculture, as well as religion, to this area of our country. His works have lived for two centuries and will live in our society as long as this country endures.

Each State is permitted only two statues in our historic Statuary Hall of the Capitol and it is worth noting in connection with this bill that California has installed the statue of Padre Junipero Serra as one of its two State heroes to be honored in this fashion.

This brave semi-invalid embodied the same spirit which motivates the men and women of our Peace Corps. You might say that in the Peace Corps, we are doing for other undeveloped nations what Padre Junipero Serra did for what is now California.

BATTLE OF LAKE ERIE SESQUICENTENNIAL MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 879) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the building of Perry's fleet and the Battle of Lake Erie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, to provide for the striking of medals commemorating the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, be taken off the Consent Calendar. Since the action of the committee in approving the legislation, the sponsoring committee has changed its mind about the feasibility of meeting the deadline established in the bill, and it has informed the House sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative WEAVER, that it would be best not to seek enactment of the legislation at this time. Since no worthwhile purpose would be served by passage of the bill, I ask that it be returned to the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NEVADA STATEHOOD CENTENNIAL MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1125) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Nevada Centennial Commission not more than twenty thousand medals with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Nevada Centennial Commission subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals shall be made of silver alloy and delivered at such times as may be required by the commission in quantities of not less than two thousand, but no medals shall be made after December 31, 1964. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

SEC. 3. The medals authorized to be issued pursuant to this Act shall be of such size or sizes as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with such commission.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, in support of S. 1125, providing for the striking of a commemorative medal on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of Nevada's admission to the Union, I would like to take this opportunity to bring forth a few highlights of Nevada's history for as you know Nevada was one of the last frontiers to join the Union, and did so at a most interesting time in our Nation's history, a time of strife and discontent in our Nation, and we are thus referred to as the "Battle Born State"—but also sometimes called the "Silver State."

Nevada became a State on October 31, 1864, but the incidents leading up to Nevada's statehood are most interesting.

Nevada was the last Western region to be explored in this country. Probably not more than one or two parties crossed Nevada before 1800 and they did not stop to explore. A few trappers explored parts of the area in search of new fur sources, but the great natural wealth of the region remained unknown until 1843 when an expedition led by John Fremont surveyed the Rocky Mountain Divide. In 1859 two prospectors discovered unusually rich gold deposits at Virginia City, Patrick McLaughlin and Peter O'Riley, and soon they took in Henry Comstock, a trapper, as partner. These deposits became known as the Comstock lode. The gold was found to be mixed with extremely rich veins of silver, and miners rushed to the area and the real development of the region began. Later discoveries of gold, silver, copper, and other minerals established mining as Nevada's most valuable industry.

At the time the Comstock lode was discovered, Virginia City was a very small settlement, but the news of the discovery spread like wildfire and miners and adventurers from California and the East flocked to the diggings to see if they could strike it rich, and in a very short time Virginia City became a bustling mining center, and the population of the entire section increased from 1,000 in 1859 to more than 6,800 in 1860.

By 1861 so many settlers had moved to the mining camps that President James Buchanan declared the area a separate territory, and when President Lincoln took office the same year, he appointed James W. Nye, a politician from New York City, as the first Governor of the Nevada Territory, and on July 11, 1861, Nye proclaimed the establishment of a territorial government.

In 1862 the territory was enlarged, and again after Nevada became a State—1864—was the area enlarged in 1866 to the present size. This is of particular interest, for in 1866 the barren dry desert land which was then added to the State was not particularly welcome and it took a couple of sessions of the legislature to come to agreement, but this barren dry desert land is where Las Vegas now lies, a booming metropolis and a tremendous asset to Nevada and the Nation.

Territorial life in Nevada was far from comfortable. The first settlers in mining camps lived in tents, in rough stone huts, or in holes in the hillsides, and all their supplies had to be hauled over the mountains from California. Prices were almost unbelievably high and lawlessness and disorder often ruled in the mining camps. To make matters worse, Indians went on the warpath from time to time between 1861 and 1864. The Army built forts to protect the settlers against the Indians, while the Army at the same time began to enforce law and order in the mining camps.

This was the picture of Nevada when it came into statehood, but the silver and gold of Nevada's mines became vitally important to the Federal Government when the Civil War started in 1861, and these precious metals provided much of the funds necessary to finance the war. In addition, the Union needed another antislavery State to make sure that amendments to the Constitution urged by President Lincoln would be passed. For these reasons, Lincoln became a strong supporter of statehood for Nevada, even though the territory had less than a third of the 127,381 residents required by Congress for statehood.

On March 3, 1863, Congress passed an act allowing a constitutional convention to meet in Nevada in preparation for statehood. The convention met in November 1863 but disputes developed over taxation and in the election in January 1864 the voters failed to approve the proposed constitution. Congress then had to pass another law authorizing a second constitutional convention. This new convention completed its work in less than 4 months and to speed statehood for Nevada the convention telegraphed the entire constitution to Washington at a cost of $3,500. Thus on October 31, 1864, Nevada became a State, and Henry G. Blasdel, a mining engineer and a Republican, became the State's first Governor, and the new State's estimated population was some 21,400 souls.

Although Nevada came into statehood through its richness in minerals and prosperity in its mining industry this picture has since changed. The richest silver deposits began to run out in 1869 and during the early 1870's silver prices began to fall on the international market. Discovery of the "Big Bonanza" in the Comstock lode in 1873 provided a new source of high grade ore, and in 1878 Congress passed the Bland-Allison Act to keep mines with lower grade ore in operation.

By this time cattle raising grew in importance and as mines closed cattle ranchers became the richest men in the State. In 1893 President Cleveland called a special session of Congress and forced the repeal of the Bland-Allison Act. This caused more mines to close. Thousands of persons left Nevada to find work elsewhere and once thriving communities became ghost towns.

Again in 1900 prospectors found huge new deposits of rich silver ores at Tonopah and although silver prices were low the ores were so rich that mines could make a profit and hundreds of miners thus rushed back to the State to share in this new wealth. That same year rich deposits of copper were discovered near Ely, Ruth, and Mountain City, and the discovering of gold in Goldfield in 1903 caused a rush of people to this area.

World War II brought other booms to Nevada for munitions factories needed large quantities of the State's copper, magnesite, manganese, and tungsten, and in 1941 a large magnesium plant opened in Henderson.

However, Nevada is no longer a busy mining State, and a drop in the price of tungsten in the 1950's was a serious blow to Nevada's mining industry, and by 1959 all but one tungsten mine had closed.

Since then foreign aid programs have imported minerals mined with cheap labor elsewhere in the world, while the Nevada mines stand vacant and the miners without a way of life.

Nevada is proud of the many famous people it has produced, and people who have lived there. Mark Twain worked as a reporter for several years on the Territorial Enterprise, a Virginia City newspaper, and made that paper famous. Francis Griffiths Newlands served Nevada both as a Representative and a Senator for over 25 years, and is the sponsor of bills for reclamation of the arid lands in the West.

Senator Key Pittman was Senator from Nevada from 1913 until his death in 1940 and he strongly supported the free coinage of silver and was the author of the Silver Purchase Act.

And the colorful, fighting Senator Pat McCarran who fought for silver with his dying breath.

William Morris Steward, a lawyer and U.S. Senator who sponsored national mining legislation, and who was the author of the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which allowed qualified Negroes to vote in national elections.

Thus, Nevada has made a tremendous imprint in our Nation's history and we wish to have a commemorative medal struck in the State's honor on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of statehood.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGE NAME OF MEMPHIS LOCK AND DAM, ALA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 453) to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Memphis lock and dam near Aliceville, Alabama, on the Tombigbee River shall hereafter be known and designated as the Aliceville lock and dam. Any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States in which such lock and dam are referred to shall be held to refer to such lock and dam as the Aliceville lock and dam.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS MOUNT HOPE BAY, R.I.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1936) authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the Mount Hope Bridge Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Mount Hope Bay between the towns of Bristol and Portsmouth, in Rhode Island", approved March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1391), is amended by striking out section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 3. If and when title to such bridge shall become vested in the State of Rhode Island or the Rhode Island Turnpike and Bridge Authority, an instrumentality of said State, the maintenance, repair, and operation of such bridge shall thereafter be governed by the laws of the State of Rhode Island applicable to such bridge, subject, however, to the terms and conditions of the Act entitled 'An Act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEMNIFICATION OF RESEARCH CONTRACTORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8611) to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do we indemnify others who are the beneficiaries, if I may put it that way, of research in addition to the proposal to indemnify the research contractors who may be working with or using facilities of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS**. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. There was a doctor working for the Veterans' Administration doing research work. He left the VA and went into private practice. The VA wanted to work further with him but he could not receive any insurance from private insurance companies. This merely gives the VA a way to protect themselves in working with a doctor of this kind.

Mr. **GROSS**. This is not designed to provide indemnification growing out of some mistake made by some research organization?

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. No; it is not.

Mr. **GROSS**. This deals only with individuals? Is this what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. This is meant to deal with individual contractors; yes.

Mr. **GROSS**. I am still not clear as to what is indemnified, who is indemnified, and for what reason.

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. Let me read to the gentleman a report from the Veterans' Administration. There was a doctor named Bovarnick who invented an expander while he was working for the VA on a blood plasma expander. He left the VA and the VA wanted to work with him again. The suppliers refused to deal with him in view of recent court decisions unless there was indemnity coverage on anything that might happen of an untoward nature in the use of these materials.

Mr. **GROSS**. Then does this indemnify if due to a mistake that may be made by an individual or by a corporation?

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. That is as I understand it.

Mr. **GROSS**. An indemnification of the individual?

Mr. **TEAGUE** of Texas. Of the individual; yes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 216 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)", and changing "(b)" and "(c)" to "(2)" and "(3)", respectively.

(b) Such section 216 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (b), as follows:

"(b) With the approval of the Administrator, any contract for research authorized by this section or for medical research or development authorized by section 4101 of this title, may provide for the indemnification of contractors to the extent and subject to the limitations provided in section 2354, title 10, United States Code, except that approval and certification required thereby shall be by the Administrator."

(c) Such section 216 is further amended by adding the following at the end of the catchline: "; indemnification of contractors".

(d) The analysis of chapter 3 of such title 38 regarding section 216 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof "; indemnification of contractors".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SAINT-GAUDENS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, N.H.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4018) to authorize establishment of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, N.H., and for other purposes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it looks like with this bill the taxpayers would get the privilege of paying some $40,000 a year in perpetuity for taking care of this memorial or monument, or whatever it is—this national historic site.

May I ask the gentleman how it has been operated and maintained up to this point?

Mr. **MORRIS**. Up until this time, this has not been a national historic site. It has been taken care of by private organizations. Whenever a site of this nature is made into a national historic park, the National Park Service assumes responsibility for the maintenance and operation of the facility and, more than likely, with the admission charges that will be made they will take care of certainly a good portion of the maintenance and operation costs.

Mr. **GROSS**. Has there been anything wrong with the operation of it in the past?

Mr. **MORRIS**. I would let the gentleman from New Hampshire, sponsor of the legislation, respond to that question.

Mr. **CLEVELAND**. The trustees have been taking care of the affairs of the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, and they have reached a point where they feel the public will be better served and the purpose of the trust will be better served if the Federal Government can take it over. There has been income and there are some plus funds. I call to the attention of the gentleman the fact that they are donating 80 acres of land with buildings thereon, they are donating to the United States $100,000 of the endowment fund. If the charges are made, it could very easily be a pay as you go proposition.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, in view of the condition of the U.S. Treasury, I do not believe we are entitled to take on a lot of these historic sites where they have been administered and serving the public well in the past. I would think they could continue as they are presently being operated. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT BY THE STATES OF COLORADO AND NEW MEXICO OF THE COSTILLA CREEK COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5949) to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is given to the amendment of the Costilla Creek Compact as agreed to by the States of Colorado and New Mexico. Such amended compact reads as follows:

AMENDED COSTILLA CREEK COMPACT

The State of Colorado and the State of New Mexico, parties signatory to this compact (hereinafter referred to as "Colorado" and "New Mexico", respectively, or individually as a "State", or collectively as the "States"), having on September 30, 1944, concluded, through their duly authorized Commissioners, to-wit: Clifford H. Stone for Colorado and Thomas M. McClure for New Mexico, a compact with respect to the waters of Costilla Creek, an interstate stream, which compact was ratified by the States in 1945 and was approved by the Congress of the United States in 1946; and

The States, having resolved to conclude an amended compact with respect to the waters of Costilla Creek, have designated, pursuant to the Acts of their respective Legislatures and through their appropriate executive agencies, as their Commissioners:

J. E. Whitten, for Colorado
S. E. Reynolds, for New Mexico

who, after negotiations, have agreed upon these articles:

Article I

The major purposes of this compact are to provide for the equitable division and apportionment of the use of the waters of Costilla Creek; to promote interstate comity; to remove causes of present and future interstate controversies; to assure the most efficient utilization of the waters of Costilla Creek; to provide for the integrated operation of existing and prospective irrigation facilities on the stream in the two States; to adjust the conflicting jurisdictions of the two States over irrigation works and facilities diverting and storing water in one State for use in both States; to equalize the benefits of water from Costilla Creek, used for the irrigation of contiguous lands lying on either side of the Boundary, between the citizens and water users of one State and those of the other; and to place the beneficial application of water diverted from Costilla Creek for irrigation by the water users of the two States on a common basis.

The physical and other conditions peculiar to the Costilla Creek and its basin, and the nature and location of the irrigation development and the facilities in connection therewith, constitute the basis for this compact; and neither of the States hereby, nor the Congress of the United States by its consent, concedes that this compact establishes any general principle or precedent with respect to any other interstate stream.

Article II

As used in this compact, the following names, terms and expressions are described, defined, applied and taken to mean as in this Article set forth:

(a) "Costilla Creek" is a tributary of the Rio Grande which rises on the west slope of the Sangre de Cristo range in the extreme southeastern corner of Costilla County in Colorado and flows in a general westerly direction crossing the Boundary three times above its confluence with the Rio Grande in New Mexico.

(b) The "Canyon Mouth" is that point on Costilla Creek in New Mexico where the stream leaves the mountains and emerges into the San Luis Valley.

(c) The "Amalia Area" is that irrigated area in New Mexico above the Canyon Mouth and below the Costilla Reservoir which is served by decreed direct flow water rights.

(d) The "Costilla-Garcia Area" is that area extending from the Canyon Mouth in New Mexico to a point in Colorado about four miles downstream from the Boundary, being a compact body of irrigated land on either side of Costilla Creek served by decreed direct flow water rights.

(e) The "Eastdale Reservoir No. 1" is that off-channel reservoir located in Colorado in Sections 7, 8 and 18, Township 1 North, Range 73 West, and Sections 12 and 13, Township 1 North, Range 74 West, of the Costilla Estates Survey, with a nominal capacity of three thousand four hundred sixty-eight (3,468) acre-feet and a present usable capacity of two thousand (2,000) acre-feet.

(f) The "Eastdale Reservoir No. 2" is that off-channel reservoir located in Colorado in Sections 3, 4, 9 and 10, Township 1 North, Range 73 West, of the Costilla Estates Survey, with a nominal capacity of three thousand forty-one (3,041) acre-feet.

(g) The "Costilla Reservoir" is that channel reservoir, having a nominal capacity of fifteen thousand seven hundred (15,700) acre-feet, located in New Mexico near the headwaters of Costilla Creek. The present Usable Capacity of the reservoir is eleven thousand (11,000) acre-feet, subject to future adjustment by the State Engineer of New Mexico. The condition of Costilla dam may be such that the State Engineer of New Mexico will not permit storage above a determined stage except for short periods of time.

(h) The "Cerro Canal" is that irrigation canal which diverts water from the left bank of Costilla Creek in New Mexico near the southwest corner of Section 12, Township 1 South, Range 73 West, of the Costilla Estates Survey, and runs in a northwesterly direction to the Boundary near Boundary Monument No. 140.

(i) The "Boundary" is the term used herein to describe the common boundary line between Colorado and New Mexico.

(j) The term "Costilla Reservoir System" means and includes the Costilla Reservoir and the Cerro Canal, the permits for the storage of water in Costilla Reservoir, the twenty-four and fifty-two hundredths (24.52) cubic feet per second of time of direct flow water rights transferred to the Cerro Canal, and the permits for the diversion of direct flow water by the Cerro Canal as adjusted herein to seventy-five and forty-eight hundredths (75.48) cubic feet per second of time.

(k) The term "Costilla Reservoir System Safe Yield" means that quantity of usable water made available each year by the Costilla Reservoir System. The safe yield represents the most beneficial operation of the Costilla Reservoir System through the use, first, of the total usable portion of the yield of the twenty-four and fifty-two hundredths (24.52) cubic feet per second of time of direct flow rights transferred to the Cerro Canal, second, of the total usable portion of the yield of the direct flow Cerro Canal permits, and third, of that portion of the water stored in Costilla Reservoir required to complete such safe yield.

(l) The term "Usable Capacity" is defined and means that capacity of Costilla Reservoir at the stage above which the State Engineer of New Mexico will not permit storage except for short periods of time.

(m) The term "Temporary Storage" is defined and means the water permitted by the State Engineer of New Mexico to be stored in Costilla Reservoir for short periods of time above the Usable Capacity of that reservoir.

(n) The term "Additional Storage Facilities" is defined and means storage capacity which may be provided in either State to impound waters of Costilla Creek and its tributaries in addition to the nominal capacity of Costilla Reservoir and the Costilla Creek complement of the Eastdale Reservoir No. 1 capacity.

(o) The term "Duty of Water" is defined as the rate in cubic feet per second of time at which water may be diverted at the headgate to irrigate a specified acreage of land during the period of maximum requirement.

(p) The term "Surplus Water" is defined and means water which cannot be stored in operating reservoirs during the Storage Season or water during the Irrigation Season which cannot be stored in operating reservoirs and which is in excess of the aggregate direct flow rights and permits recognized by this compact.

(q) The term "Irrigation Season" is defined and means that period of each calendar year from May 16 to September 30, inclusive.

(r) The term "Storage Season" is defined and means that period of time extending from October 1 of one year to May 15 of the succeeding year, inclusive.

(s) The term "Points of Interstate Delivery" means and includes (1) the Acequia Madre where it crosses the Boundary; (2) the Costilla Creek where it crosses the Boundary; (3) the Cerro Canal where it reaches the Boundary; and (4) any other interstate canals which might be constructed with the approval of the Commission at the point or points where they cross the Boundary.

(t) The term "Water Company" means The San Luis Power and Water Company, a Colorado corporation, or its successor.

(u) The word "Commission" means the Costilla Creek Compact Commission created by Article VIII of this compact for the administration thereof.

Article III

1. To accomplish the purposes of this compact, as set forth in Article I, the following adjustments in the operation of irrigation facilities on Costilla Creek, and in the use of water diverted, stored and regulated thereby, are made:

(a) The quantity of water delivered for use in the two States by direct flow ditches in the Costilla-Garcia Area and by the Cerro Canal is based on a Duty of Water of one cubic foot per second of time for each eighty (80) acres, to be applied in the order of priority; *Provided, however,* That this adjustment in each instance is based on the acreage as determined by the court in decreeing the water rights for the Costilla-Garcia Area, and in the case of the Cerro Canal such basis shall apply to eight thousand (8,000) acres of land. In order to better maintain a usable head for the diversion of water for beneficial consumptive use the adjusted maximum diversion rate under the water right of each of the ditches supplying water for the Costilla-Garcia Area in Colorado is not less than one cubic foot per second of time.

(b) There is transferred from certain ditches in the Costilla-Garcia Area twenty-four and fifty-two hundredths (24.52) cubic feet per second of time of direct flow water rights, which rights of use are held by the Water Company or its successors in title, to the headgate of the Cerro Canal. The twenty-four and fifty-two hundredths (24.52) cubic feet of water per second of time hereby transferred represents an evaluation of these rights after adjustment in the Duty of Water, pursuant to subsection (a) of this Article, and includes a reduction thereof to compensate for increased use of direct flow water which otherwise would have been possible under these rights by this transfer.

(c) Except for the rights to store water from Costilla Creek in Eastdale Reservoir No. 1 as hereinafter provided, all diversion and storage rights from Costilla Creek for Eastdale Reservoirs No. 1 and No. 2 are relinquished and the water decreed thereunder is returned to the creek for use in accordance with the plan of integrated operation effectuated by this compact.

(d) The Cerro Canal direct flow permit shall be seventy-five and forty-eight hundredths (75.48) cubic feet per second of time.

(e) There is transferred to and made available for the irrigation of lands in Colorado a portion of the Costilla Reservoir complement of the Costilla Reservoir System Safe Yield in order that the storage of water in that reservoir may be made for the benefit of water users in both Colorado and New Mexico under the provisions of this compact for the allocations of water and the operation of facilities.

2. Each State grants for the benefit of the other and its water users the rights to change the points of diversion of water from Costilla Creek, to divert water from the stream in one State for use in the other and to store water in one State for the irrigation of lands in the other, insofar as the exercise of such rights may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Article and to comply with the terms of this compact.

3. The Water Company has consented to and approved the adjustments contained in this Article; and such consent and approval

shall be evidenced in writing and filed with the Commission.

Article IV

The apportionment and allocation of the use of Costilla Creek water shall be as follows:

(a) There is allocated for diversion from the natural flow of Costilla Creek and its tributaries sufficient water for beneficial use on meadow and pasture lands above Costilla Reservoir in New Mexico to the extent and in the manner now prevailing in that area.

(b) There is allocated for diversion from the natural flow of Costilla Creek and its tributaries thirteen and forty-two hundredths (13.42) cubic feet of water per second of time for beneficial use on lands in the Amalia Area in New Mexico.

(c) In addition to allocations made in subsections (e), (f) and (g) of this Article, there is allocated for diversion from the natural flow of Costilla Creek fifty and sixty-two hundredths (50.62) cubic feet of water per second of time for Colorado and eighty-nine and eight hundredths (89.08) cubic feet of water per second of time for New Mexico, subject to adjustment as provided in Article V(e), and such water shall be delivered for beneficial use in the two States in accordance with the schedules and under the conditions set forth in Article V.

(d) There is allocated for diversion from the natural flow of Costilla Creek sufficient water to provide each year one thousand (1,000) acre-feet of stored water in Eastdale Reservoir No. 1, such water to be delivered as provided in Article V.

(e) There is allocated for diversion to Colorado thirty-six and five-tenths per cent (36.5%) and to new Mexico sixty-three and five-tenths per cent (63.5%) of the water stored by Costilla Reservoir for release therefrom for irrigation purposes each year, subject to adjustment as provided in Article V(e) and such water shall be delivered for beneficial use in the two States on a parity basis in accordance with the provisions of Article V. By "parity basis" is meant that neither State shall enjoy a priority of right of use.

(f) There is allocated for beneficial use in each of the States of Colorado and New Mexico one-half of the Surplus Water, as defined in Article 11(p), to be delivered as provided in Article V.

(g) There is allocated for beneficial use in each of the States of Colorado and New Mexico one-half of any water made available and usable by Additional Storage Facilities which may be constructed in the future.

Article V

The operation of the facilities of Costilla Creek and the delivery of water for the irrigation of land in Colorado and New Mexico, in accordance with the allocations made in Article IV, shall be as follows:

(a) Diversions of water for use on lands in the Amalia Area shall be made as set forth in Article IV(b) in the order of decreed priorities in New Mexico and of relative priority dates in the two States, subject to the right of New Mexico to change the points of diversion and places of use of any of such water to other points of diversion and places of use; *Provided, however,* That the rights so transferred shall be limited in each instance to the quantity of water actually consumed on the lands from which the right is transferred.

(b) Deliveries to Colorado of direct flow water below the Canyon Mouth shall be made by New Mexico in accordance with the following schedule:

Deliveries of direct flow water to Colorado during irrigation season

Usable discharge of creek at canyon mouth gaging station	Incremental allocations to Colorado (cubic feet per second)		Points of interstate delivery	Cumulative allocations to Colorado (cubic feet per second)	Remarks
(1)	(2A)	(2B)	(3)	(4)	(5)
25 cubic feet per second	1.05		Acequia Madre		Incremental allocation is 4.2 percent of the usable discharge when usable discharge is less than 25 cubic feet per second.
	2.53		Cerro Canal		Incremental allocation is 10.13 percent of the usable discharge when usable discharge is less than 25 cubic feet per second.
	4.70		do.	8.28	This 4.70 cubic feet per second is not a part of the Colorado allocation of the direct flow water of the Costilla Reservoir system and is not subject to adjustment in the event of a change in the usable capacity of Costilla Reservoir. Incremental allocation is 18.8 percent of the usable discharge when usable discharge is less than 25 cubic feet per second. This 4.70 cubic feet per second allocated to Colorado for delivery through the Cerro Canal is 5.50 cubic feet per second of the original 6.55 cubic feet per second allocated to Colorado for delivery through the Acequia Madre less 0.8 cubic foot per second correction for losses.
36.88 cubic feet per second	.38		do.		This 0.38 cubic foot per second is not a part of the Colorado allocation of the direct flow water of the Costilla Reservoir system and is not subject to adjustment in the event of a change in the usable capacity of Costilla Reservoir. Incremental allocation is 3.26 percent of the usable discharge in excess of 25.38 cubic feet per second and less than 36.88 cubic feet per second.
	4.04		do.	12.70	Incremental allocation is 35.11 percent of the usable discharge in excess of 25.38 cubic feet per second and less than 36.88 cubic feet per second.
38.62 cubic feet per second		1	Creek	13.70	Incremental allocation in 100 percent of the usable discharge in excess of 37.62 cubic feet per second and less than 38.62 cubic feet per second.
44.76 cubic feet per second	2.24		Cerro Canal	15.94	Incremental allocation is 36.5 percent of the usable discharge in excess of 38.62 cubic feet per second and less than 44.76 cubic feet per second.
50.91 cubic feet per second		6	Creek	21.94	Incremental allocation is 100 percent of the usable discharge in excess of 44.91 cubic feet per second and less than 50.91 cubic feet per second.
56.48 cubic feet per second	0.13		Cerro Canal	22.07	Incremental allocation is 11.18 percent of the usable discharge in excess of 55.35 cubic feet per second and less than 56.48 cubic feet per second.
61.48 cubic feet per second		1	Creek	23.07	Incremental allocation is 100 percent of the usable discharge in excess of 60.48 cubic feet per second and less than 61.48 cubic feet per second.
64.22 cubic feet per second					At usable creek discharge of 64.22 cubic feet per second the Cerro Canal direct flow permit becomes operative after 1,000 acre-feet has been stored in Eastdale Reservoir No. 1.
139.70 cubic feet per second	27.55		Cerro Canal	50.62	Incremental allocation is 36.5 percent of the usable discharge in excess of 64.22 cubic feet per second and less than 139.70 cubic feet per second.

The actual discharges of Costilla Creek at the canyon mouth gaging station at which the various blocks of direct flow water become effective shall equal the flows set forth in col. (1) increased by the transmission losses necessary to deliver those flows to the headgates of the respective direct flow ditches diverting in New Mexico.

The delivery of ditch water at the boundary shall equal the allocation set forth in cols. (2A) and (2B) reduced by the transmission losses between the headgate of the ditch and the point where the ditch crosses the boundary. The allocations to be delivered to Colorado through the Cerro Canal represent, except as otherwise indicated in col. (5) of the table above, 36.5 percent of those blocks of direct flow water of the Costilla Reservoir system which are subject to adjustment as provided in subsec. (e) of this article.

This provisions of article III 1 (a) shall not be applicable to the Colorado allocation of 5.08 cubic feet per second which is transferred from the Acequia Madre to the Cerro Canal by this amendment to the Costilla Creek compact and shall not be applicable to the 0.8 cubic feet per second which is transferred from Colorado to New Mexico by this amendment to the Costilla Creek compact.

The above table is compiled on the basis of the delivery to Colorado at the boundary of 36.5 percent of all direct flow water of the Costilla Reservoir system diverted by the Cerro Canal and the delivery at the boundary of all other direct flow water allocated to Colorado, in the order of priority, all such deliveries to be adjusted for transmission losses. In the event of change in the usable capacity of the Costilla Reservoir, Colorado's share of all direct flow water of the Costilla Reservoir system diverted by the Cerro Canal, to be delivered at the boundry and adjusted for transmission losses, shall be determined by the percentages set forth in col. (4) of the table which appears in subsec. (e) of this article.

(c) During the Storage Season, no water shall be diverted under direct flow rights unless there is water in excess of the demand of all operating reservoirs for water from Costilla Creek for storage.

(d) In order to assure the most efficient utilization of the available water supply, the filling of Eastdale Reservoir No. 1 from Costilla Creek shall be commenced as early in the spring as possible and shall be completed as soon thereafter as possible. The Cerro Canal or any other ditch which may be provided for that purpose shall be used, insofar as practicable, to convey the water from the Canyon Mouth to Eastdale Reservoir No. 1. During any season when the Commission determines that there will be no Surplus Water, any diversions, waste or spill from any canal or canals supplying Eastdale Reservoir No. 1 will be charged to the quantity of water diverted for delivery to said reservoir.

(e) The Commission shall estimate each year the Safe Yield of Costilla Reservoir System and its component parts as far in advance of the Irrigation Season as possible and shall review and revise such estimates from time to time as may be necessary.

In the event the Usable Capacity of the Costilla Reservoir changes, the average safe yield and the equitable division thereof between the States shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

Usable capacity of Costilla Reservoir (1)	Average annual safe yield (acre-feet) (2)	Division of safe yield			
		Colorado		New Mexico	
		Acre-feet (3)	Percent (4)	Acre-feet (5)	Percent (6)
0	1,800	1,510	83.9	290	16.1
1,000	3,400	2,000	58.8	1,400	41.2
2,000	4,900	2,450	50.0	2,450	50.0
3,000	6,400	2,910	45.5	3,490	54.5
4,000	7,900	3,370	42.7	4,530	57.3
5,000	9,300	3,800	40.9	5,500	59.1
6,000	10,700	4,220	39.4	6,480	60.6
7,000	12,000	4,620	38.5	7,380	61.5
8,000	13,200	4,990	37.8	8,210	62.2
9,000	14,300	5,320	37.2	8,980	62.8
10,000	15,200	5,600	36.8	9,600	63.2
11,000	16,000	5,840	36.5	10,160	63.5
12,000	16,600	6,020	36.3	10,580	63.7
13,000	17,000	6,140	36.1	10,860	63.9
14,000	17,400	6,270	36.0	11,130	64.0
15,000	17,700	6,360	35.9	11,340	64.1
15,700	17,900	6,420	35.9	11,480	64.1

Intermediate quantities shall be computed by proportionate parts.

In the event of change in the Usable Capacity of the Costilla Reservoir, the Costilla Reservoir complement of the Costilla Reservoir System Safe Yield shall be divided between Colorado and New Mexico in accordance with the percentages given in Columns 4 and 6, respectively, of the above table.

Each State may draw from the Reservoir in accordance with the allocations made herein, up to its proportion of the Costilla Reservoir complement of the Costilla Reservoir System Safe Yield and its proportion of Temporary Storage and no more. Colorado may call for the delivery of its share thereof at any of the specified Points of Interstate Delivery.

Deliveries of water from Costilla Reservoir to the Canyon Mouth shall be adjusted for transmission losses, if any, between the two points. Deliveries to Colorado at the Boundary shall be further adjusted for transmission losses from the Canyon Mouth to the respective Points of Interstate Delivery.

Water stored in Costilla Reservoir and not released during the current season shall not be held over to the credit of either State but shall be apportioned when the safe yield is subsequently determined.

(f) The Colorado apportionment of Surplus Water, as allocated in Article IV(f), shall be delivered by New Mexico at such points of interstate delivery and in the respective quantities, subject to transmission losses, requested by the Colorado member of the Commission.

(g) In the event that additional water becomes usable by the construction of Additional Storage Facilities, such water shall be made available to each State in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Commission.

(h) When it appears to the Commission that any part of the water allocated to one State for use in a particular year will not be used by that State, the Commission may permit its use by the other State during that year, provided that a permanent right to the use of such water shall not thereby be established.

Article VI

The desirability of consolidating various of the direct flow ditches serving the Costilla-Garcia Area, which are now or which would become interstate in character by consolidation, and diverting the water available to such ditches through a common headgate is recognized. Should the owners of any of such ditches or a combination of them, desire to effectuate a consolidation and provide for a common headgate diversion, application therefor shall be made to the Commission which, after review of the plans submitted, may grant permission to make such consolidation.

Article VII

The Commission shall cause to be maintained and operated a stream-gaging station, equipped with an automatic water-stage recorder, at each of the following points, to-wit:

(a) On Costilla Creek immediately below Costilla Reservoir.

(b) On Costilla Creek at or near the Canyon Mouth above the headgate of Cerro Canal and below the Amalia Area.

(c) On Costilla Creek at or near the Boundary.

(d) On the Cerro Canal immediately below its headgate.

(e) On the Cerro Canal at or near the Boundary.

(f) On the intake from Costilla Creek to the Eastdale Reservoir No. 1, immediately above the point where the intake discharges into the reservoir.

(g) On the Acequia Madre immediately below its headgate.

(h) On the Acequia Madre at the Boundary.

(i) Similar gaging stations shall be maintained and operated at such other points as may be necessary in the discretion of the Commission for the securing of records required for the carrying out of the provisions of the compact.

Such gaging stations shall be equipped, maintained, and operated by the Commission directly or in cooperation with an appropriate federal or state agency, and the equipment, method, and frequency of measurement at such stations shall be such as to produce reliable records at all times.

Article VIII

The two States shall administer this compact through the official in each State who is now or may hereafter be charged with the duty of administering the public water supplies, and such officials shall constitute the Costilla Creek Compact Commission. In addition to the powers and duties hereinbefore specifically conferred upon such Commission, the Commission shall collect and correlate factual data and maintain records having a bearing upon the administration of this compact. In connection therewith, the Commission may employ such engineering and other assistance as may be reasonably necessary within the limits of funds provided for that purpose by the States. The Commission may, by unanimous action, adopt rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this compact to govern its proceedings. The salaries and expenses of the members of the Commission shall be paid by their respective States. Other expenses incident to the administration of the compact, including the employment of engineering or other assistance and the establishment and maintenance of compact gaging stations, not borne by the United States shall be assumed equally by the two States and paid directly to the Commission upon vouchers submitted for that purpose.

The United States Geological Survey, or whatever federal agency may succeed to the functions and duties of that agency, shall collaborate with the Commission in the correlation and publication of water facts necessary for the proper administration of this compact.

Article IX

This amended compact shall become operative when ratified by the Legislatures of the signatory States and consented to by the Congress of the United States; provided, that, except as changed herein, the provisions, terms, conditions and obligations of the Costilla Creek Compact executed on September 30, 1944, continue in full force and effect.

In WITNESS WHEREOF, the Commissioners have signed this compact in triplicate original, one copy of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States of America, and one copy of which shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

Done in the City of Santa Fe, New Mexico, on the 7th day of February, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

J. E. WHITTEN,
Commissioner for Colorado.
S. E. REYNOLDS,
Commissioner for New Mexico.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISING THE BOUNDARIES OF MESA VERDE NATIONAL PARK, COLO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6756) to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colorado, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask someone if my mathematics is correct. This 481 acres of land, and I imagine most of it is rock, is going to cost $125,000, or at the rate of about $260 an acre.

Mr. ASPINALL. The area is not rock. I can assure my colleague that there are a few acres, perhaps, that are land areas that would not be cultivatable as far as growing crops is concerned. Most of the area is close to the base of the Mesa Verde itself and is flat land. It is privately owned at the present time. It has been used heretofore for raising certain crops and pasture.

As far as the price is concerned, there have been two appraisals made already. One appraisal is just about half what the upper appraised amount is.

This is a very important part of the redevelopment of the Mesa Verde area, the national park area. It was thought if the authorized amount were less it would place them at a handicap and not leave them with the authority to go ahead after the third appraisal is made. This would be true even if the third appraisal was considerably less than the $125,000. That would not be to the best interests of the area, which is one of the most visited park areas of its size and importance that we have. There is a charge to get into this park, I might say. The gentleman's mathematics is correct. Knowing this area as I do and knowing the owner as I do, I am of the opinion that the price will be less than he suggests, perhaps in the area of $125 to $140 an acre.

Mr. GROSS. Or about half what the bill calls for.

Mr. ASPINALL. I am hopeful that this will be the case.

Mr. GROSS. Could not this bill be amended to save the taxpayers some money on an assured basis?

Mr. ASPINALL. From my acquaintanceship with the present owner as well as the former owner of the area, it is my feeling that she desires to see that the park is developed along the lines now planned. The concessionaire is willing to move the concession facilities from the area where they now are up closer to the Navajo Hill area itself. I can assure my colleague I will do my best to see that there is no building up of the price above a fair appraisal figure.

Mr. GROSS. There is no need to build it up. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would do his best to get this down to the $125 or $130 an acre this land is apparently worth.

Mr. ASPINALL. I assure my colleague I will do my best to see that the appraised price is fair, and whatever that is, the owner should be entitled to receive it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park are hereby revised to include the following described lands which, subject to valid existing rights, shall be administered as a part of the park in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.):

NEW MEXICO PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COLORADO

Township 36 North, Range 14 West

Section 29: All portions of the south half and the southeast quarter northwest quarter lying south and west of the right-of-way of United States Highway 160.

Section 32: Those portions of the section lying south and west of the right-of-way of United States Highway 160, except the north entrance road to the park, the southeast quarter southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter.

Section 33: That portion of the northwest quarter northwest quarter, more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the west line of section 33 which is 456.5 feet south of the northwest corner of section 33, thence running south along the west line of section 33 for a distance of 373.0 feet, thence running east for a distance of 516.8 feet, thence running north for a distance of 132.7 feet, thence running north 65 degrees 06 minutes west for a distance of 570.0 feet along the southwesterly right-of-way of Highway 160 to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by purchase, with donated or appropriated funds, lands and interests in lands within the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park as revised by section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 2, after "sums" add ", but not more than $125,000,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY OF WINSLOW, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7601) for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,868.07 to the city of Winslow, Arizona, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the Government's fair share of the costs for the paving of streets adjacent to United States Government property known as Emmons Dormitory which is a school and dormitory for reservation Indian children and is operated by the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs.

At the time the special improvement district was formed the supervisor of Emmons Dormitory assured the Winslow city engineer and superintendent of streets that the Bureau of Indian Affairs would pay its fair share of the costs on said project. In reliance on this assurance from the supervisor the work was completed and the bill in the sum of $15,868.07 was submitted to the area office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Gallup, New Mexico, but it was then learned that there was no authority for the supervisor's assurance and the bill remains past due and unpaid.

No part of the amount appropriated in the Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay $15,868.07 to the City of Winslow, Arizona, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the Government's fair share of the costs for paving the streets adjacent to the United States property known as the Winslow Dormitory which is a facility for reservation Indian children operated by the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. The payment shall be made out of funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the construction of roads.

"No part of the payment provided for in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any amount not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7400) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to authorize the transfer of unused funds from the administrative expense reserve to the contingency reserves of the several health plans under such act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(b) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (5 U.S.C. 3007(b)) is amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentences: "The Commission, from time to time and in such amounts as it considers appropriate, may transfer unused funds for administrative expenses to the contingency reserves of the plans then under contract with the Commission. When funds are so transferred, each contingency reserve shall be credited in proportion to the total amount of the subscription charges paid and accrued to the plan for the contract term immediately preceding the contract term in which the transfer is made."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' BURIAL ALLOWANCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3941) to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of subsection (b) of section 902 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "or" after "or of a State,", and by striking out ", or a burial association".

(b) Such subsection (b) is further amended by striking out the third sentence.

With the following committee amendments:

After line 6 insert the following:

"(b) Such subsection (b) is further amended by revising the second sentence to read as follows:

" 'No claim shall be allowed (1) for more than the difference between the entire amount of the expenses incurred and the amount paid by any or all of the foregoing, or (2) when the burial allowance would revert to the funds of a public or private organization or would discharge such an organization's obligation without payment.'"

On line 5, page 2, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 13) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I imagine, without going into the history of this bill, and I hope somebody will correct me if I am wrong, that the city of Fayetteville or the governmental entity that donated the land made quite a representation to the Congress that they would give this large parcel of land if they would locate a veterans' facility there and it was on the basis probably of this representation, among other things, that they got the facility. Now they are asking that the land which has not been used by the Federal Government revert without cost to the city of Fayetteville. That is all right since it did not cost the Government anything in the first place, but the point I am trying to make is that they undoubtedly made a very fine presentation to the Congress when they got the veterans' facility. I am not going to object to the bill—but that is the way some of these things go around here sometimes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to section 2 of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Fayetteville, Arkansas, for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described tract of land, which constitutes a portion of certain lands heretofore conveyed by such city to the United States without consideration, and which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States: A tract of land situated in the county of Washington, State of Arkansas, being part of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 16 north, range 30 west, of the fifth principal meridian, and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of section 9; thence south along the east line of said section 9, 660 feet to a point; thence west 165 feet to a point; thence south 100 feet to a point; thence west 733 feet to a point; thence north 350 feet to a point; thence west 435 feet to a point; thence north 410 feet to a point on the north line of section 9; thence east along the north line of said section 9, 1,333 feet to the point of beginning; and containing 19.382 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The land authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this Act shall be conveyed subject (1) to the condition that it shall be used for park and recreational purposes in a manner which, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will not interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital situated on lands adjacent to the land herein authorized to be conveyed, and (2) to the condition that in the event that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines, within twenty years after the date of execution of such conveyance, that the land so conveyed has been devoted to any use other than for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest therein shall revert to and revest in the United States in its then existing condition, and (3) to the gas easement which was granted to the Arkansas Western Gas Company (for a period of fifty years) by the Department of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENEFITS FOR VETERANS WITH CONDITIONAL DISCHARGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2436) to amend section 101(18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(18) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (except for purposes of chapter 33 of this title) includes a discharge or release from the active military, naval, or air service given an individual on the condition that such individual immediately reenter such service.

With the following committee amendments:

In lines 5 and 6 strike out "(except for purposes of chapter 33 of this title)".

In line 9 after "service" insert ", where the service so reentered is terminated by a discharge or release which would disqualify the individual for benefits under this title."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSAL, WITHOUT REGARD TO THE PRESCRIBED 6-MONTH WAITING PERIOD, OF CERTAIN WATERFOWL FEATHERS AND DOWN FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 178 on the Consent Calendar, to the bill, S. 1994, to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to provide for the immediate disposition of certain waterfowl feathers.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of approximately five million eight hundred thousand pounds of waterfowl feathers and down now held in the national stockpile. Such disposal may be made without regard to the requirement of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)), that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE TASK OF PREPARING AN ADVISORY REPORT ON THE STEPS WHICH MIGHT BE TAKEN TO REDUCE THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I called the attention of the House on Tuesday to the action by the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in assigning to me and two of my colleagues, Representatives R. T. HANNA, Democrat, of California, and WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, the task of preparing an advisory report on the steps which might be taken to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit.

My colleagues in the House are all familiar, I am sure, with the message of President Kennedy on July 18, with specific reference to our balance-of-payments problem but because of the detail of his excellent and exhaustive message, I believe that one significant paragraph should be emphasized in pointing to the need for a special study with regard to the imbalance of tourist circulation here and abroad as it affects the overall picture.

The President said:

Another element that requires attention in our commercial transactions is the increase in our unfavorable net tourist balance. With increasing prosperity encouraging American travel abroad, total tourist

> spending in foreign countries rose another 10 percent last year, to nearly $2½ billion. This was partially offset by increased foreign tourist expenditures in the United States, but the net result was an outflow of $1.4 billion, or two-thirds of last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit. This year the cost is estimated to be still greater.

I am sure, in view of the foregoing remarks by Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Patman showed great wisdom in deciding to have this aspect thoroughly explored.

I should like, also, to call attention of the House to a letter I received today from Mr. Voit Gilmore, Director of the U.S. Travel Service of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Mr. Gilmore, a dedicated public servant, has done an outstanding job with limited resources in our efforts to generate more European tourist traffic to the United States which is so helpful in holding down this balance-of-payments deficit. I am sure the situation would be much more serious than that related by the President had it not been for the wise move by the Congress in creating the U.S. Travel Service.

Mr. Gilmore wrote me:

> We believe it is important that your study identify and highlight the relationship of the "tourist dollar gap" in our balance-of-payments situation to the total U.S. balance-of-payments position. Your subcommittee would wish to give careful attention to the fact that U.S. tourist dollars spent abroad help many other countries purchase more U.S. goods and services than we purchase from them.
>
> In studying ways to improve our travel balance-of-payments position, we believe you will find two major areas of emphasis: the "Visit USA" campaign abroad to attract foreign visitors to the United States, and the "See America" campaign aimed at U.S. citizens which is to be energized in 1964. An important distinction exists between the two. Through the U.S. Travel Service, our Government is effectively encouraging foreign travel to the United States with a program that is understood and approved by other governments. The "See America" campaign would logically be mounted by private enterprise, not by Government, because it could not only be disadvantageous to many U.S. organizations engaged in international travel, but also resented by other governments (particularly near neighbors such as Canada and Mexico) as a "don't go abroad" policy. However, substantial encouragement can be given to the American travel industry to enlarge and improve its tourist plant, thus enhancing U.S. travel destinations for U.S. and foreign visitors.
>
> We are at the complete disposal of your subcommittee for such assistance as you would find helpful and we wish you every success in your study.

NEED FOR A CONGRESSIONAL WATCHDOG COMMITTEE OVER THE CIA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned over the way the CIA has carried on its clandestine activities in an uncontrolled and unrestricted manner. For our primary intelligence community to be appropriated funds and design its own course of direction without the benefit of close congressional scrutiny is not only unwise, but also an injustice to the American citizens whom we are sworn to represent.

We need a joint congressional watchdog committee over the CIA. The only argument against such a committee is the trite argument that the Congress cannot keep a secret and this has been disproved by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Bay of Pigs fiasco in Cuba as well as recent developments in South Vietnam clearly show that the CIA and our other intelligence agencies need careful watching and evaluating by the Congress.

The CIA's apparent mistaken role of policymaker in the South Vietnam situation has backfired, and reports advise that the head of operations has been recalled by the U.S. Government. It is the role of the President of the United States to formulate the foreign policy of the United States; not the CIA. The function of the CIA is to gather information, and in some cases interpret it. To go further into the area of policymaking is unpermittable.

An editorial in Sunday's edition of the New York Times calls attention to the problem of the CIA in the area of policymaking and calls for a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence. It is encouraging to notice that more and more the newspapers of this country in their news reports on the conditions in South Vietnam are showing their concern along with Congress over the unbridled activities of the CIA. I have urged the Congress since January to adopt my bill, House Joint Resolution 211, which provides for the establishment of a joint congressional watchdog committee over the CIA and our other intelligence agencies. I feel that history has proved the need for such a committee, and I hope that the United States does not have to be rudely awakened again by another Bay of Pigs or a South Vietnam hassle before it acts.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the New York Times' editorial from Sunday's edition that I mentioned above:

STATE WITHIN A STATE?

> Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?
>
> President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantive corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to make policy.
>
> The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence, it "operates" saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programed, controlled, and directed—tend willy-nilly to influence policy, if not to make it.
>
> The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of kingmakers.
>
> Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us eons away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only code-breaking organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.
>
> But the CIA, like the FBI, has gone too long without adequate congressional accountability. A Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

THE TITO VISIT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks?

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of next week, the White House plans to welcome Dictator Tito of Yugoslavia. I wish to register my opposition to the visit of this missionary of communism.

Frankly, I am at a loss to understand why the President invited Tito to stop in Washington for an informal visit. Surely, the meeting of this assassin with our head of state can only be called a betrayal of freedom's interests.

The United States has nothing to gain from such a visit and a lot to lose. Already we can detect indications of resentment from those in Eastern Europe who are painfully aware of Tito's long record of brutality.

Ask yourself how you would react if you were one of the millions of people enslaved by world communism and saw a picture of President Kennedy shaking hands with Tito on the steps of the White House. Would it be any less revolting than the news photographs published recently of Tito, who has been given $2.5 billion in U.S. aid, and Khrushchev embracing each other when the Kremlin chief spent 15 days in Yugoslavia? This was the occasion when these two Reds told an international news conference that they represented and would work for the same thing: a worldwide victory for socialism.

How can we expect the world to seriously believe that the United States is committed to an all-out effort to defeat Communists when a gangster like Tito is invited to visit the President of the United States? Tito is a Communist dictator who seized Yugoslavia and for years carried on a savage campaign against those who opposed him. Let us never forget that if the United States has to go to war to protect liberty, justice, and religion from the onslaught of communism, Tito and his nation will be on the other side.

I am afraid that the current euphoria over the possibilities for relaxed tensions between the free world and the Communist bloc are lulling us to sleep. Despite the test ban treaty, the proposed sale of wheat to Russia, the toned-down speeches of Russian leaders, there has been no change in the avowed intention of Moscow or Peiping to communize the entire world. I pray there never will be cause for a future author to write "Why America Slept."

Perhaps, we are too far removed from "the scene of the crime" to recognize Tito for what he is. But the Serbian emigrants from Yugoslavia and the people there today know what kind of man Tito is. They shall not forget how he snatched power with the support of Soviet bayonets; how he never has given the people the right of free elections, a free press, or free meetings; how he has killed or oppressed all the proponents of democracy, beginning with Gen. Draza Mihailovic; how he has imprisoned without judge or court more than 7 million voters only because they were for real democracy.

It is regrettable that the past visits to our country by other foes of the United States have not convinced this administration of the sorry consequences which usually follow. With President Kennedy's goodbys still ringing in his ears, Algerian ruler Ben Bella met with Fidel Castro and pledged his undying devotion to Red Cuba's anti-U.S. policy. British Guiana's Cheddi Jagan accepted our hospitality and then denounced us the moment he arrived home. Now he is working on a deal with Moscow to establish a Cuba-style regime. Ayub of Pakistan received lavish White House treatment, but now we are using our foreign aid in an attempt to keep him from the friendly arms of Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, Tito should not be welcomed by this country. I believe the President has made a big mistake in issuing the invitation to him.

STRIKES HURT AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House the plight of the American merchant marine. It it is with deep regret, distress and a sense of frustration that I point out and call to the attention of the House the unusual situation that exists with reference to the ship, the SS *America*. The American merchant marine has received another setback in this instance with the cancellation of the October 4 sailing of one of the finest transatlantic passenger ships. A similar event occurred on September 14 when the SS *America's* voyage was canceled following a labor dispute in which the unlicensed crewmembers walked off the ship making such charges against an engineering officer as, being guilty of religious and racial bias, and the locking of a toilet so that unlicensed crewmembers could not use it.

As a result of this cancellation, 945 passengers already aboard the ship had to either give up their plans to sail to Europe or find alternate means of transportation.

Some 950 passengers were booked for the return voyage.

The October 4 sailing had been booked by 640 passengers sailing from New York, and another 895 on the return voyage from European ports.

Since that time the United States Lines has announced that three cruises of the S. S. *America* have been canceled. The United States Lines applied to the Maritime Administrator for permission to cancel the balance of the schedule for the year, but the administration at this time ruled that at least 2 of the 3 remaining transatlantic sailings must be made.

At the same time there are rumors in the trade that this overage vessel may never sail again, thus reducing the number of jobs available to our merchant seamen.

Scarcely more than a week earlier than the first cancellation, Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the unlicensed seamen's National Maritime Union, proudly announced the reaching of an agreement with passenger and freighter operators which would extend the existing contract from 1965 to 1969. In a report to the union membership Mr. Curran said:

> Your union proposed this long-term contract extension to the shipowners. They wanted stability in the industry so they could make long-range plans to expand their operations and build their fleets. NMU wants that kind of stability too. It will benefit our members and the merchant marine.

After the September 14 walkout the union and the United States Lines Co. submitted the dispute to arbitration, in accordance with the procedure under their contract, but not in time to permit the September sailing to proceed. Now the October sailing is held up even after the arbitrator's ruling that the men should return to work because the indications are that further controversy with the engineers' union will develop.

Mr. Speaker, we have had many months of hearings in the Merchant Marine Committee on maritime labor-management problems. All of the labor leaders and some management officials have told us that there is no situation in which labor and management cannot resolve differences without third party intervention.

Mr. Speaker, while I would not attempt to contend that the cancellation of three sailings of the S.S. *America* creates a national emergency, I must say that I feel that these recent incidents demonstrate very vividly the helplessness of the public as innocent victims of selfish and even childish fighting, with reckless disregard of the responsibilities that both the union leaders and their members should bear.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I refer not only to this incident but the previous situation just a short while ago when we had the whole Atlantic and gulf seaboard tied up. This paralyzed not only passenger and freight vessels of this Nation but cargo vessels and vessels of other nations. The docks on the Atlantic and gulf seaboard were piled high with cargo inbound and outbound. It cost this country millions and millions of dollars and emphasized the undependability of American flag lines. During that controversy the hearings which I have spoken of on the bill H.R. 1897 were proceeding in the House.

During the hearings the gentleman who controls the longshoremen on the Pacific coast testified that if the Atlantic coast, the South Atlantic coast and the gulf port stevedores requested it, he would have locked up the Pacific coast notwithstanding a valid and subsisting contract to work. And you would have had this Nation locked up—lock, stock and barrel—in its commerce, and everything else in the Nation would have had to stop operations in a comparatively short time because all of our industry is dependent to some extent on materials bought or sold abroad.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald-Tribune had an editorial which I shall include in the RECORD at this point.

[From New York Herald-Tribune, Sept. 26, 1963]

ENGINEER AT FAULT—KHEEL

(By Walter Hamshar)

United States Lines yesterday canceled the next sailing of the liner *America*, scheduled for Friday, October 4, after an arbitrator's ruling indicated further controversy instead of a settlement of the dispute which had forced the line to cancel the vessel's September 14 voyage.

Earlier in the day, Theodore W. Kheel, as impartial arbiter, ordered the steamship line to take whatever action may be necessary against Louis Neurohr, the *America's* first assistant engineer, because of charges by the National Maritime Union that Mr. Neurohr had made disparaging remarks about the crew's Negro, Puerto Rican, and Jewish members, and for other alleged activities. The NMU's refusal to sail the ship until Mr. Neurohr's removal had resulted in the cancellation of the September 14 voyage.

CANCELLATION

Mr. Kheel also directed the NMU to order its members to sign on and sail the America on her next scheduled voyage.

But the company gave up its plans for the October 4 sailing after it received an angry message from Mr. Neurohr's union, the Maritime Engineers Beneficial Association. This union demanded the first assistant engineer be continued in his employment at the same time the NMU was announcing that it interpreted the arbitrator's decision to mean that Mr. Neurohr be removed.

After announcing cancellation of the October 4 voyage, John M. Franklin, the line's chairman, said that Mr. Neurohr had been removed from his post without prejudice, pending adjudication of the NMU's charges which the company had to file with the MEBA under Mr. Kheel's ruling.

PROMOTION

Mr. Franklin said the company had complete confidence in Mr. Neurohr's competence as an engineer and that after disposal by the MEBA of the charges, the first assistant engineer will be promoted to chief engineer aboard one of its freighters, with an advance in salary. The promotion would therefore be a device to remove the first engineer from the *America* and allow the ship to sail on her next voyage October 24 to St. Thomas and San Juan.

Mr. Kheel's ruling condemned the NMU and the company for failing to bring him into the dispute until just before the *America* was scheduled to sail September 14. He also

> said that the crew's refusal to sail the ship after signing articles was a matter of the utmost gravity.
>
> MUTINY
>
> Jesse Calhoon, president of the MEBA, called the refusal mutiny. The cancellation of the voyage forced 950 passengers who already had been installed aboard the ship to find other transportation to Europe. The line said last night that 640 passengers had been booked for the canceled October 4 sailing from New York and another 895 from European ports.
>
> While Mr. Neurohr's alleged disparaging racist remarks were at the core of the controversy, Mr. Kheel's decision disclosed that the NMU also complained that the first assistant engineer had sought to direct, supervise and interfere with unlicensed personnel not under his specific authority.
>
> CHARGES
>
> Also that he sought to induce and persuade members of the unlicensed personnel to file grievances and in other ways to cause and create difficulties and dissension, and that in other ways he irritated, annoyed, and harassed members of the unlicensed personnel.
>
> The arbitrator held closed hearings for 3 days last week on the charges. Mr. Kheel did not amplify them in his ruling but pointed out that since Mr. Neurohr elected not to appear as a witness, there was no alternative but to find the charges sustained under the evidence presented.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times had an editorial entitled "The Shipping Blockade." I read from the first paragraph of that editorial:

> A fresh outbreak of interunion warfare threatens to immobilize the merchant fleets of both the United States and Canada. The senselessness, intractability and cost of such bickering in this vital industry make it essential that the two governments supply legislative remedies—as Congress did last month for the railroads—unless voluntary solutions are forthcoming swiftly.

The editorial goes on to say:

> in a field where brother unions are engaged in cannibalistic conflict.

This is strong language to come from one of the great national papers. The editorial concludes by saying:

> Arbitration machinery that covers all the unions, both in their relations with one another and with ship operators, is imperative. The unions should take the initiative in establishing it.

The editorial in full is as follows:

> THE SHIPPING BLOCKADE
>
> A fresh outbreak of interunion warfare threatens to immobilize the merchant fleets of both the United States and Canada. The senselessness, intractability and cost of such bickering in this vital industry make it essential that the two Governments supply legislative remedies—as Congress did last month for the railroads—unless voluntary solutions are forthcoming swiftly.
>
> A second sailing of the liner America has been canceled and the ship is obviously destined for involuntary retirement if no way can be found to substitute impartial judgments for brute force in the feud between its unionized seamen and its engineers. An arbitration award by Theodore Kheel, who administers the contract covering the seamen but has no jurisdiction over the engineers, has merely served to complicate what was already a hopelessly befuddled situation.
>
> This result is not the fault of Mr. Kheel, but of the basic inadequacy of a compartmentalized arbitration system in a field where brother unions are engaged in cannibalistic conflict. That the row will now spread to the rest of the U.S. Lines and ultimately to all American flag shipping is more a probability than a possibility.
>
> The interunion rivalry is even more serious in its application to Canadian vessels because it gravely imperils relations between this country and Canada, which are none too good even without this superfluous strain. American longshoremen are boycotting Canadian vessels on the Great Lakes as a gesture of support for an American-based seamen's union in its battle with a Canadian rival. A Canadian ship has actually been dynamited in an American harbor. Showdowns are at hand on the docks, in the courts, and in the Canadian Parliament, but the outlook for an amicable solution is bleak.
>
> The only men who seem to have any reasonable chance of effecting a workable peace among the squabbling unions are Secretary of Labor Wirtz and George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO. Both are resolutely opposed to legislative compulsion. Accordingly, they ought to join forces at once to demonstrate that there is enough sense of responsibility—or enough sense—among the maritime unions to do what all of them recognize has to be done without the kind of congressional club that was needed to keep the railroads running.
>
> Arbitration machinery that covers all the unions, both in their relations with one another and with ship operators, is imperative. The unions should take the initiative in establishing it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House the report that came down from the Secretary of Commerce to the Merchant Marine Committee on the bill H.R. 1897. It is an unusual report and I read this paragraph from the report which is signed by the Secretary of Labor, Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, who says:

> Accordingly, I would not favor the enactment of H.R. 1897, confined, as it is, to the maritime industry even though this measure would, in my opinion, provide, for the most part, a practical and workable basis for handling national emergency disputes, if applied to all industries in general.

Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine Committee of the House has jurisdiction only over the American merchant marine and maritime affairs. So this is an unusual report. It does not report against the bill; it does not report for the bill. He reports that he would like a bill of this nature to cover all labor disputes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the report that was sent down by the Acting Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.

He says:

> We recognize that the jurisdiction of your committee does not extend to the legislation dealing with labor disputes generally. We hesitate, in view of our previous work, to oppose on that ground alone the legislation which your committee has developed after such patient, diligent, and earnest work. We also recognize that the record of emergency disputes in the maritime field has led to a particular consideration of the problem in the maritime industry and by your committee. While not interposing objection to the enactment of the committee print, the Department of Commerce supports the concept of general rather than industry-by-industry approach to the problem of emergency disputes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point in the RECORD the full departmental report of the Department of Commerce so that those Members of the House who do not have the opportunity to learn the intricacies of this industry which is so important to America, will have an opportunity to read what this committee is endeavoring to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

(The report referred to follows:)

> THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
> *Washington, D.C., September 4, 1963.*
>
> Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER,
> *Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request of August 21, 1963, for the views of the Department of Commerce with respect to the committee print of August 21, 1963, proposed as a substitute for H.R. 1897, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.
>
> We have examined the committee print and believe it is consistent in its major provisions with the testimony given by the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor in their appearance before your committee.
>
> Moreover, the committee print is substantially in conformity with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy report on "Collective Bargaining" except for the basic recommendation that the recommended emergency disputes proceedings be applicable to industry generally rather than to a single industry. The Secretary of Commerce was a member of that Committee and, as Vice Chairman of that Committee, supported the recommendations of the Committee to the President. We still believe that those recommendations would make a significant contribution to strengthen the traditional collective bargaining process.
>
> We recognize that the jurisdiction of your committee does not extend to legislation dealing with labor disputes generally. We hesitate, in view of our previous work, to oppose on that ground alone the legislation which your committee has developed after so much patient and earnest work. We also recognize that the record of emergency disputes in the maritime field has led to particular consideration of the problem in the maritime industry by your committee.
>
> While not interposing objection to enactment of the committee print, the Department of Commerce supports the concept of general rather than industry-by-industry approach to the problem of emergency disputes.
>
> We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.
>
> Sincerely,
> FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr.,
> *Acting Secretary of Commerce.*

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is not the purpose of this committee by this bill to bring on compulsory arbitration. This bill merely lays on the table something that the President could bring up and use, if he so desired, in a case similar to the situation which we had here before us with respect to the railroads.

I, Mr. Speaker, do not hesitate to say I am in favor of men who work and who organize themselves together so that they can obtain their fair share of the earnings from their labor, so that they can obtain their fair share of the comforts and obtain for their families their fair share of the many blessings that we have here in this land.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the rank and file of labor that causes this trouble. It is the leadership of labor. There is a rivalry between labor leadership and that is shown in these editorials.

Mr. Speaker, if any Member of this House will take the time to inform himself with respect to this matter, he will find that that is what brings on the trouble. The average workingman is getting good compensation today. He is enjoying his work, if he were permitted to work. But the desire of the leadership to vie with each other and the trouble we have with interleadership rivalry in labor unions is what is causing the trouble.

We have yet another case. What was to have been the pride of the American merchant marine, the nuclear ship U.S.S. *Savannah*, lies dead in Galveston because the unions, in furtherance of their selfish interests, refused to operate it. That ship was conceived by my committee after extensive hearings, and at the time it was the first and only commercial-type ship employing nuclear power underway in the world. The Government went to great expense to train a crew for its operation to demonstrate to the world what American labor and industry could do in the utilization of this new source of power. Yet, today it is tied up to a pier because labor refused to do its share in making this dream a reality. It was not a question of money, since some of the union members aboard the vessel were receiving compensation that compared favorably with that of a Member of the House. Rather, it was evidence of the interunion rivalry that has plagued the American merchant marine for a number of years, and for which no acceptable solution is in sight.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in arbitration. I believe that good men, with fair intent and intelligent intent, having the interest of those who belong to their unions at heart, should be able to sit down with management and work out their differences. But when the differences are unreasonable and are unworkable, how in the world, Mr. Speaker, can we expect the executives of industry to sit down and give and give and give in to the demands of the leadership of labor.

Mr. Speaker, the executives of the industry have the same responsibility to the men who work in their industry that they have to their stockholders, the capital invested therein, and the welfare of this Nation.

It has come to the point today, Mr. Speaker, that the investor in this country no longer invests in merchant marine shipping and water transportation. He is afraid of it. It is not secure. It is not stable. There has not been a new company organized in this great field in many years.

While other nations are building large passenger vessels, we must console ourselves with a mere handful with little prospect of their replacement when they have reached the end of their useful lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is a bad picture. It is a picture that those Members of this House who are interested in the workingman—who are interested in getting a fair deal for men who labor—should consider seriously.

On Wednesday of this week I expect to call up in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in executive session the bill, H.R. 1897. The labor unions are violently opposed to it. But it will not hurt any labor union in this land. The leadership of labor is opposed to it. They have written all sorts of ridiculous things in their publications. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that those Members of this House who are greatly interested in labor, who come from labor areas, strong labor areas, will look at the bill fairly, and that those people who sent them to Congress will watch carefully their voting. We will be voting to establish procedures that the Congress must eventually come to for the sake of labor itself, for the sake of industry, for the sake of this Nation. You just cannot blindly go on and say that strikes do not hurt. Strikes do hurt. Strikes hurt the men who labor, their employers, and all of us. This type of strike involving the S.S. *America* has no value whatsoever to anyone except power hungry labor leaders. It will affect about 4,000 people directly and indirectly and may cause the loss of an important unit of our merchant marine.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I should like to commend the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina for taking the time to discuss this very serious problem that is before the House. I also commend him and his committee for trying to do something about the problem. I do not know what will be the fate of the bill to which the gentleman has referred. As he well knows, many Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are very skeptical and very hesitant about voting for legislation that might be construed as compulsory arbitration.

Mr. BONNER. May I say that I myself offered the motion in committee to strike out the section of this bill that authorized the President to require submission of contract negotiations to binding arbitration. This bill is similar to the one Congress passed with respect to the railroads. It gives time for collective bargaining to work. If it fails and the President wants to gain time without crippling the economy he can use it for that purpose, and if he does not want to use it he does not have to use it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman for the explanation. There will be questions raised as to what extent the compulsory arbitration principle will be applied. I would like to say this whole question of industrywide strikes is one to which the Congress has not been facing up to, with the exception of the gentleman's committee and the particular industry with which he is concerned. I want to commend him for tackling this serious problem, and I wish that the Congress and other committees with jurisdiction would do likewise.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the proposed sale of wheat to the Soviet Union is currently receiving a great deal of debate and discussion in this country. I think this is as it should be. This is a most important and serious subject. I think it is a subject which requires and deserves the widest consideration and the most deliberate study, taking into account all of the ramifications and all of the consequences before any decision is made.

I think President Kennedy is wise in delaying his decision until all the facts have been properly presented. The President obviously recognizes the many ramifications to this decision and his delay should be comforting to all Americans.

There are those who say this is a one-shot operation. There are those who say we ought to sell this wheat to the Soviet Union now and that really no precedent will be established by such action. Well, I cannot help but feel it is erroneous to say no precedent will be established. The decision that will be made as to whether or not we sell our wheat to the Soviet Union goes to a fundamental plank of our foreign policy; whether we should resume trade with the Soviet Union; it deserves the greatest study. I should like to point out that those who say this is a one-shot operation and that it will have no status as a precedent, are suggesting that we again follow the same kind of piecemeal diplomacy which has constantly gotten this Nation into trouble. And I say, "piecemeal diplomacy" advisedly because we cannot weigh this question of selling wheat to the Soviet Union as an isolated instance. It will have ramifications, I am sure, not only in the United States but throughout the whole world. Should we agree to sell wheat to the Soviet Union, I would not be surprised to hear voices raised in this country within the next few days to send Mr. Castro a great deal of our surplus commodities to help the unfortunate people of Cuba who not only have to suffer the indignity of a slave state under Castro's illegally enforced despotic rule, but who now have had to suffer the ravages of hurricane Flora which has hit that island four different times within the last 4 days. So it would not surprise me to see humanitarian Americans say we ought to help Cuba in this hour of crisis. That is why it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the question of whether or not we sell wheat to the Soviet Union is not one that can be decided on the basis of a one-shot operation, but rather it should be considered in terms of entire global strategy and on the basis of long-range plans of American foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned also about how this whole subject of selling wheat to the Soviet Union began. I have been here long enough to realize, as have most of my colleagues, that these things do not just happen. This whole question of selling wheat to the Soviet Union came up in the form of public discussion here within the last 3 or 4 weeks. One of the things that has somewhat disturbed me is how do these things get started? Who motivates these movements; who cranks up this public discussion? I am sure that those responsible Americans who have entered into this debate since the original suggestions were made, are participating in this debate in the best of good faith.

If press reports are correct, the other day former President Eisenhower spoke out in support of selling wheat to the Soviet Union and I am sure that this represents his good judgment; it represents an honest decision by the former President on the basis of his best judgment and his appraisal of the situation. I am not questioning the motives of those who are now participating in this debate. There are those on the Democratic side who have spoken out equally strongly for this proposal. The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, I believe, has indicated a strong feeling in support of selling wheat to Russia. I make this point merely to emphasize that those who are now participating in this debate, I am sure, are doing so in all good faith and come from both sides of the aisle; from both the Democratic and Republican ranks. This can not under any circumstances be described as a partisan issue because by now leading spokesmen from both parties have spoken for it and against it.

What I am wondering about is how do these things get started in the first instance? Who starts this discussion? Who plants the first stories; who sends up the first trial balloons? Why, all of a sudden, should one of the great burning issues of this country be whether or not we should sell wheat to the Soviet Union? It was less than 12 months ago when we engaged in bitter debate here in this House on the whole question of favored nations treatment to some of the satellite countries of the Soviet Union. Yet here we find some of the most conservative force in America today saying: "Well, we ought to do it; it is good for America and it is good for the farmer."

I would like to see the genesis of this campaign. I would like to see how these things get started. I am reminded that not too long ago we went through a similar experience when a great many decent people and well-meaning people, and Members of this Congress, participated in a heated debate to pass the Philippine war claims bill only to find that buried way down deep in the bushes was a clever lobbyist who cranked this whole thing up only to make a huge profit from those Filipinos who received war damage payments from the United States. You will recall that virtually every newspaper in America urged Congress to pass the bill. Those who opposed it were accused of reneging on a debt of honor. Are we witnessing a repetition of recent history? I am somewhat disturbed in this whole discussion on the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union that nobody has mentioned the international grain dealers nor has anybody suggested how much money they are going to make on this deal. I am interested, though, in the fact that some of the greatest international grain dealers in this country are strongly supporting such sales. I read in the Sunday papers of one large company in Minnesota which seemed to be pushing this the hardest. So I think we ought to find out how do these things get started. I think before a decision is made as to whether or not we are to change fundamental American foreign policy by restoring economic trade with the Soviet Union, we certainly ought to find out who is going to sell this wheat; on what terms, what profits will be made, and what will be the remuneration to the international grain merchants for handling these transactions. These are things that I think we have a responsibility to ask ourselves so that 6 months from now or a year from now we do not have another spectacle such as we saw with respect to the Philippine War Claims Act.

So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these are things that have to be asked before any decision is made. I say that this Nation is being asked to change its basic foreign policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, and if these grain speculators had anything to do with triggering the original discussion, then certainly this fact deserves to be brought out.

I am surprised at another aspect of the discussion. Everybody on this side of the ocean is making statements as to whether or not we should or should not sell the Soviet Union any wheat. It is rather surprising to me that the Soviet Union has not indicated in any way that it wants to buy this wheat. As a matter of fact, it would seem to me that the orderly process of revising American foreign policy would be first for the Soviet Union to make a formal request upon the United States to buy some of its wheat and spell out the terms under which this wheat is going to be purchased and then let the normal processes of our diplomatic relations and regulations dictate the decision.

Here, oddly and ironically enough, I have not seen anything in the record that the Soviet Union actually wants to buy our wheat. Yet we are being torn in a great debate in this country as to whether we should or should not sell it to them.

It seems to me that the President is quite proper in withholding his decision until all these facts are in.

Mr. Speaker, I am not at all persuaded by the statement made over the weekend by the Secretary of the Treasury and other responsible people that this sale, this so-called proposed sale, of wheat totaling $200 million is going to have such a great and profound effect on our balance of payments. If it is going to have that great an effect, then we certainly are in a good deal more trouble than we have reason to believe. We are now engaged in some $14 billion of foreign exports every year. I find it somewhat difficult, therefore, to believe that this proposed $200 million sale of wheat to the Soviet Union is through some miracle going to change the whole picture of our balance of payments. Since $200 million is only a fraction of our $14 billion annual export business, I do not know whether I could be persuaded to believe that this sale of wheat to the Soviet Union will resolve our balance-of-payments problem. Nor do I believe that even if the Soviet Union were to pay with gold for the wheat, would it make such an earth-shaking difference when our balance-of-payments deficit this year will total more than $3½ billion.

I am certain the American people would not object to selling wheat to the Soviet Union if the Soviet Union would agree to certain conditions precedent. I submit that we have a right to ask for these conditions.

I think, for instance, that we have a right to enter into serious discussions with the Soviet Union about withdrawing Soviet troops from Cuba. Certainly Soviet troops in Cuba have no business there—not in the Western Hemisphere. I must say that we are going to find it rather difficult to explain to the American people how we can give the Soviet Union favored-nation treatment through the sale of any wheat or any other commodity when we are faced with the problem of Soviet troops in Cuba on the one hand and a $50 billion national defense budget on the other hand.

Mr. Speaker, I have the feeling that the American people would find this extremely difficult to believe or to agree to such a concept. For this reason I think that before any discussions of resuming trade relations with the Soviet Union are had, before any serious consideration is given to resuming trade relations with the Soviet Union, this country has the right to make certain demands upon the Soviet Union. Is there any doubt that if the tables were reversed, that Soviet officials would be making demands on us before they gave an inch. History proves otherwise and we need only look at Yalta. If there is to be a detente, if there is to be a reproachment with the Soviet Union, then I think it should be a two-sided deal. I do not think we in the United States should bail out the Soviet Union unless we get some concessions. This is the lesson we should have learned from the Soviets who are the best horse traders in the world. Certainly there is no reason, just because they have suffered colossal failures in their collectivized farm system, to believe that this country will serve the cause of peace and freedom by rushing to their rescue today without any concessions to the cause of freedom by the Soviets.

I am not too sure that the American farmer himself is going to be persuaded by these proposals to sell our wheat. Yes, I have heard that there is that segment of American farmers who feel that this is a good way to dispose of some of their wheat. And I am inclined to think that perhaps this is a good way in their opinion. But I should like to remind these very fine people that this is a big country. We have a lot of problems. Piecemeal diplomacy will not solve them.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me, therefore, that if we are to resume trade relations with the Soviet Union there has to be a concerted reappraisal of our whole foreign policy. It should not be done on a piecemeal basis. I think we should sit down and find out exactly what contribution the Soviet Union is willing to make—irrevocable, unequivocal, and trustworthy contribution, if there is such a thing toward restoration of freedom throughout the world. What contribution are they willing to make toward stabilizing East-West relations? Only when we have resolved all the problems of our relationship can we sit down and seriously discuss the possibility of resuming trade relations with the Soviet Union. I do not think we should go into this picture of selling wheat to the Soviet Union as a one-shot operation. This is a subject that requires the greatest consideration and we should give it all the thought we can on a long-range basis.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman for discussing this very important and timely subject on the floor of the House. I agree with a great deal of what he has said. I agree with many of his concerns. I notice, however, that there has been a great effort on the part of some colleagues speaking on his side of the political fence to try to drag as many Republicans into this debate as possible. He mentioned former President Eisenhower as being in support of the sale of this wheat to Russia.

I was interested when I read the newspaper headlines and the leads in some of the stories that former President Eisenhower had apparently placed his stamp of approval on the proposal. But then I read the interview upon which these stories and the headlines were based. I would be remiss if I did not inject in the Record following the gentleman's comment that in reading the interview fully, I could not find where General Eisenhower did put his stamp of approval at all on the proposition. Like the gentleman who now occupies the well of the House, he indicated a number of serious reservations. He stated that it might be approved if it were a good horse trade and that it should be looked at carefully. True, he did not close the door to the possibility that a deal which would be favorable to the United States could be worked out. But as far as putting any carte blanche approval on it, I do not read that and did not read it at all into the interview which was carried on with General Eisenhower in the last few days.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight to that extent.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman would agree with me that there have been some rather impressive voices on both sides of the aisle in support of this idea of selling wheat to the Soviets. I merely mentioned the General, along with the Secretary of Agriculture to demonstrate that there have been very strong voices in both parties in support of this proposal. I do not think this is a one-party issue. I believe some of the Members of the other body from the wheat States who are very strong in their Republican beliefs and who are among the leading spokesmen of the Republican Party, have spoken out in support of this plan.

I do not want to get into a colloquy here as to whether or not this is a Republican or Democratic proposition. I merely mentioned that spokesmen from both parties have been discussing this and this is, perhaps, even a greater reason for concern.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] for bringing this very important matter before the House today. I want to say that I agree with the gentleman in his remarks. I think it is high time that we in this Congress debate this question of whether or not we should change our foreign policy.

I think it would be a mistake, Mr. Speaker, for the American taxpayers to be saddled not only with the burden of defending this country against Communist aggression but also saddled with the burden of bailing out the Russians because of their fantastic failures.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that Russia, before communism, was the largest exporter of wheat in the world. Now they are having to import it because their system has failed.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, the Russians should be using their resources to try to feed their own people and not spending their money trying to bury us. If we feed them and bail them out of this failure then they can use more of their resources trying to destroy us.

I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for bringing up this very important question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add, however, that I have every confidence in the decision that the President will make on this matter and that it is going to reflect the kind of careful consideration that we have proposed here today. I think the mere fact that he has delayed that decision up to now and has not reached any quick decision, indicates that there are some very serious questions being asked as to whether or not we want to renew trade relations in this isolated field, even though they suggest that this is a one-shot operation.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join with the gentleman in the well in expressing my concern for the piecemeal approach that our negotiators often take in dealing with the Communists in general and the Russians in particular. Among the problems that they have not recognized, it seems to me, is the question of fishing trawlers off the coast of Cape Cod. Here they are fishing in great numbers and ofttimes there have been reports that the methods and the type of nets which they are using have not been in keeping with the conservation edicts from the international bodies that regulate fishing in offshore waters.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would commend to the President's attention, and particularly to the attention of those in the State Department who negotiate with the Russians in any area, that they "look at the whole ball of wax."

A condition precedent to any resumption of trade with the Soviet Union, or with the selling of wheat, should be the question of the Russian fleet off Cape Cod living up to conservation measures that are set down in international agreements to which they are a party.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman. He is absolutely correct. It is my hope that the State Department in handing out some of these recommendations will once and for all try to come up with a program that is going to set the pace for the Soviets instead of always reacting to Soviet moves. Since the subject has been put out in the public arena we should tell the Soviet Union and the other satellite governments and the world under what conditions this Nation will entertain suggestions that we sell them our surplus commodities. If we would set down these conditions at this time, in announcing the whole subject we would then be able to recapture much of the world's confidence. We could show the world that this country indeed wants to share its bounty, its good fortune in the way of surplus commodities, but wants to share it with a feeling of dignity. If the other governments want to meet our terms, the American people, I am sure, will welcome a renewal of trade relations with Russia, but unless those demands are met I do not think the Americans will deal with the Soviet Union on its terms. It is time for the United States to state in this very important field what our terms are. We have the initiative and I think we should take advantage of that initiative at this time.

Lest someone argue that since this country gave Poland and Yugoslavia favored nation treatment in the sale of commodities, why not to the Soviet Union, let us not forget that our assistance to Poland was designed to wean her away from Moscow rule; to make her sufficiently independent of the Soviet Union so Poland could ultimately break away from the Communist orbit. In the case of Yugoslavia, our aim was to keep her independence from Moscow.

The current discussion goes to the heart of the entire cold war. Doing business with the Soviet satellites is vastly different from doing business with Moscow itself.

THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, from the grassroots has come an idea that needs our attention today. It is an idea that we have a day set aside when we pay special attention to the free enterprise system—the free enterprise idea as we know it here in this great land of ours. I have talked to a number of topnotch businessmen and others in America, in my community and elsewhere, about this, and they agree with me that free enterprise is an idea and an ideal that needs to be much better understood. Certainly it needs to be more appreciated in America than it is, in my opinion.

It is for this reason I have asked for a special order, during which time I could talk about this question as I see it, and to yield to other Members of the Congress to make their observations known in this Chamber so that they can be placed in the RECORD, be read and referred to by all who would like to know more about it, and who would appreciate knowing the viewpoint of their public servants here in Washington in regard to it.

Recently, I received a letter from an enterprising and very successful businessman, Mr. H. J. (Ben) Lischer, president of Schlegel Drug Stores in Davenport, Iowa, in which he said:

> As a comparatively small business in this day and age of the growth of our country, we heartily endorse the idea of Free Enterprise Day. We, as small businessmen, wish to salute the economic system built on personal incentive and competition as a method of growth and success.
>
> This system, which has made our country the greatest in the world, needs a day of recognition, just as we pause to recognize labor on its day and the day that is set aside in memory of those who fought for our country. Today, also, we are surrounded by other economic philosophies—principally communism—which are doing their best to proclaim the virtues of their systems around the world. So, we, too, should proclaim our wonderful free enterprise system with a day of recognition.
>
> Let us not only protect but further the economic philosophy of our forefathers through national observance of Free Enterprise Day.

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the observations and sentiments of this letter and I am glad to have the opportunity to put it into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, this question deals with a basic freedom that we have known in America for a long time, a freedom I have chosen to call the fifth great freedom—the freedom of movement—the freedom of movement of men and of goods. We in America have in our basic documents been made aware at times of the four freedoms. They too are great freedoms, indeed, among the greatest. They are, as you know, freedom from want and fear, freedom of the press, or expression, and freedom of religion. These are indeed important freedoms that also need to be more appreciated. They need to be preserved, and most of all they need to be understood, not only in this country but in the world.

It seems to me that the most important one—that is, the freedom of movement, the freedom of movement of men, and goods, or as someone has called it, the freedom of mobility—is very necessary if we want the other great freedoms to be preserved and extended.

Our pioneers, who brought the great freedoms here, and who sacrificed to establish them, gave them to us to extend. They also had in mind, though not mentioned, the freedom of movement, for the record shows early in our history they promoted all kinds of opportunities for the movement of people and the products they produced. They as individuals and collectively through their State and National Governments developed canal systems, an economical system at that time. They initiated projects that looked to the development of great rail systems, and developed through private enterprise the greatest rail system the world has ever known. In order to aid business and communication they developed a postal system with a postal road system, so that they could get messages to each other and to every section of the country, messages that helped to carry on business and otherwise abet the American system. In order to reach into the hinterlands and facilitate the western movement they built the Cumberland Road. Then as the opportunities grew and the automobile was invented, they launched on the greatest roadbuilding program the world has ever seen. Since I have been here, the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, has developed and passed legislation for an interstate highway system, a program to give us the grandest nonstop highway system in the world. This when completed will be the finest transportation asset that America has. It will indeed help the free enterprise system we are talking about. It will give us the kind of economic security we are striving for, the kind of security we want our people to have.

This will encourage another great ideal which we can proudly refer to as the American ideal, the idea that I mentioned at the inception of my remarks, that is, the ideal of free enterprise. This free enterprise system has proven to be the best, the least costly, and the most varied and abundant distribution system the world has ever seen.

So I am indeed grateful for this opportunity to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give endorsement and to give encouragement to the proposal to have 1 day in the year on which to pay special tribute to this program we call the free enterprise system.

I am now very happy to yield to a distinguished Representative in Congress, a friend of mine, the gentleman from California, who with me has a deep conviction about the basic freedom we are proud of and boast of here in this country, and who is both willing and able to speak on this important subject today. I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CORMAN].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Iowa for yielding and wish to tell both him and the House that I sincerely appreciate the opportunity of joining him in calling attention to Free Enterprise Day. Mr. Hal Phillips, a constituent of mine and a dedicated American, has been very active in obtaining nationwide support among businessmen and government leaders in gaining recognition of Monday, October 7, as a special day for taking cognizance of the importance of free enterprise in our society. More than 300 businessmen in my own district are participating in this activity today. Because of the dedication of men like Hal Phillips and the interest of the business community typified by those businessmen in my District, Free Enterprise Day has grown from a modest beginning in Massachusetts a year ago to an activity which today has national breadth and national importance.

It is particularly fitting that this House join in this endeavor because we have so recently and so clearly reaffirmed our confidence in our free enterprise system by passage of the 1963 tax bill. By a substantial majority this House confirmed the conviction of President Kennedy that growth and vitality in this Nation is dependent on the private sector of our economy under a competitive free enterprise system. The House took a major step in releasing resources to that sector with the passage of the tax bill. Hopefully the Senate soon will have an opportunity to act on that bill and we will see its results in accelerated economic growth.

More important perhaps than our economic growth or even our high standard of living however, is the individual freedom which flows from a free enterprise system of economy; the freedom of each American to choose his field of employment, to earn a decent living, to save and invest the fruits of his labor and to make a profit from that investment protected from both the interference of government and the predatory forces of monopoly, the broad freedom of choice offered the consumer to select in the marketplace those goods and services which are to his liking. This is the economic system which this Government must and will encourage and strengthen. These are the individual freedoms for which free enterprise stands and the reason that today we especially mark its importance.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert some remarks by a gentleman who has been a champion of the free enterprise system throughout all of his long career in the public service, a gentleman who was selected at the beginning of this administration to serve as Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert the remarks of Secretary Hodges concerning October 7, Free Enterprise Day:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY HODGES IN BEHALF OF FREE ENTERPRISE DAY, OCTOBER 7, 1963

> Free Enterprise Day is an occasion on which all Americans, whatever their calling or pursuit, can contemplate the economic system that has made our country the envy of the world.
>
> Free enterprise is more than simply an idea to which we can all subscribe. It designates the most vital economic system man has ever devised and it is a key factor in our leadership of the free world. Because of it, people of other countries regard the United States as the land of opportunity, the land where the old-fashioned American virtue of hard work enables the individual to rise to whatever station in life his abilities will take him.
>
> The enterprise in free enterprise means hard work, and we should not forget its accomplishments as we place increasing reliance on education, science, and technological

advances. The most sophisticated automated machine will never make hard work obsolete.

Both business and labor share the fruits of the free enterprise system and have an equal stake in its continuing vitality. A free society can remain free only as long as its economic system is vigorous, flexible, and productive. Freedom to work hard and to exercise independent business judgments, not only for our own individual gain but also for the advancement of the Nation, are principles to which we can adhere and which will bring increasingly greater security, happiness and economic well being to all our people.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank my colleague very much for his fine statement. I would like to point out to the House that Congressman JAMES CORMAN joined me this morning to visit Mr. Hodges and while we were there we had a very fine conversation about the virtues of celebrating this day and about some of the things that need to be done to better serve freedom in this area. I appreciate the gentleman's very fine and very appropriate remarks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I yield at this time to my distinguished colleague from the 12th District of Massachusetts. It is particularly appropriate to hear from HASTINGS KEITH today since free enterprise was originated in his congressional district. While in the Congress, he has earned for himself a reputation as a front-ranking defender of our economic system. He has been and is very enthusastic about this idea. He is a fine Representative with both understanding of and dedication to the basic freedoms that characterize America.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman at this time.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention that Free Enterprise Day was conceived in Falmouth, Mass., by a local chamber of commerce that desired in some way to express their feelings about the great economic freedom enjoyed in this country.

It is no coincidence that this idea was born on Cape Cod, Mass.—a place where our free enterprise system has flourished since the days of the Pilgrims. It is in the American tradition to pause periodically and reflect on some of the major elements of our great American heritage. It is altogether fitting that we set aside a day to reflect and reconsecrate ourselves to the economics as well as the spirit of free enterprise.

Some would say that it is inappropriate to reconsecrate ourselves to an economic system—that this kind of devotion should not be spent on things which are material. This would be true if we were only talking about a system through which goods and services pass from one to another; but this is not so.

Man is a spiritual, social, political, and economic animal. He does not "live by bread alone," but he must have bread to live. Free enterprise is the best system ever devised by which man can earn that bread, while at the same time maintaining his integrity and freedom as an individual. Our political, social, and spiritual traditions all emphasize the dignity of man—as, too, does our economic system. When a man is not economically free, he will not be free at all.

Other economic systems—from feudalism to communism—make the people subjects rather than active participants. The 16th century serf was required to do what he was told, so too, is the 20th century comrade. This must be so when one's next meal comes from the man giving the orders. It does not necessarily follow that a man lacks liberty solely if he does not have economic freedom. However, an atmosphere which encourages economic freedom is an atmosphere which is conducive to total freedom.

Free enterprise is one element of our freedom as Americans. We must defend it as we defend the others. We are involved in a life and death struggle with the most menacing and completely materialistic enemy in the history of man. It is well that we pay tribute to our own system, which, instead of requiring us to be slaves, allows us to be free.

I therefore ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting the Falmouth Chamber of Commerce and those other groups who have recognized the importance of celebrating a Free Enterprise Day.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I realize, of course, that free enterprise is something we should appreciate every day in America just as we appreciate every other freedom that we have as Americans and we should be deeply proud of the many freedoms that we have here in this great land of ours. They are the heart of our heritage and should be appreciated and talked about more than they are.

Monday, October 7, will be celebrated in thousands of communities in America as Free Enterprise Day. In cities from coast to coast ceremonies are taking place and thousands of business establishments are displaying free enterprise signs and issuing free enterprise proclamations.

As already indicated, Free Enterprise Day was first celebrated some years ago when a group of businessmen in Massachusetts decided they wanted to do something to celebrate the American way of life and to celebrate an important phase of it in the business community at least.

I cannot think of any day that could be more appropriately representative of America than a Free Enterprise Day. Our basic beliefs, our very national heritage are deeply rooted in the principles of free enterprise.

I would like to point out now by reflecting on history and remind you that free enterprise in America began with Jamestown. This colony was started with communal ownership of property and immediately as we reflect on history, we note that it was handicapped with greater determination for equal shares than willingness to contribute equal effort. It was saved when people were allowed to own land and to reap the rewards of their labors. The Pilgrim Fathers had much the same experience. Originally, they agreed to own everything in common. But there was such a lack of initiative that they nearly starved.

Finally the Governor and other leaders of the colony realized that they were making a great mistake. So they turned away from communal ownership and gave each family a plot of land for its own use. When the harvest was gathered, instead of famine they had plenty. And so they gave thanks to God. Thus the beginning of our Thanksgiving Day.

What do we mean by free enterprise? We hear terms such as private enterprise, free private enterprise, competitive economy, capitalism, and others, but there is one basic and very important element ever present in our American free enterprise system—that is freedom of the individual to act within the limits of the laws according to his own dictates.

The American freedom of enterprise is founded on the noble premise that individualism is the foundation of society; that every individual is a freeman and under God has the right to so use his abilities as he see fit. He may enter upon or depart from any enterprise as he deems to be in his interest. He is free to succeed or fail, to be right or wrong in his judgment as to what undertaking he may attempt.

Our free enterprise system is based on these simple principles:

First. Individuals are free to act independently or in voluntary cooperation with others to expend their energies, talents, and resources to improve their circumstances as they see fit.

Second. They are entitled to the rewards of these endeavors in porportion to the value of their services or products as determined by the free choices of customers in a free market.

The record shows, Mr. Speaker, that vast majorities of businessmen recognize that their best rewards; that is, the reward which comes from the satisfaction of a job well done, as well as monetary reward, comes to those who serve the best. This idea springs from what we have known in American as the Golden Rule and it is applied often in business. Successful businessmen know that they are entitled to rewards but they know also that the rewards of reputation of service is the best reward which can come to them and to business.

Third. They are accorded the right to possess and accumulate property for their own material welfare.

Here we have the transition step, ownership of property, in the free enterprise system from the simple barter method to capitalism. Thus the basic concept of free enterprise is not new. It is as old as history and is the natural outgrowth of man's effort to meet his human needs. Therefore I think that it is clearly discernible why the free enterprise system serves best the interest of mankind. It is the formulation of a system to the pattern of human nature rather than endeavoring to force human nature into a set pattern or system.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I would like to associate myself in this observance of Free Enterprise Day.

Mr. Speaker, the development and success of American free enterprise economy is an outstanding achievement in the history of civilization. Its strength is in its freedom. The spirit of competition, sometimes fierce, has compelled progress—new and more efficient ways of production, of manufacture, of distribution.

We have been blessed with great natural resources—but other nations of the earth have greater. Our people, however, have been industrious and inventive, and have been foremost in converting our resources to the benefit of the Nation and the world. It could not have come about, save for the freedom which our people have enjoyed—freedom from oppressive government restriction which smothers incentive and ambition.

One of the strongest bulwarks in our free enterprise system is American agriculture. Our family farms in a free enterprise economy have produced abundantly, with a record of progress in cultural and marketing practices unmatched in world history.

Contrast, if you will, the sorry plight of the Soviets, who do not believe in free enterprise. They place their trust in bureaucratic planning and their agricultural system is a shambles.

An excellent description of the situation in Russia is depicted by Paul Wohl, a special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor in Berlin, who wrote in the October 2, 1963, issue of that newspaper as follows:

SOVIETS FACE TOUGH WINTER

(By Paul Wohl)

> This will be a hard winter for the Soviet Union and most of the bloc.
>
> Either Moscow will have to sell unprecedented quantities of gold and oil in the world market to pay for massive imports of food and fodder—much larger and more variegated than the more than 6 million tons of wheat and wheat flour contracted in the past few weeks—or the Soviets will have to cut down their food consumption drastically. Political consequences are unforeseeable.
>
> What has hit the Soviet countryside this year is so extraordinary that the most careful characterization must sound sensational.
>
> The bleak outlook is worsened by the plan's high hopes, by the contrast between Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev's indefatigable efforts and the performance of the bureaucrats, by the optimistic long-range perspective held out by visiting American farm exports and what appears to be the actual situation.
>
> The causes of the emergency certainly could not be discovered on the farms visited by the American experts or in the figures published up to July. Fields and farms looked quite well this summer.

DELAYS TRACED

> Not nature but people seem responsible for this year's failure—a failure which has undone much of the progress of the good years in the early phase of Mr. Khrushchev's experiments. The full extent of the failure cannot be measured.
>
> Describing conditions in a traditionally rich farm area in Russia's black earth belt, the Soviet farm daily Selskaya Zhizn wrote on July 19: "Many collective farm peasants have lost faith in mother earth; they could not behave more indifferently toward the land which is the property of the collective farms."
>
> In August, crop reports became shorter and shorter. To quote Selskaya Zhizn of August 30 on conditions in Gorky Province:
>
> "At the present rate of work, the crop will not be harvested before the end of September." The first night frosts were reported from Moscow on September 14. The causes of delayed harvesting, according to Selskaya Zhizn, are always the same, "lack of organization and poor utilization of equipment."
>
> The indifference of the peasants was only one factor. Other factors were the administrative confusion, the ineptness and lethargy of procurement services, a faulty supply system.

EROSION REPORTED

> Slaughterhouses refused to accept livestock, machine repair services were unavailable. The apparatus behaved like a faulty vending machine in which a dime has been dropped and which, with much rattling and shaking, produces nothing.
>
> Bad weather played a secondary role.
>
> In Kazakhstan, the virgin-land granary, erosion is said to have set in. Selskaya Zhizn on August 31 significantly published a full-page article telling about Canadian experiences in fighting erosion.
>
> The Premier's insistence on immediate abandonment of crop rotation in favor of continuous cropping has curtailed pastures and spread confusion on the farms. Even if available facilities would have been used expertly, there was not enough equipment and fertilizer to make continuous cropping a success.
>
> Under the circumstances Mr. Khrushchev's experiment has disastrous results.
>
> Only the lower Volga Valley and the North Caucasus region, the so-called Kuban, reported substantial grain deliveries, but a good crop in the Kuban alone cannot change the overall picture.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for those very appropriate and timely remarks in regard to the American free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that Karl Marx once said that those who own property are free and those who do not are not free.

To this statement of Marx we can give some credence. However, illogically, he deduced that greater freedom would be achieved through the abolition of private ownership of property; and proposed Government regulation and ownership of all property in the form of state socialism. Thus, if we follow Marx's statement to its full cycle he actually proposed that no one be free—this is socialism, or Marxism, or communism, or some other "ism" of which we want no part here in America.

During the period from 1820 to the present time more than 40 million immigrants have come to the United States. We all know that in general these forebears of ours did not bring property with them. But think about what we have done under our American free enterprise system about those people who had no property and thus were not free, according to Marx. Thank God we did not seek to destroy all individual freedom by turning over all property rights to the state and thus enslaving everyone. No; through the ingenious workings of our free enterprise system we took the high road, and today we have a country of capitalists as defined by Marx. Approximately 17 million American families own stock in our industrial complex; 127 million Americans have savings accounts in the various forms of our banking institutions; 118 million own life insurance policies; 21 million have an interest in pension or profit-sharing plans; and 10 million, including farmers, own their own business. This list could be continued almost ad infinitum.

Not only are we a land of capitalists where the vast majority have a right to and do possess property but there is another marked difference between our free enterprise system and the planned economies. The mark of the planned economies is scarcity as compared to the mark of our economy—abundance.

It is time that we talked about this because they are asking us for grain to supplement the grain that they do not have for their own people and which I believe they could have if they had a different system than they now have. We have recently seen where Russia has had to turn to the Western World to procure wheat to meet the basic needs of its people. A recent article in Newsweek magazine entitled "Soviet Union: Food Failure" reads in part as follows, and I think portrays the basic weakness of the state-planned economy. I should like to quote a few pertinent facts from this article:

> One hundred million acres of new lands in Kazakhstan have produced only two good harvests in the last 7 years. Khrushchev blamed his economists. "We export mineral fertilizers because our economists have not learned yet to calculate realistically," he said. "It would be better to put a ton of these fertilizers in the earth." The Soviet Premier then announced Russia's intention to boost agricultural investments to increase fertilizer production, and to accelerate the output of farm machinery.
>
> Neither measure would do much to solve Russia's agricultural problems, U.S. specialists thought. One of them who traveled throughout Russia last month, saw huge quantities of fertilizer wasting at railroad stations. Asked why they didn't use it, local farmers replied: "It's too expensive, and we don't have transportation to bring it to the fields anyway." Nor is machinery used to full capacity, the specialist said. Nearly 40 percent of available tractors are at repair stations, and Russia does not have enough mechanics to make repairs even if they had the spare parts, which they don't. He concluded: "The farmers feel that they are underpaid, that they have little to say about planting their crops and in managing their collective farms. The Soviet Government eventually will have to give more freedom to these farmers. Otherwise, Russia will never have enough food."

Thus we have a parallel to our experiment with communal property at Jamestown and Plymouth of 350 years ago.

Now the United States with approximately 7 percent of the world's land area and 6 percent of the world's population has developed the capacity to produce almost half of the world's wealth. Four families out of every five in the United States have an automobile, 96 percent of American homes have radios, 91 percent have televisions, again this list could be extended to innumerable other items.

Not only does the American consumer have more of the world's goods than any other group but our free enterprise system is the source of constantly improving living standards of our population. At the turn of the century the average American worker's income was almost entirely consumed to meet his family's basic needs—food, clothing, and shelter. Such intangible necessities by present-day standards as expenditures for education, medical treatment, insurance, travel, and all forms of luxuries represented a small fraction of the average family budget.

We have seen a rather constant increase in the average income of individuals. In 1962 the personal income reached an all time high in the United States of $2,360 for every man, woman, and child of our national population. Not only have average incomes been rising but the percentage of family incomes required to meet basic necessities have been dropping. It is estimated that approximately 60 percent of the average family income is used for the basic needs that half a century ago consumed almost all of it. And I am sure that we would agree that the American people are better fed, clothed, and housed today than ever before even though these necessities are consuming a lesser percentage of family incomes.

Now one of the reasons of the success of the free enterprise system is that it is mobile and adaptable. It is responsive to the desires of the consumer. Each day American consumers are constantly determining the businessman's plans of future production. Planning of production under our system is controlled by the users in their acceptance or rejection of products in a free market. This is as it should be for the very purpose of any economic system is to satisfy the wants of the populace and no other system has ever met this challenge as our American form of the free enterprise system has. No other system places so high a premium upon individual responsibility, merit, and leadership as our free competitive economy. Yet no other system comes so close to providing satisfaction of the human needs and wants.

The heart of American heritage has been and should forever be freedom. Can we have political freedom if we do not have economic freedom? I ask you to ponder a moment the degree of political freedom enjoyed by their inhabitants of various lands and compare it to the degree of economic freedom enjoyed by these same people. I believe that you will agree with me that there is a corollary between the two. Thankfully we have an enviable positon in the world in both of these areas of freedom.

Our American free enterprise system has achieved its results because it cooperates with and it patterned to fit human nature. This is as it should be. The world belongs to mankind and should be molded to fit its needs and wants.

We must not endeavor to mold mankind to fit some preconceived system or plan. Free enterprise is the motor of the vehicle that has made the United States the strongest nation industrially and rewarded its people with the highest standard of living in the world.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning, I cannot think of any day that is more representative of the American way of life than Free Enterprise Day. I am most pleased to proclaim my recognition of this day. Further, I would say that not only should we recognize Free Enterprise Day today, but that we should individually dedicate ourselves toward furtherance of this wonderful system which has rewarded us so generously.

Mr. Speaker, Free Enterprise Day has received its greatest impetus from one of the finest and most outstanding drug companies in America—the Rexall Drug Co. They have responded to the demands from the grassroots and have made the experience of this idea in other parts of America known to all their independent store operators who have in many cases and almost always cooperated with the ideas in their community.

Rexall Drug Co. was founded 60 years ago this year in Boston by Louis K. Liggett. Originally there were 40 persons who helped to establish it. Today, there are nearly 11,000 Rexall drug stores in the United States. These drug stores are all individually owned by independent American businessmen. They are franchised to sell Rexall products. Rexall franchised drug stores make up the single largest affiliated group of drug stores in the country representing approximately 18 to 19 percent of the total number of drug stores in the United States. President of the Rexall Drug Co. is John Bowles, a native of Monroe, N.C. Mr. Bowles attended the University of North Carolina.

Free Enterprise Day is the largest program undertaken by the Rexall Drug Store owners of America. In 1959, Mr. Bowles and the Rexall store owners were invited by the Department of Commerce to assist in an international trade fair which was being held in Poznan, Poland. Mr. Bowles responded by going to Poznan in setting up a typical American drug store behind the Iron Curtain. This drug store was the most successful exhibit at the fair. In 1959, the Rexall Drug Store owners conducted a nationwide "let's all register, let's all vote" campaign whereby each Rexall Drug Store became a center for voting and registration information for the local community. The significant thing is that the information provided by each drug store was the latest up-to-date local information for the area where the store was located.

In 1960, in response to requests from the Secretary of Commerce and President Kennedy to boost the economy, the Rexall druggists launched "Operation Challenge"—a program to increase business in the country. Operation Challenge resulted in the buying and selling of several million dollars of additional goods throughout America.

In 1961, with the cooperation of the Department of Defense, Rexall drugstores throughout America were set up as local centers for civilian defense information. Each of the Rexall drugstores provided free information on civilian defense measures for the general public.

This year, the same Rexall druggists are leading America in establishing Free Enterprise Day. The Rexall Drug Co., through the help of John Bowles, is providing them with technical assistance and material for display.

The person within this organization who has given unstintingly so much of his time, talent, and energy to promote this idea is "Mr. Rexall"—Arthur P. Boyle, president, Rexall Club International.

Mr. Boyle is a pharmacist. Born at Patton, Pa., July 7, 1903, Art Boyle had his first job in a drug store in 1919, assigned to the ice cream fountain.

> Those were the days when we chipped our own ice and packed down the ice cream with salt—

He reflects—

> I worked from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. filling ice cream orders—in those days we didn't have 97 flavors as we do today.

Art moved to Buckley, Wash., with his family in 1922, enrolled at North Pacific College of Pharmacy & Dentistry in Portland, Oreg., and graduated in 1926. All that time he continued to work in drug stores.

> It was an era when a person could walk into a drug store and buy a vial of morphine without a doctor's prescription—

Art recalls.

> Times have changed.

After graduation, he practiced professional pharmacy at St. Joseph's Hospital, Tacoma, for 9 years, and taught at St. Joseph's School of Nursing for 11 years. In 1939, he bought his first retail pharmacy and added a second store a year later. He has since served on the board of managers for Washington State Pharmaceutical Association, and was an organizer of the Pierce County Pharmaceutical Association. He is located in Tacoma.

PRESIDENT REXALL CLUBS INTERNATIONAL

Long recognized for his driving energy and imagination, Art Boyle was fittingly elected president of the International Association of Rexall Clubs for the Diamond Jubilee Year, 1963, succeeding J. B. McCaleb, of Savannah, Tenn. In that capacity, he rules over Rexall Clubs in 47 States and 7 foreign countries—upward of 12,000 Rexall stores. Art has been part of the Rexall family since 1919. The IARC was established 48 years ago to provide a common meeting ground for the exchange of ideas among Rexallites and to help them further community service through supplying health needs to the public. Art Boyle, as president, flies 100,000 miles a year throughout the United States and Europe, delivering lectures.

FAMILY MAN—CIVIC LEADER

Art Boyle has been married to the former Edith LeLoupe, of Buckley, for 33 years. They are the parents of four sons—a trucking executive, two teaching school, one in the Air Force. His outside activities include Serra International, Knights of Columbus, Mountain View Sanitarium, and working with the Boys Club.

ART BOYLE SPEAKS OUT

Excerpts from his speeches—on longevity:

> In the time of ancient Rome, a new-born child's life expectancy was only 22 years. Today it is 70 years—and by the year 2150 it'll be 150. This increase in life expectancy can be credited to our medical research explosion. Why, 7 of 10 prescriptions filled today were not even available 10 years ago. The combined efforts of doctors, pharmacists, nurses, hospitals, university, and industry research scientists and drug manufacturers have dramatically reduced children's deaths, maternity deaths, deaths from infectious diseases, and polio deaths. We're living in a fantastic era.

On drug costs:

> For years drugs in the United States top those of any other country in quality and safety, yet—and get this—do you realize that the typical American spends 25 cents of each dollar he earns on food and tobacco, 25 cents on housing, 10 cents on clothing and jewelry—and only 1 cent of each dollar on drugs?

On college scholarships:

> As a product of the school of hard knocks—where you go out and earn your own education—I am dead set against giving money for college scholarships. I'd rather see a program devised whereby a student could apply for a loan, using it to go to college, and paying it back after graduation and he is earning money. In short, I'm against free rides. I want the student to appreciate his education and to earn it.

On Rexall self-identification:

> The first rule of merchandising is to have a good place to sell your merchandise. Now that's your drug store. Let's stop and take a look at it. Is it neat, clean, well-lighed, departmentalized, with adequately arranged displays? Mass displays at featured spots, spacious isles? This is what your customers see in competitive supermarkets—this is what they want. This is what you'll have to try to give them. Is your store identified as a Rexall Store so that when the public reads or listens to our ads they'll know where and when to go to buy Rexall products? Year after year you spend a lot of your own money (and more of Rexall's) to advertise your store, Rexall products, and sundries. All this flows down the drain if you're not identified as a Rexall Store.

On salesmanship:

> A successful salesman must be enthusiastic, intelligent, congenial, imbued with the power of positive thinking—one that people will drive miles to do business with. He is a person who forms a habit of doing the things other salesmen don't like to do. Remember the three H's—happy, hobby, habit. Form the habit of doing the hobby you are happy to do. It pays off in sales.

On organization:

> This is the age of organization—trade unions, fraternal orders, social clubs, kids' programs—everything from the AFL–CIO to the Blue Birds. All this adds up to only one answer for today's independent druggist. He'll either organize or be ostracized. Here is my proof: on the avenue where I operate my McKinley Hill store, less than 15 years ago there were 34 independent businesses; now there are only 4 still open. If the independent is to survive it must organize with other independents or lose out to chain giants.

Mr. Speaker, this ideal for Free Enterprise Day has been noted by 20 Governors of America. There are 13 who have proclaimed a Free Enterprise Day in their States. My record may not be complete but from a good source I find the following Governors who have issued a special proclamation in which they give endorsement to and encouragement to free enterprise and Free Enterprise Day: Frank G. Clement, Tennessee; Carl E. Sanders, Georgia; Frank B. Morrison, Nebraska; Bert Combs, Kentucky; J. Millard Tawes, Maryland; John M. Dalton, Missouri; Paul J. Fannin, Arizona; Terry Sanford, North Carolina; Albert D. Rosellini, Washington. I am sure there are others. In fact I am sure that every Governor in the States believes in our free enterprise system.

I am glad to have this opportunity to speak for, to aid and abet, and to otherwise encourage the extension of every freedom that we cherish as Americans and especially the free enterprise system that has done so much for so many people here in our country and has given freedom-loving people everywhere so much hope and encouragement.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, our forefathers left us a great legacy. Individual initiative and self-reliance are qualities which we, as Americans, have inherited. Such traditions are much more than mere abstractions—they are reflected in every facet of our society. Free enterprise is a prime example—a system of economic organization which best captures the basic spirit of man. Every living thing strives for freedom. Foremost within man's nature is his natural disposition to remain free, to exercise his free will. It is contrary to the nature of man to subjugate himself to an ironclad regimen, to totalitarian discipline.

The great test of our time is the clash and competition among ideologies. In addition to being a political system communism is an economic system—one with which the leaders of the Communist world have threatened to bury us through economic warfare. Our form of economic organization—that of free enterprise—is now on trial for its life.

Time and human experience have given trial to many grand and not so grand economic designs through the ages. Another chapter in that competition is being written at this very moment.

Individual initiative and the profit motive provide incentive lacking in the sterile environment of an impersonal state-owned and state-directed regime. The vigor of the competitive free enterprise economy is self-generated, not the product of artificial incentives from without or fear of reprisal.

America has a free enterprise economy. The productive energy of our great system has given us a level of economic and material prosperity never before attained. The productive power and the creative genius of the American adventure into a free enterprise economy provides an example for other freedom-loving people.

Today, within the Iron Curtain countries, the inevitable winds of discontent and unrest are beginning to blow. As prosperity and living conditions steadily improve in these countries, independence awakens. This is not to claim that these peoples necessarily want a government or a life exactly like ours. However, there is no question that they are beginning to realize the existence of and yearn for the freedom which we take as a fact of life. Even today there are reassuring signs that the yoke of tight control may be supplanted by a larger measure of personal freedom—because their governments have no choice.

The American example of industrial might and productivity has been realized through the vigor of free competition. Free enterprise is our blessing, and too infrequently we give recognition to the principles which have made this Nation truly great. Formal recognition by the establishment of a Free Enterprise Day is, therefore, fitting and proper.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take particular pleasure in associating myself today with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and the other gentlemen commenting on private enterprise. It seems to me to be altogether appropriate—perhaps even getting somewhat late—for the Members of this body to lean back and look at freedom, individual initiative and free enterprise with studied perspective.

Are we keeping our freedoms—the backbone of our Republic—intact? Or are they being eroded? Do we have complete freedom except in areas where it might do harm to others, or are we now restricting freedom in areas where some bureaucrat—perhaps erroneously—decides it may be in the public interest?

Are we encouraging free enterprise by word and deed, or are we stifling it by more and more restrictive regulations and by injecting the government and taxpayer dollars into competition with private business?

One of the first impacts Washington has on a new Congressman is that our government is big. Big in interests, big in costs, and big in plans and performance. For instance, if our national debt reaches the anticipated peak of $320 billion, as our fiscal planners estimate, it will have increased $37 billion in 3 years—a frightening 1 billion a month since January of 1961.

In June of this year, at the end of the current fiscal year, the Federal Government had $87 billion in appropriated but unspent Federal funds, and it is asking for almost a hundred billion more for next year. And, the Government has added almost 200,000 more employees.

These are accepted facts of life in Washington, swallowed with satisfaction or regurgitated in anger, depending mostly on the political philosophy that motivates the man who has to face the facts in Congress.

They exist and there is no avoiding them. They exist alongside the fact that we have a finger in almost every international pie on the globe, and we are now reaching for the pie that is supposed to be in the sky and on the moon.

They exist alongside the fact that we are a growing nation—our cities have been exploding—our population racing toward the 200 million mark—spurred on with considerable impetus, I might add, by that remarkable mother in South Dakota and her spectacular demonstration of fertility.

Perhaps as a newcomer in Washington I am fortunate. I have had an opportunity to look at many of these Federal functions with some detachment because they are a going concern and the question is not whether they are particularly good or bad, but where they are leading us as a nation.

Just 53 years ago we were a nation of less than 100 million people. Many of you will agree that you were little concerned with Washington and that Washington was little concerned about you and you got along all right. There was little Federal regulation, little Federal coercion and little Federal money trickling down.

Today, as we near the 200 million mark in population, Federal interest in our affairs has not doubled as our population, it has increased ten thousand fold.

Why, as we grow more numerical, must we grow more rigidly regulated in our personal affairs? Why is there a numerical limit on our personal liberty—and will it grow more rigid when we are 300 or 500 million Americans? I do not know, but I spend a good deal of my time and thoughts on trying to find out, because it is a fact that this grasp for power is increasing.

In the entire session of the 87th Congress the President made 88 requests for Federal spending and 29 requests for increased Executive powers. In the first 6 months of the current Congress—the 88th—the President has made 207 requests for money and 70 requests for increased Executive power. Herein lies the underlying point of contention in the debate recently on the tax bill. All of us were for the tax cut and 155 of us wanted a positive program of expenditure control so we could afford the tax cut.

I do not, I repeat, point to these facts other than to state that they are facts and we must be deeply aware of them. I cannot condone their existence or herald their virtues as some do. I simply think it is time for all of us to examine them in detail.

And when we have done this, we should rededicate ourselves to the encouragement of our citizens to a program of self-sufficiency and a lesser dependence upon the superficial resources of the Federal Government. As we advance toward a program of orderly progress, it is more important than ever that we abide by the basic concepts of our competitive free enterprise system and work to strengthen it in order to meet the major economic competition throughout the world.

All we need do is to pull the bit out of the mouth of the private enterprise system—by making increased rewards for initiative the accepted practice—and our Nation will run with a free head out of our present economic crisis.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the distinguished and able gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] for his great tribute to our free enterprise system. The free enterprise system is the very foundation stone of the American way of life. It fosters private property, initiative, independence, and individual rights. The American free enterprise system carved out of the most undeveloped continent in the world the most highly developed and productive civilization in all history. The free enterprise system in the United States made of us the arsenal of democracy in war and since the war we have furnished the whole world with much of its food and fiber.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was simply the profit motive, the capitalistic system that gave to this Nation the highest wages and best working conditions in the history of the world. Our working men and women have over half of the world's automobiles, over half of the world's radios and television sets, washing machines, and so forth. We have the best medicare, best hospitalization programs, and best library system, finest roads, telephones, and railroad system on the face of the earth. We have more churches than the rest of the world combined.

This is the story we need to tell the world. Africa, South America, and Asia need this dynamic, progressive, economic philosophy to get their own economy moving.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] for taking this special order in honor of Free Enterprise Day, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks and make a few additional comments of my own.

I have always believed that the American way of life was the free enterprise, capitalistic system. Our early American settlers made an effort to establish a collectivist system with common warehouses and common distribution to all regardless of his own production. This system failed miserably, as it has in every country which has tried it. Since these early efforts, Americans swung into the free enterprise system with the profit reward for industry and ingenuity.

Under this system, America became the greatest producer of true wealth of any other nation in the history of the world. The system of free enterprise which gives one a hope and a promise of reward for his efforts, has always been the hope of every individual. It has made it possible for a bootblack or a paperboy to become a giant of industry, and with this phenomenal growth in industry and agriculture, we have brought to the American people the highest standard of living known to man.

I know that each of us in his own community can point with pride to some great industry which grew from a small "mustard seed." One of these great examples is Knott's Berry Farm in my own county. I can well remember when Mr. Walter Knott arrived in Orange County, Calif., with nothing but a few family possessions and an idea and a determination to show what can be done in this great country of opportunity. He started out with a roadside stand, not much larger than one of the rooms in my office here, and in the space of some 45 years, he has become nationally and world famous. It should not be overlooked that Cornelia Knott, his wife, and his four children have been working side by side with him all these many years. Their dining room alone oftentimes feeds as many as 17,000 people in 1 day, and their "ghost town" exhibits are enjoyed by millions of Americans each year.

Those who have been in Washington for the past half century can well remember that Mr. Marriott started the Hot Shoppes with a single hotdog stand. These are examples of what can be done under the free enterprise system.

Government competition in the private segment of our industry is attempting to destroy free enterprise, and to supplant it with monolithic Government production and distribution. It is high time that the Federal Government should withdraw from these operations which are not specifically permitted under the Constitution. Government ownership and private ownership are opposed to each other and the two systems of collectivism and free enterprise cannot coexist. Only one can emerge successful. An examination of the collectivist systems throughout the world should warn us against the destruction of the capitalistic system which we have in America.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject I have just discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SOUTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I throw up my hands in despair over the recent events in the unfortunate country of South Vietnam. The unresolved issues in that strategic nation amount to increasing concern for all of the free nations in the world face to face with the increasing Communist designs in the area.

With millions of Americans, I am disturbed with the worldwide wanderings of the would-be first lady of the land, the sister of President Diem, Madame Nhu.

This charming lady, Mr. Speaker, is one of the potentially dangerous political figures in the world today.

What is tragic is that with all of our problems with enemies she has managed to become one of the greatest. At the same time, the country for which unfortunately she has become the spokesman has been the beneficiary of great amounts of economic and military aid.

What has she done to thank us? She has insulted the President of the United States, the presence of U.S. military troops and almost everybody else under the rising and setting sun.

She has become a thorn in the fight for democracy around the world and we are beginning to treat her as a world figure of importance, which is precisely what she wants. No one in recent history has captured the imagination of the press in various parts of the world to the extent that this shrew has.

What I want to know, Mr. Speaker, is this:

How long is the United States going to tolerate this woman?

We seemed to have reached the desperation point and the madame's own family—at least her distinguished father—has given up on her.

Are we going to keep pouring economic aid into this nation without assurances that they want to join us in the common fight?

Are we certain that the money we are giving to South Vietnam is not paying for expensive hairdos in Rome and Paris?

She has also been pictured in the most expensive stores of the Western World, some of the same stores that have broke other national leaders.

And even more basic, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask how much of a hypocrite can a human being become? Those of us who have traveled to southeast Asia and other parts of the world have been moved deeply by the continuing fight for bread that goes on; and by the general overall poverty that sickens the human personality. How can Madame Nhu continue to travel first class around the world and continue to criticize others? Why is she not home helping the needy of South Vietnam? She is a false pretender to a throne and a situation that is out of hand. It would be far better for her to cease immediately her wild spending binges and go back to the good earth where millions of her subjects are dying of poverty.

As a supporter of foreign aid programs, I am going to insist on answers to these questions. We cannot be engaged in a struggle which has already cost countless American lives and be insulted daily by one woman.

I know that the distinguished Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., will do everything in his power to meet this situation in the most diplomatic manner and that he too has suggested the close watch on our economic aid during discussions in that country.

I simply want to say that as one who has been in the struggle to extend and improve our foreign aid program I am going to have a change of heart in relation to economic grants to Vietnam until I can be assured that the American taxpayers' money is not being washed down the drain through the spending whims of one little woman whose country may very well be washed away by the surging tide of world communism.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, from time to time since the passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act in 1959, I have called attention to some of the more disturbing aspects of the performance of the National Labor Relations Board in its administration of those portions of the law for which it is responsible.

In purporting to carry out the intent of Congress, the performance of the NLRB has ranged from the dubious to the ridiculous. So sorry has been its record that only recently my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], saw fit to introduce a bill to divest the NLRB of all jurisdiction in unfair labor practice cases and to repose that responsibility in the courts of the land. When one contemplates the shattering impact which recent NLRB decisions have had in almost every aspect of industrial relations, it is small wonder that the introduction of Mr. LANDRUM's bill has been enthusiastically hailed in all parts of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise now to focus the attention of my colleagues on a recent course of conduct on the part of the NLRB and its agents which raises new doubts about this Board and its capacity to function as a quasi-judicial body. The activity which I am about to reveal indicates either that the present Board completely misapprehends its function or that it is determined to arrogate unto itself powers not contemplated by Congress.

I am reliably informed that during the last 3 months the Board and its agents have conducted a series of eight meetings with officials of certain AFL-CIO unions. In these meetings, which were held at various points throughout the country, participants discussed what they like and do not like about current Board policies.

I am informed that these meetings were arranged at the behest of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO, and were attended for the most part by regional union officials principally concerned with organizational activities. I understand that the agenda of the meetings was concerned primarily with procedures, policies, rules, and decisions of the Board in election cases as well as with proposals and recommendations advanced by the participating union officials.

Seven meetings devoted to such an agenda were conducted on a regional basis by NLRB personnel in the following cities: Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles and Philadelphia. This series of regional meetings then culminated in a final meeting in Washington, D.C., which was attended by the members of the NLRB as well as by national officers of the unions involved.

Mr. Speaker, these were not public meetings. They were private meetings. There was no public announcement that such meetings were to be held. I understand that they were not formal meetings. Instead, they were conducted in camera on an off-the-record basis. It would be fair to assume, I am sure, that all Government employees who attended meetings away from their home stations did so at Government expense.

In order to keep the record straight, I want to make it clear that just recently the NLRB has also addressed a letter to certain business organizations, particularly the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, inviting them to participate in conferences at the national level to discuss with them, presumably on a similar basis, a list of topics ranging from subcontracting to free speech—a subject about which the current Board seems to know very little.

It is my impression that the meetings now scheduled with certain national business organizations are something of an after thought called in a belated effort to impart an aura of fairness and equal treatment. However, so far as I am concerned, if meetings with a selected few business organizations are conducted on a similar basis, they will be grossly improper and subject in every respect to the same criticism which I have leveled at the private meetings already held with selected union officials.

In the very nature of things—basic improprieties aside—it would be impossible for the Board, through such procedures, to accord fair and impartial treatment to all affected parties.

What about the small independent businessmen who are not affiliated with the NAM or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce? And who, at such a secret meeting, speaks for the public?

What about the nearly 50 million workers in America who do not belong to labor organizations? Who speaks for their rights in such secret meetings?

What about those workers who choose to belong to independent or other unions not affiliated with the AFL-CIO?

Within recent weeks, the Board's bias in favor of big league AFL-CIO unions and against smaller, independent unions has become increasingly apparent.

For example, last month, on September 12, the Board dealt a severe blow to an independent union while it continued on its way toward complete repeal of section 8(b)(7) of the Landrum-Griffin Act, adopted by Congress to control blackmail picketing. In *Alton-Wood River Bldg. Trades Council*—144 NLRB No. 59—the Board reversed its own trial examiner and held that certain picketing and boycott activities by AFL-CIO unions in Jerseyville, Ill., were legal and did not violate section 8(b)(7). The employees affected in that case were already organized and lawfully represented by Local 50 of the Congress of Independent Unions. However, despite the clear restrictions in the Landrum-Griffin law against picketing in such situations, the Board held that the picketing there may continue—presumably until the employers are forced to recognize the picketing AFL–CIO unions, and thereby deprive the employees of their preference for a union which does not happen to be affiliated with the AFL–CIO.

In another recent case, a bargaining contract between the Aerojet General Corp., of California, and the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO, had expired and an independent union—the United Missile and Aerospace Technicians—filed evidence of sufficient employee support and petitioned for an election. Shortly thereafter, the IAM and the company entered into a new contract. After sitting on the case for 8 months—hopeful perhaps that the independent union would lose its impetus—the Board, in precedent shattering decision, overruled its own regional director and refused to hold an election. This means that the employees there are locked into the AFL–CIO union—at least until the contract expires again, and are thereby deprived of any semblance of free choice as to who shall represent them—see *Aerojet-General Corp.*, 144 NLRB No. 42, issue September 3, 1963.

These very recent cases should serve to illustrate and emphasize that there are others in the ranks of labor besides the AFL–CIO who have important rights at stake when the NLRB holds secret meetings. And it is time that someone should speak up in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board is an administrative tribunal with judicial functions. The Board was created by Congress to hear and decide cases by applying the laws as written and intended by Congress.

Under any circumstances, it would be somewhat irregular for a judicial body to call in organized pressure groups for advice and guidance as to the administration and interpretation of laws passed by Congress. But, surely if the Board feels the need for such assistance then, at the very least, such meetings should be public, they should be open to all, public notice should be given in advance, and all arguments or recommendations should be made on the record.

No arm of government with judicial functions should encourage or participate in—much less schedule and direct—private off-the-record meetings with any special interest group over whose activities it is required to pass judgment.

I submit that this new approach by the Board to the administration of justice is a far cry from the fundamental concept that each person is entitled to equal treatment and consideration under the law. Inevitably, such activities on the part of the Board lead to criticism and charges of favoritism which can only serve to undermine the peoples' confidence in their government.

It would be my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that the NLRB issue a cease and desist order directed at itself and its agents and put an end to this type of activity.

AMENDMENT TO SHIPPING ACT OF 1916

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation amending the Shipping Act of 1916 to require that the Federal Maritime Commission exercise to the fullest its authority to disapprove any rate or charge of any common carrier by water in foreign commerce, and of any conference of such carriers, which is detrimental to the commerce of the United States.

My amendment would make the validity of the rate depend on whether or not the rate is detrimental to the foreign commerce of the United States. Failure of the Maritime Commission to require that rates on our exports are competitive with our imports requires this legislation.

We are faced with a problem of substantial gold outflow, and a significant and continuing deficit in the imbalance of payments of the United States.

In 1949 the U.S. gold stock was $24½ billion. That figure is down now to $15½ billion and still falling—$12 billion of this remaining $15½ billion stock is frozen by the 1945 amendment to the Federal Reserve Act of 1914, so that remaining to meet our dollar commitments around the world are only $3½ billion.

At this moment we owe the outside world in excess of $25 billion, callable on demand of relatively short notice, in gold. We have lost $395 million of gold so far this year. If our present rate of loss continues, conceivably we could run out of gold sometime in late 1965.

In this climate a study by the Joint Economic Committee characterized the activity of the Federal Maritime Commission as "inadequate, shocking, disgraceful, and giving every indication that the Commission has been grossly negligent and gravely derelict in their duty to protect American industry, the public interest, and the U.S. national interest."

Specifically, the reason for the introduction of this legislation is the fact that ocean freight rates established by international shipping conferences are often from ports in the United States to North Atlantic European ports, and from our Pacific coast ports to Japanese ports, much higher on American exports than on American imports.

One of the major contributing factors to our unfavorable balance of trade is the higher conference rates for exports. Steel exported from the United States is an outstanding example. The Joint Economic Committee found that the rates on beams, angles, and girders in March 1962 were $28.50 per ton on U.S. exports, but only $19.75 on U.S. imports. On bolts the rates were $31.25 per ton on exports, but were only $24 on imports, for a difference against the American exporter of $7.25 per ton. Conference rates on castings and forgings were $44.25 on exports, but $29.25 on imports, a difference of $15. The difference of rates on screws was $22, or 90 percent higher on exports than on imports.

In a table published by the Joint Economic Committee, on steel generally for three major trade routes one finds that ingots, blooms, billots, and slabs rates on exports were 86 percent higher than on imports; on wire rods, 71 percent; on structural shapes and pilings, 69 percent; on rails and accessories, 91 percent; on nails, 34 percent; on pipe and tubing, 45 percent; and on barbed wire, 37 percent.

For 1962 our exports of steel were only 2.1 million tons and imports were 4.3 million tons. It is fair to point out that a large part of our steel exports are subsidized through foreign aid and defense support.

It costs less to send a Rolls Royce from England to the United States than it does to send a Chevrolet from the United States to England.

The cost of shipping a bicycle is as much as three times from the United States to Europe as from Europe to the United States. Cotton goods cost almost twice as much to ship from the United States to Europe as from Europe to the United States. In the case of shipments to Japan, a study of selected conference rates shows that the cost of shipments of angles, beams, and steel girders is $31.10 from the United States to Japanese ports and inbound to the United States only $15.50. Bolts and nuts cost $33.25 to export and $25.25 to import. Barbed wire costs $36.60 to export and $18.75 to import or about half of the export charge. Machine tools cost $76.50 to export and $45.50 to import into the United States.

Trucks shipped to Japan unboxed cost $50.75 and inbound to the United States only $23, a differential favoring the Japanese import over the U.S. export by 2 to 1. This discriminatory treatment of American industry and the American worker contributes heavily to our grave balance-of-payments problem.

For this reason I am asking for hearings at the earliest possible date on my legislation to force equity and fair play on the international shipping conferences—the steamship cartels of the world. For protection of the United States, its workers, and industry we must force a small measure of protection for the American dollar which is so much jeopardized by this kind of outrageous and discriminatory treatment.

The following table sets forth a series of rates sanctioned by the Federal Maritime Commission which are so out of balance with regard to carriage of imports and exports as to demand vigorous action by the Congress because of the failure of the Maritime Commission:

TABLE 1.—*Comparison of conference ocean freight rates effective March 1962 on iron and steel products for 3 U.S. foreign trade routes*

[Amounts in dollars]

Commodity	U.S. North Atlantic ports and West Germany [1]		U.S. gulf ports and North Atlantic French ports [2]		U.S. Pacific ports and Japan [3]	
	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports	Freight rate on U.S. exports	Freight rate on U.S. imports
Angles, beams, girders (structurals)	31.25	19.75	28.50	17.00	28.10	15.50
Bolts	31.25	24.00	28.50	20.50	(4)	(4)
Castings and forgings	44.25	29.25	40.25	34.00	(4)	(4)
Billets and blooms	(4)	(4)	13.25	17.00	30.35	15.50
Rails	36.75	19.75	33.50	17.00	(5)	(5)
Rods, wire, plain	29.50	18.25	(5)	(5)	28.25	15.50
Screws	46.00	24.00	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
Pipes, iron and steel, 6 inches in diameter	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	30.35	21.00
Wire, barbed	28.50	23.00	28.50	19.00	(4)	(4)
Bars, reinforcing, up to 40 feet	(4)	19.75	(4)	(4)	28.10	(4)
Oil well casings	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	33.60	21.00
Shapes, plain, not fabricated	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	28.10	(4)
Rods	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	28.25	15.50

[1] North Atlantic Continental Freight Conference tariffs.

[2] Gulf-French Atlantic Hamburg Range Conference-Continental-U.S.A. Gulf Westbound Conference.

[3] Pacific Westbound Conference and Trans-Pacific Freight Conference of Japan.

[4] Freight rate is either not available or the commodities are included in another class.

[5] Not available.

NOTE.—Freight on exports on ton basis, 2,240 pounds; freight on imports on ton basis, 1,000 kilos=2,204.6 pounds (except Japan where import freight is on the long ton basis, 2,240 pounds).

Source: U.S. Federal Maritime Commission, Division of Foreign Tariffs.

COMMENDATION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT RESEARCH

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant actions taken by this House this year was the formation of a Select Committee on Government Research, to be headed by our esteemed colleague, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama. His is a difficult but vital task. The scrutiny and analysis of $15 billion in research funds, scattered through 12 departments and 24 agencies of this Government, is a staggering assignment, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] deserves the fullest cooperation of every Member of this body.

I have had occasion over the past 2 years to examine the research activities of one of these Federal agencies and, if my findings are any criteria, this select committee's inquiry is long overdue. I refer to the Federal Aviation Agency and the disgraceful waste of more than $100 million in research funds over the past 5 years. While Congress has seen fit to provide $50 to $60 million in research funds to FAA annually, the results have been dismal. Every major research and development project undertaken by FAA has been a failure, but that Agency has, year by year, appeared before the Appropriations Committees and misrepresented the facts about the progress and prospects of their efforts. The research organization of the Federal Aviation Agency is a misnomer, because its chief interest in life has been the rewriting of job descriptions and upgrading of positions, and not research.

The Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association has spoken with great clarity and insight on this matter and copies of their study and recommendations have been furnished to every Member of this House. Their recommendations for drastic cuts in the FAA research appropriation take into account the continued need for research in aviation, but admit to the utter futility of expecting any results from the mismanagement now present in FAA, and particularly in the research department.

I had the sad duty to report to you last year the facts concerning one of FAA's misguided research efforts. That was the attempt to incorporate existing data processing—computer—techniques and equipments into the air traffic control system.

This project alone represents over $50 million wasted. Most of this money was poured into this project after it was recognized that it was a total washout. In February 1961, the FAA Administrator told a congressional committee that a three-dimensional radar, capable of portraying the altitude of aircraft, could be installed at Idlewild within 18 months. That statement was untrue then as it is untrue today. FAA has poured millions into this dubious project over a several year period. The project has now been quietly dropped.

One typical example of the waste of research funds is contained in the justification for a contract by FAA with a company in January 1961:

> Publicize the decision for early implementation of portions of DPC (data processing central) in the Boston area due to widespread and urgent interest throughout the aviation community.

This is indeed a curious example of research expenditures. Hiring a public relations organization to "publicize" a decision to implement a piece of equipment. The reason, of course, was that this equipment, the data processing central, was a failure. Over $50 million had been wasted on this effort, and the FAA was desperately seeking a Madison Avenue approach to avoid being held accountable for the failure. These are only isolated examples of the incredible inefficiency and mismanagement now rampant within the Federal Aviation Agency. I will furnish more details on other projects in the near future.

THE DANGERS OF BEING A BRACERO

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is curious to note that there are very few figures available on the accident rate of the braceros brought into this country under Public Law 78.

We know how many die, or get killed, and we know that 32 died in California last month as the result of an accident. But what we cannot find out, for some reason or another, is how safe—or how dangerous—their working conditions really are.

Safety is a big word in our machine-driven society, but we are all too often guilty of not improving safety conditions until after some accident. Thus, we allowed braceros to be hauled around pretty much like cattle until the casualty rate got intolerable. After a particularly terrible accident not too many years ago, the State of California erected a safety code on bracero buses. Yet one State assemblyman, after investigating the most recent tragedy, said:

> The average labor bus is one degree less safe than those used for sheep or cattle.

So it seems that even now the safety conditions are not very good—to understate the case.

I think that you can make a pretty good case that it is probably about as dangerous to be a bracero in the United States as it is to be a soldier in Vietnam. The casualty figures this year seem to indicate that.

But it is not safety alone that concerns us here. That lack of safety is to me an indicator of more serious symptoms. I have always believed that the bracero program is rooted in a wrong concept, and that it is evil.

I think that it is a law which feeds on the misery of a few. It is a law which permits a man brief escape from poverty, then throws him back where he started, only a little better off, and sometimes worse off. It is a law which brings a man into a free country under a contract which gives him no freedom whatever.

Mr. Speaker, the dangers of the bracero life is only symptomatic of the greater evil that lies beneath it.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Lesinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act in certain respects.

The first amendment of my bill would require the interest rates on REA loans to be increased to the actual interest paid by the U.S. Treasury on borrowings of like duration plus the small amount of one-half of 1 percent to cover the cost of financing and administering the loan program.

The second amendment would add a new criteria to section 4 of the act. Under this criteria, REA would be denied the right to make Federal loans for the purchase or construction of generation, transmission, or distribution facilities in areas already receiving central station service.

My third amendment would overcome difficulties in financing REA facilities on the open market. The Federal Government now takes a first lien on the borrower's system, so another lender would have to take a subordinate position. My amendment would permit the Secretary to either make the new lender's security equal to that of the Government, or permit the subordination of Government security in favor of the new lender. I do not believe that such action would have any serious effect upon the Government's security, provided that due diligence is exercised by both the Secretary and the new source of money in determining the necessity and economic soundness of facilities financed under the new loan.

The last section of the bill would make the provisions of the act with respect to interest rates effective upon the date of enactment, and the remainder of the bill effective as of July 1 of the fiscal year next following the date of enactment.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but that the Rural Electrification Administration Act has done a great service for this country in electrifying our rural areas. It has both extended service to such areas and caused electric companies to extend service to such areas in a more expedient manner than would otherwise be expected. I commend REA for its performance, and I further commend the cooperatives for their excellent record of repayment.

But, Mr. Speaker, in my own mind, and I am sure in the minds of the great majority of this body and of the people throughout the land, REA has been thought of as a program for the farmers. In the beginning it was, but that time has passed. Today better than half of the customers served by REA are nonfarmers, and new connections are at the rate of six or seven nonfarmers to every farmer. So the REA program is no longer a farm program.

Better than 98 percent of those in rural areas now have central station service, but from my information, practically all of those who want it have it available to them. There will be a few exceptions of ranchers who are many miles from a distribution line or some fishing and hunting lodges, but those are few and far between. In order to arrive at a figure of 2 percent not served, one has to count tenant farmers, and so forth, who may not want electricity or who do not think they can afford it, although it is available to them. So I think that we can safely say for all intents and purposes, rural America is electrified.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our cooperatives are full-fledged electric utilities. Most of them are in very good financial shape and their future job, like any utility, is promoting the use of electricity in their service areas and making short extensions to new consumers. Probably it was necessary for some Federal subsidy in the beginning of the program in order to permit coverage in sparsely settled areas, and, so far as I am concerned, it was justified; but, that job has been accomplished. The cooperatives have enjoyed subsidized Federal interest rates and exemption from taxes. Now, we must remember that the co-op is serving all sorts of customers—residential, commercial and industrial, and the cooperatives are actively promoting industrials in the area they serve. I can see no reason whatsoever for Government subsidy to supply electric power to commercial or industrial consumers. Neither can I see a reason for Federal subsidy to supply domestic consumers in suburban areas. As I said before, there might have been some reason for it in the beginning, but now since we have achieved area coverage, there is no reason for one class of customers purchasing a product—and electricity is a product—receiving benefits from the Federal Government that are denied to other citizens purchasing the same product.

Mr. Speaker, I can readily understand a cooperative manager doing everything within his power to build up loads in his service area. He is doing no more than any good utility operator would do, and if he did not try to build up his area with industries and other loads, he would not be worth his salt. So, I am not blaming the cooperative manager for attempting to obtain his own source of power supply and for promoting industry in his area. But, I do blame the REA and ourselves for permitting this rural electric cooperative program to get completely out of hand by doing things that were never anticipated or intended by the Congress when the program was first conceived, and for continuing to permit expansion of a Government subsidy that is no longer justified.

I do not think that my bill goes far enough. The cooperative consumers should be subject to the same taxes that apply to other purchasers of electric energy. After all, it is the consumer of electric energy that pays the taxes when taxes are imposed, whether he be a customer of a cooperative or of an investor-financed electric company. To excuse one consumer from paying taxes that another has to pay for a like product is discrimination pure and simple, something that has always been entirely foreign to our concept of equal rights.

The cooperatives have enjoyed an advantage, and I realize that their leaders are going to be very upset at any attempt to take any part of this advantage away from them. That is perfectly natural. No one likes to give up an advantage he enjoys, even though it may be at the expense of others. But the Congress has an obligation too, Mr. Speaker. It has the obligation of seeing that all of our citizens are treated justly and that some are not being taxed in order to give others an unequal advantage. I would venture to say that if the consumers of cooperative power were asked the question of whether they thought they should be exempt from taxes that others have to pay and whether they should be entitled to Federal money at less than cost, the vast majority would answer "No." The bill I have introduced does correct some, but not all, of the inequities that now exist.

CHET HUNTLEY DISCUSSES THE NEGRO IN WASHINGTON

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, Chet Huntley, on September 26 on the NBC television network discussed the plight of the Negro in Washington.

It was, without doubt, one of the most cogent programs ever presented on this important subject, and one free of the biases and distortions which have been part and parcel of some recent articles.

Mr. Huntley looked at urban renewal in Washington and found that:

> In the last 5 years 13,000 low-income Negro families have been displaced by renewal, and very few have found decent homes.
>
> Urban renewal for the Negro is really Negro removal, because in every urban renewal project in America there has been almost a total displacement of lower income Negro families. All urban renewal does is to redistribute the slum, so that Negro families who were living in slum conditions, once they've been cleared out, simply move to either an existing slum in another part of the city or create a new slum in a fringe area. So urban renewal, while it solves one problem, creates another problem in another section of the city.
>
> Southwest Washington, D.C., is a good example, where Negro families were moved out to make way for the urban renewal

projects. So they moved to the Northwest Washington, Northeast Washington, Southeast Washington, and helped to create some more slums.

It will get worse before it gets better. Many more thousands of Negro families will be displaced in the next 4 years. There is a dire shortage of low-income public housing in Washington, and the result is this.

Today Negro housing in Washington is five times more crowded than white. It is also more expensive. Because the white suburbs are closed, the Negro has no choice but the inner city, a polite euphemism for slum. Thus he is at the mercy of the free market. One conservative estimate is that he is overcharged about $5 million in rents a year, in neighborhoods like these. He invariably pays more for less than the white tenant.

Chet Huntley is not alone in his conclusions about urban renewal in Washington. Some weeks ago the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Catholic archbishop of Washington, asked the people of the city to:

> Act quickly and decisively to root out from our midst the social evils that blight our Nation's Capital. It is hardly necessary to state that we gain nothing by tearing down slum housing if we force the residents to create news slums elsewhere by overcrowding.

The Federal Government put more than $70 million into the urban renewal program in Southwest Washington, with the results noted by Chet Huntley. Now it is being asked to put more than $20 million into the Adams-Morgan urban renewal project, which will displace nearly 7,000 low-income people, again mostly Negroes.

Can the Federal Government continue to support urban renewal programs which are really "Negro removal programs"? I do not think the Federal Government should, unless these programs are greatly changed and vastly improved.

I include as part of my remarks excerpts from Chet Huntley's fine program on "The Negro in Washington" for the information of my colleagues.

Chet Huntley: "This is the tourist's Washington."

Narrator: "We are here in front of the U.S. Supreme Court Building in Washington. This is the home of the famous nine Supreme Court Justices, headed by Justice Earl Warren. You'll notice over the portals the words, 'Equal Justice Under Law.' It was here in 1954 that the decision was made in Washington to desegregate the schools."

Huntley: "This is another Washington."

Narrator: "Now we're here in front of this beautiful building here in Washington, the U.S. Archives of America. A little over 100 years ago slaves were sold here on this site on the open market. Now it's one of our most beautiful buildings and it houses the original Constitution, the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights."

Huntley: "And this, a short stroll from the National Archives."

Narrator: "We're standing in front of another memorial here in our Nation's Capital to another great American, Mr. Abraham Lincoln. The Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural Address are engraved on the stone. The fine paintings were done by Jules Gerne representing 'Honesty and Immortality,' the 'Angel of Truth Freeing the Slave,' and the 'Union of the North and South.' Also written here: 'In this temple, as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever.'"

Huntley: "Thanksgiving Day, 1962, a high school football game between Negroes and whites ends as a riot."

"The Negro in Washington. Chet Huntley reporting.

"This is Washington, law giver, administrator, dispenser of justice for a great nation. Washington still clings nostalgically to its past, a charming, quiet southern city with attitudes to match. But it's a recollection of another day. Big government, big wars, hot and cold, capital of the free world, lender and counselor to the new nations have produced here a big city. The expanding Federal Government, integrated its personnel and the word flashed through the South. The city burst its seams trying to accommodate the Negro immigrant.

"Today Washington suffers from all the problems that new bigness creates and certain unique problems as well. It is governed, for example, by transients, Congress, not by its own citizens. It is our only large city with a Negro majority, a majority which increases as more whites leave. These circumstances publicize, perhaps exacerbate, all the chronic stresses which afflict the racially mixed city. This report will consider Washington's schools, employment, housing, welfare, government and the Negro's role in each.

"It seems to have shocked Americans to learn that Washington has crime.

"Newspapers and magazines have recently seized upon it with an air of excited discovery. Segregationists, with ill-concealed glee, argue that crime is a predictable part of the Negro's behavior. The hard truth is that most of Washington's crime is Negro crime.

"A city 57 percent Negro with 85 percent of its major crime committed by Negroes. These statistics have led to some extravagant accusations, such as the charge that Washington leads the Nation in crime. In point of fact, last year Washington ranked seventh in rate of crime among our 12 largest cities. What is more disturbing, however, is that the crime rate is increasing.

"Last month all categories of crime were up 9 percent compared to August 1962. It was the 15th consecutive month to see a significant rise in crime.

"It is also impossible to contest the fact that the increase in Negro population has caused this deterioration in public behavior. Moreover, there have been several particularly outrageous murders in which whites have been victimized. These have been well publicized, as they should be. Less publicized is the fact that most crimes committed by Negroes are committed against other Negroes. This is hardly balm for the victims, white or Negro. It is difficult to expect these victims to take the long range view on rehabilitating the mugger.

"Some Negro leaders have raised the cry of police brutality whenever crime is mentioned. Our research did not bear this out. Washington's police force is efficient, honest and overworked and has never followed a deliberate pattern of brutality. There have been isolated incidents. Officers now act swiftly to discipline men who are too quick with the nightstick.

"Washington does lead the Nation in aggravated assault. Much of it is Negro against Negro crime; much of it family squabbles.

"Here officers investigate a stabbing. These are the kind of crimes that inevitably grow out of slums, illiteracy, joblessness and aimlessness. It is worth noting that Washington's Negroes are almost entirely innocent of crimes of affluence: Price fixing, income tax evasion, expense account padding, embezzlement, and the whole dazzling array of syndicate controlled activities."

"A valid Negro complaint is the racial imbalance of the police force. Only 16 percent Negro. There is a handful of Negro officers. Police officials say not enough qualified Negroes apply. A greater percentage of Negro police is inevitable, but whether this will materially reduce crime is unlikely. Such has not been the case in New York and Chicago. But it might improve sensitivities and diminish emotions.

"Recently congressional voices have argued that Washington police are hamstrung by regulations, such as one restricting investigative arrests. A get-tough policy is advocated: more dogs, more police, more arrests, less legal barriers to police work.

"Well, no one is in favor of crime and no one wants criminals to go unpunished. But arrests and jails, as many American cities with similar problems can testify, cannot alone stop crime. And in terms of the Negro's total experience, where he can work, where he can live, his crime rate is understandable, as understandable perhaps as his tuberculosis rate, which in Washington is one of the highest in the Nation.

"In 1954 the Supreme Court desegregated Washington's schools. Nine years later they are again virtually segregated, not by intent but through the free choice of white residents who moved or turned to private education. The Negro, many whites argue, has led Washington's schools into anarchy. Negroes respond that the schools are rundown and starved for money. Neither statement is accurate.

"These boys, for example, are not delinquents. They are poor. Workouts and breakfasts are inducements to interest them in school. Otherwise they might add to the army of dropouts. The dropout rate is 39 percent, one of the country's highest.

"This is Hine Junior High School, or 'Horrible' Hine. It is old, dilapidated, overcrowded. It is also scheduled to be closed in 2 years.

"Fire destroyed its auditorium. It was never repaired. Classrooms are in such short supply that one meets in the cafeteria. It's estimated that three-fourths of Washington's school are badly overcrowded.

"Eight hundred kindergarten children were turned away this year. High schools are 4,000 seats short; 2,600 students are on split schedules. Compared to national figures, Washington's schools are older. Pupil-teacher ratio runs about 30 to 1, close to the national average. There is a grievous shortage of library books and space. Here a classroom doubles as a library. Yet it's an oversimplification to blame all school problems on a stingy Congress. Teachers' salaries and dollars-per-pupil figures compare favorably with similar cities. Most American cities don't spend enough on education.

"An extracurricular activity at Shaw Junior High is unique. A cleanup detail for the squalid alleys adjoining the school.

"This is Backis Junior High, hopefully Washington's school of the future. It is clean and pleasant, and so are its students. But Washington needs many more like Backis. The school superintendent contends the city must spend $20 million annually on new schools for 6 years.

"Just to keep pace with population and to offset the decay of old schools, for the last 5 years instead of $20 million, only $8 million a year has been spent on buildings.

"A shortage of good teachers is probably the most serious lack. Many able white and Negro teachers left after desegregation.

"A few outstanding teachers carry a heavy burden. One is Joan Wobern, a Bryn Mawr graduate who teaches an English honors course.

"But more Joan Woberns are needed. Washington's faculty is about 70 percent Negro. Many come from below average colleges and are not well prepared. Congressional dawdling over school budgets makes it difficult to hire good teachers, who rightfully want to know how much money they'll earn and will accept other jobs rather than wait for the House committee to allocate Washington's school funds.

"And these honor pupils, as much as troubled ones, are the ultimate sufferers because of the teacher shortage.

"All of a sudden everything explodes. This is a special school for those in whom the explosion has already been touched off, disciplinary problems.

"Honesty requires repetition of some unpleasant facts. The venereal disease rate among Washington teenagers is 13 times the national average. Illegitimate births are appallingly high. Two hundred and sixty-five children were born to girls age 12 to 15 last year."

Man: "Last year we had 58 weapons taken away from the youngsters or they voluntarily turned them in. This year we have had but four, and whether that's the combination of students who have improved psychologically, socially, and the staff has been able to establish a closer rapport, we're not certain. But we have had much improvement in the turning in of weapons. It seems to be a very normal thing for these youngsters to carry knives and blackjacks and other weapons."

Huntley: "We spoke with Dr. Carl Hansen, Washington's hard-working and respected superintendent of public schools."

Hansen: "Developing a community."

Huntley: "Dr. Hansen, some Members of Congress, if I'm not mistaken, have said that desegregation of the schools in Washington is an abysmal failure. Is that true?"

Hansen: "From my point of view, no, and I think this would be shared by most of the people in the community, that the problems we have in this city school system and in the city itself are not primarily the problems of desegregation or integration but the problems of people in economic trouble, in cultural impoverishment, that sort of thing which would occur whether or not we had been recently desegregated."

Huntley: "Now, statistics indicate that the Negro student here frankly is not doing as well as his white counterpart. What do you say about that?"

Hansen: "I question the assumption of that statement. Many Negro school students do better than many white student. And for this reason I'd like to make the claim that we're not talking about race in relation to academic achievement but individuals who may do less well than they can because of handicaps which they have in their homes or lack of motivation, lack of aspiration, actually lack of opportunity to learn outside the classroom and in their home community. This is a problem of people, not of race."

Huntley: "Dr. Hansen, we've been reading all sorts of horror stories about your schools here in Washington, teachers being assaulted and vilified, frequent police calls, rape, venereal disease. Are these stories true?"

Hansen: "I think we have to talk about proportions, background. We have teachers vilified, yes; teachers who occasionally are assaulted physically by students, sometimes by parents. But when you consider that we have 134,000 youngsters and more than 5,000 teachers, and you get this number of people together, that incidents of this kind are inevitable, and against the total background of the number involved, form a very small proportion of the total. We then can see the business in perspective and avoid the generalization that we're getting so often about blackboard jungles in our school system."

Huntley: "Given a high school education, a white collar skill and sufficient ambition, a Negro can get a better job in Washington more readily than anywhere else in the United States. The main reason: big government is also a big employer.

"These Negroes do not commit crimes, do not get arrested, do not make good copy for articles about the sick city, the city in trouble, or the city of fear. They earn money, pay taxes, live in clean homes, and raise respectful children. If anything would give lie to the myth of the debased Negro, it would surely be these thousands of intelligent, well-groomed employees of the Federal Government. Many are in supervisory jobs, though not as many as Negroes think there should be. It is claimed that advancement to higher civil service grades is slow, that Negroes too often are bypassed.

"Because of Federal job opportunities, the Negroes' median wage is high—$4,800. The national average for Negroes is more than $1,000 less. Still Negro earnings in Washington fall far below the earnings of whites.

"But for the unskilled, the uneducated, Washington is as rough a place for the Negro as Chicago or New York. His rate of unemployment is three times that of the white. These unemployed hod carriers are typical. Automation, bias, and a lack of heavy industry have filled them with despair and bitterness. It's too late for them to learn to run computers.

"These men do work occasionally, but many Washington Negroes are permanently out of work."

Man: "The District of Columbia is one of the few remaining areas in the country that does not have fair employment practice legislation. Consequently, when an employer calls the employment service for—to place an order for workers, he is not bound by any rules or laws regarding discriminatory hiring. Consequently, he has the right, the so-called right to ask for white employees.

"Heretofore the employment service took these orders and after an effort to dissuade the employer from practicing discrimination hiring, the order was filled if the employer refused to change his order. But within the past 2 years, this practice has been changed. The employment service no longer processes discriminatory orders. We make an effort to persuade the employer to change the order."

Huntley: "Negroes feel with a good deal of justification that the private sector of the Washington economy is long overdue in recognizing them. Woodward & Lothrop's store is an exception. Other stores and businesses have dragged their feet. But once it becomes apparent that an articulate Negro college graduate can sell suits as well as his white counterpart without driving the customers screaming to the street, this wall will no doubt be breached.

"It was breached successfully some years ago at the Chesapeake & Potomac phone company. Negroes were quietly employed, and Washington's world did not come to an end. Unfourtunately, few other private companies have been as daring as C. & P."

Man: "The banks, the insurance companies, the real estate firms, the mortgage and investment houses, these companies are badly in need of clerical help. They lose a lot of their trained clerical help to the Government because in many instances the rates of pay are higher in the Government service. So they are constantly—there's a constant demand on the part of the business community for clerical employees.

"But up to this point with only a few exceptions the business community has consistently refrained from hiring nonwhites, no matter how well trained they are. They just don't hire them."

Huntley: "They just don't hire them. Neither does the construction industry, at least not in any proportion to their numbers in Washington, and then usually in the poorest paying jobs. In Washington, a city with no industry except construction, this ancient prejudice of unions and employers alike hits the Negro hardest. Menial labor is open to Negroes, and there are unions such as the lathworkers, bricklayers, and cement finishers who do have Negro members. But skilled jobs require apprentice training, from which Negroes are usually barred. No apprentice training, no union card, is the honored rule.

"Most construction unions are hereditary. Only sons or relatives of members are admitted. Thus, a lot of qualified whites never get in. Negroes reject this argument. They want admission now, and they contend that they can find many qualified applicants.

"This summer the District of Columbia sent out inspectors to Federal and District construction sites to ascertain if bias existed. Unions and companies were warned that unless discrimination ends, nonunion Negroes would be hired. Pressures from the Department of Labor have caused some unions, the electricians for one, to announce they'll accept Negro trainees. More unions will probably follow. But it will be at least a half-year before any sizable number of Negroes are working in the higher paid skilled jobs.

"Unemployment, job bias, all these bear directly on Washington's crime rate, its dropout rate, the lack of hope or motivation among Negro youth. These vocational students will need more than a skill to make good. They will need the good will and the good sense of the Washington community. If they fail to get it, there will be more horrified magazine articles about juvenile delinquency and more demands for a bigger police budget.

"Washington, as a place to live, is described by many Negroes as the big doughnut. The all-white suburbs, the pleasant lawns and groves of Maryland and Virginia is the edible part. The Negroes claim that they are left with the inner city, the hole.

"The voice of the bulldozer is heard in the land, and it mutters urban renewal. Since the war Washington has been undergoing a massive facelifting. Like some superannuated dowagers, she has been scraped, reshaped, and refurbished. One might assume that this kind of civic betterment was an unqualified blessing. It has not been—at least to the Negro.

"The bulldozer may knock down shantytowns and the crane may substitute apartments, freeways, and bridges. But in the last 5 years 13,000 low income Negro families have been dispossessed by renewal, and very few have found decent homes.

Man: "Urban renewal for the Negro is really Negro removal, because in every urban renewal project in America there has been almost a total displacement of lower income Negro families. All urban renewal does is to redistribute the slum, so that Negro families who were living in slum conditions once they've been cleared out, simply move to either an existing slum in another part of the city or create a new slum in a fringe area. So urban renewal, while it solves one problem, creates another problem in another section of the city.

"Southwest Washington, D.C. is a good example, where Negro families were moved out to make way for the urban renewal projects. So they moved to northwest Washington, northeast Washington, southeast Washington, and helped to create some more slums."

Huntley: "It will get worse before it gets better. Many more thousands of Negro families will be displaced in the next 4 years. There is a dire shortage of low-income public housing in Washington, and the result is this.

"Today Negro housing in Washington is five times more crowded than white. It is also more expensive. Because the white suburbs are closed, the Negro has no choice but the inner city, a polite euphemism for slum. Thus he is at the mercy of the free market. One conservative estimate is that he is overcharged about $5 million in rents a year, in neighborhoods like these. He invariably pays more for less than the white tenant.

"Washington has dutifully desegregated public facilities, hotels, restaurants, and so on. But its housing is more segregated today than it was 10 years ago.

"Often the facades of Negro homes are deceptively attractive. The interiors are not. The civic virtues don't come easily to people who live under these conditions. What is even more frightening is the resigned despair, the damp, surrendered sadness that hangs over these homes.

"Whatever happened to that happy, carefree fellow tapdancing and playing his harmonica on a river boat? George Orwell once noted that the greatest myth about poverty was that the poor were not aware of their misery, or didn't care. We persist in believing that myth, at our own peril.

"What low-cost housing there is in Washington has been successful. The areas are clean. The people look better. Jane Jacobs to the contrary, the people who live here are better off then they were in over-priced slums. But many thousands more such units are urgently needed. Getting the money is difficult.

"Washington is always short of funds. The Federal Government occupies half of Washington's land, and pays no taxes. A greater Federal contribution for public housing and other imperatives was given high priority by President Kennedy. Congress is now considering a supplementary budget.

"The middle class and wealthy Negro does better. If he has the money he can get a good house, often at a fair price. There is a Negro Gold Coast. But this too has a ghetto connotation, and upper class Negroes resent it. Most of Washington's residential areas, apart from the fashionable Northwest and a few other enclaves, are today as solidly black as Harlem.

"Capital Park Towers is an exception. It is one of the few high-priced apartments open to Negroes, and has an occupancy about 20 percent Negro. There have been no incidents, little publicity, and no great agitation by Negroes to be admitted in greater numbers. Few can afford the rent.

"A fair housing law, soon to be passed, will open up other apartments, like these, to Negroes. But it'll be little more than a gracious gesture. Open housing is meaningless unless the housing is within the economic reach of the would-be renter."

HUNTLEY: "This is Junior Village, what in simpler days was called an orphanage. It houses about 800 youngsters. Its capacity is 400. New cottages will bring this up to 700. But meanwhile it serves a favorite site for viewing with alarm. VIP's are often photographed here patting children's heads and deploring.

"A recent purge of welfare rolls aimed at families where the presence of a man in the house—husband or otherwise—could be proved, caused an upsurge of new children here. Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia, the crusader who stiffened the welfare regulations, denies this, that children were not affected by the get-tough welfare policy. In any event, Junior Village does its best, with too little space, and too little money.

"After this tour of the lower depths, it might be instructive to hear from Washington's Negro aristocracy. The speaker is Flaxy Pincott, a civic leader."

PINCOTT: "Negroes in this area are blessed, many of them, with having had much broader opportunities than has been so in other parts of the country, and for a much longer time. And so we have in Washington, at one end of the ladder, Negro men and women who had excellent education and have wonderful job opportunities. Unfortunately, there is not a close enough relationship between this group as a whole and the Negro in Washington who has no fair employment opportunity, who is not promoted on the job, on the basis of merit, who has housing problems. I believe that the Negro who has been privileged must more and more, not only be concerned, but actually get out and roll up his sleeves and help the Negro.

Mr. Huntley: "In the course of preparing this report we spoke to many people with causes to push, people with prejudices, people with bruised emotions and harsh reactions. Yet we met many Washington residents—Negroes and whites—who were calm, constructive, and determined to make this city a first-class place to live and work. None made better sense than His Excellency, Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle. We asked him about his four-point program for Washington."

O'Boyle: "Well, the program included employment, housing, need of communication between the races, and work for youth. With regard to employment, we said that merit hiring should prevail. That is, every person should be given the right to apply for the job, and if he is capable of filling it—and all other things being considered—he should receive the position. But what is more, the avenues of training and promotion, should be open to all persons regardless of racial background.

"With regard to housing, we must face the housing situation on two fronts. First of all, these should be an availability of public housing for low-income families. And secondly, open occupancy in the metropolitan area. We tear down slums, and in doing so, frequently we force the residents, to create new slums by overcrowding. People crowd into neighborhoods because they do not have the money to pay the rent in which we would call a becoming or decent place, or because they are denied the chance to rent or buy suitable housing elsewhere.

"We have another condition, third point, and that is a breaking down of the ignorance—let me call it the ghetto of ignorance—between the races. And this indifference and ignorance can easily poison, let's say, race relations in any city.

"Now it is my contention that right now and particularly after the Negro has achieved all his rights under the Constitution, that what will be needed is a Christian obligation to respect every man, regardless of race, as a person, to treat him as an individual, with a God-given nature equal to our own, and to realize that his destiny is the same as ours to be one day with God.

"I did mention a fourth point, the need to make a concerted effort to help all our youth, both white and colored. Now we have in this city, as in many other cities, dropouts from school. They should be encouraged to go back and get their high school certificate. We have the first time delinquent, who need immediate attention and support and big brother help if you will. And in addition to that, we have those who rebel against society because of the stark poverty of their home.

"Let me give an example. I know of one family man here in the city, a Negro, who is receiving for a 40-hour week, $25. There are other instances. This is by no means isolated. But what is really important is to become personally interested in the people who need our help. This applies both to Negroes and to whites."

Huntley: "Washington is not a cesspool of crime, nor an immoral, lawless jungle. There is reason for hope here. The Negro is critical of himself. He is trying to reduce the incidence of crime and antisocial behavior, not with massive success to be sure. He is receiving help and encouragement from the unusual number of friendly and liberal organizations located here. There are influential whites enlisted in his cause, including the President of the United States.

"Suburban communities are slowly beginning to accept him as a neighbor, or to think about it. There are Government jobs available if he can qualify. Private employers and unions are slowly beginning to bow to moral imperatives and economic pressures, though not necessarily in that order.

"There is a Negro upper class and a growing Negro middle class. The school system, overburdened, needs more money and sympathy from Congress. The faults of the schools are not unique; and fact will not support the contention that all their faults are traceable to the Negro.

"The sad statistics of Washington's crime, welfare, illegitimacy, broken homes, and poor housing, are frequently recited. These statistics have a deeper meaning than their drab consistency and tragic proportions.

"The word 'why' must be applied. There will be those who will cling to the discredited conclusion that the Negro is biologically or theologically inferior. That theory belongs with the notion that the world is flat.

"The other answer is to look into our history and into our conscience and discover that the Negro is precisely what we have made him. In Washington, D.C. and throughout our land. This is Chet Huntley reporting."

A HAPPY ENDING AFTER 2 YEARS OF STUDY

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, after 2 long years I believe I have finally opened the road and cleared the way for a savings of over $10 million through the competitive purchase of an Army radio.

That is the happy conclusion of a case I have studied for 2 years. It took that long to flush this radio—the AN/ARC 54—out from under wasteful sole source—no competition—procurement. During my entire study I have kept everything on written record and it is open to inspection.

This is the same radio about which I spoke here on July 17, 1963—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 12781. You will recall that on that occasion I revealed I was able to stop in July a proposed sole source purchase for this radio. This purchase, I believe, would have led to the waste of over $10 million of a proposed $22 million contract price. That conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is based on results of literally hundreds of other cases in my continuing study of the past 2½ years.

Today I can inform my colleagues that the Comptroller General, Mr. Joseph Campbell, has investigated my charges on the ARC 54. After checking my files and documentation and after having General Accounting Office auditors check the case thoroughly, Mr. Campbell backed up my contention that this radio should be bought through competitive bidding and as soon as possible.

Writing to me this week, Mr. Campbell said—

> Every effort should be made to effect needed procurement of the radio sets for the balance of fiscal year 1964 on a competitive basis at the earliest possible date. We are advising the Secretary of the Army accordingly.

This is the sole source procurement I stopped.

Mr. Campbell supplied me with a copy of his letter to the Secretary of the Army recommending that same action. He also made other statements in his letter to me that I shall develop as I explain the successful conclusion of another case in my 2½-year study of waste in defense electronics purchasing. At the same time I hope to show how regulations and policies are gradually being revised from top to bottom and how the military, at last, is beginning to clean up the mess I have exposed.

Recently, for example, Gen. Frank W. Moorman, new commandant at the Army Electronics Command at Ft. Monmouth, telephoned me to say he is in complete accord and sympathy with my views on changing procurement methods. He offered me 100 percent cooperation from his new command. This is the sort of cooperation that will help cut the monstrous cost of defense, and get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar that is spent.

In mid-October 1961, my study of the AN/ARC 54 began. By mid-November of the same year I became convinced that the radio should be bought by competitive bidding. It took 2 years for my views to prevail, but we are now on the threshold of dramatic savings.

By way of background, the AN/ARC 54 is the third part of a three-radio communications complex. The AN/VRC 12 vehicular mounted radio, about which I spoke on June 18, 1963—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11042—is another portion—$17 million was wasted buying that radio sole source before I pushed it into competitive procurement and effected a huge saving.

The other portion of the complex is the now celebrated AN/PRC 25 manpack radio. On June 25, 1963—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11495—I illustrated the way in which I had turned up past waste of $10 million in sole-source buying of this radio and the impending waste of more than that unless funds for the radio were trimmed from the budget.

Having already pushed the AN/PRC 25 into competitive procurement, I wanted to slash the fat from funds requested by the Army for the radio and succeeded in doing just that. This was accomplished when my colleague from Texas, Mr. MAHON, introduced an amendment cutting $10.2 million from the defense appropriations bill. That amendment was approved unanimously.

That is the past history of the three-part communications complex. Today, Mr. Speaker, the good news is that the AN/ARC 54 is about to be placed "on the street" for money-saving competitive purchase. The necessary papers, I understand, are ready for the signature of Assistant Secretary of the Army Paul R. Ignatius. He will do a great service for the taxpayer and for American industry when he signs them.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the AN/ARC 54, which cost $2.6 million to develop and for which $5.4 million, or $5,620 each, was paid when the radio was bought sole source, can now be bought competitively. If this is done, and I again strongly recommend that the Comptroller General's decision be followed by the Army, I predict the price for this radio will fall to about half of the $5,620 sole-source price.

The second sole-source contract for the AN/ARC 54, about which I told Members of the House on July 17, was stopped shortly after I found out about it. I protested to the Army and to the Comptroller General after my speech on the floor about the situation.

"I think any future buy of this equipment will be opened to the force of competition" if the facts in this case are studied closely. That was the way I expressed myself to the Comptroller General.

The GAO wrote me last week after completing an exhaustive study of the case. The Comptroller General mentioned "circumstances leading up to the involved procurement from Collins" for the AN/ARC 54. You can read these circumstances by referring to my July 17, 1963, speech on the floor of the House. Suffice it to say that the tracks were cleared by some paper-shuffling hocus-pocus to give a March 11, 1963, sole-source contract to Collins Radio Co., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

I learned June 21, 1963, that an additional sole-source buy of 2,964 radios was being geared up at a cost of more than $16 million. When I questioned this procurement, when I asked about add-ons to the first sole-source contract, and when I exposed the Army's sole-source funnel to Collins, things began to happen.

As the Comptroller General's letter phrased it:

> When you made your inquiry to our office concerning this transaction, a decision was made (by the Army) to withdraw this request for proposal so that alternative approaches could be explored.

The alternatives turned out to be that Army wanted to follow the sole-source route in fiscal 1964 and then maybe let industry cut the cost down in fiscal 1965. Mr. Speaker, that alternative is still pending. Meanwhile, the sole-source producer still is obligated by the first contract to produce production drawings and technical materials. They were to have been delivered in August of this year and possession of this material will allow any competent manufacturer to submit an intelligent bid and build the radio.

As a direct result of by inquiry and the GAO investigation, the Comptroller General was able to write to me:

> We are informed that while it was originally anticipated that the fiscal year 1964 requirement would need to be placed with Collins on a "sole-source" basis, this plan has since been reconsidered and a proposed procurement plan to effect a competitive procurement as early as possible in fiscal year 1964 has now been submitted to the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Logistics.

That man, Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Ignatius, and the paragraph I have cited illustrates his second, and latest, alternative. It, too, is still pending.

Therefore, Mr. Ignatius has two alternatives, but, in my opinion, only one choice. He can sign a sole-source document for the AN/ARC 54 again and thereby knock into a cocked hat all of Defense Secretary McNamara's bleatings about saving money and cutting down procurement costs. Or he can face up to the truth, and that is that the Army should now have drawings and technical information and should go competitive with the next procurement of the AN/ARC 54.

Facing up to the truth and making the only logical decision will give the Army its radios, will give industry a chance to prove its worth and will give the taxpayers one of the breaks we promised them when we passed a tax cut here a few days ago.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ignatius should follow the lead of some of his generals and admit mistakes have been made and start correcting them. He has the prodding of the Comptroller General now to back up what I have contended for 2 years—that the AN/ARC 54 should be bought competitively. He certainly should avoid alibing and distorting the record, which is what his superior, Defense Secretary McNamara, did in the AN/PRC 25 case.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to come back to the floor of the House the day the decision is made on the AN/ARC 54. I will then spell out for the Members whether the Army is interested in getting more bang for a buck or is bound and determined to commit another atrocity on the taxpayers.

In conclusion, this is the first of another series of cases I shall report in the next few days. A letter will be sent to my colleagues shortly, outlining the cases with which I shall deal. I will show how regulations have been changed, how administrative procedures are being tightened. I will prove that in several instances when I asked about a sole-source procurement the military admitted it had goofed, or worse, by pulling the purchase off the street at once.

Mr. Speaker, my battle to get a dollar's worth of defense for a dollar's worth of expense is being won. I appreciate the support and assistance of my colleagues, the Comptroller General and the civilian and military servants in the Defense Department who have seen the light and who are daily helping me with my work.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. MOSS, for 12 days, on account of official business.

Mr. LANKFORD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), from today through October 16, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. BARRETT), for an indefinite period of time, on account of illness.

Mr. RYAN of New York (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for Monday, October 7, through Friday, October 18, 1963, on account of illness.

Mr. SIBAL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) through October 25, on account of official business as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation to the Extraordinary Administrative Radio Conference of the International Telecommunications Union in Geneva.

Mr. Ellsworth (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. St Germain (at the request of Mr. Fogarty), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Secrest), for October 7, 1963, on account of official business.

Messrs. Zablocki, McDowell, Murphy of Illinois, Cameron, Frelinghuysen, Broomfield, Whalley, Thomson of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. Morgan), on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Bonner, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Pucinski, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Selden, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, October 8, 1963.

Mr. Schwengel, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. Conte, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Griffin, for 15 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Friedel.

Mr. Dent.

Mr. Roybal.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Shriver) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Fino.

Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Alger.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Burkhalter) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Hemphill.

Mr. Kornegay.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 772. An act to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.;

H.R. 1191. An act for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker;

H.R. 1192. An act for the relief of William C. Doyle;

H.R. 1281. An act for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin;

H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Kathryn Marshall;

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown;

H.R. 1696. An act defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies;

H.R. 1709. An act to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island;

H.R. 1726. An act for the relief of William H. Woodhouse;

H.R. 2256. An act for the relief of José Domenech;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended;

H.R. 2751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White;

H.R. 2770. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf;

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 3219. An act to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett;

H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason;

H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.;

H.R. 3843. An act for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr;

H.R. 4842. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4965. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States;

H.R. 5307. An act for the relief of Edward T. Hughes;

H.R. 5811. An act for the relief of L. C. Atkins & Son;

H.R. 5812. An act for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.;

H.R. 6246. An act relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay;

H.R. 6373. An act for the relief of Robert L. Nolan; and

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 3, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1280. For the relief of Jan Koss;

H.R. 2303. For the relief of Elizabeth Koloian Izmirian;

H.R. 3648. For the relief of Fiore Luigi Biasiotta;

H.R. 3762. For the relief of Anna C. Chmielewski;

H.R. 4075. For the relief of Noriyuki Miyata;

H.R. 5888. Making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7022. For the relief of Marguerite Lefebvre Broughton.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 8, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1265. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of report of Federal contributions, personnel and administration, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to subsection 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1266. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of Federal contributions program, equipment and facilities, for the quarter ending June 30, 1963, pursuant to subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1267. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations) transmitting supplemental information to previous letters regarding deletion and increases requiring adjustment of total estimated cost of Air Force Reserve projects, and naming four additional facilities for construction, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1) and authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1268. A letter from the Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Emergency Planning, transmitting a copy of the statistical supplement, stockpile report, for the period ending June 30, 1963, in compliance with section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1269. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks," together with a comparative type of changes that would be made; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1270. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the practice followed by the Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor, of making available to State employment security agencies for expenditure in the current fiscal year uncommitted granted funds arising from prior fiscal year appropriations, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1271. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequate controls for determining compliance by foreign governments with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture, June 1963; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1272. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on payments to Naval Reserve officers on annual active duty training for unnecessary days of travel and for days in which no training or travel is performed, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1273. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on overstatement of needs and illegal use of commercial-type vehicles by the Kanto Base Command, Japan, 6100th Support Wing, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1274. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill for the relief of John T. Cox"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1275. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to correct and improve the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 810. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5945. A bill to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico; with amendment (Rept. No. 811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H.R. 7179. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 812). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 8747. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 838; an act for the relief of George Crokos; without amendment (Rept. No. 813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1313. An act for the relief of Tim L. Yen; without amendment (Rept. No. 814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1174. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Unterholzer Sharble; without amendment (Rept. No. 815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta); with amendment (Rept. No. 816): Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1432. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Marrella; without amendment (Rept. No. 817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF. Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2799. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarita M. Respicio; with amendment (Rept. No. 819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4507. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Devaris; with amendment (Rept. No. 820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux); with amendment (Rept. No. 822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 8716. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 8717. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 8718. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the Touro Synagogue; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 8719. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, to insure that the Federal Maritime Commission will have full authority to disapprove any rate or change of any common carrier by water in foreign commerce, and of any conference of such carriers, which is detrimental to the commerce of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 8720. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 8721. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 8722. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that commercial motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8723. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit, for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 8724. A bill to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 8725. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 202) to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State and local penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 8726. A bill to extend to clam planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers, stockmen, and oyster planters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 8727. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 with respect to the purposes for which loans may be made thereunder and the rates of interest on such loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 8728. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to allow Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 8729. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from making certain rules relating to the length or frequency of broadcast advertisements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 8730. A bill to provide for the economic development of the Appalachian Highlands area by promoting full employment and full utilization of the abundant human and natural resources of the area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 8747. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 766. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 17th International Publishers Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.J. Res. 767. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.J. Res. 768. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 17th International Publishers Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.J. Res. 769. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 17th International Publishers Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 542. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 103; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 8731. A bill for the relief of Terence J. O'Donnell, Thomas P. Wilcox, and Clifford M. Springberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 8732. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Paula Gagliardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 8733. A bill for the relief of Adamantia and Ourania Kakogianni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 8734. A bill for the relief of Thomas Meyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8735. A bill for the relief of Andrea Giusto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8736. A bill for the relief of Anna and Simon Leiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 8737. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Cutrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8738. A bill for the relief of Norton Dew Patrick Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 8739. A bill for the relief of Capt. Henry F. Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 8740. A bill for the relief of Donato Di Vice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8741. A bill for the relief of Stanislau Kacprowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8742. A bill for the relief of Miss Rosina Manfredi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H.R. 8743. A bill for the relief of Victor J. Blumenfeld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 8744. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jung Soon Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 8745. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys E. Walters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 8746. A bill for the relief of Roger A. Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

335. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of Monahan Post No. 64, the American Legion, Sioux City, Iowa, signed by 582 citizens, requesting Congress to resolve that the Monroe Doctrine continues to be a basic plank in American foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

336. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, old Faithful Station, Wyo., requesting Congress always to appropriate exactly the same amount of money for U.S. debt reduction as it appropriates for foreign aid; to the Committee on Appropriations.

337. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to Congress passing legislation permitting the Department of Defense to furnish vehicles and drivers for high school seniors to tour the leading State and Federal institutions within their State and Federal areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

338. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to urban renewal programs in certain areas in Chicago, Ill., and New York, N.Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

339. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to travel in certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

340. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., requesting a special U.S. House committee to investigate the vast sums of money attempting to show that Governor Rockefeller, of New York, wears the "liberal image"; to the Committee on House Administration.

341. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to the U.S. House of Representatives replacing page boys with disabled veterans; to the Committee on House Administration.

342. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., requesting Congress to pass legislation providing for a suitable memorial to William Jennings Bryan, who was one of America's great Democrats; to the Committee on House Administration.

343. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to passing legislation requiring an adequate memorial to James Wilson, of Carlisle, Pa., because he was a fighting, real Democrat; to the Committee on House Administration.

344. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to creating a position of Delegate of the Territory of Guam as a nonvoting Member of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

345. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to Congress providing for studies to be made into the deleterious effects of cigarettes and cigars with the Food and Drug Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducting the survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

346. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., asking Congress to pass legislation requiring a water-route transportation service between Seattle, Wash., and the ports of southeastern Alaska, as a Federal project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

347. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to Congress passing legislation extending the territorial waters of America to the 12-mile limit, mainly to protect fishing rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

348. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to Congress passing legislation requiring the Post Office Department to display in a prominent place in every post office a list of ZIP code numbers by cities and areas of cities, and explain the function of the number; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

349. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to referring of cases to the U.S. district court by the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

350. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., asking Congress to provide for a special committee to check upon the enforcement of all U.S. laws never repealed, especially regarding admission of States to the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

351. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to creating a Cabinet department for Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 183d anniversary of the historic Battle of Kings Mountain. On October 7, 1780, American patriots crushed a strong British Army at Kings Mountain and thus paved the way for the ultimate surrender of the British Commander in America, Lord Cornwallis, at Yorktown, Va., on October 19, 1781.

The citizens of Kings Mountain, N.C., commemorated the historic battle, which took place in their vicinity, with a huge parade on October 5, 1963, and a fine address delivered by our distinguished colleague, Hon. Basil L. Whitener, who represents Kings Mountain in the Congress.

I know that my colleagues will want to read the remarks he made on the battle, which, along with the Battle at Guilford Court House, is described as the turning point in the American Revolution. Under unanimous consent, I include the speech in the Record.

Address by Basil L. Whitener, Member of Congress, at Kings Mountain, N.C., October 5, 1963

Mr. Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen, I am deeply grateful for the honor you have bestowed in inviting me to take part today in the ceremonies commemorating the 183d anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain. It is a privilege to join in paying tribute to our heroic forebears whose great victory on October 7, 1780, guaranteed the success of the American War of Independence.

One feels a deep sense of history as he stands here this afternoon in a countryside hallowed by the blood and sacrifice of men who put liberty before life and honor before fortune.

The Battle of Kings Mountain was not just another conflict in the long march of history. The heroic deed accomplished here at Kings Mountain on October 7, 1780, was one of the great and decisive military events of all time. The blow struck for liberty by the God-fearing patriots from South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, Kentucky, and Georgia, who marched to meet British tyranny at Kings Mountain, has earned for them an honored place forever in the hearts of freedom-loving men.

Kings Mountain is a name cherished by all Americans. It is a name of particular significance, however, for us who live in this section of North Carolina. Nearly all of us have been reared in the shadow of Kings Mountain. Many of us can trace our lineage to the gallant men who met Ferguson's British Regulars and Tories and inflicted upon them a defeat which rallied the faltering cause of freedom in the gloomy fall of 1780.

At that time the cause of American freedom was at a low ebb. American arms had suffered one defeat and disaster after another. The struggle for independence for a time seemed hopeless. Lord Cornwallis occupied Charlotte. The Tory sentiment loyal to the English King was strong in certain parts of North and South Carolina.

In a letter to a friend, General Washington wrote: "I have almost ceased to hope."

The decisive defeat inflicted upon Ferguson and his men here at Kings Mountain electrified the Colonies. The death of Ferguson swept away the clouds of doom and despair which hung over the Revolutionary Armies. With renewed vigor and determination they won victory after victory until their struggle was crowned with success by the British surrender at Yorktown.

In writing of the Battle of Kings Mountain in 1822, Thomas Jefferson said: "I remember well the deep and grateful impression made on the minds of everyone by that memorable victory. It was a joyful annunciation of that turn of the tide of success which terminated the Revolutionary War with the seal of independence."

Vice President George M. Dallas, in a letter written in 1855, said: "The spot where that battle was fought is certainly linked in thought inseparably with the independence of our country and the patriotic gallantry of Southern men."

And the great orator, Edward Everett, who delivered the address at Gettysburg immediately preceding Lincoln's immortal message, had this to say of Kings Mountain: "History will reserve a bright page in the annals of the Revolution for the names of the gallant men who fought the Battle of Kings Mountain."

Our forefathers did not march on Kings Mountain in the pursuit of fame, fortune, or at the command of a powerful government. The gallant men of the mountains descended upon the British tyrants to protect their homes, their loved ones, and their cherished way of life.

It has been said that nothing is more typical or representative of the early pioneer spirit of America than the people of the southern highlands. Their love of personal independence, their loyalty and devotion to the principles of free government, and their belief in God have been, since the beginning of our Nation, a powerful and sustaining influence. Their strong character was reflected in the victory at Kings Mountain.

The descendants of the heroes of Kings Mountain have helped to create great States. They have made a lasting contribution to our free institutions. Our liberty today can be traced back through the descendants of the patriots of 1780.

My friends, there is an inspiring lesson to be learned from the sacrifice made here 183 years ago. It is a lesson we must not forget for, as an eminent philosopher has said, those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

The patriots of 1780 faced tyranny in the form of British oppression. They were taxed without representation, impressed into the military and naval service of the British crown, and their homes and crops laid waste by Tory loyalists. Through their indomitable spirit and fierce determination to be free they overcame insurmountable obstacles and fashioned for us a free nation.

We are faced today, in a manner, with some of the same problems which confronted our forefathers. The concept of military warfare and the political and economic conditions existing in the world have changed since victory was won at Kings Mountain.

But, my friends, freedom still has its enemies. British tyranny has long disappeared but Americans must still be vigilant lest the heritage bequeathed to them by our forefathers at Kings Mountain be sacrificed for all time.

The enemy of freedom in the world today is communism, a materialistic philosophy which proclaims that man has no God, and whose purpose in life is for the greater glory of the state. The enemy of freedom today is communism, and it is nurtured and supported by hunger, disease, privation, ignorance, and intolerance wherever found in the world.

Communism has enslaved nearly 1 billion people throughout the world. It has required the American people to spend billions of dollars since World War II to halt its insidious spread. American boys at this very moment are in isolated encampments in southeast Asia, in Berlin, and in countless other points around the globe because of the threat of communism to the free world.

We must never forget that communism is dedicated to the destruction of our way of life. Our forefathers knew that there was no hope of reconciliation with the British sovereign. They dared, therefore, to risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

It is for us, their descendants, to realize that there can be no lasting conciliation with a system of government which has as its purpose the enslavement of mankind, a political philosophy which proclaims that the end justifies the means, and a form of tyranny that offers no hope for the future of civilization.

This we must realize as we face the strong tides of the future. Our Nation must not be lulled into a false sense of security. We must not permit the conciliatory gestures of the Communist masters to lead us into a fatal trap.

Less than 3 million Americans fought the greatest power on earth in 1780 and out of their great victory fashioned a free government which has been the marvel of the ages. Today 190 million Americans are faced with the challenge of preserving that government. We can do so only if we keep our faith in Almighty God, the source of all freedom, and continue to cherish and defend the great ideals and principles forming the bedrock upon which rests our free society.

The Battle of Kings Mountain is a stirring reminder of the fact that America was launched upon its course by courageous men dedicated to the high ideal of freedom. As we remember the deeds of Campbell, Sevier, Shelby, Cleveland, Chronicle, Hambright, McDowell, Winston, Preston, and the patriots under their command, let us resolve to protect the liberty they gave us in October 1780, on the slopes of Kings Mountain.

On October 4, 1855, John S. Preston of South Carolina delivered a great speech in this vicinity commemorating the Battle of Kings Mountain. In conclusion, I would like to quote his closing remarks:

"That spirit which won these fields and now makes them sacred to us is of the Eternal God, and will live and dwell forever on this American soil. We are the sons of heroes and sages. Let us be true to ourselves, be true to our country, be true to the God who gave it to us; be faithful to the blood shed here by our sires, and we will be the sires of free men as long as the earth owns man for its master. Such, at least, is the faith and hope of the Christian and patriot as he kneels on this holy place."

No. 13—"California: The Gamblers' Paradise"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to point out to the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of California, the extent of gambling in that State.

California is indeed a Golden State for organized crime rings that finance their shoddy operations with the proceeds of illicit gambling.

Legal betting at the track is a bigtime operation in California. Last year's parimutuel turnover was $522 million. The revenue to the State treasury was over $39 million. This legal gambling activity made California the second ranking in parimutuel betting in the country.

However, this action is peanuts when compared with illegal off-track wagering. California's share of the estimated national off-track gambling last year was over $4.3 billion. This represents California's share of the figure given to the McClellan committee.

Other testimony by State investigations commissions indicates that total illegal gambling in California could have reached over $8½ billion in gross turnover in 1962. About 10 percent of this gross is retained by the professional gamblers—more than $800 million lines the filthy pockets of the mob.

Since this kind of money helps support other criminal enterprises, it can safely be said that crime activities in California are well endowed. Illegal gambling bankrolls every shady operation in the book.

According to expert opinion, Mr. Speaker, the crime syndicates use about 15 percent of their profits to corrupt law-enforcement agencies and other public officials. Needless to say, this money is not working for the legalization of gambling. Only legalized gambling would wipe out the treasury of organized crime.

Because of the failure and refusal to legalize gambling under proper Government regulation and control, ostrichlike officialdom has made the people of California unknowing colleagues of the crime syndicates.

Government supervised and regulated gambling, in the form of a national lottery, would not only undercut the underworld, but would clean up the political process and build up our depleted National Treasury.

Burying Ourselves With Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, are we going to bury ourselves?

Considerable has been said and written about selling American wheat to the Communists and from all indications, the Kennedy administration is preparing the public for a grain deal with Russia and possibly other Communist nations.

I have opposed the sale of wheat to the Russians because, in my opinion, it is not in the best interests of this Nation either economically, politically or militarily to make such a sale.

Communism has not abandoned or renounced its long range objective of burying this Nation of ours and all other nations and peoples who believe in the concepts of free enterprise and freedom.

Communist agriculture is in deep trouble because the Red rulers have placed a higher priority on industrialization and the production of weapons designed to destroy us, than they have placed on food production for their own people. It is both dangerous and paradoxical for the United States even to consider using the products of the American way of life, which communism is determined to destroy, to strengthen that ideology. How do you meet the challenge of communism by enhancing its economy, by helping it overcome its shortcomings? By supplying the Russians and other Communists with food products we will, in effect, be freeing large sections of their labor force to continue the development and construction of weapons they hoped to use to bury us.

With communism engaged in cruel and vicious aggression and subversion against our allies and the United States, it would be morally and strategically wrong for us to subsidize those intent on destroying us. It is bad enough to subsidize wheat that is to go into domestic storage, but it would be sheer financial and political madness to give Khrushchev a subsidy for wheat that he needs. It would amount to American taxpayers subsidizing communism.

In the struggle to preserve freedom, no form of warfare can be neglected. If America aids Russia in waging economic warfare with wheat purchases we are asking for trouble. In exchange for sales now, we would be harvesting possible national tragedy later on.

We are spending more money on our defenses than ever before in peacetime to meet the challenge of communism. Now to turn around and feed the mouth that is going to bite us seems, indeed, foolhardy.

If the United States should sell wheat to the Russians or any other Communist nation, thus making up for the deficiencies of the Communist agricultural system, thus enhancing the Red economy, it will, indeed, be difficult hereafter for our Nation to call upon our friends and allies to assist us in resisting Communist aggression, the same system which we would have helped strengthen.

If the United States-Russian wheat transaction is consummated, how can we then request other free nations to curtail their trade and aid to Cuba? What will be our policy toward Red China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Cuba in the event any of these nations should hereafter offer gold or dollars in exchange for wheat or other U.S. surplus commodities? Certainly a sale of wheat to Russia would affect the success of our policy of containment in regards to Cuba.

The value of the relatively small amount of grain it would remove from our surpluses is very small in comparison to the billions we are spending all over the world not only to maintain our own defense and security, but to help other countries defeat communism. One of the arguments for foreign aid is that it is used to defeat and contain communism. It seems rather ridiculous on one hand to spend billions in foreign aid to defeat and contain communism, and on the other hand feed and nurture its suffering economy.

The wheat deal certainly runs counter to our professed policy which is to oppose the spread of communism and to help others oppose it.

No wonder the rest of the world does not understand our foreign policy. By such a sale we would in effect be burying ourselves.

Under present circumstances, I shall continue to oppose any such sale.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of October 5, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

WORLD'S SICKNESS IS COMMUNISM

The whole world is suffering today because of the basic infection, communism. To meet the problem we must start with a basic policy.

1. Recognize the world's sickness is communism.

2. Isolate the sickness—label it—refuse to deal with it.

(a) Communism is based on godless materialism;

(b) In any deals in which godless materialism is engaged with the God-fearing, the evil will sabotage the trusting.

3. Determine to give no foreign aid to the enemy, no aid to be used in subjugating people, no action to dignify the dishonorable.

We have failed to accept this basic policy and have encouraged the spread of the sickness.

THE UNHAPPY RECORD—WHAT DEALS HAVE COST

The growth and spread of the sickness has been helped by appeasement, deals, trusting unwisely, indication of weakness, lack of firm policy.

1. Yalta, Potsdam, Teheran: results: a divided Germany and the encirclement of Berlin; the enslavement of free Poland, Czechoslovakia, the death of free China, communist control of the Kuril Islands to set the stage for present Communist influence in Asia.

2. Berlin: Building the wall, thus violating a number of agreements including the right of free access. Enslaving behind the Iron Curtain millions of free Germans, wholesale murder of men, women and children for the crime of trying to escape to freedom.

3. Cuba: The loss of a free nation, the establishment of an enemy military base within shooting distance of the United States, a training area and embarkation point for saboteurs and subversion throughout Latin America.

4. Laos: Acceptance of a Russian proposal for a "troika" and the eventual control of the country by the Communists. Providing a staging area to export communism to surrounding free nations.

5. Vietnam: Recognition of a divided country giving the Communists a stronghold in North Vietnam has resulted in continued pressure on South Vietnam and has now brought death to American boys who are fighting a war that is not a war.

6. Korea: Communist control of North Korea resulted in war and 133,000 American casualties, humiliation and defeat for the United States and the strengthening of Communist influence throughout Asia.

7. United Nations: Trusting Soviet Union proposals for the charter and subsequent understanding has made it possible for the Russians to have their own man as head of the military secretariat continuously, even during the Korean war when Russia was supporting the enemy the U.N. was fighting. The Soviet Union has used the veto power to sabotage the U.N. and use its machinery against the United States; has bled the taxpayers of the United States to build and strengthen Communist countries.

8. Finally, we now have in being a test ban treaty which endangers our defenses and we are trying to enter into a deal to help the Soviet economy by selling Russia wheat to make up for its own inefficiencies. We will use American taxpayers' money to subsidize the sale.

AN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

No deals with the enemy—communism

1. Accept and recognize the challenge of the all-out war the Communists have declared on us.

2. Brand the sickness as communism. Stop supporting and aiding Communists, socialists, and neutrals. Provide foreign aid only to our friends and then on a self-help basis through loans and providing know-how for them to do the things they feel best for their country.

3. Withdraw recognition of Communist governments—brand them outlaws of civilization. Do not dignify them by negotiation and deals. Recognize they will not honor contracts, but use them as a step to victory for their side.

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?"—(II Corinthians, 6-14).

Fiftieth Anniversary for Rev. Gabriel Takacs, OFM

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 1963, a well-known and beloved member of the Hungarian Franciscans, the Reverend Gabriel Takacs, OFM, will celebrate the 50th anniversary of his monastic vows.

This half century of dedicated work by a dedicated man will be observed at the monastery of the Transylvanian Franciscan Fathers in Youngstown, Ohio. On that occasion the laying and blessing of the foundation stone of a new chapel at the monastery will take place. The first mass will be celebrated by Father Gabriel in a setting which is dominated by a statue of the first Saint and King of Hungary—Saint Stephen.

Father Gabriel began his priestly life in 1913, during World War I, in Transylvania, then under Roman rule. During World War II he worked among the Hungarian refugees in the displaced persons camps of Europe for a period of 6 years. When the displaced persons camps were emptied, Father Gabriel followed that part of his flock which took up a new life in the United States of America. After arriving in the United States he resumed his work among the Hungarian emigrees in Cleveland, Ohio. His leadership and intellectual attainments were soon recognized and he became editor in chief of the Catholic Hungarian Sunday, which is now the largest Hungarian language newspaper published in the United States.

Over the years Father Gabriel has been a tower of strength to the cause of the Hungarian nation and to the emigrees from that land who have taken up a new life in the United States. This mild, charitable, and warmhearted priest is revered by his countrymen and respected by many thousands of Americans who have come to know him through his many good works and unusual undertakings. To all he is a champion, a Christian life as a living answer to the problems and dangers of this age.

Father Gabriel Takacs, OFM, can look back over the past 50 years with the satisfied reward that comes only to those who live by the dictum, "The crown of victory shall go only to those who enter the fray."

Address by Hon. Basil L. Whitener at Kings Mountain Battleground, October 6, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 1780, a decisive blow was struck for American independence. On that date, 183 years ago, patriots from North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Virginia, and Georgia inflicted a disastrous defeat on the British Army at the historic Battle of Kings Mountain.

The battle was fought in the congressional district I am privileged to represent in the Congress. My district adjoins that of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable BASIL L. WHITENER. The town of Kings Mountain, N.C., is located in Mr. WHITENER's district.

On Sunday, October 6, 1963, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] made a stirring speech on the Kings Mountain battleground commemorating the American victory of October 7, 1780, before a distinguished gathering of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I know that my colleagues will find his remarks to be most interesting:

ADDRESS BY BASIL L. WHITENER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AT KINGS MOUNTAIN BATTLEGROUND, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1963

It is a great pleasure for me to be here this afternoon and to have the privilege of joining you in commemorating the Battle of Kings Mountain. I am particularly pleased that I have the opportunity to be with a group dedicated to the preservation of the principles upon which our great Nation was founded.

I know of no organization in America more imbued with the spirit of Kings Mountain than the Daughters of the American Revolution. Your great organization stands for the very highest ideals of American citizenship. Through the years it has been the vigilant guardian of constitutional government. Your organization has faithfully protected and defended the liberties won by our forefathers and the free institutions which they bequeathed to us.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the Daughters of the American Revolution on the great service the organization has rendered, and is rendering, to the American people. May your efforts to defend our cherished institutions and to expose the enemies of our country from within and from without continue to be crowned with success.

It is good to be here this afternoon and have the privilege for a few minutes of sharing with you some of the history and some of the inspiration of the Battle of Kings Mountain; 183 years ago the American Colonies were locked in a great struggle for freedom with the mother country. They had been ignored by a haughty sovereign and oppressed by a tyrannical Parliament. Their pleas for a redress of grievances had gone unnoticed by Parliament and the Royal Court. Forced at last to take up arms in the defense of the liberty their forefathers had wrested from King John at Runnymeade and which had been guaranteed to them in the Magna Carta, they engaged the English Armies and Loyalist sympathizers.

In the fall of 1780 the outlook for the success of the American effort for independence was not bright. An event was soon to happen, however, that was to rouse the Colonies to one last magnificent effort which was to culminate in victory.

In every great struggle for the rights of man throughout history there has been one decisive event which has determined the subsequent course of mankind. The Greeks had their Thermopylae, the British and French their Waterloo, and the Blue and the Gray their Gettysburg.

In the great struggle for American independence the decisive event was the Battle of Kings Mountain. It was not a military effort that required great planning, nor was it one supported by trains of supplies and equipment. The battle was one of those events that quite frequently happens in the course of history without major planning, but which leaves its imprint indelibly stamped on the affairs of men.

On October 4, 1855, one of America's greatest historians journeyed to this vicinity to take part in the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Kings Mountain. He was the learned and respected historian, George Bancroft.

Of the great victory won here he had this to say: "Let the battleground before us be left no longer as private property. Let it be made the inheritance of the people; that is, of all who are heirs to the benefits that were gained on the day which we commemorate. Let a monument rise upon its peak as a memorial of the heroism of their fathers, as an evidence of the piety of their sons. The deeds that were there performed bid us ever renew our love of country. Let the passion for freedom flow forth perennially like the fountains that gush in crystal purity from your hillsides. Let the Union stand like your mountains which the geologist tells us are the oldest and firmest in the world."

Were Bancroft living today he would be pleased to note that a grateful Nation has reserved the Kings Mountain Battleground as a national shrine.

History has reserved a bright page in the annals of the Revolution for the names of the gallant men who fought the battle of freedom on the slopes of Kings Mountain. I think it is altogether fitting and proper this afternoon to recount something of what took place here on October 7, 1780. As members of a patriotic organization dedicated to preserving the history and traditions of our wonderful Nation, I know that you share with me the pride that I have in the stirring events leading up to the Battle of Kings Mountain.

In the report of the battle signed by William Campbell, Isaac Shelby, and Benjamin Cleveland we have this stirring account of the battle:

"On receiving intelligence that Major Ferguson had advanced up as high as Gilbert Town in Rutherford County and threatened to cross the mountains to the western waters Col. William Campbell with 400 men from Washington County of Virginia, Col. Isaac Shelby with 240 men from Sullivan County of North Carolina, and Lt. Col. John Sevier with 240 men from Washington County of North Carolina assembled at Watauga on the 25th day of September (1780) where they were joined by Col. Charles McDowell with 160 men from the counties of Burke and Rutherford who had fled before the enemy to the western waters. We began our march on the 26th (of September) and on the 30th we were joined by Colonel Cleveland on the Catawba River with 350 men from the counties of Wilkes and Surry. No one officer having properly a right to command in chief. On the 1st day of October we dispatched an express to Major General Gates informing him of our situation and requesting him to send a general officer to take command of the whole. In the meantime Colonel Campbell was posted to act as commandant until such general officer should arrive.

We marched to the Cowpens on Broad River in South Carolina where we were joined by Col. James Williams with 400 men on the evening of the 6th (October) who informed us that the enemy lay encamped somewhere near the Cherokee Ford on Broad River about 30 miles distant from us. By a council of the principal officers it was then thought advisable to pursue the enemy that night with 900 of the best horsemen and leave the weak horse and footmen to follow as fast as possible. We began our march with about 900 of the best men that evening about 8 o'clock and marching all night came up with the enemy about 3 o'clock p.m. of the 7th (October) who lay encamped on the top of Kings Mountain 12 miles north of the Cherokee Ford in the confidence that they could not be forced from so advantageous a post. Colonel Shelby's and Colonel Campbell's regiments began the attack and kept up a fire on the enemy while the right and left wings were advancing forward to surround them which was done in about 5 minutes and the fire became general all around. The engagement lasted an hour and 5 minutes, the greatest part of which time a heavy and incessant fire was kept up on both sides. Our men in some places where the regulars fought were obliged to give way a small distance two or three times but rallied and returned with additional ardor to the attack. The troops upon the right having gained the summit of the eminence obliged the enemy to retreat along the top of the ridge to where Colonel Cleveland commanded and were there stopped by his brave men. A flag was immediately hoisted by Captain DuPoistre, the commanding officer (Major Ferguson having been killed a little before) for a surrender. Our fire immediately ceased and the enemy laid down their arms. The greatest part of them charged and surrendered themselves to us prisoners at discretion. It appears from their own provision returns that day found in their camp that their whole force consisted of 1,125 men out of which they sustained the following loss: Of the regulars, 1 major, 1 captain, 2 sergeants and 15 privates killed, 36 privates wounded. Left on the ground, not able to march, 2 captains, 4 lieutenants, 3 ensigns, 1 surgeon, 5 sergeants, 3 corporals, 1 drummer, and 49 privates taken prisoner. Loss of the Tories, 2 colonels, 3 captains, and 201 privates killed. One major and 127 privates wounded, and left on the ground not able to march, 1 colonel, 12 captains, 11 lieutenants, 2 ensigns, 1 quartermaster, 1 adjutant, 2 commissaries, 18 sergeants, and 600 privates taken prisoner. Total loss of the enemy 1,105 men at Kings Mountain. The loss on our side, 28 killed, 60 wounded."

I have read this partial report of the Battle of Kings Mountain signed by William Campbell, Isaac Shelby, and Benjamin Cleveland because it is the most succinct and descriptive narrative of the conflict that I have ever been able to find.

In 1 hour and 5 minutes of fighting on Kings Mountain the whole course of American history was changed and the concept of free government was firmly established in the new world.

The significance of what had happened at Kings Mountain was immediately realized throughout the American Colonies. No one understood what the victory meant better than did the British. Realizing that the Southern Campaign had been lost, British forces began the retreat which ended with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis approximately a year later at Yorktown.

The Continental Congress adopted a resolution praising the heroes of the decisive battle. The Congress resolved:

"That Congress entertains a high sense of the spirited and military conduct of Colonel Campbell and the officers and privates of the militia under his command displayed in the action of October 7 in which a complete victory was obtained over superior numbers of the enemy advantageously posted on Kings Mountain in the State of North Carolina and that this resolution be published by the commanding officer of the Southern Army in general orders."

The mountain men who marched to glory at Kings Mountain were of the fine English, Scotch, Irish, and German blood so prominently identified today with the industry and culture of North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Kentucky. The heroes of Kings Mountain fought to maintain the liberty they had inherited from their forebears. In so doing they were military architects for a system of government which has been the model of free governments in the Western Hemisphere and of many other parts of the world.

From 13 colonies comprising approximately 3 million people in a loosely bound confederation, our Nation has grown under the principles bequeathed to us by our forebears at Kings Mountain to a giant among nations.

In 183 years our 3 million people have become 190 million Americans. Our prosperity and material progress has been without equal in history.

We owe a lasting debt to the brave men who marched down out of the mountains and rescued a war for independence that was about to be lost. We can best pay our debt of gratitude to our Revolutionary forebears by reaffirming our faith in the ideals for which they fought and rededicating ourselves to the principles which guided their destiny.

So long as we have organizations such as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American ideal will be kept bright and our constitutional principles will be venerated. As long as the Daughters of the American Revolution continues to support the heritage of our past the light of freedom will not be extinguished.

Our Nation is faced with grave problems on the domestic and international fronts. The challenge of the times in which we live requires the very best in our national character.

The faith of our fathers made us great. That faith, if preserved, will sustain us in the future and will continue to guide our paths along the way of freedom. Our enemies will never triumph unless we turn our backs upon the heroic heritage of our forefathers.

The Daughters of the American Revolution hold high the torch of liberty. The DAR is the embodiment of the spirit of Kings Mountain.

I want to say again how happy I am to be with you this afternoon. It has been a high honor to join with you in commemorating the Battle of Kings Mountain. The story of that battle has passed into history, but the lesson to be gained from it will last forever.

Trade With the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this week's column by Mr. Thurman Sensing, of the Southern States Industrial Council, is concerned with the question of whether the United States should sell wheat to the Soviet Union. It is entitled "Shall American Taxpayers Subsidize Communism?"

In this column, Mr. Sensing has done an excellent job of analyzing this important question which is of much concern to the Members of the Congress, who expressed in 1961 a consensus against such trade with the Communists. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Sensing's column be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of his column my newsletter for this week which is also on this subject. It is entitled "Two Wrongs Don't Make a Right."

There being no objection, the column and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENSING THE NEWS—SHALL AMERICAN TAXPAYERS SUBSIDIZE COMMUNISM?

(By Thurman Sensing)

No sooner had the Kennedy administration achieved ratification of the treaty of Moscow than the New Frontier began to push for agricultural trading with the Soviet Union. This trade, if allowed to come into existence, would be a major danger to the American safety and economy.

The administration's hopes and plans became apparent in a number of ways. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, who steered the Moscow treaty through the Senate, promptly ordered hearings for a study of ways and means of relaxing export controls. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, who recently returned from a trip to Russia, also began discussing the possibility of selling agricultural products to Russia.

No doubt, the pressure will be heavy to approve this trade. The Soviet Union again has suffered a disastrous crop failure. It is badly in need of wheat and has made large purchases from Canada. Evidently, it hopes to make similar purchases of American wheat.

"Why not sell it to them?" some people ask. "We don't lose anything by getting Russian money for surplus U.S. wheat." There is plenty wrong with that observation. Let's see what it is.

It is well to begin with Canada. In order to sell its wheat to Russia, the Canadian Government had to agree to regard the Soviet Union as a favored trading partner. This means, for example, that the Canadians will have to buy large quantities of Russian goods. When this kind of two-way trade is established, it links countries together. Henceforth the Canadians will have to orient their thinking more in the direction of what the Russians want.

One reason the Canadian Government approved a trade deal is that it wanted to boost prosperity in the wheat-growing areas and win popularity. Perhaps the Kennedy administration has a similar political goal for the U.S. wheat States. But when Canada buys more Russian goods, it buys fewer United States goods. This means that the gold flow into the United States is reduced, thereby making more vexing an already critical gold problem. The dollar is further undermined.

If the United States were to sell wheat to Russia, the Russians would, of course, pay the world price. This is 60 cents a bushel less than our domestic price. But this domestic price is supported by U.S. subsidies. Understand what that means. If the Russians buy United States-supported wheat at the world market price, the American taxpayers will be subsidizing wheat sold to the Reds.

It's bad enough to subsidize wheat that is to go into domestic storage, but it would be sheer financial and political madness to give Khrushchev a subsidy for wheat that he needs. It would amount to American taxpayers subsidizing communism.

Actually, it is in the United States interest to deny Russia access to wheat and to force her thereby to divert more labor into farm production. The Soviet Union much prefers to pay cash for wheat overseas than to make such a diversion of labor. The Reds don't want to take manpower out of their armament plants and heavy industry, the areas where they are fiercely trying to catch up with the United States.

Therefore, if the United States allows Russians to buy wheat over here, it is helping Khrushchev carry out his grand design to strengthen the Soviet industrial system. Obviously, this is not in the U.S. interest. But these days the American Government seems to have forgotten all about preserving the American interest, whether it is in the Caribbean, in space, the Far East, or on the farm.

In the struggle to preserve freedom, no form of warfare can be neglected. If America allows Russia to wage economic warfare with wheat purchases, we are asking for trouble. In exchange for some sales now, we would be harvesting possible national tragedy later on.

Also, it is silly and shallow thinking to take the position, as some people do, that it would be all right to sell wheat to Russia and the other Iron Curtain countries but not to Red China and Cuba. A Communist is a Communist.

STROM THURMOND REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE, OCTOBER 7, 1963

TWO WRONGS DON'T MAKE A RIGHT

In August 1961, Congress restated the policy that the United States should "in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nation other than * * * friendly nations." Wheat sales by the United States to the Soviet Union are within the prohibition of this policy. Yet it has become obvious that the executive branch of Government, at least, now looks with favor on sales of wheat to the Communist nations.

Three main arguments are now advanced for selling wheat to the Soviets:

First, the United States has large surpluses of wheat, and the cost of storage is high;

sales to the Communist bloc would diminish the surplus and reduce storage costs.

Second, the Communists can obtain wheat from other free world nations such as Canada and Australia, even if we don't sell to them.

Third, the sale of wheat and other products to the Communists would help to offset the serious balance-of-payments deficit of the United States, which results primarily from the heavy outflow of foreign aid.

A fourth argument, used privately, is that the political consequences of the rejection of the wheat plan by the farmers in the referendum of last spring could be softened.

The factors on which the public arguments are based are not new. They were all in existence in 1961 when Congress made the latest policy decision against selling such commodities to unfriendly nations. U.S. wheat surpluses go back for years. Canada was selling wheat to Red China in 1961. The balance-of-payments problem reached a high in 1960.

Regardless of the soft words from Khrushchev in the past few months, no one could seriously believe that the Moscow test ban treaty converted the Soviet Union from an unfriendly nation into a friendly nation. No witness who testified on the treaty denied that the Communists, including Khrushchev, continue to stanchly maintain their goal of world domination.

Communism still pits its atheistic slave system against our free system. As Khrushchev so often repeats, the "conflict of systems" must continue until one or the other falls.

Although the conflict of systems takes military, economic and psychological forms, the conflict is fundamentally ideological. The basic issue in the conflict is whether the despotic slave system of communism is better than the free systems of the non-Communist nations, or whether an orderly existence of society can result from an applied philosophy of godless materialism.

In no other way has communism proved its abject failure more clearly than in its demonstrated incapacity to feed the people under its control. Continuous Soviet agricultural failure confronts every person behind the Iron Curtain with daily evidence of the bankruptcy of Communist regimes and the Marxist doctrine.

There is reason to believe that the Soviet agricultural failure this year was intensified by sabotage efforts of the Soviet people, expressing their opposition to the Communist regime in the only way they have, albeit a costly one to themselves.

If the United States now participates in covering up the Communist agricultural failures, the greatest weakness of the Communists will be hidden, and the opposition to communism of the oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain nullified. Instead of having to devote even greater portions of its resources to overcome its agricultural failures, the Communists can divert material and human resources even further toward military and subversive efforts to dominate the remainder of the world.

Khrushchev now has trouble with the people throughout the bloc. The people want more freedom, and the more they could get, the more they would want and the more trouble Khrushchev would have. Is it either moral or advantageous for the United States to help the Soviet leaders relieve their internal political difficulties?

Our free world allies are now trading with the Soviets far more than we. The efforts of the United States to curtail such aid to the enemy have been halfhearted. We have mildly criticized our allies for yielding to the lure of profits and temporary internal political gains flowing from dangerous trade with the Communists.

It is now time to prove that we will support our principles with actions as well as words. Two wrongs do not make a right, and if the United States now demonstrates the courage of its convictions, our allies may be influenced to reexamine their own actions and policies on trading with the enemy.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, with several Congressmen and Senators from both parties, I have sponsored H.R. 3669, the quality stabilization bill. This bill has been reported out by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I expect it will be on the floor within a short time.

This bill is soundly conceived and written to help preserve our American system of free enterprise. Such men as Congressmen THOR TOLLEFSON, CHET HOLIFIELD, ELFORD CEDERBERG, RAY MADDEN, and OREN HARRIS, as well as several other Members, have joined me in sponsoring the bill in the House. In the Senate, as S. 774, it bears the names of such distinguished men as HUBERT HUMPHREY, THOMAS KUCHEL, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, and KARL MUNDT.

In spite of the extended hearings, at which all facts on the quality stabilization bill were developed, some critics are attacking it with slogans that carry a completely erroneous impression of what the bill actually will do. There are valid reasons to support this bill. I have heard of no valid reasons to oppose it. But that does not stop the sloganeers, who cry out in the name of the so-called little people—the miners, laborers, the small store owners, and the retired people.

Mr. Speaker, these little people are the ones who elect me to this House. I am thoroughly convinced the bill is in the best interests of these people. It will help protect them from the unscrupulous. It will do nothing to harm them.

The editors of the National Independent Labor Journal have carefully analyzed the quality stabilization bill. This Journal is the newspaper of the national independent unions, and speaks for these fine people who will benefit, along with all Americans, from this bill. The Labor Journal studied the bill. The editors went over it carefully. Their editorial is based on objective study, not on slogans.

Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial from the National Independent Labor Journal in the RECORD:

QUALITY STABILIZATION BILL HAS OUR SUPPORT

The Journal believes that the free, competitive enterprise system will be fortified by the enactment of the quality stabilization bill (H.R. 3669 and S. 774) now before Congress. That system of free, competitive enterprise has helped give the American consumer more economic benefits than any other system in the history of man.

It is 100 percent consistent with free, competitive enterprise to urge that a manufacturer who builds a valuable property in the good will for his trademark be able to protect that property. The quality stabilization bill will permit just that, but at the same time it will safeguard the consumer against arbitrary pricing or conduct by the requirement that the trademarked product be in free and open competition before the law can be used.

We foresee many benefits flowing from the enactment of the quality stabilization bill. We believe that it will be a major step toward the elimination of the "let the buyer beware" philosophy so harmful to the consumer. We see a strong assist to our small businessmen, because this act will help eliminate the "might makes right" philosophy of the jungle.

We believe that a stable and fair distribution structure, coupled with stable and fair conditions of employment, will give added incentives to a manufacturer and to labor to build better and better products, thereby giving the consumer greater and greater value for his investment in the product.

When a manufacturer gets hurt by retailer pirates who for their own gain usurp and damage the manufacturer's good will in his trademark, then labor gets hurt in two ways—one, as a consumer; second, as an employee, because the welfare of the employee—the welfare of labor—is interdependent with the welfare of the employer.

The quality stabilization bill therefore has our vote.

Two-hundredth Anniversary of Touro Synagogue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the historic Touro Synagogue, which is located in Newport, R.I.

My bill provides that the profile of George Washington shall appear on one side of such coins with his immortal words "To bigotry no sanction" inscribed under such profile, and on the reverse side of such coins there shall appear a likeness of Touro Synagogue.

That venerable house of worship was dedicated on December 2, 1763, and almost 27 years later, our Nation's first President, George Washington, visited Touro Synagogue and first proclaimed religious freedom. Shortly thereafter, President Washington wrote these meaningful words:

> For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection shall demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It is also appropriate to recall that the General Assembly of Rhode Island met in Touro Synagogue for the first time after the evacuation of Newport by the British during September 1780. Today, it is the oldest house of Jewish worship standing in the United States and is of national interest to Jew and Christian alike.

It was, therefore, quite natural that in view of its historic associations, the Touro Synagogue was designated as a national historic site under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of August 12, 1935. I feel that this is a most opportune moment to reassert our recognition that the United States is still a religious nation.

The bill I am introducing today is a companion to S. 2179, sponsored by Senators PELL, PASTORE, JAVITS, and KEATING, and I most strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation so that it may be enacted into law at this crucial time in our history. Surely religious freedom is no less important now than it was 200 years ago when Touro Synagogue was dedicated.

Extension of Civil Rights Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming 265-to-80 vote of the House in favor of extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 1 year is extremely heartening news to supporters of freedom and equality for all Americans regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The Civil Rights Commission has probably done more to publicize and report on the serious national problems we face in the civil rights and civil liberties field than any other single agency in our history. It has helped throw the bright, cold light of exposure on the festering wounds of inequality in America since its establishment in 1957. I find it difficult to measure the debt of gratitude we owe this outstanding Commission for its service to the cause of a better America in the days and years ahead.

Admittedly, it was unfortunate that the House had to resort to a piecemeal, one-shot, temporary extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, but, under the circumstances, the only other alternative would have been to allow the Commission's authority to expire, and with it, much of the good work it has done.

As we know, the omnibus civil rights bill, just reported out by the Civil Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and now to be considered by the full committee, contains a provision making the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency.

Since it may be some weeks, however, before we know the final version of the civil rights bill, and what more permanent status it may accord the Commission, the action of the House was most timely and most appropriate.

As additional comment on the importance of the civil rights bill and its historic roots, I insert in the RECORD the text of my October 7, 1963, weekly report to the residents of the 30th Congressional District.

The report follows:

CONGRESSMAN ED ROYBAL REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

STRONG CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM GIVEN TOP CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITY

The first real break in the 9 months long legislative logjam on the administration's civil rights proposals came last week with final approval by the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil Rights of a greatly strengthened bill designed to assure equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans, regardless of race, creed, color, ancestry or national origin.

Though marking only the beginning of what promises to be a long and arduous legislative journey, this development is extremely heartening to those of us who believe Congress has an urgent duty to take a strong, unequivocal stand in favor of the principle of equality in education, training, employment, use of public facilities, access to public accommodations, housing, and voting.

As Californians, with such protections already on the statute books, and as early leaders in the fight to extend our American constitutional heritage of freedom, equality, and individual liberty to all the State's citizens, we sometimes tend to take this heritage for granted and often do not fully realize the importance of dynamic national leadership in the civil rights field.

Comprehensive program

The subcommittee's sweeping 10-part bill includes provisions on voting, public accommodations, legal remedies for deprivation of rights, desegregation of public schools and public facilities, a new Community Relations Service, a permanent Civil Rights Commission, State and local programs getting Federal financial assistance, a new Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, nationwide Census Bureau factfinding surveys on the extent of voting discrimination, and strengthening the right to higher Federal court review of civil rights cases.

In the Bill of Rights tradition

Coming during this year's 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, this comprehensive civil rights proposal reminds me of another interesting and pertinent chapter of early American history.

The Founding Fathers and a solid majority of the citizens of the original 13 States were so much in favor of written, enforceable guarantees of civil rights and civil liberties that they insisted on what became the first 10 amendments to the Constitution—the world-famous Bill of Rights—as a condition for ratification.

Historians unanimously agree that, without this firm assurance that the first order of business for the new Government would be adoption of such civil rights guarantees, it would have been nearly impossible to obtain ratification from the required nine States.

A meaningful bill

I was very happy that the subcommittee has approved such a strong proposal on civil rights. It assures that, even though the full committee, the House and the Senate may tone it down somewhat, we will nevertheless come out this year with a good bill, of which we can all be proud.

It will be a major step in our effort to eliminate the poison of racial and minority group discrimination, abolish, once and for all, second-class citizenship in this country, and fulfill the revolutionary dream of freedom and equality for all Americans.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Samuel 12: 23: *God forbid that I should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for you.*

O Thou who hast taught us in Thy word to engage in intercessory prayer grant that we may not fail to pray for those who daily find the struggle of life so very difficult and burdensome.

We earnestly beseech Thee to hear us as we pray for all whose lives are attended with many failures and disappointments and whose very thoughts are continually flowing in sadness.

May the children of darkness and depression be filled with hope and cheer as they take knowledge of our confidence and trust in the assurance that Thy grace is sufficient for all their needs.

Give us a clear sense of duty and a new perception of the opportunities of helping to bear the burdens of others and to bring sunshine into hearts that are weary and sad and may all our service to humanity be manifestations of the spirit of our blessed Lord who was moved with compassion and went about doing good.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1172. An act to amend Public Law 86-518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86-518.

HOUR OF MEETING THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House convenes on Thursday next it convene at 11 o'clock in the morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, this matter has been discussed with me by the majority leader and I have discussed the matter with other Members. It occurs to us with good reason that the convenience of a great many Members would be served if we could meet at 11 o'clock, and in all likelihood complete consideration of the bill that will be up on Thursday next.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on April 10, 1962, our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], addressed the House on the subject of the National Labor Relations Board and numerous cases decided by it and by the Supreme Court. On June 5, 1962, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] and I replied to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and those two gentlemen repeated their performance on June 18, 1963. Again my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] and I replied this past July 11. Subsequently, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] spoke again on the same subject on August 27, at which time he introduced the bill H.R. 8246. Yesterday the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] addressed himself to the same subject again. The pattern was unchanged. The speech was a reflection, once again, of his ideas of how the NLRB should operate. It was not anything but a personal opinion.

As chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction over this matter, I take this time simply to call attention to the fact that our distinguished colleagues are speaking for themselves only, not for the subcommittee or indeed, for the House or the full committee. I see no need for any further rebuttals on the floor of the House, for it is evident that the proper place for such discussions is in committee where the matters can be discussed objectively.

I think this dialog has lasted quite long enough and there will be no further replies except, of course, if there is legislative consideration of these matters.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MADAME NHU

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thought it might be of interest to the House to know that in my capacity as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on State Department personnel and foreign operations, I am going to launch an inquiry into how this 20th century Lucrezia Borgia, Madame Nhu, got a diplomatic visa to visit this country and continues to insult our servicemen and men who have died fighting for Vietnam. She says they are spectators at this battle. I would say if they are, then we ought to get them into a less dangerous spectator sport. This woman has set off in Paris and Rome on a shopping expedition, and I suspect the American taxpayers will be interested as to how much of our U.S. dollars—we are pouring $1½ million a day into that country—and I am sure the American taxpayers will be interested to know how much she is spending of that on new clothes in Paris and Rome. She is an evil woman. She should not have been allowed to come here. Since she is neither a government official nor a diplomat, she should not have a diplomatic visa. I think it is bad enough for her to insult the United States on foreign shores, but certainly this comic strip Dragon Lady should not be allowed to come here and do it.

WHEAT FOR RED GANGSTERS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a deal to give Communist Russia wheat is unbelievable. It is beyond me how any rational person in the United States today could seriously consider openly and brazenly aiding the cause of communism in such fashion.

We poured $11,000 million of lend lease into Russia during World War II and were visited in return with the most inconceivable ingratitude in all the history of the world. Our pilots who landed in Russia were interned and brutally mistreated. Our military observers were not permitted at the front, and much of our aid was used for conquest. Russia repaid our kindness by helping North Korea and Red China to launch a war to destroy freedom.

Mr. Speaker, we did not even learn by experience. We poured scrap iron and oil into Japan and thus indirectly helped fashion the infamous attack upon our men at Pearl Harbor. Our soldiers were slain on the battlefields with our own scrap iron. Adolph Hitler's war for conquest never could have gotten off the ground without aid from those whom he intended to destroy. Surely the United States is not again going to bail out faltering, incompetent communism.

The test ban treaty may indeed have been the first step and this proposed wheat deal is the second step—not toward peace but toward enslavement, degradation, war, and surrender of national honor. We are being charmed by the snake of "peaceful coexistence." The people of the United States are looking to this Congress to prevent this wheat deal and preserve the integrity of this great country.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PAY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with this Nation wallowing in debt yet indulging in the fiction that a tax cut will cure the financial evils that abound, the situation is to be further compounded with pay increases for Members of Congress and the executive branch of Government.

Under the terms of the bill introduced yesterday, Members of Congress would get a $12,500 a year increase to $35,000. Justices of the Supreme Court would be increased $15,000 a year to $60,000. Cabinet officers would also go up $15,000 a year to $40,000.

Mr. Speaker, these and other increases which I do not have the time to list are unconscionable and I trust that unlike last week, when Members of the House voted themselves fringe benefits, they will stand and be counted on a rollcall vote for the benefit of the taxpayers who will pay these bills if ever they are paid.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 812)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 7.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 17, 18, 22, 23 and 26 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,369,071,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,913,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$191,325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,355,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,889,145,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,385,575,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,386,141,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,453,376,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 11, 20 and 27.

Richard B. Russell,
Carl Hayden,
Lister Hill,
John L. McClellan,
Allen J. Ellender,
Harry F. Byrd,
Leverett Saltonstall,
Milton Young,
Margaret Chase Smith,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

George Mahon,
Harry R. Sheppard,
Clarence Cannon,
Gerald R. Ford,
Harold C. Ostertag,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Statement

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Military personnel, Army

Amendment No. 1: Provides $100,000,000 by transfer from the Army stock fund and defense stock fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $125,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides $50,000,000 by transfer from the Army industrial fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $65,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Military personnel, Navy

Amendment No. 3: Provides $30,000,000 by transfer from the defense stock fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $37,000,000 from the Navy stock fund and the defense stock fund as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Strikes language providing for transfer from Navy stock fund as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Provides for transfer of $90,000,000 from the Navy industrial fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $110,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Military personnel, Air Force

Amendment No. 6: Provides for transfer of $45,000,000 from the Air Force stock fund and the defense stock fund instead of $20,000,000 by transfer from the defense stock fund as proposed by the Senate and $175,000,000 by transfer from the Air Force stock fund and the defense stock fund as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Restores language proposed by the House providing for transfers from the Air Force stock fund.

Amendment No. 8: Provides for transfer of $10,000,000 from the Air Force industrial fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Reserve personnel, Army

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement.

National Guard personnel, Army

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $242,800,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $240,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement.

It is the intent of the committee on conference, in providing the amounts indicated in amendments numbers 1 through 8, inclusive, to provide for carrying out the program of military personnel strengths proposed in the budget estimates. It is understood that adjustments may be sought in connection with the supplemental estimates covering the costs of the recently enacted military pay increase.

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Operation and maintenance, Army

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $3,369,071,000 instead of $3,361,000,000 as proposed by the House and $3,375,643,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Navy

Amendment No. 13: Provides a limitation of $7,800,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $2,913,600,000 instead of $2,905,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,919,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $191,325,000 instead of $191,000,000 as proposed by the House and $191,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $4,355,500,000 instead of $4,341,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,370,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $180,800,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $176,600,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $2,931,094,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,958,894,000 as proposed by the House.

Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $2,889,145,000 instead of $2,877,445,000 as proposed by the House and $2,928,845,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference has deleted the funds restored by the Senate for the EA6A aircraft. The program presented to the Committee on Appropriations for the modification of existing aircraft to the proposed EA6A configuration is approved and should be accomplished with funds presently available in this appropriation item. Funds restored to the bill by the Senate in the amount of $10,200,000 for the Gulfstream aircraft are deleted. Funds restored to the bill by the Senate in the amount of $11,700,000 for the T2B trainer aircraft are approved.

Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate $2,059,589,000 instead of $2,080,089,000 as proposed by the House and $2,068,089,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Aircraft procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,385,575,000 instead of $3,328,900,000 as proposed by the House and $3,395,075,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have reduced by $9,500,000 the funds restored by the Senate for the C–141 aircraft. This is to be applied to the procurement of spare parts and is not to interfere with the number of aircraft programed in the bill as approved by the Senate.

Missile procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,141,990,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,129,490,000 as proposed by the House.

Other procurement, Air Force

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $878,299,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $871,299,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $1,386,141,000 instead of $1,363,141,000 as proposed by the House and $1,391,141,000 as proposed by the Senate. The committee of conference approves an increase of $23,000,000 for the defense communication satellite as proposed by the Senate and is agreed that $5,000,000 above the House amount be restored to the LANCE missile program to be offset by a corresponding reduction in an aircraft development program.

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $3,453,376,000 instead of $3,416,146,000 as proposed by the House and $3,483,376,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase above the House amount includes $30,000,000 for the mobile medium range ballistic missile program and $7,230,000 for a classified project.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 26: Provides for a limitation of 20 per centum on indirect expenses in connection with research grants as proposed by the Senate instead of 25 per centum as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GERALD R. FORD,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 166]

Arends
Barrett
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Bolling
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Buckley
Burton
Cameron
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dulski
Fisher
Frelinghuysen
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hoffman
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Lankford
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
Michel
Mills
Moore
Morrison
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rivers, Alaska
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schenck
Shelley
Sheppard
Sibal
Staebler
Stubblefield
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Ullman
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Wilson, Bob
Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 345 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, last June 26 the House passed the defense appropriation bill which provided $47,082,009,000 for defense for the then forthcoming fiscal year, which is now the current fiscal year. The reduction made in the defense budget by the House was $1.9 billion. Some of these reductions were, in effect, paper reductions. Other reductions were made for the purpose of enforcing better economy and more efficient management in the Department of Defense. Other reductions were made because the committee and the House did not believe that the Defense Department was ready to effectively spend certain funds which were requested. It was the opinion of the House, in some instances, that requests for funds were premature.

The House bill went over to the other body and the other body more or less agreed with the position of the House and the bill which we had approved. It added some $258 million to the bill. In conference, the House agreed to a compromise amount of $47,220,010,000.

The bill as reflected in the conference report is $138,001,000 above the House figure and $119,697,000 below the amount in the bill as it passed the Senate a relatively short time ago.

There is a new atmosphere in the country, to some extent, as a result of the test ban treaty which was recently approved by the Senate. I know that all Members are most anxious that we not let down our guard; that we not become complacent; that we not be induced into a state of euphoria, against which Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff warned, as a result of this treaty.

The Congress, by its approval of this bill, will in my judgment show that we continue to be alert to the dangers of Communist aggression. This bill is $7 billion above the comparable defense appropriations for the last year of the previous administration. It is $7 billion above the average annual appropriations for the 3 years just prior to the time this administration came to power.

I am not saying that in order to be partisan because, insofar as I know, there are no partisan aspects to the measure which is before us. I am saying it for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that we are trying to buy $7 billion more in defense now than we were trying to buy 3 years ago. Since that time, some costs have gone up, but higher costs are responsible for only a small portion of the increase.

Approval of this conference report will indicate to the Congress, will indicate to the Government, will indicate to our own people, will indicate to our friends and those who oppose us, the determination and resolution on the part of the American people to remain alert, to remain strong, and to be willing to continue to pay whatever price may be necessary for the preservation of our liberties.

We continue to be the leading country in the world from a military standpoint. We have a clear military superiority over the Soviet Union. Favorable action on this report will be a declaration of our intention to remain in a position of military superiority.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give us some idea where the money is going that is represented by the $138 million above the House-approved figure?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, I was just coming to that. There are many minor differences, but the major differences are as follows: The House provided $20,500,000 for a so-called roll-on roll-off cargo ship for military transport. The other body struck out this amount on the ground that it was premature, that private enterprise was building a ship which might be a sufficient ship for the purpose. So the funds for this ship were eliminated by the other body and we agreed to the elimination. This may well be only a postponement to next year, but at any rate that is one of the differences involved here.

We have a series of programs involving satellites of one kind or another. The House agreed to the Senate increase in the funds for the defense communications satellite in the amount of $23 million. That is one of the larger items.

In my judgment, one of the most important things we did was to change our position somewhat on the so-called MMRBM, the mobile medium range ballistic missile. We provided funds for it last year. We provided $43,100,000 in the House bill. We struck out $100 million on the ground that the Department of Defense had not made up its mind, had not determined resolutely to proceed with the production of the mobile medium range ballistic missile.

The Secretary of Defense did not appeal this reduction of $100 million to the Senate. However, General Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, did say that he hoped that the other body would restore the $100 million which we had stricken out for the mobile medium range ballistic missile. The other body did not approve the full $100 million, but put in $60 million.

I believe that this weapon, if it can be perfected, will be an important addition to our arsenal. It will be transportable on a truck, and by our aircraft. We would be able to deploy ballistic missiles to almost any area of the world and be ready to use them, if necessary, on very short notice.

In the event of something less than a total, all-out war, we would not be required to fire intercontinental ballistic missiles from the United States, but we could fire this weapon from mobile sites near whatever area of the world the difficulty had arisen.

Mr. Speaker, this weapon is designed to fill the range gap between the ICBM's and the Army missile called the Pershing, which has a range of 400 miles. The mobile medium range ballistic missile would have a range up to about 2,000 miles.

Mr. Speaker, those are the more significant items. The conference report appears in the RECORD of today. I know the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is interested, as we all are, in the situation with respect to personnel. We are maintaining in this bill the same military personnel, 2,695,000, that was requested in the budget. We did not cut one single person in uniform requested by the President. The President's budget proposed a reduction of 10,000 in the current fiscal year in civilian personnel. The House and Senate conferees, having agreed upon a reduction of $1.7 billion in the bill, have made certain that there would be the budgeted reduction and a considerable additional reduction in civilian personnel.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, is the gentleman speaking of American nationals as well as foreign nationals, or just American nationals in his reference to personnel in the Military Establishment?

Mr. MAHON. I am speaking of American nationals, but a reduction will be made in the deployment overseas of civilian personnel as a result of some of these readjustments.

Mr. GROSS. Well, if the gentleman will yield further, I would hope so because the Comptroller General has stated that we had some 2,000 Japanese nationals surplus to our needs employed by the military in Japan and if that situation exists in that same proportion around the world, we are certainly spending a lot of money on foreign nationals that ought to be stopped and stopped immediately.

Mr. MAHON. As the gentleman knows, the General Accounting Office is an arm of the Congress and we have conferred repeatedly with Mr. Campbell, the Comptroller General, who has cooperated very closely with the committee and who has been immediately available to us and who has worked with us in an effort to achieve all possible economy and efficiency in the Department of Defense.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. GROSS. With the signing of the so-called test ban treaty and the thawing of the cold war, if it may be called that, and with the newfound affinity for the Soviets that we see displayed and becoming more pronounced almost every day, including the proposed deal on wheat, I wonder where we are headed.

May I ask the gentleman, with this new-found affinity for the Russians, what about the appropriations next year? Does the gentleman think we might substantially cut the defense appropriation bill for the next fiscal year on the basis of this warmness, this thawing out, that is taking place all over the landscape?

Mr. MAHON. I have not believed and do not believe that there has been a thawing of the cold war. I think the danger to our country is as great and immediate as it was previously. It is for that reason I feel that we are on solid ground in approving the second highest peacetime defense bill in the history of our country, and that is what we do if we approve this conference report.

Mr. McNamara, the able, industrious, and highly competent Secretary of Defense, for whom I have great respect, took the position when he came into office that we needed to give ourselves greater strength in certain areas, such as increasing the mobility of our forces. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in this area. We have also done a terrific job toward modernizing the Army so it would not have to use World War II weapons. Our defense appropriation bill has gone up $7 billion above the last full fiscal year of the previous administration. We should not let defense costs escalate rapidly. I believe that defense spending will level off. One of the reasons why I support some reductions in this bill is that we do not want a series of peaks, and sudden retrenchments if we can avoid them. We want a consistent program of strength. I would not be surprised if the defense budget next year is not approximately at the same level as the present budget. I hope it will not have to go up. I think we are on a rather high plateau now. My hope is we are not going to have to go higher in defense spending, at least for the next few years.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not too impressed with the talk of peace and good will that seems to be growing in volume around the world, and particularly in this country these days?

Mr. MAHON. I am not cognizant of that myself. I think we want to avoid war if we can. National defense is an insurance policy. We are buying and continuing to pay the annual premium on it. We have coming into the inventory every month and year an increased number of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-launched missiles. At no time can we relax our vigilance. We have done a good job in maintaining our military position. We must continue to do so.

Mr. GROSS. With the arms race continuing at full speed, would it not be more than a little incongruous if we now supplied the Russians with wheat and flour that they need to feed the manpower that provides the ability to produce the weapons that may well be used against us?

Mr. MAHON. This is an issue not facing us in this conference report. I have not made an intense study of that matter, nor have I discussed it with officials of the Government. My idea would be to look upon this providing of wheat to the Soviet Union with a great deal of reservation and caution. I am not so sure but what the Soviet Union can secure in the markets of the world the wheat it needs, but that issue is not involved here.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is there anything in the language which would clarify the situation on subsidized wheat sales to the enemy?

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing in this bill which has any relationship to that at all. As this bill passed the House and also the other body, there is nothing in here about wheat.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman will recall in the Agricultural Act last year there was an attempt to set forth policy. I wonder if there was any further attempt to set policy about subsidizing wheat sales to the enemy included here.

Mr. MAHON. Nothing along that line is in this bill or report.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, I have no lengthy comments to add to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I think this is a good compromise. It is very close to the House bill. It is good legislation and I endorse it.

Mr. MAHON. I shall insert tables in the RECORD giving specific figures with respect to all the services and more of the details in order that they may be readily available to the Members of the House.

At this point, under leave to revise, extend, and insert tabular material, I offer a summary and a detailed tabulation of the estimates, the action to the two Houses, and the conference agreement:

Department of Defense, 1964

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS

Title	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Military personnel	$12,992,690,000	$13,235,200,000	$12,848,200,000	$12,850,700,000	$12,850,700,000	−$384,500,000	+$2,500,000	
Title II—Operation and maintenance	11,688,724,500	11,792,237,000	11,678,337,000	11,741,030,000	11,714,033,000	−78,204,000	+35,696,000	−$26,997,000
Title III—Procurement	16,647,110,000	16,724,800,000	15,666,472,000	15,763,747,000	15,706,047,000	−1,018,753,000	+39,575,000	−57,700,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	7,021,558,000	7,262,000,000	6,889,000,000	6,984,230,000	6,949,230,000	−312,770,000	+60,230,000	−35,000,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	48,350,082,500	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:								
Army	11,637,874,000	12,579,628,000	12,095,563,000	12,117,106,000	12,105,534,000	−474,094,000	+9,971,000	−11,572,000
Navy	15,176,832,000	14,966,300,000	14,369,838,000	14,424,088,000	14,369,963,000	−596,337,000	+125,000	−54,125,000
Air Force	19,482,917,000	19,178,400,000	18,365,935,000	18,547,840,000	18,493,840,000	−684,560,000	+127,905,000	−54,000,000
Defense agencies	2,052,459,500	2,289,909,000	2,250,673,000	2,250,673,000	2,250,673,000	−39,236,000		
Total, Department of Defense	48,350,082,500	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Department of Defense, 1964—Continued

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Title	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House	Senate
Military personnel, Army	[1]$3,662,900,000	[2]$3,885,000,000	[3]$3,785,000,000	[2]$3,785,000,000	[2]$3,785,000,000	−$100,000,000		
Military personnel, Navy	[4]2,747,400,000	[5]2,676,000,000	[6]2,614,000,000	[5]2,614,000,000	[5]2,614,000,000	−62,000,000		
Military personnel, Marine Corps	667,900,000	678,600,000	678,600,000	678,600,000	678,600,000			
Military personnel, Air Force	[7]4,167,690,000	[8]4,148,000,000	[9]3,943,000,000	[8]3,943,000,000	[10]3,943,000,000	−205,000,000		
Reserve personnel, Army	239,200,000	210,100,000	210,100,000	210,100,000	210,100,000			
Reserve personnel, Navy	85,600,000	92,300,000	92,300,000	92,300,000	92,300,000			
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	28,100,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000			
Reserve personnel, Air Force	50,100,000	55,100,000	55,100,000	55,100,000	55,100,000			
National Guard personnel, Army	261,800,000	240,300,000	240,300,000	242,800,000	242,800,000	+2,500,000	+$2,500,000	
National Guard personnel, Air Force	53,000,000	58,300,000	58,300,000	58,300,000	58,300,000			
Retired pay, Defense	1,029,000,000	1,163,000,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	−20,000,000		
Total, Title I—Military personnel	12,992,690,000	13,235,200,000	12,848,200,000	12,850,700,000	12,850,700,000	−384,500,000	+2,500,000	

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Title	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Operation and maintenance, Army	$3,452,552,000	$3,395,200,000	$3,361,000,000	$3,375,643,000	$3,369,071,000	−$26,129,000	+$8,071,000	−$6,572,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	2,864,414,000	2,934,000,000	2,905,000,000	2,919,200,000	2,913,600,000	−20,400,000	+8,600,000	−5,600,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	194,000,000	192,300,000	191,000,000	191,650,000	191,325,000	−975,000	+325,000	−325,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	4,407,977,000	4,385,000,000	4,341,000,000	4,370,000,000	4,355,500,000	−29,500,000	+14,500,000	−14,500,000
Operation and maintenance, Defense Agencies	358,987,400	451,400,000	446,000,000	446,000,000	446,000,000	−5,400,000		
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	174,400,000	176,600,000	176,600,000	180,800,000	180,800,000	+4,200,000	+4,200,000	
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	194,400,000	222,700,000	222,700,000	222,700,000	222,700,000			
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army	622,000	528,000	528,000	528,000	528,000			
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Communication System, Army	6,900,000							
Claims, Defense	[11]19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000			
Contingencies, Defense	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000			
Court of Military Appeals, Defense	472,100	509,000	509,000	509,000	509,000			
Total, Title II—Operation and Maintenance	11,688,724,500	11,792,237,000	11,678,337,000	11,741,030,000	11,714,033,000	−78,204,000	+35,696,000	−26,997,000

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Title	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	$2,520,000,000	$3,202,000,000	$2,958,894,000	$2,931,094,000	$2,931,094,000	−$270,906,000	−$27,800,000	
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	[12]3,034,660,000	3,066,000,000	2,877,445,000	2,928,845,000	2,889,145,000	−176,855,000	+11,700,000	−$39,700,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	[13]2,919,200,000	2,310,000,000	2,080,089,000	2,068,089,000	2,059,589,000	−250,411,000	−20,500,000	−8,500,000
Other procurement, Navy	903,600,000	1,208,000,000	1,175,231,000	1,175,231,000	1,175,231,000	−32,769,000		
Procurement, Marine Corps	256,000,000	207,700,000	201,960,000	201,960,000	201,960,000	−5,740,000		
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	3,562,400,000	3,559,000,000	3,328,900,000	3,395,075,000	3,385,575,000	−173,425,000	+56,675,000	−9,500,000
Missile procurement, Air Force	2,459,000,000	2,177,000,000	2,129,490,000	2,141,990,000	2,141,990,000	−35,010,000	+12,500,000	
Other procurement, Air Force	956,250,000	951,500,000	871,299,000	878,299,000	878,299,000	−73,201,000	+7,000,000	
Procurement, Defense agencies	36,000,000	43,600,000	43,164,000	43,164,000	43,164,000	−436,000		
Total, title III—Procurement	16,647,110,000	16,724,800,000	15,666,472,000	15,763,747,000	15,706,047,000	−1,018,753,000	+39,575,000	−57,700,000

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Title	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimates, 1964	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Budget estimate	House	Senate
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army	$1,319,500,000	$1,469,900,000	$1,363,141,000	$1,391,141,000	$1,386,141,000	−$83,759,000	+$23,000,000	−$5,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy	1,475,958,000	1,572,900,000	1,525,713,000	1,525,713,000	1,525,713,000	−47,187,000		
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	3,632,100,000	3,621,800,000	3,416,146,000	3,483,376,000	3,453,376,000	−168,424,000	+37,230,000	−30,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies	444,000,000	447,400,000	434,000,000	434,000,000	434,000,000	−13,400,000		
Emergency fund, Defense	[14]150,000,000	[14]150,000,000	[14]150,000,000	[14]150,000,000	[14]150,000,000			
Total, title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	7,021,558,000	7,262,000,000	6,889,000,000	6,984,230,000	6,949,230,000	−312,770,000	+60,230,000	−35,000,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	48,350,082,500	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000

---

[1] In addition, $350,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[2] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[3] In addition, $190,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[4] In addition, $25,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[5] In addition, $120,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[6] In addition, $147,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[7] In addition, $70,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[8] In addition, $30,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[9] In addition, $210,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[10] In addition, $55,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[11] In addition, not to exceed $3,300,000 may be transferred from "Retired pay, Defense."
[12] In addition, transfer of $165,000,000 from "Aircraft and related procurement, Navy."
[13] In addition, $20,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[14] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer.

NOTE.—Although the amount appropriated is $1,130,000,000 below the appropriations for 1963, about $500,000,000 of that apparent reduction represents functions transferred to other bills, particularly military construction. It should be noted, also, that approximately $900,000,000 more will be required in 1964 to finance the recently enacted military pay increase.

The statement of the managers contains a clear explanation of the majority of the items in conference, but I would like to add a few words on some of the matters.

In the appropriations for "Reserve personnel, Army," and "National Guard personnel, Army," the Senate provided language calling for the programing of these Reserve components at end strengths of 300,000 and 400,000 respectively. The House had provided for maintaining those strengths as an average for the year. The fiscal year having begun with these organizations below the programed strength, it is obviously impossible to maintain an average without permitting significant overstrengths at some later date.

In the "Operation and maintenance" accounts, in addition to the item restored in the amount of $1,500,000, for Army mobility exercises, the conferees agreed that reductions in the estimates for maintenance of noncombat vehicles should be $3,250,000 in the Army and $7,500,000 in the Air Force. The House had proposed reductions of $5 million and $10 million respectively.

In the Navy, full restoration of $3 million for surface missile and equipment rework, as proposed by the Senate, was agreed to.

For the Army National Guard, the addition by the Senate of $4,200,000 above the budget was approved. The conferees were advised that $3,200,000 was required for the pay of technicians to avoid an unintended reduction in numbers. The $1 million is to augment funds available for the procurement of repair parts.

Section 538 of the general provisions contains the limitation on indirect expenses of research grants. The House had proposed 25 percent, and the Senate 20 percent. The conferees on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation, meeting prior to the Defense conference, had agreed on 20 percent in that bill. In an effort to attain uniformity, the Defense conference agreed on 20 percent and the Independent Offices appropriation bill has subsequently been reported with a similar 20-percent limitation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, an able member of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have done a good job on this bill. The amount is relatively low compared to the original budget request. The House action resulted in a reduction of $1.9 billion. There was some concern that cuts had been too drastic, and in some areas I think that concern was justified. Yet the Department of Defense requested restoration of only $437 million, about one-fourth of the House cut. The Senate showed unusual restraint but added $257 million. In the conference this amount was pared $119 million. So the bill comes back to the House $138 million higher than when it passed this body. This still represents a cut of $1¾ billion below the budget recommendations.

This is a significant saving which speaks eloquently for the effectiveness of the job that was done originally in the House.

There are one or two items in this bill on which I think the conferees should have made a stronger effort to sustain the House position. One is the provision on naval ship repair. In this section the language of last year's bill was substituted by the Senate and agreed to in conference. The House language was definitely superior, and the recommendation now before us is highly disappointing. I must warn against the danger that inhouse capability may be lost in the effort to provide work for the private yards. The naval shipyards must have the capability to perform any ship repairwork which is required. The private yards can be selective. When the more desirable work is taken away by the private yards, the cost runs up on the less desirable jobs which are left for the Navy yards. The American merchant marine has almost priced itself out of business. That means less shipbuilding and repairwork for the private yards. For that reason they are seeking to secure an increasing share of Navy work. The House language offered greater flexibility and a better opportunity to meet emergency conditions.

There may be some who look at the lessening of tension in the world and who question the need for a defense expenditure of $47.2 billion. Let me assure the House, it is the expenditures which have been made for defense, and the resultant marked improvement in our defense posture, which have made it possible to bring about a lessening of tension. This is not a time to consider a reduction on defense capability? Communism is still communism, and it means us no good.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MAHON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 336, nays 3, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 167]

YEAS—336

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Colmer
Conte
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McLoskey
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, Pa.
Rooney, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Short
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger

NAYS—3

Alger
Curtis
O'Konski

NOT VOTING—67

Addabbo
Barrett
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bow
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Cameron
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Diggs
Dulski
Feighan
Fisher
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hall
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hoffman
Jones, Mo.
Kee
Kilburn
Lankford
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
Michel
Mills
Moore
Morrison
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Passman
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rostenkowski
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schenck
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sibal
Skubitz
Staebler
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Ullman
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Watts
Whalley
White
Wickersham
Wilson, Bob
Zablocki

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Morrison with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. White with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. MacDonald with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. McIntire.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Pillion.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Schenck.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Ryan of New York with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Utt.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Martin of California.
Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Bolling with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Staebler with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Harding.
Mr. Moss with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Wickersham.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 14, line 8, strike out "maintain an average" and insert "attain an end".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 5, line 18, strike out "maintain an average" and insert "attain an end".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: On page 17, line 10, strike out "$2,080,089,000" and insert "$2,068,089,000".

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,059,589,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 43, line 8, strike out—

"Sec. 539. Of the funds made available in this Act for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels, not to exceed $352,752,400 shall be available for such repair, alteration, and conversion in privately owned shipyards."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 539. Of the funds made available in this Act for repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels, at least 35 per centum shall be available for such repair, alteration, and conversion in privately owned shipyards: *Provided*, That if determined by the Secretary of Defense to be inconsistent with the public interest based on urgency of requirement to have such vessels repaired, altered, or converted as required above, such work may be done in Navy or private shipyards as he may direct."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Mahon moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this motion has to do with ship conversion and repair.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Gill].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, when this measure was before the House earlier this year, there was considerable floor discussion on the so-called 35–65 rider. This is the rider which establishes the division of repair, alteration, and conversion work between the private and public shipyards.

We are all aware that the basis for the drive by the private shipyard interests to get an ever larger share of this type of Government work is caused by the drop in private ship repair and construction work. Many of the private yards feel they must have an even larger share of the Government dollar in order to stay in business.

However we may understand their plight, we cannot forget that the maintenance of adequate work forces at naval shipyards is central to our national defense effort. When you suddenly need the Government yards they must be there, staffed by efficient and skilled personnel.

For example, nibbling away at the work force at Pearl Harbor, which is the only large facility of this sort in the middle of the Pacific, could be disastrous if we were called on, as we have been many times in the past, for a sudden maximum naval effort. If our skilled employees leave us for lack of work they will, in many cases, leave the State of Hawaii. This means that in times of emergency you will have to replace them from the mainland at a tremendous increase in cost and, probably, a great loss of efficiency. This same situation can exist in varying degrees in other Government yards throughout the Nation.

We are told at great length that Government yards are inefficient. The quoted text is the Andersen report, issued in November 1962. While it is true that this report finds, generally, that private yards have lower costs on new construction, it makes no such finding as to repairs, alterations, and conversions. In effect the report either found no significant difference in costs between public and private yards, or could reach no conclusion that there was a difference on these items. Those who are interested are referred to pages 5 through 7 of the Anderson report.

Further, I think we should all recognize that any attempt to compare private and public yard costs in both new work and old, is to some extent, comparing apples and oranges. Public yards have certin built-in overhead which cannot and should not be avoided; public yard employees cannot be laid off with the same abandon as those in private yards when the work is slack. It should be obvious to all of us that the economy argument, much favored this season, can be self-defeating if it destroys an effective work base in the public yards.

It is the opinion of many of us that the House language in this bill was an improvement and gave the Navy reasonable flexibility to maintain the integrity of the public yards. I regret that the House conferees were unable to maintain their position and have, in effect, reverted to the old language in the present law.

My concern for the welfare of the public shipyards, as an essential arm of our defense system, requires that I oppose the recommendation of the conferees on this particular rider.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Leggett].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the plain and simple fact is that the action of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee in recommending first one version and now another version of a limitation on public-private ship repair to deprive many Members of the right to fairly debate this limitation—65–35—and to deprive the Congress of the right to work its will on this issue.

Regardless of the generous remarks made in favor of the managers of the bill at its last hearing, we are locked in a life-or-death struggle with the private shipbuilders council who has a mania for eliminating our entire naval shipbuilding system.

To hear the private yards talk they are almost out of business. Yet, while the Navy will do less business this year than almost any year since World War II, we find private yards experiencing their 2 very best years in their history since 1946.

Figures do not lie—and I present them now for the first time to the Congress.

Apportionment of Navy shipwork, 1953–64

[In millions]

Fiscal	Repair, alteration, and conversion				New construction				Gross construction, repairs, alterations, and conversions			
	Navy	Percent	Private yards	Percent	Navy	Percent	Private yards	Percent	Navy	Percent	Private yards	Percent
1953	$434	93.0	$33	7.0	$256	45	$303	55	$690	67	$336	33
1954	279	83.0	56	17.0	0	0	427	100	279	36	483	64
1955	404	84.0	76	16.0	320	43	415	57	724	59	491	41
1956	519	85.0	88	15.0	388	31	861	69	907	49	949	51
1957	684	72.0	259	28.0	550	35	1,010	65	1,234	49	1,269	51
1958	523	88.0	68	12.0	303	20	1,282	80	826	40	1,235	60
1959	612	86.0	96	14.0	474	25	1,376	75	1,086	42	1,472	58
1960	444	85.0	75	15.0	86	15	430	85	530	51	505	49
1961	489	86.0	80	14.0	484	33	1,489	67	973	38	1,569	62
1962	600	78.0	166	22.0	772	32	1,621	68	1,372	42	1,787	58
1963	599	64.6	327	35.4	274	13	1,888	87	973	31	2,215	69
1964	[1] 507	62.5	[1] 303	37.5	309	18	1,413	82	816	32	1,722	68
Total									10,410		24,443	
If no 65–35	631	78.0	179	22.0	309	18	1,413	82	940	37	1,592	63
Military Sea Transport Service											33	
Plus military assistance domestic shipbuilding											80	
Plus average private repairs and construction											633	
Total											713	
Total comparison, public versus private shipbuilding									816	23	2,468	77

[1] $150,000,000 conversion funds unallocated.

These figures show first of all that the tables have turned 100 percent in the past 10 years. In 1953 the Navy had 67 percent and private yards 33 percent. Those figures were switched in 1954 and thereafter for a number of years an effort was made to split the business.

In the years since 1961 havoc has broken loose with the private yards expanding overnight to 62 percent of the business without a limitation like we are here considering.

Last year the limitation expanded the private yard share to 69 percent and this year the figure remains at 68 percent.

As the figures show, were the limitation removed the private yard share would still be 63 percent.

If you consider private yards share in Military Sea Transport Service, $33 million; military assistance contracts, 100 percent; $80 million in 1962; and their average private repairs and new construction, their share of the total shipyard dollar rises to 77 percent.

You might ask the question "How private is private enterprise when it is dependent for 70 percent of its business from the Government?"

I submitted to Congress statistics a few months ago when this matter came up showing that massive contracts in a few private yards resulted in mass production savings and thus the reason for out performing some of the public yards.

Electric Boat has over 13,500 employees and $600 million worth of work in process. Is it any wonder that one yard building 14 submarines at one time can show a cost saving?

My home yard of Vallejo lost 500 men last year as did every other naval yard in the country. I received another 400 man cut notice this week. I might here state that if loss of employees will result in my home yard of being more competitive I will favor the cuts but I think it unfair that private yards get away with the bacon.

Private yards are not only 70 percent dependent on the Government as indicated but they are usually located in areas of low wage rate—we have no new construction on the west coast.

The statistics I presented in July showed that the private yards were subsidized over $550 million in Department of Commerce budget in the postwar years to construct the 30-percent private business I have referred to.

In conclusion I would just like to point out that ship repair business is not a competitive business in any respect—it's cost plus of the first magnitude with the company who bids it lean and opens up the vessel entitled to all the extras at fancy prices.

Secretary BeLieu recently pointed this up in a letter to my office:

> Awards are usually made on a formally advertised competitive basis. In the interest of obtaining maximum competition, bids are solicited where practicable on a split bid basis; i.e., separate bids are requested on topside and drydocking work. This enables qualified small firms which do not control a drydock to bid on the topside work. However, split bidding is sometimes not practicable because of fleet requirements. Sometimes because of urgency or for other reasons, repair work is negotiated with a specific yard. With regard to conversion work, where definitive specifications are available, contracts are usually awarded on a nationwide competitive basis. In the case of conversion of warships, however, where complex electronics and ordnance work is usually involved, naval shipyards are called upon to do the work. Preparation of detailed specifications to serve as a basis for competitive bidding is especially difficult because the repairs involved, unlike the conversion portion of the job, cannot be fully known until the ship is opened up and equipment is taken apart and inspected. This same difficulty is applicable to repair work only and is of course present to a greater degree in the repair of complex warships.
>
> In contracting for repair and conversion work, the chief difficulty, therefore, is that in many cases only part of the work can be the subject of competition. Whether by formal advertising or negotiation, competition can be invited only on that part of the work which is known and can be specified. Subsequently, when the ship is moved to the yard of the successful bidder, the ship is opened up and the full extent of the work is ascertained. The additional work found to be needed may exceed the amount of work on which the competition and the original award was based. This additional work must be the subject of negotiation with the successful yard, which is in a very advantageous bargaining position because the ship is already in its yard and opened up. The cost of putting a ship back in operating condition and moving it to another yard usually is prohibitive. The advantages of competition on conversion and repair work thus may be subsequently nullified by change orders negotiated at a time when the Government is in a very poor bargaining position.

In summary I submit I have made a case where we should have 65–35 in reverse with the Navy being guaranteed 35 percent of the business. We have an unfair division at the present time and this amendment will just compound the issue. I ask that we resist the amendment and insist on disagreement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion because I feel that it will impose a difficult burden upon the Navy in allocating its work between the naval shipyards and the private shipyards. As you all know, there has been constant competition, so-called, between the private and the public shipyards. For a number of years this was satisfactorily handled, I think in most everybody's estimation, by the Navy itself in utilizing its own good discretion assigning work fairly between private shipyards and its own Navy shipyards. Under the pressures of some of the private yards this provision about 2 or 3 years ago started to appear in the appropriation bills. It was a legislative dictation that there be an allocation roughly on the basis of 65 to 35. Now, for a couple or 3 years that system was in operation, and it became apparent that the wording of the language was such as to say that not less than 35 percent would be going to the private yards, which meant to the Navy that an adequate reserve of work always had to be kept back, kept back and money not expended, and necessary work not being done in order that this legislative limit be met.

What the House did was to recognize that that imposed a great difficulty on the Navy and particularly in emergency situations in assigning this alteration, repair work and conversion work, some of which is of an emergency nature. So the House this year switched it around so that it meant not less than 65 percent would go into the Navy yards. It imposed a different burden and gave the Navy more flexibility. The other body twisted it back again, and it now reimposes this difficulty on the Navy in scheduling work. I think our language was much better and I had hoped that our conferees might insist on it and make certain that it be in this. Personally I do not believe this provision in legislation is necessary at all, but if it is to be in legislation, it should be in the right wording. To do so means we would have to reject this language.

In summation I want to say this: This language applies to repairs, alterations, and conversions. It does not apply to new shipbuilding. There are other provisions on that. New shipbuilding is different. You can allocate that on a long-range basis. Repair and alteration is another matter, requiring greater flexibility, and the latter was given by the House language, but is being taken away by submission to the other body's revised wording.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may require to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion by the distinguished chairman of the committee to retain the Senate language guaranteeing 35 percent to the private yards.

As a result of the language in the fiscal 1963 appropriation bill which specified that private yards should receive not less than 35 percent of Navy alteration repair and conversion contracts, privately owned shipyards report they have benefited. In the years immediately prior to the adoption of this so-called 35–65 formula, I am told that an estimated 75 to 80 percent of such work was performed in naval yards. The provision before us today, which not exactly conforming to the fiscal 1963 language, is of sufficient merit that it has the support of a broad range of shipping interests, labor interests, the administration and, in my home district, both labor and management groups.

There are two principal benefits flowing from the provision. First, it enables the private shipyard to maintain its managerial skills and its labor skills and techniques in good condition should a national emergency arise. Second, a cost study prepared for the Navy itself, concluded that private shipyards frequently built Navy vessels at less cost to the Federal Government, and, therefore, to the taxpayer, than do Navy shipyards. I refer to the Andersen report issued this year.

It has been reported to me that private yards are currently operating at less than half capacity, while conversely Navy yards are operating at 90-percent capacity. On the grounds of national security alone, it is proper to require that private yards, in view of their tremendous contribution during World War II, be allocated 35 percent of the work.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I served on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for many years and I think I am familiar with this problem. While I sympathize with the gentleman from Honolulu and my colleague from California, they are particularly concerned with naval shipyards in their own districts. I have no major ship construction yard now in my district. Under reapportionment I lost the yards, I formerly represented. But let me point out to you that when we get into an emergency we need private shipyards. We have to build them then at great expense and effort. If we are going to dry up the private shipyards of this country, we are doing a disservice to the Department of Defense, and the Department of Defense recognizes this. If you want to get down to a matter of efficiency, you could do most of the work that the Navy is doing now in 2 or 3 yards, but it maintains a series of yards as standbys against an emergency. It has to have the private yards as standbys against emergency, too. Do you want to have the only know-how on building or repairing ships located in the naval shipyards, or do you want this spread throughout the economy so that in case of emergency you have this valuable asset to fall back on? I think that the division is a fair one. It protects both the Navy and encourages the private shipyards that are indispensable in time of war.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain tabulations relating to the conference report and the amendments in disagreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the motion which is pending is to recede and concur in the Senate position that in ship alteration, repair, and conversion the business of the Navy shall be distributed 65 percent to the public shipyards and 35 percent to the private shipyards. In my judgment this seems to be a reasonably satisfactory compromise. It is the language of the present law which was approved by Congress last year; it is the language which is contained in the President's budget; it is the language which is agreeable to the Secretary of Defense. I realize that there are many shades of feeling in regard to the situation. But in view of all the facts and circumstances, I trust that the House will approve the position of the conferees and agree to the motion which provides for 65–35 percent distribution of work in this field of Navy activity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the recent military coups in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras are of grave concern to all Americans. Our Nation has a deep commitment to constitutional government not only because it raises and enhances the dignity and personal freedom of those citizens who enjoy its benefits, but also because it provides the means whereby change can come about in an orderly fashion. Our concern about the takeover by military juntas in these countries is not predicated upon approval of every action taken by the constitutionally elected leaders of those countries—indeed, perhaps some programs and actions should have been undertaken in a different manner than they were. The true failure here, however, lies in the use of unconstitutional means to make a change instead of leaving this decision to the citizens of those countries expressed through a free ballot.

I address myself today, however, to the implications which these military coups may have for American foreign policy and our aid programs. Should we interpret these setbacks as evidence of failure of the Alliance for Progress? I think not. It is my judgment that these overthrows are clear evidence of the urgency of the need for an ever stronger effort through the Alliance for Progress.

We are engaged in a long-range war in this hemisphere to make freedom prevail over oppression; enlightenment over ignorance; and economic well-being over poverty. We will not win every battle, but we shall win the war through the combined efforts of the nations of this hemisphere joined in a common effort through the Alliance for Progress.

The 200 million people of Latin America are engaged in a gigantic revolution—the "revolution of rising expectations." It is a peaceful revolt against injustice, poverty, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy, and appalling living conditions. In many countries more than half the people are undernourished and illiterate, and millions of children are denied an education because of the lack of schools and teachers.

The people of the hemisphere know that a better life is now possible. They want the material and social benefits enjoyed by the peoples of other nations in the 20th century, and they are impatient for change. They are determined that the decade of the sixties should become a decade of development.

The Alliance for Progress is a sustained cooperative effort, jointly planned through the Organization of American States and consisting of sound national programs for long-term economic and social development. The aim of the Alliance is, as President Kennedy declared:

> The construction of a new community of American nations in which all our citizens can live not only free from fear but full of hope.

The Alliance has begun to lay solid foundations for progress. Latin Americans are beginning to build and own homes, send their children to new schools, receive previously unattainable medical attention, farm their own fields, gain jobs in new industries, travel over new roads, and join unions, credit institutions, and cooperatives that aim to serve instead of exploit.

Thus, we must measure our setbacks in this hemisphere—hopefully only temporary—in the context of some of our gains. We are making gains.

El Salvador, for example, has become one of the shining lights in the Alliance for Progress.

Before the Alliance, El Salvador was a typical Central American Republic. Military governments, in cooperation with the landed aristocracy, had kept the country in a semifeudal condition. Seventy-five families controlled 90 percent of the wealth, with the country's 2.7 million people working primarily on the large fincas of the great landlords.

El Salvador was one of the first Latin American nations to implement the Charter of Punta del Este, which established the Alliance for Progress. In early 1961, steps were taken to halt the flight of capital. A stabilization program was developed in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund in order to correct the balance-of-payments deficit and strengthen the country's currency. As a result of these controls, El Salvador now has a favorable balance of payments.

El Salvador continued its economic reform program by raising, in September 1961, the progressive income tax rates. These are now among the highest tax rates in the hemisphere. As a result, revenue receipts have increased over 40 percent. In 1 year governmental revenues were increased by $10.5 million. Other tax reforms followed. Measures were taken to increase the amount of tax paid for consumption and luxury goods. Tax collecting procedures were simplified and improved.

Hand in hand with administrative reforms new planning machinery was established. A National Council of Economic Planning and Coordination, composed of El Salvador's leading economic specialists, was created to spur economic activity and prepare long-range program budgets.

Recognizing that economic development must be coordinated with social development to provide a balanced approach for the overall well-being of the people, Alliance for Progress officials in El Salvador also tackled the social problems of the country. In early 1962 an agency was created for providing supervised production credit to small farmers. In little more than a year, nearly 6,000 agricultural credit loans have been made. Seven health centers, to serve 150,000 people were constructed in 1962. In addition, a mobile rural health program was begun, designed to serve 300,000 persons a year.

The National Housing Agency of El Salvador has already constructed 1,500 home units since the start of the Alliance. Just recently a national homebuilding mortgage agency was created, modeled after our own FHA, for stimulating greater investment in housing. This is a major step forward in the housing field, which is generally recognized as one of the most important aspects of social reform.

Education now consumes 22 percent of the national budget. In October 1962, apprenticeship training legislation was enacted. By December, some 300 apprentices were registered in training. A domestic peace corps has been organized in El Salvador to perform adult education and community development work.

El Salvador's economic growth is now greatly improved. In 1962, for example, industrial production rose over 20 percent from the previous year.

Another good sign of the economic vitality of El Salvador is the increasing amount of outside private capital being invested in the country. A combination of Esso and Shell already has an investment of more than $10 million; Phelps Dodge is building a $2 million copper and aluminum wire and cable plant. The Phillips Co. of the Netherlands is constructing a $600,000 electric light bulb and appliance plant. Italian and U.S. interests are establishing a $300,000 pencil and office supply plant.

Under the able hand of President Julio Rivera, and with the cooperation of Alliance for Progress officials, El Salvador is demonstrating to Latin America and to the world the effectiveness of the Alliance for Progress. El Salvador is not the only Alliance success story. Venezuela, Mexico, Argentina, Colombia—are all moving ahead of the anticipated schedule for the Alliance for Progress.

In El Salvador, as in many other parts of Latin America, the desired progress is being achieved through peaceful and creative evolution—an evolution more rapid, more comprehensive, and touching the lives of more people, than any that our history has ever known.

ESTABLISHING JOINT COMMITTEE TO SUPERVISE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Mrs. **KELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **KELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is most unfortunate that, for the past few weeks, there is evidence of misunderstanding in our military operations and military objectives, including our Central Intelligence Agency. Mr. Speaker, I feel there is no need to enlarge on this subject, but to state the fact that back in 1952, I foresaw the need to establish a joint committee of Congress to supervise all intelligence activities. I sought the advice of the late Senator McMahon, of Connecticut, who had so ably worked and helped to establish the great Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. He gave me much good advice and I sought also the advice of many lawyers who assisted in writing a resolution which was introduced by me on July 20, 1953, and was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 168. I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress. This same resolution was numbered House Concurrent Resolution 29 in the 84th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 85th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 86th Congress; House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 87th Congress; and House Concurrent Resolution 3 in the 88th Congress. While I do not believe in the numbers, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that "three and out" is a good omen. Let us "out" with this resolution in the Rules Committee, and pass it on the floor.

Congressman Zablocki also introduced this resolution, as did Congressman Judd. It was over a year before any other Member of the House introduced a similar resolution and it was after much urging that Members of the other body followed our advice. The history surrounding this joint resolution is well established in the archives of Congress, but I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that I firmly believe that, had this joint committee been established in the past, many of the problems involving U.S. intelligence would not be in the forefront of world news today. I therefore urge that the Members of Congress look into the need for such a resolution, sponsor one, and urge action by the present Congress.

To give a brief background on the story on this subject, I will insert again a statement I made in the past.

Statement by Hon. Edna F. Kelly, in Support of House Concurrent Resolution 3 To Establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters Before the Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, March 1, 1961

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee. I am grateful to the committee for its invitation to appear here today and give testimony in support of House Concurrent Resolution 3 which I introduced.

Perhaps it is somewhat appropriate that this matter was originally scheduled for hearing before this committee on the anniversary of the birthday of our first President. This coincidence prompts me to look back to the principle upon which our country was founded and upon which our Constitution is based. I, therefore, urge each of the members of the committee, bear in mind when considering my resolution, the constitutional system of checks and balances between the executive and legislative branches of this Government.

While hindsight is infinitely clearer than foresight, when discussing House Concurrent Resolution 3, I cannot help but reflect and think that had this resolution been adopted 8 years ago, when I first introduced it in the 83d Congress, many unfortunate incidents involving the security and prestige of the United States might have been avoided.

I cannot emphasize too strongly, however, the continuing need for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence Matters. With the high degree of world tensions, with the farflung scope of our foreign policy and other activities, when a single miscalculation may bring disaster, such a committee, as an arm of the Congress, is urgently required. The resolution calls for a continuing study, by such committee, of our Government's intelligence activities "and problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government."

As you know under the present system, the Central Intelligence Agency, which was created in 1947 is responsible only to the National Security Council. There is no supervision or control by the legislative branch. The extent of its independence is demonstrated by the lack of review of the agency's expenditures by the Congress. In short, CIA makes its own policy and procedures, spends as much money as it may require, reviews its own errors if its conscience so dictates, and selects such remedies as it deems proper to correct its errors and to improve its operations. In this system the errors are never admitted while others which must be or are obvious may, after proper preparation, be presented as premature or unexpected.

While the need for secrecy in our intelligence activities is obvious, I feel, as many of my colleagues, that until a Joint Committee on Intelligence is created, there will be no way of determining what defects in the CIA may be covered by the veil of secrecy with which it is shrouded. Our success with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy certainly justifies the present undertaking.

Lest the committee or the public consider this proposal to be quickly conceived or inspired by the recent U–2 incident, I consider it important to explore the background of this resolution.

Late in 1950, while serving on the committee which was responsible for the enactment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (Battle Act), I came to realize the tremendous lack of knowledge, on the part of the Congress, of intelligence matters. After 2 years of periodic consultations with Members of the House, Members of the other body, and legal counsel, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 168 in the 83d Congress. While I endeavored to convince many other Members of the House to cosponsor my resolution, my success was limited to my distinguished colleagues Mr. Zablocki (H. Con. Res. 169, 83d Cong.) and Mr. Judd (H. Con. Res. 170, 83d Cong.).

Thereafter, I continued to press for the adoption of this resolution in each succeeding Congress (84th Cong., H. Con. Res. 29; 85th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3; 86th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3; 87th Cong., H. Con. Res. 3). As time passed, other of my colleagues either introduced similar resolutions or voiced their approval.

In 1954 a similar proposal was introduced in the other body. In 1955 this committee held hearings on this same resolution and referred the matter to a subcommittee for study. Thereafter, an additional hearing was held but no further action was taken.

During the 84th Congress, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration considered a similar resolution sponsored by 36 Members of the Senate, and reported it favorably (S. Rept. 1570, 84th Cong., 2d sess.). In its report the committee included several germane comments of the task force of the Second Hoover Commission.

The report stated:

"The task force is concerned over the absence of satisfactory machinery for surveillance of the stewardship of the CIA. It is making recommendations which it believes will provide the proper type of 'watchdog' commission as a means of reestablishing that relationship between the CIA and the Congress so essential and characteristic of our democratic form of government, but which was abrogated by the enactment of Public Law 110 and other statutes relating to the Agency. It would include Representatives of both Houses of Congress and of the Chief Executive. Its duties would embrace a review of the operations and effectiveness, not only of the CIA, but also of all other intelligence agencies."

The report continued:

"Although the task force has discovered no indication of abuses of powers by the CIA or other Intelligence Agencies, it nevertheless is firmly convinced, as a matter of future insurance, that some reliable, systematic review of all the agencies and their operations should be provided by congressional action as a checkrein to assure both the Congress and the people that this hub of the Intelligence effort is functioning in an efficient, effective, and reasonably economical manner."

The future insurance was not provided.

If it had, would we have been stabbed in the back by the shipment of arms by Russia to Egypt during the then pending 1955 Foreign Ministers Conference? Would we have been informed on the Hungarian Revolution; the downgrading of Stalin; Iraq; the sputnicks and the Cuban situation? Because we lack information these questions must be left unanswered.

All of this does not mean that I want to see the Congress go into the intelligence business. What I desire is proper and legitimate congressional control over such activities. The Hoover Commission Task Force outlined the areas of congressional interest as follows:

1. Conduct comprehensive studies of foreign intelligence activities of the United States;
2. Look for overlapping and duplication;
3. Determine whether expenditures are within budget authorizations and in keeping with the expressed intent of Congress; and
4. Consider whether any of the activities are in conflict with the foreign policy aims and programs of the United States.

With these tools the Congress would reassume its constitutional authority and in no way jeopardize intelligence activities.

One of the principal arguments advanced against my resolution is that no other nation permits legislative control of its intelligence activities. Such system is practical for the Soviet dictatorship and even for Great Britain where the administration is a part of and responsible to Parliament. Under our Constitution, however, with delicate system of check and balances, dislocations as in the case of CIA cannot be tolerated.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully urge that this committee do favorably report House Concurrent Resolution 3 for action by the House.

SECURITY RISKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on 2 successive days last week articles appeared in Chicago's American newspaper in regard to the State Department's move to oust Otto Otepka, Chief of the Evaluation Division of the Department's Office of Security.

These articles follow:

[From Chicago's American, Oct. 2, 1963]

THE ALLEN-SCOTT REPORT: BITTER ROW ON SECURITY RISKS

WASHINGTON.—The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has pried open a real can of worms in its investigation of the State Department's move to discredit and oust Otto Otepka, 48, Chief of the Evaluation Division in the Department's Office of Security.

In digging into the Otepka case, the Senate probers have uncovered a backstage effort within the State Department to clear the way for a number of former security risks, including Alger Hiss, to worm their way back onto the Government's payroll as either employes or consultants.

According to the sworn testimony before the subcommittee, one of the central figures in this maneuvering is Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs.

ADVISORY APPOINTMENTS

Cleveland touched off the bitter security row within the Department by appointing a number of persons with questionable security backgrounds to an advisory committee to study the staffing of Americans on international organizations.

According to the testimony, Cleveland also made inquiries as to whether it would be possible to bring Hiss, a former State Department official convicted of perjury to conceal espionage, back into the Department.

Otepka was so shocked over Cleveland's activities that he sent a series of blistering reports to his superiors, including one that was routed through channels to McGeorge Bundy, the President's Chief White House Adviser on Foreign Policy.

One of these reports included a detailed box score of persons with questionable security background whom Cleveland had either brought into the Department or was in the process of trying to obtain job clearance for.

When the State Department's daisy chain tipped off Cleveland that he was being watched, he retaliated swiftly by having John F. Reilly, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, place Otepka under surveillance. This was arranged through the office of Attorney General Robert Kennedy, a personal friend of Reilly.

Otepka was then removed from security operations. His phone was bugged and he was placed under close observation after it was learned that Senate investigators had questioned him, under subpena, about security risks in the Department.

Charges of misconduct, involving the alleged release of documents to the Senate Subcommittee, were filed against Otepka September 23 by John Ordway, Chief of the Personnel Operations Division.

According to the findings in a State Department investigative report, evidence was found that Otepka had furnished "a copy of classified memorandum concerning the processing of appointments of the advisory committee on international organization staffing to Mr. J. G. Sourwine, staff director of the Senate Subcommittee for Internal Security. This memorandum concerns the loyalty of employees or prospective employees of the Department within the meaning of the Presidential directives of March 13, 1948."

INFORMATION ON SECURITY RISKS

The report also charged that Otepka was responsible "for the declassification of a document containing classified information addressed to McGeorge Bundy, the White House, and signed by William H. Brubeck, Special Assistant Secretary and Executive Secretary of the Department." This document contained information about security risks within the Department.

Otepka, a civil service and State Department officer for more than 20 years, has one of the most outstanding records in his field of work in the Government. He was responsible for sending Irving C. Scarbeck, a Foreign Service Officer, to jail for passing U.S. secrets to the Russians, and for investigating William Wieland in connection with the State Department's Cuban policy. In all his investigations, the records show he has bent over backwards in protecting the rights of individuals under his surveillance. The Senate Subcommittee now plans to give Otepka the same protection.

[From Chicago's American, Oct. 3, 1963]

A PLOT TO BRING HISS BACK

We are almost beyond being surprised at any goings-on in the State Department, but we do find this one astonishing: There is a group in there that is working like mad to bring the convicted perjurer, Alger Hiss, back into the Department. And for this purpose, the group is trying to get one of the Department's chief security officers fired. The officer is Otto Otepka, Chief of the Evaluation Division. He is opposed to the return of Hiss and to the proposed hiring of several men of doubtful loyalty.

These strange facts were set out on our editorial page Wednesday in the Allen-Scott report, which said the revelations had been brought to light by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. A leader in the movement to get Otepka out of Hiss' way, according to testimony given to the Senate subcommittee, is Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Affairs. Cleveland, according to testimony given before the Senate subcommittee, has been asking how it might be possible to get Hiss back on the payroll.

Hiss, you will remember, was convicted (and served a prison term) on charges of having perjured himself to cover up the fact that, while serving as an official of the State Department, he supplied Russia with U.S. secrets. If Cleveland wants Hiss back, then obviously Cleveland should not be in the American State Department.

The Senate subcommittee should bring all phases of this peculiar situation to the country's attention. And in the meanwhile, it should not permit the firing of Otepka for thinking and acting like a loyal American.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is imperative that the Department of State advise the country forthwith as to whether or not there is any truth in the allegation that they are working to bring Alger Hiss back into the State Department. All America will want to know whether or not the charges in the above articles are correct—and if so, it is time that the Congress do something about it. If the statements are not true, the Congress and the American people deserve to know the facts.

WHEAT SALE TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last night's Washington Evening Star and this morning's New York Times carried stories saying that a wheat sale to the Soviet Union was all but concluded. I find this all a little astonishing and disturbing.

It is astonishing because the administration apparently after only a few days of trial balloons and calculated press releases, without any genuine public or congressional debate, is willing to do handsprings to help relieve Khrushchev from the disastrous failures of Soviet agriculture. It is disturbing because nowhere have I found in the press reports a consistent statement of facts and figures that clearly spell out the factors that are involved in this deal. No one seems to know where this deal will lead. This fact raises a great many questions that must be settled before I, in my own mind, can support such a sale.

For instance, we are being told from many sides that the trade is in everybody's best interests—we dispose of our wheat surplus and get some needed gold and they get the wheat. But is it really that simple? Can we treat this trade deal as an isolated event in the cold war? Can we ignore the fact that the American people are spending more than $55 billion this year to protect the free nations of the world from communistic aggression? Why are we so eager to get a paltry $200 to $300 million when we are at the same time spending 250 times that much to prevent the extension of communism? Why is the administration in such a hurry to conclude this deal?

As I understand the Latta amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1961, it declared the policy of Congress to be against the export or sale of any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nation that is not considered to be friendly. In the face of this clear and unmistakable pronouncement of congressional policy, it would seem that the President would undertake to consult officially with the Congress before considering any transaction such as has been reported in the press. It seems imperative to me that under the circumstances, Congress should be consulted on such a basic and far-reaching change of policy.

Another question: So we sell $250 million worth of wheat to the Soviets. That would really only represent a small dent in our surplus of over $3½ billion. So we make a few fast gold bricks. Is it worth it? The consequences of this trade deal will not end when the wheat-laden ships leave our harbors. We will have taken Khrushchev off the hook at home and he will be able to say to the Soviet people, "Look what I've done. I've gotten our capitalistic enemies to subsidize communism." No one could help but applaud such an astute leader.

How can we ever again ask the free nations of the world not to trade with communistic nations?

There is much about this whole transaction to be thoroughly explored. It should be done deliberately. We should not act in haste. We should not impulsively turn to a new form of dollar diplomacy devoid of other considerations. The President should make known all of his reasons for such a deal and let the American people and the Congress evaluate them. The quick shuffle that we are getting causes me to be suspicious. We must not be too anxious for a few pieces of silver or gold.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I am including a sampling of letters received from residents of Michigan's Sixth Congressional District with respect to this proposed transaction:

LANSING, MICH.,
October 2, 1963.

Hon. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Your last report (Sept. 30) did not contain anything about the administration's proposal to sell surplus wheat to the U.S.S.R., but when it was composed maybe the matter did not seem so possible.

There are many things in our Government that may be the discretion of the Executive Department and the Cabinet officers reporting to it, but is there no way that the ordinary citizen who tries to think the problems of our country through can express indignation at the inconsistency(ies) of the foreign policy? (except I mean by writing you). Why cannot we, the people, vote on selling vital supplies to our enemies?

I hope I am not inhuman and un-Christian in rebelling against such a proposal. I don't want anyone to go hungry—but when someone threatens to bury you (and Mr. K's threat was not an idle one) is it sensible or commercially wise to buy some of the spades, shovels and bulldozers for him? I would be willing to help pay the sums that will compose the profit or price of such sale if the commodity was kept from Russian life in even the same fashion that pigs and wheat were destroyed 30 years go with less purpose.

Perhaps, everyone who agrees with me will not take the time to write you about their resentment of such folly on the part of the weather-vane foreign policymakers, but considering there was no use to write Michigan Senators my opinion of the treaty because of their committed prejudgment, I couldn't let this opportunity pass to condemn such bad business and lack of patriotism.

Most sincerely,

——— ———.

FLINT, MICH.,
October 2, 1963.

DEAR SIR: I was reading the newspaper this evening. In it was an item saying that this country may sell wheat to the Russians, if our President approves. Well sir, I can tell you now it made me pretty damn mad to think that the leaders of this country would even think of doing a thing like that.

Here we are with a national debt so high and our leaders in Washington asking for more. But the thing that tops it off is, the money they say is necessary to protect us from the very people we are going to sell wheat to.

As I have been reading about our past relations with Russia, I keep seeing where we have pulled their "chestnuts out of the fire", before. In fact it seems we have pulled a lot of "chestnuts out of the fire", for friends and foes alike, and our friends have turned out to be not so friendly either. I hope maybe we will wake up some day to the facts of life and get a little tougher. But if not that, lets get a little more for our money.

I cannot cite all of the figures, but I am sure you know them quite well. The figures I am referring to are: what it costs to maintain our defenses, also what it costs to support our so-called friends. If you add them all up, it would come to a pretty neat sum. Yet, there are leaders in this country jumping like a lot of fish out of water for a chance to help the Russians. Who by the way are the one's who said "We will bury you." They forgot to add that we will help them dig the hole.

The argument goes like this, for selling wheat to the Russians. "If we don't sell it to them some one else will." Well let me tell you something. The only ones in position to sell to them are our so-called friends. So I say, let them sell to the Russians. It will show who will sell us out for a better deal. As you have gathered by now I am against this deal. I am a disabled veteran and I add this only because I want you to know that our country had a little pride once.

Thank you.

——— ———.

BRIGHTON, MICH.,
October 2, 1963.

Representative CHARLES CHAMBERLAIN,
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you in regard to the sale of wheat to Russia.

My husband and I are against this sale of wheat to Russia or any other communistic country.

We pretend to fight communism, yet here we are in the act of feeding it.

I remember a few years ago we sold scrap iron to a country and how did it come back. This is the same thing. We will be nourishing it. I feel that President Kennedy has let the American people down by this approval of wheat being sent to Russia.

Thanking you for your kind attention to past correspondence, I am

Yours truly,

——— ———.

U.S. POLICY AIMS IN LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the rush of recent events makes necessary some restatement of basic U.S policy aims in Latin America. In this regard, I commend Assistant Secretary of State Martin for his forthright and realistic statement of last Saturday relating to what this country can and should do about government upheavals in the hemisphere.

There is no question but that the best interest of the United States lies in the existence of a democratic and economically stable Latin America. Thus, our purpose in the area is to create an atmosphere in which democracy and economic stability can flourish.

But as Assistant Secretary Martin rightly points out, democracy is "a living thing which must have time and soil and sunlight in which to grow."

"We must do all we can to create these favorable conditions," Mr. Martin says, "and we can do and have done much." However, he continues, "we cannot simply create the plant and give it to them; it must spring from seeds planted in an indigenous soil."

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I have often criticized past State Department attitudes and actions which I believe were not in the best interests of our country. However, Mr. Martin's incisive analysis of our Nation's responsibility and capability in dealing with Latin American coups and government upheavals deserves special praise, coming as it does when a confused clamor is heard to enforce democracy-by-gunboat in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

We may hope that Mr. Martin's words are now to be followed by action supporting his thesis that we should not adversely judge the new regimes in these countries until additional evidence is in regarding their composition and intentions.

Confused indeed is the chorus that calls for immediate action, drastic action, even direct military action by this country to restore the Juan Bosch and Villeda Morales governments to power. Many of these voices are the same ones who so often in the past have been cautioning against any effective action directed against the Soviet satellite, Cuba. Where now are their arguments concerning the U.S. need to recognize the fact that it cannot enforce its will on the hemisphere? Where now the admonitions concerning the effect on world opinion if the United States intervenes in the domestic affairs of smaller countries? Where now the counsel of inaction and patience, the talk of "complexities" and the warnings against "oversimplifications" whenever steps are urged to meet the very real threat of Castro's Cuba to the hemisphere?

Gunboat diplomacy—is that not the very course which some now urge this country to pursue in the Dominican Republic and Honduras? But why, we may ask, do some of these same observers of the Latin American scene take an ambivalent position regarding undemocratic regimes of the left and the right? If these observers can be patient about Castro's Cuba, its undemocratic and totalitarian rule over the Cuban people, its role as a Soviet satellite increasing tensions throughout the hemisphere, and its service as a base for military and subversive operations against hemispheric security—why then impatiently urge the administration to call out the marines to intervene in the Dominican Republic and Honduras?

Surely these observers cannot seriously believe that the military juntas of the Dominican Republic and Honduras represent a more immediate and sinister threat to our hemisphere than the Red Army-supported regime of Fidel Castro. Is it then a matter of principle? Do they wish the United States to assume the role of arbiter, creator, and protector of preferred democratic regimes? But if principle is indeed their concern in the Dominican Republic and Honduras, why is the same principle not applicable to the noxious existence of a Cuban Communist tyranny less than 90 miles from our shores? Perhaps we have entered into what some term a new phase of the cold war—but are we now to give undemocratic regimes supported by Comrade Khrushchev favored status over our home-grown Latin American models?

Yet we do not really know whether the events in the Dominican Republic and Honduras are not in fact serving the long-range interests of the people of those countries. This is not to say that a military coup is in the best interests of democracy—although only the myopic would seriously deny that the cause of hemispheric democracy would benefit if it were possible for the military arm of the Castro regime to overthrow its government. Or would there be some voices raised even then to restore the Castro regime to power with American might.

In that the fall of any legally-constituted government to armed force is a step backward, I regret the upheavals in the Dominican Republic and Honduras. But let me make clear that I do not simply regret the action taken by the military of these countries. Rather, I regret the prevailing conditions of governmental disorder and neglect which served to spur action by the military.

Can it be denied that Presidents Bosch and Villeda Morales both failed to come to grips with the paramount threat facing their people's democratic government and the hemisphere as a whole—that is, the subversive threat of Communist dictatorship?

Can it be denied that both Presidents Bosch and Villeda Morales temporized in dealing with this Communist threat, and by so temporizing hastened the day of a coup by either the left or the right?

Despite all the clamor condemning the action of the military of these countries last week, let this be made clear: Democracy was doomed in the Dominican Republic and Honduras not by its strong enemies—but by its weak servants.

Let us stand back then and view these recent events from the perspective of our hemisphere's past history and future capabilities. What is truly deplorable is the historic fact that many of our Latin American neighbors, whether their governments are democratic or dictatorial in origin and structure, have yet to master the technique of orderly power transition.

Indeed, as Mr. Martin pointed out, governments in Latin America have suffered from instability through the years, and nondemocratic power transfers are not likely to disappear overnight. Latin America suffers from what might be called the habit of revolution, and until sufficient time passes and a proper climate exists to change this habit, our own policy options are limited.

We can deplore this fact. But let me frankly admit that if governments are to fall in Latin America, I would prefer that they fall into the hands of those more favorably disposed to the United States than to the Soviet Union.

Let me put it bluntly—a dictatorship is odious, but if driven to a choice, I prefer a dictatorship seeking our support and friendship than a Communist dictatorship capable of furnishing missile emplacements to those who would bury us. Would our recognition of military juntas in the Dominican Republic and Honduras be immoral policy for our country? Incredibly, some of the very people who make this argument see nothing wrong with recognizing, doing business with, and even furnishing U.S. foreign aid funds to Communist dictators.

At the same moment some observers are demanding and obtaining from our State Department a cutoff of foreign aid funds to the new military regimes of the Dominican Republic and Honduras, Dictator Tito—with an effrontery made possible only by 15 years of subsidization by the United States—was launching his own Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

Upon completion of his visit to Bolivia, Tito pledged a $5 million foreign aid program to assist the Bolivian economy. We support Tito's Communist dictatorship with vast amounts of foreign aid—and stand by to watch our own funds either directly or indirectly being used to violate the Monroe Doctrine, as well as our inter-American agreements regarding Communist infiltration into the hemisphere.

And while this outrage against sanity is being committed, some observers are calling for gunboats, Marines, and economic reprisal against a military junta which has brought down the government of a man who, among other democratic accomplishments, sanctioned a school for the training of Communists and Communist agents in his capital city of Santo Domingo.

What then should be our course in dealing with the new military regimes, the Dominican Republic and Honduras?

First, I would seriously suggest that we rid ourselves of any notions of guilt concerning governmental upheavals in this hemisphere which might produce regimes favorable to our point of view in international affairs. If the Bosch and Villeda Morales regimes had to go, as the evidence would indicate, let us at least be thankful that they did not join Castro's Cuba as Communist satellites in the Caribbean.

Second, I would advise that although we deplore governments that hold power by force, we provide pro-American, anti-Communist dictatorships at least the same considerations we show Communist regimes.

If we can pour $2.5 billion into Tito's Yugoslavia, with the nebulous notion that somehow we would wean this military dictatorship to the ways of democracy, can we not afford a degree of tolerance to Latin American military regimes? Or must a dictator be Communist before some critics find him fit for coexistence and accommodation?

Finally, I commend the counsel of Assistant Secretary Martin with the fervent hope that his words will soon be backed by deeds.

"We must use our leverage," said Mr. Martin—

> To keep these new regimes as liberal and considerate of the welfare of the people as possible. In addition, we must support and strengthen the civilian components against military influence and press for new elections as soon as possible so that these countries once again may experience the benefits of democratic legitimacy.

Can anyone doubt the wisdom of this course?

Consider only whether, for all his abuses of democratic process, a Batista subject to inter-American leverage would not, as history proved, have been preferable to the odious Communist dictatorship which, born in the name of "democracy" now subjugates the Cuban people and threatens the hemisphere?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I am pleased that the able gentleman has found more comfort in the words of the Assistant Secretary of State than I did. My own fear is that the attitude of acquiescence and condonation, if not sympathetic understanding of these military takeovers in Latin America, has opened the door to every junta in Latin America that wishes to usurp power.

I wish the able gentleman did not feel that he had to put us on the hard alternative of either sending the Marines and gunboats or taking a military dictatorship in these Latin American countries. I would like to feel that there is something else we can do than take the extremes of acquiescence or of military intervention in these cases.

May I add one other thing: If I remember correctly, Castro came to power as a military dictator, not by election. If my memory is not in error, I believe Batista took power the first time as a military usurpation. Probably he was elected the second time. So it may well be that if this country had followed a great Republican Secretary of State, Secretary Stimson, back in the days when the Japanese were moving into Manchuria, and the U.S. Government had a policy of not recognizing governments that came into power by force, in the long run our integrity would have been less impaired and perhaps all of us better off.

Mr. SELDEN. I have never advocated the overthrow of a freely elected government by force. I have advocated, however, using the influence of our Government to move these military dictatorships to a more democratic form of Government. Our aid missions were not removed from Guatemala, Peru, or Argentina after their Governments were overthrown by military coups during the past 18 months.

Although our aid programs were suspended temporarily, they were resumed when we found those governments were moving in the right direction. There have now been free elections in both Peru and Argentina, and civilian governments are in control of those countries.

To remove our aid missions without first ascertaining fully the composition and intentions of those in control of the Governments of the Dominican Republic and Honduras is, in my opinion, a hasty and unwise move.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to the gentleman from Alabama, who is one of the most knowledgeable Members of this Congress on affairs in Latin America and South America, that I am glad to see him take the well of the House today to try to alert the Congress to what is going on in some of these countries. It is true, as my friend from Florida just suggested, that Castro came to power as a military regime, but who supported the coming of Castro to power in Cuba? The people in our own State Department who refused to allow certain materials to be moved to Batista, who was then the legal government of Cuba.

Now Batista was probably a ruthless man, but I will say this for him—he took extreme action and Cuba was never infested with a Communist regime or with Communist sympathizers. It is true probably that he dealt with them rather harshly because apparently he took them out one morning and shot them and gave them a trial that afternoon—and disposed of that situation permanently. The gentleman well knows that in the Bosch regime there is no doubt in anyone's mind that he has not only surrounded himself with Communist sympathizers and known Communists, but he has been sympathetic to their situation and has assisted in using his country as a base of operation by the Communists. So I say that while we may deplore the way the present government is operating, nevertheless I think we should destroy, at any time we can, any government that is hostile to the philosophy and the well-being and security of this Nation of ours. We have a responsibility there. We had a great responsibility in Cuba that we did not exercise. So rather than to call for gunboat diplomacy and bringing in the Marines in these countries, we had better look around and see who is our true friend there and support those governments that support the United States of America. I do not care whether they are under military rule, military dictatorship, or otherwise, as long as they support us, let us support them. I agree with what the gentleman from Alabama has said here today. I am very happy that he has brought this critical and dangerous situation to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I should like also to commend the gentleman from Alabama for bringing to our attention these very constructive and worthwhile remarks and for pointing out the situations which exist throughout this hemisphere. The gentleman from Florida who has just spoken has anticipated a point that I, too, wanted to make and which I think should be underscored. Too often, not only in this hemisphere, but throughout the world we have been quick to criticize governments which were, in effect, friendly to us for one reason or another. Certainly, we do not like a dictatorship wherever it occurs. We like freely elected governments and hope that all people may soon live under the freely elected governments of their own choice. But, when this is not yet possible, I want to join the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Alabama in saying, let us not be too quick to criticize governments which are at least friendly to us.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman has made and compliment him on the clarity of his argument and the sound constructive approach he has taken. I, like him, do not like juntas or dictatorships, but if they do come about, let us make sure they are friends of ours and not friends of the Communists.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Alabama for having the foresight and for bringing to the attention of this Congress not only today but over the years the dangers which threaten our communications in the Caribbean. Cuba, Santa Domingo, Haiti, and these other islands lie between North America and South America. They are astride the vital communications necessary for the survival of the United States of America and they are the connecting link between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his courage and for his foresight. I do not know of a single instance where the gentleman has been wrong in standing in the well of this House and in bringing to our attention these problems threatening the security of this country and the Caribbean and Latin America.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank my colleague from South Carolina for his complimentary remarks.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama. He has performed a very worthwhile service to this body, to the Congress, and to the country. I hope that his voice and his words will be heard and heeded by those who serve in the Latin American section of the Department of State. It is my belief that the philosophy expressed today by the gentleman from Alabama is more in accord with the interests of the United States of America than the policy which sometimes comes out of the State Department in relation to Latin American affairs.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman on the remarks that I had the privilege of hearing. The other day I made a comment that many of the ultraliberal presidents in many of the countries now crying crocodile tears for Juan Bosch, should have had a few tears shed, and should have taken a similar position, when Castro took over Cuba. Now they are concerned that Bosch has been kicked out. The reason he has been kicked out, or one of the principal reasons, was that he was too soft on communism. That is why the military became perturbed and the business people of the country became perturbed, and that is why he was overthrown. That is why it would be idiotic for the United States to follow the suggestions made by some people that we use armed forces to return Bosch to power. It is interesting that some of the people making that suggestion now, have been rather critical of many of us who have been calling for action even short of war in the past, with regard to Cuba. I suggest that the gentleman in the well is one who has joined many times in calling for additional action in order to have an effective program to get rid of Castro's communism in Cuba, with economical and political quarantine being the results.

I refer not only to people in the United States, but the liberal rulers of many of these countries who are known to have been friendly with Juan Bosch and associated with him for many years. It is interesting to note that their attitude on this is entirely different than where there have been other military takeovers. I would like to again suggest that it appears obvious to me that one of the reasons Bosch was overthrown was because of his pro-Communist leanings, his softness toward communism, his recognition of the Communist Party, permitting the Communists to be elected to public office, and permitting 150 Communists to return to that country and take part in the educational system. It was obviously of concern to a great many of the business people and the military.

It appears to me that something must be done with regards to U.S. policy as it relates to the Alliance for Progress. Of course, I am sure that the gentleman from Alabama has, as have I on many occasions, taken it up with the State Department. Time and time again I have asked why there is not more drive in the Alliance for Progress toward doing something about softness on communism in these countries, through their governments, as a condition for Alliance for Progress funds. There should be some encouragement at least to those nations and those governments fighting communism. I am fearful that if this does not become the touchstone and the basis of our Alliance for Progress program, that is, fighting the idea of communism wherever it may appear and wherever it appears to be gaining a foothold, that countries such as Brazil, where they are having serious troubles today, are likely to be the next to be overthrown because of the Communist problem in that country.

I am sure the gentleman and I could name a number of other countries that have similar problems. So I think the gentleman properly pinpoints how serious this problem is.

I would like to add it appears to me that the Alliance for Progress program should be directed toward doing something about the real cause for military juntas, and that is, the Communist buildup in those countries.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman from Florida. I might point out in closing, Mr. Speaker, that late in May and again in early June, speaking on the floor of this House, I pointed out that uncontrolled activities of the Communists in the Dominican Republic had been called to my attention. I urged our State Department to convey to President Bosch my belief that such activities could threaten the overthrow of his freely elected government either by the right or by the left. President Bosch accused me of meddling in the affairs of his government and the State Department disclaimed any connection with my statement. I regret that what I predicted could happen in the Dominican Republic has taken place. Let us not, therefore, adversely judge the new regimes in either the Dominican Republic or Honduras until additional evidence is available regarding both their composition and intentions.

PETITION OF GRIEVANCES OF NORTHEAST AIRLINES EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, to include extraneous matter; and also that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest in the strongest terms of which I am capable against the recent attempt of one J. G. Adams, Director of the Bureau of Enforcement of the Civil Aeronautics Board, to "gag" the aggrieved employees of Northeast Airlines and, by so doing, prevent them from engaging in the "heinous crime" of trying to protect their means of making a living.

Recently, as all Members know, the CAB capriciously ruled that the New York-Miami service of Northeast Airlines must cease and that service to Florida will be the exclusive province of Eastern and National Airlines. The result of this strange ruling would be that not less than 2,000 employees, most of them Massachusetts residents, would lose their jobs with an annual loss in wages in excess of $10 million.

Even the dullest bureaucrat, however insulated and remote he might be from the public at large, should have some idea of the amount of human misery caused by this type of action. It is hard to conceive of any member of the human race so devoid of sympathy for his fellowman who would not be stirred by the plight of 2,000 families suddenly and whimsically cut off from their means of obtaining the necessities of life.

It is hard to imagine anyone who would be surprised that those individuals caught in this terrible predicament would fight against this decision with every legal means at their disposal. I am not surprised and I am sure that no Member of this House is surprised that the employees of Northeast Airlines have launched a gigantic campaign to have this unjust ruling reversed. Mr. J. G. Adams, however, is surprised and he has attempted to pressure Northeast Airlines into forcing the airline employees to stop urging their relatives and friends to write to the President, to Members of this House, and to Members of the other body enlisting their support.

In a letter to James W. Austin, president of Northeast Airlines, Adams held Northeast responsible for the activities of its employees. The letter read in part as follows:

> Whether employees have engaged in these activities with or without the knowledge or approbation of Northeast's management does not alter our conclusion. In our opinion, Northeast has an obligation to assure compliance by its entire organization with applicable Board regulations in matters of this nature. Continuation of such activities after this notice, without objection on the part of the company and lack of firm corrective steps where the company itself seems involved would, in our opinion, be equally violative of the Board's principles of practice.

In all my years in public life I cannot recall any statement quite as asinine as Adams' letter to the president of Northeast. Does Adams really think that the company could, even if it wanted to, halt the spontaneous efforts of several thousand American men and women who stand face to face with the eminent prospect of joblessness? Where has this man Adams been all his life? The reaction of the employees is as natural as any action ever could be. I am proud of the men and women of the Northeast work force who are willing to stand up and fight for their jobs.

On the other hand, I am ashamed that we have people like Adams holding positions of responsibility in the upper echelons of the Federal Government. The removal of such individuals from positions of trust should receive the very highest priority.

I sincerely hope that this Government has not gotten so remote from the American people that obscure officials can thwart the wishes of the President and Congress with complete impunity. The actions of Adams are out of keeping with the American tradition; they are more in line with the arbitrary edicts of a government official in some totalitarian state.

This whole situation involves a sordid mess which should give cause for Congress to look carefully into the operations of the so-called independent regulatory bodies. Judging by the Northeast case, the CAB is independent all right; independent of justice and apparently independent of the Congress of the United States. But I wonder if the CAB is entirely independent of favoritism toward one airline over another?

Northeast Airlines, in the past 6 years, has made an impressive contribution to the general public with its Florida service. In 1957, Northeast's share of the winter traffic from New York to Miami was but 5.9 percent of the total; by the winter season of 1962–63, it had risen to a very respectable 26 percent, despite fierce competition from its two strongly entrenched rivals. With the tremendous growth in traffic along this route, I am at a loss to explain why if Northeast was needed in 1957 it is not needed even more in 1963.

I feel strongly that the CAB should do all in its power to strengthen and not try to kill progressive airlines like Northeast. I cannot understand either the Board's strange solicitude for Northeast's two rivals who stand to be the only recipients of the action of the CAB or the strange lack of concern for a much smaller airline struggling to gain a place for itself.

Governor Peabody of Massachusetts was absolutely right when he labeled the action of the CAB as "illogical, ill-conceived and incredible." Clearly, the strange antics of the CAB deserve the closest possible scrutiny from the Congress.

The CAB has obviously adopted a policy of "the public be damned" and has clearly chosen sides in the economic struggle. Having created this situation by its absurd decision the Board now seeks to muzzle justifiable criticism which comes as a result of this decision. Can anyone help but wonder about what kind of mind is responsible for such an incredibly stupid state of affairs?

Even greater efforts on the part of the men and women of Northeast Airlines must be forthcoming. If enough enthusiasm is enkindled I am sure that this unjust situation will be rectified and that Northeast Airlines will have its New York to Florida service restored on a permanent basis. Simple justice demands at least this.

Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I include the following:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., September 24, 1963.

Re Violation of the Board's Principles of Practice.

Mr. JAMES W. AUSTIN,
President, Northeast Airlines, Inc., Logan International Airport, Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. AUSTIN: This Bureau is in possession of information indicating that Northeast Airlines, Inc., has engaged in a program designed to exert pressure upon the Board, in an improper manner and contrary to the Board's Principles of Practice, in an effort to have the Board reverse its position in the *New York-Florida Renewal Case,* Docket 12285, et al.

As part of this program, Northeast or its employees allegedly have engaged in the following activities:

A. Distribution of handbills attacking the Board's decision and urging the public to appeal to the President for reversal of the decision. These handbills reportedly were distributed by Northeast employees during periods of employment and were available at Northeast ticket counters.

B. During in-flight announcements, Northeast pilots have urged passengers to write or wire the Board and Members of Congress requesting reversal of this decision.

C. Handbills and petitions requesting similar action by the Board and Congress have been distributed to passengers on Northeast flights, and at Northeast ticket counters in the United States and Canada.

D. Employees and management personnel of Northeast have solicited friends, travel agents, hotel operators, and various businessmen to take similar action.

E. Travel agents have received mail solicitations from Northeast employees to wire or write their Congressman concerning the subject decision.

F. Automobile bumper stickers and buttons to be worn on the person have been distributed by Northeast employees in an effort to arouse public opinion.

G. Banner towing has been used in an effort to influence the President to seek a reversal of this decision.

H. Seat packs on Northeast flights have contained copies of a letter from Mr. Leo A. Furlong, Jr., of Florida, to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board criticizing him for his vote in this proceeding.

I. Northeast's Director of Purchasing has distributed a letter on Northeast's letterhead soliciting letters and telegrams to the President and Members of Congress urging a reversal of the Board's decision.

J. A letter has been circulated bearing the signature and title of a Northeast captain attacking the Board's decision and soliciting letters and telegrams to the President and Members of Congress urging reversal of such decision.

K. Northeast officials reportedly have spoken over the radio and in person before groups or to individuals and have urged public action in an effort to overturn the Board's decision.

L. Northeast has allegedly inspired newspapers and radio editorials to arouse public opinion against the decision.

Northeast, as any other applicant, has the right to inform interested persons as to the merits of an application. A party may also communicate with civic and municipal groups, who are parties to the proceeding, for the purpose of urging them to seek reconsideration, pursuant to the Board's regulations, of an adverse decision.

In the opinion of this Bureau, however, Northeast's activities, if they have actually occurred, exceed permissible bounds. Solicitation of assistance from nonparties in an effort to persuade the Board to change its decision in the New York-Florida case, in our view, is contrary to the Board's principles of practice.

Efforts to bring pressure upon the Board, which are instigated directly or indirectly by an applicant, are totally inconsistent with a proper recognition of the Board's quasi-judicial functions. In this connection, your attention is invited to the principles governing practice before this Board. Section 300.2 thereof provides, in pertinent part, that:

"It is essential in cases to be determined after notice and hearing and upon a record, or any other cases which the Board by order may designate, that the Board's judicial character be recognized and protected. Therefore, from time of filing of an application or petition which can be granted by the Board only after notice and hearing, or, in case of other matters, from the time of notice by the Board that such matters shall be determined after notice and hearing and upon a record or that its principles of practice shall be applicable thereto:

* * * * *

"(d) It is improper that there be any effort by any person interested in the case to sway the judgment of the Board by attempting to bring pressure or influence to bear upon the members of the Board, its staff or the examiner in the case, or that such person * * *, directly or indirectly, give statements to the press or radio, by paid advertisements or otherwise, designed to influence the Board's judgment in the case.

"(e) It is improper that any person solicit communications to the Board or any of its members or its staff or to the examiner in the case other than proper communications by parties or nonparties permitted under rules 14 and 15 of the Board's rules of practice. Anybody soliciting the support of another person shall call such person's attention to the provisions of rules 14 and 15."

This provision is designed to prevent and condemn pressure tactics in a proceeding such as the New York-Florida case. On the basis of the information presently available to us, we construe such circularization and solicitation of the public in the manner described above as a disregard of the Board's established standards, and such activities should be terminated immediately. In the *Reopened Kansas-Oklahoma Local Service Case,* order E–19560, May 3, 1963, one of the carrier parties was found to have violated the principles of practice as a result of a campaign to bring external pressure from the public, newspapers, and congressional leaders to compel the Board to change its decision in the same case. That situation closely parallels the instant case and the allegations concerning Northeast's present activities.

There can be no excuse for the management itself engaging in or encouraging activities such as these, if such allegations are true. The Board's rules are well known. Whether employees have engaged in these activities with or without the knowledge or approbation of Northeast's management does not alter our conclusion. In our opinion, Northeast has an obligation to assure compliance by its entire organization with applicable Board regulations in matters of this nature. Continuation of such activities after this notice, without objection on the part of the company, and lack of firm corrective steps where the company itself seems involved, would, in our opinion, be equally violative of the Board's principles of practice.

Because we feel that it would be appropriate that you advise key persons in your organization of the contents of this letter, 100 copies are being supplied.

Sincerely yours,

J. G. ADAMS,
Director, Bureau of Enforcement.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES
Boston, Mass., October 3, 1963.
Re your letter of September 24, 1963.
Mr. J. G. ADAMS,
Director, Bureau of Enforcement, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: Although we in Northeast's management know that there has been a widespread reaction to the Board's decision in the New York-Florida case, and that this reaction has resulted in certain of the activities outlined in your letter, I wish to assure you that such activities do not reflect any program on Northeast's part to exert pressure on the Board and that, quite to the contrary, Northeast's management has, in my judgment, done all that it reasonably could do to assure compliance by Northeast's people, with the Board's principles of practice.

I might say that, in analyzing the specific matters referred to in your letter, the activities fall, in general, into three categories; namely:

(a) Activities which had their initial origin in the spontaneous reaction of Northeast's people and the general public to the impact of the decision. Except to the extent that such activities have been continued under the sponsorship of others, such as labor unions—over which Northeast has no control and no right of control—these have been halted;

(b) Activities in which, to the best of my knowledge Northeast employees have not been involved. An example is paragraph H of your letter. Northeast does not supply seat-packs, and if copies of Senator Furlong's letter, which his office distributed in Florida, were left in Northeast planes, they were not, to our knowledge, placed there by Northeast people;

(c) Activities in support of so-called grandfather rights legislation now pending in Congress, with which we believe Northeast's management—even if it wished to do so—would have no legitimate right to interfere.

I would like further to point out that we in the Northeast organization have not taken a mere passive attitude in this matter, but rather have taken scrupulous care to observe, and to see that our people observed, the Board's principles of practice. At the outset of the case, our office of general counsel was asked to prepare an outline of permissible conduct during preparation for, and hearings in, the case and to discuss and answer questions with respect thereto at a meeting of key company personnel. This was accomplished, and I know of no instance of departure from the advice there given. Following the Board's press release and subsequent formal decision, counsel was again consulted, on several occasions, with respect to the propriety of particular action. In conformity with that advice, we in management have adhered to a policy of:

(a) Not making public statements concerning the decision; [1]

(b) Not commenting to newspaper and other media reporters, except to answer questions relating to planned procedural steps;

(c) Informing parties to the case of their procedural rights, but informing others who inquired as to how they might assist Northeast that the Board's rules did not permit any action on their part.

The strictures which I, and the rest of us in Northeast's management, have imposed upon ourselves have been frustrating to an extreme degree. However, we have recognized that, whatever others might do to mar the quasi-judicial image of the Board, we were personally bound by the principles of practice and personally obligated to do what we could to bring about full organizational compliance with those principles.

This we have done, and if your office has been informed that any program of pressure has been "instigated directly or indirectly" by Northeast, as page 2 of your letter suggests or that Northeast has "engaged in or encouraged" activities which were improper, this information is simply incorrect. As previously stated, we have halted improper activity where we had the ability to do so. Mr. Thomas Grace, our operations vice president halted the inflight announcements referred to in paragraph B by a communique to all pilots dated July 30. Mr. F. M. Coates, vice president, administration and finance, halted the circulation of the letter referred to in paragraph I, as soon as we learned of its existence and reprimanded its author.

Where activity which would be improper on Northeast's part, however, has sprung, independently: (a) from distress on the part of families and friends of Northeast people; or (b) from the reactions of labor unions to such things as Mr. MacIntyre's public statements or the chairman's letter of late August to other airline presidents with respect to employment of Northeast people; or (c) from the general public response to what their Senators and Congressmen and the Department of Justice have said publicly about the decision; it is obvious that halting of such activity is beyond my power or the power of anyone else in Northeast Airlines.

I have, in accordance with your suggestion, distributed copies of your letter to our appropriate supervising personnel. I have also distributed a copy of this letter to the same individuals, so that our company's policy of compliance may be confirmed.

Very truly yours,
JAMES W. AUSTIN,
President.

TRANSPORT WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA AFL-CIO, LOCAL 515, AIR TRANSPORT DIVISION,
Saugus, Mass., October 3, 1963.
ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

MR. BOYD: As representatives of nearly 1,000 employees at Northeast Airlines this is to inform you that these employees take exception to the charge that their efforts to retain employment is being labeled as illegal. How long has it been considered, in this country, illegal to foster and encourage passage of legislation by duly elected representatives? No one will ever convince us that our efforts have been of a clandestine nature, nor will anyone ever convince us that the original decision stemmed from anything but a clandestine plot.

A recent article in the Miami Herald stated that you were bleeding but that you were not going to be pushed around. Sir, we have been bleeding and have been pushed around for the past 2 months. We, however, are able to hold our head high.

Your weapon is absolute power and immunity from the ballot and obviously the administration. Our only weapon is the ballot. Unfortunately your future does not depend on the ballot directly, but the administration can give you the credit for every vote they lose in the next election, because the authors of this letter pledge that their future vote and those of whom we represent will be reflected by the outcome of Northeast's struggle to rectify a gross injustice.

The recent letter to the company listing the violations by the employees included all our efforts as near as we could ascertain, but in event something we carried out was not brought to your attention and to keep you up to date conveniently, enclosed are the back issues and the latest issue of the weekly publication that is prepared by the undersigned.

You will note that this is a form letter, the reasons being (1) we want to make sure that all interested parties receive a copy and (2) after the many visits to Washington of late, a little bit of the political was bound to rub off on us.

ROBERT COOMBS,
Vice President.
GEORGE MORRIS,
Secretary.

OCTOBER 4, 1963.
Mr. J. G. ADAMS,
Director, Bureau of Enforcement,
Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: It was rumored, Monday last, September 30, 1963, that you had notified the company (Northeast Airlines, Inc.), of the Civil Aeronautics Boards' displeasure at certain activities by the company and its employees relative to the adverse decision in the New York-Florida Renewal case.

I have, this day, seen this document and find that it, in fact, exists.

I will not now, or at any time, presume to speak for the executive body of Northeast Airlines. I speak only for myself and the employees embraced by the local that I represent.

If I wish I may read many things into this document that negate the Constitution of the United States and the Bill or Rights. So I may better understand; are you saying that we may not address ourselves, regarding this adverse decision, to our families, friends, business acquaintances or the press? That we may not solicit the support of the public servants that are public servants because the majority of us have so wished. Do you really feel free to tell us what we will or will not wear on our person? Can you, legally, strip our cars of any adornment that is in no way "slanderous"? Have you, sir, notified the President of the United States that he is not permitted, under rules 14 and 15, of the Board's rules of practice, to suggest that we make our attitudes known to the CAB? Have you at any time suggested that Mr. M. McIntyre, president of Eastern Air Lines, be muzzled?

Your Mr. Boyd has had a field day at the expense of Northeast and I am sorry that you saw fit to compound his felony.

I have no intention of seeking legal advice or interpretation on this document that you have sent. I answer it sir, because I am first, an American. I represent hundreds of others that are also, first Americans and secondly, Northeasts' employees. We cannot allow anyone to rob us of the privileges contained in the Constitution of the United States or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Boyd may be able to render this company bankrupt—he may be able to curtail our life's work but he will not, through your Bureau, deprive us of our privileges under the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

It is inconceivable that either Mr. Boyd or yourself think that fighting for the survival of this company, or our jobs, in any way necessary, is improper behavior.

It must be comforting to Mr. Boyd to be able to seek relief through your Bureau. It is unfortunate for the rest of us that we cannot be aided and abetted by an "official body" of the Government.

In closing, I make a request for 200,000 copies of the letter addressed to Mr. James Austin: Re violation of the Board's principles of practice. In reading this document, you have suggested distributing 100 copies to key persons. We consider all persons, interested in our welfare, key persons. We had over 200,000 signatures on the petition to our Congressmen and feel they should all be made aware of the "rules of behavior" in this matter.

---

[1] As you undoubtedly know, I was requested by the New England congressional delegation to appear before it in early August to answer questions concerning the decision. I was also asked, with Chairman Boyd and the president of Eastern Air Lines, to testify before the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. On these two occasions, and only on these two occasions, have I commented publicly on the decision. Northeast management has had no taped or other radio interviews and has issued no press releases, such as those released by Eastern's president in mid-August commenting upon the merits of the decision.

Respectfully,

CHARLES F. SINCLAIR,
President, Local 515 TWU ATD.

Mr. Speaker, I have stated before that if the CAB does not reverse its decision, I am going to call for a reappraisal of their decision and reappraisal of the Board's activity.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is something that Congress should look into. I do not think we can take this decision lightly, not when it affects the economic future of New England, not when it affects the jobs of over 2,000 persons, not when it is a decision that acts favorably in behalf of 2 other airlines.

Mr. Speaker, competition should be encouraged in this country. Congress never intended, when it established the CAB, for it to hand down or prepare decisions of this type. I serve notice that this fight is not over. We are just beginning to fight. We are waiting to see what the CAB is going to do and believe me, we will be on the floor of this House fighting all the way for the Northeast employees.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the admirable statement which the very distinguished gentleman has made, the very strong, declarative and forceful statement which he has made, with regard to the Northeast decision.

I think, of course, that what the gentleman has said about the decision is absolutely correct. It is an outrageous piece of chicanery as well as very unfair and unjust to try as CAB has done, to gag the employees of Northeast, or anyone else who may desire to protest, a ruling that has become, and is known to the American people, as grossly unfair, and the most generally unjust decision that has been rendered by any Federal administrative regulatory agency in this country for a long time. Thus, the Board adds insult to injury, denial of constitutional right of petition to ill-considered, antisocial, administrative action. Such repressive measures challenge the very integrity of free, representative government.

The recent incredible decisions by CAB, virtually breaking up the great Northeast Airlines, has caused a wave of indignation in many parts of the Nation.

The split decision in which the Chairman of the CAB voted with two other members of the Board to dismember Northeast Airlines and turn its choicest business over to its competitors has brought widespread demands for a thorough, impartial, and nonpartisan investigation by the Congress of this decision of CAB, as well as other decisions, carving up rich, competitive airlines' territories in an arbitrary, discriminatory manner that has shattered public confidence in the operations of CAB and in Federal regulatory agencies in general. The decision, shocking as it is, not only reflects upon the agency that made the decision, but it indirectly reflects on other regulatory agencies of the Government. People have the right to expect that these agencies will conduct their affairs with evenhanded justice. They are dismayed when they do not conform to this expectation.

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, this decision has cast a dark shadow of suspicion and doubt upon the competency, fairness and impartiality of a very vital and important Government agency charged with regulating and controlling our great air transport industry.

This decision is comprehensible only to the three CAB Board members who promulgated it. There is no practical justification for this outrageous decision, no legal grounds for it, no fairness or justice involved in it.

The decision is a cynical, defiant repudiation of the public interest and the interest of the flying public; a flagrant and biased disregard for the interests of certain great regions of the United States, a gross discrimination against New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C., and the great State of Florida, a palpable piece of rank administrative favoritism, and a calloused, merciless neglect and disregard of the clear interests of more than 2,000 highly capable, talented, trustworthy, and faithful employees of Northeast Airlines who are entitled to better treatment from this Government than that which has been accorded them, and are entitled to speak up in protest and demand for revision.

The CAB in this decision has not acted as a quasi-judicial board. It is not such a board. There was nothing judicial about this decision. It was a decision rendered by a segment of a politically constituted board—two Republicans and one Democrat—renouncing and perverting the purposes for which it was created by the Congress.

The decision is a plain reflection on the credulity and the mental capacity of every Member of this body and the Congress, since here is one of our legislative creatures defiantly flaunting its broken trust in our faces and perpetrating a glaring injustice upon Northeast Airlines and the American people.

Let this Congress act as the great body it is, the greatest deliberative body in the world, to clean up this mess in this and other regulatory agencies. Regardless of what the courts may do in this case, let us have a full-fledged, deep and broad investigation designed to bring justice into all regulating agencies, speedily rectify the great wrong that has been done, and provide necessary laws as soon as they can be enacted to require CAB, and all other regulatory agencies, to follow the rule of law, extend fairness and impartiality to all, and fully recognize the rights of labor, business enterprise, and the American public. This Congress must act now.

I want to commend and congratulate the very able and distinguished gentleman, my beloved and esteemed colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE], for the very fine speech he has made for Northeast, for the cause of justice, and for the interests of the traveling public.

Mr. BURKE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I want to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts and commend him for the forthright statement which he has made. I have discussed this matter with many members of the Northeast Airlines, pilots and others. Their approach has been a reasonable one. They are trying to fight for their jobs. But it seems to me this letter of Mr. Adams goes much further than the decision of the CAB because in truth what he is trying to do is take away from these people one of the most sacred rights we have in this country, that is, the right of petition. These people did the only thing they could do. They came down to their duly elected representatives to try to have their day in court, to explain their position and see if a wrong could be righted.

I think there is one thing more that should be said. All of us were surprised and shocked by this decision, but there is one other lesson I think we can learn from this, and that is that the Congress itself has the responsibility given to it by the Constitution, but we continue to delegate our own power to quasi-judicial boards and the executive branch of the Government. So it seems to me that as we review this whole case we should constantly keep in mind the fact that when we delegate power many times it comes back to haunt us.

Again I compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts on the excellent presentation he has made here this afternoon.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I, too, want to join with my colleagues from Massachusetts in protesting this decision of the CAB. In my 5 years in the House I have never seen such a travesty on justice by an administrative agency as is the case here. It is small wonder that it has prompted such eloquence on the part of my colleagues.

I, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, felt the need to look into the background of the decision. I went to the Library of Congress and other agencies available to us, and discovered a paper known as the Bluestone report, a working paper intended to guide the CAB in their policy decisions. I maintain that this Bluestone working paper has a philosophy that is not in keeping with the free enterprise system of which this Congress spoke at length yesterday.

The Bluestone report on page 43 with reference to the question of competition says, in effect, that in many areas of our Nation traffic is so limited that the certificated airline should have a monopoly, but in practically all other instances we should have what it referred to as a duopoly. They say that oligopoly is inefficient.

This is contained in the Bluestone report. Now then in the majority opinion published by the CAB in this particular case, we found the Chairman and his majority cohorts mouthing the same philosophy that was contained in that Bluestone report.

It says:

> We cannot accept Northeast's argument that established Board policy favoring multiple competition requires the continuation of three carrier service in the East coast-Florida market.

May I interject here, Mr. Speaker, that this is one of the largest markets available in the world today.

The Board goes on to say:

> The amount of competition that should be authorized in a given market does not turn on the number of carriers the Board may have authorized in some other markets, but depends upon the specific facts and circumstances affecting the markets under consideration.
>
> We here find only that a third carrier is not needed at the present time in the East coast-Florida markets.

Now here is what I object to.

Just think of it. The CAB is saying it is "not needed." The question should be, and it is vital to the free enterprise system in any of these competitive situations—not how many are needed but how much competition can the traffic stand? As long as we have an administrative agency that is determining that policy for airlines in this country based upon what is needed and not based upon how much the traffic can stand, there is hanging over the heads of all the other airlines operating now in the markets, where there are three or more carriers, a threat of a decision similar to this adversely affecting them and the traveling public of America.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this was not the intent of the Congress. I believe it was the intent of the Congress to foster the free enterprise system in a general way and in particular as far as the traveling public is concerned, to foster it in connection with any airline routes operating in the country.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend and compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] for obtaining time to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the seriousness and the gravity of the situation confronting Northeast Airlines because of the arbitrary, unfair and unjust decision rendered by the Civil Aeronautics Board in denying the application of Northeast for a permanent franchise and the cancelling of its temporary certificate which authorizes it to extend airplane passenger service south of New York City to Philadelphia, Washington, and cities in Florida.

This matter is well summed up in an editorial appearing in one of our newspapers entitled, "An Air of Monopoly," which follows:

> The case of Northeast Airlines is a dramatic reminder of the scope of Federal control of this industry. And the question arises if this control is not itself an important cause of the industry's present difficulties.
>
> For some time the Civil Aeronautics Board has been accused of insisting on excessive competition—more carriers on given routes than demand warrants. Now it seems to be changing; it voted to remove Northeast from the New York-Florida route, leaving two carriers in one of the world's largest passenger markets and confining Northeast literally to that geographical area.
>
> Whether this is good or bad policy, it is a death sentence for the company. Or rather, it would be except for one thing: The CAB generously offers to let its victim hang on through the device of Federal subsidy of its reduced operations.
>
> At the same time the agency seems to be unfavorably disposed just now toward a more natural way of reducing excessive competition, the way of mergers. It recently rejected, without explanation, the proposed combination of Eastern and American.
>
> Surely such policies and procedures pile anomaly atop anomaly—misjudging markets, then summarily evicting a carrier, then throwing it a sop of subsidy while frowning on a normal business solution. It is hard to believe that real competition would have done a worse job than all this bureaucratic control.
>
> But even that, unedifying as it is, is not the whole of the matter. Part of the present competitive confusion stems from the CAB's record of inherent opposition to competition of various kinds; it is almost as though it had been established to form an airlines cartel.

The Boston Globe aptly quotes:

> You would have to dig below cellar level to find the morale of large segments of the American aviation industry.

With particular reference to the incredible decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board to strip Northeast Airlines of its Florida operating rights, which runs include Boston to Florida and intervening points, this article recalls that:

> Before this temporary certificate was granted to Northeast you could not go nonstop to these different points. There was no such service. It always involved a change of plane in New York. It was, in fact, hell on wheels to get air reservations for Florida.

"With this decision," this statement goes on to say "make no mistake New England has been given the short end" and they expressed the hope that "when the decision of the Board is reviewed in our courts it will be justifiably reversed."

One wonders if consistency means anything to this self-styled opinionated Board and, if so, how do they differentiate between the case of Northeast Airlines and the case of Capital Airlines.

The Civil Aeronautics Board in 1959 issued a permanent certificate to Capital Airlines despite a total indebtedness of $53 million of which $9 million was due in a year and a negative capital working position of $2 million. At the time of this decision Capital did not even have sufficient new equipment to fly the requested routes but, notwithstanding, the Civil Aeronautics Board held that:

> With the important markets being made available to the carrier by our extension herein Capital will be able to acquire such additional aircraft as may be needed in the future to satisfy the needs of traffic growth.

In Northeast's case, it involved one of the world's largest passenger markets, between Boston and Florida. What was involved in Northeast's request for a permanent certificate for its Florida service. Northeast had held a temporary certificate or license for 6 years and CAB figures show that it has run up a better record each year. It carried but 11,679 passengers in 1957 to the playpens of Miami, Jacksonville, Fort Lauderdale, and Tampa. In 1962, it carried 77,671, and the most elemental arithmetic chalks that up as a seven-fold gain.

Six years ago 10,000 travelers flew Northeast to and from Philadelphia. In 1962, the figure was 110,000—11 times as many.

In 1957, 12,699 passengers chose Northeast to take them to Washington or back. In 1962, the traffic count was 190,619—a fifteenfold increase.

All that should add up to a successful trial period for Northeast—and, if figures do not lie, it does.

It causes further concern as to what test does this Board apply before making its decisions granting licenses, franchises, or certificates. Does it base them upon the test of convenience and necessity or the rule required by the Federal Aviation Act, to wit: "fit, willing, and able" to fly the routes for which a line requests permanent certification.

Certainly if such rules were followed in the case of Northeast the logical conclusion to be reached would be that it met and qualified for the requested certification.

What will happen if this decision is not reversed?

First. A subsidy in the amount of $3 million will be given to keep Northeast operating just in the New England area which subsidy will be paid by all the taxpayers of the United States and there is serious question if Northeast Airlines can survive even with this subsidy.

Second. The impact on the economy of New England will be seriously affected, and why: 1,600 skilled employees will be thrown out of work. These employees now annually earn $13 million, most of which is spent in New England. Some $2,750,000 which Northeast now spends in New England each year for everything from nuts to bolts, to jet engines and ash trays will be discontinued.

It would seem tragic that if this airline, which in 6 years of direct competition with two larger carriers has steadily increased its share of business to the point where it now carries 6 out of every 10 passengers who leave Boston for Miami; an airline that carries more than 1,500,000 passengers a year, that has captured more than 60 percent of the New England-Washington traffic, and nearly as much of the New England-Philadelphia load; an airline that ferries more than 25,000 travelers a month to New York, should be doomed to extinction and oblivion by the 3-to-2 decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board. In other words, this unfair decision was decided by the vote of one man.

It is hoped that justice will ultimately prevail in this case and Northeast will be permitted to continue to be an important part of the airline industry of our country.

Mr. BURKE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I was much impressed with what my distinguished colleague from the Fourth Massachusetts District said in opening his statement:

> The case of Northeast Airlines is a dramatic reminder of the scope of Federal control of the airline industry.

I will not address myself today to the merits or demerits of the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Rather I would like to associate myself with what my distinguished colleague [Mr. Burke] has said about this letter from Mr. Adams to the president of Northeast Airlines. Our learned colleague from the Sixth Massachusetts District [Mr. Bates] referred to a very sacred and a very precious right, the right of petition. We have in the letter of Mr. Adams clear evidence of the arrogance of the bureaucracy which governs the airline industry today. I would like to let the CAB know that I think that the people whose economic well-being is being adversely affected have a right to let their convictions be known.

I would like to let the CAB know that the employees of Northeast are not going to lie down and die; and we in New England are not going to lie down and die, either. It seems to me that the entire structure of the policies of the CAB deserve prompt and exhaustive examination by this House. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts; I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'Neill].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, as of Monday next there will be no Northeast planes running south of New York City. That means that the Boston to Philadelphia run will be canceled; the Boston to Washington run will be canceled, and the Boston to Florida run will be canceled.

The Boston to New York to Florida run is the second busiest run in America today. In 1958 the CAB believed there were three lines necessary to take care of that great traffic. After 5 years they have cut it down to two. This is a most distressing situation when you take into consideration the number of jobs and what it means to the economy of the area in which all of us live who come from Massachusetts. At the present time there are employed about 2,200 people. This cutback means a loss of somewhere between 1,600 and 1,800 jobs with an annual payroll of over $12 million a year. It is a devastating thing indeed not only for those employees but for the passengers who are looking for swift service in this day and age to various sections of the South.

It is only the natural thing to do for a man, to fight for his life, to fight for what he believes in and mostly to fight for his very position. In the latter part of September a letter came out from the CAB criticizing the Northeast Airline employees, including the pilots, the passenger agents, and the hostesses, for speaking to the passengers and the public at large about their plight and asking them to write to their Congressman and asking them to write to the U.S. Senators. We appreciate the pressure that is coming our way. I am ashamed that the CAB cannot take the pressure that is put on them.

At this point in my remarks I wish to insert a copy of the reply of Charles F. Sinclair, president of Local No. 515, TWU, ATD, to the Civil Aeronautics Board and to say that I am in full agreement with the sentiments which he expresses:

October 4, 1963.

Mr. J. G. Adams,
Director, Bureau of Enforcement, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Adams: It was rumored, Monday last, September 30, 1963, that you had notified the company (Northeast Airlines, Inc.,) of the Civil Aeronautics Board's displeasure at certain activities by the company and its employees relative to the adverse decision in the New York-Florida renewal case.

I have, this day, seen this document and find that it, in fact, exists.

I will not now, or at any time, presume to speak for the executive body of Northeast Airlines. I speak only for myself and the employees embraced by the local that I represent.

If I wish I may read many things into this document that negate the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights. So I may better understand; are you saying that we may not address ourselves regarding this adverse decision, to our families, friends, business acquaintances or the press? That we may not solicit the support of the public servants that are public servants because the majority of us have so wished. Do you really feel free to tell us what we will or will not wear on our person? Can you, legally, strip our cars of any adornment that is in no way "slanderous"? Have you, sir, notified the President of the United States that he is not permitted, under rules 14 and 15, of the Board's rules of practice, to suggest that we make our attitudes known to the CAB? Have you at any time suggested that Mr. M. McIntyre, president of Eastern Air Lines, be muzzled?

Your Mr. Boyd has had a field day at the expense of Northeast and I am sorry that you saw fit to compound his felony.

I have no intention of seeking legal advice or interpretation on this document that you have sent. I answer it, sir, because I am first, an American. I represent hundreds of others that are also, first Americans and secondly, Northeast employees. We cannot allow anyone to rob us of the privileges contained in the Constitution of the United States or the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Boyd may be able to render this company bankrupt—he may be able to curtail our life's work, but he will not, through your Bureau deprive us of our privileges under the Constitution or the Bill of Rights.

It is inconceivable that either Mr. Boyd or yourself think that fighting for the survival of this company, or our jobs, in any way necessary, is improper behavior.

It must be comforting to Mr. Boyd to be able to seek relief through your Bureau. It is unfortunate for the rest of us that we cannot be aided and abetted by an official body of the Government.

In closing, I make a request for 200,000 copies of the letter addressed to Mr. James Austin, re violation of the Board's principles of practice. In reading this document, you have suggested distributing 100 copies to key persons. We consider all persons, interested in our welfare, key persons. We had over 200,000 signatures on the petition to our Congressmen and feel they should all be made aware of the rules of behavior in this matter.

Respectfully,

Charles F. Sinclair,
President, Local 515 TWU ATD.

This is one of the worst decisions I have ever seen in my years in public life. It is unbelievable—a 3-to-2 decision, after 5 years, with the record showing what it has about the Northeast line from Boston to Philadelphia and the necessity of more flights from Boston to Washington, as well as the necessity of more flights from Boston to Florida.

Mr. Speaker, before Northeast took over the Florida run, if you lived in the city of Boston and wanted to go to Miami or Jacksonville or any one of the southern cities, priority was given to the New York people. Then, as an afterthought you were able to board one of the planes from Boston.

This is a political decision. This is a decision that should be repealed. I hope in fairness to the employees, in fairness to the economy of New England, and especially of Boston and Massachusetts, and in fairness to the riders, instead of waiting for this case to linger on in the court 4 or 5 years, that the CAB will review their decision and will reverse their decision and while the court cases are pending allow Northeast to continue all of the runs that they have at the present time.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, along the lines of the comments just made by my colleague from Massachusetts, I have received two letters which I would like to have inserted in the Record dealing with the action of Eastern Airlines now that they feel they have a sure thing. One of the letters indicates a curtailment in their winter schedule of service to Florida. It is from the Provincetown-Boston Airline which depends for its feeder traffic on Northeast and Eastern Airlines. It speaks very critically of this decision. That letter was dated July 30, 1963, when Eastern sent out an advance winter schedule. The other letter from which I would like to quote came in today from a constituent in the town of Hingham which is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. It is typical of the problems that the traveling public is already realizing with Eastern Airlines. Already they are talking like they have a monopoly, not even a duopoly, but the monopoly that they feel they are going to have.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include these letters at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

Provinceton-Boston Airline, Inc.,
Provincetown Municipal Airport,
Provincetown, Mass., September 14, 1963.

Dear Sir: I have just received the enclosed Eastern Airlines advance winter schedule to Florida effective December 18, 1963. If this schedule is printed in anticipation of Northeast no longer being in the Miami market, it is a joke. You will note there is only one daytime jet direct from Boston to Miami (flight 627 at 9:30 a.m.), the same as Eastern operated last year when Northeast was in the market. Today Northeast cannot provide normal service in its precarious position.

If this is Eastern's answer to the airline traveling public as to how it will fulfill the passenger demand in the coming season, you will never hear the end of the screaming. Eastern will have a 100-percent load factor to be sure, but it falls far, far short of replacing the service of Northeast Airlines. Note they even discontinue their present morning jet service between Boston and Philadelphia. I personally feel strongly that there will be no end to New England discontent if Northeast is removed from the Florida market. Your efforts to stop this are certainly in the interest of your constituents and the air traveling public.

Very truly yours,
PROVINCETOWN-BOSTON AIRLINE, INC.,
JOHN C. VAN ARSDALE, *President*.

E. KENT ALLEN,
Hingham, Mass., October 7, 1963.
Representative HASTINGS KEITH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On the flight down and return my convenience and interests were held secondary to those of Eastern who is apparently trying to drive Northeast out of business. If this is a sample of how Eastern operates, it does not auger well for the service to New England in the future.

Very truly yours,
E. KENT ALLEN.

Mr. BURKE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my distinguished colleagues from the New England region who are disturbed with recent allegations that Northeast employees are exerting undue influence in their attempt to clarify their position.

The decision of the CAB aside, I do not feel that an agency of the U.S. Government should attempt to supress the views of an aggrieved party. Certainly, the members of the Northeast Airlines staff are concerned with the 3-to-2 CAB decision, and they have strong allies who greatly fear the monopoly aspects of the decision.

There are approximately 2,000 employees involved in the decision of CAB, and it seems that the attempt of J. G. Adams, Director of the Bureau of Enforcement of the CAB, to silence these individuals is a classic example of a bureaucratic official devoid of any feelings for the honest and genuine constitutional right to dissent.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman BURKE. I, too, share his sentiments that no Government employee or Government agencies should attempt to gag American citizens from expressing their views to their elected Representatives and Senators on a matter which is so vital to them and their families. Some 2,000 employees of Northeast Airlines, and most of these are residents of my State of Massachusetts, face the loss of their jobs and their livelihood if the airlines cannot keep its Florida route. I think they are justified in writing to their Congressmen and Senators and I resent the fact that the Civil Aeronautics Board is trying to prevent Northeast Airlines employees from contacting us.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE A 2-YEAR EXTENSION OF CONSERVATION RESERVE CONTRACTS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would authorize a 2-year extension of conservation reserve contracts which are scheduled to expire this year. My bill would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to extend these agreements for 1 or 2 additional years.

About 7 million conservation reserve acres will be released for production next year if the present legislative impasse continues.

At least one-third of this acreage—maybe more—will be eligible under the feed grains program. Cost of land diversion under the feed grain program is more than twice as much as under the conservation reserve, about $29 compared with $12 an acre.

If this land is permitted to go into the feed grain program, taxpayers will be getting less than half as much land retirement for their money. I estimate prompt passage of my bill would give taxpayers a $15 million advantage. The cash outlay for land retirement would probably be about the same, but dollar for dollar, taxpayers would get more than twice as much land retirement.

My bill would authorize the extension of conservation reserve contracts scheduled to expire this year through 1965, the last year for which the feed grains program is authorized.

RESIDUAL OIL—COAL'S CYNICAL DISREGARD FOR THE CONSUMER

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, once again I find myself constrained to speak on a subject of increasing concern to all of us in New England as another winter season aproaches. Another bizarre footnote has been added to the strange saga of the efforts of the coal lobby to place the economy of New England at the mercy of the coal industry by insisting on totally unjustified restrictions on the import of residual oil.

Recently, I pointed out the incredible inconsistency of the coal lobby's position against subsidies for development of atomic power. Today I find an even more incredible example of the inconsistency in the coal position and further evidence of the coal producers' cynical disregard for the welfare of the consumer. I am informed that anthracite coal of domestic size suitable for home heating is in short supply in New England. This is shocking. What will happen to New England homeowners who depend on coal for their heat? Obviously, they will have to pay a higher price—engendered by the shortage—for their coal, if they can obtain it at all, or they will have to convert to some other form of heat. If they convert to oil heat, as some will have to do, they could find themselves paying a premium for their fuel because of the coal industry's selfish insistence on quotas on the import of oil into New England. This situation is a perfect example of the complete falseness of coal's argument that free oil imports hurt the coal industry. Now, in spite of quotas and restrictions, the coal industry is not even meeting New England's needs. This makes a mockery of coal's cry-baby act about its need for market protection by the use of quotas costing New England $30 million a year.

The fact is that coal—to a greater degree than any other industry in the country—is not only demanding, but getting, to have its cake and eat it, too. The problems of the coal industry and coal-producing States would be much better met by honest efforts of producers to develop markets rather than dissipating their efforts in finding a scapegoat for their own failures.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me how Congress can continue to countenance such a situation. It is our responsibility—all of us, no matter what part of the country we are from—to see that no one area of the country is made to suffer from an attempt to solve the economic ills of another area by means of a Government-imposed formula.

We in New England, Mr. Speaker, have our economic problems and we sympathize with the problems faced by our friends in other areas of the country. However, we are bending our efforts to work out our difficulties without burdening the rest of the Nation. All we ask is that our colleagues in the coal producing areas do not unfairly burden us in their attempts to cure their own economic troubles.

NO OUTCRY IS INDICATED

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues has asked a specific question, pertaining to the tragic train-bus accident in my district on September 17 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 17584, September 19, 1963.

"Why is there no outcry?" he asks.

We know our colleague is sincere in asking his question. We know his motives are pure. I believe he posed the question solely to receive a specific answer. I believe our colleague wanted the public, living far from the horrible scene, to better understand the true facts.

He obviously wanted a public answer, otherwise he would have made private inquiry. He obviously preferred an answer in the RECORD, otherwise he would have selected another media in which to pose his inquiry.

I do not believe he intended to stir up extravagant excitement about this event, or to arrogantly arouse base emotions by his inquiry.

I do not believe our colleague is trying to treat this tragedy as a triumph. I am convinced the question was not purposefully posed for political profit. He was not attempting to wrench wretched propaganda from the misery of unfortunate men. He would not try to wring gain from the pain of anguished bodies.

He asks, "Why is there no outcry?"

I do not believe our colleague wanted to create crass clamor based upon the pitiful split second lapse of prudence by the busdriver—which could have happened to any one of us, bright or dull, young or old, experienced or inexperienced, in Congress or out, Mexican or American, freeman or slave.

He would not play politics with agony, misery, tragedy. I believe our colleague asked the question for no other reason than to elicit a factual answer to the question.

He was not attempting to dredge up from a moral morass any spurious opposition to the bracero program. He did not intend to add further grief to the mourning families involved. He did not intend to cause the tortured driver any more excrutiating mental anguish. Although others would prostitute their standards of decency, morality, and rectitude for political purpose our colleague from Texas would not. He simply wants to know why there is no outcry. The simple answer is that there was no outcry because there was nothing for which to cry out. Most decent people were too absorbed by shock and genuine sympathy to go about devising or contriving ways in which to use the tragedy for any political purpose.

Reporters of all news media, newspaper, radio and television, were on the scene as quickly as possible. Their reports were prompt and accurate and widely circulated. They are independent—not affiliated with or beholden to any chain or group. They have often crusaded for causes for and on behalf of the Nation, State, county, city, individuals, and, yes, the braceros. If there were any basis or justification for an outcry, one or all of the many news media in the area would have been quick, willing, and able to respond.

Their trained judgment and discernment, their adherence to the principles of their profession and their individual probity permitted no outcry. Knowing many of them personally, I am certain they cried privately in sympathetic grief and that they prayed quietly for the alleviation of the remorse of the unfortunate driver and for the consolation of the loved ones of the deceased men. But they found no good or valid reason for crying out.

The accident was so terrible that no one needed to magnify the horrendous tragedy.

Law enforcement officials of the State and county were on the scene within 4 minutes. Their investigation and reports were made thoroughly, yet expeditiously. Excepting the written statements of the possible criminal defendants, the official reports are available for those interested. An inordinate interest has been shown in this case. In this short time it may be the most dog-eared case on record.

The various law enforcement agencies involved have excellent records for fairness and competence. If, during this investigation, the most horrible and tragic in California history, any of these public officials had discovered any reason for outcry, they would have discharged their duty promptly and professionally. I know many of these officials personally. I am certain that if any of the dozens of officials, passersby, witnesses, or families of the victims saw or discovered anything about which they should cry out, the outcry would have been widely circulated and loudly publicized already. But there was nothing for which to cry out.

Several investigations, local, State, and national—maybe international—have been conducted. These agencies and their sleuths certainly would have cried out by now if crying out were indicated. But nary a word.

There is a small group in the area who oppose the bracero program because it wants Mexican nationals to be admitted to the United States as freemen—permanent residents and citizens. They are on the scene and have full access to all of the facts and expert judgments regarding the bus accident. They would not hesitate to publish and use any legitimate argument against the program. But they are decent, honest people. They would not cry out falsely.

We would expect the clergy to cry out if there was reason. They have not. Although churchmen have been mistaken, misinformed, and misguided about some aspects of the bracero program, they understand this accident. This was an occasion where the clergy could contribute—not by crying out, but by giving comfort, solace, strength. They did this splendidly.

Certain labor bosses are anxious to organize the fieldworkers into unions for reasons ranging from a selfless, compassionate desire to improve the wages and working conditions of the farm laborers to the selfish desire to fill the union coffers with more dues. These union organizers see the bracero as an impediment to their plans. Although they have a reputation for fighting hard and ruthlessly for what they want, they would not use this tragic accident as a basis for agitation. They are not indecent, immoral, inhuman. They will not cry out without facts.

Invitations and exhortations to cry out, find fault, criticize, and deplore produce some response. Although the regulations under which this accident occurred were among the most stringent in the world, there have been three gratuitous suggestions:

First. Require all railroads to be underground; only buses, trucks, and passenger cars have surface rights.

Second. Pesticides should be prohibited on vegetable crops growing near roads or highways; they may cause an adverse effect on the driving dexterity of passersby, tourists, fieldworkers.

Third. Mexicans should not be permitted to drive buses or cars in the United States; their driving record is bad. How absurd. How ridiculous.

I am certain no one in my district would accept these suggestions. Members of all races and nationalities are too often negligent. Can you imagine a law requiring a different driving test for different nationalities in Texas? Certainly not in California.

No driver's restriction, no stricter requirement, no more stringent licensing procedure or test would have prevented this accident. It could have happened to anyone, a Congressman, a highway patrolman, a professional race driver.

A requirement that all of the more than 100,000 private railroad crossings in the United States be equipped with grade separations or automatically activated barricades is preposterous and unnecessary.

This crossing was used by the citizens of Monterey County, the officials of the farm and packing company and their families and employees. It was safe for anyone who exercised ordinary, garden variety prudence and care. The most modern, the most perfectly engineered and operated facility will not prevent human negligence.

I am certain that no Congressman would deign to substitute his judgment concerning the safety regulations for local passenger buses in California for that of the appropriate State and local regulatory agencies.

The complete answer to our colleague's inquiry is that no outcry is indicated. No amount of exhortation will induce decent, honorable people to cry out falsely. No inducement or motive would provoke the most avid opponent of the bracero program from my district to cry out about this train-bus accident. Such outcry would be dishonest, depraved, indecent, immoral.

Parenthetically, some miserable men would like to create a false impression that Mexican-Americans hate the bracero. This is not true in my district—and probably not elsewhere either—where there is genuine mutual respect and gratitude. In poignant, dramatic contradiction of this big lie of falsified hate, more than 9,000 Mexican and Mexican-American people attended the mass funeral of the men who died in the horrible accident. People there do not attend funerals of people they hate. This was probably the most largely attended funeral in our district. No, only a very few Mexican-Americans—and from other places—hate the bracero.

The people of our district were so genuinely stunned and shocked by the grievous tragedy that they could only offer condolences and sympathy. Any outcry will have to come from afar, from the ignorant, from the misinformed, from ghouls, from political opportunists, from mean men.

STATE LEGISLATION RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on August 19, 1963, I reported to this body the progress being made by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations with regard to State-local problems in the field of property tax administration. I would like now to report some significant progress in other aspects of State-local and metropolitan area relations.

As our colleagues will recall, the Commission is a relatively new body, established by Congress in 1959, just 4 years ago. Its basic purpose is to bring together representatives of the Federal, State, and local governments to seek solutions to common problems.

I was privileged to join with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] in sponsoring the legislation establishing the Commission, and it has been a distinct pleasure to serve as a member of the Commission since its establishment.

As a continuing national body, the Commission is not content with merely making studies and recommendations. As I reported in August, the Commission members want to see the recommendations put into effect. A significant step in this direction has been taken recently by the Commission in cooperation with the Council of State Governments. At the September meeting of the Council's Committee of State Officials on Suggested State Legislation, nine model State acts drafted to carry out Commission recommendations, were adopted for distribution to State legislative and executive leaders, as were policy statements endorsing two other recommendations. This brings to 16 the number of model State laws, initiated by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which have been endorsed by the Council of State Governments.

The draft bills endorsed this September are designed to strengthen the States and localities by providing the following statutory authority:

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

This suggested legislation has the purpose of increasing the mobility of State and local public employees so that their abilities might be used more fully and to best advantage. The bill provides for transferability of retirement credits earned by public employees within a State. The bill is patterned largely after the Illinois Reciprocal Retirement Act.

COOPERATIVE TAX ADMINISTRATION AGREEMENTS

This suggested legislation permits two or more local jurisdictions to provide joint administration of, or contractual arrangements for administering, one another's taxes, including both property and nonproperty taxes. The lack of such authority in a number of States presently forces reliance on too many small inefficient units of tax administration.

COLLECTION OF LOCAL NONPROPERTY TAXES BY THE STATE

This legislation provides a procedure by which a State on a reimbursable basis, could make its superior tax collecting machinery available for the collection of local government nonproperty taxes where such taxes are otherwise authorized by State law. The suggested bill is based on a 1963 Colorado statute, and follows the general principle established in such States as California, Illinois, Mississippi, New Mexico, and Utah where, for example locally levied sales taxes have been collected by State agencies for some time.

EXCHANGE OF TAX INFORMATION

This suggested legislation authorizes State and local tax administrators within a State to exchange, with each other and with Federal tax administrators, on a reciprocal basis, information pertinent to improved tax administration. This would be a counterpart to the U.S. Revenue Act of 1926 and subsequent congressional enactments which contain explicit authority for giving State tax officials access to Federal tax returns.

LOCAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BOND FINANCING

The suggested State legislation establishes safeguards against abuse of public funds in attracting industrial development by: First, subjecting all industrial development bond issues to State approval; second, restricting authority to issue such bonds to local units of general government—counties, municipalities, and organized townships; third, giving priority to communities with chronic surplus labor; fourth, limiting the total amount of such bonds which may be outstanding at any one time in the State; fifth, prohibiting such financing for the pirating of industrial plants; and sixth, enabling citizens to initiate referendums on proposed industrial development bond projects.

REGULATION OF NEW MUNICIPAL INCORPORATIONS

The suggested legislation makes all new incorporations subject to the review and approval of a State unit of government responsible for insuring that the proposed incorporations would assist, not hinder, the orderly development of local government within metropolitan areas. The bill is based in large part on chapter 414, Laws of Minnesota, 1959.

EXTRATERRITORIAL PLANNING, ZONING, AND SUBDIVISION REGULATION

The suggested legislation gives municipalities jurisdiction over planning, zoning, and subdivision regulation in unincorporated areas where county planning, zoning, and subdivision authority is not being exercised. Residents of the extraterritorial areas would be appointed to the planning commission and board of zoning adjustment for participation in making recommendations on planning, zoning, and subdivision matters applying to those areas. The draft bill is based on North Carolina statutes. A number of other States have this type of legislation. The most recent enactment, perhaps, is a 1963 act of the Texas Legislature.

METROPOLITAN STUDY COMMISSIONS

This legislation authorizes the establishment of locally initiated metropolitan area study commissions to develop proposals for revising and improving local government structure and services in the metropolitan areas concerned. The suggested legislative language is based on a 1963 Oregon statute.

STATE WATER RESOURCES PLANNING AND COORDINATION

In most States today, separate agencies are responsible for administering such State water resources programs as water pollution control, development of new water supplies, and allocation of water rights. The draft legislation provides for the placing of overall water resource planning, policymaking and coordination responsibility in a single unit of State government. This unit is empowered to provide the Governor and the legislature with assistance in directing the coordinated use, development, and regulation of the water resources of the State and in establishing uniform policies to minimize conflicts between the various operating agencies and water interests of the State. Other States which have followed this general approach currently include Oregon, Missouri, Kansas, Ohio, and Rhode Island.

The significance of these draft State legislative bills, from the national point of view, lies in their strengthening effect upon the Federal system. No single level or unit of government today can solve our domestic governmental problems by itself. But more than any other level, the States provide the legal, geographic, and political setting for dealing with problems of local finance, population growth and fragmentation of governmental structure in urban areas. These proposed model State acts are designed to increase the ability of local governments to meet their current problems. The tools which localities can utilize, the money they can spend, and the powers they can exercise are by and large determined by their State governments.

The endorsement of the Commission's proposed State legislation by the Council of State Governments is one of a number of recent signs of the increasing awareness on the part of State governments of their need to assume a more positive role of oversight and assistance to local governments. All three levels of government are so related in our Federal system that positive State action in these legislative areas of retirement, improved tax administration, improved local government organization and planning, and coordinated water resources, will strengthen the whole intergovernmental system.

While I have dealt with only one aspect of the work of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, it illustrates the Commission's practical and useful approach to the difficult task which we here in the Congress have given it. I predict that its effectiveness will continue to grow.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN CATTLE MARKET?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, with cattle production in the United States increasing at a faster rate than consumer demand, I am sure many of you share my concern regarding the fate of American cattle producers. However, for the seventh straight year U.S. ranchers, farmers, and others engaged in the meat industry are faced with a problem just as serious—the importation of processed beef. The administration has decided that it is not enough for American cattle producers to compete with one another, the agriculture policy of this country has been geared along the lines that require American cattle producers to compete with cheap labor and processing areas of the world as well. Recent Department of Agriculture figures predict that in 1963, importation of processed beef will be greater than ever. With tabulations for the first 6 months of this year just completed, it was disclosed that 482 million pounds of processed beef found its way to U.S. grocery store shelves. If the second half of this year is anything like the first half, we can expect the 1962 total of 942 million pounds of imported processed beef to be increased substantially. Frankly, I am concerned about what the future holds for the thousands of men and women engaged in the producing and marketing of beef in this country if the present policy of the Federal Government toward this problem is permitted to go unchallenged.

URBAN RENEWAL IS REALLY NEGRO REMOVAL IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL AND IN EVERY OTHER URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT IN AMERICA

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Kyl] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing evidence that the urban renewal program, which began with a good idea and high hopes, has developed problems which threaten its existence. Unless basic changes are made and unless the program is redirected, further degeneration is in prospect.

The General Accounting Office has issued its studies of the urban renewal programs in the Nation's Capital, and in Cleveland, Ohio, and these studies show that there was no requirement that the urban renewal officials paid any attention to recommended techniques of rehabilitation and spot clearance, but always took the most expensive and wasteful ways to clear slums. In Cleveland, a building worth $800,000 was declared substandard because it had debris in the basement. A $600,000 building, otherwise attractive and in excellent repair, was declared substandard and razed because the closing devices on fire doors were faulty.

In Washington, D.C., blighted areas were leveled in what started to be worthwhile projects. The areas were in part at least residential slums, though the report by the General Accounting Office shows that more than $2 million of structurally sound buildings were destroyed.

After 12 years, many of the displaced persons are still seeking adequate housing. They simply moved from one slum to another in other cases. The area cleared is now full of highways and superduper glass apartment buildings which rent for $175 per month and up unfurnished.

The corrective effort should be twofold. Improvements in basic urban renewal law must be made. Even more important, however, is a correction of the tax system which makes operation of slums profitable, and which prevents improvement of private property through punitive provisions.

The urban renewal programs in the District of Columbia, as revealed by the House of Representatives Subcommittee on the District of Columbia headed by Congressman John Dowdy, Democrat, of Texas, has developed the most shocking conditions. In spite of this information there is no attempt being made for improvement. There is more than economics involved, because the urban renewal program has caused serious displacement of American citizens. The Negro, currently involved in a basic civil rights battle, has been a major casualty of urban renewal programs in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere, so that these programs are known among Negroes as urban removal programs.

Some weeks ago the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Catholic archbishop of Washington, asked the people of the city to:

> Act quickly and decisively to root out from our midst the social evils that blight our Nation's Capital. It is hardly necessary to state that we gain nothing by tearing down slum housing if we force the residents to create new slums elsewhere by overcrowding.

Chet Huntley, on September 26, on the NBC television network, discussing "The Negro in Washington," said:

> In the last 5 years 13,000 low-income Negro families have been displaced by renewal, and very few have found decent homes.
>
> Urban renewal for the Negro is really Negro removal, because in every urban renewal project in America there has been almost a total displacement of lower income Negro families. All urban renewal does is to redistribute the slum, so that Negro families who were living in slum conditions once they've been cleared out, simply move to either an existing slum in another part of the city or create a new slum in a fringe area. So urban renewal, while it solves one problem, creates another problem in another section of the city.
>
> It will get worse before it gets better. Many more thousands of Negro families will be displaced in the next 4 years. There is a dire shortage of low-income public housing in Washington, and the result is this.
>
> Today Negro housing in Washington is five times more crowded than white. It is also more expensive. Because the white suburbs are closed, the Negro has no choice but the inner city, a polite euphemism for slum. Thus he is at the mercy of the free market. One conservative estimate is that he is overcharged about $5 million in rents a year, in neighborhoods like these. He invariably pays more for less than the white tenant.

I do not think the people of Iowa should be taxed to support such urban renewal-Negro removal programs in the Nation's Capital, or anywhere else in the Nation.

If the special interests backing these programs want to take the land from low-income Negro families for the benefit of private interests then they should not have the blessing of the Federal Government in doing so.

Nor, for that matter, should they have the help of the Government's powers of eminent domain in advancing programs which are the oldest and most discredited "get-rich-quick" gimmicks all tricked out in modern dress.

Recently the Senate passed a bill, S. 628, which was described by Senator Thomas J. McIntyre in these glowing terms in the Congressional Record of July 16:

> This bill would provide clear legislative authority for the use of the urban renewal process in the redevelopment of commercial areas of the District of Columbia.
>
> The authority of the existing District of Columbia Redevelopment Act is now limited to the residential areas of the Nation's Capital.
>
> The enactment of the bill would remove this limitation and place the District of Columbia on a par with the other major cities of the United States by permitting it to proceed with the orderly redevelopment of the downtown area.

If this were all that S. 628 did, I do not think many in this House would object to its enactment. On the other hand, Representative John Dowdy, of Texas, has been unfairly criticized for offering some reasonable and necessary amendments to improve and clarify its purposes.

Senator Jack Miller, Republican of Iowa, offered amendments in the Senate to improve S. 628.

Senator Miller said during the Senate consideration of S. 628 that it would authorize the destruction of any commercial or residential structure anywhere in the District of Columbia which some nonelected public official determines in his mind would:

> Impair, arrest, or prevent the sound growth, development, or redevelopment of the District of Columbia.

Senator Miller pointed out that the report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress entitled "Audit of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, fiscal years 1957 and 1958" states that:

> We were informed that certain commercial structures which during our site visit, seemed to be sound in appearance and condition would probably be demolished. These structures, located on 7th and 12th Streets between the Southwest Expressway and D Street in areas which are to be redeveloped for commercial uses, have an estimated total cost of about $2 million for acquiring and demolishing.

Senator Miller then said:

> If businessmen or homeowners in the District of Columbia are ousted because of a whim or fancy, or some abuse of discretion, or some blind ignorance of what the rules are, to whom can they turn? They cannot turn to anyone except Congress. While perhaps the bill (S. 628) does not affect us personally very much, we have an obligation to the people of the District of Columbia; we have an obligation to every individual property owner in the District, to make certain that his property is not taken away from him without due process of law or without just compensation. It is also our duty to make certain that the objective of the redevelopment plan is not used as an excuse to trample on the rights of the property owners. Unless we recognize that private property rights should be given protection, we do not legislate very well. Property owners have no one except Congress to turn to for safeguards of their rights. I do not think those rights are safeguarded by the bill. They have not been safeguarded in the administration of the law in Cleveland, or in the District of Columbia in the Southwest project area.
>
> We would be remiss if in our zeal to get moving with the redevelopment of the downtown area we on the floor of the Senate did not write into the bill safeguards which would make certain that the people will have their property rights protected.

Unfortunately Senator Miller was not successful in having his proposed amendment adopted. The amendment would have prevented the destruction of any sound structure.

For this reason, the Members of this House must insist on amendments which will assure that Federal taxes paid by all of the people, and eminent domain powers, will not be misused in the future to secure the removal of low-income families from urban renewal areas and for other undesirable purposes.

Further, all Members of this House should be willing to strongly support and insist on an amendment to S. 628 when it is considered here which would prevent the destruction of structurally sound business and residential structures. This is the minimum safeguard which we should insist upon, otherwise the cost of urban renewal programs in the Nation's Capital will become astronomically high and will further aggravate our budgetary situation.

Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks studies of S. 628 which were made by the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office which will be helpful to us as we attempt to assess how much fact and how much fancy there is in the assertion that this bill would not do anything other than allow urban renewal in downtown Washington, an assertion which has repeatedly been made by its chief sponsor in Washington, D.C., Downtown Progress, Inc.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1963.

SECTION 1. Short title: "District of Columbia Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963".

SEC. 2. This section sets forth new findings and declarations of necessity. Among the new findings are: (1) that there are nonresidential slum and blighted areas; (2) that the residential and nonresidential slum and blighted areas, in addition to constituting a serious threat to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia, contribute substantially to the spread of disease and crime, to the imposition of severe public economic and social liabilities, and to the impairment, arrest or prevention of sound growth, development or redevelopment of the District of Columbia.

The section also makes the findings previously made that these areas cannot be eliminated solely by regulatory processes and the normal operations of private enterprise. It adds to the finding that the plans for elimination of slum and blighted areas should be comprehensive, the qualification that the plans should be within the general framework of the plan for the National Capital prepared by the National Capital Planning Commission. Another new legislative finding contained in this section is that it is necessary in the public interest to permit the exercise of police powers.

SEC. 3. This section strikes out the existing definition of "substandard housing conditions" and substitutes therefor a definition of "slum area or blighted area". A slum or blighted area under the new definition is an area in which there exists one or a combination of factors of such an extent or nature as to contribute substantially: (1) to the spread of disease or crime, (2) to impose severe public economic or social liabilities, or (3) to impair, arrest or prevent the sound growth, development or redevelopment of the District of Columbia; and which factor or combination of factors would result in a serious and growing threat to the public health, safety, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., September 30, 1963.

Does S. 628 do anything other than allow urban renewal in downtown Washington?

The changes in the declared purpose of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act along with the deletion of the definition of "substandard housing condition" and the addition of the definition of "slum area or blighted area" in said act do more than allow renewal in downtown Washington.

First, these changes broaden the underlying base upon which the Redevelopment Land Agency might predicate action with respect to residential projects. Under the present act the authority to acquire property for residential redevelopment projects is predicated upon the need to effectuate the discontinuance of the use for human habitation in the District of Columbia of substandard dwellings and of buildings in alleys and blighted areas. Under S. 628 the authority to acquire property for residential as well as for downtown redevelopment projects would be predicated upon the existence of any one of the following factors which would be of such an extent or nature as to contribute substantially: (1) to the spread of disease or crime, (2) to impose severe public economic or social liabilities, or (3) to impair, arrest or prevent the sound growth, development or redevelopment of the District of Columbia; and which would result in a serious and growing threat to the public health, safety, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia.

While it is impossible to set forth definitively the outer limits of the increased breadth of the authority proposed to be granted by S. 628, it is possible to state affirmatively that the criteria set forth in the declaration of purpose and in the definition of "slum or blighted area" of the bill do more than extend the powers granted by the present act to the downtown area.

It is conceded that it is neither necessary nor desirable to artificially define terms in a statute if they possess readily understood meanings in the speech of the people or in the trade, business, etc., to which the statute applies. Definitions of certain terms of the proposed bill, however, are needed to disclose their meanings. A definition is especially needed as to the meaning of "a factor of such an extent or nature as to contribute substantially to impose severe public economic or social liabilities."

Further, the stated right to exercise police power granted by subsection (f) of section 2 of S. 628 is not contained in the present act.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1963.

Hon. JOHN DOWDY,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 4, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter dated September 23, 1963, herewith is our analysis of, and comments on, Senate bill 628, 88th Congress, 1st session, which passed the Senate on July 16, 1963, and which your committee is now considering.

Senate bill 628 would amend sections 2 and 3 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended (5 D.C. Code 701 and 702), to authorize the redevelopment, under urban renewal processes, of nonresidential areas of the District of Columbia. The act now authorizes urban renewal projects in predominantly residential areas only.

Section 2 of the act sets forth the general purposes of the act. The proposed section 2 eliminates the caption "General Purposes" and substitutes therefor the caption "Findings and Declarations of Necessity." The proposed new section sets forth determination by the Congress as follows:

1. Subsections (a) and (b) conclude that there are residential and nonresidential slum and blighted areas in the District of Columbia, that such areas constitute a serious threat to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia which situation cannot be effectively corrected with the means presently available.

2. Subsection (c) concludes that the effective elimination of existing and potential slums and blighted areas necessitates that these areas be dealt with on a comprehensive basis, and that all plans related thereto shall be prepared within the framework of the comprehensive plan of the District of Columbia.

3. Subsections (d) and (e) declare that the public policy of the United States is to employ the powers granted by the act to eliminate existing and potential slum and blighted areas, and that the method by

which real property is acquired and disposed of furthers and benefits the public interest.

4. Subsection (f) declares that public powers, such as the power of eminent domain and the police power, may be employed to further the provisions of the act.

The bill would amend also certain definitions contained in section 3 of the act, as follows:

1. A "project" (definition j) is defined as being "a slum or blighted area;" the act now merely defines it as "an area."

2. The definition (r) of "substandard housing conditions" is deleted. Instead, the bill provides for a definition of a "slum area or blighted area." The definition clearly states that a slum or blighted area can be "a residential or nonresidential area, or combination thereof." Because the bill defines a project as being a "slum area or blighted area," the most significant effect of the revision of definition (r) is to make wholly or partially nonresidential areas eligible for urban renewal.

We have no firsthand knowledge concerning the desirability of enabling the District of Columbia to renew nonresidential areas, and since the bill, if enacted, would not affect the functions of our office, we have no comments concerning its merits or recommendations regarding its enactment. However, we offer the following observations concerning the bill.

Subsections (d) (e) and (f) of the proposed section 2 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, above, clarify the provisions of the current law concerning the problem of elimination and prevention of slums and blighted areas in the District of Columbia, by placing the powers conferred upon the Redevelopment Land Agency within the framework of the public interest, thereby constituting the legislation as a proper exercise of Federal power by the Congress. A discussion of these matters, as applied to the present law, is contained in the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court rendered in the case of *Berman* v. *Parker*, 348 U.S.C. 26.

We also should like to call your attention to the definition in the bill of a "slum blighted area," contained in the amended subsection (r) to section 3 of the act. In our opinion, the definition is so broad that any area of the District of Columbia could conceivably be classified as a slum or blighted area. The bill provides that one or more of several factors must be prevalent in order for an area to be so classified. These factors "may include," but are not necessarily confined to, such conditions as deteriorating buildings, obsolete buildings, and overcrowded buildings. In the absence of more precise guidelines, such factors can be applied to an area on the basis of subjective determinations.

For example, one could well assume that any building is deteriorating from the moment it is erected. If applied literally, any area could be classified as slum or blighted under the deteriorating factor. As another example, a commercial structure may be considered to be obsolete. However, a building is obsolete only in relation to a specific land use. The relationship between a use of a building and a preconceived land use may well be determined on a subjective basis.

We note also that the definition of a slum or blighted area gives no cognizance to the degree or severity of deterioration, dilapidation, et cetera. Thus, an area may be considered to be a slum and may be scheduled for large-scale demolition even though the blighting factors can be readily corrected. For example, an overcrowded or deteriorating building may be substantially improved through normal enforcement of codes or through normal maintenance. Although the bill does recognize degree in a sense, it does so in terms (e.g., severe social liability, impaired sound growth) which are also susceptible to subjective evaluations.

In a recent report to the Congress (B–118754, dated June 28, 1963) on the premature approval of large-scale demolition for the Erieview-I urban renewal project, Cleveland, Ohio, by the Urban Renewal Administration, we stated that many buildings were classified as being substandard on the basis of vague environmental factors, and that such classifications were used as a basis for large-scale demolition of the area. We stated that under URA's criteria, a city could, with Urban Renewal Administration approval, designate any of its buildings as "substandard" and schedule such buildings for demolition even though far less costly methods of urban renewal could accomplish the objectives of the urban renewal legislation. We directed our recommendations for corrective action to the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.

Because urban renewal in the District of Columbia is carried out by the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency through loans and grants made by URA pursuant to the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, the criteria established by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Urban Renewal Administration would govern the eligibility of designated slum clearance and urban renewal projects in the District of Columbia. Accordingly, the situation disclosed in our report on the Erieview project would not necessarily be repeated in the District of Columbia if Housing and Home Finance Agency and Urban Renewal Administration officials administer the program in the manner recommended by us, or if the Congress incorporates the substance of our recommendations in the basic urban renewal legislation. In either event, of course, there is nothing to preclude any city from establishing more rigid requirements than are contained in the basic legislation or in URA regulations.

Mr. Owen of your staff requested our advice specifically as to whether S. 628 would (1) transfer the power of eminent domain to private industry; (2) provide the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency with additional police power; and (3) place all private development in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the National Capital Planning Commission. A careful analysis of the provisions of the bill in question indicates that as to question (1) no power of eminent domain is transferred to private industry. The right to condemn real property is clearly set forth under section 5 of the present law and such right is conferred upon the Redevelopment Land Agency only. The police power granted the Redevelopment Land Agency under the present law has not been changed under the bill in question. Under the proposed subsection (r) of section 3 of S. 628 the slum and blighted areas covered by the proposed bill have been extended to nonresidential areas, and also additional factors have been provided in determining slum and blighted areas. The police powers of the Redevelopment Land Agency thus have been broadened to apply to this additional authority. Question (2) is answered accordingly.

As to question (3), all private development in the District of Columbia has not been placed under the jurisdiction of the National Capital Planning Commission. This Commission is empowered under section 6 of the current act to make and develop a comprehensive or general plan for the development of the District of Columbia. This provision of the act would not be changed by enactment of S. 628. Since the comprehensive plan is intended only as general outline and guide for the development of the District of Columbia, within which the various project areas may be more precisely planned and calculated, there would be no interference with private development by the formulation of the comprehensive plan. The 1945 act requires the Planning Commission to adopt boundaries for a proposed project area redevelopment plan which, when adopted and approved by the District Commissioners, would place the area, within the boundaries approved, under the control of the Planning Commission, insofar as further implementation of the plan is concerned. However, it is the view of our Office that land areas outside the boundaries of specific area redevelopment plans would not be precluded from development by private interests so long as there was no conflict with the overall comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, October 7 has been designated by many as Free Enterprise Day. Free enterprise—like other freedoms—should be appreciated and cherished by each American citizen. If America's greatness can be attributed to a single cause, it is, in my opinion, freedom of individual enterprise, of thought and of action.

The United States, with 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's land, has developed the capacity to produce 50 percent of the world's goods. We are the best fed, best clothed, and best housed people in the world. We have reached a standard of living which no other nation has been able to emulate during the long, stormy history of the world. The productive capacity of our farms and our factories, and our mines is the envy and hope of a free world.

The strength of our economic system is in its freedom and in the spirit of competition which has produced more efficient methods of production and distribution.

Throughout the world, progress has been synonymous with those systems of government whose economies are based on free competition and the recognition of individual initiative. Our Government must not do for our people the things that they can do for themselves. Such lessens individual initiative and is a dangerous procedure. Basically, I favor as little governmental regulation and control as possible, and I do not favor the Federal Government rendering services which can be rendered by the States or local units of government.

In the next few days business and industrial leaders throughout my congressional district in North Carolina will conduct many Free Enterprise Day celebrations. One community is planning a large parade, followed by a banquet and speaking. I join with business and industrial leaders in my congressional district and across the Nation in the belief that observance of this day helps in effectively telling the free enterprise story.

From time to time in our history other systems of government have attempted intrusions and, like unwelcome guests, have asserted with unrestrained propaganda that other ideologies are more sound than free enterprise. Yet today I believe we are seeing the deterioration of these systems of economy and government. The Soviets are admittedly in economic trouble. So are the Cubans and the Red Chinese.

At the very moment that we now pause to pay special tribute to free enterprise, negotiations are in progress to consider the sale of surplus U.S. wheat to Russia where the lack of a system of free enterprise and accompanying individual initiative has caused agricultural economies to falter.

So long as we in the United States continue to recognize the rights of the individual and his right to compete freely with other individuals, according to his own dictates and abilities, I believe we will continue to offer our citizens a trusteeship to a promising future. To this purpose we rededicate ourselves today.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM HAS BEEN A CRUTCH AND A TRAP TO MANY AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the bracero program has been a crutch and a trap to many American farmers for years. Some growers would rather not use braceros, but must do so because of the pressures of competition. Witness this letter which I recently received from one of the largest farm operators in Arizona:

PHOENIX, ARIZ.,
September 25, 1963.

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding the extension of the bracero program or Public Law 78, which I understand is slated to come up for discussion in the House of Representatives, I wish to ask your help in defeating the bill.

I have been for a long time a large user of the Mexican nationals but it is time to eliminate this law as it is causing a hardship on the migrant labor who are citizens of the United States. We have plenty of labor available now. We realize we will have to pay more money for this labor but we should as no one can live on wages now being paid on account of this bracero program.

The only grower and shippers that want this program extended are the large growers that are trying to dominate our business in all producing areas. We have an overproduction on practically all fruits and vegetables today due to this bracero program.

I am an American and I would like to work the American people at a wage they can live on, so I ask for you to vote against the extension of this program.

We farm today 3,000 acres of land, one of the largest grower-shippers in Arizona and without this program we intend to stay in business and we intend to help the American farm labor earn a better living.

Kindest regards.

Very truly yours,
BODINE PRODUCE CO.
A. W. BODINE.

AIR ROUTE TRAFFIC CONTROL CENTER, SAN ANTONIO, TEX.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last year a decision was announced by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, Najeeb E. Halaby, that the Air Route Traffic Control Center in San Antonio, Tex., would be relocated in Houston, Tex. This announcement came without prior warning or hearing of any kind, and in view of the fact that the San Antonio center had been built at a heavy cost to the taxpayers only 4 years prior to the announcement that it was to be abandoned, the decision appeared to be somewhat shrouded in mystery. Since the Center is in the district which I represent I naturally felt a responsibility to inquire into the decision to vacate its premises and to uproot a great number of FAA employees who had made San Antonio their home.

My modest request for information on this matter was met by such rude and arrogant resistance by Mr. Halaby that I was at first shocked. Determined to get beneath a situation that was obviously being whitewashed I broadened the inquiry and intensified my efforts to learn the facts. The reason for Mr. Halaby's arbitrariness in withholding information from me became clear when certain facts were pried loose. The decision to relocate the Center was as arbitrary as the behavior of the Administrator. The facts justifying the move were long in coming because the move itself is unjustifiable.

The two reasons given for the decision to relocate the Center were safety and efficiency of operations. Upon examination both reasons proved to be spurious. Appropriations for the move had not been requested. Where was the money to come from to effectuate it? It was finally admitted that funds from other accounts—accounts that had been set up for the purchase of safety equipment scheduled to be installed in other centers where it was long overdue and where flying conditions had become hazardous because of its absence—was to be siphoned off to facilitate an unnecessary move, a move from a center which had been constructed only 4 years earlier, which was up-to-date and needed no repairs or renovations. This was how the goal of air safety was to be reached, by jeopardizing the air safety facilities in other centers throughout the country.

The attempts to defend the move on an economic basis have proven to be equally weightless. In fact, the move represents a loss of more than $4 million, which are to be wasted in the construction of a new, unnecessary center.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of the seriousness of these charges. They indicate not only that a bad decision has been made at a high governmental level, but that there is an inherent defect in the decisionmaking process that led to it. This defect lies in the fact that the decision was made by one man, the Administrator, who operates on the belief that he is not a public servant, but that he is some sort of absolute dictator or commissar, not responsible to the people who pay his salary or to the elected officials who are charged with the duty of representing the people.

Let me give you just one further example of the supreme arrogance of the man. Many months have passed since the question of the abandonment of the San Antonio center has been discussed in public. This time was utilized to collect additional data and to reexamine the problem. My initial conclusions were strengthened by this study and in the sincere desire to present my findings objectively and without fanfare, I reduced them to writing and included them in a letter to Mr. Halaby. The letter was mailed on September 23, 1963. More than 2 weeks have since elapsed. Mr. Halaby has not seen fit to even acknowledge its receipt. No reply to the letter has been received. Surely, 2 weeks is a reasonable time to allow for an answer to one's letter.

The complete text of my letter to Najeeb E. Halaby follows:

SEPTEMBER 23, 1963.

Mr. NAJEEB E. HALABY,
Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALABY: I have continued over the past year to devote a considerable amount of time to the study of the problems arising from the proposal by the Federal Aviation Agency to relocate the San Antonio ARTC center to a location in Houston. My initial conclusion that such a move is not only unnecessary but represents needless expenditure of public funds, has been confirmed. The following contains the facts on which this conclusion is based.

From an operational standpoint, the existing San Antonio ARTC center is completely adequate, and meets the standard established for the construction of new ARTC center buildings. From a cost standpoint, the abandonment of San Antonio ARTC center, and the construction of a new ARTC center in Houston would entail the needless expenditure of in excess of $4 million.

Unfortunately, in the documentation of the case against the San Antonio ARTC center by the FAA, there has been a preoccupation with comparing the costs of operating two centers (New Orleans and San Antonio) versus one center (Houston). That type of comparison has established a heavy prejudice against the continued operation of the San Antonio ARTC center. It has also distorted the facts of the situation almost beyond recognition.

In order to place the matter in the proper perspective, it is absolutely essential that the factors arising from a consideration of the New Orleans ARTC center be eliminated from the comparison. Accepting the fact that the New Orleans ARTC center is to be closed, a net reduction in the total number of ARTC centers is accomplished, whether the San Antonio ARTC center is retained, or whether the San Antonio operation is relocated to Houston. The only consideration to be shown to the closing of the New Orleans ARTC center is with respect to the allocation of the New Orleans ARTC area among adjacent ARTC centers (Jacksonville, Memphis, Fort Worth, and San Antonio/Houston). The costs arising from the closing of the New Orleans ARTC center relate to that project alone. Such costs are not materially affected by the location of the San Antonio ARTC center. Therefore the introduction of New Orleans costs in the comparison of San Antonio and Houston is improper.

The central issue then is a comparison of the cost of maintaining the San Antonio ARTC center, with the cost of abandoning the San Antonio center and constructing a new center in Houston.

In previous correspondence, and specifically in his letter of May 18, 1962, your Deputy Administrator offered the justification of a central location of an ARTC center within its boundaries. Obviously this consideration has not weighed very heavily upon the FAA in considering locations of other ARTC centers, when one observes the location of the ARTC centers for the following areas: Los Angeles area, Seattle area, Salt Lake City area, Minneapolis area, Chicago area, Indianapolis area, Boston area, New York area, Washington area, and Miami area.

It is immediately obvious that in at least one-half of the ARTC areas in the contiguous United States, the ARTC center is located nowhere near the middle of the area. In most of the areas named above, the imbalance is more pronounced than it would be with the proposed expansion of the San Antonio area. Actually, in two of the areas, Cleveland and New York, the move to a new ARTC center location took the ARTC operation further away from the geographic middle of their respective areas.

Previous reference by the Federal Aviation Agency to computer costs are meaningless in a comparison of San Antonio versus Houston. There is no computer in the New Orleans ARTC center and neither is there a computer in the San Antonio ARTC center. The FAA has been unable to establish any factual basis upon which to project computer costs to the year 1970. Certainly the experience gained in the rental of 1958-vintage computers does not provide such a basis. Neither has the FAA's research program produced anything workable in the field of data processing. In any event, with the closing of the New Orleans ARTC center, the comparison becomes that of San Antonio versus Houston. In either location, computer costs would be the same and therefore this item is meaningless in a cost comparison.

Similarly, the cost advantage claimed by FAA with respect to microwave repeater links for remote radar fails to consider the feasibility of utilizing common links for more than one remote radar. Approached on this basis it can be shown that the overall cost of microwave repeater links for San Antonio will be approximately the same as for Houston. FAA justification purports to show that an additional 17 microwave link repeaters would be required in order to remote certain long-range radars to the San Antonio ARTC center as compared to Houston. Under FAA's proposal, separate chains of microwave towers would be established from each remote radar to the ARTC center. This plan would ignore the fact that portions of these chains would lie along a common path and could share the same set of microwave towers. For example:

1. A microwave chain exists between San Antonio and Houston and would serve to remote radar in either direction, i.e., Houston to San Antonio (present); or, San Antonio to Houston (proposed).

2. FAA has stated that 13 microwave towers would be required to remote the New Orleans radar to Houston, whereas 22 microwave towers, or an additional 9, would be needed to carry the New Orleans radar to the San Antonio ARTC center. Actually, the existing chain of microwave towers between Houston and San Antonio could also carry the New Orleans radar over that portion of the chain. Therefore, it is clear that no additional microwave towers would be required to remote the New Orleans radar, whether the ARTC center be located in San Antonio or Houston.

3. With respect to the Alexandria, La., radar, proposed for 1964, FAA has stated that no additional microwave towers would be required in remoting this radar to Houston rather than to New Orleans as originally proposed. FAA has further claimed that a net increase of eight microwave towers would be required to remote the Alexandria radar to San Antonio. Again, as shown in item 2, above, the Alexandria radar microwave chain could be constructed to join the existing chain at Houston, and this radar information could be carried with the New Orleans and Houston radar information on the existing microwave towers between Houston and San Antonio.

Thus it is clear that the total requirement for microwave towers to remote radar to the ARTC center would be identical in either San Antonio or Houston, and therefore this item is of no concern in a cost comparison. Failure to consider this possibility in FAA's previous justification registered an advantage to the Houston site in excess of $1.5 million.

The present ARTC center building in San Antonio is adequate to handle the increased activity resulting from a reapportionment of the New Orleans ARTC area. FAA estimates of a $500,000 construction program to expand the San Antonio ARTC center building are erroneous. The existing building is adequate to accommodate additional positions of operation transferred from the New Orleans center, as well as any data processing equipment contemplated for this or any other center.

In addition, every relocation of ARTC centers by FAA in recent years has been for the purpose of providing modern adequate facilities in lieu of outmoded, cramped, and inefficient quarters. The existing San Antonio ARTC center meets the standards of the recently constructed ARTC centers at other locations. Also, the San Antonio ARTC center is not burdened by the expensive and questionable innovations imposed by civil defense.

Although FAA has contended that the location of an ARTC center need not be concerned with the nature of the traffic within the area, there are certain factors relating to the location of the San Antonio ARTC center that are unique, and which deserve special consideration. The heavy concentration of military aircraft in the San Antonio area, and the special nature of their individual missions require daily coordination between the ARTC center and the various military bases. Much of this coordination is of a nature that cannot be accomplished over telephone lines. These military operations, important in peacetime, assume far graver proportions in an emergency situation. The removal of the ARTC center from San Antonio to any other location would have serious consequences on the smooth conduct of military operations from bases at San Antonio.

In summary, the decision must be made in terms of retaining the existing, adequate, and vital ARTC center in San Antonio, or moving that center to Houston. Such a decision must ignore the closing of the New Orleans ARTC center, since those costs would apply equally to San Antonio or Houston.

In my judgment, the retention of the San Antonio ARTC center will represent an immediate saving in excess of $4 million over the construction of a center in Houston.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ, M.C.

Mr. Speaker, a reasonable person would have responded within 2 weeks. A Federal employee who realizes he is only a public servant would feel obligated to answer a letter. The head of an important Federal agency would want to cooperate with Members of Congress, to be aboveboard, to offer honest explanations for his actions. Not so Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby. Under the circumstances, his rude silence means two things:

First. He has no facts to rebut the contentions and the facts alleged in my letter of September 23.

Second. The facts stated and the conclusions drawn in that letter are all true and correct.

We can expect that an appropriation will be asked for this year to support the move in question. Mr. Halaby is not so silent when it comes to asking Congress to turn over the people's money to him. The move that was originally scheduled to take place was postponed after I raised the issue that it was a wasteful plan, and now Mr. Halaby will ask this House for money to make the move so as to partially shift the responsibility for it onto our shoulders. I sincerely and humbly request that in the interests of both air safety and fiscal responsibility this particular request for an appropriation is scrutinized and that the facts that I have tried to bring before the public are considered in this regard.

THE GRAVE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT PROBLEM

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, many, if not all, of our great travel industries and travel service industries are as concerned as the President and my colleagues in Congress about the grave balance-of-payments deficit problem and are anxious to help us find ways and means to offset the balance-of-payments deficit.

As I mentioned yesterday, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, has assigned to me and two of my colleagues, Representative R. T. HANNA, Democrat, of California, and Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey, the task of preparing an advisory report on the steps which might be taken to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit.

The three of us met recently with representatives of the travel industry and representatives of Government for an exploratory discussion pertaining to procedures and areas in which we might inquire.

Following the September 30 meeting at which all present expressed enthusiasm, I received several letters from these experts. Today, I should like to quote from the communication by Mr. Stephen S. Halsey, vice president of the American Express Co.

AMERICAN EXPRESS CO.,
Washington, D.C., September 30, 1963.

MY DEAR MR. PEPPER: It was a great pleasure to join you for lunch today, and I greatly appreciate being included in the group which you gathered to discuss the function of your new subcommittee. I am greatly cheered by the creation of the House Subcommittee on Tourism. I think it is vitally important for the Congress to examine in detail the tourism industry, since it is one of the largest industries in the United States. The travel industry has an important function in helping to offset the balance-of-payments deficit. While it is a fact that the imbalance in the travel account was $1.4 billion in 1962, it is clear that travel expenditures by Americans have wide effects on the whole economy of the United States, and on the economies of our allies and friends abroad.

Our balance-of-payments deficit makes it imperative that every aspect of American industry seek new methods to increase this country's share of world commerce. Increasing the number of foreign travelers to the United States is one important method of increasing U.S. revenue. An excellent start has been made by the U.S. Travel Service, but much more can be done.

This encouragement of foreign visitors fits closely with the administration's new program of "See the U.S.A." Work done by the Government and industry to bring this program into being will help stimulate the flow of visitors from abroad. However, I feel strongly that the many related industries benefiting from travel generally need an additional stimulus. Your subcommittee will provide that stimulus.

In my opinion, it would be appropriate for your subcommittee to examine the industry programs already underway which encourage travel in the United States and to the United States; and to bring into focus the many programs which can be undertaken by local and State governments, and by private industry groups.

Other governments, particularly in Europe, helped solve their balance-of-payments difficulties by actively promoting tourism. We should do no less.

American Express, which has long been active in the promotion of travel to the United States and within the United States, is ready to assist in all programs which encourage the increased flow of peoples between countries. I consider it a signal honor to have been included in your preliminary discussion, and I hope that you will call on me for assistance as your program develops.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN S. HALSEY,
Vice President.

WEST VIRGINIA: NO LONGER SHORT-CHANGED

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I have made no secret of my findings over the past few years when they reveal that West Virginia is being short-changed, because for many years the great Mountain State was the "forgotten State." Today, when this House overwhelmingly passed the Department of Defense appropriations bill, I thought it might provide a good opportunity to take stock of where we stand on prime military contracts.

In the fiscal year 1960, West Virginia ranked 46th in the Nation—right near the bottom of the heap—in the per capita amount of prime military contracts. In that year, $36,098,000 in prime military contracts went to West Virginia, which the Legislative Reference Service estimates to be only $19.51 for every individual in the State.

At this time last year, I presented figures to the House which indicated that for the fiscal year 1962 West Virginia had vaulted to 30th in the Nation in the per capita amount of prime military contracts. In that year, a total of $133,782,000 was awarded to the State of West Virginia in these contracts. This constituted a total of $72.31 per capita in West Virginia—a whopping increase of 270 percent. In the rate of increase registered during fiscal year 1962 over fiscal year 1960, West Virginia ranked third highest among the States of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I have just been able to obtain official Department of Defense figures for the fiscal year 1963, which reveal an even brighter picture for the State of West Virginia. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, West Virginia's total of prime military contract awards rose even further to $162,201,000. This constitutes a total of $88.59 per capita.

What does this mean, comparatively?

It means that in the per capita amount of prime military contracts, West Virginia jumped from 46th in the Nation in fiscal 1960 to 26th in the Nation in fiscal 1963.

It means that West Virginia's per capita share of prime military contracts rocketed upward 354 percent from 1960 to 1963.

It means that West Virginia's rapid rise in per capita share of prime military contracts now ranks the Mountain State second in the Nation, when contrasting 1963 against 1960.

It means that when you compare the total dollar value of prime military contracts, 1963 and 1960, West Virginia shows a 230-percent increase, which is the third highest rate of increase in the Nation.

It means that in the fiscal year 1960, West Virginia's share of the total national amount of prime military contracts was a piddling 0.2 percent, in fiscal 1961 the share was 0.3 percent, in fiscal 1962 it rose to 0.5 percent, and in the fiscal year 1963 West Virginia's share had risen to 0.7 percent.

All in all, these official figures demonstrate conclusively that President Kennedy has kept his promises to West Virginia in full measure.

Mr. Speaker, in order to drive home the points which I have made and to document them further, under unanimous consent I include official Department of Defense statistics showing the trend of prime military procurement awards over $10,000 for the fiscal years 1960 through 1963:

Net value of military procurement actions by fiscal year

[In thousands]

State	Fiscal 1960	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963	State	Fiscal 1960	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963
Alabama	$103, 371	$105, 564	$154, 419	$194, 990	Montana	$27, 058	$94, 538	$31, 264	$79, 349
Alaska	78, 649	91, 797	63, 320	103, 476	Nebraska	71, 034	51, 123	53, 172	33, 559
Arizona	168, 974	244, 837	152, 951	285, 751	Nevada	8, 965	8, 850	8, 246	13, 143
Arkansas	10, 891	46, 586	84, 798	39, 114	New Hampshire	72, 272	104, 589	58, 926	51, 174
California	4, 839, 252	5, 276, 760	5, 993, 244	5, 835, 670	New Jersey	1, 274, 664	949, 737	1, 063, 096	1, 251, 608
Colorado	246, 749	465, 904	565, 279	444, 196	New Mexico	77, 707	63, 540	60, 729	61, 642
Connecticut	838, 535	1, 018, 500	1, 213, 067	1, 048, 449	New York	2, 377, 522	2, 642, 803	2, 668, 744	2, 500, 146
Delaware	53, 352	28, 180	47, 197	67, 035	North Carolina	172, 899	237, 196	268, 990	258, 987
District of Columbia	95, 499	149, 551	181, 954	238, 120	North Dakota	8, 683	12, 980	99, 627	64, 855
Florida	489, 803	492, 654	645, 478	583, 237	Ohio	907, 068	1, 004, 245	1, 129, 017	1, 345, 686
Georgia	177, 924	300, 529	337, 478	423, 290	Oklahoma	146, 519	123, 433	135, 825	111, 204
Hawaii	48, 971	26, 916	31, 875	45, 206	Oregon	23, 963	27, 626	46, 129	41, 777
Idaho	46, 630	14, 131	26, 121	8, 634	Pennsylvania	671, 314	804, 389	952, 058	887, 452
Illinois	385, 053	437, 250	531, 008	486, 067	Rhode Island	26, 081	25, 292	57, 966	46, 970
Indiana	310, 632	353, 202	571, 184	486, 759	South Carolina	31, 314	40, 804	65, 212	57, 747
Iowa	147, 443	126, 819	179, 153	130, 406	South Dakota	43, 591	27, 626	112, 682	80, 630
Kansas	573, 563	538, 687	393, 507	331, 687	Tennessee	109, 396	144, 069	183, 794	183, 478
Kentucky	32, 741	45, 778	43, 510	55, 725	Texas	1, 138, 026	1, 138, 471	1, 006, 253	1, 203, 123
Louisiana	197, 157	139, 336	244, 036	195, 341	Utah	176, 394	349, 611	298, 596	408, 127
Maine	32, 216	96, 977	79, 585	58, 409	Vermont	18, 746	16, 176	16, 421	12, 258
Maryland	515, 887	527, 591	469, 491	606, 365	Virginia	422, 164	505, 158	446, 183	484, 989
Massachusetts	1, 070, 436	1, 072, 370	1, 310, 055	1, 060, 165	Washington	715, 087	646, 359	921, 115	1, 051, 581
Michigan	600, 947	590, 480	677, 786	633, 047	West Virginia	36, 098	61, 884	133, 782	162, 201
Minnesota	192, 984	188, 652	297, 306	273, 757	Wisconsin	167, 214	221, 749	258, 735	219, 427
Mississippi	46, 946	69, 395	100, 220	186, 039	Wyoming	41, 754	24, 252	22, 551	125, 081
Missouri	336, 668	337, 500	545, 553	686, 111					

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Hardy (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today and the balance of this week on account of official business.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Albert), through October 17 on account of official committee business.

Mr. Addabbo, for balance of week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Burke (at the request of Mr. Mahon) for 1 hour, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Holifield, for 30 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. Brock (at the request of Mr. Ellsworth), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, October 15, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Miller of California.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. Ellsworth) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Barry.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. Burke) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. St. Onge.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1172. An act to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.;

S. 453. An act to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala.;

S. 743. An act to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of this 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 812. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America;

S. 814. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1125. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood;

S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906; and

S. 1994. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of certain waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 772. An act to provide for the transfer for urban renewal purposes of land purchased for a low-rent housing project in the city of Detroit, Mich.;

H.R. 1191. An act for the relief of Wilmer R. Bricker;

H.R. 1192. An act for the relief of William C. Doyle;

H.R. 1281. An act for the relief of Capt. Leon M. Gervin;

H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Kathryn Marshall;

H.R. 1459. An act for the relief of Oliver Brown;

H.R. 1696. An act defining the interest of local public agencies in water reservoirs constructed by the Government which have been financed partially by such agencies;

H.R. 1709. An act to establish a Federal commission on the disposition of Alcatraz Island;

H.R. 1726. An act for the relief of William H. Woodhouse;

H.R. 2256. An act for the relief of José Domenech;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended;

H.R. 2751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jesse Franklin White;

H.R. 2770. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justine M. Dubendorf;

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 3219. An act to provide for the payment of a reward as an expression of appreciation to Edwin and Bruce Bennett;

H.R. 3369. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason;

H.R. 3450. An act for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.;

H.R. 3843. An act for the relief of Wallace J. Knerr;

H.R. 4842. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4965. An act for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States;

H.R. 5307. An act for the relief of Edward T. Hughes;

H.R. 5811. An act for the relief of L. C. Atkins and Son;

H.R. 5812. An act for the relief of Quality Seafood, Inc.;

H.R. 6246. An act relating to the deductibility of accrued vacation pay;

H.R. 6373. An act for the relief of Robert L. Nolan; and

H.R. 6443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, October 10, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1276. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.), as amended (agreements with Korea, Guinea, and Indonesia), submitted in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 85–128 was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 8748. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 8749. A bill to extend for not more than 2 years the conservation reserve contracts expiring in 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 8750. A bill to provide for Federal assistance on a combination grant and loan basis in order to improve patient care in public and other nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes through the modernization or replacement of those institutions which are structurally or functionally obsolete and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 8751. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1931, to provide that certain proceedings of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), shall be printed as a House document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 8752. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit payment of child's insurance benefits after attainment of age 18 in the case of a child attending a college or university; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 8753. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORGAN (by request):

H.R. 8754. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 8755. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore and Recreation Area in the States of Maryland and Virginia, to provide for its

orderly development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8756. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 1 year to 6 months the period for which an individual must have been married (in most cases) in order to be considered the wife, husband, widow, or widower of his or her spouse for benefit purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 8757. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 8758. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 8759. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to prohibit the subsidized export of any agricultural commodity to Communist nations and to prohibit sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation of any agricultural commodities to such nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 8760. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code to provide for the training of certain Reserve units organized to serve as a unit; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8761. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 8762. A bill to validate payments previously made by conservation district employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 8763. A bill to provide a particular designation for the proposed dam and lock now under construction known as the Millers Ferry lock and dam, Alabama; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 8764. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 770. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting nonsectarian prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on Intelligence Matters; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORAN (by request):

H.R. 8765. A bill for the relief of Kenneth York Sue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 8766. A bill for the relief of Ki-soon Park and his wife, Ryo-bong Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 8767. A bill for the relief of Algonac Manufacturing Co. and John A. Maxwell, individually; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8768. A bill for the relief of Roger and Sandra Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 8769. A bill for the relief of Remedios R. Yankton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 8770. A bill for the relief of Lessie Mae (Saxon) Wilson and Mrs. Beatrice Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

352. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to publishing as a House document a research paper entitled "State Compacts With Foreign Governments, With Congressional Approval, as Provided for by Article I, Section 10, U.S. Constitution"; to the Committee on House Administration.

353. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to various joint United States-Canadian problems; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1963

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 3, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in the midst of toiling days when the constant pressure of national decisions weighs heavily and takes its toll of bodies and spirits, we are grateful for quiet cloisters of peace and prayer where at an altar of contrition we may bow for Thy forgiveness and cleansing. Without Thee, our striving would be losing, for our strength is unequal to our tasks.

Here on this battlefield of ideas and commitments, help us to consecrate ourselves anew to the fulfillment of the aims and dreams of a new world of justice and equality, for which America's sons are even now dying on the far frontiers of freedom.

In today's anxieties and commotions, steady us with the certainty that though willful men imagine a vain thing and though the earth were removed and the mountains cast into the midst of the sea, the Lord of Hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Senate now operating under limited time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. Under the order of yesterday, the Senate, after having taken a recess, now resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, House bill 4955; and under the order its further consideration will be under limited debate and with controlled time.

The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday be dispensed with, and that it be considered as read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of the secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield 3 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported yesterday that the United States is the only remaining source for wheat throughout the world.

To newspapers speculating on the possible sale of wheat by this country to the U.S.S.R., this suggests only that we might ask a higher price—cash price, that is.

Mr. President, the big fact that this country alone has the world's surplus wheat should suggest to this Government, not a higher cash price, but, as some of us have already suggested, a genuinely meaningful price for freedom: We sell the wheat Russia badly needs only if Russia makes a real concession to freedom. I have listed a large number of possible concessions, such as removal of Russian troops from Cuba, or knocking down the Berlin wall. Then we make a real gain for freedom. But if we sell for cash, regardless of the price, the gain is sure to be for Russia and communism.

Mr. President, the established fact that this country has the only surplus wheat should put at rest, finally, the big argument that has been used by those who defend this "deal" as a cash transaction: The argument that Russia will get the wheat, anyway.

The fact is that they will not get the wheat, anyway. We alone have the wheat—not Canada, not France, not West Germany, but the United States of America.

Russia will get wheat only if she gets U.S. wheat.

Certainly, Mr. President, this central fact should dissuade this country from selling wheat to the U.S.S.R. at a subsidized price. Such a subsidy would be a gift to Russia, as it is to the nations to whom we now sell our wheat.

In any event, Mr. President, as the New York Times reported yesterday—

> Because of the gloomy outlook in farm production, it is expected that the Soviet Union for the next few years will have to emphasize the production of more food to feed its expanding population.

This means less war production, less big space breakthroughs with military implications, less control over Communist satellites, such as Cuba, who look to the U.S.S.R. as the world's biggest wheat producer to provide their food. It means all this, Mr. President, unless we bail out Russia by selling her at subsidized prices all the wheat she cares to buy, with no concessions that might permit freedom to gain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two articles, published in the New York Times and the Washington Post, and an editorial from the Drovers Journal, reporting on this country's wheat monopoly and powerful bargaining position in this situation.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1963]

WHEAT SURPLUS DWINDLING FAST—SOVIET PURCHASES SOLVING PROBLEM OF AN EXCESS FOR MANY NATIONS—BASIC SHIFT IS NOTED—THIS COUNTRY NOW HAS ONLY LARGE SUPPLY AVAILABLE—FLOUR ALSO INVOLVED

(By J. H. Carmical)

Trade circles watched with rapt attention last week a mystery melodrama entitled, "Will the Russians Buy Wheat in the United States?"

Despite a statement by Premier Khrushchev that the Soviet Union had acquired enough wheat to meet its domestic needs, there was lively speculation that a large sale to Russia would still be consummated. By the weekend, traders were waiting impatiently for some word from Washington.

Even if no direct sale of wheat is made to the Soviet Union, however, the Russian crop shortage has already caused a fundamental change in the world wheat situation this year.

Heavy purchases of wheat in recent weeks by the Soviet Union have practically solved the wheat surplus problems that have plagued many nations since shortly after World War II.

No large free supply of wheat is available now except in the United States. Faced with an acute shortage of that vital cereal, the Russians have bought all they could.

FLOUR PURCHASED

The first large purchases were of flour in Western Europe. Reports in the trade are that these have amounted to the equivalent of some 100 million bushels of wheat. Of these, more than one-third were obtained from West Germany, with the rest obtained largely from Italy and France.

Involved in these sales of flour by West Germany were some 28 million bushels of wheat purchased from the United States. Some of the purchases of flour in the other European countries probably represented wheat purchased here, which had been sold at bargain prices. Thus, this country already has furnished indirectly a large amount of wheat to Russia.

Australia, which will start to harvest her crop in a few weeks, has sold 58,500,000 bushels of wheat to Russia, all that she felt safe in selling at this time. Argentina, which soon will start harvesting her crop, is expected to have practically no wheat for sale.

Little, if any, wheat is now available for export from Canada despite her record harvest this year. Canada has contracted to deliver to Russia by July 31, 1964, an estimated 239 million bushels. With her other commitments, Canada is expected to be scraping the bottom of her wheat bins by that time.

In the purchase of the equivalent of about 400 million bushels of wheat, the Soviet Union apparently bought all it could before turning to this country. With no more available elsewhere, Russia is now seeking to buy some 110 million bushels in this country.

Since the Soviet Union started buying, the world price has advanced from around $1.60 to $1.80 a bushel. The Russians paid about $1.90 for the Canadian wheat. Although there is some opposition in the Kennedy administration and other quarters to the sale of wheat to Russia, it is understood that about the only real question is that of price.

As a result of the Government's support policy, the domestic price of wheat has been held at some 50 to 60 cents a bushel above the world level. If the price should be at the world level, it would mean that the U.S. Government was supplying wheat to the Russians cheaper than to the people here, but no higher than to other foreign nations.

To make wheat grown here competitive in the world market, the Government has been paying a subsidy of up to 60 cents a bushel for wheat exported in the regular commercial way. Should the wheat be purchased by the Russians from private sources and the Government make its usual subsidy payments, the result would be the same, since the Russians still would be able to obtain wheat here cheaper than domestic users.

The argument is made that Russia is going to get what wheat is wanted either directly or indirectly, and why not sell directly in the hope of improving relations. Any wheat or flour sales made by Western Europe would have to be replaced largely by wheat from this country, since Europe does not produce enough of the cereal for its needs.

It is difficult to determine accurately the food situation in Russia. However, Premier Khrushchev last week termed the situation "difficult" and has demanded that more irrigation projects be developed and that the fertilizer output of Russia be increased.

According to some agricultural experts who have just returned from Russia, much more is needed to strengthen Soviet agriculture than additional irrigation and fertilizer projects, both of which would require years and then a further long period to determine how to use them efficiently.

NEW PLANS IN EFFECT

Apparently, Premier Khrushchev's new plans already are being put into effect. Reports from Western Europe indicate that heavy purchases of fertilizer materials already have been made by Russia and that West Germany, an important factor in that industry, has advanced prices and is not making new commitments to other countries.

Russia has inquired here about plants to make ammonium nitrate, one of the three main ingredients in fertilizers.

This fertilizer ingredient is made from hydrogen gas, largely a product of oil refinery operations, and nitrogen obtained from the air. These are blended in the presence of a catalyst to make the ammonium nitrate.

Since the Soviet Union is the second largest oil-producing nation and has a large number of refineries, the development of an ammonium nitrate industry would be a logical step for the Russians. Other petrochemical operations probably would follow, with the result that Russia might shift emphasis from the sale of oil products abroad to petrochemicals.

Because of the gloomy outlook in farm production, it is expected that the Soviet Union for the next few years will have to emphasize the production of more food to feed its expanding population.

[From the Washington Post]

UNITED STATES, AS LAST MAJOR WHEAT SOURCE, MAY BOLSTER PRICE TO RED NATIONS

(By Frank C. Porter)

The United States is the only remaining source for wheat purchases by grain-hungry oversea nations, the Agriculture Department reported yesterday.

This confirmation of a widely held assumption is expected to bolster the demand of some legislators that any wheat sale to the Russians be at the roughly $2-a-bushel domestic price rather than at the world or subsidized price, which is about 60 cents less.

This reasoning holds that the United States, as the only substantial source of supply, can afford to dictate price and should recoup the 60-cent subsidy paid farmers if any wheat is sold to the Red bloc out of Government-held reserves. The administration is considering sales at the subsidized price.

Meanwhile, Government officials said an administration decision on sale of a reported $250 million worth of wheat to the Soviet Union would be forthcoming in a day or two.

The White House is understood to be delaying its ruling, expected to be favorable, until sentiment in Congress crystallizes in favor of the deal.

(It was also learned that the U.S. Government has been in direct touch with Soviet officials for the first time on the proposed sale, Robert J. Donovan of the Los Angeles Times reported yesterday.

(The first official contact occurred secretly in the last few days. Llewellyn E. Thompson, the President's adviser on Soviet affairs, met with Soviet Embassy officials here to try to ascertain what terms the Soviets intend to offer. Heretofore the Russians had made their overtures solely through American trade channels.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(Exactly what the Russians told Thompson is not known. Reliable information indicates, however, that while some short-term credit may be involved, the Russians will make substantially a cash offer that may run as high as $250 million. Thompson's talks were described by his colleagues as "satisfactory.")

At a foreign policy briefing at the State Department yesterday, newsmen were told that Russia is expected to spend nearly $1 billion for food purchases abroad this year. Hobbled by severe crop failures, the Soviet Union has already committed nearly $700 million for Australian and Canadian wheat.

Administration officials also explained that these purchases are particularly costly to Moscow since the Soviet Union must sell gold to pay for them. Russian production costs of gold are double its worth on the world market, they said.

One spokesman estimated that the U.S.S.R. probably has gold reserves of $4.5 billion to $8 billion. American gold reserves top $15 billion.

The Agriculture report noted that of other major wheat exporters, Canada has sold about all that port and delivery facilities can handle. Australia has sold most of its crop. Argentina's crop doesn't appear large enough to permit heavy exports. In addition to the big drop in Soviet production, the Department said the Western European harvest may be 300 million bushels below last year's.

The flat endorsement by Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon Sunday of wheat sales to Russia has been interpreted as preparing the climate for a favorable White House decision.

[From the Drovers Journal, Oct. 1, 1963]

LET'S NOT BE FOOLED

If we don't miss our guess too far, it is quite likely that Americans are about to behold a grand Indian summer rapprochement with Soviet Russia reminiscent of the great United States-Russian togetherness binge of World War II days. And if such a mood of warm and good feeling develops, as it appears to be doing now, it is going to take an awful lot of individual straight thinking on the part of all Americans to keep a clear image of the Communists as the ruthless apostles of totalitarianism that they really are.

Apologists and fuzzy thinkers are already painting the big picture, trying to gloss over the deficiencies of dictatorships on the way to making them more acceptable to good Americans.

For example, a nationally respected news commentator recently noted that Russia is probably headed for a bad harvest, but that "in all fairness," much of the blame must be attributed to "the poor climate." He failed to mention, however, that the poor harvest in prospect will be the fifth in a row, and if it weren't for the opening up of new lands to cultivation, Russian agriculture could be said to be in a virtual state of stagnation.

Experts, however, are not limited to this apology for Russian farm failures. They point out that "Soviet farming is much less abundantly supplied with tractors and other farm implements, fertilizer, herbicides, fungicides, etc.—in short, with capital and modern technology," than we are. Nothing is said, of course, of the fact that the Russians have had the same 45 years that we have had to develop all these things, but they have not done so.

These and other apologies for Russain failures usually lead up to the classic general apology of all. That is that the Communists (not just Russians, but all Communists) have been really just misguided. They are like adolescent boys and are merely in a stage in their progress toward commonsense adulthood. It is implied that once they see the light, they will, of course, all become free enterprisers. All it takes on our part is reasonableness and good will.

But this is utter nonsense. We know by their own statements that Communists are dedicated to dictatorship of the proletariat, which can be conveniently shortened to dictatorship, period. We know that in actual fact, privileged classes of gangsters operate Communist countries, and that these gangsters are ruthless, cunning, utterly self-serving, faithless, and unreliable. And we must not fall for their bunk—especially when they talk about agriculture.

Let's not forget that the Canadians have a poor climate for raising food, too. But they have managed to come up with huge wheat surpluses. Let's not forget that the Scandinavian countries have a northern clime and a Socialist bent, yet they manage societies of abundance.

Let's not forget that the Russians have had almost a half century to build an agricultural industry as well as a housing industry, consumer goods industry, steel industry, and armament industry, and so far they haven't matched us in any of these things. Certainly, they have had the same 18 years the Japanese and Germans have had to develop a food industry. But bread is in tight supply in huge Russia today, while overcrowded Japan is self-sufficient in rice—unbelievable as it may seem.

Let's face it and capitalize on it. Communism is a failure as a system. Democracy is a success; free enterprise is a success. Yes, we may have a thaw in the cold war, but communism is still dedicated to the destruction of capitalism, true democracy and liberty. Let's not rush to bail the Communists out of their troubles—food troubles or otherwise—unless it is to our real advantage. Let's keep our heads and remember that the last time we were all good friends, the Russians stole half of Germany, most of the Balkans, took a Japanese island, and declared they won the war by themselves. Since then, they have tried to run us out of Berlin; they have put a base at our backdoor; and have threatened us almost without ceasing. It takes more than one swallow to make a summer. It should take more than one test ban treaty and one Canadian wheat deal to make a Communist a good guy.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY C. McPHERSON

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yesterday, several Senators expressed their appreciation of the services of Harry McPherson, who has left the Senate and his position of general counsel for the Democratic policy committee, to enter service in the Department of the Army.

I wish to associate myself with all the things that were said about Mr. McPherson. He is one of the most gifted young men I have met in recent years. He was a very valued servant of the Senate, a man of character and integrity. Even when a Senator knew that his views did not coincide with those of Mr. McPherson, one trusted him implicitly in any matter of advice or in any matter of research.

He will be missed in the Senate. I extend to him my very best wishes for success in his new position.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield me 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 1 minute on the bill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am pleased to note the widespread support throughout the United States for selling our surplus wheat to Russia for gold or hard currency. The support in North Dakota comes from all shades of political thinking—conservative, middle-of-the-road, and liberal—from farmers, businessmen, professional men, and others.

At the present time, nearly all of the approximately 200 food commodities produced in the United States are available to the Russians; only wheat, cotton, and about two other farm commodities are not now available at world prices to the Russians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial—from the Bismarck Tribune of October 5, 1963—entitled "Wheat Deal Considerations;" one—from the Fargo Forum of October 5, 1963—entitled "Wheat Won't Lift Nikita Off His Self-Made Hook;" and another—from the Fargo Forum of October 6, 1963—entitled "Law of Supply and Demand Spurs Wheat Sale to Russ."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune, Oct. 5, 1963]

WHEAT DEAL CONSIDERATIONS

As usual, irrational emotions cloud the issue in any discussion of such a matter as sale of U.S. wheat to Russia.

Although it is good and proper to do humanitarian deeds when such deeds are not in conflict with the national interest, the basic and main reason for selling wheat to Russia would be to benefit the United States—not Russia.

If we refuse to do something that might possibly benefit Russia even when we know it is certain to benefit this country more, we injure ourselves more than we aid the cold war enemy.

It has to be demanded that the wheat be paid for in gold, and that there be no side commitments of any kind, of course. U.S. agreement to a sale under any other conditions would amount to betrayal of this country's interests. That we could not approve.

But we have wheat to sell, and we want to sell it. If Russia wants our wheat, and is willing to deplete its gold reserves to get it, instead of buying it someplace else, it is hard to see how it could do anything but benefit this country. And that should be the No. 1 consideration in this as in every other international negotiation: If it's to be to our benefit, we go along; if it isn't, we don't.

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Oct. 5, 1963]

WHEAT WON'T LIFT NIKITA OFF HIS SELF-MADE HOOK

German experts on Soviet economy differ sharply with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer about the wisdom of selling wheat to the Soviet Union.

Shipments of grain and flour will not in themselves "lift Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev off his self-made hook," they say.

So far as the transactions are for cash or short-term credits, they say, they actually may complicate the Soviet leader's problems and increase the pressures for eventual political concessions to the West.

Only if the Soviets were granted long-term credits on generous conditions could Khrushchev achieve the kind of relief he seems to be seeking, says the well-regarded Soviet expert of the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung.

The argument of German experts is based on the premise that Khrushchev has been and will be compelled to sell Soviet gold in large quantities to finance his crash program for grain purchases.

The very speed at which this is being done is proving to be expensive.

Experts at Radio Free Europe in Munich point out that freight rates from Canada's St. Lawrence River to the Soviet Black Sea ports have risen by 25 percent in recent weeks as a result of the demand for shipping space.

Soviet gold sales in large quantities are serving meantime to depress the world price. Gold prices have fallen 4 cents an ounce on the London market since the end of August, a period in which the Soviets have unloaded some $220 million worth of their hoarded stocks.

Soviet gold sales in September alone were about equal to their average annual sales since 1957.

More fundamentally, a writer in the scholarly journal East European Economy, points out two additional factors.

One is the gold probably actually costs the Soviets about 2½ times the current world prices to produce. Before the Soviet ruble was boosted in value in 1961 the cost of Soviet gold may have been 5 times the world price, writes Michael von Berg.

For this reason the Soviets are desperately eager to pay for their free world purchases in raw materials, primarily in oil. But the market for Soviet raw materials in the Western world is decreasing.

The writer's second point is that the Soviets are compelled to rely more and more on gold to finance the imports of Western machinery and equipment, which still are essential to the ambitious industrial plans.

In their early phases the Communists had a very cavalier approach to the question of gold. Nicolai Lenin once boasted it was not important in a Communist economy.

Before his death Lenin was altering his views, and by Joseph Stalin's time the great importance of gold in Soviet dealings with the West was recognized. Since then the closest official secrecy has been maintained about Soviet gold production and stocks.

Berg agrees in his conclusion with that of the Frankfurter Allgemeine's expert.

In the economic competition between communism and the free world it is Moscow that is pressed for time—not the West.

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Oct. 6, 1963]

LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND SPURS WHEAT SALE TO RUSS

What a difference the law of supply and demand makes in trade relations between the United States and Russia. This Nation may soon OK the sale of wheat to Russia.

All kinds of reasons will be given as to why the United States should make such a sale. The Democratic reasons will be different from the Republican reasons. President Kennedy's reasons will be different from those of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Republican prospect for the 1964 Presidential nomination.

Yes, there are all kinds of explanations, but when you boil out all of the political gobbledygook, there remains this simple economic explanation:

The United States has too much wheat and Russia has too little; in addition Russia has gold with which to pay for the wheat, and the United States is anxious to recover some of the gold it has been paying out in world trade circles in recent years.

Of course, the wheat deal is far from consummated, and the odds are that Russia will come up with some gimmick which will make the deal politically impractical for the Kennedy administration. The Washington Democrats aren't about to sell wheat to Russia if there is going to be a major political backfire from such a trade in the 1964 election year.

The statement by Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN that he is in favor of a wheat sale paid for by gold on the barrelhead doesn't bind the entire Republican Party or all its potential candidates for the presidency. For instance, House Minority Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK hasn't taken a stand on the sale itself, but he has posed a series of questions which should be answered before a deal is made.

The wheat deal may look bipartisan at the start, if it is made, but if anything goes wrong, we can hear the "I told you so" chorus of Republican critics who are against any deal with the Russians for anything.

But the law of supply and demand has been in existence since long before the United States became a nation, and before communism took over Russia. The idea of getting gold for unneeded wheat is so inviting that many critics of Communist Russia now see nothing wrong with such a deal. As a matter of fact, any deal which would reduce the U.S. wheat surplus in return for an inflow of gold would be welcome.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have received a number of communications from persons who, I believe, are familiar with the farm problem in the Communist countries. The communications state that the farmers of the Communist countries are sabotaging the government by deliberately failing to produce food, for the purpose of bringing to an end the Communist domination. The letters I am receiving also state that by selling wheat to Russia, we would sabotage the efforts of the farmers of those Communist nations in their efforts to emancipate themselves.

We are, of course, motivated to a minor degree by humanitarian purposes in urging the sale of this food. We are also motivated by the prospect of obtaining gold for our country.

The decision which, I believe, ultimately must be made, is how we are best to insure the future life of our Nation, and how best we can induce the farmers of the Communist countries to continue their efforts to break down the entrenchment of the Communist governments.

A few days ago I stated my opposition to this proposal. My opposition is growing stronger, rather than weaker.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

HURRICANE AND SUFFERING IN CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have a very disturbing and perplexing problem of foreign policy in connection with the humanitarian aid that ought to go to the victims of the terrible storm that has been raging in the Caribbean. We are a religious nation. The overwhelming majority of our people are Christian. I believe that we have an obligation always to try to put into practice in the affairs of government our religious principles. I find it very difficult to see any moral justification for any policy that does not go immediately to the relief of the suffering of people, even though their governments may be our enemy. I cannot reconcile such a course of action with the teachings of Christ, in which I believe, and I do not share the view that we should wait for the government to ask us to help their people.

So on the religious-moral basis, I would that my Government were proceeding now with full speed to supply the many hundreds, if not thousands, of fellow human beings who are also the children of God, who are suffering untold agonies in Cuba as a result of the storm. The same is true of Haiti. We ought not to wait for Communist Castro to make any plea to us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

If we wish to move beyond the religious justification for the plea that I am now making, in my judgment it also would be in the national self-interest of the United States, worldwide, in respect to our prestige, for I know of no more effective lesson that we could teach in regard to the superiority of the system of freedom over a system of enslavement than that free men practice their religious principles.

I hope that before the day is out the American people and the world will be reading that we are seeking to bring the relief of medicine, food, and supplies of sustenance to the thousands of Cuban people who are living in such an hour of agony at the present time.

Lastly, we must reach the people behind the Iron Curtain if we are ever going to help them lift the Iron Curtain that denies them access to the world. In my judgment, the best way to weaken communism is to reach people behind the Iron Curtain; and therefore, as a Christian, I suggest to my Government that in the present hour it not forget the religious basis of our form of government.

FIASCO IN GUINEA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the September 27, 1963, issue of the Washington Post there appeared an article written by Mr. Rowland Evans and Mr. Robert Novak, entitled "Fiasco in Guinea."

This article points up the complete failure of our policy in regard to this country. On September 9, I submitted to the Senate a report calling attention to the manner in which, under our AID program, we were furnishing aviation fuel to Guinea while at the same time this country had made a deal with Russia to refuel their planes en route to Cuba. These planes were being refueled from the same tanks in which our foreign aid gasoline was being deposited. Yet in that instance, just as in this case, the State Department hid behind a cloak of secrecy to conceal the real facts from the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Fiasco in Guinea," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, September 27, 1963]

FIASCO IN GUINEA

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

In the steamy West African Republic of Guinea, where the cold war is a daily occurrence, Uncle Sam has just fumbled a golden opportunity to score a few points.

Last spring American diplomats shouted from the housetops—and we reported—how a small American airline called Alaska Airlines, Inc., was replacing Soviet aircraft in Guinea. But until today it has been a well-kept secret that the deal has gone sour.

Alaska Airlines planes were grounded some 3 weeks ago. Although the United States is working discreetly to replace Alaska Airlines with a big American line, the Russians now are flying the commercial routes again. Furthermore, nobody knows whether a $700,000 U.S. loan ever will be repaid.

That is bad enough. But intensive inquiry reveals a breathtaking amount of bureaucratic buck-passing. As usual, the bureaucrats seem less interested in solving the problem than in making sure they don't get the blame for it.

The story dates back to 1958, when Guinea became the first French African colony to win independence. Refused help by both France and the United States, Guinea turned to Moscow for long-term aid.

But Russians are even worse than Americans at administering foreign aid. Guineans are particularly displeased about how much it costs government-owned Air Guinea to operate four-engine turboprop Ilyushins.

So, Guinea negotiated an agreement with Alaska Airlines to sell them less sophisticated aircraft, four-engine DC–4's and single-engine Lockheed.

When Alaska Airlines could not find private financing, AID—the U.S. foreign aid agency—bought $700,000 worth of Guinean notes. In other words, Uncle Sam lent Guinea $700,000.

Trouble began May 14, 2 weeks after the first DC–4 arrived, when it nosed into the ground during a landing. After that unhappy start, trouble multiplied until Air Guinea grounded the Alaska planes, citing safety reasons.

Alaska Airlines claims that Air Guinea is so infested with Communist-bloc personnel that life is impossible for an American line.

The State Department laughing off these charges as something strictly from Ian Fleming, puts most of the blame on Alaska Airlines—but will not give details.

All that is sure now is that the Government's attempt to escape responsibility by calling this a private affair between Alaska Airlines and the Guinean Government just won't wash.

The government could have stopped this deal any place along the line. AID could have refused the $700,000 loan, which was approved 3 days after the DC–4 accident.

Buck-passing reached the ridiculous when an AID official privately sought to blame the Federal Aviation Agency for giving the DC–4's pre-export approval. Told of this, a furious FAA official raised the roof, denying any prior knowledge of the deal. AID then backed down, admitting there was no special report inspection by the FAA (the planes had passed routine inspections, however).

Whoever is responsible, nobody can deny that the fiasco has hurt United States-Guinean relations and helped the Soviets. An international lawsuit, and a congressional investigation are distinct possibilities. Moreover, AID lawyers now are puzzling whether to make Guinea pay up that $700,000.

TRIBUTE TO HARRY C. McPHERSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois yields himself 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a matter of genuine regret that the Senate loses the able services of Harry McPherson. In my memory, he is by all odds one of the most affable, most agreeable, and most accommodating persons to ever serve the Senate. His departure is obviously a great gain for the Army, but a distinct loss to the Senate. I wish him Godspeed. I wish him well. I know that anything to which he turns his hand will be successful. He is a scholar. He is a young man of high competence. It was a real delight to have him in the service of the Senate and to have the benefit of his wisdom. We shall certainly miss him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join Senators who have spoken so highly of Harry McPherson's personal service to the Senate. Many times, in his official capacity as a staff officer of this body, he has performed service for me that created a great debt of gratitude on my part. He is one of the most able young men with whom I have been associated in recent years. I congratulate him on his promotion. His promotion is our loss, but I am certain that he will perform a dedicated service in his new assignment.

RESIGNATION OF ROBERT G. BAKER AS SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a minute on a very delicate subject. I do not cease to be appreciative of the services and acts of friendship of a friend even though that friend may follow a course of action that leads to a situation that may cause him to resign a position. It is a matter of great regret to me that circumstances have developed that resulted in the resignation from the staff of the Senate of Mr. Robert G. Baker. I know nothing about the merits or the demerits of the controversies and troubles that led to his resignation. But I do know that there is not a man or a woman in this body who over the years has not received some very effective service consonant with and consistent with Mr. Baker's duties as the secretary to the majority. I am very sad about the whole occasion. But I am not one to forget the services and the best qualities of a friend, merely because a situation develops in which he may have made mistakes that result in a course of action, in this instance, that has lost us the services of Mr. Baker. I regret that very much. But I am human enough to say to a friend who needs help that I am not going to walk out merely because a friend may have made mistakes. Anyone may draw from that statement any inferences he wishes to make. Bobby Baker performed many effective services for each one of us in the Senate all within the framework of his duties to us and his obligations to his position as secretary to the majority. I thank him for his services and trust and pray that he will be able to resolve his difficulties in a manner commensurate with the facts and justice which will enable him in the future to make full use of his inherent fine abilities.

I am very sad about the whole thing. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that under the circumstances he followed the wise course of action—in my judgment, the only course of action that should have been followed. That was typical of him, too, because when all is said and done he recognized, because of his long association with the Senate, that, after all, the Senate had to come first, above the personal interests of anyone connected with it.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 215 AND 216)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill H.R. 6143, which is Order No. 535 on the calendar, is a bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education. In my judgment, the provisions of that bill, which permit the making of such grants and loans to universities and colleges which are owned, operated, or controlled by religious denominations, are in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution. When that bill is reached for consideration by the Senate, I propose to offer two amendments to it.

One amendment would provide that grants and loans shall not be made to universities and colleges which are controlled or operated by religious denominations. The other amendment would make it certain that any taxpayer would have a right to have a judicial review of the constitutionality of any loan which the Federal Commissioner of Education proposes to make.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may send forward the texts of the proposed amendments and have them printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, and also have them printed and laid on the desk to be called up when the bill is reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 215

On page 68, line 10, insert the following: between the word "institution" and the semicolon: "which is not owned, controlled, or operated by a religious denomination, or which has no sectarian religious requirements applicable to its students, to its teachers, or to the members of its controlling board or trustees;".

AMENDMENT NO. 216

On page 71 insert the following new section between subsection (c) of section 303 and section 304:

"SEC. 304. Not less than 60 days before making any grant or loan to any institution of higher education under the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice that he proposes to make such grant or loan on a day to be specified in such notice. At any time before the day so specified, any taxpayer of the United States suing in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers may bring a civil action in the nature of an action for a declaratory judgment against the Commissioner in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Notwithstanding any decision, statute, or rule to the contrary, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to entertain, try, and determine such civil action, and to enjoin the making of the proposed grant or loan in case it adjudges that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Upon the bringing of such civil action, the Commissioner shall refrain from consummating the proposed grant or loan and withhold the amount of the proposed grant or loan until the final determination of the civil action. In the event two or more civil actions are brought under the provisions of this section challenging the constitutional validity of the same proposed grant or loan, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may consolidate such civil actions for the purpose of trial and judgment."

Renumber section 304 on page 71 as section 305; section 305 on page 73 as section 306; section 306 on page 73 as section 307; section 307 on page 73 as section 308.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I call up my amendments numbered 214 and ask that they be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 26, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the figure "$153,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$160,000,000".

On line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$198,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$258,000,000".

On line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$243,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000".

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to consideration of the amendments en bloc? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today in behalf of those who cannot now serve in this body, those who do not have the opportunity to vote for those who do have the honor to sit in the Senate of the United States. I rise to speak on behalf of the youth of America.

H.R. 4955, the bill being considered by the Senate, is designed to increase the effort being made by the Federal Government in the important field of vocational education. Its enactment will enable more Americans to receive better training in the skills and trades needed to find and maintain employment. Its provisions will provide countless numbers of Americans with a better way of life.

I intend to support H.R. 4955 as a step toward strengthening the American economy. I have only one reservation in pledging my wholehearted support. H.R. 4955 is only a half a loaf. It does not provide enough of our national resources to cope with the greatest economic problem of this age: providing millions of Americans with the skills needed to keep the wheels of industry humming and idle hands harnessed with adequate, fulltime employment.

Yes, H.R. 4955 is a step forward. But the race for more rapid economic growth and the race against unemployment will not be won by the timid. Just as we would not delegate one beaver to dam the roaring Colorado, the junior Senator from Indiana contends that less than a total effort will fail in stimulating an economy which finds 35,000 workers losing their jobs each week to automation and a total of more than 5 million Americans who are unable to get jobs.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have offered an amendment which would by 1967 implement the minimum recommendations of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. Note that the President's consultants urged the Federal Government to provide at least $400 million in 1963–64, whereas my modest amendment would postpone reaching this goal until 4 years later. Even this prolonged increase will considerably add to the long range resources provided for vocational and technical training under H.R. 4955 as it is now presented to the Senate.

I am aware, as the committee was, that it is impossible to expect the States to absorb an immediate increment of $400 million. But I do feel that with a graduated program, such as that proposed in my amendment, we can easily attain the needed amount by 1967. I am proposing that for fiscal year 1965 we authorize additional Federal expenditures of $160 million. This is $7 million more than the amount proposed by the Senate committee. I have talked with many who have been connected for many years with the problems and needs of vocational education, and they have assured me that if they can usefully program an increment of $160 million in 1965—and they feel that they can—they will be able to use almost twice as much additional Federal assistance by 1966. I have therefore proposed an authorization of $258 million for 1966. In 1967 my amendment would authorize a $400 million addition to the current Smith-Barden program, to fully implement the program as proposed by the President's Advisory Committee.

It is my feeling that if $400 million is a minimum figure to meet today's needs, we will need at least that much more than Smith-Barden by 1967 when the number seeking vocational education will be far higher.

I urge the adoption of this amendment for the three basic reasons:

First. History has shown that for each Federal dollar expended for vocational education, State and local governments have provided more than $4. Few other programs provide this incentive for increased effort to meet a problem on the grassroots level. Few other programs have such a multiplying effect on the total resources applied in a given field.

Second. The demand for skilled and highly trained workmen has never been greater. The demand for nonskilled workers has never been less. With the rapid technological changes occurring today in industry, this trend not only will continue but also will accelerate. If the 2½ million new workers who will enter the labor market each year of this decade are to find jobs, they must possess the skills required to run space-age machines. If the 35,000 workers being replaced by machines each week and the 5 million of their fellow workers who preceded them on the unemployment rolls are to find means to provide a livelihood for their families, they must be equipped with space-age know-how.

Third. Although the amendment would considerably increase the long-range allocation of resources for vocational education, the increase would be comparatively gradual. This step-by-step, 4-year increase would enable the development of adequate programing and planning to insure the efficient assimilation of all additional funds.

But the pressing need for increased efforts in the area of vocational education cannot be fully understood unless this problem is placed in proper perspective with numerous other problems which confront our Nation today.

It is no exaggeration to say that the boys and girls of today face problems of unparalleled proportions. Our youth face the frequent frustrations of a world which is changing so rapidly that the solutions to today's problems are antiquated and made obsolete by the rush of tomorrow's technology.

What other generation has faced such a population explosion as now faces the United States? In 1945, there were 46 million persons under 20 living in the United States. In 1960 there were 70 million. And by the end of the decade—by 1970—there will be 86 million. These young people are faced with the stark reality of a growing labor force. Twenty-six million new young workers will enter the labor market during the next decade. They will find tomorrow's jobs seriously affected by automation. But already one of four young workers is unemployed, and the unemployment rate for young people is twice the national rate.

But the problem facing American youth today is not solely a matter of numbers. The winds of change are swift and the labor needs of our Nation are changing at a phenomenal rate. For example, the total number employed as electronic technicians in 1960 was seven times the number so employed just 10 years earlier in 1950. In that same decade our need for airplane repairmen was up by 50 percent, and our need for tailors down 50 percent. We employed almost 3½ times as many mathematicians in 1960 as we had 10 years earlier; but only a third as many coal miners; twice as many pilots, bank tellers, and office machine operators, and half as many farmers and fishermen.

Vocational education helps prepare our Nation's youth to meet the changing demands of our society. Here again statistics tell the story. The unemployment rate of those receiving vocational training is less than 5 percent; while the unemployment rate of those in a comparable age group who have not had any vocational training is over 15 percent.

A greatly expanded vocational education program is not a panacea to the trials and tensions facing our young. But most assuredly such a program is an important part of the comprehensive effort which our Government must make to solve problems ranging from automation and agriculture to education and employment.

Yes, the youth of America today face a changing world. The problems are numerous, complex, and interrelated. Only a comprehensive, farsighted approach can solve the problems facing today's youth and make America an even better place in which to live tomorrow.

There are those in this body who say Government should not interfere, should not expand, should not offer assistance to individuals or groups who are incapable of solving critical problems themselves. Yes, there are those who refuse to recognize the need for an active role on the part of our Federal Government.

It seems to me we should recognize that the purpose of the Federal Government is not the proliferation of elaborate Government programs for their own sake. Rather, our goal is the development of opportunity for success in our society, which places its highest value on the twin virtues of individual achievement and social diversity. This diversity is best served by cooperative, unregimented relationships between the governmental partners in our system. The Federal role is best conceived as one of compassionate self-restraint, with maximum emphasis upon the stimulation of State and local activities where possible, and upon Federal programs in those areas where a concerted national effort is clearly required. Each individual citizen must chart his own destiny, but it is the duty of our Federal Government to provide opportunity for the individual to develop to the full extent of his capabilities.

I am concerned about the full development of the resources of youth in this great land of ours. Quite frankly, I am alarmed by those who place more importance on the conservation of gold and silver, oil and water, timber and wheat. I am alarmed by those who apparently ignore the past value this Nation has placed on the full development of its youth, who ignore the imperative national need to continue this policy today.

When we look at the other countries of the world, we realize how fortunate we are. In totalitarian systems young men and women are valuable chiefly as additional increments of power in the hands of the ruling elite. Totalitarian youth policy is successful to the extent that younger generations aid in the achievement of objectives prescribed by dictatorial governments. In principle, such a policy is uncomplicated and easily administered. It is far simpler to manage youth than to enable them to manage their own affairs and achieve their own ambitions.

Still, if we look at other areas of the world, we find that in other societies, youth problems are solved by the uncontrolled interplay of natural forces: death in childbirth, malnutrition, exposure to the elements, disease, and short life expectancies. In some instances, the means of effectively combating these scourges to human life are lacking. In other cases, the will to combat them is absent.

In the United States, as we in this body know, we reject such approaches to youth policy. We condemn the equally unsavory notions that youth is, on the one hand, merely a tool of Government, or, on the other hand, that it is a surplus commodity without value to itself or society, which must live or die by the law of the jungle.

But the development of youth will not result from the mere repetition of obvious truths. Rather, it will follow from a clear understanding of the stakes involved for both youth and society generally, of the barriers to individual development, and of the nature of public responsibility in this field.

Just as our predecessors recognized the need for child labor laws and the Civilian Conservation Corps, so today we must recognize the need for legislation to assist the country's youth toward the fullest development of their capabilities.

No President has better expressed this need than President John F. Kennedy. He fully recognizes the complex and interrelated problems facing our youth today. Consequently in the first Executive message on youth in history he has presented a comprehensive program designed to eventually solve these problems.

The omnibus education bill, the Manpower Training Act, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, the National Service Corps, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act are all part of the overall program to assist the young men and women of this Nation. Individually these programs will do no more than make a dent in the challenge facing us. Enacted together, they provide a mighty phalanx which will determine the difference between success and failure in the development of our youth.

But the Kennedy administration realizes—and I believe most of us in this body realize—that the final solution to the problems facing our youth must include programs which do more than treat the immediate ills of the younger generation. The strong, economically and emotionally well balanced family unit is the bulwark of our American way of life. Any threat to this structure is a threat to America herself.

As a consequence we see the need for legislation which will strengthen the environment of the American home. For example, the proposed tax cut which provides more job opportunities, and more take-home pay for Dad, is a direct benefit to Junior. Manpower training programs and unemployment compensation for the adult unemployed also have benefits for their families.

It is not difficult to argue that the school dropout problem can be immeasurably improved by a better standard of living in the home, a better education for the parents—the creation of conditions which provide more incentive to achieve on the part of the children.

Certainly the inferior housing, inferior education, and inferior job opportunities which result from discrimination against minority groups have a lasting effect on the children of these families.

Much attention has been directed at the increase in juvenile delinquency and youth crime. According to the FBI, youths under 18 account for 44 percent of the arrests for all major criminal offenses. Twenty percent of the Nation's youth will have police records before they are 18. And last year arrests of persons under 18 passed the 1 million mark for the first time in our history—a 9 percent increase over 1961 arrests.

One cannot condone these acts of violence. It is wrong to seek excuses for law violators. But what effect would good jobs, adequate educations, or suitable living facilities have on these statistics? Certainly many a first offender is the victim of his environment, and yet there are those who say that government has no responsibility to sponsor programs which seek to change this environment.

In many ways the United States is a contrast in irony. To be sure, we are the strongest and richest Nation in the history of civilization. And I wholeheartedly concur with President Kennedy when he said in his inaugural address:

> I would not change places with any other people or any other generation.

But, can we afford to remain content? Can we afford to remain complacent?

American today has more men and women employed than ever before. Yet, can we be content so long as there are over 5 million unemployed?

America has the highest overall standard of living in the world. Personal and corporate incomes are at an all-time high. Yet, can we remain complacent so long as 450,000 children of migrant farmworkers live in poverty? So long as the children of more than 6 million rural families live in conditions close to poverty?

The American system of education is the best in the world. We educate more people in a wider number of subjects than any other nation. Yet, can we be content so long as 1.5 million children sit in overcrowded classrooms? So long as 2 million children attend schools with substandard health and safety conditions? So long as 10 percent of all classrooms are fire hazards? So long as 3 of every 10 children in the fifth grade today will not graduate from high school? So long as 11 million Americans can barely read and write?

Can we as Members of the U.S. Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world, declare with great conviction that "The youth of America is her most valuable resource" and yet by our very deeds refuse to take every available means to protect and develop this resource?

Yes America is a great nation. The President is dedicated to making it an even greater nation. But, we did not achieve this status by complacency. We will not maintain our status by complacency. And unfortunately some of this complacency exists within the sacred halls.

H.R. 4955, the bill I seek to amend and strengthen, is one of a series of measures designed to strengthen the educational capabilities of the United States. These bills combined are the most important measures before the Congress.

Our system of public education has been responsible for the protection of the basic American freedoms and for the growth and development of our free enterprise economy.

However, although the free enterprise system permits us to place our own price tag on the value of a commodity, we have not yet placed the proper value on education.

What is our education worth to us in America? The value of the educational system in a democracy cannot be calculated in dollars; nor can it be measured simply by the number of engineers, mathematicians, and scientists it produces. A democratic educational system is best evaluated by the degree to which it permits the individual student to assert his individuality, to develop his own capabilities and interests to the utmost. Our educational system seeks not simply to turn out doctors, lawyers, and Indian chiefs; but to encourage the fulfillment of individual goals. Where the curriculum is limited—as it is in so many parts of our country—individuals are denied this chance to assert themselves. Less than 5 percent of our school systems today offer the range or alternatives that this vocational education bill would help them establish. Mr. President, some of my colleagues frequently aver that they oppose government activities which impinge on the rights and choices of individuals. I submit that vocational education, by opening new alternatives to students all over the country, in fact broadens this realm of free choice and thus makes a positive contribution to the cause of individual liberty. How free is the student who has both the aptitude and ability for a given trade, but who is unable to train for that profession because his community cannot provide for such training.

But what does an education mean to the individual American citizen? Education means a job. We know, for example, that 1 out of 10 workers who fails to finish elementary school is out of work, while only 1 of 50 college graduates is unemployed. We know, also, that in March of 1962, workers 18 years and older who were high school dropouts accounted for 64 percent of the Nation's unemployed.

The statistical evidence of the value of education is staggering. For example, the difference between a seventh grade education and a high school education is $128,000 in wages during a lifetime; the difference between a high school education and a college education is $188,000. If present trends continue, by 1970 there will be 8 million children who do not graduate from high school. The total loss in wages to these 8 million individuals over the period of a lifetime is the astronomically high figure of $1,024 billion—a tragic loss to the individuals involved and to the economy as a whole.

In addition to the loss of wages resulting from inferior education the remedial costs of such deficiencies is equally staggering.

Let us look at the costs which all the taxpayers of the country must bear. For example, unemployment benefits total over $3½ billion, public assistance programs total over $2 billion, health and medical payments total almost $3 billion per year. Public loss as a result of crime and juvenile delinquency amounts to more than $2 billion per year. It is true that providing the best educational opportunities will not entirely eliminate this $10½ billion public expenditure. But what more accurate application can be found for the adage "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"?

The statistics of loss caused by decreased wages plus those necessitated by remedial programs do not tell the entire story. They do not tell the story of greatly needed technicians and specialists yet untrained.

Our universities are producing 3,000 Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences each year. But by 1970 they will need to turn out 7,500 a year. Our medical and dental schools must increase their enrollment from 46,000 today to 75,000 by 1970. Our nursing schools must double their graduates by 1970. We also have the problem of a decline in the number of trained pharmacists and optometrists. Pharmacy graduates dropped from 5,800 in 1950 to only 3,700 in 1962. Optometry graduates declined from 2,400 in 1951 to 1,400 in 1962. Without sufficient numbers of these highly skilled professionals, America will be irrepairably damaged.

What value do we place on education in this country? The most important ingredient of a good educational system is the teacher. Despite this fact, the average salary of classroom teachers in large urban centers in the academic year 1960–61 was $6,096; while the average salary of persons in eight other professions requiring a college degree was more than $3,000 higher—$9,474.

The President's omnibus education bill calls for an expenditure of $5 billion. Unfortunately, only a part of this bill will become law. Yet $5 billion—the amount needed to enact the entire program—is less than half of what we spend in 1 year on alcohol, less than we spend on tobacco, and less than we spend in 1 year on barber shops, beauty shops, and cosmetics.

The American public spends approximately the same amount annually for recreation as it does for its entire educational program, including all Federal, State, and local programs combined.

Admittedly, much of my previous discussion has been directed toward the general problems facing young Americans with particular emphasis on the entire area, the broad area, of education. I have taken this liberty, quite frankly, because it is my deepest conviction that the major problems confronting this country cannot be solved on a piecemeal basis. Rather, a comprehensive, all-out effort must be made.

The vocational education bill before the Senate is not intended as a cure-all. It will not solve all the problems. But it is my contention that no other legislation better exemplifies the need to revise our efforts to cope with the new, highly technical problems of this age.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time allotted to the Senator on his amendments has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield the Senator time on the bill. How much time does the Senator need?

Mr. BAYH. Three minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the Senator from Indiana 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. BAYH. That will be more than adequate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the past, we have tended to downgrade technical education. It has played what could be called the role of Cinderella to its more glamorous stepsisters in the field of education. It is time that we stopped thinking that vocational education is for the deadheads, that it is the solution for the culturally deprived, or that it is a convenient dumping ground for those problem youngsters whom the regular teachers cannot handle.

This has never been the case, but now, more than ever before, we must look upon vocational education as a part of a balanced, overall program designed to meet the manifold complications of our industrial society. We must look upon vocational education as one means of meeting the need for specialization, as one way of preparing our youth for the more diversified labor market of tomorrow. In short, vocational training is one means of preparing our young people for useful roles in modern society.

Mr. President, I should like to make one final plea for my amendment, a plea for more resources in vocational education. In this era, when a diploma does not guarantee a job, let us fully implement this program designed to see that each student is "job-trained." "Job-trained" with the skills needed today and tomorrow.

Let us insist that the vocational programs of this country be large enough to do the job. Let us not be satisfied with half a loaf. We must not be content to send a boy to do a man's work—unless, of course, he has been trained in the best skills our great country's resources can provide.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. BAYH. I yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana. I commend him for his most inspiring message about the youth of America. The junior Senator from Hawaii will be proud to support the amendments offered by the junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for his willingness to join me in offering the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate has just listened to the maiden speech of the able new Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. Before I comment on his speech, I wish to apologize to him, first, for the number of times I was interrupted in my capacity of working on the bill on the floor; and second, because I was called to the cloakroom on a matter of policy. But I heard most of the Senator's speech. I congratulate him upon it.

If I were to make a maiden speech this year, I do not know of a better subject than a plea for more support for the youth of America. After all, the greatest resource we have is the potential brainpower of the youth of America.

We sorely need the authorization for the magnitude of appropriation that the Senator from Indiana asks for. I congratulate him on his speech. What he has said to the Senate is what the experts are saying, for the recommendation carried in his amendment is the recommendation of the Presidential panel of consultants on vocational education appointed by the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who is now our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

It would be pleasant if we were in an economic position to appropriate all the money for which the Senator asks. However, I am sure the Senator realizes the position of the Senator from Oregon.

Yesterday we heard a speech on the other side of the issue, a speech by the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who sought to reduce the amount of the authorization drastically from that recommended by the committee by an overwhelming vote. Both the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Indiana, in my judgment, have proved by their eloquent pleas the soundness of the position of the overwhelming majority of the committee in presenting its recommendation, which will be most helpful and will be so much better than the situation is at present. It will get us on the way to an improved program of vocational education in the years to come.

The Senator from Indiana knows that I try to be a political realist in the Senate. When I take note of the fact that we are recommending substantially more than is provided in the House bill, but short of what the Senator from Indiana is recommending, the question before us is, Is this a reasonable, conscionable, compromise of the different points of view in the Senate? I respectfully submit that it is. Therefore, I find myself compelled to oppose the Senator's amendments. Nevertheless, he has made an eloquent, able record in support of the principle of the program.

I understand the position of the Senator from Indiana to be that he will not press his amendments, in view of the situation in which the committee finds itself. However, I thought he ought to know of the high regard in which I hold him, his speech, and his recommendation. I hope that in the years to come we may reach the figure that the Senator from Indiana has recommended.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 1 minute, to enable me to respond to his remarks?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the leadership the Senator from Oregon has exhibited in making what I have described in my remarks as a considerable step forward; and I share his concern with economic conditions and the condition of the budget.

The reason why I proposed this amendment in all seriousness was that it seemed to me that this is one area where, by investing more money in resources, we have better than a 50–50 chance to get more than our money back. As I pointed out, the State and local governments spend $4 for every $1 spent by the Federal Government; and of course the Senator from Oregon is aware of that.

I appreciate his counseling with me on this matter. I hope that, under his leadership, his subcommittee will consider my amendment. The Senator from Oregon will note that my amendment for this year called for the same allocation of funds that his illustrious subcommittee proposed; but I felt that if we could assimilate this large an increase the first year, we could assimilate with great ease additional increments, until finally, in a 4-year period, we reached what the President's advisers have said we could have and should have reached this year.

I do not intend to press now for action on my amendment; but I would ask the Senator from Oregon to use his great prestige in the interest of further consideration of this measure at a later date.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Indiana will withhold withdrawing his amendment for just a moment, in the interest of the time problem, I should like to use some time on the amendment and then yield similar time to other Senators, rather than yield time on the bill.

In reply to the remarks of the Senator from Indiana, let me say that I quite agree with him. Yesterday, I said that in the long run this expenditure is not going to cost the taxpayers 1 cent. In the long run we shall be supporting a program which will make people employable, whereas otherwise thousands of them might be unemployable. If we do not train them for employment in an age of automation, I fear they would be in danger of permanent unemployability.

The school dropouts of today—and there are thousands of them—who remain untrained will find themselves unable to be employed. Today they are unemployable, and cannot contribute to the support of the Nation. They will be a continuing drain on the resources of all levels of government. They will require social welfare benefits, unemployment compensation benefits, and add to the costs of our jails and prisons, because from this group of unemployables there will come a very large proportion of the dissident element of our society who run afoul of the law and thus place an additional tax burden upon the American people.

We must remember also the group of unemployed, for whom we shall have to find jobs. Many of the latter will need training for the upgrading of their skills. This bill seeks to provide for that.

I know of no better opportunity that the Senate will have this year to strike a body blow at the social problems which accompany automation, than the one offered by means of this bill.

However, I point out that this can be considered as a program of loans by the taxpayers, not an actual appropriation of their money without a return of the amount appropriated. Time will prove that these people, who otherwise would be unemployed or unemployable, will be able to get jobs as a result of the training provided by the vocational education and training program, and they will be earning salaries so much higher than any income they otherwise would earn that over the years they will return to the Treasury of the United States, in the form of taxes, many times the cost of this program. The program will enable them to pay large amounts of taxes which otherwise they would not be able to pay.

I have an unanswerable argument on that point, by way of proof which I have used in the previous debates on this subject, because it is undeniable that the educational provisions of the GI bill of rights have not cost the taxpayers 1 cent.

This is so because the earning capacity of a college graduate, over his lifetime, is shown statistically to be approximately $435,000, as compared to $257,557 or about half that amount for a high school graduate who enters the labor force. The differences among the taxpaying ability of the educated persons, the vocationally trained persons and that of those who lack such education or training will represent so many more tax dollars in the Treasury of the United States that the cost of this program will be repaid many times over.

Yesterday, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] drew to our attention the results of studies made as to the value of vocational agricultural training. These studies were reported on page 99 of "Education for a Changing World of Work" the report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education.

They can stand repetition for they carry conviction. The panel said and I quote:

> High school graduates who have completed 3 or more years of vocational agriculture hold a significant economic advantage over farm-reared high school graduates who have not had such training. An Iowa study of 1943–54 graduates who were farming in 1955 showed that 89 percent of those with training in vocational agriculture were above hired-hand status, 57 percent farmed 161 acres or more, and vocational agriculture graduates realized in 1955 a mean of $7,720 in total gross sales from farming. Of the graduates who did not have vocational agriculture training, 79 percent were above hired-hand status, 48 percent farmed 161 acres or more, and all those with farms realized a mean of $5,788 in total gross products. Thus, vocational agriculture graduates realized an average of $1,932 more in 1955 than other graduates who worked on farms.
>
> A study of the effectiveness of vocational agriculture was conducted in Mississippi in 1959 to find out what effect vocational education had, over a period of 30 or more years, on farming and on other aspects of the lives of the people in the community. Of the 1,090 farmers surveyed, 21 percent (232) had taken vocational agriculture in high school, 48 percent had participated in adult farmer classes, and 16 percent had received all-day adult farmer instruction. Those who received organized instruction in vocational agriculture lived in better homes, achieved a higher rate of production, and participated in more community activities than others.

Both the GI bill studies and the vocational agricultural studies I have just referred to can be cited against my position. On the basis of these arguments the distinguished Senator from Indiana might well ask why I cannot support his amendment at this time. My answer is this: not only do we have a problem in the Senate and in the House, but we also have the greater problem of explaining this situation to the American people, who still do not understand the facts. We cannot go too far ahead of them. However, the fact that we are proposing this amount this year does not mean, I say to the Senator from Indiana, that next year—if public opinion demands it—we cannot amend the existing legislation so as to provide for increased amounts.

I wish to state that I am entirely convinced that once the people in the districts of America begin to understand the value of this program to their communities and to the employment problems in their communities, and the great social and economic benefits that will flow from it, public opinion will demand an enlargement of the program.

We are starting the new vocational program with this bill, if we succeed in our attempt to have the Senate pass it. I am satisfied that, with that start, we shall not need to worry about the future of the program, so far as further increase is concerned, because the people will realize its value and will demand its expansion.

So I believe this is the wisest course for us to follow this year. That is why—it is no secret to many Senators, and I explained it to the Senator from Indiana before we began in this colloquy, when he had not made up his mind about what he would do—it is my position that if he presses for adoption of his amendment, I shall urge its defeat, for the reasons just stated; and if he withdraws his amendment, as chairman of the subcommittee, I shall thank him from the bottom of my heart, and shall give him my assurance that year after year, so long as I serve in that capacity, I shall continue to press for an ever-expanding program to bring educational benefits to the youth of the country, because, as I said in debate yesterday, the potential brainpower of the rising generation in America is the greatest defense weapon we have, and we must develop it so that we constantly keep ahead of Russia in brainpower. That can be accomplished only by means of programs such as this one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota whatever time he desires to have on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding to me, so that I can join other Senators in commending and congratulating the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] for this, his maiden address to the Senate, on a subject of very great importance, not only to the individual citizens, but to the whole Nation and, indeed, to the cause of freedom throughout the world.

I am very much pleased that the Senator from Indiana has become, as shown by his statement today, such a stanch ally of this program of Federal aid to education and, indeed, so strong a supporter of education itself.

I know that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, is indeed heartened by the message the Senator from Indiana has delivered, and is encouraged by the fact that he has in the Senate another powerful force to advance in Congress the cause of education.

The Senator from Indiana is to be commended for selecting this particular subject matter for his area of special interest and special concern, because it cannot be repeated too often that the nation that educates its youth is the nation that has a future; the nation that deals with the great force called brainpower is the nation that has the real power; and every time a boy or a girl is denied a full and equal opportunity for an education to the fullest extent of that individual's capacity to absorb and to learn, so often is the nation denied wealth, strength, morality, and progress.

If the Congress of the United States did not do one other thing than to provide the best schools humanly possible, the finest teachers and the best and most modern facilities for instruction, we would do more for the cause of freedom in our Republic than any other one thing that we have ever done.

Later in the debate it is my intention to place in the RECORD a rather concise history of the programs of Federal aid to education. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] and other Senators will be interested to note that the rise of the gross national product of our country can be traced by the amounts of money that have been invested in education at the Federal, State, local, and private levels. As sure as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west we can trace the rise of the prosperity of America, the growth of our economy, and the increase in our gross national product by looking at how much money we are putting into education. As the amounts of money in education are reduced or in any way inhibited, we see a drop in the gross national product or a leveling off of what we call our economic growth.

The Senator from Oregon has wisely and truly said that today we have thousands of people, young and old, who are inadequately educated either academically or in vocations. Therefore, those people are not permitted to make their real and full contribution to the wealth and strength of our country. They ought to be released and permitted to make their contribution. I can think of nothing that is more unkind and undemocratic than to deny to a person the opportunity to develop himself to the maximum of his capacity and ability. I can think of nothing that more depletes the resources of America than to deny the development of the greatest human resource; namely, the human mind and the human spirit. Today and in the future the real power of America will be the power of the intellect and the power of the mind—simply put, brainpower. That is the real resource. It is more important than our gold resources, our forests, our mines, or the land that we have. The real power, and the real secret to our power, is educational development—brainpower.

The Senator from Indiana ought to rejoice in the fact that by his good judgment he has selected this subject as the project to which he wishes to dedicate his energies, and, indeed, to give his life to during his career in the Senate and as a matter of public service.

I believe the history books of our Nation will have a special chapter for men and women who at an early time saw the importance of improvement in educational facilities, instruction, educational curriculum, and educational programs. The Senator is correct. No nation ever spent itself into bankruptcy by educating its people. The poorest nations are the most illiterate. Illiteracy and ignorance spell poverty and destitution. Education and enlightenment spell prosperity and strength.

Let it be crystal clear that when our Government starts to cut back on expenditures, it may well be cutting its own throat if it cuts in the field of education. Every time we reduce an educational budget, or every time we provide an inadequate budget, we concede a victory to the forces of fear, tyranny, oppression, and poverty.

I commend the Senator from Indiana. I am delighted that he has spoken up as he has. Earlier today he told me that he would make his speech as his initial major address to the Senate. It is a compliment to him. What a refreshing experience it is to see a brilliant, able young man—a U.S. Senator—take that stand and advocate that course of action.

I salute the Senator from Indiana. I compliment him and commend him. I hope that he will continue to carry on the fight in the years to come, because if he does, he will make a greater contribution to our country than was ever dreamed humanly possible as a result of the fact that he dedicated his life to the education of our people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time remains to the opposition to the amendments of the Senator from Indiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The Senator from Oregon has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to yield to the Senator from Alaska. Did the Senator from Indiana wish me to yield to him?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I shall be glad to wait until the Senator from Alaska has concluded. I should like to respond to both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Alaska desire?

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, when one of our colleagues makes a speech of unsurpassed eloquence and expresses far more ably than we ourselves can what we would say, we meet the situation by saying that we associate ourselves fully with the able and eloquent remarks—in this case—of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]. He has said exactly what I wish I could have said as well as he said it.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] is to be warmly congratulated, not only for selecting his theme, but for presenting it so eloquently. I fully agree with the Senator that the greatest resource in the United States is our human resource. The way to develop that resource is through education. Yesterday in colloquy with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] on the education bill I said although there were many important priorities—national security, civil rights, taxation, resource development—none of them is equal in importance to education, because education is not merely an abstract objective but it is essential to the building of our economy to take care of the thousands of young people who are unable to obtain employment because they do not have adequate training. Through education we strike at unemployment which I consider our major domestic problem.

I should like to support the amendments of the Senator from Indiana. I have listened carefully to the objections raised by the able chairman of the subcommittee. I point out that there might be a way of raising the necessary money beneficially.

Yesterday in reporting to the Senate on the 10 countries in the Near East, I quoted from an interview given by Dr. Leona Baumgartner, Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and likewise Frank H. Bowles, president of the college entrance examination board. They pointed out the way unwarranted expenditures are being perpetrated under the foreign aid program as a result of our urging upon many foreign countries aid to create educational projects which are unsound or not needed.

The senior Senator from Oregon is well aware, as I am, of the numerous wastes in the foreign aid program. I should like to have him consider—perhaps not for immediate reply—whether we might transfer some of that money that is now wasted and which we are squandering abroad on worthless educational projects in areas where we should not be spending money at all to the benefit of our youth at home. That might be a way of finding some of the money which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] has said should be used for the education of our own youth to give them vocational training and to enable them to obtain employment.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield my remaining time on the amendment to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. I again thank the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] as well as the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] for their kind remarks. What the Senator from Oregon has said about the need for public opinion is true.

I feel also that in my State—and there are those who would say that the people of my State might not be quite as favorable to this proposal as the people of other States—the citizens are finally coming around to the conclusion that this problem must be solved. It has been multiplied time and again by the financial crises which confront all the States. There is hardly a State today that does not have to consider ways to increase taxes, to find new sources of revenue. Why? It is because of the mushrooming numbers of children and the need for increasing resources plowed into the area of education.

In my home community in the State of Indiana, the property tax rate—and the State makes a great effort to permit localities to handle this subject—has reached the point where it is almost confiscatory.

With the burdens resting upon the States and local communities as they do today, we who serve in the Congress must recognize that this great problem, of national interest, cannot longer be ignored.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for giving me his assurance that the committee will delve into the ramifications of my amendments. Since the amendments were designed to project a long-range image of additional emphasis in this area, perhaps with his assistance there will be a good possibility that the amendments can be considered and accepted the next time the Senate acts upon this type of legislation.

I thank the Senator for being so thoughtful and helpful in this regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senator does what I believe he is about to do, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleagues, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who is in charge of consideration of the pending bill; the deputy majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]; the distinguished Senator from the far northern State of Alaska [Mr. Gruening]; and other Senators in extending congratulations and commendations to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], who has now made his first speech after serving 10 months in this body. The Senator has shown great patience and great tact.

I believe the speech was well worth waiting for. I hope, now that the ice has been broken, the Senator will not be so modest, but will contribute more and more to the effort being made in the Senate to pass various worthwhile pieces of proposed legislation. The Senator's record has been outstanding. His contribution today has been most magnificent. The assurances given by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon are encouraging. I congratulate the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader. Certainly, when a freshman Senator hears the remarks made concerning his interest in education which have been made by the stalwarts in the Senate who have complimented me, it is a great honor. I wish to tell all the Senators how thankful I am, and how much I appreciate their remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Indiana is withdrawing his amendments?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendments, because of the assurances given me in this regard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to withdraw the amendments.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 384. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes;

H.R. 491. An act vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands;

H.R. 3488. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana;

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations;

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek compact;

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes;

H.R. 7193. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union;

H.R. 7235. An act to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the Clerk and the Marshal of the Supreme Court;

H.R. 7400. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to authorize the transfer of unused funds from the administrative expense reserve to the contingency reserves of the several health plans under such act;

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.;

H.R. 8265. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Iowa Ordnance Plant Reservation, Iowa;

H.R. 8611. An act to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors;

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as Wright Brothers Day; and

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.;

S. 453. An act to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala.;

S. 743. An act to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of this 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 812. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America;

S. 814. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1125. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood;

S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the act approved March 23, 1906; and

S. 1994. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of certain waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 384. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8265. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Iowa Ordnance Plant Reservation, Iowa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 491. An act vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 3488. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; and

H.R. 7193. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the first union health center in the United States by the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 3941. An act to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the offset against burial allowances paid by the Veterans' Administration for amounts paid by burial associations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5949. An act to consent to the amendment by the States of Colorado and New Mexico of the Costilla Creek Compact; and

H.R. 6756. An act to revise the boundaries of Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7235. An act to amend sections 671 and 672 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the clerk and the marshal of the Supreme Court;

H.R. 7601. An act for the relief of the city of Winslow, Ariz.;

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; and

H.J. Res. 475. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7400. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to authorize the transfer of unused funds from the administrative expense reserve to the contingency reserves of the several health plans under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8611. An act to facilitate the performance of medical research and development within the Veterans' Administration, by providing for the indemnification of contractors; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I support the vocational education bill, the extensions to the National Defense Education Act, and aid to schools in federally-impacted areas.

Since 1917 the Vocational Education Act has been one of the outstanding examples of Federal-State cooperation in a program designed to prepare young men for employment. In this era of rapid change in our economy and employment opportunities, and the increasing demand for specific skills, this legislation is more necessary than ever.

This bill is the positive, sensible approach to meeting the problems of unemployment and providing our industries with the skills they need to improve their competitive position.

In New Hampshire, one of the most industrialized States in the Nation, we have made excellent use of the vocational education program. And the New Hampshire Legislature has approved the construction of more vocational schools which will provide our youth with the opportunity to obtain skills and become employed. In 1962 alone, Federal vocational education funds were matched over 1½ times by the State of New Hampshire and local funds. Combined expenditures in the State amounted to over $739,100 and provided training for 7,600 persons.

Mr. President, let us remember that when the committee was considering the Youth Conservation Corps, testimony showed:

> There are 4 to 6 million people unemployed and at the same time there are 4 to 6 million job openings. The difference is lack of skills.

I voted against the Youth Conservation Corps as I saw no advantage in sending our youth into the woods and bringing them out still unskilled and untrained to take advantage of job opportunities. I do support this vocational education bill because it answers this very need.

Now, turning to the National Defense Education Act, which has proved through the years that it has merit and warrants extension.

Seven New Hampshire colleges and universities participated in the student loan program in 1963, and 2,047 students received loans in 1961 and 1962.

New Hampshire schools are strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction through the purchase of equipment and materials. Enrollments in language courses have steadily increased; all secondary schools will offer French during this school year and more secondary and junior high schools have added complete language laboratories.

In 1962, 18 guidance and counseling programs continued and 8 schools established new programs with full-time counselors.

This past summer, Dartmouth, St. Anselm's, and Rivier Colleges conducted modern foreign language institutes, enrolling a total of 145 teachers.

Finally, Mr. President, I urge the Senate to approve the full 3-year extension of aid to impacted areas.

This program is not only essential, it is just. Through the years we have put virtually every school district which receives this aid "through the wringer" in delaying extension of the act beyond a reasonable time and usually after the school districts have prepared their budgets for the year.

It is about time we extended this program for 3 years and gave the school boards, superintendents, and the taxpayers the benefit of being able to plan on receiving these funds.

Undoubtedly a complete study and review of this program is needed. But this is true of every Federal program, so why should we single out this particular program every year and demand a mere 1-year extension pending a full review? This review has been called for the last 3 years, but has never been conducted. I submit the review can be conducted while the program is in force, and any revisions found to be required can be made.

I am particularly pleased that the committee is recommending a 3-year extension. A bill which I introduced in this session called for a 2-year extension of this aid, but I am glad to vote for the additional year.

In New Hampshire, 40 school districts received $1½ million in impacted aid in the fiscal year just ended. These districts need to know the Congress supports the impacted aid program. I feel this is a good opportunity for us to demonstrate our support of a program that is needed and is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I speak in support of H.R. 4955, a bill to expand and extend vocational education opportunities, to extend the National Defense Education Act, and to extend Public Laws 874 and 815. I will vote for this bill, and I have no doubt that it will be approved by the Senate, as it has been by the House.

This legislation continues programs which have been in operation for a number of years, and which have been of great importance in helping students secure higher education, in helping school districts in impacted areas, and in helping our Nation improve the quality of education.

Part A of H.R. 4955 authorizes four programs directed to the improvement of vocational education: one would provide continuing financial assistance to States to maintain and extend existing programs of vocational education; one would offer grants for research relating to vocational education and the financing of pilot demonstration projects; one would establish area residential vocational schools near urban areas having large numbers of unemployed young people or high school dropouts; and one would provide part-time employment in public agencies or institutions to needy youths of 15 through 20.

The bill reported by the Senate committee authorizes funds in the amount of $1.435 billion for the first 5 years of operation, as contrasted to the House bill authorization of $630 million for the first 5 years. The President originally requested $92 million for 1 year, and I believe that the House increase for 5 years is ample to meet the needs that have been pointed up in hearings.

Yesterday, Senator GOLDWATER offered an amendment substituting the money authorization of H.R. 4955—as passed by the House—for the amount provided in the Senate committee-approved bill. I voted for the amendment, as a supporter of vocational education, for I believe this is a great hope for our national problem of unemployment. But because the bill, as reported by the Senate committee, is costly, and because I do not believe the vast sums included in the Senate bill could be effectively used at this time, I voted for the amendment. I believe the House figure is sufficient, and if proven needs in vocational education develop there will be ample time for their consideration. I point out that in only 3 months a new session of Congress will begin, where these needs can be considered.

Further, there are other programs which have been approved by Congress from which the training results are only now beginning to be seen. Among these are the Manpower Development Act, and the retraining provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, which I supported. These two programs will have an impact on the problem. They provide funds, and will also reduce the need for the amount authorized by the Senate committee.

Part B of H.R. 4955 extends the National Defense Education Act student loan program for 3 years, and increases the present $90 million authorization to $125 million for this fiscal year, $135 million for fiscal year 1965, $145 million for fiscal year 1966, and $150 million for 1967. There is also a provision raising the institutional loan ceiling from $250,000 to $800,000, which does not affect the total cost of the program. NDEA, which I cosponsored when it was introduced and enacted upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower, provides loans and fellowships, and has been instrumental in helping many young people get through college who otherwise would have been denied the opportunity. Requests this year from colleges for loan funds for students have exceeded the $90 million presently available by $35 million, and this authorization will allow Congress to meet these requests for scholarships and fellowships by including the needed funds in a supplemental bill. When the original NDEA bill was before the Senate, I offered the amendment to provide loans rather than grants for college students, which is fair, and has resulted in savings, and I am pleased that the program has met with so much success in the 5 years since its enactment.

Part C of H.R. 4955 extends Public Law 815, relating to public school construction, and Public Law 874, relating to operation and maintenance costs of public schools in "impacted areas." Several amendments were proposed by the administration when this bill was sent to Congress, but the committee has recommended a straight 3-year extension of the act, and I support this extension.

As one who has supported educational programs since I have been in the Senate, and the particular programs contained in this bill, I am happy to vote for H.R. 4955 today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in support of H.R. 4955 as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As one who testified before the Education Subcommittee last June, urging improvements in vocational education and extension of the National Defense Education Act and impacted areas laws and as a cosponsor of the vocational education amendments approved by committee, I am particularly pleased that this important measure has been promptly brought up for Senate action.

I have no doubt the bill will pass with overwhelming support, as indeed it should.

For it is an important and urgently needed step forward in strengthening the Nation's schools and educational opportunities.

I am pleased at the assurances offered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that he will consider further improvements in vocational education. I am pleased also at his assurances that H.R. 4955 is but the first installment of educational measures to come before the Senate during this Congress.

In closing, I wish to commend members of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee for their diligence and hard work in the field of education and their leadership in this field. I congratulate the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the committee, and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for persevering on education bills so that the Senate might have the opportunity to vote on this bill.

I strongly support the pending bill and trust the House will go along with the Senate amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

THE NEED FOR EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in this debate on a highly important public question I do not believe it would be entirely inappropriate for me to refer to the problem of education in the State from which I come.

Twelve years from now 659,000 students will be attending college and university classes in California. A faculty of 44,000 professors, instructors, and teachers will be required for those young students—twice the faculty in all our State colleges, public and private, today.

The annual budget of our great public institution, the University of California, is now $450 million. Almost half of that comes from grants made by the Government of the United States.

There are three new college campuses preparing for construction or actually under construction at the moment in California. One is in my own county of Orange. One is at Santa Cruz, in the central coastal region. The other is in San Diego. Each new college campus will cost $400 million.

In 1975 the public educational systems of California on a collegiate level will cost $1 billion a year.

The people of California pay a 4-percent sales tax. They pay a State income tax which I believe is higher than that of most States which have personal income tax laws. In addition, the people of my State have approved overwhelmingly bond issues to finance higher educational facilities. Thus, California is attempting to deal with the problem of education. It always has. It always will.

As our population passes the 17 million mark and goes toward what is now conservatively estimated will be 42 million by the end of this century, education continues to be for California, as for the entire Nation, a basic, critical question which obviously must be solved, so that future generations will be able to utilize their brains for the good of this country and for the good of mankind.

But education is not a problem indigenous to your beautiful State of Hawaii, Mr. President [Mr. Inouye in the chair] or to mine. It is indeed a matter of national concern.

But our concern cannot be alone with higher education. If the bricks and mortar and the talented teachers and administrators are not available at the elementary and secondary school levels throughout America there will be an inadequate reservoir of students with which to fill the junior colleges, State colleges, and private and public universities. The economic growth, continued well-being and defense of our way of life is directly related to the capacity of our country to educate its youth. Opportunity must be available to all who seek it regardless of their race and particular economic circumstance and regardless of whether they aspire to the highest level of graduate work in their chosen intellectual field or to the most skilled level of vocational training. America, and the world needs not only gifted natural scientists but also gifted technicians. Both are essential. Both are included in the bill now before the Senate.

H.R. 4955, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

First, authorizes a permanent program of financial assistance to the States in order to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education; encourages the development of new vocational education programs through research grants and the financing of pilot and demonstration projects; permits the establishment of area residential vocational schools through grants to States, public educational institutions, and colleges and universities; as well as, through State grants, authorizes part-time employment in public agencies or institutions, to needy youths between 15 and 20 so that they might obtain vocational education training on a full-time basis; and

Second, extends for 3 years—from June 30, 1964—the National Defense Education Act of 1958, increasing the total amount available for student loans and raising the present restrictive institutional ceiling and providing flexibility so that fellowships might be more fully utilized; makes available to the seventh and eighth grades the guidance, counseling, and testing services now supplied to secondary schools; and

Third, extends for 3 years—from June 30, 1963—the impacted area program which has operated for well over a decade under Public Laws 815 and 874, modified only to include the District of Columbia under the program.

Mr. President, I have spoken many times in the Senate over the last decade in support of the impacted area programs. This program is of particular importance in my own State where thousands of people arrive each week from all over America to make their homes. Many of these people are sent to California to serve at a particular Federal installation. Without the impacted area program, the already overburdened property taxpayers would long ago have been overwhelmed by the influx of new defense-connected residents in what but a few years ago were relatively unpopulated areas. Even more important, young people would have gone uneducated. The extension of this program without crippling amendments is essential.

Education is not a partisan problem. Both the platform of the Democratic Party and the platform of the Republican Party recognize a responsibility to improve educational processes in America.

If, however, I may be permitted to be partisan for a moment, I recall with considerable pride that the late great Bob Taft, who was the leader of my party in the Senate, put through the Senate the first general Federal aid to education bill in modern American history.

But, as I say, this represents not merely the wave of the future. It represents the American way of life. Every young man and young woman should have an opportunity to be trained in the skill of his choice and to be intellectually equipped to face the challenges of the nuclear age in which we live.

That is the reason why I wished to make these comments. I thank my friend the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who is in charge of consideration of the bill, for permitting me to do so. I ask unanimous consent that an intriguing article published in the July 1963 issue of Reader's Digest entitled "California Builds Big for Education" may be printed in full in the Record at this point as well as a few of the hundreds of letters and telegrams I have received in support of this bill from business, education, and labor leaders in California.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

California Builds Big for Education

(By Ben Hibbs)

On the eastern approaches to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, a flashing signboard ticks off California's moment-by-moment population growth, in figures that grow larger as you watch—like the meter on a gasoline pump.

The signboard is worth noting. Since 1950, California's population has rocketed from about 10,600,000 to something over 17 million. The State's soothsayers forecast 42 million by the year 2000. Any eastern State with industry and population surging in at this rate would view the phenomenon with consternation. Californians, however, who describe their State as "dynamic," seem undismayed. They are ceaselessly making studies of the problems—and opportunities—ahead, planning, building, getting ready.

The foresight and exuberance being poured into this planning can best be seen in the area of public higher education, where the State faces a staggering problem. By 1975—just 12 years hence—it is expected that 588,000 students will be streaming to State and junior college and university campuses. Add the estimated enrollment in California's numerous private institutions and you get the fantastic total of 659,000 students. For all these institutions a faculty of 44,000 will be required, as compared with 20,000 today. To prepare for this dizzy growth, California in the spring of 1960 passed into law its master plan for higher education, which has since come to be regarded as a model throughout the Nation.

Under this plan, California is now building, simultaneously, three huge new branches of its State university. One campus is near Santa Cruz, 80 miles south of San Francisco; another is in Orange County, some 50 miles southeast of Los Angeles. The third, rising a few miles north of San Diego, will be integrated with a small nearby branch of the university which consists of a graduate science school and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Each campus is being laid out to accommodate an eventual student body of 27,500, the maximum set by the board of regents. Each will become a fullfledged university, with professional schools, graduate training and research facilities. San Diego will be ready for its first undergraduates in autumn 1964, the other two a year later.

Even without its new campuses, the University of California is the largest in the Nation. UC's enrollment of full-time students last fall was 58,616, and its faculty now numbers close to 5,000. Wisely, California does not try to pack all these students onto one campus. When the new branches open their doors, the university will be operating on nine campuses.

Berkeley, the parent campus, and the Los Angeles branch (UCLA) are already huge, with 25,000 and 20,000 students, respectively. The other campuses now operative—at Davis, Santa Barbara, Riverside, San Diego, and the medical school at San Francisco—are smaller but ticketed for immediate expansion in varying degrees. Davis, for example, once an agricultural college, is becoming a full-range university. Among other far-flung facilities, UC operates 70 research and extension stations, 50 farm advisory offices, adult education courses in 175 communities, and 2 atomic research installations.

In addition, California has a fast-growing system of 17 State colleges—several with enrollments over 10,000. The State also gives substantial support to 69 2-year community junior colleges. In sheer numbers, both these systems are larger than the university.

Giantism in education, as in any other area of life, brings its problems. In the mid-1950's the State's higher education complex seemed headed for chaos. Each of the three systems was vocally jealous of its rights, and demanding expansion in line with its own ambitions: Junior colleges wanted to become 4-year institutions, State colleges wanted to achieve university status. There was no strong central planning body to iron out the differences.

Finally, in 1959, a team of eight top-flight California educators was appointed to study the problem. President Arthur G. Coons, of Occidental College, a private institution, was named chairman. A year later, the team turned in a far reaching and decisive report. Adopted almost in full by the legislature, this master plan became law.

The plan lays down clear lines of authority and coordination, states the duties of each system, suggests orderly programs of expansion. Under its provisions, the university will become more and more for juniors, seniors, and graduate students, with a gradually diminishing ratio of freshmen and sophomores. The State colleges will continue to be colleges, but will give graduate work through the various master's degrees and will take part in selected doctoral programs jointly with the university. The community colleges will remain 2-year institutions, giving (1) instruction leading to further college work, (2) academic courses for those who plan to go no further, and (3) strong vocational training to teach the skills for which California's highly technical industrial complex is clamoring.

Perhaps the most important provision of the plan is its firm ukase on the division of students. The university now draws its young people from the top eighth of the State's high school graduates, the State colleges from the top third. The junior colleges must accept any boy or girl with a diploma from an accredited California high school. Students, however, can move freely from one system to another—when they have raised their academic performance to the necessary levels. (Actually, many students eligible for the university attend State and junior colleges from choice.)

Where will California find the horde of additional college teachers needed by 1975? UC has long prided itself on the quality of its teaching and research staff—which includes 11 Nobel Prize winners, more than any other institution in the country. Will quality suffer in the search for quantity? Not in the opinion of Dr. Clark Kerr, president of the statewide university complex. "We'll get the people," he says, "and the quality will be just as good as it is now, maybe better."

The UC chancellors are trying to make college teaching a more attractive career for young people. They are combing lists of retired faculty for still vigorous men, and they are looking hopefully to retired military, diplomatic, and business personnel. But, above all, UC frankly expects to raid other institutions, particularly the big universities of the East and Midwest.

"The East is sending great segments of its population to California," said Dr. Kerr, "and we must have some of its faculty."

The building of the new campuses offers an exciting challenge. The one in Orange County is a good example. This county is among the fastest growing areas in the world. Space-age factories and research installations, flanked by vast housing developments, spread across the landscape. In the middle of this seething activity is historic 93,000-acre Irvine Ranch, an immensely valuable landmass only now beginning to move toward urbanization. Here, on 1,000 choice acres given to the State by the Irvine Co., will rise the University of California, Irvine. Ground will be broken for the first classroom building this fall.

Around the perimeter the Irvine Co. has set aside 10,000 acres for the development of a university-oriented town and residential communities. On the drawing boards are industrial parks, subdivisions, shopping centers, highways, and water reservoirs.

"Just as the land-grant colleges were founded a century ago to serve the rural nation of that era," says Chancellor Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr., "so we are building Irvine to serve the urban world today. We expect to develop the closest kind of cooperation with southern California's industrial complex, but this doesn't mean that Irvine will become just another big technological school. Here, technology and culture will not be mutually exclusive."

The plan for the Santa Cruz campus is the bold brainchild of Chancellor D. E. McHenry, formerly dean of academic planning for the statewide university system. On a 2,000-acre site a complex of 15 to 20 residential colleges will be built, each to have its own faculty, classrooms, housing, and eating facilities for perhaps 600 students. Each college will lean toward one branch of learning: history, modern languages, literature, the natural sciences. Typically, the student will get at least half of his instruction in his own college, but will cross the campus to other colleges for courses not offered in his own unit. A university library and other general facilities will be centrally located, and graduate and professional schools will be added as needed. As at Irvine, closed circuit TV cables will connect all buildings.

"We think we have a concept here," said Chancellor McHenry, "that will combine the advantages of the small college and the big university."

At the new San Diego campus, a modified plan of smaller units will be used. Three clusters of four colleges each will be built, and each cluster will operate as a unit. Heading this development is Chancellor Herbert F. York, one of the country's leading physicists.

A real conundrum is whether California's taxpayers can and will support all this panoply of higher education. The annual budget of the university alone is about $450 million. About half of this, however, is Federal money—chiefly for research work which the Government hires UC to do. Thus the university's actual operating budget is about $225 million, and of this about $158 million comes from State funds. The rest is derived from student fees, gifts, and endowment. In addition, UC is currently spending from $50 to $75 million a year on new buildings and facilities. The estimated tab for constructing the three new branches is about $400 million each. By 1975, the operating budgets for California's three systems of higher education are expected to add up to more than a billion dollars annually, about two-thirds of which will come from State funds.

California is a wealthy State with a relatively high level of personal income. With a skyrocketing population and burgeoning industries, perhaps it can continue to foot the bill. The team of master planners say flatly that it can. Despite a 4-percent sales tax and a State income tax already in the middle ranges, Californians last autumn voted 2 to 1 for a large bond issue, chiefly to finance new plants for higher education.

Will California's higher education cosmos become a ponderous learning factory in which the average student loses contact with his teachers, loses his own identity? Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy, of UCLA, an outspoken defender of the big university says, "In recent decades there has been an explosion of knowledge as well as of population. Consequently it is almost impossible these days for the smaller school to offer the enormous range of subject matter that young people need to prepare for useful lives in this complex world.

"The day of spoonfeeding in higher education is past. We must encourage independent study, put the student more on his own responsibility and treat him like an adult, as European universities do."

Since its earliest days, California seems to have been more passionately committed to public education than most States. Ever since it was founded in 1869, Californians have particularly loved and cherished UC. The State constitution gives the university autonomy, there is no political meddling with its management and the university's board of regents is a hardworking, nonpartisan body. Under the warming sun of such boons, the university has flourished. Not surprisingly, it feels equal to the challenge—as do the State colleges and junior colleges, and the Californians themselves.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *Oct. 4, 1963.*

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your active support of H.R. 4955. This legislation concerns programs of critical importance to education in California—extension of the National Defense Education Act, passage of new Vocational Education Act, and continuation of Federal aid for "impacted areas." We are hopeful that you will resist any crippling amendments to this legislation.

MAX RAFFERTY,
Superintendent of Public Instruction.

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., *October 4, 1963.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support for companion bill to H.R. 4955 involving funds for vocation education and impact area education funds.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY CHAPTER, NATIONAL ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION.

SAN BERNARDINO., CALIF., *October 4, 1963.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request support of H.R. 495, regarding extension of Public Law 815, 864 and 874. Funds are urgently needed to maintain present educational standards in federally impacted areas of this county.

ROY C. HILL,
County Superintendent, MF Schools,
San Bernardino County.

LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS,
July 8, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUCHEL: There is now pending before the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress a bill on vocational education known as H.R. 4955, which was introduced by Representative CARL PERKINS, Democrat, of Kentucky. This legislation was introduced as a separate vocational education bill and states that its purpose is to maintain, extend, and improve vocational education programs. It does not, however, replace, repeal, amend, or change in any form the existing vocational education acts; nor are the funds authorized under the Perkins bill earmarked for any particular phase of vocational education, but, rather, funds can be used for any and all phases as determined by State boards of education responsible for vocational education.

H.R. 4955 is endorsed and fully supported by the American Vocational Association and has the support of State and local vocational educators in California.

Mr. Kuchel, I am convinced that this is an urgent piece of legislation. The need for vocational education was never greater. With the population influx experienced in California, especially southern California, education in general and specifically vocational education must be supported by Federal funds. Quality vocational education is expensive, far more than the local taxpayer can adequately support. Yet, the need exists as evidenced by our industrial growth and the report of the President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education that vividly indicated the need to train youth and adults in gainful occupational skills. For 80 percent of the 26 million youth who will enter the labor force in the next decade without a college degree, the public schools must assume the responsibility and be given financial support to offer these young people adequate vocational training. This can be accomplished by the passage of H.R. 4955.

I would respectfully urge your support for H.R. 4955, the vocational education bill, when it reaches the floor of the Senate.

Yours very truly,

Donald F. Reynolds,
Supervisor, Trade and Technical Education.

Los Angeles
Trade-Technical College,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 5, 1963.

The Honorable Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Kuchel: Over the years I have tried to keep you informed regarding proposed legislation that affected the welfare at this school (more than 10,000 students annually), as well as directly affecting vocation education in this Los Angeles area. I hope you realize that Los Angeles city schools do employ Federal funds to an appreciable amount.

Recently, I again studied the content of the proposed Perkins (H.R. 4955) enactment. I believe that it embodies those essentials necessary to put vocational education "on its feet" for the good of our local citizenry and future industrial expansion.

Unfortunately, in the past, the Congress has passed limited educational legislation that neither visualized a complete vocational program nor provided funds enough to more than establish token efforts.

The Swanson report clearly indicates the vocational education needs of our Nation, and, in my belief, we should embody as much of the conservatively stated Swanson report into legislation as the wisdom of the Congress finds practical. The general need for establishing more emphasis upon vocational education at all levels is so apparent that I do not believe it is necessary to labor this point. Continued automation developments, among other trends, will accelerate the need for more opportunity for vocational retraining, skill training and new levels of broad technical training for new occupations that are appearing on the economic horizon.

I do hope you will again review the Swanson report and personally support the Perkins (H.R. 4955) legislation, which I do recommend to be for the long-term good of California and our Nation.

Respectfully,

F. Parker Wilber,
President.

San Diego, Calif.,
October 4, 1963.

Senator Thomas Kuchel,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your support of H.R. 4955 appropriation for vocational training. The additional funds are needed in this area.

W. J. de Brunner,
San Diego Building and Trades Council.

Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America,
San Diego, Calif., October 4, 1963.

Hon. Thomas E. Kuchel,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: As spokesman for the Union Glaziers and Glassworkers of San Diego and Imperial Counties I would like to request that you support the passage of H.R. 4955 without amendments.

We feel it would benefit our area to have this bill passed.

Truly yours,

Francis J. O'Connor,
Business Representative.

Mills College,
Office of the President,
Oakland, Calif., September 26, 1963.

Hon. Thomas Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: The National Defense Education Act is presently scheduled to expire on June 30, 1964, unless it is further extended. I understand that the extension is provided for as a part of H.R. 4955 now being considered by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I hope you will urge your colleagues on the committee to support the extension of the NDEA and that when the matter comes up for vote on the floor, you will vote in its favor.

With my best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

C. Easton Rothwell.

Lawndale School District,
District Administration Offices,
Lawndale, Calif., September 30, 1963.

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: The financial condition of the Lawndale school district is such that, as a result of defeat of two tax issues within the last 2 years, we face additional cutbacks in services that will result in inferior educational presentation to the children of this district. We are intensely concerned with the status of the Federal aid to education bill which was voted out of the Senate Education Subcommittee on Wednesday, September 11. In light of our present financial condition, we urge you to use your influence with the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to report this bill and we ask that you support the provisions of this bill when it reaches the Senate floor. We are aware of the desirable provisions in all four portions of this bill, particularly, of course, concerning part "C" involving the extension of the impact area legislation of Public Laws 815 and 874. * * *

The amount of money involved for the Lawndale school district has averaged $30,000 per year. In a district where the total budget is less than $3 million, this represents a serious threat to our financial stability particularly when we have a built-in deficit of approximately $50,000 per year, causing us to live off reserves—reserves which have now come to an end.

Sincerely,

Morris E. Lusk.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I announce that I cannot yield more time on the bill. I have only 15 minutes remaining.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 69, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) (1) Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 10." and by inserting at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In any case in which the Commissioner makes such arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities, he may also make arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities for children residing in any area adjacent to Federal property on which such minimum school facilities have been provided or otherwise constructed, with a parent who, during some portion of the fiscal year in which such education is provided, was employed on Federal property, but only if the Commissioner determines after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency (1) that the provision of such minimum school facilities is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this chapter, and (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children."

(2) The second sentence of such section 10 is amended by striking out "authority and" and inserting in lieu thereof "authority, or".

On page 69, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 69, between lines 12 and 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) (1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out "authority and" and inserting in lieu thereof "authority, or".

(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out "employed on such property" and inserting in lieu thereof "employed on Federal property".

On page 69, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the amendment, when read, is very technical; when explained, it is quite simple, when its import is understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. It is my understanding that I have a half hour on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 15 minutes.

Simply stated, the amendment seeks to give the Commissioner of Education, who administers the impacted areas statutes, Public Laws 815 and 874, the same authority in respect to attendance at school of children whose parents work on a U.S. base or post, but live off that base or post, which he now has with respect to the children whose parents work or serve on the post and also live on the post.

Let me restate that, because it is a very simple proposition. The principle of this amendment is to give the same authority to the Commissioner of Education with respect to paying, under the impacted areas program, for the schooling of children who live off the base with their parents, but whose parents work on the base, as he now has with respect to children of parents who both live and work on the base.

The Commissioner says, with respect to the children whose parents work and live on the base, that if they cannot find in the area a suitable or nonsegregated public school, he will build a school on the base for them. But he says he has no such power with regard to the children of parents who work on the base, but live off the base.

Therefore, I am trying to bring both practices into harmony.

The practical point is that only 10 percent of the children in 15 Southern States are involved in the HEW antidiscrimination policy. According to our information, of the 564,000 children who go to school there and are the children of U.S. personnel, either civilian or military, only 10 percent, or roughly 56,000, reside with their parents on a base. Hence, the Commissioner says that if he cannot find a nonsegregated school for them, he can build one or provide them with suitable or nonsegregated facilities. But he says he cannot do the same as to the other half million children, and therefore those children are compelled, in many, many instances, to attend segregated schools, which are then aided by Federal tax moneys.

I have offered a number of amendments such as this one, and I assure the Senate that I am just as weary of the process as is any other Senator. The same motion will probably be made to table the amendment as is usually made. Perhaps it will be; perhaps it will not be. Heretofore motions have been made to table such amendments. Perhaps it will be done in this instance. The question is, Why go through this process time and again? In the first place, I have set a ground rule for myself. I am not doing it except for new programs. This proposal is an extension of the impacted areas program for 3 years. We are now proposing to put this same plan into effect until 1966, as it expires in 1963.

It is inconceivable that, with literally a civil rights revolution raging in the country, the United States, with the taxpayers' money, is aiding segregated programs in Southern States—not old programs, or incidents that have happened in the past, but new programs, or extensions of old programs, which thereby become new programs. This is a salient instance of it.

The anomalies involved are fantastic. Let us take this particular case. The Commissioner of Education says he has no authority to find or build nonsegregated schools for those 500,000 children. He says, "I must pay, under the impacted areas program, to segregated schools." He says it specifically. I asked him this question, and I have it in writing, so there is no question about it:

> Question. Are Public Law 874 and Public Law 850—

That is, maintenance and construction—

> payments now being made to local school districts which practice segregation in their public schools?

That is clear enough, is it not, Mr. President?

> Answer. Payments are being made to such school districts. Public Law 874, as presently written, does not contain any provision authorizing the Commissioner to withhold payments otherwise due and payable to local school districts on the ground that they practice segregation.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that this is so and the President cannot stop it. I say he has power under the Constitution to stop it this afternoon. It is a sticky question only in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is tragic, sad, and a shocking disgrace, so far as the United States is concerned, that it is allowed to continue. So, knowing of these instances and seeing them as they come from my own committee, I have voted to report such programs. It would be a distinct abnegation of my duty as a Senator if I did not draw the situation, as best I could, to the attention of the Senate and the Nation.

Hearings were held some months ago on just this issue; an entire day of expert testimony was taken by the Education Subcommittee on May 17. The President has been thoroughly alerted to the facts, and the testimony is clear that he has the power to remedy them. Yet the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not hesitated to put the same facts—and its contrary policy—in writing.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to me from the Department, dated October 4, 1963, be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1963.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: During the executive session of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on September 25 for consideration of H.R. 4955 you asked certain questions of Mr. Conley, assistant general counsel of this Department, and requested that we furnish you our replies in writing. This we are glad to do, and I am setting forth below the questions as reported by Mr. Conley and our answers.

Question. Does section 6(b) of Public Law 874 authorize the Commissioner of Education to provide education in on-base schools operated by the Federal Government on a desegregated basis to off-base federally connected children (i.e., children whose parents are employed on, but do not live on, Federal property) who now must attend local public schools operated on a segregated basis?

Answer. Section 6(b), in pertinent part, reads as follows:

"(b) In any case in which the Commissioner makes such arrangements for the provision of free public education in facilities situated on Federal property, he may also make arrangements for providing free public education in such facilities for children residing in any area adjacent to such property with a parent who, during some portion of the fiscal year in which such education is provided, was employed on such property, but only if the Commissioner determines after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency (1) that the provision of such education is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children, and (3) in any case where in the judgment of the Commissioner the need for the provision of such education will not be temporary in duration, that the local educational agency of the school district in which such children reside, or the State educational agency, or both, will make reasonable tuition payments to the Commissioner for the education of such children."

Our interpretation of the word "suitable," as used in section 6(a) of Public Law 874, to exclude segregated education, would apply equally to the use of that term in clause (2) of the above-quoted subsection. However, clause (3) of the above-quoted subsection precludes (except in Puerto Rico, and outlying islands) the on-base education of off-base children for other than temporary periods, unless the State or local educational agency agrees to make appropriate tuition payments. There is, moreover, no authority to construct such facilities for the education of off-base children. Hence, the use of the authority in this subsection without tuition charge has, in actual practice, been limited to situations where the education of off-base children would be of a temporary character; e.g., where a child's parent is moved to a new station in the middle of a school year and cannot immediately be provided quarters on the military base.

Question. Are Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 payments now being made to local school districts which practice segregation in their public schools?

Answer. Payments are being made to such school districts. Public Law 874, as presently written, does not contain any provision authorizing the Commissioner to withhold payments otherwise due and payable to local school districts on the ground that they practice segregation. In the case of Public Law 815, the Department is cooperating with the Attorney General in the litigation of several cases involving such school districts which, if successful, would establish the right of the Government to obtain a court order requiring such school districts, or at least those that have received construction grants, to provide desegregated education to federally connected children, and might permit withholding of construction funds if this obligation were not carried out.

Question. Do the vocational education provisions of H.R. 4955 authorize the Commissioner to withhold grants from State or local educational agencies which practice segregation in the provision of vocational education?

Answer. These provisions clearly require that the benefits of the program be made available to all qualified persons without regard to race, but they contain no specific grant of authority to withhold funds from grantees which practice segregation. The circumstances under which discriminatory practices of one kind or another would warrant a withholding of funds may depend upon legislative history developed in the course of congressional consideration and action on the bill, and upon any judicial precedents which may be pertinent when the question arises in the course of the bill's administration.

Question. Has the Library Services Act been interpreted by the Department as precluding grants for library services which are provided on a segregated basis?

Answer. The definition of "public library" at section 9(c) of the Library Services Act (i.e., a "library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region * * *") has been interpreted by the Commissioner as excluding any library which discriminates in the provision of library services on the basis of race, creed, or color.

Sincerely yours,
ALANSON W. WILLCOX,
General Counsel.

Mr. JAVITS. Still, the situation persists. I cannot see how a Senator like myself, with all this information at hand, can fail to ask the Senate to act on it if the President does not—and he will not. I say he has the power to do so immediately. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not agree with me as to the power which that Department has. The Department of Defense, the Department of Labor, the Post Office Department, and other departments have acted entirely equivalent to what I am proposing. Why must this Department be an exception?

The former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare [Mr. RIBICOFF], who is now in the Chamber, is the author of the policy about on-base children. He himself offered such a proposal, but he himself, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, felt bound by the opinions of lawyers in his Department. I cannot quarrel with him about that, but I can and do quarrel with the President who appoints the Secretaries and who has the authority to act.

This whole problem has not been swept under the rug. A few days ago we received the 1963 report from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. I call the attention of the Senate to page 196 of that report, headed "Discrimination in Education." I want the Senate to know what is happening under the cover of this situation. The Commission reports the following experience, on page 197:

> This has been an embittering experience for many Negroes. For some Negro families, assignments to southern installations require them to expose their children for the first time to segregated schools. In some cases, children must travel up to 40 miles each day to and from the nearest Negro school. They frequently find rundown buildings with obsolete textbooks and equipment, and overcrowded classrooms maintained by inadequately trained teachers. In States such as Mississippi, where 357 of 642 Negro elementary schools do not meet minimal State—

Not National, but State; State of Mississippi—

> accreditation standards, the quality of the education may be so inferior as to jeopardize the student's chances of acceptance when he seeks to enroll at another institution. Segregation has an added impact on both white and Negro families living on military installations. They see their children, who live and play together on base, line up by race to await the arrival of segregated school buses to take them to their segregated schools.

I now read from page 199 of the report:

> The result has been that there are schools adjacent to military installations which are built, maintained, and operated almost entirely with Federal funds and attended almost exclusively by the children of military families, which exclude Negro children.
>
> At one Air Force base in Alabama, Negro children bypass such a school every day on their way to the more distant Negro school. Not only is the school operated with Federal funds; it was built upon property deeded by the Federal Government to the school district in 1955 soon after the Defense Department's policy of integration of on-base educational facilities went into effect. The deed did not require that the school be operated for the benefit of all children.

One further anomaly it seems to me indicates the ridiculousness of everything we are doing. We are extending the impacted areas program; we are authorizing the appropriation. And at one and the same time we are suing in court to desegregate some of the schools to which we are giving money under the impacted areas program and to which we are agreeing that the Deartment of Health, Education, and Welfare is compelled to send children, notwithstanding that they are segregated.

How silly can we be? Suppose I owed somebody $100 and he owed me $200. Would I pay him the $100 and sue him for the $200? I would have to be insane to do so. But that is exactly what the United States is doing. The United States is paying Federal funds to these segregated schools, and then is suing them in court to restrain them from being segregated. It was bad enough when that plan was in effect, up to June 30, 1963. However, that plan has expired. We are now renewing it. We are apparently going to renew it on precisely the same basis. That is what we shall be doing if we renew the plan without my amendment being added to the bill.

Mr. President, it is not only an assault on commonsense and reason, but also an insult to intelligence. That is precisely what the Senate is proposing to do today.

The excuse is given, "Perhaps the suits will yield rulings in our favor." Such suits have been dismissed in Federal courts in Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi. It was held that the Government had no status or standing to bring such suits.

Mr. President, we are living in a topsy-turvy world. The Government, it is said, has no status to sue, but, nonetheless, it does have status to pay money to support such schools. In one case in Virginia the court sustained the suit, and it is now on appeal.

The argument is made, "Let us wait until the main civil rights bill is under consideration. Then we will give the President discretionary authority to withhold money from such school districts." I say that the President has discretionary authority now. He does not need any new authority. He does not need a statute to give it to him; almost every Department has so stated, except HEW. He is not doing anything about HEW's contrary position.

Some Members may wonder why Negroes demonstrate. Mr. President, they can read. They have a few pretty good lawyers; certainly as good as I am. They understand what it is all about. They can read the Constitution.

When Members of the Senate talk about the danger to domestic tranquility in the civil rights revolution, I hope they will think of cases like this. Blatant to the point of stupidity, yet we hide our heads in the sand.

I close upon this note. We are sometimes told that if one of these amendments were to carry, we would kill the bill, and therefore it is bad to offer it.

I am in favor of Federal aid to medical schools, to graduate schools, to dental schools, and to education generally. Therefore, as a liberal—and I am proud of the designation—I am told that I should not offer an amendment which would kill the bill. However, we are engaged in a struggle for the very soul of America, and I believe that struggle is more important than any bills, not merely the bills I have named and which I support. This is an ideal case for doing precisely what I have been advocating. Most of this money goes to Southern States. They get millions of dollars. We do not get very much of this money in my State, or in many other parts of the country. This money will very heavily subsidize southern schools.

That is where it would hurt. Let our southern friends filibuster. That would be fine. Let them be the ones responsible for their not getting the money. This is the ideal bill on which to add such an amendment. If they kill the bill, they kill something they dearly want. I doubt very much that they would do that, although I am not privy to their plans.

For just about every reason one can think of, and not only for the sake of justice under the Constitution, but for commonsense, let us adopt the amendment. I would like to change the policy of the Department, which in my opinion is only tying its own hands by its own interpretation of what the law says. Nonetheless, we face a reality, not a theory. Let us untie the Department's hands, so that they can proceed to do justice to children of parents who live off the base, just as we do for children of parents who live on the base.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

This is really not a civil rights amendment, even though it would have that thrust. It would enable the Department to get out of the entanglement in which it finds itself, and thus be able to do justice to the children who find themselves subjected to this embarrassment, so demeaning to them, in areas where the public school systems are segregated and where the parents have no choice, as left to them by the United States, but to send children to segregated schools. If there ever was an amendment which should be adopted, it is this one.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I wish to say to my friend from New York that I know he would not deliberately put me on the spot. That would be furthest from his intentions, I am sure, because we are too fond of each other. He is a brilliant lawyer, as he has just demonstrated. He has stated the opposition's arguments, which is good legal pleading strategy. However, stating the arguments does not answer them. Therefore I shall have to repeat a few of the arguments that he stated but which, in my judgment, he did not answer.

I plead with him not to press the amendment. I take the same position here as I did in committee. I opposed the Senator's amendment in committee. His amendment was defeated in committee. In due course in the debate I shall do exactly what the Senator from New York said probably would be done; I shall move to lay his amendment on the table. I shall move to lay it on the table for what I consider to be good and sufficient reasons.

The Senator is a great libertarian. I believe I have demonstrated time and time again that my objectives are the same as his. The Senator from New York and I are coauthors of a general amendment to the civil rights laws of this country which would end all Federal aid to any Federal program in which segregation exists.

I believe that is the sound way to proceed. It is a sound amendment, and it ought to be adopted as an amendment to the civil rights laws. I believe that in the not too distant future such an amendment will be adopted in the great civil rights debate that will be before the Senate.

I opposed an amendment 2 years ago, in connection with S. 1021, the general Federal aid bill, which would have had the same practical effect as the Senator's amendment today. I have opposed similar amendments since about 1947 or 1949 when a public housing bill was before the Senate. I sat on the Senator's side of the aisle at that time, and some of my distinguished Republican colleagues offered an amendment to the public housing law. It was known as a civil rights rider. The proponents of that amendment were different in one respect from the proponent of the pending amendment. They were really opposed to the public housing bill. I asked them whether, if the amendment were adopted, they would vote for the bill.

Of course, they are honest men, and they admitted that they would not do so.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In this instance the Senator was not in that same position; but the principle, I respectfully say, is the same, because, in spite of his statement, it is true that his amendment would kill the bill. The bill would never be passed by the Senate with such an amendment added to it. I am going to be a realist. In my capacity as leader of the proponents of the bill, I owe a responsibility to the undertrained in this country, to the boys and girls in this country who need the benefits of the pending bill; and we should not penalize them in connection with what amounts to a civil rights rider on the bill, when the real responsibility of Congress is to measure up to its overall obligation to pass an adequate civil rights law.

I believe we have a duty to enact the needed legislation, to get it on the books, and to reserve our civil rights fight for the major battle that is about to take place. I wish to quote from a statement made by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze, which appears on page 228 of the hearings. Secretary Celebrezze was testifying, and was interrogated by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]:

> Senator PROUTY. Would you object if a provision were included in the bill which would be applicable to all times which would forbid funds authorized to be appropriated under this act to be sent into a State where racial discrimination existed?
>
> Secretary CELEBREZZE. Senator, I would give you the same answer as we gave you on the youth employment bill, and as I stated in my opening statement, I don't believe that education should be depended on to solve all the sins of the world, and that we should attack that by a frontal bill, and we should leave that to a civil rights bill such as has been introduced by Senator CLARK, because I am convinced that if such a provision goes in a bill we will get no bill. That has been our experience.
>
> So through the action that the administration has taken, through the lawsuits that it has filed in four or five cases, through the fact that there is pending before this distinguished body bills which deal directly with the problem, I would suggest that it be omitted from this bill.

A majority of the committee voted accordingly. I do not need to tell my friend the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] what I suffered in disagreeing with him on a matter of procedure in the handling of a civil rights subject; but that is the real difference. This is basically a procedural difference. Is this the time and place to conduct a major civil rights debate in the Senate, to the sacrifice of educational benefits for tens of thousands of young people all over the country who will benefit from the bill if we succeed in passing it, but whose benefits would be lost if the bill failed of passage? I think not.

I also point out that this is a wide, encompassing bill. The bill includes impacted area legislation; but it includes also national defense education amendments; and it includes vocational education. I do not reflect upon the good senses of the Senator from New York; I merely disagree with him in this instance. I say that good commonsense dictates the course of action I have suggested.

I shall not move to table the Senator's amendment until the Senator from New York has had full opportunity to make his argument. He knows that we have tried to persuade each other, but that it is hopeless. We are nonpersuadable, so far as the changing of our positions is concerned. We are going to have to count it out in the Senate on the motion to lay the Senator's amendment on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. First, there is a distinction between what I am trying to do with respect to this bill and what I have tried to do in connection with other programs, such as the youth employment and mental health programs, and others. It is necessary to offer this amendment, and I have so drawn it in this particular instance, in order to give authority to the HEW to do what it is doing for children who live on the base, namely, build schools and otherwise provide for their schooling. This is affirmative action, not merely the negative action of withholding the funds; although I believe the withholding of funds could just as effectively accomplish the purpose. I do not believe schools are going to persist in their practices if important elements of support are withheld from them. Nonetheless, if this amendment should be adopted in this case, it would allow the HEW to do what it is actually doing for the children on base. This amendment would correct a very serious discrimination within the Federal Establishment.

Children who live on base fare differently from children who live off base. Some—10 percent of them—are going to nonsegregated schools because they have to live on a base; some go to segregated schools—90 percent of them, because they are unfortunate enough to live off base.

The fundamental argument against the amendment is that the program will go down the drain. Is not that the very reason why it has been possible to frustrate and kill civil rights legislation on the floor of the Senate? It is always considered by itself, not in relation to things which are of vital interest. Hence, Senators who oppose civil rights bills with a filibuster—and they are a minority—can always have an edge over the rest of us, because we are fighting the battle. Yet they are ahead; they lose nothing. If they defeat the legislation, they defeat it. If they do not, they do not. They do not lose anything in the substantive program; whereas in this program, they do lose something. This is one case where they can lose something by defeating the bill. Yet we always shy away.

For how long are we going to submit to the tyranny of a minority? That is exactly what it is. There is just as much tyranny, as history has shown for a century, in a minority as there can be in a majority.

The final and very important point of difference is this: It is beyond me to understand why one of the President's departments, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has to follow a policy of dissent, for that is what it comes down to. In the Department of Agriculture there is some dissent, but the consequences are not so great. In the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare it is very great.

The situation does not exist in the Department of Defense, in the Post Office Department, or any other Government department. The Department of Defense is the most salient example. Consider the attack mounted against the Department of Defense because of Secretary McNamara's directive with respect to off-base facilities. That Department has not budged an inch. That Department is right. I hope it does not budge an inch and will stick to its guns.

But HEW is a Department that runs a government within a government. The President cannot avoid responsibility for it. The members of his party cannot avoid responsibility for it.

The President was not afraid to make a housing order, not so comprehensive as it should have been, but quite a sweeping order. He made it. Why do we have to bridle at a proposal which affects children and would direct the payment of taxpayers' money into totally new programs? Why must the President be looking over his shoulder to see what is happening in the Southern States on this matter? Why did he, after a time, issue the housing order? In a sense, equality in this instance is even more crucial, because it involves direct payments by the Federal Government to State agencies which are segregated. Under the housing order, Federal credit or Federal insurance was generally involved, which is pretty potent, but it is not getting money on the barrelhead.

For all these reasons, and with great regret, I feel that this battle has to be fought. The minority party has a duty. I am a member of the minority party. The minority has a duty to expose, and a duty to propose constructive alternatives. The minority would not be doing its duty otherwise. It could go down to defeat 50 times. It could go down to defeat but could ultimately prevail. In my judgment, the minority would not be doing its duty unless it exposed this situation, which is what I am doing today. I am trying to point out where the duty lies, where the responsibility lies, and what must be done, particularly in light of the dangerous situation which exists in the country today.

We are not living in the 1940's or the 1950's; we are living in 1963, when bombings, raids, and disorders are occurring, with great fear of more to come. Thus it is our duty to do whatever we can to make certain that justice is done, in order to avoid dread consequences. That is my argument.

If the Senator from Oregon is ready to move to table my amendment, I should like to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Am I entitled to a quorum call?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall ask that there be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side.

If I ever committed murder—God forbid—the attorney I would like to have would be the Senator from New York; but he would be defending a guilty party.

I feel, somewhat, that that is the best answer I can make to his argument, which I consider to be the wrong side of this case. The Senator pointed out that the Southern States receive a great benefit under the impacted-area legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table that appears on page 22 of the committee report, entitled "Public Law 874; Appropriations, fiscal year 1962."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public Law 874: Appropriations, fiscal year 1962

Category and State:	*1962*[1]
Appropriations	$247,000,000
Total entitlements	[1]246,633,498
Net entitlements:	
Alabama	5,349,576
Alaska	6,808,231
Arizona	5,189,876
Arkansas	1,428,031
California	42,033,957
Colorado	7,163,724
Connecticut	2,457,392
Delaware	259,832
Florida	6,215,166
Georgia	5,592,672
Hawaii	4,938,280
Idaho	1,918,609
Illinois	4,352,845
Indiana	1,282,105
Iowa	$832,826
Kansas	5,838,375
Kentucky	1,472,530
Louisiana	964,454
Maine	2,062,810
Maryland	9,461,446
Massachusetts	7,131,493
Michigan	1,918,719
Minnesota	501,835
Mississippi	1,840,855
Missouri	2,724,784
Montana	2,186,652
Nebraska	2,757,568
Nevada	1,569,402
New Hampshire	1,320,536
New Jersey	5,974,390
New Mexico	5,172,539
New York	6,058,625
North Carolina	2,781,324
North Dakota	916,227
Ohio	5,615,602
Oklahoma	7,490,344
Oregon	1,176,678
Pennsylvania	5,096,775
Rhode Island	2,218,765
South Carolina	3,809,630
South Dakota	2,425,471
Tennessee	2,511,403
Texas	13,981,061
Utah	2,257,324
Vermont	57,533
Virginia	15,559,386
Washington	9,911,802
West Virginia	141,120
Wisconsin	702,584
Wyoming	931,349
Guam	188,432
Virgin Islands	71,150
Payments to Federal agencies	13,379,770

[1] May be changed on basis of additional information.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I call attention to the amounts of money that States which are not Southern States receive:

Alaska, $7 million; California, $42 million; Colorado, $7 million; Connecticut, $2 million; Oklahoma, $7 million; New York, $6 million; Oregon, $1½ million.

Mr. President, these are substantial sums that go to States that are not Southern States.

Last of all, let me point out that it is a mistake to believe that a school district that gets impacted area money does not make a contribution in return. In fact, the impacted area money, school district by school district, is only a small proportion of the total amount of taxes paid in each district.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I repeat what I have said many times—namely, that as a matter of legislative policy and sound procedure, I am opposed—and have been opposed for years—to all civil rights riders to substantive legislation. In my judgment, that is not the way to handle civil rights legislation. The way to handle it is to enact a civil rights law, not to proceed by way of this piecemeal approach, because the latter will only result in the death of the legislation that is sorely needed for the benefit of people from coast to coast, and from north to south. Surely that would be the result.

Mr. President, I have been requested by a number of Senators who wish to be called to the Chamber—and I wish to enable them to use whatever time remains—to request a quorum call at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] desires 2 minutes. I yield 2 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the efforts of the Federal Government to enforce school desegregation are handicapped by the contradictory policies and practices of various Government departments. In practical terms, the Department of Justice is bringing lawsuits to enjoin practices financed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In moral terms, the commitment of the Federal Government to the principle of nondiscrimination in publicly supported programs is undermined by continued Federal subsidization of segregation in just such programs.

Strong speeches and eloquent appeals to Governors, mayors, and even operators of private businesses are all to the good. Statements that desegregation is morally as well as legally wrong have my complete approval. But these pronouncements would have much more impact if the Federal Government practiced more faithfully what it preaches so vigorously.

The standard set by the Federal Government has been far from satisfactory. The impacted areas program is only one example, but it is typical of the reluctant, confusing, and contradictory approach of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other agencies to this problem.

There are at this very moment schools adjacent to military installations which are built, maintained, and operated almost entirely with Federal funds which wholly exclude Negro children. The Commission on Civil Rights in its recent report cites one case in which the children of Negro servicemen at an Air Force base near Montgomery, Ala., are excluded from a nearby school which not only is operated with Federal funds, but which was built on property deeded by the Federal Government to the school district.

It is disgraceful to subject an American serviceman to such humiliating treatment. Negro servicemen do not choose their posts, and they certainly have nothing to do with the Defense Department's decision to station more than 46 percent of all Armed Forces personnel in the United States in 17 States which maintain segregated school facilities. The use of Federal tax funds to support discrimination against the dependents of men who may be asked to risk their lives for their country, is indefensible by any standard of right and wrong.

It is said that some progress has been made since the Secretary of HEW announced in March 1962, that segregated schools would not be considered suitable for children who reside on Federal property. But only a small percentage of dependents live on Government property, and as of last month, the policy announced by the Secretary of HEW more than a year ago has affected only 26 of the 242 segregated school districts where children reside on Federal property and attend schools in the community.

The amendment which is now pending would extend this requirement of nondiscrimination to all schools in impacted areas constructed or maintained with Federal funds. Actually, there should be no need for such an amendment, since the President already has ample authority to require a policy of nondiscrimination in the expenditure of all Federal tax funds. The Commission on Civil Rights has recommended specifically that the President use this power in the impacted school program, and I strongly endorse this recommendation.

The requirement of nondiscrimination in tax-supported schools will not be affected by our action on this amendment. This obligation stems directly from the Constitution, and neither the refusal of Congress to give it legislative expression or the President to give it practical application can alter the situation.

But we do have an opportunity today to reaffirm our commitment to constitutional principles and to compel a reluctant department to carry out the command of equal protection. An affirmtutional principles and to compel a rejection of any attempt to table it will evidence our determination to face up to the civil rights crisis facing our Nation. Billions already have been spent on this form of aid to education. This investment in education is an investment in the future of our country. By adopting this amendment, we can make certain that all the children of America, regardless of their race, enjoy the benefits of this program, due them as a matter of right and justice.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds to thank my colleague from New York for his support, which is typical of the fight which he has been making in the Senate in the monumental struggle for civil rights. If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] wishes to make a motion, I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the reasons I have already stated in the debate in answer to my friend from New York in opposition to his amendment, for the reasons set forth in the committee hearings, and in the light of the overwhelming majority vote in our committee against the Javits amendment, I move that the amendment of the Senator from New York be laid on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Engle]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 35, as follows:

[No. 185 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Walters
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—35

Aiken
Allott
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
McIntyre
Mechem
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—11

Case
Curtis
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Johnston
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Nelson
Tower

So Mr. Morse's motion to lay on the table Mr. Javits' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer amendments to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. It is proposed on page 69, between lines 5 and 6, to insert the following:

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 15 of such Act is amended in the third sentence by striking out "and (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) for one year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which occurred the sale or transfer thereof by the United States, any property considered prior to such sale or transfer to be Federal property for the purposes of this Act, and (C)".

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

On page 69, line 6, to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 69, between lines 12 and 13, to insert the following:

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out "housing" in clause (B) of the third sentence.

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

On page 69, line 13, to strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 69, line 17, after "shall" to insert a comma and the following: "except as otherwise provided,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Connecticut yield to himself?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time would the Senator like?

Mr. DODD. About 5 or 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is in control of the time in favor of his amendment. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. DODD. Seven minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the amendment would lessen the impact on school districts of the sale of Government-owned property to private interests.

My amendment would redefine the meaning of "real property" under Public Law 874 which presently offers relief to school districts 1 year beyond the sale of Government-owned housing property to private buyers. I feel this provision should apply to the sale of Government-owned industrial and nonhousing property as well.

The problem which this amendment remedies was originally brought to my attention by the sale, consummated last December, of a number of Government-owned buildings in the Electric Boat Co. compound in Groton, Conn.

The sale of this property had an immediate and devastating effect on the city of Groton and 20 other Connecticut towns where Federal impacted aid was based, in part, on this Government-owned property now in the hands of private owners.

The economic crisis was felt immediately, as anticipated Federal aid was based on the attendance of schoolchildren of federally connected workers as of October 1962. The sale took place after many delays, changes, and modifications, and resulted in an immediate reduction in aid to be received.

Mr. President, it is readily apparent that this property now in the hands of the Electric Boat Co. will be taxed by the city of Groton. However, the tax assessed is not computed until the next tax year, and will not approximate the Federal school aid formerly received when these buildings were Government-owned. Of course, the other towns affected will receive no relief from this property tax revenue.

I feel that the present law discriminates in its definition of "real property" and in the extent of its aid coverage following the sale of such property.

In many instances where there was a sale or disposal of Federal property, the program which caused the increase in workers and their families continues on and the burden on the schools and their facilities is in no way lessened by the sale.

This is certainly true in this case.

The amount of Federal aid, moreover, is markedly reduced without a corresponding increase in taxes assessed against the property sold.

In 1956 an amendment was inserted in Public Law 874 which stated that the provision of the law applied:

> For 1 year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which occurred the sale or transfer thereof by the United States, any housing property considered prior to such sale or transfer to be Federal property for the purposes of the act.

This clause offers partial protection to school districts with a preponderance of "housing property," but offers no relief when the Government property sold is nonhousing. This is precisely what has happened in the sale of this property to the Electric Boat Co., in Groton.

As I have said, this sale has had an immediate and serious economic effect on the school budget of Groton and 20 surrounding towns. These towns and cities, dependent to a large extent on Federal aid to impacted areas, had no way of planning because the sale of these buildings took over a year to consummate.

Mr. President, situations of this type are, of course, not restricted to the State of Connecticut and they can and will occur in many towns and cities throughout the United States as the Federal Government is called upon to dispose of Federal nonhousing property at its installations.

Some might say that relief can be sought under subsection (f) of Public Law 874, "Adjustment for Certain Decreases in Federal Activities." A measure of relief may be possible to some of the towns affected but not to all of them. At the present time, even though the sale of this property took place almost a year ago, eligibility for aid under this subsection has not been determined as yet and the various school districts are suffering because of this further delay and uncertainty.

Of course there is no such relief provision under Public Law 815 and school construction plans for several towns have had to be curtailed because of reduced Federal school aid brought about by the sale of the property.

I feel that striking out the word "housing" and thus making all property eligible for relief extension and permitting the payment of aid benefits "for 1 year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which the sale or transfer occurs" is only simple justice and wise economics in that it provides for intelligent planning and lessens the overall impact of the property sale on the towns concerned.

I submit this amendment at this time and request and solicit the support of my colleagues for an affirmative vote on it.

I think it is an equitable and fair solution to this problem, and I earnestly hope that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon will look favorably on my amendment and accept it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I reply to the Senator from Connecticut, I wish to do two things. First, I should like to make brief comment on the procedural situation confronting us. Many of our colleagues have asked me what the schedule of amendments for the rest of the afternoon is. Some Senators have a very important engagement downtown at 4 o'clock. I have assured them that I will do all I can to protect their interests. I should like to ask now what amendments will be offered. I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] intends to offer an amendment. Does any Senator know whether the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] will press an amendment?

So far as I know at the present moment, the only amendment that remains is the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Therefore I should say that we shall probably be through by 4 o'clock. Of course, no one can predict what will happen, but I hope we may get through in time so that our colleagues can keep their downtown appointment.

Second, I promised to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. I yield 12 minutes to him.

THE PROBLEM OF CUBA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the problem of Cuba is urgent. Ignoring it will not make it go away. It lies at the heart of U.S. and hemispheric security.

Communist Cuba is no mere nuisance beneath the notice of a great power like the United States. It is a menace, a privileged base for the systematic subversion of every free government in the Americas. It symbolizes our weak and vacillating foreign policy everywhere. It is the anvil on which is being shattered our image as a great and responsible nation dedicated to freedom.

I know that nothing bores so much as yesterday's crises, nor captures our full attention like today's new sensation. But Cuba is not just yesterday's crisis; it is today's crisis and unless we do something about it, it will be tomorrow's crisis—a crisis which we may not then be able to overcome.

Make no mistake about it, the situation is continuing and dangerous, and the hard facts are not being adequately presented to the American public.

We hear, for example, a great deal these days about Soviet fishing trawlers. There has been considerable discussion of their encroachments on nearby fishing grounds, but very little of the fact that many of them operate in and out of Cuba.

A recently issued report of the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the House Armed Services Committee states: "More than a dozen seagoing Russian trawlers of the *Okean* class make regular round trips between the North Atlantic fishing banks and Cuba." The report further states that naval and Coast Guard witnesses had agreed in testimony before the committee that these ships "could be landing or picking up spies or saboteurs or smuggling military items and that this could be done with little chance of detection in the landing or picking up operations."

There are also reports of a Soviet subsidized Cuban "fishing fleet"—a fleet which grows larger as the supplies of fish available in Cuban markets grow smaller. Can this be a red herring fleet?

This past May 11, the Cuban Consolidated Naval Construction Enterprise reportedly announced that it had budgeted $15 million to build 88 ships, 70 of which were to be of the Lamba 75 type. The Lamba 75, with a 29.5-ton cargo capacity and a 250-horsepower engine is an ideal vehicle for subversive operations.

Then there are reports of paratroopers being trained at sea, of a Russian tanker based at Georgetown, British Guiana, to supply fuel for Soviet and Cuban vessels in that area, of arms being transshipped through British Guiana, of Castro-inspired violence in Venezuela and Colombia, of Castroite guerrillas attempting to enter Bolivia, of training schools for subversion and revolution being set up all over Cuba.

On July 26 in a speech which received little notice in the United States, Castro proclaimed:

> The duty of the revolutionaries, of the Latin American revolutionaries, is not to wait for the change in the balance of power to produce the miracle of social revolution in Latin America, but to take the fullest advantage of everything favoring the revolutionary movement and make revolutions.

Then this Soviet puppet practically pinpointed some of the targets, when he said:

> And what are the political situations in these countries—Peru, Colombia, Argentina, Paraguay, Venezuela, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador? Complete lack of stability, where the governing classes no longer control. We know by experience, and by conviction, that every people that does what the Cuban people has done will have the decided support of the Soviet Union and all the Socialist camp.

Soviet and Cuban fishing fleets are obviously trafficking in a good deal more than fish in the Western Hemisphere's troubled waters.

Let us raise the curtain of silence, face the hard facts of Cuba, and the intrinsic relation of these facts to our whole sagging foreign policy.

Last October the Soviet presence in Cuba was branded as "unacceptable"; to this day, the Soviet occupation forces remain.

Last October, the continued existence in this hemisphere of an advance base of Communist imperialism was labeled "unthinkable"; today, the administration flatly refuses to disavow eventual coexistence with a Red-dominated Cuba.

Last October the President pledged the solemn commitment of U.S. honor, U.S. will, and U.S. policy to the goal of Cuba's liberation; yet Castro's Communist tyranny becomes more deeply entrenched with every passing day.

History may well record our time as one characterized by brave words and timid deeds unless we once again shoulder our responsibilities and go about the not always comfortable business of world leadership.

Ratification of the partial nuclear test ban treaty does not sweep away grievous problems such as Soviet Cuba.

Administration spokesmen answer public and congressional concern over Cuba with one stock debate stopper. What would you have us do, they ask, go to war? Discussion is then shrouded in a mushroom cloud of self-righteous horror. Yet there are alternatives, constructive alternatives short of war to our present course. Since mid-June my distinguished colleagues, Mr. MORTON, of Kentucky; Mr. ALLOTT, of Colorado; Mr. CURTIS, of Nebraska; Mr. MUNDT, of South Dakota; Mr. DOMINICK, of Colorado; Mr. HRUSKA, of Nebraska; Mr. BENNETT, of Utah; Mr. PEARSON, of Kansas; and Mr. SIMPSON, of Wyoming, have all offered on this floor not only specific criticisms of present policy but specific proposals for effective action short of war, action calculated to launch the process of Cuba's liberation from Castro and Soviet military occupation.

They include a proposal for formation of a provisional government around which all the forces of a free Cuba might rally; proposals for a leakproof pacific blockade against all strategic traffic; for a quarantine to isolate Cuba as a base for Communist subversion; for the imposition of tough penalties against all blockade runners; for preparations for the rehabilitation of Cuba after Castro and Soviet occupation; and for a no-quarter political and psychological offensive against Castroism and world Communist aggression—all reinforced by the unequivocal demand for an immediate end to the Soviet occupation of Cuba and, thus, of the Western Hemisphere.

The response to these proposals has been almost total silence. As far as the administration and its apologists are concerned, our discussion of alternatives to inaction have been entirely ignored.

How can we account for this silence—rationally, within the bounds of substantial evidence, and beyond the confines of sheer partisan advantage?

One explanation might run in terms of electoral politics—but its implications are almost too shocking to contemplate.

It is true though that despite weeks and months of prior warning, missile sites were "discovered" in Cuba only in late September 1962. This was followed by the hastily devised "quarantine" which was successfully mounted in October. The Soviets, eyeball to eyeball, blinked first—or was it a knowing wink—just in time for the 1962 congressional elections.

An administration bent on electioneering the promise of Cuban liberation next year might well be impatient with solid proposals for Cuba's liberation and rehabilitation made this year and a damper on all serious debate and discussion would be its logical reaction. Are they being advised:

> Let us put Cuba in the deep freeze until we can come up with big fireworks, with startling promises of 1965 action, to be unveiled in the fall of 1964?

I do not believe that this temptation will be implemented, since it would be so contrary to our continuing security. But what then is the explanation? Could it be that the administration is in truth as timid, indecisive, and vacillating as it seems to be? Cuba would not be the only case in point, it would simply be the most serious in a long list—a list including Laos, Berlin, the decline of the Atlantic Alliance, India's seizure of Goa, and the United Arab Republic's aggression in Yemen.

But the anvil on which our prestige and position are being shattered is Cuba.

For a great Nation such as ours to tolerate the armed intrusion of an expansionist power so close to its own shores cannot help weakening our position throughout the world.

Those who question our intentions in Latin America are certainly not reassured by our appeasement of Castro.

Those who question our resolution over Berlin cannot be reassured by our lack of resolution over Cuba.

Those who question our staying power in southeast Asia are not reassured by Cuba.

Those who question our intentions in the Middle East are not reassured by our accommodation with tyranny in Cuba.

We must recast our Cuban policy into the encompassing frame of the worldwide struggle with communism before we can fairly come to grips with all the issues which daily bedevil us. We must not be taken in by the mounting chorus of the experts, the so-called Kremlinologists, that because of the partial test ban treaty and Soviet troubles with Red China, Khrushchev is so affably ready to do business with us, that U.S. concessions are in order.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev to tear down the Berlin wall.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev to remove his occupation troops from Cuba.

I have heard no offer from Khrushchev for real and meaningful disarmament.

I have heard no renunciation by Khrushchev of the Communist goal of world domination.

Instead we hear talk of U.S. troop withdrawals which would weaken our position in Europe, of nonaggression pacts which would legitimize the Soviet's World War II conquests, and of some new-found respectability on the part of the butchers of Budapest.

Mr. Khrushchev's hand controls the cold war thermostat, and all he seems to have to do is tap it up a degree or so and we glow as if bathed in the sunlight of a new era. Personally, I do not believe this sun will burn so warmly as to give us a lasting tan.

It is true that there have been changes in Soviet tactics, postures, and images. The time and mode of our "burial" has possibly been altered. But who can soberly conclude that the grave has been filled in? The Soviet Communist Party declared in its reply to Chinese Communist criticism published in Izvestia this past July 14: "We fully stand for the destruction of imperialism and capitalism. We not only believe in the inevitable destruction of capitalism but are doing everything for this to be accomplished as soon as possible."

Is there more than one explanation of this declaration of policy?

Yet, so many of our officials and opinionmakers walk and talk amidst the delusions of their own inflated hopes, apparently assuming that our roadmaps for the future and Khrushchev's are interchangeable.

Though some of the milestones, such as Cuba, seem to be all too similar and all too dangerous for the United States, our desired destinations are still poles apart. The clash of basic principles, whether we wish to recognize it or not, is still very real and this fact must be reinserted into our strategic calculations before we relax ourselves into Mr. Khrushchev's burial ground.

We cannot make the hard decisions required of U.S. foreign policy on the basis of talk of a "good atmosphere" or a "new climate." One observer has termed this the science of "meteorological diplomacy." Aristophanes depicted similar political follies as "Cloudcoocooland."

I have always been intrigued by the mysteries of the universe, but when it comes to the diplomacy of the United States, I believe that the basis should be eternal principle and national interest—not stargazing—and certainly not Red stargazing.

To wait is to suffer later. To plan—and to act upon a plan—should be the order of the day.

Let us delay no longer on the menace of Cuba, 90 miles near. Let us give serious consideration to the proposals which have been offered here in the Senate, and let us hope sincerely that our foreign policymakers will stop ignoring serious proposals for our security and will formulate now a course of real and meaningful action in the national interest.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania upon his speech with respect to the Cuban question and for calling the situation to the attention of the Senate again. There is no question, as shown by events, that the Cuban question is still foremost in the minds of the American people. Until the administration has spelled out a policy for the Nation and gives indication that it has such a policy and will pursue it, the people will be left in a quandary concerning our purposes and aims in Latin America.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his remarks.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to add my commendation of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I commend him particularly for raising the question of fishing boats, which the Russians obviously are using, in my opinion, for the sole purpose of mapping the underwater territories off our coasts, for military use at a later date.

I have spoken on two occasions about the military buildup in Cuba. To me, it is extremely serious. Information is reaching us constantly, from a variety of sources, concerning this problem. One of the better articles I have read is contained in a column entitled "Huge Soviet Missile Complex in Cuba," written by Daniel James, and published in the Denver Post of September 17, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Huge Soviet Missile Complex in Cuba

(By Daniel James)

Washington.—Russian guided missiles are still in Cuba some of them secreted in tunnels located in the Province nearest the United States, Pinar del Rio, according to sources inside Cuba.

The Russians are said to have dug five big tunnels at La Gobernadora Hills, near the main Cuban base at Mariel, in Pinar del Rio. It was at Mariel, just down the coast from Havana, that Khrushchev landed most of the missiles that precipitated the crisis last October.

The La Gobernadora tunnels are 105 feet wide—wide enough for two-way traffic—and have reinforced ceilings 30 feet high. A Castro army lieutenant who has defected, and who personally toured the tunnels during their construction, reports that at least two of them penetrate La Gobernadora for a distance of 6 miles.

One tunnel has been air-conditioned for the storage of nuclear warheads, and another equipped with refrigerating equipment for storing liquid oxygen used for ballistic missiles, according to sources inside Cuba.

Furthermore, add those sources, electrical systems have been installed at the nearby base of Meseta de Anafe, and those systems are in turn connected with the guided-missile centers at La Gobernadora as well as the big horseshoe-shaped military complex around Havana.

Pinar del Rio, it should be kept in mind, commands the Florida Straits. It has become the site of a great new Soviet military complex, say informants recently out of Cuba, with Russian Army GHQ located at La Gobernadora.

Another part of western Cuba where missiles are reportedly being stored is the Isle of Pines, just across the Gulf of Batabano from Pinar del Rio.

Fresh information indicates that the main Soviet installation on the Isle of Pines is at the Bay of Siguanea, and is manned by an estimated 2,000 Soviet soldiers and technicians armed with the following:

SAM air-to-ground missiles, land-to-sea missiles, underground strategic missiles, Komar rocket-launching vessels, plus such conventional weapons as tanks and artillery.

Also at Siguanea, according to underground sources, is a large submarine base under construction. It is said to consist of sub pens, still in construction, similar to those built by the Germans at their famous Kiel naval base during World War II.

The Soviet military complex in Pinar del Rio is, literally, so complex that the Russians had to build an intricate communications system to maintain contact with all their forces there. The system was built underground, it is said, and connects La Gobernadora with these other bases: San Julian airbase (MIG 21's), San Diego de los Banos, Soroa, Villanueva, Gramma, Finca Suset, and Meseta de Anafe.

"Pinar del Rio has been converted into one immense Soviet military camp," claim resistance leaders in Cuba.

A Russian military construction-supply center near Mariel alone extends for almost 3 miles, says a freedom fighter now in the United States, Gustavo Pernas Calva. "It is visible to any traveler from Havana to Pinar del Rio."

Mariel itself is wholly under Soviet military control, according to a man who formerly belonged to the office of the Chief of Staff of the Cuban Navy, Juan Guerra Fernandez. He reports that about 1,200 Cuban Navy personnel were discharged from Mariel recently and replaced by Russians—a move that completed Soviet control of the base.

One purpose for that control is that the Soviets are intent on protecting their great construction-supply center nearby, which consists of foundries, a cement plant, and a thermoelectric plant in the final stages of construction.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expend the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by my distinguished senior colleague from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. He has presented to the Senate a real problem, which affects not only the Groton and New London area of Connecticut, but other areas, as well, which might be similarly situated. The amendment is worthy of the support of all Members of this body. I hope the amendment will prevail.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, and 27 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the bill, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 2436) to amend section 101 (18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 2436) to amend section 101(18) of title 38, United States Code, to permit the furnishing of benefits to certain individuals conditionally discharged or released from active military, naval, or air service, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Georgia desires to call up a conference report. I yield to him, with the understanding that the time will not be charged to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee of conference agreed on appropriations totaling $47,220,010,000 for the various military programs and activities of the Department of Defense, exclusive of military construction, family housing, civil defense, and military assistance. This total is $119,697,000 under the Senate bill, which totaled $47,339,707,000; and $138,001,000 over the House bill, which totaled $47,082,009,000.

The Conference Committee total of $47,220,010,000 is $1,794,227,000 under the budget estimates of $49,014,237,000, and $1,130,072,500 under appropriations totaling $48,350,082,500 for fiscal year 1963. However, when the 1963 appropriation is adjusted to exclude $467,300,000 provided for the support of military family housing, which is not included in the pending bill, the decrease under appropriations for fiscal year 1963 is $662,772,500.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record at conclusion of my remarks a tabulation giving the amount of the 1963 appropriation, 1964 budget estimate, House allowance, Senate allowance, and conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill, and a tabulation giving the same information by titles of the bill and organizational component.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with respect to title I, Personnel, the committee of conference agreed on transfers from various working capital funds to the military personnel appropriations totaling $325 million. The House bill provided for transfers totaling $547 million, and the Senate bill included $300 million from these sources.

The conferees on the part of both Houses were in complete agreement that the programed end strengths of 975,000 for the Army, 670,000 for the Navy, 190,000 for the Marine Corps, and 860,000 for the Air Force were to be maintained. The Department of Defense has assured me, by letter of October 4, 1963, that these programed strengths will be maintained. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Deputy Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1963.
Hon. Richard B. Russell,
Chairman, Department of Defense Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Department of Defense appropriation bill as passed by the Senate recommended, in connection with the military personnel appropriations of the services, that the additional funds in the amount of $247 million, made available for transfer by the House to the military personnel appropriations from revolving funds, be retained in the revolving funds. The Department of Defense considers this action to be prudent and necessary. We fully concur in the statement in the Senate committee report, "* * * any transfers from the revolving funds in addition to those indicated in the budget estimates would jeopardize the programed actions of the revolving funds in fiscal year 1964." This was expanded upon in my presentation made to your committee on August 20, 1963.

In response to your request, if the military personnel appropriations of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force are passed in the amounts contained in the Senate bill, I assure you that the Department of Defense will, as we understand it to be the intent of the Congress, carry out the military personnel program of the active forces and in the programed strengths as presented by the Department of Defense and the services in the course of the hearings on this bill, and as indicated in the justifications submitted to the committees of the House and the Senate. It would be our intent to carry out this program without a change in program, but at the same time, to practice every available economy in doing so.

In the event that the funds appropriated are subsequently determined to be inadequate to defray the minimum costs of the previously stated programs, it would then be our intent to submit in the usual manner a request for supplemental appropriations, supported by detailed information indicating the added requirement. This we believe to be the intent of both the House and the Senate with which we fully concur and recommend as the course of action to be subscribed to by the conferees on the Department of Defense appropriation bill, 1964.

Sincerely,

Roswell Gilpatric.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in the other action in title I, the House conferees agreed to the appropriation of an additional $2,500,000 provided by the Senate for needed National Guard training and schooling. The conferees also agreed to the Senate language providing that the Army Reserve and Army National Guard will be programed to attain an end strength of 300,000 and 400,000, respectively.

In title II, operation and maintenance, the conference agreed insofar as "Operation and maintenance, Army" is concerned, to restore $1,750,000 of the House reduction for the maintenance of noncombat vehicles; the full budget request for field exercises; and $4,821,000 of the unspecified reductions made by the House.

For "Operation and maintenance, Navy" the conference agreed to provide the full amount for necessary surface missile and equipment rework and $5,600,000 of the unspecified reductions made by the House. Partial restoration of $325,000 was made for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps."

For "Operation and maintenance, Air Force" it was agreed to restore $2,500,000 of the House reduction for maintenance of noncombat vehicles and $12 million in unspecified reductions.

An additional $4,200,000 provided by the Senate for Army National Guard technicians and repair parts was approved.

In title III, procurement, for "Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army," the conferees agreed to the Senate action restoring $3,900,000 for instrument training helicopters and to the Senate reduction of $31,700,000 in the aircraft program.

For the Navy, the conferees agreed to restore the House reduction of $11,700,000 for the T–2B trainer aircraft but disallowed the Senate restorations for the EA6A Intruder aircraft and the TC–4B Gulfstream trainer. With respect to the disallowance of funds for the procurement of the EA6A electronic reconnaissance aircraft, the committee of conference made it clear that the program recently submitted to the Congress for the modification of existing A6A aircraft to perform this mission shall proceed with available funds. The Senate conferees agreed to accept the House action in regard to a reduction in labor and material cost increases in "Shipbuilding and conversion" for which the Senate had restored $8,500,000. The Senate reduction of $20,500,000 for the proposed roll on/roll off cargo vessel was agreed to.

For the procurement programs of the Air Force, the conferees agreed to the Senate action restoring $25 million for the RF–4C reconnaissance aircraft; $16,175,000 for the HC–130E aircraft program; $10 million for funds in lieu of recoupments and so-called free assets in two appropriations; and $9,500,000 for programs, previously deferred, but now approved. For the C–141 aircraft program, the conferees approved restoration of $15,500,000 of the House reduction of $25 million. The reduction is to be applied to the spare parts program and not to the procurement of aircraft.

In title IV, "Research, development, test, and evaluation," for the Army, the conferees approved Senate restorations for the defense communications satellite program and the Lance program, but stipulated that the latter restoration be offset by a reduction in an aircraft development program.

For the Air Force, the conferees approved a restoration of $7,230,000 for a classified project, and $30 million of the Senate increase of $60 million for the development of the mobile medium range ballistic missile.

With regard to general provisions, the House agreed to the Senate limitation of 20 percent on indirect expenses of research grants and to the Senate language in connection with ship repair, alteration, and conversion.

There were a couple of items on which the committee yielded most reluctantly and only after considerable discussion, but, generally speaking, I believe that that the conference report before the Senate represents the thinking of the Senate as previously discussed on the floor. In many areas of appropriations, I believe that it will require a belt-tightening consonant with the desire to provide the most defense for every dollar expended. On the other hand, however, I am certain that the defenses of our country will be strengthened during fiscal year 1964 and thereafter by the proper application of the funds provided.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. President, there is one amendment in disagreement.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7179, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
October 8, 1963.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, and 27 to the bill (H.R. 7179) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$2,059,589,000".

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 20.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

EXHIBIT 1.—*Appropriations for the Department of Defense, fiscal year 1964*

SUMMARY

Title	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Military personnel	$13,235,200,000	$12,848,200,000	$12,850,700,000	$12,850,700,000	−$384,500,000	+$2,500,000	
Title II—Operation and maintenance	11,792,237,000	11,678,337,000	11,741,030,000	11,714,033,000	−78,204,000	+35,696,000	−$26,997,000
Title III—Procurement	16,724,800,000	15,666,472,000	15,763,747,000	15,706,047,000	−1,018,753,000	+39,575,000	−57,700,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	7,262,000,000	6,889,000,000	6,984,230,000	6,949,230,000	−312,770,000	+60,230,000	−35,000,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:							
Army	12,579,628,000	12,095,563,000	12,117,106,000	12,105,534,000	−474,094,000	+9,971,000	−11,572,000
Navy	14,966,300,000	14,369,838,000	14,424,088,000	14,369,963,000	−596,337,000	+125,000	−54,125,000
Air Force	19,178,400,000	18,365,935,000	18,547,840,000	18,493,840,000	−684,560,000	+127,905,000	−54,000,000
Defense agencies	2,289,909,000	2,250,673,000	2,250,673,000	2,250,673,000	−39,236,000		
Total, Department of Defense	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Military personnel, Army	[1] $3,885,000,000	[2] $3,785,000,000	[1] $3,785,000,000	[1] $3,785,000,000	−$100,000,000		
Military personnel, Navy	[3] 2,676,000,000	[4] 2,614,000,000	[3] 2,614,000,000	[3] 2,614,000,000	−62,000,000		
Military personnel, Marine Corps	678,600,000	678,600,000	678,600,000	678,600,000			
Military personnel, Air Force	[5] 4,148,000,000	[6] 3,943,000,000	[5] 3,943,000,000	[7] 3,943,000,000	−250,000,000		
Reserve personnel, Army	210,100,000	210,100,000	210,100,000	210,100,000			
Reserve personnel, Navy	92,300,000	92,300,000	92,300,000	92,300,000			
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000			
Reserve personnel, Air Force	55,100,000	55,100,000	55,100,000	55,100,000			
National Guard personnel, Army	240,300,000	240,300,000	242,800,000	242,800,000	+2,500,000	+$2,500,000	
National Guard personnel, Air Force	58,300,000	58,300,000	58,300,000	58,300,000			
Retired pay, Defense	1,163,000,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	1,143,000,000	−20,000,000		
Total, title I—Military personnel	[8] 13,235,200,000	[9] 12,848,200,000	[8] 12,850,700,000	[10] 12,850,700,000	−384,500,000	+2,500,000	

[1] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[2] In addition, $190,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[3] In addition, $120,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[4] In addition, $147,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[5] In addition, $30,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[6] In addition, $210,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[7] In addition, $55,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[8] In addition, $300,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[9] In addition, $547,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[10] In addition, $325,000,000 to be derived by transfer.

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Operation and maintenance, Army	$3,395,200,000	$3,361,000,000	$3,375,643,000	$3,369,071,000	−$26,129,000	+$8,071,000	−$6,572,000
Operation and maintenance, Navy	2,934,000,000	2,905,000,000	2,919,200,000	2,913,600,000	−20,400,000	+8,600,000	−5,600,000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	192,300,000	191,000,000	191,650,000	191,325,000	−975,000	+325,000	−325,000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	4,385,000,000	4,341,000,000	4,370,000,000	4,355,500,000	−29,500,000	+14,500,000	−14,500,000
Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies	451,400,000	446,000,000	446,000,000	446,000,000	−5,400,000		
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	176,600,000	176,600,000	180,800,000	180,800,000	+4,200,000	+4,200,000	
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	222,700,000	222,700,000	222,700,000	222,700,000			
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army	528,000	528,000	528,000	528,000			
Claims, Defense	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000			
Contingencies, Defense	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000			
Court of Military Appeals, Defense	509,000	509,000	509,000	509,000			
Total, title II—Operation and maintenance	11,792,237,000	11,678,337,000	11,741,030,000	11,714,033,000	−78,204,000	+35,696,000	−26,997,000

EXHIBIT 1.—*Appropriations for the Department of Defense, fiscal year 1964*—Continued

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	$3,202,000,000	$2,958,894,000	$2,931,094,000	$2,931,094,000	−$270,906,000	−$27,800,000	--------
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	3,066,000,000	2,877,445,000	2,928,845,000	2,889,145,000	−176,855,000	+11,700,000	−$39,700,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	2,310,000,000	2,080,089,000	2,068,089,000	2,059,589,000	−250,411,000	−20,500,000	−8,500,000
Other procurement, Navy	1,208,000,000	1,175,231,000	1,175,231,000	1,175,231,000	−32,769,000	--------	--------
Procurement, Marine Corps	207,700,000	201,960,000	201,960,000	201,960,000	−5,740,000	--------	--------
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	3,559,000,000	3,328,900,000	3,395,075,000	3,385,575,000	−173,425,000	+56,675,000	−9,500,000
Missile procurement, Air Force	2,177,000,000	2,129,490,000	2,141,990,000	2,141,990,000	−35,010,000	+12,500,000	--------
Other procurement, Air Force	951,500,000	871,299,000	878,299,000	878,299,000	−73,201,000	+7,000,000	--------
Procurement, Defense agencies	43,600,000	43,164,000	43,164,000	43,164,000	−436,000	--------	--------
Total, title III—procurement	16,724,800,000	15,666,472,000	15,763,747,000	15,706,047,000	−1,018,753,000	+39,575,000	−57,700,000

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimates	House	Senate
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army	$1,469,900,000	$1,363,141,000	$1,391,141,000	$1,386,141,000	−$83,759,000	+$23,000,000	−$5,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy	1,572,900,000	1,525,713,000	1,525,713,000	1,525,713,000	−47,187,000	--------	--------
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	3,621,800,000	3,416,146,000	3,483,376,000	3,453,376,000	−168,424,000	+37,230,000	−30,000,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies	447,400,000	434,000,000	434,000,000	434,000,000	−13,400,000	--------	--------
Emergency fund, Defense	[11] 150,000,000	[11] 150,000,000	[11] 150,000,000	[11] 150,000,000	--------	--------	--------
Total, title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	7,262,000,000	6,889,000,000	6,984,230,000	6,949,230,000	−312,770,000	+60,230,000	−35,000,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	49,014,237,000	47,082,009,000	47,339,707,000	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000	+138,001,000	−119,697,000

[11] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer from other appropriations.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the bill to strengthen and approve the vocational education program is one of the most important measures to come before the Senate in recent years. If it is approved by the Congress in the form reported by the Senate committee, I am confident that it will go down in history as one of the most significant achievements of this session. The need to update the Federal vocational education assistance program has been obvious for many years. I am pleased that the Congress is at last facing up to the problem of providing a system geared to the realities of our modern economy.

I have never been able to understand why the House of Representatives founders on a general aid to education bill and then gives overwhelming approval to specialized Federal aid measures. Every Member of the Congress knows that we have had Federal aid to education since the founding of the Republic—and we have it now in many shapes, forms, and fashions. But the House still refuses to approve the kind of bill that would enable the States to take care of educational problems peculiar to their systems. In the last fiscal year it is estimated that nearly $2 billion in Federal funds were expended for the support of education—ranging all the way from education of Indians to donations of surplus property to the States. In the 1962 fiscal year Arkansas' educational system benefited from nearly $20½ million in Federal aid. It is interesting to note that if the word "vocational" were struck from the title and the declaration of purpose of this bill it would not be far from being a general Federal aid bill.

If we had a strong program of Federal aid to education this bill would not be necessary. But it appears that this is the closest we will get anytime in the foreseeable future to providing meaningful Federal support for education, and I hope that it will pass the Senate by an overwhelming margin.

Edward T. Chase wrote in the April issue of Harpers:

> The biggest failure of American education is not its inability to produce more scientists than Russia. It is the way in which it is turning millions of young people into unemployables.

This is what this bill is designed to prevent. Any system that concentrates on training youth for work in agriculture when the experts say only 1 in 10 can hope to make an adequate living farming is badly in need of revision. We are wasting the Nation's most precious asset—its youth—by failing to recognize that the vocational demands of today are a far cry from those of 1917 when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. In 1920 each farmworker fed himself and 7 others—today he feeds 25. It took 276 hours to produce a bale of cotton in 1910—it takes about 55 today. As late as 1950 only 1 percent of the Arkansas cotton crop was harvested by machine; about 60 percent of this year's crops will be machine picked. Statistics leave little doubt that the job picture is changing constantly and we must make drastic revisions in our approach to vocational education if workers are to be available to fit the needs of tomorrow's economy. We will be doing a grave disservice to American youth by training them for no more than filling a reserved spot on the unemployment roles.

Technology has revolutionized every facet of our economy. The President's Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education pointed out in their recent report, as examples of changing job demands, that automatic elevators have displaced 40,000 operators in New York City and the Bureau of the Census used 50 statisticians in 1960 for tabulations that required 4,100 in 1950. Although automation and technological change hit both skilled and unskilled workers it is the unskilled, less educated worker who suffers the most. Ten percent of those who failed to finish elementary school are unemployed compared with a 2 percent rate for college graduates. In March 1962 64 percent of those unemployed failed to finish high school.

Anyone who doubts the seriousness of the youth employment problem which, of course, stems in large measure from a faulty educational system, should read the report of the President's Committee on Youth Employment. The Committee pointed out that 40 percent more young people will be seeking jobs during the 1960's than in the 1950's and if the current rate of unemployment persists we will have close to 1½ million unemployed young people by 1970. Of the young people who will enter the labor force between 1960 and 1970 nearly 30 percent will not have a high school education, 9 percent will have only a grade school education or less. These are sobering statistics and loaded with political dynamite unless we do a better job in preparing these young people to assume a useful place in society.

A look at the daily want ads shows that countless jobs remain unfilled while we have millions drawing relief or unemployment compensation. We do not have enough skilled workers to go around and the unskilled, uneducated worker is a drug on the market—and a burden on the economy. This is intolerable in a capitalistic society. The loss to our economy from those who fail to get an adequate education is subject to much guesswork. Dr. Walter Heller has estimated that $100 million is lost in lifetime earnings for each 1,000 young people who have the ability to graduate from college, but stop at high school. We cannot afford to let this kind of loss to the economy continue. Dr. Ginzberg of Columbia University said recently:

> Our economic system is misnamed. Capitalism suggests that the key factor in development is capital; actually it is the values, aspirations, and skills of people.

Unfortunately, there is little general appreciation of the investment character of education. If our society looked upon an investment in education in the same way we look upon an investment in physical capital I am sure there would be a sudden, dramatic increase in funds spent for education. Development of human capital, the key to the success of our form of government and any capitalistic economy, is relegated to a very low place on our national priorities totem pole.

Much attention has been focused recently on the school dropout problem and its relationship to the civil rights issue. There is little doubt that many of the grievances asserted by Negroes spring from educational and economic roots, not from deprivation of constitutional rights. Little can be done to improve the lot of the Negro—or the white—who has little education or no skill. In an economy where it has become cheaper to dig ditches by machine than manpower the ditchdigger faces a bleak future. Statistics exploring the composition of underprivileged America, white and black, always point to educational shortcomings.

It is only if we attack the underprivileged problem at its source in the schools, and in the training classes, that we will ever be able to make net gains in improving the lot of these unfortunates. Bigger jails, increased welfare payments, and higher unemployment compensation offers no permanent solution. The training programs that will be possible under this will equip our youth with skills fitted to the needs of society. It is much more economical to educate our youth for a meaningful role in society than to neglect them now and pay the unavoidable costs of social dereliction later.

As Walter Lippmann said on a recent television appearance you can always wait a few years to rebuild a slum or build a highway, but you cannot wait with education of children. He said:

> If you don't educate them, they'll be uneducated when they grow up, and they'll be the parents, uneducated parents, of the children who will be still less educated. So you get a thing that is a * * * vicious spiral downward.

This bill may not stop the spiral downward but it should at least slow it down.

The change made in the Senate bill to take into account the income level of the States in distribution of the grant funds improved the bill considerably. In the case of Arkansas it means about a one-third increase in grant funds based on the $108 million authorization for the first year—$1,288,920 as opposed to $951,145 under the formula of the House bill. As a Senator from a poor State I naturally have a somewhat selfish interest in insuring that our economic situation is taken into consideration in the formula. There are few Members of this body who would dispute the fact that the need is greater in underdeveloped States than is the case with the more industrialized States.

It is easy to understand one of the great difficulties in building Arkansas' economy when we consider the fact that, according to the 1960 census, 15 percent of her adults over 25 had less than 5 years of schooling compared to the Nation's average of 6.7 percent. More than 36 percent of the Negroes over 25 in Arkansas had less than 5 years of schooling, compared with the national average of 23.5 percent. Only 29 percent had a high school education. These educationally underprivileged are also economically underprivileged and offer little in helping to build a progressive economy. Many are—or will be—a burden on their skilled and more fortunate fellowmen. These unfortunates have found, or will find in the years ahead, that the world has passed them by—that a person with only his labor to sell has little, if anything, to sell. A substantial program of vocational education will go a long way toward insuring that Arkansas' young people, and those coming behind them, do not enter the working world with the same two strikes against them.

The committee action in adding the NEA and the impacted areas amendments is commendable. There is no question about the success of the programs authorized under the National Defense Education Act. The student loan program has been so well received that it has in a short period of a few years become an essential program in financing college training. There is a demonstrated need for expanding the loan authorization limit. The demands in my State for loan funds was so critical this year, for example, that only 53 percent of the amounts requested by the colleges could be approved. The increase in the authorization to $125 million will go a long way toward meeting the greatly increased demands for student loans.

I suppose there is no Federal aid to education program as popular with the Congress as the one for federally impacted areas. It is unfortunate that we cannot stir up this kind of congressional support for a general Federal aid bill. I always have more communications from school officials in Arkansas about bills to extend this program than I do on any other educational measure. But I am pleased that the committee added the amendment to extend these two aid programs which are so important to many districts in my State.

There has been some objection to this bill on the basis of cost. It authorizes a total of $173 million for the vocational educational features in the next fiscal year. This is far less than the amounts that are being spent for the impacted areas program. When we consider the size of the space and defense programs the new authorizations being asked here become chicken feed in comparison. It should be remembered that it will avail us very little to put a man on the moon if we cannot handle our problems here on earth. Such an accomplishment would divert attention from our difficulties for a while, but the realities of preparing our young people for this complex, ever-changing society will still be there after we come back to earth. If we cannot afford to pay for a good educational system we cannot afford to live in a democratic society.

In closing, I wish to pay tribute to the senior Senator from Alabama for his longstanding, unfailing concern with educational problems. If the whole Congress had followed his leadership on aid to education legislation many years ago the current educational crisis might not be facing the country now. American youth have no stronger champion than Senator HILL.

I also want to congratulate and thank the senior Senator from Oregon and the members of the Education Subcommittee who have devoted so much time to educational problems this session. The hearings held by the subcommittee have made a strong case proving the need for greater support for education at all levels, Federal, State, and local. The seven volumes of testimony comprise a massive documentation of problems—and opportunities—facing our educational system. The senior Senator from Oregon has done an able job in focusing public attention on this most critical problem and I congratulate him for his work on this bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. How much time have I left on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio, inasmuch as I have to reply to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] before my time runs out.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. I have consulted with as many members of my committee as I have been able to consult, while at the same time doing my work in the Chamber. They agree with me that I should offer to take to conference the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, with the understanding that there will be no commitment that it will come out of conference.

I wish the Record to show that the Senator from Connecticut wrote me a letter; and I believe the Senator has presented a case in behalf of the communities in Connecticut that deserve the very careful attention of the conferees. We have not had an opportunity, as members of the subcommittee, to study it, but I wish the Senator to know, and I wish the Record to show, that there are some legal problems involved in the amendment that the Senator offers. There are some definitive problems in relation to the whole impacted area legislation that we must examine from the standpoint of precedential import.

The question has also been raised by counsel as to whether it might have any effect on the lifespan of the legislation itself. The Senator from Connecticut is a very distinguished lawyer, and he knows that when those legal matters are raised they must be considered by the committee. That is the responsibility of the committee. But on the other hand, it would not be fair to the two Senators from Connecticut for me to seek and urge the defeat of the amendment, when I myself cannot say in all honesty that I believe the amendment should be defeated. But it is my job not to have added to the bill any amendment that I cannot endorse, but I can endorse this amendment sufficiently to agree to take it to conference; and then between now and the conference I should like to have the Senator from Connecticut sit down with me and the other members of the committee, so that we can go into these matters, and so that the Senator can make further arguments in support of his amendment.

If I could not have the amendment taken to conference with that understanding, I would have to urge the Senate to oppose the Senator's amendment, because I am not sure of all of its implications. If what I have said is satisfactory to the Senator, with the approval of my colleagues—and I have talked with them, so I am sure that they would approve the restrictions that I have placed on taking the amendment to conference—and with the understanding which I have offered to the Senator from Connecticut, I would be willing to take his amendment to conference.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DODD. That is typical of the most generous and fair way in which the Senator from Oregon has treated all questions that have arisen. I am perfectly satisfied to have the amendment so considered and accepted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be adopted on that basis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both Senators yield back their remaining time?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] wishes to offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. On page 68, line 23, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1964".

On page 69, line 2, it is proposed to strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1964."

On page 69, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "1963–1964" and insert in lieu thereof "1961–1962".

On page 69, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "1966" and insert in lieu thereof "1964".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The purpose of the amendment is to cut back to 1 year the 3-year extension of the impacted area program set forth in Public Laws 815 and 874.

My reasons for proposing the amendment are that the impacted area program as presently administered is, in my judgment—and I believe in the judgment of almost everyone who has looked into it—grossly inequitable. There are school districts that are receiving money under those two statutes to which they are not entitled. There are school districts receiving more money than they are entitled to. There are some school districts which are not getting as much money as they should. The Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has wrestled with that difficult problem for several years. Senators will recall that on September 9, 1961, the President of the United States wrote a letter to the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield]. The letter appears in the Congressional Record, volume 107, part 14, page 19058. In that letter the President said:

> Therefore in my judgment a 1-year extension of school aid for impacted areas and the National Defense Education Act provide the best assurance that reevaluation of legislation affecting education will take place early next year.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the President's letter may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

September 9, 1961.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: You have asked my views concerning legislation to extend aid for schools in federally impacted areas and to extend the National Defense Education Act.

As you know, my recommendations to the Congress for legislation to help achieve educational excellence in this country included continuation of the federally impacted area program and extension and strengthening of the National Defense Education Act. I still believe that both of these steps are urgently needed.

An extension of these programs should make it possible for the Congress to make a careful review of their content and costs next year. School aid to federally impacted areas could then be reexamined to update its operation and effect possible economies. Also, the increased demands which are being thrust upon this Nation make it especially important that we give consideration next year to strengthening those provisions of the National Defense Education Act which improve the quality of education in this country.

Therefore in my judgment a 1-year extension of school aid for impacted areas and the National Defense Education Act provide the best assurance that reevaluation of legislation affecting education will take place early next year.

Sincerely yours,

John F. Kennedy.

Mr. CLARK. At that time there was great resistance in the House of Representatives to the passage of a general omnibus Federal aid to education bill as advocated by the President. The Senate in general, under the brilliant leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon, took the President's view. We passed a good Federal aid to education bill in 1961. It festered in the House for over a year. The House Rules Committee was opposed to Federal aid to education. The racial and religious issue became involved in the problem. The House did nothing for a good long while. The only whip we had over the House to make them come around to talk about the merits of a general Federal aid to education bill was the impacted areas provision which we in the Senate had held back very carefully and with a good many restrictions. If the House had ever been able to get away with passing impacted area legislation for 3 or 4 years, that would have been the end to a Federal aid to education bill. Today the impacted areas bill is Federal aid to education on a grossly inequitable basis. It gives generous Federal aid to education for certain school districts while denying it to other school districts that are even more entitled to it.

Back in 1961, on the recommendation of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we wrote into our general aid to education bill in the Senate section 204 of S. 1021, which reads as follows:

> The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1963, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874 as extended by this act, including an analysis of

> the relation between Federal payments under those laws and Federal payments under title I of this Act, and its recommendations to what the future relations between these two laws on that title should they be further extended.

That section never became law because we were never able to pass a general Federal aid to education law. We finally arrived at a conference report after the House had acted in a quite different way from the way we acted. But the conference report was killed in the House. So the study has never been made.

At the time of which I speak, in 1961, it was the view of the majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—and I was in that majority—

> It is the considered judgment of the majority of the committee that only a 1-year extension of the program at this time is advisable.

The 1-year extension was provided so that we would not be cutting off the aid which many meritorious school districts needed while we were making the study. That action gave them one more year during which time we could make the study. But the study has never been made. And now the same committee which came out with a recommendation for a 1-year extension 2 years ago has come out with a recommendation for a 3-year extension this year. The President of the United States, who asked us to make a careful study, did so in order that recommendations might be made which would eliminate the inequities in the program, asked for a 4-year extension, which would be tapered off in the last few years to deal with some of the inequities that are supposed to exist in the absence of a comprehensive study.

The Comptroller General has been most critical of these two federally impacted area bits of legislation, Public Law 815, and Public Law 874. I say in all good humor to the Senator from Oregon, whose position I fully understand, that if I were in his shoes I would do just what he is doing now. Having strongly advocated with me and other Senators on the floor of the Senate 2 years ago that we should hold the extension down to 1 year, he finds himself committed for reasons for which I have great sympathy to push for a 3-year extension. Mr. President, I should like to take my friend from Oregon off the embarrassing spot on which he finds himself. Therefore my amendment would cut down impacted area legislation to 1 year so that a study can be made to continue to hold some kind of whip over the House in support of a better education bill than we could otherwise get them to go gack to when we were on sound ground in 1961.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I shall answer the Senator in greater detail later. I see that the great Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is about to speak on the subject. I have not the slightest idea where he stands on the issue, but I wish to quote a great citizen of Illinois in the glorious past history of America—Abraham Lincoln. He said:

> It is a very dumb man who has not more sense this year than he had last.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has used 8 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if it is not true that the 3-year extension of aid to impacted areas is put in as a bait in order to induce certain Members of the Senate to vote for Federal aid to higher education and, if we get the bill through the Senate, to persuade certain Members of the House to vote for Federal aid to higher education who otherwise would not vote for it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is well aware how reluctant I am to pass on the motivations of any Member of the House or of the Senate. Without dealing with motivations, perhaps that would be the effect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not probable that the Senator from Oregon foresaw the possible effect, and therefore included the provision for 3 years as a bait to gain votes which otherwise he would not be able to obtain?

Mr. CLARK. I would not wish to take eloquent words out of the mouth of my friend from Oregon, who, I am sure, will be able to express his own views as to why he thought it desirable to change his position this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not extraordinary that some Members of Congress will vote for Federal aid to impacted areas, which is the least desirable and least defensible form of Federal aid to education, and yet oppose a general measure?

Mr. CLARK. I have found that quite impossible to reconcile in my own mind, but I know that each of my colleagues is eminently sincere in the position he takes. To me the situation is fantastic.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall vote in favor of the amendment, because there are undoubtedly in existence what are called impacted areas which are rich and completely unjustified in asking relief from this source.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I wish to make a reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida and to the Senator from Oklahoma.

I very much appreciate the help that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has been to me and to the committee on education legislation. He is performing a very valuable service in pointing up areas of our legislative consideration of impacted areas which should be brought before the Senate.

In this instance, however, I am constrained reluctantly to oppose the adoption of his amendment. I base this on the following grounds:

First, if it were to be adopted then we should be faced in February or March of 1964 with the same problem we are now laboring to resolve. As I said yesterday in my speech, we have an obligation, in my judgment, to permit school administrators a reasonable leadtime in order to make the decisions which they must make in the expenditure of school dollars. If the Senator's amendment is adopted—and I trust it will not be—we will but continue to complicate unnecessarily the program operations of the school districts which educate one-third of America's boys and girls.

We face a parliamentary situation to which I should like my good friends from Pennsylvania and Illinois to give heed. The House committee reported a 1-year program. If the Senate adopts a 1-year program there will be nothing to discuss on that point in conference; and it is important that we go into conference on this matter, for reasons I shall shortly point out. If we go into conference on a 3-year Senate proposal, I know it is not necessary to tell my friends what the usual conference procedure is. When one is in any bargaining position at all, one at least has an opportunity to obtain a 2-year provision. I shall fight for the 3 years, for the reasons I am about to state. I always put my cards on the table. I have a problem of conference leadership in this regard.

I should like to have Senators hear me through on what I believe would be a great injustice to many school districts in this country if the Senate should adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania. Adoption of the committee 3-year extension would not mean we would lose any opportunity during the 3 years to bring about reforms in the administration of the aid to impacted areas program.

The Senator has pointed out quite clearly that 2 years ago a study was proposed in the general aid bill. We passed S. 1021 in the Senate, but we lost it, as the Senator knows elsewhere in the Congress.

I pledge to the Senator now, as chairman of the subcommittee, that with his valiant help—I am sure we can have the unanimous support of the committee—I shall officially call upon the various officers of the administration to proceed with the kind of study we have been seeking, and I shall ask them to work in close cooperation with the Comptroller General of the United States, who has placed on file some instances where the law has required administration of this program in a manner which I think must be corrected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. It is important that we have some time for the preparation of that study. The Senator well knows that it cannot be done in less than a year. That is what it adds up to, as I shall show in a moment. We cannot have it done in less than a year and put into effect any recommendations which may result from the study.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK. Why should we not write the study provision into the bill, as was done in 1961?

Mr. MORSE. That is a thought which has not been proposed before.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to the Senator that many Members of the Senate would support him if he were willing to offer an amendment to the pending bill to incorporate in the bill the provisions of section 204 of S. 1021 of the 87th Congress, so that when the Senate goes to conference there will be a study on the line in the Senate bill. I believe that would cause no difficulty.

Mr. MORSE. I am perfectly willing to put my head on the block right now as chairman of the subcommittee. We can agree upon an amendment. I am willing to take to conference a proposal for a study, as an amendment to the bill. I have no objection to doing that. We shall need a few minutes to decide on the phraseology of the amendment. I hope the Senator will write it out and submit it to me. Perhaps he can do so while I am concluding my argument. Then I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. May I modify my amendment by proposing an amendment in the nature of a substitute?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Since the yeas and nays have not been ordered on the amendment, the Senator may modify his amendment in any way he desires.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the Senator is working on his amendment, I should like to finish stating my reasons for my position. I am willing to put the reasons into the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator wish to hear them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon a question. Is not the inclusion of the impacted areas provision the green trading stamp with which the Senator from Oregon hopes to induce others to buy the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. I do not engage in that kind of bartering. I am presenting this proposal on its merits. My goods sell themselves, they are so meritorious. I do not need any bonus. I am presenting a sound proposal. I want the Senate to hear me through. It will take only a few minutes.

Mr. President, my second ground is that there is much merit in many of the substantive revisions which could be made to the law. The Senate should permit us to do this thorough job free from the pressure of extending the acts. A 3-year extension as in the committee proposal will provide us this time.

Third, if the Senator's amendment is adopted, then other Senators, all of whom have very worthwhile suggestions, would press for the adoption of their proposals which would make a hodgepodge out of the bill.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] would extend these provisions of the impacted area program which expired June 30, 1963, for 1 year only until June 30, 1964—and it is October now—instead of for a 3-year period as recommended by the subcommittee and by the full committee. It is understood that the 1-year extension is proposed in order that needed changes can be made in these provisions to be effective for the period after the 1-year extension.

I agree that some changes are needed in this legislation. In fact, I have stated to this body a number of times in the past, when these programs were before this body for further extension, that the payments authorized by the legislation should be brought more in line with actual burdens caused by Federal activities which they are intended to meet.

My objection to restricting the extension to 1 year instead of 3 years as the subcommittee proposed is based on a number of considerations.

Some of the provisions in each of these laws are permanent, such as the provisions which authorize payments for those schoolchildren who live on Federal property. Those provisions authorizing payments to all other categories of Federal impact ended June 30, 1963. We are well into the 1963–64 school year and the 4,000 school districts throughout the country that are dependent on these payments to help finance their school programs do not know what to count on for the current year because this Congress has not acted on the legislation. They are in a most difficult position, because they have established their tax rates and set their budgets expecting the Federal assistance.

If we extend this program for only 1 year, we will then be faced with the necessity for detailed review of the temporary provisions in order to make the changes determined to be necessary. This legislation even with a 1-year extension probably will not be completed for a month or two. Shortly after the first of the year these school officials will be faced with developing budgets again for the 1964–65 school year. It would be extremely difficult for the Congress to act on these changes at the next session of Congress in time for the school board members to know what the changes are and how they would affect each district in order to take proper recognition if the reduction in Federal payments in preparing their next year's budgets.

Even if the changes could be worked out and enacted into law at a reasonably early period next year, the school officials in these impacted districts would find it extremely difficult to make the budget adjustment without a period of transition during which they could find additional sources of revenue to help finance their school operation. It takes time to make this kind of transition.

During the 13 years of this program a number of changes have been proposed, and some have been incorporated into the legislation. Invariably the Congress has taken the position that restrictive amendments should be enacted and the school superintendent should be given time to know what they are and how they would affect the local tax rate and income for schools before they are put into effect.

The history of these programs shows that opponents of any change or restriction in the amount of the Federal payments have an effective argument against the changes, when they are proposed to be put into effect without an adequate transition period. This was the position taken by the administration in its recommendations to the Congress on the program this year. The administration recommended that the legislation be extended for 4 years, with no change the first year and gradual changes during the next 2 years.

In addition, the subcommittees that handle this legislation need ample time to have studies conducted and obtain the necessary information on which to base the restrictive amendments.

A 3-year extension without change, except for the inclusion of the District of Columbia, would give time for obtaining the facts and information on which the changes would be based, to enact the changes into law, and give the local school officials time to make the necessary transition. It is also to be pointed out that, if agreement can be reached on the changes that are needed sooner than appears practicable at the present time, amendments can be made effective prior to the expiration of the present 3-year extension proposed by the committee. In other words, the 3-year extension should be considered as the outside limit during which the changes can be made in an orderly manner, but should not preclude the making of desirable amendments prior to the expiration of the 3-year extension should that be found desirable by the Congress. The administration recommendations now before the Congress might well be the basis for amendments which could be made effective prior to the end of the 3-year extension now being recommended. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent that there be printed from the 12th annual report on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815 an excerpt setting forth the highlights of these programs.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS

PUBLIC LAW 874—MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

The sum of $1,426,512,788 has been appropriated for this program from its beginning in 1950 through fiscal year 1962. For the 12th consecutive year the number of school districts and the total amount of their entitlements increased; $247 million was appropriated for fiscal year 1962, as compared with $217.3 million for fiscal year 1961.

The number of eligible school districts increased from $3,965 in fiscal year 1961 to 4,065 in fiscal year 1962. Increases were chiefly attributable to growth in school population and new or expanded Federal activities.

The total number of pupils in the 4,065 eligible districts approximated 11 million, or about one-third of all pupils attending public elementary and secondary schools in the

Nation. Federally connected pupils totaled more than 1.75 million, representing approximately 15.2 percent of the total attendance in eligible districts.

Over 255 million acres in federally owned property were claimed as a basis for entitlement in fiscal year 1962. The number of different Federal properties claimed as a basis for payment totaled 5,288, an increase of 106 over 1961.

Entitlements of over $230 million resulted from pupils who resided on Federal property or resided with a parent employed on Federal property, or both. Entitlements of approximately $233 million constituted about 5.2 percent of current operating costs of eligible districts. Payments of over $13 million were made for pupils residing on 48 Federal installations, chiefly military bases.

PUBLIC LAW 815—CONSTRUCTION

The sum of $1,087,919,000 has been appropriated from the beginning of the program in 1950 through fiscal year 1962.

The sum of $946.9 million in Federal funds has been reserved for 4,961 construction projects submitted by approximately 1,840 different local school districts. Of these projects, 1,326 are new elementary schools and 1,963 are additions to elementary schools, 461 are new secondary schools and 846 are additions to secondary schools, and 365 are for improvements to existing facilities, such as equipment and heating plants; 4,469 of these projects are completed, 407 are under construction, and 85 are in the preconstruction stage.

To the Federal funds, school districts have added an estimated $670 million (exclusive of site, off-site improvements, and other costs) for a total of over $1.6 billion used to construct 53,345 classrooms and related facilities for 1,546,777 pupils.

Of the total granted to local school districts, almost $42 million has been allocated under section 14 (formery title IV) to 250 projects to provide 1,428 public school classrooms for 40,889 pupils (primarily children living on Indian reservations), and funds for 40 projects costing over $7.5 million have been reserved for construction of temporary school facilities housing 13,928 pupils.

In addition to the funds granted to local school districts approximately $123 million has been allocated for Federal construction of 310 projects on Federal property, comprising 3,241 classrooms and related facilities for 98,447 pupils living on Federal property.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make my plea in the interest of helping the school districts operate efficiently by enabling the school districts to have the leadtime we provide. We can bring forward, discuss, and correct, in that leadtime, any disjointures in the program which need to be corrected.

I have already assured the Senator from Pennsylvania that he can count on me to stand shoulder to shoulder with him in that respect.

I have also indicated to him that, if he will give me the language, calling upon the proper officials in the Government to direct that an appropriate study be made of the impacted area program, I will be willing to take it to conference in order to let the conference consider it on its merits.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to be recognized on my own time.

Mr. MORSE. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that his speech would be more pertinent after I modify my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I doubt if it will be more pertinent, because I am going to oppose the amendment completely. I agree with the position taken by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. HOLLAND. About 7 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Not only do I oppose completely the amendment the Senator from Pennsylvania has offered, but also I oppose it in the form in which he has indicated he would like to amend it further.

Here is the situation confronting us: There are Senators who think the impacted areas bill is some kind of gracious gift, some boon from the Federal Government to the districts that maintain public schools in the very swollen population areas where great defense projects are located.

I want to tell them in the first place that they could not be more wrong; that there has never been any attempt to repay those districts for the full cost of educating the extra children added to their school programs by reason of defense establishments. On the average less than half of the added expense is paid to those districts for the cost of the attendance in their schools of children brought into those areas by uninformed personnel or civilian personnel at such great bases, for example, as the area around Cape Canaveral, where the public schools have been doubled in size by reason of children coming from Patrick Air Force Base and from the NASA organization in that area.

If the impacted area program is not continued and if, as a result, those children are not permitted to attend public schools, but, instead, the Federal Government is required to build and operate schools of its own to take care of those children, it will cost the Federal Government a good deal more than twice as much as it provides to pay a part of the debt which it owes to these districts.

Is it a debt, Mr. President? I say it is because not only are these large numbers of added children brought into impacted areas to go to public schools, but at the same time great areas are taken off the tax rolls of the particular counties where the impacted areas exist.

It seems to me that here is something the Federal Government should do as a matter of fairness, apart from its paying for a just proportion of the cost these additional children add to the public school burdens in impacted areas.

This program is not to be compared with the ordinary Federal aid program, because in this instance the Federal Government itself brings in large numbers of children to add to the school burden. The local people are required to pay half or more of the load of the added number of children, and the Federal Government pays half, or less than half, of that load. It seems to me from any standpoint this is just legislation.

Let me discuss for a moment the approach which has been taken by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Yesterday, he twice used the term "sweeten" in remarks in which he said this provision was put in the bill in order to sweeten the other provisions in it. I think that was hardly complimentary of the other members of the committee who reported the bill to the Senate. I think it was hardly complimentary of Senators who think here is a just debt that we owe to the school districts where the heavy population of children exists because of the presence of defense facilities.

I notice today that the Senator has changed his approach. Instead of having sugar, he is going to have a whip, because twice today in his speech he said this is a whip we are going to hold over the head of the House. How is that going to look in the record of the debate—that the Senate feels it has some prestige which permits it to hold a whip over the head of our coordinate body at the other end of the Capitol which must consider this legislation? It is wrong, and it is not justified by the equities of the situation.

I point out one other thing. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania read into the RECORD a request from the President asking for a 1-year approach to the extension of this particular program and the national defense education program 2 years ago. In this bill the national defense education program is extended for 3 years and is enlarged sizably. Yet the Senator from Pennsylvania says it is wrong to have an extension of the federally impacted areas program for 3 years. However, it is not proposed to be enlarged——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I have more time?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I am glad the Senator from Florida is taking the time. I agree with everything he says.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to be standing shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Oregon on this proposal or on any other proposal in which we find this situation existing.

The national defense education program is extended by the same bill for 3 years and sizably enlarged, and the committee in its wisdom gave equal treatment to the impacted areas part of the education program. Yet the Senator from Pennsylvania, using a whip today, but some sweetening or sugar yesterday, says this part of the program should be reduced from 3 years to 1 year.

The vocational education part of the program, which is, of course, in the same bill—there are three large parts to it—is expanded for 5 years and greatly increased in size. But it is only the impacted areas provision which affects so vitally so many counties where defense bases or establishments of one kind or another are located that the Senator thinks should be cut down to 1 year.

I want to stand back of the Senator from Oregon in his statement that, from the standpoint of fiscal responsibility in the impacted areas affected, it is highly important that the extension be for 3 years instead of 1.

My file is full of letters from school boards all the way from Cape Canaveral to Key West, the submarine base, and Boca Chica Naval Air Station, to Jacksonville, where the Naval Air Station is, and Escambia County, where Pensacola Naval Air Station is, which have had to start the school year without knowing how much to provide for the operations of the schools because of the long delay in this matter.

This is October. They were supposed to have fixed their programs last summer. The schools must open in late August or early September. As a result, there is confusion and frustration in those areas because Congress has not told the school boards what they can depend upon in this regard.

A 1-year extension would be 1 year of frustration, and nothing more. A 2-year extension, would take care of next year when we will not be in session as late as October, because we will be out in the hustings in the presidential and congressional election. A 3-year extension—and I commend the committee for its good judgment in this respect—would give time for the matter to be handled in a normal way both by the school districts affected and by the committees of Congress, and in that way enable Congress to decide what it wishes to do by way of further extending all or part of the program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is making a brilliant argument against an amendment which I do not intend to press. He knows very well that I said 10 minutes ago I would take a 3-year extension if the study could be included. The Senator is speaking against something that no one is proposing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator is withdrawing both the sweetening and the whip, because I do not believe either reflects any great credit on any of us.

In order to be fair to people in many counties across the Nation—and my State happens to have 10 or 12 of those counties—and in fairness to the school authorities, the proposed legislation should be passed as reported by the committee.

I commend the committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, for having recognized that only the 3-year extension would give fair treatment both to the school districts and the local officials, and also give time for Congress and the administrative agencies to consider any changes needed in this program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 7 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 21 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had not intended to enter into the discussion. Perhaps I should not, since the Senator from Pennsylvania does not intend to press his amendment.

However, I believe that we need to consider the whole impacted area problem a little more fundamentally than my good friend from Florida has done.

The impacted area problem began in the early days of the Korean war. It was started at the instance of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who realized that, with the Armed Forces being enlarged from something less than 1 million to more than 3 million, with the defense budget increasing from about $14 billion to approximately $42 billion, large numbers of servicemen would be congregated in areas which were not prepared to receive the children of servicemen who needed schooling, when housing had not yet been built to provide the basis for general property to support the local tax rolls.

This was also true, of course, in connection with the starting of new industries, such as the Atomic Energy Commission's plants in South Carolina and Kentucky, and the development of war industries elsewhere.

In other words, large numbers of persons would be dumped upon localities without the local tax base growing at the same time.

I voted for the impacted areas bill. I not only voted for it, but, since I was then a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I worked very hard for it.

However, I point out that that was 12 or 13 years ago. In most instances the communities have grown up. Housing has been built to provide for servicemen and defense workers, and this has furnished a local tax base, which did not exist 12 years ago.

It may be true that certain communities, such as Cape Canaveral and communities like Cocoa in Florida do not have sufficient general property to support schools. In those instances I can well believe that Federal funds are appropriate. However, in many cases the so-called impacted areas have long since adjusted to the flush of warwork and defense installations. They have grown up. We find prosperous suburbs, prosperous communities, well able to support the schools, nevertheless receiving Federal grants; and, once receiving Federal grants, holding on to them with great insistence. We find Representatives and Senators who would fight to the death against any general program of Federal aid to education designed to help needy communities defending the claims of prosperous communities to continue to receive unnecessary subsidies.

It is this type of thing which, frankly, I find somewhat repellent. This has caused me to enter the intellectual dispute. It is no longer a parliamentary dispute. I hope that sometime people will practice consistency. It is anomalous to have people attack Federal aid for education for needed communities and yet demand it for communities which have long since outgrown any need if, indeed, there was any need in the first place.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I modify my amendment, and ask that the clerk read the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 69, after line 7, it is proposed to insert:

> (D) The Commissioner of Education shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1965, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, and his recommendations as to what amendments to these laws should be made if they are further extended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand from the reworded amendment that the Senator is not now insisting upon reducing the 3-year extension to 1 year, but is insisting upon a study being made before the end of 1964?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under those conditions, of course, I withdraw my opposition, and I commend the Senator for making the change.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. How much time have I remaining? Do I get an additional 15 minutes, or do I still have available only 15 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not get any additional time.

Mr. CLARK. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the amendment is self-explanatory, although I agree thoroughly with what to my way of thinking was the brilliant argument made by my friend from Illinois in answer to the argument made by my friend the Senator from Florida, which has now become largely irrelevant in view of my modification, which modification I now ask my friend from Oregon to accept.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator state briefly what the modification does to his amendment?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. I have withdrawn the amendment which would have confined the impacted area extension to 1 year.

Mr. KUCHEL. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Not because I thought I was wrong, because I do not think I was; but because it was completely obvious that I was not going to get anywhere. Therefore, it was necessary to sweeten the amendment a little to make it applicable to the present situation.

I am agreeing to a 3-year extension of the impacted area provision, albeit reluctantly, and am writing into the bill the same provision which was in the general Federal Aid to Education Act which was passed in 1961, calling on the Commissioner of Education to make a study of the operations under Public Laws 815 and 874, and to report to Congress and the President by January 1, 1965, as to what amendments, if any, he recommends should be made to the legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does the modified amendment which the clerk has read embody the full text of the Senator's amendment as it is now at the desk?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. There is nothing "under the rug." I have concealed nothing from my dear friend from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I wanted to be sure there was nothing to impair the operation of the act for the next 3 years.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I congratulate the Senator upon modifying the amendment. I have joined with the Senator many times in trying to correct inequities by having a uniform general aid to education bill. I still support that principle.

However, I cannot overlook the fact that we could do a great injustice while awaiting the passage of such a law. Although the Senate has passed such a bill many times, it has been defeated or delayed by the other body for various reasons, often outside the scope of general Federal aid.

Therefore, I am delighted that the Senator from Pennsylvania has agreed to a study rather than a 1-year extension. I believe such a study would result in providing continued opportunities for defense-impacted areas, which in my State have the highest scale of taxes within the State. Such aid supplies the only possibility for providing adequate education in many outlying Army and Air Force bases and defense production areas within the larger centers.

I feel that the 3-year extension which the Senate bill provides would first make possible a good study, while we hope we can get together with the other House on a general Federal aid to education bill.

School executives will be able to know 6 or 8 months ahead that they can sign contracts with teachers—it is hard to find good teachers these days—and make certain of tenure of office and plan for a more effective school system.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has made a worthwhile improvement.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator. As a matter of legislative history, I felt it was more important, indeed, that we should not give up the increased need to look analytically and carefully into the impacted area legislation. In my opinion, it still contains glaring inequities. It needs a careful going over. Under the bill as originally proposed, it would not have received such a study.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator obviously has a right to his opinion that there are inequities in the law. That is an opinion which is not shared by some of the rest of us.

Mr. CLARK. In California.

Mr. KUCHEL. It is not the intention of the Senator from Pennsylvania, is it, to indicate that the legislative intent expresses any dissatisfaction with the present law?

Mr. CLARK. I cannot make legislative history any better than the Senator from California can. I should like to indicate my opinion, my legislative feeling, that there is a substantial inequity. I cannot speak for the Senate—I hardly ever do.

As a result of the great expansion of defense industries in that great State, which was the subject of some comment on the floor of the Senate yesterday by the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the State of the Senator from California has been able to get such an overwhelming proportion of defense industries into his State that that State does not need any Federal aid to education bill. It has already received such aid.

Mr. KUCHEL. That is not correct. I said earlier in the debate that in 12 years there will be almost 700,000 college students in my State. California will be required to pay for 44,000 professors and instructors.

However, in the interest of time, and because the Senator from Oregon has other labors to perform in the public interest, I am glad to see that the Senator from Pennsylvania, while not having changed his mind, has changed his amendment. I salute him.

Mr. CLARK. I am the first to admit that the State educational system of California is the best in the country. There is no doubt about it. If all States had as good an educational system as California, perhaps we would not need any Federal aid to education. I commend the Senator from California, because he has always supported general Federal aid to education legislation in the most unselfish way. His State really does not need it, because it has the best State system. It is generous of him to support those of us who represent other States which are not so fortunate.

Mr. KUCHEL. That legislative history is comforting to one who is growing old in the public service.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it correct to say that the Senator from Pennsylvania is really not concerned with taking away any of the inequities which California now enjoys, but, rather, proposes to make those inequities universal among the States?

Mr. CLARK. That is my own view. I favor comity among the States.

I hope the Senator from Oregon will accept my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Pennsylvania has demonstrated again the wonderful cooperation he always extends to me as one of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Education. The only other member of my subcommittee who is presently in the Chamber is the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is also chairman of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have consulted with the Senator from Alabama. I said on the floor yesterday that we owe much to him for the progress made in recent years in the whole field of education. We owe him a debt of thanks for the aid he has given us in the vocational education bill. I have consulted with him, and he agrees with me that I should go out on the end of a limb, so to speak, and assume responsibility for the subcommittee and the full committee by agreeing to take the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to conference. I shall take it to conference and do everything I can to try to obtain favorable consideration for it in conference, because the proposed study is needed. We supported it last year. We took it through the Senate 2 years ago. The Senate is already on record in support of this proposal.

I thank the Senator from Illinois for his argument in support of expanding Federal aid to school districts educating the other two-thirds of American boys and girls, because the impacted area program now provides such aid to school districts involving only one-third of the schoolchildren of the Nation. I think he has made an eloquent argument in support of a universal Federal aid to education program.

Another result of the study that will be made will be that we shall discover that the study itself will be another monumental volume that can be used in support of a general Federal aid to education bill. Once that study has been made, it will be possible to do equity to the plea that has been made for years for universality of Federal aid to education.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it not true that in almost every case in which a Federal installation has been constructed, the actual tax base in the general area has been improved?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Federal installations are usually made after chambers of commerce have come forward and stressed the need and urged that a Federal installation be made, and all the benefits that will be made available to the Federal Government if the installations are made.

Chambers of commerce know the value of installations to the economy of their areas and States. In almost all instances such installations have raised the tax base.

Mr. President, I accept the amendment. I urge the Senate to adopt it. I will take it to conference.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

The modified amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I ask unanimous consent that it not be read but, rather, that I may state the purport of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

The amendment which I send to the desk would substitute for the committee bill, the President's omnibus bill, which is S. 580. My purpose in proposing this substitute is to bring before the Senate the critical nature of the educational crisis in this country. My fear is that the pending bill and the other bills which have been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare do not adequately deal with that crisis.

Yesterday, I had occasion to speak at some length in the Senate on the very close connection between the failures in our educational system and the continuing chronic and persistent unemployment which afflicts our country in most areas, and so seriously affects our country in many areas, in my own State and elsewhere, where unemployment is chronic and persistent, and has been for a very long time.

The Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has been holding comprehensive hearings since early May in dealing with the paradox of continuing unemployment in areas where our educational system has fallen down in not giving an adequate basic education to members of the labor force in areas where men and women have lost jobs because the industry in which they had earned their livelihood has become obsolete and they have no employable skills to enable them to get additional employment.

This testimony has highlighted the continuing heavy rate of school dropouts, which every year is turning hundreds of thousands of young people out on the streets, with no employable skills. We have seen the drastically heavy unemployment rate among minority groups, particularly Negroes, largely because of lack of skills.

So with the coming—at an increasing pace, in my opinion—of automation and with the relatively recent marriage of the computer to the assembly line, we find a situation in which unemployment at the lower levels of skills is constantly growing.

Last week, one competent witness, Mr. John I. Snyder, Jr., a manufacturer of automation equipment, told our subcommittee that, in his opinion, the progress of automation—using that word in its broadest sense—was destroying 40,000 jobs a week, so that there is a continual increase in the number of people who are being put out of work each week, each month, and each year, because they have no employable skills and their jobs have been taken away from them by machines.

At the same time, the size of our labor force is increasing at the rate of approximately 1 million a year; so the market is being flooded with new entrants into the labor force at the same time that the processes of automation are decreasing the job opportunities.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this point, will the Senator yield, so that I may present one statistic?

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. This is a statistic with which I am quite sure the Senator from Pennsylvania is familiar. He will recall that it came up in our hearings—that testimony was given, and was verified by several expert witnesses—that if we could just stop automation right now at its present level, with no more automation, it would take, for many years to come, 35,000 new jobs per week to meet the job loss that the present level of automation is causing. If that statistic does not cause the Members of this body to take a hard and long look at the objectives the Senator from Pennsylvania and I and our committee have in mind in regard to coming to the assistance of education, I do not know what statistics they need.

When the Senator from Pennsylvania finishes his remarks, I shall have more to say as to why I do not support his amendment; but I am in complete agreement with him as to the crisis that faces the American people—not the educational system, but the American people—in connection with this matter, and as to the necessity to provide the support that is needed in order to train people so they can be employed in the new era of automation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and I am happy that he brought that basic statistic to the attention of the Senate.

It is well established that there are fewer jobs in manufacturing today than there were a few years ago; and there is no really practical possibility, according to most of the economists whom we have called before our subcommittee, of expanding markets in the area of manufacturing, thus producing new opportunities for the sale of manufactured goods in sufficient quantities to create new employment opportunities in manufacturing.

Even in many of the service areas, job opportunities are shrinking, as banks and retail establishments turn more to the use of computers and to various modifications of business machines which enable them to do the same amount of work with fewer employees.

While this condition is going on with respect to the blue-collar and the white-collar workers in the lower salary grades, a paradox exists with respect to the highly skilled occupations—engineers, chemists, biologists, physicists, and particularly in the more erudite branches of those professions; and the result is that we are in short supply for many occupations which are badly needed in the interests of our national security and our national well-being.

In fact, the other day we were informed that normally conservative looking ahead establishes the fact that by the year 1970 we will need 690,000 new engineers, but we are preparing to turn out only 270,000 engineers from the engineering schools presently in existence.

The relevance of all this, Mr. President, to our present educational dilemma is that expert after expert—starting with the Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, and including the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, and also including the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion E. Folsom, who gave us some splendid testimony, and Senators will recall that he is still a high executive in the Eastman Kodak Co.—and witness after witness have testified that the best single weapon—not the only weapon, but the best single weapon—with which to deal with the unemployment situation, both at the level where there are so many unemployed at the moment, and with the problem of manpower utilization at the top of the pyramid, where skills are in short supply, is to upgrade our educational system.

Mr. President, on that basis my thesis is that the bill before the Senate and the bills which have also been reported to the calendar which deal with the expansion of library services and with some aid to higher education are both too little and too late. The least that we should be prepared to do is to accept the President's omnibus bill, send it over to the House, and hope that adequate popular support could be marshaled behind it and that the administration would really fight for it. Parenthetically, I must say that the administration, in my opinion, ran away from its own bill before a shot had been fired. I deplore that. I suspect that the advice that they received was unsound. Of course, they think that they know best. But I believe that if the President would fight for his bill, we could pass it. I think we ought to give him an opportunity to fight for it. For that reason I have offered the amendment in the nature of a substitute to put the President's bill before the Senate in order that the country may see that there are at least a few Senators who believe that the bill which has come from the committee is not good enough to meet the crisis which confronts the country.

The best material in support of what I am saying is contained in the message of the President himself on the subject of education, which he sent to Congress under date of January 29, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's message on education in support of his omnibus bill may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE ON EDUCATION

Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress. Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education, coupled with widespread availability of college education.

For the individual, the doors to the schoolhouse, to the library and to the college lead to the richest treasures of our open society: to the power of knowledge—to the training and skills necessary for productive employment—to the wisdom, the ideals, and the culture which enrich life—and to the creative, self-disciplined understanding of society needed for good citizenship in today's changing and challenging world.

For the Nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being. A free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures of our educational system breed failures in our social and economic system: delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power and an increase in tax-supported benefits. The loss of only 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education through high school. Failure to improve educational performance is thus not only poor social policy, it is poor economics.

At the turn of the century, only 10 percent of our adults had a high school or college education. Today such an education has become a requirement for an increasing number of jobs. Yet nearly 40 percent of our youths are dropping out before graduating from high school; only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school; only 8 percent of our adults have completed college; and only 16 percent of our young people are presently completing college. As my science advisory committee has reported, one of our most serious manpower shortages is the lack of Ph. D.'s in engineering, science, and mathematics; only about one-half of 1 percent of our school age generation is achieving Ph. D. degrees in all fields.

This Nation is committed to greater investment in economic growth; and recent research has shown that one of the most beneficial of all such investments is education, accounting for some 40 percent of the Nation's growth and productivity in recent years. It is an investment which yields a substantial return in the higher wages and purchasing power of trained workers, in the new products and techniques which come from skilled minds and in the constant expansion of this Nation's storehouse of useful knowledge.

In the new age of science and space, improved education is essential to give new meaning to our national purpose and power. In the last 20 years, mankind has acquired more scientific information than in all of previous history. Ninety percent of all the scientists that ever lived are alive and working today. Vast stretches of the unknown are being explored every day for military, medical, commercial, and other reasons. And finally, the twisting course of the cold war requires a citizenry that understands our principles and problems. It requires skilled manpower and brainpower to match the power of totalitarian discipline. It requires a scientific effort which demonstrates the superiority of freedom. And it requires an electorate in every State with sufficiently broad horizons and sufficient maturity of judgment to guide this Nation safely through whatever lies ahead.

In short, from every point of view, education is of paramount concern to the national interest as well as to each individual. Today we need a new standard of excellence in education, matched by the fullest possible access to educational opportunities, enabling each citizen to develop his talents to the maximum possible extent.

Our concern as a Nation for the future of our children—and the growing demands of modern education which Federal financing is better able to assist—make it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the existing limited number of special programs. We can no longer afford the luxury of endless debate over all the complicated and sensitive questions raised by each new proposal on Federal participation in education. To be sure, these are all hard problems—but this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems.

State and local governments and private institutions, responsive to individual and local circumstances, have admirably served larger national purposes as well. They have written a remarkable record of freedom of thought and independence of judgment; and they have, in recent years, devoted sharply increased resources to education. Total national outlays for education nearly trebled during the 1940's and more than doubled during the 1950's, reaching a level of nearly $25 billion in 1960. As a proportion of national income, this represented a rise from little more than 4 percent in 1940 to nearly 6 percent in 1960, an increase of over 40 percent in total effort.

But all this has not been enough. And the Federal Government—despite increasing recognition of education as a nationwide challenge, and despite the increased financial difficulties encountered by States, communities, and private institutions in carrying this burden—has clearly not met its responsibilities in education. It has not offered sufficient help to our present educational system to meet its inadequacies and overcome its obstacles.

I do not say that the Federal Government should take over responsibility for education. That is neither desirable nor feasible. Instead its participation should be selective, stimulative and, where possible, transitional.

A century of experience with land-grant colleges has demonstrated that Federal financial participation can assist educational progress and growth without Federal control. In the last decade, experience with the National Science Foundation, with the National Defense Education Act, and with programs for assisting federally affected school districts has demonstrated that Federal support can benefit education without leading to Federal control. The proper Federal role is to identify national education goals and to help local, State, and private authorities build the necessary roads to reach those goals. Federal aid will enable our schools, colleges and universities to be more stable financially and therefore more independent.

These goals include the following:

First, we must improve the quality of instruction provided in all of our schools and colleges. We must stimulate interest in learning in order to reduce the alarming number of students who now drop out of school or who do not continue into higher levels of education. This requires more and better teachers—teachers who can be attracted to and retained in schools and colleges only if pay levels reflect more adequately the value of the services they render. It also requires that our teachers and instructors be equipped with the best possible teaching materials and curriculums. They must have at their command methods of instruction proven by thorough scientific research into the learning process and by careful experimentation.

Second, our educational system faces a major problem of quantity—of coping with the needs of our expanding population and of the rising educational expectations for our children which all of us share as parents. Nearly 50 million people were enrolled in our schools and colleges in 1962—an increase of more than 50 percent since 1950. By 1970, college enrollment will nearly double, and secondary schools will increase enrollment by 50 percent—categories in which the cost of education, including facilities, is several times higher than in elementary schools.

Third, we must give special attention to increasing the opportunities and incentives for all Americans to develop their talents to the utmost—to compete their education and to continue their self-development throughout life. This means preventing school dropouts, improving and expanding special educational services, and providing better education in slum, distressed, and rural areas where the educational attainment of students is far below par. It means increased opportunities for those students both willing and intellectually able to advance their education at the college and graduate levels. It means increased attention to vocational and technical education, which have long been underdeveloped in both effectiveness and scope, to the detriment of our workers and our technological progress.

In support of these three basic goals, I am proposing today a comprehensive, balanced program to enlarge the Federal Government's investment in the education of its citizens—a program aimed at increasing the educational opportunities of potentially every American citizen, regardless of age, race, religion, income, and educational achievement.

This program has been shaped to meet our goals on the basis of three fundamental guidelines:

A. An appraisal of the entire range of educational problems, viewing educational opportunity as a continuous lifelong process, starting with preschool training and extending through elementary and secondary schools, college, graduate education, vocational education, job training and retraining adult education, and such general community educational resources as the public library;

B. A selective application of Federal aid—aimed at strengthening, not weakening, the independence of existing school systems and aimed at meeting our most urgent education problems and objectives, including quality improvement; teacher training; special problems of slum, depressed, and rural areas; needy students; manpower shortage areas such as science and engineering; and shortages of educational facilities; and

C. More effective implementation of existing laws, as reflected in my recent budget recommendations.

To enable the full range of educational needs to be considered as a whole, I am transmitting to the Congress with this message a single, comprehensive education bill—the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. For education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education. This bill recalls the posture of Jefferson: "Nobody can doubt my zeal for the general instruction of the people. I never have proposed a sacrifice of the primary to the ultimate grade of instruction. Let us keep our eye steadily on the whole system."

In order that its full relation to economic growth, to the new age of science, to the national security, and to human and institutional freedom may be analyzed in proper perspective, this bill should be considered as a whole, as a combination of elements designed to solve problems that have no single solution.

This is not a partisan measure—and it neither includes nor rejects all of the features which have long been sought by the various educational groups and organizations. It is instead an attempt to launch a prudent and balanced program drawing upon the efforts of many past Congresses and the proposals of many Members of both Houses and both political parties. It is solely an educational program, without trying to solve all other difficult domestic problems. It is clearly realistic in terms of its cost—and it is clearly essential to the growth and security of this country.

I. THE EXPANSION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR INDIVIDUALS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Our present American educational system was founded on the principle that opportunity for education in this country should be available to all—not merely to those who have the ability to pay. In the past, this has meant free public elementary and secondary schools in every community—thereafter, land-grant, State, and municipal colleges, and vocational education—and more recently, job retraining and specialized teachers for students with special educational problems.

Now a veritable tidal wave of students is advancing inexorably on our institutions of higher education, where the annual costs per student are several times as high as the cost of a high school education, and where these costs must be borne in large part by the student or his parents. Five years ago the graduating class of the secondary schools was 1.5 million; 5 years from now it will be 2.5 million. The future of these young people and the Nation rests in large part on their access to college and graduate education. For this country reserves its highest honors for only one kind of aristocracy—that which the Founding Fathers called "an aristocracy of achievement arising out of a democracy of opportunity."

Well over half of all parents with school-age children expect them to attend college. But only one-third do so. Some 40 percent of those who enter college do not graduate, and only a small number continue into graduate and professional study. The lack of adequate aid to students plays a large part in this disturbing record.

Federal aid to college students is not new. More than 3 million World War II and Korean conflict veterans have received $6 billion in Federal funds since 1944 to assist them to attend college.

Additionally, the National Defense Education Act college student loan program has aided more than 300,000 students in more than 1,500 institutions who have borrowed nearly $220 million. In 4 years of operations, defaults have totaled only $700 while repayment rates are more than twice that required by law.

But as effective as this program has been, it has not fulfilled its original objective of assuring that "no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need." The institutional ceiling of $250,000 per year on the Federal contribution limits loan funds in at least 98 of the presently participating institutions. The annual statutory ceiling of $90 million on Federal appropriations restricts the size of the program. As a result, only about 5 percent of the students enrolled in participating colleges are assisted. Additionally, the forgiveness feature for teachers is rendered less attractive as well as less meaningful by excluding those who go on to teach in colleges, private schools or on oversea military posts. This proven program must be enlarged and strengthened.

Other types of assistance are needed. For students who cannot meet the financial criteria under the National Defense Education Act loan program, a loan insurance program—drawing on techniques well established by the FHA and other Federal programs—would encourage banks and other institutions to loan more money for educational purposes.

Moreover, many students from families with limited incomes cannot and should not carry a heavy burden of debt. They must rely largely on income from employment while in college. For these students, the Federal Government should—as it did in the days of the National Youth Administration—help colleges provide additional student work opportunities of an educational character.

A serious barrier to increased graduate study is the lack of adequate financial aid for graduate students. Only 1,500 fellowships are permitted annually under the National Defense Education Act program, upon which we are dependent for urgently needed increases in the number of college teachers and the number of graduate students pursuing other courses essential to the Nation's advancement and security. The National Science Foundation has broad authority for fellowships and training grants, but its program, too, has been restricted by limited appropriations. The President's Science Advisory Committee has predicted that the dramatically increasing demand for engineers, mathematicians, and physical scientists, will require that the output of Ph. D.'s in these fields alone be increased 2½ times, to a total of 7,500 annually by 1970, and that the number of master's degrees awarded annually be substantially increased. In all fields the need exceeds the supply of doctoral recipients. The shortage is particularly acute in college teaching, where at present rates the Nation will lack 90,000 doctoral degree holders by 1970. It is clearly contrary to the national interest to have the number of graduate students limited by the financial ability of those able and interested in pursuing advanced degrees. Fellowship programs can ease much of the financial burden and, most importantly, encourage and stimulate a fuller realization and utilization of our human resources.

The welfare and security of the Nation require that we increase our investment in financial assistance for college students both at undergraduate and graduate levels. In keeping with present needs and our traditions of maximum self-help, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to—

1. Extend the National Defense Education Act student loan program, liberalize the repayment forgiveness for teachers, raise the ceiling on total appropriations and eliminate the limitation on amounts available to individual institutions.

2. Authorize a supplementary new program of Federal insurance for commercial loans made by banks and other institutions to college students for educational purposes.

3. Establish a new work-study program for needy college students unable to carry too heavy a loan burden, providing up to half the pay for students employed by the colleges in work of an educational character—as, for example, laboratory, library, or research assistants.

4. Increase the number of National Defense Education Act fellowships to be awarded by the Office of Education from 1,500 to 12,000, including summer session awards.

5. Authorize a thorough survey and evaluation of the need for scholarships or additional financial assistance to undergraduate students so that any further action needed in this area can be considered by the next Congress.

6. In addition, as part of this program to increase financial assistance to students, the 1964 budget recommendations for the National Science Foundation, which are already before the Congress, include a proposed increase of $35 million to expand the number of fellowships and new teaching grants for graduate study from 2,800 in 1963 to 8,700 in fiscal 1964.

II. EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Aid to college students will be to no avail if there are insufficient college classrooms. The long-predicted crisis in higher education facilities is now at hand. For the next 15 years, even without additional student aid, enrollment increases in colleges will average 340,000 each year. If we are to accommodate the projected enrollment of more than 7 million college students by 1970—a doubling during the decade—$23 billion of new facilities will be needed, more than 3 times the quantity built during the preceding decade. This means that, unless we are to deny higher education opportunities to our youth, American colleges and universities must expand their academic facilities at a rate much faster than their present resources will permit.

In many colleges, students with adequate modern dormitories and living quarters—thanks to the College Housing Act—are crammed in outmoded, overcrowded classrooms, laboratories and libraries. Even now it is too late to provide these facilities to meet the sharp increases in college enrollment expected during the next 2 years. Further delay will aggravate an already critical situation.

I recommend, therefore, the prompt enactment of a program to provide loans to public and nonprofit private institutions of higher education for construction of urgently neded academic facilities.

The opportunity for a college education is severely limited for hundreds of thousands of young people because there is no college in their own community. Studies indicate that the likelihood of going to college on the part of a high school graduate who lives within 20–25 miles of a college is 50 percent greater than it is for the student who lives beyond commuting distance. This absence of college facilities in many communities causes an unfortunate waste of some of our most promising youthful talent. A demonstrated method of meeting this particular problem effectively is the creation of 2-year community colleges—a program that should be undertaken without delay and which will require Federal assistance for the construction of adequate facilities.

I recommend, therefore, a program of grants to States for construction of public community junior colleges.

There is an especially urgent need for college level training of technicians to assist scientists, engineers, and doctors. Although ideally one scientist or engineer should have the backing of two or three technicians, our institutions today are not producing even one technician for each three science and engineering graduates. This shortage results in an inefficient use of professional manpower—the occupation of critically needed time and talent to perform tasks which could be performed by others—an extravagance which cannot be tolerated when the Nation's demand for scientists, engineers, and doctors continues to grow. Failure to give attention to this matter will impede the objectives of the graduate and post-graduate training programs mentioned below.

I recommend, therefore, a program of grants to aid public and private nonprofit institutions in the training of scientific, engineering and medical technicians in 2-year college-level programs, covering up to 50 percent of the cost of constructing and equipping as well as operating the necessary academic facilities.

Special urgency exists for expanding the capacity for the graduate training of engineers, scientists and mathematicians. The President's Science Advisory Committee has recently reported that an unprecedented acceleration in the production of advanced degrees is immediately necessary to increase our national capability in these fields. Added facilities, larger faculties, and new institutions are needed. I have recommended, therefore, in the proposed 1964 budget already before the Congress, a strengthening of the National Science Foundation matching grant program for institutions of higher education to expand and improve graduate and undergraduate science facilities.

Because today's trend in colleges and universities is toward less lecturing and more independent study, the college and university library becomes even more essential in the life of our students. Today, as reported by the American Library Association, nearly all college libraries are urgently in need of additional books, periodicals, scientific reports and similar materials to accommodate the growing number of students and faculty. Additionally, they need buildings, equipment and publications to serve their academic communities, whether public or private.

I recommend the authorization of Federal grants to public and private institutions of higher education for library materials and construction, on a broad geographic basis, with priority to those most urgently requiring expansion and improvement.

Expansion of high quality graduate education and research in all fields is essential to national security and economic growth. Means of increasing our supply of highly trained professional personnel to match the rapidly growing demands of teaching, industry, government, and research warrants our interest and support.

We need many more graduate centers, and they should be better distributed geographically. Three-quarters of all doctoral degrees are granted by a handful of universities located in 12 States. The remaining States with half our population produce only one-fourth of the Ph. D.'s.

New industries increasingly gravitate to or are innovated by strong centers of learning and research. The distressed area of the future may well be one which lacks centers of graduate education and research. It is in the national interest to encourage establishment of these critically needed centers of advanced learning, especially in parts of the Nation now lacking them.

I recommend enactment of a Federal grant program administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the development and expansion of new graduate centers. I also urge appropriation of the increased funds requested in my 1964 budget for expansion of the National Science Foundation program of science development grants, which will also contribute to strengthening of graduate education.

Our experience under the National Defense Education Act with respect to modern language and area centers has demonstrated that Federal aid can spur development of intellectual talent. They deserve our continuing support, with assurance that resources will be available for orderly expansion in keeping with availability of teaching talent.

I recommend that the current modern foreign language program aiding public and private institutions of higher learning be extended and expanded.

III. IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY

A basic source of knowledge is research. Industry has long realized this truth. Health and agriculture have established the worth of systematic research and development. But research in education has been astonishingly meager and frequently ignored. A fraction of 1 percent of this Nation's total expenditures for education is now devoted to such research. It is appalling that so little is known about the level of performance, comparative value of alternative investments and specialized problems of our educational system—and that it lags behind, sometimes by as much as 20 or even 50 years, in utilizing the results of research and keeping abreast of man's knowledge in all fields, including education itself.

Highest priority must be given to strengthening our educational research efforts, including a substantial expansion of the course content improvement programs which the Government has supported, particularly through the National Science Foundation. Two interrelated actions are necessary:

1. I have recommended appropriations in the 1964 budget for substantially expanding the National Science Foundation science and mathematics course materials program and the Office of Education educational research program.

2. I recommend legislation to broaden the Cooperative Research Act to authorize support of centers for multipurpose educational research, and for development and demonstration programs; and to broaden the types of educational agencies eligible to conduct research.

The second step to improvement of educational quality is teacher training. The quality of education is determined primarily by the quality of the teacher. Yet one out of every five teachers in the United States has either not been certified by his State as qualified to teach or failed to complete 4 years of college study. In the field of English, between 40 and 60 percent of the secondary school teachers lack even the minimum requirement of a college major in that subject. Thus it is not surprising that, largely because of unsatisfactory elementary and secondary school instruction, our colleges and universities are now required to spend over $10 million annually on remedial English courses.

The lack of teacher quality and preparation in other fields is equally disturbing. More than two-thirds of our 1.6 million teachers completed their degree work more than 5 years ago. Yet, within the past 5 years, major advances have been made—not only in the physical, biological, engineering, and mathematical sciences, but also in specialized branches of the social sciences, the arts and humanities, and in the art of teaching itself.

In addition, we lack sufficient trained teachers for 6 million handicapped children and youth, including 1.5 million mentally retarded and another 1.5 million with very serious social and emotional problems. Only through special classes, taught by specially trained teachers, can these children prepare for rehabilitation, employment, and community participation. Yet less than one-fourth of these children now have access to the special education they require, primarily because of the lack of qualified special teachers, college instructors, research personnel, and supervisors. It is estimated that 75,000 special teachers—55,000 more than presently available—are needed for the mentally retarded alone.

The teacher training support programs of the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education have demonstrated their value.

I recommend, therefore:

That the National Science Foundation program for training institutes for teachers in the natural sciences, mathematics, engineering and social sciences be expanded to provide for upgrading the knowledge and skills of 46,000 teachers, as provided in my 1964 budget recommendations;

That new legislation be enacted to (a) broaden authority for teacher institutes financed by the Office of Education, now restricted to school guidance counselors and language teachers, to other academic fields; (b) authorize a program of project grants to help colleges and universities improve their teacher preparation programs by upgrading academic courses and staff, by encouraging the selection and retention of their most talented prospective teachers, and by attracting and training teachers from new sources such as retired military personnel or women whose family responsibilities permit them to teach; and (c) authorize training grants through colleges and universities for teachers and other education personnel requiring specialized training, with particular emphasis on the training of teachers of the mentally retarded and other handicapped children, teachers of gifted or culturally deprived children, teachers of adult literacy, librarians, and educational researchers.

IV. STRENGTHENING PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Improved research and teacher training are not enough, if good teachers do not choose to teach. Yet present salary schedules in some cases are too low at the start to compete against other positions available to college graduates. In almost all cases, they are too low at the top to retain our ablest young teachers. Without sufficient incentive to make teaching a lifetime career, teachers with valuable training and experience but heavy family responsibilities too often become frustrated and drop out of the profession. Their children may never try to enter. Although teachers' salaries have generally improved in the Nation in recent years, there are still districts which have starting salaries below $3,000.

Good teachers, moreover, need good schools. Last year, over 1,500,000 children were in overcrowded classrooms and an estimated 2 million others were studying amid grossly substandard health and safety conditions. In many areas school dropouts, or the education of the economically disadvantaged, the culturally deprived, the physically or mentally handicapped, and the gifted require specially designed programs which simply are not available.

I am not the first, but I hope to be the last President to be compelled to call these needless shortcomings to the Nation's attention. These are national problems crossing State boundaries, and deserving of national attention. In our mobile population—where every year one out of five families moves, sometimes across the street, but often across State lines—every family has reason to make teaching in every State a more rewarding and productive profession, and to help every State strengthen its public elementary and secondary education, particularly in those school districts that are financially unable to keep up.

Yet let us face the fact that the Federal Government cannot provide all the financial assistance needed to solve all of the problems mentioned. Instead of a general aid approach that could at best create a small wave in a huge ocean, our efforts should be selective and stimulative, encouraging the States to redouble their efforts under a plan that would phase out Federal aid over a 4-year period.

I recommend, therefore, a 4-year program to provide $1.5 billion to assist States in undertaking under their own State plans selective and urgent improvements in public elementary and secondary education including (1) increasing starting and maximum teacher salaries, and increasing average teacher salaries in economically disadvantaged areas; (2) constructing classrooms in areas of critical and dangerous shortage; and (3) initiating pilot, experimental, or demonstration projects to meet special educational problems, particularly in slums and depressed rural and urban areas.

I also recommend extension of the National Defense Education Act programs which contribute to improving the quality of elementary and secondary education. Grants for testing, guidance, and counseling programs should be expanded and continued beyond the 1964 expiration date. This program has great relevance for the detection of incipient problems which inhibit learning and for development of the talents of our youth. N.D.E.A. assistance for science, mathematics, and foreign language laboratory equipment—which is essential for adequate educational programs using newly developed teaching methods—should also be continued beyond 1964.

Finally, in regard to elementary and secondary schools, I recommend a 4-year continuation of those portions of the federally affected area laws which expire June 30, 1963. These statutes now assist some 4,000 school districts located in every State, which together enroll one-third of all public elementary and secondary school pupils in the Nation. Almost 60,000 critically needed classrooms have been constructed at a cost of $1.15 billion to house more than 1,700,000 pupils; and school operating budgets have been supplemented by more than $1.7 billion. For fiscal 1964 the present provisions would be extended. Limited modifications of the existing provisions, which would take effect beginning in 1965, would overcome certain inequities demonstrated by past experience. Also, the District of Columbia should be added to the jurisdictions eligible to participate.

V. VOCATIONAL AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

Since the wartime administration of President Woodrow Wilson, Congress has recognized the national necessity of widespread vocational education. Although revised and extended frequently since 1917, the national vocational education acts are no longer adequate. Many once-familiar occupations have declined or disappeared and wholly new industries and jobs have emerged from economic growth and change. The complexities of modern science and technology require training at a higher level than ever before.

For this reason, 2 years ago I requested the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to convene an expert and representative committee to review and evaluate the present vocational education laws and to make recommendations for their modernization. The report of that Committee shows the need for providing new training opportunities—in occupations which have relevance to contemporary America—to 21 million youths now in grade school who will enter the labor market without a college degree during the 1960's. These youths—representing more than 80 percent of the population between the ages of 16 and 21—will be entering the labor market at a time when the need for unskilled labor is sharply diminishing. It is equally necessary to provide training or retraining for the millions of workers who need to learn new skills or whose skills and technical knowledge must be updated.

Both budgetary action and enactment of new legislation is called for. In my 1964 budget I have recommended funds which would permit doubling the number of workers to be trained by the Manpower Development and Training Act programs. These programs have, in their brief existence, already enrolled more than 18,000 men, women, and out-of-school youths who are being trained in occupations where jobs are available.

In addition, I recommend the legislation to—

(a) Expand the scope and level of vocational education programs supported through the Office of Education by replacing the Vocational Education Act of 1946 with new grant-in-aid legislation aimed at meeting the needs of individuals in all age groups for vocational training in occupations where they can find employment in today's diverse labor markets, and

(b) Provide employment and training opportunities for unemployed youth in conservation and local public service projects. The details of this latter proposal are contained in a separate bill—the Youth Employment Opportunities Act—and will be discussed in a later message to be sent to the Congress.

VI. CONTINUING EDUCATION

Education need not and should not end upon graduation at any level. An increasing number of Americans recognize the need and the value of continuing education. The accountant, the salesman, the merchant, the skilled and semiskilled worker, all interested in self-improvements, should all be afforded the opportunity of securing up-to-date knowledge and skills. Only one American in eight has even taken as much as one college course. Yet the State universities and land-grant colleges which offer the majority of extension or part-time courses enroll less than a half million people. Due to inadequate finances and facilities, these colleges can offer only a very limited adult education program. I recommend legislation authorizing Federal grants to States for expanding university extension courses in land-grant colleges and State universities. Despite our high level of educational opportunity and attainment, nearly 23 million adult Americans lack an eighth-grade education. They represent a staggering economic and cultural loss to their families and the Nation. I recommend again, as part of this comprehensive bill, a program to assist all States in offering literacy and basic education courses to adults.

The public library is also an important resources for continuing education. But 18 million people in this Nation still have no access to any local public library service and over 110 million more have only inadequate service.

Advanced age, lack of space, and lack of modern equipment characterize American public library buildings in 1963. Their rate of replacement is barely noticeable: 2 percent in a decade. There are now no Carnegie funds available for libraries—nor have there been for 40 years.

The public library building is usually one of the oldest governmental structures in use in any community. In one prosperous Midwestern State, for example, 30 percent of all public library buildings were built before year 1910, and 85 percent were erected before 1920. Many other States are in a similar situation.

I recommend enactment of legislation to amend the Library Services Act by authorizing a 3-year program of grants for urban as well as rural libraries and for construction as well as operation.

VII. CONCLUSION

In all the years of our national life, the American people—in partnership with their governments—have continued to insist that the means of education shall forever be encouraged, as the Continental Congress affirmed in the Northwest Ordinance. Fundamentally, education is and must always be a local responsibility, for it thrives best when nurtured at the grassroots of our democracy. But in our present era of economic expansion, population growth and technological advance, State, local, and private efforts are insufficient. These efforts must be reinforced by national support, if American education is to yield a maximum of individual development and national well-being.

The necessity of this program does not rest on the course of the cold war. Improvement in education is essential to our Nation's development without respect to what others are doing. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile noting that the Soviet Union recognizes that educational effort in the 1960's will have a major effect on a nation's power, progress and status in the 1970's and 1980's. According to a recent report prepared for the National Science Foundation, Soviet institutions of higher education are graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as the United States. While trailing behind this country in aggregate annual numbers of higher education graduates, the Soviets are maintaining an annual flow of scientific and technical professional manpower more than twice as large as our own. At the same time, they have virtually eliminated illiteracy, with a 23-fold increase since the turn of the century in the proportion of persons with an education beyond the seventh grade. This Nation's devotion to education is surely sufficient to excel the achievements of any other nation or system.

The program here proposed is reasonable and yet far-reaching. It offers Federal assistance without Federal control. It provides for economic growth, manpower development and progress toward our educational and humanitarian objectives. It encourages the increase of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and critical intelligence necessary for the preservation of our society. It will help keep America strong and safe and free. I strongly recommend it to the Congress for high priority action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 29, 1963.*

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there are six titles to the President's bill. The first deals with the expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education. Those are proposed amendments to the National Defense Education Act. Some, but not all of them, are included in the pending measure. Those which are not included are the ones which, in my opinion, in many ways would do the most good. Those which are included are those which are most readily salable and which, to use a phrase to which I hope my friend from Florida will not object when I use the words, are put in to sweeten the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe my friend's use of the word "sweeten" at the present time is considerably different than his earlier use; and I have no criticism.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend very much.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the President's bill concentrated on elementary and secondary education? The committee has come forth with a bill on vocational and higher education and impacted areas. It is like trying to build a skyscraper without foundations. Is that not true?

Mr. CLARK. In all deference, the Senator is only partly correct, because there are six titles to the President's bill. The first title dealt with expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education. That is the National Defense Education Act amendment.

The second title is expansion and improvement of higher education, which would apply to facilities, libraries and the like.

The third title is for improvement of educational quality, which is teacher training. To some extent that is based on the Conant report on the education of American teachers. Of course, that is higher education.

But the Senator is quite correct in that the fourth title is "Strengthening Public Elementary and Secondary Education." It deals with teachers' salaries and classroom construction, and it proposes to phase out impacted areas. That is the part of the bill which is not being reported at all. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that that is one of the most important parts of the bill. I regret that nothing on that subject is coming from the committee. Perhaps that is the basic reason why I am substituting the omnibus bill for the pending measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not extraordinary that people will go in for Federal aid for the frills, but not Federal aid for the basic elementary training upon which higher education must be based?

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator is correct. But I have the feeling—and I suspect the Senator from Illinois agrees with me—that our educational system needs upgrading from grade school to graduate school. There is no part of it with which we can be thoroughly satisfied. While I agree with the Senator that ignoring the problems of the primary and secondary schools is the major weakness of the bill, I suggest also that the provisions of the bill do not deal adequately with the other aspects of our educational program. I point out that title VI, Expansion of Continuing Education, which deals with adult education, with better community libraries, is to my way of thinking as important as many of the other titles.

I believe I have said enough to indicate why we should give viability to the President's message, to the President's program, and to the President's bill. I again stress that the situation is a critical one. We, I suspect, are too apt to be a few Neros with fiddles while Rome is burning. As I said yesterday—and I close on the same note—one of our best witnesses before the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower said that we are engaged in a race between education and catastrophe, and catastrophe is on its way to win.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator planning to ask for a vote on his amendment, or does he intend to withdraw it?

Mr. CLARK. My present intention is to withdraw the amendment, but I could not feel it in my heart to do so until the Senator from Oregon tells the Senate why he thinks I am mistaken.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. No one is a more ardent supporter of the President's omnibus bill than is the senior Senator from Oregon. I completely agree with the bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that the problem was threshed out in committee. The Senator pressed for consideration of the omnibus bill. I told him that I would have to oppose it in committee. But, as he knows, the record of the committee will show that I gave assurance to the committee that the Senators would have an opportunity to vote up or down each title of the President's bill before we got through with the program. I intend to deliver on that statement. I found myself in the position in which we had to make the installment approach. We did not have money enough to pay the full price all at once. We had to go into installment buying on the educational package. That is the end of the analogy. It is not a very good one, but it makes a point.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As the Senator knows, I am eager to cooperate with him in moving the bill to expeditious passage. It does not seem to me wise to press my pending amendment to a yea-and-nay vote. I see no indication that an effort will be made to add the various titles of the President's bill piecemeal to the pending measure. Has the Senator from Oregon thought that we should perhaps handle those proposals in the other two education bills that are on the calendar? Otherwise we would not have an opportunity to vote on them if we do not vote on the amendments which I have proposed.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to speak on that question for a moment. The Senator knows what we seek to do from the standpoint of procedure in handling all proposed education legislation. We have taken up the bill now before the Senate. There will be before the Senate the bill relating to higher education. There will be a bill relating to libraries. There will be before the Senate the Prouty-Keating bill for the benefit of teachers in private schools.

In my judgment, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is quite correct in pointing out that, after all, the whole foundation of the American educational system is the elementary and secondary schools. We shall have to come to grips with that problem, too, because colleges can be no better than the elementary and secondary schools. The sad fact is, as some have heard me say over the years, that the American people—and we are as guilty as they—and, in our seats of responsibility, perhaps more so—because we are really cheating tens of thousands of young men and women out of a college education each year because, first, of the great mistakes we are making in our educational policy of sending children to grade schools and high schools which are so low in their standards that the students cannot qualify for college. Tens of thousands of others cannot afford to go on to college because they do not have the economic means to do so.

I have always tried to scotch the argument that if a young man or woman has incentive, ambition, and initiative he or she can go to college. That is nonsense. Many of them are in such an economic position that they cannot possibly go to college.

That is why I believe it so important that we adopt the various titles of the overall bill. We shall have an opportunity to do so.

As this session drags on, and the slow pace continues to characterize it, I say to my friend from Pennsylvania this afternoon, that I believe we may have an opportunity to vote on every title of the President's bill before this term of the Congress concludes. There will be another term. I shall try to obtain a vote on each provision this term, but I would not wish for someone to say, "You did not keep your word." I can only deliver to the extent I can obtain the cooperation of the Senate. I am satisfied that we shall have an opportunity to vote, before the two sessions of the Congress conclude.

I believe it would be wonderful if we could place on the books for the first time in our history the beginning of a rather comprehensive program of Federal aid to education.

I am satisfied that once the American people see the dividends from that program they will say to Members of Congress, "Expand it." And the program will be expanded to meet the President's objectives.

Although I am not alone, I wish to take my full share of the responsibility off the shoulders of the President. It is true that we consulted with the President, and we have talked about the parliamentary situation confronting us in both Houses. I speak for myself and not for the President. I believe this was a decision reached by a majority of us who have charge of education legislation.

It is not in derogation of the House when I point out that there is a problem in the House. We were satisfied that if we went forward with an omnibus bill a good many parliamentary barriers would exist in the House over which we could not climb—higher than the Berlin wall. There is the problem of obtaining a rule. It might not be possible to obtain a rule. We did not think we ought to wait to see. We did not think we ought to take the chance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. If he does not wish to answer the question, I shall fully understand.

Mr. MORSE. If I do not answer the Senator's question, it will be because I cannot answer the question.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator believe the Senate will pass an omnibus bill?

Mr. MORSE. I believe that, on the installment approach we are making, we shall pass on the major subject matter of each title of the omnibus bill in due course of time. I sincerely believe that. But that is the only way we can pass an omnibus bill. I think if we sought to pass the proposal now suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania we would not be able to pass it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I heartily commend the distinguished Senator and his committee for having adopted what he calls the piecemeal approach, rather than the omnibus approach. The Senator has heard me speak frequently on this floor in regard to the omnibus approach, not merely on education, but also on agricultural matters and other things. The wisdom of his course is now being abundantly confirmed. There was passed the other day, without any serious dissent, a bill to give aid to medical, dental, and osteopathic schools.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Alabama did that. That was done under his leadership.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know, but it is a part of the health and education program. Everyone could tell, by looking at the figures presented, that there is a shortage of professional talent in those fields which justifies Federal help of the type which is to be given under that bill.

Now the distinguished Senator from Oregon has presented a bill embodying three very important subjects; vocational education, the National Defense Education Act, and assistance to defense impacted areas.

As to vocational education, there are some of us who have as much interest in the civil rights problem as anyone else, who cannot vote for and would not vote for and would strenuously object to ever approving some of the more drastic provisions in the omnibus civil rights program. But vocational education is a part of the civil rights program, though offered now in a purely educational bill which I believe all Senators can support.

All Senators realize that the better the education of the underprivileged, regardless of what their color might be, the better equipped they will be to obtain the economic prizes which are available only to educated people. This program will go further in the long run, in my judgment, to meet many of the civil rights problems than the more drastic and coercive measures which are proposed in the omnibus program.

I am happy to have the opportunity to support in this measure the vocational education proposal, though I would have preferred that the approach be a little slower from the standpoint of the money involved. I voted yesterday for the $600 million plus authorized by the House over the 5-year period, rather than the estimated $1½ billion in obligational authority contained in the committee bill.

I approve the large expansion of vocational education. I strongly approve the expansion of the National Defense Education Act, to give more opportunities to more young people to equip themselves better than would be at all possible if they had to rely solely upon their own resources or the resources of their families.

I agree completely, as I have already stated, with the extension of aid to defense impacted areas, which I believe is simple justice, and not in the category of other programs in this and other bills, which involve the question of wisdom rather than justice. I believe the aid to impacted areas should be passed on the concept of the Federal Government doing justice to communities which are badly disturbed in their school systems by the influx of thousands of children and the simultaneous cutting down of their tax bases by taking large areas off the tax rolls.

I congratulate the Senator for this piecemeal approach. I think he is accomplishing good results by this approach. I am happy to be able to stand with him. I believe he would have been unable to accomplish the desired results if he had continued with the omnibus approach.

I believe the Senator is showing great wisdom and great practicality. I commend him warmly. I hope there will be many occasions when I can stand with him. I would not have been able to do so if he had insisted on the omnibus bill in the field of Federal aid to education. I am happy about the course the distinguished Senator has adopted, and I want him to know that I believe he is rendering great service to the entire Nation by following this approach.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida very much for his comments. His comments give me an opportunity to make a brief reference to one subject matter he raised. It may not be wise for me to comment on it, because I may be guilty of doing what I told my students never to be guilty of. I told them never to overtry their case, never to raise any issue which did not have to be raised in order to get the court to pass on the merits of the case. Nevertheless, I am not going to duck the issue. I am glad the Senator raised the civil rights point in his comments.

I commend Southern Senators who have been standing with me on this vocational education bill. In my judgment, the vocational education bill has many strengths. One of them is its uniformity of application to all people in this country irrespective of the color of their skin who need some training for employment or need some retraining or upgrading of training so that they can take new jobs because they have lost old jobs.

I was not happy about the fact that in the course of this debate I had to find myself in opposition to my good friends from Pennsylvania and New York, and others Senators on the Javits amendment this afternoon. I felt it had no place in the bill, but I think a vocational education program based upon a uniform application of the bill in the matter of training for jobs, including Negroes, is about as sound a piece of civil rights legislation as we could have before us this afternoon. I do not think any Senator from the South, the North, the East, or the West will deny that what is needed in connection with the problems of civil rights in this country is to increase job opportunities for Negroes. Job opportunities for Negroes cannot be increased if they are not trained so they can hold jobs in this day of automation.

That is one of my strongest arguments in support of my defense of the bill. It is a sound bill because it seeks to benefit the whole country in connection with the matter of training or retraining for employment.

How much time have I, Mr. President?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

REGULATION OF COLLECTIVE INVESTMENT FUNDS MAINTAINED BY BANKS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], and myself, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill establishing standards and procedures for the regulation and operation of collective investment funds maintained by banks in the conduct of their trust department functions.

The bill has been discussed to some degree in the Banking and Currency Committee in connection with the bill that was put through on the Securities Act some time before.

The primary objectives of this bill are twofold:

First, to provide certain basic investor protections for the participating interests in bank collective investment funds through statutory requirements for reporting and public disclosure; and

Second, to resolve the overlapping jurisdictional claims of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Comptroller of the Currency with respect to regulation of collective investment funds maintained by national banks through statutory provisions specifically vesting in the Federal banking agencies the sole authority to regulate and supervise collective investment funds maintained by national and State-chartered banks.

For 25 years national banks have been permitted to maintain pooled funds—known as common trust funds—for the investment and reinvestment of funds held by the bank in the capacity of trustee, executor, administrator, or guardian. This right was first granted in 1937 by the Federal Reserve Board, which at that time had the statutory responsibility for supervision and regulation of the trust activities of national banks.

The common trust fund has been rather widely utilized by banks for the management of certain trust and fiduciary accounts, because this pooling method permits more efficient, economical, and diversified investment of fairly small accounts than would be possible if the same accounts were to be managed and invested separately and individually. According to the 1962 survey of common trust funds conducted by the Federal Reserve Board, there were, last year, 564 common trust funds being administered by 343 banks across the Nation. Approximately 165,000 separate fiduciary accounts were pooled in these common trust funds, representing an average participation of about $21,700.

Under section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code, a bank—either national or State—could obtain tax-exempt status for its common trust fund only if that fund was maintained in conformity with the rules and regulations of the Federal Reserve Board. Thus, State-chartered banks and national banks have adhered to nearly identical procedures in the operation of their common trust funds.

In September of last year the Congress adopted legislation approved by the

President as Public Law 87–722, which transferred from the Federal Reserve Board to the Comptroller of the Currency the statutory authority over trust powers of national banks, including common trust funds. Section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code was correspondingly amended so as to provide that the tax-exempt status of common trust funds would be predicated on conformity with the rules and regulations issued by the Comptroller of the Currency.

Early this year the Comptroller of the Currency, acting under the authority of Public Law 87–722, issued a revision of the regulations governing the trust activities of national banks. With respect to collective investment funds these revised regulations included two important changes. They permitted banks to pool or commingle for investment purposes assets held by the bank as a managing agent or as a trustee for a Smathers-Keogh self-employed retirement plan.

Immediately upon the issuance of the revised regulations by the Comptroller, the Securities and Exchange Commission announced its belief that these newly authorized pooled funds bore such a similarity to mutual funds that such funds would be subject to SEC regulation under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940.

The Comptroller of the Currency has disputed the position of the SEC, holding that the pooling of Smathers-Keogh trusts and managing agency accounts does not involve the entry of bank trust departments into the mutual fund business but, on the contrary, represents only a modest extension of the common trust fund procedures to two other well-defined classes of fiduciary accounts.

Both the Comptroller and the SEC have remained resolute in their views on this matter. As a consequence, any bank which plans to utilize these new pooling powers for either managing agency accounts or for Smathers-Keogh trusts must presently anticipate regulation of these collective investment funds by two Federal agencies. Duplicative Federal regulation is not a circumstance to be cherished by any private institution, and it is an especially distasteful prospect for the already heavily regulated commercial banks.

This problem of duplicative regulation of bank-maintained collective investment funds was considered earlier this year by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. That subcommittee received testimony from Chairman Carey of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Comptroller of the Currency, Mr. James Saxon, and witnesses representing the banking industry. The subcommittee concluded, after its study of the problem, that legislation was necessary to eliminate the present condition of overlapping claims of jurisdiction.

Mr. President, the legislation which I am introducing today is specifically designed to carry out the recommendation of the House Committee on Government Operations.

The bill, as presented, consists basically of two parts. The first part takes care of the necessary amendments to the Securities Act of 1933, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, in order to eliminate the jurisdictional conflict between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Comptroller of the Currency.

The second portion of the bill provides in quite specific terms the standards and requirements which must be met by banks which establish and operate collective investment funds in connection with their trust department functions. These requirements are explained in more detail in the text of a section-by-section analysis which will immediately follow my remarks.

Mr. President, the need for this legislation is particularly critical in the case of the Smathers-Keogh self-employed retirement plans. The Smathers-Keogh Act, H.R. 10, becomes fully effective at the end of this calendar year. The terms of that act contemplate that many of these retirement plans for the self-employed will be trusteed plans with commercial banks acting as the trustee. Because of the limited size of the typical Smathers-Keogh plan, it will be necessary for the bank trustee to place the assets of these plans in a commingled fund for economic and efficient administration. If such pooled funds are subject to SEC regulations in addition to regulation by the Federal banking agencies and regulation for tax purposes by the Internal Revenue Service, it is, indeed, doubtful whether many banks will be interested in undertaking this new type of activity. In my opinion, this unfortunate turn of events would gravely limit the potential effectiveness of the Smathers-Keogh Act. I hope, therefore, that this legislation will receive early and favorable consideration by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and by both Houses of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there may be printed in the Record the text of a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. DOMINICK. In that connection, I should like to add that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], in the process of the debate on the Securities Act bill, previously passed by this body, stated, when I offered an amendment similar to this to the Securities Act, that it should not be taken up at that time because no hearings had been held on it, but that if such a bill were introduced he would undertake to hold hearings on it as soon as practicable. So I am hoping this bill will have hearings and that consideration of it will proceed thereafter as soon as possible.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be held at the desk through next Monday, for additional cosponsors. I feel the bill has great merit, and additional Senators may wish to sponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 2223) to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Dominick (for himself, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. McIntyre), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Exhibit I

Section-by-Section Summary of Proposed Bill Establishing Reporting and Disclosure Requirements for Collective Investment Funds Maintained by Banks

SHORT TITLE

The first section of the bill provides that it may be cited by its short title—the Bank Collective Investment Fund Act of 1963.

SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS

Section 2a of the bill defines the term "appropriate supervisory agency" as used in the bill and specifies the categories of banks which each such supervisory agency shall supervise for the purposes of this bill. It provides that: National banks and banks operating under the laws for the District of Columbia shall be supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency; other member banks of the Federal Reserve System shall be supervised by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; other federally insured banks, not falling in any of the foregoing categories shall be supervised by the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and any nonmember, State-chartered bank, which does not hold deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall, if it chooses to come under the terms of this bill, be supervised by such one of the three Federal supervisory agencies as it may elect in accordance with the provisions of section 2b.

The last-mentioned category of banks covers a small group of State-chartered trust companies (about 50 according to 1962 FDIC figures) which are not members of the Federal Reserve System and which do not hold deposits insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. This provision of the bill operating in conjunction with section 2b would provide that these trust companies could voluntarily come under the terms of the bill by electing to have their collective investment funds supervised by one of the three Federal banking agencies. This choice and election has purposely been drafted in permissive rather than mandatory language to avoid any challenge of unconstitutionality.

Section 2b of the bill defines the term "bank" to mean—

(1) a banking institution organized under the laws of the United States;

(2) a member bank of the Federal Reserve System;

(3) an insured bank as that term is defined in the Federal Deposit Insurance Act;

(4) any other banking institution or trust company, whether incorporated or not, doing business under the laws of any State or of the United States, a substantial portion of the business of which consists of receiving deposits or exercising fiduciary powers similar to those permitted to national banks under section 92a of title 12, as amended, and which is supervised and examined by State or Federal authority having supervision over banks and which has filed with any one of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Deposit

Insurance Corporation, a written declaration that it elects to maintain any collective investment fund established by it in accordance with the provisions of this Act; and

(5) a receiver, conservator, or other liquidating agent of any institution or firm included in clauses (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this paragraph.

Except for the language appearing in clause (4) with respect to the filing of a written declaration this definition is closely patterned after the definition of "bank" contained in the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 2c of the bill defines the term "collective investment fund" to mean a common trust fund or other pooled or collective fund maintained by a bank for the collective investment and reinvestment of assets contributed thereto by such bank in its capacity as trustee, executor, administrator, guardian or managing agent, or a fund consisting solely of assets of retirement, pension, profit sharing, stock bonus, or other trusts which are exempt from Federal income taxation under the Internal Revenue Code.

This definition includes all collective investment funds presently permitted to national banks by regulation 9 of the Comptroller of the Currency.

Section 2d of the bill defines the term "managing agent" to mean the capacity assumed by a bank upon the creation of an account which gives the bank possession of property and confers upon the bank investment discretion for the management of the account. The requirement that investment discretion must be conferred upon the bank imposes a heavy fiduciary obligation on the bank thus elevating this relationship above the normal principal-agent relationship.

Section 2e of the bill defines the term "plan" to mean the written plan required under section 6 of the bill. This plan will provide a rather detailed description of the manner in which the particular collective investment fund is to be operated.

SECTION 3. AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

This section of the bill amends Paragraph (1) of Section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 776(1)) so as to exclude from the definition of "security" contained in that Act any interest in a bank-maintained collective investment fund which is subject to the provisions of this bill. This amendment has the effect of exempting all collective investment funds subject to the requirements of this bill from the operation of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended.

SECTION 4. AMENDMENT TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

This section of the bill amends Paragraph (10) of Section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(10)) so as to exclude from the definition of "security" contained in that Act any interest in a bank-maintained collective investment fund which is subject to the provisions of this bill. This amendment has the effect of exempting all collective investment funds subject to the requirements of this bill from the operation of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

SECTION 5. AMENDMENT TO THE INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940

Presently Paragraph 3 of section 3(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (15 U.S.C. 80a-3(c)(3)) provides that "any common trust fund or similar fund maintained by a bank exclusively for the collective investment and reinvestment of moneys contributed thereto by the bank in its capacity as a trustee, executor, administrator or guardian" is not within the meaning of "an investment company" as that term is used in the Act. This section of the bill amends the paragraph in which the above-quoted exclusionary language appears so as to also exclude from the operation of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, any other bank-maintained collective investment fund subject to the requirements of this bill.

SECTION 6. THE PLAN, THE FINANCIAL REPORT, AND THE POWERS OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Section 6a of the bill requires that any bank covered by the bill and which maintains one or more collective investment funds shall maintain each such fund in conformity with the provisions of the bill and in conformity with the rules and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency pertaining to collective investments by national banks. The requirement of conformity with the rules and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency is patterned after the present provisions of Section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S.C. 584) which specifies that a bank-maintained "common trust fund" must be operated in conformity with the Comptroller's rules and regulations, pertaining to collective investments by national banks, in order to qualify for Federal income taxation.

Section 6b provides that the rules and regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency shall be directed at insuring that the collective investment funds of national banks are maintained in full accord with proper conduct of fiduciary business. It also specifies that these rules and regulations shall provide for the full disclosure of relevant information to persons having interests in accounts which are presently or may in the future participate in the collective investment funds. This section authorizes the Comptroller of the Currency to include in his rules and regulations definitions of accounting, technical, and trade terms used in the bill.

Section 6c of the bill provides that for each collective investment fund maintained by a bank, the bank shall be required to file with the appropriate supervisory agency (as defined in section 2a) a written plan (the contents of which are set forth in section 6d) describing the proposed manner in which the fund is to be operated. Also any revisions or supplements to the plan must be filed with the appropriate supervisory agency. All documents, so filed, are to be available for public inspection at the appropriate supervisory agency.

Section 6d specifies the contents of the written plan to be filed under the requirements of 6c. The purpose of the plan is to provide a detailed description of the manner in which the collective investment fund is to be operated. The items specifically required by Section 6d to be included in the written plan are provisions describing the type of types of assets in which it is contemplated the collective investment fund is to be invested, the allocation of income, profits and losses, the terms and conditions governing the admission or withdrawal of participations in the collective investment fund, the auditing of accounts of the bank with respect to the collective investment fund, the basis and method of valuing assets in the collective investment fund, the minimum frequency for valuation of assets of the collective investment fund, the period following each such valuation date during which the valuation must be made, and the basis upon which the collective investment fund may be terminated. Additionally this section requires the inclusion in the written plan of such other matters as may be required by the Comptroller of the Currency to define clearly the rights of participating interests in the collective investment fund.

Section 6e requires that banks annually prepare a financial report for each collective investment fund. The financial report is to be filed with the appropriate supervisory agency within three months (or within such other time as the Comptroller may by regulation prescribe) after the close of the accounting period covered by the report. This report like the written plan shall be available for public inspection at the supervisory agency where filed. Section 6e further requires that after filing, a copy of the financial report and a copy of any amendment to the plan, adopted during the period covered by the financial report, shall be furnished by the bank (or notice given that a copy of such report and a copy of any such amendment will be furnished on request without charge), with respect to each account participating in the fund, to each co-fiduciary and to each person who, under the instrument pursuant to which the bank is acting, has the right to be consulted about investments or to amend or revoke any terms of such instruments. Persons having only a beneficial interest in the participating accounts were purposely not included among those to whom financial reports must be furnished, for the very valid reason that the identities of such persons may not be known by the bank (i.e. a contingent remainderman in the case of a trust or several thousand employee-beneficiaries in the case of an employee pension plan). However the Comptroller of the Currency is given the authority to require, by regulation, that the financial report and amendments to the plan be furnished to persons beyond those specifically set forth in the bill and could, therefore, include certain holders of a beneficial interest.

Items to be included in the financial report are:

(1) a detailed listing of all assets and liabilities of the collective investment fund, showing in the case of assets both cost and market value and concentration by major fields;

(2) a statement of increases or decreases in gross asset valuation since the last prior report;

(3) a statement of earnings;

(4) a statement of realized gains and losses;

(5) a statement of investments purchased, sold, or redeemed since the last prior report; and

(6) such other accounting or financial information as the Comptroller of the Currency shall by regulation require to furnish adequate information to persons having interests in participating accounts.

Section 6f provides that at or prior to the time of the first participation of an account in a collective investment fund, a copy of the written plan as currently in effect, or a summary thereof, and a copy of the latest financial report shall be furnished by the bank, without charge, to those persons, who under section 6e are specifically entitled to receive copies of the financial report on an annual basis. Like 6e this section also empowers the Comptroller to specify by regulation other persons to whom such documents shall be provided. The reason for permitting a summary of the plan in lieu of the formal document, which is to be filed under Section 6c, is that in certain cases the trust agreement governing the fund may be used by the bank to meet the Section 6c requirements. In these cases a summary would be much more meaningful and informative to the layman than would the technical legal provisions of the trust instrument.

Section 6g provides that interests in a collective investment fund shall not be evidenced by any certificate and shall not be transferable except at the termination or partial termination of a trust or estate as the corpus of another trust. Under the procedures generally employed by banks which presently maintain common trust funds or similar collective investment funds the only physical evidence of participating interest in the fund is a ledger entry or similar accounting record of the bank. Thus at present there is no certification. However to prevent the growth or development of any practice which might lead to security-type trading of interests in bank-maintained collective investment funds it is deemed advisable to prohibit certification or general transfer of such interests. The limited exception to the general prohibition on transferability is intended to permit the continued use of certain interfund transfers of participations which have been determined as being not inconsistent with accepted trust practice by the Federal Reserve Board during its regulation of trust activities by national banks. A case example of such an interfund transfer might be the transfer of a distributable share from a terminating testimentary trust to a living trust in the same pooled fund. By permitting direct transfer the need to liquidate and reinvest the proceeds would be avoided. Such transfers, of course, are not permitted if the purpose is to accomplish an improper avoidance of tax liability.

Section 6h provides certain specific and general requirements for the Comptroller of the Currency's rules and regulations pertaining to collective investment funds. It requires that the Comptroller's rules and regulations shall include provisions governing—

(1) the manner in which a bank may advertise or publicize its collective investment funds;

(2) limitations on the interests that a bank may have, as a result of creditor relationships or otherwise, in its collective investment funds;

(3) the percentage of a collective investment fund that may be represented by any one participating account;

(4) limitations on the percentage of investment by a collective investment fund in the securities of any one issuer; and

(5) maintenance of liquidity of collective investment funds.

While it would, doubtless, be possible to specify statutory standards in each of these five areas, it is judged that the sounder and more effective approach is to leave the actual drawing of limitations and restrictions to regulations which are tailored to operational experience and regulatory oversight.

This section further directs the Comptroller to promulgate such additional rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act. Such provision merely reinforces the authority granted by section 6b to the Comptroller of the Currency to prescribe rules and regulations designed to assure that the collective investment funds will be maintained in accordance with accepted fiduciary practices and that important information concerning the operation and maintenance of the fund will be provided to persons having a definable interest in a participating trust or account. It should be noted that regulation 9 of the Comptroller of the Currency already includes very comprehensive provisions dealing with such matters as public merchandising, conflict of interest, and self-dealing.

Section 6i vests the Comptroller of the Currency with the discretionary power to exempt any class or classes of collective investment funds or transactions from any provision of this bill or any rule or regulation promulgated thereunder; provided, the Comptroller determines such exemption to be in the public interest and consistent with the spirit and purposes of the bill. This discretionary power to exempt is similar, though less extensive in that it is limited to class exemptions, to the powers granted to the Securities and Exchange Commission in section 6c of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended.

Section 6j provides that the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall furnish to the Comptroller of the Currency copies of all documents (plans, financial reports, etc.) which the bill requires banks to furnish to those agencies. This provision was included to assure that the Comptroller of the Currency will have available all information needed in the exercise of his rulemaking powers under the bill.

SECTION 7. TRANSITION PERIOD

Section 7a grants a 180-day grace period, in which banks may make such changes as are necessary to bring the operation of their presently established collective investment funds into conformity with the requirements of the Act.

Section 7b makes it unlawful after the date of enactment for a bank covered by the Act to commence operation of a collective investment fund without first filing a written plan with the appropriate supervisory agency.

SECTION 8. ENFORCEMENT

This section vests responsibility for enforcement of the bill's provisions and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder in the three Federal banking agencies according to their areas of supervision as defined in section 2a. This provision avoids any dislocation of the established supervisory jurisdictions of the three Federal banking agencies.

SECTION 9. PENALTIES

This section authorizes the imposition of a fine, not to exceed $25,000, on any bank which is duly convicted of wilfully violating any provisions of the bill or the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder or which makes any untrue statement of material fact or omits the statement of material fact in any of the documents required to be filed under the provisions of this bill. It was deemed necessary to include a special penal provision in this bill since the sanctions generally available to the Federal banking agencies to effectuate these enforcement activities would not be appropriate for use in the limited area of banking covered by this bill. It should be noted that section 584 of the Internal Revenue Code (15 U.S.C. 584) already offers a strong incentive for banks to conform with the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency pertaining to common trust funds. Failure to conform is basis for denial of exemption from Federal income taxation.

SECTION 10. EFFECTIVE DATE

This section provides that the provisions of the Act shall take effect immediately upon the date of enactment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. I understand that the Senator from Oregon has agreed to yield some time to the Senator from Delaware. May I inquire how much time is left both in behalf of and in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 15 minutes remaining; the Senator from Oregon has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. If no Senator will raise a point of order because of the obvious conflict of interest in which I am acting, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware from my time, on behalf of the amendment, and 5 minutes from the time of the Senator from Oregon, in opposition.

DISAPPEARANCE OF OVERSEA SHIPMENTS OF $100 MILLION OF GRAIN

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on July 16 I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that there had disappeared or had been illegally diverted approximately 24 million bushels of feed grain valued at $32 million. These 24 million bushels of feed grain had been shipped to Austria but they had never arrived at that destination. They had been shipped under the provisions of Public Law 480.

Today I have received a report from the Comptroller General of the United States. It is dated October 7. The letter accompanying the report, signed by the Comptroller General, reads in part as follows:

> In our review, we noted that commodities with an estimated export market value of approximately $100 million had been shipped to Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam under title I during calendar year 1962 but had not been accounted for by required reports on the arrival and disposition of commodities. In the case of Vietnam, no reports of the arrival and disposition of commodities had been received since inception of the title I program in that country in 1958, although commodities with an estimated export market value of about $50 million had been shipped to that country. Reports on shipments to several other countries were not submitted on a quarterly basis but covered longer periods of time; some of these reports were submitted approximately 10 to 20 months after the shipments covered in the reports were made. We noted also that reports of commodities received by Egypt during the period February 6 through November 23, 1962, showed about 44,000 metric tons less than the quantities shown on bills of lading as having been shipped to Egypt.

The Comptroller General states further:

> On the basis of our review, we have concluded that the Department of Agriculture has not obtained sufficient information from its agricultural attachés overseas or from representatives of American Embassies nor has it had adequate procedures for ascertaining that surplus agricultural commodities sold to foreign countries and financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I are received and used in authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the letter and excerpts from the report may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Comptroller General points out the complete lack of control by the Government over the final destination of these commodities which are sold at these low prices. They are either traded for material which we do not need or sold for soft currencies. He points out that the Government has no assurance that they are going to the country to which they are shipped.

The Comptroller General points out that there is no assurance that these are not being diverted to unfriendly nations, that some may even have been supplied to Russia and her satellites, and sold not at world prices, but at practically giveaway prices, all at the expense of the American taxpayers.

In July we found that 24 million bushels, valued at $32 million had been lost. Today the Comptroller General is saying that there is complete lack of accounting with respect to another $100 million worth of grain during calendar year 1962, that allegedly had been shipped to Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam.

I respectfully suggest that the time is long past due when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should act on the resolution which was submitted on July 16, asking that the committee undertake a thorough investigation of all sales under Public Law 480. I believe that Congress has reached the point where we should stop these sales until an accounting has been made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand the Senator to state that with respect to these surplus foods which we shipped, no accounting has been made, and that they might have gone to unfriendly nations?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the statement of the Comptroller General. On July 16 when I disclosed that we had lost the other grain, I raised that possibility and suggested that the Government did not know where it went. The Department of Agriculture issued a statement emphatically denying that any of it had gone to Russia or her satellites, although in the next paragraph of their statement they stated they did not have the slightest idea where it had gone. How these officials can tell where it did not go when they do not know where it went is something they have not explained.

Today I am reading not my statement, but the statement of the Comptroller General. He states that there is a complete lack of control, and that these goods may have gone to "unfriendly nations," in which event it could have gone to Russia, and someone could have pocketed the money. These commodities which we had practically given away could have been transferred in many different ways.

The point is that the taxpayers are paying for these goods which are being shipped to these foreign countries under the guise of getting rid of surpluses or assisting needy people in those countries.

The Comptroller General now states that $100 million worth has not gone where it was supposed to go. The Department of Agriculture has the responsibility of telling us where it went, and at least to exercise a greater degree of concern as to what is happening to these grains. I have not been able to get any indication that anyone in the Department even cares where they have gone. All I can get from them is a loose denial that there has been any loss. That statement is ridiculous. On July 16, 1963, I said 24 million bushels worth $32 million had disappeared en route to Austria. Here is another $100 million worth gone. I was wrong in that I underestimated the lost grain by $100 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the $100 million involve the cost of surplus foods that were sent to Turkey, Colombia, and South Vietnam?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The item that went to Austria——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is a separate item.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is a separate item?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; that is not covered in this Comptroller General's report. That is a separate item involving $32 million. It has finally been confirmed that that shortage exists. Now here is another $100 million worth on top of the $32 million that I mentioned. That makes a total of $132 million of agricultural commodities which have not reached the countries to which they were shipped. No one knows where these commodities went and, I regret to say, as far as the administration is concerned, they do not seem to care.

EXHIBIT 1

(Excerpts from October 1963 report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States on inadequate controls for determining compliance by foreign governments with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (commonly known as Public Law 480), Department of Agriculture, June 1963.)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, October 7, 1963.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Herewith is our report on inadequate controls within the Department of Agriculture for determining compliance by foreign governments with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I, Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), commonly known as Public Law 480.

Under title I of Public Law 480, the President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with friendly nations or organizations of friendly nations to provide for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and for payment to be received in local currency of the recipient country. From inception of the title I program in July 1954 through December 31, 1962, the U.S. Government signed sales agreements with 44 foreign governments. The estimated cost to the Government of financing the agricultural commodities exported under the agreements, including ocean transportation costs, was about $9.5 billion and involved the movement overseas of more than 67 million metric tons of agricultural commodities.

The law requires the U.S. Government to obtain commitments from foreign countries that will prevent the unauthorized resale or transshipment to other countries of agricultural commodities made available under title I of the act and to take steps to assure that agricultural commodities sold or transferred thereunder do not result in increased availability of those or like commodities to unfriendly nations. To determine compliance with these statutory requirements, the Department of Agriculture requires its agricultural attachés in foreign countries to obtain specified information and to submit quarterly reports showing, among other things, the quantity of commodities arriving in each country and the disposition of commodities made available. In those countries where agricultural attachés are not assigned, the Department has requested the American Embassies to submit the required information.

On the basis of our review, we have concluded that the Department of Agriculture has not obtained sufficient information from its agricultural attachés overseas or from representatives of American Embassies nor has it had adequate procedures for ascertaining that surplus agricultural commodities sold to foreign countries and financed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under title I are received and used in authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations. As a result, the Department has not had adequate assurance that foreign governments are complying with statutory restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I.

The Department has not received required information on arrival and disposition of commodities in some foreign countries; in some cases the information was obtained on an irregular basis or was not complete. Followup action to obtain required reports has not been sufficiently aggressive. Furthermore, information was not readily available in the Washington, D.C., headquarters office of the Department as to reports required and received, and there were no formal control records indicating the quantities of commodities shipped to each foreign country and the quantities reported as having arrived in each foreign country, so as to enable prompt detection and investigation of any differences. Also, effective arrangements have not been made with the Department of State to have the American Embassies obtain the required information in certain countries. In addition, the Department of Agriculture has not issued instructions setting forth the extent of independent verification expected to be made, by attachés, of information required to be obtained from foreign government agencies relative to the arrival and disposition of commodities.

In our review, we noted that commodities with an estimated export market value of approximately $100 million had been shipped to Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam under title I during calendar year 1962 but had not been accounted for by required reports on the arrival and disposition of commodities. In the case of Vietnam, no reports of the arrival and disposition of commodities had been received since inception of the title I program in that country in 1958, although commodities with an estimated export market value of about $50 million had been shipped to that country. Reports on shipments to several other countries were not submitted on a quarterly basis but covered longer periods of time; some of these reports were submitted approximately 10 to 20 months after the shipments covered in the reports were made. We noted also that reports of commodities received by Egypt during the period February 6 through November 23, 1962, showed about 44,000 metric tons less than the quantities shown on bills of lading as having been shipped to Egypt.

We are recommending that the Secretary of Agriculture take certain specific actions to strengthen controls for determining that surplus agricultural commodities made available to foreign countries under title I are actually received and used in authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations. Among other measures to be taken, we believe that the Secretary should consider the possible advantages to be achieved by requesting the assistance of the Agency for International Development, Department of State, in those countries where that Agency's personnel are located, for the performance of arrival accounting and end-use investigations of surplus agricultural commodities made available under title I.

In commenting on the matters discussed in this report, the Department of Agriculture has advised us that it plans to take certain specific steps to strengthen its current procedures for determining future compliance by foreign countries with restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I. In addition, the Department of State and the Agency for International Development have advised us of their willingness to assist the Department of Agriculture in resolving the problems presented in this report.

The benefits to be derived from the actions proposed by the Department of Agriculture will depend on the effectiveness with which these actions are carried out. We intend to review at a future date the specific actions taken by the Department and to examine into the effectiveness of such actions in providing adequate controls to determine that surplus agricultural commodities made available under title I of Public Law 480 are actually received and used in authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Secretary of State, to the Administrator, Agency for International Development, and to the Director, Food for Peace.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

On the basis of our review, we have concluded that the Foreign Agricultural Service of the Department of Agriculture has not obtained sufficient information from its agricultural attachés overseas or from representatives of American Embassies nor has it had adequate procedures for ascertaining that surplus agricultural commodities sold to foreign countries and financed by CCC under title I, Public Law 480, are received and used in the authorized foreign countries and do not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations.

In many cases FAS has not received required information on the arrival and disposition of commodities in foreign countries; in some cases the information was obtained on an irregular basis or was not complete. Followup action to obtain required reports has not been sufficiently aggressive. Furthermore, information was not readily available in the Washington, D.C., headquarters office of FAS as to reports required and received, and there were no formal control records indicating the quantities of commodities shipped to each foreign country and the quantities reported as having arrived in each foreign country, so as to enable prompt detection and investigation of any differences. Also, in those countries where agricultural attachés have not been assigned, effective arrangements have not been made with the Department of State to have the American Embassies obtain the required information for FAS. In addition, the agency has not issued instructions setting forth the extent of independent verification expected to be made, by attachés, of information required to be obtained from foreign government agencies relative to the arrival and disposition of commodities.

As a result of the above weaknesses in controls, the Department of Agriculture has not had adequate assurance that foreign governments are complying with statutory restrictions placed on the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

Specific deficiencies disclosed by our review are described in the following sections of this report.

REQUIRED INFORMATION ON ARRIVAL AND DISPOSITION OF COMMODITIES WAS NOT ALWAYS RECEIVED

Although FAS Field Instruction No. 5 requires agricultural attachés to submit quarterly reports containing information relating to arrival and disposition of commodities made available under title I, our review disclosed that the required information was not always received. For some shipments, no reports were received; in other instances the reports were submitted on an irregular basis. In our test of the controls being exercised by the Department of Agriculture over the disposition of agricultural commodities made available under title I of Public Law 480, we selected 253 ocean bills of lading applicable to shipments of about 747,000 metric tons of surplus agricultural commodities to 14 foreign countries during the period April 1960 to November 1962. We found that FAS files did not contain reports showing evidence of arrival for about 209,000 metric tons of commodities applicable to 132 of the 253 bills of lading selected for review.

Because required quarterly reports on the arrival and disposition of commodities made available under title I were not being received, FAS brought this situation to the attention of agricultural attachés or, where no attachés were assigned, to the attention of American Embassies, in 15 countries in August 1961, and solicited the cooperation of the attachés or Embassies in furnishing the required reports. Our review in June 1963 showed that commodities had been shipped to 14 of the 15 countries during calendar year 1962 but that for 3 of these countries (Colombia, Turkey, and Vietnam) no reports on arrival and disposition of commodities had been received, although agency records indicated that commodities with an estimated export market value of approximately $100 million had been shipped under title I to the three countries during that year. In this connection, no reports of the arrival and disposition of commodities in Vietnam had been received pursuant to FAS Field Instruction No. 5 although, according to FAS records, commodities with an estimated export market value of about $50 million had been shipped to Vietnam since inception of the title I program in that country in 1958. Similarly, reports had not been received for any of the numerous shipments arriving in Yugoslavia after January 1960, and in Spain after May 1959. In this connection, the last shipment to Spain was made in December 1961.

A few reports on shipments to other countries were not submitted on a quarterly basis as required but covered longer periods of time; some of these reports were submitted approximately 10 to 20 months after shipments were made.

We discussed with an official of the Program Operations Division, FAS, the failure in many instances to obtain the required information on the arrival and disposition of commodities in foreign countries. He informed us that this failure may have been due to some extent to laxity on the part of agricultural attachés. Another contributing cause, according to the official, was that the work of the FAS section responsible for obtaining the reports suffered because the section operated without a chief from early 1960 until September 1962.

Although, as previously noted, many of the required reports had not been received for calendar year 1962, specific requests for the missing reports had not been made at the time of our review in June 1963. In our opinion, FAS should have been more aggressive in following up on the failure of attachés and Embassies to submit required reports on the arrival and disposition of commodities in foreign countries.

Many reports did not show arrivals by vessels, disposition of commodities, or measures taken by foreign governments to comply with statutory restrictions regarding disposition of commodities.

In our review of 238 reports submitted to FAS by agricultural attachés, we found that many of the reports were incomplete in that they did not show, as required by FAS Field Instruction No. 5, arrivals by vessels, disposition of commodities, or statements as to measures taken by foreign governments to comply with statutory restrictions regarding the resale or transshipment of commodities.

For example, reports from the attaché in the United Arab Republic (Egypt) on commodities arriving after September 1959 did not show arrivals by vessels; the reports showed quantities shipped from the United States rather than the quantities delivered in Egypt. In a report dated April 21, 1960, the agricultural attaché in Egypt stated that:

> "Our contact in the Ministry of Supply on Public Law 480 matters does not concern itself with delivery weights and is no longer able to supply this information to us. If this information is needed, we can make an effort to obtain it from some other source."

The Assistant Head, Program Analysis Section, FAS, informed us that the attaché was not requested to try to obtain such information.

Regarding the requirement that reports received from attachés must show the disposition of commodities in foreign countries, reports received from the attaché in Egypt on commodities arriving after September 1959 did not comment on the disposition of commodities. Similarly, a report dated April 9, 1962, from the acting attaché in Chile did not show information as to the disposition of over 150,000 metric tons of grains, tobacco, and vegetable oil made available to Chile under title I during the period November 1960 through September 1961.

Of the 238 reports selected by us for review, less than half included a statement obtained from foreign governments, as required by FAS Field Instruction No. 5, describing the measures taken to prevent resale or transshipment of commodities, and containing current assurances, supported by statistics, that the commodities will not result in increased availability of the same or similar commodities to unfriendly nations. In this connection, we noted a report covering shipments to Chile, wherein the acting attaché stated that "No specific measures have been established by the Government of Chile to prevent the resale or transshipment of title I commodities to other countries." However, the acting attaché indicated that other information available to him gave evidence that there had been no resales or transshipments.

We found that the Program Analysis Section, FAS, had not, in most instances, met its responsibility for initiating follow-up action with agricultural attachés concerning incomplete reports.

SALE OF WHEAT TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 1 minute?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it becomes increasingly apparent with each news report that a substantial change in our national policy in trading with the Communists is to be made by Executive decision preliminary to a sale of wheat to the Soviet Union.

This change of policy, it seems to me, especially in light of prior legislative expression should be considered by the Congress. Many questions are involved. This proposed transaction is something more than the existence of the simple facts that we have wheat to sell and the Soviets have gold with which to buy.

Pertinent to the Congress deliberation would be a study of the world wheat situation as to this country's wheat stocks, the 1963 crop production estimate, the total supply in 1963 and 1964 and our consumption, both domestic and export. Note should also be taken of wheat production and consumption in the Communist bloc nations, the total wheat export capacity of the free world other than the United States and finally a forecast of the world wheat needs in the immediate years ahead in the various parts of the world.

Mr. President, I have prepared in the briefest possible form charts dealing with these subject matters. The information is available to all through the Department of Agriculture. Such information is presented here in different form in the outline heretofore mentioned. From the cold statistics presented, there emerges the central and meaningful fact that in the future changing world, it is not inconceivable that once again our farmers may be called upon to produce maximum capacity to supply rising world grain needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement entitled "1963 World Wheat Situation."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEARSON: 1963 WORLD WHEAT SITUATION

Possible future sales of American surplus grain to the Soviet Union gave me an opportunity to review the world grain situation in its present form and to look at Department of Agriculture forecasts for the future. The following table gives the latest USDA information on U.S. wheat stocks and how they have been consumed in past years:

U.S. wheat stocks

	Bushels
Carryover as of July 1, 1963 (including 1963 crop and all previous years) (on farm and off farm storage)	1,189,406,000
1963 crop production estimate (spring wheat not included; available Oct. 14)	1,134,051,000
Total supply for 1963-64	2,323,457,000

[Million bushels]

	Total	Domestic	Export
Grain disappearance:			
1962-63	1,200	570	630
1961-62	1,300	581	719
1960-61	1,300	638	662
1959-60	1,100	590	510

In the Communist-bloc countries, the grain picture is not too clear, but reports from U.S. citizens returning from European tours report a hard winter and severe drought during the ripening season which has seriously reduced wheat production.

Wheat production in Communist-bloc countries

	1962	1963	Average annual consumption
	Million bushels		
Albania	No report	No report	No report.
Bulgaria	60	Same	62,000,000 (import 2,000,000 from Russia).
Czechoslovakia	53	Down 3,000,000 bushels	Consumption equals production and also importing 3,000,000 bushels from Canada.
Cuba	(1)	(1)	16,400,000 bushels annually.
East Germany	40	Down	Consumption higher than production.
Hungary	69	Same	Consumption equals production.
Rumania	140	Same	Do.
Poland	90	Less	Gomulka told Freeman on recent tour crop would be slightly less than production. On Aug. 16, 1963, Poland purchased 3,700,000 bushels from Canada and also received Public Law 480 wheat from United States.
Yugoslavia	110	Production up, good corn crop	Consumption nearly equals production. Imports wheat from United States and Canada and has not purchased Russian wheat for past 5 years.
Russia	2,000	1,600,000,000 bushels; crop off at least 20 percent; may be worse.	Russia largest producer in Europe. Usually exports 150,000,000 bushels annually, mostly to Eastern Europe.
Red China [2]	No report	No report, but believe food situation is better.	Imported 200,000,000 bushels from Canada and Australia to meet demands.

[1] No measurable wheat production.

[2] 2 reports say the situation is better, 1 report says it is worse. Official prediction indicates grain situation next year will be much better in Red China.

Western nations have become the granary of the world in the past 2 years and the three major exporters of wheat are all estimated to be in a stable condition after the major sales to Russia.

Western wheat export capacity (other than United States)

	Surplus Stock	Production		Export	Domestic consumption
		1962	1963		
	Million bushels	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	*Million bushels*	
Canada	485	566	694	(1963) 309 (1962) 358	150,000,000 bushels.
Australia	[1] 150	307		230	80,000,000 bushels (1962 prospects good but not as good as 1962; commence harvest in December).
Argentina	[2] 85	190		50-55	130,000,000-135,000,000 bushels (1963 crop not far enough advanced; however, she expects better crop).

[1] Estimate; will be cut to 25,000,000 bushels by end of crop year.

[2] Estimate.

USDA forecast of world wheat needs in 1966

[Metric tons]

	Total consumption	Total production	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
Latin America	14.2	11.5	−2.7
Africa	10.2	6.4	−3.8
West Asia	15.3	13.9	−1.4
Far East	34.2	21.8	−12.4
Communist Asia	31.1	26.1	−5.0
Total	105.0	79.7	−25.3

(The above figures are in metric tons; however, converting the deficit tonnage to bushels, this portion of the world is expected to be 929 million bushels short of their needs by 1966.)

	Total consumption	Total production	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
Canada	4.8	13.8	+9.0
United States	17.1	29.9	+12.8
Western Europe	48.1	41.2	−6.9
Soviet Union	51.6	56.6	+5.0
Eastern Europe	20.4	17.4	−3.0
Australia-New Zealand	3.2	6.8	+3.6
Total	145.2	165.7	+20.5

(Converting the surplus production of this group of nations to bushels, the total is expected to amount to 753 million bushels which would be applied against the deficit of other nations. These USDA projections indicate 176 million bushels of grain would have to be drawn from surplus stocks of Western nations.)

These figures were compiled to show what our present position appears to be and what we can expect within the next 3 years. As the world population increases, it is not inconceivable that once again our farmers may be called upon to produce at maximum capacity to supply rising world grain needs.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself as much time as I may require. I am about to withdraw my amendment. Before I do so, I should like to state my reasons briefly.

First, there is a reason of tactics. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is in charge of the bill, and the chairman of the committee [Mr. HILL] have been in disagreement with me on the matter of tactics. So, I believe, are the President of the United States and his principal advisers in the area of education. So are at least some of those in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who have been advising both the President and the White House staff, and also members of our committee. It occurs to me that when so able a group of experienced parliamentarians, who are well aware of the practical situation in the Senate and the House, and elsewhere, are in drastic disagreement with me on tactics, there is at least the possibility that I am wrong. Therefore, I am prepared to yield my judgment on tactics to that of more experienced Senators and members of the administration who are not in accord with me.

I would have liked to see the omnibus bill "take off." I would have liked to see it reported from committee. I would have liked to see the White House ask us to fight for it on the floor of the Senate, on the floor of the House, and in conference. If that had been done, I think it might have been enacted.

But I yield my own views and my own emotions, to the perhaps, wiser parliamentary experience of Senators who have the primary responsibility for handling the bill and carrying through this body and through conference, into law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania has once again demonstrated the high degree of statesmanship with which he serves in the Senate. I was in the Senator's State the other night, in Washington County, some 35 miles from Pittsburgh. There I had an opportunity to speak to 1,300 or 1,400 of his constituents at a huge banquet. During the course of my speech, I dwelt upon the leadership of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania over the years in the field of education. I devoted a part of my speech to the subject of education. I said there what I shall say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I said to those people of Pennsylvania, the constituents of Senator CLARK, that, in my judgment, no Member of the Senate is more dedicated to the educational needs, and to doing something about them, for the boys and girls of this country, than is the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. I know how difficult it is for the Senator to follow now a parliamentary course of action about which he has serious question. When the omnibus approach was discussed in committee it did not receive full support. He has not let me forget that on one occasion, I said I was for a "minibus" approach this year rather than for the omnibus bill. I went on quickly to qualify my statement by saying that I was for a "minibus" bill in order to get the program started. We have more than a "minibus" bill before us this afternoon. We have a bill which, in my judgment, is of great significance.

But even though we differed on the parliamentary strategy that should be followed, the Senator from Pennsylvania, on amendment after amendment which would have really done great damage to the bill in committee, stood shoulder to shoulder with me and was a great source of strength to me in reporting a bill both from the subcommittee and the full committee. I would be ungrateful if I did not say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I deeply appreciate his withdrawal of the amendment.

It would be unfortunate to take his proposal to a vote, because if it were defeated—and I would do everything I could to defeat it—there would be those who would read into that defeat trouble for us in the future, when we shall be asked to have some other installment or title of the President's program passed upon.

So all I can say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, from the bottom of my heart, is, "Thank you." I appreciate his willingness to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. I sincerely thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind words. I assure him that I know full well that there will be many more matters with respect to which we will see eye to eye. This is a rather unusual case, in which our judgment is not now entirely in accord.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oregon will yield as much time as is necessary, in order that the Senator from West Virginia may be accommodated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield such time as I may have on the amendment; if not, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia 5 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the comment of the astute chairman of our Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is, in essence, what I had meant to say when I sought recognition.

I shall not be repetitive, but the RECORD will indicate that the commendation which has been given by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], in connection with the careful consideration of the pending measure and other proposed legislation vital to the strengthening of the educational level of this country, is one in which I heartily concur. The Senator from Pennsylvania knows that even though I joined with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and also with the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MORSE], as we considered how best to bring this measure to the floor, how to effectively proceed, at least partially, toward the aims and the goals which we all share, that I also disagreed with Senator CLARK.

But I wish to reemphasize what has been well said. The Senator from Pennsylvania has been one of the stanchest adherents of an all-out effort, which should be made, not only in this forum but throughout the country, to give to our educational system the strength which it must have if we are to meet the obligations of the Nation in the process of transition, technical change, and great challenge.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his unduly generous words.

Mr. President, the second reason why I am withdrawing my amendment is that we are again, as we have been so often in the past, largely at the mercy of the House of Representatives. We know that the other body has parliamentary procedures, which it will not hesitate to use, which would make it impossible to have the President's omnibus bill, if the Senate were to pass it, ever to be passed by the House or go to conference. While I deplore that situation, and while I hope that in the infinite wisdom of an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives, the House will, in due course, remove from the House Committee on Rules some of the power which it now exercises—I do not believe it is out of order under our rules to say this—which is the antithesis of democracy and entirely out of order in terms of the Founding Fathers' idea as to what the House of Representatives should stand for under a democratic order in which majority rule should prevail. Nevertheless, the situation which exists is a fact of life. Therefore, I shall not press for a vote on the amendment.

My third and final reason is that to press this amendment to a final vote——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. CLARK. My third and final reason for not pressing this amendment to a vote is that it would embarrass the President of the United States, because in my opinion many Senators who would not vote for the omnibus bill, if they were confronted with a request from the White House to vote for it, would—if they were confronted with a request from the Senator in charge of the bill and the chairman of the committee to vote for it—unhesitatingly vote for this amendment. But the fact is that some Senators would be confronted with a very difficult dilemma as to whether they should support what the President once asked them to vote for, in the President's very eloquent message which he vigorously supported, or, on the other side of the dilemma, or whether they should say to the Senator in charge of the bill, the chairman of the committee, and the leadership of the Senate, that we should vote down what the President once asked for. I am not willing to put the occupant of the White House and his principal advisers in that embarrassing position.

So, Mr. President, for the three reasons I have just stated, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania is withdrawn.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island such time as he needs. If need be, I shall yield him time on the bill or, if not, then time on the amendment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the bill before us represents a major breakthrough in the field of vocational education and training. It is a dramatic departure from our existing programs which have been oriented primarily toward the training of persons in agriculture and home economics. And in light of our space age technology, it is a program that we may well have delayed too long. This morning, my staff contacted the Department of Employment Security in Rhode Island. Our attention was called to an amazing fact—that in testimony received from leaders of the business community it was estimated that the inability to fill 1 highly skilled job could result in the loss of up to 50 semi- and unskilled positions. For example, the loss of or inability to get a setup man—a very highly skilled position—in a machine tool plant would mean a number of machines that could not be operated. This would result in a loss of jobs for the men who deliver material to the machines, the takeaway men, clerical help that make up such things as payrolls, and the unused services to the plant itself. Thus the loss of that 1 position has the vicious multiplier effect of eliminating up to 50 more jobs. It is a perfect example of the classic, for want of a nail the kingdom was lost.

Coupled with this, Mr. President, is the fact that Rhode Island cannot meet the needs of industry and business in supplying skilled and semiskilled workers. There are employers who desperately need weavers, loom fixers, turret lathe operators, screw machine operators, machine repairmen—there is a widespread need for almost all skills. And I am certain that what is true in Rhode Island is duplicated in almost every State in the country.

Rhode Island presently has an unemployment rate hovering around 7 percent. In light of the facts I have just mentioned, this unemployment rate can be substantially reduced if we can only train and provide people with the skills necessary to fill these vacant jobs. The multiplier effect which has resulted in such a high unemployment rate, can work in reverse and reduce this unconscionably high, and unnecessary percentage of unemployed workers.

The legislation we are considering will provide $108 million for fiscal year 1964, with increasing amounts over the next 4 years. It is designed to effect comprehensive changes in the field of vocational education, particularly with respect to the training of our young people—the school dropouts and those who have only completed high school. It will cut across wide areas, and explore new fields. But basically, its intent is to meet present and future, recognizable needs.

I cannot agree with those who say this program is too costly or too big. I find it difficult indeed, to equate the spending of Federal funds with the very real human factor of 4 million unemployed persons in the United States. The evidence is before us of the need for decisive action—action on the part of this Congress to help our citizens gain the skills necessary for employment. I feel we can do no less than respond to this need and act to meet it, without cutback or clamor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I have any time left on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time remains on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, from the time available on the bill, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] such time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe that a statement by one great American best states the case for the bill before us. John Adams said:

> Laws for the liberal education of youth * * * are so extremely wise and useful, that, to a humane and generous mind, no expense for this purpose would be thought extravagant.

I believe that statement by the great John Adams expresses the importance of education and the sentiments of all of us.

THE HISTORY OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. President, the intervening years have seen the passage of much legislation directed toward the education of our young people—far more than we realize; but much remains to be done.

Our first venture in national support of education, the Land Ordinance of 1785, antedates not only John Adams' concern, but also the Constitution itself. Since that day we have witnessed a wide variety of legislative proposals. A brief look at the chief landmarks may assist us in gaining the needed perspective to make a proper assessment of current proposals.

The Land Ordinance and the Northwest Ordinance, setting aside a section of each township for the public support of education, were further strengthened by the Ohio Enabling Act of 1802.

During the administration of Andrew Jackson, the Federal Government appropriated to the States $47 million for the specific purpose of school construction, much as recent legislative proposals have provided.

In 1962, Congress enacted the Morrill Land Grant Act, granting each State 30,000 acres of public land per Member of Congress, for the establishment of institutes of higher education to teach agriculture and mechanics. From this act sprang the great land-grant colleges and universities of our Nation. A grand total of 118 million acres, an area approximately four times the size of the State of New York, was granted by the Federal Government for educational purposes.

In 1867, Congress expressed its concern for education on a continuing basis by creating the Office of Education.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 provided for Federal grants to public schools for vocational education in agriculture, trades and industries, home economics, and the training of teachers in these subjects. This was a landmark in our grants-in-aid programs, in providing specific assistance in areas where an unmet need existed.

The depression years witnessed Federal support for education through the establishment of the National Youth Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the building of schools with the help of the WPA, and grants for schoolbus transportation.

During the war years this Government accepted its responsibility for assistance to education in the war-affected localities. Federal support and aid for impacted areas has been reaffirmed periodically since that time.

In 1944, we passed the most extensive and expensive education measure ever. It provided for the training of our returning servicemen under the GI bill. To this we added the program for the disposal of surplus property, which provided further assistance to education.

The Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act are evidence of our post war concern and support for education international in scope.

Realizing that a healthy mind must reside in a healthy body, we enacted the School Lunch Act and the School Milk Act.

A program of loans for college housing has received increasing support since it was begun in 1950.

To these must be added the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which provides aid for a variety of programs in areas of high priority at every level of education, from the elementary school through graduate training.

The National Science Foundation and Public Health Service grants are a relatively recent and extensive indication of Federal support for many aspects of education. The Library Services Act and support for educational television are further recognition of our diverse interest and support.

All these form an impressive, but by no means an exhaustive, list of our predecessors' efforts in this area, intended to serve as a reminder of the scope and duration of their concern. To provide further perspective, I believe an examination of the Federal programs of assistance to education over the past 25 years would prove helpful. At my request, the Legislative Reference Service has prepared a chart illustrating the funds expended by program in each fiscal year during this period. For purposes of better comparison, both actual dollar appropriations and the value of these appropriations in terms of 1963 dollars of purchasing power are given. This chart will be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks today.

THE ROLE OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Ever since the enactment of Smith-Hughes in 1917, the Federal Government has played a major role in vocational education. The George-Barden Act supplemented the Government's role in this area.

Some change in the emphasis of vocational education is long overdue. This bill provides for such action in line with the recommendations of the President's Advisory Panel on Vocational Education. This is necessary in order to fulfill the Nation's needs for trained manpower to supply our increasingly complex and demanding labor market. New jobs require special skills. Training and retraining are constantly needed in order to keep workers abreast of our rapidly changing technology.

Much of our recent effort has not been directed toward the areas of primary need. Ten million members of our labor force are employed in office occupations, but no funds are presently provided for this area. While we still have a need for better trained personnel in agriculture and home economics, these are no longer the areas of greatest need. We must update our efforts and must provide greater flexibility in the vocational aid programs. The proposed legislation is designed to achieve this end.

Area-vocational-technical schools presently provide training for less than one in five high school students in our larger cities. There were 900 applications for 500 vacancies in the Minneapolis Vocational School this fall; and there would have been many more except for the fact that it was general knowledge that the chances of acceptance were slight. For a large percentage of our youth who will not be going to college, and who cannot gain admission to vocational training, the present program is woefully inadequate. When we add to this number the large number of dropouts, we witness the development of a large pool of future unemployables who will swell our welfare costs. How much better it would be to prepare them now for jobs, rather than be faced with this task after they are out of school and are out of work.

RESEARCH AND PILOT PROGRAMS

Section 4(c) of the Senate committee version of this bill provides for a most significant authorization of 15 percent or $16.2 million, of the first year's funds, to be earmarked for research grants, leadership training, and pilot or developmental programs. Much research now receives Federal support under the NDEA, Cooperative Research, and the National Science Foundation. Frankly, we are doing far too little. Unless we can improve the efficiency of teaching and the speed of learning, we are going to be inundated by the problem confronting us. The expanding demands for better educated and trained manpower to cope with our increasingly complex technology and social system require increased investment in research, in new educational techniques, and technology.

We spend an estimated one-tenth of 1 percent on research in education, compared to 3 to 5 percent expenditures by private industry in this area. Some industries spend a greater share on market research in the color and shape of the container than we do on improving educational efficiency. As Tom Clemens, Acting Chief of New Media in the Office of Education, recently put it:

> If we conducted research and development in rocketry as we do in education we would still be trying to perfect a bigger and better catapult.

The Federal Government may have extensive research contracts, concentrated in a relatively few universities, but little of it is directed toward education, in general; and vocational education, in particular, is ignored.

We cannot expect the local school district and teacher training institution to take the financial lead in research, in view of the pressing day to day problems confronting them. The Federal Government must assume more of this responsibility, because local governments, in their attempts to solve the pressing problems of today, will, of necessity, rely on other school districts, or States, or other bodies to do something about the long-range problems involving research and experimentation.

STUDENT LOAN FUNDS

I am not going to address myself to all sections of the bill before us, although they all merit our support. I should like, however, to call particular attention to the increase in the student loan funds, as provided under title II of the NDEA. These would be increased from the present $90 million to $125 million for the fiscal year 1964.

This section also provides for raising the institutional limit from the present $250,000 ceiling to $800,000.

These are most needed changes. Currently approved capital contributions total $122 million for the fiscal year 1964. For the State of Minnesota they total $3,890,478, from an original request of over $4 million. Our allocation under the present authorization was only $2,307,412, or 69 percent of the approved requests.

Because of the $250,000 limitation on funds for any one institution, the students at the University of Minnesota were able to borrow only that small portion of total requests of $1,017,000. Three other institutions in Minnesota had requests in excess of the $250,000 limit. Even the proposed ceiling of $800,000 is too low, but it would permit the students in the larger institutions to receive considerably greater equity of treatment than that accorded them under the present law.

Mr. President, I cannot believe that this Congress is going to refuse to provide the capital necessary in order to make loans to able, willing, and needy students. It is a sound investment.

The present proposal should be considered not only in the light of what we have done in the past, but also in terms of what we have failed to do and the increased magnitude of the task confronting us. The question is, not whether we are doing as much as we did yesteryear, but whether we are doing enough to meet the infinitely more complex problems confronting this Nation today, and to provide for the rapidly burgeoning numbers of young people involved. This bill builds in modest fashion upon the groundwork which has been developed over the years.

Extensive public debate has been waged, in recent years, over Federal aid to education. Congress has acted both timidly and inadequately. The people have time and again indicated their support of increased Federal aid. The latest poll, the Louis Harris poll, published in the September 9 issue of the Washington Post, showed 59 percent in favor, only 27 percent opposed, and 14 percent undecided. If the undecided are excluded, the figures are 70 percent in favor and 30 percent opposed. I only wish all our legislative measures enjoyed such a high degree of public understanding and support.

To do less than this proposal calls for would challenge us to demonstrate that there is no need, or that the National Government is so impoverished, and other units so much less so, that we cannot afford to appropriate the relatively paltry funds required for its operation. With State and local debt increasing 190 percent during the past decade, compared to a 10 percent increase in net Federal debt during the same period, we cannot refuse to assume responsibility for a proper share of the financial burdens which the future of education entails.

Even a cursory examination of what we have previously done and what we are now being asked to do, when compared to existing resources, should put to rest the mind of our most foreboding prophet of deficit and doom. During the past 25 years we have spent over $49 billion, in terms of 1963 dollars, on education. This is an average of $2 billion a year. Actual dollar expenditures have exceeded $41 billion over this 25-year period. We are now spending at a $2¼ billion annual rate. This is less than the 25-year average, when compared to our gross national product, our national budget, or the number of our young people to be educated. It is less than half of what we were spending per year in the 1947–50 period. In 1950—not our peak year—we were spending more than 1.1 percent of our gross national product on Federal aid to education. In 1962, this had dropped to less than four-tenths of 1 percent.

Today, few among us would question the wisdom of the investment we made at that time. Let us not be found wanting when, 15 years hence, our present decisions are judged from a position of like perspective. Let us fervently hope that our successors and those of us who may still be here will be able to say that the 88th Congress faced the task before it and heeded both the words of John Adams and those of Cicero, when he asked:

> What greater or better gift can we offer the Republic than to teach and instruct our youth?

We cannot be satisfied with less than has been proposed. We cannot permit some future foreign historian to pick from the ruins of our civilization a copy of Whittier's "In School Days" and see therein, not the poet's nostalgic recollections of childhood, but our epitaph:

> Still sits the school-house by the road,
> A ragged beggar sunning;
> Around it still the sumachs grow,
> And blackberry-vines are running.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his leadership. This is good legislation, and it is long overdue. It will do much to provide equality of opportunity for millions of our people, and will do a great deal to insure the continuing prosperity and strength of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table entitled "Payments to States and Individuals Under Selected Programs of the Federal Government Relating to Education, 1938–63 Fiscal Years," and one entitled "Federal Expenditures for Education: GNP and Population."

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years

	1938		1939		1940	
	Actual (CPI 49.1) [1]	Adjusted (215.7 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 48.4) [1]	Adjusted (218.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 48.8) [1]	Adjusted (217.0 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($13,438,805)	($28,987,500)	($15,241,157)	($33,347,651)	($21,626,229)	($46,928,916)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	575,204	1,240,715	1,325,000	2,899,100	3,961,875	8,597,269
School milk					756	1,640
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	31,466	67,872	23,554	51,536	23,391	50.758
National forests	1,167,215	2,517,682	1,215,924	2,660,442	1,455,972	3,159,450
Mineral leasing	2,684,709	5,790,917	2,207,106	4,829,148	2,098,716	4,554,214
Taylor Grazing Act	431,193	930,083	515,464	1,127,835	373,485	810,462
Submarginal lands						
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training (high school)						
War-affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools	8,549,018	18,440,231	9,954,109	21,779,590	13,712,034	29,755,114
II. Higher education	(15,602,021)	(33,653,559)	(17,598,645)	(38,505,796)	(19,963,558)	(43,321,510)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	4,530,000	9,771,210	5,030,000	11,005,640	5,030,000	10,915,100
Office of Education:						
Howard University	530,000	1,143,210	540,000	1,181,520	557,000	1,208,697
Mentally retarded—Fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—Individuals						
Cooperative research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—Colleges	10,542,021	22,739,139	12,028,627	26,318,636	14,376,558	31,197,713
Veterans building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]						
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships						
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants						
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and Assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange						
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training (colleges)						
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(207,089,512)	(446,692,075)	(151,521,249)	(331,528,493)	(129,130,220)	(280,212,616)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	17,540,622	37,835,122	17,968,122	39,314,251	18,584,624	40,328,673
Experiment stations	6,292,500	13,572,922	6,841,250	14,968,655	7,448,750	16,163,788
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	21,775,977	46,970,782	21,775,977	47,645,838	21,775,977	47,253,870
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for Blind	75,000	161,775	175,000	382,900	125,000	271,250
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	145,000	312,765	150,950	330,279	150,950	327,562
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real						
Personal						
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits						
Maritime education						
WPA:						
School buildings	122,135,687	263,446,676	61,630,050	134,846,549	42,123,170	91,407,278
Education projects	34,529,036	74,479.130	37,980,900	83,102,209	28,243,054	61,287,427
Interior: Education of Indians	4,595,690	9,912,903	4,999,000	10,937,812	10,678,695	23,172,768
Total	236,130,338	509,333,134	184,361,051	403,381,940	170,720,007	370,463,042

	1941		1942		1943	
	Actual (CPI 51.3) [1]	Adjusted (206.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 56.8) [1]	Adjusted (186.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 60.3) [1]	Adjusted (175.6 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($89,158,582)	($184,436,112)	($134,988,159)	($251,617,930)	($145,135,268)	($254,857,531)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	13,118,908	27,077,426	21,858,957	40,745,096	[5] 17,563,000	30,840,628
School milk	592,103	1,222,101	1,473,801	2,747,165	5,801,573	10,187,562
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	22,786	47,030	22,833	42,561	26,887	47,214
National forests	1,555,755	3,211,078	1,692,877	3,155,523	2,502,543	4,394,466
Mineral leasing	2,245,740	5,048,007	2,742,980	5,112,915	2,853,162	5,010,152
Taylor Grazing Act	556,955	1,149,555	549,252	1,023,806	490,333	861,025
Submarginal lands						

See footnotes at end of table.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1941		1942		1943	
	Actual (CPI 51.3) [1]	Adjusted (206.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 56.8) [1]	Adjusted (186.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 60.3) [1]	Adjusted (175.6 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary—Continued						
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training (high school)	$57,701,316	119,095,516	$99,704,280	$185,848,778	$113,877,914	$199,969,617
War affected localities:						
Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maintenance and operation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Federally affected areas:						
Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maintenance and operation	-	-	-	-	-	-
National Defense Education Act—States	-	-	-	-	-	-
NYA student aid—high schools	13,365,019	27,585,399	6,943,179	12,942,086	2,019,856	3,546,867
II. Higher education	(24,242,291)	(50,036,089)	(30,906,156)	(57,609,074)	(30,171,084)	(52,980,423)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5,030,000	10,381,920	5,030,000	9,375,920	5,030,000	8,832,680
Office of Education:						
Howard University	567,160	1,170,618	760,756	1,418,049	1,064,000	1,868,384
Mentally retarded—Fellowships	-	-	-	-	-	-
National Defense Education Act—Individuals	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cooperative research	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teachers of the deaf	-	-	-	-	-	-
NYA student aid—Colleges	14,170,029	29,246,940	9,237,211	17,218,161	3,809,523	6,689,522
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	-	-	-	-	-	-
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants	-	-	-	-	-	-
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools	-	-	-	-	-	-
National Science Foundation: Fellowships	-	-	-	-	-	-
Department of State: Educational exchange	-	-	-	-	-	-
Inter-American Educational Foundation	-	-	-	-	-	-
Defense vocational training (colleges)	4,475,102	9,236,611	15,878,189	29,596,944	20,267,561	35,589,837
III. Extension education, special:						
Education and other assistance	(125,112,959)	(258,233,148)	(143,211,104)	(266,945,497)	(127,052,410)	(223,104,031)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	18,591,002	38,371,828	18,956,918	35,335,695	18,956,950	33,288,404
Experiment stations	6,862,500	14,164,200	6,926,207	12,910,450	6,926,207	12,162,419
Office of Education	21,775,977	44,945,617	21,768,122	40,575,779	21,768,122	38,224,822
Vocational education	-	-	-	-	-	-
War training food production	-	-	-	-	-	-
War relocation education centers	-	-	1,803,000	3,360,792	-	-
Education of CCC enrollees	125,000	258,000	125,000	233,000	125,000	219,500
American Printing House for the Blind	143,000	295,152	142,000	264,688	182,700	320,821
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Library services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Surplus property:						
Real	-	-	-	-	-	-
Personal	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veterans' Administration education and rehabilitation benefits	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maritime Education	-	-	38,948,268	72,599,572	69,924,336	122,787,134
WPA:						
School buildings	39,974,704	82,507,789	25,846,520	48,177,913	-	-
Educational projects	27,233,406	56,209,750	18,785,939	35,016,990	-	-
Interior—Education of Indians	10,407,370	21,480,812	9,909,130	18,470,618	9,169,095	16,100,931
Total	238,513,832	492,705,349	309,105,419	576,172,501	302,358,762	530,941,985

	1944		1945		1946	
	Actual (CPI 61.3) [1]	Adjusted (172.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 62.7) [1]	Adjusted (168.9 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 68.0) [1]	Adjusted (155.7 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($225,968,855)	($390,474,180)	($118,704,627)	($200,492,114)	($114,036,364)	($177,554,617)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	7,814,149	13,502,849	5,796,384	9,790,093	5,833,555	9,082,845
School milk	26,585,420	45,939,606	41,613,080	70,284,492	51,290,171	79,858,796
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	38,476	66,487	35,809	60,480	39,334	61,243
National forests	4,066,307	7,026,578	4,149,662	7,008,779	3,463,764	5,393,081
Mineral leasing	4,310,006	7,447,690	4,029,152	6,805,238	4,046,280	6,300,058
Taylor Grazing Act	507,755	877,401	498,044	841,196	480,079	747,483
Submarginal lands	-	-	-	-	-	-
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training—High School	59,287,855	102,449,413	48,770,467	82,373,319	535,662	[8] 834,026
War-affected localities:						
Construction	[7] 72,275,212	124,891,566	-	-	[9] 12,731,733	19,823,308
Maintenance and operation	[7] 51,083,675	88,272,590	13,812,029	23,328,517	[9] 35,615,785	5,453,777
Federally affected areas:						
Construction	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maintenance and operation	-	-	-	-	-	-
National Defense Education Act—States	-	-	-	-	-	-
NYA student aid—High schools	-	-	-	-	-	-
II. Higher education	(18,629,111)	(32,191,104)	(12,816,078)	(21,646,356)	(11,029,275)	(17,172,581)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5,030,000	8,691,840	5,030,000	8,495,670	5,030,000	783,710
Office of Education:						
Howard University	891,340	1,540,236	908,000	1,533,612	911,000	1,418,427
Mentally retarded—fellowships	-	-	-	-	-	-
National Defense Education Act—individuals	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cooperative research	-	-	-	-	-	-
Teachers of the deaf	-	-	-	-	-	-
NYA student aid—colleges	-	-	-	-	-	-
Veterans building construction and equipment to educational institutions	-	-	-	-	-	-
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	-	-	-	-	-	-
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships	-	-	-	-	-	-
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants	-	-	-	-	-	-

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1944		1945		1946	
	Actual (CPI 61.3) [1]	Adjusted (172.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 62.7) [1]	Adjusted (168.9 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 68.0) [1]	Adjusted (155.7 percent) [1]
II. Higher education—Continued						
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange						
Inter-American Educational Foundation					[11] $5,088,275	$7,922,444
Defense vocational training (colleges)	$12,707,771	$21,959,028	$6,878,078	$11,617,074		
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(119,922,250)	(207,225,649)	(152,445,104)	(257,496,672)	(399,459,095)	(621,957,812)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	18,996,950	32,826,730	22,996,840	38,841,663	23,394,062	36,424,555
Experiment stations	7,001,207	12,098,086	7,001,207	11,841,929	7,206,208	11,220,066
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	21,768,122	37,615,315	21,768,122	36,766,358	21,768,122	33,892,966
War training food production			[13] 1,587,923	2,682,002		
War relocation education centers					[13] 6,307,711	9,821,106
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for Blind	125,000	216,000	125,000	211,125	125,000	194,625
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	155,200	268,186	204,100	344,725	167,000	260,019
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real						
Personal						
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits			24,973,000	42,179,397	295,000,000	459,315,000
Maritime education	62,434,921	107,887,543	64,399,352	108,770,506	35,487,274	55,253,686
WPA:						
School buildings						
Education projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	9,440,850	16,313,789	9,389,560	15,858,967	10,003,718	15,575,789
Total	364,520,216	629,890,933	283,965,800	479,635,142	524,524,734	812,685,010

	1947		1948		1949	
	Actual (CPI 77.8) [1]	Adjusted (136.1 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 83.8) [1]	Adjusted (126.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 83.0) [1]	Adjusted (127.6 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($95,440,604)	($129,905,663)	($105,161,992)	($132,924,757)	($120,135,502)	($153,292,901)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	77,619,229	105,639,771	86,767,946	109,674,684	94,924,931	121,124,212
School milk [3]						
Shared revenues:						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	49,217	66,984	57,095	72,168	60,775	77,549
National forests	4,624,570	6,294,040	6,040,470	7,635,154	7,780,076	9,927,377
Mineral leasing	5,984,135	8,144,408	9,539,517	12,057,949	11,330,647	14,457,906
Taylor Grazing Act	517,113	703,791	256,964	324,802	185,211	236,329
Submarginal lands						
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training (high school)						
War affected localities						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation	[10] 6,646,340	9,045,669	2,500,000	3,160,000	5,853,862	7,469,528
Federally affected areas:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools						
II. Higher education	(9,108,991)	(12,697,336)	(187,852,936)	(237,455,151)	(60,321,308)	(76,969,988)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5,030,000	6,845,830	5,030,000	6,357,920	5,030,000	6,418,280
Office of Education:						
Howard University	2,995,414	4,076,758	427,480	549,375	5,121,450	6,534,970
Mentally retarded—Fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—Individuals						
Cooperative Research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—Colleges						
Veterans Building Construction and Equipment to Educational Institutions			[17] 166,460,104	210,405,571	23,196,110	29,598,236
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College Housing Loans [4]						
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and Traineeships						
Public Health Service: Fellowships, Traineeships, Training Grants						
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange						
Inter-American Educational Foundation	1,083,577	1,774,748	14,820,352	18,732,925	26,973,748	34,418,502
Defense vocational training—Colleges			1,115,000	1,409,360		
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(2,931,590,110)	(3,989,893,480)	(3,831,997,886)	(4,819,418,327)	(3,254,346,842)	(4,152,546,418)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	27,322,824	37,186,363	27,322,824	34,536,050	30,836,263	39,347,072
Experiment stations	7,206,208	9,807,649	8,950,807	11,313,820	9,703,707	12,381,930
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	21,768,122	29,626,414	25,035,122	31,644,394	27,127,882	34,615,177
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for the Blind	125,000	170,125	125,000	158,000	125,000	159,500
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for the Deaf)	247,800	337,256	259,500	373,512	320,500	408,958
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real	[14] 284,473,734	387,168,752	[18] 21,336,642	26,969,515	39,402,958	50,278,174
Personal	[15] 254,050,280	345,762,431	[19] 145,261,269	183,610,244	[19] 85,598,180	109,223,278

See footnotes at end of table.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1947		1948		1949	
	Actual (CPI 77.8) [1]	Adjusted (136.1 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 83.8) [1]	Adjusted (126.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 83.0) [1]	Adjusted (127.6 percent) [1]
III. Extension education, etc.—Continued						
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	$2,313,233,484	$3,148,310,113	$3,584,666,608	$4,531,019,088	$3,035,382,120	$3,873,147,432
Maritime education	10,112,081	13,762,542	7,254,414	9,169,579	7,654,991	9,767,769
WPA:						
School buildings						
Educational projects						
Interior:						
Education of Indians	13,050,577	17,761,835	11,785,700	14,897,125	18,195,241	23,217,128
Total	3,036,139,705	4,132,496,479	4,125,012,814	5,189,798,235	3,434,803,652	4,382,809,307

	1950		1951		1952	
	Actual (CPI 83.8) [1]	Adjusted (126.4 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 90.5) [1]	Adjusted (117.0 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 92.5) [1]	Adjusted (114.5 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($144,945,186)	($183,210,715)	($157,443,951)	($184,209,952)	($220,762,968)	($253,342,617)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	112,599,713	142,326,037	118,081,894	138,155,816	98,466,313	112,743,928
School milk						
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests			71,930	84,158	107,294	122,852
National forests	7,813,896	9,876,765	8,362,897	9,784,589	13,974,027	16,000,261
Mineral leasing	10,569,004	13,359,221	13,908,542	16,272,994	16,391,932	18,768,762
Taylor Grazing Act	297,986	376,654	288,385	337,941	331,984	380,122
Submarginal lands	228,447	288,757	3,008	3,519	552,174	632,239
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training (high school) war-affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation	6,737,223	8,515,850				
Federally affected areas:						
Construction			2,955,566	3,458,012	55,494,893	63,541,652
Maintenance and operation	6,698,917	8,467,431	[16] 13,771,729	16,112,923	35,941,311	41,152,801
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools						
II. Higher education	(90,981,928)	(115,001,536)	(48,613,439)	(56,877,724)	(68,148,116)	(78,029,593)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5,030,000	6,357,920	5,030,000	5,885,100	5,030,000	5,759,350
Office of education:						
Howard University	9,508,500	12,019,123	4,262,000	4,986,540	4,001,000	4,581,145
Mentally retarded—fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—individuals						
Cooperative research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans building construction and equipment to educational institutions	37,015,534	46,787,635				
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]			16,895,000	19,767,150	24,413,000	27,952,885
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and trainee ships						
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants					9,481,000	10,855,745
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships						
Department of State: Educational exchange	39,427,894	49,836,858	22,426,439	26,238,934	25,223,116	28,880,468
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training—colleges						
III. Extension education, special education, and other assistance	(3,028,391,373)	(3,827,886,134)	(2,214,699,981)	(2,591,199,298)	(1,597,788,550)	(1,829,467,075)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	32,159,840	40,650,038	32,141,338	37,605,365	72,057,930	82,506,330
Experiment stations	11,006,207	13,911,846	11,016,208	12,888,963	11,028,708	12,627,871
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	26,622,628	33,651,002	26,685,054	31,221,513	25,862,968	29,613,098
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for Blind	125,000	158,000	125,000	146,250	125,000	143,125
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	353,800	447,203	368,200	430,794	390,000	446,550
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real	[19] 6,678,041	8,441,044	[19] 1,463,470	1,712,260	[19] 1,515,375	1,735,104
Personal	[20] 110,306,652	139,427,608	[20] 47,843,129	55,976,461	[20] 38,741,660	44,359,201
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	2,815,021,445	3,558,186,544	2,062,647,580	2,413,297,990	1,415,523,711	1,620,773,835
Maritime education	6,755,004	8,538,325	5,292,414	6,192,124	4,377,133	5,011,817
WPA:						
School buildings						
Education projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	19,362,756	24,474,524	27,117,588	31,727,578	28,166,065	32,250,144
Total	3,234,318,487	4,126,098,385	2,420,757,371	2,832,286,974	1,886,690,634	2,160,839,285

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1953		1954		1955	
	Actual (CPI 93.2) [1]	Adjusted (113.6 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 93.6) [1]	Adjusted (113.1 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 93.3) [1]	Adjusted (113.5 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($369, 163, 671)	($419, 369, 931)	($399, 506, 616)	($451, 841, 983)	($424, 622, 726)	($481, 946, 803)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	133, 540, 019	151, 701, 462	176, 220, 595	199, 305, 493	152, 071, 195	172, 600, 806
School milk					17, 220, 281	19, 545, 019
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	131, 588	149, 484	122, 755	138, 836	102, 579	116, 427
National forests	17, 358, 503	19, 719, 259	18, 697, 371	21, 146, 727	16, 393, 583	18, 606, 717
Mineral leasing	17, 255, 527	19, 602, 279	20, 675, 791	23, 384, 320	23, 605, 409	26, 792, 139
Taylor Grazing Act	346, 165	393, 243	350, 461	396, 371	347, 838	394, 796
Submarginal lands	448, 049	508, 984	461, 034	521, 429	374, 968	425, 589
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training—high school						
War affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction	134, 089, 151	152, 325, 276	112, 854, 536	127, 638, 480	129, 256, 192	146, 705, 778
Maintenance and operation	65, 994, 669	74, 969, 944	70, 124, 073	79, 310, 327	85, 250, 681	96, 759, 532
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools						
II. Higher Education	(93, 972, 860)	(106, 753, 169)	(94, 040, 322)	(106, 359, 605)	(96, 271, 402)	(109, 268, 042)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	5, 030, 000	5, 714, 080	5, 051, 500	5, 713, 247	5, 051, 500	5, 733, 453
Office of Education:						
Howard University	4, 047, 000	4, 597, 392	2, 555, 000	2, 889, 705	7, 654, 000	8, 687, 290
Mentally retarded—fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—individuals						
Cooperative research						
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	51, 545, 000	58, 555, 120	48, 357, 000	54, 691, 767	47. 153, 000	53, 518, 655
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships					790, 000	896, 650
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, and training grants	9, 991, 000	11. 349, 776	13, 104, 000	14, 820, 624	14, 046, 000	15, 942, 210
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools						
National Science Foundation: Fellowships			1, 726, 978	1, 953, 212	1, 808, 667	2, 052, 837
Department of State: Educational exchange	23, 359, 860	26, 536, 801	23, 245, 844	26, 291, 050	19, 768, 235	22, 436, 947
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training—colleges						
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(894, 925, 687)	(1, 016, 635, 582)	(798, 179, 118)	(902, 740, 582)	(916, 683, 872)	(1, 040, 436, 196)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	32, 117, 059	36, 484, 979	32, 129, 979	36, 339, 006	39, 675, 000	45, 031, 125
Experiment stations	11, 041, 208	12, 542, 812	11, 773, 708	13, 316, 064	15, 733, 708	17, 857, 759
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	25, 336, 460	28, 782, 219	25, 418, 894	28, 748, 769	30, 350, 881	34, 448, 250
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for the Blind	185, 000	210, 160	185, 000	209, 235	215, 000	244, 025
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	503, 000	571, 408	451, 000	510, 081	674, 000	764, 990
Library services						
Surplus property:						
Real	722, 710	820, 999	5, 209, 351	5, 891, 776	4, 270, 953	4, 847, 532
Personal	56, 805, 475	64, 531, 020	85, 634, 352	96, 852, 452	105, 739, 398	120, 014, 217
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	734, 073, 888	833, 907, 937	600, 350, 904	678, 996, 872	679, 890, 169	771, 675, 342
Maritime education	4, 023, 883	4, 571, 131	4, 228, 737	4, 782, 702	2, 593, 290	2, 943, 384
WPA:						
School buildings						
Educational projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	30, 117, 004	34, 212, 917	32, 797, 193	37, 043, 625	37, 541, 473	42, 609, 572
Total	1, 358, 062, 218	1, 542, 758, 682	1, 291, 726, 056	1, 460, 942, 170	1, 437, 578, 000	1, 631, 651, 041

	1956		1957		1958	
	Actual (CPI 94.7) [1]	Adjusted (111.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 98.0) [1]	Adjusted (108.1 percent)	Actual (CPI 100.7) [1]	Adjusted (105.2 percent [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($452, 105, 682)	($505, 454, 094)	($520, 991, 874)	($563, 192, 217)	($490, 131, 961)	($515, 618, 822)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	181, 574, 361	203, 000, 136	230, 407, 202	249, 070, 185	174, 499, 551	183, 573, 528
School milk [3]	45, 842, 194	51, 251, 513	60, 023, 914	64, 885, 851	65, 182, 562	68, 572, 055
Shared revenues:						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	114, 301	127, 789	129, 404	139, 886	105, 474	110, 959
National forests	19, 412, 708	21, 703, 408	28, 490, 343	30, 798, 061	26, 975, 307	28, 378, 023
Mineral leasing	24, 255, 983	27, 118, 189	28, 256, 124	30, 544, 870	34, 380, 278	36, 168, 052
Taylor Grazing Act	365, 923	409, 102	358, 270	387, 290	401, 293	422, 160
Submarginal lands	459, 795	514, 051	491, 389	531, 192	558, 249	587, 278
Office of Education:						
Defense Vocational Training—high school						
War-affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction	94, 607, 593	105, 771, 289	75, 054, 616	81, 134, 040	78, 746, 855	82, 841, 691
Maintenance and operation	85, 472, 824	95, 558, 617	97, 780, 612	105, 700, 842	109, 282, 392	114, 965, 076
National Defense Education Act—States						
NYA student aid—high schools						

See footnotes at end of table.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1956		1957		1958	
	Actual (CPI 94.7) [1]	Adjusted (111.8 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 98.0) [1]	Adjusted (108.1 percent)	Actual (CPI 100.7) [1]	Adjusted (105.2 percent) [1]
II. Higher education	($241, 557, 837)	($270, 061, 661)	($287, 019, 854)	($310, 268, 463)	($327, 764, 485)	($344, 808, 238)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	505, 500	5, 647, 577	5, 051, 500	5, 460, 672	5, 051, 500	5, 314, 178
Office of Education:						
Howard University	5, 006, 000	5, 596, 708	3, 686, 200	3, 984, 782	4, 212, 000	4, 431, 024
Mentally retarded—fellowships						
National Defense Education Act—individuals						
Cooperative research			1, 000, 000	1, 081, 000	2, 300, 000	2, 419, 600
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	191, 231, 000	213, 796, 258	213, 411, 000	230, 697, 291	234, 522, 000	246, 717, 144
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships	2, 053, 000	2, 295, 254	2, 938, 000	3, 175, 978	4, 380, 000	4, 607, 760
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants	15, 666, 000	17, 514, 588	36, 252, 000	39, 188, 412	45, 224, 000	47, 575, 648
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools			3, 943, 551	4, 262, 979	7, 476, 623	7, 865, 407
National Science Foundation: Fellowships	2, 266, 528	2, 533, 978	2, 132, 985	2, 305, 757	3, 196, 538	3, 362, 758
Department of State: Educational exchange	20, 283, 809	22, 677, 298	18, 604, 618	20, 111, 592	21, 401, 824	22, 514, 719
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training—colleges						
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	(1, 092, 089, 829)	(1, 220, 956, 429)	(1, 127, 134, 778)	(1, 218, 432, 695)	(1, 125, 696, 346)	(1, 184, 232, 557)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	45, 475, 000	50, 841, 050	49, 865, 000	53, 904, 065	50, 715, 000	53, 352, 180
Experiment stations	19, 549, 708	21, 856, 574	22, 969, 708	24, 830, 254	23, 581, 708	24, 807, 957
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	33, 180, 364	37, 095, 647	37, 063, 018	40, 065, 122	38, 733, 174	40, 747, 299
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for the Blind	234, 000	261, 612	240, 000	259, 440	338, 000	355, 576
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for the Deaf)	2, 764, 000	3, 090, 152	3, 162, 000	3, 418, 122	2, 420, 000	2, 545, 840
Library services			2, 050, 000	2, 216, 050	5, 000, 000	5, 260, 000
Surplus property:						
Real	4, 123, 339	4, 609, 893	2, 629, 772	2, 842, 784	2, 454, 261	2, 581, 883
Personal	163, 597, 933	182, 902, 489	176, 146, 705	190, 414, 588	238, 942, 173	251, 367, 166
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	781, 858, 944	874, 118, 299	786, 952, 509	850, 695, 662	709, 726, 348	746, 632, 118
Maritime education	2, 744, 405	3, 068, 245	2, 836, 229	3, 065, 964	3, 049, 845	3, 208, 437
WPA:						
School buildings						
Educational projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	38, 562, 136	43, 112, 468	43, 219, 837	46, 720, 644	50, 735, 837	53, 374, 101
Total	1, 785, 753, 348	1, 996, 472, 184	1, 935, 146, 506	2, 091, 893, 375	1, 943, 592, 792	2, 044, 659, 617

	1959		1960		1961	
	Actual (CPI 101.5) [1]	Adjusted (104.3 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 103.1) [1]	Adjusted (102.7 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 104.2) [1]	Adjusted (101.6 percent) [1]
I. Elementary and secondary	($593, 990, 967)	($618, 932, 579)	($678, 346, 497)	($696, 661, 852)	($701, 504, 341)	($712, 728, 410)
Agriculture:						
School lunch [2]	203, 344, 753	212, 088, 578	226, 111, 648	232, 216, 662	226, 300, 000	229, 920, 800
School milk	72, 600, 189	75, 121, 997	79, 400, 000	81, 543, 800	86, 685, 047	88, 072, 008
Shared revenues: [3]						
New Mexico and Arizona forests	117, 161	122, 199	113, 861	116, 935		
National forests	22, 204, 787	23, 159, 593	29, 668, 588	30, 469, 640	[22] 35, 671, 616	36, 242, 362
Mineral leasing	35, 807, 080	37, 346, 784	36, 430, 776	37, 414, 407	34, 736, 941	35, 292, 732
Taylor Grazing Act	432, 855	451, 468	448, 000	460, 096	641, 000	651, 256
Submarginal lands	460, 109	479, 894	452, 894	465, 122	391, 987	398, 259
Office of Education:						
Defense vocational training—high school						
War-affected localities:						
Construction						
Maintenance and operation						
Federally affected areas:						
Construction	76, 192, 027	79, 468, 284	70, 553, 171	72, 458, 107	59, 248, 637	60, 196, 615
Maintenance and operation	138, 873, 887	144, 845, 464	166, 660, 735	171, 160, 575	207, 639, 466	210, 961, 697
National Defense Education Act—States	43, 958, 119	45, 848, 318	68, 506, 824	70, 356, 508	50, 189, 647	50, 992, 681
NYA student aid—high schools						
II. Higher education	(265, 661, 644)	(277, 085, 096)	(364, 772, 521)	(374, 621, 380)	(620, 591, 580)	(630, 521, 046)
Agriculture: Land grant colleges	5, 051, 500	5, 268, 715	5, 051, 500	5, 187, 891	7, 276, 500	7, 392, 924
Office of Education:						
Howard University	4, 636, 300	4, 835, 661	5, 498, 000	5, 646, 446	5, 490, 000	5, 577, 840
Mentally retarded—fellowships	1, 000, 000	1, 043, 000	308, 191	316, 512	813, 683	826, 702
National Defense Education Act—individuals	3, 194, 834	3, 332, 212	18, 068, 873	18, 556, 733	34, 442, 434	34, 993, 513
Cooperative research	2, 700, 000	2, 816, 100	3, 200, 000	3, 286, 400	3, 356, 000	3, 409, 696
Teachers of the deaf						
NYA student aid—colleges						
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions						
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	135, 993, 000	141, 840, 699	193, 041, 000	198, 253, 107	432, 878, 000	439, 804, 048
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships	4, 799, 000	5, 005, 357	6, 200, 000	6, 367, 400	6, 860, 036	6, 969, 797
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, training grants	70, 357, 000	73, 382, 351	87, 602, 000	89, 967, 254	71, 437, 000	72, 579, 992
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools	4, 707, 671	4, 910, 101	5, 315, 182	5, 458, 692	5, 951, 930	6, 047, 161
National Science Foundation: Fellowships	6, 631, 857	6, 917, 027	11, 139, 724	11, 440, 497	12, 959, 997	13, 167, 357
Department of State: Educational exchange	26, 590, 482	27, 733, 873	29, 348, 051	30, 140, 448	39, 126, 000	39, 752, 016
Inter-American Educational Foundation						
Defense vocational training—colleges						

See footnotes at end of table.

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1959		1960		1961	
	Actual (CPI 101.5) [1]	Adjusted (104.3 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 103.1) [1]	Adjusted (102.7 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 104.2) [1]	Adjusted (101.6 percent) [1]
III. Extension education, special education and other assistance	($1,045,669,111)	($1,090,632,883)	($1,017,126,717)	($1,044,589,139)	($864,937,816)	($878,776,792)
Department of Agriculture:						
Extension programs	53,715,000	56,024,745	53,715,000	55,165,305	63,373,746	64,387,726
Experiment stations	24,445,708	25,496,873	24,445,708	25,105,742	31,521,495	32,025,839
Office of Education:						
Vocational education	41,399,068	43,179,228	39,140,434	40,197,226	39,797,725	40,434,489
War training food production						
War relocation education centers						
Education of CCC enrollees						
American Printing House for the Blind	400,000	417,200	400,000	410,800	400,000	406,400
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	972,000	1,013,796	1,229,000	1,262,183	1,074,000	1,091,184
Library services	6,000,000	6,258,000	6,131,000	6,296,537	7,414,221	7,532,849
Surplus property:						
Real	4,665,834	4,866,465	[24] 25,000,000	25,675,000	31,000,000	31,496,000
Personal	279,763,762	291,793,604	[24] 425,000,000	436,475,000	376,000,000	382,016,000
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	581,467,457	606,470,558	387,915,575	398,389,296	253,489,629	257,545,463
Maritime education	3,265,908	3,406,342	4,016,000	4,124,432	5,108,000	5,189,728
WPA:						
School buildings						
Education projects						
Interior: Education of Indians	49,574,374	51,706,072	50,134,000	51,487,618	55,759,000	56,651,144
Total	1,905,321,722	1,986,650,558	2,060,245,735	2,115,872,371	2,187,033,737	2,222,026,248

	1962		1963	Total	
	Actual (CPI 105.4) [1]	Adjusted (100.5 percent) [1]	Actual (CPI 105.9) [1]	Actual	Adjusted
I. Elementary and secondary	($856,279,000)	($860,560,771)	[21]($922,042,000)	($8,130,837,602)	($9,353,932,618)
Agriculture:					
School lunch [2]	279,900,000	281,300,000	169,993,000		
School milk	83,900,000	84,319,500	105,000,000		
Shared revenues: [3]					
New Mexico and Arizona forests					
National forests	25,155,000	25,280,775	27,315,000		
Mineral leasing	39,066,000	39,261,330	45,000,000		
Taylor Grazing Act	214,000	215,070	529,000		
Submarginal lands	(23)		(23)		
Office of Education:					
Defense vocational training—high school					
War-affected localities:					
Construction					
Maintenance and operation					
Federally affected areas:					
Construction	64,190,000	64,510,950	100,897,000		
Maintenance and operation	246,625,000	247,858,000	282,322,000		
National Defense Education Act—States	117,229,000	117,815,146	190,986,000		
NYA student aid—high schools					
II. Higher education	(597,819,000)	(600,808,095)	(607,887,000)	(4,243,343,442)	(4,662,589,615)
Agriculture: Land-grant colleges	14,519,000	14,591,595	14,500,000		
Office of Education:					
Howard University	7,007,000	7,042,035	7,492,000		
Mentally retarded—fellowships	1,495,000	1,502,475	1,500,000		
National Defense Education Act—individuals	49,230,000	49,476,150	42,285,000		
Cooperative research	4,644,000	4,667,220	6,985,000		
Teachers of the deaf					
NYA student aid—colleges	1,495,000	1,502,475	1,500,000		
Veterans' building construction and equipment to educational institutions					
Housing and Home Finance Agency: College housing loans [4]	339,768,000	341,466,840	300,000,000		
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Training and traineeships	9,651,000	9,699,255	13,300,000		
Public Health Service: Fellowships, traineeships, and training grants	117,512,000	118,099,560	150,522,000		
Atomic Energy Commission: Fellowships and assistance to schools	5,342,000	5,368,710	5,700,000		
National Science Foundation: Fellowships	16,800,000	16,884,000	21,500,000		
Department of State: Educational exchange	30,356,000	30,507,780	42,603,000		
Inter-American Educational Foundation					
Defense vocational training—colleges					
III. Extension education, special education, and other assistance	(798,328,000)	(802,319,640)	(715,245,000)	(28,809,774,919)	(35,220,804,220)
Department of Agriculture:					
Extension programs	57,649,000	57,937,245	61,611,000		
Experiment stations	36,207,000	36,388,035	38,207,000		
Office of Education:					
Vocational education	53,463,000	53,730,315	56,877,000		
War training food production					
War relocation education centers					
Education of CCC enrollees					
American Printing House for Blind	670,000	673,350	739,000		
Gallaudet (Columbia Institution for Deaf)	1,256,000	1,262,280	1,458,000		
Library services	8,231,000	8,272,155	7,500,000		
Surplus property:					
Real	60,000,000	60,300,000	50,000,000		
Personal	380,000,000	381,900,000	345,000,000		
Veterans' Administration: Education and rehabilitation benefits	142,476,000	143,188,380	85,479,000		
Maritime education	4,875,000	4,899,275	4,675,000		

See footnotes at end of table.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Payments to States and individuals under selected programs of the Federal Government relating to education, 1938–63 fiscal years—Con.

	1962		1963	Total	
	Actual (CPI 105.4)[1]	Adjusted (100.5 percent)[1]	Actual (CPI 105.9)[1]	Actual	Adjusted
III. Extension education, special education, and other assistance—Continued					
WPA:					
School buildings					
Education projects					
Interior: Education of Indians	53, 501, 000	53, 768, 505	63, 699, 000		
Total	2, 252, 426, 000	2, 263, 688, 506	2, 245, 174, 000		
Grand total				41, 183, 955, 963	49, 237, 326, 453

[1] Adjusted sums were determined by increasing actual sums by percentage increase in Consumer Price Index, all items, between the year concerned and the first 9 months of fiscal year 1963. Consumer Price Index (1957-59=100) and percentage increase given for each year.

[2] Where applicable combines estimated value of commodities distributed and Federal funds allotted.

[3] Funds may be used for public schools or roads according to State legislature's direction.

[4] Amounts are stated in gross unadjusted sums.

[5] Combines school milk and "indemnity plan."

[6] Computations for July 1, 1945, to Jan. 28, 1946.

[7] Allotments, fiscal years 1941–44.

[8] Allotments, fiscal year 1945 to Feb. 28, 1946.

[9] Includes allotments for extended school services, fiscal year 1945 to Feb. 28, 1946.

[10] Allotment.

[11] Cumulative, fiscal years 1942–46.

[12] Allotment, July 8 to Dec. 31, 1945.

[13] Cumulative, fiscal years 1943–46.

[14] Cumulative, June 1944 to December 1947, value of property donated.

[15] Cumulative, June 1944 to December 1947, acquisition cost to Government of property donated.

[16] Entitlements—all years.

[17] Cumulative, September 1946 through February 1948. Cost for construction and fair value of equipment.

[18] Fair value of transfers to all nonprofit institutions through 1950. 1951–59 for educational institutions only.

[19] Acquisition value of property donated. Estimated amounts distributed to educational institutions.

[20] Estimated amount distributed to educational institutions only, at acquisition costs.

[21] Does not include surplus commodity distribution.

[22] Includes shared revenues for New Mexico and Arizona—forests.

[23] Not available.

[24] Fiscal years 1960–63 acquisition costs of property distributed to schools, hospitals, and civil defense agencies.

Sources: U.S. Treasury—annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances; U.S. Office of Education—"Federal Funds for Education" (for various years). U.S. Bureau of the Budget—"The Budget of the U.S. Government" (for various years), appendix.

Federal expenditures for education: GNP and population

Year	Federal aid in millions	Federal aid in 1963 dollars, in millions	Gross national product in 1963 dollars, in billions	Population
1938	236	509		
1939	184	403		
1940	171	370	218	132, 600, 000
1941	239	493		
1942	309	576		
1943	302	531		
1944	365	630		
1945	284	480	361	140, 500, 000
1946	525	813		
1947	3, 036	4, 132		
1948	4, 125	5, 190		
1949	3, 435	4, 383		
1950	3, 234	4, 126	359	152, 300, 000
1951	2, 421	2, 832		
1952	1, 887	2, 161		
1953	1, 358	1, 543		
1954	1, 292	1, 461		
1955	1, 438	1, 632	451	165, 900, 000
1956	1, 786	1, 996		
1957	1, 935	2, 091		
1958	1, 944	2, 045		
1959	1, 905	1, 986		
1960	2, 060	2, 115	518	180, 700, 000
1961	2, 187	2, 222		
1962	2, 252	2, 264	558	186, 000, 000
1963	2, 245	2, 245		

Sources: Legislative Reference Service, Statistical Abstract of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make several other observations on the pending legislation.

One of the important parts of the bill is the one which increases the research and special project grants from 5 percent to 15 percent. This is an area that deserves full support. Research and training have long constituted one of the most sorely needed aspects of this program. If we ever hope to expand the program, measures which will provide trained personnel and improved methods seem indispensable.

First. One of the good features of this bill is that it gives added flexibility to the entire program.

Second. Perhaps the most significant portion, and one which provides a forward-looking approach, is the one which establishes a work-study program for young people in need of part-time work in public institutions, so that they may earn up to $45 a month, and thus be able financially to undertake full-time vocational training. This would call for the expenditure of $50 million initially.

Third. Other committee amendments that are of special significance include (a) The one which permits the training of semiskilled as well as "skilled," under the definition of vocational education; (b) the provision which allows high schools that give vocational education programs to come under the terms of vocational schools.

Fourth. There is also included an amendment which would extend the NDEA for 3 years. It would be amended in two significant ways: (a) The authorizations for the student loan program would be increased from the present $90 million to $125 million, and then progressively to $150 million by 1967. These funds are now exhausted; (b) the institutional ceiling in the student loan program would be raised from $250,000 to $800,000.

Fifth. Part C of the bill would extend the impacted areas legislation to include the District of Columbia, while extending the enabling Public Laws Nos. 815 and 874, for 3 years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

I wish to say to my colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], that I owe her both an apology and an expression of thanks, because earlier this afternoon I understood that she wished me to yield her some time, and I had planned to do so; but on the way along, something has intervened. However, I am soon going to be through with the bill; and then my colleague can take the floor in her own right. I am very sorry I have not previously yielded that time to her.

Mr. President, I now yield time on the bill to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I support H.R. 4955, a bill that would greatly strengthen basic vocational education across this Nation, extend and expand the provisions of the National Defense Education Act, and provide the provisions of Federal funding for schoolchildren in those districts impacted by Federal activity.

In my opinion, this measure would direct Federal expenditures to those key points in our educational system which will result in the expansion of our total, well-trained, manpower pool and will be of tremendous value for an increasing economy. This is legislation which provides assistance at not just one level or with one type of education but offers an opportunity for assistance at the secondary and higher levels of education, in vocational and general education. It is a bill designed to stimulate local and State expenditures, thereby multiplying the effect of each Federal dollar.

The provisions for vocational education would redirect, expand and modernize our training programs so that they will be both of high quality and realistic in terms of the Nation's projected manpower needs for job opportunities. In fiscal year 1964 this sought-for act would increase Federal funds for vocational education by $108 million more than the $57 million now provided. For the State of West Virginia, this would mean an increase from the present Federal spending of approximately $640,000 by an amount of $1,217,405, nearly 200 percent of the present expenditure.

In addition to this expansion of the basic vocational education programs, this proposal provides for a new work-study program by which young men and women now unable to receive appropriate training because of their lack of funds could be paid for employment in a public agency thereby earning sufficient funds to continue their vocational education. West Virginia would be allotted some $568,788 out of the total of $50 million to be made available to all the States during fiscal year 1964.

The third vocational education provision would be for the purpose of establishing vocational education residential schools. It would attempt to find a new approach to handling some of the social and personal problems that are related to school attendance while one is at home, thereby enhancing the value of training.

Together, these three important programs will help the Federal Government to realize its important role in providing and stimulating a vocational education suited to manpower and economic needs in this and the coming decades.

The second part of H.R. 4955, to expand and extend the National Defense Education Act, also has my earnest approval. This important act, which has now 5 years of splendid accomplishment, must first be extended, and secondly, improved and strengthened so that it fulfills the purposes originally designed. I call attention to one particular amendment to the National Defense Education Act that is of vital concern to those of us in West Virginia, as well as those in other States. I speak now of the student loan program which has become such a valued success that present authorizations are no longer adequate. The institutions of higher education are applying for funds in the sum of $125 million while there are only $90 million available. Institutions in my State for fiscal year 1964 requested some $1,380,000. Only 65 percent or $880,000 could be made available for such students. Provision within H.R. 4955 would authorize $125 million of student loans for this fiscal year and would increase amounts appropriately in the next 2 fiscal years to more effectively meet the demand of this extremely important phase of educational aid.

Another feature of H.R. 4955 embraces amendments to the student loan program. At present no institution may receive in excess of $250,000 in 1 year for loans to its students. West Virginia University could have used more than $300,000 in the current academic year. There are, Mr. President, 121 institutions across our country that also requested more than $250,000 for this year. By this bill we would raise that ceiling to $800,000, thereby permitting the use of loan funds to the extent that institutions prove their needs.

Other titles of the National Defense Education Act would be altered so that this excellent instrument of Federal assistance is updated and made more appropriate to the particular needs of American education. I urge that the Senate give strong support in extension of this act as provided in the pending measure.

I stress there is reason, also, to extend Public Laws 815 and 874. Since 1950 Federal funds through these laws have been assisting local educational agencies in circumstances where the Federal Government has had a particular responsibility for aiding such agencies in educating federally connected children. From 1951 to 1962 more than $1 billion has been provided under Public Law 815 for construction. West Virginia during that period has been assisted by $243,148 of Federal funds. Under Public Law 874, providing for operating expenses of local educational agencies that have federally connected children approximately $247 million were made available in fiscal year 1962. Of that amount West Virginia was the recipient of $141,120. The extension of these two laws for 3 years is of vital importance not only to those school districts which are directly affected but also because it is some measure of the responsibility that the Federal Government shares in educating America's youth.

I wish to express appreciation to Chairman HILL, of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, for his reasoned counsel and valued leadership. I believe our thanks to Senator MORSE is shared in by all Members of this body, even those in disagreement with his viewpoint, for the fair manner in which he couched his sponsorship of this bill. He has been dedicated to the high purpose of a better educational system for our country. Within our Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and in the Senate itself we have had a thorough consideration of this bill.

Mr. President, I urge once again that the Senate give overwhelming approval to the three parts in this educational bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senate has listened to one of the most able members of the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman—the Senator from West Virginia. We spent hours and hours and days and days in the hearings at this session of Congress on proposed education legislation. The Senator from West Virginia has one of the best attendance records at those hearings of any member of the committee. Not only did he attend, but in my judgment his examination of the witnesses was exceedingly helpful in bringing out the evidence that we needed in order to present to the Senate the facts that were presented in the volumes of hearings. I wish to thank him for the great cooperation he extended to me at all times.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I rise in support of the pending legislation. First, I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee and the Senator in charge of the proposed legislation. I particularly wish to direct my remarks to the extension of Public Laws 815 and 874. The extension of those two sections is of vital importance to my native State of Nevada, where we have experienced a vast and explosive growth due to defense installations. It is all too true that we, in a State that is the fastest growing State in the entire Union, have been unable to keep up with the school population.

We welcome Federal installations and we like to think that our wide open expanses offer much to our Nation in our space and nuclear activities. Nevertheless, we realize along with this effort tremendous burdens are placed on our communities. In southern Nevada, where we now have many defense activities, some of our schools have been on half-day sessions for 5 years. Our population is rising percentagewise faster than any other State in our Nation.

Nevadans are rugged individuals. They are perfectly willing to carry their share of our national defense effort; however, we are caught in a complex situation where our citizenry has been unable to meet the educational needs without Federal assistance in federally impacted areas.

We also have the reverse of a situation, where just 4 years ago, one county had three times more defense employees in a Federal complex than are working today. The county expanded its schools to provide educational facilities to meet the demands of federally housed and federally based families with children of school age. The population of the county is approximately the same as it was during times of increased employment. Yet there was no taxable income from property taxes to assist the school district in maintaining its plant facilities.

It is in such situations as these, that demand the attention of Members of this body and demand Federal assistance to maintain and educate our youth under proper standards.

Mr. President, I believe H.R. 4955 is a necessary and equitable bill and I will support its provisions. Under the Senate formula, the State of Nevada will receive $98,770 for vocational training; $72,000 under the work study provisions of the bill. Public Laws 815 and 874 will aid materially. In 1962, Nevada schools received $1,573,650. These figures are small indeed compared to our total authorized national request; but they will have far-reaching and beneficial effects in meeting our educational needs. It will be money well spent. I believe the bill should receive the support of this body.

Failure to extend Public Laws 815 and 874 would cause untold damage in an area where the defense installations have been shrunk, as well as cause great damage schoolwise in areas that experience a great population growth.

I commend the senior Senator from Oregon for his effective work in this field and for his realistic approach in extending that program for a total of 3 years.

I also wish to add that I am delighted to note from the report that for the first time the Senator from Oregon has brought under the coverage of those two statutes, Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, the District of Columbia. I remember that about 3 or 4 years ago I pointed out on the floor of the Senate some of the needs of the District of Columbia, and that we should attempt to find sources to meet those needs. The Senator, I believe for the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

first time, was the author of an amendment which would bring the District of Columbia into the impacted area program. At that time the effort was not successful. I would say to my good friend from Oregon that I hope this time it will be completely successful, because I believe the school needs of the District of Columbia in this federally impacted area, with the great problems that we have in the District of Columbia, should be taken care of in the same manner as they are in the States that surround us.

I also commend the Senator from Oregon for the attention he has given to the implementation, the acceleration, and the augmentation of the amounts included in the bill for the national defense educational loan program. It is a worthy program. It is not only worthy of the present generation but will do untold good as we move forward through the many problems that we face. We cannot undersell our youth. The costs of a higher education are increasing yearly. Returns to our Nation cannot be measured in dollars alone. This is a minute part of such a program. Students seeking loans and desiring to advance their education are young people of ambition. They are our Nation's hope along with thousands of other students, whose parents are financially able to educate their own children.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my reply to the Senator from Nevada is that I am going to quit while the quitting is good. I appreciate his remarks very much. The Senator from Nevada is the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, on which I have the honor to serve as a member. His support of the bill means a great deal to me. I appreciate it very much. In my judgment, he is one of the great chairmen of Senate committees.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the role of the Federal Government in the area of vocational education is a historic one, dating back more than 100 years to the first Land Grant College Act. This was the first demonstration of the Federal Government's faith in a system of academic and vocational education for those who work with their hands as well as with their heads. This concept was broadened in 1917 by the Smith-Hughes act to include high schools. Further breadth was added in 1946 with the passage of the George-Barden Vocational Education Act. These were reasonable measures designed to meet the needs of a growing population. No one can seriously question their effectiveness. They have performed a valuable service and performed it well.

The present program has made a valuable contribution to the Nebraska educational system, particularly in the area of vocational agricultural education. And I would welcome the opportunity to support a reasonable expansion of the present program in order to meet the needs of our day. In this bill, however, we are not confronted with a reasonable program. We are being handed another in this administration's inexhaustible supply of crash programs.

In dollars, this bill is 15 times the President's original proposal for vocational education as presented in his education message to Congress on January 29 of this year. It calls for the expenditure of $1.435 billion over a period of 5 years as compared with the President's original proposal to spend $92 million over a period of 4 years. Certainly, the demands for vocational education have not grown by this much during the past 8 months.

Mr. President, we all know that these increases were brought about as a result of the President's civil rights message of June 19. In that message, he stressed the high rate of unemployment among our high school dropouts and unskilled youths. With this bill he proposes to take these high school dropouts off the rolls of the unemployed by placing them in training schools and subsidizing them while they are there.

Thus, Mr. President, this is no longer a bill designed to meet the expanded needs of vocational education. There are some who regard it as a relief bill which is designed to improve the politically embarrassing unemployment statistics necessarily issued by the Labor Department.

Such an approach to the unemployment problem is not novel. Earlier this year, the Senate passed the Youth Conservation Corps bill and approved the extension of the Manpower Training and Development Act. Both of these measures were designed to alleviate the unemployment problem in the ranks of the high school dropouts. Both approached the problem in substantially the same manner proposed in this bill.

With the Youth Conservation Corps bill, the Senate authorized the expenditure of $500 million over a period of 5 years. In the manpower training and development bill, the Senate increased the authorization for 1 year from $161 million to $322 million.

If we pass this bill in its present form the Senate will have succeeded in authorizing $2,257 million during this session of Congress for the primary purpose of relieving unemployment in the age bracket between 15 to 20, and in particular for the high school dropouts.

This does not take into consideration the money which is already being spent for this same purpose under the Area Redevelopment Act and the retraining provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. President, the problem of providing technical schooling for those young men and women who need it and want it, is, of course, a serious one. Finding a useful and productive place in our society for the youngster who leaves school should be an objective of all thoughtful persons.

But, like so many of today's complicated difficulties, it cannot be solved merely by drenching it with money, as one douses a campfire, no matter what the administration believes.

The President once criticized the foreign aid program as "bureaucratically fragmented." Yet he approaches this problem in precisely the manner of which he was critical. Administration of these programs will be scattered across several agencies of Government with inevitable waste, duplication, and ineffectiveness.

Mr. President, in addition to the vocational education provisions of this bill which would substantially benefit my own State, this bill contains a section which provides for the extension of the impacted areas legislation. This provision is particularly important to Nebraska citizens because of large numbers of military personnel in various parts of the State. For these reasons, I would like very much to support this aspect of the bill.

However, I cannot in good conscience vote for the entire measure in its present form.

In a few months we will be debating a tax bill which calls for across-the-board reductions amounting to approximately $11 billion. The people of this Nation need and deserve a tax cut. In an effort to rally support for the tax bill the President promised to maintain "an even tighter rein on Federal expenditures, limiting outlays to only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need."

The inflated proposal we have under consideration today certainly belies any intention to keep that promise. If the President really wishes to gain the confidence of the American people, he should curtail the steady stream of spending proposals with which he has bombarded the Congress. This measure would be an excellent place to start.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL: A GOOD STEP FORWARD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the bill before us, H.R. 4955, while of modest proportion, will help solve some of the national education needs of the Nation. I regret that it is not more comprehensive. It should be. But I do regard H.R. 4955, as amended by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, desirable, and shall vote for it.

This proposed legislation endorses and implements the words of President John F. Kennedy who earlier this year in his message on education to the Congress observed:

> We must give special attention to increasing the opportunities and incentives for all Americans to develop their talents to the utmost—to complete their education and to continue their self-development throughout life.

Provision A of H.R. 4955 will help in this development as it relates to the vocational education and training of high school students, high school dropouts, post high school youth preparing to enter the labor field or those who are working but need training or retraining. Help will also be available to those who may be handicapped.

I commend the Members of the Senate Education Subcommittee for paying special attention to the need for construction of area vocational education schools in, as the report on H.R. 4955 points out, "large urban areas having substantial numbers of high school dropouts and unemployed youth," and for seeing the need for a second new program which would initiate the establishment of "a work-study program for young people in need of part-time work in public institutions so that they may earn up to $45 a month, and thus be able financially to undertake full-time vocational training."

Mr. President, this Nation needs both of these programs and I hope the Congress will approve them.

Automation with its many blessings has many debits. As automation speeds our productivity so does it add to our unemployment rolls and place more Americans on the nonproductive list—where they do not want to be and where they need not be, especially if we take the proper steps to head off such unemployment by adequate training.

I have said many times that I regard unemployment as the most serious problem confronting our Nation today. It was for this very reason that I introduced legislation earlier in this Congress which would increase the amount available for the accelerated public works program from $900 million to $2.6 billion, the amount spent overseas for foreign economic assistance.

When I introduced S. 1121 on March 19, I said it was time for us to do as much for the folks at home as for those abroad. I called for an end to half-measures. I am delighted that from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has come a positive response.

Part B of the bill before us would extend for 3 years the provisions of the National Defense Education Act and contains four amendments to the general provisions of the act. I will not discuss these amendments in detail. They have been thoroughly explained by the able members of the committee, but I endorse them. Certainly, for example, the National Defense Education Act should be extended to American Samoa.

The National Defense Education Act has been of substantial benefit to Alaska. In September Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, who is doing a fine job in that position, informed me that since the act was signed into law September 2, 1958, Alaska has received funds totaling slightly more than $557,000.

It is pertinent to comment on amendments to title VI of the National Defense Education Act which would extend the title for 3 years and authorize, in addition, the training of teachers of pupils for whom English is a second language.

It is disturbing to read in the committee report on H.R. 4955, as amended by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

> Our domestic need is great for teachers of English as a second language—for schools in Puerto Rico, for the 800,000 Spanish-speaking children who are in the schools of New York City alone, for the 45,000 Indian children in Federal schools most of whom have a native language other than English, and for the many thousands of classes across the country which must be organized for native speakers of foreign languages both in the schools and in Americanization programs.

Many Alaskans have written, telephoned, or wired, or talked to me personally to express the hope that Public Law 815, relating to public school construction, and Public Law 874, relating to the operation and maintenance cost of public schools, would be extended.

The bill we are considering would extend both programs for a 3-year period, or to June 30, 1966. Under the extension the District of Columbia would be brought under this coverage. I concur.

Public Law 815 has been of considerable benefit to Alaska. In the period from 1951–62, the State has received $29,283,725 for public school construction.

Public school construction facilities within Alaska are cramped. Gov. William Egan advises me that Alaska needs approximately 200 classrooms to relieve overcrowded conditions and approximately 125 classrooms to replace those which are obsolete.

Today, in the year 1963, some 500 pupils attending rural elementary schools in the 49th State will not have access to high school. This is a sorry situation.

Further, Governor Egan tells me that our independent school districts are bonded to capacity to finance minimum elementary and secondary school construction and cannot expand curriculum offerings into vocational areas.

So it is painfully clear, Mr. President, that the language of H.R. 4955 is needed.

In closing, I wish to compliment again the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his ceaseless efforts on behalf of improved educational opportunities for the children and adults of this Nation. I want also to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for his long and tireless service in this area.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield back the remainder of his time except for 1 minute, which I would ask that he yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time except 1 minute, which I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I take this occasion once again to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for the superb skill and sound generalship he has shown in handling the bill now ready for a vote. He has performed in his usual courteous, gracious, and efficient manner. I believe the bill is thoroughly understood. I hope that it will be passed overwhelmingly. To the Senator from Oregon I extend the greatest credit possible.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for the remarks of a biased friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the minority yield back all time on the bill?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield back all remaining time.

Mr. MORSE. All time is yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON and Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 186 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—4

Hickenlooper
Hruska
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—16

Byrd, Va.
Case
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Hayden
Johnston
Metcalf
Miller
Morton
Robertson
Russell
Tower

So the bill (H.R. 4955) was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to correct section numbers in H.R. 4955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for three years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Presiding Officer appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. JAVITS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to correct two typographical errors in the committee amendment, as amended, to H.R. 4955, as follows:

On page 34, line 16, strike out "officers" and insert in lieu thereof "offices."

On page 43, line 15, strike out "18" and insert in lieu thereof "8."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed, as passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 4955

[As amended and passed in the Senate]

An Act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, to extend for three years the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress (federally affected areas), and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

PART A—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Declaration of purpose

SEC. 1. It is the purpose of this part to authorize Federal grants to States to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, to develop new programs of vocational education, and to provide part-time employment for youths who need the earnings from such employment to continue their vocational training on a full-time basis, so that persons of all ages in all communities of the State—those in high school, those who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, those who have already entered the labor market but need to upgrade their skills or learn new ones, and those with special educational handicaps—will have ready access to vocational training or retraining which is of high quality, which is realistic in the light of actual or anticipated opportunities for gainful employment, and which is suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit from such training.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $108,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $153,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $198,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and each fiscal year thereafter $243,000,000, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this part.

Allotments to States

SEC. 3. (a) Eighty-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

(1) An amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged fifteen to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(2) An amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

(3) An amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which is less than $10,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments to each of the remaining States under such subsection, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than that amount.

(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

(d) (1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this part. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

(3) The term "per capita income" for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

Uses of Federal funds

SEC. 4. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), a State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415), the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87–27), or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–794)) who have already

entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities, but not more than 10 per centum of a State's allotment for any year may be used for the construction of facilities for a high school department, division, or other unit described in section 8 (2)(B);

(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership, including periodic evaluation of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities.

(b) At least 40 per centum of each State's allotment for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1968, and at least 25 per centum of each State's allotment for any subsequent fiscal year shall be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) or (5), or both, of subsection (a), and at least 3 per centum of each State's allotment may be used only for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of subsection (a), except that the Commissioner may, upon request of a State, permit such State to use a smaller percentage of its allotment for any year for the purposes specified above if he determines that such smaller percentage will adequately meet such purposes in such State.

(c) Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to colleges and universities, to State boards, and with the approval of the appropriate State board, to local educational agencies, to pay part of the cost of research and leadership training programs and of experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such institutions, boards, or agencies, and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities, who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs, and of communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed.

(d) For the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility and desirability of residential vocational education schools for certain youths of high school age, there are also authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and such sums as the Congress may determine for each of the next four fiscal years, for grants by the Commissioner to State boards, to colleges and universities, and to public educational agencies, organizations, or institutions for the construction, equipment, and operation of residential schools to provide vocational education (including room, board, and other necessities) for youths, at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the time of enrollment, who need full-time study on a residential basis in order to benefit fully from such education. In making such grants, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed and shall seek to attain, as nearly as practicable in the light of the purposes of this subsection, an equitable geographical distribution of such schools.

State plans

SEC. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this part shall submit through its State board to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies; and, if such State board does not include as members persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the State, and a person or persons representative of junior colleges, technical institutes, or other institutions of higher education which provide programs of technical or vocational training meeting the definition of vocational education in section 8(1) of this Act, provides for the designation or creation of a State advisory council which shall include such persons, to consult with the State board in carrying out the State plan;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the results of periodic evaluations of State and local vocational education programs and services in light of information regarding current and projected manpower needs and job opportunities, and to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this part will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 4(a) so that all persons in all communities of the State will as soon as possible have ready access to vocational training suited to their needs, interests, and ability to benefit therefrom, and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors, and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

(4) provides for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State, approved by the State board and by the State head of such system, looking toward such offices making available to the State board and local educational agencies occupational information regarding reasonable prospects of employment in the community and elsewhere, and toward consideration of such information by such board and agencies in providing vocational guidance and counseling to students and prospective students and in determining the occupations for which persons are to be trained; and looking toward guidance and counseling personnel of the State board and local educational agencies making available to public employment offices information regarding the occupational qualifications of persons leaving or completing vocational education courses or schools, and toward consideration of such information by such offices in the occupational guidance and placement of such persons;

(5) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this part;

(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part; and

(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board designated pursuant to paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State board that no further payments will be made to the State under this part (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure) until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this part (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(d) A State board which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b) or (c) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

Payments to States

SEC. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5 or the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or both, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

Labor standards

Sec. 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this part shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

Sec. 8. For the purposes of this part—

(1) The term "vocational education" means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State board or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment in business and office occupations, and any program designed to fit individuals for gainful employment which may be assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding any program to fit individuals for employment in occupations which the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance and counseling in connection with such training, instruction related to the occupation for which the student is being trained or necessary for him to benefit from such training, the training of persons engaged as, or preparing to become vocational education teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

(2) The term "area vocational education school" means—

(A) a specialized high school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(B) the department, division, or other unit of a high school providing vocational education to persons who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(C) a technical or vocational school used exclusively or principally for the provision of vocational education to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market, or

(D) the department, division, or other unit of a junior college or community college or university which provides vocational education, under the supervision of the State Board, leading to immediate employment but not leading to a baccalureate degree,

if it is available to all residents of the State or an area of the State designated and approved by the State Board, and if, in the case of a school, department, division, or other unit described in (C) or (D), it admits as regular students both persons who have completed high school and persons who have left high school.

(3) The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(4) The term "construction" includes construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, and includes site grading and improvement and architect fees.

(5) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(6) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(7) The term "State board" means the State board designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (that is the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)) to secure to the State the benefits of that Act.

(8) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State, or any other public educational institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a vocational education program.

(9) The term "high school" does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

(10) The term "Vocational Education Act of 1946" means titles I, II, and III of the Act of June 8, 1936, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa-15ggg).

(11) The term "supplementary vocational education Acts" means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam).

Advisory Committee on Vocational Education

Sec. 9. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Vocational Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee"), consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be chairman, one representative each of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and Labor, and twelve members appointed, for staggered terms and without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such twelve members shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public, and not more than six of such members shall be professional educators. The Advisory Committee shall meet at the call of the chairman but not less often than twice a year.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 5 and the approval of projects under section 4 (c) and (d).

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Amendments to George-Barden and Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Acts

Sec. 10. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in title I, II, or III of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), or in the Smith-Hughes Act (that is, the Act approved February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 929, ch. 114; 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28)), or in supplementary vocational education Acts—

(a) any portion of any amount allotted (or apportioned) to any State for any purpose under such titles, Act, or Acts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for any fiscal year thereafter, may be transferred to and combined with one or more of the other allotments (or apportionments) of such State for such fiscal year under such titles, Act, or Acts, or under section 3 of this part and used for the purposes for which, and subject to the conditions under which, such other allotment (or apportionment) may be used, if the State board requests, in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, that such portion be transferred and shows to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that transfer of such portion in the manner requested will promote the purpose of this part;

(b) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for agriculture may be used for vocational education in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in agricultural subjects, whether or not such occupation involves work of the farm or of the farm home, and such education may be provided without directed or supervised practice on a farm;

(c) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for home economics may be used for vocational education to fit individuals for gainful employment in any occupation involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects;

(d) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for distributive occupations may be used for vocational education for any person over fourteen years of age who has entered upon or is preparing to enter upon such an occupation, and such education need not be provided in part-time or evening schools;

(e) any amounts allotted (or apportioned) under such titles, Act, or Acts for trade and industrial occupations may be used for preemployment schools and classes organized to fit for gainful employment in such occupations persons over fourteen years of age who are in school, and operated for less than nine months per year and less than thirty hours per week and without the requirement that a minimum of 50 per centum of the time be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, if such preemployment schools and classes are for single-skilled or semi-skilled occupations which do not require training or work of such duration or nature; and less than one-third of any amounts so allotted (or apportioned) need be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers who have entered upon employment.

Extension of practical nurse training and area vocational education programs

SEC. 11. (a) (1) Section 201 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 15aa) is amended by striking out "of the next eight fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(2) Subsection (c) of section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "of the next seven fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

(b) Section 301 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 15aaa) is amended by striking out "of the five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal year".

Periodic review of vocational education programs and laws

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), shall, during 1966, appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the vocational education programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this Act and other vocational education Acts and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such vocational education programs and the Acts under which funds are so appropriated.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor (in equal numbers), persons familiar with the administration of State and local vocational education programs, other persons with special knowledge, experience, or qualification with respect to vocational education, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Council is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(d) The Council shall make a report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this part and other vocational education Acts) to the Secretary, such report to be submitted not later than January 1, 1968, after which date such Council shall cease to exist. The Secretary shall transmit such report to the President and the Congress.

(e) The Secretary shall also from time to time thereafter (but at intervals of not more than five years) appoint an Advisory Council on Vocational Education, with the same functions and constituted in the same manner as prescribed for the Advisory Council in the preceding subsections of this section. Each Council so appointed shall report its findings and recommendations, as prescribed in subsection (d), not later than July 1 of the second year after the year in which it is appointed, after which date such Council shall cease to exist.

(f) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

Work-study programs for vocational education students

SEC. 13. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next four fiscal years such sums as may be necessary, for the purpose of making grants to States as provided in this section.

(b) (1) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated under subsection (a) for such year as the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of the State, in the preceding fiscal year bears to the population aged fifteen to twenty, inclusive, of all the States in such preceding year.

(2) The amount of any State's allotment under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under subsection (c) shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under paragraph (1) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this paragraph during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment for such year.

(c) To be eligible to participate in this section, a State must have in effect a plan approved under section 5 and must submit through its State board to the Commissioner a supplement to such plan (hereinafter referred to as a "supplementary plan"), in such detail as the Commissioner determines necessary, which—

(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the supplementary plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in approving work-study programs, under which policies and procedures funds paid to the State from its allotment under subsection (b) will be expended solely for the payment of compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs which meet the requirements of subsection (d), except that not to exceed 1 per centum of any such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, may be used to pay the cost of developing the State's supplementary plan and the cost of administering such supplementary plan after its approval under this section;

(3) sets forth principles for determining the priority to be accorded applications from local educational agencies for work-study programs, which principles shall give preference to applications submitted by local educational agencies serving communities having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or who are unemployed, and provides for undertaking such programs, insofar as financial resources available therefor make possible, in the order determined by the application of such principles;

(4) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this section;

(5) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this section, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(d) For the purposes of this section, a work-study program shall—

(1) be administered by the local educational agency and made reasonably available (to the extent of available funds) to all youths in the area served by such agency who are able to meet the requirements of paragraph (2);

(2) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be furnished only to a student who (A) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a vocational education program which meets the standards prescribed by the State board and the local educational agency for vocational education programs assisted under the preceding sections of this part, or in the case of a student already enrolled in such a program, is in good standing and in full-time attendance, (B) is in need of the earnings from such employment to commence or continue his vocational education program, and (C) is at least fifteen years of age and less than twenty-one years of age at the commencement of his employment, and is capable, in the opinion of the appropriate school authorities, of maintaining good standing in his vocational education program while employed under the work-study program;

(3) provide that no student shall be employed under such work-study program for more than fifteen hours in any week in which classes in which he is enrolled are in session, or for compensation which exceeds $45 in any month or $350 in any academic year or its equivalent, unless the student is attending a school which is not within reasonable commuting distance from his home, in which case his compensation may not exceed $60 in any month or $500 in any academic year or its equivalent;

(4) provide that employment under such work-study program shall be for the local educational agency or for some other public agency or institution;

(5) provide that, in each fiscal year during which such program remains in effect, such agency shall expend (from sources other than payments from Federal funds under this section) for the employment of its students (whether or not in employment eligible for assistance under this section) an amount that is not less than its average annual expenditure for work-study programs of a similar character during the three fiscal years preceding the fiscal year in which its work-study program under this section is approved.

(e) Subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 5 (pertaining to the approval of State plans, the withholding of Federal payments in case of nonconformity after approval, and judicial review of the Commissioner's final actions in disapproving a State plan or withholding payments) shall be applicable to the Commissioner's actions with respect to supplementary plans under this section.

(f) From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner shall pay to such State an amount equal to the amount expended for compensation of students employed pursuant to work-study programs under the State's supplementary plan approved under this section, plus an amount, not to exceed 1 per centum of such allotment, or $10,000, whichever is the greater, expended for the development of the State's supplementary plan and for the administration of such plan after its approval by the Commissioner. From a State's allotment under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such payment shall equal 75 per centum of the amount so expended. No State shall receive payments under this section for any fiscal year in excess of its allotment under subsection (b) for such fiscal year.

(g) Such payments (adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds allotted under subsection (b).

(h) Students employed in work-study programs under this section shall not by reason of such employment be deemed employees of the United States, or their service Federal service, for any purpose.

Federal control

Sec. 14. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

Short title

Sec. 15. This part may be cited as the "Vocational Education Act of 1963".

PART B—EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

Amendments to title I—General provisions

Sec. 21. (a) Section 103(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time it appears therein.

(b) Subsections (g) and (h) of such section 103 are amended by inserting "or, if such school is not in any State, as determined by the Commissioner" after the words "as determined under State law" wherever such words appear in such subsections.

(c) Subsection (i) of such section 103 is amended by striking out "does not include" and inserting in lieu thereof "includes" and by inserting before the period ", except that no such school or institution shall be eligible to receive any grant, loan, or other payment under this Act".

(d) Subsection (k) of such section 103 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", or any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school".

Amendments to title II—Loans to students in institutions of higher education

Sec. 22. (a) The first sentence of section 201 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for the two succeeding fiscal years, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any school year ending prior to July 1, 1964, to continue or complete their education" and inserting in lieu thereof "$90,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the next fiscal year, $125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $135,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $145,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the next three fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received loans for school years ending prior to July 1, 1967, to continue or complete their education".

(b) Section 202 of such Act is amended by striking out "1964" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1967".

(c) Effective with respect to fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, section 203(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "$250,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$800,000".

(d) (1) Subparagraph (2)(A)(i) of subsection (b) of section 205 of such Act is amended by inserting "or at a comparable institution outside the States approved for this purpose by the Commissioner" after "at an institution of higher education".

(2) Subparagraph (3) of such subsection is amended by inserting "or in an elementary or secondary school overseas of the Armed Forces of the United States" after "State".

(3) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall apply to any loan (under an agreement under title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) outstanding on the date of enactment of this Act only with the consent of the institution which made the loan. The amendment made by paragraph (2) of this subsection shall apply with respect to service as a teacher (described in such section 205(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958) performed during academic years beginning after the enactment of this Act, whether the loan was made before or after such enactment.

(e) Section 206 of such Act is amended by striking out "1968" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

Amendments to title III—Financial assistance for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction

Sec. 23. (a) Section 301 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(b)(1) The second sentence of subsection (a)(2) of section 302 of such Act is amended by striking out "as soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, and again between July 1 and August 31 of the year 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "between July 1 and August 31 of each odd-numbered year". The third sentence of such subsection is amended to read as follows: "Each such promulgation shall be conclusive for each of the two fiscal years in the period beginning July 1 next succeeding such promulgation, except that the allotment ratios promulgated in 1959 shall be conclusive for each of the four fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1964".

(2) Effective with respect to allotments under section 302 or section 305 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 302 is further amended by striking out subsection (a)(4) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and section 305(a), respectively, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) or (b) of this section, or section 305(a), as the case may be, for such year."

(c) Section 303(a)(1)(A) of such Act is amended (1) by inserting "and published" after "printed", and (2) by inserting "of test grading equipment for such schools and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries serving such schools, and" after "or both, and".

(d) The second sentence of subsection (b) of section 304 of such Act is amended by striking out "four succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years".

Amendments to title IV—National defense fellowships

Sec. 24. (a) Section 402 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(b) Such section is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 402", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine."

(c) Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study $2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition."

Amendments to title V—guidance, counseling, and testing

Sec. 25. (a) Section 501 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and $17,500,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the three succeeding fiscal years".

(b)(1) Effective with respect to allotments under section 502 of such Act for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, the third sentence of such section is amended by striking out "$20,000" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000".

(2) Effective with respect to allotments under such section 502 for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1963, such section 502 is further amended by inserting "(a)"

after "SEC. 502." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year for carrying out the State plan; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 501 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year."

(c) (1) Subparagraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 503 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) a program for testing students who are not below grade 7 in the public elementary or secondary schools of such State, and if authorized by law in corresponding grades in other elementary or secondary schools in such State, to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program: *Provided*, That no such program shall provide for the conduct of any test, or the asking of any question in connection therewith, which is designed to elicit information dealing with the personality, environment, home life, parental or family relationships, economic status, or sociological or psychological problems of the pupil tested; and".

(2) Subparagraph (2) of subsection (a) of such section 503 is amended by striking out "public secondary schools" and inserting in lieu thereof "public elementary or secondary schools", and by inserting "who are not below grade 7" after "students" in clause (A) thereof.

(d) (1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of such Act is amended by striking out "four succeeding fiscal years", and inserting in lieu thereof "seven succeeding fiscal years", and by inserting before the semicolon ", including amounts expended under the State plan for State supervisory or related services in public elementary or secondary schools in the fields of guidance, counseling, and testing, and for administration of the State plan".

(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section 504 is amended by striking out "the cost of testing students in any one or more secondary schools", and inserting in lieu thereof "the cost of testing students, who are not below grade 7, in any one or more elementary or secondary schools", and by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(e) (1) Section 511 of such Act is amended to strike out "five succeeding fiscal years" and to insert in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

(2) Such section is further amended to insert "who are not below grade 7 in elementary or" after "students," and to insert "elementary or" after "counseling or guidance in a public".

Amendment to title VI—Language development

SEC. 26. (a) Section 601 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "1964" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1967".

(b) Section 611 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "As used in this section 'modern foreign language' includes English when taught to persons for whom English is a second language.".

Amendments to title VII—Research and experimentation in more effective utilization of television, radio, motion pictures, and related media for educational purposes

SEC. 27. (a) Section 701 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," and after "auditory aids,".

(b) Section 731 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," wherever appearing therein.

(c) Section 761 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "printed and published materials," after "motion pictures," wherever appearing therein.

(d) Section 763 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

Amendments to title X—Miscellaneous provisions

SEC. 28. (a) Section 1008 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam,".

(b) Section 1009(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "eight succeeding fiscal years".

PART C—FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

Amendments to Public Law 815

SEC. 31. (a) (1) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(2) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out "1963" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(3) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1960–1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1963–1964".

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 15 of such Act is amended in the third sentence by striking out "and (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) for one year beyond the end of the fiscal year in which occurred the sale or transfer thereof by the United States, any property considered prior to such sale or transfer to be Federal property for the purposes of this Act, and (C)".

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

(c) Section 15(13) of such Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "Guam,".

Amendments to Public Law 874

SEC. 32. (a) Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), are each amended by striking out "1963" each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1966".

(b) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out "housing" in clause (B) of the third sentence.

(2) The amendment made by this subsection shall be effective on and after July 1, 1962.

(c) Section 9(8) of such Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "Guam,".

Comprehensive study

SEC. 33. The Commissioner of Education shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1965, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, and his recommendations as to what amendments to these laws should be made if they are further extended.

Effective dates

SEC. 34. The amendments made by sections 31 and 32 shall, except as otherwise provided, be effective July 1, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO STAFF MEMBERS FOR WORK ON H.R. 4955

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to express, very briefly, my appreciation to a wonderful staff, who made possible the preparation of the material on behalf of the committee that was brought to the floor this afternoon.

I believe we have one of the most able legal counsels on the Hill assigned to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I refer to Mr. Jack Forsythe, who has been with us a good many years. His legal counsel has been found by me to be unfailingly correct. He performed yeoman service in connection with the bill, and I want to thank him publicly for his splendid work.

We also have the very brilliant staff member, Mr. Charles Lee, who in connection with this bill, performed many hours of work far beyond the line of duty.

On behalf of the full committee, I express to both of these gentlemen the very sincere gratitude for the wonderful staff work they have given us.

I also wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Mike Bernstein, minority counsel, and to Ray Hurley, minority professional staff member.

The best evidence I can give of the high esteem in which I hold Mike Bernstein as a member of the legal staff of the committee is that I have been trying to hire him away from the Republicans. They have too much of an attachment or hold on him. He does excellent work.

Whenever I present any problems to him that call for presentation of legal opinions to the committee, I never fail to receive the same quality of service that we receive from Jack Forsythe. What I said about Charles Lee is equally applicable to the minority counsel, Ray Hurley.

Also, I wish to mention a team that was made available to us, at our request, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, who worked with us throughout our committee consideration of H.R. 4955. I refer to the following gentlemen:

Dr. Peter Muirhead, Assistant Commissioner of Education and Director of Program and Legislative Planning.

Dr. Samuel Halperin, Director of Legislative Services Branch, Office of Education.

Mr. B. A. Lillywhite, Associate Director of Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas, Office of Education.

Mr. Theodore Ellenbogen, and his colleague, Mr. Reginal Conley, Office of the

General Counsel, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Gordon Ambach, Office of Program and Legislative Planning, Office of Education.

And Dr. Walter M. Arnold, Assistant Commissioner of Education and Director of Division of Vocational and Technical Education.

During the hearings on the bill, we good naturedly said that Senators conducted a seminar, and from time to time we assigned seminar papers to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They were hard, tough assignments, but we never asked for a memorandum from these men whose names I have just read which they did not prepare, and their work was of a very high caliber.

On behalf of the committee, I thank them all.

Lastly, I want to thank the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, and the Commissioner of Education, Mr. Keppel, for the splendid cooperation they extended to our committee.

PROCUREMENT OF EXPERT ASSISTANCE BY INDIAN TRIBES IN CASES BEFORE THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 447, H.R. 3306, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Chief Clerk. A bill (H.R. 3306) to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 22, to insert a new section, as follows:

> Sec. 7. After the date of the approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall approve no contract which makes the compensation payable to a witness before the Indian Claims Commission contingent upon the recovery of a judgment against the United States.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. For the information of his colleagues, will the Senator from Montana inform us what his schedule is for the remainder of the day, what he anticipates may be taken up tomorrow, and any further information as to the rest of the week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to respond to the question raised by the distinguished acting minority leader.

Following action on the pending bill, it is the leadership's intention to bring up Calendar No. 533, Senate bill 1588, a bill reported by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge] from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which I understand is approved on both sides.

Following that, it is intended to lay before the Senate tomorrow as the pending business, Calendar No. 425, S. 1915, the so-called Proxmire bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Following action on that bill, it is anticipated that the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 534, S. 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Following that, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 535, H.R. 6143, an act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

The latter two measures will not necessarily be considered in that order. They may come up this week or next week, but as of now, that is the best information I can give the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator contemplate that he will move to have sessions each day this week—Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the majority leader be in a position to inform us when he intends to bring up the rule change as to germaneness? Can he give us a date?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island take that up with the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. PASTORE. I did that. He said he was going to take that matter up in the policy committee. I understand that the Republican policy committee met today. I was wondering if we could ask the distinguished Senator from California what is to be done in that connection. I think it would be helpful to bring about a rule of germaneness in debate for 3 hours after the morning hour, so as to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. KUCHEL. May I say to my colleague that the distinguished minority leader was compelled to leave Washington for Chicago. He will return the day after tomorrow. With the great patience which the Senator from Rhode Island always exhibits, I would appreciate his withholding the question until the Republican leader returns.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall be very glad to accommodate him in that regard.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I happen to be chairman of the Republican policy committee. The matter was not taken up today in the policy committee, so no answer can be given to the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. It was not taken up?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. It was not brought up today. So I cannot give him an answer. It will probably be discussed at a later time.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. Hill, and Mr. Burdick):

S. 2220. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cotton when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

S. 2221. A bill providing for the establishment of a national cemetery in Fort Reno, Okla., on certain lands presently under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2222. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to encourage the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the maritime industry; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK (for himself, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. McIntyre):

S. 2223. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, and the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the regulation of collective investment funds maintained by banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dominick when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ambrosio Medina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. Bayh):

S. 2225. A bill for the relief of Christiane Antoine Bronas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 124. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as Wright Brothers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S.J. Res. 125. Joint resolution providing for the recognition of the 50th anniversary of the American Society for Metals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S.J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim December 7, 1966, as Pearl Harbor Day in commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the attack on Pearl Harbor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

SHIPMENT OF GRAIN TO U.S.S.R.

Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. Dominick) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 210) to recommend that at least 50 percent of grain sold to U.S.S.R. be shipped in U.S. flag vessels and that ships in violation of presidential embargo in relation to trade with Cuba be barred from participation, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE SALE OF SURPLUS PRODUCE TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Proxmire, and Mr. Scott) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 211) establishing the Select Committee on the Sale of Surplus Agricultural Produce to Communist Countries, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Dodd, which appears under a separate heading.)

ENCOURAGEMENT FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS WHO RECEIVE STUDENT LOANS TO PRACTICE IN CERTAIN AREAS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists. The bill embodies the amendment that I offered on the floor of the Senate. It was rejected by a very narrow margin. But many Senators gave their assurance that if it was introduced as a separate bill, they would support it.

I ask unanimous consent that it remain at the desk until the close of business for tomorrow for Senators who wish to do so to sign as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 2220) to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists, introduced by Mr. Cotton (for himself, and Mr. Hill and Mr. Burdick), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SETTLEMENT OF JURISDICTIONAL DISPUTES IN MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill which, if adopted, will declare the policy of the United States to be that there shall be no stoppage in the movement of vessels under the U.S. flag because of disputes between two labor unions or more.

At present, two vessels are laid up because of disputes between two labor unions. One is the U.S. nuclear propelled vessel the *Savannah*, and the other is the passenger vessel *America*.

This bill provides that there shall be no strike, lockout, or interruption of work in connection with any dispute between two labor unions serving the merchant marine.

The bill contemplates the orderly adjustment of the dispute between the two parties. If they cannot, in accordance with the procedure outlined in the bill, settle the dispute between themselves, one of the parties if it has consented to arbitration in the peaceful negotiations, may then certify to the Secretary of Labor that the dispute exists between two labor unions, that one party has agreed to arbitration and the other has not.

The Secretary of Labor then shall attempt still to procure a settlement by negotiation and conciliation. If he is unsuccessful in procuring the settlement, he then, under the bill, is authorized to appoint an arbiter or a board of arbiters who shall give a hearing to both parties. At the close of the hearing he shall render his decision dealing with the manner in which the dispute should be settled. That decision will be final.

Mr. President, in my judgment, while we look adversely upon arbitration, this subject is of such importance that it warrants the approach which I have suggested. The Government simply cannot suffer viewing contests in disputes between labor unions which impose unjustified wrongs and damages upon the operators of ships, exploitation of the rights of American citizens, and disrepute throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2222) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to encourage the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the maritime industry, introduced by Mr. Lausche, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SHIPMENT OF GRAIN TO U.S.S.R.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution relating to the sale of grain to the U.S.S.R. The resolution provides that not less than 50 percent of the cargoes involved in any wheat transaction with Russia be carried by American-flag vessels. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be held at the desk until the close of business tomorrow for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received, appropriately referred, and under the rule, be printed in the Record; and, without objection, the resolution will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Senate Resolution 210

Whereas the U.S. Government is contemplating the sale of millions of bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union; and

Whereas it is reported that representatives of the Soviet Union have indicated their willingness to conclude a cash sale; and

Whereas it appears that the United States may improve its mounting balance-of-payments deficits as a result of such a sale; and

Whereas it would appear that the Soviet Union has estimated that its grain supplies from domestic production this year would be as much as 18 percent below the 1962 level; and

Whereas it appears that the Soviet Union is most anxious to purchase U.S.-produced grain; and

Whereas serious concern has been expressed by Members of Congress in relation to the U.S. mounting balance-of-payments deficits; and

Whereas it is a fact that the U.S. Government policy, at the moment is to encourage the use of U.S.-flag vessels wherever possible in order to assist our balance-of-payments earning posture; and

Whereas it would appear that under certain terms and conditions governing the sale of such grain the mandatory use of U.S.-flag vessels for delivery of the grain to Russia would not be required under present law; and

Whereas it is a fact that the U.S. maritime industry is depressed and employment therein is at low level: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that one of the conditions of the sale should be the mandatory participation of U.S.-flag vessels in the delivery of not less than 50 percent of the cargoes involved in such transactions; and be it further

Resolved, That foreign-flag vessels which have engaged in transportation to Cuba since the Presidential embargo shall under all circumstances be barred from participation in these transactions.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY AGRICULTURAL SALES TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution calling for the establishment of a Senate select committee to study all the implications of the proposed Soviet wheat deal and of sales of agricultural produce in general to Communist-bloc countries. Senators Cooper, Dominick, Mundt, Proxmire, and Scott have joined me as cosponsors.

This is a modest resolution. It does not ask that we reject the Soviet bid to purchase American wheat out of hand or under all circumstances. It simply asks that before concluding the proposed transaction, we pause and give careful study to all its implications, and to the terms of sale that could most effectively protect the interests of the free world.

The resolution points out that there is no immediate danger of famine in the Soviet Union. It asks the select committee to be appointed under its terms to report to the Senate by February 1 of this coming year. And it expresses the sense of the Senate that no grain deal should be concluded with the Soviets until the results of the committee's study are available for the guidance of the administration.

There are some who have spoken out in support of the proposed transaction, with no strings attached. There are others who have expressed their categorical opposition to it.

There are still others who, while they oppose selling to the Soviet Union at a subsidized price, would be willing to sell wheat to the Soviets on appropriate terms and subject to certain elementary conditions.

But no matter which viewpoint we are disposed to support, I believe that all of us are agreed that the proposed wheat sale to the Soviet Union is a matter of very great importance, a matter that may have many serious implications, for better or for worse, from the standpoint of the free world.

It is not a matter which should be decided by snap decision or by hurried judgment designed to meet some imaginary deadline.

It is a matter, on the contrary, that calls for both conscientious study and earnest deliberation. Above all, it is the kind of matter that should be the subject of careful consultation between the executive and the legislative branches.

The haste with which we appear to be rushing into this transaction is both unwise and unbecoming. There is no valid reason why we cannot give ourselves a few months to study this many-sided problem before a decision is made.

There will be no famine in the Soviet Union before February of next year. Nor is there any danger that the Soviets will take their bid elsewhere if we refuse to sign an agreement tomorrow and on their terms.

The fact is that the Soviets cannot purchase the quantities of grain they require from any other source. The unprecedented purchases of wheat on the world market by both Red China and the Soviet Union have completely exhausted the substantial reserves which previously existed in Canada, Australia, and other countries.

As matters now stand, the United States commands virtually the entire available surplus of food grains.

It has been suggested that over the coming 2 years the Soviets may require imports of some 10 million tons of wheat, beyond the imports for which they have already contracted. But the world wheat market has now become so tight that the Soviet Union would be hard put to find a half million tons outside the United States.

In all the haste to conclude a deal with the Soviet Union, the fact that the United States now has a corner on the world wheat market is generally ignored. But this fact by itself has a many-sided significance.

First of all, it signifies that we have reached a point where the prices previously prevailing on the world market become meaningless: For all practical purposes, the world price of wheat is now the American domestic price.

If, in the face of this situation, we now permit the Soviets to purchase American surplus wheat at last year's world market prices, we would be guilty of a several hundred million dollar giveaway for which no justification can be offered, political, commercial, or moral.

Our unique position as custodian of the world's entire wheat surplus has another grave implication.

The underdeveloped countries of the world requires substantial annual imports of grain foods in order to maintain their peoples at a bare subsistence level.

Over the coming 2 years, at least, these underdeveloped countries will be completely dependent on the United States for their imports of wheat and other basic food grains.

Before making any irrevocable long-term commitments to the Soviet Union, humanity as well as commonsense dictates that we make a careful study of the potential demands from all sources over the coming 2 to 3 years.

Mr. President, the Soviet economic crisis confronts us with an unprecedented opportunity to underscore the economic advantages of freedom and the total economic ineptitude of Communist tyranny. I hope we will take advantage of this opportunity.

I hope that in our propaganda to the Soviet sphere and to the uncommitted countries we will make the contrast between the agricultural surpluses that prevail in the great countries of the free world and the chronic agricultural shortages that are the rule wherever communism holds sway.

I hope that we will pin the blame for these shortages squarely where it belongs: on the principle of compulsion which is at the heart of Communist philosophy and economic practice. Forced collectivization does not work because the peasants who are thus collectivized lose all incentive to produce. And this basic difficulty is compounded when, as is the case in the virgin lands, millions of people have been transferred against their will to a remote and difficult area of the Soviet Union.

The basic weakness of Communist tyranny is the fact that wherever it has succeeded in taking power, it has displayed an infallible genius for converting food surplus areas into food deficit areas, or in preventing the expansion in agricultural production which has proceeded, decade by decade, in virtually all of the countries of the non-Communist world.

But, beyond pressing our propaganda advantage, I hope that we will not hesitate to press the tremendous political and strategic advantages inherent in the present situation.

The Soviets must have American wheat in order to survive: this fact is basic. We are in a position to impose conditions in the interest of freedom, and I believe we should impose them.

The very least we can do is to insist that, as a condition of bailing the Soviets out of their new manmade agricultural crisis, the Soviets call a halt to their subversive activities in this hemisphere and elsewhere.

If we fail to exact even this elementary concession from the Soviets in return for the sale of wheat to them, then we shall be placing ourselves in the position of indirectly abetting the subversion of the free world by financing and feeding an enemy who is daily encouraging acts of violence and terrorism in Venezuela and other Latin American countries; who is inciting Sukarno against the newborn state of Malaysia; and who is giving direct material and political support to the Communist insurgents in Laos and Vietnam.

Mr. President, I hope that my resolution will be reported to the floor as expeditiously as possible.

I hope that the proposed sale of massive quantities of wheat and other agricultural surplus to the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc will be given the careful study which it merits.

And I hope that the administration will see fit to agree to the several months' delay proposed by this resolution before itself entering into any agreement with the Soviet Union or before granting permission for private sales to the Communist bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 211) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the massive purchases of wheat on the world market by Communist China and the Soviet Union has for the first time in history created a situation in which one nation—the United States— commands virtually the world's entire available surplus of food grains; and

Whereas this confers on the United States the responsibility of controlling future world trade in food grains, and endows it with immense potential political and strategic advantages; and

Whereas it is clear that the Soviet Union, despite its unprecedented purchases from Canada, Australia, and other countries, can meet its own heavy requirements only by drawing on the American grain surplus; and

Whereas the underdeveloped countries of the world must also look in coming years to the American grain surplus to meet their own food deficits; and

Whereas in the absence of any immediate danger of famine in the Soviet Union, the question of whether and under what circumstances to sell grain to the Communist bloc countries should not be decided by snap judgment but by careful deliberation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on the Sale of Surplus Agricultural Produce to Communist Countries (hereinafter referred to as the select committee) consisting of nine Members of the Senate of whom five shall be members of the majority party and four shall be members of the minority party. The President of the Senate shall designate one Senator to serve as chairman of the select committee, and such Senator shall be from those Senators appointed from the majority party.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the select committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee.

(c) A majority of the members of the select committee shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that the select committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony. The select committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate.

(d) No legislative measure shall be referred to the select committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measures to the Senate.

(e) The select committee shall cease to exist on February 29, 1964.

Section 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the select committee to conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to the acceptance of any offer of the Soviet Union or other Communist bloc country to purchase surplus wheat or other surplus agricultural produce from the United States. It shall be the further function of the select committee to determine the relative advantages and disadvantages of accepting any such offer and to determine the circumstances under which the sale of surplus wheat and other grain to the Soviet Union or other Communist bloc countries can be reconciled with the best interests of the free world. In carrying out such study and investigation the select committee shall give special consideration to:

1. The unique position of the United States as custodian of the world's entire surplus of wheat.

2. The probable wheat requirements in coming years of the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc countries.

3. The probable wheat requirements in coming years of our allies and of the underdeveloped countries of the world.

4. The consequences of any such sales by this country upon its balance-of-payments problem.

5. The question of extending credit to the Soviet Union in connection with any such sale, with specific reference to the settlement of the long overdue debt to this country of $800 million for American lend-lease aid to the Soviet Union during World War II.

6. The desirability of revising present laws governing the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to foreign nations.

7. The potential impact that the replenishment of the strategic food reserve of the Soviet Union may have on Soviet control over the satellites and on Soviet aggressiveness.

8. The potential impact of the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union on the conduct of the cold war generally, and whether a demand for an abatement of Communist subversive activities in this hemisphere and elsewhere should be imposed as a condition of sale.

9. The possibility and desirability of concerted future trade policy, as it relates to wheat and other grain, with the other two major free world producers, Canada and Australia.

(b) On or before January 31, 1964, the select committee shall submit to the Senate a report of its study and investigation together with its recommendations for any measures which it considers to be necessary or desirable.

Section 3. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the select committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the select committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the special committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,600 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the members of the committee who are members of the minority party.

(c) With the prior consent of the department or agency concerned, the select committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of the General Accounting Office or any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis or otherwise the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the select committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the select committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Subpenas may be issued by the select committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the select committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Section 4. The expenses of the select committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the select committee.

Section 5. It is further declared to be the sense of the Senate that no sale of wheat or other agricultural surplus should be concluded with the Soviet Union or any other Communist country until the results of the study and investigation authorized by this resolution are available for the guidance of the administration.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to express, from this side of the aisle, a warm word of appreciation for the highly constructive resolution which the Senator from Connecticut has submitted. I have been happy to join as a cosponsor of the resolution, because obviously the delay from now until February 1 will not have any direct bearing on whether the Soviets can use the wheat if they get it.

The Senator from Connecticut has provided us with some real food for thought. To me, one of the disturbing features of our foreign policy is that we are afraid to win the cold war. We tremble in the face of victory.

At this particular time in the cold war, the Russian food supply is breaking down, so far as their capacity to supply themselves and their satellite countries is concerned. We should not now retreat in the face of victory.

Appropriate consideration of the resolution should be given by the committee to get all the facts before us, because a major switch in American foreign policy is involved. It appears that we are resolved never to win in the cold war, because when victory becomes apparent, we start a retreat.

I salute the Senator from Connecticut for making another major contribution in the field in which he is already very well versed and distinguished, that is, preaching the doctrine of consistency in the cold war against communism.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 217)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill—S. 1915—to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 6, after line 13, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to issue, within sixty days after the enactment of this Act, recommendations with respect to minimum standards for milk for manufacturing purposes, and shall include in such recommendations sanitation standards equivalent to those recommended by the United States Public Health Service for grade A fluid market milk (contained in a publication of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Milk Ordinance and Code"). Any recommendations issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall supersede any recommendations heretofore issued by the Department of Agriculture on the same subject.

PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM IN THE SENATE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] may be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 202, relating to a public address system in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 8, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.;

S. 453. An act to change the name of the Memphis lock and dam on the Tombigbee River near Aliceville, Ala.;

S. 743. An act to furnish to the Padre Junipero Serra 250th Anniversary Association medals in commemoration of this 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 812. An act to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America;

S. 814. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 1125. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood;

S. 1936. An act authorizing the State of Rhode Island or its instrumentality to maintain, repair, and operate the bridge across Mount Hope Bay subject to the terms and conditions of the Act approved March 23, 1906; and

S. 1994. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of certain waterfowl feathers and down from the national stockpile.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY AT ARKANSAS STATE FAIRGROUNDS, LITTLE ROCK, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Thursday my State was honored by a visit from the President. In his speech at the Arkansas State Livestock Show the President discussed a theme which is overlooked all too often these days when it is the fashion to blame either the Federal Government or the Communists for all the ills of modern society. The point that much of the progress throughout the country, and certainly in my own State, would not have happened had there not been a close working relationship between the local, State, and Federal Governments was made in the President's usual able manner.

We are grateful that the President took time from his busy schedule to spend a day with us.

I commend his speech to Senators and other readers of the Record and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the President, Arkansas State Fairgrounds, Little Rock, Ark.

Ladies and gentlemen, Governor Faubus, distinguished guests, I appreciate very much the hospitality shown to all of us and the chance to visit what Congressman Mills has described as the greatest State in the Union and to have a chance to say a few words about Arkansas and the South and the country.

I am particularly glad to be here in company with the Arkansas delegation which occupies a position of influence not only affecting the welfare of this State, but also the welfare of the United States, because the men whom you send from Arkansas, by virtue of their long service, now occupy a position of the highest importance affecting the welfare of every American regardless of where he may live and, thus, the senior Senator, Senator McClellan, who occupies the position as head of the investigating committee on which I once served, has served this country and State with distinction and has been the architect of a good many of the dams and basins which we have looked at from the air today.

The junior Senator from Arkansas, Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which I once served with him, who was the floor manager of the legislation recently passed to make it possible for both the Soviet Union and the United States and the world not to resume once again atmospheric testing which destroys our atmosphere and our hopes for peace; and your Congressman, Wilbur Mills, who is chairman of the committee which determines taxes, which determines the level of income, which determines the tariffs, the chairman of the committee which recently, last week, in the Congress passed the most far-reaching economic bill which has passed the House of Representatives in 15 years; and Chairman Harris, from this State, of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who now works on a bill this week which will do more for mental health and mental retardation in children than any bill the Congress of the United States has ever passed. And Congressman Gathings and Congressman Trimble, who serve on the Agriculture Committee and the Rules Committee.

These men write the laws which affect not only this State, but all the States, and I think they write good laws, and I am glad to come down here and salute them and salute the people who sent them to Washington.

These are forward-looking measures and they are forward-looking men, and their contribution to the welfare of this country may come as a surprise to those whose view of the South may be distorted by headlines and headline seekers. The old South has its problems and they are not yet over, nor are they over in the rest of the country, but there is rising every day, I believe, a new South, a new South of which Henry Grady spoke about 80 years ago, and I have seen it in your universities, in your cities, in your industries—the new South I saw this morning on the Little Red River, the dams and reservoirs through the White River, and the Arkansas River Basin in a sense symbolizes the new South for they mean navigation for your commerce, protection for your cities, opportunity for your people.

Why is it that before these great developments this State steadily lost population and now, in recent years, this State has grown far faster than the rest of the United States? These things don't just happen. They are made to happen. They represent effort by the people here. They represent basically effort and leadership by the people here, but they also represent effort by the people of the United States working through the Congress which makes it possible to build these dams, which makes it possible to develop this State, which makes it possible to develop the United States.

This State, this country, the National Government has not invested hundreds of millions of dollars in Arkansas in order to dominate the State. Far from it. The fact of the matter is that these great projects will pay for themselves many times over as the State of Arkansas rises in income.

At one time, 25 years ago, the Federal Government spent $20 in this State for every dollar that this State sent to Washington. Now it is 2 to 1. Then it will be even, and sooner or later in the next 10 years this State, with its steadily rising income, will be among the most prosperous in the country. That is the new South. That is what cooperative effort can do.

It is too bad that headlines haven't reported that in the past 5 years, southern colleges and universities have increased their expenditure by 40 percent, their physical plant by 50 percent, the average faculty salary by 25 percent. All of this represents an investment in people and resources, and I am proud to say that the National Government has had its part in this great, cooperative effort—in guaranteeing the homes, in making it possible to guarantee the crops, in building these dams, in contributing to the universities and the schools, in helping in vocational training, in helping to build hospitals, in all these things that make it possible to release the energy of the people of Arkansas and cause this State to steadily move upward.

That is what I am proud of, and that is what this country is proud of and this State is proud of.

Since the close of the Second World War, the relative importance of manufacturing has grown twice as fast in this State as in the Nation as a whole—four times faster than the rate of manufacturing employment, four times faster in Arkansas than it has in the rest of the Nation.

Per capita income does not lag behind as much as it used to. In 1940, the per capita income in this State was about $300 or more. Now it is five times as much in 21 or 22 years. Those things just don't happen.

I think that a lot of that comes from the wise decisions that this country made in the thirties under the administration of Franklin Roosevelt and which have been built upon since then which have permitted us in this State and country to enjoy prosperity from 1945 until 1963, in contrast to the depression which occurred in this State from 1919 to 1935. And those who wish to turn the clock back, those who wish to stand still, those who wish to end the partnership which exists between this State and the National Government and every other State should just read the history of Arkansas from 1919 to 1935.

This rising tide in this State and in the South and in the Nation must continue. We must build those dams, we must use our resources, we must educate our children, we must provide jobs for our people. These are the great assignments which this generation of Americans in the sixties has before it.

I am glad to say the people of Arkansas and the Members of Congress you sent there have recognized it. This is no time to stand still. This country of ours occupies a position of unique leadership throughout the world. Without the United States, the cause of freedom would long ago have been washed away.

There are 1 million Americans serving outside our borders today defending the cause of freedom all around the globe. This is an assignment which we have accepted, which has been thrust upon us, and I think we accept it with pride, but in order to meet our commitments to ourselves and those who depend upon us, this country must continue to make a great national effort all over the country, North and South, East and West, in order to move our life forward, in order to make it possible for us to find the jobs for the people who are coming after, in order to make it possible for your sons and daughters to go to college.

We are going to have twice as many trying to get into college in 1970 as in 1960. You are going to have 10 million Americans trying to get jobs in the next 2½ years.

This country has great opportunities and great responsibilities and I hope that this State and others like it will associate together to provide a fairer opportunity for all Americans, to realize their talents, to make something of themselves, to give them a fair chance which is what we stand for and which our Constitution promises.

So I come here today with a good deal of satisfaction and pride and appreciation for what your Congress has done, what your State has done, most of all what our country has done.

This great new South contributes to a great new America, and you particularly, those of you who are young, I think, can look forward to a day when we shall have no South, no North, no East, no West, but one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is what we are building in this country today.

SPREAD OF SOCIALISM AND DICTATORSHIP IN AFRICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an article entitled "Welensky Blasts 'Pomp' of Africa Independence," written by

Arch Parsons, and published in the Washington Post of today, October 8, 1963.

According to the article, Sir Roy Welensky, the outgoing Prime Minister of the Central African Federation, is concerned with the very items I discussed when I was in Southern Rhodesia last December. At that time the politicians there, particularly this Dr. Hastings Banda who is now in Washington, and other persons, took offense at the objective judgments I made on the impending dissolution of the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, or the Central African Federation.

Sir Roy Welensky comes to the same conclusion that I reached when I was in Southern Rhodesia. I stated then that Nyasaland was incapable of a successful "independent" government because it had no natural resources and few trained personnel. While it might have had one good leader in Dr. Banda, that alone was not sufficient to make Nyasaland independent.

I stated then that in order for Nyasaland to be able to proceed to develop its own resources, it would be necessary for it to obtain assistance from the United States or from some other source. I predicted that Great Britain would desire to wash its hands of the entire business, and that our Nation would then be called upon to supply the cash needed to operate this "independent" country.

Of course, this turned out to be the case, and I should like to read from this statement, as follows:

> Welensky appeared to be seeking to cut the ground out from under the reported purpose of Banda's visit for economic help—

And I join him in that—

> Nyasaland will lose about $20 million in British assistance when it becomes independent, Welensky said, adding with a trace of sarcasm, "I assume our American friends will step in and play the role of generous donors once again."

Welensky, in this article, points up a strange and serious paradox in our foreign policy as it is directed toward the continents of South America and Africa. He need not have gone so far afield to find paradoxical examples. In my report to the Senate on our operations in Africa, I gave attention to the paradox which is evident in regard to our attitude toward the Congo and the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from that report be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa

A PARADOX OF POLICY

But, comparing our foreign policy stand on the Katanga question and the situation confronting the Nyasaland-Rhodesia Federation, which is equally important if less dramatic and expensive, we run into a strange paradox. On the one hand we have strongly advocated the integration of Katanga with the Central Government, while on the other hand we have expressed support for, or at least expressed no objection to the British policy of granting independence to the territory of Nyasaland—all in the name of self-determination.

Nyasaland is as poor as Katanga is rich. The native leaders of the Nyasaland territory are attempting to break away from the federation of which it is a part. Ninety percent of Nyasaland's population makes its living through subsistence agriculture of the lowest level. Some of its needed revenues for governmental operations are obtained from the mineral-rich Rhodesias. Where will these revenues come from once Nyasaland is independent? Who will be the Santa Claus? The suspicion is that much of the burden will be ours, for how can taxes be laid on a people to whom the plow is little known, who do all of their farming with the hoe and rake, who have scarcely used an ox or a burro for transportation or traction, even though these animals are available?

Who will suffer because of independence? The natives. What shall it profit them to gain independence if, in the process, they lose the means by which their Government can be sustained and operated for their benefit. I suppose they feel that we will come in to provide them with a new source of revenue. Of course, this should not be permitted. Now it may be that Nyasaland is not obtaining sufficient aid from the Rhodesias, and that the present leadership in that territory does not feel secure, but that problem could no doubt be met when independence for the Federation becomes a reality.

It is often charged that those who do not favor immediate independence for all the people of Africa are "excessively concerned with economics." I found this attitude prevailing in many quarters when I was on my tour. Perhaps the concern on my part, and on the part of others, is excessive. But the fact remains that without a stable and productive economic system there is little chance of any real development.

It is true that our aid may build some of the schools and a few hospitals; it may train a few teachers, or a few technicians. But our total effort can amount to no more than a drop in the bucket. Teachers must be paid, students must have books, and technicians must have the tools with which to work. These will be necessary as long as any country remains in any coherent form. They cannot be provided by us forever. The best we may do is point the way and provide a very small beginning.

The drive for true self-determination requires an economic base from which to move, and many new countries in Africa, including Nyasaland, do not have it. It requires a population that may be taxed and it requires, above all, the historical background and the continuing facilities needed to provide a long succession of responsible leaders.

THE FAULTY PARALLEL

The advocates of immediate independence are fond of pointing to the story of America's struggle for independence against the British. They delight in saying, "In the opinion of Great Britain, your own country was not ready for independence when you sought it." This much of the analogy between our country and the people of Africa is no doubt true; beyond this point, however, it breaks down completely.

A people who can produce a Declaration of Independence; a people who can produce the Federalist Papers; and a people whose leaders draw up these documents with the certain knowledge that a great proportion of the population will be able to read them, is eminently prepared for independence. A nation whose population by nature contains the habits of thrift necessary for capital accumulation, whose population, because of environment if nothing else, has gained the necessary habits of hard work, is certainly ready for independence.

At the time of the inception of American independence, our people were bound together by a common language. In hardly a nation in Africa south of the Sahara is there a national population sharing a lingua franca outside of that necessary for the carrying on of trade and commerce. While in some cities English or French may predominate, 20 miles out into the bush the lines of oral communication break down almost completely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do hope that the President of the United States will not agree to assist Dr. Banda. I believe it would be a serious mistake for us to take any steps which would further encourage the dissolution of the Federation of North and South Rhodesia and Nyasaland. If we make the first grant of funds, it will merely be the first aid we will be called upon to give in order to maintain a government incapable of maintaining itself. We should quit the tiptoe diplomacy that we are practicing in Africa.

I hope, I repeat, that the President will not promise Dr. Banda any support, except as I suggested in my report, a small amount of technical assistance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article to which I have referred, to be followed with a further excerpt from my African report relative to the situation in the federation.

There being no objection, the article and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1963]

Welensky Blasts Pomp of Africa Independence

(By Arch Parsons)

Sir Roy Welensky, the outgoing Prime Minister of the near-defunct Central African Federation, accused the United States and Britain yesterday of allowing the spread of socialism and dictatorship in Africa.

Welensky asserted that American and British policy toward African nations amounts to a "double standard" under which what is regarded as "anathema" at home is viewed as "acceptable" for Africans. How can one deplore the trend in South America and yet condone the same in Africa? he asked.

The Central African Federation, composed of the British territories of Nyasaland and Northern and Southern Rhodesia, is being dissolved. Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia have refused further association with the white-dominated Southern Rhodesian government.

Speaking at a luncheon of the National Press Club, Welensky said he is being "kicked out" of office as a result of British policy and plans to withdraw from politics. "I've not come to this country to ask for anything," he said.

Sir Roy is scheduled to confer with President Kennedy this morning.

Giving the "costly pomp of independence" to new African nations, Welensky said, means only that they will be subservient to "more ruthless and exacting masters than ever colonialism came near to being." He charged that "the Western Powers have made it almost certain that political change in Africa must be by assassination."

Welensky took particular aim at Nyasaland, declaring that it has an annual per capita income of about $70—"what is spent in Britain on an ordinary dog"—and asserting that 15 Africans have been arrested there recently "for no more than criticizing the head of state."

The man to whom he was referring, Nyasaland's Prime Minister Hastings Banda, is also in the United States. He will have an opportunity to present his side of the story to President Kennedy at a meeting scheduled for Thursday.

Welensky appeared to be seeking to cut the ground out from under the reported purpose of Banda's visit: economic help.

Nyasaland will lose about $20 million in British assistance when it becomes independent, Welensky said, adding with a trace of sarcasm, "I assume our American friends will step in and play the role of generous donors once again."

U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA

The federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland has a population of about 8,200,000. North Rhodesia produces much copper and gold and other minerals, while South Rhodesia developed more agriculturally. Much acreage was given to the Europeans as an inducement to settle in the area. The federation was established in 1953, and is now in a state of instability toward self-government and/or independence, because Nyasaland is eager to secede from the federation. I was informed that the British would soon consent to Nyasaland's wishes. In North Rhodesia there is well-organized African leadership opposing the conservative white factions. South Rhodesia's main concern is the degree of African representation in its legislature.

North Rhodesia has a total population of 2,309,000, with 84,900 non-Africans; South Rhodesia, 3,030,000, with 243,000 non-Africans; and Nyasaland, 2,800,000, with 21,400 non-Africans—a total population of 8,139,000 in the federation. Its total area is 487,000 square miles—as large as Texas, California, Wisconsin, and Massachusetts combined.

During my visit in 1953, formation of the federation was just about to come into being. It was to consist of South Rhodesia, a self-governing colony since 1923; North Rhodesia and Nyasaland, which were British protectorates under the direct administration of the British Colonial Office.

The fear of the native Africans domiciled in North Rhodesia and Nyasaland that they would be ruled by the Europeans who were residing in all three areas of the proposed federation, led to an agreement that powers regulating the daily life of the Africans, would remain with the territorial government. Certain common services and powers affecting Europeans primarily were given to the federal government. It was also provided that North Rhodesia and Nyasaland should continue to enjoy separate governments under the protection of the British crown for as long as their respective peoples desired. It was also agreed that the federation would attain independence only when the inhabitants of the three territories expressed a desire for it themselves.

The principal responsibilities of the Federal Government are in the spheres of external affairs (where certain functions have been delegated by the United Kingdom Government) and in such matters as defense, immigration, imports and exports, citizenship, customs, and currency and coinage. As a matter of fact, the principal responsibilities retained by the territorial governments are the administration of African affairs, African agriculture, African primary and secondary education, police and internal security, and labor. There were certain provisions made for the review of the federal constitution within a certain period, in order to determine whether changes would be in order.

Reviews have been made, and certain recommendations followed, but it looks as through secession will be demanded by Nyasaland, as well as Northern Rhodesia. The main advocate of secession, from what I can understand, is Nyasaland, the poorest and least able to take care of itself. From all indications, tremendous progress had been made by the federation as a whole since 1953 and up to about 1961, when there developed rumblings of possible secession by Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia.

It would be a serious mistake to arrest the great industrial development that has taken place since federation. There is no doubt that many of the natives—the blacks—have benefited and are now benefiting from such development. I could hardly believe my eyes when I flew over a portion of Salisbury as we approached the airfield. When I was here in 1953 there were no skyscrapers, there were few fine schools and churches, or modern homes. Today the city is a real metropolis. This area has attained, in only a few years, second place in all of Africa for industrial development. Its further progress is even more promising if only the existing leadership can be maintained. If each territory is to go its own way, it will be calamitous to the natives. Especially will that be true of Nyasaland, by far the poorest of the three territories.

It would be far better to permit the federation to continue to function, and perhaps in a short period of time independence could be granted to the federated states as a unit. It would be tragic if secession were permitted. If it should happen then Nyasaland's progress will be greatly retarded for lack of resources. Almost 100 percent of its black population is engaged in subsistence farming. Most of the farming is done by hand—with the hoe and the rake.

There are only 42 teachers who would qualify for teaching in the secondary schools now in existence, I was informed. Nyasaland receives much financial help from the Federal Government because the territories of Northern and Southern Rhodesia are very rich in mineral and manufacturing resources. Nyasaland will require outside aid for an indefinite period should secession occur, and it might be well to warn its present leadership that such aid will not come from the United States. Let the British, who are not objecting to secession, from what I can understand, take over the burdens of this unfortunate area of Africa.

Unscrupulous leaders are fanning jealousy toward the whites, and trying to build up race hatred for everything the white man stands for—even such benefits as law and order, medicine and education. I was told that in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia the institutions of civilization are being portrayed as part of the federation, and the federation as the enemy of the natives.

Churches, schools, hospitals, and farm buildings, particularly those used for the benefit of the Africans themselves, have been destroyed by fire. Supporters of moderate political parties have been physically attacked, and such programs as the inoculation and dipping of cattle against disease have been stopped in many places because of intimidation and because the dipping tanks have been filled with stones. The vaccination of Africans against smallpox and spraying against malaria have been opposed for political gain and called the "white man's evil."

It seems that the ultimate aim of this is to destroy all support for the present Federal Government, thus clearing the way for the local extremist leaders to rule without challenge and for their own benefit. While the terrorist acts are being carried on in the name of "freedom" and "independence," they are really the efforts of a few corrupt and self-seeking leaders to gain political control regardless of their people's welfare.

It is my belief that the whole issue at the international level is saturated in politics. No doubt the United Kingdom and the United States are anxious to retain the support of the secessionists in the United Nations. I find it strange that our Government has done all in its power to prevent the State of Katanga in the former Belgian Colony from seceding for fear the Congo will break up into many separate "independent" countries. But in the case of the Federation of North and South Rhodesia and Nyasaland, we are not objecting. We are apparently willing to go along with the United Kingdom. This appears to be inconsistent and fuzzy diplomacy, to say the least.

PROFITS FROM SPACE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at a time when the Congress is involved in a discussion of the validity and the worth of making large sums of appropriation money available for our efforts in space, it seems to me particularly timely that a splendid article, entitled "Our Spin-Off Profits From Space," written by Dr. Toby Freedman, and published in This Week magazine for October 6, 1963, should be printed in the RECORD for the edification of Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR SPIN-OFF PROFITS FROM SPACE

(By Dr. Toby Freedman)

A distinguished U.S. Senator expressed himself this way: "What do we want with this vast worthless area—these endless mountains, deserts, and whirlwinds of dust? I will not vote one cent from the public treasury for the project."

But it wasn't the moon the Senator was referring to. It was California. Daniel Webster, 120 years ago, was opposing the appropriation of $50,000 to establish mail service to the Far West.

Space scientists today are in the same spot as Webster's opponents in 1844—who couldn't predict the discovery of gold in 1848. We can't foresee exactly what we will get out of our proposed $20 to $40 billion trip to the moon. But we are following one of the great laws of history: the dedicated pioneer shall have his discovery. It may not be what he was looking for. But it may be better.

All great pioneering efforts have this in common—the enthusiasm, excitement, and adventure they generate release tremendous intellectual and emotional energies. The orginal goal may not be reached but the byproducts may even surpass that goal.

Columbus failed to reach India, but stumbled on a continent. Alexander Fleming wondered why his staphylococci culture was getting moldy. The mold was penicillin.

The Apollo manned lunar program also will have its share of glorious accidents. It is rapidly unfolding into a measure of the total technical competence of this Nation—the most demanding national goal the United States has ever set for itself in peacetime. The more than 9,000 industrial organizations contributing to space flight are uncovering new facts, new products, and new ways to do things.

In the same way the manned moon shot, still several years in the future, has already brought discoveries which have changed our lives, from the new nosecone ceramics to newly opened medical research paths. I have compiled a list of some of the great spin-off benefits that the space age has already ushered in.

MEDICAL MIRACLES

Electronic circuits similar to those used in spaceship guidance systems will soon help make the blind see, the deaf hear and the lame walk. A portable radar set worn on the chest is being tried out for certain blind people. An electronic "organ of Corti" for one type of deafness is now in the prototype stage and a Brooklyn surgeon, by closing a switch, enabled a paralyzed patient to stand up and walk.

A farmer—a stroke victim—in Illinois wears a space suit. He isn't going to the moon. But the pressurized suit took him out of bed and made it possible for him to work again.

INSIDE WORK

A revolutionary development by a space lab made it possible for a 500-kilocycle transmitter to work 8 hours nonstop on electrical power generated across electrodes implanted under a rat's skin. No biological functions were disturbed in the process. This is of intense interest to medical men, since it allows electronic devices implanted in the body to regulate its functions or to monitor physiological reactions without using any extremely connected wires.

A "breathing checker" used on Project Mercury astronauts in space is now aiding cancer research.

FLASH WARNINGS

Electronic sensors similar to those plastered on the astronauts' bodies to measure their physical reactions to spaceflight now act as "electronic nurses" in hospitals to signal for flash warnings of changes in patients' conditions.

TINY HELPERS

Pinpoint-size ball bearings for satellite equipment are now used in ultra-high-speed painless dental drills. Tiny transistors designed for spacecraft equipment have made possible lightweight hearing aids.

NEW CANCER SURGERY

Cryogenic cancer surgery in which cancerous cells are literally frozen to death owes its development to low-temperature liquids used in space.

HEALTHY PEOPLE, TOO

Not only the sick but healthy people will benefit from medical spin-offs. In fact, a new branch of medicine has been created: the study of healthy people and the enhancement of their capabilities.

X-ray equipment developed for examination of Polaris rocket motors makes it possible to produce human X-ray photographs at only one-thirtieth the previous radiation exposure.

NONMEDICAL MIRACLES

Since I am a physician I have naturally thought of the successes of the space program in my own field, contributions that to my mind have already paid back the cost. But many scientists point to great achievements in other areas:

Space research has also developed a new housepaint that never needs renewing, and a glass that stays sterile permanently.

A system of weather satellites will lead to accurate prediction and partial control of the weather, saving billions for agriculture, for the lumber, transportation, and retail marketing industries.

Besides reducing the waste of water resources and the damage inflicted by storms, research on concentrated food for astronauts may break the back of world hunger. Worldwide communication systems using telstar-like satellites will advance international understanding and cooperation.

Studies of the earth in the clear light of space may tell us more about our own planet—such as the surprising discovery we made a few years ago that we're pear-shaped—than we can ever learn from its surface.

MORE TO COME

I have 100 pages of notes on other spin-offs from the space program, from jet-drills for mining taconite and computers that teach Spanish to the possibility of air-conditioned clothing operated by tiny sun-power satellite generators. But I am convinced that the greatest returns lie in the future, as unknown to us as California gold in 1844.

All these benefits—and the moon, too—will be ours for an annual cost of $5 billion which, by the way, is less than we spend every year on face powder, lipstick, and nail polish.

In any case, the Old World is gone forever. As President Kennedy said, "Space is there and we're going to climb it." The only question is will we get to the moon—first or second?

ERIEVIEW

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on September 30 I spoke in this Chamber regarding the proposed Erieview urban renewal project in Cleveland, Ohio. Printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks were an article and an editorial from the Cleveland Press.

At that time I was critical of the fact that an employee of the General Accounting Office was permitted to conduct an investigation and write a report on a matter in which it was stated he admitted he was somewhat prejudiced. Now, an article has appeared in the Plain Dealer, one of Ohio's great newspapers in Cleveland, Ohio, and one of the great newspapers of the Nation, wherein Marion R. Beeman, who before his retirement last May was head of the Cleveland Office of the General Accounting Office, denies that he was prejudiced against the Erieview project.

In the interests of fairness, also, in order that my colleagues may have all the facts before them, I ask unanimous consent that this article "Prejudice Not Mine, Retorts GAO Aid," which appeared in the Plain Dealer on October 3, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREJUDICE NOT MINE, RETORTS GAO AID

(By James M. Naughton)

Genial, gracious Marion R. Beeman, 67, likes nothing better in retirement than to read a good book or putter in the garden of his Moreland Hills home.

Beeman retired in May from his post as head of the Cleveland office of the U.S. General Accounting Office, which is charged with making sure—for Congress—that Federal money is spent properly.

The gray-haired, gray-mustached Beeman smiles a lot in conversation. He speaks openly and frankly. It is easy to tell he appreciates the value of a word.

One word—prejudiced—has made of Beeman overnight a national villain. He was criticized in a Senate speech Monday by U.S. Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio. YOUNG said Beeman's actions "jeopardized the future development of a great city * * *." The speech is a part of history, as part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Beeman laid the groundwork for a GAO report on the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, which sharply criticized the Agency for its approval of plans to demolish standard buildings in Cleveland's Erieview urban renewal project.

On September 23, a story in the Cleveland Press quoted Beeman as saying he was "somewhat prejudiced" against Erieview before starting his investigation. An editorial the next day in the Press claimed "The Dice Were Loaded" against Erieview because of Beeman's prejudice.

Actually, Beeman said yesterday in an interview, the dice were loaded against Beeman and the GAO. Not until yesterday's interview did he make public his ire over what he says was a misquotation.

"It doesn't hurt me one way or the other," he explained. "My friends know the truth."

He is speaking out, he said, because "what I do feel bad about is an attempt to try to discredit one of our GAO office reports. To try to make our office look bad through an unjustified attack one me—that I don't like."

Beeman said he has pride in the GAO and in the work he did for it.

Senator YOUNG has since admitted to a Plain Dealer Washington bureau reporter that he had only the two Press articles to support his Senate speech criticizing Beeman.

He also admitted that he did not see a September 24 Plain Dealer story quoting Beeman, in clarification, as having "no ill feeling before, during, or after our study against the city, HHFA, or Erieview. We were just collecting the facts and turning them over to our Washington office."

Beeman said the Press reporter who quoted him as being "somewhat prejudiced" angled for several minutes to get those words in Beeman's mouth.

"I don't recall using it," Beeman said yesterday. "Saying you are 'somewhat prejudiced' is like saying you are 'somewhat pregnant.' I'm not silly enough to say that."

He reiterated that "some 30 people" worked on the GAO report—through six stages of revision and review in Washington—before it became a finished product.

YOUNG was quoted in his Senate speech as saying: "It has now come to light that the GAO official who wrote the first report was Marion R. Beeman and that he was 'somewhat prejudiced' against Erieview even before he began his report."

Beeman pleasantly remarked he held no grudge against YOUNG.

"I'm a registered Democrat," he said. "I always had respect for YOUNG. I voted for him before and I'll probably vote for him again."

He said the GAO is "responsible to Congress, including Senator YOUNG. Our duties are to protect Federal funds, to be sure they are spent the way Congress intended."

In his remarks to the Senate, YOUNG said he had studied the report thoroughly and also that "some of the suggestions merit further consideration, particularly those regarding the classification of substandard buildings."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HRUSKA BEFORE NEBRASKA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Nebraska Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts held its 23d annual convention in Norfolk, Nebr., October 6 to 8.

Their programs are always of great educational and inspirational nature. This year was no exception. There is always kept in mind by their committees and officers the close and dedicated interest which all of the membership stoutly maintain in the field of soil and water conservation.

The meeting in Norfolk marked the end of a 2-year term as president for Mr. Elmer Juracek, of O'Neill. His leadership has been constructive and sound. The convention elected in his place Merlon England, of North Platte, heretofore vice president of the group. Confidence was generally shared that Mr. England would carry on as president in the best traditions of that office.

It was my good fortune to be on the program on Monday, October 7. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I made on that occasion be printed in the Congressional Record at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Senator Roman L. Hruska, Before the Nebraska Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, 23d Annual Conference, Norfolk, Nebr., October 7, 1963

President-elect England, President Juracek, members and friends of the Nebraska Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, it is good to be with you today to report to you as your Senator and to visit about the progress and the problems of soil and water conservation.

Principally, I want to discuss two bills now in the Congress, both growing out of the recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources of the 86th Congress. Its report was made to the first session of the 87th Congress in January 1961.

This was one of the most important studies ever undertaken by a congressional committee. Its subject may lack the drama of civil rights, or crime hearing or the tax reduction bill, but in its overall impact, it has vastly more significance. It is literally a life and death matter.

This report brought into sharp and startling focus the urgency of the need for action to head off the day when shortages of water supplies will constitute a significant barrier to our economic and social progress.

The committee made five major recommendations, each one of which was backed up by volumes of testimony, charts, graphs, and projections. Briefly stated, the recommendations were:

First. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States.

Second. The Federal Government should stimulate more active participation by the States in planning and undertaking water development and management activities by setting up a 10-year program of grants to the States for water resources planning.

Third. The Federal Government should undertake a coordinated scientific research program on water.

Fourth. The Federal Government should prepare biennially an assessment of the water supply demand outlook for each of the water resource regions of the United States.

Fifth. The Federal Government in cooperation with the States should take steps to encourage efficiency in water development and use.

Those recommendations were not made lightly. They were made against a background of studies which identified several major portions of the United States, which by 1980 will be short of water to meet its commitments to a growing population and increased demands by agriculture and industry.

Among the five major "trouble regions" is our upper Missouri Valley. And the year 1980 is only 17 years away.

The recommendations were based on the committee's belief that future water demands can be met best by a proper combination of the following efforts: (a) construction program; (b) scientific research; (c) development of known technical methods; and (d) strengthening of Government policies affecting water development and use. However, the select committee report wisely observes:

Such a combination of efforts cannot be achieved overnight, and will require the combined efforts of the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government, as well as a continuation and strengthening of work in these fields by State and local governments and private enterprise.

Earlier this year, I was pleased to join with Senator Anderson, of New Mexico, in cosponsoring a bill to implement recommendation No. 3 of the Senate report. That bill, S. 2, establishes at land-grant colleges and universities water resource research laboratories to pursue on a broad front answers to the questions of how best to conserve and manage our water resources.

S. 2, as you know, has been passed by the Senate and hearings have already been held in the House. There is a very good chance that it will be approved this year, permitting the initiation of water research centers at colleges and universities across the Nation by 1964, or at the latest, by 1965.

It is a good bill and will mean a great deal for Nebraska. One of its chief attractions is the fact that it is based on the time-honored concept of the Hatch Act of 1887 which first established the system of agricultural experiment stations at colleges of agriculture. It laid out a pattern of Federal-State cooperation which has worked remarkably well.

We have a rather different problem, however, in a bill now before the Senate to implement recommendations 1 and 2 of the select committee's report. This bill, also introduced by Senator Anderson, is called the River Basin Commission bill, or S. 1111. It is a revision of a similar measure offered 2 years ago which encountered very stiff resistance from those who contend that States' water rights are paramount to Federal rights. This has been a definite national policy of a century's standing. The hearings before the combined Committees on Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs deadlocked on this old, old controversy.

The bill, in addition to making funds available to the States for developing water plans, would have created a Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Army.

The controversial provision dealt with the establishment of individual river basin planning commissions. The States objected, among other things, to setting up a commission at the request of only one State; they contended that two-thirds of the States involved should make the request.

More than that, however, the States balked at the idea of appointment by the President of the members of the commissions. They argued that this meant Federal domination. They insisted on the right to appoint their own representatives. And finally, the States wanted language written into the bill which would recognize the primary rights of States to their own water resources.

Senator Anderson recognizing the old and deep division of opinion on the State versus Federal water rights, has this year introduced a compromise bill which appears to go a long way toward solving the problem.

In seeking such a solution, he has my fullest support, because like it or not, planning of some kind is going to be done whether the Congress provides an orderly way or not. It will require the best efforts of all of us who are concerned about the conservation of soil and water to work diligently toward this end. There is not much time.

Senator Anderson has attempted to meet the objections raised in the last Congress by working out with representatives of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments language which is intended to preserve the status quo in regard to water rights and to let the debate over that issue proceed.

Whether this will accomplish its objective, it is difficult to say.

There are, moreover, some aspects of the bill which I find particularly troublesome. The river commissions will have a chairman appointed by the President. The other representatives come from each of the States involved and each of the agencies which the President finds has a substantial interest in the planning. As a practical matter, this will mean the Department of Interior, Army—that is the Corps of Engineers—Agriculture, Health, Education, and Welfare, Commerce, and perhaps the Bureau of the Budget. That means that in nearly all cases there will be half a dozen Federal representatives, plus the Chairman.

Few of these commissions will involve six States, so the Federal view will be better represented than the States. It seems to me consideration might be given to allowing each State two representatives to better balance the Commission.

It is true that so far as voting is concerned, there are only two votes, that of the Chairman, appointed by the President, and the vice chairman, appointed by the States. That seems a fair division, but recalling the top-heavy Federal representation on the Commission, the States may be overwhelmed by sheer weight.

Another thorny question revolves around adequate compensation for disturbed or appropriated State water rights. The argument is made that this has no place in a planning bill, but to provide for this in the legislation itself might go a long way toward meeting the objections of those who fear the arbitrary action of Federal bureaus.

I am sure that S. 1111 is not a perfect bill. Even if it is enacted this year—and that is only a 50-50 proposition at the moment—it would take from 5 to 10 years to organize the commissions, make the studies and complete the reports.

Ten years from now would be 1973 and that would be only 7 years away from the 1980 date of water shortage forecast by the Senate select committee.

It is for that reason that I support the principle and purpose of S. 1111. Overall, it it is a good bill. I shall develop my views more fully during debate on the floor of the Senate and I am hopeful that the measure may be improved along the lines discussed with you here today.

The Nation, under the leadership of people like you who are dedicated to the conservation of our resources, must very soon make up its mind. The solution may wait, but the problem will not.

TWENTY YEARS OF RECLAMATION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the development of the modern West owes much to the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation. It has created green, fertile fields out of deserts and helped provide the power for a complex economy of industry and commerce.

An analysis of the Bureau's work appeared September 3 in the Powell Tribune. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Powell Tribune, Sept. 3, 1963]

Twenty Years of Reclamation

The Bureau of Reclamation will look back on 20 years of river basin administration September 9, when regional offices were established in the West, September 9, 1943.

At one time Billings, headquarters for region No. 6, served the entire Missouri River Basin drainage. Later, region No. 7 was established in Denver.

A look at the past, just since September 1943 in region No. 6, reveals the construction of 12 storage dams and reservoirs, and two other multiple-purpose dams are under construction.

The 14 reservoirs, located in northern Wyoming, Montana, North Dakota, and South Dakota will have a total capacity of 6,783,000 acre-feet.

In the same period, 115,000 irrigable acres have been made available for irrigation, represented by 14 units or projects, which includes the Heart Mountain unit. Currently under construction are the facilities for an additional 49,700-acre unit which includes acreage under Yellowtail Dam.

Within the Upper Missouri River Basin, the Bureau says it is continuing work in preparation of some additional 90 irrigation units located in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and northern Wyoming which will serve 2½ million acres of land, about one-tenth of which is to be provided a supplemental water supply.

Other benefits of the Bureau's work in addition to irrigation are flood control, municipal and industrial water supplies, recreational opportunities, improvement of fish and wildlife habitat, the benefits of multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs, and the low-cost hydroelectric power with a system now that has a capacity of 1,630,000 kilowatts of Federal hydropower in its eastern division.

Reclamation has been a big boost for the West. There is still much to be achieved through unused water supplies and development of sites for hydropower by either private or public sources.

THE MUSKIE WATER POLLUTION BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday, in the course of my remarks on the critical question of air and water pollution, I referred to S. 649, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, sponsored by Senator Muskie and others, and reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works. Unfortunately, my brief summary of the bill did not reflect some of the important revisions in the bill, made by the Committee on Public Works.

Because of the importance of this legislation, I wish to summarize the provisions of S. 649, as amended and reported by the Committee on Public Works.

First. The bill sets the purpose of the Water Pollution Control Act "to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

Second. Under the bill, an additional Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to supervise water pollution control activities. A new water pollution control administration would be established to administer comprehensive programs for water pollution control, interstate cooperation and uniform law activities, enforcement of abatement, and Federal installation pollution abatement programs.

Third. The legislation would authorize a 4-year, $20-million-a-year grant program for research and the development of improved methods of coping with the problem of combined storm and sanitary sewer systems. Grants would be on a 50–50 matching basis. It would increase sewage treatment plant maximum grants from $600,000 to $1 million for each community, and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a combined system for several communities. It would authorize an additional 10 percent in the amount of a grant for construction of waste treatment works for projects conforming with a comprehensive plan for a metropolitan area.

Fourth. S. 649 would direct the application of enforcement measures to abate pollution when any person is prevented from marketing shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce as a result of such pollution.

Fifth. The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary to encourage the development of quality standards on interstate rivers and to set such standards in the absence of standards set by State or interstate agencies consistent with the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act. The discharge of pollution into a classified river lowering the quality of the water below that established by the quality standards would be subject to abatement enforcement under the act. The bill would tighten up on the abatement and control of pollution from Federal installations.

Sixth. The bill establishes a procedure for liaison between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the soap and detergent industry for the development of decomposable detergents and standards of decomposability for such detergents. It would require rules and regulations preventing the importation of detergents not meeting such standards, and would authorize similar rules and regulations preventing the transportation and sale in interstate commerce of detergents not meeting standards of decomposability. The proposed standards would be developed and recommended by a committee composed of industry and Department representatives. The Secretary would not be permitted to issue the standards and regulations until the committee had certified that detergents conforming to the standards are generally available. The bill also provides for congressional review of the problem.

Seventh. Finally, the bill provides for a system of audits for grant funds, and makes the authority and function of the Secretary of Labor, with respect to labor standards, applicable to the act.

Mr. President, I am impressed by the proposed legislation and by the general agreement of the committee on its provisions. The members of both parties who worked to achieve a consensus on this legislation are to be commended for constructive legislation draftsmanship.

BANK MERGERS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, last week the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] and I were privileged to attend and address the 62d Annual Convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks which met at Williamsburg, Va.

Among the many interesting speeches delivered at the convention was a speech by the Honorable G. Russell Clark, chairman of the board of the Commercial Bank of North America, and formerly superintendent of banks for the State of New York. In his speech, Mr. Clark discussed the Bank Merger Act and the problems which have been raised by the decision in the Philadelphia bank merger case. And in his speech Mr. Clark made several suggestions for handling bank mergers which deserve careful consideration.

He also described graphically the extent to which the decision and the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia bank merger case went in disregarding the purpose and intent and understanding of the Congress in enacting the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

I was much impressed by Mr. Clark's speech, and I believe that it would be helpful to the industry and to the public to make his views available to them.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that Mr. Clark's address at the convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Who's in Charge?

I appreciate very much the opportunity to discuss with my former associates in the bank supervisory field, as well as my fellow associate members of NASSB, some of the basic causes for the present disturbances and anxieties which are present today in our business.

It sems to grow increasingly difficult for the average banker to keep abreast of the rapidly changing, and at times contrary, winds of supervisory opinions on a multitude of banking matters. It seems as though we need more anchor and less sail.

We are concerned with supervisory regulations and opinions in many areas including chartering, branching, interest rates, examinations, etc., but one of the most widely discussed is that of the bank merger area. I should like to direct a few thoughts in that direction.

When the Bank Merger Act of 1960 with its seven tests for applicability to bank mergers was enacted, it was claimed, and widely predicted in the publications of the day, that this legislation was the cornerstone on which, at long last, positive direction would be given to bank mergers. You will recall that this act vested authority over mergers in one of three Federal agencies, i.e., Federal Reserve Board, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and Comptroller of the Currency. The jurisdiction over national bank mergers is vested in the Comptroller; State member banks in the Federal Reserve Board, and insured State nonmember banks in the FDIC.

The latter two agencies give their consideration to merger proposals following affirmative action by the respective State banking departments. The Comptroller has sole jurisdiction over national banks and also sits as one of three members of the FDIC, which has brought objection from the NASSB.

At the time of the passage of the Bank Merger Act of 1960, great debates took place as to the posture of the Justice Department in the bank merger field, and it was finally resolved by requiring the Justice Department to submit an advisory opinion on each merger before the Federal bank regulatory agency having approval jurisdiction. Such advisory opinions were also required from each of the other two bank regulatory agencies.

Substantial pressure was exerted in certain quarters to place the Justice Department in a commanding position on bank merger considerations. In the testimony preceding the legislative sessions, the then Chairman of the FDIC, stated:

"No examination or review by the Department of Justice, or other agency or commission outside the bank supervisory field, of the facts of a merger transaction, can be an adequate substitute for the background, knowledge and current information which presently reposes in the supervisors."

The trend of congressional thinking on this point has been recently reflected in S. 1642, covering amendments to the Securities Act. The Senate in this bill proposes to give full and complete regulatory powers over disclosure and trading in securities of banks to the Federal supervisory agencies as against the Securities and Exchange Commission.

On June 17, 1963, a decision was rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Philadelphia National Bank case which has had the apparent practical effect of removing conclusive judgments on bank mergers from the duly authorized supervisory agencies to the realm of legal decision.

This decision, expressing the views of five members of the Court, holds that section 7 of the Clayton Act applies to all bank mergers. To the mind of the average banker it means that regardless of approvals given by appropriate supervisory agencies, merger proposals involving banks shall be subject to Federal antitrust laws and that such mergers approved by the appropriate bank supervisory agencies are not immune from challenge under such laws.

The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, who has fully demonstrated over the years a clear and objective view on banking matters, has expressed himself as shocked by the decision, and that it "is one of the most incredible cases of judicial legislation which the Court has handed down." "I was shocked," he said, "both at the result and at the Court's casual disregard for congressional intent and purpose."

In the case at hand, the Court decided that inasmuch as the proposed merger would result in the control, by one bank, of over 30 percent of the commercial bank business conducted in the Philadelphia metropolitan trade area, section 7 would be violated. The merger would have resulted in a bank, the largest in the city of Philadelphia, with 36 percent of the area's total bank assets; 36 percent of deposits; 34 percent of net loans. It would also have resulted in making a national bank the largest bank in the area superseding the present largest bank—a State bank. It would also be able to retain this ranking even though all the remaining 39 banks in the area were to merge into the State bank.

By way of comparison, in the New York area a merger of the first and third largest banks would produce a lower percentage of all New York City bank resources than the merger discussed here would represent of all bank resources in the city of Philadelphia.

It should be mentioned here that two of the remaining Justices dissented on the ground that section 7 did not apply to bank mergers. Another agreed in part with the dissenters.

The ninth Justice did not participate in the decision.

Furnishing a partial background to this decision is the historical fact that, prior to the institution of this case, the Justice Department had taken antitrust action in only one other case—a case which was subsequently settled during the course of litigation.

To complete the background of the case in the lower court it would be helpful to quote from the opinion of the presiding justice:

"Generally, the complaint alleges that commercial banking and several of its integral parts comprise interstate commerce; that commercial banking with its integral parts fills an essential and unique role in the Nation's economy with a combination of services unduplicated by other financial institutions; that existing and potential competition in commercial banking in the Philadelphia area would be substantially and unreasonably lessened; that the merger would substantially and unreasonably increase concentration in banking in the Philadelphia area and that existing and potential competition in the commerce and industry served by commercial banks in the Philadelphia area would be substantially and unreasonably lessened. Parenthetically it may be noted at the outset that the last of these averments has not been seriously presented by the plaintiff and, for all practical purposes, has been abandoned."

From the viewpoint of the layman—and the average banker—the foregoing serves to highlight one outstanding fact: that this decision by the highest court in the land has changed all the ground rules applicable to mergers in the banking field. In one thrust we have been placed in a position where no longer can a banker, contemplating a merger operation, look only at the proposal from the standpoint of long-range economic effect on the community or trade area in which his bank is located. Banks are now in the general position vis-a-vis antitrust statutes of any other corporate entity, inasmuch as the decision applies to all mergers, including mergers between banks. Our previous posture, under which banking has operated for so long a time, has now apparently been dissolved. Under the belief that banking has been for years closely regulated and subject to supervision and controls of governmental bank supervisory agencies, both State and Federal, we felt, perhaps overoptimistically, secure in our belief that further controls were unwarranted and unnecessary. The thoroughness of the Congress in its consideration of Senate bill 1062 in the spring of 1960 indicated crystallized opinion on the question of the agencies of Government which should be charged with responsibility for approval of bank mergers. Senator Fulbright, who with Senators Robertson and Capehart, were sponsors of the bill, said in presenting the bill for vote:

"As it passed the Senate, S. 1062 expressed the view of the Senate, for the third time, that bank mergers should be regulated by the Federal banking agencies on the basis of banking factors and competitive factors and with no single factor being in itself controlling. S. 1062 was a clear statement, for the third time, of the Senate's view that the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act should not apply to bank mergers. The amendments to S. 1062 made by the House do not change this aspect of the bill. The House has agreed with the Senate that bank mergers should be controlled by the Federal banking agencies on the basis of both banking factors and competitive factors, and that section 7 of the Clayton Act should continue to be inapplicable to bank mergers."

The Bank Merger Act of 1960 also received the following accolade from the then Senator Johnson of Texas on the day it passed the Senate:

"This bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers. It eliminates a number of gaps in the statutory framework, which now permits many bank mergers to occur with no review by any Federal agency. It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency, under these comprehensive standards, and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of the bank mergers by asset acquisitions and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

By comparison, in his dissenting opinion, Justice Harlan while saying that section 7 of the Clayton Act did not apply to a bank merger, said with respect to the Bank Merger Act of 1960, "its enactment turns out to be an exorbitant waste of congressional time and energy."

In the hit show, "The King and I," the King sings a lovely song in which he expresses the thought that those who seek to protect him will protect him out of all he owns, and concludes that it is a puzzlement. So it is with the average banker as he views the judicial-legislative-supervisory fog which surrounds his objective merger. He is advised to consult competent counsel and to take advantage of the Antitrust Division's clearance procedure. Does the banker, or his counsel, first consult his primary supervisory agency; the Federal Reserve Board; the FDIC; or the Comptroller following his State supervisor; or does he commit what may be the unpardonable sin of going over their respective heads to the Antitrust Division?

To the layman, therefore, it now appears that the advice which the primary supervisory agency was required to seek from the Department of Justice by the intent of Congress, is now no longer to be categorized as advisory, but rather, in the nature of a warning that if the decision reached by the primary agency is not parallel to that of Justice, then a suit may be forthcoming.

A spokesman for the Division said recently that "assuming that all relevant information regarding a proposed merger has been supplied to us, and as soon as the agency having initial jurisdiction has advised us of its decision, we shall advise such agency and the parties to the proposed merger of any action that the Antitrust Division intends to take regarding the merger." The element of time involved in consideration of a merger is most important to a participating bank, its depositors, its shareholders, and the trade area it serves. It is to be hoped that there will be no undue delay in finalizing opinion on a merger, and if there is no action to be taken by the Division it would not seem unreasonable to expect a prompt statement to that effect. In effect, it appears to place the three bank supervisory agencies in the position of the average State bank supervisor, namely, that it has only the initial veto power and any approval that it may extend may be vitiated by a nonbank governmental agency. The only criteria which Congress apparently delegated to the attention of the Justice Department in mergers was that of the competitive factor, which has now, apparently, contrary to the intent of Congress, been assigned the role of the primary and dominating factor of the seven controlling factors. The traditional banking factors have been relegated to a place of secondary importance.

It is a fair statement, I believe, to say that relatively few bank mergers do not have some elements of lessening of competition; but, conversely, favorable consideration of the banking factors may justify an agency granting approval of a merger even though it may have an adverse effect on competition.

To illustrate the wide range of terminology upon 115 mergers submitted to the Justice Department for comment, as published in the recently released annual report of the comptroller for 1963, we read the following characterizations of the basis for Justice Department advisory opinions:

"Favorable	0
No adverse effect	12
Not substantially adverse	37
Slightly adverse	3
Adverse effect	26
Significantly adverse	3
Substantially adverse	34
Substantially adverse and serious anticompetitive effect	7
Threat of litigation	1
Total	115"

(NOTE.—Total as shown in the report although it adds to 123.)

On the same merger proposals, the Federal Reserve Board employed the following terminology regarding its advisory opinions:

"Will increase competition	4
May increase competition	7
No adverse effect on competition	33
No serious adverse effect on competition	3
Will have little adverse effect on competition	21
Probably no adverse effect on competition	2
Might have adverse effect on 2 parties	2
Might have adverse effect on competition	6
Will eliminate competition between 2 banks exposing remaining banks to greater competition	11
Will eliminate some competition	12
Will eliminate substantial competition	6
Will have adverse effect on competition	2
Will eliminate present and potential competition	5
Will result in concentration	1
Total	115"

The FDIC was concise, by comparison:

"Enhancement of competition	1
Overall effect on competition would not be unfavorable	102
No effect on competition	2
No adverse effect on competition	1
Appears favorable	1
Effect would be unfavorable	8
Total	115"

The report also reveals that the Comptroller approved during 1962, 110 applications for merger, including 3 emergency decisions, while denying 7, and 1 was withdrawn.

During the same year according to the Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board, the Board approved 37 and disapproved 5 mergers, consolidations, acquisitions of assets or assumptions of liabilities. This report also reflects that 94 reports on competitive factors were sent to the Comptroller and 38 reports to the FDIC.

Banks are, therefore, in a never-never land as far as mergers are concerned. It appears that the tiniest nuance of judgment on the part of any one of the agencies involved may throw a merger one way or the other. The absence of unanimity as between the governmental agencies involved as to the worthiness of a merger has beclouded the atmosphere and has led to proposals for a single Federal commission to rule on bank matters including mergers. The banker, therefore, finds himself in a most difficult position, not knowing what laws, rules, regulations or interpretation are applicable to his proposals.

We can appropriately characterize the present situation as one where we are confused with promotional interpretations—in other words, interpretations of laws and regulations which tend to favor one group of banks under a supervisor against other groups of banks under other supervisors. This tends to create a great deal of dissatisfaction among those who are left without equalizing privileges and may cause banks to shift from State to national bank basis or vice versa, depending upon the degree of enforcement of sound and conservative banking practice or conversely, the relaxation of the same standards.

To add to your collective confusion, a thought-provoking passage appears in the district court's opinion which may have escaped your attention, and which I quote:

"The court was not impressed with the attempts of the Government to show that banking is of minor importance in the life of a community generally and of almost absolute unimportance in the business life of the community. The Government, in its attempt to establish this contention by testimony that no single particular individual industrial organization has ever entered a particular territory, because of the presence or absence of banking facilities, has ignored the industrial history of the United States. Should one ever speculate as to whether any industry would enter a community without banking facilities, the answer would be completely obvious. Historically, banking facilities have preceded industry in every community."

As bankers, we have been trained in the belief that we are, and have been by practice and tradition cast in the role of service institutions. It comes as somewhat of a shock to learn, particularly in the centennial year of the dual banking system, that, as indicated by the court, a high officer of Government evaluates our services at such a minimal level. It confirms the thought that if Federal authority ever reaches a point where it supersedes and submerges the authority of States over State banks, that will be the point of no return and will mark the demise of the dual banking system.

The greatest deterrent to this trend is the capable and efficient State bank supervisor. In spite of long experience in this field, I am not one who believes that the old way is necessarily the best way to conduct our business, either as bankers or as supervisors. As we have grown as a nation from an essentially agrarian society to the foremost industrial power in the world, the challenges and opportunities for development of our country through our banking system have required the continuing broader development of the public interest objective by bank supervisors. Yours are the standards of judgment by and under which we operate our banks. We can be helped by your awareness of our problems and we may be hindered in our progress and services if you take a position against progressive thinking.

Your appraisal of the needs of a sound and conservative banking system is the fulcrum upon which can tilt the vitality and effects of our efforts. There have been a number of proposals designed to break the logjam which seems to exist in consideration of bank mergers and chartering by supervisory agencies. It seems to me that if criticism of a system is undertaken, then a responsibility exists for suggestions to effect corrections in that system. Accordingly, I submit the following outline of a plan for a more uniform and understandable course to be followed in bank merger applications by supervisory agencies:

1. That bank mergers and charters be first considered by a district committee composed of (a) the superintendent of banks of the State in which the banks seeking to merge are located, (b) the chief national bank examiner of the district, (c) the chief FDIC examiner of the district, (d) the chief Federal Reserve bank examiner of the district. In any case the representative would be the senior official of his agency in the district in which the applicant banks are located.

Approval of a merger would require a three-fourths vote of those participating as above.

If disapproved by the district committee, the application would be terminated. If approved, notice of such approval would be given to the applicant banks and to a Board of Review located, for convenience, in Washington. This Board of Review would be given not more than 30 business days after receipt of such approval of the district committee, to indicate its disapproval of a merger or charter application; otherwise the decision of the district committee would stand. To carry out the intentions of Congress as expressed in the Bank Merger Act, notice of the approval of the district committee would also be furnished to the Justice Department with the provision that the views of the Department on the competitive effects of the merger be furnished to the Board of Review not more than 30 business days after receipt of such notice.

The Board of Review would be composed of the following representatives appointed by their respective boards for a term of 3 years:

1. A member of the Federal Reserve Board.
2. A member of the FDIC Board, assuming that the previous legislative recommendation made in this connection by the NASSB is adopted; namely, that the Comptroller of the Currency should not be a member of the FDIC Board.
3. The Comptroller of the Currency.

Disapproval of a merger would require a two-thirds vote of the Board of Review.

I am aware that many proposals along these lines have been previously made. It is always possible, however, that perhaps from the sum of ideas represented, a gleaning by the proper legislative body of these proposals would produce a pattern which would serve to alleviate the present ferment in our industry.

It has been said that we are the victims of our own shortcomings. Avoidance of public controversy, and indeed, avoidance of contact with our legislative representatives has long been a hallmark of our behavior. We have need for a better field of understanding on the part of both segments. The leaders of our industry as well as our trade associations, acting in concert with the progressive, intelligent State supervisor and legislators can contribute much at the grassroots level of each State to bring about a clearing of the uncertainty that impedes our ability to fully serve the free-enterprise economy which has made this country outstanding on the pages of history.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON BEFORE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SUPERVISORS OF STATE BANKS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, one of the outstanding speeches delivered at the 62d annual convention of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks at Williamsburg, Va., last week was the scholarly and profound address by the eminent Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON.

The gentleman interjected in his moving prose quotations from the Constitution and by the great architects of our Republic as he traced the development of the dual banking system with our maturity as a nation.

The Senator brought to the convention his many years of experience as a member and chairman of the Senate's Banking and Currency Committee. He spoke also from the knowledge accrued to him through his tenure on the Senate Appropriations Committee. He spoke from knowledge not only of banking and the affairs of finance but also from a knowledge of history and the affairs of State.

In describing the fledgling years of the dual banking system, the Senator noted:

> The strength of the system—its continuance for 100 years in spite of efforts to destroy it—demonstrates that it meets the needs of the country and that it is soundly based on the same principles which lie behind the Constitution of the United States.
>
> Constitutional government is wisely based on recognition of the fact that the governors of a nation are not themselves supreme and cannot act arbitrarily.

The remarks of the Senator from Virginia will be long remembered not only by the Nation's bankers but also by students of constitutional history who have taken cognizance of the interplay of our development as a nation and the development of our banking institutions.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech on the dual banking system by the Senator from Virginia be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUAL BANKING SYSTEM

I welcome the privilege of speaking on the subject of the dual banking system to the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks on the system's 100th anniversary. It was created, as you well know, by the National Currency Act, later the National Bank Act, in 1863.

Williamsburg is an appropriate place to discuss a system of banking that is derived from the basic principles of federalism (a Union of sovereign States) written into the U.S. Constitution largely by men who had learned their law and their concept of government here in Williamsburg.

State banks and supervisors of State banks, of course, represent one of the two great branches of the system, which grew out of the needs of American commerce and industry. No lawyer or banker or economist sat down and dreamed it up. The First and Second Banks of the United States represented short-lived attempts at a dual banking system. The National Currency Act was not passed to create such a system. It was passed to help sell Government bonds, which would be used to back up new national bank notes. It was expected that the new national bank system would supersede State banks. And when, in 1865, a heavy direct tax was levied on State bank notes, the elimination of State banks was considered to be certain. However, demand deposits soon superseded currency as the principal money supply of the country. The expected death of State banks, like that of Mark Twain, proved to have been slightly exaggerated. State banks flourished, making loans through deposit credit. At the end of 1962 there were 8,907 State banks with deposits of $120 billion, compared with 4,505 national banks with deposits of $143 billion.

The success of the dual banking system has led other financial institutions to copy it. We already have dual Federal and State savings and loan and credit union systems, and the mutual savings bank industry is earnestly seeking legislation to create a dual mutual savings bank system.

The strength of the system—its continuance for 100 years in spite of efforts to destroy it—demonstrates that it meets the needs of the country and that it is soundly based on the same principles which lie behind the Constitution of the United States.

Constitutional government is wisely based on recognition of the fact that the governors of a nation are not themselves supreme and cannot act arbitrarily. They are trustees for the people and are bound by the general rules laid down by the people. Constitutional government must be so devised as to enable the people to give effect to their needs and desires, and it must provide for doing this in an orderly fashion, without permitting passing fancies to upset the foundations of the government, and without unduly restricting changing demands arising from changing circumstances.

Washington, Madison, George Mason, and other Virginians were among those who created the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution they wrote set forth a new system of government. It embodied two basic principles to insure that the Government would in fact be a government of laws and not of men, and would in fact be the servant and not the master of the individual.

The first of these great principles is federalism. Under it the States continued as sovereign entities but became integral and essential parts of the new government.

The second of these great principles is the separation of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, each coordinate with and equal to each of the others but not entirely independent of the others.

James Madison in No. 51 of "The Federalist," described this division of the Central Government into three departments, as using language equally applicable to the separation of powers between the States and the Central Government.

"The great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department," Madison said, "consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defense must in this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions."

This framework does not necessarily establish an efficient form of government. "The doctrine of the separation of powers," said Mr. Justice Brandeis in Myers versus United States, "was adopted by the Convention of 1787, not to promote efficiency but to preclude the exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was, not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy."

The authors of the Constitution firmly rejected all proposals to give the Federal Government broad and sweeping authority to enact legislation or authority to veto State action. Instead of broad and general powers, the Federal Government was given only the specific powers enumerated in the Constitution, and the 9th and 10th amendments were added later in order to leave no doubt on this point.

An organization so constructed can successfully work only when the officials running it exercise good judgment and discretion and restraint. Judge Bynum, of North Carolina, expressed this in *Brown* v. *Turner*, 70 N.C. 93, when he said, "While each (department) should firmly maintain the essential powers belonging to it, it cannot be forgotten that the three coordinate parts constitute one brotherhood, whose common trust requires a mutual toleration of the occupancy of what seems to be a 'common because of vicinage,' bordering the domains of each."

The dual-banking system arises from the same origins and illustrates the same problems as the Constitution. The States have always seen needs for banks as depositories and as lending institutions. The States have chartered banks since well before the adoption of the Constitution. Yet, the Federal Government has always been concerned with monetary matters and, beginning with Hamilton's report on a national bank, has shown increasing interest in banking matters. And the two systems have developed side by side over the years.

Like the U.S. Constitution, the dual-banking system involves a fundamental line of distinction between State banks and Federal banks. But, like the U.S. Constitution also, the Federal functions are shared by three organizations: the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve System, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The Commission on Money and Credit, the Heller Committee, and many other authorities have pointed out inefficiencies in this arrangement. And I think all of us have perceived a great amount of what might be described as "friction." But, however much we may admire efficiency and abhor friction, we know that arbitrary power and autocracy are far worse.

There are many different ways in which our banking system can meet the needs of the community. What is good for Detroit is not necessarily good for Williamsburg, Cheyenne, or Anchorage. A loan on timber tracts in Oregon may be quite different from a loan on a timber tract in Texas. A dairy loan in Wisconsin may be quite different from a dairy loan in Idaho. A liquid investment in Florida may turn out to be a frozen asset in Alaska.

In a country as vast and variegated as ours, diversity and change are the rule, rather than the exception. We should, therefore, not be surprised to find many differences in the laws and regulations and practices of banking in the different parts of the country.

One of the principal sources of variety in our banking system is the organization of banks—unit banks, countrywide branch banking, statewide branch banking, affiliated banks, correspondent banks and bank holding companies. These differences are not always easy to explain. Sometimes there are sound reasons in geography and business practices in a particular State, and at other times only historical or emotional factors can be found to justify a particular State's rules. But we should not be surprised that different branching rules have been established in New York and in Arizona, in Vermont and in California. No one system of bank organization is so demonstrably superior to all others in all parts of the country that one rule must be prescribed for the entire country. On the contrary, it seems to me there is much to be said for a system which permits diversity and experimentation with different forms of bank organization, so long as it is clearly recognized that the form of bank organization is not an end in itself but merely a means to an end, which is providing the best banking service possible to industry, commerce, and the public generally.

Whether or not we agree with the present branching arrangements in our own or another State, and whether or not we feel competent to revise the branching laws of our own or another State, I think we must not overlook the principle laid down in the McFadden Act in 1927—that the branching arrangements of national banks should follow those prescribed by State law in a particular State. This rule is essential to the transfer of banks from Federal to State or from State to Federal charters. Last year, in reporting such a bill, which became Public Law 87-721, I said, "The existing law as to the retention of branches in cases of conversion, consolidation or merger operates as a deterrent to State banks converting into national banks in certain States, and hence is inconsistent with the dual banking system which contemplates that State banks should be able to convert freely into national banks and vice versa."

The importance to the dual banking system of the ability to convert from one jurisdiction to another also gives strength to the view that national banks and State banks should have substantially the same powers and limitations, with respect to investments, trust powers, and the like. It is not, of course, necessary that these powers and limitations be identical, but if there are any wide discrepancies, conversion from State to national charters or vice versa would not be possible.

The dual banking system can provide adequate facilities for commerce, industry, and the public only if each of its two parts is strong and vigorous. This poses challenges both to the Federal Government and to the States. But, can the Federal Government give needed control and assistance to achieve Federal objectives, without taking over control and responsibility from the State banking authority? Can the States provide responsible and effective State banking systems, able to stand on their own feet without reliance on Federal crutches? I believe they can.

This brings us to consider two major Federal institutions to which many State banks belong—the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The Federal Reserve System has been given vast powers to regulate the flow of bank credit and money in order to promote economic growth and stability and is a remarkable combination of Federal, State, and private elements. The Board of Governors, which is generally held to be independent of the executive branch and is usually described as an arm of the Congress, consists of Governors who are given nonrenewable 14-year appointments subject to confirmation by the Senate and who can only be removed for cause. They are in no respect members of any particular administration, but are intended to provide "a fair representation of the financial, agricultural, industrial, and commercial interests, and geographic divisions of the country." The Federal Reserve banks, with stock owned by member banks, have a degree of independence from the Federal Government, and the member banks participate in the election of the presidents and directors of the Federal Reserve banks.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created in 1933 to make sure that demand deposits would continue to serve as the Nation's principal monetary supply by means of the insurance of individual deposits in the Nation's banks. FDIC has built up a huge reserve fund out of premiums paid by the many insured banks, and it now seems hard to believe that the commitment of the Federal Government to support this insurance will ever be needed. FDIC is given authority to examine and supervise insured nonmember State banks in order to provided additional protection against banking practices which might prejudice a bank's deposits and make it necessary to draw on the insurance reserve.

Your proposal that the same Government agency should have the power to pass on the insurance of deposits in new National as well as new State banks is worthy of consideration.

The duties and powers of the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC are broad and sweeping. They must be in order to carry out their functions. But neither they nor the State member and insured banks nor the State bank supervisors should ever forget for one moment that the State banks are chartered by the States, and are operated under State laws, and are responsible first and foremost to the officials of the States which created them.

This association was formed more than 60 years ago for the purpose of providing a place for supervisors of State banks to discuss their problems, and to increase the usefulness and efficiency, and to promote the general welfare, of State banks. I understand that the latest step in this program has been the decision of this association to establish a school for the training of State bank examiners. This seems to me a most desirable undertaking. Bank supervision begins with the bank examiner, and in order to carry out fully their responsibilities under the dual banking system, each and every State banking department must have a careful and well-trained and adequate staff of bank examiners. I am sure that the establishment of the association's new school for training examiners will prove to be a great step forward for the dual banking system.

The dual banking system can provide the banking services needed by business and the public only if both parts of the system are strong and effective. We must remember that, while the dual banking system has two parts, it is a single system. Judge Bynum's remarks about the three branches of the Federal Government are applicable to the dual banking system—the National banks and the State banks must firmly maintain the essential powers belonging to each of them, but they must always act together as one brotherhood, with mutual toleration, in order to carry out their common trust. And they must work together for the preservation of American constitutional liberty within the framework of a system of private enterprise.

CUBAN INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I take the Senate floor to eulogize a victim of American duplicity and indecision.

On September 14 a modest green covered offset publication originating from an address on Ponce de Leon Boulevard in Coral Gables, Fla., printed its 144th and final edition.

The death of this amazing literate fact sheet was viewed with mixed emotions. In Miami, in more than two dozen countries, in myriad newspaper offices and private homes throughout the United States, there was regret and surprise. But there can be no doubt that the death of Carlos Todd's Cuban Information Service elicited a satisfied sigh from the administration, for this unpretentious publication had for nearly 3 years committed the unpardonable sin of telling the Cuban story as seen from inside that miserable island. The facts carried in the Cuban Information Service almost continuously contradicted the hackneyed blandishments of administration spokesmen, which in itself speaks well for the journalistic prowess of Editor Todd.

Carlos Todd, it should be pointed out, brought an excellent set of credentials to Coral Gables with him. He was run out of Cuba and his post as columnist in the Havana Times by no lesser a Communist than Fidel Castro. The "Cult of Fidel" could not stand the searing revelations of Mr. Todd's editorials when it became apparent that Castro's strings were pulled by Moscow and his peoples' revolution was nothing more than a Soviet manipulated guerrilla war.

Mr. Todd was not just a refugee when he landed in Miami. His reputation could have opened the door to any one of a dozen top newspaper positions, but this man sought not a sinecure. He chose instead to combine his fervent desire for a free Cuba with his knowledge of Castro's communism and his broad journalistic background to organize his own branch of the "Pen and the Sword" which may eventually free the sovietized nation. Mr. Todd's efforts created the "Cuban Information Service" which would have seen its third anniversary November 3.

The gentleman is a lecturer of no mean repute. He articulates in impeccable English. He has an analytically perceptive mind which can penetrate morasses of governmental verbiage and graps the saliencies. However, he is not given to extravagant language as his publication revealed. He employed a sardonic sense of humor as he brought the issue of Cuba and the administration's duplicity into sharp focus. But now, partly through the simple facts of economic life and because of the pressure exerted on him by the administration, the "Cuban Information Service" has gone the way of several score other papers whose editors in exile ruffled the wrong Federal feathers.

As an example of the services provided by the "Cuban Information Service," I should like to have two excerpts printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first insertion, from the August 24 issue, could well be called the "Painful Truth About Cuba." It contains revealing statistics, pointing out that Cuba, which the United States hopes will prove an unbearable economic burden on the Soviet Union, is indirectly draining the United States of five times as much as the beachhead is costing Khrushchev.

These figures are attributed to an organization called the "Truth About Cuba Committee." However, I am informed that in round numbers they are quite accurate.

The first portion of the table, "Yearly Cost of Cuba's Communism to the United States," is broken down into roughly eight divisions which puts the total annual cost of Cuban communism in U.S. taxpayers' dollars at $2,057,250,000.

Other data reveals that the loss of U.S. trade with Cuba amounts to $450 million annually and that all in all Cuba, operating with impunity only 90 miles from the United States, is a far greater burden in dollars than it is in rubles.

I should like also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks Mr. Todd's final letter from the editor, dated September 14, in which he recalls that:

> The Russians, during the October 1962 crisis, demonstrated that they were completely unwilling to escalate any conflict over Cuba into nuclear war. Yet, after snatching defeat from the jaws of victory then, spines have not stiffened in Washington where Cuba is concerned.

Although the Cuban Information Service is no more, I am pleased to announce that the activities of Mr. Carlos Todd will not cease. His prose will soon emanate from a friendly European country and will continue to provide inspiration and information to all Cubans fighting underground and in exile awaiting the day when sanity and the Monroe Doctrine will supplant the New Frontier and its doctrine of retreat.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This Painful Truth Is Revealed by Miami's "Truth About Cuba Committee"

YEARLY COST OF CUBA'S COMMUNISM TO THE UNITED STATES

U.S. citizens' losses deducted in taxes prorated 4 years, $125 million.

U.S. Government's property losses prorated 4 years, $25 million.

Yearly tax loss in Cuban trade, $25 million.

Cost to U.S. taxpayers in increased sugar prices yearly, $784 million.

Half of yearly cost of Alliance for Progress, $1 billion.[1]

MAINTAINING CUBAN REFUGEES, YEARLY

Bay of Pigs invasion, $40 million.

Prisoners' ransom, $53 million.

Prorated over 4 years—annually, $23,250,000.

Total yearly cost of Cuban communism to U.S. taxpayers, $2,057,250,000.

Loss of U.S. trade with Cuba amounts to $450 million, annually. Loss in production payrolls is incalculable. Money cannot buy the tremendous loss in prestige in the hemisphere.

It is estimated that the Russians spend $400 million a year to support their Cuban colony. It is costing the United States over five times as much. Bear this in mind the next time anyone claims that the way to get rid of communism in Cuba is to make it too expensive to maintain. Too expensive for whom?

A Letter From the Editor

This Cuban Information Service published its first issue on November 3, 1960. Since that time, we have endeavored, to the best of our ability, to provide our recipients with news of the truth about Communist Cuba and of the rising Red tide that threatens to engulf the Latin American nations.

Editorially, our sole purpose has been to work for the freedom of our country; and, in doing so, to attack anything and anybody who pretended to delay or preclude the day of Cuban liberation.

The CIS was never intended to be a profit-making organization. It was distributed gratis to over 700 newspapers and 1,000 radio and TV stations scattered from Alaska to Patagonia. We sent it free to college and university libraries, members of the faculty, student organizations, the Washington diplomatic corps, some Senators and Congressmen, other governmental figures, labor unions, religious institutions, etc., etc. The CIS found its way to Great Britain, West Germany, Spain, Austria, Italy, the Philippines, France.

It is very difficult to obtain the confidence of people who receive something gratis. Anything that is free, is looked upon with suspicion. Yet in these 3 years, we managed to prove to the press and individuals in over 27 countries that our news sources were sound and the items we published trustworthy. Never once have we wilfully published a falsehood, and a rumor was always classified as a rumor. Our editorial policy, like all editorial policies, was strongly subjective. As far as our resources permitted, we tried to fight for the liberation of our country. We shall never cease to do so.

That this manner of procedure was successful is proven by fat scrapbooks, which contain quotations from this CIS in newspapers throughout the United States and Latin America, sometimes with credit, and sometimes without allusion to the source of the information presented. At all times, our only concern was to get the message across; and, while it is comforting for the ego to obtain a personal mention, the matter of paramount importance was to disseminate information and opinion with or without credit.

As editor of this CIS, I have been personally attacked by the Cuban Communist press on several occasions. The CP Havana daily Hoy and its sister paper, Revolucion, employed the grossest language in referring to my person. I was accused of being a Fascist, a lackey of the imperialists, a reactionary, a counterrevolutionary, a drunken playboy, and—the supreme smear—a homosexual. Havana's weekly Bohemia dedicated an entire article to my activities. Communist newspapers in Latin America lavished insulting prose attacking me personally. But then, I have also been under the fire of the New York Times and the New York Post, as well as the Moscow publication Trud.

It is comforting to know that the comrades spent so much time, effort, paper, and ink to attack me. They rarely engage in a campaign of discreditation unless they feel that a person is doing them some harm, no matter how small.

And now, with this issue, the CIS must cease publication. The reason is very simple: While we have received generous contributions from many individuals who received this service, their vital aid was not enough to balance the goodly number of news media and institutions which received the CIS gratis.

I, personally, cannot continue to work indefinitely without remuneration. Few people can, unless their name happens to be Onassis. Responsibilities to my dependents make it impossible for me to do so. Nevertheless, no matter what I do or where I go, I shall endeavor to contribute what I can to the cause of Cuban freedom.

I wish to thank the many who spontaneously offered financial help; and the many in the United States and in Latin America who, when things looked blackest for our beloved Cuba, wrote letters of encouragement that served to make a man feel that his work was of some use, no matter how small.

I also wish to thank those here, in Maimi—Cubans, and Americans who formerly resided in Cuba—who willingly volunteered their services for the weekly chore of assembling, stapling, folding, stamping, and mailing the CIS. Without their invaluable aid, we should have been hard put to get CIS out in the mails.

This CIS predicted, long before it actually became evident, that Brazil would turn toward communism and that the comrades had heavily infiltrated the government of that country; that Cheddi Jagan and wife Janet began the same process in British Guiana well over 2 years ago; that Juan Bosch is leading the Dominican Republic down the same path to ruin; that Communist terror in Venezuela would intensify following the same plan employed by Castro.

We predict here that this is only the beginning; that all of Latin America will fall into Communist hands, unless the United States takes firm action against the Havana regime of Fidel Castro; and that the Communist conquest of the Southern Hemisphere will become fait accompli in less than 10 years, quite possibly in 5.

The Government and the people of the United States have not yet understood that the Communist offensive in Latin America is an attack on the United States, and not an internal affair between Communists and their opponents in South and Central American countries. The main enemy of communism is here, in this country; and all victories gained by the Reds in the hemisphere are victories against the United States of America.

We fully agree with the "Soliloquy" of Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo and feel that there is much to be explained in the strange actions of all Western governments—certainly including the United States—and their reluctance to take one single effective action against Communist Cuba.

The Russians, during the October 1962 crisis, demonstrated that they were completely unwilling to escalate any conflict over Cuba into nuclear war. Yet, after snatching defeat from the jaws of victory then, spines have not stiffened in Washington where Cuba is concerned.

It is, as Dr. Nunez says, all very mysterious. And we ask ourselves, what would the United States have done if Hitler's Nazi legions had established a formidable "Festung Cuba" under American noses, in 1940. Ah, how different matters would have been then.

Those who are more concerned with the welfare of this country than with political victories, those men who represent the real profiles in courage of our day and age, may yet turn the tide of public sentiment and sound the alarm bells of freedom.

For unless the United States of America is willing to accept the responsibilities and the risks attendant to all power, that power will eventually dribble through the hands of the men who enjoy its privileges, but are not willing to fight for its continuance, against a deadly foe who is determined to destroy this country at all costs. "We will bury you." said Nikita Khrushchev. And, by Lenin, unless the inexorable, worldwide advance of communism is halted and rolled back, so they will.

RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON AFL–CIO CONVENTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the 8th annual convention of the Oregon AFL–CIO was recently concluded. This organization, which has been responsible for many progressive and forward-looking programs in the State of Oregon, adopted resolutions putting the organization on record in support of a number of major issues which now confront our country.

One of the resolutions called upon Congress to give prompt and favorable consideration to legislation which would provide hospital insurance coverage to the elderly under the social security system. The resolution points out that some 18 million persons 65 years or over are in need of assistance in securing health care benefits such as those provided by the King-Anderson bill.

I ask consent to include in the RECORD a number of resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Oregon AFL–CIO.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 13

Whereas the present Kerr-Mills medical assistance program does not meet the needs of the vast majority of the Nation's aged; and

---

[1] The committee estimates conservatively that at least half the cost of the $2 billion spent annually in the crash program of the Alliance for Progress is due to the existence of Communist Cuba.

Whereas less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the Nation's citizens age 65 and over receive any medical assistance from the existing program; and

Whereas older people need more medical care than younger people; and

Whereas older people have higher medical costs than younger people; and

Whereas hospital care is expensive and hospital costs are rising; and

Whereas older people are less able to pay for medical care in their retired years; and

Whereas health insurance that is now available to older individuals and that provides reasonable protection is extremely costly; and

Whereas health insurance that is now available to older individuals at moderate cost provides only severely limited protection; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill (S. 880 and H.R. 3920) which provides a national program to meet this national problem by providing hospital insurance coverage to 18 million persons over 65 beginning January 1965 and future coverage for present workers and their wives (or widows) when they reach 65: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon AFL–CIO, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 880 and H.R. 3920, in view of the urgency of the conditions above described; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO urge all affiliated organizations to appoint committees in their local unions for the sole aim and purpose of instituting a letter writing campaign whereby members will be encouraged to write their Congressman expressing support for this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That such campaign be implemented at once as indications are that this session of Congress may take action on this legislation; and be it finally

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO reaffirm its support of Anderson-King legislation by officially writing each Oregon State Congressman and Senator, requesting their their support.

Adopted September 20, 1963, Oregon AFL–CIO.

RESOLUTION 26

Whereas the problem of unemployment throughout the United States is continually expanding with a labor force that increases with each passing year and automation that takes its toll by replacing American workers with machines; and

Whereas many of our senior workers are unable to keep up with the pace set by automated industry, thereby being forced into a labor market where there is no place for them; and

Whereas these displaced workers are in most cases under the retirement age as established by our present social security laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Oregon AFL–CIO go on record in favor of reducing the retirement age for men and women under social security from 65 years to 60 years of age with no reduction in present benefits.

Adopted by Oregon AFL–CIO convention, September 20, 1963.

RESOLUTION 39

Whereas when employees are inducted into the postal service certain rights and benefits are explained to them. Among these are hospital plans partly paid for by the Federal Government. They are handed brochures of the various commercial hospital plans, but no mention is made of employee union sponsored plans, except the mention that other plans are available; and

Whereas in all fairness to the new employee he should be offered all of the plans in order to make a wise choice among them as to the one best suited for him and his family; and

Whereas the presentation of only the commercial plan brochures is in fact a recommendation of these plans, and a discrimination against the employee union sponsored plan: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Civil Service Commission be petitioned to issue a ruling that brochures of all hospital plans available to the new employee be given to the new employee at the time of his induction into the postal service, in order that he may choose among them the plan best suited to his needs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our delegation in Congress since it was the Congress that made these benefits available and the intent of the Congress should be carried out in rulings of the Commission entrusted with the implementation of the law approved by the Congress.

Adopted September 20, 1963, by the Oregon AFL–CIO convention.

RESOLUTION 40

Whereas the Fair Labor Standards Act provides that time and one-half shall be paid for work in excess of 40 hours per week or in excess of 8 hours per day by any employer engaged in interstate commerce; and

Whereas there is no escape from this for the employer except for supervisory employees; and

Whereas the Post Office Department does not conform to this act laid down by the U.S. Congress by the device of labeling one-fifth or more of its employees as substitutes, or temporary employees, while at the same time paying part of its supervisory force time and one-half; Therefore be it

Resolved, That all employees of the Post Office Department be paid time and one-half for overtime as defined under the Fair Labor Standards Act; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our delegation in Congress with a request to contact their respective committees in the House and Senate urging enactment of legislation to provide time and one-half for all employees of the postal service, with the exception of supervisory employees.

Adopted September 20, 1963, by the Oregon AFL–CIO convention.

RESOLUTION 54

Whereas the farm labor migrants who come into Oregon to help harvest our crops are the most poorly paid working people in our State and often work and live under substandard conditions; and

Whereas the farm labor migrants are excluded from the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, State Labor Elections Act, and State minimum wage law for women and minors, and are usually excluded from social security, State industrial accident law, State unemployment compensation law, and most public welfare programs; and

Whereas the labor movement must take leadership in assuring farm labor migrants full participation in the American way of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO support inclusion of farm labor migrants on an equitable basis in social legislation that protects other workers.

Adopted September 20, 1963, by Oregon AFL–CIO convention.

TITO'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on September 24 on the floor of the Senate, I vigorously protested against the proposed visit of Tito to the United States. I reiterate that I do not subscribe to the visit of Tito to our country, knowing that peremptorily after the war for political reasons he put to death Mihailovitch and put to death more than a hundred thousand Croats, Serbs, and Slovenes. He is not the type of man whose character and morality I fit him to be honored by our country and especially not by our President.

Mr. President, similar views are well expressed in a letter I received from Mr. Anton K. Rumpf, regional president for the States of Ohio and Michigan of the Society of the Danube Swabians. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIETY OF THE DANUBE SWABIANS,
Chicago, Ill., October 4, 1963.

The Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: I wish by means of this letter, to express in my name and this I am also permitted to do in the name of my many friends and countrymen, our complete support on your stand against the visit to this country of the Communist dictator, Josip Broz Tito.

My friends and I, the Danube Schwabians from Yugoslavia and now U.S. citizens, support your stand for the following reasons:

(1) Tito is a tyrant who came to power against the will of the peoples over whom he rules. He has grown in power through the massacre of his political adversaries and potential opponents. Among his many victims are the 200,000 Danube Schwabians murdered in Yugoslavia. Those who remained, he expelled from their homeland and confiscated their property.

(2) Tito's foreign policy is definitely anti-American as is proven in the records of the United Nations. His regime is as Communist as is the one in the Soviet Union, and they share the same endeavor, to bury America.

With the millions of American citizens, we lift our voices against the visit of Tito to the United States. We protest because we consider that his visit is neither in our national interest nor in the interest of the moral and political principles which we advocate as the citizens of this free country.

Please accept our warmest greetings and heartiest wishes.

Respectfully yours,
ANTON K. RUMPF,
Regional President for the States of Ohio and Michigan.

BOSTON VOTE IS KEY TO RACIAL MOVES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, Morris Cunningham, able and perceptive Washington correspondent for the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal, has written a very enlightening column regarding the racial turmoil and a school board election in the city of Boston.

Mr. Cunningham's fine article points up what I have said many times on the floor of the Senate, that the racial problems of the Nation are not confined to the South.

I commend that article to my colleagues of the Senate for their most careful reading and study, and therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON VOTE IS KEY TO RACIAL MOVES

(By Morris Cunningham)

WASHINGTON, October 5.—The smashing election victory of a Boston School Board member, who campaigned against transporting pupils to achieve racial integration, has sent a ripple of concern through the ranks of Democratic racial extremists here.

Executive offices and Capitol cloakrooms in Washington buzzed this week with excited comment on the magnitude of the victory scored in the Boston city election by Mrs. Louise Day Hicks.

As chairman of the Boston School Board, Mrs. Hicks has strongly opposed demands that de facto school segregation in Boston be ended by transporting Negro pupils to and from schools outside of their neighborhoods.

Despite sit-ins at the Boston School Board offices, mass marches, public denunciations, and other pressures, Mrs. Hicks has stuck steadfastly to her position.

Integrationists marshaled their forces to defeat her in last week's city election.

But when the returns came in Mrs. Hicks led all 10 other candidates for the school board and collected about 21,000 more than Mayor John F. Collins in the mayor's successful bid for renomination.

Mayor Collins received 57,085 of the about 122,240 votes cast for mayor while Mrs. Hicks swept the school board election with about 88,000 votes.

Viewing the results editorially, the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram, one of Massachusetts better newspapers, said:

"The shock waves are going out from the Boston primary, which was an emphatic victory for the forces of conservatism on the Boston School Committee (board) a personal triumph for its chairman, Mrs. Louise Day Hicks, and a punch in the nose for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People."

One of the issues in the school board election was whether the board would employ a local educator, Deputy School Superintendent William H. Ohrenberger, as school superintendent, or hire the deputy superintendent of the New York City school system for the job. After the election, the local man was employed.

This issue was closely related to the question of transporting pupils since the New York school system has been shifting pupils about in buses for sometime to achieve greater racial balance.

Saying the major issue was ending de facto segregation, the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram continued:

"The NAACP has led a demand that Negro students be transported from inferior schools in Negro districts to schools in other sections. This issue was crystallized in the candidacy of a Negro for the school committee (board).

"What shocked the NAACP and sympathizers with Negro demands for a better break all around was the drubbing the Negro candidate received, and the endorsement given to Mrs. Hicks, in the silk stocking wards, where liberalism is supposed to be entrenched.

"Could Boston, the home of abolition, be called anti-Negro from this day on?"

The Transcript-Telegram said this would be "putting the case too hard."

"Nevertheless," the editorial continued, "the story is plain enough that upper crust liberalism is too often lived in a vacuum. North or South, when love for the underdog is challenged by self-interest, the secure intellectual turns out to be a human being after all."

Washington politicians are now looking to the forthcoming city elections in Philadelphia and Indianapolis, where racial issues also have been raised, for additional readings on what some are calling a revolt of white voters in the North.

If this turns out to be the case, it could carry vast significance in the 1964 Presidential election, particularly in a contest between President Kennedy and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

GOVERNMENT BY INTIMIDATION IS EMERGING IN UNITED STATES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report, dated October 14, 1963, carries a profoundly revealing article by an able and distinguished Mississippian, the Honorable John Satterfield, who served with wisdom and ability as president of the American Bar Association in 1961–62.

The article is entitled "Government by Intimidation Is Emerging in United States." The learned statement by Mr. Satterfield is a very effective and sound answer to charges by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy that lawyers who disagree with the decision in Brown versus Board of Education and who seek its reversal or a court determination in their clients' own case are professionally irresponsible.

Mr. Satterfield's answer to the Attorney General's charge is able and outstanding and goes to the heart of the questions. I commend it most highly to every Member of the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT BY INTIMIDATION IS EMERGING IN UNITED STATES

(By John Creighton Satterfield)

Only four persons were mentioned in the attack upon lawyers and judges by Attorney General Kennedy in his speech to the Missouri Bar Association at Kansas City last Friday, September 27, 1963. These were "the Governors of two States, a former president of the American Bar Association, and a Federal district judge," all of whom are lawyers. I am the third person named. This attack, however, directly involves many members of the legal profession and many public officials throughout the United States. Ultimately, every citizen of the United States will be affected by the pattern of which this attack is a part. Its purpose is to intimidate all persons, including public officials, lawyers, and judges, who do not bow to the desires of Attorney General Kennedy and of President Kennedy.

On the surface the reason and purpose of these attacks may be obscure. In each incident which gave rise to these attacks, the Attorney General, by the use of overwhelming forces available to him, had already obtained his desires. As a part of the pattern, however, the purpose is clear.

The Attorney General states that the action of each person in each separate situation "smacks of duplicity," is "professionally irresponsible," amounts to "demagoguery," lacks "good faith," that the statements by each are "something less than the truth," and that every time a lawyer represents a client opposing the Attorney General in the field of integration—desegregation—the "client is being victimized," and that such action of an attorney is an "unscrupulous exploitation" of the client.

The slanderous nature of these statements by the Attorney General of the United States is demonstrated by the definition of slander contained in "American Jurisprudence," volume 33, page 39:

"Slander, as now understood, has been defined as the speaking of base and defamatory words which tend to prejudice another in his reputation, office, trade, business, or means of livelihood."

The Attorney General, in his speech, specifically refers to three basic legal principles the spirit of which he alleges is being ignored by those who defend integration suits. These propositions are that it is proper to avail oneself of every legal defense to test the validity and applicability of a rule of law, that a court decision binds only those who are a party to it, and that a court-made rule of law should always be open to reexamination.

The Attorney General has said:

"Often there is room for much discretion and honest disagreement as to when cases are alike or unalike. But clearly, in the matter of desegregation, there can be little or no room for argument in good faith as to when one situation is different—in the legal sense—from another in which the law has been laid down."

This statement by the Attorney General is completely without basis in fact or in law.

The Brown desegregation decision of 1954 has already been distinguished or held inapplicable in a number of cases involving alleged discrimination. Many other cases now pending in this general area of law involve questions so different from the Brown case as to be completely removed from the basic principles outlined therein. If one case can be as broad in its application as the Attorney General would lead us to believe, the citizens of the United States would not be entitled to due process of law and equal protection of the laws.

Of the four persons specifically attacked in the Attorney General's speech, one is referred to as "a Federal district judge who recently overruled the Brown decision on grounds that its findings of fact were erroneous." In the case of Stell versus Board of Education, Judge Frank M. Scarlett found that the effect of segregation upon Negro students in Georgia in 1963, shown by the evidence in that case, differed materially from the facts presented in the Brown case as to the effect of segregation upon Negro students in Kansas in 1954. Substantial differences in facts as between two cases cannot logically be ignored simply for the sake of expediency. The slander of a Federal judge is quite different from constructive criticism of the legal principles involved in a judicial decision.

To those who know the facts, the repeated references by Attorney General Kennedy to "dilatory tactics" are unconvincing. Suits involving integration have been handled expeditiously by the courts. In fact, such cases have repeatedly been advanced upon the dockets and writs requiring integration have been issued by courts of appeal even before the record of the appeal from the district courts has reached the appellate courts.

It is a novel position for an experienced lawyer to take—that, because a decision has been on the books for 9 years, it is bad faith and "unscrupulous exploitation" of a client for a lawyer to urge either that the facts in his case are different or that the earlier case should be differentiated or overruled. Plessy versus Ferguson was repeatedly reaffirmed by the Supreme Court over a period of 56 years. If 15 justices have permitted the Brown case to stand—as is affirmed by the Attorney General—doubtless 50 judges had reaffirmed Plessy versus Ferguson and Gong Lum versus Rice. Yet when the Solicitor General of the United States joined in a brief to have these cases overruled, he was not accused by the Attorney General of the United States—or any other lawyer, so far as I know—of being guilty of bad faith, of being professionally irresponsible and of victimizing or exploiting his client.

SIT-INS VERSUS THE COURTS

The Attorney General would further have us believe that the reason for demonstrations and sit-ins by Negroes today is the lack of remedy in the courts. Yet he argues that Negroes will ultimately prevail in the courts because the Brown decision covers all of their grievances.

On the other hand, he does not mention that those who oppose many of the aims of Negro leaders have refrained from marches and demonstrations and have put their faith in the courts, hoping that, in the long run, justice for all will prevail. The Attorney General slanders them for so doing. To use the streets in mass demonstrations which, in the words of President Kennedy, "create tensions, and threaten violence—and threaten lives" is laudable. To settle disputes in the courts is to be condemned.

A new type of government is emerging upon the American scene—"government by intimidation" is now about to take the place of "due process of law" and "liberty under the law."

The first step in the pattern is to intimidate all those who oppose the desires of the Federal executive branch of our Government. This intimidation is carried out by public castigation, threats of financial reprisals against public bodies and individuals, and the misuse of the power of the Federal executive branch to command the attention of the public press.

The second step is to extend Federal control over individuals, businesses, and State and local governments far beyond that provided in the Constitution of the United States. This was begun by the issuance of Executive orders in certain particular fields. A limitless expansion of such Executive authority is now being attempted by the new package of legislation introduced in the Congress in June and called, for tactical and public relations purposes, "The Civil Rights Act of 1963."

The third step will be the use of the vast financial power of the United States to strangle every public body, every business, and professional establishment, and every individual daring to act contrary to the wishes of Attorney General Kennedy and the threat of the imposition of Federal fines and imprisonment without trial by jury.

The initial use of the first step in the pattern was in April 1962, when a steel-price increase was announced. The citizens who made the price decisions were accused by the President through nationwide media of being guilty of a wholly unjustified and irresponsible defiance of public interest. He castigated them as a tiny handful of steel executives whose pursuit of private power and profit exceeds their sense of public responsibility, who can show such utter contempt for the interest of 185 million Americans. It was publicly announced that defense contracts might be withheld and that the Federal Government might use its investigative powers to bring about prosecutions for violations of antitrust laws.

Intimidation as a governmental policy has been repeatedly used since that time. The speech of Attorney General Kennedy at Kansas City is a perfect illustration. I have been actively opposing throughout the United States the grasp for Federal power in the Civil Rights Act of 1963 and am doing so at the present time. The others mentioned have opposed the Attorney General. Hence we must be intimidated or defamed.

Why is this legislation so important to the Attorney General? It would grant unlimited powers to the Attorney General and the President and his appointees to withhold Federal funds in every program or activity in which Federal financing is involved directly or indirectly by way of grant, contract, loan, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise.

The authority is demanded that all contracts in every program shall contain such conditions as the President may prescribe; that there be created a commission—with powers conferred upon it by the President—to take over the supervision of employment, promotion, demotion, and handling of employees of more than 90 percent of the businesses in the United States.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION: DISGUISED

The purpose of this legislation has been disguised by repeated references to public accommodations and Government contractors. These constitute less than 1 percent of the businesses affected. In fact, it would affect every bank which is a member of the Federal Reserve System or insured by the FDIC (Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation), every form of financing affected by Federal insurance or guaranty, all depositors in every bank covered by the FDIC, and all borrowers therefrom. It would draw under Federal executive control almost every farmer in the United States, as it includes every person who receives any sort of financial benefit from every Federal program in the field of agriculture. It would also draw under Federal control practically every retail shop, department store, market, drugstore, gasoline station, restaurant, motion picture house, theater, stadium, hotel, motel and lodging house and in fact every establishment which pays any privilege license or tax to any State or municipality.

It includes uncontrolled authority to call loans, withdraw support of the FDIC and the Federal Reserve Board, and other similar entities, to cancel contracts, to blacklist banks, savings and loan associations, contractors, realtors, farmers, cooperatives, farm organizations, or any other institution or person falling within its classification.

HOW ELECTIONS COULD BE CONTROLLED

Under this proposed act, the Federal Government would obtain control of education through the misuse of every existing Federal financial program, including grants-in-aid, research grants, lunch programs, scholarships, and similar activities. Also, it would constitute the first step toward placing all elections—"general, special or primary elections held solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate for public office"—under the absolute control of the Federal Government.

THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most exciting ventures now going on in this country is the effort of the American people to raise $30 million for the construction of the National Cultural Center. We all look forward to the day when our Nation's Capital will have facilities for the presentation of performers from this country and abroad. On that day, all Americans will rejoice in their cultural showcase and take pride in the fact that the construction was made possible by private contributions.

Today we are particularly indebted to those public-spirited citizens and organizations who are devoting their time and energy in alerting the entire country to the dream of the National Cultural Center and the need for contributions to make this dream a reality. I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks in the RECORD a speech by Edgar M. Bronfman, Chairman of the Seat Endowment Committee of the National Cultural Center, before the American Legion National Convention at Miami Beach, Fla., on September 10, 1963, and a resolution passed by the American Legion in support of the National Cultural Center.

There being no objection, the speech and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CULTURE AND THE STRUGGLE FOR MEN'S MINDS, BY EDGAR M. BRONFMAN, MEMBER OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE NATIONAL CULTURAL CENTER BEFORE THE AMERICAN LEGION NATIONAL CONVENTION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA.

Mr. National Commander, your eminence, Cardinal Spellman, Governor Bryant and other distinguished guests and delegates to the convention.

Mr. Commander, may I first express my gratitude to you and to the officers and members of the American Legion on behalf of the trustees of the National Cultural Center for the opportunity to appear before you to enlist your support for this great national project.

In this area of continued international tension and crisis between the forces of communism and of freedom, we all must address ourselves to the important responsibility that rests heavily on the shoulders of all Americans. For, as we go, so goes the free world.

This era of tension and crisis has been called the cold war. Actually, this is an oversimplification. It is really many cold wars—military, economic, social, political, and cultural.

While we are busy concentrating on the first four cold wars, and rightly so, we are in grave danger of losing the last—the cultural cold war.

An indication of its importance is revealed in the hearings going on this very week in Washington before a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee studying ways of winning the cultural cold war.

Now, at first glance, it is hard to see music, ballet, opera, and drama as effective weapons in the battle between the operating ideologies of communism and the free world. Let me assure you that these are weapons, and mighty potent ones. The Soviets and their satellites are using them for all their worth.

We are familiar with the tremendous receptions that the Bolshoi Ballet and other Soviet performing artists have received throughout the world. Why do they put so much effort behind culture? The answer is rather simple. Culture is the only international language. It is understood by all people, everywhere.

In the battle for men's minds, now going on, this international language plays a vital role. As an example, just consider the statement that Prime Minister Nehru of India once made to Martha Graham, leading American dancer. He said to Miss Graham, "Your dancing and artistry will do more than all the planes and dollars in gaining understanding of the United States in India."

While American artists have gone abroad and made a creditable showing on behalf of our country, there still is much to be done. For instance, whereas many of the world's leading nations have national theaters and halls in their capitals which serve as showcases for the performing arts, our Capital, Washington, D.C., has nothing comparable.

To show how seriously the Communists take this fifth dimension of the cold war, even in economically hoveled Poland recently, a $40 million cultural center was proudly unveiled.

It was in such a showcase in Moscow that a talented Texan, Van Cliburn, was first discovered. I'm sure that every American was very proud of his feat. But, didn't we all wince a bit at the thought that he had to go so far from his native land for recognition as an artist; that the Soviet Union, in particular, discovered this talented young American musician. Too many American artists must go abroad for such recognition.

Also, the lack of proper facilities in our Capital has created an erroneous and damaging impression of this country and the fine values for which it stands. When our Nation's seat of government was being planned, George Washington dreamed of it as a cultural as well as a political center of our growing Nation.

But, it wasn't until 1958, when President Eisenhower signed the act establishing a National Cultural Center that this dream began to become reality. In signing the act, President Eisenhower eloquently expressed his hope of one day seeing an American "Mecca, where all could see what America is really capable of showing—not only in her factories, in her productivity, in her great strength, wealth, prosperity—but what she could show in the arts and in those things that appeal to all that is spiritual and esthetic in the senses of man."

President Kennedy in lending his support to the National Cultural Center said: "There has been a growing awareness that the United States will be judged—and its place in history ultimately assessed—not alone by its military or economic power, but by the quality of its civilization."

The Center is nonpartisan, nonpolitical—it is for all Americans.

I am proud and pleased to be a member of the Center's board of trustees, which includes many leading Americans from all walks of life. Therefore, I can speak from firsthand knowledge of the great effort being put behind it.

Congress has provided the land for the Center. However, the buildings will be paid for by all the American people at an estimated cost of $30 million.

The National Cultural Center will contain three separate performing halls—a symphony hall, a theater and an auditorium for opera, ballet and musical comedy. And there will be ample room for future expansion. Here, our country's most outstanding performers will display their talents. Here, celebrated artists from abroad will find the appropriate setting to perform in the Nation's Capital. Here, also, the most promising of our young artists will get the chance for recognition by the American public.

I would like to emphasize the last point. There will be talent competitions in every State. The best talent from the farthest corners of our Nation will be given the opportunity to appear at the National Cultural Center. Radio and television programs will be broadcast from the Center throughout the country. The potential audience of the National Cultural Center is really 180 million Americans. And, as time goes by, quite likely, most of the rest of the world.

All it needs—is to be built. That takes money—$30 million. I'm asking you Legionnaires and all Legion posts throughout the country for your enthusiastic support of this vital idea—the National Cultural Center.

Because you are keenly aware that we must win the cold war on all fronts. Because you are such a strong force of national leadership and in your communities—you can help make the National Cultural Center a living reality, a symbol of our determination to uphold freedom and the total dignity of man.

Here's how you can help. Collectively, the Center will have 6,450 seats, each to be endowed by a gift of $1,000. On the back of each seat, the donor's name will be emblazoned forever. Can you imagine an entire area of American Legion post seats as a symbol of their dedication to winning the struggle for men's minds?

Your contributions would be further expression of the American people's determination to win the cold war on every single front where it is joined.

When the Communists opened the cultural cold war, they thought that they were playing to our weakness. You and I know this is not true. It is up to all of us here and throughout the country to help meet this challenge by supporting with all our hearts the National Cultural Center.

National Cultural Center,
Washington, D.C.

Whereas the Congress of the United States has recognized the need for a National Cultural Center; and

Whereas by act of Congress, our Government agreed to provide a suitable site for such an establishment in the Nation's Capital; and

Whereas this act of Congress authorized a nationwide campaign to give all Americans, individually or in organizations, an opportunity to share in the establishment of this cultural showcase; and

Whereas in keeping with the spirit and intent of this act, the President of the United States and Commander in Chief of our armed services, has urged participation in and support of this effort; and

Whereas the Washington Area Committee for the National Cultural Center has invited the cooperation of veterans organizations in the District of Columbia and neighboring Maryland and Virginia, as representative of the 22 million men and women now living who have served in the military and naval forces of our country; and

Whereas members of the Department of the District of Columbia, American Legion, are cognizant of the need for the facilities and services which the National Cultural Center will provide in the Nation's Capital, and are desirous of lending support to any patriotic effort to enhance the strength and prestige of our country, culturally as well as militarily; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Miami Beach, Fla., September 10–12, 1963, That every effort be made to make this National Cultural Center a reality and that copies of this resolution be forwarded to interested parties and that appropriate steps be taken to bring the National Cultural Center into being.

VIETNAM MUST CHANGE OR FORFEIT AID

(At this point Mr. Walters took the chair.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, once more, for the sixth time, a Buddhist monk has voiced protest of oppression by the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam in the most drastic manner possible, by becoming a flaming torch in suicide. No one can deny the depth of conviction which has driven desperate people to such terrible acts in order to draw the world's attention to their plight. These are acts of desperation, and we must face up to the fact that our own position in Vietnam is becoming desperate, too.

For despite the charms and blandishments of Madam Nhu on American television programs, Vietnam's Government can only be described as an oppressive dictatorship in fact if not in name. Madam Nhu herself is quoted in a recent Saturday Evening Post article—placed in the Record by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] on September 26—as having said:

> All the Buddhists have done for this country is to barbecue a monk.

And she has advocated beating the Buddhists "10 times more."

As "strong man" of the regime, Madam Nhu's husband has recently, since the start of the Buddhist protests, brought the "Special Forces" battalions in Saigon up to some 1,200 men. Their commander, with personal loyalty to Nhu, is a former counterespionage chief. His units include "two groups dressed in civilian clothes, armed with knives, pistols, and grenades for street fighting," according to Stanley Karnow, author of the Post article.

These are only a part of the 7,000 troops stationed in or near the capital, far from the fighting against the Vietcong, troops that have been used in the mass attack of August 21 on Buddhist temples, against demonstrations by the people, against even high school students, who have been arrested by the hundreds. Students, because of their opposition to the regime, are being inducted into the army if they are over 20 years old; if younger, they are being rounded up and sent to "reeducation centers," another name for detention or concentration camps.

The pattern is familiar—the "elite" forces reminiscent of Nazi storm troopers, the intolerance of any word of criticism, the use of a proclaimed Communist threat as an excuse for Fascist methods. Mr. President, this regime does not represent the people of Vietnam and does not care about the people.

Dr. Erich Wulff, a German psychiatrist who was in Vietnam to establish a new psychiatric program at the University of Hue, was an eyewitness of the May 8 attack by armored cars with 37-millimeter guns, in which shots were fired into a crowd assembled at the radio station to hear an address by a Buddhist leader who had been banned from the air. Dr. Wulff was a speaker last week at a luncheon in Washington attended by several members of Senate office staffs. He showed photographs of the bodies, riddled and bloody, of some of the seven children and one woman who were killed in that unprovoked assault on defenseless people.

Mr. President, those armored cars bore the insignia of U.S. aid, clasped hands under stars on a blue field with the red stripes of a shield below. The common people of Vietnam may not be able to read, but they can understand those signs. They do not know that those machines, and the trucks which carry students away to arrest, have gone out of our control into the hands of the dynastic Ngo Dinh family's minions. To them, this is the sign of the United States. We are accomplices in repression, tearing down the very democracy that we profess, by our aid, to be building up. This abuse of our aid must be stopped, and stopped without delay.

Dr. Wulff further observes, in an article which Senator Church inserted in the Record on September 11, that there is disillusionment and discontent among even the regular army officers, who are being distracted by the country's internal condition from their task of fighting the Communists of Ho Chi Minh. He quotes a young captain as saying:

> Just what are we fighting for anyway? For Diem and his family? If the physical and spiritual terror here gets much worse, there will be nothing to choose between us and the North.

Dr. Wulff continues:

> His opinion is shared by many younger officers of the middle grades. As for the recruits, I myself saw 10 truckloads of troops, sent out against a crowd of students in Hue, signaling encouragement to them. The regime stabilized the situation in Hue only by flying in military police from Danang and part of the presidential guard from Saigon. In critical situations the government can apparently rely only on special troops.

Mr. President, those special troops—the 1,200-man force of Colonel Tung—according to uncontradicted reports are receiving pay of $250,000 per month—$3 million a year—from our own Government. Why, I ask? We must withdraw from any degree of complicity in antidemocratic tyranny of this sort.

Even Madam Nhu's own father, the resigned Ambassador to the United States, said in an interview only the past Sunday that Diem and his family—

> have become the strongest roadblock to victory because they have misused American aid to suppress their own people instead of using the aid to unite the people in the fight against the Communists.

In his remarks this week, Dr. Wulff, a dedicated medical man, not a politician, but a civilian observer who happened to be on the scene, related that he had seen in the course of his duties in Hue about 50 political prisoners, of whom there are reportedly at least 30,000 today, including hundreds of Buddhists priests and students whose crime was making honest protest. Of the 50, Dr. Wulff found only 2 who were Communist guerrillas. Others were peasants who had made political remarks about leaders in their own areas. Some had been in prison for 1 to 2 years, without even knowing why.

The most severe local oppression occurs in the inland areas, out of sight of the Americans in Saigon. The result is that most of those who are sympathizers with the Vietcong, who have been brought into cooperating with them in the Mekong Delta and elsewhere, are not Communists. Communists have increased their hard-core regulars from 18,000 to more than 25,000 in the past year. And they are gaining their converts, not by the attractiveness of their program, but by the hatred of oppressed people for their own corrupted and tyrannical government—a government which we are continuing to keep in power.

"Saigon is now a city of suspicion," says a former high officer of the Diem regime, the holder of a Columbia University doctorate in political science, a man who resigned his post in protest against the Buddhist oppression. He added:

> Modest houses of American officials are under surveillance. Telephone lines are tapped. The Times of Vietnam daily accuses the United States of being "imperialistic" or worse.

This paper, incidentally, is the one which reputedly serves as the mouthpiece for Madam Nhu and her husband.

Our own Nation has become involved with the affairs of this country on the other side of the world because we stand for freedom and for the rights of people. We sent our aid there to help the people, not to help Diem maintain power by disregarding scheduled elections and turning his presidency into a tyrannical dictatorship. Yet the picture I have painted is one which shows us to his own oppressed people as an accomplice in oppression. Our 15,000 troops there, our 100 dead, our $500 million in aid this year—$1½ million a day—were not intended for these antidemocratic purposes. This great effort is being diverted to dictatorial disregard of the people. The fight against the Vietcong is halfhearted. The image of the United States is being trampled in the mud within view of the whole of southeast Asia, not to mention the rest of the world.

Mr. President, I wish to paint you another picture of American aid in that part of the world. I want to tell you the story of a common, ordinary Indiana dirt farmer, from Steuben County, who has been pouring out his life, and even $7,000 of his own funds, for the past 3 years in warm, human aid to needy people far up in the frontier area of Laos. It is the story of a man who has become a legend among the Meo tribesmen, a man who has lived peaceably on the frontier where territory has changed hands to the Communists and back again, who has had to jump up from sleep at a sudden warning and plunge into the jungle five times in 1 year to escape Communist guerrillas, a man who has for many months had a price of $25,000 on his head, offered by the Pathet Lao, and yet who has won the love of the primitive people he serves, so that he is in no danger of being turned in for that most tempting reward.

That man is Edgar Buell, known as "Pop" Buell, or to the natives as "Tan Pop." In Meo "Tan" means "Mister," and "Pop" means "sent from above."

At 50, "Pop" Buell is an old man by native standards in a land where 35 is a ripe age to attain. He has been in Laos since June 1960—at first as a $60-a-month volunteer with the International Voluntary Service; but now he is with our Government's Agency for International Development. He has just been home to Indiana, where his father has been seriously ill. He also reported in Washington. He returned to Laos just the other day.

I cite "Tan Pop," or Edgar Buell, as an inspiring example of the kind of aid we really should be emphasizing—the same sort of thing we are doing with the Peace Corps and through the Alliance for Progress, the kind of activity which does not feed communism by turning people away from us, but turns them from communism because they find ours the better way. But it takes a different point of view from that of the military leadership which sees the whole struggle in terms of armored cars, machineguns, and snipers.

Edgar Buell speaks Meo, Lao, and Thai. Ninety percent of his time has been spent behind enemy lines, helping the wandering bands of tribesmen to find new village sites, to organize air drops of rice and other essentials, to bring them seeds, and help them raise crops under the nose of the enemy. Sometimes walking for days, sometimes flying in tiny planes, he has organized and personally kept going a $1,500,000 relief program for the Meo tribesmen in the midst of the Communists—a total figure, let it be noted, amounting to no more than 1 day's cost of our aid to Vietnam. He has started 29 schools for these people where there were none before. Although without medical training himself, he has delivered some 30 babies, and has given practical medical treatment to hundreds. He has brightened the lives of thousands of children with gifts of candy; and soon he will be receiving shipments—which will total 25,000 rubber balls and 50,000 balloons—being made for him voluntarily by rubber workers in a Sandusky, Ohio, union who are giving up their coffee breaks to do the job with company cooperation. His work in the Rural Development Branch of AID has been vital to the lives of the 50,000 to 60,000 Meo tribesmen who have been driven from their mountain homes by Communist Pathet Lao soldiers.

But, rather than tell more about this man, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, an article about him. It is entitled "An American Hero," and was published last year in the Saturday Evening Post, and has been reprinted by AID.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, here is a contrast which is running through our divided policy in many parts of the world—military support to prop up tyrannical dictatorships, nullifying the good we are doing through AID, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, and our assistance to United Nations agencies for people. On the one hand, we present our true face as humanitarians; on the other side, we show the U.S. insignia on the vehicle of oppression against Buddhists and students. In Latin America, we stand idly by, for lack of a positive policy, and watch military juntas take over the Dominican Republic, Honduras, and other democratic states, through dictatorial methods. Then we recognize the dictators, and we are once more in collaboration with the very thing we say we are fighting.

This inconsistency in foreign policy must stop. On Friday, I issued a statement on the Latin American situation. In it, I said:

> Withholding of aid funds and expressing diplomatic displeasure are not enough.
>
> A hemispheric police force under the direction of the Organization of American States must be set up. The President should direct our OAS delegates to take the lead in the setting up of such a force, which should be equipped to move rapidly to protect popular, democratic governments against military takeovers.

In short, we must do more than talk. This is precisely the case in Vietnam. We have talked, but we have not acted. We have said to Madam Nhu, to President Diem, and to their cohorts, "If you are not good children, we may take away your candy." But like the indulgent parent whose child knows the talk is only threat, and who can therefore get away with any degree of bad behavior, we get the answer, "All right, I'll be good"—but with action quite the opposite. We have come to be known as a paper tiger, and the teeth of a paper tiger never bit anyone. It is time we not only bared our teeth, but used them.

I am one of the cosponsors of the resolution of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], Senate Resolution 196, now before the Committee on Foreign Relations. That resolution declares:

> It is the sense of the Senate that unless the Government of South Vietnam abandons policies of repression against its own people and makes a determined and effective effort to regain their support, military and economic assistance to that Government should not be continued.

We desperately need foreign aid of the kind typified by the man whom the natives call Tan Pop, "Mr. Sent From Above"; but we need just as desperately to stop tearing down all the good we do with these programs and people by supporting governments which oppress their own ordinary citizens.

The Vietnam resolution needs not only to be passed, it also needs to be implemented in the foreign policy of our Nation, with firmness and with the kind of discipline which alone prevents juvenile delinquency. If the Diem regime will not use our money for promotion of democratic ends, why should we continue to coddle its leaders as we are doing? We started out in Vietnam to put down the threat of communism; but what good will it do to eliminate communism, only to replace it with repressive dictatorship?

The time has come to give the paper tiger some teeth. We have the ability and the power to withdraw at least a portion of our aid, in order to help persuade Diem and Madam Nhu and their Government to commence to toe the democratic line, for the welfare of all their people. We need action, not just threats. Let us withdraw, or perhaps place in escrow, depending upon a change for the better, at least a portion of our aid, perhaps 20 percent. If we are to be the adoptive uncle to Vietnam or to any other country, let us exert our right to discipline. That is the only way we can perform our true function for democracy in the world.

EXHIBIT 1

AN AMERICAN HERO—THE EXCLUSIVE STORY OF HOW AN AMERICAN FARMER HAS DEVOTED HIS LIFE TO A ONE-MAN CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY IN WAR-TORN, COMMUNIST-INFILTRATED LAOS

(By Don A. Schanche)

PART 1

Edgar Buell was squatting, native style, on a dusty path which bordered a worked-out opium field high in the mountains of northern Laos. He is a little runt of a man, and except for his thinning hair and heavy-rimmed spectacles you could mistake him for one of the 200,000 Meo tribesmen who inhabit those jungle-sheathed mountains. His skin is weathered from a lifetime on an Indiana farm and darkened from 2 years of baking in the tropical sunshine of Laos. His khaki trousers were spotted with the dirt of daylong hikes up mountain trails to the Meo villages we had visited that week, and he was shirtless, warming his bared torso in the afternoon sun.

Buell was discussing the economics of opium with two Meo village leaders, who listened attentively, almost rapturously. He spoke in a mixed vocabulary of tribal Meo and Lao, the national language of Laos. If you listened closely, you could almost hear northern Indiana colloquialisms buried in the strange monosyllabic words.

Opium, the only exportable cash crop raised in Laos, is a poor crop for the Meo, Buell explained. Harvesting it is hard, painstaking work. Even though the Meo grow the best opium in the world, the farmer's reward for the stuff is abysmally low; a batch that might sell for $100,000 if smuggled into New York brings the Meo farmer about $1. In Buell's easygoing but forthright lecture to the tribesmen, there was no hint of moral considerations. The evils of opium's misuse in a civilized Western society would be inexplicable to the primitive Meo. Buell stuck to crop economics. Sweet potatoes, he said, would grow beautifully in the rich earth of the hills. They would bring more money, and besides, the farmers and their families could eat them.

As the Meo village leaders nodded in thoughtful agreement, Buell looked up at me. "Americans ought to know," he said, "that diplomacy ain't all white shirts, nice pants and money running out of your pockets. More of us have got to get down with the people. That's where you can do some good for them and for America."

Edgar Buell rarely has occasion to wear a white shirt and nice pants, and when money runs out of his pockets, it is more often his own, earned in years of work raising corn and soybeans on an Indiana farm, than it is Uncle Sam's. The 49-year-old retired farmer is one of that woefully small group of Americans overseas who were extolled by Eugene Burdick and William Lederer in their misnamed book "The Ugly American," whose hero was not ugly, but splendid. These are the Americans who volunteer to go to remote corners of the world where they can use a lifetime of practical experience in helping the miserable people our leaders euphemistically call the "less fortunate" or "underdeveloped."

Buell went to Laos in June 1960 as a $60-a-month volunteer, an agricultural adviser for International Voluntary Service, a private Peace Corps which contracts the services of its volunteers to various U.S. aid programs abroad. He took this step after a deep personal tragedy, the death of his wife. In the vernacular of northeastern Indiana, and the farm where he spent most of his life, Buell explained what propelled him to Laos. "It ain't so complicated. Maloreen and I was a team. When that one good horse got off the wagon, I couldn't go on alone back home. But here, I don't know why, I can go alone."

As his words indicate, he is a gentle man, tempered by a life that has been both hard and good. Physically he is wiry and tough, hardened by 2 years of climbing up and down the mountains of Laos. If a word could describe his features, that word would be "homely"; it is a warm kind of homeliness, underlined by alert, curious eyes, that draws other men to Edgar Buell and inspires confidence in people less fortunate than himself.

The Meo people with whom Buell works are among the least fortunate people in the world. Fortune has not smiled on them at all. Even without the recent war, which has torn them from their land, they live at the absolute bedrock of human existence. Their farmland is mostly vertical, climbing up the sides of rugged mountains and cleared by slashing and burning the tangled jungle which chokes it. After a few years of growing hill rice, opium, and vegetables in one spot, they pick up their meager possessions and move to another mountain to repeat the process. They live in grass-thatched, bamboo-walled huts. Virtually everything they have is handmade, mostly from bamboo.

A Meo woman is lucky if she survives childbirth. She is luckier still if half of the children she bears survive childhood. And she can count her blessings if she or her husband lives to be more than 35 years of age. If she knows Edgar Buell or the legend of Edgar Buell which is passed from mouth to mouth and village to village in northern Laos, she probably thinks of him as some kind of god. To the Meo, he is.

Pop means sent from above

Buell's name in Meo, the flattering sobriquet of which he is more proud than any award or honor he has received, has a godlike meaning. The Meo call him Tan Pop. Tan means "mister." Pop, in Meo, means "sent from above." To fellow Americans in Laos he is simply Pop Buell, with no spiritual overtones. But the legend of Pop Buell is passed around with awe in the American community too. Already Buell's efforts have eclipsed the record of Dr. Tom Dooley, the young St. Louis physician who established two jungle hospitals in Laos before he died in 1961.

"Sometimes Pop puts the rest of us to shame," said one of the men he works for. "He has more courage, more commonsense and more human compassion than any other man I have known."

Pop Buell's job is an emotionally and physically crushing one, on which hang the lives of 50,000 to 60,000 harassed Meo tribesmen who have been driven from their mountain homes by Communist Pathet Lao soldiers bent on conquering all of Laos. Most of these Meo refugees wander the hills or settle in temporary villages in Xieng Khouang Province, bordering the famed Plaine des Jarres where one of the principal battles of the Laotian civil war was fought. They are surrounded by hostile Communist and so-called neutralist forces who are allied in battle against the royal government. Every day the noose of enemy troops closes a little tighter.

The warlike cease-fire in Laos

If you read the news of southeast Asia regularly, you probably have the impression that there has been a cease-fire in Laos, that the country has been in a more or less quiescent state pending the negotiation of a more permanent peace based on formation of a neutral, coalition government. The impression is misleading, particularly in Xieng Khouang Province. For many months, long before the recent heavy fighting, there has been war every day. Men have been killed.

Villages have been burned. People, mostly the uncomprehending but bitterly angry Meo, are tortured. Pop remembers the horrifying ordeal of one village which he visited just after the Pathet Lao had sacked it.

"They wanted to set an example," he explained. The memory of it made him wince. "So they took one of the wives of the village Nhi Khon (leader) and stood her up in front of everybody. One of the Communist soldiers took his gun and shot off one of her breasts and then the other. Then they left her there to die."

Pop and I saw another "example" while visiting some wounded Meo in a neat little hospital run by Filipino volunteers in Vientiane, the administrative capital of Laos. He was a boy about 9 years old, perhaps 10, although he was small and frail. Mercifully he was unconscious. He had been hit with shotgun pellets. The entire right side of his body was peppered with ugly little wounds. "His father was a village leader," Pop sighed. "When the Pathet Lao came, they shot the boy as an example. To the Meo, sons are more precious than anything." The boy died a few days later.

To Pop Buell, the oppressed Meo people are his people, their villages his villages. He spends most of his time living with them in beleaguered Xieng Khouang Province, in the middle of the closing enemy noose. He has learned their language, as well as Lao and Thai, which he also must use. He eats their food, sleeps in their huts, doctors their sick, counsels their elders and keeps flowing the relief supplies on which they depend. He works at the very end of the chain of U.S. aid.

Recently Mr. Pop was elevated from his low-paid volunteer status to a higher paying post as an employee of the Agency for International Development, the Government Agency which administers American economic aid abroad. He works for a branch of AID called Rural Development which, in peaceful countries, assists in the construction of rural roads, trains rural craftsmen and helps to improve agricultural conditions. In Laos the war has paralyzed virtually all these AID functions. Instead, American AID workers have had thrust upon them thousands of war refugees who need help to stay alive. More than half of these refugees are Meo tribesmen who depend on Pop Buell for sustenance.

Because of the war, it has been more than a year since these Meo refugees have been able to stop in one place long enough to plant and harvest rice, their basic food. Normally in a war-torn country such refugees would be herded into huge camps where they could be fed and clothed until they could return to their homes. But the Meo, a fiercely independent people, will not leave their beloved mountains, even though the hills are surrounded and shot through with Communist agents. Instead they wander in bands of up to 2,000 people, looking for places to settle. It is Pop's job to find these wandering bands, help them locate new village sites, and organize air drops of rice and other essentials until they can get on their feet.

To do this he spends 90 percent of his time living behind enemy lines. Sometimes, while trudging along hidden jungle pathways in the roadless, uncharted mountains, he comes upon villages never before visited by a white man. The lithe, jungle-toughened people he meets on these trails may be friend or enemy; Pop has no way of knowing. Any night while sleeping in a bamboo-and-thatch hut in the hills he may have to jump up and plunge into the jungle to escape the Pathet Lao. Pop has learned to sleep with his clothes on. "It saves time," he says.

Pursued by Reds before dawn

In the past year he has had to make such predawn escapes five times. The most recent was 3 months ago. Pop was asleep in a Meo hut when a scout burst through the low doorway and awakened him.

"Pathet Lao are just down the hill," the scout whispered.

He had barely spoken when the Communists opened fire. Pop rushed from hut to hut in the village, rounding up women and children. While a platoon of village guards—some of them firing flintlock muskets—held off the enemy attack. Pop hoisted a child onto his back and joined the villagers on a trek down a path on the other side of the hill. They spent all the next day hidden in the jungle valley below, then climbed back up to the plundered village that night.

"It's surprising how well you can see to walk on those trails in the moonlight," Pop says.

On another occasion, fleeing from a Pathet Lao attack, Pop walked for 18 hours with a baby on his back. It was the rainy season and the trails were slippery with greaselike mud. Some of the paths were almost vertical, and descending was less a matter of walking than of skiing.

"It wasn't so bad," he says. "When you get in a situation like that, you do what you have to. Anybody would."

In spite of his seemingly casual attitude, Buell worries about possible capture. Twice in the past year powerful Radio Hanoi, the Communist propaganda voice which broadcasts from North Vietnam to all of southeast Asia, has mentioned the "notorious, warmongering American imperialist, Tan Pop." Buell has heard that the Communists have offered a $25,000 reward for his capture. He suspects that many of the villages in which he works have been infiltrated by enemy agents.

"Of course I worry about it," he says. "If I didn't there'd be something wrong with me, wouldnt there? But I love these Meo people and I know that damned near every one of them loves me. I have to put all my faith in them because when I am up there with them I have very little contact with anybody else."

Pop's only contact with the outside world is a tiny walkie-talkie radio with which he can converse with the American-piloted drop planes which occasionally fly in with relief supplies. Sometimes a Helio-Courier, a big-winged, light plane capable of landing and taking off on 300-foot strips, drops onto a dirt runway hewn from a mountainside by the Meo. When they are available, Pop uses these planes to lift him from village to village. Otherwise he walks.

The week I spent with Pop Buell in the mountains of Xieng Khouang began with a hair raising Helio-Courier flight through the mist-shrouded mountains. We had been in Vientiane for almost a week, waiting for the fog to lift from the mountains so we could get in to the village of Lang Tien, about 2 days' walk from the enemy-held Plaine des Jarres. When the fog thinned a little we took off. Our pilot, Bob Smith, boosted the little plane to 7,000 feet to avoid ground fire as we flew over Pathet Lao territory.

"You get shot at every time you fly over here," Pop explained. "I came back in an airplane once that picked up 17 bullet holes in the wings. Amazing they didn't hit anything that mattered."

Smith, a civilian pilot working for Air America, the subsidiary of Civil Air Transport which flies most of the civil and military airdrop missions in Laos, cut his altitude to duck under the clouds which hugged the mountaintops of Xieng Khouang. From that moment on it was like a roller-coaster ride through a coal mine. Smith's view of the mountains was limited to massive shadows which lurked in the mist ahead of us. But flying on a combination of instinct and intimate knowledge of territory he had covered many times before, he snaked the little plane through narrow passes that left little more than 30 feet of maneuvering room on each wingtip, and across mountain plateaus from which trees rose so high I thought they would brush our undercarriage.

Bouncing landing in Lang Tien

Suddenly Pop pointed toward a cluster of thatch-roofed huts nestled near a short dirt strip. Smith flipped the light plane into a steep turn, and a minute later we were bouncing along the uneven runway.

"These pilots make a lot of money," Pop said, "sometimes $3,000 to $5,000 a month if they fly a lot. But they ain't got a very long life expectancy. You got to take your hat off to them. They earn every cent they make."

I looked at Buell in wonderment. His own job involves more hazard and uncertainty than the work of the highly paid pilots, however great their courage.

"It ain't the money or the hazards that matter," Pop explained. "If it was I would have quit long ago. I don't have to work. I just want to get it across to as many people as I can that America is a good place and Americans are good people. At the same time I think I'm doing these people some good."

How much good he is doing was immediately apparent. Lang Tien, more an area than a village, is a cluster of hillside communities overlooking a small plateau inside the ring of mountains. All told, 5,000 people live in the area. Most of them are Meo refugees, but about 1,000 are Lao Thung, another of the many ethnic groups which inhabit Laos. The Lao Thung are friendly but tend to be lazy and more careless about cleanliness than the Meo. Many years ago they were slaves, and both Lao and Meo still tend to consider them as such. When anything is passed out, the Lao Thung are the last to get a share, and it is rarely a fair share.

From America, provisions by parachute

That afternoon a C–46, bearing salt, tools and 50 sacks of rice, made a low pass over the plateau and dropped its cargo for the refugees. As the free-falling rice sacks and the parachute-borne tools dropped, Pop talked to the Nhi Khon of the village.

"These supplies do not just drop out of the sky," he said in his mixed Meo and Lao. "They come from America because the Americans want to help you. The supplies are given to the Laotian Government, and the Laotian Government gives them to me to bring to you. They are for all of you and each man must get his fair share. We consider a man a man, whether he is a Meo or a Lao Thung. He must get the same share."

The Nhi Khon, a progressive leader who probably did not require the lecture, nodded in agreement and withheld distribution of the supplies until representatives of the Lao Thung village arrived to claim an equal share.

That night we were invited to the same Lao Thung village for a celebration honoring Tan Pop. After a long trek along a starlit jungle trail, we climbed the ladderlike stairway into the hut of the village chief. Proudly he boasted that he was 70 years old and had seven wives and 30 children. A half dozen children under 5 attested to his vigor.

The Nhi Khon of Lang Tien, who accompanied us, wryly explained the mountaineer's polygamy. "In this country, blankets are very dear," the Nhi Khon said, "so we have many wives to keep us warm." For himself, said the Nhi Khon, he had only two.

Inside the hut, dimly lighted by flaming rags dipped in animal fat, we squatted around an earthenware urn filled to within an inch of the brim with a fermented rice mash. Protruding from the urn were long, thin bamboo rods, hollowed to serve as straws. From these we sipped the sickly sweet rice wine while the Nhi Khon, taking a cue from Tan Pop, lectured the Lao Thung chief on the importance of planting garden seed and not relying entirely on the Americans to provide for his people.

"If you do not plant the seeds and care for the gardens," said the Nhi Khon, "you may end up picking rocks instead of food from your fields. You cannot eat rocks."

Earlier Pop had opened dozens of cans of seeds—lettuce, cabbage, bean and several other vegetables—and explained to the Nhi Khon that greens were important to the diet. Now the Nhi Khon was carrying the message to the Lao Thung, as he would carry it next day to the other villages around the plateau. Pop knew that the message would be more effective if it came from the Nhi Khon than if he delivered it himself, because the Nhi Khon would be there to see that the garden work was done.

"Working with these people is the same as working with my own people back in Steuben County, Ind.," he explained. "You got to take it slow and easy. Ain't it the same? You don't just barge in and tell somebody you're helping him. You take it easy, and you help him to help himself. That way it means something to him and it sticks with him."

The tribesmen's conversation shifted to politics, and I asked Pop to translate for me.

"They're talking about the war," he said. "There's a lot they don't understand. You've got to realize that the whole world, for these people, is no bigger than the distance they can walk. But they know more than you'd think they would."

The Nhi Khon was talking now, obviously with great feeling, explaining something to Pop. I could see the wizened little Indiana farmer's face grow taut with emotion as he turned to translate the Nhi Khon's remarks to me.

"I'll try to give you this exactly the way he said it to me," said Pop. "Here it is: 'Before the trouble came, the Meo people did not need help. When the trouble came, we heard about the Thing.' (He's got a picture of the United States and the United Nations all wrapped up in one big, good ball which he calls the Thing.) 'Until the Others (North Vietnamese Communists) came, we could have beaten the Pathet Lao with our muskets and crossbows. But we kept on fighting them and we thought we were fighting for the Thing. We were told that the Thing would come to help us. But so far the Thing has not been much help. Now we wonder if the Thing will move us to another country where we can live in peace. Will it?'"

An unanswered question

Pop paused and I saw that a tear was running down one of his cheeks. "You answer him," he said quietly. "I can't. That's what I thought the Thing was for too."

Knowing U.S. policy in Laos, the drive for a neutral coalition government which seems certain in the long run to hand the entire country and the Meo as well over to the Communists, I couldn't answer him either.

During the 6 days that followed, we visited a half-dozen more villages, some by foot, some by air. In each of them, Edgar Buell, retired Indiana farmer of meager education but great natural intelligence and wisdom, was welcomed as Tan Pop, the near god. In each village Pop made it a point, almost upon arrival, to walk to every hut and either step in or peer in to utter a few words of encouragement to the wives, tending their cooking fires on the hard dirt floors.

"I've still got enough American in me to show a lot of respect for motherhood," he explained. "Besides, they ain't got a very good life. A few kind words does them a lot of good."

As we made the rounds through the village of Sam Thong, about a day's walk from Lang Tien, a sobbing woman ran out of a hut from which burst sounds of wailing and the clanging cymbals of the village medicine man. Inside we could see the wasted body of her husband. He had died of tuberculosis that morning. The grieving widow fell into Pop's arms and sobbed on his shoulder. From the look of mixed grief and hope in her tear-filled eyes, I guessed she thought there was a chance Edgar Buell could bring the man back to life. He patted her in that awkward way of a man who can do nothing, and we moved on.

But Pop can and does help the sick. Although he has no medical training, 2 years' working largely on his own in Laos have given him a cram course in medical problems that would horrify most Americans. His first case was a native woman who was on the verge of a miscarriage. At the time, before the battle of the Plaine des Jarres, Pop and another IVS volunteer were manning a lonely station at Lhat Houang, not far from Xieng Khouang. They had a radio with which they could call any or all of the other American detachments in Laos. Stumped by the problem but unwilling to abandon the woman to the ineffective treatment of a medicine man, Pop got on the radio and called Mary Jane St. Marie, an American IVS nurse.

Step by step, Mary Jane explained the process of miscarriage to the Indiana farmer. "He wouldn't understand medical terms," Mary Jane said, "so I gave it to him in good, basic farm language."

At the end of the conversation, in which she also told Pop how to deliver a baby, and what to do to try to prevent miscarriage, other radio operators in remote regions of Laos broke in. "Thanks, Mary Jane, and you too, Pop," said one of them. "I think I've got a case like that up here and I've been wondering what to do about it."

As it turned out, Pop managed to prevent the miscarriage. The baby was born a few months later. Pop and I visited the mother and her healthy 18-month-old son last April. He picked the child up and said, "Little boy, you make it all seem worthwhile."

Buell the makeshift physician

Although he says that he has lost count, Pop estimates he has delivered about 30 babies since that first case. Whenever he goes into the mountains, he carries a well-stocked medicine kit for treatment of minor infections and ailments, but it usually runs dry before his village-hopping tour is over. In one village a man who had accidentally rammed a sharpened bamboo stake into his eyebrow, opening a gaping wound, came to us for help. Pop grabbed my only bottle of whisky and poured it on the slash. "Ain't got any disinfectant, but this will do," he chuckled as he closed and dressed the wound.

In each of the villages Pop was constantly surrounded by small children. At our first stop I saw why. From his battered suitcase he drew a huge bag of hard candy. He made sure that each child in each village got at least one piece.

The children had another reason for being drawn to the little American. All of them recognize him as the man who brought education to the Meo. In years past there were no schools in the Meo villages. Tucked away in the remote mountains, the Meo were too hard to reach, and the Laotians thought them unworthy of education anyway. When Pop began working with the mountain people, he immediately sought to correct the tragic oversight. As a graduate of a one-room country school in Steuben County, Ind., he had little awe for the complexities of modern education. But American officials in Vientiane did. When he tried to get backing from them, he was told that schooling the Meo would be impossible. There were no qualified teachers. "Hell," said Pop, "who needs qualified teachers? All I wanted to do was teach them to read and write."

No school bell needed here

In each refugee village, Pop knew, there were a few tribesmen who had gone for a year or two to Laotian schools and could read and write the language. Without bothering further to establish formal U.S. educational aid to the Meo, Pop told leaders in each village to build a schoolhouse. Then he scrounged writing pads, pencils, and chalk from everyone in Vientiane who owed him a favor. In villages where an educated Meo was available, Pop put him to work as a schoolteacher. Then he spoke to the Laotian Government's Minister of Health and Social Welfare, a man named Touby Lyfoung, who is a Meo himself and is often called King of the Meo. Touby provided the missing teachers. At present Pop's school system includes 29 1-room, dirt-floored schools. Belatedly the Americans now offer Pop all the support he needs.

"Sure, the Communists will take over these schools one of these days, but I don't think the people will forget who put them there in the first place," Pop says. "They might get only 6 months of schooling before the Communists come, but I don't care. There's no telling what they might pick up in 6 months, and it's sure better than nothing. These kids come to learn. They don't need no school bell. They're in there when the teacher arrives."

There is much more to say about Pop Buell: about the love and fulfillment and tragedy of his life in America; about how he came to Laos; about his heroic efforts there, often under enemy fire and in the face of unbelievable hardships. Some of these adventures I will recount in a further report next week. But for now, listen to one more remark from Pop Buell in Laos. On our last day in the mountains of Xieng Khouang, as we were waiting for a plane to take us back to Vientiane, I asked Pop why he stayed on, knowing that unless the United States changes its policy in Laos the Communists are bound to take over.

"You've got to have something to keep you going," he replied. "The Communists probably will take over soon. But everything turns in time, and it will turn again here someday. It may be 10 years or 50 years, but when that day comes these people are still going to remember Tan Pop. That's the only thing that keeps me going. No man is big enough or brave enough to work like this without some kind of purpose. I'm sowing seeds that, by God, someday is going to grow."

PART 2

At dawn one morning last April I was stumbling sleepily down a jungle path behind enemy lines in the mountains of northern Laos. Walking jauntily ahead of me, humming what sounded like "When the Saints Go Marching In," was Edgar Buell, the retired Indiana farmer whose work has made the difference between life and starvation for 50,000 to 60,000 primitive Meo tribesmen. Ignoring his happy mood, I mumbled something about the long days we had been putting in; up at dawn, a 4- to 6-mile hike on an empty stomach, time out to care for the sick in remote mountain villages, visits to village gardens and opium fields, and interminable nighttime conferences with village leaders.

"Most folks look on 8 hours as a good day's work," said Buell, smiling. "I was always of the opinion that I ought to do a little bit extra after I've done my day's work. It's that little bit that sells America."

Buell has done more than a little bit extra. Since moving to Laos 2 years ago he has organized and personally kept going a $1,500,000 relief program for the benefit of the thousands of Meo refugees who have been driven from their land by Communist Pathet Lao soldiers. Although he has the active and hearty support of the Laotian Government, the U.S. Agency for International Development for which he works, and many friendly Americans, Laotians, Thais and Filipinos, the job of getting the supplies to the homeless, hungry Meo has been largely his alone. To accomplish it he spends most of his time living with the Meo under primitive and dangerous conditions. He has been shot at, run out of villages by attacking Communist troops, and exposed to a variety of diseases which run the gamut from amebic dysentery to leprosy. Radio Hanoi, the powerful Communist propaganda voice of southeast Asia, has twice broadcast a lookout for him, and he has been told that the Communists have offered a $25,000 reward for his capture.

A legendary figure

To the Meo people, among whom he has become a legendary figure, Buell is known as Tan Pop, which translates as "Mister Sent From Above." It is a godlike name for someone the Meo consider a godlike man, and with good reason. Since the fall of the famed Plaine des Jarres a year and a half ago, when Mister Pop was first swept into the maelstrom of war in Laos, he has performed tasks which to the Meo, and to many Americans as well, seemed superhuman.

At times the job has been not only risky but expensive too. Buell, working as a $60-a-month volunteer, was stationed at the village of Lhat Houang along with another International Voluntary Service adviser named Dick Bowman, now with the Peace Corps in Washington. They had two helpers, a young multilingual Meo named Chung, and an equally adept Chinese boy named Tsieng. In late 1960, war around the Laotian administrative capital of Vientiane, and in the city of Vientiane itself, had totally disrupted the U.S. mission there, so that Buell's isolated outpost was left without supplies.

They refused to flee

Normally an American caught on such a limb would call for a last-ditch evacuation plane and get out. But Pop and Bowman decided to stay. They were busy training carpenters to build a dormitory for a school at Lhat Houang, giving agricultural advice and helping to care for the sick in smaller villages in the area. But without a weekly supply plane to bring food and other essentials, they had no means of support.

After searching around, Pop found a place in the nearby town of Xieng Khouang where he could cash his personal checks on the Edon State Bank of Edon, Ohio, just across the border from Pop's home farm in Steuben County, Ind. For 2 months Buell personally financed the U.S. aid program in Xieng Khouang Province, drawing from his own retirement fund in the Edon Bank.

"I don't know exactly how much I spent in those 2 months," he says, "but counting that and other things I've bought to give to the Meo people, I've used up about $7,000 of my own money out here. I don't expect to get any of it back, but neither do I expect to spend any more. I can't afford it."

Although Pop and Bowman felt secure, it was a tenuous kind of security. The area was thoroughly covered by Communist Pathet Lao guerrilla forces, and they often came uncomfortably close. One night, after administering penicillin to a child suffering pneumonia in a village about 15 miles from Lhat Houang, Pop and Chung were returning by Jeep to their quarters. Suddenly a barrage of small-arms fire erupted from the thick jungle beside the crude road.

"They kept it up for about 2 minutes," Pop recalls, "but the best they could do was blow out one tire of the Jeep. They was either lousy shots or they was just trying to scare us. Anyway, we walked the rest of the way home."

The Plaine des Jarres fell on New Year's Eve, 1960, and with it went Lhat Houang. Three days before, Pop, whose medical training consisted of nothing more than the delivery of calves on his Indiana farm, was called to attend a native woman in labor. By that time, with the instruction of an American nurse who also worked for IVS, he had presided over several deliveries, so he was not alarmed. When he arrived in the village he found the woman dead. She had been in labor for 28 hours. But listening with a stethoscope, he could hear the baby's heartbeat.

"I got the baby out and dipped her in cold water, then warm water, like they did me when I was born. She was breathing OK, but she died later and I felt terrible. Losing a mother and a baby like that, I thought those people would never trust me again. I laid up all night worrying about it and wondering what I could have done. The next morning some of the men from the village come to my door, and for a minute I thought they was after me. But they had come to invite me to a breakfast in my honor, because they knew I had tried."

On New Year's Eve he was returning with Chung from the funeral of the mother and child when he met Dick Bowman and Tsieng, heading hell-bent for the Plaine des Jarres airport. Enemy troops were closing in, they said, and the evacuation plane was waiting for them.

"Hell," said Pop, "I got to go to Lhat Houang and get my clothes." With Chung beside him, Pop raced to his house in Lhat Houang. As they entered the front yard they saw dozens of enemy soldiers in the back. Turning around, they raced away in a hail of bullets. A few hours later they took off in an evacuation plane. As they looked down, they could see enemy troops digging gun emplacements at the end of the runway.

John Tobler, then director of the U.S. aid program in Laos, wrote Pop a commendation, the highest award he could give a volunteer worker. "In the face of great personal danger * * * your effective and intelligent handling of an extremely difficult situation materially contributed not only to the achievement of project objectives but also to the effective strengthening of the U.S. position."

Pop lost 30 pounds

During that period Pop's weight dropped from 135 to 105 pounds. He was exhausted. But after a brief recuperation in Bangkok he plunged into the urgent new job of saving the Meo refugees. Pop began the dangerous and wearing task of rounding up wandering bands of refugees, settling them in new villages behind enemy lines, and organizing air drops of rice and other supplies to keep them alive. Having learned the Lao language in order to work more effectively at Lhat Houang, he began studying Meo so that he would not have to take an interpreter on his long treks through the mountains. Pop now speaks Lao, Meo, and Thai, none of them perfectly, but all well enough to get along without help.

"Now Tan Pop has traveled much and is known by all of my people," says Lao Health Minister Touby, himself a Meo. "He is the only man who can go to them and find out their needs."

Like a Johnny Appleseed of democracy, Mister Pop wanders from village to village in the mountains distributing garden seeds and other supplies to help the resettled Meo get back on their feet.

"I try to give them things that they can do something with themselves," he says. "Their main diet is rice, and I have to give them all of that because the Communists haven't let them stay in one place long enough to harvest a rice crop, so U.S. aid has to airdrop all of that to them. But for the rest of the stuff, like vegetable gardens, I just help them to help themselves. It's just like back home. When you sell a man something, hope that he makes a profit on it when he sells. That way he'll be back for more."

The ancient age of 49

During the week that I accompanied Pop Buell on a tour of mountain villages, I began to understand his near-divine status with the Meo. One reason is his age. At 49, which is barely middle-aged by American standards, he is an ancient to the Meo. They cannot understand how a grandfather can be ramrod straight and tough enough to climb mountain trails night and day with even the most stalwart tribesmen. Another reason is his almost limitless self-control.

"I get mad as hell sometimes," Pop says, "but I figure if I'm going to get along with them I've got to hold it back, so I do. And I never cuss, either to them or at them. I don't care if a man don't speak your language, he knows when you're cussing and it hurts him."

As we sat down to dinner in the hut of a village chief one night, Pop looked up from the strange variety of food on the table and told our host that his food was very good. It was the same, Pop said, as the food we eat in America. The only similarity I could see was that some of it was cooked. On the table before us were intestines of water buffalo, a plate of raw pork blood, a variety of pale broths, some unidentifiable vegetables and a murky bottle of Nom Saly, a 2-week-old corn whisky which tastes as if it contains used innersoles. While Pop ate with gusto and I tried to imitate him, the chief happily repeated Pop's praise to some other villagers. He was proud that his food was like that in America.

In countless little ways Pop has made himself one of the Meo, and they welcome him as such. Other Americans would take cases of C-rations to supplement a not-always-palatable native diet; Pop never brings so much as a can of beans. "Just as soon as I opened a can," he explains, "I'd be setting myself apart from the people, and it just wouldn't be the same anymore." His only concessions to civilized living are frequent baths in mountain streams. "I'm trying to teach these people to stay clean because dirt causes a lot of the disease up here."

The Meo people know that theirs is not a safe and placid country. Many of them have been shot, some of them tortured, and almost all of the refugees have been chased by Communist troops. The fact that an American would live their life and share their peril has made a deep impression and has created a bond that is far stronger than if Pop had been born among the Meo.

To them he seems fearless—"But I got just as big a yellow streak as any other man," he says. Among Pop's first acts when he arrives in a village is to inquire about escape trails in case the Pathet Lao come. "If things get too hot, I want to know which way to run."

We were talking about the possibilities of capture one night when Pop looked up at me. "If you ever hear that I'm missing out here, just don't give up on me. In a year and a half I've learned this country pretty well. I know these people and I know they'll take care of me. It might take me 6 months, but any time it's necessary I know that I can walk out of these mountains all the way to Thailand without getting caught. You just cross your fingers and wait. I'll show up in better shape than I was when I left."

Before he came to Laos in June, 1960, Pop Buell had a rewarding but sometimes hard life in Indiana. His mother and father, Clara and Elson Buell, were farmers in Steuben County, and they helped all five of their sons, and their daughters as well, to become farmers. The elder Mrs. Buell, now 72, and her husband, 76, are still somewhat puzzled over the impulse that took their son to faraway Laos. "I just hope he takes care of himself," says Mrs. Buell. "When he was little, I had to make him a bright red sunbonnet so we wouldn't lose him in the cornfield. But he was capable. Even when he was just 5 years old he was a good onion weeder."

"The reason Edgar Buell can get along so well over there in Laos," says Merritt Boyer, one of his former high school teachers and a longtime friend, "is this: From the time he was a little devil on up, when his dad told him to do something, he did it regardless of how hard it was. If he didn't have any tools to do the job with, he found a way to do it anyway."

Will Rogers' young disciple

As a youngster Pop Buell was active in the Future Farmers of America. When he was 16 he won a free trip to an FFA convention in St. Louis. There, for keeping the best dairy records, he won another prize: a week with a dozen other boys on the Will Rogers ranch at Claremore, Okla. For years thereafter he emulated the great humorist, and today he still shows traces of Roger's influence in his healthy disdain for stuffiness and Government red tape. "I read everything Will Rogers ever wrote," says Pop, "and when he was on the radio I listened to every broadcast. I rate my favorite Americans like this: Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Abraham Lincoln, and Will Rogers. I have to put a Republican in that group, but hell, Lincoln was a rural boy and he was everything every other American ought to aspire to be."

As Democrats in an overwhelmingly Republican section of Indiana, the Buells were well-known, if politically isolated. When Paul V. McNutt ran for Governor in 1932, the silver-haired politician came into Steuben County on a stumping tour. Edgar Buell, as the leading young Democrat in a county otherwise barren of McNutt supporters, was given the job of introducing the would-be Governor at an outdoor hoedown and barbecue.

"Some of us got to drinking before the speechmaking and things was getting pretty wild," Buell recalls, "but somehow I managed to get up and make an introduction speech.

"Five minutes later I couldn't remember what I said, but after Mr. McNutt got through talking he came up to me and thanked me for the nice introduction. Then he looked at me real straight and said, 'Mr. Buell, just remember. Always be an adult.' I never forgot that."

All of the Buells were, and still are, known for their unbending honesty; Edgar was no exception. But in 1936, after marrying his high school sweetheart and starting to carve out a meager life on a partially arable farm, he decided to break the pattern. It was December. With Christmas coming, the newlywed Buells had no money for presents. Edgar decided to go to the bank in Edon and borrow $50. "I'll tell them it's for a new calf," he said to his wife, Mattie Lorene. "They'd never let me have the money for Christmas presents, but they'll give it to me for a calf."

"You never lied before, Edgar," said his wife, "and nothing good can come from lying now, even if it is for Christmas."

Buell blurts the truth

Undeterred, Buell went to the bank. Art Mauerhan, now executive vice president of the Edon State Bank, remembers the awkward young farmer stammering as if he couldn't decide what to say. Finally Edgar blurted:

"Mr. Mauerhan, I come in here to tell you I needed $50 for a new calf, but that ain't true. I need to borrow the money so we can have Christmas."

He got the $50 and a top credit rating, which still stands at the Edon Bank.

Home with his wife, whose name Edgar and everyone else contracted to "Maloreen," Christmas plans progressed happily until the two suddenly thought of a tenant farmer, Rollie Fraley, who lived with his wife and six children in a small shack on one corner of their farm. The Fraleys, who had just migrated to Indiana from Kentucky, were dirt-poor. They planned to have no Christmas at all. With half of their $50, Edgar and Maloreen played Santa Claus to the Fraley children.

Every Christmas after that bleak one, Edgar Buell dressed up in a Santa Claus suit and brought toys to country children who otherwise would have received none. By 1957 the list of children swelled to include dozens whose parents also bought them presents but who waited for Santa Claus nonetheless. All over Steuben County today you can find children and adults who remember Uncle Edgar's words each Christmas: "May the good Lord be just a little good to you."

The early years on the farm were hard ones. Although the Buells had two healthy children, Howard and Harriet, Maloreen suffered complications after the birth of the second child and was bedridden for months. "They had to have a hired girl," recalls Forrest, "and poor Edgar didn't have any money to pay her. But he had a good vegetable garden. Every Saturday before it was time to pay the girl, Edgar would pile a truck full of produce and drive all over the area peddling it. When he got up enough money, he would come home and give the girl her wages."

When the war came, Buell was naturally draft exempt as a farmer. "He had enough land and livestock to keep three men out of the Army," said a neighbor. He also had a number of extracurricular jobs, among them the assistant chairmanship of the county alcoholic beverage board and a post on the Agriculture Department's Corn Loan Board. Technically, a draft-exempt farmer was not supposed to do other work, and someone complained about Edgar's extra jobs. "To hell with them," Edgar said, and went to the draft board to ask for induction. He failed his physical examination because of poor eyesight. Determined to go anyway, he got new glasses. A few months later he was a corporal in the horse cavalry, helping to train recruits at Fort Riley, Kans. He did not get overseas. At war's end he was a supply sergeant at Fort Knox.

The war years and postwar years were good ones for agriculture, and Buell's farm grew and prospered. From a start of 142 partially arable acres, his holding expanded to a productive 249-acre farm. Together with Maloreen he poked into every civic activity in the county that was open to them. While Edgar worked with 4-H clubs and coached Little League baseball, Maloreen looked far and wide for people who needed a helping hand. "If she heard about a sick old lady who needed her house redecorated," says an old friend, Mrs. Jesse Ketzenberger, "she'd drop her own work and go over and hang the lady's wallpaper herself. I wouldn't run down Edgar, but Maloreen was twice the person he is, and he would be the first to agree."

Love in another wrapper

"The marriage was a perfect one," says Edgar, "but we used to argue. Anybody who says he don't argue with his wife is either lying or there's something wrong with him." Not surprisingly, the argument usually concerned how to raise Howard and Harriet. Edgar, accustomed to the Spartan ways of his own father, bridled at Maloreen's easy-going way with the children. "I thought she was too lenient," he says, "but after a while I learned she was right. She just put her love out different than I was used to. She just wrapped them up in it." (Today Buell's 25-year-old son Howard, whose wife Bonnie expects a child this summer, operates his father's farm. Harriet, now 24, has one son and expects another child soon. Her husband, Wesley Gettys, teaches high school in Somerset, Ohio.)

In 1958 tragedy struck. Maloreen developed a mysterious malady which doctors were unable to diagnose. For 6 months she grew weaker. Hospitalized in Fort Wayne, about 40 miles from the Buell farm in Steuben County, she appeared to be improving. Every night Pop would drive down to Fort Wayne to sit with her until she fell asleep. One night after he had been in her room only a short while, Maloreen looked up at Edgar and said, "I'm sleepy. You'd better go home now."

"She usually wanted me to stay until 9 o'clock, and it was only 7," Buell recalls.

As Buell said good night from the hospital room door, Maloreen smiled and called, "Goodby, Edgar."

"She never said 'goodby' to me before," he recalls.

By the time Edgar had driven the 40 miles to Steuben County, the doctor had telephoned. Maloreen was dead.

Buell tried to go it alone on the farm. Howard was away for a 2-year tour in the Army. Harriet was working in Columbus, Ohio. It was a dismal life. Oversolicitous friends and relatives kept popping in. And a few widows began calling regularly, with obvious designs.

One day a former Alcoholic Beverage Board colleague drove into the farmyard and showed Edgar an advertisement for International Voluntary Service in a farm magazine. IVS needed experienced farmers, preferably college graduates, to lead its young volunteers overseas. For a year he corresponded with IVS headquarters in Washington, sending applications, character references and pleas that the college requirements be waived in his case. "Finally I squeezed my whole life down into a two-page letter and they accepted me," he says. Howard was back from the Army and had married Bonnie. He was eager to take over his father's farm. "I was ready to retire from farming anyway," says Pop, "so I turned it all over to Howard." A month later, Buell was in Laos, a country whose name he had never heard before.

In a way, he treats Laos just as if it were Steuben County, only bigger. Like farmers everywhere, his favorite offduty pastime is "ging visiting." He calls on Health Minister Touby, an exalted Lao-Government figure, with the same simple, straightforward approach he would make to Jake Fifer, who lives down the road a piece from Pop's farm in Indiana. Col. Vang Phao, the onetime French Army sergeant who leads a tough and well-trained force of Meo guerillas in north Laos, shares the same camaraderie with the Indiana farmer as do Pop's brothers back on the farm. When the two sit in the courtyard of Vang Phao's house, swinging their crossed legs and laughing at each other's sallies, it sounds almost as if they were a pair of Indiana farmers gossiping about a neighbor's new silo. You can almost hear them utter an occasional "by golly," in Meo.

To the relief of Vang Phao and everyone else with whom Pop works, he has signed up for another 2 years in Laos. "I couldn't leave these people now," he says. Tragically events in Laos since my visit may force Pop to leave them. At this writing, Communist troops have swept the Royal Government out of most of northwest Laos, and the effect of the move on the rest of the country is still uncertain. Pop and his beloved Meo tribesmen are in the northeast and thus were not directly involved in the recent Laos battles. But further Communist victories could so isolate the Meo that Pop would have to get out. Even if a solution is found in the much-sought coalition of neutrals, Communists, and the Royal Government, most Americans on the scene predict that within a few months the Communists would control all of

Laos. It is unlikely that they would want Mister Pop around "selling America." Thus Buell's heroic efforts may be frustrated. But, as he told me one day in the mountains, "I'm sowing seeds that, by God, someday is going to grow."

The most effective American

Other Americans also are sowing the seeds of democracy overseas but in many travels to almost every part of the world I have never seen one who did it so effectively as Mister Pop. I told him one day that men with such a combination of simplicity, intelligence, and guts are rare. He was embarrassed. "I ain't unusual," he said. If you look around I think you will find at least one Edgar Buell in every rural county in America."

When I left Mister Pop in Laos, he was getting his garden seeds and supplies ready for a 10-day trek through mountains which, theoretically at least, are held by Communist forces. Pilots had reported seeing large bands of Meo refugees wandering the jungle trails in the area, and Pop was on his way to find them and help them if he could. He had never been in the area before and had no way of knowing whether his reception would be friendly or final. Just as I began writing this report, I received a letter from him, written from a tiny village which he described as being "real close to the enemy."

"For the first time since I can remember," he wrote, "I came off from Vientiane without my medicine kit.

"Was greeted here by a family who were the victims of a hand grenade, a sad sight. I got two young girls patched up by using what we had here, and put the father in the Helio-Courier and sent him to O.B. (the Operation Brotherhood hospital run by Filipino volunteers under sponsorship of the Manila and Vientiane junior chambers of commerce). The worst one (of the girls) I took to a house, washed and bandaged, and put her to sleep. A little boy is not too bad. If the girl is still alive and if a Helio can get in here, she will go to O.B. tomorrow.

"I have just ate again and am about ready for bed. Was you ever deep in the jungle at night, locusts chattering, plus some kind of hunting bird, a mortar shell (exploding) now and then, plus cold and dark? That is this place tonight. I believe I will leave my shoes on."

MORE RIGHT THAN RATIONAL

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, H. L. Hunt's "Life Line" considers it a remarkable and sinister coincidence that Senator NEUBERGER "spoke very strongly against the 'Life Line' program and other patriotic anti-Communist endeavors," a scant 3 years after "a manifesto of 81 Communist parties, issued in Moscow in 1960, called for a concerted drive against anticommunism all over the world."

I may be naive, Mr. President, but I confess that opposition by Communists to anticommunism hardly strikes me as a startling phenomenon. "Life Line" evidently considers me a good deal worse than naive. The implication, of course, is that Senator NEUBERGER is a Communist, a party to the "international anti-freedom conspiracy."

Though "Life Line" treads a careful path of innuendo, implication, and false analogy, it is left to the individual letter-writer usually anonymous to fill in the blank spaces. One public-spirited citizen wrote:

> You Jews run true to form, you attack everything American—along with the Communists—to promote the destruction of America and the final takeover.
>
> **You don't like the DAR because you never could be eligible. Your ancestors probably got here about 1900, after the Christians built this country.**

And a friendly postcard:

> If you are so strong for the commies, why don't (you) get yourself a passport and move over there. You are against everything that scents against these birds and the word "patriotism" is a nausea to your nostrils. * * * Why don't you get next to yourself and take a course in "Americanism" it might illiminate (sic) your soul, if you have one.

Another anonymous stalwart called it "most unfortunate"—though I suspect he really meant to say "fortunate":

> That you have exposed your role in the international conspiracy to undermine the U.S. Government in the Jewish drive for international socialism.

One more thing, Mr. President. I have apparently been shrinking perceptibly in the last few months. Indeed, I seem to have undergone a metamorphosis which has quite undone a lady from Grosse Pointe, Mich., who wrote—

> Believe me, you look mighty small in the press, and smaller still to those who once thought you a gentleman.

While I find these insights into my character, lineage and loyalty interesting, I think it would be profitable to review the provocation which apparently elicited this concerted venom.

Several months ago, I expressed my growing concern with the use by nominally apolitical, "educational," or "religious" organizations of their tax-exempt status as a shelter for essentially political activities. If I may be permitted to say so, this was not a notably radical proposition. It happens to be against the law. Congress, since 1934, has expressly prohibited any organization from claiming tax-exempt status while any "substantial part of its activities" is "carrying on propaganda."

I cited the Life Line radio broadcasts as a noteworthy illustration. I also cited the wildly intemperate resolutions of the DAR, principally because the Senate was at that time contemplating printing the DAR report as a Senate document, adding, in terms of Federal subsidization, insult to injury.

It is true that I disagree with some of the resolutions of the DAR, such as the one which stated:

> The Domestic Peace Corps would delay the entrance of the youth of this Nation into the field of free enterprise.

Another of the resolutions with which I disagree states that——

> Congress is tarred with the brush of "progressive encroachment upon the constitutional rights of the several States of the Union with serious impairment of their vested rights, liberties, and control of their institutions."

Another resolution of the DAR with which I do not agree is—

> The Federal courts are "usurping the rights and powers of the legislatures of the several States."

I also disagree with the DAR resolution that the administration—

> Through "subservience" to the United Nations has "permitted communism to become entrenched 90 miles off our shore in Cuba."

There are other resolutions with which I disagree, but I do not disagree with the DAR's right to pass the resolutions. I only disagree with their tax supported status.

Evidently, the precise nature of my objections was not entirely clear, at least to Life Line. Life Line accused me of trying to silence the "voice of freedom." I said:

> The Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, thankfully, but it does not guarantee that political propaganda shall be subsidized by tax concessions. * * * It is no doubt true that in a given instance the line between education and political propaganda is a difficult one to draw. Whatever the reasons I think it is incumbent upon the tax service to terminate, and with more than deliberate speed, the fraudulent use of the "educational" exemption as a tax haven for partisan political propaganda. And I intend to use every resource at my command to see that this is done. Not, let me repeat, for the purpose of silencing political activity, but merely for the purposes of eliminating the tax-exemption subsidy.

Life Line also accused me of questioning the activities of the DAR because "it has passed resolutions on public policy with which she herself does not agree." I said:

> I have concentrated upon the propaganda activities of the extreme rightwing. There is no question that the same standards must apply to tax-exemption abuses by leftwing organizations. But to those who ask me why I concentrate my fire upon the extreme right, I answer that the flood of material which inundates my office daily, rarely, if ever, comes from the left.
>
> Nonetheless, there will undoubtedly be abuses by groups displaying all colors of political persuasion. And it should follow, without comment, that any reforms instituted must be applied without regard to the ideological position of the offender.

Perhaps I may be forgiven if I find it difficult to translate my remarks into an exposé of my "role in the international conspiracy." On the other hand, perhaps there was a defect in the language of my remarks. This particular speech must have been very confusing, for the very next day the president general of the DAR indicated that she had not understood me at all. She wrote:

> So far as the term "politicking" is concerned, I am surprised at its use and am at something of a loss to know just what is meant inasmuch as the national society maintains no lobby at National, State, or local government levels, contributes to no political party or candidates in any way, initiates no legislation, and does not—as do a number of organizations—even in its own internal setup have any legislative chairmen. Yes, the DAR, being interested in the preservation and maintenance of our constitutional Republic, does urge its members as individual good American citizens to be informed and to exercise the privilege of the franchise and vote, but how one votes is entirely up to the individual.

The term "politicking" was hers, not mine, but it is generally what I had in mind.

Let me try again. Several days ago I received from a member of the DAR in good standing a copy of a bulletin apparently circulated to all members by the National Defense Committee of the DAR, stating in part:

Test Ban Treaty—Stop, Look, and Listen

A test ban treaty has been regarded by its proponents as a first and necessary step to complete and total disarmament. This ratification of the treaty must be considered as implied approval of "complete and total disarmament" with all of the consequent dangers to America—including loss of sovereignty and the ability to defend ourselves.

A very practical reason for opposing a test ban treaty is the risk that tactical training for troops in handling and firing nuclear weapons would all but be ruled out.

The great danger of this treaty is that the United States may be mousetrapped into unilateral disarmament, while the Soviet Union makes itself invincible. Instead of being a victory for the administration, as it is now represented, it may well turn out to be a great catastrophe for all of America.

In view of the Soviet Union's entrenched position in Cuba and their long record of broken promises, it is incredible that such a treaty should be even contemplated. If you agree with the above, it is urgent that as individuals you immediately contact your Senators by letter or telegraph opposing this test ban treaty. Today the press reports hearings are being held and that the treaty may be voted on by the Senate this week.

During the past several weeks, Sane, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, has similarly been circulating a bulletin to its members and friends stating in part:

Now It's Up to the Senate, and You

A test ban treaty will put an end to widespread radioactive fallout from nuclear testing. Present and future generations will be spared additional reproductive damage and bone cancer. Little can be done about what has already occurred.

The spread of nuclear weapons and their development by new nations will be slowed, reducing the chances of nuclear war.

But most important—the world will have taken the first step to end the suicidal nuclear arms race.

By ratifying the treaty, the Senate can make clear the will of the American people to seek a just and lasting peace under honorable and safeguarded agreements.

Write three letters and write them now. One each to your Senators, and one to President Kennedy, indicating in your own words, your support for the test ban agreement.

Mr. President, men and women of good will are surely to be found in the camps of those who oppose as well as those who support ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty. The DAR speaks for the partisans of one camp. Sane speaks for many of the partisans of the other. But Sane must rely upon taxable dollars to finance its activities, while the DAR enjoys tax exemption. Yet it is the express policy of Congress that the Treasury shall be neutral in national political debates.

I believe that steps must be taken to insure the future neutrality of the Treasury, and I am hopeful that under the firm hand of Commissioner Caplin, of the Internal Revenue Service, this anomaly will not long continue. This is, and was, my point. It does not, I take it, constitute treason.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTHERN LAKE STATES REGION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, a Northern Lake States Regional Land and People Conference was held in Duluth, Minn., on September 24 and 25.

The conference was sponsored by the Department of Agriculture. Some 1,200 local leaders from the 81 counties in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, which make up the region, participated in the conference. Secretary Freeman, State officials, and several of us from the congressional delegations of the three States also took part in the meeting.

The main purpose of the conference was to hear and consider the judgment of leaders in the Northern Lake States region on how to coordinate the efforts of all groups, government and private, for the development of the area.

There were panel discussions on area problems from the local viewpoint. A Governors' panel reviewed the problems and opportunities from the State level.

Four evening workshops were held on the following subjects:

First. The multiple-use management of the resources of the region;

Second. Development of local initiative for action and coordination between related groups and locations;

Third. Solving land ownership and governmental structure problems;

Fourth. The place of outdoor recreation in the development of the region.

At the close of the conference, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman addressed the group. He summarized the findings of the conference and outlined the work ahead. I believe his remarks will be of interest to all as an example of how coordinated efforts can help people meet community and regional problems and provide new opportunities.

I ask unanimous consent that the address given by Secretary Freeman at the closing session of the land and people conference at the Hotel Duluth be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Job Ahead

(Address by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at closing session of Land and People Conference, Northern Great Lakes Region, at the Hotel Duluth, Duluth, Minn., September 25, 1963.)

I am greatly encouraged by the events of the past 2 days. They suggest that the work we have done here is only the beginning of a grassroots effort to build for the economic expansion and growth of the Northern Lake States region.

This conference has been constantly in my thoughts for over a year. It really began during an airplane flight near the Jay Cooke State park outside Chisholm early in 1962. We were looking at part of the Superior National Forest and I realized as we flew over the parks and forests—and the farms, cities and lakes—that there were few places in the world to equal this region. On trips all over this country and abroad over the past 2 years, I've seen many beautiful places, but none of them begins to match the outdoor resources here. I've always felt the Northern Lake States region is one of the most beautiful in the world. But, on that inspection flight, I suddenly realized that even I—who knew it so well—had underestimated the beauty * * * and the potential of this region for development of outdoor recreation. The promise of this region, I saw, extends not just to the people who live here, but to all Americans.

At that moment, I decided to ask the Forest Service to begin preparing a report on resources and recreation in this area, looking toward a conference of State and local people to begin planning for an organized development effort. You have the report—which I commend to you highly—and now we are nearing the end of the beginning.

We have heard from many distinguished people—public servants, educators, businessmen, bankers, executives, workers, and housewives—who pledge their support to plan together to develop the resources of this region.

We have heard President Kennedy call for the full employment of these abundant resources as a means of achieving full employment of people. And we are challenged by his willingness to commit the full resources of the Federal Government to the task we undertake.

We have heard from Governor Rolvaag, our host, and from Governor Reynolds, of Wisconsin, and from Mr. Conboy, who represents Governor Romney, of Michigan. They have made it clear that we can build on a foundation of solid beginnings in resource development.

We knew before we came here of the problems and needs of this three-State region. Over 9 percent of a work force of 560,000 persons is unemployed today. The estimates for this winter forecast an unemployment rate of as high as 20 percent. I know the problems of northern Minnesota intimately, and have felt them deeply. As Governor, there was no problem that concerned me more, nor any that received more attention. We built highways, and the high bridge. We invested heavily in higher educaton to expand the university branch at Duluth and to strengthen the junior colleges. State parks were expanded. The port of Duluth was built, giving Minnesota an ocean seaport. Commercial peat operations began in volume. Conditions would be worse without these efforts, but they serve only to emphasize there is still much to be done.

Those unemployment statistics are not just numbers, but people who want jobs, who want to work and cannot because there is no place where they can find employment. We must not rest until there is a job for everyone. It will not be easy, but we are resolved, regardless of the difficulties, to reach that goal.

This region over the years has taken it on the chin in many ways. Historically it has been a supplier of raw materials, and those resources have been depleted through exploitation so rapidly that the cries of "unlimited supplies of timber and iron ore" are cynical in retrospect. The Lake States region is located far from the population centers, and the roads necessary for easy access have been difficult to obtain.

But the people are tough and determined, and this makes the challenge that much more worth the effort. This region is richly endowed with resources. Its timber, though once despoiled for short-term gain by shortsighted people, now covers four-fifths of its land area. There are 27,000 lakes and over 3,000 trout streams—over 3 million acres of water surface—for those who seek outdoor recreation. This region serves a potential market of 50 million outdoor recreation seekers. Its mineral resources, of which the richest have been stripped and mined away, are being unlocked by science and technology. These advances already have created new jobs, and soon will bring thousands more. The people of this region are well educated, for they have always placed a high premium on schools and colleges.

These facts have all been described in detail in the "Resources and Recreation" report which compiles research data that has been developed in a number of Federal and State resource studies. Each of you have a copy of this report, and I urge you to study it and use it when you return home.

The report provides a resource catalog as well as a guide to development opportunities which are available through multiple-use conservation techniques. President Kennedy last night indicated that multiple use means full employment of resources, for when resources interact one on the other, their uses multiply to a sum greater than the individual total. Applied to the job ahead, this concept can produce an explosion of opportunity.

Now, judging from what I have heard this morning, you have prepared an ambitious blueprint. But I think each of us know that the job ahead will be difficult, and that the results of the work we do here will not produce jobs tomorrow. If we have the will to put this blueprint into action, it can begin building for jobs and prosperity.

The report purposefully does not suggest how the people of this region should develop the resources they possess, for that is the job of this conference to outline and the task which the people themselves must undertake. Let me emphasize one thing, however.

The report makes clear that of all the resources it catalogs, there is one that stands out over all others—and that is water. No other area in the United States has anything to compare with the water resources of this area. As we seek to develop growth opportunities, we need to keep constantly in mind that we should lead from strength—and the strength of this region is water resources and the multiple uses that can be made of the lakes and streams that stretch out in magnificant abundance.

Recreation is paramount among these uses. I am convinced, on the basis of long and careful observation, that recreation development is the fuse that will set off a great economic boom in the Lake States in the years ahead. That fuse already has been lit, and it should receive concentrated attention in the years immediately ahead. We often spend our time looking for another model T, or radio, or television industry to fuel the next boom cycle. We tend to overlook the trends in public taste which forecast change. Outdoor recreation is a strong, developing trend, and this region should prepare for it. I venture to predict that by 1980, recreation will be the mainstay of the Lake States economy—and it will be a healthy economy. It could happen sooner, and, if it does, then I will be happy to say I was wrong.

It will come when better transportation—highways and airport facilities—becomes available. This, too, has long been a dream of mine, to have a transportation net that draws this area into the center of our population mass. The Mackinac Straits Bridge and the High Bridge between Duluth and Superior are part of it. The four-lane lakeshore highway along Lake Superior is another. It includes the Grand Rounds of Superior, which now is completed so that a motorist can drive on good highways completely around Lake Superior. The completion of the Trans-Canadian Highway helps draw the east-west line of a target sight, and the work now progressing on the Mississippi River Parkway is beginning to fill in the north-south line of the sight. The Northern Great Lakes region is the target on which this sight is focused. One of the current problems in speeding this development is the lack of recognition given recreation as in justifying highway construction. It should have equal weight given other factors which reflect conditions of another era.

I do not, in my enthusiasm, mean to downgrade the economic stimulus which will come as we apply multiple use conservation to timber, mining, or agriculture. Each of these will be developed to a much greater extent. But the big target is water and the recreation potential it holds.

I am impressed by the clear, practical recommendations which the four panels have presented here this morning. They suggest additional research and cataloging of resources is needed. They meet head on the difficult questions of land adjustment, tax policies, and adequate public and private investment. They recognize, as Senator GAYLORD NELSON stressed, last Monday, the need for an organizational structure to coordinate actions on a regional basis. I believe they rightly emphasize that the need is not for more new Government agencies, but for more effective coordination of existing public and private resources.

The first workshop on multiple use management has recommended that a thorough water resource inventory be made. It will provide the basis for careful planning of our water resource uses through zoning and pollution control. We only need to look elsewhere in the Nation to see the exploding demand for water resources.

The panel also urged that land use patterns should encourage agricultural uses for land where suitable, but it noted many of the problems in the region today can be traced to early land speculation which encouraged farming on land better suited to other uses. The first workshop also recommended greater research and development activities in the use of timber and wood.

They suggested further that a multiple use management policy affecting all lands in the region be planned and coordinated by the individual States, and that research management in this area be done in cooperation with the Federal Government.

As the resource report indicates, the potential from multiple use conservation principles on private lands is substantial. Farms adjacent to National or State forests can develop vacation facilities utilizing nearby trials for hiking and horseback riding. Farmland near lakes or streams can earn, as some are doing now, as much from vacation cabins and campgrounds as from crops.

The second workshop on developing local initiative and coordinating local programs has made a number of sensible proposals. It has suggested that the county board of commissioners should be more closely associated with the local rural areas development groups, primarily to tie organized local efforts to develop new jobs into the established legal framework. These groups should involve private citizens very strongly, including those with timber, mining, utilities, cooperative, and labor interests.

The workshop recognized that a better understanding of the nature of the region's problems is needed, together with an educational program which will encourage greater local initiative and action.

The third workshop on land ownership and governmental structure accepted a most difficult assignment in an area where controversy can be found under the nearest rock. They recommended a reimbursement system through which State and local agencies owning land in an area would reimburse the local tax body. Payments would be based on an acceptable evaluation procedure.

This workshop also urged that zoning laws, which generally are adequate, be used more effectively; and suggested that exchanges of land in areas where Federal, State, and private lands are intermingled should be carried out to create larger, easier to manage blocks under the same ownership.

The fourth workshop on outdoor recreation emphasized the need for an immediate recreation inventory in each State, and suggested that it be carried out in cooperation with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The members also expressed concern over the lack of coordination between public and private recreation development, and suggested that some means be found to coordinate these activities to prevent overdevelopment and harmful competition.

This workshop also recommended that promotional efforts to encourage tourist visits should be coordinated on a regional basis. This has never been an easy task, even within States. But the time has come to realize that by creating a bigger pie, the pieces get bigger. The panel also recognized that the number of suitable airports in the region should be increased, and that other forms of transportation should be improved. They emphasized again the need for high speed entrance highways to carry people to the area from metropolitan centers.

I think you can all be proud of the work you have done in these workshops. Your recommendations, which tell you what needs to be done, are specific, practical, and realistic.

These recommendations make it clear that you believe the work of economic development must be done in the local community and the individual State, and I heartily agree. The role which has been assigned to the Federal Government, outside the responsibilities on land it holds in public trust, is primarily to advise and to provide technical and financial assistance when it is asked. There is much in these recommendations for the State governments to consider and to chew on—primarily that it is up to the States to serve as a center to stimulate local action and to coordinate programs between local communities.

It also is clear that something more than individual State action and something in addition to Federal coordination is needed. The problems reach across State boundaries, and therefore, as President Kennedy said, the response of the State government must also reach across State borders.

The President has expressed his willingness, his desire, to sit down with all three States when they have developed a coordinated plan for regional action. I would urge you, in looking at the job ahead, to call very soon a land and people conference in each State and, later, in your own area. When you have developed local and State plans for resource development, then bring together the proposals for public and private actions at a regional meeting.

The Federal agencies represented here will be glad to assist in the planning where you desire; we will be prepared to give technical assistance where you desire; and we will provide financial aid wherever it is possible. You, however, must take the lead and make the important decisions.

I cannot forecast, nor can you, the final form of the regional organization which will evolve. But I can indicate to you now some of the programs which will be available for your use.

One of the most important will be rural areas development. Many of you have some experience with RAD already, but I doubt if many of you are aware of what it is possible to achieve when it is vigorously applied locally.

We began this program in the Department of Agriculture in 1961. In 1962 with the passage of the Food and Agriculture Act the Congress strengthened it enormously. In the past 2 years we have helped local people encourage industry to move into rural areas, creating an estimated 52,000 new jobs—primarily in the commercial and industrial field. We have provided technical advice and financial services that helped more than 10,000 farmers develop income-producing recreation facilities on their land. We expect to provide assistance to at least 9,000 more before July 1964. In addition, some 2,800 farmers in 34 States have agreed to divert 140,000 excess cropland acres to other more productive uses.

The accelerated public works program already has created more than 216,000 man-months of employment in our rural areas, in addition to long-range benefits that come from developing our natural resources and protecting our lands from flood. In this region alone, over 1,700 jobs were created last winter in the national forests under this program.

These are just a few of the direct job-creating activities. We have authority for low-cost 30-year loans to finance rural renewal and resource conservation development projects. The small watershed program has been expanded to include development of public recreation areas and extra water storage capacity for future municipal and industrial use. Sponsors of 42 watershed projects are planning recreation areas in projects now approved.

In the past 2½ years, we have advanced more funds for rural housing than in the previous 11 years of the program's existence. These housing loans since 1961 have created 85,000 man-years of employment and have added, in terms of impact, almost $2 billion to the rural economy. They create a growing demand for lumber, for plumbing, heating and electrical equipment, for concrete, masonry, millwork, plaster and paint. And the furniture store also benefits.

This program has strengthened the rural economy. Business on Main Street is improved. Deposits in country banks in most farming areas have jumped 8 percent since 1960.

But the most important result today cannot be measured in economic terms alone. There are rural areas development groups organized now in two out of every three counties in the Nation. Over 65,000 people—local people—are actively working on problems of area development, creating new jobs, improved services and developing natural resources.

This is a program of promise to the future of this region, both in terms of what you are doing here and what will take place under your leadership when you return home. And it is but one tool which you can use to build for the conditions of growth.

I have the greatest confidence that the future of this region is bright. Our society is changing under the pressures of automation, mechanization and the advances of science. While we attempt to catch up with these changes, the backlash—immediate and painful—sometimes seems stronger than the progress underway. But these changes which are going on throughout our economy can if we will it and work at it, mean a new dimension in the level of living for all people. It will enable more people with more money and more leisure to enjoy the rewards of our great outdoors—an essential ingredient to a meaningful life.

I think we had better get ready for them here, for they will be coming as surely as night becomes day.

DEDICATION OF CALHOUN BEACH MANOR, A RETIREMENT HOME FOR OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on September 15 I had the privilege of attending the dedication of the Calhoun Beach Manor, a retirement home for older citizens.

I congratulate the board of directors of the United Church Homes and the staff for the excellent facilities provided, and more particularly on the fine spirit which motivates the efforts of all those responsible for establishing and maintaining Calhoun Manor.

The dedication address was given by Dr. Roy G. Francis, professor of sociology and statistics at the University of Minnesota. In his address Dr. Francis spoke of the changing needs of the aged and of the response required from citizens and institutions to enable them to live in dignity. I ask unanimous consent that the dedicatory address of Dr. Francis be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Added Years—A New Dimension to Church Service

(By Roy G. Francis)

This evening, we have a happy obligation to fulfill. Let us to it joyfully, for this is not a somber occasion. The mood should be like that at Easter: serious, yet with the foreknowledge that good news is ours. Being serious does not mean being grim. Let us, then, acknowledge this cheerfully, anticipating a genuinely happy mood.

I am afraid that to too many people, the presence of religious symbols acts like the proverbial wet blanket. We too often feel that we cannot laugh in church, and the sudden appearance of a minister stifles spontaneity. I am reminded of a little boy who did not know the minister was visiting his mother. Happily he charged in, bearing with him a rather shabby rat, dangling from his grimy fist by its tail. "Don't worry about this old rat, mom," he exclaimed, "it's dead. We whacked it, and thumped it, and slammed it, until—" and then he saw the minister—" until God called it home."

As I said, we are not here for any morbid reason. It is not a mausoleum which we are dedicating tonight. It is not one of those sad nursing homes—those stainless steel halfway houses between retirement and death. Nor is it a poor farm. No structure that brings fear into youthful hearts is here involved. Indeed, it is precisely because none of these concepts describes this venture that we feel restrained to ask why, in God's name, we are here. What business is it of the church to involve itself in surroundings such as this? Are we not, somehow, obligated to the indigent?

We ask these questions as though the church has no concern for those who are not destitute. We ask these questions as though material success contains no threat to man's fulfillment of his divine obligations.

The cold, if not dull, statistical information regarding the aged is hardly news. Not only has the life expectancy of the average person increased some 20 years during the last 50 or so years, the percent of our population which is 65 or older continues to increase dramatically. Regardless of the changes in the birth rates we may experience, this segment of our population will continue to increase for the rest of this century.

These demographic changes carry with them fairly enormous consequences. Thomas Jefferson was able to write, "Here I am, 35, an old man—and what have I done?" Who, tonight, would claim that anyone is old at 35? Men and women past 70 are reluctant to admit they are old, though somewhere after reaching 72 they will confess that they have aged a bit.

Our aged are today's Pilgrims. No other generation has succeeded in living as long as has our current crop of elder people. And therein lies the problem.

We have no sensible traditions to guide us. All of our images and fears of being old are derived from inadequate experience. The image of the aged person as being wise and respectful comes essentially from rural areas of a bygone day. The aged person a hundred years or more ago could know most of what there was to know; it was gained by experience. But today, we are creating so much knowledge every year that no one can accumulate a great deal of it. More importantly, in the past, the aged person was rare; few could aspire for old age. After all, "the good die young," and the cemeteries were full of headboards to prove it. It was an Irishman who wondered where the bad guys were buried since the epitaphs implied that all of the dead had been truly wonderful people.

For the first time in the history of man, we have the prospect of both spouses surviving some 10 or 15 years after their youngest child is married. This is the age of grandparents—and we don't know what to do with them.

Historically, in a farming area, in which the average age at death for the male was around 50 years, a young farmer about 25 or so could expect to inherit the farm in just a few years because at that time his own father was close to the age when most had already gone. Today, a farmer of 50 can expect to farm for another 15 years and still have several years of retirement. In the past, the son who was to inherit the farm could well be expected to take care of his parents their few remaining years. There was a certain profit in doing so. The farm boy today is in a dramatically different situation. At age 25, he can scarcely wait for his father to die: he would be over 40 when he could inherit the farm. And the urban man is in a situation even more different—few indeed are those who expect to inherit any property. One's inheritance today is primarily in the form of the best education one's parents could afford—and, frequently, ill afford.

Thus, when we were building up the notion that the children should physically take care of their aged parents, there were two justifying factors present both of which are absent today that made such a demand sensible. First, the "quid pro quo" of material inheritance is largely lacking today; and, second, the age at death has changed so markedly that the situations must be considered to be completely different. The image of the child taking care of his parents is virtually meaningless today. We will return to this point shortly.

For the landless, and the propertyless, the picture I have sketched of some vague historical past never existed at all. Compared with the landed gentry, the town's poor had even less of a claim to life. Through epidemics, accidents, poor diets, and general ignorance, many people were protected from suffering through prolonged old age. The need for a rationalized system for caring for the aged poor is a modern one. In the days when charity was a personal thing; when people knew those whom they helped; when charity was an obligation; even then, there was a pitiful secular structure for the impoverished aged.

We have never liked to witness poverty, and absolutely abhor the sight of the death of the impoverished. We have long ago developed strategies to round up the aged poor and get them out of sight. These places we called "poor farms." I suppose that, at least to a generation ago, the poor farm was an institution more feared than jail. The poor farm was the final admission of failure. The next step was Potter's Field and the unmarked grave where the return to dust was hastened by unslacked lime. This was the ultimate shame. Pitiful insurance programs to insure proper burial are still common among the poor in many regions of our country today.

I remember the shocked conversations of the adults in my hometown when an aged couple had to go to the "county home"—even that euphemism did not improve the image much—their tones were more hushed then than when they talked of a forced marriage of some young girl. The community shared in the shame of those poor people.

It meant that we, too, had failed. We were unable to do our personal charity. In a short time, however, it all passed: out of sight and out of mind is a shrewd empirical observation.

Experiences of this kind color our image of what being aged is all about. We can understand the need to help the indigent. We are willing to support, by legislation, homes for the needy aged. We are even willing to indulge in some sort of minimal medical care. Public nursing homes for those without families: this we understand, this we support. Not old, grimy buildings like the county poor farms. But parking lots for the tired poor, just the same.

How many young, aggressive, and successful adults give their time and understanding to these helpless poor? How many find out what life or death is like in these institutions we are creating today? Who knows whether the home provides TV and tranquilizers as the strategies of control? And who cares, as long as we can feel that we've done something?

As I said, this sort of home we can understand; but we are bugged by doing something nice for the elderly. We often cannot understand why anyone, especially a church, should find it necessary to create something like we have here in Calhoun Beach Manor. This is not a poorfarm; we wouldn't mind being here ourselves. But the old question comes to haunt us again: isn't the problem really a family problem even today? Ought not the family, the children of the aged, provide as they used to?

It doesn't always make sense to make such a demand.

Let us understand that today's children are highly mobile. With which child ought the aged parent live? Those who did not move? Which child should be burdened with the sight of the parents becoming increasingly helpless and about to die? Which set of grandchildren must be subjected to the strain of accommodating to a senile relative? Or ought the family accept the parent as long as the oldster can contribute and then seek relief when the burden is great? Should the parent be shunted around from child to child? Must the parent be made to feel that he is a burden? Has he no right for independence? Must we impose a way of life onto the parent: should he be made to feel that he is imposing, upsetting, destroying the lives of his children and grandchildren? Is this the reward for growing old? Is this what we mean by love? Do you, may I ask, wish to impose yourself and your troubles on your children when you grow old? Do you feel that your children owe this to you, because of all that you have done for them: or did you care for them because you loved them?

We in the middle class find it easy to help the indigent. But we strangely will do nothing for another member of the middle class unless his middle class standing is destroyed. Let us imagine a rather common situation: Imagine a person who has by hard work, sacrifice, and service, achieved marginal middle class standing. There must be millions of them in the United States today. He would like to give something to his children: a college training, perhaps medical training. Suddenly, he is forced to make difficult choices: take care of his aged parents with little help from his less successful brothers or sisters; educate his children through college; live without some of those things we associate with a middle class style of life. In short, if he is to provide both for his parents and educate his children, he must leave the middle class and return to that lower level of living he had worked so hard to leave.

If we are sincerely concerned with maintaining an open class system in America; if we mean it when we say that achievement ought to be rewarded, and not punished, then we must be willing to protect the achievement of the kind of young men and women I've just described. The doctrine that the child with any means at all must care for his parents implies that many will be economically punished because they dared to try to succeed. It is time, I think, that the middle class person begin to think of strategies to protect those values which guide and determine his life.

What I am suggesting can, in no sensible way, be taken to imply a lessened concern for the indigent aged. In no way am I suggesting that the social problems for the impoverished elderly person should be weakened. I am unconcerned whether a person is impoverished because of being a spendthrift, or of illness, or of any reason: the dignity we owe our fellow man is sufficient to require our continued efforts to improve the last years of our destitute.

But I am adamant in insisting that care for the biological needs of man is insufficient. The concept of the dignity of man does not exclude those of the middle class.

Man, as a creature created in the image of his God, is himself a creative being. His capacity for creativity ought not be stifled, just because he has reached some mysterious birthday. Forced by rules and sometimes ill health from being economically productive, he is thereby forced to leave the creative experiences of the work-a-day world. He is deprived of the social reality of being one of a group.

The modern urban world is one in which organization is needed to solve problems. Few are so affluent or so powerful as to be able to go it alone. Moreover, there is something positive to be said about functioning in a group, more than the old cliche "there is safety in numbers." It is a well-known sociological fact that significant reinforcement or validation of a social identity comes only from others. Sharing experiences—problems as well as successes—builds relationship which endure.

The sad part of contemporary aging is that the older person is pushed out of most of his social sets in the process. He is forced out of work; his place on civic committees is taken by younger, more energetic men and women. He faces problems quite different from his younger acquaintances. His is not the problem of PTA, of securing the promotion, of the numerous things the young men on the upward climb are caught up in. Frequently, his interests are quite opposite that of his younger friends.

More importantly, he relates to death in a way the younger person does not. His string is running out. Out of 100 who reach 65, half will die within 15 years. Of those who reach 75, over half will die within 10 years. The younger person can still afford to escape serious concern with the end of life. The fact of retirement presages the end.

Physiological changes take place. Sins of the past are heaped on the remaining years: improper care of the body ultimately claims its reward. The need for medical services increases with each passing year.

The need for a social experience is also increased, since his life-time work associations are also gone. His is still a 24-hour day. To force a person to spend it in idleness, in contemplation of things passed, or in unnecessary concern for the end soon to arrive is a punishment only the criminal waiting execution is forced to endure. It is hardly right to have this be the reward for growing old. The older person needs an opportunity to be kept mentally active. He needs opportunities to be creative, to express himself in tangible ways.

Thus it is that a group solution to the problem of aging is sensible. It makes good sense for people with like problems and interests to be together. They can assist each other in securing a happy identity for the remaining years of their lives. No longer need they feel unwanted, that their lives are an intrusion upon the happiness of others. In a group they can work out techniques by which they can individually contribute to the group itself, with a reasonable expectancy of having that contribution appreciated and respected.

Moreover, as their medical needs increase, it is actuarily sound to proceed on a group basis. The strategy of averaging costs makes sense; competent help can be secured, and sensibly administered. There is little need for an obstetrician in such a home as this: the services can be designed to fit the special needs of the population served.

There are some who object to this tendency to combine retirement facilities and nursing services. Any charge that it is forcing those in good health to support those in bad health is statistically unsound; the day will most likely come when they, too, will need help.

It is sometimes said that the high death rates, alluded to earlier, have a morbid effect. From the perspective of middle age, this may be true. We in the middle ages are afraid to die. We dislike talking about it. It sort of ruins the conversation—kills it, you might say. We would feel depressed were we surrounded by the passing of our friends. But, as I said earlier, older people view the end of life differently than do we who have yet to achieve or fail in our goals. In or out of a retirement home, the older person is fully aware of others' passing. Experiencing this in a world shared by others similarly placed not only makes it easier to accept the fact of death, but by "role taking," the elder person is enabled to prepare for his own moment of passing.

Then, too, if we continue to separate the retirement facilities from the nursing services, we are essentially saying to our old folks, "there will come a day when you must go away—and die among strangers." This we cannot bring ourselves to say.

But still the question lurks: Why the church?

Fundamentally, because secular society has failed. The only success which the secular society has given has been a small effort to meet the biological needs of the elderly. This has been a small effort to meet the biological needs of the elderly. This has only been haphazardly done. It has done virtually nothing for the social needs of our senior citizens.

The real reason we cannot trust the secular world is that its measure of man is necessarily a material one: how large a note can be delivered? How much money can be extracted? These are the questions of interest to the secular society. From a materialistic standard of interest, the aged find themselves subject to vacillating images in recent times. During the great depression—remember the Townsend plan?—the hue and cry was to retire them because they had done their stint: and they held jobs young people needed. During World War II, and again during the fifties, we needed them for our labor force—and praised them for their skills, their patience, their loyalty. Not too long ago, some politicians were suggesting we lower the voting age because there were too many old people, giving the vote an alleged conservative look. Today, in an economic world increasingly automated, and soon to be assaulted by the postwar baby boom rushing into the labor market, we find the oldster untrainable for new jobs—and, presumably, deserving retirement. We have recently reduced the age at which a person can obtain social security benefits—thereby removing him from the labor market earlier than before.

The fate of the aged ought not be left to the whims of such a mechanism. We cannot trust a part of the world that measures man as a material thing: the elderly are bound to be found wanting.

We need an institution that is relentless in its faith in the dignity of man. We cannot endure one run by a frightened little bureaucrat, nor one who regards the aged solely in terms of possible profit. We ought not coin gold from an old man's sorrow.

We need an institution which derives its justification for being in the premise that man, everywhere and at all ages, is the child of his Creator and therefore deserves the best that society can offer.

The church is such an institution.

Or ought to be.

For if it is not, then it is we who make up that institution who have failed.

Therefore, if our aged are to be helped to create a world in which they can continue a dignified social life, in creative activity, we must require of our church that it explicitly accept the responsibility for seeing that this is possible.

There are enormous ramifications of this charge. There is still much to be done. But fear of difficulty must not deter us from our obligation.

We dare not fail.

We can turn to no one else.

So, you see, it is not the Calhoun Beach Manor which is being dedicated this evening. It is we, we who are given the charge and the opportunity. We must dedicate ourselves to the implications and the demands of this responsibility. We must dedicate ourselves to this form of witness, a witness which will enable our elders to continue their witness to the meaning of the Gospel. In this we are not alone. The rock on which our faith rests will not fail us now.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

YOUNG FARM LEADERS FROM LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES GREETED BY PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 59 young farm leaders from Latin American countries who have just completed 6 months of community level training in 25 rural communities in the United States were greeted by President Kennedy today in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Eleven of the group had their on-the-farm training in rural communities of Minnesota.

Each member of the group has elected responsibilities in the regional and national campesino or cooperative farm organizations in Chile, Peru, Bolivia, and Venezuela. They were brought to the United States under the sponsorship of the National Farmers Union through a contract with the Agency for International Development as an Alliance for Progress project. This program represents the first direct tie between the campesino leadership in these four South American countries and rural farm community leaders and programs in the United States.

The young Latin American farm leaders were presented to the President by James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and John Baker, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

President Kennedy emphasized the importance of agriculture in developing countries, and saluted the project as an indication of close ties between farm people of North and South America.

The farm leadership participants who trained in Minnesota and the names of the farm families with whom they have spent the last 6 months, included:

Bolivia: Luis Salazar, on the farm of Edward Ackman, Lake Lillian. Benjamin Romero, on the farm of Gene Blake, Adams.

Chile: Sergio Tejos, on the farm of Ellis Anderson, Clara City. Tulio Vesperinas, on the farm of Axel Larson, Montevideo.

Peru: Guillermo Renteria, on the farm of Archie Bjornberg. Emilio Rojas, on the farm of Winston Peterson, Kerkhoven. Jaime Villar, on the farm of Leif Fostervold, Atwater.

Venezuela: Antonio Centeno, on the farm of Warren Lowe, Faribault. Pastor Gonzalez, on the farm of Rudy Clohn, Garfield. Angel Moreno, on the farm of Richard Stowe, Dundas. Thomas Rebolledo, on the farm of Henry Jantzen, Parkers Prairie.

THE LARGER SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INDICTMENT OF A MARYLAND PHYSICIAN ON CHARGES OF FRAUDULENT TEST REPORTS ON NEW DRUGS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I commented in the Senate on the announcement of Thursday, October 3, 1963, by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, of the indictment of a Maryland physician on the charge of submitting false clinical test reports on five new drugs.

Attorney General Kennedy stated that a Federal grand jury in the District of Columbia had returned the indictment following an 11-month investigation by the Food and Drug Administration.

The Nation is gratified that law enforcement arms have acted on these exceedingly serious charges.

If the charges are proven in the court case which will follow, the doctor's crime will be shown to be a terrible breach of the highest principles of the medical profession and of the laws of the land.

Under our tradition of justice, an individual is, of course, innocent until he is proven guilty. I will not, therefore, comment on this particular physician. His fate is now in the hands of the law.

CRIMINAL INDICTMENT PART OF A LARGER NONCRIMINAL PATTERN

I do, however, want to comment on what I regard as some of the larger implications of this indictment.

The indictment should not be thought of as if it had occurred in a vacuum.

It is, unfortunately, part and parcel of a larger pattern which has prevailed in recent years.

It is a pattern in which not one, but several, physicians and non-M.D.'s have been suspected of filing fraudulent test reports.

How, it may be asked, did these alleged cheats ever expect to get away with it?

VARIOUS FACTORS WERE EXPECTED TO PREVENT DETECTION

The answer is, they probably expected to escape undetected because of a number of factors.

One was the fact that the Food and Drug Administration has been so seriously overburdened with masses of new drug applications that faulty submissions could and did slip by.

Mr. President, the Food and Drug Administration, regrettably, has been understaffed for the many duties that it is called upon to perform. I have urged time after time that the Food and Drug Administration be given the personnel required to meet its obligations under the Food and Drug Act. We need to upgrade the Food and Drug Administration, to provide more professional talent, particularly in the Bureau of Medicine, so that this fine organization, which is entrusted with protecting the public health so far as food and drugs are concerned, can better do its job.

No less than 3,000 new drug applications on drugs intended for human use alone flooded FDA in 7 years, not to mention 6,000 supplements to new drug applications. A mere handful of overworked FDA medical reviewers has been available to try to screen this "flood" of applications.

TOO FEW TRAINED TESTERS

A second factor was that FDA, the drug industry and the healing arts professions have watched relatively passively while the shortage of trained clinical testers grew more and more acute.

The result has been that often standards of drug testing have alarmingly deteriorated. This is not a mere personal opinion of mine; it is the conclusion of some of America's greatest testing experts, as expressed in article after article in professional journals.

MEDICAL PROFESSION HAS DEPLORED "TESTIMONIALS"

Drug tests have been conducted without the slightest scientific controls. "Clinical evidence," according to FDA physicians like Frances Kelsey, has often consisted of mere testimonials: "I gave this drug to my patient. He seemed to improve."

Often, little or no real scientific proof has been offered—merely statements of personal conclusions, empty testimonials. These testimonials sometimes were almost as bad as the type that the greatest medical journals of the land had deplored in previous years. We should recall the long and inspiring battle of medical journals in years gone by against so-called "miraculous cures" by what were called patent medicines, which were allegedly "proven" only by laymen's testimonials in glowing advertisements.

Today, in a scientific era, FDA has had a right to expect and demand scientific evidence on new drugs, by controlled clinical trials, for example. Unfortunately, FDA did not get such evidence in many cases.

THE PARADOX OF SUPERB AND OF MEDIOCRE TESTING

U.S. drug testing thus became more and more paradoxical.

On the one hand, superb testing—conscientious, thorough, brilliant—often was conducted by drug companies of unimpeachable reputation on many outstanding drugs.

On the other hand, mediocre and substandard testing was often conducted on good, bad, or indifferent drugs. Both types of testing seemed to be approved by FDA.

When some unscrupulous individuals saw and heard that FDA was allowing drugs to be approved without real scientific evidence, it was almost inevitable that such individuals might figure on "making a fast buck." Their trick was to concoct testimonials on "skeleton" evidence or out of whole cloth. This is what may have occurred in the Maryland case.

The roots of the case were laid in an age of often slipshod testing where a philosophy of "anything goes" has too often prevailed. It should, therefore, come as no surprise that some few individuals—even those who took the Hippocratic oath—may have violated all that their great profession has sought to attain.

I do not presume to offer final interpretations on this subject. FDA investigations are still underway.

But I do offer these tentative and personal observations in the hope they will encourage America's healing arts to deal now with the situation.

Our medical and allied professions are the greatest in the world. Drug testing is fundamentally their responsibility.

Professional standards are their responsibility.

No one, I believe, is more shocked by the Maryland case than the 99 out of 100 American physicians who are honest and law abiding and of U.S. drug companies whose hard-earned reputations of integrity are their greatest asset.

Yesterday I commented at some length on the implications of the indictment which I have mentioned today. One of my duties is to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations. Our subcommittee has been checking into the organizational structure and administrative effectiveness of the Food and Drug Administration under the Food and Drug Act, as amended. The subcommittee has made recommendations.

All I can say now is that the new drugs which are coming on the market must be subjected to the most careful testing to protect the public health. We must be assured of the professional competence of those who do the testing, and we must make certain that every precaution and protection is made available to assure that the testing procedure is carried out according to the law and according to the highest of standards.

My statement today is designed to emphasize the importance of effective enforcement of the health protection features such as research and adequate drug testing in our Food and Drug Act.

POSSIBLE SALE OF WHEAT TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on a bulletin which just came over the press wires.

From time to time I have taken the Senate floor to urge a change in policy on the part of our Government relating to the sale of our vast stocks of surplus wheat, which impose a terrific financial burden upon the taxpayer because of the very high storage and handling costs. I have urged that the wheat stocks be made available not only to our friends and allies and to the non-Communist countries but also, at least at the present time, for cash or gold to the Soviet Union and the eastern European countries.

I am fully aware that my recommendation and position are highly controversial. I know it can be said this could strengthen the Soviet Union, that the Soviet Union and the Communist countries could use the wheat for military or foreign policy purposes and objectives.

There is a severe food shortage in the Soviet Union. Moreover, there have been crop failures in several other countries of eastern Europe. This is not a matter of conjecture. It is well known. One does not have to go to the FBI or the CIA to find out about it. One can go to the Weather Bureau or any one of the many international organizations which keep records and make accountings of crop conditions, shipments, food products, and raw materials. One can check with the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, or can check under the terms of the International Wheat Agreement, of which the Soviet Union is a member.

I have said on the floor of the Senate, and outside this Chamber, that not only did the Soviet Union want to buy some wheat, not only was it buying wheat from our stanch ally and friend to the north, Canada, but other countries were in the market with cash for wheat. I mentioned three—Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria; and I could add a fourth, Poland. There may be others.

Here is the bulletin from Ottawa, by the Associated Press:

> Trade Minister Mitchell Sharp announced today that Communist Bulgaria has agreed to purchase up to 450,000 metric tons of Canadian wheat during the next 3 years.

This is the first of many of this kind of announcement we are going to face.

I repeat what I said before—if the policy of the United States relating to the sale of wheat and other agricultural commodities that are in surplus is one of denying the Communist countries these products in order to weaken them, we ought to insist with our allies that it be a concerted effort. A one-country embargo and boycott cannot be placed against a country the size of the Soviet Union.

I have said repeatedly that our unwillingness to sell wheat directly has promoted a kind of hypocritical, devious situation. We are selling wheat to other countries who in turn resell it to the Soviet Union, or, better for their purposes, process it into flour and sell it to the Soviet Union or other Communist countries in Eastern Europe.

The facts are clear. Canada, which is as good a friend and as stanch an ally as the United States ever has had, or ever will have, openly is selling to Communist countries her stocks of wheat.

I have not been critical of such transactions, because these are decisions for the Canadians to make. The British, the French, the Canadians, the Germans, and the Italians have refused to follow our regulations and policies relating to foodstuffs in sales to the Soviet Union. They have cooperated with respect to strategic materials. The Germans, for example, canceled a large contract with the Soviet Union for the sale of steel pipe, at considerable cost to German manufacturers and the German economy. I commended the Germans in the Senate at the time, and I want to do so again, because it was a courageous act, an act of sacrifice and real cooperation with the United States and its policy relating to the Soviet-bloc countries. But when it comes to foodstuffs, we are the only one of the major agricultural nations that refuses to sell certain food commodities to Soviet-bloc countries.

We sell all kinds of food commodities that are not within the Commodity Credit Corporation's activities. We are today selling food commodities to the Soviet Union when those food commodities are not price supported or in surplus.

The argument is over the fact that when we sell wheat or cotton, such sales must be subsidized in the export market—not subsidized for the Russians, but subsidized for the Americans—a subsidy to our farmers, not to the Russians.

No matter to whom we sold wheat—if we sold wheat to the Eskimos—we would have to subsidize it, because our domestic wheat price is substantially higher than the world price, and, under the International Wheat Agreement, we must meet certain international pricing conditions.

The Soviet Union is a member of the International Wheat Agreement, and comes within the confines and jurisdiction of the Wheat Agreement. So are we.

So the relationship is not new or radical or of an unusual nature. The only thing that is unusual about it is that the greatest capitalistic nation in the world refuses to do business. We apparently are so addicted to storing wheat and stockpiling surpluses that when we have an opportunity to sell, we do not know how to go about it, unless we sell to certain friendly nations.

I repeat, if it is the policy of this Government that no foodstuffs shall be shipped by our allies and ourselves, and if there is no way these food supplies can be obtained by a devious or indirect route; if that policy can be enforced, a legitimate case could be made. Perhaps a moral case could not be made for it, but at least a legal case might be made for the refusal to sell wheat to the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries.

How ridiculous the situation is. It can be described as follows: Any country in the world can buy wheat from the United States if that country says it is a friend or a non-Communist country or does not belong to the Soviet or Chinese Communist bloc. Any one of those countries that professes to be our friend is at liberty to sell wheat to the very country we refuse to sell to, and it can sell the very same wheat that the Soviet Union could have purchased from the United States.

I have before me information that last year the United States sold 450,000 metric tons of wheat to West Germany. During the same period the West Germans sold 604,000 metric tons of flour to the Communist countries, of which 385,000 metric tons were sold to Red China.

We sold the wheat to Germany. The Germans received subsidized wheat. It was not the Soviet Union that was subsidized. We sold the wheat at the world price with an export subsidy, and the Germans ran it through their flour mills, giving Germans jobs, and permitting the German manufacturers to make a profit. The Germans sold the flour, made out of American wheat, to Communist China.

And yet we have people in this country who say we must not sell any of our wheat to the Russians.

I am of the opinion that since we are attempting to ease some of the tensions of the cold war, one of the ways to talk to the Russians is to talk commerce. People who learn to trade with each other hesitate to fight with each other. One of the surest foundations on which to build up our relationships is on an an economic base that makes sense.

I am not deluding myself. The Soviet Union may have a good crop next year and may not buy anything from us. Traditionally, the Russians export wheat. But the Soviet Union is going to have trouble with her new lands in Siberia, and I will tell the Senate why. I was born and raised in South Dakota, and the prairie lands of South Dakota are similar in many ways to the new lands of Siberia. When a plow is put to an area in which the rainfall is limited, after 5 to 7 years, the subsoil moisture disappears, and, without proper soil conservation and irrigation practices, plus fertilizer, there soon exist the beginnings of a dust bowl.

I lived through the Dust Bowl in the Dakotas. I do not speak of theory. I speak from hard, cruel experience.

Mr. President, the Soviet Union has something that we need—money, gold. I heard on the floor of the Senate today that every time we come face to face with victory, we become afraid of it and retreat from it.

The Soviet Union has a shortage of wheat and has a supply of gold. We have a supply of wheat and a shortage of gold. We are the largest commercial nation in the world. We are facing a balance-of-payments deficit of approximately $3 billion a year. We need gold for our foreign policy objectives. We need gold for our defense overseas. We need it for a host of activities, including the exporting of American capital to help build up non-Communist areas of the world.

The Soviet Union has been able to mine more gold than we have been able to mine. The Soviet Union has gold bullion and has set aside, according to reliable estimates, $1 billion of it, to be used to purchase food. We have the wheat, and it is rotting in the bins. It is costing the taxpayers a fantastic sum of money. Government costs of storage in 3 years will be more than the amount of any export subsidy on the amount of wheat the Soviet Union says it wants to buy from us.

The Russians have gold, and we have a shortage of gold. The Russians have a shortage of wheat, and we have an abundance of wheat. Wheat spoils if it stands too long. Gold does not spoil. We can stockpile gold without deterioration. The price of gold is stable. The price of wheat is unstable. The United States is not going to experience a shortage of wheat if we sell it to the Soviet Union.

The No. 1 problem facing us economically is a deficit in the balance of payments. We happen to be in the fortunate position of having a customer who wants to buy wheat and to pay for it with gold, in cash. We have the supplies with which to meet the demand. However, we also have a kind of political blindness and prejudice that denies us a chance even to indulge ourselves in rational, prudent thought.

Does anyone believe that the Soviet Union will become immeasurably stronger because she buys some wheat from us? Is it not better for the Russians to be buying food instead of guns? Is it not better that she should spend her hard currency on things like wheat, rather than on missiles or tanks or guns?

If we had any sense, we would be trying to sell more food, and have the Russians use their resources of gold, their hard currency, with which to buy consumer goods, so that they would not have the money to spend for hard goods.

We find it so profitable to be anti-Communist—profitable politically, not economically—that we blind ourselves to the opportunities which are available.

I am hopeful that our Government will reverse its present policy. That is why I speak about this in the Senate day after day. I have made up my mind to do something about it. It does not make me politically popular. I am receiving all kinds of mean, nasty letters that accuse me of being a Communist, that accuse me of socialism, that accuse me of undermining the security of our country. I get such letters from the same people who complain about the high cost of government, who complain about our food supluses, who complain about everything. I am of the opinion that food can be a tremendous source of good in the world, if we use it that way.

I do not believe that the Soviet Union is going to overwhelm the United States because it spends half a billion dollars trying to feed its people and uses its money to purchase goods and supplies from the United States.

I do not want the Russian people to think that the American Government is so heartless and so cruel, or so foolish, that if there were a real need for food, as we talk peace and as we talk about better understanding in the world, we would deny those people the right to buy it.

We have normal diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has a trade mission in the United States which is purchasing items regularly. We sell drugs to the Soviet Union; also certain food products, all of which are designed to save people's lives.

If we want to carry out the idea that we ought to deny the Russians food, because if we give the Russians food it will strengthen communism, we ought to deny the Russians medicines.

How long does anyone think the American people, who attend their church or synagogue, would support a policy which states that a man who is dying, and whose life can be saved by penicillin or a mycin drug, will not be helped, because he is a Russian or a Communist, and that we would deny such a man food or medicine?

I do not believe we would do it. Even on the field of battle, when an enemy is shot down, and a medical officer of our military forces finds that man on the field of battle, he is healed if it is possible to heal him. Even the worst criminal in our prison is given medical care and food. People who have murdered their neighbors, who have violated every law of the country and of humanity are provided with food and with medicine.

Apparently a country finds itself in such desperate circumstances that it needs food, and is willing to pay for it. I am one Senator who is willing to sell it.

If we did not make such commotion about it, it might do us some good morally in the world. However, I suppose by the time we do sell the wheat—and I believe we will sell it—we will have insulted everyone who has any sense of social consciousness or any sense of decency, so that people will say it was nothing more or less than a cold-blooded business deal.

I do not care who the man is who is hungry or who the man is who is sick, or what his political ideology is. My religion tells me I should help him. I remember the story of the Good Samaritan. If I can say that my religious convictions and my faith demand of me that I help the needy and feed the hungry and heal the sick, I believe my normal instinct, my sense of decency, and my respect for human beings would indicate that if a man wants to buy food, we should sell it to him. If our country has at least normal or reasonable relationships with a country, we could very well give serious thought and favorable consideration to such an arrangement.

Surely we should do it, as long as we know that the policy that we presently are pursuing is ineffective. It is as ineffective as anything could be. Mark my words, if the Canadians should sell all of their wheat to the Russians—and they could very well do so—they could very well come to us to buy the wheat from us, and then they could sell it to the Russians. The French had a bad crop this year. The French farmer did not produce a surplus this year. Normally France is an exporting country. Therefore France is buying wheat from the United States to sell to Russia. Of course, it is made into flour first. That permits the French to make a profit. It permits French citizens to profit under such an arrangement. It permits the people who have invested in flour mills to get some return on their investments. I am all for that. I would like to have it tried out on America for a change. I would like to see the flour mills in Minnesota, in Buffalo, N.Y., and in Texas, and in the west coast States of Washington, Oregon, and California, and the flour mills in every other part of our country have a chance to produce flour out of our wheat.

I do not take any special joy in knowing that we will have a bigger surplus this year than we had last year. I do not take any special joy in reading, occasionally, that much of the wheat was destroyed because of rodents or vermin, particularly when I know it could have saved lives, had we had a policy that permitted it, and particularly when I know that certain countries are willing to pay for it.

So I call to the attention of the Senate once again that while we argue and wonder what we ought to do—and this goes for the administration, too—while we wonder whether it is politically feasible and economically desirable to make a sale, our dear, good friends to the North, in Canada, make a sale and sign contracts, and our good friends in Australia make a sale and sign contracts. While Chancellor Adenauer chastises us for even thinking about a sale, for even contemplating a sale, his own people are doing a land office business with the Soviets. I say once again that I do not take issue with the fact that the Germans are doing a lucrative business in foodstuffs that they process, that the American farmer produces, and that the American taxpayer subsidizes. But I believe it would be a good idea if we considered the possibility of a more sensible, reasonable program of our own.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 9, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate, October 8 (legislative day of October 3), 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Douglas Henderson, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tourism in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I was personally proud and pleased that when the gentleman from Texas, Chairman PATMAN, so wisely decided to create a small Subcommittee on Tourism within the Banking and Currency Committee that he saw fit to name this particular Representative from California to serve with the gentleman from Florida, Chairman CLAUDE PEPPER, and the gentleman from New Jersey, WILLIAM WIDNALL. I hope it is now well known that the 34th District which I represent is the home of one of the best known tourist attractions in the world—Disneyland. It is also widely known for the Knott's Berry Farm, a longtime tourist attraction of growing size and complexion, and a more recent addition, the Movieland Wax Museum. Orange County, Calif., has also enjoyed for years a wide renown for its beautiful beaches and the colorful and useful Newport-Balboa Harbor.

That such an area should be acutely aware of the economic potential within the fields of tourism and travel is clearly understandable. We know from firsthand and productive experience the economic advantages that come with the development of a product to meet people's demands for recreation and diversion within a society which is at the same time creating frustrating complexities and a scale of income sufficient to finance a short respite from the mundane demands of the daily grind.

Chairman PEPPER has called the tourist industry the "sleeping giant" of our economy; and he has chosen his descriptive phrase well and accurately. The potential for business expansion by encouraging the growth of tourism by both Americans and foreign visitors is truly great.

The President has recently announced a program of intra-America travel under the banner of "See the U.S.A." To prepare for a realization of the expectations of this new program, we must upgrade our travel accommodations, increase the number, the spectrum of choice, and the quality of living accommodations and above all learn how to become better hosts. By doing this for our own citizens we will be automatically building a more attractive product to merchandise abroad. It would be unfortunate if we gave the impression of the "Ugly American" in reverse because we failed to realize how important the role of the good host is in tourism.

The side benefits in the social, economic, and political facets of our lives by the healthy development of this industry of tourism are particularly impressive. Mr. Speaker, we hope to be able to bring to this House in the near future some of the positive fallout that can inure to our betterment from a dynamic, well-planned tourist program.

Columbus Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, Amercans this year are observing the 471st anniversary of the discovery of the Western Hemisphere by Christopher Columbus, the great Italian navigator.

We take great pride in Christopher Columbus, not only for his journey of exploration into uncharted seas, but also for his bravery and his courage associated with his discovery of America. Nearly five centuries have passed since that historic discovery which inaugurated a new era in human affairs. From that day on in 1492, civilization has made great strides forward on the road to human freedom and human achievements.

Columbus is often described as the great dreamer of his day. Surely he must have been dreaming not only of the physical shape of the world, but also of a world at peace and of a happy mankind, living in righteousness and justice. In the perspective of history, we see Columbus as a dedicated and religious man who inspired countless generations and will continue to inspire many generations to come, as long as America remains the symbol of liberty and moral leader of a free world.

On July 18, 1963, I introduced a bill which provides that October 12 of each year be recognized as a legal holiday for the whole Nation and that it is to be known as Columbus Day. I suggested, at that time, that this day be observed as a day of rededication of the American people to strive for the kind of world envisioned by Columbus, a world of peace and justice. I suggested also that it be a day of prayer for peace and a day to honor the achievements of this great Italian discoverer.

On October 12, Columbus Day, we join with our fellow Americans of Italian extraction in paying tribute to Christopher Columbus. We also take the opportunity on this occasion to express our pride and appreciation for the invaluable role which Italian-Americans have played in the growth and the upbuilding of our country. We salute them for their loyalty and patriotism, for their civic endeavors, and for their participation in all phases of our national activities.

Remarks of Senator Clinton P. Anderson at NASA Fifth Anniversary Banquet, Washington, D.C., October 5, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, delivered a fine address at the dinner given by the Aerospace Industries Association, celebrating the fifth anniversary of the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Senator ANDERSON's address is particularly pertinent to the times and I call attention of all who are interested in the space program.

The address follows:

I would start tonight with a question: What do you do on the birthday of a 5-year-old child? If it's a boy, you will pat him on the head and say he will grow up to be President. If it's a girl, you pat her too, but you rarely know whether to wish her well in the movies or in matrimony. But when it's an institution, something more than a pat on the head is required. Usually, it's a pat on the back.

Tonight has been no exception. Tributes are being paid to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration this evening and they are abundantly deserved.

NASA's achievements over the last 5 years can be calculated and counted. As a result of its endeavors, man's knowledge of the universe has been significantly increased. The accomplishments of the agency have impressively added to the confidence we feel as a Nation in our scientific and industrial ability. And a firm foundation has been laid down on which new accomplishments can be erected. These, I am confident will come to pass.

At the pace NASA is developing, it is fast approaching adolescence. As a father of two children and a grandfather of five, I claim some experience with the problems of childhood. The capacity to consume increases voraciously, energy is poured out in many directions, and sometimes the growing process starts more bonfires than adoring parents can put out.

It would be extraordinary, indeed, if an agency, whose budget has multiplied some 15 times in but half a decade, whose numbers have grown by a factor of four, and whose bases of operation literally circle the globe, were free of difficulties. Large private enterprises and institutions are not immune to internal troubles. It is not surprising to find a large public enterprise such as NASA encountering some difficulties.

There are problems as to how much of its research and development NASA should do within the agency and what portion should be done by private contractors. This gets to the heart of NASA's ability to monitor effectively vast technical endeavors. There also is the problem of whether the space program will have the number of qualified people and the support it requires to fulfill its objectives. This is a matter of establishing priorities for human, as well as material, resources.

The top men at NASA headquarters here and the men who run the centers are vigorous, knowledgeable, and ambitious for the success of their enterprises. This is as it should be, and I would be deeply disturbed if I thought these qualities were being stifled.

But the very strength of the centers and their directors presents problems in management for headquarters.

Tonight we might recall the words of a stoic philosopher, Lucius Seneca, who long before Apollo was anything other than a Greek god, cautioned: "When a man does not know what harbor ue is making for, no wind is the right wind." I believe it is good seamanship to follow the rule that once the captain chooses the harbor, all in the crew must help reach it. My hope is that the centers and the farflung organization of NASA never forget that rule of good organization.

NASA at the top recognizes its problems and intends to do something about them. Jim Webb and others who have responsibility for this program know that they have my abiding support, and I believe that of the Congress generally, in solving these problems—problems that are on a lesser order than the technical and natural obstacles we may encounter on the journey to the moon. But the expedition to the moon will be far more difficult if we do not overcome the managerial impediments here on the ground.

While our attention is focused on NASA, the aerospace industry also has its responsibilities for its future is inexorably bound to the future of the space program. The aerospace companies must measure up to the precise demands that success in space requires.

The price tag on space is expensive, and it just might make very good sense to mix dollars and rubels in space exploration. I support President Kennedy's pronouncement at the United Nations.

But let's remember that there would be no basis for the modest space research agreements the United States has with the Soviet Union if this country had not demonstrated to the Russians the great strength of our space program. We bargain—and must continue to bargain—from a position of strength and those who criticize space spending should not overlook this fundamental point.

The most urgent question of the moment is: What will be the level of space appropriations for fiscal year 1964? No, I did not misspeak myself. I am not thinking of the level to be recommended in the 1965 budget soon due for review. I am worried about fiscal 1964—one-third of which is now behind us with no space appropriation bill even close to adoption and no clear signal as to what the outcome is likely to be. If reports are accurate, the House Appropriations Subcommittee had one four-to-four tie vote on the question of whether to provide NASA a meager feeding or a starvation diet. This is no way to raise a healthy child. Normally we overfeed the children a little, burp them over our shoulder, and hope they will keep down most of the formula received from the nursing bottle. We are trying to raise NASA on a skimpy feeding and if we are to attain our goals which have been publicly announced and generally accepted, we must give this 5-year old the food which will sustain its life.

How can NASA tell what to do in the present, unsettled circumstances? Do we hold to the moon shot in the 1960's as the national goal? Or do we depend upon some unlikely occurrence to minimize NASA needs and relieve an already unbalanced budget?

It is quite obvious that there is an attitude of holding tight reins on space spending. This is reflected in the statements I hear on the floor of the Senate by some of my colleagues who are sympathetic to the pursuit of new knowledge in space but whose criticism of NASA is based on the matter of priorities. They contend that there is much unfinished business, many social needs unmet, here on earth. I agree, but we cannot operate a massive venture such as NASA on a stop and go, wait and see, basis. NASA's objectives and its timetable cannot be shuffled and reshuffled every week to meet the mood of the moment. There should be flexibility, but this flexibility should not become uncertainty that weakens an important effort. NASA should fly to the moon, but not by the seat of its pants.

NASA should not have to depend for support on whether or not the Russians succeed in a rendezvous. It should not have to win favor simply on the number of astronauts it puts in space or how much attention it receives in the magazines. These 5 years have been amazingly successful and the next 5 years and the years which come after will also bring success.

I am willing to support a treaty that we do not test atomic bombs in the atmosphere, but I am not willing to sit down in contentment until the Russians have surprised the world again as they did with their first sputnik and are able to announce that they have completed a rendezvous in space and have taken the first long steps toward putting a man on the moon.

So tonight I suggest to you that NASA does not so much need a pat on the back as it needs a strong shoulder at the wheel. The space appropriation bill must come from the Congress above a $5 billion level, and it must come soon. Too many projects hang in the balance; too much momentum will be lost; too many NASA people will wonder whether it is worthwhile to work long hours under stress and strain when the life of their organization hangs in the balance. This group tonight can and should help turn the tide by devoting itself vigorously in the coming days toward pushing through Congress an adequate space appropriation bill.

I can well imagine what Jim Webb might be wishing for as he blows out the candles on NASA's birthday cake. You and I can put on that cake the one candle for NASA to grow on. Let's be sure we do it tonight.

And so, God bless us everyone as Jim Webb surveys, not three coins in a fountain, but five candles on a birthday cake.

Audits & Surveys Co. Marks 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 10th anniversary of the Audits & Surveys Co., the Nation's second largest marketing research organization. Although the headquarters of this company are located in the State of New York, its work and the effects of its work touch every region represented here. It is for this reason that I feel the following will be of interest to all my colleagues and that they will join me in paying tribute to this pioneering firm.

Since our birth as a nation, the American marketplace has evolved from village square to shopping center. This development has radically altered traditional marketing techniques. Instead of artisans or farmers selling their wares to familiar customers, giant corporations are filling the needs of a public from which they are separated by thousands of miles and echelons of distributors and retailers. The resulting loss of immediate, direct communication between producer and customer is one of the central problems of modern marketing. In the last few decades, the enormous growth of the American business community has emphasized the pressing need for accurate, meaningful statistical profiles of the consumer marketplace.

Marketing research, blending the diverse disciplines of mathematics, psychology and sociology, supplies this vital information to the Nation's manufacturers. However, as with any scientific research, valid findings can only result from valid methods. It also follows that meaningful interpretations can be made only in full knowledge of a study's limitations and aims. It is interesting to note that 5 years ago, Solomon Dutka, founder and president of the Audits & Surveys Co., admonished the entire research industry to avoid using data which carried no specifications as to its quality or reliability. In a speech before the American Marketing Association, he called for rigid application of statistical quality control procedures to assure greater accuracy of research findings.

His comments were based on long experience. Prior to forming his own firm in 1953, Mr. Dutka was well established in both the academic and business worlds. He began his career as a college statistics instructor and is still active in academic circles as an adjunct professor at New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration.

In 1945 he received a special citation from the Secretary of War for his work in nuclear physics during the Manhattan project. In 1950 the American Statistical Association, of which he is a fellow, appointed him a delegate to the United Nation's Subcommission on Statistical Sampling.

Audits & Surveys was founded by Mr. Dutka when he was 29. From a 1-room office with one secretary and one client, his firm has had a dramatic growth. Today it maintains a headquarters staff of 300 and a nationwide network of more than 2,500 field reporters who collect, tabulate, and analyze marketing data for some 100 clients.

Among the firms it serves are some of the Nation's leading corporations, including American Telephone & Telegraph, Campbell Soup, Columbia Broadcasting System, Du Pont, General Electric, General Foods, General Motors, Life magazine, Look magazine, Procter & Gamble, S. C. Johnson.

During its 10 years of operation, the company has pioneered new methods of market analysis which are contributing valuable marketing data for the Nation's manufacturers.

This includes an advanced concept of market analysis which involves the auditing of every type of retail outlet that carries a specific product category. This is a continuous and comprehensive nationwide audit which reports the brand-by-brand share of the total market held by competing products.

To achieve statistical accuracy in this project, Audits & Surveys conducts a yearly sample census of the country's retail population—the largest privately conducted study in the United States, second in scope only to the business census of the Bureau of Census. It provides current information on the number and type of retail and service outlets in the country.

In addition to these research services, the firm maintains a consumer survey division which seeks to determine consumer attitudes, opinions, and behavior.

Working closely with Mr. Dutka in the development of these concepts and services, is a member of the U.S. Census Advisory Committee, Lester R. Frankel, executive vice president of Audits & Surveys. As a statistician with the Bureau of Census, Mr. Frankel designed and organized the first nationwide probability sample of the labor force in the United States. His sample design, created in the late 1930's, is still used by the Bureau.

Also an adjunct professor of statistics at New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration, Mr. Frankel is president of the Market Research Council, a director of the American Management Association, and fellow and past national director of the American Statistical Association.

Audits & Surveys has traveled a long way in 10 years. It has attracted special assignments from business and the Federal Government. It has expanded into foreign markets, establishing operations in Canada, Latin America, and Europe.

But more important, it has helped to bring market research further along the road in its quest for accuracy and reliability.

Audits & Surveys can be justly proud of its record of achievement. I am happy to offer my congratulations to this firm as it begins its second decade of service to American business and very best wishes to Solomon Dutka, a leader of our free enterprise system.

Remarks of Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall at a Meeting of the Arizona State Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 8, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on September 28 the gentleman from Colorado, Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, spoke at the meeting of the Arizona State Reclamation Association. As always, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], gave an outstandingly fine speech on reclamation, a subject with which few people are as familiar and knowledgeable as he. Since the reclamation program is of interest and importance to every Member of the Congress and to every citizen of the United States, I felt his remarks should be given an even wider audience than that which was fortunate enough to hear him speak in Phoenix. Therefore, it is my real pleasure and privilege to place Congressman ASPINALL's fine speech in the RECORD for all to read:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WAYNE N. ASPINALL AT A MEETING OF THE ARIZONA STATE RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

It is indeed a pleasure to have this opportunity to join you at this luncheon meeting of the Arizona State Reclamation Association, and comment briefly on a program that has been so important in your past and is the key to your future—the Federal reclamation program.

I believe that the surroundings in which you are meeting today constitute the best example in our entire Nation of what reclamation means to an arid land. For it is in this valley that a Federal expenditure of only about $25 million over 50 years ago is today producing crops each year valued at about four times that amount, and the project provides the primary support for more than a half million people.

I could give you other examples of how reclamation development has paid comparable dividends and speak to you in glowing terms of the great contribution which the Federal reclamation program has made to the economy and wealth of our Nation. I could paint for you a rosy picture of great expectations and hopes for the future of reclamation. However, I believe you would prefer to have from me, instead, a completely frank appraisal of the Federal reclamation program as it exists today and some of the problems which we presently have before us. I have chosen to make my remarks along this line in order that you may better understand what we are up against in moving this program forward in the years ahead. After a few comments on the general program, I intend to give you my thoughts on future water development in your area.

Today, all parts of the Nation are being caught up in a movement toward full comprehensive development of water resources. This movement is emerging as the dominant conservation issue of our times. In no area is this more evident than in the Pacific Southwest where available water resources are already overcommitted and the problem is one of conservation and finding new sources. While the water problems in other areas are not as critical as they are in the Southwest there are ever-increasing demands throughout our entire Nation for the limited supplies that are available. Water shortage is no longer just a western problem. Our Nation's economic future demands that we develop to the fullest extent all of the Nation's water resources, whether the water eventually is to be used for agriculture, for industry, or for our rapidly growing cities and towns.

The problem, which we who are interested in the Federal reclamation program are facing, is to determine the role which this program will play in our overall water resources development task. Will reclamation play an important role in a balanced national water development program? Or will it be shoved aside, leaving a serious gap in meeting our national needs? The answer depends on our resolving the many serious problems facing reclamation today, and on getting our overall

Federal water programs better coordinated and under control.

As you know, the Federal reclamation program for reclaiming arid lands in the West was initiated largely to meet an urgent need that developed around the turn of the century after numerous setbacks and failures in private irrigation undertakings. The program has undergone changes in purpose and direction from time to time to meet the changing needs of our people. Congress has met these needs as they developed by providing statutory authority for the changes. For example, in 1926, after a study of a special fact finders committee, Congress passed legislation alleviating some of the shortcomings of the reclamation program and returning it to a sound and supportable position. In the 1930's, when the need developed for overhauling the basic legislative authority to take into account the multiple-purpose concept, it was met by enactment of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, which modified and brought up to date the general provisions of reclamation law with respect to multiple-purpose projects, nonreimbursable allocations, repayment periods and contracts, power and municipal water operations, etc.

During this period when Congress was changing the scope and direction of the reclamation program, it was also initiating and modifying other water resources development programs. The number of Federal agencies with responsibilities for water resources development has increased and agency missions have been broadened. There are now four Federal departments with major nationwide operating responsibilities for water resources programs—Army, Agriculture, Interior, and HEW. For a while, these programs went along without any serious conflicts or apparent need for coordination. However, more recently, due to the expansion and broadening of programs and the ever-increasing demands placed upon our limited water supplies, conflicts have developed. There is competition among the agencies for the water resources funds included in the annual Federal budgets. The Federal water agencies operate under different laws, policies, and procedures, and, unfortunately, under the multiple-purpose concept, some of the water development agencies have, in some instances, been given overlapping authority. The Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and Soil Conservation Service have been empowered by law to do, in many cases, much of the same work. In addition, there is the problem of improving the arrangements for State and local participation in the planning of water resources development.

It became obvious to me several years ago, with respect to the Federal Government's total water development effort, that we very much needed better means of orderly planning, coordinated effort, and a sensible division of responsibilities. It seemed to me to be particularly important to the reclamation program that we find the answer to this need, for reclamation, being a sectional program, would be the first to be hurt in any every-agency-for-itself approach. It was 5 years ago that I first introduced legislation aimed at meeting this need, but during this 5 years, little has been accomplished. This is a critical period for the reclamation program.

The problems of those of us who are friends of reclamation are really twofold. First, there are problems directly related to the reclamation program itself, and, second, there are problems involving all the water development agencies which cut across the jurisdiction of several committees of the Congress. I shall comment upon only a few of the problems now facing us.

First, with respect to getting our reclamation projects through the Congress, we normally have no major difficulties if we stick to the policies and criteria that have been recommended and established for general application. It is when exceptions are made to our established policies that we get into trouble. Not only do we have difficulty in justifying authorization and construction but sooner or later the projects which do not conform to established policies, come home to haunt us. We have several projects in this category at the present time—projects on which serious problems exist because, years ago, we made exceptions to the policies relating to sound planning procedures.

The matter of repayment is one area of project consideration where we have not followed a consistent policy. The 1939 act set the permissible repayment period at 40 years plus a development period—but exception after exception has been recommended by the Department of the Interior and concurred in by the Congress, with no time limitation, until very recently, placed upon payment of that part of the irrigation cost to be repaid by power revenues.

In 1956, we developed a repayment formula in connection with the consideration of the Colorado River storage project. The authorizing act for that project calls for repayment of the entire irrigation cost within a period of 50 years plus any authorized development period, including that portion which is to be repaid by power revenues. This has seemed to me a sound and supportable policy with respect to repayment of all projects and Congress has followed it since that date. Although it has not been written into each authorizing act all projects authorized since 1956 will comply with this policy. Therefore, during the last few years we have been following, for the first time, a uniform policy although it is not written into general law. My position, and that of my committee, is that this repayment policy should be continued and that all new projects recommended for authorization should comply.

At the present time, my committee is holding up consideration of any Missouri River Basin project units until the Missouri River Basin project is made to conform to this repayment policy. It has been over a year now since I requested the Department of the Interior to take the necessary actions to put the Missouri basin project on a sound basis and to furnish my committee the financial studies to show this had been accomplished. The study still has not been received.

Another example of a policy that has been developed over the years and is being followed, although it is not a matter of law, relates to the amount which the irrigation water users must repay. By numerous actions on individual project legislation, Congress has indicated that water users should be required to pay in accordance with their ability to pay, on the basis of economic studies by the Department, and that the remainder of the irrigation cost would then be paid by surplus project revenues from the disposal of power and municipal water where such revenues are available. This policy has worked well in connection with our large multiple-purpose basin developments. I believe that financial assistance can be provided in this manner to all potential projects although the reclamation West is not entirely covered by basin accounts. For instance, there is no basin account in the Northwest but irrigation projects in that area have been tied to the Bonneville power system or units thereof for assistance. This policy of power assistance to irrigation development is, of course, very important to the future water development in your area as well as the entire Pacific Southwest.

The policy of water users paying in accordance with their ability to pay is sound and supportable provided the repayment ability determination is equitable and some other means is used for determining project justification. However, when procedures are altered so that the amounts required to be repaid by the water users are becoming smaller and smaller percentagewise, while benefit-cost ratios are more favorable under the recently adopted formula for determining irrigation benefits, questions are bound to arise, especially when it appears that established procedures have been changed for the express purpose of making certain projects conform to a particular policy. For instance, about 2 years ago, the Bureau of Reclamation revised its procedures for determining irrigation benefits when it was having difficulty showing favorable benefit-cost ratios for many of its projects. The new procedure was used for the first time in connection with the Garrison project and has even been referred to as the "Garrison formula." Since the Garrison project had an unfavorable benefit-cost ratio under the previous procedures, it appeared that the new formula had been worked out in an attempt to justify this project as well as others that were in difficulty. In other words, some projects that were economically unfeasible in the past have become economically feasible due to application of the new yardstick. This naturally caused criticism by the committee and others and has raised serious problems in connection with moving projects through the House. I believe the new formula is justified and supportable but the way it was adopted certainly left it open to suspicion. We still haven't authorized a large project that depends upon this new formula for justification.

We get into trouble when the executive tries to assume the responsibility for establishing policy. Congress is the policymaking branch of our Government and that is as it should be, for Congress is most representative of the people. The policies which Congress adopts should be responsive to the need and desires of the people. However, the way in which Congress is organized to consider the legislative matters relating to water makes it very difficult to obtain uniform water policy application to all Federal programs and agencies. I refer particularly to the committee structure where legislation bearing on water resources policy is considered by several congressional committees. Nevertheless, in my opinion, Congress must face up to this problem if it is to retain its policymaking prerogative.

Congress is going to have to give increased attention to policies for adjustment to newer uses of water such as recreation, fish and wildlife, and to the impact which these uses have on those uses established in the past. The problems brought about by increasing urban and suburban growth will have an impact on the direction that future water policy must take and there must be more consideration given to the important problem of Federal-State relationships in dealing with water resources. Water quality control is becoming ever more important as a matter to be considered in water resources development all over the country. We must find supportable methods for determining project feasibility, comparing projects, and making judgment as to where Federal assistance is most needed. The policies must be flexible to meet conditions as they emerge so they may be adapted to changing requirements.

Experience has shown that if Congress does not fulfill its responsibility to set policy, the executive will and must attempt to assume this responsibility. Let's take, for example, the matter of allocations to recreation and to fish and wildlife. Congress has not established a firm policy with respect to allocations to recreation in connection with water projects. In the absence of congressional policy, the executive has been making its recommendations, until very recently, in accordance with an Executive order known as Budget Circular A–47. In October, 1961, President Kennedy established the Water Resources Council comprising the Secretaries of Interior, Army, Agriculture and HEW, and asked this Council to draft new policies and procedures to be used in evaluating water projects.

In May of 1962, the Water Resources Council submitted its recommendations to the President and they were approved and put into effect on May 15, 1962. Unfortunately, the Council only completed a portion of the task assigned to it. Its recommendations involved only the formulation of projects and procedures for determining economic justification. The recommendations did not cover the matters of cost allocation, reimbursement and cost sharing. Project planning under the new procedures has resulted in recommendations for expanded land acquisition programs and large joint-cost allocations to recreation and to fish and wildlife without any established policy with respect to reimbursement or cost sharing. There is not even agreement among the executive departments as to what they should recommend to Congress in connection with the individual projects that are submitted. The Corps of Engineers adopted its own policy which, in effect, permitted 25 percent of the project cost to be allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife on a completely nonreimbursable basis. The projects authorized by Congress in the 1962 Omnibus Flood Control Act were authorized on the basis of this policy and, as a result, Congress has gone along with a writeoff of about $250 million or about one-fourth the total cost, chargeable to recreation and to fish and wildlife, although I venture to say that this fact is known to very few Members.

In view of the situation, my committee held 4 days of hearings in March and April of this year on this matter. The purpose of these hearings was to try to determine what policies and procedures were being followed and to develop an allocation policy which would be applicable to all Federal water programs. Not only is allocation policy involved but the question of entrance and user fees at Federal reservoirs is involved, and this, in turn, gets us into recreation policy which is involved in other broad general legislation presently being considered by my committee and the Congress. This is the land and water conservation fund bill. As we proceeded with our consideration of this matter, it became apparent to the committee that it could not adopt an allocation policy without statutory establishment because allocation policy involved several executive departments and several committees of the Congress. In other words, the committee could not follow the procedure used in establishing the maximum repayment period—a policy involving only reclamation projects and only the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. Having determined that statutory establishment of a general allocation policy was required, the committee decided that the appropriate procedure would be for the administration to recommend legislation upon which all the departments and the Bureau of the Budget could agree. On May 22, my committee adopted a resolution calling for the administration to submit its recommendations with respect to allocation policy and stated that, pending receipt of such recommendations, no project plan should be submitted to the Congress proposing a joint-cost allocation to recreation and to fish and wildlife. This action by the committee has held up submission of all reclamation projects while the administration attempts to meet the committee's request. To date, the legislation has not been submitted to Congress. I do know that the departments and the Bureau of the Budget are diligently trying to reach agreement. The Bureau of the Budget now claims that it never gave its blessing to the Corps of Engineers' allocation policy last year.

I hope that the administration will submit its proposed legislation soon. When it is received, it will be given top priority by my committee. It should be considered before any of the projects. In the meantime, the reclamation program is stalled.

When the program does get rolling again we will have the problem of priorities among projects. Reclamation must be a program of orderly advancement. Our program of project authorizations should be generally in the same order of magnitude as our construction program. I see no sense in authorizing in one Congress projects costing in total say $2 or $3 billion when our construction program is running from one-half to six-tenths of a billion dollars. If our authorization program greatly exceeds our construction program over any extended period, we permit the executive branch to pick and choose the projects it wants to build, perhaps on the basis of political considerations, and we end up with a lot of out-of-date plans on the book shelves. Our experience in the Missouri Basin in this connection should have taught us a lesson.

There are also problems involving the relationship of reclamation projects to agricultural surpluses. This relationship must be better understood or it will continue to plague us. For instance, it is not generally known that the reclamation program has been less of an offender in connection with this problem than such programs as the agricultural research program, the agricultural conservation program, or the Corps of Engineers' flood control program. Information furnished me by the Corps of Engineers some time ago indicated that agricultural production on lands reclaimed or protected by the corps has exceeded the production on reclamation projects and that the crops on corps protected lands are those which contribute more to the surplus problem than crops grown on reclamation project lands. Of course, aside from the fact that crops grown on reclamation projects have little effect upon agricultural surpluses, I have always contended that our ability in the United States to produce surplus food is reassuring in view of the future world food shortage predicted by many economists. I would say that surpluses are preferable to shortages. Just last week Soviet Premier Krushchev called for stepped-up agricultural production on irrigated lands, and during this same week Russia concluded a deal to purchase 6.2 million tons of wheat from Canada over a 10-month period. A few days later, Russia also announced the purchase of an additional 1.3 million tons of wheat from Australia.

In addition to the few specific problems which I have discussed, there are the usual and longstanding problems that stem from the fact that reclamation is a sectional program. The reclamation States have only 107 Members out of 435 Members in the House of Representatives and many of these are not friendly to the program. Success in getting reclamation projects through the House depends upon (1) having favorable and worthwhile projects to present, (2) having the reclamation West united in support, and (3) having a better understanding among Members of the House from outside the reclamation States.

My remarks up to this point should give you a realistic idea of the rather rough and tough road which any large water development program faces in Congress today. Now, what you are most interested in, of course, is what this all means in terms of needed water conservation and development in the Pacific Southwest.

During the hearings on the central Arizona project over 12 years ago, I made it clear that I did not oppose development in Arizona of water resources to which Arizona was entitled. On that memorable day of April 18, 1951, when the central Arizona project was "put on the shelf" by action of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I offered a substitute motion to the motion offered by Mr. SAYLOR requiring that the controversy between the States of Arizona and California be taken to the Supreme Court. My substitute motion, which would have permitted reconsideration of the project upon request of a majority of the committee, was offered because I did not believe it was in the province of the committee to say that this matter must be decided by the Supreme Court, and because I had hoped that Arizona and California, following the example set by the upper basin States, might arrive at a friendly compromise agreement. However, my substitute motion failed and the original Saylor motion, on which I voted "present," was adopted.

My position with respect to water resources development in Arizona has not changed since 1951. I will support any program for developing water resources that Arizona is entitled to if it conforms to the policies and criteria which we have established with respect to justification and feasibility. Of course, the legislation must be brought before the Congress in a timely manner. By this, I mean that Arizona should not expect the Congress to lay aside all the other projects and water policy matters it has been working on and studying over the last several years in order to give immediate attention to Arizona's desires. I understand, of course, how Arizona feels after waiting more than 12 years for a court decision. However, we must face reality. Conditions have changed. New studies are necessary. The condition of water surplus which prevailed 12 years ago has been drastically altered. Ground water supplies in the Lower Colorado River Basin are being seriously depleted by overpumping. The Glen Canyon Reservoir is now being filled and the lower basin has to share Colorado River water with the upper basin. There has been a shift in water usage. Water needs for recreation and fish and wildlife are receiving more and more attention. The water needs for municipal and industrial use are greatly increased. For example, I noticed just a few days ago where Arizona's mineral industries would require an additional 3½ billion gallons of water annually by 1980, raising the total requirements for these industries alone to 32 billion gallons per year. The point I am making is that we cannot just pick up where we left off on April 18, 1951, in the committee of which I am now chairman. There are only four members of the committee who were serving in 1951. While it may seem that I am advocating "starting over from scratch," I assure you that I shall keep in mind and give consideration to the long delay forced upon Arizona in its water development program.

I have continued to be interested over the years in potential water resources development in the Lower Colorado River Basin. As a matter of fact, it was my letter to Secretary Udall last November, prior to the Supreme Court's decision, which initiated the "basin approach" and resulted in expediting Interior's studies in the lower basin. My letter requested an outline for a coordinated comprehensive program under which the water needs of the entire southwest area might be provided for. In his reply of January 18 of this year, Secretary Udall recognized the need for an areawide approach and on January 22 he announced the start of a new study aimed at a regional solution of the water and power problems of the Pacific Southwest. This is the study which was speeded up and given top priority in June after the Supreme Court's June 3 decision in the case of *Arizona* v. *California* and which was completed and submitted to the Colorado basin States last month.

I have not studied in detail this five-State regional plan—referred to as the Lower Colorado River project—but I will comment to this extent: First, I believe that an areawide approach is necessary and that unity and cooperation are imperative if the water needs of the Pacific Southwest—the fastest growing area in the Nation—are to be met. This approach has been successful in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Extended controversy will benefit no one and will serve only to worsen, for all concerned, the water crisis in the Southwest.

Secondly, I believe that the plan must be one that will provide better water management and develop new water supplies and not one that would benefit one area to the detriment of another. An effective water conservation program must necessarily be a part of the plan. In order to help finance the cost of works that will be involved, I agree with the proposal for a basin development fund. All the States that are involved should take an active part in developing this regional plan.

My advice to you, in Arizona, and to water leaders in California and the other States as well, is that you not be too impatient but that you carefully evaluate this proposed areawide plan in a constructive and cooperative manner, and that you honestly attempt to develop in cooperation with the Department of the Interior a plan of development which all States can support. I sincerely believe that this approach on the part of a united Arizona has the best possible chance of success with respect to relieving the water crisis here in Arizona and the Southwest. If you bring to Congress such a plan and it conforms to present policies and criteria, I can assure you that it will be placed in position for the earliest possible consideration by the Congress consistent, of course, with the consideration of other water development projects on which we are already working.

Finally, I cannot emphasize enough the importance of unity within Arizona and agreement among the five States, and especially Arizona and California. My committee and the Congress have been following a policy of not deciding differences within a State and hesitate to consider a basin water development program when there is a serious controversy between or among the States involved. The problems of successfully moving a large reclamation program through the House of Representatives are so great under the best of conditions that the addition of a serious intrabasin controversy would present a very difficult task.

SENATE

Wednesday, October 9, 1963

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 3, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid: Give, we beseech Thee, to these servants of the commonwealth clear vision, clean hands, and pure hearts, as facing great tasks and grave responsibilities, they ascend this holy hill of the Nation's life.

Thou knowest that we long to see the spirit of the Master regnant in our common life—cleansing it from all that is unwholesome; sweetening every human relationship; composing the differences of class with class, race with race, and nation with nation; delivering from the lust for gain or power which narrows interest, crushes affection, and hardens the sympathies.

Work in us and in all men a miracle of grace and renewal. Steady our purpose to give the best that is in us, body, mind, and spirit, to the right that needs assistance, and against the wrong that needs resistance. Grant us to pass this day in glad service and in inner peace, without stumbling and without stain.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 8, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes, during which memorials, resolutions, and the like may be submitted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I understand, the morning hour is to be limited to the introduction of bills and the making of insertions in the Record, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair inquire whether that is the intention of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate Procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors (Rept. No. 560);

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution to print, for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, 25,000 additional copies of a revised committee print entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual" (Rept. No. 558); and

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics" of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations (Rept. No. 559).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2226. A bill to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to make expenditures to correct substantial defects in one- to four-family dwellings covered by mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, or to compensate homeowners for such defects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2227. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

REMEDY OF SUBSTANTIAL DEFECTS IN FHA INSURED HOMES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be received out of order and appropriately referred, a bill to authorize the Federal Housing Administration to remedy substantial defects in federally insured homes.

The proposed section 517 of the National Housing Act would enable the FHA to extend aid to distressed homeowners who, after relying upon FHA appraisals and inspections, find substantial defects in their properties. Such cases are isolated and relatively few in number, but there have been situations in which faulty inspections or mistakes in judgment have resulted in serious deficiencies in the properties. In many instances builders when notified correct the deficiencies and, especially during the first year following the completion of construction while the builder's warranty remains effective, this is obviously the most preferable solution.

However, from time to time the press has properly reported certain "horror cases" where the corporation which built the home is no longer in existence, has no assets, or refuses to cooperate. The proposed section 517 would enable the FHA to handle such cases as well as those in which the property is more than 1 year old and the deficiencies, such as the failure of septic tanks to function, make the property uninhabitable or unfit for occupancy.

In these hardship cases under present law the family owning the home generally defaults in mortgage payments, and the property, after being acquired by the FHA under the provisions of the mortgage insurance contract, is repaired and sold on the open market. Thus the FHA bears the expense of correcting the deficiencies, but only after the original homeowners have been displaced and have lost their equity. The bill would permit the FHA to correct the defect before the family is pressed to the point of abandoning its home.

The FHA has operated in a similar manner for a number of years by providing a limited guarantee or warranty against defects in properties which have been acquired and sold by the Commissioner. The cost of performing under such guarantees or warranties has been relatively small and claims from home purchasers have not been excessive. Under the proposed section 517 the FHA could give similar protection to families purchasing homes in reliance upon FHA appraisals and inspections. The cost of administration would be kept to a minimum by making decisions of the Federal Housing Commissioner final and conclusive without resort to the courts.

Another bill to deal with this problem, S. 1200, introduced by Senator Gruening, takes a somewhat different approach. Hearings have been announced by the Housing Subcommittee for October 17 and 18, and I very much hope that the bill now being introduced can be considered at the same time.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2226) to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to make expenditures to correct substantial defects in one- to four-family dwellings covered by mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, or to compensate homeowners for such defects, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"EXPENDITURES TO CORRECT OR COMPENSATE FOR SUBSTANTIAL DEFECTS IN CERTAIN MORTGAGED PROPERTIES

"Sec. 517. (a) The Commissioner is authorized, with respect to any property improved by a one- to four-family dwelling heretofore or hereafter covered by a mortgage insured under the provisions of this Act which he finds to have substantial defects, to make expenditures for (1) correcting such defects; (2) paying the claims of the owner of such property arising from such defects; or (3) acquiring title to such property.

"(b) The Commissioner shall by regulations prescribe the terms and conditions under which expenditures and payments may be made under the provisions of this section, and his decisions regarding such expenditures or payments, and the conditions under which the same are approved or disapproved, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to judicial review."

ADDITIONAL EXEMPTION FOR BLIND DEPENDENT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an additional tax exemption to a taxpayer who has a blind dependent.

Since January 1, 1948, the Internal Revenue Code has provided an extra exemption for the blind taxpayer, which presently would allow him $1,200 instead of $600 of income tax free. The purpose of this second exemption is to help compensate the sightless for the additional costs of his handicap. These include such items as special tools and devices, appliances which assist him in coping with his disability, and the frequent necessity of hiring the assistance of sighted persons to read for him or otherwise aid him. This special exemption, of course, is of use only to the blind who has income of his own, the person who as an adult has sufficiently overcome his handicap to earn a living. It is in the nature of an "equalizer" needed to help stretch his income, often meager enough at best, toward parity with those of us fortunate enough to have the use of our eyes.

But there are many blind who do not earn income of their own, and to whom this special exemption is useless. Even when they are dependents, children, or otherwise, the taxpayer who supports them receives only one exemption. Yet the dependent blind are as needy of the special and costly aids to help in their adjustment to life in the dark as are those who have already achieved the state of financial independence.

The parents of a sightless child incur extraordinary expenses on his behalf. As he progresses through school he needs, increasingly, supplements to the parents' own help through hiring others to read to him. He may need a braille typewriter and other special aids. He must be escorted to and from school, often with mounting taxi fares or other special costs. The extra costs are not just normal expenses incurred in acquiring an education, but extra costs incurred because of blindness. The extra exemption I propose recognizes that fact, and assists the taxpayer to meet those extra costs of the handicap.

The situation is not much different in the case of the dependent blind person who is older, who may be supported by a son or daughter, or the newly blind who is engaged in efforts at rehabilitation. When they step out of the familiar home environment, they must be accompanied by a sighted person. If the supporting relatives are working, again there are extra costs.

Mr. President, the relief my bill would afford to taxpayers with a blind dependent would cause comparatively little loss to the Treasury, but it would be a considerable boon to the devoted guardians of these handicapped. I trust the committee will favorably report and the Senate will adopt this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2227) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is blind, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

VILISAV MARKOVIC—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

On motion of Mr. Lausche, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1981) for the relief of Vilisav Markovic, and the bill was indefinitely postponed.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS AND CORRECTION OF PRINTING OF AMENDMENT (AMENDMENTS NOS. 215 AND 218)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on yesterday I stated I proposed to offer certain amendments to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, H.R. 6143, when it is considered by the Senate. The amendments have two purposes. The first and primary purpose of the amendments is to eliminate from eligibility for grants or loans under the bill those institutions of higher learning which are in substance owned, controlled, or operated by religious denominations. The second purpose is to make it certain that any taxpaper suing in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers shall be able to obtain a decision as to the constitutionality of any grant or loan which the Commissioner of Education may propose to make.

Unfortunately, in the printing of one of the amendments which I presented on yesterday there was inadvertently omitted the word "not" on line 2, where the word "not" should have been inserted between the word "is" and the word "owned".

In order to obviate this mistake, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to present again this particular amendment, designated as amendment No. 215 to H.R. 6143, and ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Record at this point in its correct form and that it also be reprinted in its correct form and allowed to lie on the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 215) was ordered to be reprinted, reprinted in the Record, and to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 68, line 10, insert the following between the word "institution" and the semicolon: "which is not owned, controlled, or operated by a religious denomination, or which has no sectarian religious requirements applicable to its students, to its teachers, or to the members of its controlling board or trustees".

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in addition, I ask unanimous consent that I may submit a third amendment and have such third proposed amendment printed at this point in the Record and also printed for the purpose of lying on the desk until the bill is considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the desk; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 218) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On page 69, line 12, insert the following additional sentence after the word "individual": "The term 'nonprofit institution', as used in subsection (a)(4) of sec. 301, does not include any educational institution which is owned, controlled, or operated by a religious denomination, or which has any sectarian religious requirements applicable to its students, to its teachers, or to the members of its controlling board or trustees."

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 219)

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FLYING OF AMERICAN FLAG OVER U.S. SHIP "UTAH"—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] appear as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 703) to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941, the next time the bill is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS IN COAL MINES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] appear as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2203), to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines, at any future printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SALE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to S. Res. 211, which relates to the wheat investigation.

I also ask unanimous consent that any other Senator who wishes to have his name added may do so at the next printing of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as an additional cosponsor of Senate Resolution 211 at its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF OVERTIME TO CUSTOMS OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of September 24, and October 1, 1963, the names of Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Miller, Mr. Moss, Mr. Scott, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Young of North Dakota, and Mr. Young of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2173) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees, introduced by Mr. Dominick on September 24, 1963.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address by Senator Jennings Randolph delivered at dedication of Centennial Roadside Park in Tucker County, W. Va., on October 6, 1963.

THE SITUATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, one of America's finest newspapers, has an excellent Washington bureau, staffed by good correspondents. One of these correspondents is Richard Dudman, who recently wrote an article entitled "Move in Senate To End U.S. Aid Believed Useful to Kennedy as Lever Against Vietnam Regime." The article was published in the October 2 issue. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Move in Senate To End U.S. Aid Believed Useful to Kennedy as Lever Against Vietnam Regime—McNamara Mission Cited as Evidence of Continuing Policy of "Sink or Swim With Ngo Dinh Diem"

(By Richard Dudman)

Washington, October 2.—Senator Frank Church's proposed resolution calling for a cutoff of U.S. aid to South Vietnam is considered a mounting threat to the government of President Ngo Dinh Diem.

The Idaho Democrat visited Vietnam last December. He says he heard the same claims of military victory, but saw the same evidences of political defeat, that he had witnessed in China as a military intelligence officer when the mainland regime of Chiang Kai-shek was about to collapse.

After the Vietnamese special forces and secret police raided the Buddhist pagodas and arrested thousands of monks and students August 21, Church introduced his resolution.

It says: "Resolved, that it is the sense of the Senate that unless the Government of South Vietnam abandons policies of repression against its own people and makes a determined and effective effort to regain their support, military and economic assistance to that Government should not be continued."

This was Church's counter to the policy of sink or swim with Ngo Dinh Diem, which the Kennedy administration had adopted but was reappraising in the light of the government's dispute with the Buddhists.

"It is urged upon us that the Communist presence in South Vietnam requires us to support the Diem regime regardless of how repugnant it becomes and irrespective of its contemptuous refusal to respond to our entreaties," Church said.

"To accept such an argument is to concede that the great American Republic is no longer the master of her own course in South Vietnam, but has become the servant of the Mandarin autocracy which governs there."

Since Church introduced the resolution September 12, with 22 cosponsors, others have joined the group until it now stands at 33—almost one-third of the Senate.

The latest to sign as cosponsors are Senators Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, Abraham Ribicoff, Democrat, of Connecticut, and John Sherman Cooper, Republican, of Kentucky.

When he introduced the resolution, Church asked that it be held only a week for additional sponsors. He asked for prompt Senate action after that.

President John F. Kennedy has said publicly he is against cutting off aid at this time. Privately, the administration is understood to have welcomed the move as a lever to use to persuade Diem to make changes. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge is understood to have cited the resolution to Diem as a clear indication that the United States is not prepared to support him no matter what.

Now, instead of seeking early floor action, Church is prepared to have the resolution remain pending. He would seek a vote only if the President gave his personal approval, because few Democrats would vote for it if they thought Mr. Kennedy opposed it.

The belief is crystallizing that the President, after a period of doubt, has decided that this country's policy shall remain sink or swim with Ngo Dinh Diem.

Some read that interpretation into his decision to send Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara to Vietnam to appraise the situation. The Department of Defense has held to the view that the war is gradually being won and that it would be a mistake to forsake Diem, regardless of his shortcomings. These persons say that McNamara could not be expected to return from his week's tour of inspection with any other answer.

If Mr. Kennedy had leaned toward the view—apparently held by most American civilians in Vietnam—that Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, are so unpopular that the situation is headed toward disastrous political defeat, then he would have sent someone like Under Secretary of State W. Averell Harriman instead of McNamara, it is argued.

Whether this interpretation is correct, the resolution remains a solid reminder that U.S. patience is not inexhaustible.

The roll of signers may serve also as a barometer of Madam Ngo Dinh Nhu's success in her forthcoming 3-week speaking tour of the United States.

If she can put over the line that President Kennedy has been misinformed and that only a treasonous conspiracy is critical of her family's anti-Communist government, it is said, then the list of signers may shorten as Senators remove their names.

If, on the other hand, she continues her talk about "crazy American ideas of democracy," Buddhist priests barbecuing themselves, and young American officers as little soldiers of fortune, the list could grow rapidly.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the world was once again shocked by the events which transpired in South Vietnam last weekend. On Saturday, yet another Buddhist monk committed suicide, in protest against the Diem government. At that dreadful scene of self-immolation, three American newsmen, legitimately concerned with the event, were cruelly beaten by the Vietnamese police.

Mr. President, it is bad enough when the Diem government puts severe restrictions on our newsmen; it is inexcusable when our newsmen are beaten and abused in their legitimate attempts to do their jobs. We should demand apologies from the Diem regime, punishment for the police responsible, compensation for the newsmen, and ironclad assurances that such beatings will not occur again.

In the issue of October 6, the New York Times published an excellent editorial, entitled "Violence in Saigon." I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIOLENCE IN SAIGON

Almost immediately after Secretary McNamara left South Vietnam with an optimistic report on the war against the Communists, the continued conflict between President Diem's regime and the Buddhists and other opposition elements has exploded into new turmoil. Another Buddhist monk, the sixth since June, had burned himself to death to protest the regime's repressive policies and new student demonstrations have erupted to the same purpose.

The police of President Diem's brother Nhu who sacked the Buddhist pagodas, are now turning to violence against American press correspondents. Three who had witnessed the monk's suicide were beaten by plainclothesmen and one had to be hospitalized. Among the three was our own correspondent, David Halberstam, whose resourcefulness and courage in reporting the facts about both the war and the internal situation in Vietnam have made him the target of special criticism by the Nhus. Correspondents report events, they do not make them. In that job they are entitled to adequate facilities and above all to personal safety. And the American people are entitled to the facts about a war in which American blood and money is being spent.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the newsmen beaten was David Halberstam, the energetic Times correspondent for South Vietnam. Mr. Halberstam and John Sharkey, of the NBC, were attacked when trying to protect Grant Wolfkill, also of the NBC, who had just taken pictures of the burning monk.

Mr. Halberstam has done first-rate work in his reporting for the Times from South Vietnam, despite the onerous restrictions placed upon newsmen there. Recently, James Reston, Washington bureau chief of the New York Times, called Halberstam's reporting brilliant—truly unusual praise when printed in the columns of the Times. Halberstam had previously distinguished himself as a reporter for the Nashville Tennessean and as Times correspondent in the Congo. He has been Times correspondent in Saigon for more than a year, and has been one of the three full-time American correspondents stationed in that country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD his latest commentary—an article entitled "Saigon: Failure To Solve Political Problems May Erode Will of People To Press War," which was published in the October 6 issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS OVER VIETNAM AS VIEWED IN SAIGON—FAILURE TO SOLVE POLITICAL PROBLEMS MAY ERODE WILL OF PEOPLE TO PRESS WAR

(By David Halberstam)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, October 5.—There was, in the midst of the whirlwind McNamara-Taylor visit here, a moment of restlessness when the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were late and reporters waited at a tiny boondock airstrip for their arrival. An American officer was there and he was talking with the reporters about how tough it was in his area, a real see-saw battle where the Vietcong seemed to be increasingly formidable.

Just the other day, he noted 80 Vietnamese youths deserted from a hamlet.

Why was that? asked the reporters.

Well, the officer said, the youths in this area weren't very happy.

Why? said the reporters.

Well, because on palace orders, much of the effort and many of the troops in the area were going into the building of four land development centers. But only Catholics are permitted in centers and most of the people in the area are Buddhist, he said.

NOT MENTIONED

The anecdote, as Arthur Sylvester noted later, did not come up at the main VIP briefing.

South Vietnam is like this, a complex country where there is usually on the surface no sign of political trouble at all. Even the war is nominally a war against the Communist insurgents. Yet it is also Vietnamese against Vietnamese, a highly political war in which the problem is certainly not lack of Government force or air might, certainly not lack of Government loudspeakers.

Robert S. McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor are gone now, and the prediction for victory is 1965.

Despite the optimistic date for the American departure from this country, the V.I.P. visit is regarded here as having been somewhat of a victory for Ambassador Lodge. For it is believed here that Mr. Lodge impressed deeply on Secretary McNamara the extreme seriousness of the political situation, the fact that political and military aspects could not be separated, and that even the military outlook was not overly bright.

RISKS KNOWN

From now on, according to sources here, Washington knows full well what it is walking into and what risks it is taking. It knows just how tough the political-military situation is and that the political part is omnipresent.

There was one moment in the briefings by Mr. Sylvester, a moment of great importance in discussing this war. It came in the first 2 days when Mr. Sylvester was most optimistic and had just said that all indices were favorable.

If that were so, asked a reporter, perhaps there was an explanation for one baffling statistic—that each year the Government wiped out about half the hard-core Vietcong estimated to exist at the beginning of that year, only to find at the end of the year there were more Vietcong than ever before?

Mr. Sylvester said he did not know the answer, but at any rate it was a good question.

It is a good question, one that has eluded many American senior advisers here now, just as in considerably different days it eluded the French. It is one reason that this war grinds on and why even the finest helicopters and finest advisers and finest rifles have their limitations. For to some degree, probably a large degree, this remains a fight for men's minds as well, a subtle Asian game in which the enemy is practiced and cunning.

ONE VIEW

There is, of course, one way to look at Vietnam, and that is that the enemy is the Communists and therefore, the idea is to kill Communists; Ngo Dinh Diem and Ngo Dinh Nhu are anti-Communists and their troops are fighting the Communists. All this is true, but it is not the way the Vietnamese look at it. Nor do the Vietnamese, even anti-Communist ones, feel that the war is going well.

Rather, and this is coming from sophisticated anti-Communists who are actively engaged in this war, there is now a fear that this can turn into an ugly meat-grinder war, where one side's military superiority is matched against the other side's political superiority. South Vietnam's Vietcong do not call themselves Communist; they are only the critics of the Government's mistakes, albeit mistreatment of Buddhists or a greedy local official.

The sophisticated anti-Communist Vietnamese now fear that the Americans may be setting the stage for a frustrating, elusive type of war where more American prestige is involved than American control.

Just how much the political affects the war is difficult to tell. It is not a country where entire regiments throw down their weapons, as long as they are paid and are not harassed unnecessarily. Nor is it a country where the Vietnamese are likely to turn to Americans and note that they will not take risks because they are Buddhists and do not love the Government. Sometimes Vietnam seems to be more a country of impressions than of facts as Westerners know facts.

ICY REMINDERS

Yet in evaluating the political impact on the military, here are some icy reminders:

1. As a general rule, the longer a person stays in Vietnam the more he becomes convinced that the political aspect is very real and very important, that there is a direct relationship between the way the Ngo family government operates and some very basic problems in this war. This is not simply exposure to an admittedly unhealthy and neurotic political atmosphere in Saigon, but in fact a product of regular visits to the countryside and a tracing back of problems there to political origins.

2. The more a man stays here, the more he is apt to become concerned with what he considers the basic problem of the Government's reaction to its challenges, and come to feel that the flexibility and responsiveness needed for complex and cruel challenge are simply missing, as is perhaps an ability to

place the best possible personnel in the most difficult situations.

There is considerable pride at stake here, and, be it removal of the small outposts in the Mekong Delta, which actually serve the Vietcong as weapon supply points—or admission of responsibility for the incident in Hue last May that started the Buddhist crisis, there is, in the view of many observers, a desperate absence of some of the qualities needed to win. There is around the palace today a vast cocoon of intrigue, suspicion, distrust, separating the family from what it needs to be told and the people who are willing to tell it.

TWO ASPECTS

There are in a war like this two aspects of the political situation which are important. First is the popularity of the Government itself. In this situation, the Government is considered extremely isolated and has created a situation where its main and perhaps only remaining claim to power is through police-state methods. This is certainly true of governments throughout the world, particularly in underdeveloped areas, but most such governments are not faced with a situation where, because of the nature of the war, police techniques may be something of a handicap.

There has been relatively little tangible evidence of any effect of the Buddhist crisis. Yet knowledgeable Vietnamese say effect cannot be underestimated, that it has already affected the morale of officers and civil servants.

SERIOUS SITUATION

They are reporting, and so are some American intelligence and political officers, that the feeling in the countryside is extremely serious, that the people are more susceptible than ever to Vietcong propaganda. According to these sources, it is already affecting the civil servants and it is becoming harder to get civil servants to go out in the field. Similarly, Vietnamese are warning that there is a subtle change in feeling among young officers and less willingness to take risks.

These Vietnamese are warning that, if Americans are aware of the Government's shortcomings and police methods, then the Vietnamese themselves are even more aware of these shortcomings. The Vietnamese are warning not to underestimate the rural political consciousness, even though for Westeners there may be few evident signs of it.

VOICE OF AMERICA

There are people in the villages with radios—often given by the United States and agencies—and the peasants listen to the Voice of America and hear reports of the Buddhist and political crises. They also hear about the crises from the Buddhists, themselves, and from the Vietcong, who make propaganda from Saigon's troubles.

A second aspect of the political problems of this country is the way the Government itself reacts: The way it names commanders in vital sections for political reasons; the way it stamps its own tactical doctrines on these commanders, inhibiting enterprise, creating in them a fear of taking risks and of casualties in the field. The way it starts programs in one area only to change its mind midway and shift resources to another area.

HEAVY FIGHTING

It is a blunt fact of this war that most of the fighting is now in the Mekong Delta region, where the Vietcong are becoming increasingly aggressive and well armed. Similarly, it is a blunt fact that the Government's commander of the delta is a man generally looked down on by his Vietnamese military contemporaries as a political officer sensitive to the palace winds and militarily cautious. It is also a blunt fact that, in the past, American leverage in a situation of this sort has been minimal, either in changing commanders or changing tactics.

It is also a fact that, while some of the political problems of Saigon do not reach to countryside, a government such as this does not necessarily create 42 provincial chiefs all with an instinct for the needs of the people. There are provincial chiefs who have that instinct, and in these instances the military and political program often goes well. But too often these men are the exception, and too many of the provincial chiefs have their jobs chiefly because they are loyal and only secondly under a merit system.

MRS. NHU'S FATHER SAYS AID CUT COULD INFLUENCE SAIGON'S POLICY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Tran Van Chuong, the former Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, has the respect of the citizens of this country for his courage in resigning his position, to protest the autocratic practices of the Diem government. This decision was made much more difficult by the fact that, in resigning, Mr. Chuong was severing family connections, since he is the father of Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu. Mrs. Chuong, Mrs. Nhu's mother, also resigned her position as South Vietnamese observer at the United Nations, at the same time.

Although it must be painful for Mr. Chuong to speak, the citizens of the United States owe him a debt of gratitude for presenting his analysis of events in South Vietnam. Mrs. Nhu will receive extensive opportunity to present the viewpoint of the Diem-Nhu government, during her visit to the United States. It is good that a man as knowledgeable about Vietnamese affairs as Mr. Chuong is willing to speak out in order to give perspective to Mrs. Nhu's comments. On October 8, at the Harvard Club of New York, Mr. Chuong called for a selective cut in American aid to South Vietnam, saying that this pressure might "make even the present Government better." I ask unanimous consent to have a news article reporting on Mr. Chuong's speech, from the October 9 issue of the New York Times, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1963]

MRS. NHU'S FATHER SAYS AID CUT COULD INFLUENCE SAIGON'S POLICY

South Vietnam's former Ambassador to the United States, who is also the father of Mrs. Ngo Dinh Nhu, called yesterday for a "selective" cut in American foreign aid to his country.

Tran Van Chuong said that threats to end all such aid would not be taken seriously in South Vietnam "because of the effect such an action would have on the war effort" against the Communist Vietcong guerrillas.

But a selective cut, he said, might apply enough pressure to "make even the present Government better." He did not detail the cuts that should be made.

The former envoy spoke at a luncheon at the Harvard Club given by the American Friends of Vietnam. About 50 persons attended.

Tran Van Chuong resigned August 22 because of Saigon's harsh policy toward Buddhists and other dissenters against official policy. His wife resigned as the South Vietnamese observer at the United Nations.

He said neither of them would see their daughter during her stay in the United States. They may, however, visit their 17-year-old granddaughter, Le Thuy.

Tran Van Chuong compared the present Government in Saigon with a physician who says "the patient has a heart attack, a tumor on the brain and very dark spots on the lungs, but his feet and arms work well."

President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam is a "devoted Roman Catholic with the mind of a medieval inquisitor," he said, and added that there was "no possibility of ever winning the war under the present regime."

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, according to the morning newspapers, it seems fairly apparent that the Russians have asked us for several millions of tons of American wheat. It also seems obvious that the Kennedy administration is about to accede to this request, regardless of what effect that might have on bailing our cold war enemy out of a jam on its homefront.

I should like to say that I believe it is entirely possible for the United States to benefit from the proposed sale of millions of tons of wheat to the Soviet Union—provided the price is right.

The price I speak of, Mr. President, goes beyond the dollars and cents consideration, even though it is very important to the hard-pressed American taxpayer. No, I am speaking of a price which could weigh on the side of freedom. I am speaking of a price which could go to the heart of the problem of world tensions, about which we have heard so much recent discussion. It goes to the need for positive, demonstrable action by the Soviet Union to prove its good faith in these current and rapidly moving arrangements between East and West.

I believe that Russia should initially be made to pay the full U.S. price for the wheat, so that our taxpayers who have subsidized the wheat at upwards of 50 cents a bushel do not have to pick up a part of the Khrushchev tab.

But far more important, Mr. President, I believe Mr. Khrushchev should be made to remove immediately—not next year, at a political time, but immediately—his Soviet troops and military equipment from the island of Cuba. I suggest this is the least price we should charge for helping out Mr. Khrushchev in his hour of need.

TRIP BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO BILLINGS AND GREAT FALLS, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several weeks ago, during the trip by the President of the United States to the Northwest, we in Montana were honored to have him stop at both Billings and Great Falls. The people of Montana as a whole, regardless of political affiliation, were highly pleased to see the President of the United States. During the course of his speech at the fairgrounds in Billings, Mont., the President paraphrased Thoreau, by saying, "I walk toward Montana." We appreciate very much his sentiments, his speeches, and his presence.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD various editorials and articles which were published in Montana newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Billings Gazette, Sept. 26, 1963]

A Warm Welcome for the President

It was a gala occasion at the fairgrounds yesterday when Billings welcomed a smiling and personable President Kennedy who 3 years ago called on us in a bid for our votes.

The trip this time was billed as nonpolitical, a not unusual label for Presidential tours, but regardless of purpose, it was gratifying to have him with us and hear what he said about developing the natural resources of the West.

Federal policy on resource development is vital to a State like Montana with 37 percent of its land controlled by the Federal Government. Timber, mineral, and recreation resources on the public domain provide jobs for thousands of Montanans in the mining, lumbering, oil, and tourist industries and account for much of our annual income.

Thus it was encouraging to hear and read President Kennedy's statement that the Nation's natural resources program needs some of the national effort and purpose put into the development of the atomic bomb.

It was pleasing, no doubt, to the President, to receive such a warm welcome upon his arrival in Billings. The occasion brought Democratic dignitaries here from throughout Montana as well as Wyoming, and should be an inspiration for party workers.

[From the Great Falls Tribune, Sept. 26, 1963]

Land of Shining Mountains Bids the President Welcome

We are happy to join in the enthusiastic welcome that all Montana is extending to the President of the United States. We are appreciative of his inclusion of Great Falls on his speaking schedule. We regret only that the pressure of his responsibilities does not permit him to stay longer. Many have found surcease from stresses among the mountains, streams, and forests of our Treasure State's recreation wonderland.

It is particularly fitting that President Kennedy should have started his conservation tour by stopping in Pennsylvania to dedicate the ancestral home of Gifford Pinchot to the further service of conservation. Pinchot, first Chief of the Forest Service, and adviser to President Theodore Roosevelt, was America's foremost conservationist.

Pinchot once said: "A nation deprived of liberty may win it, a nation divided may reunite, but a nation whose natural resources are destroyed must inevitably pay the penalty of poverty, degradation and decay."

It is also fitting that the President should have included Montana in his conservation tour. Montanans have, since our early pioneers cleared the frontier, always thought and acted to conserve our valued land and water riches. Hence, we can readily appreciate the development of the New Frontier in conservation, reclamation, and recreation which President Kennedy so vigorously espouses.

So the President's plea to preserve our national heritage will find sympathetic hearers. And seeing at firsthand how much our Land of the Shining Mountains has to offer should give him an increased awareness of Montana's important role in his program.

[From the Montana Standard-Post, Sept. 29, 1963]

President's Vision—Montanans Enjoy Sharing It

When President John F. Kennedy said in Great Falls that he would like to make the Northwest of which Montana is a part "a garden to attract people from all over the United States and the world," he was not thinking of a rose garden.

What he had in mind appears in other parts of his Great Falls speech—something more on the order of a vegetable garden, which combines beauty to delight the eye with productivity to satisfy more material appetites.

The President spoke of harnessing rivers, reclaiming and irrigating land; of a "partnership" in which farmers and Government "will improve this rich land through science."

He related Northwest development with the kind of world which would result from easing of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, a world of continuing competition "in the fields of productivity, education, economic growth, culture, and happiness."

We have had Presidents who did not seem to know exactly where Montana is, what it contains, what could be done with it and for it. This one—and we have to believe his information stems in large part from members of our congressional delegation who obviously have his ear—came to our State with realization of its size, its resources, and its potentialities.

From that knowledge the President projects a vision which Montanans enjoy sharing with him.

To materialize that vision remains primarily the task of Montanans themselves. In one area of that task, the President offers a "partnership," a proper offer from the Chief Executive of the Nation of which Montana is a part.

But those who have planned and created gardens know well enough that the indispensable ingredient in productivity is good, hard digging.

The gardener may or may not have a rich uncle who wishes him well and admires his work and would like to contribute something, but the hands of the rich uncle seldom fit the handle of the spade, the rake, and the hoe.

In the last analysis, the President leaves with us not the prospect of what he can do for us, but the vision which he shares with us of what we could do for ourselves, perhaps with some help given freely or at a fair price.

[From the Helena Independent Record, Sept. 25, 1963]

Welcome to President Kennedy

Montana is honored by having as its distinguished guest today the President of the United States.

We think that citizens of all political beliefs are putting aside their differences to give President Kennedy a real western greeting.

The visit of a President is not a common occurrence and the Treasure State should go all out to show that we are glad that Mr. Kennedy is here and we hope that he comes again.

The fact that we are off the beaten path is what makes the visit so rare. In these days of air transport the small communities see less and less of the great and near great personalities of the day.

Time was when the President traveled by train and he couldn't get across this vast domain without having to make a number of stops. That was why the ordinary citizen out here in the sticks probably saw more of the Roosevelts, Wilson, Coolidge, Hoover, and the other Presidents of the last generation than they do of those who soar through the stratosphere.

In that day, too, our fishing streams could compete as an attraction, but today one must have a seashore and a saltwater yacht basin in order to attract Presidential vacationers.

But let us hope that our pleasant fall weather continues for another 24 hours and perhaps we will make such an impression on Mr. Kennedy that he will want to come back oftener and stay longer.

And so, just for today, we join the thousands of Montanans who are extending a nonpolitical welcome to their own President.

[From the Montana Standard, Sept. 29, 1963]

J.F.K. Saw Montana's Best Face

(By Thomas E. Mooney)

Great Falls.—The Big Sky country put its best autumn face forward Thursday when President Kennedy paid his second visit in as many days to the Treasure State.

And thousands upon thousands of Montanans sat in 80°-plus September sun for hours to see and hear the Chief Executive of the country in an appearance here. He spoke in Billings Wednesday.

GAY, COLORFUL, POLITE

Many in the stadium crowd—best estimate in my opinion was about 15,000 persons—sat under the warm sun for nearly 2 hours, awaiting the Chief Executive's arrival. It was a gay crowd, colorful, enthusiastic, and polite. Scores of police, highway patrolmen, deputy sheriffs, and special officers lined the route of the auto cavalcade from the airport to the stadium and were on duty inside the stadium itself.

Temporary fencing was strategically placed in the stadium, separating a 1,600-seat reserved section from the rest of the football field. The reserved area faced the speaker's stand, as did a special stand for photographers. Added to the members of the professional picture-taking corps were hundreds of amateurs who snapped shots from here and there as the program developed.

The crowd, huge for Montana, enjoyed the warm sunshine and presented a gala air. One was impressed with a feeling that many of them—and some had come 100 miles or more—just wanted to see the President. There were indications that it really didn't matter too much what the President said—the mere fact that he was in Montana on a glorious autumn day was sufficient.

There were cries of, "There he is, there he is" when the Presidential party drove into the stadium with its motorcycle escort. There was a craning of necks as the big crowd stood in a spirit of welcome—not a wildly enthusiastic western welcome, but an applause-filled, spontaneous welcome for the Nation's leader.

TEENAGERS HEARD

The latter was compounded by the scores and scores of shrill-voiced teenagers and subteenagers, who made up a big portion of the stadium crowd.

The reserved section held State dignitaries, other than those who were with the official party. It also included legislators, members of the Supreme Court, county Democratic officials, former lawmakers, many Republicans, and just Montanans in general.

Applause for those on the speakers' stand, who included congressional delegation members Mansfield, Metcalf, and Olsen, as well as the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, and Gov. Tim Babcock, was rather evenly divided—although the audience continually had to strain to hear what was said, due to use of a loudspeaker system that certainly left much to be desired.

Other than the President, the loudest applause seemed to be for Senator Mike Mansfield, who always draws a popular reception in his home State.

YOUTH AND GRACE

I, like many of my friends who sat in the reserved section, was impressed by the President's extremely youthful appearance, his grace in meeting the youngsters in the audience, his tact in stopping the auto caravan as it was about to leave the stadium to chat with the former Democratic Chairman, Harry J. McGregor, who sat in a wheelchair.

I must confess that much of the President's speech was lost to me. By straining, I could hear parts here and there. But his delivery was sincere and he frequently was interrupted by applause.

TEXT IGNORED

Since he departed almost completely from his original text, he presented something of a problem to several of the newsmen in the Presidential party.

Only a few of the newsmen actually reported what was being said in Great Falls. One unbiased listener told me later he was amazed at the difference between early reports of the Friday afternoon appearance and the actual speech itself.

The whole crowd appeared to have enjoyed the day. The cloudless sky, the hot sun, the gentle breeze which occasionally stirred leaves on trees in nearby yards and parks, all added to the festive air.

And as the Kennedy cavalcade pulled out of the stadium, there arose from the crowd a single, youthful, female voice:

"Goodby, Jack."

PROMISING DEVELOPMENTS IN FOREIGN AID

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in recent years the American people and Congress have been quite properly concerned by the reluctance of many of the prosperous free nations to accept a fair share of the burden of assisting the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We have felt, quite rightly, that other advanced free nations have no less at stake than we in the economic development of the poorer countries under free institutions. Again and again, we have encouraged our free world partners to join us in a cooperative effort in the field of foreign aid.

Their response, though not yet adequate, is nonetheless encouraging. Year by year, many of the industrial countries of the free world have been providing a growing volume of development assistance on increasingly liberal terms. This assistance has been provided both through bilateral programs and through the international lending institutions.

I wish today to call the attention of the Senate to two recent documents which illustrate this encouraging trend: A white paper issued by the British Government showing the increasing efforts of the United Kingdom in the field of foreign aid and a speech delivered by George D. Woods, president of the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, and the International Development Association, pointing out the significant contributions and still greater prospects of these institutions.

The British white paper issued in September 1963, points out that Great Britain's aid program doubled in size between 1957–58 and 1961–62. Disbursements totaled $414 million in 1962–63 and it is estimated that they will total between $504 million and $616 million in 1963–64. In addition, Britain intends to extend the maximum repayment period for loans from 25 to 30 years, with grace periods of up to 10 years, and also, in certain instances, to waive interest payments and defer capital repayments for a period of 7 years.

The amounts of British aid are, of course, small in proportion to those of the United States and the loan terms are less liberal. The direction of the British aid program, however, is encouraging—toward considerably greater amounts on increasingly generous terms.

In his speech before the boards of governors of the international lending institutions on September 30, President Woods welcomed the willingness of the capital-exporting countries to increase their contributions in support of the International Development Association, which will enable IDA to operate at a higher level. Calling for expanded efforts in the fields of industry, agriculture, and technical assistance to education in the less developed countries, Mr. Woods urged the board of governors to "take the fullest possible advantage of the strong financial position in which the Bank now finds itself. We should not hoard our strength," he said, "we should use it." Mr. Woods called specifically for more liberal lending terms, with longer grace periods and longer repayment periods.

These developments and prospects in the foreign aid efforts of our free world partners should encourage us to sustain our own efforts in this important area of our foreign policy. I commend particularly to my colleagues' attention the following excerpt from President Woods' speech:

> So far as the capital-exporting countries are concerned, each year a little more of their growing strength is put at the disposal of the developing world. The flow of development assistance now comes from more sources than ever before; it is better coordinated than in the past; and, over the last 5 years, the amount of assistance has risen by more than 50 percent.
>
> This aid needs to be continued, and on an increasing scale. Equally important, the terms on which it is provided, although now somewhat better than in the past, still need to be improved. The efforts of the Bank and IDA to alleviate the problems posed by the debt structure of our less developed members will be of little avail unless bilateral aid is more generally available on terms reflecting the recipients' legitimate needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a summary of the British White Paper, "Aid to Developing Countries," provided by British Information Services, and also the text of President George D. Woods' address of September 30 to the Boards of Governors of the World Bank, International Finance Corporation, and International Development Association.

There being no objection, the summary and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the British Record, Sept. 20, 1963]

AID TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

A Government white paper "Aid to Developing Countries," was published on September 17, the first since 1960 to give a comprehensive account of Britain's aid program.[1] This supplement sets out the main points of the white paper.

The difference between the standards of living in the industrialized and the developing nations has increased rather than diminished, and the task of helping the developing nations must continue until such time as they can achieve a self-sustained economic growth. In this task the principal donors are the industrialized nations of the free world. This total flow of resources from these nations is currently running at nearly $8.4 billion a year, of which some $5.6 billion comes from public funds. The United States of America contributes well over half of this sum: the other principal donors being Britain, France, and Germany.

PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The British private investor has played a leading part in the economic development of the world; for example, the development of America, North and South, owed much to funds invested from Britain. British investment still plays a vigorous part in the growth of developing nations, the level of British investment being, in relation to the national income, among the highest in the world. Of some $840 million a year invested overseas, something like half is invested in less developed countries, mainly in the Commonwealth. This does not include private commercial credits extended to oversea importers.

BILATERAL GOVERNMENT AID

Britain's ability to maintain, and perhaps increase, the size of its aid program depends on the soundness of its domestic economy. The large, increasing calls for improved social services and amenities and the cost of defense constitute a formidable burden on domestic expenditure. In addition, Government expenditure overseas is running at $1.4 billion a year, one of the largest items being the substantial disbursement of economic aid to developing countries.

Since the war, Britain has disbursed a total of $3.8 billion in oversea aid. Disbursements in 1961–62 totaled $448 million and in 1962–63, $414 million; the best estimate for 1963–64 is somewhere between $504 and $616 million. The British aid program doubled in size between 1957–58 and 1961–62. This is the fastest rate of growth of any sector of Government expenditure of comparable size. The amount of aid that can be provided depends primarily on the balance-of-payments position, but annual expenditure on aid is now large enough to have implications for the budget as well as for the balance of payments and, in deciding what it can afford to spend on aid, the Government has to take into account the trend in public expenditure as a whole and the general state of the economy. Aid tied to purchases of British goods and services, especially when there is surplus industrial capacity, imposes less of a charge on the balance of payments than untied aid which can be spent anywhere. The part of British capital aid that is formally tied consists of loans to independent countries of the Commonwealth and to foreign countries. This represents about one-quarter of the total expenditure on aid. The remainder of British capital aid consists of loans and grants to colonial territories and of grants to some newly independent Commonwealth countries and one or two foreign countries. It amounts to rather more than half of all aid expenditure at present. British multilateral aid is not tied. Although British aid is tied in part, the Government is prepared to join in any genuine international move toward the untying of aid.

Notwithstanding the argument in favor of untied aid, there are occasions when it is sensible for an industrialized nation to finance the supply of aid from surplus productive capacity. The British Government has recently taken steps to do this, as a temporary measure, and something like $42 million of additional aid has recently been offered under such arrangements.

---

[1] Cmnd. 2147, "Aid to Developing Countries," price 60 cents. The previous white paper was Cmnd. 974, "Assistance from the United Kingdom for Overseas Development," of Mar. 14, 1960. Price, 20 cents.

Rather more than half of Britain's aid expenditure takes the form of outright grants and about 80 percent of British loans have been made available for periods of 20 years or more, at a rate of interest at which the Government itself can borrow, plus a small service charge. Hitherto, the maximum period has been 25 years, with 7 years grace before repayment starts. For the future, Britain will, in suitable cases, make loans for up to 30 years, with grace periods before repayment of up to 10 years. Further, in selected cases, the Government is prepared to waive interest for the first 7 years as well as deferring capital repayments. Concessions of this sort would reduce from, say, 5½ to below 3 percent, the effective rate of interest on a 25-year loan. But these facilities can be offered only where they are absolutely necessary; if they were offered widely, it might impair Britain's ability to maintain its expenditure on aid.

CAPITAL AID

Aid to colonial territories

Assistance to the dependent territories must be the first charge on the British aid program. Bilateral aid to colonial territories rose from $161 million in 1959–60 to over $267 million in 1961–62. In 1962–63 it was $170 million. (Since the last white paper was published in 1960, 9 territories then dependent have become independent.) Assistance takes several forms: Budgetary assistance is given to a number of territories which, for lack of revenue, cannot maintain a reasonable level of administration and resources without outside assistance. Over 20 territories are currently receiving grants totaling some $36 million a year. Assistance under the Colonial Development and Welfare Acts is provided to supplement specific projects or general development programs drawn up, and partly financed, by the colonial governments. Aid may take the form of outright grants or of loans. Some $882 million have been allocated between 1946 and 1964 in respect of specific colonial development and welfare schemes. A further $70 million has been added for the period up to March 1966. The Commonwealth Development Corp., established as a public company in 1948 (then the Colonial Development Corp.), undertakes the financing on a commercial basis, on its own or in association with private enterprise, of a wide range of projects within the dependent territories and in those Commonwealth territories that have become independent since the passing of the act. Long-term advances outstanding at the end of 1962 totaled about $257.6 million.

Aid to independent Commonwealth countries

The pace at which colonial territories have moved toward independence has quickened in recent years and the timing of each move has been determined primarily by political factors. Some emerging territories have faced, and are facing, difficult economic problems. Dependent territories must have first call on the available resources, but Britain is determined to assist independent countries for which she was formerly responsible insofar as she is able. At the time of independence it is customary for the British Government to offer a financial settlement to include an amount which broadly reflects what the territory would have received under the current colonial development and welfare loan had it not become independent; independent countries may also receive loans for the purchase of goods and services under the Export Guarantees Act; the Commonwealth Development Corp. (see above) is now empowered to invest in all countries in which it could invest when they were dependent territories. To supplement these sources a new policy of commonwealth assistance loans was introduced in 1958. As a result of the new facilities now available and of the accelerated move toward independence, British capital loans to independent Commonwealth countries rose from $10.6 million in 1957–58 to $145.6 million in 1962–63.

The following are examples of assistance given during recent years to certain independent Commonwealth countries: British pledges in respect of loans to India since the beginning of her third 5-year plan (1961–65) amount to $350 million; between 1959 and 1962 the British Government made loans to Pakistan totaling $98 million; the British contribution to the Indus Basin Development Fund, organized under the auspices of the International Bank, is $58 million; since 1950, Britain has contributed over $840 million in capital aid, apart from some $25 million in technical assistance, under the Colombo plan, which began as a Commonwealth initiative and now embraces all the developing countries in south and southeast Asia; a tied loan of some $14 million was advanced toward the Volta hydroelectric scheme in Ghana; Britain has provided over $89.6 million in loans to Nigeria since the became independent in 1960; assistance to Sierra Leone has totaled $18.2 million; to Tanganyika $54 million, over half in outright grants; to Uganda over $35 million; the East-Africa Common Services Organization has been lent some $17 million and aid to Cyprus since 1960 has amounted to some $54 million. In May 1960 the Commonwealth Economic Consultative Council decided to set up a special Commonwealth African assistance plan to focus attention on aid and to help raise the standard of life in the less developed Commonwealth countries in Africa.

Aid to foreign countries

Bilateral aid to non-Commonwealth countries rose from $28.8 million in 1957–58 to $42 million in 1962–63. Much of this aid still goes to countries with whom Britain has historical links, such as Jordan. In the past 3 years, however, the geographical distribution has been broadened. Surplus capacity loans totaling $10.8 million have been offered in recent months to Chile, the Cameroon Republic, Algeria, Senegal, Syria, Afghanistan, Vietnam, and Korea. Laos has received a grant of $10.1 million, and the Sudan a loan of $14 million. Nepal is being granted $2.8 million, together with a loan of $2.2 million, mainly for electrification. A loan of $10.8 million is being made to Turkey under the aegis of the OECD consortium.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

For most developing countries, capital aid in itself is not sufficient to insure economic and social progress; they also need technical skills, and assistance with training their people in these skills. In 1961 the Government set up the department of technical cooperation to coordinate and direct British activities in this field. Technical assistance is now being provided to over 100 countries. Expenditure, including contributions to international agencies but omitting the expenses of the DTC, is estimated at $84 million in 1963–64, a more than sixfold increase since 1957–58.

The oversea service aid scheme, by which Britain assists dependent territories to retain the services of experienced British officials after gaining independence, accounts for about half the present expenditure on technical assistance. Some 15,400 officials are covered by the scheme. In 1962 the Government decided that the future recruitment of administrators, technicians, doctors, etc., could be more effectively arranged by taking people for limited periods of service overseas rather than as members of a career oversea service. Recruitment is handled by the DTC in cooperation with other Government agencies. A total of 1,637 appointments were made in 1962. Substantial support is given to societies sending young people for voluntary service overseas. In 1963, 250 graduates and 300 school-leavers are going abroad. In 1964 the numbers will be 500 and 300 respectively. Developing countries attach the greatest importance to the development of educational systems at all levels. Britain helps by advice; by aid and equipment (in cooperation with British industry $1.8 million is being provided for equipment for the Delhi College of Engineering); by assisting with the teaching of English; by the supply of teachers in general (some 750 nonuniversity teachers left Britain in 1961–62 to work in developing countries, and the numbers have increased since then); and with facilities for study in Britain (there are more than 60,000 full-time oversea students in Britain, two-thirds of them from developing countries). The Government also gives significant support for research bearing on economic and social problems. In the current financial year the cost is over $5.6 million. Experts in the field of medicine are recruited for service overseas and oversea students trained in British medical schools. Assistance is given in agriculture, in the carrying out of topographical and geological surveys and in the preparation of development projects and programs. Close contact is maintained with such agencies as the Working Group on Technical Cooperation of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee.

MULTILATERAL AID

Britain is a firm supporter of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and of its two affiliates, the International Development Association and the International Finance Corporation. It has paid in $260 million (the 10 percent of subscriptions which has been called up) to the IBRD and the Bank has raised some $56 million through the issue of bonds in London. Britain's initial subscription to the IDA is $131.6 million, and to the IFC $14.3 million.

The decision of the United Nation's General Assembly to designate the 1960's the development decade was warmly supported by Britain and the British Government has responded in a number of ways, e.g., by a substantial contribution to the world food program. Britain is a major contributor to the United Nations regular budget, which contains provision for technical assistance in various fields, and also to the specialized agencies, whose activities are directed largely to solving the problems of the underdeveloped countries. It participates in the aid programs of the OECD and cooperates fully with the Commission for Technical Cooperation in Africa.

Government aid disbursements in 1962–63 (provisional)

[In millions of dollars]

	Grants	Loans	Total
Bilateral aid:			
Colonial territories	113.1	56.6	169.7
Independent Commonwealth	57.7	116.8	174.5
Other countries	24.4	17.6	42.0
Total bilateral aid			386.2
Multilateral aid			27.7
Total aid			413.9

ADDRESS TO THE BOARDS OF GOVERNORS BY MR. GEORGE D. WOODS, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD BANK, INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, SEPTEMBER 30, 1963

Mr. Chairman, this is in many respects a notable occasion. It is notable as the largest assemblage of financial leaders ever to gather together anywhere in the world. I am happy to bid you all welcome—and particularly to associate myself with the greetings extended by the chairman to the 20 new nations, most of them from Africa, which have joined our membership since we last met.

This occasion is notable, too, for its absences. We miss Per Jacobsson, in whose death the world lost a devoted and uniquely competent public servant. My friend, Mr. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, has stepped into large shoes, but I am confident that they will fit him comfortably. We have had several visits, and I look forward to the Fund and the Bank working together in close collaboration at all levels.

Absent, too, on this occasion is Eugene Black, who is engaged on one of the new assignments he has undertaken. It was to a large extent his imaginative leadership which made the Bank what it is today. The tributes paid to him last year need no gilding from me. I want only to record that the Bank and its member countries are deeply in his debt.

The Bank and the Fund, under Eugene Black and Per Jacobsson, became strong and powerful instruments in the world's struggle against poverty, instability, and ignorance. But that battle has just begun. Indeed, what really makes this occasion notable is the urgency of the problems that still press in on us and the readiness of our members, if I sense their mood correctly, to explore new ways by which our institutions can more effectively meet those problems.

In talking to you this morning, it is my intention to concentrate primarily on the future opportunities for the Bank, as I see them, rather than on the record already made. That record is set out in detail in the annual reports of the Bank and its affiliates and I want only to comment on a few highlights of the past year.

First of all, I want to welcome the willingness of the capital-exporting countries to continue and increase their annual contributions in support of the International Development Association. The proposal which the executive directors have submitted to the governors on this matter constitutes a heartening endorsement of the multilateral approach as the most effective means of providing development assistance on an objective, nonpolitical basis. Whereas the $750 million of convertible funds in IDA's initial resources were payable by part I countries over a period of 5 years, this proposal calls for an additional $750 million to be contributed in a period of only 3 years. This is a significant acceleration in contributions which I hope will permit IDA to maintain its operations at the higher level they are now reaching. We are aware that the demand for IDA funds will in all probability exceed the supply, and its policies should therefore be kept under constant review.

Let me also draw your attention to the variety of the operations of the International Finance Corporation. The Corporation obtained wider private participation in its investments than in any previous year. It continued to make loans to private industrial enterprises, but in addition it used in several ways the new powers of equity investment you gave it 2 years ago. It made investments in the share capital of industrial companies and entered into standby agreements in connection with the issue of shares and of debentures as well. It also successfully liquidated its first underwriting commitment, made in the previous year, in respect of a share issue.

Another significant development during the year has been the growing activity of the Bank group of institutions, under the leadership of IFC, in the establishment and support of local private industrial finance companies. In this field, IFC's ability to acquire equities has opened substantial new opportunities by making possible joint action by IFC and the Bank or IDA.

Finally, let me make an observation about the volume of Bank lending. At $442 million it was considerably lower for the fiscal year ended last June 30 than it was in the previous fiscal year. However, in the 3 months since June 30, we have approved additional loans amounting to $350 million, and our pipeline is full. From where I sit, the prospect is not for a downward trend in the Bank's operations.

Mr. Chairman, one advantage of a change of command such as we have now had in the Bank and its affiliated organizations is that it provides an opportunity to take stock of our position, to look afresh at our organization and at our problems and policies. And since our problems are to a large extent those of the developing countries, we must look first at their situation.

Despite the voices of pessimism, there is no doubt in my mind that a considerable advance has been made by the underdeveloped countries in the postwar period. Over the last 15 years their industrial production has risen 2½ times and agricultural production by almost 40 percent. By historical standards, this is a notable achievement. Not only do many underdeveloped countries have a substantial record of growth in production and investment, but equally important, an impressive fund of experience and skill has been created. The time is not too distant, I believe, when some countries which are now themselves struggling with the problems of development will be helping others less advanced. A few such instances are indeed already emerging. This is the best proof, if proof were needed, that achieving sustained economic growth in the developing nations is not a task without end or without hope.

But the development problems still facing us are huge. If anything, the need to quicken the tempo of economic growth is now more urgent than ever, simply because aspirations for progress are now so universal. In many underdeveloped nations the rate of progress remains discouragingly slow. And there are many new nations taking up the reins of their own affairs for the first time which are joining the development race far in the rear.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the occasion for trying to analyze all the many factors which serve, in varying degree in different countries, to put a brake on economic progress. There are three problems, however, which, because of their importance and the breadth of their impact, seem to me to warrant special attention. The first of these is that in too many cases the export structure is unbalanced and export earnings are not increasing at a satisfactory pace. I will call this the "commodity problem." The second is that a number of governments are burdened by heavy debt service obligations over the short and medium term. This I will call the "debt problem." Finally, there is the difficulty confronting almost all the developing countries of formulating and carrying out economic and financial policies which are effective in mobilizing and properly allocating the resources available to them for development. I will call this the "policy problem."

Let me deal first with the commodity problem. Despite considerable industrial advance since the war, most underdeveloped countries have remained dependent for their foreign exchange earnings on a limited range of primary products. Prices of these products suffer from severe fluctuations. In addition, international demand for many of them increases only moderately. In the postwar period—one of prosperity in the developed world—the export income of underdeveloped countries as a group has increased at only 3 percent per year. All evidence suggests that this is less than the growth in the needs of these countries for imports to achieve a satisfactory growth in income. Import substitution as a means of saving foreign exchange expenditure is a partial answer. If the national market is small, however, the room for efficient import substitution is limited and growth is difficult unless new exports can be developed quickly. The alternatives facing these countries are either to contain their imports and depress their income growth or to widen their exchange gap and face future balance-of-payments difficulties.

The past year has seen an upswing in commodity prices following a sharp downward movement from 1957 to 1962. But it is not clear that this recovery will be lasting and, in any case, it does not touch the problem of those countries whose exports face competition from more efficient synthetics or from agricultural production in the importing regions. It follows, therefore, that a far-reaching diversification of the production and exports of the developing countries is a basic requisite for their sound economic progress.

Turning now to the debt problem, it is common knowledge that the external obligations of the developing countries have risen considerably over the past several years. This fact by itself is not disturbing. As long as a country needs net capital inflow and can use it productively, there is nothing inconsistent between growing indebtedness and growing economic strength. Even the interest burden on the existing debt is not excessive. The disturbing factor in the current situation is the unfavorable structure of the debt for many countries. All too frequently, too much of the debt has been contracted at short or medium term, so that there is an excessive concentration of repayment obligations in the early years. In one geographic area, for example, half of the present debt has to be repaid during the next 5 years. This is a matter which needs to be given greater weight in the future in fixing the terms upon which development assistance is made available.

Finally, let me say a few words about the policy problem within the developing countries themselves. Efforts to mobilize national resources for economic development have been handicapped by political and social factors, by runaway inflation and capital flight, and by other impediments to economic growth. Ideological preconceptions in some underdeveloped countries have caused private foreign investment to hesitate or even turn away. Some of these obstacles—political expediency, inflation, ideologies—also prevent rational allocation of investible resources. Admittedly, no one can prescribe with assurance any one optimum pattern of investment. Nevertheless, the large and glamorous prestige project which is not productive or the small feeder road which is not maintained are easily recognized instances of waste. Nor is it difficult to find instances where balance-of-payments pressures can be traced to improper domestic policies. Insufficient savings efforts or inadequate fiscal and monetary policies can slow down export growth or be the main cause of external financial difficulties.

Mr. Chairman, as I have already indicated, the three problems which I have touched upon are only part of the background against which the Bank group of institutions must now formulate their future policies. To the economic difficulties they present must be added the fact that most of our new members lack the administrative structure, and are inexperienced in the techniques, necessary to carry forward the development process. To lend money to them wisely involves a much greater investment of human skills than in the case of countries with a longer experience of development administration. In some countries, too, a number of the more obvious and more easily manageable investment projects, mostly of an infrastructure nature—the large powerplants, the highway, railroad and port expansion schemes, the big irrigation projects—have already been or are being financed. These countries now have a growing need for help in other sectors, in particular in agriculture, industry, and education, which often present much greater problems of appraisal, planning, and management.

All of these considerations suggest, I believe, that the time has come when the Bank will have to add new dimensions to both its lending and technical assistance activities. We will have to be prepared, on the one hand, to give more technical advice and assistance earlier in the development process and, on the other, to follow development into its more advanced stages and to use new techniques for that purpose. This will not involve any sharp or radical change in direction. The financing of basic services which has been the bulk of our business in the past will continue to be the bulk of our business in the future. But I do suggest that, if the Bank in the next decade is to make as large a net contribution toward meeting the needs of its less developed member countries as it has up to now—and certainly this should be a minimum target—we must be ready much more often than heretofore to leave this proven ground and venture onto less familiar terrain.

If we are going to intervene earlier in the development process, for example, we are going to have to do much more to help agriculture. In a great many of our less developed member countries, agriculture employs four-fifths of the population. It also provides materials and generates the market demand which together are the basis for healthy industrial growth.

The scale of our lending for agriculture has not, in my view, been commensurate with the importance of this sector. Thus far most of it has been for large-scale irrigation, flood control or land clearance projects. I believe that we must now intensify our support of agricultural development on a broader front—through such means as helping to finance storage facilities and farm-to-market roads, and through strengthening agricultural organizations that extend credit and technical help to the farmer. Such programs are unlikely to yield quick and dramatic returns, and they will be expensive to support in terms of both manpower and administrative costs. But the need is clear and urgent.

One way, I think, in which the Bank could be especially useful is by helping to build up local agricultural credit and investment institutions, which might progressively become important channels for our financing to the agricultural sector and catalysts for a wide range of measures to raise its productivity. Such institutions, by associating technical advice and supervision with the provision of investment funds, can greatly enhance the effectiveness of both. There is an obvious analogy with the role of the industrial finance companies in many countries, with which we have developed such satisfactory relationships. The problems of agricultural financing are different, and inherently more difficult, in many ways. But if, in addition to their direct impact upon agricultural production, our loans serve also to build up vigorous, efficient national agricultural development agencies, we shall have made a valuable contribution to long-range economic progress in the borrowing countries.

We must also make our assistance to industry a good deal more versatile than it has been so far. In this way, we would contribute directly to the diversification of our members' economies and thus to an easing of what I have referred to as the commodity problem. In some cases what would be involved would be the financing of new industries, of a kind that had not existed before in the developing country. Even though these industries might be slow to gain a foothold and slow in paying out, it would often be appropriate for us to give them assistance, I believe, both for their own sake and because they would form the nucleus around which other development would take place.

Another type of assistance to industry which we are investigating is the possibility of providing, in appropriate cases, long-term financing for the import of individual pieces of equipment, components, and spare parts. Loans of this kind would be particularly valuable in cases where full use cannot be made of existing industrial capacity because there is no foreign exchange with which to buy such equipment from abroad. Qualifications may have to be applied to this idea, but an investigation of the possibilities is, I think, an important and timely task.

Still another question we are exploring is the extent to which the Bank is impeded in its efforts to help industry by the requirement of a governmental guarantee for its loans to private borrowers. Private enterprises are often reluctant to seek a Government guarantee, and governments often find it constitutionally or politically difficult to give one. It was partly for this reason that the Bank first came to be interested in industrial development finance companies; while Bank loans to them must be guaranteed, they themselves can make nonguaranteed loans to private enterprises. The creation of IFC itself was in large part prompted by the deside to give the Bank an instrument for investing without guarantee. But, notwithstanding these initiatives, I think there is need for assistance which neither IFC nor local financing companies can today provide. I have in mind cases where loan capital is required in large amounts, generally by established shareholder-owned enterprises. I am actively exploring with the Bank's executive directors the extent of this unsatisfied need and what may be the most desirable and effective means of meeting it.

Agriculture and industry are not the only fields in which I think we should expand our efforts. In particular, I believe that we will have to do more to help create the facilities necessary to the spread of education. Education is of course a valued end in itself, but it is also of central importance in the whole development process. It imparts the skills that are needed at every level of activity, from the effective use of planning techniques in Government and business right down to proper employment of simple hand tools in workshops and on farms. Secondary and vocational schools, in particular, can have a fairly rapid impact on development by providing the middle-level manpower as well as the specialists in administration, agriculture and other subjects that are so important in economic growth. IDA, as you know, already has made one credit for school construction in Tunisia, and is considering similar credits elsewhere. I believe it would now be appropriate for the Bank, too, to lend for school facilities of high economic priority.

As Mr. Black told you last year, we have also been formulating our ideas on our proper role in providing technical assistance to education. On the basis of the advice I have received, I have concluded that our help here is likely to be most effective if it is linked closely with actual Bank or IDA lending for educational facilities. On the whole, this attack, in which our technical assistance and our financing will reinforce each other, seems likely to bite deeper into the problem than an independent program of grants.

If we broaden the scope of our interests in the ways I am suggesting, we shall inevitably be led into fields which are already the primary concern of other international bodies, such as FAO, UNESCO, and the United Nations Industrialization Center. I welcome this as offering new opportunities for collaborating with other members of the United Nations family and for strengthening the already close relationships we have established with them. We do not intend to trespass where other agencies are better qualified than we. Nor do we intend to risk the dilution of our own special skills by building an ever-larger bureaucracy. Cooperation, not competition, will be our purpose, and to this end we shall, whenever feasible, join our sister agencies in the exploration and support of promising new projects.

The whole range of development problems as they are now evolving is extremely complex and we are only beginning to find the answers to them. One thing I am sure of, however: as we move out to meet these problems, we should take the fullest possible advantage of the strong financial position in which the Bank now finds itself. We should not hoard our strength, we should use it.

To use but one example, I think the Bank now not only has ample reason, but ample strength and ample experience to modify the terms of its lending, in appropriate cases, so that they will be more suitable for the new kinds of clients and the new kinds of projects that must begin to concern us. In particular instances, the grace period may need to be lengthened, to allow the project financed to be brought into full earning power, or to give a longer breathing spell to a borrower whose repayment capacity may take some years to build up. And it would be equally reasonable, in given instances, to lengthen the maturity of Bank loans which up to now have generally had a maximum life of 25 years.

Because of our strong financial position, too, the executive directors have concluded that it is no longer necessary automatically to allocate our net income, as it accrues, to the Bank's supplemental reserve. They have decided that, instead, the allocation of net income, whether to supplemental reserve or otherwise, will be considered annually after the close of the fiscal year. I welcome the action of the Governors this morning in noting that decision with approval.

Mr. Chairman, I have emphasized the new directions in which I believe the Bank must move because that is the immediate business which concerns us here today. But we must frankly recognize that the Bank's efforts are only a small part of the picture. If the tempo of development is really to be quickened, if we are really to make progress in solving the problems which I sketched at the beginning of this talk, it will call for increased determination and more effective action by national governments, both of the industrialized and of the less developed nations.

So far as the capital-exporting countries are concerned, each year a little more of their growing strength is put at the disposal of the developing world. The flow of development assistance now comes from more sources than ever before; it is better coordinated than in the past; and, over the last 5 years, the amount of assistance has risen by more than 50 percent.

This aid needs to be continued, and on an increasing scale. Equally important, the terms on which it is provided, although now somewhat better than in the past, still need to be improved. The efforts of the Bank and IDA to alleviate the problems posed by the debt structure of our less developed members will be of little avail unless bilateral aid is more generally available on terms reflecting the recipients' legitimate needs.

In addition to finance on sounder terms the developing world requires from the industrialized nations not only increasing aid, but also easier access to their markets. The primary products of many underdeveloped countries today encounter trade obstacles, be they tariffs, quotas, or internal taxes. Trade restrictions are also a serious barrier to the efforts of the developing countries to industrialize and to diversify their export structures—tasks which would be inherently difficult enough even with free access to markets. The forthcoming United Nations

Conference on Trade and Development will provide a useful opportunity for the developed countries to reexamine their trade policies vis-a-vis those less developed. The outcome of that reexamination will be of the greatest significance.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier the importance of proper resource utilization in the developing countries, what I called the policy problem. I want to revert to that subject, particularly in connection with the difficulties of project preparation and execution. Although these are a common experience everywhere, I cannot refrain from expressing my concern at the length of time which is generally necessary for our borrowers to prepare a project and make it ready for financing. Even on projects already approved, the rate of disbursement is often slow, and it seems recently to have become even slower.

This is a serious matter and we intend to investigate it thoroughly. The less developed countries cannot afford project delays if they want to realize rapid growth. If part of the trouble lies in our own procedures, we shall seek to improve them. We intend to explore, too, ways in which we may be able to help our borrowers to remove bottlenecks. No assistance from outside can be effective, however, unless the Government is itself committed to speeding up project work by simplifying administrative and other practices and by giving to it appropriate priority in the allocation of scarce personnel resources.

In some cases project delays are due to a shortage of local funds needed to supplement the foreign-financed component of investment. This raises a much wider issue of resource mobilization which time does not permit me to explore today. But plainly there is little sense in borrowing external resources if at the same time national capital is escaping abroad. We can only guess at the size of this outflow and it varies greatly from country to country, but certainly considerable funds are involved. At the initiative of one of our Executive Directors, we are considering, in collaboration with the Fund, whether there is anything that external agencies can usefully do to encourage capital repatriation.

Mr. Chairman, financial and technical assistance from the Bank and other public sources is never going to be more than marginal to the requirements of the developing countries. While we can lubricate the machinery, the chief driving power must come from elsewhere—most of all from the developing countries themselves. But there is one source in particular of which much more use can be made; I am speaking of the energies, the talents and the capital that exist in the private sectors of both the developed and underdeveloped countries. We have an obligation to do all we can to create the condition which will unlock this resource.

One proposal which we have been actively exploring with this objective in mind is the plan to establish facilities, under the umbrella of the Bank, for the conciliation and arbitration of international investment disputes. The Executive Directors, together with the staff, have had this matter under study following the request made of them by this Board of Governors at last year's annual meeting. The proposal has now been given the form of a draft convention. Over the next 6 months or so, this draft will be discussed at a series of conferences of legal experts of our member countries, to be held, through the courtesy of the four regional Economic Commissions of the United Nations, in Addis Ababa, Bangkok, Geneva, and Santiago. I have high hopes that in 1964 the Executive Directors will be able to present to this Board concrete conclusions and recommendations on this matter.

My enthusiasm for the proposal to establish a conciliation and arbitration center is simply a reflection of my interest in exploring all possible ways in which the Bank can help to widen and deepen the flow of private capital to the developing countries. It is not the business of the Bank, nor of its President, to tell the developing nations within the Bank's membership that they must accept private capital from abroad as a partner in their development efforts or what kind of price it is reasonable for them to pay in order to achieve such a partnership. Those are issues which our members, as sovereign nations, must decide for themselves. Whatever decisions they make, the Bank, as a nonpolitical international organization, must and does accept without reservation.

For my part, however, I believe that, to a great extent, the attitudes of many of the less developed countries toward foreign private investment are based on the outdated past rather than on present facts. And I am convinced that those of our members who adopt as their national policy a welcome for international investment—and that means, to mince no words about it, giving foreign investors a fair opportunity to make attractive profits—will achieve their development objectives more rapidly than those who do not. For a country which is known to be hospitable to private investment will have access over the years to a much larger and more stable pool of capital than its neighbor which relies solely on government-to-government aid. It will have access, too, to a much larger pool of industrial personnel—managerial, administrative, and technical—and to a much larger mass of scientific and technological information than it could possibly acquire in any other way. Most important of all, its economy will be stimulated and invigorated by the many different contacts, at many different levels, which a hospitable investment climate will make possible between enterprises and individuals within its own borders and those within the borders of the industrialized countries. None of these advantages is likely to be fully available to any nation whose government, however well motivated and however well administered, decides to relegate the private sector to a subordinate role.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the quality of the World Bank group and of the spirit and competence of its personnel. It is my firm intention to guard the good name and reputation of our organizations, and at the same time to strive for an ever more expert staff, for these are indeed the foundation pieces upon which our future effectiveness will rest. This morning I have deliberately sketched for you horizons for the Bank's future activities in the broadest terms. The matters I have touched on are being thoroughly studied, and it is not my intention to move with undue haste in implementing them. However, I do assume your concurrence in the broad proposition that without departing from the high standards that have served so well in the past, the Bank and its affiliates should and will advance to new plateaus of usefulness to the people of their member countries.

FOLK MUSIC

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we in Arkansas have been slightly amused by the folk singing craze that seems to have affected certain of our metropolitan areas. The Arkansas Ozarks have produced folk music and folk musicians since long before Peter, Paul, and Mary and Bob Dylan became the rage among sophisticated urban crowds. Those of us who have long known and enjoyed genuine folk music are, of course, pleased that this truly American art form is now available to the rest of the country.

Through the years Arkansas has borne the brunt of coarse and heavy handed humor directed at some of our real or imagined shortcomings. However, one quality has always been ascribed to my State—it and its people are genuine and without affectation. Its music and its musicians are no less endowed with this characteristic. There are, I am sure, as many genuine fiddlers, banjo pickers, and guitar players in northern Arkansas as anywhere else in our great Union. Fortunately for the rest of the country we are beginning to export the music they produce and more and more people are coming to Arkansas in order to savor these melodies in their native setting.

Mr. President, the time may come again when the Senate is in recess and many of my colleagues may wish to escape Washington. I can think of no finer place to relax, meditate, and to put the problems of the world into proper perspective than in the hills of Arkansas where genuine folk music can be enjoyed.

A well-written account of the hospitality and music to be found in Mountain View, Ark., appeared recently in the Memphis Commercial Appeal. I can second without reservation the endorsement given to the musicians of Stone County, Ark., by the author of the article, Mr. Paul Flowers. I commend it to my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Paul Flowers' Greenhouse

Mountain View, Ark.—Like Topsy, this thing "jes' growed." Therein lies its charm, the spontaneity of people perpetuating a tradition of their ancestors.

Each Friday evening, in the Stone County, Ark., courthouse the Rackensack Folklore Society cuts loose with a hootenanny, and even standing room is taken before the show gets underway.

With Mrs. Greenhouse, James Bobo, of Hardy, and Miss Patti Moody, of Memphis, I crashed this outbreak last week. Wild is the word for it.

Lacking the artificiality of Tin Pan Alley and Hollywood, this is folk music by and for the people who created it and preserved it in the first place, without benefit of exaggeration, a stranger to all commercialism. The only way to spend money is for soft drinks from a vending machine downstairs, or in J. R. Cook's Rainbow Restaurant for country-style provisions.

The thing was born with preliminaries for the Stone County Folk Festival last spring, but it caught on so violently that folks just kept on coming, with instruments, every Friday night, to exhibit their musical wares. Most every week, a homeboy farmer, Jim Morris, presides as master of ceremonies and does a little turn with his old handmade guitar. Away from home he's Jimmy Driftwood, who parlayed "The Battle of New Orleans" into astonishing sales figures. In Stone County he's still Jim Morris.

From a hall back of the judge's bench, singles and groups of Rackensackers file to the bar of justice, where a microphone has been set up. Perhaps Jim Morris will introduce Dave Morrison who has come all the way from Clinton, Okla., but for the most part one set of players strolls in as another set winds up, and there is no intermission.

By and by things get hot, and the dancers, unable to contain themselves any longer, leap out of seats and jig up storms in the aisle. Felix Wallace, who is none of your business how many years old, stomps up a routine that would exhaust most men half his age, and Jack Fletcher, who hardly came down in the last shower either, comes up with buck-and-wing, jigs, and whatever tunes Jimmy Ballard, of Timbo, Hershel Sutton, of Batesville, Kenneth Avery, of Timbo, or Buddy Lancaster, of Mountain View, happen to be playing.

In the aisle, while the floor shakes as if to collapse, Luther Dickson, Dale Rouse, Mrs. Carolyn Rainbolt, and Mrs. Jurd Treat jump into the act. If I can find out who built that Stone County courthouse, I will hire him to erect structures invulnerable even to the bomb.

The next morning, it starts all over again in the square, while Lloyd Westbrook, county agricultural agent, is staging and helping to judge a poultry exhibit, but Lloyd, pausing in Gerald Cain's drugstore, grabs a pickin' bow, pokes one end into his mouth which serves as a resonator and amplifier, and here we go again.

"I learned to play the pickin' bow in 20 minutes," said Lloyd, "but it took me 5 years to learn how to pat my foot."

"Humph," said Jack Fletcher, "I wore the necks off two banjers and the hosshair off of eight fiddle bows before I found out that it's all in your feet."

Later, I walked around court square with C. Edward Tudor, managing editor of the Stone County Leader, and we had to pause every few steps to let oldtimers try out the pickin' bow Jimmy Driftwood had autographed for me.

Sometimes I talk too much, and too loud. At J. R. Cook's, I ordered up sausage and hotcakes for breakfast, asking for either honey or sorghum. The waitress didn't have either * * * only homemade synthetic maple flavored stuff, but Leon Banscom, coffee breaking at an adjoining table, heard my plea.

"I've got a pickle jar of fresh sorghum out in the car," he said, "if you want it." I did, so he fetched the molasses, which like sausage, is always plural in Stone County.

A man could travel to Jakarta, Vietnam, Addis Ababa or Hyannisport and never find such accommodation. And would they do this for Ernie Dean, the old Arkansas Traveler? For Inez Robb, or Allan Trout, of Louisville, or Gene Sherman in Los Angeles, or Lowell Nussbaum in Indianapolis, or Ann Landers?

Of course they would. No stranger comes to Mountain View. You're home folks as soon as you enter the village of 902 patriots.

The Rackensackers will use these Friday night sessions to practice for the big Ozark Folk Festival at Eureka Springs October 24–25–26. They have a special interest, for their farmboy neighbor, Jim Morris, alias Jimmy Driftwood, will MC the show.

KEEP THEM OUT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, editorials continue to reach my office supporting the suggestion which I have made for an investigation into Communist infiltration of the motion picture industry. Indicative of this support is an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Herald Examiner for Tuesday, October 1, which I ask unanimous consent to be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Keep Them Out

Senator Karl Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, has urged that the Senate Internal Security Committee conduct a new investigation of Communist infiltration of the motion picture industry. His argument in support of his recommendation makes it apparent that such an investigation should be conducted at the earliest possible opportunity.

Senator Mundt, who was a member of the House committee in 1948 which conducted the Hollywood 10 hearings, is well aware of what a damaging effect can be caused by the hiring of Communists in motion picture making.

The Senator now charges that many of those identified in 1948 as Communists have been rehired by Hollywood film makers. He also pointed to the resolution passed by the American Legion at its recent convention demanding an investigation of the recapture of the film media by agents of the Communist conspiracy.

The South Dakota legislator points out that:

"They are again in a position to pervert the morals, to prejudice the thinking and to weaken the patriotic motivations of young Americans as well as adult citizens who see motion pictures."

And on another horizon he pointed to an international danger in subversive twists in American films:

"Especially in this day and age, when so many of our American motion pictures are being exported abroad, it is imperative that none of them in any way be utilized by traitorous Communists in our midst to downgrade America or to betray our constitutional concepts of freedom and justice."

Southern Californians well remember the downgrading of Americanism and loyalty to country which was caused when Communists were having their way in Hollywood film making, and how they finally were rooted out of the industry.

It is the duty of the Senate Internal Security Committee to expose what assertedly is happening today with the return of ousted Communists who have filtered back into the film industry. It is the duty of the film makers to the American public to keep these dangerous persons out of the industry.

There can be no temporizing with, or appeasement of, Communists who persistently are working for the wrecking of our free U.S. Government.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on Saturday of this week we pay homage to Columbus as well as to Italy and its people. In doing so, we extend to those of Italian origin or descent the appreciation of a grateful Nation and the heartfelt wishes for the continued resurgence of the Italian Republic.

It was 471 years ago that Columbus and his three frail ships reached the Western Hemisphere. Throughout history, few men have had to fight so desperately for their ideas and few men have been forced to face unknowns of such proportion and consequence. The heritage of Columbus, the son of a wool merchant, is indeed the heritage of a true pioneer.

We are all familiar with the challenges encountered and the hardships endured in the preparation and conduct of his journey. The financial and physical problems, however, were not the most burdensome. The responsibility for the failure of the voyage would be entirely his. Columbus was gambling not only his future, but also his life and the lives of those accompanying him. Their fate depended upon the validity of a concept generally regarded as absurd—that one could reach the East by sailing west.

Today our country also faces a future that is both challenging and uncertain. As this pioneer, whose only chart was faith, dared to face the unknown in a superstition-ridden world, we too must summon all our courage and skill in order to extract the promises and avoid the perils of life in a nuclear world. In the tradition of Columbus, we must strive to bring to all mankind a higher civilization—one noble in purpose and humanitarian in practice. At the present time, the need for men of such dedication and faith is more urgent than ever. The question now is not whether a few will succeed or fail, but whether all will perish or prevail. On this day, it is appropriate that we not only pay honor to Columbus as a man and source of inspiration, but also that we recognize the debt owed to his native land. Many Italians have brought their energies and talents to Massachusetts and the entire Nation. Their economic, cultural, and political contributions have been of immense significance in the development and prosperity of my home State.

In the achievements of Columbus, there is a lesson for us all. This adventurous Italian was willing to sacrifice personal comfort and risk life itself in defense of a concept which he held to be true. Likewise, those who would enjoy the blessings of human liberty must be of equal courage and commitment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, 471 years ago this week Christopher Columbus, the son of a Genoese weaver, navigated his 3 little ships and 120 men into the waters of the Western Hemisphere.

The great Italian explorer had to conquer more than the Atlantic Ocean in 1492. He fought poverty, ridicule, physical anguish, disappointment, treachery, and ingratitude in an effort to prove some scientific truths which we now accept without question.

His was a victory for all civilization. But today I want to call special attention to the fact that he was an Italian, the first of many who came to the New World in the next several centuries and made important contributions to benefit our society.

This week, as we pay tribute to the memory of this great Italian, the atmosphere in Washington is being poisoned by the testimony of a man who is a criminal and who happens to be of Italian descent.

I regret to have to raise this issue so bluntly, but it is a matter of deep concern to me because I believe that Joseph Valachi, because of his name and the names of some of those he is testifying about, is doing the saddest of injustices to millions of decent, hard-working Americans who also happen to be of Italian origin.

Mr. President, this is in no sense a criticism of the hearings or those who are conducting them. Organized crime in America is an ugly subject which must be investigated and must be exposed if we are to know how to legislate most effectively against crime.

My comments, however, are directed at Americans in general and some news writers in particular who are using these hearings as an excuse to defame a whole people.

I ask them to remember that some 12 million Americans of Italian descent are following these hearings with horror and disgust while Valachi talks about the very lowest elements of society. I suggest that any heavily publicized, heavily televised hearings about the worst elements of any race, religion, or national origin would be equally sordid and unfair to those groups.

But, above all, I ask all Americans this week to remember that after Christopher Columbus, Italy gave us a great number of outstanding persons who helped make America better and helped shape the American way of life into what it is today.

To name just a few:

Enrico Tonti came from Italy in the 17th century to join LaSalle in exploration of the Western Hemisphere. Among his other achievements was the exploration of the Mississippi to its mouth.

Francesco Vigo came to America from Piedmont in 1775 and became a successful merchant. When the expedition of George Rogers Clark in the Revolutionary War seemed about to fail for lack of supplies, Vigo put his fortune at the disposal of the Revolutionary cause and made possible the success of Clark's campaign against the British in the West.

Philip Mazzei, from Poggio-a-Caiano, settled in Virginia in 1773 and became a friend of Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson translated some of Mazzei's patriotic American writings into English and was influenced by these writings in his own drafting of our Declaration of Independence.

Constantino Brumidi, the outstanding Roman painter, is known to all of us in the Congress. Beginning in 1855 he started work in the Capitol and introduced the art of fresco to this country. Every day we walk under his magnificent paintings in the corridors and in the rotunda, which was his great love. When he began his work on the rotunda frieze he was 70 years old, but he worked for 3 years from a belt that hung 100 feet from the floor. As the partial result of a fall, he died in January 1880, leaving behind some of the truly great works of art in America.

Charles Barsotti came here from the Pisa area in 1872, established the first Italian daily in the United States and was known as an outstanding civic leader and philanthropist.

Enrico Caruso, the grand opera tenor from Naples, spent the last 20 years of his life making the air of America beautiful with his singing—and also contributing great sums of money to the Allied cause in World War I.

Luigi Palma di Cesnola, of Rivarolo, came to the United States in 1860, founded a military school for officers and then enlisted and fought through the Civil War. As a naturalized American he became American consul to Cyprus, and later director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.

Louis Amateis of Turin came to America in 1883 and did outstanding work as university professor, architect and sculptor.

Nor can we omit such scientists as Enrico Fermi, who made possible the use of atomic power. Its ultimate use for peaceful purposes can and will open up a whole new world and a better life for all peoples.

Mr. President, I have named only a few of those Italians who have contributed substantially to our culture, and only those who are no longer alive.

But I urge my fellow Americans on Columbus Day to think of the 12 million Italians and persons of Italian origin who are living today in the United States, who make us proud by their incalculable enrichment of the wonderful land that is our America.

PULASKI DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, October 11 marks the 184th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski—a renowned soldier in the forces of freedom and a symbol of the European support which helped make American independence possible. I am pleased to join with those citizens of Polish birth or ancestry in observing the anniversary of the death of one of freedom's foremost defenders. Pulaski distinguished himself by his valor, his military genius, and his tireless zeal in the pursuit of liberty for his people. Unable to achieve this end in his homeland, he crossed the Atlantic and made the supreme sacrifice in an effort to bring liberty to America.

Pulaski fought for freedom on the battlefields of both the Old World and the New. For, in 1768 he joined with his father in active rebellion to combat the domination of Poland. The young nobleman's military exploits were temporarily successful and he ultimately became the commander in chief of the Polish patriots. However, his forces were finally crushed and scattered, his estates confiscated, and he was forced into exile in 1772.

While in exile in France, Pulaski met Benjamin Franklin and offered his services to the cause of independence. In 1777 he joined Washington's army as a volunteer. After distinguished service at the battle of Brandywine he was promoted by Congress to the rank of brigadier general in the Continental Army. He shared the hardships and deprivations of Valley Forge and then received permission from Congress to organize an independent corps of cavalry. To that time, the cavalry had amounted to little or nothing in the revolutionary forces. Pulaski, who used the remnants of his personal fortune to help equip the men, is now considered to be the father of the U.S. cavalry. When he led the American and French cavalry at Savannah, Pulaski had already played heroic roles at the battles of Brandywine, Trenton, and Flemington. In the siege of Savannah, October 9, he gallantly charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry, was mortally wounded, and died 2 days later.

Thus, today we honor a man to whom freedom was a lifetime objective. Whether on the battlefields of Europe or America, Pulaski's cause was the same—the cause of freedom. Now, as we pay tribute to Pulaski's contributions to bringing liberty to this land, let us also express our fervent hope that the spirit which motivated him survives in his native country and may one day prevail.

WHERE DOES GOLDWATER STAND?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Where Does Goldwater Stand?" published in the U.S. News & World Report of September 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHERE DOES GOLDWATER STAND?

Question. Senator Goldwater, when do you expect to announce your intentions for 1964?

Answer. I can't give you an exact date, because, as I have said, I'm playing this thing by ear day by day. I would much prefer to run for the Senate, but I realize that I am being put in a position more and more in which I have to make a decision.

Things may change between now and the time of decision, which I would say would come sometime around the closing date for filing in the New Hampshire primary. That will be in January, I think. And, if the tide still runs the way it is running now, I'm going to have to say yes or no. I wouldn't want to say yes or no now, because I think it's much too early.

Question. If you miss the nomination for President, would you still have ample time to run for reelection to the Senate?

Answer. Yes. I have to file as a candidate for the Senate, I think, the week before the national convention. Our primaries in Arizona aren't until the second week in September. If I happen to decide to seek the nomination for President, and not get it, my name will be in for the Senate, which is my real love, and I would run. If I decided to seek the nomination for President, and got it, I would not run for the Senate.

Question. You would not?

Answer. Absolutely not.

Question. Is this your own decision, or are the laws of Arizona such that you couldn't run for both President and Senator?

Answer. It's my own decision. Our State attorney general gave a ruling which indicates to me that no State could deny a man running for two Federal offices—that is, he could run for the Presidency or the Vice Presidency and a Senate or House seat. His ruling is that the State law does not deal with this case. But I wouldn't run, I don't think it's right.

Question. Is it necessary, Senator, to have your permission to file your name in the New Hampshire primary?

Answer. As I understand it, no.

Question. If you do decide to run for the presidential nomination, would it be your plan to enter most of the primaries?

Answer. It would certainly have to be any candidate's plan to enter enough primaries to convince Republicans across the country that he could get votes, and to discourage his opposition from continuing in the race.

Question. How can a Senator find time, in addition to his Senate duties, to go out and run in primaries around the country?

Answer. He would have to do as President Kennedy did—just ignore his senatorial duties. I think he missed over 200 votes in the Senate that last year.

But I do have an advantage here that other so-called "hopefuls"—if that's the word—do not have.

For most of the years between 1954 and this year, with the exception of the 2 years before my last election to the Senate, I've been traveling this country as chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee. I have a map stuck up on the wall, and you can see from the number of pins the thousands of speeches I've made. I have traveled over a million miles, and I don't think anyone in this party knows more Republicans than I do.

This accumulation of Republican friends wasn't done with the idea of using it for anything except getting Republicans elected to the Senate and the House. It came as a byproduct of just doing my job as a Republican. And now, of course, if I decide to seek the nomination, this becomes my most valuable asset. It's an asset that almost any other candidate would have to develop. And you don't develop a million miles and a thousand speeches just overnight.

Question. In connection with your possible candidacy, do you think it would be good for the country if a second term were denied to Kennedy in 1964?

Answer. I think it's absolutely essential.

Question. Why?

Answer. I think we have to have a change in 1964—not because of the individual, but because of the steady and increasing reach for power over the daily lives of Americans by the President and the men around him.

Question. Senator, some people have identified you with the John Birch Society. Are you a member of that society?

Answer. No. I have never been a member of it. In fact, when it was organized, the head of the society, Mr. Robert J. Welch, was asked if he would support Nixon or GOLDWATER for the Presidency. This was back, I think, in 1958 or 1959. He said no, GOLDWATER was too far to the left and Nixon was a Socialist.

Question. Is Mr. Welch now a supporter of yours?

Answer. No; He's not. In fact, I have a letter here that was written to a friend of mine, and Mr. Welch says:

"No matter how high my regard for Senator GOLDWATER might be, I could neither support him nor oppose him in the forthcoming campaign, because whatever I did would be construed as an official position of the John Birch Society."

That same letter from Welch said this:

"The John Birch Society takes absolutely no position in political campaigns, and, therefore, neither can I. Since about half of our members are Republicans, half Democrats, and with a sprinkling of independents, you can readily see why this policy is necessary."

Question. Then, so far as you know, the John Birch Society, as a society, is not supporting you?

Answer. No, I've never heard of them supporting any candidate, frankly, and I know they're not supporting me for anything, including running for the Senate in Arizona.

Question. Many people have said that you should either accept the support of the John Birch people or repudiate that support. What is your comment on that?

Answer. Well, these people who have suggested that have never given me any good reason for doing it. If it's because the Birch Society takes an extreme position now and then, I can recall American Legion posts that have taken extreme positions. The Americans for Democratic Action, I believe, have some very extreme positions.

My answer is that the members of the Birch Society have a constitutional right to take the positions they choose, even though I might disagree with them. I don't agree, for example, that Earl Warren should be impeached. I might disagree with Earl Warren, but I don't go so far as to say impeach him. But anybody has a right to suggest impeachment of any public official in this country.

I don't agree with the idea of repealing the income tax, but they certainly have the right to suggest that. According to those who are trying to read something dangerous into this nebulous "far right" theory, all these people—not just the Birch Society, but all Americans who oppose, for example, the United Nations—and there are millions of them—should be denied this right to hold strong minority opinions.

So I can't bring myself to disavow a group that is exercising its constitutional rights, and I repeat my challenge to those who have asked me to do this: Point out what they're doing that is dangerous, name names and places that they occupy in the Republican Party, prove that these people in these places are tending to take over the Republican Party and destroy it. I know of no working members of the party above a few precinct-committee people in Arizona who are members of the Birch Society.

Question. Then you don't agree with those who say the John Birch Society is dangerous to the country?

Answer. A statement I saw in the paper puts the total membership of the Birch Society at around 12,000 to 15,000. Now, if 12,000 to 15,000 people—like the former Chief Justice of my Supreme Court in Arizona, a Democrat, or the president of our second-biggest bank, a Democrat—are dangerous to the United States, I shudder to think of the danger of the Americans for Democratic Action.

Question. Would you call yourself a disciple of the "radical right?"

Answer. I don't think I'm a radical in any position. I think there are some radicals in this country. We've always had them. Washington, Jefferson, and others have been plagued with these people. Lincoln was plagued with them.

But it's very difficult to put your finger on them. Just who are they? Some of these groups are very selfish in nature, very narrow in nature. Others are broad. But I still want somebody to spell out "far right."

Question. How would you define the "far right?"

Answer. I might try it. In my opinion, if you had a "radical right," it would be a fascist position—sort of like George Lincoln Rockwell and his Nazis—in no way associated with the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. On the "radical left" you'd have the Communist Party, in no way associated with the Democratic Party or the Republican Party.

So you get the spectrum down then to what, on the left, are called "liberals," but who are not "liberals" in the true or existing sense of the word; and on the Republican side, "conservatives."

Now, I imagine there can be extremes in those positions. The farthest to the left, not being a Communist, would be an "extreme liberal." The farthest to the right, not being a Nazi, would be an "extreme rightist."

I think the "conservative" movement, which is neither of these, contains more people than any other movement in the country.

Question. Do you think there are more "conservatives" in this country than "liberals"?

Answer. I think so.

Question. Over the years, Senator, have you consistently supported the Republican nominee for President?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Would you expect the so-called "liberal" wing of the Republican Party to support a "conservative" nominee of the Republican Party in 1964?

Answer. If they're worthy of the name Republican, I would expect them to support the candidate. I couldn't see them voting for Kennedy without becoming Democrats.

Question. Would you support the Republican nominee in 1964, even though he turned out to be a "liberal" Republican?

Answer. I would support the Republican nominee in 1964 because I don't care who the Republican nominee is, he's going to be better for the United States than any New Frontiersman.

Question. Have you actively supported "liberal" Republicans in State elections?

Answer. Yes. I have supported men like Senators JAVITS, CASE, KUCHEL, and COOPER. I've raised considerable sums of money for them. I went into New York City to help raise money for Governor Rockefeller.

So, as I say, I believe in the two-party system. I believe we ought to have our little arguments within the system, but, when the time comes, we ought to argue with the opposition.

WHERE REPUBLICANS DIFFER

Question. Are you and Governor Rockefeller at odds on all issues?

Answer. Well, the Governor and I have met together here in Washington at least four times in the last 12 months. We've seen each other in New York, I think, at least twice. And I would say that our areas of disagreement are relatively small. Rockefeller and I are much closer together than Hubert Humphrey and Harry Byrd—we're both Republicans and they're both Democrats.

I think the field of public welfare, the welfare state, is where you find the Republican Party at odds. When you get into fiscal responsibility, taxation, foreign policy, the rest of the domestic policy, I don't think there's a great deal of difference.

Question. In that case, why is Governor Rockefeller so critical of you?

Answer. I don't know, frankly. I'm at a loss on that. Up until the time I read his recent statement, if you had asked me that question, I'd have said, "We're friends. I trust him, I like him, and so on."

It doesn't mean that I don't still like him, but I had no advance warning of his change in attitude until he issued that statement. I had assumed the situation was one of Rockefeller and Goldwater working for unity in the Republican Party.

THE SOUTH HAS BEEN GOING MORE AND MORE REPUBLICAN

Question. Has there been any contact since that statement?

Answer. No. I haven't seen hide nor hair of him since, and I don't expect to.

Question. Senator, have you advocated that the Republicans simply cross off the big industrial States of the East in 1964?

Answer. No. I don't know where that ever started. I'm a very practical politician. I don't cross anybody off anyplace, anytime. I have said that I think the large cities in the East are going to be very tough for Republicans for the very simple reason that the Democrats control the city machinery.

Now, you give me a mayor and city council of New York as Republicans and I'm going to take New York City for a presidential candidate. It's as simple as that. He probably has 500,000 votes before the polls open in the morning—not crooked, they're just machine votes.

I think we have to be practical and recognize that the large eastern cities are not likely to go for Republicans at the presidential level. But we can sure as heck work in them, and we can work for better organization.

And I've never said forget the Negro vote or the Italian vote or any minority vote. Go after them. I say we should do our strong hunting where the ducks are flying.

Question. Do you think a Republican nominee in 1964 will have a good chance of carrying New York State?

Answer. My honest opinion is "no," because New York City is controlled by a Democratic machine.

Now, by the same token—and that's what makes this answer a little hard—the State is controlled by a Republican administration. If northern New York would vote with the same intensity as downstate New York, then my answer would be the other way. But, in looking at it in a very practical manner, and looking at history, I would expect that New York City would again do a better job of getting the vote out than would the more conservative elements up north.

SOUTH'S DRAMATIC TREND

Question. Can a Republican nominee win the South?

Answer. The South, since 1948, has been going more and more Republican. This has nothing to do with the race issue, because it was going on before the Supreme Court decision. Its tempo hasn't increased appreciably, percentagewise, since the Supreme Court decision, but we trebled our vote for congressional candidates from 1958 to 1962, and my guess is that we'll at least double it or even treble it again in 1964. You could have a pretty dramatic change in the South in Republican House Members.

I think 10 or 12 more Republican seats out of the South could be expected in 1964. But if we get the switch we've been having, it's going to be better than that. The Republican strength in the South in presidential elections has been in the big cities—42 out of the 53 went for Nixon.

You find the violent, die-hard segregationist living out in the rural areas, where you find the violent, die-hard Democratic Party. But, in the cities, it's becoming more and more Republican-oriented.

Question. Where else can you see a combination of States that could elect a Republican as President?

Answer. I think the Middle West—and when I say "Middle West," I go all the way from the Pennsylvania line on out to the Rocky Mountains—the Rocky Mountain States, the Southwest. I think the Republicans' chief problem will be in the larger boss-ruled cities—not because of the candidate, not because of the party, but because the Republicans don't control the machinery.

Question. Is the problem in the cities related also to the large labor vote and the large Negro vote?

Answer. The Negro vote, I think, will go about as it has gone in the past—some 80 percent in the large cities for the Democrat. We can't tell what the Negro vote is out in the West. We treat it as a vote, not as a separate entity.

The union man, I've always believed, votes as he feels he should. There are some exceptions. I would say where the UAW (United Auto Workers) is strong in Detroit, they pretty much vote the union line. But some studies show about 25 percent of even Walter Reuther's union to be Republican. In my State, in the most heavily organized county in the State, where the largest mines in the world are and 85 percent of the working force belongs to the union, I carried that county last time, which was a great switch from the time before.

The studies that I have seen show that about 42 percent of the union members consider themselves Republican. This was back in the 1950's. There are no up-to-date studies that I know of.

Eisenhower got the majority of the union vote in both of his elections. So I don't write that vote off. But I don't think we have made the approach to them. I think we should visit more freely with the union people, convince them that our interests are their interests, that under the Republican Party they are going to earn more and earn it longer and more of it than they've been able to do under the Democrats. After all, if there are more jobs created, there will be more people employed.

TROUBLES IN CALIFORNIA

Question. What about California? How do you assess that, Senator?

Answer. Right now, Republicanwise—I hate to use the word—it's a mess. The party is disorganized. There are no immediate signs of its coming back together, although there are a lot of darn good people working on it. I have a feeling that they will achieve unity out there well in advance of the time it is needed.

It will be a tough State for either the Democrats or Republicans to say, "It's in the bag."

Question. Could you win without both California and New York?

Answer. Theoretically, yes, you can—but it's assuming a lot of strength in a lot of areas. You'd have to have Texas, you'd have to have Illinois, you'd have to take Ohio, Indiana, seven of the Southern States, the Mountain States——

Question. And some of New England?

Answer. I always look on New England as a strong Republican place, and I think we'll see it stronger this time.

Question. How about Massachusetts?

Answer. Well, Massachusetts will naturally go to Kennedy—and Connecticut, Rhode Island. But I think in New Hampshire, Maine, Vermont, we will win.

Question. You spoke of the Democrats' having gained successes in the North by controlling the big-city machines. Has that also been true of the South?

Answer. No, because it wasn't necessary. The Democrats have never bothered much about the South. The South has been treated like a little stepchild.

Name me a man of the stature of RICHARD RUSSELL, Senator from Georgia, for example, who occupies a place high in Democratic Party councils. I don't think he even knows where the Democratic national headquarters are located. And the South is beginning to resent this. This philosophy may come back to haunt the Democrats, because, if they can't take the South and they can't take the Middle West and the Rocky Mountain West, then we may be approaching a day when we can say, "We might win without New York and California."

California is a little different horse. Her big cities are not boss-controlled cities, as the eastern cities are. City politics out there are just big-city politics without the gangster-boss element that we find in virtually every large eastern city. When I say "large," I mean a million and above.

Question. Senator, what do you think will be the dominant issues, to be decided in 1964?

Answer. Oh, it's kind of hard to say now. It will be a year from now before the campaign will be getting underway. I think foreign policy will certainly be one issue—Cuba, Laos, Vietnam as it now stands, although Vietnam could change—and the general growth of communism and our seemingly inability to stop it; certainly the outflow of gold; the slowness of our economy—although this could change—and fiscal irresponsibility.

I think this fiscal thing has a great potential, because more and more people are understanding what you mean by taxes and the deprivation of private property.

Question. Senator, speaking of national issues, what is your own record on integration of the races?

Answer. My record, of course, was made in my own State. I don't think you can make other than a legislative record in Washington, and I'll stand on my legislative record here.

In Arizona, my retail company has always hired Negroes. It's only been recently that any Negroes have been interested in saleswomen's jobs, although we have two Negro beauty operators, and have had them for some time. Out of about 500 employees, I think we have about 25 Negroes, and some of them in very responsible positions.

When I became adjutant general for the Air National Guard, I integrated that organization, and it ultimately resulted in the whole Guard movement being integrated.

The first official act that I was able to get accomplished as a member of the city council in Phoenix was the desegregation of the restaurant at the local airport. Earlier, when I got back from World War II, I found that we had acquired segregated high schools, which we didn't have when I went to high school there. I made, for that time and that town, a sizable contribution to the court fight to end segregation.

I'll stand on my record, what I've done in this field in my own State and elsewhere.

Question. What do you say in the South about civil rights?

Answer. When people in the South ask me my stand, I say I'm opposed completely to discrimination. I think that this is the problem—not segregation. But I hesitate as an Arizonian to go into some other State and try to tell them to do things. I discuss it with them, but using only moral persuasion.

Question. Do you mean that segregation laws or integration laws ought to be a State and local matter?

Answer. As far as everything goes, except the Supreme Court decision on schools.

The last civil rights bill—the one in 1957, which caused the long filibuster—was too broad. It would have allowed the Attorney General to use this pretense to go into any area of our lives in our States. I think today, if a tight and limited law were written aimed at correcting specific situations in school districts or schools, even the South might buy this. But nobody is going to stand by for a bill that is a blunderbuss and allows the Attorney General to ride off in all directions, abusing the daily lives of people.

Question. What about the civil rights bill now before Congress?

Answer. I would oppose completely the provision on public accommodations—hotels, motels, restaurants, etc.—and accept no compromise on it. It's entirely unconstitutional. I think if we enact that we can kiss goodbye to our concept of limited Government, our concept of constitutional guarantee of rights, and I'll have no part of it.

Question. Do you mean that it gives the Federal Government too much power over the daily lives of people?

Answer. It does. I feel very strongly that, when a man invests his property in a business, he has the legal right to conduct that business any way he wants to, just so it doesn't do damage to other businesses. I think he has a moral obligation, in his advertising, to say that he will not cater to this group or that group or any group he chooses. I think this is an inherent right of property, and, if we destroy this concept of control of property, then we're giving acquiescence to the idea that property can be taken from us without the due processes of the law.

DANGER OF POLICE STATE

Question. Could that provision be enforced without a vast Federal police force?

Answer. I don't see how it could, and this in another reason that I think this administration has to go. I think we're getting closer and closer and closer to situations that require a police state. And this is the reason I don't think some of these people really understand what they're asking for when they support the public-accommodations proposal.

Question. How do you feel about the proposed power to withhold Federal assistance in instances where discrimination is practiced?

Answer. The Republican Party was going to take a position that such withholding should be mandatory. However, we were warned by Senator **Hruska** of Nebraska to take another look at it, because this is much broader than anybody has realized. It gets into small business loans, for example.

Let's say that a small store in California has a small business loan, and the charge is made that segregation exists. Then every Federal project in that State, conceivably—but certainly in that political subdivision—would have to be stopped.

So the Republicans are taking another look at this. We don't want it to be discretionary, because this gives the President too much power.

I FAVOR WITHDRAWING RECOGNITION FROM RUSSIA

Question. As you see it, Senator, where does this trend toward concentration of power lead?

Answer. The trend, for at least 30 years, has been to a completely centralized Government.

Today we're seeing small business in trouble because of the oppressive size of Government, which requires taxation to the point where small businessmen can't retain profits.

The big man can get along today, but how long is it going to be before even big business can't withstand the combined pressures of big labor and big Government? Then how long will it be before big labor can't withstand the total power of big Government? Then you have one thing left—you have Government, period—Government running business, the labor unions, the daily lives of the people. These are my fears.

Question. Could this come about without the consent of the people, as expressed in the congressional elections?

Answer. Yes, it has been coming about mainly because too many of the people in this country have not voted.

Question. In other words, people are not alert to the danger—

Answer. They don't understand it. I think they're beginning to understand it.

I think businessmen are beginning to see that the present trend can only lead to Government takeover. I think some of the labor leaders are beginning to be fearful of this, because of the way Kennedy has had to handle the railroad strike. He was suggesting compulsory arbitration, which means the end of striking, and that, in my opinion, is the only weapon the workingman has. It does away with collective bargaining, and this is just another natural step toward wholesale Government control of both business and labor.

Not that the Kennedys necessarily are going this route with a purpose, but I think they just inherited this 30-year philosophy that the Federal Government has to have more power, that it has to be able to control business, labor and the lives of individual people in order to govern the United States properly.

GETTING A CLEAR-CUT VOTE

Question. Do we need a clear test at the polls in a national election—to find out what the majority of the people think?

Answer. I'm beginning to think that it would not be a bad idea. That doesn't necessarily mean that I am the only conservative. As I say, Republicans are conservative. Some Republicans would give the people more of a choice than others. But, regardless of who the Republican might be, there would be a basic difference between that person and Kennedy, because they would represent fundamentally different principles of government.

Question. You support right to work laws, do you not?

Answer. As a State matter, yes; I would not propose a national right to work law, although I have an amendment in now to the Taft-Hartley Act that would give the States the right to determine whether they would have the union shop or not. In other words, in the absence of State legislation calling for the union shop there would be an open shop. But this is not the same as national "right to work"; nor would I support a national right to work amendment.

Question. Would you favor withdrawing recognition from Soviet Russia and other Communist States?

Answer. I have always favored withdrawing recognition from Russia. I never favored recognition from the start. I remember when it was first done. I think we lent dignity to a movement that doesn't deserve the respect that goes with formal recognition. I don't like to lend dignity and respect to an outfit that says they're out to bury us.

Question. Do you think we can coexist with a Castro-type Cuba?

Answer. This word "coexistence" is a misunderstood one. Can we coexist with the Cubans, the Russians, the East Germans? We have to, as people. But do we have to coexist with the philosophy of communism? No. I don't see how we can do it without the almost-certain knowledge that sooner or later one of us won't be around to coexist either with or together. The philosophy is the point that I disagree on.

Now, coexistence has been recognized by the leaders of the Communist movement as the greatest weapon they have. This goes clear back to Engels and Marx, Lenin, Stalin—and I have many quotes on that that I've dug up, pointing out the desire of the Communists to establish coexistence and then find that our leaders mistake what coexistence is.

I know Senator **Fulbright** has a fit every time I speak against coexistence. He misunderstands it. He thinks that I want to have war—to annihilate people. You can't annihilate ideas. You replace bad ideas with better ideas, and that's what we ought to be getting along with.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT CUBA

Question. What course would you advocate on Cuba?

Answer. The course that I've advocated constantly, I've never changed on, would be a blockade—as Kennedy imposed—the training of Cuban exiles, the equipping of Cuban exiles. All of this should be done in conjunction with the Organization of American States.

I would advocate the establishment of a single Cuban government-in-exile. This would be the first "must."

Then we should support from the air, with supplies and equipment, any movement they might undertake to overthrow the Castro regime.

Question. Could we do that without getting the United States involved in a war?

Answer. I'm absolutely convinced we can, and I think most of the American states are convinced that we can, too.

Question. As time goes on, is it getting more and more difficult to overthrow the Castro regime?

Answer. Yes, yes. At the Bay of Pigs, that very limited number of men, if we had carried through with supplying them, would probably have succeeded and would have made the difference now in Cuba. But now Castro has the second-best army in this hemisphere.

Question. What is your view on foreign aid?

Answer. If we have to live with foreign aid—and I don't think we do have to live with foreign economic aid—I think it should be used as a "rifle," aimed at specific areas where we can gain an advantage over the Russians. And I don't think we're gaining it by giving foreign aid to the 90-odd countries that we give it to. We might find a project in some country that Russia would be willing to try to outbid us on. Let her do it. She can't afford an economic race with us at the present time, and I think it will be a good number of years away until she can.

I would rather see this foreign-economic-aid money channeled into technical assistance and the Peace Corps concept, because I think this is going to prove desirable. I've always had faith in it. I'd like to see us encourage more private investment around the world, although we have a whale of a lot of it at the present time.

Question. Would you channel more of this money into loans and less into grants?

Answer. I certainly would. And I would expect the country receiving a loan to demonstrate that it could provide collateral or some sensible basis for a loan. And then again, I'd look pretty carefully at whom I was lending it to.

Question. What kind of countries should be getting aid?

Answer. The countries that needed it right after the war no longer need it. I think that a country like Greece could certainly be interested in loans, because they need development. Turkey, if she needs it. Countries that are with us or can be brought with us. Pakistan, by all means. I would put a question mark around India, because you never know where she is.

In the Latin countries, I think our whole program there needs reorienting. The idea is good, but we're not getting the job done, because we're assuming that the Latins are going to make changes in their social patterns that they're not ready to make or willing to make.

Question. You have spoken of the danger of $100 billion budgets. How much do you think this Government ought to be spending?

Answer. Well, let's not start with the 100 billion. My objection is not to any one figure. It's just to excessive spending, where we're spending more than we're taking in. I don't think any country can do that, any more than a business can.

They can do it during wartime. But if you just recall what happened in 1929 to Austria, from precisely the same things we're doing in this country today, then you have a better understanding of my fear of deficit spending. Now, Austria was engaged in housing projects, rural and urban redevelopment, and the expenditure of funds over and above what they were taking in, and, in spite of all warnings, they continued to do it, and when the collapse came, it started a world depression.

There's nothing to prevent the United States from starting a world depression if our credit and our currency and our economy were to collapse.

Our gold-outflow situation, some will argue, is offset by the some $70 to $75 billion that's owed us by foreign countries. What assurance have we that they'll pay off when we get in trouble?

So, my objection to budgets is not $100 billions; it would be $90 or $80 or $70 or $200, if the amount is more than we take in.

I think we can effect reductions in the nature of $7 billions, maybe $10, but I won't go as far as some people who say $15. I think the agricultural program presents the best opportunity. And I think health, education, and welfare is another area. Where we had 7 million people on relief in 1936 and we have 7 million people on relief in 1963, and it's costing us many times as much to handle these people.

Question. Would you, over a period of years, phase out various welfare programs?

Answer. Oh, I don't think you can do that. Take social security, for example. I think it could be made flexible and voluntary—flexible by allowing a man to choose a higher salary on which to pay, say, up to $10,000, and voluntary in that, if a man didn't want to go under it, he wouldn't have to. He might decide that he could provide a better retirement for himself.

I think that, around 1970, employees and employers are going to start looking at the 10-percent tax, as it will be then, and say, "I can get a much better policy through private sources than I'm getting out of the Government." Then I'd expect to hear some push for a change in social security.

Question. To make it voluntary?

Answer. Or to rewrite it completely and bring it up to date, make it conform with modern times, and make it more actuarially sound than it is today.

Question. What about the general field of welfare?

Answer. Such programs have become established in people's minds. I would merely stop the introduction of new programs, because I think we're in every conceivable field that we can get into. And then I would start trying to convince the Governors of the States that, if they took these things back, they could do them with less money. Then the Federal Government would be able to reduce spending by similar amounts and not be required to tax so high.

HOW TO CUT TAXES

Question. As matters stand now, do you oppose the tax cut of 1963?

Answer. I haven't seen it in its entirety. I fundamentally oppose any tax cut without a cut in expenditures.

Question. And you don't see any prospect of a cut in expenditures?

Answer. No, and just a quick look at the proposed tax cuts: While they have made a gesture toward the area that's needed, where it's needed, I don't think it's enough.

Question. What area do you mean?

Answer. This is the area of encouraging capital investments. When you think that our rate of capital investment in the last quarter of last year, for the first time since 1957, equaled 1957, and that this year its only a little bit above the 1957 figure, you begin to see, in my opinion, what's wrong with the economy, why it's sluggish. We are not replacing antiquated factories, antiquated stores, warehouses, and so forth, and we're trying to get along with machinery that is far outpaced by European factories.

And the plain fact of the matter is today: Where can you find a good investment? I mean, you're actually as well off, in most cases, putting money in Federal or municipal bonds as you are going into corporate stocks.

I remember in my own business when a 10-percent profit was not impossible. I don't argue that that was a proper rate. But a 2½-percent profit today is very high. And the probability of withstanding any prolonged dip in sales in my business just doesn't exist today. In the 1929 depression, I went 5 years with the dropoff in sales and managed to live. I couldn't do it today.

I think it's well and good to talk about cutting the lower bracket income taxes, but when you give a man $12 to $20 more a month, I can't see him going crazy in spending. And you give the high income man $100 more a month—that isn't going to mean much to him. But if you give a corporation a real break, so that they can turn around and invest, say, 10 percent more next year than they invested this year, I can see the economy running into a manpower shortage in a relatively short time.

Question. Would you say that the proposed 48-percent rate for corporations is still too high?

Answer. I think it is.

Question. And would you say that a 70-percent rate—that's the proposed top rate—for individuals is too high?

Answer. That's confiscatory.

Question. You've been quoted as saying that a graduated tax is a confiscatory tax. Is that your view?

Answer. I don't think I'd put it that way. But I think it has been destructive of initiative—and when you destroy American initiative, you destroy the possibility of more earnings.

I found that in my own business, even before I got out of it some 10 or 12 years ago. You'd ask a young executive if he'd like to take a higher job; he would say, "Well, let me take a look at it." And he'd come back and say, "No, Mary and I have decided that I had better stay where I am because if I take that higher job, Im going to have to work harder and I'm not really going to make enough more to make it worth while—so no, thank you."

NEEDED: A NEW TAX CODE

Question. Then you don't believe in any graduation at all in the income tax?

Answer. I won't go that far, but I'm opposed to the theory. I'd like to see some other suggestions made in the whole field.

In fact, if I had anything to say about this tax picture, what I would do would be to assemble some knowledgeable legislators, some knowledgeable academic people, some knowledgeable business people, some knowledgeable labor people, and say, "Get off in the corner and write us a new tax code that's going to produce sufficient revenue in a fair way for our Government."

Then, when this has been accomplished, you proceed to sell it to the Congress, and when you're convinced you have it sold, throw the old tax code out of the window and enact a new one—start all over again.

This thing we're working on is a mess.

Question. Are you concerned about the complications in the present tax law and the new complications that are being written in by the new tax bill?

Answer. You cannot write new additions to this tax code without giving jobs to about 2,000 new tax attorneys a year. I have no objection to tax attorneys, but you can't write something to correct an evil here without producing an evil over here. And this to me, frankly, is one of the major sources of immorality in this country—the fact that the father will go home and say, "Well, I beat Uncle Sam out of 200 bucks today," and the kid says, "Gee, how did you do that, Dad?" "Well, real smart—here's how I did it." Perfectly legal, but is it moral? So the kid say, "Well, the old man stole 200 bucks from Uncle Sam. I'll steal a dollar from somebody."

I did a little piece on this once—it never got into print—on what the Volstead Act and the income tax amendment have done to the morals of our people.

Question. Do you agree that a tax cut is essential to the economy?

Answer. In 1954 we cut taxes by 7.4 billion, but the economy was running at a pretty vigorous rate and the money was reinvested.

I think it was only 2 years before we were collecting twice as much as we cut. Now, if the economy were moving at a faster clip today and there wasn't this antibusiness attitude, anti-stockmarket attitude, anti-investor attitude on the part of the administration, I think I'd be wholeheartedly for a tax cut.

Question. At the risk of another, larger deficit?

Answer. Even at the risk of a larger deficit, because I think the expenditures and increased sources of taxation would offset the deficit. But I don't think that will happen now. I hope I'm wrong, because a tax cut—even this one—would be good if it didn't mean offsetting this by more inflation—increased costs all along the line.

CONCERN OVER A TEST BAN

Question. Will you tell us, Senator, whether you are for or against the ratification of the nuclear test ban treaty?

Answer. I have some very, very serious reservations about it. I am not convinced yet that the political advantages outweigh the military disadvantages, and I would say that it's in this general area that the administration has been most lax in selling its bill.

They're very general. They don't spell out what they mean by political advantages, where the military have spelled out very precisely the military disadvantages. And I have to agree with Dr. Edward Teller, with Gen. Curtis LeMay, with General Power, General Schriever. I think the Russians are ahead of us—not just in weapon size, because I don't think that's too important—but in nuclear know-how, which I think is very important.

I'm worried about whether our missiles will get there, whether or not the Russians have an antiballistic missile system that will keep them from getting there.

The fact is that we don't know enough about nuclear environment or electromagnetic pulse or fireball blackout. We know there are problems, and I know that some of them can be solved underground and in laboratories, but we can never be sure unless we continue atmospheric testing.

I have to hear some pretty sound political arguments given to me in the next 2 or 3 weeks before I can decide that politics offsets the military disadvantage, and, if I were the administration, I would be coming up to the Senate with more and more argument on the political end.

All they talk about is a "next step." What is it? Nonaggression? I don't think they have a chance of getting a nonaggression pact through this Senate, or even approved by the military.

So where are the political advantages? Frankly, I can't see them today.

FBI INVESTIGATION OF BOMBINGS OF NEGRO HOMES AND CHURCHES IN ALABAMA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated October 8, 1963, addressed to me, from Harvey H. Hewitt, colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired, of Falls Church, Va., regarding the FBI investigation of bombings of Negro homes and churches in Alabama.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 8, 1963.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: On September 13, 1963, there was broadcast over Washington television station WTOP a portion of a press conference held by Gov. George Wallace regarding FBI investigation of bombings of Negro homes and churches in Alabama.

From Governor Wallace's statements I got the impression that he believed certain evidence concerning the bombings which the FBI had uncovered was being withheld from the public because of some embarrassment such evidence might bring to the Department of Justice.

I wrote to you on September 14, saying I felt Governor Wallace's charges were serious ones that bring into question the integrity of our system of justice on the Federal level. I asked that the charges be looked into to determine their truth or falsity. I expressed no opinion of my own either one way or the other.

You referred my letter to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover whose reply was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 25, 1963—pages 17971 and 17972. Unfortunately for me, your prefacing remarks to Mr. Hoover's letter as published in the Record implied that I, personally, had claimed that on the basis of the number of bombings in Alabama, the FBI had been either inefficient, negligent, or both. My letter had contained no such claim or suggestion.

I have the highest personal confidence in Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and in the important work being done by the FBI. I would never without just cause suggest inefficiency or negligence. I respectfully request that this letter be published in the Congressional Record so as to correct any erroneous impression that might have been created as to my position in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Harvey H. Hewitt.

ROYALTIES FROM MINERAL PRODUCTION ON FEDERAL LANDS IN WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, one of the potentials for economic growth in the State of Wyoming is our vast storehouse of mineral deposits. Even now these minerals are being utilized to provide a thriving industrial base in many parts of the State.

Since about 50 percent of Wyoming is in Federal ownership and an even greater share of the mineral rights belong to the Federal Government a sizable sum is contributed to the Treasury each year for the right to mine these minerals.

Mr. President, I am the sponsor of a bill to provide that 90 percent of these royalties are returned to the State of origin. To me this would provide for a more equitable distribution of this money and would be a positive step in providing State governments with additional revenue to meet their steadily rising expenses.

The benefits of this action are outlined in an editorial published recently by the Kemmerer Gazette. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Big Payday

For many years, Wyoming's Senators and Congressmen in Washington have beat the drums loudly in an effort to get for their State 90 percent of the royalties from mineral production on Federal lands within Wyoming.

You may have wondered what all the shouting is about.

The thing that generates all the excitement over 90 percent return is potentially the biggest payday in Wyoming's history. The situation is this:

More than half of the lands within Wyoming's borders are owned by the Federal Government. The Federal Government collects a royalty on all natural resources produced on these public lands.

The Federal Government retains 10 percent of all these royalties to administer the collection of the royalties. Federal statute earmarks an additional 52½ percent of all the royalties to the reclamation fund which helps finance new reclamation projects in the West.

The remaining 37½ percent is given to Wyoming State government to spend in any way that it sees fit. The way we choose to spend our 37½ percent of the royalty is to give half of it to the Wyoming Highway Department for construction of new highways and half of it to subsidize education in the State. The portion that goes to education is shared equally between the State school foundation fund and the University of Wyoming.

How much money does this 37½ percent amount to?

The amount varies each year as the mineral production on public lands varies. A conservative average of Wyoming's annual receipts from the mineral royalty is about $12 million.

The question has long been argued of why should Wyoming and other Western States get only 37½ percent. Why shouldn't they collect the full 90 percent?

The remaining 52½ percent that goes into the reclamation fund represents only a very miniscule part of the total amount of money that is spent on reclamation projects. If this money were taken away from reclamation, the loss would hardly be noticed. Moreover, some other States (Texas is one) receive reclamation projects without contributing a dime to the reclamation fund.

Another argument is that when Alaska was admitted to the Union, its State constitution specifically required that 90 percent of the public land mineral royalty be returned to the State. If Alaska gets a 90-percent return, why shouldn't Wyoming?

If Wyoming did get a 90-percent return, that average paycheck of about $12 million each year would all of a sudden skyrocket to about $30 million each year.

To give an idea of just how great an impact this $30 million would make in Wyoming, we point out that Wyoming's general fund is expected to collect and pay out in the neighborhood of $36 million in the current 2-year period.

The benefits derived by Wyoming citizens from this added revenue would be tremendous. The added school foundation payments would usher in a new era of highest quality education in the local school districts. The construction debt at the University of Wyoming would be paid off very quickly and the university, too, would enjoy a lucrative financial future.

And let us not forget that the mineral royalty is derived from depletable resources. Part of the royalty receipts, therefore, ought to be used to aid in the establishment of nondepletable industry (this was the theory of the reclamation fund).

Anyway you look at it, a 90-percent royalty return would be the "Original big payday" in Wyoming. And it would cause a virtual fiscal revolution in our State government.

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, every day the postman delivers to my office a large quantity of mail of the variety very aptly termed "fright mail" by my good friend the assistant minority leader [Mr. Kuchel]. This mail views with more than considerable alarm almost every aspect of our national life. According to these writers nothing is going right and national collapse is around the corner.

Not only would I dispute this argument but I would suggest that never before in history has any nation achieved a standard of living equal to ours or the capability to defend itself in as positive a manner as we have in the United States at this moment.

Mr. President, an editorial entitled "The Upward Trend," published in the October 5 issue of the Wyoming Eagle contains some excellent comments on the state of the economy and the chances for further improvement through the reduction of income taxes. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wyoming Eagle, Oct. 5, 1963]

The Upward Trend

Thanks to the aggressive, forward-looking programs of President Kennedy and his administration, the U.S. economy right now is at the highest level in history—and still heading upward.

It will be recalled that when President Kennedy assumed his duties, 33 months ago, the Nation's economy was weak, to say the least.

Not only has the Nation avoided a new recession under the Kennedy administration, but its economy has maintained a steady upward trend to its present record high level.

Unemployment has been reduced by 1 million.

Personal income is up $21 billion in the last year and $50 billion in the last 33 months—and it's still climbing.

Businessmen plan to spend at an annual rate of $41.1 billion on new plants and equipment in the current quarter of 1963.

Industrial production and corporate profits, before taxes, are up sharply.

The gross national product has been soaring upward and is expected to be nearing the $595 billion mark by the end of this year as compared with the $500 billion level President Kennedy inherited. The GNP climbed by $8 billion during April, May, and June of this year, and experts have estimated it rose by approximately another $8 billion during July, August, and September.

And, despite this economic upward trend, prices have remained remarkably stable, all along the line.

As of now, the Nation's current climb is in its 32d month, and experts are predicting it will continue into 1964, making it the second longest peacetime upswing in more than a century.

The longest business upturn in the last century was the 50-month climb during the middle 1930's.

Perhaps the most amazing thing about the current economic uptrend is the fact that it has occurred in spite of the heavy tax drag on both individuals and businesses.

Most experts agree the economic advance can be maintained—even accelerated—by reducing that tax drag.

It has been explained that the President's proposed tax cut would leave individuals with more money to spend on goods and services, which, in itself, would spur the economy. It also would leave business with more money to spend on new plant and equipment, thus creating more jobs and increasing production.

More jobs, more production, more profits, and more spending for goods and services would, of course, increase the tax base and perhaps, eventually, offset any temporary drop in the National income that might result from the tax cut.

It seems logical to expect that, if the President's tax cut measure, already approved in the House, is passed by the Senate, the present economic uptrend might continue to set a new, alltime longevity record.

Indeed, it might help to put an end to the huge deficits that have been plaguing the Government for many years.

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, D. A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service spoke at the 23d annual meeting of the soil and water conservation districts in Spearfish, S. Dak., on October 7, 1963.

Mr. Williams, a native son of South Dakota, heads the finest agency of its kind in the world, serving all our people and serving them splendidly. He complimented soil conservation district leaders on their accomplishments over the past quarter century. He challenged them to accept even greater responsibilities in the future. Districts today have an unparalleled opportunity to become the overall resource and rural development leaders of their communities. The Department of Agriculture's program of Rural Areas Development has a key role for district supervisors. Only the local people can make the program a reality.

District leaders and their cooperators can meet this challenge by widening their horizons, and by making full use of the human resources in every district.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this excellent speech by D. A. Williams.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RURAL AREAS DEVELOPMENT AND LAND USE

It always fills me with a great sense of pride to come back to this part of the country—to my home State, and now the home State of the five Fischer infants who last month made news around the world. These babies, along with the thousands to be born this day, are the major reason we meet. For their futures—whether they find them in the city or in the country—may well depend on the decisions that our generation makes at meetings such as this.

I am especially pleased with your choice of the theme for your meeting: "Rural Areas Development and Land Use." It indicates that you are aware of the key role soil and water conservation has in the welfare of a community. It indicates that you have accepted as opportunities the challenge of new problems brought about by our ever-changing and complex society.

South Dakota has made remarkable progress in soil and water conservation. You have come a long way since your first soil conservation district was formed over 25 years ago. You have seen the district's role grow from one of controlling erosion to one of providing the stimulus and direction needed for the economic development of rural areas. You and your counterparts across the Nation have provided the leadership.

Twenty-five years ago conservation efforts were prompted by the fear of ultimate exhaustion of our natural resources. That fear has been largely removed by new knowledge. Instead of simple preservation, our goal today is to use and manage resources in ways to get the greatest benefit from them—for town and country—now and in the future. Wise use, rather than restraint of use, is the keynote. Idle resources make no contribution to economic growth. Today the practice of soil and water conservation consists mainly of applying new technology in ways to keep land resources productive and useful.

It is true that today we are producing more food and fiber than we can consume, sell abroad, or use in the food for peace program without disrupting the economics of the countries we seek to help. Even if the population continues to grow at the present rate, we expect that by 1980 we will need about 50 million fewer acres of cropland than we had in 1959. This is not because we have too much land. Indeed, we have no surplus of productive land. It is because we need to make some adjustments in the use of land.

We need to shift uses of land within the agricultural plant itself to create a balance between production and need. However, shifts of cropland from crops now in surplus to uses that meet the needs of all Americans must be made in ways that will reward the farmer and not cut his income.

According to the Bureau of the Census our population in the year 2000 will be about double what it is today. It follows that we will need nearly twice the agricultural production we have today. Our land must produce proportionately more meat, dairy, and poultry products, fruits and vegetables, and other food for the soaring population in addition to supplying much of the raw materials for industry. And it also must provide room for living—for housing, industry, recreation, and other requirements.

At the same time, we are told that by the year 2000 all demands for land, if taken separately and added together, would total 50 million acres more than the total area of the 48 contiguous States. Even today we are feeling the pressures of competition for use of our land. These must be met with intelligent decisions as to what land use should have priority—or what multiple uses are to the best advantage of all.

Land and water are unique among natural resources in the extent to which they serve multiple uses. An acre in forest can provide timber, wildlife, recreation, erosion control, water supply, and protection from runoff—all at the same time. Farmland can produce birds and small game and recreation along with crops and forage. Reservoirs and streams can be managed to produce wildlife and many kinds of recreation while at the same time providing flood prevention and water supplies for human, agricultural, and industrial use.

Attainment of maximum, long-term benefits from multiple-use depends on careful planning and proper management.

The increasing use of land for nonagricultural purposes involves more and more people—builders, engineers, recreationists, planning officials, sportsmen—in addition to the farmer and rancher. Each has his own interest and his own specialized knowledge. We need to blend these interests and this specialized knowledge. We must combine them with our own in order to work out a satisfactory land use pattern—one that combines all needs. The time has passed when we can deal independently with our resources. We can't go at the job piecemeal. We must not overlook any of the implications—social, economic, or political—in planning the overall use and development of our resources. All interests must work together.

But who will lead the way?

Soil and water conservation districts are in a position to supply the leadership that is required for this undertaking. Your organization has the knowledge of the capabilities of the soil. You know how soils can be used. Many of you may have had a part in the conservation needs inventory recently completed. You all have firsthand knowledge of the resources in your area. You know the resource problems in your area. You have the organization and the power to make decisions and to act. Indeed, districts have unique qualifications to give leadership to a program of developing and managing our natural resources—a leadership that will assure that all resources are making a maximum contribution to conservation and to the economy and needs of the community.

Proper land use is one of the objectives of the Department of Agriculture's program of rural areas development. Although soil and water conservation and rural development have been synonymous concepts for some 30 years, only lately have we begun to use rural areas development as a descriptive term. The program is a combination of old and new programs and authorities to be used by local leaders in creating new economic opportunities in rural America. The program seeks to fulfill several high-priority national goals. I'd like to give you these goals:

1. To increase the income of people living in rural America and to eliminate underemployment.

2. To improve the family farm system of American agriculture.

3. To expand job opportunities through loans, grants, technical services, and training programs that create new factories, stores, recreational enterprises, crafts, and services of all kinds.

4. To promote outdoor recreation opportunities on privately owned and public lands—recreation that provides a new source of income for the farmer and rural businessman and at the same time serves the need of our growing urban population.

5. To readjust land use, nationwide, to meet national needs and to bring the use of each acre in line with its capabilities.

6. To provide appropriate services and adequate financial support for the protection and development of our soil, water, forest, fish and wildlife, and open spaces.

7. To improve existing rural community facilities and institutions, and where needed to build new ones so that people in our rural areas are assured pure water supplies, first-rate schools and hospitals, and other services that are standard in a modern community.

8. To make continuous and systematic efforts to eliminate the many complex causes of rural poverty.

This is a vast undertaking. And it leaves no doubt in one's mind about the place resource conservation has in rural areas development.

Soil and water conservation districts will have to play a key role to make the program a success. Only the local people can make the program a reality. The Department of Agriculture can help technically and financially, but the initiative must come from the local people. They must furnish the drive and the leadership.

A good starting point is updating district work programs. I'm pleased to report that about 800 districts across the Nation have taken advantage of Secretary Freeman's offer of a modernized cooperative working agreement. They have broadened their district programs to meet the needs of these modern times. However, there are still many district programs that date back 20 to 25 years. Ideas, plans, programs, and concepts adequate then are not adequate today. Today we need programs that reflect all of the long-time resource needs of the community—not just agricultural land; not just watershed projects and flood prevention needs; not just woodland needs; not just farm needs and problems; but all community needs—parks, playgrounds and other recreational facilities, tourism, water storage, and local industry to improve the economic welfare of the community. Things that directly concern all citizens in all walks of life.

A revised district program recognizing the immediate and long-term needs of the community can form the basic foundation for the local rural areas development effort and thus make a valuable contribution to the future economy of the area.

I urge that each district make updating its work program a prime objective.

Congress, through the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, authorized new activities tied directly to the district program. These, combined with the old, will help rural communities respond to their aspirations for development and growth—for program services that will stimulate their economies, both farm and industrial, both commercial and cultural, both human resources and natural resources.

The new programs include cropland conversion, resource conservation and development, amendments to the small watershed program, and assistance in establishing income-producing recreation enterprises on private rural land.

The major objective of the cropland conversion program is to help farmers shift land from producing crops in oversupply to grass, trees, wildlife, and recreational uses. The program is underway on a pilot basis in 237 counties. In addition to cost-sharing materials, services and other assistance needed for conservation measures, the Department can offer adjustment payments to help maintain an adequate income during the transition from cropping to other uses. Long-term agreements will be based on a basic conservation plan developed in cooperation with a soil conservation district and with the assistance of an SCS technician. You will undoubtedly recognize the new long-term agreements as an application of the principles that have proved so highly acceptable and workable in the Great Plains conservation program.

Resource conservation and development projects will enable farmers and ranchers, city people, rural communities, civic groups, and others to work together to improve land use patterns and develop the natural resources of rural areas. The Secretary has authorized the SCS to give planning assistance to the first of these projects—a project in a four-county area of southern Indiana. I am glad to see that a project here in South Dakota is among the first 15 proposals. It involves over 1 million acres in Bon Homme and Charles Mix Counties. Land conversion, flood and sediment control, accelerated rangeland improvement and land treatment, and the development of recreational facilities and municipal water supplies are the main objectives of the proposed project.

Amendments have broadened the small watershed program to make it more adaptable to local needs. Funds can now be advanced to local organizations to develop water supply for future municipal and industrial use and to preserve critical sites for future construction of water impoundments. Also, cost sharing is now authorized for public recreation developments in the projects. We have received over 40 proposals for adding recreation to watershed projects. Two of the proposals were from South Dakota—the Pattee Creek project in Lincoln County and Turkey Ridge Creek project in Turner County.

Farmers and ranchers may now receive technical help from SCS and loans from the Farmers Home Administration in developing income-producing recreational facilities. Recreation acres as part of the basic farm plan can mean more effective use of the land, additional income for rural landowners, and expanded recreation opportunities for both urban and rural people. Our public parks, camping grounds, lakes, and beaches are jammed with people searching for outdoor fun. The increased leisure time, higher income, and the ease of travel on our great highways draw people to out-of-doors as never before. The simple pleasures head the list—hiking, swimming, boating, picnicking, fishing, hunting, and camping.

Our public recreation facilities—even though they will continue to grow in number—will not be able to keep up with the booming demand for outdoor recreation. The demand can be met, however, on privately owned lands—the farms, ranches, and woodlands that make up nearly three-fourths of our land area.

During the past year, activity in this phase of the Rural Areas Development program has been extremely gratifying. Nearly 10,000 district cooperators—131 of them in South Dakota—established one or more income-producing recreation enterprises on their land. About a tenth of these cooperators are making recreation their primary source of income. The enterprises include vacation farms, fishing and swimming waters, picnic and camping grounds, hunting preserves, and the like. This is a relatively new use for private rural land, and a new business for farmers and ranchers.

These are some of the new tools provided by Congress last year. Each directly concerns and needs the support of soil conservation districts to make it fully effective.

Your State has been alert to its resource legislative needs. South Dakota legislators have provided tools designed to fit many conservation needs and objectives, and combinations of needs and objectives.

In addition to your soil conservation district's law you have provided for watershed districts, which can be organized under the wing of soil conservation district supervisors at the beginning, and thereafter operate independently.

Your more recent conservancy act provides for conservancy subdistricts. These subdistricts, which can cover larger areas than other special-purpose districts, have some authorities not granted in other legislative acts—authorities that can contribute greatly to coordinated resource development programs generated by soil conservation districts, watershed districts, and irrigation and drainage districts.

If all these tools are to be used and coordinated effectively, it will be the soil and water conservation districts that make it so. While success will be measured by the desire of rural people to move ahead, it will depend on the leadership the rural people are offered.

That is your challenge. It is your new challenge.

Over a quarter of a century ago districts were challenged with the need to combat soil erosion on agricultural land. They accepted that challenge. Their success is strikingly revealed throughout the country.

You as district supervisors have every reason to be proud of your record. You have proved beyond a doubt that a democratic group of locally elected people can successfully undertake the vast job of protecting and developing our soil, water, and related resources.

The job 25 years ago was far simpler than the job today. And the job ahead is far broader in scope and more complex than we could have ever envisioned when the first district was formed. It extends into the backyards and the daily lives of everyone in every community in the Nation.

Today districts have an unparalleled opportunity to become the overall resource and rural development leaders of their community. They can assume this broader leadership by widening their horizons, by recognizing the valuable contributions other individuals and organizations can make to the overall program, and by making use of these important human resources. By doing these things districts can go into new heights. They can make their second quarter century more productive than the first 25 years.

Although the concept of resource development has broadened many times, the fundamentals have not changed. We have not changed the basics of our program. What we are doing is refining it and realining it to keep up with the fast-moving world in which we live. We can cope with change only by meeting it head-on and adapting it to our purpose. This is resource conservation and rural areas development.

Is the challenge worth it? I'm sure it is.

PORK BARREL?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, an analysis of the August article in Life magazine charging that there is a huge Federal "pork barrel" from which Members of Congress ladle foolish water development projects for their constituents back home has been made by the Democratic National Committee.

It is a nonpartisan analysis. It defends projects launched during Republican administrations—like Fryingpan-Arkansas—as well as the many for which the Democratic Party has been largely responsible.

On Monday of this week I took issue on the Senate floor with the Life editorial view toward public works projects. I now ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the valuable material which the Democratic National Committee has assembled.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Life: "The Flaming Gorge Dam * * * will generate power at a cost higher than its selling price."

Fact: The Flaming Gorge Dam, which is part of a dual-purpose power producing-irrigation project, will pay for itself as well as the entire project. By the end of the payout period, over $900 million of surplus power revenues will be available to the Upper Colorado River Basin States to assist in developing needed and worthwhile additional units.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE SACRAMENTO (CALIF.) CANAL—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: "Now the channel, which can silt up quickly because of its soft banks, will require constant dredging."

Fact: The old 10-foot channel from Sacramento to the sea required $300,000 annually for maintenance. The enlarged and improved channel is estimated to require $650,000 annually. This cost of maintenance is included in the estimated average annual cost of the project and is not considered to be excessive when compared with other projects throughout the Nation.

Life: The Sacramento Canal opens "a port nobody has to have * * * (a seaport) no one needs."

Fact: The Sacramento Canal will open up inland Sacramento to oceangoing ships up from San Francisco Bay and produce navigational benefits estimated to average over $4 million annually when compared to annual costs. The benefit-cost ratio is 1.4 to 1 or 2.2 to 1 depending on whether the calculations are based on 50- or 100-year life. Local interests are required to contribute over $4 million to the project and are required to provide terminal facilities estimated to cost $11.4 million. In addition, they have reconstructed Rio Vista Bridge at a cost of about $3.2 million, and have constructed other pertinent facilities for the project estimated to cost $7 million.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE ST. ANTHONY'S FALLS (UPPER MISSISSIPPI) PROJECT—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: "The fatal flaw in St. Anthony's is that now as the project nears completion after 26 years in the works, nobody seems to want it or know what to do with it."

Fact: River tonnage on the upper Mississippi between St. Louis and on up toward Minneapolis has already increased 13 times in the last 25 years. Over 200 new industrial plants have been built along this river in the last decade, and one of the major reasons for this expansion is that water transportation is cheaper for shipping bulky products than is rail or truck transportation. In addition, the project created employment at the construction site and additional employment at distant places wherever the materials and equipment used in the construction were manufactured. Although the project is not entirely completed (the upper locks are scheduled for dedication soon) the

Corps of Engineers has already issued permits for two new terminal facilities and a third is in process. The consensus of shippers in the area is that there is no question that private enterprise will develop adequate terminal facilities.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE GLEN ELDER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT IN KANSAS—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: Glen Elder "will irrigate land that isn't needed for crops."

Fact: Not only is there no irrigation system in the Glen Elder unit but to the contrary, the unit will take 20,000 acres out of production. This 20,000 acres is now producing wheat and sorghums—both surplus crops.

In addition the Glen Elder flood control project will add to the $11.3 billion benefits that have already accrued to the Nation's taxpayers in the form of preventive flood damage as a result of similar reclamation projects.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE POST OFFICE—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: Labels subsidy programs as "notorious money wasters" and states: "Juicy as they are, public works projects are by no means the only sources of slicing pork out of the Federal Treasury. Perhaps the oldest and most cherished of all is the Post Office Department."

Fact: This attitude toward subsidy and the Post Office which Life professes to hold is hard to reconcile with the fact that the Luce publications will this year receive an estimated Federal subsidy of more than $1 million a month[1] in the form of lower-than-cost mailing rates. Further it is estimated that the loss to the Post Office Department and the taxpayers on each new Life subscription (which consists of 52 issues) is $2 per year. This represents the difference between what Life pays the Department for making delivery and what it costs the Department to deliver them.

Life: "It seems fair to call it (post office construction) pork. Success in scattering new post offices generously around a congressional district has kept more men in Congress longer than any other wrench in the political tool kit."

Fact: Despite the fictional whim that post offices are built to meet the caprices of campaign politics—4,000 post offices were reviewed between September 1961 and June 30, 1963, in instances where space and facilities were found to be inadequate. Of those cases only 1,100 survived the scrutiny. Thus only 25 percent of the eligible new post offices were authorized under tight budgetary limitations.

Life: "The Post Office binds itself to rent the buildings from 20 to 30 years with renewed options up to 50 years."

Fact: 90 percent of all leases are for 10 years or less.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE U.S. EMPLOYMENT SERVICE—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: Public funds spent for USES are "for political advantage first and the public welfare second."

Fact: 321 million placements in 30 years of its existence demonstrates the integrity of the public employment system.

Life: "This agency (USES) managed on a $1 million budget in 1933 when it was trying to find work for some of the 12.8 million jobless. It now spends $169 million a year."

Fact: This statement arbitrarily overlooks the population and labor force increases over the 30-year span and the increased costs of salaries, rents and equipment. In addition, in fiscal 1933 USES was not a nationwide system as it is now.

Life: USES "now spends $169 million a year, most of it on people who are employed—to find them better jobs."

Fact: 97 percent of USES placements according to a survey made May 19, 1963, are the unemployed.

Life: "The unemployed laborers (are no longer) the main concern of the service."

Fact: Almost 2 million jobs for unskilled workers were found by USES in 1963 alone in spite of the downtrend in total unskilled openings.

Life: "To attract professional people, some State agencies build elaborate offices devoted exclusively to placement of professional people with free parking lots in downtown districts."

Fact: Nationwide, there are only 10 separate local public employment offices devoted exclusively to placement of professional people. Not a single one of them has a free parking lot.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT SURPLUS CROPS—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: "The spectacle of using scarce tax dollars * * * to grow feed grains (on reclamation projects) at the same time the Federal Government is spending more dollars to pay farmers to take other feed grain producing land out of production is beyond comprehension."

Fact: Less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the wheat produced comes from reclamation projects. Feed grains grown on reclamation projects are less than one-half of 1 percent of the surplus. None of it goes to commercial markets therefore the argument that reclamation should be stopped because of crop surpluses is specious.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE OMNIBUS BILL—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: Charged "pork barrel" and claimed the "redoubtable pirate bands keep going after the loot" with an eye to "political advantage first and the public welfare second."

Fact: In 1958 Congress enacted an omnibus bill. It was the first one in 4 years. A total of 130 new construction projects were embodied in the legislation as it came to the House, affecting this many widely scattered areas throughout the United States and its territories. Seventy-one of these projects involved flood control and allied purposes. Forty-eight were to facilitate navigation. Eleven were concerned with hurricane protection and beach erosion.

The year 1958 was an election year. The Democratic Party was the majority party in Congress (231 Democrats to 199 Republicans.) Under these circumstances, if political advantage had been the motivation as is charged by Life, this omnibus bill would have been lopsided with authorizations on behalf of districts represented by the majority party in the House.

Yet a Democratic majority was presenting legislation which authorized projects in 67 districts served by Republicans and in only 55 districts served by Democrats. This same general principle applies in the omnibus authorization bill of 1960 and 1962. This fact puts the lie to Life's attempted indictment that political advantage to individual Members is the motivation behind such legislation.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
September 1963.

FACT SHEET "PORK BARREL" OR "HOGWASH" BACKGROUND

On August 16, Life magazine published a distorted attack on Federal aid projects tastefully entitled "Now—See the Innards of the Fat Pig." It failed somehow to dissect the innards of the publications chain of which it is a member and which annually is subsidized to the tune of an estimated $22.9 million in postal pork.

The substance of its charge was that many Federal projects are simply worthless investments that waste the taxpayer's money. The charge is demonstrably false and Life has evaded a reexamination of its article based on the facts.

An immediate drumfire of bipartisan reaction against what was called Life's "journalistic monstrosity" rolled from the floor of Congress as well as from newspapers and organizations across the country. Language ranged from:

"They use the term 'pork barrel' * * * my reply is 'hogwash.'"

WAYNE ASPINALL,
Democrat, of Colorado.

To—

"The authors of the Life magazine article used questionable techniques in a broadside aimed at all Government programs in referring to them as pork barrel projects."

MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Republican, of Wisconsin.

WHAT LIFE SAID—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Following is a sampling of charges made by the magazine article, together with their refutation by statements from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 14, 15 and 19, 1963.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT RECLAMATION IN GENERAL—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: "The pork barrel, by long and cheerful habit, works best in just a few fat-cat categories. By tradition as old as the country the happiest hunting grounds for the pork barreler have been public works with its roads, dams, parks, waterways."

Fact: Reclamation is one of the Federal programs that provide for the return to the U.S. Treasury of the dollars spent—92.2 percent of the cost of all authorized projects is repaid to the Government; 7.8 percent representing flood control, fish and wildlife and recreation benefits—has been declared by Congress to be in the public interest and nonreimbursable.

Tax revenues from farmers and businesses in reclamation areas amount to about $400 million a year. These revenues now total $5.1 billion—more than the total cost of all the reclamation projects that have ever been built.

For each worker on an irrigated farm, two additional jobs are generated in local towns.

Reclamation projects supply water for municipal and industrial needs of more than 10.1 million persons.

Taxes alone that have been generated in reclamation areas have returned more than the entire cost of all projects ever built under the program.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE ARKANSAS NAVIGATION PROJECT—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: "The most outrageous pork barrel project in U.S. history."

Fact: Based on July 1962 prices the annual benefits of this combined navigation and power-producing flood control project, are estimated to be $65.7 million and it has been conservatively estimated that the project will stimulate, as has the completed Ohio River project, $1 billion in personal income for the area.

Life: Deriding the channel section of the Ark-Nav Life says: "A 516-mile channel to the landlocked port at Catoosa, Okla." illustrates "in a grandiose overblown way * * * the intricate workings of the pork barrel."

Fact: Life chooses to ignore the fact that this city of Catoosa is actually the port for Tulsa and the central Oklahoma oil region, and that the waterway will serve many other cities en route, including Little Rock.

Life: Slamming the flood control aspect of the Ark-Nav, Life says: "The fingerlike dikes reaching out into the Arkansas River to snare passing silt are part of the most outrageous pork barrel project in U.S. history."

Fact: In 1927 major floods washed away between 2,500 and 3,000 acres of rich bottom land. In 1943 another great flood caused damages that ran into millions of dollars. To avoid further losses, these dikes were constructed. The dike systems are similar to those which have proved their effectiveness many years in stabilizing banks and confining flows to desired channels on the lower Missouri River, another stream which in its natural state was characterized by meandering flow, high sediment content and wide variations in stream discharge. The dikes are also part of a multipurpose plan that will make it possible for the river valley to become at least as important industrially as the Ruhr Valley in Germany.

---

[1] The most recent figures indicate that Life will receive an estimated $14.5 million subsidy, Time $6 million, Fortune $202,000, Sports Illustrated $2.2 million in 1963 making a total subsidy for Luce publications this year of $22.9 million or $1.9 million a month.

Life: "Here is the fattest slice of all * * * $1.2 billion."

Fact: To date $341 million has been appropriated, not $1.2 billion.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE FRYING PAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: "Project water is expected to increase greatly the alfalfa crop of Colorado which already has about a million acres of alfalfa in the soil bank that no one is allowed to cut."

Fact: Colorado does not have 1 million acres of alfalfa in the soil bank. The project will not bring any new land under irrigation. It will however generate over 500 million kilowatt-hours of electricity annually and boost water supply to municipalities.

Life: "Out of this pair of neighboring Colorado lakes in the Rockies, water that now flows west will flow east and $170 million will flow out of U.S. taxpayers' pocketbooks."

Fact: This multipurpose water diversion, power-producing irrigation project is comparable to the highly regarded Big-T in Colorado and like the Big-T will bring a return of millions of dollars to the taxpayers.

WHAT LIFE SAID ABOUT THE UPPER COLORADO PROJECT—WHAT THE FACTS REALLY ARE

Life: One of the "tasty items in the steaming pork casserole."

Fact: This labeling of "pork barrel" is hard to reconcile in view of Life's statement in their April 9, 1956, issue which said: "The project will open a rich new region to the United States which could produce everything from sugarbeets and peaches to uranium and molybdenum and provide a promising new center of population for the country."

CONSERVATION OF INDIANA DUNES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have just received correspondence from Mr. Sam Ropchan, president of the Fort Wayne, Ind., chapter of the Izaak Walton League. In it is incorporated a resolution of this group concerning the Indiana dunes.

Mr. President, as you and my colleagues know, this is a project of great interest to many people in the Midwestern United States.

I believe it would be fitting if permanent record of this resolution would be made.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Ropchan's letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT WAYNE CHAPTER,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE
OF AMERICA, INC.,
Huntertown, Ind., September 26, 1963.

Senator BIRCH BAYH,
Senate Office Building,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SENATOR BAYH: The Indiana division of the Izaak Walton League of America, in convention assembled, September 21–22, 1963, at Kokomo, Ind., reaffirmed its resolution of September 30, 1952, for the conservation of the Indiana dunes. The resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the Indiana dunes on the shore of Lake Michigan constitute one of nature's greatest gifts to Indiana; and

"Whereas the dunes are one of the wonders of the world which attract interested visitors from all over the world; and

"Whereas the growth of adjacent urban areas has destroyed a substantial portion of the original dunes area; and

"Whereas the continued normal expansion of the urban areas, together with other construction proposals threaten further great destruction of the dunes area to the point of virtual extinction: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Indiana division of the IWLA in convention assembled*, That further destruction of the dunes is contrary to both public interests and conservation principles; that the remaining dunes areas should be permanently preserved for educational and recreational use of all the people and for posterity.

"Adopted this 30th day of September 1952.

"Reaffirmed this 22d day of September, 1963."

Every chapter present at this convention voted affirmatively for this resolution.

Conservationally yours,
SAM ROPCHAN,
President.

NEED FOR SERVICE CORPS STRONG AND CLEAR

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, nowhere have I seen a more clear and persuasive statement of the purpose of the National Service Corps bill than that set forth in a letter by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] printed in the Wall Street Journal of October 1.

In his letter the Senator points out the conservative nature of the National Service Corps. The corps will provide a practical and useful channel for our Nation's idealism. The corpsmen will in no way restrict or impugn local initiative. On the contrary, corpsmen only will serve where and when they are invited by local authorities.

Under the extremely able and dedicated leadership of the Senator, the National Service Corps bill, S. 1321, passed the Senate August 14. It has now been referred to the House Education and Labor Committee where hearings have been held. I am extremely hopeful the other body will soon be able to work out a version of this proposal acceptable to it so that National Service corpsmen may soon be at work in the field.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSTRUMENT OF IDEALISM

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

As the chief sponsor of the National Service Corps bill, I was sorry to see that your newspaper, which prides itself on its conservatism, was opposed to this idea (editorial, "Dramatizing Our Problems," Sept. 17). For those who can escape the automatic reaction that any idea originated in Washington is automatically bad should see this measure as conservative in essence. For the Service Corps will be a practical instrument of our Nation's idealism.

The National Service Corps will make available to public and private agencies across the country trained, full-time volunteers. But these volunteers, a small and carefully chosen group, will only undertake a project at the specific request of a local community agency, and then only with the approval of the Governor of the State in which they will serve.

At the basis of the National Service Corps idea is the concept of local initiative. The Service Corps will draw on the talents of the entire Nation to supply local communities with skilled manpower. But the project on which these volunteers will work will be developed and administered by the local communities themselves. The Service Corpsmen will not and cannot go where they are not wanted. But I am convinced that they can play an important role in helping many communities in their own efforts for a better America.

I agree that we should do all that we could to strengthen the work of existing agencies. This is exactly what the National Service Corps is intended to do. Obviously, the 5,000 volunteers envisioned by the corps cannot do all of the job that needs to be done. But I very much doubt that any social worker or welfare official would say that in the welfare field we are doing as good a job as might be accomplished at the present time. In the course of extensive hearings on this bill, social workers, religious leaders, and public officials almost unanimously endorsed this proposal. And they supported it precisely because it would be a genuine contribution to their work in terms of people rather than money.

Will the Service Corps propagandize as your editorial warns? I think not. For it is not propaganda to tell someone the facts. And the fact is that in midst of our boasted land of plenty, poverty, hardship, and despair still exist. How many Americans know of the life of the migrant trapped in an economic treadmill; of the misery on our Indian reservations; or the forgotten daily tragedies in our mental hospitals? If, by the example of their hard work and sacrifice, the volunteers can make others aware of these problems, show them that something can be done and encourage them to do it, their work will be more than justified.

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.

EAST-WEST RELATIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on October 9 Roscoe Drummond's column appeared in the Washington Post. I would like this enlightening article regarding East-West relations to be placed in the RECORD. Mr. Drummond aptly points out the aims of the Soviet bloc in the current thaw in American-Soviet relations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

LONDON.—The European experts on Soviet affairs are asking all the right questions about the smiles and soft words which now cloak Kremlin policy.

There is no doubt that we are experiencing a pause that is refreshing East-West relations. If we are to act wisely in this mellow climate and find out whether it is shadow or substance, we must come as closely as possible to answering these questions:

What is the primary cause of the Soviet thaw?

What does Moscow hope to get from the West in the "new steps" the Soviets are constantly saying both sides ought to take?

How long is the thaw going to last—before it freezes over?

The European Kremlinologists are no more unanimous than their American counterparts. There are too many uncertainties to permit unanimity. But there is a consensus in the answers to these questions. If you rule out the wishful thinkers who are afraid to face reality, the answers come out about like this:

Primary cause: The only new factor to emerge between the time the Soviets rejected the test ban in 1959 to the time they embraced it this summer is the Sino-Soviet feud. This was the overwhelming incentive for the Soviets to sign the test ban and thus demonstrate, as relations with Red China were badly deteriorating, that the Kremlin could reach a significant agreement with the West. Obviously there are additional reasons—Moscow's desire to reduce the danger of nuclear war and ease the strains on the Soviet military budget.

What next? At every forum available to them, Soviet spokesmen are now busily engaged in exhorting world opinion to demand that the West join with Russia in taking further steps in the pursuit of peaceful coexistence. They are not talking about such modest things as guarantees against surprise attack and wider exchange of people and ideas. No, they are talking about NATO's signing of a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites, creating a nuclear free zone in central Europe and recognition of the satellite state of East Germany.

In the sunshine of Soviet smiles at the U.N., let's not fool ourselves as to what these steps would really mean.

A nonaggression pact with Eastern Europe would mean that we would be putting the seal of Western approval on the very aggressions by which the Soviet Union snuffed out the freedom of these once independent nations and rob these people of all hope of future release.

A nuclear free zone in central Europe would dangerously upset the balance of military power in all of Europe—to the disadvantage of the West.

Any recognition of East Germany's puppet regime means acceptance of the enduring division of Germany, which is the greatest abnormality of all the postwar arrangements.

When the Soviet spokesmen talk of steps like these, they are seeking to obtain by thaw the very one-sided aims they have been seeking to get by threats. This is why we have to be so alert to see that the present thaw is not our undoing.

How long? Is the new thaw going to last longer than previous thaws? The consensus among the experts on this side of the Atlantic is that the relaxed East-West climate will last until one of two things happen: Either until Red China and the Soviet Union make up their differences—which seems unlikely soon—or until Moscow concludes that there is nothing much it can get by smiles alone.

There could be one other factor which would keep the thaw in being for at least a year; that is, Mr. Khrushchev's decision that he should not rock the Kennedy boat until after the 1964 election, on the ground (whether sound or not) that a reelected Kennedy administration would be less unwelcome to Moscow than any probable alternative.

PROCUREMENT OF EXPERT ASSISTANCE BY INDIAN TRIBES IN CASES BEFORE THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the unfinished business, House bill 3306, and that it be made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It comes automatically before the Senate, in view of the taking of the recess.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3306) to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, following line 22, it is proposed to insert:

> Sec. 7. After the date of the approval of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall approve no contract which makes the compensation payable to a witness before the Indian Claims Commission contingent upon the recovery of a judgment against the United States.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to make inquiry of the Chair as to whether the committee amendment involves only a new section 7.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have no objection to that; but subsequently I wish to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out section 2, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

> Sec. 2. No loan shall be made under this Act to a tribe, band, or group if it has funds available on deposit in the Federal Treasury or elsewhere in an amount adequate to obtain the expert assistance it needs or if, in the opinion of the Secretary, the fees to be paid the experts are unreasonable in light of the services to be performed by them.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to offer my amendment and to use the time while I am so doing to discuss for a little bit, the rather strange nature of the bill.

I point out to Senators and to the President that some time ago, in an effort to try to do something about Indian claims which were being handled individually, Congress established the Indian Claims Commission, under which we gave to the Indians the right to bring suit against the United States for monetary sums which were very substantial in nature. Those suits have been filed. After a certain due date under that bill all further claims of this nature were cut off. But I point out to the Senate that already there have been judgments issued by the Indian Claims Commission in the total amount of more than $89 million, and that this amount has been paid. That was the judgment amount out of a total of $338,311,000, which was claimed in those cases. In addition to the cases that have been tried and determined up to date, a great number of cases are still on file. Those cases are astronomical in amount and size. I have been told by the very distinguished Chief Commissioner, former Senator Watkins, that a part of the problem in trying to process those claims is the fact that the Indians who are making the claims do not have sufficient funds to present the necessary evidence to the Commission, both with respect to title and also the accounting as to the amount of possible culpability so far as the U.S. Treasury is concerned.

These cases have been pending for quite a long time. After considerable study former Senator Watkins came forth with a proposal which has been passed through the House and which is in the bill before the Senate. That proposal would provide that the United States, through the Federal Treasury, would supply to the Indians who were making claims against the Treasury the necessary money in terms of a revolving fund so that they could pay the witnesses in order to prove their cases. I have been a lawyer for a considerable number of years. This is the first time that I have ever heard of a defendant providing the money to the plaintiff so that the plaintiff could prove the case against the defendant. That is exactly what the bill before the Senate would do. We would provide $900,000 so that the Indians could hire, on a fixed-fee basis, the necessary witnesses to present their claims before the Indian Bureau. I have real difficulty in my own mind in justifying a situation in which a defendant in any case should provide the funds to the plaintiff to prove the case against the defendant who was supplying the money. It does not make any sense. It also seems to me that that is particularly troublesome in a case in which we are dealing with the taxpayers' money.

On the other side of the argument I must say—and I am sure that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] would agree with my statement—that considerable expense is involved in maintaining the Indian Claims Commission. I have before me an estimate of cost which would indicate that it costs about $1,651,000 per year to provide the lawyers for the Justice Department, the General Accounting Office clerks and accountants who are checking the records, and to pay the Indian Claims Commission, not counting personnel in the Interior Department. The theory of the bill is that if we provide these funds, the necessary time during which that amount of money or more will have to be spent on opposition to the Indians' claims can be cut down. Even if we provide the money, there are approximately 380 dockets still pending. I can see no cutoff date in the future by which we will be saving that amount of money. What I have done, however, in order to try not to be too obstreperous on the question, is to work with former Senator Watkins, who is a very conscientious person and who has done a very fine job as Chief Commissioner, to try to see if we cannot devise some method to insure that funds which we would provide under the bill would be used only if the Indians did not in fact have other funds available to them. It does not make any sense to me under any circumstances to provide taxpayer funds for the Indians to prove their cases if, in fact, the Indians already have money of their own available for that purpose.

That is the point of the amendment I have offered. I have considerable doubt as to the precedent which might be established by the bill and the advisability or desirability of it. I cannot see why, as fiduciaries of the taxpayers' money, we should be providing taxpayers' funds in order to permit the Indians to sue the taxpayers and prove their cases. That is exactly what we are doing in this situation. However, as I said, the proposal is an experiment in an effort to try to move the cases along. I have told Commissioner Watkins that I would go along with the proposal if my amendment should be adopted. All we can do, I presume, is to let the proposal go through and try to see whether it will work.

I have before me a record of the dockets. I have some concern about the delay that is evidenced in the status report on some of the dockets.

For example, under docket 18(P), which deals with the Red Leg Band of Indians who are suing the Government, the status report is that they are awaiting briefs after hearings, the arguments having been heard on October 11, 1962. I do not know of any other case in which a full year has been required to file briefs after an argument has been concluded.

There are other cases which are similar in nature and which seem to me to be unduly delayed. Perhaps the bill before the Senate will stimulate the prosecution of those claims, and perhaps we can get rid of them sooner than would otherwise be possible. I took up with the Chief Commissioner and with other members of the Commission other possible amendments, and have abandoned them as not being practical at this particular moment. But for the Record I think I should state what they were.

First, I tried to devise a system under which, if the claims which are already on file were not prosecuted with diligence—within a certain length of time—they would be dismissed with prejudice. But the problem is to determine a definition of what "prosecution with diligence" is. It is very difficult.

The next thing that I desired to be sure of was that there would be a flat prohibition in the bill against the employment of expert witnesses on a contingent-fee basis, namely, that they would receive a share of whatever the eventual judgment might be.

Obviously that practice would do nothing except to provide an incentive to have the evidence presented by the experts colored to say the least. That is a practice which should not be encouraged by Congress. I was happy that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] and his subcommittee were able to incorporate a flat prohibition of that kind of procedure in the present bill as an amendment.

The other point which I think should be taken up again—and I say this for Record—is the fact that there has been on file for a considerable period of time a resolution which would require periodic reports from the Bureau concerning possible emancipation of Indian tribes, and the degree to which such emancipation can be accelerated. It seems to me that rather than keeping the Indians as wards of the U.S. Government, as rapidly as possible we should turn them loose so that they can become fruitful citizens, in the full meaning of that term, in comparison with other groups.

This obviously does not belong in this particular bill, but I wished to bring it up so that the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] would know that I wish to get together with him and with the staff members to see if some action can be taken.

Again I urge that the amendment I have offered to the bill be adopted, in order to insure that we shall not be simply wasting the taxpayers' funds, even though we are embarking on a highly unusual and unprecedented course by passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado indicated, the objective of the bill is to expedite the handling of the backlog of cases now pending before the Indian Claims Commission. The committee has been mindful of the fact that it costs the Government some $1,650,000 a year to operate the Commission, and there are still some 380 cases yet to be litigated. The committee feels that passage of the bill would help to expedite the litigation by enabling impecunious tribes to obtain the expert witnesses who are required in order to proceed with the adjudication of the claims now pending.

For these reasons, I have no objection to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment and proceed promptly to pass the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho a question about the bill.

Would the bill in any way affect the problem which is presented for the Indians in southern New York, whose lands were flooded and who have claims against the Government arising from that fact?

Mr. CHURCH. No. The bill would not affect that situation at all. It relates only to claims now pending before the Indian Claims Commission, all of which had to be filed some years ago. Therefore, it would have no effect or application whatever to the situation to which the Senator refers.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 3306) was read the third time and passed.

NEW YORKERS OFFER AID TO AID

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Prouty in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, hundreds of letters pour into the Senate Office Building every day addressed to Senators. We receive letters addressed in peculiar ways, which finally reach their destination, thanks to the efficiency of the postal employees. Many people write expressing their views on various Government programs, but only a few are prepared to offer any help.

Recently, I received two letters from Long Island constituents expressing opposition to the cut in the foreign aid bill proposed by the House of Representatives. They were most disturbed over this cut not only because of the harmful effect it might have on the economic growth of underdeveloped countries but also because of the tremendous damage it might do to the United States in our struggle against communism.

Because these two fine ladies wanted to do more than just write to me, they each sent in a check in the amount of a dollar to be forwarded to the Agency for International Development.

I have learned that the Agency for International Development has authority to accept such checks from citizens who wish to help it. Although I suspect it took a good deal of consultation to obtain permission to accept the $2, I believe it will be effective.

It is not always possible for all of us to give practical support to pending legislation. But when it is, it is refreshing and encouraging to have constituents who, instead of merely expressing their views, take it upon themselves to go the extra mile and offer a little hard cash support for the programs they believe in.

These ladies have set a fine example. I hope that, considering the state of the Federal Treasury, their example will be followed by many others. I am sure the Treasury would have no objection if they wished to earmark the money for whatever particular Government project they wished to help.

So my congratulations go to these two fine ladies, Mrs. William R. Fleischer, of 120 Elm Drive, and Mrs. Elinor Perkell, of 125 Elm Drive in Roslyn, N.Y., both of whom are members of the League of Women Voters, for this very effective way of demonstrating their support for the foreign aid program. I am following their directions and transmitting their checks directly to David Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce has ordered reported favorably a bill to deal with one phase of the civil rights problem, the public accommodations provision. I understand the bill will be ready for consideration in a period of perhaps 10 days.

I hope that this bill will be the vehicle for moving ahead on the whole civil rights package. Such a procedure is most likely to achieve results at this session in this important field. The opponents of civil rights legislation can be expected to oppose any meaningful bill by extended debate and the sooner we begin our consideration of this subject the more likely it is that we can complete action before the end of this session. If a bill comes to the Senate from the House of Representatives, in the interim we will be in a much better position to act promptly than if we wait until the last moment before beginning our deliberations.

There is no reason for further delay in acting on a problem which already has been neglected for too long. The Senate should move ahead now with the vehicle which the Committee on Commerce has proposed for dealing with this important problem. I hope that the leadership schedules the bill for early action.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 425, S. 1915, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

THE NORTHEAST AIRLINES CASE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, when an independent body is created in the Government by the Congress, to act, in a sense, as an arm of the Congress, and assigned the responsibility of making decisions, in my opinion Members of Congress should be cautious and restrained in interfering with, seeking to influence, or publicly criticizing the exercise of the quasi-judicial powers by such a commission.

For that reason, many of us who are intensely interested and vitally concerned in the air transportation problem of New England and the Northeast, especially the northern New England States, have refrained from appearing to criticize the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board in the Northeast Airlines case, in which Northeast Airlines was refused a permanent certificate for the so-called New York-Florida route, after it had been operating under an unusual temporary certificate for several years.

However, the time has come when I feel the attention of the Senate and of the country should be directed to at least two aspects of this situation, in view of the decision made only yesterday by the CAB. It is in the interest not only of the people I represent, but of all the people, that these matters be emphasized and brought to the public's attention.

First, there has been a marked and rather amazing precipitancy and haste in the handling of this case since the first decision. It has seemed almost that the CAB had a sense of compulsion to kill off Northeast Airlines service to Florida as quickly, as quietly, and as completely as possible.

The original decision was a 3-to-2 decision. An appeal was taken. The decision on the appeal was issued yesterday with rather astounding promptness, in view of some of the cases that we have watched linger for some time. And even before the decision was made, only a short time after the appeal was taken the CAB with perhaps commendable but still with rather surprising promptness hastened to grant a subsidy to Northeast Airlines to operate its routes locally, north of New York and Boston in New England.

There is something rather interesting in that speed.

In addition to that is this rather striking fact: The Department of Justice sought to intervene, I believe as a friend of the court, and file a petition for reconsideration of the decision. I am astounded to find that the CAB arbitrarily denied the Department of Justice the right even to intervene and be heard. I will not say that that is unprecedented, because I am not familiar enough with the precedents to make such a sweeping statement, but I say without fear of contradiction that it is extremely unusual, if not unprecedented.

The two minority members of the CAB themselves said in their dissenting opinion yesterday that it is almost unprecedented for one of the quasi-judicial commissions to refuse to even listen to the Attorney General of the United States or his representatives who seek to intervene in the public interest.

But that was done, and the decision came down yesterday afternoon denying the appeal. Of course, all that Northeast now has left is an appeal to the courts, which I understand is in progress.

I briefly review these events merely to suggest to you, Mr. President, and to the Senate, that this strange haste, this unusual promptness, when the Commission is divided only 3 to 2, when there has been no unanimity in its decisions, and this unusual refusal when most of these bodies welcome the opinion of the Department of Justice and the Attorney General, merit our attention.

It certainly means something.

The second fact that I feel should be made a part of the public record is the grounds on which Northeast Airlines was denied its certificate, after serving the Florida route for 6 years, and was cut off from that privilege and denied its permanent certificate.

The Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, held hearings on the subject of the impact on the New England States transportation problems of the decision. Those hearings, as was so very ably stated by our chairman, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], were not held for the purpose of going behind the decision of CAB, but they were held primarily to try to find where New England and the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont would stand, what their position would be, and what their prospects of air service would be if the decision became final and Northeast were denied the Florida route, because there was some question as to whether Northeast, even with a subsidy, could survive the unusual blow which had been dealt to it, because it has never been customary—and the Chairman of the CAB testified it was poor policy—to issue a temporary certificate.

In the course of his testimony before our subcommittee, I interrogated the distinguished Chairman of CAB as to the grounds and reasons for the denial of the Northeast Airlines certificate. I had assumed—and I asked him questions which were prompted by the assumption—that the main reason was the feeling on the part of three members of CAB that Northeast Airlines did not have enough financial resources and stability adequately to continue to serve the New England-Florida market. I was somewhat surprised, therefore—as is shown on page 182 of the transcript of hearings—when the Chairman, Mr. Boyd, said, even though just before the decision was made Northeast secured substantial new backing and resources, that the Board did not act on the basis of that knowledge, and that the decision in the case did not rest—and I now quote his words—"on the fitness or unfitness of Northeast Airlines."

That statement is found at page 183 of the transcript of the hearings.

I continue to quote from the hearings:

> Senator COTTON. Did not rest on the financial resources or ability?
>
> Mr. BOYD. No, sir.
>
> Senator COTTON. It rested, rather, on the fact that there was too much competition in the Florida run?
>
> Mr. BOYD. No; it did not rest on too much competition, although it reaches the same result, but that there was no need at this time for a third carrier.
>
> Senator COTTON. Well, that was the basis of it—two carriers were enough?
>
> Mr. BOYD. That is correct.

I read from page 192 of the transcript of hearings:

> Senator COTTON. I thought I understood you a moment ago to say that the basis of this decision was that there should be two instead of three lines into Florida.
>
> Mr. BOYD. That is quite correct. But I trust you would not for a minute limit us to one string to our bow.

Parenthetically, I observe that that is a rather remarkable and interesting phrase on the lips of a quasijudicial officer in discussing a 3-to-2 decision, which would virtually put one of the great and pioneer airlines of the country out of business, and certainly endanger the air service of the section of the country which I in part represent, but which, I have no doubt, was done with true judicial impartiality and calmness. Nevertheless, I think it is a rather interesting play on words. I repeat it:

> I trust you would not for a minute limit us to one string to our bow.

That sounds to me more like a phrase used by someone who was speaking with a sense of partisanship, who was siding on one side of a question. It does not sound like the cold, impartial, measured utterance of a judge.

However, the fact remains that the testimony shows that the main reason for the decision was that two carriers in the New York-Florida market were enough.

The two dissenting members of the Civil Aeronautics Board in their dissenting opinion, started their dissent by saying:

> The New York-Miami market is the second largest passenger mile market in this country. It is one of the heaviest traveled markets in the world. The east coast Florida run is among the richest routes in the world, generating nearly 2 million passengers and 2 billion passenger-miles a year.
>
> In 1956 a veteran Board examiner, plus a unanimous Board, found an immediate and urgent need for adding competition on this route because of the failure of Eastern and National adequately to serve the needs of the traveling public.

The Department of Justice, in its brief—the brief which CAB would not even consider—referred to the statistics of the air transportation markets in this country for the calendar year 1962, which includes the Los Angeles-New York market, the Miami-New York market, the New York-San Francisco market, the Chicago-New York market, the Chicago-Los Angeles market, the Chicago-San Francisco market, the Chicago-Miami market, and so on—15 of the important air transportation markets in the Nation. Those statistics show that in 1962, in the matter of passenger miles, the New York-Miami market stood second in the number of passengers carried. It was practically tied for second place. That is only the New York-Miami market; it is not the New York-Florida market, or the New England-Florida market.

With respect to all passengers to Florida points—both the west coast and east coast—from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, 1,762,679 passengers were carried in 1962.

Everyone of those 15 major markets is served by three carriers, and three of them are served by four carriers. The Chicago-New York market is served by four carriers. The Chicago-Los Angeles market, with fewer passengers and fewer passenger-miles than the New York-Miami run, has four carriers.

The Los Angeles-San Francisco market, with fewer passenger-miles and fewer passengers, is served by four carriers. All the rest are served by three.

In its brief, which was not even considered by the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Department of Justice, after citing these statistics in a table, drew this rather striking conclusion:

> Clearly, judging by the above table, on economic grounds alone, if the New York-Miami pair does not require at least three carriers, there is not a market in the country that does.

Yesterday, when the decision was handed down reaffirming the original decision refusing the appeal, the CAB again stated as the principal ground of its refusal:

> In the final analysis, Northeast's proposals are but another effort to provide the service in markets in which we have found additional service is not needed.

Only under extreme circumstances would I wish to review or seek to criticize the decision of a quasi-judicial tribunal downtown. But I recite these hard facts—and I do so reluctantly—because, so far as I am concerned individually—and this is my own feeling and suspicion—I do not believe that the CAB will adhere to its stated conclusion by its majority that two carriers to Florida are enough. If the three members voting in the majority believe that now, I have little expectation that they will believe it 3 months from now or a year from now. The two dissenters certainly do not believe it now. They feel that at least three carriers are necessary.

If the CAB persists in putting the Northeast Airlines to death and kills it off, and a few months from now sees fit to certificate some other airline as a third carrier from New York or Boston to the Florida market, the CAB will have put itself in a position, in the administration of justice, where it really will have something to account for. If that event should occur, it will be too late to save Northeast Airlines. It may be too late to pick up the pieces as regards service to and from the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont and other parts of New England, and to save us from the situation which confronts us today, when we are told that adequate substitute service will be provided.

I have requested that the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]—and he has most graciously granted my request—call the Civil Aeronautics Board before the subcommittee in executive session to sit with us, the two Senators from Maine [Mrs. SMITH and Mr. MUSKIE], my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], and and the two Senators from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN and Mr. PROUTY], so that we may inquire of the Board—not to argue about their decision, but to obtain some definite information from them, for our own satisfaction, as to the kind of service they are prepared to guarantee to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I gladly yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. I have been listening with interest to the Senator's speech concerning the situation of Northeast Airlines and the decision of the CAB relating to it. I compliment him upon his action in requesting that the chairman of the subcommittee hold the meeting which he has suggested.

In the course of his remarks, the Senator referred to the need for a third carrier in the Florida market. I think it would be a useful addition to his remarks to include in the RECORD some comments which are contained in a full-page advertisement paid for by several business firms in northeastern Maine and published in the Bangor Daily News of September 21–22, 1963. It includes a statement entitled "The Northeast Story," written by a Northeast Airlines pilot, Capt. Bob Mudge. It is an excellent presentation of the case of Northeast Airlines.

At a point in my remarks where it would be convenient for the Senator from New Hampshire, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTHEAST STORY

(From Capt. Bob Mudge, Northeast Airlines pilot)

YOUR HELP IS NEEDED

Want to get in a fight? Boy, we have a beauty going right now and we sure can use your help. Our story is rather long and complicated—but we feel it is one vital to the principles of our country and therefore is important to every American citizen.

Seven years ago, Northeast, a small New England airline, was given a chance to compete against the bigtime airlines to large cities south of New York. For the first time in 23 years we were free of Federal subsidy and on our own. These were tough years. We tripled our size which ran up fantastic training costs. We had to buy new fleets of aircraft. A DC-6B fleet for Florida, a Viscount fleet for the high density commuter market. Then the big boys started playing with pure jets. With more help from free enterprise, we, too, got a fleet of beautiful new Convair 880's. The country cousins had the right tools to work with, and not 1 cent had been provided by the Government.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE HAS FAITH IN US

We had financial problems, plenty of them. Because of the temporary nature of our route certificate we had to finance our planes over an unrealistically short time. Add to this the high cost of training, the abnormally high cost of advertising necessary to create an identity in new markets, and high cost of supporting originally low-load factors. We lost money all right—a lot of it. Every cent of it, though, was from private enterprise. Private enterprise had faith that we would eventually develop into a successful airline. Private enterprise still has this faith.

OUR POSITION VERSUS THE CAB

On July 26, the Civil Aeronautics Board lowered the boom. After hearings they decided Northeast should no longer be allowed to fly south of New York. They cited three reasons:

1. The public benefits anticipated when the certificate was granted have not been realized.

To us, the term "public benefit" when applied to a transportation system means simply the carrying of people from one place to another, as they desire, in a safe, comfortable, and convenient way. In a freely competitive route structure the degree to which a particular carrier has succeeded in meeting this public benefit can readily be determined by the share of the market he attracts.

If one carrier flies 60 percent of the traffic, another 30 percent and a third 10 percent, it is obvious that the first carrier has more fully met the public benefit than either of the other two. How did Northeast do on this score? We took on American, Eastern and National over routes on which they held permanent certificates and for the most part were firmly entrenched. We had to battle every step of the way.

Since the CAB said, in granting these route awards, that it was concerned greatly with improved service for New England to points south, let's study the traffic going south of Boston.

In 1962 we carried 61 percent of all the passengers between Boston and Miami. Northeast ended up dominating the market while competing against two permanent certificate holders. In the smaller markets to Jacksonville and Tampa we did our share by carrying 25 and 33 percent, respectively.

Look at the commuter routes. Boston-Philadelphia we carried 67 percent of the traffic. Boston-Washington we hauled 73 percent. On both of these routes we were competing against American, Eastern, and National on an unrestricted basis. The CAB says the public benefits anticipated have not been realized. Just what did the CAB expect us to do—run everyone else out of business? After all, we only held a temporary certificate and we had a hundred and one other big problems facing us. If we carried many more people in these markets, we might well be facing charges of monopoly.

2. The future prospects for operation of Northeast's system on a profitable basis are extremely remote.

Most of us have been brought up to believe that in America's free enterprise system that a businessman has the right to risk his own capital as he sees fit. That, if a man set his eye on a star, he has the right to pursue this star. If it costs him much money to finally arrive there—this is his business and his alone. That, even should he spend every cent he has in the pursuit of this star, and he then falls—this, too, is his right.

In this case we find a Government official taking on the responsibility of evaluating a business risk for a private enterprise. The Hughes Tool Co. entered the picture several years ago when Northeast was in serious financial trouble. This company believed in the future of Northeast and invested millions of dollars in this belief. The CAB allowed Hughes Tool Co. to pursue its star with its course laid clear before them. Just prior to the decision, plans were made that would finally put Northeast on a sound financial footing. The Hughes Tool Co. offered to dissolve some $26 million of debt and was rapidly working out arrangements for the settlement of much of our remaining obligations. Our financial picture looked bright.

Not only was our past debt picture looking bright, but we had now attained good market identity—we carried the highest load factor in the industry in early 1963. Costs had leveled out. All we needed was a permanent certificate so that our long-range equipment programs could be put on a more realistic basis.

The action of a Government agency evaluating a business risk and enforcing irrevocably on the business its decision is one aspect of this case that is important to all people in this country. Just how much control over an individual business can a Government official have? Certainly the Government must have some say in cases where it has money invested—but in this case Northeast was not asking for Federal subsidy (even on its short-haul routes)—yet the CAB is forcing us to fly these short-haul routes only, in a hopeless competitive position on a subsidy of some $3,700,000 a year. This is your money.

There is some justification for the CAB entering into control of airline business when the public convenience and necessity are involved. When this is the case, they must act in the public interest and for the public convenience and necessity. When the public selects one carrier on a route 73 percent of the time from a free choice of several carriers—they should be allowed the right to fly this airline. The CAB does have public responsibilities.

This apparent eagerness on the part of the CAB to force a subsidy status on Northeast is all the more surprising, when, in the same paper announcing the final decision, appeared an article announcing that the CAB was taking steps to cut subsidies to airlines. The confusing CAB.

3. The remaining two carriers are capable of meeting the requirements of this market.

This is probably the crux of the whole decision. The Board stated that they wished to reduce competition and that two carriers are enough on this market.

How quickly we seem to forget the protection and service provided the public last summer while Eastern was grounded by a strike. Northeast was the prime carrier on many routes involved that kept things moving.

Or perhaps we forget that in a technology such as ours, airplanes can get "bugs" in them. Remember the groundings of various types of aircraft? Remember equipment which was not grounded, but which did have severe restrictions placed on it and the public in masses chose to fly other types of equipment until the restricted aircraft finally proved safe. In this particular instance our two competitors happened to fly some types of airplanes which had been restricted, but Northeast was able to come to the rescue with other types of equipment. In the future we shall see new aircraft types taking to the sky—who is to say that these, too, will not have "bugs" which could result in groundings or loss of public confidence?

Before Northeast was granted the right to fly south of New York, the passenger desiring to fly to Florida was often faced with many inconveniences: no nonstop service out of Boston, scurrying around for a reservation or simply no seats in New York and being forced into waiting until a most inconvenient time.

COMPETITION IMPROVES SERVICE

What has happened since Northeast entered the south of New York markets? What about development of the routes? Has Northeast simply stolen traffic from the other carriers and thus made them lose money? Or has this extra competitive effort brought about development of the routes? Let's see.

It is true that on the New York-Miami route the traffic has not grown as anticipated. But, there are many other important markets involved here. Boston-Miami has grown 27.5 percent and, remember, this is one of the routes that was of prime concern. Some others:

	Percent
Boston-Philadelphia	77.0
Boston-Washington	163.7
Boston-Jacksonville	63.9
Philadelphia-Jacksonville	147.6
Philadelphia-Tampa	156.9
Baltimore-Miami	134.4
Baltimore-Tampa	1181.5

In view of these figures it would seem that perhaps we had done more to stimulate new traffic than we did the capturing of old. Effective competition can do more than this—it can improve service for public convenience.

What kind of service did the two prime carriers give on the Boston-Washington run before Northeast began to fly?

In 1956: American, one nonstop; Eastern, one nonstop.

In 1963: National, no nonstops; American, one nonstop; Eastern, five nonstops; Northeast, nine nonstops.

What kind of service did the two prime carriers give on the Boston-Philadelphia run before Northeast began to fly?

In 1956: American, two nonstops; Eastern, one nonstop.

In 1963: National, no nonstops; American, one nonstop; Eastern, five nonstops; Northeast, five nonstops.

LOOK A BIT CLOSER

American is not complaining—they are making money. Note that in the case of effective competition, American has given way on service so that it is scheduling realistically to the traffic it is carrying. Eastern, on the other hand, is keeping up schedules but not flying the traffic to justify it. This is particularly apparent when you consider Northeast is flying largely 44 passenger Viscounts while Eastern is using larger and greater capacity aircraft. It is rather obvious that since Northeast carries 73 and 67 percent of the traffic over these routes that Eastern is overscheduling seats in relation to their share of the market. Is it any wonder that it now claims it is losing money?

FREE COMPETITION HAS ITS RISKS

This is simply competition at work—nothing more sinister than that. Take the Washington-New York market. Here Eastern really licked us. We had originally come to dominate this market, then Eastern got the air shuttle idea. This was fine, new service. The public liked it, and our traffic fell off rapidly. If we had been preparing a case for the CAB rather than operating an airline efficiently, we perhaps would have chosen to keep flying our flights, keep flying empty seats around the route, then pleaded with the CAB that there was overcompetition and that Eastern should be forced off the route. We could then provide the public with the service they have already indicated they did not want. This may sound ridiculous—and it is—yet it is exactly what is happening to us now. In the case of Northeast in the Washington-New York market when we lost our competitive position, we did what any realistic businessman would do—we got out of the unprofitable market and concentrated our efforts where we felt we could be successful. This is not new—American has done the same thing and so has National. National essentially does not serve the Boston-Washington market at all nor the Philadelphia-Boston run even though they hold a permanent certificate over these routes for commuter service. Instead they are concentrating on their profitable southern transcontinental route.

If normal competitive forces are permitted to work, we will find results like those just mentioned. The carrier desired by the public will prevail. The other carriers will go elsewhere to seek their markets—areas they can successfully serve. No Government mandate is needed.

HOW PERMANENT IS PERMANENT?

If the Government must tamper with the free enterprise system—how can it justify elimination of the prime carrier? While we have no ill feeling toward National, logic would point to the elimination of this carrier from many of these routes. First, it has failed obviously to compete in these markets. Secondly, it has a highly profitable southern transcontinental route on which it is concentrating. In no case would it involve a Federal subsidy payment. Would it not be more logical to eliminate this carrier if only two carriers are desired on these routes?

The fact that National holds a permanent certificate while we held only a temporary does not seem to be all important. In the first place, we understand the Board at this time is under proceedings to remove permanent certificates and claims full right to do so. Secondly, if this is a firm policy of the Board to eliminate third carriers on runs as important as this—then many permanent certificates will have to be lifted in the near future. This particular route in question is the second heaviest in the country.

The question may well be asked as to whether or not a permanent certificate can, or should, be revoked. We don't know the answer, but for years we have felt that our marriage certificate represented a pretty permanent status—yet we all know that there are methods of dissolving or modifying these agreements which hold so much permanency in both courts and church. Take, also, our country's Constitution. Even this can be amended and modified when circumstances indicate such action is necessary. It is, therefore, rather difficult to conceive of a permanent certificate issued by the CAB that is so powerful that it cannot, under some circumstances, be changed. If, however, it truly cannot be revoked, then it would seem rather silly for the CAB to formulate a new policy which can be applied in only the Northeast case.

WANTED: THE RIGHT TO COMPETE

We don't really want National eliminated—we just want the right to compete freely. Normal competitive forces will effectively eliminate those carriers unable to compete. We don't mind losing a fair race. We just hate to win the race and lose the decision.

At the time Northeast was granted its new routes on a temporary basis, National and Eastern (among others) were granted permanent certificates into what was previously largely Northeast territory. They got turnaround rights at such places as Boston-New York-Washington (EAL) and Boston-Philadelphia and Boston-Washington for National. Now, with the revocation of all rights granted to Northeast and none of these granted National and Eastern, Northeast finds itself in a hopelessly competitive position even on its old Boston-New York run.

HOW YOU CAN HELP

If you believe that Northeast has earned the right to fly these routes; if you believe that the third carrier has stimulated business and substantially aided in the development of these routes; if you believe that free enterprise should be allowed to evaluate its own risks without Government interference; if you think that Government should refrain from unnecessary subsidy payments—then vote for Northeast now. We are on the verge of immediate bankruptcy and it is not certain that we have the necessary funds to adequately fight this case. We will not give up, but we do need your help desperately. You can save an airline by—

1. Writing to President Kennedy, your congressional representative, Senator Mike Monroney (chairman, Aviation Subcommittee), Chairman Alan Boyd, of the CAB. Tell them your feelings on this case. As a matter of fact, even if you do not agree with us, write and tell these men. This is a very important case, not only for Northeast but for the entire country. It is dealing with some very fundamental principles.

2. If you have occasion to fly between east coast cities—fly with us. In this way you will cast your vote to indicate to Government that you feel our services are valuable and at the same time you will help us finance our battle for life as an airline.

3. Finally, if you can, let us know that you have helped and are joining us in this fight. We would like to thank you for writing and welcome you aboard our flights.

Bob Mudge,
Captain, Northeast Airlines.

P.S.—I apologize for the length of this story—I find I am more pilot than writer. Should you desire further information, please write to me at Lynnfield, Mass.

We heartily endorse Captain Mudge's suggestions and urge you to take immediate action. This message is sponsored by business firms who are vitally interested in the continued progress of northeastern Maine.

Bangor & Aroostook Corp.; Bangor House Motor Hotel; Dead River Co.; Eastern Fine Paper & Pulp Division, Standard Packing Corp.; Eastern Trust & Banking Co.; Freese's Department Store; Great Northern Paper Co.; Kagan-Lown & Co.; Maine State Federated Labor Council; Queen Charterhouse Motel; the Merrill Trust Co.; Viner Bros., Inc.; Webber Oil Co.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention particularly to this portion of Captain Mudge's story:

What has happened since Northeast entered the south of New York markets? What about development of the routes? Has Northeast simply stolen traffic from the other carriers and thus made them lose money? Or has this extra competitive effort brought about development of the routes? Let's see.

It is true that on the New York-Miami route the traffic has not grown as anticipated. But, there are many other important markets involved here. Boston-Miami has grown 27.5 percent and, remember, this is one of the routes that was of prime concern. Some others:

	Percent
Boston-Philadelphia	77.0
Boston-Washington	163.7
Boston-Jacksonville	63.9
Philadelphia-Jacksonville	147.6
Philadelphia-Tampa	156.9
Baltimore-Miami	134.4
Baltimore-Tampa	1181.5

I am sure the Senator would agree that these figures indicate that those are growing markets, which could well support the kind of third-carrier service which Northeast Airlines provides.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, regarding the statistics offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the table from which I have quoted in my remarks makes a comparison between the number of passengers and the number of passenger miles for selected city pairs, and is found in the brief of the Department of Justice and in the decision of the CAB.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comparison of passengers and passenger-miles for selected city pairs—On-line O. & D traffic, calendar year 1962

City pair	Number of passengers	Passenger-miles	Number of carriers serving pair
Los Angeles-New York	467,430	1,143,333,780	3
Miami (Fort Lauderdale)-New York	384,610	967,763,340	3
New York-San Francisco	293,950	754,275,700	3
Chicago-New York	1,021,370	726,194,070	4
Chicago-Los Angeles	375,280	653,737,760	4
Chicago-San Francisco	234,730	435,189,420	3
Chicago-Miami	290,420	345,599,800	3
Los Angeles-San Francisco	885,750	307,355,250	4
Detroit-New York	451,670	216,801,600	3
Chicago-Denver	174,490	160,007,330	3
Atlanta-New York	206,880	154,746,240	3
New Orleans-New York	104,020	121,703,400	3
Chicago-Tampa	89,970	89,970,000	3
Chicago-Atlanta	130,980	77,016,240	3
New York-Birmingham	37,880	32,690,440	3

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has mentioned the States of New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont. We in Massachusetts are also vitally interested in the Northeast Airlines; but the course for Congress to take at the present time is a great question.

However, I hope the Senator from New Hampshire, who is on the committee that has authority over the CAB, will point out, in the course of his remarks, that this whole situation involves the prestige of New England and the question whether it is entitled to have an airline that is based there and will extend its service to other parts of the country. In short, the question is whether New England will have any air transportation of a satisfactory character.

It seems to me that if the CAB decision stands, certainly the northern New England States and Boston must be provided with greater service than they would have without Northeast Airlines. It seems to me that proper air transportation is fundamental to the prestige of New England, its trade, and its future trade and progress as one of the industrial centers of the United States.

I appreciate very much what the Senator from New Hampshire is attempting to do, and thank him for his remarks.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, as I do the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie].

I shall yield the floor in a minute, but first let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I did not intend in any way to minimize the interest of the great State of Massachusetts and its citizens in Northeast Airlines.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know that.

Mr. COTTON. I emphasized Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont only because Massachusetts is fortunate enough to have national service by other airlines, whereas we in northern New England are in a more desperate situation. Therefore we are emphasizing our plight, because it is so much worse. However, I certainly appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. Both he and his colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], have been unremitting and unceasing in their efforts in connection with this matter. For that, everyone in New England is grateful to them.

Mr. President, at the time when I yielded to the Senator from Maine, I was commenting on what I cannot help but feel is a real possibility; namely, the execution will occur, the guillotine will fall. In that event, Northeast Airlines would be relegated to a desperate struggle to recoup; it would have to change its equipment and its setup, in order to cope with its reverses, even with the help of a subsidy, and it would have to become a feeder airline; or—we hope that will not happen, but certainly it is possible—it would even be driven into bankruptcy, or into the hands of a receiver, or into some other disaster.

I have even been reluctant to discuss the decision of this quasijudicial body, for I do not wish my remarks to be considered a covert threat; but I believe these things should be said now. In view of the fact that only three members of the Board out of five are behind this decision, and the other two have written some of the finest opinions I have ever read against it, and in view of this repetition of the statement that this great Florida market only requires only two airlines, if the CAB should, within a few months or a year in the future, suddenly decide to certificate another carrier in that market after it has put Northeast out of business it would be an act that would demand an investigation by the Congress.

I do not believe that this decision is based on the fact that that great, rich route, which is the richest in the country, does not require a third carrier. If it does require a third carrier, the carrier which has struggled for 6 long years should be given that chance. If anyone else is given that chance, more will be said about it. I hope this is not taken as a threat, but it is a fact and I believe it should be said right now, and should be considered before it is too late.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for one comment?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from New Hampshire is mentioning Florida and the rich Florida route. I believe the Senator wishes to remember that New England is vitally concerned also with Philadelphia, Washington, and Baltimore, and places south of New York. If this line is taken away from us, we will have no direct or satisfactory transportation to those areas, as well as to the South.

Mr. COTTON. I understand that. But the reason I was emphasizing the Florida route was that that the route to Florida is the backbone of profitable business that would enable Northeast Airlines to serve New England.

Northeast Airlines cannot make enough profit on trips from Boston to New York, or Philadelphia, or even Washington, to make the difference and give them the resources to do the job for us in New England, and that is the reason.

It was not that I was minimizing the importance of that service. I enjoy it myself, as I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts does, and I hope we can continue to enjoy it. It is highly necessary and convenient and helpful to have Northeast Airlines service from Washington to Boston, and from Washington to New York, but the point is that Northeast Airlines lives or dies on its most profitable route that was given them 6 years ago and then taken away from them by a 3 to 2 decision which was reaffirmed yesterday after what I again say was a remarkably hasty action, in which the Attorney General of the United States was not even allowed to intervene.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

It should be pointed out that the disenfranchisement of a trunk carrier is without precedent in the history of the CAB. Since it is, we should take a particularly careful and close look, not only at the merits of the case, but at the implicit policy which it implements. The decision can have an impact not only upon the fortunes of Northeast Airlines and service of the Florida market, but also on other situations throughout the country which may be decided upon the basis of the policy that has been laid down.

DEATH OF EX-SENATOR FREDERICK HALE, OF MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, from the critical years of World War I to the beginning of World War II, Frederick Hale, of Portland, represented Maine in the U.S. Senate. Senator Hale, who served in the Senate from 1917 through 1941, died on September 28, in Portland at the age of 88.

Fred Hale was a responsible statesman. He was born and brought up in the world of politics. His father and grandfather, Eugene Hale and Zachariah Chandler, served as U.S. Senators, Hale from Maine and Chandler from Michigan.

Hale's integrity, independence, and loyalty were well recognized and highly respected by his colleagues. He never hesitated to vote against the dictates of popular opinion when he felt such a course of action justified. Although noted for loyalty to his political party, Senator Hale's conscientious review of all critical issues occasionally led him to desert party ranks.

For a good part of his Senate career, Hale chaired the Naval Affairs Committee. He consistently supported the need for a large Navy and looked with a dim view on the Washington Naval Disarmament Treaty of 1921. Senator Hale was a vigorous advocate of preparedness on the grounds that it cost less than war.

His objections to economy cuts in the Navy's budget finally resulted in the development of a cruiser building program. Recognizing the weakness of the American Pacific Fleet, he worked long and hard for the strengthening of the Navy's base at Pearl Harbor. As World War II loomed on the horizon in 1939, he warned that aid to Britain was essential to the safety of our country.

Senator Hale is remembered for the interest he displayed in helping to solve the personal problems of Maine men and women, no matter how humble the person, no matter how insignificant the problem. His interest in people was a reflection of his kindly but retiring personality.

In these and many other ways, Fred Hale represented the best qualities associated with our State of Maine—independence, courage, and concern for others. It is an honor to be one of his successors.

FAILURES OF COMMUNISM TO PRODUCE ITS CIVILIAN NEEDS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, frequently there are heard from heads of friendly governments and their diplomats expressions of perplexity concerning our sometimes irreconcilable attitude toward governments whose political philosophies and designs are entirely incompatible to ours. In a powerful voice, we hold our democracy with its freedoms of self-government and free enterprise as an example for others to follow; and on the other hand, by deed, we seem to subscribe to socialistic and communistic philosophies by lending a hand to perpetuate them or help cover up their failures. Can we blame those puzzled, friendly peoples if they ask us: "Why do you not practice what you preach?"

Red Russia, from Stalin to Khrushchev has continued a relentless campaign through deceit, harassment, and subterfuge to gain world supremacy, both militarily and economically. Communism has failed miserably to achieve either, and today Khrushchev's failing economy is being held up for the whole world to see what it really is. Significantly, it is now proposed that we, through the sale of surplus wheat, bail out Khrushchev's floundering Communist economy, and help to cover up its flagrant errors and incapabilities. Are we to be so naive to now acquiesce and to relieve Mr. Khrushchev of his suffering from the bitter fruits of slave labor?

Mr. President, Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe, Director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, has very ably made an analysis of the failures of communism to produce its civilian needs in a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times. In order that this thoughtful letter might be given wider reading, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 2, 1963.

THE EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
Times Building,
New York, N.Y.

SIR: Not a few of the most tragic mistakes in national conduct are made in small installments. The risks we incur in concluding a wheat deal with the Soviet Union, which, according to the New York Times of October 2, 1963, is now favored by the U.S.

Secretary of Agriculture, seem to be smaller than those inherent in the conclusion of the nuclear test ban treaty. Yet, like the nuclear test ban treaty, it signifies the abandonment of heretofore strongly held policy positions. Hence, the wheat deal which the administration is now ready to make should be submitted to the widest and most searching deliberation rather than be consummated in a precipitate and offhand way.

With proper management, the Soviet Union could be the largest grain producer upon earth. Her cultivatable acreage is larger than ours; and the soil of the Ukraine is more fertile than any comparable wheatlands in this country. Before World War I, Russia was one of the major wheat exporters in the world market; before World War II, the east European countries now under Communist rule supplied a large part of Western Europe's food requirements. If the Communist system, 46 years after its establishment, has not licked the problem of agricultural production then it follows that it is a rotten economic system. The most highly planned socialist system upon earth fails to satisfy the dietary needs of the population—and this in the face of its alleged record achievements in science and technology and the vast potential wealth of the arable land.

Whatever might be the purpose of American policy, it should not be to help the Communists to gloss over their spectacular failure. Communist leadership has directed Soviet capital investment into space spectaculars and the creation of nuclear power, designed to coerce the West into retreat and appeasement. The Soviet machine for war and blackmail has been built at the expense of the welfare of the Russian people. The United States should not only not assist Communist leadership in passing the buck for these pernicious investment policies but should also point out vigorously to world opinion the true cause of the Soviet economic debacle. All the Soviets have to do is to shift the funds now spent on military-technological "firsts," including 100-megaton nuclear tests, into tractors, fertilizers, and agricultural research and Soviet food rations per capita would be more than ample to insure a healthful diet. Incidentally, an accurate reading of the Soviet Union's balance sheet reveals that the distinction now being made by Western governments between strategic and nonstrategic materials is meaningless: if wheat imported into the Soviet Union abets the Communists' preference for the military-technological sector of the Soviet economy, rather than the consumer sector, then these wheat imports are strategic.

The advocates of the wheat deal point to the advantages to be derived from selling part of our gigantic wheat surplus against hard cash. The hard cash which we are likely to receive will be Soviet gold, mined by slave labor in eastern Siberia. This unpalatable fact might not weigh heavily in the mind of those concerned with solving the problem of our agricultural surpluses by expanding our export markets. Yet the simplest calculation should reveal that the real problem of American agriculture and the world market for agricultural products is not insufficient demand but the fantastic price-support and quota policies pursued by major Western countries. The remedy for the ills of American agriculture will not be found in selling a parcel of our wheat surplus to the Soviets but in the adoption of rational and equitable domestic agricultural policies and, in a long overdue agreement among the free world's major agricultural exporters. These steps will have to be taken before Atlantic partnership will develop into something more tangible than pious declarations. The wheat deal with the Soviet Union might help us to evade for a while the need for coming to grips with the problem of our domestic agriculture. This might not be the least of its many unfortunate implications.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ.

TITO'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OPPOSED

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with respect to the visit of Tito to the United States and the contemplated purpose of honoring him as a guest at the White House, there have come to my desk sheafs of letters from fugitive Germans, Hungarians, Rumanians, Croats, Slovenes, and Serbians describing the terrors to which they were subjected at the hands of Tito. Each of these groups relates countless instances of executions and brutal treatment of prisoners—all for the purpose of exterminating any voice that might rise to protest against Tito's taking of power in Yugoslavia.

In my opinion, a serious mistake is being made in honoring that man.

I have repeatedly expressed my disappointment concerning the proposed visit of Tito to the United States. I have said that he should not come to our shores and that he should not be an official guest of our Government. In strong words from the Serbian National Defense Council of America, the President of the United States is requested to cancel this proposed visit. I ask unanimous consent that the text of a recent telegram received from the Serbian National Defense Council of America be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 8, 1963.

Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

From a meeting of 20 American Serbian organizations called to protest the invitation of the Communist tyrant Tito to the White House, we appeal to you, to plead with President Kennedy to cancel this infamous visit. If diplomatic protocol demands that this Communist executioner is to be seen please advise the President to meet him at the United Nations building and not in the White House, the glorious and sacred home of all Americans. Furthermore ask President Kennedy to demand from the Yugoslav dictator an immediate release of Bishop Varnava Nastikch, of Gary, Ind., and make it possible for this Christian martyr to return to his native land, the United States of America.

DR. UROSH L. SEFNER,
President of the Meeting Serbian National Defense Council of America.
CHICAGO, ILL.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with respect to the sale of wheat which the President of the United States may very well approve today. My statement picks up from the speech which I made on East-West trade, including the wheat sale, on October 3 last. I wish to summarize it now because of the imminence of the decision.

First. I believe the decision on the one-shot wheat transaction should be left to the President. If he feels it is desirable in the national interest—and from present indications he does—he should approve it. But if he approves it, he should give assurances to the Congress, first, that the wheat deal represents only a one-time commitment; second, that any revision of our trade relationship with the Soviet bloc will be done in cooperation with the Congress.

The wheat transaction should not represent the opening of a new trade relationship between the United States and the Soviet bloc. There are many outstanding economic issues between us and the Soviet bloc, including past Soviet bloc debts. There are also such questions as the protection of U.S. patents and copyrights; the settlement of commercial disputes; dumping and market disruption; the free access of U.S. businessmen to markets and buyers in the Soviet bloc, and so on. I have dealt with each of these points at some length in a speech on the Senate floor on October 3.

Second. The wheat deal may create an opportunity to open negotiations with the Soviet Union regarding outstanding economic issues. I am for taking advantage of that opportunity. But I am not for backing into an expanded trade relationship with the Soviet bloc on the basis of a one-shot wheat deal. An increase in nonstrategic trade should be conditioned on the success of such negotiations.

Third. The matter of harmonizing and unifying Western policy regarding trade with the Soviet bloc remains a crying need. West Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, and other countries in Europe do a great amount of business with the Soviet bloc. We do not. Nonetheless, the whole free world relationship with the Soviet bloc has broken down by virtue of this inconsistency of policy. I urge the administration to undertake immediately an effort within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to concert East-West trade policy. The economic and political value of a unified Western policy on this question would be immense.

Fourth. Congress should begin a reexamination of the entire issue of U.S. policy regarding trade with the Soviet bloc, with a view to grant the President authority to use our foreign trade as a flexible instrument of policy to be turned on and off as required by the state of United States-Soviet relations in our national interest. Today the President's hands are tied by existing legislation with respect to credits and tariff policy. I wish to free the President's hands in order that he may, in the best interests of the United States, use trade with the Soviet bloc as a tool in the effort to deal with cold war issues.

Fifth. Finally, Mr. President, the question of the extension of long-term credits will inevitably arise because the Russians cannot buy very much unless they get extensive credit. Provided Congress gives the President authority to negotiate on credits, it should be made conditional; on the real lessening of tensions in the cold war and should not come about without major political concessions on the part of the Soviet Union.

I believe the issue of credit worthiness of the Soviet Union, for either long-term private or public U.S. credit, is the real area in which it is possible to negotiate in respect to political problems as for example, Cuba and Berlin.

It may very well be that we shall see great opportunities opening up before us. I have summarized today the techniques by which those opportunities may be availed of with benefit for rather than danger to our national interests.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently there was published a very fine statement by Dr. Arthur Flemming, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on health care for the aging. I again call to the Senate's attention the fact that he is heading a task force, which I had a good deal to do with putting together. This is the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged, and it is expected to make a report which many of us now feel will provide the definitive solution to this problem and the basis for a bill capable of gaining widespread support in the Congress, again bringing the issue to the fore—as it should be—as a major possibility on the legislative calendar. I expect the committee's report to be available this month. I believe it will represent a significant development so far as the Congress is concerned, for the task force is widely regarded—not only by people in the administration and by myself but also by those in trade unions—as the group which will find the answer.

Considerable progress is being made to enlist bipartisan support for health care legislation, and out of the discussions and studies that have been underway since the beginning of the year, I deeply believe the issue will emerge and be more vital than ever and we will have a stronger bill capable of enlisting more support than the ones now pending before the Congress, and capable of enactment into law. The kind of bill that I look forward to will provide basic protection against the high costs of hospital care under social security. But it will also make it possible for the private sector of our economy—group health services, cooperatives, trade union health plans, and insurance plans—to participate effectively and at lower cost than anything presently available and providing a far wider range of benefits than any bill now before the Congress. The partnership of Government and the private economy can deal with health care for the aged most effectively and at a reasonable cost.

This subject was cogently explored by Dr. Arthur Flemming, at a meeting in Denver, Colo., on August 19. Dr. Flemming, president of the University of Oregon, is also chairman of the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks of Dr. Flemming which appeared in Senior Citizens News, October 1963.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is a general agreement that a problem does exist which our Nation must solve. Studies conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare show that persons 65 and over are confronted with health and medical bills each year that average twice as much as those for the rest of the population. And all of us know that the cost of medical care keeps increasing. In fact medical-care prices have risen more than other prices.

Bureau of Census data show that in 1960 the aged had to try to pay their medical bills out of annual incomes that averaged about half that received by persons under 65—from $1,000 for aged persons living alone to $2,900 for families headed by aged persons. It is clear that those whose income was equal to the national average and those who were below the average didn't have much left for the medical bills after taking care of the bare necessities of life.

Too many of the aged are unable to afford health insurance or are considered too poor a risk. In fact the number carrying some form of health insurance is just over half of the aged population. In most cases they carry hospital insurance. In many instances it falls far short of meeting the costs of illnesses.

These and other similar facts explain why a larger proportion of the aged than any other group in our population are forced either to turn to public or private welfare agencies for payment of their medical bills or to rely on free care from hospitals and physicians. And the sad thing is that many do not choose either alternative. They just neglect their health.

Surely a Nation that is founded on the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being can and must find a solution to this problem—a solution that will meet the needs of this generation and will keep the next generation from confronting the problem that now confronts us.

It was my privilege on January 12, 1961, to deliver the closing address at the first White House Conference on the Aging. At that time in referring to the problem of health and medical care for the aged, I said:

"I am convinced on the basis of my own experiences that this problem cannot be resolved by relying solely on private voluntary efforts. * * * I am convinced that the Federal Government must become an increasingly effective partner if the problem is to be handled properly."

An adequate health and medical insurance program for the aged should provide them with substantial help in meeting the costs of the following items: Hospital care, skilled nursing home care, organized home care services, dental services, prescribed drugs, and physical restoration services.

If the aged are to enjoy the benefits of a well-rounded program of this kind a law must be enacted that will do the following two things:

First, inaugurate through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged.

Second, authorize and encourage those who are engaged in private insurance to join forces so that they can offer the aged a health insurance program at reasonable prices that will help cover the costs of organized home care services, surgical services, laboratory and X-ray services, dental services, prescribed drugs, and physical restoration services.

Such a law would provide the foundation for a partnership between the Federal Government and private insurance that would mark the dawn of a new day for the aged in dealing with the economic hazards of illness.

And both the Federal Government and the field of private insurance have had experience in forging such a partnership. For 28 years we have been operating under a social security program which has provided certain basic benefits for retired persons. Today we find that private insurance has worked out over 30,000 private pension plans that supplement the benefits that social security has provided. From 1940 to 1961, life insurance in force grew from $115 to $685 billion. There is no doubt that the Federal Government's old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program has stimulated the growth of private insurance in this country.

What has happened in the pension and life insurance fields can and must happen in the field of health insurance.

Here are some of the considerations that I believe should be kept in mind in developing through social security a nationwide hospital and skilled nursing home insurance program for the aged:

1. The program should be financed by a payroll tax shared equally by both employers and employees or paid by the self-employed.

2. Receipts from the tax should be placed in a special fund and benefits paid under the program should be related to the resources in the fund.

3. The payroll tax should be fixed at a level that will make it possible for benefits to be paid to the aged that will give them a fair chance to maintain their independence in dealing with the costs of hospital and nursing home care.

4. Persons who have contributed to the fund should be eligible at age 65 for the benefits provided by the program.

5. All employed and self-employed should be included in the program. It is impossible to predict, for example, what persons entering the labor market for the first time this year will have financial resources at age 65 that would enable them to get along without the protection that such an insurance program would provide.

6. The cost of providing health protection to the present aged who have not had the opportunity of participating in the social security program should be met from general revenues.

Such a program, to quote from President Kennedy's February 1963 message to the Congress, "is based on the fundamental premise that contributions during the working years, matched by employer's contributions, should enable people to prepay and build earned rights and benefits to safeguard them in their old age."

But such a program isn't enough if it is left standing by itself. It is true that hospital and skilled nursing home costs loom large in many illnesses. That is why the Federal Government should single them out in developing an insurance program for the aged through social security.

However, the services of physicians, surgeons, dentists, and physical therapists can also be costly. And Congress can help the aged deal with these costs without involving the Federal Government in any new program.

It should do it in the same law in which it establishes a hospital and skilled nursing home program for the aged.

It should declare that it is sound national policy for private insurance companies and nonprofit health plans to join forces, including a pooling of risks, and offer the aged in any State a health insurance program at reasonable prices that will cover the costs of services rendered by physicians, surgeons, physical therapists or any other costs connected with an illness.

It should then remove any legal obstacles, such as antitrust laws, that stand in the way of putting such a policy into effect.

In brief in one law the Congress should establish a limited health insurance program through social security and, at the same time, clear away the obstacles that stand in the way of private insurance developing an effective program for supplementing the Government's program.

When I was called upon in August of 1958 to come to grips with the problem of health and medical care for the aged I deveolped a strong conviction that the Federal Government should not do anything that would block the growth of private health insurance. At the same time I quickly realized that, because of the unusual risks involved, private insurance was not going to be able to offer an adequate program at a price that would be within the reach of a sufficiently large percentage of the aged. I examined and worked on various plans under which the Federal Government would have underpinned the efforts of private insurance. None of them made or has made any headway.

I now believe that private health insurance will grow along sound lines if the Federal Government, through social security, develops an insurance program for the aged that is restricted to dealing with the costs of institutional care. This will leave the rest of the field to private insurance and relieve it of heavy risks. It should at the same time be given the right by the Congress to pool its resources. This should lead to the offering of health insurance policies at premiums that will be within the reach of the aged and also within the reach of younger persons who want to take out policies now that will guarantee them benefits at 65 and beyond. Also, it should be kept in mind that some of the $475 to $525 million in purchasing power which is now allocated annually for hospital coverage of the aged will become available for payments of premiums on private policies.

In summary, I believe that a partnership should be established between the Federal Government and private insurance in the health insurance field. If it is brought into existence we will have at long last moved from the talk stage into the action stage in dealing with the problem of meeting the health and medical bills of the aged.

I recognize, of course, that even if this partnership is formed there will be a percentage of the aged whose needs will have to be met through public welfare programs. I favor the Federal Government providing generous support to the States in connection with their programs for providing medical care for persons receiving old-age assistance. I favor the Kerr-Mills law which makes it possible for the States to receive generous support from the Federal Government if they decide to help persons 65 years of age and over who are not receiving old-age assistance but whose income and other resources are not sufficient to meet their medical expenses.

But these are public assistance programs. They are not substitutes for an adequate public and private insurance program to care for the health and medical costs of the aged. Our fellow citizens do not want to sit around and wait for sickness to develop and then have their bills met through public assistance programs. They want to participate in insurance programs that will assure their ability to maintain their independence in dealing with the costs of health and medical care. The time has come to give them the opportunity of participating in such programs. We insult them when we tell them that they needn't worry but that we will take care of them under old-age assistance or the Kerr-Mills program.

Let's not take pride in our ability to add aged persons to public assistance rolls because they are medically indigent. Rather let us insist on the Congress taking action that will provide our people with both public and private insurance programs under which they will have earned benefits that will safeguard them in their old age and keep them off public assistance rolls. This is the only kind of a program that is consistent with our Nation's dedication to the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being.

AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS DEMAND HOSPITAL INSURANCE NOW

Many American organizations—including senior citizen clubs, labor unions, religious, and social groups—will focus their attention on the hearings on the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963 which are expected to open in the House Ways and Means Committee at the end of October or early in November.

Though the legislation directly concerns more than 18 million Americans who are now 65 or over—because the program will operate as a logical extension of America's time-tested social security and railroad retirement systems—it will indirectly affect many millions more. It will help the elderly get the health care they need, lighten the burden on their sons, and daughters, and protect savings for the education of their grandchildren.

Some of the many statements supporting the program which have been made by national organizations are reproduced on these pages. The forthcoming hearings will offer indisputable evidence of the urgent need for enactment of the King-Anderson bills.

Council for Christian Social Action United Church of Christ:

"*Be it resolved,* That the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ favors legislation designed to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, medical, and surgical services for all retired and disabled persons, and urges favorable consideration of such legislation by State legislatures and the Congress of the United States.

"We would encourage the purchase of voluntary private health insurance by those who have the means to do so. But we must not lose sight of the inadequacy of these programs to serve many of the neediest cases, and we should recognize the responsibility of all citizens in our industrialized society to share in meeting the health needs of those whose limited resources cannot be expected to pay for adequate insurance. We believe the costs of medical service to those persons should be met in the most equitable manner possible, either through the social security system or through a program of general taxation, so that no aging person shall ever lack proper care because of economic inability or be subjected to indignity in order to qualify for it.

"We urge church members to give careful consideration to this subject and to express their convictions to their respective legislators."

Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds:

"The board of directors of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds approves in principle the use of the mechanism of the old-age and survivors insurance program for financing an expanded program of health services for persons 65 years and over.

"Provision of health services to the aged by Jewish institutions has become a matter of growing concern. Increased costs of medical care and the increased demand for these services by the aged place great strains upon the physical resources of Jewish institutions and increase institutional deficits substantially."

National Council of Jewish Women:

"Only a small percentage of Americans are able to save enough, during their working lives, to sustain the cost of protracted or catastrophic illness in old age. As the retirement age is lowered, and as people live longer, a new class of Americans is being created—the medically indigent. These are people who, for the first time in their lives, must turn to family, friends or public agencies for help.

"Many elderly people live in fear of what will happen to them if they get sick, and anxiety itself is one important cause of illness. With medical insurance, there is the likelihood that the extent of illness would decrease among the aged.

"Today Americans are able to insure themselves against destitution in old age, through their contributions to the social security system. The Federal Government must also make it possible for people to insure themselves against the cost of catastrophic illness.

"The National Council of Jewish Women believes that an insurance program of medical benefits under social security would make an important contribution to the serenity, dignity, and security of the later years."

National Council of Churches of Christ:

"As previously noted, the general board has stated, 'If voluntary prepayment plans cannot accomplish the desired ends, Government should protect the health of people by making possible the prepayment of health services.' This is precisely what the social security system would be able to provide efficiently through the mechanisms of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. Therefore, the National Council of Churches supports in principle legislation which will extend the benefits of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance to include adequate health care for retired aged persons." [1]

Synagogue Council of America:

"The constituent organizations of the Synagogue Council of America endorse the proposal * * * that the Federal social security system be broadened to include hospital and nursing home care for persons over 65. Such costs account for a very large part of the total expenses of medical care for older people. Extension of Federal assistance would lift a heavy burden of expense and of fear from the minds of those who have surely earned at least this freedom from fear.

"Jewish religious tradition makes mandatory the maximum care of those in the final years of life. We urge that this minimum step of adequate medical assistance be undertaken for the elderly in our society without delay."

Unitarian-Universalist Fellowship for Social Justice:

"Whereas meeting the health needs of our older population constitutes one of the most pressing social problems in this country; and

"Whereas medical and hospital costs continue to mount so that serious illness for retired persons often wipes out his life's savings or places great burdens on his children; and

"Whereas the program of health care for the aged under the Kerr-Mills law is inadequate because it is limited to the indigent; and

"Whereas the need is for a program that will treat the older person with dignity rather than requiring him to become penniless to qualify: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Fellowship for Social Justice (Unitarian-Universalist) voices its conviction that medical care for the aged should be established and financed through the social security system."

American Nurses' Association:

"The American Nurses' Association supports the extension and the improvement of the contributory social insurance to include health insurance for beneficiaries of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. * * *

---

[1] In its pronouncement on the churches' concern for public assistances adopted June 4, 1958, the general board stated: "The National Council of Churches affirms that the use of social insurance, as exemplified by old-age, survivors, and disability insurance is to be preferred to economic dependence upon the public assistance programs."

"The benefits of modern medical science should be available to all citizens of this country. Health services which are essential to social well-being are expensive and likely to become more so in the years ahead. Without insurance protection against the costs of illness, the disabled, retired, and aged must often depend on public relief in times of sickness. * * *

"Certainly, insurance coverage against the costs of illness which may occur after retirement, which insurance can be paid for during the working years, would be less costly to the public than tax-supported public relief for health care—a dependency which is distasteful and degrading to citizens of this country."

Nationwide Insurance Companies:

"The cost of voluntary insurance policies cannot be borne by older persons alone. Realistically, the most that can be hoped for is that somewhat more than half the aged can pay premiums of about $100 per year. A $100 annual premium cannot cover more than a fraction of the aged medical care needs. * * * Private insurance companies can design health insurance packages to meet the important supplemental areas of medical need not met by the existing legislative proposals. * * *

"With a balance of effort on the part of both industry and Government, a program can be built which will provide for every citizen's health needs in his old age. The social security system can provide the foundation for a comprehensive private-public health insurance system; it is the function and the opportunity of private, voluntary insurance to build on this for completely adequate health care at reasonable costs."

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations:

"This is a bill about the personal well-being of men and women, those who are retired, those who are about to retire, those who are barely beginning their working lives, and everyone in between.

"We, as an organization, believe in the social security system. So does this Ways and Means Committee; neither of us has to prove this point. It is written in the history of our times. * * *

"To be meaningful, a system of old-age insurance must guard against all frequent and predictable threats, and by far the greatest of these is long-term, costly illness.

"This bill proposes to insure against this eventuality in exactly the same way as our social security system insures against total loss of income. Every worker, and his employer, would put aside a modest sum each week to create a fund that would pay a substantial part of his medical expenses after he retires.

"Now what in the world is wrong with that?"

National Association of Social Workers:

"The total system of social insurance, in order to fulfill its social purpose in American life, should protect all workers and their dependents against the major economic hazards of modern life and should provide benefits adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of living commensurate with the Nation's productive capacity and sense of social justice. * * *

"We have studied the arguments against extension of OASDI to health care. We cannot agree with them. The patient's free choice of hospital or physician is not curtailed. It is not a free service. It does not have to reduce the quality of care. It will not discourage medical education, research, or advancement. It is not socialized medicine. It is not a system of regimenting doctors or bringing them under bureaucratic control."

John P. Roche, national chairman, Americans for Democratic Action:

"ADA supports medical care for the aged under the social security system because only thus can older people who live in double jeopardy—facing both illness and poverty—get the hospitalization they need without the crushing burden of hospital costs from already inadequate incomes. Hopefully Congress will not permit itself to be immobilized by slogans which were outdated when social security became a fact over a quarter of a century ago." July 24, 1963.

James Patton: "As president of both National Farmers Union, a general farm organization dedicated to support the best economic interests of farmers, and Farmers Union Insurances, which are straight-line insurance companies which serve our farmer-members, I have been aware of the problems concerning senior citizens in rural areas.

"One of the most pressing of these problems is that of providing adequate health care for rural senior citizens. The reason for this stems from the fact that while less than 10 percent of the Nation's population live on farms, nearly one-third of our elderly reside on farms or in rural towns. As young people leave the rural areas, the elderly stay or return and the ability of the farm community to support the elderly becomes a greater and greater problem.

"There is another fact that makes it very difficult for older people in rural areas to receive proper health care. It is unfortunate, but true, that the incomes of people in rural areas are not as high as they are in urban sections of the country. In fact, average cash incomes in rural areas are less than half of those in urban areas. With farming being a high-risk, low-income profession it is obvious that our older people in rural areas are in need of more adequate health insurance protection than that which they are now receiving.

"I mentioned that I was also president of our own insurance companies because in this capacity I have had the opportunity to become well acquainted with the private insurance sector. While our insurance companies have done their best to provide the necessary medical coverage for our older members, the economic facts of running an insurance company dictate that premium costs be high—in many cases too high for lower income farmers and retired residents of small towns to afford.

"These observations have led me to the conclusion that enactment of a Federal program of hospital insurance for America's older people is a necessity long overdue. The delegates to our recent convention of National Farmers Union stated in the adoption of their policy program that 'A comprehensive national prepaid health care and medical facilities insurance program should be set up under the auspices of the Federal Government that will enable everyone to receive fully adequate medical, dental, hospital, and health services.'

"On behalf of National Farmers Union I pledge our cooperation in the drive to enact the President's health care program."

Hospital Progress, magazine of Catholic Hospital Association:

"Even political opponents of the OASI approach to health insurance for the aged admit that a measure based on that approach not only is inevitable, but actually will be enacted in a matter of years, if not months. The American Hospital Association itself has observed that, in terms of services, coverage and low-cost financing, the use of the aged OASI mechanism for health care of the aged 'probably cannot be matched nationwide by any other system, public or private.' Government officials and congressional committees have testified that the OASI system is actually sound, that the proposed health insurance program for the aged under this system could not break down, as individual State programs for all practical purposes could and might.

"The question at this point, then, would appear to be how this health insurance program under OASI might best be expressed in public law. Two proposals introduced in the first session of the 87th Congress—the King-Anderson and McNamara bills—come close to providing a workable plan. Neither is perfect. Both would have a serious impact on hospital planning, orientation and organization. But, if there are objections, if there are alternatives, suggestions and recommendations, then hospitals should voice them now before enactment forces mere dumb consent."

W. A. Boyle, president, United Mine Workers of America:

"United Mine Workers of America most heartily endorses H.R. 3920 and S. 880, known as the King-Anderson bills, and the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963. These bills provide payment for hospital care for all Americans who have reached the age of 65 through the contributory social security and railroad retirement programs.

"The members of the United Mine Workers of America prefer to contribute during their productive years to a program of medical care which will provide retirement benefits that they have rightfully earned. We oppose the voluntary health programs and the type of public assistance proposed by the Kerr-Mills program.

"The officers and members of our organization will do everything possible to urge the Members of the 88th Congress to vote for the administration's Hospital Insurance Act."

Social policy committee, national board, YWCA:

"The YWCA, with a deep concern for the health and welfare of people, has always sought to help meet these needs in such a way as to preserve the freedom, dignity, and self-respect of individuals. We have also continuously supported the principle of old age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) as a means of meeting certain social needs. In line with these principles and after much study and discussion, the national board voted at its April meeting to support the principle of extending the system of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) to include payments for health benefits for the aged."

Group Health Association of America:

"No voluntary insurance plan of any sort can create the necessary resources to provide adequate coverage for this older age group. It is just a question of trying to get blood out of a stone. * * * It is * * * gratifying to see the Federal social security system used as a solution to the problem of more adequate health care for the aged.

"This bill would not control medical practice. It would make medical practice as the doctor wants to practice it more available."

Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York:

"Our experience shows that most of our subscribers who are 65 and retired are unable to continue their insurance. (The President's) program will provide the necessary hospital coverage and thereby enable large numbers of older people to continue their voluntary medical care insurance."

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Finally, Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement concerning the pending bill, so far as our position in New York is concerned. New York is the second leading dairy producer in the United States, so it is important that certain thoughts be expressed with regard to the pending bill.

The problem of establishing a real consensus of view among dairy farmers and consumers—because New York is a State with a great number of consumers—on a bill with relation to the marketing of milk is a very real one. In order to determine whether there was a real consensus among New York dairy farmers, the bipartisan steering committee of the New York congressional delegation wrote to a number of the leading New York farm organizations and dairy cooperatives requesting their opinion on Federal legislation. I am quite gratified to be able to report that the leaders in the dairy industry in our State have been cooperative and responsive in providing the steering committee with their views.

The results of this inquiry show that a strong consensus of opinion in support of a single bill is not capable of ascertainment in our State. There is still a strong feeling in New York that dairy farmers ought to be left to solve their problems themselves and that Federal legislation regulating agricultural production through quotas and high fixed price supports should be avoided.

There is a strong sentiment in New York State in opposition to the use of production allotments or quotas, as provided in the pending bill, and a belief that the free market system is the more effective instrument for reducing farm surpluses.

I have long believed in the objectives of a farm program which would insure adequate income to fluid milk and manufacturing milk producers, would reduce the staggering cost of the dairy program to the Federal Government, would reduce existing inventories of agricultural surpluses, and would encourage progress toward more efficient production and marketing.

The pending bill would establish a program keyed to a class I or base excess plan. Under Secretary of Agriculture Charles Murphy, in testifying before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on April 3, explained the operation of the base excess plan by stating that it proposed to remove an incentive for increased production which the existing marketing orders, using a blend price, created. Thus, for his allotment the producer would receive his share of the amount required to be paid for milk needed for fluid use plus an adequate reserve, and for his excess milk would receive the lowest class price.

There are at present 37 current marketing orders which contain "base excess" provisions and which provide for the calculation of new bases each year. However, in view of existing figures on production and net income, it would appear difficult for us in New York to justify the position that such a plan would be an answer to a major lessening of the excess production.

Before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there was conflicting testimony as to whether such a plan could effectively accomplish its primary objective; namely, to significantly reduce milk production. Testimony was received that the establishment of a base excess plan would not substantially reduce production in fluid milk order markets.

The apparent small impact which a base excess plan would have on the reduction of surpluses was clearly pointed out in a table prepared by the Department of Agriculture contained in the committee report. It indicates that the estimated milk production under the bill would be 124.9 billion pounds, whereas in the 1963–64 marketing year production amounted to 125.5 billion pounds. The reduction would be only 600 million pounds. In any event, dairymen will continue to produce milk as long as the lowest class price is sufficiently high to help pay for fixed costs of production.

Moreover, the question of increased farm income is also left unsettled. With respect to the base excess plan contained in certain other bills upon which the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings earlier this year, Under Secretary Charles Murphy testified before the committee on April 3 that under a base excess plan without payment the net income of farmers would be reduced $47 million from the 1963–64 marketing year level. While the Department of Agriculture indicated that establishment of the plan incorporated in the bill before the Senate would result in an increase in net producer income of $7 million from the 1963–34 marketing figures, it seems unlikely that producers in New York would approve such a plan under their referendum unless it was proved beyond much doubt that the plan was economically preferable to the terms of the existing market order.

The uncertainty of the bill's effect upon the reduction of surpluses and the uncertainty as to whether it would improve the income of dairy farmers has been highlighted by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's statement in the Department's report on the measure, in which he recognized the limitations of the measure. He said:

> We believe a class I base plan such as incorporated in proposal S. 1915 might achieve some improvement in the income position of some fluid milk producers, and we perceive no objection to it as far as it goes. At the same time, should legislation provide only class I base plans in Federal orders, the results would be so limited that neither the necessary reduction in total national milk production nor the much needed improvement in total dairy income would be achieved.

The establishment of production controls and quotas should be viewed in the light of the precedent which last May's national wheat referendum created. This referendum established that the farmers of this country—certainly the wheat farmers—are strongly opposed to Federal production controls and to Federal supply management programs.

I believe we ought to consider this lesson, drawn from the feed grain area, as equally applicable to the dairy industry in New York. Moreover, we must be conscious of the fact that increased prices for class I fluid milk which will undoubtedly result from the establishment of a program as contemplated by this legislation may well result in higher costs to the consumers and therefore ultimately reduce consumption of fluid milk.

In New York I have done my utmost to listen carefully to what the dairymen themselves desire, and hence have been in close touch with the effort of the steering committee of the New York congressional delegation of which I am a member to obtain a consensus of opinion on the bill. We could not obtain this. I look forward to some program on which there can be a clear consensus of opinion.

I have received strong communications, however, to the effect that at this time the dairy industry in New York prefers to operate under the present Federal milk marketing orders, subject only to necessary adjustments in such orders.

The sentiment of the New York dairymen as reflected in letters to the New York steering committee and in heavy mail to my office indicates a firm faith, in free market enterprise and a belief that competition rather than restrictive Federal regulation of production meets their farm problems.

As I have said, I have tried to pay the strictest attention to what the dairy farmers in my State desire. I also have very deeply at heart the consumer problem.

I appreciate very much that the principal sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], has tried to find a program that he thought would be appealing now. I say to him that there are some farm groups in my State that are for the program, but a consensus in favor of the bill does not exist. I would welcome any such consensus upon a dairy program and look forward to its realization. On the basis of careful study, I feel it my duty to vote against the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I appreciate the friendly remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York, but I invite his attention to a couple of aspects of the bill. The Senator from New York has said that he felt this question should be left to the farmers to decide. That is exactly what the bill does. Under the present law the farmers do not have a choice as to how the receipts from the marketing orders are distributed. The present law, as interpreted and administered by the Department, requires a blend pricing system. The bill would permit farmers, if they voted better than 2 to 1 in any particular marketing area, to have a class 1 price system instead of a blend price system. It would be up to them. So the choice and opportunity of farmers would not be limited. This bill would broaden them.

The second point I should like to make is that there is not one line, not one comma, of production control in the bill; there is nothing that would effect any kind of Federal restriction. That aspect of the law would not be changed. The testimony is very strong on that particular issue.

I urge on the distinguished Senator from New York, who is an excellent Senator, and a wise and able man, consideration of the fact that people from New York State, including the Grange and, as I understand, the Milk Producers Federation, people who particularly represent the dairy farmers, came before the committee and enthusiastically supported the legislation and said the dairy farmers would benefit from it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. First I wish to answer the Senator from Wisconsin. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to suggest that although the Milk Producers Federation favored the original Proxmire bill, some of the members of the Milk Producers Federation, including some of the very largest ones, particularly in the East, later dissociated themselves from the decision of the Federation of Milk Producers and, as the Senator from New York has said, the consensus, to my knowledge, of the milk organizations is that no legislation at this time is vastly preferable to the adoption of either the Proxmire or the McCarthy bills.

But the Senator from Wisconsin is correct. At first the federation approved the bill, but I do not know that the producers affiliated with it are all in favor of it. Some of the largest organizations, like the Lehigh Valley, the Dairymen's League, the United Farmers in New England, which is the largest of the cooperatives, and which has about $28 million worth of business a year, have since dissociated themselves from the decision of the federation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. The official position taken by the Milk Producers Federation, both the New York and the national, is on record before the committee as being in favor of the legislation, and the Grange was consistently for it. In fact, the Grange's witness in the hearings was from New York. Mr. Harry L. Graham, dairy consultant for the New York State Grange, gave testimony favorable to the legislation. He told me that the Mutual Federation of Independent Cooperatives, the Metropolitan Bargaining Agency, the Eastern Milk Producers Federation, and the New York State Grange, whose membership totals 54,000 farm and rural families, all favor the bill. The New York Farm Bureau, with 13,000 farm and associate members, however, is against it.

Mutual and Eastern polls indicate almost 90 percent approval among its members. The Metropolitan Bargaining Agency required a two-thirds vote to support both the Proxmire and McCarthy bill approaches. The Grange survey shows 89 percent in support. The Oneonta State Times showed 80 percent approval in a poll conducted by them. Mr. Graham says that even Farm Bureau members support the Proxmire bill by 5-to-4 ratios, according to the Oneonta State Times survey.

Mr. JAVITS. I feel strongly that the consensus—and the bipartisan steering committee of the New York congressional delegation tried to take an honest consensus—has been considered with extreme care. It was at the request of Representatives STRATTON and ST. GEORGE that the steering committee, which represents Republicans and Democrats both in the House and in the Senate, made this survey. Analyzing the results of the survey, I assure the Senator that I have quoted it correctly.

As to the Senator's point about a referendum, I am no marketing expert on milk. The Senator from Wisconsin is extremely competent in that field. But I have tried to educate myself as a duty to my constituents. I have millions of city constituents, and I claim good credentials for knowledge of their problems, but I have studied and tried to learn about the dairy industry problems.

It is true that there would be a referendum, but when we legislate we are legislating compulsion, if the legislation should pass, on a minority. Therefore, we cannot say we should pass this legislation because the farmers will take care of themselves and will vote. If they vote for it, there will be compulsion on a minority which may be in opposition. So when we legislate a program, I think we have a duty to see that that program meets the qualifications and standards which are wished to be imposed.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the present situation is that there is compulsion on the farmers in the marketing area to take a blend price. They do not have an alternative. The bill gives them a choice. A two-thirds vote would be required to change the present situation.

In the Chicago area, and probably in the New York area, an overwhelming majority of the farmers want to change the system. But there is compulsion, anyway. There is compulsion now because they have to take the blend price, which is grossly unfair, forcing them to produce more than they want and forcing that burden upon other citizens, because the farmers impose surpluses on them which would not be imposed if they could succeed in having a different pricing system.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot agree that those are the views of the farmers. I am convinced that the consensus of the views of dairy farmers is against the program. The point is that compulsion would impose a new system on them. The status quo is involved. They are satisfied.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. First, Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from New York in giving credit to the Senator from Wisconsin for attempting to improve the position of the dairy producers. I know he is doing so with the best of intentions. Although he says there is no compulsion connected with the bill which he proposes, and it has to be adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the producers in any order area, nevertheless the only way in which the bill which he proposes would work in the long run would be by Government controls and allocations on all milk.

I come from a State which, with all due respect to Wisconsin, is the most intensive dairy State in the Union. It has more cooperative members and more cows per acre than any other State; and we depend on the industry for about three-fourths of our agricultural revenues.

On the west of us is New York, which, next to Wisconsin, is the largest producer, alternating back and forth with Minnesota for that honor or privilege from year to year.

New York and north Jersey have a marketing area. I believe it is the largest in the United States. It is followed by the Chicago area. New England has too many areas. At the present time we have five. They ought to be united into one, but they are not. Let us assume that the New York area votes to allocate class 1 production among producers——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's remarks, but I will yield the floor, so that he can be recognized in his own right. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. I wished to yield the floor so that the Senator from Vermont could finish the colloquy. I wish to leave the floor. However, I will yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. GRUENING. I gladly yield to the Senator, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. As I was saying, New York is one of the largest producing States in the Union, and most of the milk produced there is shipped to the New York market. At the present time, however, about 500 to 700 million pounds a year is being shipped into the Boston market. That is produced on the border between the two milksheds. Those counties of eastern New York shift from one order area to the other, as the price advises or suggests.

Therefore, assuming that New York voted to allocate the marketing of class I milk among those farmers, there is nothing in the Proxmire bill which would require them to reduce their production. The tendency would be for the northern New York milkshed to join with the milksheds in New England, that is, with the order areas in New England, or else unload their surplus for whatever price they could get, either of which programs would virtually destroy the New England market, and New England might inevitably have to do what New York had done, namely, vote to allocate.

There would be confusion all around. Piecemeal regulation will not work. It would not be feasible to have producers in one area say, "We will operate our milk production one way," and have producers in an adjoining area say, " We will operate it another way." Complete Federal control would be required to make it work. That is what our people are afraid of. That is why they are opposed to legislation at this time. We understand the sincerity with which the Senator from Wisconsin and others are working to enact legislation. However, it does not fit into our economy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I invite the Senator's attention to page 4 of the bill, where the following language appears:

> (iv) In the case of any producer who during any accounting period delivers a portion of his milk to persons not fully regulated by the order, provision may be made for reducing the allocation of, or payments to be received by, any such producer to compensate for any marketings of milk to such other persons for such period or periods as necessary to insure equitable participation in marketings among all producers.

If there is a leakage, to which the Senator properly calls attention, it can be prevented by the provisions of the bill. We recognize that there is a problem. I believe we have met it by this language.

Mr. AIKEN. It will not work to have one county operate under one program and an adjoining county under another program, as is the situation in eastern New York, which has from time to time, over the years, shifted back and forth between two order areas. They could shift to another order area or they could unload their surplus milk for what they could get.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If that were done, their allotment would be reduced, as provided in the bill. This program has been tried. It is no longer a theory. It is a practical, accomplished fact. It has been done in British Columbia, where the situation may be a little different. A similar program has been tried in Georgia, where it is liked very much. Six cooperatives have had the strength in various marketing order areas to put this plan into effect. It has worked. It worked very well.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator is saying is true; if they shifted to another order area their allotment would be reduced, but that would be in the area from which they shifted, not in the one into which they shifted. Under the example I have given there would be no provision for the allotment of class I milk.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is a possibility and a problem. I believe I can answer it in the course of my presentation.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure, with the understanding I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED FCC RULEMAKING

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am concerned about the proposal of the Federal Communications Commission to incorporate into its rules the TV and radio advertising time regulations contained in the codes of the National Association of Broadcasters. As the Senate knows, the FCC has issued a notice of such rulemaking—docket No. 15083—and written comments on the proposal were filed on September 30.

I oppose the FCC proposal because I believe self-regulation should be fully utilized first. I am convinced that the broadcasting industry has matured sufficiently to be able to establish criteria which would accomplish the objectives everybody desires.

In my opinion, action by the FCC in establishing in detail the amount of time which a broadcaster may use for advertising would be an indefensible intrusion of government into the everyday activity of broadcasters. It is true that in the past the broadcasting industry, like every other industry in the United States, has not achieved perfection. In the fast-growing television world, developments have galloped along at such a pace that the industry has not always been able to take the swift steps necessary to fully safeguard the public interest. Like most Americans, I have grumbled about excessive commercials infringing on programs, but I am impressed with the steady improvement now throughout the country in commercial practices of our radio and television stations. Particularly have I noted the improvement in service by the public-spirited broadcasters in Utah. I have also been rather reassured by the recent statement of former Gov. LeRoy Collins, president of the National Association of Broadcasters, on the extent to which the industry is making progress in this field.

I feel, therefore, that the industry should not be denied the opportunity to remedy present deficiencies on its own. Furthermore, I am fearful that if the FCC makes rules on commercial time limitation for broadcasters, this will be the first step on the road to complete economic regulation of an industry that should be allowed to grow in a free enterprise climate.

I realize that there are substantial legal arguments against the right of the FCC to make rules on advertising broadcast time. An examination of congressional deliberations in both the House and in the Senate on the Radio Act of 1927, and again on the Communications Act of 1934, convinces me that the FCC was never given the authority to make rules relating to commercial time limitations. I think, therefore, that this issue could very well be fought out on the legal front—and won.

But the question before us is not just a legal issue. The question is simply this: Are we going to permit the broadcasting industry to continue to grow under the competitive system as envisioned in the 1927 and the 1934 acts, or are we going to use the back door to force on the broadcasters a public utility concept which eventually would mean the regulation of the entire broadcasting economy—including the regulation of their charges and costs?

Mr. President, I have every confidence that the broadcasters can put their own house in order without further Government action. If they fail—and I believe they will not fail—then Government action may be justified.

I hold, however, that if the FCC decides that the Government should move, the Commission should come to the Congress with their proposal, and let it be fully debated here.

I hope the Federal Communications Commission will not stifle the very significant efforts the broadcasting industry is making to improve its commercial practices. Once the Commission has carefully examined the comments which have been filed in docket No. 15083, I trust that the Commission will see the wisdom of withdrawing its proposal.

COUNTERFEITING OF U.S. CURRENCY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, some time ago my attention was attracted to an article in a Sunday newspaper supplement magazine, Parade, where the following statement appeared. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EASY DOLLARS

Of all the world's currencies, easiest to counterfeit is the U.S. dollar. That's the opinion of Marcel Sicot, Secretary-General of Interpol, the international police organization. This is why most counterfeiters throughout the world concentrate on turning out fake dollars. Most difficult currency to copy is the French banknote.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I was deeply concerned that there was some feeling on the part of such a well-known criminologist that the currency of the United States was the easiest in the world to counterfeit and I, therefore, inquired of the Secretary of the Treasury for further information. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Arnold Sagalyn, Director of Law Enforcement Coordination, Treasury Department, to show that the statement attributed to him was never made by him and is completely false and without foundation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
LAW ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION,
Washington, D.C., June 21, 1963.

HON. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: Your letter to Secretary Dillon relative to an item on counterfeiting of U.S. currency in the May 26 issue of Parade magazine has been referred to me for reply. For your information Mr. Marcel Sicot, Secretary General of the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol) sent the Treasury Department the following statement:

"I have been informed that an American syndicated magazine, Parade, has quoted me as stating that U.S. currency is the easiest to counterfeit of all the world's currencies.

"Neither I, nor any member of the Interpol Secretariat staff, has ever expressed such a statement on the subject of counterfeiting American currency to Parade, or any other publication or journalist. Any such opinion or statement attributed to me on this matter is completely false and without foundation. I wish to state that as far as currency counterfeiting is concerned, it is a recognized fact that U.S. currency is so well protected with security features incorporated in its paper, printing, and engraving that it is without question among the world's most difficult currencies to counterfeit."

In an effort to make amends, Parade magazine is now preparing an article for early release which will refute its May 26 story and will report that U.S. currency is without question the best protected and most difficult to counterfeit in the world.

There is no doubt that many foreign counterfeiters try to counterfeit American dollars because they are so highly valued and widely accepted. However, U.S. currency is so well protected by the extremely high quality of the paper, engraving, printing and other security features incorporated in it, and by the U.S. Secret Service with its record of success in apprehending counterfeiters, that no counterfeiter in modern times has ever succeeded in making a perfect counterfeit of a U.S. bill. On the contrary, almost all of the counterfeit dollars that have appeared in various countries abroad have been of a very poor quality and readily detected by anyone familiar with and competent to judge U.S. currency.

At the 4th International Conference on Currency Counterfeiting held in Copenhagen, Denmark, in September 1961, this very subject was discussed by the delegates. In this connection the following pertinent report was presented to the conference by Thomas De La Rue & Co., Ltd., the largest commercial banknote printer in the world:

"Some banknotes are of so low a value that counterfeiting is highly unlikely. On the other hand some currencies are so readily accepted throughout the world that counterfeits of any value are likely to find a ready market. An illustration of this point is the fact that counterfeiters have spent considerable time attempting to copy the American dollar bill—not because it is easier to copy, but because it is most readily accepted by people who are not thoroughly familiar with it * * *. However, these notes have been so well protected with security features that successful counterfeiting is fortunately rare."

In the last fiscal year counterfeiters turned out some $4 million in counterfeit currency. However, the U.S. Secret Service was able to seize $3,500,000 of these counterfeits—or $7 out of every $8—before they could be put into circulation. In proportion to the $31 billion in U.S. paper currency in circulation today, this infinitesimal fraction of counterfeit money is a tribute to the protection built into and around American currency.

The Treasury Department is confident that the best guarantee against the counterfeiting of U.S. currency is provided by the security features of our currency, coupled with effective enforcement by the U.S. Secret Service.

Sincerely yours,

ARNOLD SAGALYN,
Director.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in fact, Mr. Sagalyn goes on to point out that U.S. currency is so well protected with secret features incorporated in its paper, printing, and engraving that it is without question among the world's most difficult currency to counterfeit.

Mr. Sagalyn goes on to point out that in the last fiscal year there were $31 billion of paper currency in circulation. Out of an effort to counterfeit our currency, which amounted to a total of $4 million, Secret Service agents seized $3.5 million before it could be put into circulation. This proof of the vigilance of the Secret Service in protecting our currency shows that they operate with such efficiency that 7 out of every 8 counterfeit dollars never leaves the criminal's shop.

THE COLD WAR GI—THE NEGLECTED VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator from Texas, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The subject to which I desire to refer is one in which the Senator from Alaska has displayed deep interest, and to which his great intellect and compassionate heart have been devoted; that is, to provide 5 million Americans an opportunity in life. I refer to the 5 million veterans of the cold war who have been called away from their normal pursuits.

Mr. President, many articles have been written in support of the cold war GI bill. One of the most eloquent of these articles was published in the Nation on March 2, 1963. Written by Nora Levin, the article is entitled: "Needed: A New GI Bill, the Neglected Veterans." This is a well written article and well worth the time that it takes to read it. I assure Senators that it will give them food for thought.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Nora Levin's article: "Needed: A New GI Bill, the Neglected Veterans," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A NEW GI BILL—THE NEGLECTED VETS

(By Nora Levin)

The current concern with high school dropouts may lead some officials in Washington to consider afresh the disquieting profile of the cold war GI's drawn by the Bradley Commission in 1954–55. These are the GI's postdated January 31, 1955—the day President Eisenhower declared the Korean emergency to be over and all GI education and training benefits came to an end. Not much is known about the several million men who have been discharged from the Armed Forces since that date; they seem to have slipped into the twilight gray of the cold war world and remain one of the few problems unstudied by proliferating foundation grants. However, the Bradley Commission report projected a disturbing future for them which, in turn, partly explains our present unemployment dilemma.

Half the total group of peacetime servicemen came from semiskilled or unskilled occupations and more than one-third had no job experience prior to their induction. About 40 percent had less than a high school education and, according to the report's analysis, lacked the educational background and aptitude for regular college work:

"Except for such training and experience as they may acquire while in service, they will be poorly equipped to enter the labor market. Many of them will need trade and vocational training of below college level in order to make up for the civilian work experience and seniority lost by virtue of military service.

"The regular education system is not equipped to meet their needs; otherwise, they would have stayed in school longer."

In every aspect—in terms of educational background, civilian job experience prior to induction, and aptitude for college—World War II veterans were much better prepared for absorption into the civilian economy after discharge.

An unemployment survey made recently in Pennsylvania, which suffers 10 percent of the Nation's unemployment, shows, in a nutshell, the manpower crisis. Over one-fourth of the half-million jobless studied were veterans. Of the 228 occupations in which manpower was needed, 197 required people with less than college training but with very definite skills. Skills are precisely what the cold war GI doesn't have—skills that could give a handle to drifting lives. While it is obvious that a training program for several million post-Korean veterans will not solve the national unemployment problem, it is also true that the group grows larger year after year and constitutes a built-in irritant that tends to aggravate recurring unemployment crises.

Every Congress, the Senate conducts extensive hearings on legislation to give these GI's educational and training benefits—a perennial labor of love for Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat of Texas, particularly. The Senate passed such a bill in 1959, and although hearings were held on it in the House during 1960, it was not reported out by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. The Senate Labor Committee again reported the bill in 1961, but it was not scheduled for floor action in the Senate during the balance of the 87th Congress. Although many feel that a majority of both Senate and House would vote for the legislation, strong opposition by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations has thus far prevented action. (While President Kennedy voted for the cold war GI bill as a Senator, and was elected on a 1960 Democratic Party platform endorsing such a measure, his administration has argued no less forcefully against the bill than the previous one.)

It is a curious thing—perhaps symptomatic of our bewildered life in this flinty age of the cold war—that post-Korean veterans and their problems have engaged practically no public interest or concern. The tides of studies on the American educational crisis eddy round them. The American Legion, the largest and most powerful of all the veterans' organizations, considers them ineligible for membership and unworthy of receiving training benefits. The military professionals think of them primarily as a pool from which to entice back the cream as military career personnel. The Eisenhower administration felt that training benefits for them would be too costly and would unbalance the budget; the administration then added the strained argument that a basic educational program of truly national scope would be blocked by giving special consideration to post-Korean veterans. The present administration echoes the arguments. And the men themselves lack any organizational platform from which to speak. It has been left to individual educators, vocational counselors, liberal Senators and the smaller veterans' organizations to sustain the struggle, albeit in the close confines of congressional hearing rooms.

Over a period of 6 years, these men have patiently repeated to closed audiences the incalculable values, represented by increased skilled manpower and the orderly readjustment of servicemen to civilian life, that could be imparted to millions of additional younger men. In reading through the reams of testimony, one recalls how unruly, even violent, our veterans frequently proved to be in past years. It was this fact which led to the passage, in 1944, of the GI bill for World War II veterans. In terms of cold, hard cash alone, the bill has been a self-paying proposition: by 1970, the $15 billion invested in it will have been more than paid back in terms of an additional $1 billion per year paid in Federal income taxes as a result of increased income levels attained.

No single national program has given so many people so many skills in so many pursuits as has this GI bill. One-third of the 8 million veterans who used the program enrolled in craft, trade and industrial courses; 700,000 went into business and management courses; 440,000 engineers, 240,000 teachers, 168,000 doctors and dentists, 112,000 scientists, 105,000 lawyers and 93,000 social scientists and economists owe their training to the bill. Despite the fears of some that colleges would be converted into "educational hobo jungles" under the program, university educators and administrators by the hundreds have testified that GI's brought stability and maturity into the classroom. The program was a major contribution to the national welfare and the country would be weaker educationally, economically and from the point of view of national defense if we had not embarked upon it.

The Korean readjustment training program will show even more impressive results. About 3 million young men have trained under this program at an average yearly cost of a little more than $500 million.

Proposed veterans' legislation anticipates that about 4 million veterans will be discharged during the period February 1, 1955, to June 31, 1963 (when the present draft law ends). Over a projected 5-year period, almost 1.5 million veterans would participate in GI benefits, according to Government estimates. Costs for the first year would be about $93 million. Costs would gradually rise to a peak expenditure of $500 million for the fifth year, and would then gradually decline. Stacked against the $1.5 billion cost of stabilizing wheat prices, or against a total Federal budget of $98 billion, these amounts seem very modest indeed.

January 31, 1955, seems a peculiarly arbitrary date for cutting off benefits. Aside from the fact that, on a purely personal basis, servicemen inducted on February 1, 1955, felt the same sense of hardship and sacrifice that inductees the day before experienced, all of our days since 1955 have been cold-war days. If we are not at war, we surely are not at peace, as everything in our lives today bears testimony. Men alerted in Guantanamo Bay, South Vietnam and Berlin, or men holding the 38th parallel in bleak Korea are looking, or have looked, into the eyes of the enemy. As if in belated recognition of this fact, the Defense Department last June announced that tens of thousands of servicemen would be eligible for a new campaign medal to be awarded for hazardous duty in the cold war. Designated the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, it will be given for service during certain periods in Berlin, Lebanon, Quemoy and Matsu, the Formosa Straits, the Congo, Laos, and South Vietnam.

Many cold war GI's are bitter because their years in service represent a real sacrifice of roles in civilian life: school, school-and-work combinations, jobs, and normal family life. In many cases, college work has to be taken on a piecemeal basis, indefinitely postponed or given up if the draft intervenes. The Bradley Commission Report warned that the main handicap incurred by post-Korean veterans, aside from a service-connected disability, would be the disruptive effect of military service on education. The preservice educational and job experience of these men indicate that their training needs are great. However, military service does little or nothing to satisfy these needs. The inservice opportunities given draftees for vocational studies and work experience do not offset the interruption of schooling or jobs.

This is not the place to go into the confusion created by the pulls of two conflicting systems—conscription and military professionalism—each with its own rationale, justifications and objectives. But a few comments may be injected. The Army is the only service that uses the draft, and it bluntly admits using it chiefly as a spur to keep enlistments up. The draft calls take only a fraction of the total number of eligible young men, and under present rules the mathematical chances of being drafted are getting smaller and smaller. The fact is that the old and honored claim of universal obligation slides into the dustbin of history, along with the muzzle-loading rifle and cavalry saber. War has now become a business for razor-sharp specialists, and more and more manpower experts are attacking the draft because it is outmoded as an effective system to meet the security needs of the country.

Among those who are drafted, there is much bitterness and antagonism and more than the usual amount of soldier griping. Cold war uncertainties hang over the draftee's future; he is furious because luckier friends have escaped his lot, and he is being denied not only the fringe benefits which former GI's enjoyed, but also the key instrument with which to regain a substantial parity with his luckier contemporaries—education and training benefits. Moreover, because deferments are generally available to financially able young men, the burden of military service, always a financial hardship, passes to those who are least able to afford it. As Senator YARBOROUGH has put it, "This is class legislation, unfair and inequitable unless we act to equalize the disadvantage suffered by those who serve * * *. We must at least give the young man who fulfills his military obligation some means by which he can catch up with the world that has passed him by."

The military professionals generally have argued against continuing training benefits on the ground that they lure men out of military service and handicap the services in their efforts to retain career personnel. The low reenlistment rate is attributed to the enticement of education benefits. This generalization has apparently been based on an Air Force survey of first-term airmen's reasons for not reenlisting. When the material is examined carefully, however, some curious discrepancies show up. First, only 5 percent of the airmen involved and 10 percent of the officers were queried; secondly, the questions posed in the survey do not ask specifically why a man wants to leave military service, but simply asks him to check one of eight plans he intends to carry out during his first civilian year; thirdly, only those men were queried who had indicated previously that they intended to leave the force at the end of their current enlistment; fourthly, questions on education do not appear in every questionnaire. So we have a percentage of a percentage of a percentage of airmen saying that they expect to go to school, or work-and-go-to-school after their separation from service. This is not extraordinary news.

The obvious distaste for a circumscribed lifetime of military service felt by many men had apparently not occurred to the questionnaire makers. In the 1959–60 hearings, Senator YARBOROUGH eloquently reminded an Air Force witness that many men simply cannot stomach a military career, and that freedom from military service restrictions is a positive need for some human beings.

Admittedly, the professionalization of a segment, perhaps all, of the Armed Forces is a necessity, but so long as military conscription commits draftees to fixed, limited periods, it is indefensible to apply to them the criteria, the pressures and the psychology of an elite military career group.

In fact, the retention rate for first-term airmen with 4 to 6 years of service was built up from 10.9 to 31.2 percent, almost threefold, from 1954 to 1958, despite the eligibility of these men for educational benefits under the Korean GI bill during this period. Senator KUCHEL, of California, has testified that the rate has moved up strikingly to 45.7 percent during the first 6 months of 1959, exceeding the rate recommended by the Cordiner report.[1] All of the personnel represented in this rise were likewise eligible for Korean training benefits. Thus, the competition between a service career in the Air Force and GI bill benefits has been largely overcome, or at least nullified, by now. The factors working for a military career are positive ones: more stabilized operations, leadership-training programs and important career incentives such as medicare, survivors' benefits, social security. Then the military pay bill of 1958 offers improved opportunities for advancement and compensation for special skills, retirement benefits, increased military housing, and improved procedures in training, transferring, and assigning military personnel.

The percentages of reenlistments in the critical occupation groups—technology, etc.—is naturally lower because of the unsaturated demands for civilian technical labor. Competition for technical personnel between civil industry and the military will go on apace until increasing numbers of technically trained persons are available in civilian life. New legislation for post-Korean veterans would go a long way toward stopping this competition, toward salvaging irreplaceable human potentialities, and toward taking us off that chilling platform where men in responsible places make a whipping boy out of education.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alaska for yielding. I know that he has gone to the White House on this subject and has done much work on it. I have observed him in committees and on the floor of the Senate, working on this question. There is no more eloquent voice in the Senate for the cause of providing opportunities for neglected veterans, who have been robbed of their opportunities, than that of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Texas. As its sponsor, no one has fought harder for this needed legislation than he. It seems unfortunate that we cannot get the support for it that it so manifestly deserves. I am particularly pleased that the Senator has placed in the RECORD an article from the Nation magazine, with which I was twice in the past associated, once as managing editor, and once as editor. I am glad that today it is still advocating the kind of good causes it advocated when it started life almost a century ago, shortly after the Civil War, has advocated ever since, and that it is still going strong. It has ever been a torch bearer for freedom and democracy, so I am not surprised that it is supporting your cold war GI bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Alaska for his editorship of the Nation. Like him, I am glad to see that it is still supporting good measures like the cold war GI bill. The article which I have placed in the RECORD is in keeping with the high quality of articles that were published in the Nation during the editorship of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is difficult for me to understand why a bill that is so manifestly an educational bill, a bill which has been favorably received in this body, cannot be received favorably in the other body, also. Unlike some educational bills which are merely abstract contributions to this highly important subject, this bill would return economic dividends, it would provide opportunities for the young men who have served their country and have been taken out of civilian life and have had their careers interrupted to receive training which would make them more fit to earn a living and earn a better livelihood, that livelihood in turn revert-ing in the form of higher taxability to the Nation's economy, which unfortunately is now lagging in many areas.

---

[1] Subsequently, the rate increased markedly.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have the same difficulty in understanding why a bill that the experience of this country shows will pay dividends to the Government, to our economy, and to the intellectual development of our people is shunted aside. The bill has been on the Senate calendar for some time, having been reported favorably by the committee. It has languished on the calendar since July 2, 1963. It is coauthored by 39 Senators. The bill has been shunted aside too long. I think it is time for the leadership not only to call it up, but help to press it and pass it.

Mr. GRUENING. I see no validity whatever in the objection that has been raised that these men have not actually been engaged in combat. In the first place, some of them have. Some of them, who would have been eligible for benefits under the bill, lost their lives in Vietnam. These men are serving under hardships in many places throughout the world. It would be interesting to learn of the number of men who would have become eligible in the last 3 months.

But I would not consider that a pertinent argument in any event, because they have been taken out of civilian life and their careers have been dislocated.

Many of them have been unable to get work because of their liability to impending draft. Hardship and injustice have been worked on hundreds of thousands of Americans, which could be requited by providing them with the kind of educational opportunity that has proved so successful in post-World-War-II years. I find it difficult to understand why the bill cannot be passed.

I, too, urge the leadership to call up the bill. I join with the distinguished Senator from Texas in asking the leadership to take the matter seriously and to bring up the bill and support it.

It is quite likely that all educational bills proposed by the administration will not pass at this session of Congress. It is desirable that one or two be enacted, so that we can go back to the people after this session and report that we passed one or two good educational bills, of which this is one, that will benefit the economy of the Nation.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in respect to the inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Alaska concerning the number of men who have served in actual combat, as between cold war veterans and the so-called hot war veterans, I have made some inquiries. I have attempted to ascertain the number of the 16 million veterans of World War II who actually were under fire. I have been unable to obtain those statistics. Apparently they are not available. But I have received information from persons who have studied this subject and are informed. It is their opinion that of the 16 million World War II veterans, less than half were ever in combat. Millions never reached the combat zone. Of the 4¾ million veterans who served in the Korean war, millions never went overseas; and a majority of those who did were never in combat.

So the criterion for readjustment benefits has not been whether a man was under fire or in combat, but whether he was taken away from his civilian occupation and environment, and kept out of them for periods of time.

This is a readjustment bill; it is not a bonus bill. It is a readjustment bill that will let men readjust to civilian life when they return, because civilian life does not stand still.

The average veteran of the cold war serves 27 months—2 years and 3 months—which is longer than the average period of service during the Korean conflict. When a man goes away for 2 years and 3 months and then comes back, he does not find the same county, the same city, the same State, the same Nation, or the same economy. They have moved ahead. So unless he has this readjustment training to enable him to move with them, he is permanently at a disadvantage in his battle with life.

This bill is an act of simple justice. Not only will it give these veterans an opportunity to be more productive, but the country owes it to them. The experience with the veterans of the Second World War and the Korean conflict shows that.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Texas, who is sponsoring this legislation, whether he is not pleased with the increasing public acclaim and the approval which newspapers are giving to it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. It is most encouraging that the greatest support for the GI bill has come, not from party leadership or government leadership, but from the people. It is coming, as the Senator from Alaska has said, in words such as those spoken yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. It is also coming in words such as those spoken today by the distinguished Senator from Alaska. Furthermore, in the letters I have read in the newspapers and in the letters that have come across my desk, there is a growing demand from the people of this country that the promise contained in the Democratic platform of 1960—the pledge that we would give this additional benefit to these veterans—be complied with. I regard it as a pledge of honor by the Democratic Party, and it is written into our platform.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from Alaska yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I believe everyone in the country knows that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] has been the spearhead in our fight to try to get this administration—and the previous administration, for that matter—to recognize the obligation we have to the so-called peacetime veterans.

I have received a very interesting letter from a veteran overseas; he pleads for our passage of the bill of the Senator from Texas. I shall use his letter as a basis for a speech, next week. Meantime, I commend the Senator from Texas for his leadership in this field.

As the Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Texas know, I am a strong supporter of the President's program on education. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I have the responsibility of trying to take that program through the Senate; and yesterday we made a start, with the very important vocational education bill. But I am keenly disappointed that the President's program does not include the education bill for the GI's, because I believe it is the most democratic of any education bill we can pass. It carries out the obligation we have to these veterans.

Mr. President, I close by saying this bill will not cost the taxpayers one cent. It will provide these veterans with an opportunity to get an education, which thousands upon thousands of them will never get otherwise. The increased earnings they will be able to make by means of that education will result in increased taxes which will return to the Treasury many times the cost of their education.

In short, this bill is commonsense and good business; and from it we will reap two great dividends: a financial dividend, and a security dividend.

The security of this Republic can never be any stronger than the developed brainpower of its people. But today we are wasting the brainpower of tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of our young people who are being denied a college education, because we do not have the vision and the foresight to pass legislation such as the bill the Senator from Texas is urging.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I share his sentiments entirely.

The facts he has mentioned have been proved in the hearings before our committee. It was actually proved that veterans of World War II and those of the Korean conflict are, by means of their increased earnings, paying into the Treasury more than enough money to pay for the cost of the GI training, even if we do not consider their contributions to the economy of the country and their brainpower development.

We should also point out that today the Soviet Union is graduating from her colleges, each year, three times as many engineers and scientists as the number who graduate from our colleges, and 2½ times as many medical personnel.

We cannot always rely solely on the leadership or the largess of the past. It is time to educate this generation.

I thank the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse].

THE ALLIANCE AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Friday, October 11, will mark the third anniversary of the signing of the Act of Bogotá. The act begins as follows:

> The Special Committee To Study the Formulation of New Measures for Economic Cooperation, recognizing that the preservation and strengthening of free and democratic institutions in the American republics

> requires the acceleration of social and economic progress in Latin America adequate to meet the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of the Americas for a better life and to provide them the fullest opportunity to improve their status—

The Act of Bogotá concludes as follows:

> In approving the Act of Bogotá the delegations to the Special Committee, convinced that the people of the Americas can achieve a better life only within the democratic system, renew their faith in the essential values which lie at the base of Western civilization, and reaffirm their determination to assure the fullest measure of well-being to the people of the Americas under conditions of freedom and respect for the supreme dignity of the individual.

In offering his 10-point program to Latin America, which he termed "the Alliance for Progress," on March 11, 1961, at a White House reception to Latin American diplomats and Members of Congress, President Kennedy stated:

> Our unfulfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions.

Please note that President Kennedy said, in what was deemed an epoch-making address, that the Alianza could best be achieved "within the framework of democratic institutions."

He continued:

> If we can do this in our own hemisphere, and for our own people, we may yet realize the prophecy of the great Mexican patriot, Benito Juarez, that "democracy is the destiny of future humanity."

Later in the same address he said:

> To achieve this goal, political freedom must accompany material progress. Our Alliance for Progress is an alliance of free governments, and it must work to eliminate tyranny from a hemisphere in which it has no rightful place. Therefore let us express our special friendship to the people of Cuba and the Dominican Republic—and the hope they will soon rejoin the society of freemen, uniting with us in our common effort.

I submit, Mr. President, as we all know, that unfortunately the people of Cuba have not yet rejoined the society of freemen. They still groan under Castro and his Russian-supported Communist tyranny.

In Santo Domingo, however, it seemed, until 2 weeks ago, that the people of the Dominican Republic had rejoined the society of freemen. The military tyrant and Dictator Trujillo had been killed over a year earlier; and, after an interim period of transition, an exemplary election was held—a free election by freemen; Juan Bosch was elected President, a legislature was elected, and a constitution was adopted.

But now he and his democratically elected government have been overthrown by a military junta, by the same means by which the tyrant Trujillo came into power 32 years ago.

Three days after President Kennedy's speech in which he stressed the importance of the framework of democratic institutions for the Alliance for Progress, he reemphasized the same idea in a message in which he asked Congress to appropriate $600 million to carry out this purpose in Latin America.

On that occasion, on March 14, 1961, he said:

> The Act of Bogotá marks a historic turning point in the evolution of the Western Hemisphere. For the first time the American Nations have agreed to join in a massive cooperative effort to strengthen democratic institutions through a program of economic development and social progress.

Then he reverted to the importance of political democracy, as follows:

> The people of Latin America are the inheritors of a deep belief in political democracy and the freedom of man—a sincere faith that the best road to progress is freedom's road.

Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress is today at the crossroads. If the administration again weakens and does anything other than use all the means at its disposal—and I stress the words "all the means"—to secure the restoration of the democratic processes in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras, it might as well forget the Alliance for Progress.

The Kennedy administration has it in its power to restore the Dominican people to the society of freemen.

President Kennedy made a correct start in that direction by withdrawing recognition of the junta, recalling our Ambassador, and announcing the suspension of economic aid.

There is gratifying evidence that he will hold firm in the announcement received yesterday from the State Department which states:

> We view the recent military coups in the Dominican Republic and Honduras with the utmost gravity. The establishment and maintenance of representative and constitutional government is an essential element in the Alliance for Progress. Stable and effective government, responsive to the popular will, is a critical factor in the attainment of social and economic progress.
>
> Under existing conditions in the Dominican Republic and Honduras there is no opportunity for effective collaboration by the United States under the Alliance for Progress or for normalization of diplomatic relations. Accordingly, we have stopped all economic and military aid to these countries and have commenced orderly reassignment of the personnel involved.

For if the administration reverses the splendid pronouncements about the framework of democracy when President Kennedy launched the inspired idea of the Alliance for Progress 2½ years ago, it will itself have scuttled the program.

As 22 Senators pointed out in a telegram to the President on Wednesday, October 2, mere withdrawal of recognition and announcement of cessation of foreign aid was not enough. The continued presence of the U.S. personnel—diplomatic, military, Peace Corps—in these countries would serve to indicate that these announced policies were only temporary. There are still other measures that the administration could adopt if it means what President Kennedy said when he launched the Alliance for Progress and asked Congress to appropriate $600 million to get it started.

Events of the past year and especially those of the past weeks indicate clearly that the Alliance for Progress is in grave danger of being scuttled by military coups against democratically constituted governments.

However, there appears to be an ominous split within the administration. For on Sunday last Mr. Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, sent up the first trial balloon espousing the startling doctrine that we must not grow unduly concerned when an illegal military junta forcibly takes over and throws out a constitutionally elected civil government. He enunciated the theory that there are good and bad juntas and that we must wait and see whether the military juntas which took over in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras are good or bad.

In addition, there have been the semiofficial leaks from official sources indicating a feeling on the part of some highly placed officials in the Department of State that the time has come to make a distinction between good and bad military juntas.

This is not only sheer nonsense. It is a gross betrayal.

Let it be pointed out at this point that in the long troubled history of Latin America there have never been two more clear-cut instances of honest elections and of democratic regimes overthrown by military juntas.

The election in the Dominican Republic was just that.

In Honduras, President Villeda Morales was elected 6 years ago in a free and honest election and was to complete his term with an election of his successor scheduled for October 12. It was to prevent this election of a President who the military feared might cut down their privileges, that they overthrew him. No formula can be devised to rectify this situation other than the restoration as nearly as possible of the status that existed at the time of the overthrow.

A patchwork of promises by the usurpers to do something different will not meet the situation. In the case of the Dominican Republic the honest election has been held. The junta deposed not only the President and Vice President and sent them into exile but abolished the constitution and the legislature. It would be unthinkable for our administration to have any truck with these usurping outfits, either in the Dominican Republic or in Honduras. The administration should use its full powers to insist that the ousted officials be brought back and restored to office and that the constitutional process be restored in the case of the Dominican Republic to serve out their terms under the constitution; and in the case of Honduras to permit the election scheduled for October 12 to take place. This should be made unmistakably clear to the usurpers.

It is not pertinent for those who seek to palliate the military overthrows to point to weaknesses, real or fancied, in the administration that was overthrown. No administration is perfect. But the irreducible fact is that the administrations in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras were honestly elected. If they should have proved or should prove so unsatisfactory that the people who elected them want a change, there are constitutional ways of effecting that change.

Likewise, almost invariably the usurpers allege that the administration overthrown is either Communist or infiltrated by Communists or soft on communism. It happens not to be true in either case. Nor does it alter the fact that they were elected and that there is no basis for these allegations in the case of the Bosch and Villeda Morales administrations.

The current issue of the Commonweal, for October 11, contains an editorial entitled "Caribbean Failure." It states that on the contrary Bosch was "firmly opposed to communism." I should point out that the Commonweal, an excellent journal of opinion, represents the voice of Catholic laymen. For this reason its judgment on Bosch and the situation in the Dominican Republic is all the more significant and authoritative.

I shall now read it:

Once again the U.S. hopes for a "showcase for democracy" have gone aglimmering in Latin America, for familiar reasons but with less cause and more ominous implications than the usual military takeover. Juan Bosch's regime, the first to be freely elected in the Dominican Republic in 32 years, was to be the elusive shining example to Latin America and a countervailing power to Castro's Cuba in the Caribbean. Its fall strengthens Castro's hand and deals another blow to the Alliance for Progress—already reeling from the House of Representatives decision to cut nearly a billion dollars from its 1964 budget.

Bosch was in some respects a mercurial leader and not the State Department's first choice to lead the Dominican Republic out of the Trujillo era. But there were good grounds for hope. Bosch was well-educated in the humanist tradition, almost awesomely honest, and democratic to the core. By the exigencies of a delicate situation, and by temperament as well, he did not gravitate easily to extremes. Though he let it be known early that he preferred his policies to be made in Santo Domingo rather than in Washington, he worked closely with the Alliance for Progress. His decision to "bury the past" and avoid an all-out purge of all who worked under Trujillo was wise and practical. Indeed, Bosch often seemed to be quite in the tradition of the pragmatic Yankee politician with his eyes fixed more firmly on the job to be done than on the hurts of the past, whether those hurts entered the political arena under anti-Trujillo, anti-Communist or anti-American banners. Though firmly opposed to communism, he refused to move against the nation's four Communist Parties on the grounds that in a democratic society they have as much right to function as any other party as long as they obey the law. His anticommunism, though he might not have called it by that name, did not issue in cheap rhetoric or the jailing of domestic Communists, but in the vision of social reform as the cement of a stable non-Communist republic.

In short, Bosch possessed a rare combination of assets, which makes his overthrow all the more crushing. Once again the right, led by an army that has come to believe it has a permanent political role as a protector against communism, has prevented a fledgling democratic regime from moving far enough to the left to undercut the appeal of communism and bring stability to the nation. And once again the umbrella of anticommunism has been thrown over a successful attempt to frustrate a sound democratic anticommunism based on social reforms.

The Dominican coup increases the pressure on Romulo Betancourt, who is striving to become Venezuela's first freely elected President to step down after a complete term in office. That term runs until December, and the attempts to bring about his fall, aided by Castro, can be expected to mount in coming weeks. Should Betancourt survive the attempts at assassination and insurrection, the prestige and added stability of the fragile democratic experiment in Venezuela may be considerable. In this connection, it is very interesting to note the attitude of much of the conservative press in this country. In the name of anticommunism, it has let it be known that it thinks Betancourt must go.

Also, a most illuminating article on the background to the takeover by the military junta in the Dominican Republic appears in the current issue of the New Republic. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Victor Alba entitled "Why Bosch Fell" may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Tuesday's Washington Post and Times Herald contains the second trial balloon espousing the thesis of the good military junta. It is carried in a front page article by Murray Marder. I ask unanimous consent that that article, as well as the critical editorial in the same issue of the Washington Post, be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. The Post editorial rightly points out, as I did on Monday, that Assistant Secretary Martin's "animadversions" are likely to encourage more military coups and suggests that Mr. Martin had better read some of the speeches President Kennedy made during his campaign on Latin American affairs, and as I have pointed out, after he became President, when he launched the Alliance for Progress.

Likewise, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the October 9 issue of the Washington Post by Dan Kurzman, headed "U.S. Arms, Inaction Helped—Naive Honduran Rule Abetted Military Plots," as well as a brilliant satire by Art Buchwald printed Tuesday in the Washington Post entitled "Somewhere in Latin America" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. The keystone of the Alliance for Progress is the establishment of a civilian form of government giving strength and protection of the rights of the individual in each country. Under this thesis, under no circumstances can a military junta forcibly overthrowing a duly constituted civilian government be characterized as "good."

The two trial balloons appearing in the press within 3 days have ominous overtones. If adopted as the official administration policy this doctrine of the "good" illegal military takeover will surely spell the end of the Alliance for Progress.

The time has come for the administration to denounce—clearly and without ambiguity—this unhealthy doctrine and to serve notice on each and every country joined with us in the Alliance for Progress that the United States will not countenance the illegal overthrow of any duly constituted government in any Latin American country by a military coup. The time to speak out is now—tomorrow may be too late.

The Alliance for Progress was the inspired idea of President Kennedy. It was and is a great concept. It is, as I said earlier, at the cross roads. It is now in mortal peril, in part due to past vacillations of President Kennedy's own administration. Now he alone can save it.

EXHIBIT 1

WHY BOSCH FELL

(By Victor Alba)

The September 25 overthrow of the Dominican Republic's first constitutional government in a generation was, to many people, unexpected—but it shouldn't have been. In each of my three visits to the island during President Juan Bosch's 8 months in office, a coup d' état was in the making.

The air force, Trujillo's pet military group, would, it was assumed, lead the takeover. On one occasion Bosch, without giving in to the insurgents' demands, persuaded them to drop their plan—and then dismissed the lieutenant and Castroite priest behind it. The other two times, the air force officials abandoned their plot on learning that U.S. warships were steaming toward Santo Domingo. (They had probably not forgotten that, on the fall of Trujillo, when the air force was about to stage a coup, it was the presence of U.S. ships that encouraged the people to take to the streets and head it off. At that time the Dominicans, with neither political parties nor experience in the politics of an open society, were unprepared to do what they might have done then—but never again: disarm the army, which had been willing to submit to Trujillo's tyranny for 30 years but could not put up with 8 months of a constitutional president's administration.)

It was not one branch of the armed services but all three, together with the police force, that finally carried out the coup. Its leader, at least for purposes of public consumption, was the Secretary of Defense, Gen. Víctor Viñas Román, of whom Bosch once told me, "I believe he's loyal, wants stability in the country, and is an effective counterweight to the ambitions of his fellow officers."

The most highly regarded of the Dominicans exiled under Trujillo, Bosch was the only one to build up a political party and to hold on to his progressive, democratic beliefs. He and the members of his Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD) were the first to return on the dictator's death, but rather than take part in the intrigues that developed around the Council of State, they set out to shape public opinion, to strengthen their party organization, and to teach the politically unaware Dominicans what a political party is. Throughout the campaign, Bosch was accused of being a reactionary, of having pocketed the exiles' funds (in all the years I have known him, he has lived modestly), and of being a Communist. Yet he won hands down, and PRD gained control of both houses in the legislature. In view of the fact that the elections were organized by the council of state, which Bosch charged with fiscal irresponsibility, there can be no doubt as to the honesty of Bosch's victory.

FIRST-CLASS CITIZEN

Yet, from the day he took office, the president was under attack. Not a series of attacks, but a single, coordinated, systematic attack. A leader of the opposition, who claimed to be of the left, told me a few hours after the inauguration, "Tomorrow I'll go after him." My "why?" was answered with, "You surely don't think we can have the masses governing us."

He was right. PRD was the party of the worker, of the farmer, of the man in the street, not of the politician or of the intellectual. For the first time in the Dominican Republic the common people had a say in the government, while the ruling caste found itself out of power. Such a situation was intolerable.

Bosch's administration was not a spectacular success. When he took office the treasury was in the red, because, in order to win the people's support in the forthcoming elections, the Council of State that followed Trujillo had embarked on a lavish spending program that had to be paid for by its successor. Then there were the armed forces—armed but without the slightest regard for constitutional government. Then there was the church, among other things resentful because a priest who had accused Bosch of being a Communist during the campaign had been made to look foolish in a television debate with the candidate. And there were 12 political parties besides PRD, only one of which, the National Civic Union, had a certain amount of strength but no experience, and all of which were determined to topple the government by a short cut; they were too impatient to build up a loyal opposition, to convince the voters of their views, and to wait for the next elections. Add to this the scurrilous attacks against the president, PRD's loss of dynamism since assuming power, and the lack of administrative training among many office holders, and it is not hard to see why the government was not a model of efficiency. Yet it was planning broad national reforms—and thus assuring the military coup against it.

During the campaign Bosch had called for reforms in the Dominican society, which has been rigidly stratified. At the top are the "first-class citizens," as they call themselves, who have always been in control; descendants of Spaniards, and of "hidalgos of pure blood," they are the landholders and businessmen who speak disparagingly of "the niggers." The middle layer of Dominican society is made up of "second-class citizens," also descendants of Spaniards but not of the pureblooded hidalgos; after taking part in the uprisings of a century of constant struggle, they are now gaining strength in the world of business and the liberal professions. At the bottom is the rest of the population—farmers, small shopkeepers, day laborers, and white-collar workers—the "third- to tenth-class citizens." There is neither communication nor mobility among the castes. (Trujillo was himself "second-class" and never able to become "first-class," but he was supported by the top caste because he served its ends.)

Among the other measures that Bosch advocated was one that touched on the vital issue of the disposition of the ex-dictator's property. He thought the state should, through autonomous agencies, administer the Trujillo family's property that the state had attached on the caudillo's death—holdings that make up at least 30 percent of the nation's economy. And, of course, he talked about agrarian reform.

Alongside the small properties in certain parts of the country, there have existed two kinds of large estates: those belonging to the Trujillos—modern and mechanized—and those belonging to a handful of large landowners who carved their estates and plantations out of public or abandoned property. (As recently as a few months ago, a lawyer and ex-presidential candidate under Trujillo was adding to his holdings by traveling around the country in a truck loaded with barbed wire and fencing in and labeling as "private property" all the unclaimed land he came across.)

The state owns 500,000 hectares of land, taken over from the Trujillos, who, in turn, had taken them from the state or from private owners, and large landowners have another 62,500 hectares. The first-class citizens naturally did not welcome the prospect of an agrarian reform, even though the lands to be distributed under Bosch's program were to be those that are unoccupied, belonging either to the state or not under cultivation; they were even less enthusiastic at being deprived of power for the first time in the country's history. Besides, they wanted to buy up Trujillo's property cheaply for themselves.

That the first-class citizens would favor the overthrow of Bosch at any cost was thus a foregone conclusion, and that they would win some military support, probable. The question was whether the government would be able, in time, to give new impetus to the PRD, to get the reforms underway to the point where they could not be rolled back, and to retain the support of the United States. Bosch's government had strong backing from Washington up to the end, but it failed in the other two objectives. It failed out of fear that if the masses were marshaled behind the PRD and Bosch, or if the reforms got a real start, the military would take over. It was a vicious circle.

THE STIFLED OPPOSITION

The first-class citizens found a way of breaking the circle in their favor by spreading word that Bosch was a Communist. Nobody believed the story, because the president's record was clear. But he did refuse to outlaw three Communist groups, as he had been asked by the military and by the opposition (they had never made such a demand of Trujillo, when in 1946 and 1961 the dictator allowed the Communists freedom of action; one of Bosch's first acts, on assuming the presidency had been to dismiss a number of Castroites whom the council of state put in key positions).

Not a few U.S. newspapermen, used to getting information from first-class Dominicans who, under Trujillo, were the only ones who could talk to them, believed their old informers and asserted that Bosch was indeed surrounded by Communists.

Why did Bosch refuse to go after the Communists and Castroites? First, he told me, because they were within the law; if they were outlawed, they would wage guerrilla warfare from the hills, and, in order to defeat them, the military would insist on a suspension of constitutional guarantees and, along with them, of the reforms. Second, because sharp divisions were arising among international communism, Castroism, and the Dominican Communists, and prosecuting the three local organizations (none of them very strong) would help unite the Communist movement.

Bosch never attempted to stop the vitriolic attacks against his policies, nor did he hold out favors to his opponents who were always ready to accept them. He declared no state of siege and jailed no one for political reasons. Yet every day the newspapers and radio stations, not a single one of them on Bosch's side, repeated the cry that "the government has stifled the voice of the opposition."

Bosch had faith—apparently too much—in the commonsense of his countrymen and in the belief that even his enemies would see that he was acting in good faith. But it was precisely because they saw it, and realized that if the President remained in office a year or two the Dominican Republic would no longer be their private property, that the "first-class" citizens swayed a handful of priests and military officers to their side and turned them against the constitutional government.

What will be the consequences of Bosch's overthrow? For the country, disastrous. Democrats will lose faith in elected government as a means of carrying out reforms. The masses will be more impatient and more susceptible to demagogy. And when, some day, a constitutional regime is restored, things will be even worse than when Bosch took over. For the military has played into the hands of the very people it claims to be defeating (the same people who received favored treatment from the Council of State, when it was in power), giving them a chance to proclaim that social reform cannot be carried out gradually and democratically in Latin America but must be accomplished quickly and by force. The United States will also come in for criticism, even though this time it had nothing to do with the coup, and U.S. policies in the hemisphere will suffer another setback.

Much of the ground that Castro and Khrushchev lost in Latin America during the Cuban crisis of October 1962, can now be regained, thanks to the intransigence of a few thousand Dominicans who are unwilling to stop living off 3 million of their countrymen.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1963]

LATIN POLICY DEFENSE BRINGS ADDED DISCORD

(By Murrey Marder)

The Kennedy administration's efforts to justify its Latin American policy in the face of a series of military coups took on added dimension yesterday—and discord.

A high-ranking official said that the large number of fledgling democracies that have developed in Latin America in the last few years have meant there are more vulnerable governments in office.

With these young democracies attempting social and economic reforms, he said, tensions have been intensified, and the old order is fighting to retain its prerogatives.

The official said in a background discussion of foreign policy that, in a comparative sense, the kind of military coups that have taken place in the last 2 years represent "progress."

The progress, he said, is reflected by the fact that in recent military takeovers, the Latin military regimes have been more civilized than their predecessors. Instead of old-style dictatorial methods, the official said, the new regimes recognize a responsibility to the people and a necessity to return to constitutional government.

This does not mean that the United States favors or condones military coups, the official emphasized. But he said the changing pattern, nevertheless, represents a gain during a transition stage of pain, difficulty and turmoil in altering historic patterns.

Under the rules of the background conference the official could not be identified. But the views were an amplification of the policy expressed in public on Sunday by Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. In discussing military coups, Martin said that some have produced beneficial results in Argentina, Peru, and elsewhere: he said democracy cannot be imposed by fiat.

ALLIANCE UNDERCUT

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, yesterday criticized Martin's argument and rationale, charging that it "undercuts and destroys the entire premise of the Alliance for Progress."

Martin has done just what he denied doing, "delivered an apology for military coups and 'strong-man' rule in Latin America," charged MORSE, who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America.

The Martin policy, said Morse, would be a throwback to 1957 policy: "When U.S. support of Fascist governments caused millions of Latin Americans to look to Fidel Castro instead of to the United States for deliverance from poverty and violent repression."

RESULTS FAR FROM IN

Morse said that "even in the best of cases" cited by Martin, Peru and Argentina, "the results are far from in." Morse said that in Guatemala, which Martin mentioned, "there does not even appear to be any election in sight," nor, similarly, "does there appear to be any return to constitutional processes in sight in Ecuador."

Even so, "these are the exceptions," said Morse, "and Mr. Martin does not mention the general rule" that the more common result is that the longer military regimes stay in power, the "more rigid" and "more cynical" they become.

"We should have it clearly understood from the officials in charge of Latin American affairs," said Morse, "that the military faction that seizes power in Latin America is, in the same stroke, taking its country out of the Alliance for Progress, so far as U.S. economic and military aid are concerned."

SEES SMOKE SCREEN

All U.S. aid to the Dominican Republic and Honduras has been suspended, and the aid missions recalled. But Morse said yesterday, "One can only assume that Mr. Martin has laid down the typical diplomatic smoke screen of shoulder-shrugging preliminary to recognition and aid to the new dictatorships of the Dominican Republic and Honduras."

But informed sources last night said that officials of the Agency for International Development are urging the administration to make a very tough stand on withholding aid to the two countries, as a warning to others.

There have been claims in both the Dominican Republic and Honduras that a dominant reason for the military coups there was what has been called a dangerous softness of the constitutional regimes on communism. But American official sources said that in neither case was that the true major reason for the coups, which also involved mixtures of military, political, and economic opposition and desire to maintain threatened positions of privilege.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1963]

Recommended Reading

Assistant Secretary Martin's animadversions about the difficulties of democratic governments in Latin America, on the nobility of some of the military regimes that have had to liquidate them, and on the inability of the United States to do anything about it—in any case—are not likely to prevent more military coups. They are more likely to encourage them.

Those who speak for this country ought to be saying that we will not deal with unconstitutional regimes, that we prefer even inefficient elected governments to the most competent military government. It is one of the weaknesses of elective systems that they occasionally turn up an administration that is riddled with nepotism, reeking with privilege, saddled with graft, and crippled by sheer incompetence. When that happens, the citizens ought to turn to the constitutional means of providing a legal alternative at the first opportunity. They ought not turn to a military regime for an instant remedy.

There is a great deal of truth about Latin America's past in Secretary Martin's remarks. But this administration was going to change the bad old past of military dictatorships. It was not to be an administration that looked with complacency and resignation on military coups.

Before the election, Mr. Kennedy said that this country should "strengthen the cause of freedom throughout all Latin America"; that we should not allow Latin America to be "unsure of our stand on native dictators as well as Communist dictators"; that we ought to "make the American Revolution the chief import of Latin America"; that our policy in Latin America should "precede events and not follow them"; that the Eisenhower administration "lacked the leadership and the vigor to act"; that "we ought to eliminate all despotism in Latin America"; that we have let Latin Americans think we are "more interested in stable regimes than free governments; more interested in fighting against communism than in fighting for freedom."

The President made some good speeches about Latin American affairs, during the campaign. Assistant Secretary Martin ought to read them.

Exhibit 3

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 1963]

U.S. Arms, Inaction Helped—Naive Honduran Role Abetted Military Plots

(By Dan Kurzman)

Tegucigalpa, Honduras, October 8.—The military coup that overthrew the democratic government of Honduras last Thursday was rooted, like most Latin American coups, in military ambition, rightist greed, government naivete and U.S. indecision.

These factors, in potent combination, made a coup inevitable. Under the deposed regime of President Ramon Villeda Morales, the military enjoyed a constitutional position perhaps unique in the world. It was not directly responsible to the executive branch of the Government, but only to itself and, in limited degree, to the legislature.

Military leaders were jealous of their autonomy and feared that they would lose it after elections that were scheduled for later this month. The presidential candidate of Villeda Morales Liberal Party, Modesto Rojas Alvarado, was strongly favored to win, and the military was convinced that he would seek to reduce its power.

That Rojas would do just that, appeared, in military eyes, to be reflected in the refusal of the Villeda Morales government to let the army supervise the elections in accordance with the constitution.

Ironically, the United States, which tried to discourage the coup, is to a considerable degree responsible for having paved the way for it. In 1954, the Honduran Army was weak, disunified, and severely lacking in political influence. But with the pro-Communist Guatemalan regime of Gen. Jacobo Arbenz consolidating its power, the United States poured arms into neighboring Honduras for use by Guatemalan Gen. Castillo Armas, who eventually invaded his Red-controlled country and ousted Arbenz.

But in order to disguise this interference in Guatemala's internal affairs, the United States signed a military assistance treaty with Honduras which called for the importation of the arms, as a byproduct. The treaty also provided for the establishment of a strong Honduran army. Col. Oswaldo Lopez Arellano, became chief of the armed forces, a job from which he finally catapulted into his present position as head of the military government.

Until the very day of the coup, the United States was a helping friend, as attested by the Alliance for Progress handclasp emblems painted on military trucks that have carried political prisoners to jail since the coup.

REDS, CORRUPTION BLAMED

In an interview, Lopez said that corruption and Communist infiltration in the government were factors in the coup, but he made it clear that the threat to the army's position was the principal element.

Like most modern Latin American military leaders today, he does not appear to oppose democracy as such. He is only opposed to it in the measure that it endangers military influence and privileges.

Nor was the military immune to efforts by rightist politicans, mainly of the Nationalist Party, to exaggerate these dangers for their own purposes.

The rightists were horrified by Liberal Party attempts to push through "communistic" social and economic reforms. Most Honduran businessmen favored a coup and their sentiment was shared by U.S. businessmen here.

"Maybe now things will be more efficient," a representative of one American firm said.

Significantly, the buildup of the armed forces with American aid was started under and nurtured by a Nationalist Party regime—a fact that the Nationalists have not let military leaders forget.

If the military lacks comprehension of democracy, democratic leaders appear to have been equally ignorant of the realities of military power. Rodas, like President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic, who was ousted in a similar coup 2 weeks ago, virtually dared the military to take action.

CIVIL GUARD WAS ISSUE

With incredible naivete, Rodas, in his campaign speeches, constantly emphasized that, as president, he would build up the strength of the Civil Guard, presumably a Liberal Party police arm, at the army's expense. This force was created by Villeda Morales in 1959 as a counterpoint to the army when it was suspected that the latter, particularly because of its autonomous nature, could not be trusted.

Unlike Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt, the Honduran leaders would not compromise with the military.

In view of these factors, anything the United States might have done short of using force, may have been futile. Nevertheless, many observers here think the tough statement issued by Secretary of State Dean Rusk announcing severance of diplomatic and economic relations apparently for a prolonged period, was much too long in coming.

U.S. officials here tried to persuade the military not to launch a coup, but, handicapped by the examples of America's "soft" action after other coups, particularly in the Dominican Republic, it was hard to convince the army leaders that the United States meant business.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1963]

Somewhere in Latin America

(By Art Buchwald)

"Colonel Henriques, it's time for a coup."

"Already, general? We only had elections last week."

"Exactly. We've given them a fair chance and obviously they failed."

"That's true, general. They had their opportunity and they didn't know what to do with it. It was the same last year. We gave them free elections and the next thing we knew the politicians were running the country."

"Let this be a lesson to you, colonel. Every time the civilians get in they let the opposition leaders out of jail, lift newspaper censorship, and start screaming for land reform."

"Not to mention that they want the rich people to pay taxes."

"Well, colonel, we must start planning. Call the air force and navy and tell them what we're up to just in case the president reaches them before we arrest him."

PUT ON ROTATING BASIS

"I think we'll have to give the air force a role in the junta, general. The last time they were very angry that they didn't get a job.

General Fernandez told me if he wasn't included in the next coup he would refuse to fly the president into exile."

"Then we'll send him by ship."

"The navy also told me they wanted a role."

"Dammit, colonel, you can't have a coup if you let everyone into the junta. What did they teach you at the military academy, anyway?"

"I'm sorry. What should I tell General Fernandez?"

"Tell him the air force can organize the next coup after this one."

"And the navy?"

"Tell them they have the next coup after the air force. We'll do it on a rotating basis."

IT'S THE REDS—AGAIN

"Yes, sir. Now I think we better draw up some kind of excuse for the coup. The United States is supporting this Government."

"Ah, it's good you remembered that. We'll say the coup was necessary because the Communists, paid by Castro, planned to take over the Government."

"We said that the last time," the colonel says.

"So we'll say it again. We will say that as soon as we clear the Communists out of office we'll hold free elections."

"Do you think they'll buy it?"

"They have every other time. At first they'll be upset, but they'll get over it. Tell the CIA what we're up to so they can notify their people in Washington in advance of the coup. In that way the CIA will be very grateful to us because they had the information first."

"General, you're a genius."

HOUSE ARRESTS ALL SET

"Colonel, when you have been in and out of juntas as long as I have, these things come naturally. Also we must arrange with Quada Sierra to move their troops to our border so we can claim we're being threatened from without and can ask for new military equipment. I hate to surround the Presidential Palace in those rusty old tanks."

"Would Quada Sierra do it for us?"

"Why not? We did it for them."

"Yes, sir. How many house arrests do you want to make?"

"Let's see. The Cabinet, the leaders of the political parties, the university students, and the palace guard. I think we should arrest about 500, and then we can have an amnesty for Christmas."

"The families will be so grateful."

"I guess that will be all, colonel. I have to start working on my proclamation speech. "Fourscore and 7 weeks ago."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express my complete approval of every comment the Senator from Alaska has made in his brilliant address.

I assured my friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] that I would not interrupt at any length at this time, and I shall wait until the Senator from Wisconsin has had time to present his position on the pending bill before I discuss this subject at length. I told him that now I would take only a minute or two to reinforce what the Senator from Alaska has said.

This morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations I notified the Secretary of State that I would be answering the apologists at the State Department for military juntas in a speech I intend to deliver later this afternoon. It is well that the Senator from Alaska has served further notice on the State Department that its line on Latin America is not going to be bought by a good many Senators. Not only is the Alliance for Progress at the crossroads; but also, in my judgment, American foreign policy is at the crossroads.

As I indicated to the Secretary of State this morning, I do not wish to read any more statements in the press given by so-called high spokesmen in the Department of State. Talk about managed news. So-called top secret meetings are held over there with newspapermen. Why the newspapermen go to them I do not know. I do not know why representatives of a free press would walk into a conference and then have to report that they were spoken to only by high spokesmen.

I made clear to the Secretary of State this morning that, if they have any answer, I would like to know whether what I read in the press is the answer of the Secretary of State, or of Martin, Ball, Bell, or someone else.

I shall have more to say on that subject later this afternoon. I completely agree with the Senator from Alaska that the free world has its eyes on us, to determine whether we are to engage in some more hypocrisy in American policy, and whether we shall find an apologetic way of supporting military junta overthrows of constitutional government.

As I said to the Secretary of State this morning, "I am interested in seeing what you will bring out of the Dominican Republic. It is not enough to bring out an ambassador."

I also pointed out to him that the great briefing we received by Martin and Martin in the Foreign Relations Committee the other day, in my judgment, was the most unsatisfactory briefing on foreign policy to which I have listened from the State Department in my many years of service on the Foreign Relations Committee. If that is an example of what we will get out of briefings as to American foreign policy in Latin America, the sooner that policy goes down the drain the better, and the sooner we get new leadership in regard to foreign policy in the State Department the better.

I hasten to add, when I say that, that I do not refer to the Secretary of State. I have great confidence in the Secretary of State. I am satisfied that the Secretary of State too often catches up on things after the fact because he is not notified before the fact as to what is going on. This dedicated public servant, Dean Rusk, has been working hard on another front seeking to protect the best interests of this country in his conferences and negotiations with Russia and in his conferences with other diplomats. I fear that what has happened in Latin America is that it has gotten away from the Secretary of State. I plead with him to see to it that he finds out what is going on in the State Department in regard to Latin America.

I say this for now—and I shall have more to say later this afternoon. I have the answer for Martin and Martin. The free world wants to know whether as an American policy we are withdrawing from the Dominican Republic and from Honduras, or only play acting. We must bring out not only the Ambassador and the military mission and the economic mission, but, as I said to the Secretary of State this morning, we must bring out the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps is probably closer to the situation in the Dominican Republic than any other group of American ambassadors in the Dominican Republic. If we bring out the Peace Corps, for the first time the people of the Dominican Republic will know that we mean business in opposition to military dictators.

I shall have more to say about this apology of Martin the other day—in respect to a statement that came out of the State Department which I understand can be attributed to him—to the effect that we may work out some constitutional return, that it may not be Bosch but it may be some other constitutional officer within the membership of the old administration, and that we may support the effort to place them back in power.

That is a play on words. That is a subterfuge. If we do that with the military junta still in power, the so-called constitutional officer will be a stooge and a front.

Later this afternoon I shall discuss an article published in this afternoon's Star, as to the reactions to the Martin line in Caracas today. Free nations in Latin America, free governments in Latin America, are trembling in their boots today because they do not know whether the Martin line or the Alliance for Progress commitments are the present program of the U.S. State Department. We went into the Alliance for Progress on the pledge that we are going to support constitutional governments in Latin America. When constitutional governments are destroyed by military juntas—and the sad fact is, as was pointed out in this morning's Post, by men trained by the American military—there is destroyed the opportunity to develop constitutional democracies in Latin America.

So I say to my administration, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, "You must cut the cord completely and make clear to the Dominican Republic and to Honduras that there will be no aid of any kind or description."

I shall answer later this afternoon the apology and alibi and rationalization of Martin and Company in the State Department, that that policy might play into the hands of the Communists, for it is the State Department today that is playing into the hands of Communists in Latin America by giving the impression that they may in the near future support military juntas on the ground. According to Martin, there are good and bad military juntas. Imagine such a statement coming from the State Department—that there can be a good military junta, overthrowing a constitutional form of government, in defiance of the United States, set up through the lips of the United States when the Alliance for

Progress was established. It does not make any sense.

I will not support such a policy. I warn the administration that there are millions of Americans who are not going to support it, because the American taxpayers are "fed up" with pouring out hundreds of millions of dollars into so-called foreign aid when it results, in the last analysis, in aiding the threat of communism, and not stopping the threat of communism, because when military regimes are built up, and democratic governments are sacrificed, the way is paved for a Communist revolution.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I wonder whether he noted, in one of the trial balloons, attempts to suggest that a different policy was indicated, that there may be some justification for the junta, because the people of the Dominican Republic did not rise and protest. In the first place, they have risen and protested. In the second place, President Juan Bosch said he did not want them to and urged them not to, because he did not want them to be mowed down with the military weapons the United States furnished the military. He did not want any bloodshed. Nevertheless, the people have demonstrated. Many have been jailed.

We know how the Dominican people feel. They lived under the rule of a dictator for 30 years. They know what it is to have dictators over them as they now again have. It is shocking that anyone should dream, as Assistant Secretary Martin has done, of trying to justify the disgraceful overturn of a constitutional government, a government which we supported and wanted to see successful, of the type which the President predicted there would and should be when he launched the Alliance for Progress. Now we see an attempt to suggest a contrary idea—that perhaps a junta might be "good," and perhaps we ought to recognize it. If that is done—if that becomes the practice—the Alliance for Progress will be dead, and does not deserve to live.

I yield the floor.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate bill 1915, which I have cosponsored with my colleagues, Senator Proxmire, Senator Magnuson, and Senator Hart. I especially commend the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] for the able way in which he has handled this important legislation.

The class I base system makes it possible for dairy farmers in Federal orders, who show by a two-thirds majority that they want it, to have a procedure where each individual farmer can make his own decisions and not be affected by the operations of another farmer in his own area.

Leaders of the dairy industry in my State have informed me that if our Federal order was amended to allow a producer to retain his share of the class I sale without consistently increasing his production, this would go a long way toward improving our producers' position and bringing into closer balance our market needs and supplies.

It would go a long way toward bringing the national supply more nearly in balance with the market needs.

Mail is not always a true barometer of the feelings of a constituency, but the indications of support of this dairy legislation from the dairy people of my State have been most significant.

The Puget Sound area, as elsewhere, is hamstrung with milk production greater than its market needs. Under present provisions, this is becoming more acute inasmuch as producers establish a new production base each year. In order for a producer to prevent receiving a further deleted base price, he must increase his production in an amount equal to the market increase.

This has resulted in an "annual base race" that is deleterious to our dairy economy.

S. 1915, on acceptance by those in the marketing area, would permit a dairy farmer to sell his fluid milk at a price more closely related to the class I price. He would not be put in a position of accepting an average price because of another farmer's increased production.

This bill presents the Senate with an opportunity to help stabilize an industry so vital to our Nation's physical as well as economic health. I hope that the Senate will see fit to approve this bill without amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a few representative communications and excerpts from communications I have received from my constituents in behalf of this legislation.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lynden, Wash.,
July 26, 1963.

I want to thank you for your help in introducing Senate bill 1915, the class I base plan for dairymen. We need this tool to help in our problem in the Puget Sound.

The Whatcom County Dairymen's Association at its annual meeting voted on this plan. We have never had such producer support for any legislation. Our membership is just over 1,000 producers and there were no votes against the plan. We need this tool to improve our marketing of milk.

Harold Knight,
President, Whatcom County Dairymen's Association.

Port Townsend, Wash.,
August 10, 1963.

This is the only sane solution to our problem. It is already too late to save a lot of family-size dairy farms who have been the backbone of the industry.

John G. Boulton,
Farmer.

Seattle, Wash.,
August 7, 1963.

We are very pleased to learn that you and Senator Magnuson have cosponsored Senate bill 1915 and we feel this bill properly embodies the National Milk Producers Federation dairymen's class I base plan.

We are writing today to Senator Ellender, as well as other members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, urging their favorable action.

Again, on behalf of our producing dairymen members, we wish to express our sincere appreciation for your cosponsorship of Senate bill 1915 as we feel this will be of material assistance in reducing the dairy surplus production.

E. E. Pedersen,
President, United Dairymen's Association.

Sequim, Wash.,
July 18, 1963.

I sincerely hope you will do all in your power to assure passage of a voluntary class I base plan for milk in Federal milk orders. Our market is in bad condition. A realistic base plan will help immeasurably.

Douglas Lewis,
Farmer.

Seattle, Wash.,
January 31, 1963.

I can assure you that the producers in the Puget Sound milkshed are strongly in favor of the class I base plan approach to a solution of the surplus problem which exists in this market and on a national level.

W. F. Penney,
Manager, Northwest Dairymen's Association.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senate yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am proud and happy to have the cosponsorship of the distinguished Senator from Washington in this bill. His support always means a great deal in this kind of legislation. He comes from a great dairy State. It is also true that the dairy farmers in his area are familiar with the experiment in British Columbia, where this kind of program is in operation. It has worked exceedingly well. It has made possible a reduction in production, and an increase in farm income. If we can do that, we shall accomplish the prime objectives of farm legislation: namely, to increase farm income and reduce the cost to the taxpayers. The experience of an area which borders on Washington State are helpful in that regard.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Wisconsin has summed up the situation very well. As the Senator knows, this problem has been with us for a long time. The proposed legislation represents an effort on the part of the dairy farmers to do something about it. I commend the able leadership that has been given to the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin in so ably presenting this legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey].

DEFENSE INFORMATION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY: KEY TO PROGRESS IN NATIONAL RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had intended yesterday, at the time of the approval of the conference report on the defense appropriation bill, to bring to the attention of the Senate a particular phase of that appropriation, namely, the part that deals with research and development. This is a fundamental part of our total defense effort. The entire area of research and development in the Federal Government's activities is one that has been very closely watched by the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on Reorganization and Interagency Coordination.

In my judgment, these appropriations will achieve their highest yield only if progress is quickened in improving the handling of scientific and technical information.

I refer to all phases of information—to storage, retrieval, abstracting, indexing, evaluation, and dissemination of information.

In the same way, the U.S. Government, as a whole, will reap maximum benefit from its $14.7 billion expenditures for research and development only—if progress is accelerated in the field of scientific and technical information all along the line—in all the major scientific agencies.

THREE OBJECTIVES

In these next few moments, I should like to mention several phases of the problems of Defense and of Governmentwide research.

I shall do so from one viewpoint of getting the greatest results in science and technology; in the shortest period of time; through the most efficient and economical use of taxpayers' resources.

A WELCOME ACTION: STUDY BY HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE

This is substantially the same challenge to which our colleagues in the House of Representatives have recently and very helpfully addressed themselves.

It will be recalled that the House has just set up a 9-man select committee to study the Federal research and development program.

I welcome this step. Out of the House study can, I believe, come great good.

A huge program which involves some $15 billion out of an almost $100 billion Federal budget—certainly does bear the most earnest study by both Houses.

But it is not just the expenditure of money which merits our attention, as important as these funds are. For at stake also are other greater values:

First. The successful defense of America and of the free world, including the deterrence of war.

Second. The growth and prosperity of the civilian economy.

Third. A higher standard of living for our own and other peoples.

Fourth. Success in the conquest of disease and disability.

INTEREST FROM STANDPOINT OF SEVERAL COMMITTEES

It has been my personal privilege to work on Federal scientific problems as a former member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and now, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. But I have been particularly honored to consider this issue, also, as chairman of two subcommittees: in the Government Operations and Senate Small Business Committees.

TWO BROAD GOALS FOR U.S. TAXPAYERS

From these two vantage points, I have done whatever I could for two broad goals: they have been to make sure that—

First. The American taxpayer gets every possible cent of value out of every dollar spent for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

That means that Federal scientific missions in defense, space, and medicine must be accomplished with greatest possible efficiency.

Second. The American taxpayer gets every possible dividend and byproduct from Federal science spending.

That means that our entire Nation must benefit—the defense and the nondefense communities; the space and the nonspace communities; business, large and, particularly, small; all regions, not just those already well-endowed with great university-defense complexes; nonprofit sources like universities, foundations, institutes, and cooperatives; dynamic industries and so-called lagging industries.

"HAVE" AND "HAVE NOT" COMMUNITIES

Just recently, our Senate Small Business Committee, for example, held hearings on the crucial impact of defense-space expenditures on the Nation's economy. These hearings spotlighted some progress; but they showed urgent and still largely unfulfilled needs of labor-surplus areas.

The fact is that the Congress insists that this Nation not see a worsening of the gap between (a) scientific "have" and (b) scientific "have not" communities.

Judicious distribution of defense-space expenditures can help narrow that gap. It can help tap the pool of skills and talent available in labor-surplus areas.

To achieve all these goals requires many things. One of the things is information—timely, reliable, easily accessible, reasonably complete information.

INFORMATION NEEDED BY BROAD SOURCES

To whom? To five broad sources:

First. To the decisionmakers in the executive branch, including the President, the heads of agencies and other policymakers and implementers.

Second. To the Congress—its committees, subcommitees, and individual Members.

Third. To the scientific community within Federal agencies—that is, in so-called intramural laboratories.

Fourth. To the scientific community outside Federal Agencies—in extramural, contractor, and grantee institutions.

Fifth. To the broad scientific community which is not within either a contractor or grantee status.

The flow of information is not a luxury; it is a "life and death" necessity, "life and death" for industries, for communities, for the Nation's economic health, for survival, for deterrence of war, for progress, for prosperity.

That is not an exaggeration. It is a hard fact.

And no single Federal agency has a greater responsibility in all of these respects than the Agency whose research appropriation we are now considering—the U.S. Department of Defense.

And so I should like to comment specifically on this Department's needs for scientific and technical information.

COMMENDATION OF RECENT PROGRESS BY DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The year 1963 has witnessed impressive improvements in the handling of scientific and technical information by the Department of Defense. These improvements come, I may say, as a result of a well-respected promise which was made by the able Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric, to the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee.

In our hearing of September 1962 Mr. Gilpatric frankly conceded the need for reforms.

He stated:

> I am frank to admit that there are major deficiencies both in our technical information system in the Defense Department, and in the way we have organized to do it.

He added:

> We have no complaints and any criticisms which you and your staff have directed toward the Defense Department I must say have been merited in this area. I will go forth and do better.

The Deputy Secretary has been true to his word, as we knew he would be. He has faithfully discharged that responsibility. I should like to compliment him, Vice Adm. Charles B. Martel, who, during his recent tour of duty, carried out Mr. Gilpatric's mandate, and Mr. Walter Carlson who serves as Director of Technical Information for the Office of Director, Defense Research and Engineering.

At the same time, as these excellent leaders have been aware, the Pentagon must now try to make up for what have literally been lost years. The Pentagon has a long way to go toward converting what is now largely a chaotic, unplanned patchwork of information systems into a rationally integrated system of systems on a departmentwide basis.

A PANORAMA OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION NEEDS

The Defense Department, in effect, still confronts a mammoth backlog with respect to first, management information needs—all the way down the line of civilian and military administrators; second, in-house scientific and engineering information needs; third, contractor information needs; fourth, civilian economy, that is, noncontractor needs; fifth, needs for two-way international flow of information; sixth, cooperation with professional and trade societies.

I shall mention only a few highlights of these needs.

I shall not mention other information problems, such as what are termed command-and-control challenges—which are somewhat distinct from issues of scientific and technical information, per se.

SOME MANAGEMENT TOOLS ARE USED EFFECTIVELY

For the Department as a whole, reliance has been placed on what has been known as the DD 613 information forms. This system is described in a 1961 report issued by our subcommittee which I will mention shortly. The DD 613 system has been a limited tool for management use; it has not served the scientific and technical performers, nor was it designed to so serve. The Office of Director of Defense Research and Engineering does use the 613's as well as Technical Development Plans—TDP's. So do program managers in the individual services—for similar purposes of review, consolidation, and adjustment of programs. Some supplemental reporting procedures are also used, depending upon urgency, size of program, number of services affected, and so forth.

LITTLE INTERSERVICE INFORMATION "POOLING"

Meanwhile, none of the three armed services yet has a modern, internal system of technical information systems of its own. None, as yet, has fully effective access to output from the others' information systems. None provides effective input to the others' systems.

Fortunately, the respective services are moving ahead to place their individual information "houses" in better order.

First, Army: In January 1963 the Department of the Army submitted a plan for an internal scientific and technical information program. This program was the result of an Army-wide conference held in the fall of 1962, which it was my pleasure to greet in the form of a specially recorded message.

The Army requested and received $800,000 of emergency funds to initiate the program during the 1963 fiscal year.

Second, Air Force: This Department is holding a similar Department-wide conference in Dayton, Ohio, during the week of September 30, 1963. Results, similar to those of the Army meeting, are anticipated.

Third, Navy: The Navy which pioneered in the great PERT research planning systems is now, I understand, in the process of reviewing its scientific and technical information activities. On an overall basis, science information-wise, it is not as far advanced as the Army and the Air Force, I understand.

ENORMOUS STATISTICS INVOLVED

The full dimensions of the services' information problems can only be understood in terms of the enormous number of papers and reports which are involved in an over $7 billion research, development, testing, and evaluation program.

For example, it is estimated that around 1½ million documents will be requested from the Defense Documentation Center in the current fiscal year. And this is still "only a drop in the bucket," in terms of contractor information needs.

As one reads statistics such as this, he gains a better understanding of why this committee and subcommittee have insisted on central indexing and abstracting of all projects and reports and on thorough decentralized use of such abstracting and indexing.

The incontrovertible fact is that without such systems, it is virtually impossible for an Army, Navy, or Air Force source to know whether or not he is unintentionally duplicating, first, his own service; second, another service, in present and/or canceled or completed work.

A few additional statistics will serve to underline both progress and problems:

Research management:	
Approximate total DOD research projects	*Around* 45,000
Estimate total on mechanized file in the Defense Documentation Center	33,000
Current rate of addition in the Defense Documentation Center file (week)	400

Rates of operation, Defense Documentation Center

	Fiscal year—		
	1962	1963	1964[1]
Documents cataloged	25,000	34,000	80,000
Documents requested	828,000	1,025,000	1,500,000
Bibliographic searches	4,100	6,000	9,000

[1] Estimated.

Current rate of acquisition is estimated to be only about 50 percent of the useful technical report literature in DOD. The effect of removing previous limitations on input—such as on restricted data—as set forth by the March 1963 instruction is beginning, fortunately, to show up:

Serving the public:	
Science information exchange:	
Approximate total DOD projects, tasks, subtasks	45,000
Estimated number classified (and therefore not reportable to the exchange)	10,550
Estimated candidates for inclusion in science information exchange	34,450
Approximate total DOD items now in science information exchange	10,000
Public sale of DOD technical reports, fiscal year 1963: Number transmitted from Defense Documentation Center to Office of Technical Services, U.S. Department of Commerce	11,168

A joint study last spring checked into whether some reports, then being placed on limited distribution, and thus not available to the public, should have been unlimited and should have been sent to OTS. The study showed that a number had been limited due to human errors at printing establishments. Corrective measures are being taken. Meanwhile, DOD and Commerce are examining other steps needed to expedite DOD document flow to the public.

In my judgment, the Defense Department and the Office of Technical Services have hardly "tapped the surface" of transmitting information to the nondefense community.

In this connection, I should like to recall this colloquy at our 1962 hearing:

ISSUE OF AUTHORITY TO DISSEMINATE INFORMATION FOR CIVILIAN PURPOSES

> Senator HUMPHREY. There has been some suggestion made in some of the other committees of Congress and bandied around in some of the professional journals—the idea of statutory mandate to the Department of Defense to distribute unclassified information for the benefit of the Nation's civilian economy, possibly through the Office of Technical Services or some other technical office. I believe that NASA has something in its basic law that provides for this, and so does the Atomic Energy Commission.
>
> Nothing in the law relates to DOD in this respect. What would be your view of that?
>
> Mr. GILPATRIC. Well, first of all, I believe we have the authority now under our basic legislation, not the mandate, but inherent authority under the armed services legislation to do this.
>
> I think we should do it. * * *
>
> Therefore, I don't believe that such a statutory mandate is necessary.

I commend Mr. Gilpatric for this wholesome attitude. The Department of Defense must now proceed with the job.

NO "AUTOMATIC FALLOUT" INTO CIVILIAN ECONOMY

A sustained, well-coordinated, well-planned effort must be made by both DOD and NASA to convert military and space scientific and technical findings into civilian technology.

We know that the rosy preliminary speculations about automatic fallout from military-space fields into the civilian economy were largely overoptimistic.

There is a vast amount of information in Department of Defense specialized information centers, in particular, which will have to be painstakingly converted into civilian use. This will require comprehensive effort by the Agency, by the Nation's universities, particularly its colleges of engineering, in cooperation with the business, labor and agricultural communities at the grassroots of America.

IDENTIFYING USER NEEDS

Meanwhile, DOD's top priority must continue to be the needs of its own inhouse and extramural community. Unfortunately, no programs, in DOD or elsewhere, have successfully and fully identified the specific technical information needs of various categories of scientists and engineers performing different functions. In recognition of this, DOD is, I understand, about to sign a contract for a study that will involve interviewing 1,200 to 1,800 inhouse technical people engaged in R.D.T. & E. work to find out what information is used, how they use it, and where they get it. The study will run more than 1 year and will cost in excess of $250,000. Its results, however, can help determine the whole future planning for better information systems.

I do want to stress that neither this nor any other user study should be allowed to drag and/or proliferate, so that we end up "studying studies," instead of serving customers.

I believe in research and, as necessary, in research on research. However, there is a point beyond which sciences' habit of studying science becomes almost an end in itself, instead of a means to an end.

Mr. Carlson who previously performed outstandingly in the Engineers' Joint Council—on behalf of the Nation's engineers—is, I am glad to say, customer-oriented. That is how DOD information sciences must remain—geared to serve the man on the bench, in the arsenal, or the testing ground.

INTERNATIONAL NEEDS

As I indicated earlier, there are generators, as well as recipients overseas, as regards scientific and technical information.

I am personally not at all satisfied with the international exchange of scientific information. For one thing, the needless duplication and the delay in translation, abstracting and indexing is often appalling.

For another thing, the flow of information tends to be only one way—from the United States—to overseas.

Industrialized foreign nations soak up all the information they can get from us—from our Government, our industry, and our agriculture.

They are less diligent in efforts for reciprocity.

Insofar as allied nations are concerned, there has been some effort, from time to time through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Advisory Group on Aeronautic Research and Development, to foster increased reciprocity. Unfortunately, however, the United States is still largely at the giving end of scientific and technical information.

And such little as we do obtain from abroad often does not enter into the mainstream of the Federal pool of information—available to all three military services, as well as to civilian agencies and the national community.

Information flow to and from the developing nations is another matter. Here, I believe, the United States has a still golden opportunity to enable these hard-pressed countries to improve their standards of living, through increased access to our information resource. With but a modest expenditure, we can make a maximum contribution through better information flow to the developing lands.

INFORMATION A NATIONAL RESOURCE

I want to emphasize that information is indeed a national resource.

It requires national goals for maximum use—and national plans, programs, and budgeting.

It requires genuine—not token cooperation—between report media and professional journals, between so-called primary and secondary publications, as well as among "secondary"—for example, abstracting and indexing publications.

And it requires bold, imaginative vigor to meet tomorrow's increasing information needs.

Modern science and technology offer interservice, interagency, interdisciplinary, international challenges. We have no alternative but to respond accordingly.

SIX YEARS OF WORK BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS AND THE INFORMATION ISSUE

It is, I believe, appropriate to recall the 6 years of constructive effort by the Senate Committee on Government Operations on issues confronting U.S. science and on science information, in particular.

This committee's principal scientific effort began in 1957—months before a new scientific age dawned with the launching of Soviet Sputnik I.

By direction of the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], a broad study of problems of Federal science, particularly scientific organization, was inaugurated in August of that year.

The spectacular Soviet achievement of October 4, 1957, in launching the first earth satellite, served merely to accelerate our own committee's efforts.

Fortunately, by that time, our review was already well underway.

Much of the committee's effort was necessarily delegated to the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Oranizations, since the parent committee was committed to so many other legislative duties.

Down through the years, the full committee and the subcommittee have worked in closest harmony on science problems.

THIS COMMITTEE'S FIRSTS

Six years have elapsed. During this eventful period, many newspaper and magazine articles have commended the committee's and the subcommittee's science efforts. According to those write-ups, the Government Operations Committee and its Reorganization Subcommittee achieved many distinctions. Let me mention but six—the committee and subcommittees were:

First. The first group in the Congress to devote attention to the overall challenges of scientific and technical information.

Second. The single congressional group which has devoted the longest and most sustained attention to all aspects of this issue—to information hardware and software—machines and procedures, abstracting and translating, published and unpublished information, data on current research, on canceled research and on completed research, to libraries and specialized information centers, to current announcement services and retrospective bibliographic services—indeed to the whole gamut of information science.

Third. The first congressional group to explore the potential of scientific contributions in developing areas through use of U.S. owned—or managed—foreign funds. Indeed, before the end of 1958, legislation to this effect, sponsored by myself and supported by our committee and by the Foreign Relations Committee, became the law of the land. This is the famous section 104K of Public Law 480, authorizing use of counterpart funds for support of scientific information, including translation, and scientific research overseas.

Fourth. The first congressional group to urge reorganization of the structure of Federal scientific activities—in view of the fact that existing agency organization has been made obsolete by the overlapping of scientific studies.

Fifth. The first to consider problems of long-range budgeting for Federal research and development. We recognized, for example, that weapons systems may take 5 to 7 years or longer to complete—from discovery through development. Space programs are on a 10-year research basis; yet, elsewhere, long-range research planning has been notable by its absence.

Sixth. The first subcommittee to view Government-wide problems confronting the sciences of man—the so-called behavioral sciences—which receive, unfortunately, only around 2 percent of the total of Federal research outlay.

And, there have, I believe, been other pioneering steps—taken by this committee and subcommittee. I mention these matters for the factual record and for historical perspective. I believe the public should be aware that the U.S. Senate has been alert to its responsibilities. And, in so doing, I should like to pay tribute to the members of the full committee and the subcommittee—who have supported these studies with unbroken unanimity down through the years.

SOUNDING THE ALARM ON THE INFORMATION CRISIS

Year after year, this committee and subcommittee have held hearings, issued reports, committee prints, documents, releases, urging the executive branch and the scientific community to wake up to the crisis of scientific and technical information.

When we started, we felt like "voices crying in the wilderness." Few agency heads paid more than lipservice to information problems. Few professional and trade societies acknowledged the issue to be a high priority.

The Office of Science Information Service of the National Science Foundation was paid little heed by its agency peers. Its pleadings tended to fall on half-deaf ears.

Within the Federal Government, the Department of Defense was, unfortunately, one of the most backward, from an information standpoint.

Gradually, however, year after year, the agencies began to recognize the problem. Belatedly, they began to take constructive action.

So did the professional and trade societies. Soon the "bandwagon" picked up momentum, and now, most Federal and professional sources are on it.

We welcome them aboard. They have arrived none too early. Indeed, many are taking information actions in 1963, which they should have taken and could have taken much earlier; for example, back in late 1958, when we submitted our original recommendations.

Be that as it may, it is the future that counts. I mention the past only for purposes of providing background. The agencies must learn from their mistakes, particularly from their errors of information omission and delay.

In the field of information, the agencies have made relatively few mistakes of commission. The plain fact is that, with few exceptions, they are still only in the opening stages of ushering in a long-overdue information revolution.

The revolution is not a matter of computers, it is a matter of mind—of outlook—of grasp of the essential truth of today's information challenge.

THE AGE OF AUTOMATION

Like it or not, we are in an age of automation. Information automation is not designed to replace the human mind; it is designed to liberate the mind from information drudgery. It is designed to free the mind for its more creative tasks—for evaluation, for the truly innovative idea—concept—theory—experiment—induction—deduction.

Let me mention a half-dozen of our specific publications and a few of their many results.

THE 1958 HEARINGS

First. In 1958, this committee proposed what was then known as the Science and Technology Act of 1958. One of the purposes of that act was to establish a series of specialized National "Institutes" in the physical sciences—a specialized institute of meteorology, for example, another on oceanography and so forth.

In the succeeding years, this idea has been substantially adopted. The institutes are not called by that name, but actually they represent precisely what we had in mind; namely, specialized centers devoted to one major area of science.

The National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo., is, of course, a leading example.

With respect to information, as such, this committee, in these 1958 hearings, laid the basis for later years' advances in the views which we presented. At that time, we inquired about a truly national information system.

Only in 1962 and in 1963 have the agencies and the professional societies finally caught up with some of the unified concepts which the subcommittee first advanced at that time. Thus, the National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services commissioned a report—which was released earlier this year—on a national information plan. And the National Science Foundation has generated other reports, looking toward the linking of what are now largely isolated information efforts.

THE 1960 REPORT

Second. In 1960, the committee, as a whole, published Senate Document No. 113, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled, "Documentation, Indexing, and Retrieval of Scientific Information."

This has come to be regarded as somewhat of a classic of information science. There has probably been no single document ever published by the Congress, which contains a clearer exposition of advanced systems of information, storage and retrieval than this document, as prepared by the staff of the parent committee.

THE 1960 HEARINGS

Third. The same year, the subcommittee held hearings on "Coordination of Activities of Federal Agencies in Biomedical Research." In these hearings, for the first time, all of the major Federal agencies conducting biomedical research were asked to report on their cooperation with respect to current research. It was at these hearings that the Federal health agencies were, for the first time, directed by the Congress to start thinking of themselves not in isolation, but as members of a Federal medical community.

PROGRESS AT NIH

If anyone would like to see an example of the constructive effect of this subcommittee's work, he might like to compare first, the relative disinterest of the agencies in indexing systems on current research, as reflected at the start of those 1960 hearings; and, second, the active interest of these same agencies in current research systems, as reflected by their actions in 1963.

The National Institutes of Health offer a case in point. NIH was among the least interested agencies in indexing its current research. The Institutes asserted that such information was of interest solely to administrators—not to working scientists. NIH was wrong.

Three years later, NIH has, fortunately, changed its tune. At our urging, it has issued a massive index of over 15,000 extramural research grants. And at our urging, it is, for the first time, combining in its next index both the intramural and the extramural research in one comprehensive index.

What is more, NIH and the Public Health Service now express pride—and rightly so—in the services that these publications provide to the scientific community.

We welcome NIH's change of heart. We commend it for its progress, belated as it may be.

We say, there is still more progress to be made.

NIH still does not perform for its extramural and intramural scientific community the tiniest fraction of information services, that is; in sponsoring evaluation—review journals—such as are provided by the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautical and Space Administration. It is not just a matter of the difference between an agency concerned with technical reports—that is; NASA—and one which works through open journals—NIH—nor is it just a matter of inadequate legal authority and funds; it is a matter of the low priority which NIH has, unfortunately, accorded this and other information problems traditionally.

The fact is that NIH has asked little of the Congress, insofar as information advances are concerned. Congress has had to force information advances on NIH.

APRIL 1961 REPORT

Fourth. In 1961, we published a report, "Coordination of Federal Activities in Biomedical Research and in Other Scientific Areas," Senate Report 142, 87th Congress, 1st session.

This report resulted in major changes in the system of overall budget analysis on Federal medical research activities. The effect of the report was to precipitate a change by both the U.S. Bureau of the Budget and the National Institutes of Health in accounting for Government-wide health research.

ANOTHER 1961 REPORT

Fifth. Also, in April 1961, we published Senate Report 263, 87th Congress, 1st session, entitled, "Coordination of Information on Current Scientific Research and Development Supported by the United States Government." This report offered the first substantial analysis of the problem which is even more acute today than it was then—how to monitor some 160,000 separate research and development projects which we estimated were then under Federal support.

The report pointed out that there was at that time no means by which any one source—even the President of the United States—could determine exactly what research the Federal Government was supporting. Actually, the same unfortunate situation continues to prevail today, despite some improvement.

The report described and pointed out weaknesses in the Department of Defense, in particular, including in the DD-613 system on which management heavily relied then, as it relies today.

SEPTEMBER 1961 REPORT

Sixth. In September 1961, we followed up on the aforementioned report with a specialized analysis on current research. It was entitled, "Coordination of Information on Current Federal Research and Development Projects in the Field of Electronics." This report estimated that because of weaknesses in information and communications, as much as $200 million of funds might be spent in wasteful, needless duplication—solely in the one crucial area of electronic research.

THE 1962 HEARINGS

Seventh. In 1962, the subcommittee held hearings on long-range budgeting for research and development. We quickly revealed that there was no genuine exchange of long-range research plans between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

In addition, several of the "old line" agencies on which these top spending agencies crucially relied and continue to rely, such as the Weather Bureau and the National Bureau of Standards, did not have adequate information as to other agencies' long-range research plans, so as to coordinate their respective operations.

As a result of our hearings, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the U.S. Department of Defense at least have made formal arrangements for the first time for exchange of long-range research plans. Infinitely more remains to be done, however, in interagency, long-range programing.

The Congress must, of course, continue to exercise its rightful annual control of the purse strings, as required under the Constitution. But, this Nation cannot sustain 5-year and 10-year research efforts on the basis of merely 12 months of planning. The result is inefficiency and waste—stops and starts—loose allocation and reallocation of manpower.

We do not want rigid long-range plans, of course, but neither do we want wobbly, ad hoc, temporary plans.

THE 1962 COMMENTS ON DOD

Eighth. In March 1962, I presented to the House Committee on Appropriations, a 25-page publication—identified by code number S 3-11-62—on information weaknesses in the Department of Defense.

I quoted authoritative estimates that from $1 to $2 billion in the $7 billion Federal research and development total, might be needlessly wasted because of communications weaknesses. The handicaps of what was then known as the Armed Services Technical Information Agency—which has since been renamed the Defense Document Center—were highlighted.

As a result of this presentation, the House Committee on Appropriations, for the second year in a row, reiterated a plea—made by our committee—for improvement in Defense information—House Report 1607, 87th Congress, 2d session, page 48.

In addition, in 1962, the Senate Appropriations Committee soundly wrote into its own report, at our subcommittee's suggestion, insistence on DOD-NASA-AEC interagency information cooperation—Senate Report 1578, 87th Congress, 2d session, page 10.

I was happy to commend the Senate Appropriations Committee's excellent action in a statement in the Senate last year—on June 15, 1962, just as I commended the House's action earlier.

PRESENTATIONS ON USDA, HEW, AND AID

Ninth, tenth, and eleventh. That same year and the following year, 1963, I issued separate presentations on problems of scientific and other information in three other major departments: (a) The Department of Agriculture, April 1962—S 4-3-62; (b) the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 1962—S 5-4-62; (c) the Agency for International Development—S 5-3-63.

As a result of the first, increased support is beginning to be provided to the National Agricultural Library.

As a result of the second, a whole series of actions has occurred. For example, the report called for a Conference on Medical Communications. Such a Conference was convened in November 1962 and out of it grew a series of welcome recommendations which are now in the process of at least partial implementation.

As a result of the third, a presentation on coordination of techncial assistance, some partial steps have been taken by AID to improve internal, interagency, intergovernmental, and public-private coordination.

DRUG INFORMATION

Twelfth. In late July 1962, the subcommittee turned to still another front—drug information. Out of our hearings and a series of statements have come the first steps toward what I hope will be a long overdue National Clearinghouse on Drug Information.

There will be, in addition, I trust, national clearinghouse on overall chemical information—on pesticide information; cosmetics information, and food information.

This subject is mentioned in the third in the subcommittee's series of hearing-exhibit volumes on "Inter-Agency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation," released September 26, 1963.

These, then, are 12 sets of actions and presentations; several more could be mentioned.

CONCRETE RESULTS

I have mentioned a few of the concrete results of the committee's and subcommittee's efforts.

The principal result has been to help strengthen cross-fertilization of scientific knowledge and, conversely, to help cut down on needless, unintentional, unplanned duplication of effort.

Let me mention how this has been done.

First. Improvements have been made in the scientific information systems of every major Federal scientific agency. The result has been to strengthen management's ability to manage, science's ability to discover, and engineering's ability to engineer.

PROGRESS BY SCIENCE INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Second. The Biosciences Information Exchange, which was devoted exclusively to recording information on medical science research projects, was converted, at our prodding, into an overall Science Information Exchange. This Exchange will ultimately cover all of the physical, mathematical and engineering sciences.

A statistical picture of SIE, as it is known, shows this increased coverage:

First. Total receipts of all proposals and projects—life sciences and physical sciences—rose to about 75,000 for the year ending June 30, 1963. This does not include about 15,000 update changes to records already in SIE collection.

Second. Total active projects—life sciences and physical sciences—"on the shelf" were about 60,000, as of June 1963.

Third. Projects registered as physical science by SIE totaled 17,668 on September 1, 1963.

In addition, about 2,500 physical sciences projects were recently received and are now being processed.

But what does SIE's progress really mean? Let me quote from what the Director of SIE, Monroe Freeman, Ph. D., told a June 1963 conference, sponsored by the HEW Department:

> We have information that the information services are effective, for in about 500 returns of a questionnaire, 97 percent of the research scientists queried said they learned through the Exchange about new projects in their specialties they did not know about; 70 percent said the material was of good quality with little irrelevant matter; 85 percent indicated comprehensive coverage; and 65 percent took the time to add comments and suggestions. A letter from a major industrial laboratory said, "Thank you for the current research résumés. Two of them describe research projects we had intended to start next month." Another letter said simply, "I have worked on this project for 2 years only to find myself scooped last week." Most of the respondents said they used the information to: (a) keep up with what is going on; (b) avoid duplication in preparing proposals; and (c) contact other scientists they did not know.

In fiscal year 1965, the National Science Foundation will undertake managerial and funding responsibility for SIE.

REPORT BY PRESIDENT'S SCIENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Third. A special panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee was set up to consider the issue of information. This expert panel, headed by Alvin Weinberg, Ph. D., director of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, made an excellent study on the subject and issued an historic report, which has resulted in many information improvements.

Several of these improvements were first recommended by our committee. One such included making certain that in every single major scientific agency of the U.S. Government, there be a single individual, responsible for scientific information.

Earlier, what was known as the Crawford task force submitted to the President's science adviser a still bolder blueprint for information clearinghouses throughout the U.S. executive branch.

Fourth. A standing committee on scientific information in the Federal Council for Science and Technology is now hard at work on interagency information problems.

Fifth. The President's Office of Science and Technology has taken a commendable and continuing interest in overseeing Government-wide information advances. I should like to pay tribute to Dr. Jerome Wiesner for his impressive contribution to information advances. The results of his enlightened interest may be seen in the June 18, 1963, "Status Report on Scientific and Technical Information in the Federal Government," as issued by the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

Sixth. The National Science Foundation has been strengthened in its diligent efforts to spur improvements throughout the scientific and technical community.

NO ONE SOURCE CAN CLAIM CREDIT

Let this point be clear. In recent years, there has been somewhat of a "snowball" effect as regards information advances. No one source—our own committee or subcommittee—claims more credit than is rightly any one source's due. The fact is that many sources have aided in the process; many sources share credit.

What counts is that progress be continued without letup; for there is no reason for complacency; the road ahead is long and hard.

A functioning national and international information network is still to be established.

A FEW TASKS AHEAD

A functioning Government-wide index of all research and development reports is still but a hopeful gleam in our eyes.

There is still only one joint NASA-DOD Information Center, at Huntsville, Ala.

Information service at the grassroots of America is still only in its embryonic stage, through 12 regional technical report centers and a hodgepodge of separate agency centers

Compatibility or convertibility between agency information systems is still only a goal, not a reality.

The Office of Technical Services of the U.S. Department of Commerce is still by and large only a sales agency; it is not a comprehensive service agency; and it functions by relatively primitive means in an age of high-speed computers and printers.

Literally dozens of other needs, as recognized by our committee and subcommittee, could be cited, to illustrate the Nation's "unfinished information business."

It will always be "unfinished." But it had best be greatly improved, and soon.

CONCLUSION—A POSSIBLE SCIENCE COMMISSION

I should like to refer to one final phase in this connection.

It has been the repeated judgment of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, as a whole, that this Nation could greatly benefit from the establishment of a Hoover-type Commission on Science and Technology.

Such a commission would, ideally, in our judgment, consist of a "balanced mix" of representatives of the executive and legislative branches, as well as the national science and engineering community.

Senate-approved legislation for such a commission is now, once more, pending before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

We recognize, realistically, that, no doubt, many Members of the House feel that the establishment of the distinguished select committee represents all that is necessary at this time.

To some extent the formation of this House committee does indeed diminish the necessity for an independent appraisal, such as a commission could provide.

I believe, however, that the House should not "close the door" on the concept of an independent commission.

As many observers have pointed out, a group which would have representation from the executive agencies and from the private scientific community, working side by side with legislators, might be in a somewhat stronger position than a group of busy legislators who are necessarily already heavily committed to other duties.

Perhaps, an arrangement could be worked out in which a commission, if approved, could be designated to study such specific topics as the House select committee might choose not to review—partly because of the limited time the select committee has available.

In any event, irrespective of whether any further action is taken on the commission bill, I know that each of the committees and subcommittees of the Senate and House which have jurisdiction over scientific activities will continue their individual efforts to strengthen the Nation's scientific and engineering program.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I notice with considerable interest that the Secretary of Agriculture, speaking today at North Platte, Nebr., has come out four square and frankly in favor of selling wheat to the Soviet Union and to any of her eastern satellites that make firm offers to pay for the wheat in dollars.

In the past the Secretary has been somewhat hesitant with respect to this subject. The news ticker account of his speech, which I have before me, is timed very carefully, I believe, in connection with the press conference which the President of the United States will hold later today.

The Secretary pointed out:

> We would sell wheat for cash on the same basis as in any cash export sale, just as we have done for years.

He went on to say:

> I am not one of those who are fearful of open competition in products or in ideas.

I commend the Secretary on his statement. It was needed for a clarification of policy. I am hopeful it will carry considerable weight in the councils of the administration.

I have attempted to do the best I could in outlining the importance of this matter—the hazards and the assets—and I feel that, on balance, it is in our national interest to consummate the sale, and also in the interest of improving our export position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news ticker account of Secretary Freeman's statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> NORTH PLATTE, NEBR.—Agriculture Secretary Freeman said today he feels the United States should sell wheat to the Soviet Union and any of her East European satellites that make "firm offers to buy for dollars."
>
> Freeman said he believes American public sentiment favors the sales by about a 4–1 margin.
>
> Freeman's statement was made in a speech prepared for delivery to a Wheat Belt farmer meeting here. President Kennedy was expected to announce approval of wheat sales to the Soviets at a news conference late today.
>
> Freeman's public advocacy of the wheat sales was added today to his prepared text for the speech.
>
> "It is my judgment that we should sell wheat to the Russians and to the other Eastern European nations where firm offers to buy for dollars are made through the private trade," he said.
>
> "We should do this not only because of the dollars-and-cents advantages, but also because of the increased people-to-people contacts which will result."
>
> Today's farm meeting was one of a series which Freeman has been holding to find out how farmers feel about present and future Government farm policies. Freeman said that in six similar meetings and at others, including one of the American Bankers Association, he sounded out opinions about the proposed wheat deal with the Russians.
>
> "There is no doubt in my mind that the people, based on the reaction of these audiences which are a cross section of the public, would support a cash sale by a margin of 4 to 1," Freeman said.
>
> Freeman said American private traders had indicated the Soviet Union was prepared to buy 4 million tons of wheat (about 140 million bushels) for about $260 million.
>
> Freeman said such a sale would have "many practical and immediate advantages." It would greatly improve the U.S. balance of payments, lower the cost of storage and handling of Government surplus farm crops, and boost farm income, he said.
>
> "We estimate that the sale of wheat in the amount discussed recently between the Russians and U.S. grain traders would save the U.S. taxpayer more than $200 million over the period of time we could normally expect the grain to remain in storage."
>
> Freeman pointed out that surplus wheat acquired by the Government is normally held for 5 years with storage interest and handling charges of 26 cents per bushel per year.
>
> Freeman challenged an argument by some critics of the proposed Soviet deal who object to selling wheat to Communist countries at prices lower than those paid by Americans. At present, all U.S. wheat exports move at world market prices which are some 55 cents per bushel below U.S. prices. The gap is covered by a Government export subsidy.
>
> Freeman said any export subsidy paid on wheat sold to the Soviet Union "would not go to the Soviets, but to American wheat farmers." He added:
>
> "We would sell wheat for cash on the same basis as in any cash export sale, just as we have done for years. Any cash export sale is made with an export subsidy and this sale would be no different."
>
> Freeman said any wheat sale to the Soviet Union would be in addition to other products exported to Russia, such as tallow, seeds and hides.
>
> "I am not one of those who is fearful of open competition in products or in ideas. Democracy * * * can only be the victor over the communism of a secret society, and I am eager to accept that kind of a contest," Freeman said.
>
> Freeman also told the wheatgrowers that the administration would take "every possible opportunity" to expand wheat exports and bolster wheat prices next year.

AID TO HURRICANE FLORA VICTIMS

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, reports continue to pour in on the appalling losses of life and property in the Caribbean caused by Hurricane Flora. From the latest dispatches, it is clear that the hurricane has been the worst storm in recorded history to hit the Caribbean islands. I am glad to hear that the American Red Cross has offered supplies and workers to the Cuban Red Cross and that the Red Cross and CARE have joined to organize relief to stricken Haiti. It was fortunate indeed, and timely, that the U.S. Navy should have once again been in a position to render prompt assistance from the carrier *Champlain* along the coast of Haiti.

All of these steps have been generous and openhearted reflections of the concern of the American people for the men, women, and children who are suffering so grievously from the great Caribbean storm. As the Washington Post said in an editorial this morning, I am "confident that the people of this country will back up this generous offer despite the suspension of regular economic aid to the oppressive Duvalier regime in Haiti and the general embargo on trade with Castroist Cuba."

Mr. President, I strongly believe that the policy of the United States should be clear and unmistakable: That we as a people and a government will offer aid to those who suffer.

We must never permit ideological differences to bar American assistance to men, women, and children who suffer from hunger, disease, and natural catastrophes.

If people are starving and we have food, it is morally wrong to turn aside—even if a totalitarian regime rules the nation of hungry people.

If people are suffering from epidemic disease, and we have drugs and doctors, it is morally wrong to look the other way—even if the government of that people's country displays sour and arrogant contempt for the offer of such aid.

If people are overwhelmed by great natural catastrophes, and we have rescue vehicles, aid teams, food, medicine, and shelter, it is morally wrong to turn our backs on their suffering.

The American people will never go wrong by relying on their own basic instincts—which are humane and compassionate. We have a magnificent tradition of responding to the needs of the suffering. We must never permit political considerations to deter us from what we know is right.

And we know that it is right to bring aid to the sick, food to the hungry, and comfort to those whose loved ones and whose homes and property have been swept away by the tides of disaster.

We are not now talking about governments or extending aid to governments; we are talking about people, and extending compassion and assistance through great voluntary, philanthropic, charitable organizations which have the facilities for making this aid available.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles and an editorial from the October 9 Washington Post be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Flora Batters Cuba; Heads for Bahamas—Total of Deaths for 8 Days May Top 5,000

Miami, October 8.—Hurricane Flora broke out of Cuba into the Atlantic tonight and bore down on the Bahamas with 100-mile-an-hour winds, leaving entire cities in shambles and perhaps more than 5,000 persons dead in the Caribbean in 8 days.

In Haiti, Health Secretary Gerard Philippeaux reported that 2,500 persons are dead or missing and "the number may double." Flora hit Haiti Thursday night with winds the weather bureau said may have reached 200 miles an hour.

Another 160 were reported dead elsewhere, including 9 in Jamaica and at least 112 in Cuba.

"Since the time Columbus discovered the New World," the Miami Weather Bureau said, "no hurricane has dealt so devastating a blow to the countries of Haiti and Cuba."

The weather bureau said total damage would amount to "several hundred millions" of dollars in Cuba. In Haiti, the figure "may be under $100 million due to low value of many buildings destroyed."

Flora was some 450 miles southeast of Miami last night, moving 9 miles an hour toward the southern Bahamas. The weather bureau said the hurricane "offers no further threat to western Cuba, Central America, Florida, and the east coast of the United States."

Rains were slackening off in Cuba, where precipitation from Flora was measured in feet, but the Weather Bureau said "flooding will continue for some time." The U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay today caught a glimpse of the sun for the first time in 6 days.

Guantanamo personnel were ordered back into storm shelters for a time this morning when Flora took a threatening turn, but despite flooding and 60-mile-an-hour winds on the fringe of the hurricane, damage there has been relatively minor. Guantanamo normally gets 17 inches of rain a year; it has gotten that much in the past 6 days.

In Cuba, there were radio reports of 80 deaths at Mayari, Premier Fidel Castro's birthplace on the island's northeast coast. Havana radio reported 10 deaths in Caimanera as water in the streets reached a depth of more than 3 feet. The broadcast reported 400 buildings demolished in Camaguey Province, with casualties "not known at the moment." It said mines in eastern Cuba were flooded.

While the eastern half of Cuba was stricken, the situation was reported normal in Havana, Matanzas and Pinar el Rio Province in the west.

The report of 80 dead at Mayari came from an amateur radio operator in a broadcast monitored in Miami last night.

Before another radio operator, apparently in Havana, interrupted the report to shut off a further listing of casualties, the Mayari man told of bodies stacked on rooftops and others floating in floodwaters that covered more than three-fourths of the city.

"The situation is desperate," the Mayari operator said. "Please do something. There is danger of an epidemic."

Then he was cut off with the radioed command: "Comrade remember your orders; remember your orders."

Another broadcast that was heard in Miami today reported that the town of Santa Cruz del Sur, on Cuba's southeast coast, was being flooded from the sea. The town was wiped out by a tidal flood on November 9, 1932, which claimed 3,000 lives.

Nearly 60,000 Cubans were reported today to have fled their homes. There was fear for the fate of thousands of others isolated by the storm waters and without means of getting help since high winds made the use of helicopters impossible.

Castro set up hurricane relief headquarters in Holguin, Oriente Province, today after getting ducked while trying to cross the Rioja River with 16 aides in an amphibious jeep.

Press dispatches said the overloaded jeep started to founder and the government group swam to the other side. Peasants pulled the swamped jeep out of the river while Castro and his aides took a bus some 20 miles to Holguin.

Cuban Communist leader Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, head of the National Agrarian Reform Institute, ordered immediate readjustments in rationed food supplies. Meat quotas in Havana were slashed 50 percent. It was announced there would be no more coffee until further notice. The vegetable quota was cut 60 percent.

At least half the island's crops have been wiped out.

The American Red Cross yesterday offered supplies and workers to the Cuban Red Cross, but no reply has been reported.

A committee representing Cuban refugees in Miami asked President Kennedy to aid political prisoners in Cuba and other Cubans hit by the storm. No request for aid from the Cuban Government is known to have been made to the U.S. Government.

Rodriquez announced that the Soviet Union has agreed to transfer to Cuba 5,000 tons of coffee the Russians had bought from Brazil.

He said that losses in rice and cotton will have to be replaced through extraordinary imports.

In Haiti, heavy rains continued in the disaster area, causing more floods.

Two helicopters from the U.S. Navy aircraft carrier *Lake Champlain* were engaged in an aerial survey of the stricken areas, and more helicopters were to be pressed into service.

Members of the American Red Cross were at work, and in New York CARE, the international relief agency, said $110,000 in food and other relief supplies were authorized for distribution in Haiti. It issued an urgent appeal to Americans for funds.

Haitian officials said 90 percent of the farms, factories, and homes were destroyed in the storm area. Many coffee, rice, and banana plantations were wiped out. Health Minister Philippeaux estimated that two-fifths of the country was devastated. At least 100,000 Haitians were homeless.

The north coast of Haiti's southern peninsula, an area populated by nearly 130,000 persons, was hardest hit. Philippeaux said entire towns were destroyed.

Flora's Ruin May Have Set Back Cuban Economy by Year or More

(By Al Burt)

Miami, October 8.—Hurricane Flora probably set Cuba's economy back a year, and may curb some of Premier Castro's ambitions to foment other revolutions in Latin America.

Flora has swept across Cuba's richest lands, in Camaguey and Oriente Provinces, and the multi-million-dollar damages insure at least three things of political importance:

1. The weakest phase of Castro's regime, the economy, suffered a heavy blow.
2. Cuba will need more outside aid for recovery.
3. New, serious troubles at home probably will force Castro to divert his attentions from hemispheric subversion and concentrate on Cuban matters.

WEAKENED CAPABILITIES

Originally, Castro promised the mass of Cubans a better life, more of everything. He was not able to deliver before, and Hurricane Flora seriously weakens what capabilities he had.

Cubans, who already had tightened their belts, now will have to tighten them more. Dollar estimates of the damage right now are pure guesses, but they run as high as $500 million. In time, the estimates say, the economy was set back from 1 to 3 years.

Those who contend that this makes Castro ripe for immediate overthrow may be overenthusiatic.

There is no doubt, though, that it eventually could lead to new dissatisfaction and produce more fertile areas for the developing of anti-Castro sentiment.

The Soviet Union, already pouring $1.5 million a day into Cuba, probably will be asked for more. With problems of its own, the U.S.S.R. may not be able to deliver.

SUGAR IS MONEY CROP

The most likely development is that Castro, desperate for hard cash, will be forced to solidify his position at home and at least partially curb his subversive program in the hemisphere.

Cuba's money crop is sugar.

It is used to get dollars for badly needed foreign exchange. Last year, Camaguey and Oriente Provinces produced about 50 percent of Cuba's 4.8 million tons.

They were expected to carry about the same load this year in producing only 3.5 million tons. Cuban officials say Hurricane Flora wiped out 60 percent of the sugarcane in these areas, and the damage estimates are still incomplete.

WOOD AND METAL SHORT

Officials say 90 percent of the coffee crop is destroyed, and report heavy damage to rice, bananas, and other food crops. The Cauto River Valley, richest on the island, was directly in the path of the hurricane. The river itself is now said to be some 7 or 8 miles wide.

In addition, houses in both Provinces have been destroyed. Because of a shortage of wood and metal, housing construction in Cuba during the last 2 years has been virtually at a standstill.

The major sugar mills, cattle producers, and copper, nickel, and cobalt mines are in the two provinces. Radio reports say mill roofs have been ripped off and the electrical machinery inside flooded and ruined. Because this may be impossible to replace right away, some mills probably will be cannibalized for working parts to get the others back into operation.

Castro put rescue operations in the hands of Cuba's only political party, the United Party of the Socialist Revolution, "to avoid anarchy."

However, it was apparent that Castro himself was getting a little uneasy. A monitored radio report found one operator complaining of not being able to establish communications with Santiago, but that Castro kept harassing him to set them up anyway.

"We have told Comrade Fidel that conditions are very bad, but he keeps calling insistently; you know the way he does," the announcer said.

HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE

It is an accident of nature that Hurricane Flora spilled her worst disasters upon Haiti and Cuba. The American Red Cross acted in accord with its finest tradition when it hastened to offer both countries relief for their stricken people. We are confident that the people of this country will back up this generous offer despite the suspension of regular economic aid to the oppressive Duvalier regime in Haiti and the general embargo on trade with Castroist Cuba.

Reports from Haiti that from 2,000 to 4,000 persons have perished and that 100,000 have been left homeless suggest that the storm is one of the worst in the history of the Caribbean. Apparently there was much less loss of life in Cuba, but the toll in terms of crop damage and destruction of homes has been enormous. The Island of Tobago and other areas have also suffered heavy losses. The circumstances call for an immediate and generous response on the part of the United States and its relief agencies. In the presence of disaster ideological differences should not stand in the way of the humanitarian impulse.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the point the Senator from Minnesota has made on assistance to the people, I stress people of Cuba, I could not agree with him more completely. We should be willing to give all the assistance we can as a people, not to the Castro government, but to the people of Cuba. Great institutions like the Red Cross are ideally suited for this purpose. We should do it in the way which dramatizes our role of compassion and concern and sympathy for the distressed people of Cuba. The majority whip has made a wonderful statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. He clearly states the position that I have taken. I knew that this would be his reaction, because he is a man of generous nature and compassionate outlook.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I rise to support the bill which is now pending before the Senate, S. 1915. Michigan is an area with regard to which people immediately think, first, of automobiles, and, next, perhaps, of recreation. In truth and in fact, the fluid milk business and the dairy industry in Michigan is vital and important and substantal. For years it was my privilege to sit with the Senator from Wisconsin on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I recognize his concern, which is certainly mine, that some effective effort be made to resolve the increasingly acute problem in this area.

The class I base plan for milk marketing orders has had my support for many months. Early in this session I introduced S. 953 setting forth such a proposal. Later I was pleased to join with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] in proposing S. 1915 which is now before the Senate for action.

There has been widespread support for a class I base plan among the dairy producers in the State of Michigan. Much of the milk in our State is produced under milk marketing orders, and dairy production represents a very sizable portion of the farm income in Michigan.

For some time there has been a recognition that the present Federal milk order program has built into its operations a price incentive to the producer to gradually increase his production. This incentive has been one of several factors that has aggravated the surplus of manufacturing milk and increased the cost of the price support program.

The program which Senator Proxmire and I have sponsored and the Agriculture Committee has now reported to the Senate is a step in the right direction. Some Federal order markets have twice as much surplus as can be justified for meeting their fluid milk requirements. These surpluses not only depress prices in their immediate markets, but add to the surpluses acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

But I do not believe bases in Federal orders alone will be adequate to reach all of the problems we should meet in the dairy field. Producers in Federal orders will probaly not reduce the marketing enough under this type of base plan to cut CCC purchases of butter by a sizable amount. We might expect this plan to curtail expansion on the part of producers. There remains the matter of total milk production and the concern that producer income not be jeopardized. For that reason I will also support the amendment which will be proposed by Senator McCarthy.

It was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for 4 years. This service was helpful to me in an understanding of agricultural problems, some of which I am convinced no sound solution yet has been developed. I commend the members of the committee and especially the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. Proxmire, and the Junior Senator from Minnesota, Mr. McCarthy, for their leadership, as well as the chairman, Mr. Ellender, for bringing this bill to the Senate.

It is important that Congress act on this proposal now. We cannot afford to jeopardize the continued existence of the dairy price support programs. For some time now it has seemed to me that a sound dairy policy should seek six main objectives. These would include the following:

First. the program should contribute to a reduction of excessive supplies of dairy products which threaten the entire dairy industry—including fluid markets, and create huge price support costs.

Second. The program should protect the income of dairy farmers.

Third. The program should not increase consumers milk prices.

Fourth. The program should not involve direct Government controls over individual producers' cow numbers or output of dairy products.

Fifth. The program should reduce Federal expenditures for dairy price-support programs.

Sixth. The program should allow flexibility, expansion of production by efficient producers, and not constitute barriers to trade or prohibit entry of new producers.

The steps we will take today in the passage of the Proxmire-Hart bill, S. 1915, and hopefully in the adoption of the McCarthy amendments, will move us closer to meeting these objectives.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. I am grateful to him. He is a cosponsor of the bill. He comes from a great dairy State. I appreciate his statement very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, be added as a cosponsor of S. 1915. I am grateful to the Senator for his action. He is an outstanding expert on agriculture, and was for many years before he came to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a typographical error appears on page 13 of the committee report on the bill. The eighth line of the first full paragraph on page 13 begins with the words: "It does not appear to contemplate."

The words should be: "It does appear to contemplate."

The word "not" was inserted by error in printing the report. Since it completely changes the meaning of the sentence in which it has been inserted, I make this statement to clarify the Record. It is the heart of the bill. I shall read the sentence as it should be corrected:

> It does appear to contemplate that supply and demand are to be influenced or adjusted by means of changes in the levels of prices

payable to producers; and that would be the objective of paying a producer a higher amount for needed milk and a lower price for excess milk.

That provision is the heart of the bill; therefore, I am happy to have the chance to make the correction and call the Senate's attention to it.

DAIRY BILL

Mr. President, the principal objectives of S. 1915, before the Senate today, are these:

First. To reduce the national dairy surplus and the cost to taxpayers of the dairy price support program.

Second. To provide dairy farmers an opportunity to increase net income.

Third. To permit individual producers to produce in line with market requirements for fluid milk products without having their prices reduced by present surplus or increased production of other producers.

Fourth. To eliminate a basic defect of blend pricing which provides milk producers a price higher than the lowest class price for manufacturing milk in excess of the market's normal supply requirements for fluid milk products.

And, Mr. President, I want to stress the fact that this proposal does not in the slightest degree represent production control. It does not limit any producer to any maximum quantity of milk he is allowed to produce or sell. It does not place any physicial limitations on the number of cows he may keep. It does not limit in any way any factor of production or sale of milk.

Mr. President, S. 1915 represents a sincere effort to correct one of the principal problems plaguing farmers who market milk in Federal market order areas.

EXTENSIVE COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on March 18, 19, 20, and 21, and April 3, of this year, on S. 398, introduced by the chairman of the committee, S. 900, introduced by me and cosponsored by the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and S. 953 introduced by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. As a result of these hearings a compromise bill was developed incorporating a number of suggestions made by the Department of Agriculture. Further hearings were held on May 14 and 15 on the compromise bill and S. 1317, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. Following the hearings there was a continuing effort to meet the objections which had been raised in the latter hearings. S. 1915, which was introduced on July 18 by me, and cosponsored by the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], is the result of this effort. This bill met the major objections of the representatives of producers who market milk covered by Federal market orders.

The intent of the proposed legislation is to make it clear that the Secretary of Agriculture may provide for allotments under milk marketing orders, so that instead of receiving a uniform blend price, producers will receive a higher return on milk covered by allotments and a lower return for milk in excess of allotments. The bill does not affect the minimum prices paid by handlers, but deals only with apportionment of the proceeds among producers.

BILL IS LIMITED

Specifically, I would like to point out that:

First, the bill covers only milk marketed in areas covered by Federal market orders, although I think I can show that it will greatly benefit, over the years, the manufacturing producers, who do not come under these orders.

Second, I assure Senators and the industry that the bill contains absolutely no mandatory features whatsoever. It is a completely voluntary program which can be accepted or rejected by farmers in a referendum.

Third, if rejected by farmers, the remainer of the order will continue in effect.

Fourth, the bill in no way limits either production or marketings.

Fifth, the bill contains absolutely no penalties.

And sixth, the bill will in no way affect the price of milk to consumers.

PRESENT INJUSTICE TO DAIRY FARMER

At the present time, farmers under a milk market order receive a blend price for all milk delivered. The blend price is based upon a combination of the high price received for milk used for fluid consumption and the low price received for milk used for manufacturing purposes.

Because different prices apply to milk disposed of in the several classes, a method of pooling, or distributing the total returns from sales of milk among producers at a uniform price, is used in conjunction with classified pricing.

Under "pool" procedures the total money value of all milk delivered by all producers—that is, the total pounds of milk in each class, multiplied by the minimum class price—is combined in one pool, and the pool is divided by the total amount of producer milk which is priced under the order. Then, all producers are paid the same "uniform" or blend price per hundredweight for their milk shipments.

And since the blend price, at least originally, is substantially higher than the manufacturing price, some producers tend to increase production in order to increase income.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is making an able speech, but he is touching on a point that is disturbing so far as the residents of the great metropolitan centers of the country are concerned. Do I correctly understand from what the Senator is saying that there can be two cans of milk, one can going as fluid milk to the cities, where the price is, let us say, $4 a hundredweight, or 8 cents a quart; and another can of milk going to a creamery to be made into butter or cheese, with a price, let us say, of $2 a hundredweight, or 4 cents a quart? The milk is identical in its origin and quality but the city folks would pay twice as much in order to drink it in fluid form, as would be paid if it went to a dairy or a creamery.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to answer the Senator.

First, the consumption in the city is likely to be no more in proportion of fluid milk, than of cheese, or ice cream which is what happens to manufactured milk. So the consumer in the city and country would be affected equally. But the point I wish to make is that fluid milk must meet certain requirements, such as the bacteria count. Also, production of fluid milk requires a particular kind of equipment, which imposes a real burden on the dairy farmer. So there is a solid reason for paying the dairy farmer more to produce fluid milk. That is the justification.

Manufacturing milk is used to make ice cream, which city people consume, cheese, and dried milk. It does not require the same kind of manufacturing equipment. The farmer does not have to buy the same kind of equipment as does the producer of fluid milk. Therefore, it sells at a lower price.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that some dairy cooperatives in effect have a closed membership; and that one dairy farmer, who is a member of the cooperative, has access to the city fluid milk market, and thus receives a higher price; while another dairy farmer, who has equally good sanitary standards, but is ineligible for membership in the dairy cooperative, is excluded from selling in the city, and is forced, thereby, to dump his milk at creameries at a lower price to have it made into butter and cheese?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is true that cooperatives have been the source of much strength to farmers. Without cooperatives, farmers would be in a worse condition today than they are. But it is not at all necessary for a farmer to belong to a cooperative to sell his milk under a marketing order. It is necessary for him to find a buyer. That is not always easy. If the farmer produces milk that qualifies in terms of its bacteria count and other requirements—and it is very difficult to do this—and if he invests the large sum of money that is required to produce such milk, then he must also find a buyer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But is it not true that the big dairy distributors, such as Borden, National Dairy Products, and the rest, largely control the distribution of milk inside the cities, and that, in general, they have buying contracts with the cooperatives and buy only from members of the cooperatives? Is that not true?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe not.

I feel very strongly about this matter, because Wisconsin produces more milk than any other State, and exports more milk than the next five biggest milk exporting States combined do, and produces 70 percent of the milk for the Chicago market. I do not find any strong objection to the relationship between cooperatives and the processors.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCARTHY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps I might make a contribution in connection with the question posed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. An individual farmer has every right in the world to sell his milk to any city distributor to whom he can sell it. But unless he belongs to a cooperative, he has no market, for few are large enough to distribute their own milk in city markets. So, as a practical matter, they do better by belonging to a cooperative.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the second point true—that the city distributor will purchase fluid milk only from the members of the cooperative?

Mr. AIKEN. The city distributors—I will say this for them—have been showing steadily increasing incomes for about 10 years, in almost every quarter. I do not believe National Dairy has failed to increase its earnings in every quarter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe the statement of the Senator from Vermont is quite responsive to my question. Is it not true that the practice of a great many distributors in the big cities is to buy only from members of cooperatives?

Mr. AIKEN. They wish to buy in quantity. They will buy from any area or any seller who can distribute full tanks and can guarantee deliveries day by day throughout the year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The processors want to buy the milk for the lowest price they can and will buy from the producers who offer them the best terms. Borden's have every interest in keeping the price down.

The cooperative has a responsibility to its membership. It has to, if it is to operate for very long; it has to do all it can to get the best possible price. So the cooperatives serve an essential need. If they did not provide an opportunity for the farmers to have the benefit of some sort of effective negotiating organization, the processors would play them off against each other; and then the price received by the farmers would be even lower than it is now—and I believe the Senator from Illinois will agree that in many areas it is now shamefully low.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was very much interested in the plight of the dairy farmers in the battles in connection with the Chicago milkshed in the early 1930's. Some of my friends assisted in the organization of the Pure Milk Cooperative Marketing Organization. I agree with this portion of its function; but are not we getting into a position in which each side protects the other, but with the result that there is an extremely high price for fluid milk? I have not checked up on the recent price of fluid milk to the consumers, and I believe it is around 24 to 25 cents a quart, or was when I last heard. How much per hundredweight do the dairy farmers in Wisconsin who belong to this organization receive?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That amount varies. At the present time it is about 7 cents a quart or three and a half dollars a hundredweight; that is the blend price they receive. The class I price would be higher—closer to 7½ cents a quart.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then they get one-third of the retail price. How much would they get if they sold milk of the same quality and of the same butterfat content to the creamery, for manufacturing into butter or cheese?

Mr. PROXMIRE. They would get the regular support price, which is $3.14 a hundredweight—the national average, seasonally adjusted, or about 6 cents a quart.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One of the features of a monopoly, with which I have always disagreed, has been class prices—that is, to charge one group a higher price for an identical product, and to charge another group a lower price.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is talking about manufacturing milk, which is not milk that will meet class I requirements. Class I milk has to meet certain requirements that are quite different from those for manufacturing milk.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If a farmer's production under class I is only 60 percent for human consumption, the other 40 percent is sold for manufacturing purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator makes a good point. The fact is all milk that comes into the class I market, has to meet this very high and difficult standard. Not all of it, however, can be used for class I purposes, fluid consumption. Some of it will have to go for manufacturing purposes, where it competes with manufacturing milk that will not meet class I requirements. Too much of this milk is now going into manufacturing. That is what we want to get away from, and that is the problem this bill helps to solve.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If that is the purpose, that is fine. But the city consumers all over the country have been "taken for a ride," on the basis of being compelled to pay a higher price for milk destined for their consumption than the price of identical milk used in another channel. Of course, one of the traits of a monopoly is to charge different people different prices for the same article—solely according to their ability to pay.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The 1937 Marketing Act was enacted during the first year that I was in Washington. So far as milk was concerned, the purpose was to insure that milk produced under strict sanitary conditions for sale to meet the needs for fluid consumption of a marketing area, would be sold at a premium, because of the fact that the producer had to maintain sanitary conditions at great cost; and the manufacturing milk which did not meet those requirements was to be sold apart from the sanitary milk. Of course some reserve supply of fluid milk would have to be provided, and this could be sold to the handlers at the manufacturing milk price. But we did not want to encourage the production of large supplies of high-quality milk meeting strict fluid requirements and then have it sold for manufacturing purposes at low prices.

However, when the Secretary of Agriculture fixed the minimum price at which the milk was to be sold, and developed the method by which all the milk produced in the marketing area was blended in price, there was an incentive to produce more milk for the fluid market than was needed to assure adequate supplies and reasonable reserves.

Today only 39 percent of the milk that is produced for direct consumption in the Chicago marketing area is actually used for fluid consumption. The rest is used for manufacturing purposes.

This bill seeks, as I understand, to make it clear that the Secretary of Agriculture can establish a pricing arrangement which will discourage production of milk for fluid markets in excess of that need for fluid requirements. Then producers of milk meeting these sanitary requirements will be able to obtain a good price for their milk, commensurate with the costs of meeting these requirements, and milk which is produced for manufacturing purposes can be sold at the support price which is equal to 75 percent to 90 percent of parity. Today that manufacturing milk sells for $3.14.

So we are trying to return to the law which was enacted in 1937, and have it administered as Congress intended. That is all this bill will do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, indeed. In fact, I understand that the chairman of the committee and other members of the committee feel that the Secretary of Agriculture could take that action now if he would.

Mr. ELLENDER. He could.

Mr. PROXMIRE. He feels that he cannot. The purpose of the bill is to clarify the situation and enable him to do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. Fifteen years or more ago the blended price was established. As a result, most of the milk which is now produced for manufacturing purposes is produced in the same facilities as is the milk which is used for direct consumption. It was never so intended under the law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that the question posed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has been completely answered. When milk is sent into the Chicago market, which is a marketing order area, all of the milk is of the same quality. It is all produced under the same conditions. Forty percent of it is sold as fluid milk and goes into tea, coffee, and children drink it. The other 60 percent is used for manufacturing purposes. But that 60 percent is the same sanitary grade of milk as is the 40 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is precisely what I was trying to establish. The milk sells at a lower price, does it not?

Mr. AIKEN. It sells at a lower price, but it is the same high grade of milk.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The result is a dual price system.

Mr. AIKEN. I have not completely answered the Senator's question yet. The milk which goes into manufacturing is the same grade of milk that goes on the tables of consumers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is fine.

Mr. AIKEN. States outside the marketing order areas have laws for manufacturing milk. The conditions under which manufacturing milk is produced are entirely different under those laws. To the best of my knowledge, no State permits a bacteria count of more than 200,000 in raw milk or 30,000 in pasteurized milk for fluid consumption. In my State it is half of that—100,000 in raw milk and 20,000 for pasteurized milk. Yet the milk produced for manufacturing alone can have a permissible bacteria count of up to 10 million in some States and 3 or 2 million in most States.

The question is as follows: Do we wish to transfer the production of milk from areas which have the highest sanitary requirements to the areas which have the lowest sanitary conditions? The question is as simple as that. It is a mystery to me why the consumers of our country have not risen up. I think it is because they do not understand the milk business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am trying to establish some facts on which we can properly rise up.

Mr. AIKEN. I intend to speak on the subject before we finish the debate, and at that time I shall bring out more details. The effect of the bill will be to transfer the production of milk from the areas in which farms have the highest sanitary requirements to those having the lowest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In effect, the Senator is saying that the States do not have as high sanitary standards as those of the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. No. The manufacturing milk standards are set by the States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The marketing orders are issued by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. AIKEN. They have a set of standards for milk used for manufacturing purposes. Some of the States permit 3 milligrams of sediment per milliliter of milk. If the Senator does not know what "sediment" means, I can explain it to him in the corridor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe I know that very well.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows. He has seen a cow put a foot into a pail.

I wish to raise the standard of quality of milk in our country and not provide any incentive for lowering it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why do not the other States raise their standards then?

Mr. AIKEN. Not all the States are covered by the bill proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin, as far as I know. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin how many States in the Union are covered by his bill?

Mr. PROXMIRE. All States having Federal marketing orders.

Mr. AIKEN. California is not covered. North Carolina and South Carolina are not covered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Those States are not covered by Federal marketing orders.

Mr. AIKEN. They operate under State laws. Would the Senator's bill operate under State laws?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No; Federal law.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are no marketing orders in California.

Mr. AIKEN. Only 8 percent of the milk in Minnesota is subject to marketing orders; 92 percent of the production of that State would not come under the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The fact is that the bill would not affect the movement of milk from Wisconsin to Vermont, Minnesota, or some other State. It would merely affect the distribution of payments to the farmers who produce milk in a particular marketing order, so that they would receive the class I price for that part of their milk which is sold as class I milk and a lower price for that part which is excess and would be sold for manufacturing purposes. Therefore the farmer would be discouraged from increasing his production and would be encouraged to drop his production and tailor it for a more economical operation.

Mr. AIKEN. Though excess production would not figure in the formula, it does affect the market. As the Senator knows, the Secretary of Agriculture fixes a minimum price. When a surplus exists in the market, the minimum price becomes the price in almost every case, though not always. So it would affect the consumer, I believe, if the surplus were eliminated. The price in the marketing order areas would naturally go up. The distributors would see to it that the price to the consumers would go up anyway.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator from Vermont knows, there is an enormous surplus now in the marketing areas. Fifty percent of the milk production is from those areas. A good deal of that is excess milk and beyond the requirements. There should be some excess. The Senator would agree that in Chicago 61 percent of the milk is excess milk and 39 percent is fluid milk. We could go a long ways toward curtailing production without putting the industry in a position in which the consumer of class I milk is in any danger of having his price go up.

Mr. AIKEN. I would agree, because a certain excess of the supply of milk is necessary in order to meet the market demands from day to day. The consumers of the country are getting much higher quality processed dairy products than they would if they had all those products produced in the areas which are much more lax in their sanitary requirements.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall come to that point in a moment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the question of the Senator from Illinois, it is that if the bill should pass the Congress, the chances are that the price of milk which is sold throughout the country will be higher than that which now prevails. What is the Senator's position on that question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. My position on that question is that the price will not be higher. The bill will not affect the price of fluid milk to the consumer at all. It will not affect it.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That point should be emphasized and underlined. The bill has nothing to do with the price paid by consumers. It is a good point. That is the question which the Senator from Illinois has asked.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. However, under the blend price system, as the proportion of milk used for manufacturing purposes increases, the blend price for all milk delivered under the order decreases.

Therefore, as deliveries of milk into the market increase, with the resultant lower price, all farmers are compelled to increase production in order to maintain their income.

Obviously, the effect is that producers are on a treadmill of increased production. Not only do the farmers suffer, but also the taxpayers suffer. It means that excess milk is produced. Under the law it is necessary for the Department of Agriculture to support milk at a minimum of 75 percent of parity. This year we are paying out $450 million, at least, and maybe more.

INCREASED DAIRY PRODUCTION LARGELY IN MARKETING AREAS

For example, since 1940 the number of markets covered by Federal orders has increased from 17 to 83. The amount of milk regulated under these orders has increased from less than 20 percent to almost 50 percent of all the milk marketed in the United States. Over the same period, the percentage of Federal order milk used for manufacturing purposes has increased from less than 30 percent to almost 40 percent. In some of the larger markets the amount of milk used for manufacturing purposes exceeds the milk used for fluid purposes. In the New York-New Jersey market only 49 percent, and in the Chicago market only 39 percent of the milk delivered by producers was used in class I in 1962.

These examples dramatize the contribution to surplus milk that is made by the marketing orders. The fact is that if we could eliminate the blend pricing system, we could go a long way toward relieving the burden on the taxpayer while at the same time giving the dairy farmer an opportunity to curtail his production to what is needed. It is fantastic that in the Chicago marketing area we should produce nearly twice as much excess milk—and most of the milk is produced by Wisconsin farmers—as is used for the fluid purpose for which the order is designed.

In other words, for every 1 quart that is used for fluid purposes there are 2 quarts of excess.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One and a half quarts.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is nearly 2 quarts. One and a half quarts might be a bit more accurate.

Unquestionably the blend price is responsible for much of this increase in production. This is because the blend price encourages farmers to produce excess milk which goes into manufacturing purposes but returns to the farmer a blend price, above and usually far above the manufacturing price. In the same way, the blend price inhibits a farmer from reducing production because he does not receive the fluid price for any of his milk, regardless of how sharply production is reduced.

HOW BILL CORRECTS PROBLEM

This legislation corrects this situation both by discouraging farmers from increasing production and encouraging them to reduce production. This is because production in excess of allotments will receive only the lower manufacturing price that is, what the excess milk is actually worth. Decreased production will still permit the farmer to retain his fluid base which permits him to receive the higher fluid price for that part of his reduced production that falls within his base.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope my good friend does not mind my questions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The questions are very helpful. This is a complicated subject, and it is good to have questions asked.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is an initial difference in price for identical milk, merely because the milk is destined for different markets. Why should a can of milk which meets the same bacterial standards and other requirements, which goes into the manufacturing milk market, be sold for less than milk which goes into the fluid milk market? Why not have one price for both?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The reason is that the price for fluid milk relates to the demand for fluid milk, the market for fluid milk. It is the demand-supply situation which creates the situation in which the price is higher.

If the only milk were milk produced in America—as the Senator says, were milk which met the same sanitary requirements—there would not be a problem. Then there would be one price, and that would be it. That is not the existing situation.

The excess milk is put into manufacturing. In addition, the farmers of the State of Minnesota produce 90 percent of their milk exclusively for manufacturing purposes. The farmers of Wisconsin produce probably 80 percent of their milk exclusively for manufacturing purposes.

Most of the milk which is used for manufacturing does not have to meet the same requirements. It does not require the expensive equipment. It does not require the same investment. It does not require the same meticulous care. Therefore, it can be produced more cheaply.

We are trying to provide that milk which goes for manufacturing purposes shall bring a manufacturing milk price, and that milk which is used for fluid milk purposes shall get a fluid milk price.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But milk which is identical, which goes to the fluid milk market, gets a higher price.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why should there be a difference, merely because it is a different market, when the milk is the same at its origin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the situation which exists at the present time. Under the blend price system, that situation exists at the present time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are three prices now, in a sense. So far as the consumer is concerned, there is the fluid milk price, the blend milk price, and the manufacturing milk price.

This proposal would clarify the situation, by providing only two prices. Milk used for fluid purposes would be sold at the fluid milk price, and milk used for manufacturing purposes would be sold at the manufacturing milk price.

The reason why the situation cannot be made airtight, which I feel would completely satisfy the Senator from Illinois, is that we do not have a situation, and we are unlikely to have a situation, in which the farmers will produce precisely the amount of milk needed for fluid purposes and no more. There will always be some excess.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There could be one price, a blend price to apply to all milk going into manufacturing and into the fluid milk market—not three prices; not two prices; but one price.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If we provided that kind of situation, there would be some unfairness to the farmers who have spent all their money, made large investments, and so forth, to produce class I milk.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The farmer who could not meet the class I standards would be compelled to accept a lower price.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That would be quite complicated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope the Senator from Illinois understands that under the marketing agreement certain sanitation requirements must be met by the farmer, in order that he may receive the minimum price fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture. The cost of producing that milk, as the Senator from Wisconsin stated, is much greater than the cost of producing milk for manufacturing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to labor this point unduly, but I am talking about milk of identical quality, a part of which goes into the fluid milk market and receives not far from 30 percent more than the part of identical milk which goes into the manufacturing milk market. I speak of milk of identical quality.

I say that under this system the city consumers of milk are being forced to pay an excessive price and are being compelled to carry on their back, if I may mix my metaphors, the lower prices paid by the producers of butter and cheese.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not have the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that this kind of situation is not confined to milk, but occurs naturally in other fields involving highly perishable commodities?

In the field of producing tomatoes, for instance, only tomatoes which can be taken to the fresh vegetable market—which are no better than the others which go into juice and into canneries—sell for a better price. They sell for a better price because they are used for a purpose which the housewife considers to be a superior purpose. But the tomatoes are not any better. The tomatoes which are put into juice or into cans are no poorer in quality, no less edible, as tomatoes, than those which go to the fresh vegetable channel. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us consider the field of strawberries. Many strawberries are produced in my State.

The producers have found it highly desirable, because of a better price structure, to sell as many strawberries as possible to those who consume fresh strawberries. If a huge production were rushed into the trade at any fixed time that would be likely to cut down the price of all, so the strawberry producers carefully limit their sales in the fresh strawberry trade to those the market can take at a good price. They know they will not receive the same price for identical strawberries sent for various kinds of processing.

Is there anything illegal, unfair, or inequitable about that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. I believe the answer is apparent to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is the outstanding economist in the Congress today. I believe it is apparent.

That is what happens. Any producer has to produce for a market. He can expect, to the extent that he produces for that market, to get the market price. When he produces in excess of what the market will buy he can expect a lower price, and he must be willing to accept it.

If there were a uniform blend price for all milk, including manufacturing milk, that would mean that there would be a vast overproduction. There would be no way of providing the discipline which the lower manufacturing price system uses to discourage farmers from producing more than is needed.

At the present time there is an overproduction. If there were a blend price of say $4 a hundred, we would face many headaches in terms of overproduction, which would be enormous.

Furthermore, there would be difficulties because of the fact that some States have set up barriers to the free flow of milk, and insist on them. This would complicate the situation. That is the great advantage of trying to price the product on the basis of the market and what the market will pay and what can be sold on the market. That is the reason why we run into conflict with the position of the Senator from Illinois. The difficulty is that we cannot have it both ways. The price cannot be based on the cost to the producer and on the market. This bill places the price of the milk on the basis of what the market will pay for it, and not on the costs of the producer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the point. The Senator would hold up the city consumers for the higher price.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, does the city consumer have to pay any more for fresh milk than I have to pay in the small town where I live, or the Senator from Wisconsin has to pay where he lives? Is not the difference in the form of the product which is offered and the use which the consumer is to make of it, rather than a question of penalizing the city or the village purchaser?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. Fluid milk price adjustments are made on the basis of the cost of trucks, changes in daily requirements, bottling schedules, as well as the fact that the farmer has to have more expensive equipment and a bigger investment to produce the higher class milk.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. How much does the Senator from Wisconsin estimate enactment of the bill would increase dairy farm income?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Department of Agriculture made an estimate, which I think was a very conservative one. It made an estimate for 1 year. In subsequent years I believe the increase in dairy farm income would be much greater. It was estimated the net income would be increased by $7 million.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is absolutely correct, but I believe it would cost more than $7 million to provide the machinery for putting the law into effect.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No machinery is required.

Mr. AIKEN. Only States that have marketing orders will share in the $7 million increase; and that would not include States like Georgia, California, and other States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have an editorial from Hoard's Dairyman in Wisconsin, which does a beautiful job of answering that allegation. The less excess milk produced in a marketing area, the less competition for farmers producing manufacturing milk. Farmers who produce manufacturing milk would have a better price. That is where the increase in the farmer's income will come from. It may be that the increase in the price to the dairy farmer will result from a higher price for cheese or ice cream. The Senator from Vermont will agree that a more equitable adjustment will be achieved, especially since the income of the farmer is too low.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The spread between the consumer and the farmer has been increasing practically every year, but I am also aware of the fact that production of milk has dropped for 9 consecutive months. Production of butter has dropped 90 to 100 million pounds in 10 months. The production of cheese goes on the market as fast as it is ready; this reflects the fact that milk consumption is increasing at the same time production is going down.

The whole situation in dairying is much better. People tell me if they can only be left alone in the next few years, without having more legislation inflicted on them, they will reach a balance between supply and demand.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Vermont is the outstanding expert on this question.

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Statistics may show that, but the dairy farmer has been waiting for a long time for a balance between demand and supply. Meanwhile, his income has dropped from 10 years ago, and all his costs have risen drastically. It will cost taxpayers $450 million for dairy supports this year, a great improvement over last year, but many people in the administration feel this is at least $100 million too much.

This measure would go a small way toward solving the serious problems of overproduction that most people believe have plagued us over the years. The farmers do not have to have this program unless they want it. It will not interfere with farmers in order areas if they do not want it.

Mr. AIKEN. The price of butter on October 1 was 4 cents a pound higher than it was a year ago.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then it dropped 2 cents.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, it dropped 2 cents. I did not want to bring that up.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Vermont's sentimental attachment to the cow, and I well understand the passionate affection he has for the cow so that anything that diminishes the demand for the products of the cow is viewed by him as something of a calamity. But may I point out that the decrease in consumption of milk is principally due to two factors.

In the first place, doctors have informed the public, correctly or incorrectly, about the dangers of cholesterol and the part which butterfats play in the stoppage of blood vessels, and therefore the effect which they have in stimulating strokes, heart attacks, and the like. I note that the dairy industry does not like that information. I have heard the Senator from Wisconsin make very strong speeches deprecating the emphasis on excess cholesterol, but that factor undoubtedly has played a part in the diminished consumption of butter, cream, ice cream, and so forth. Therefore, it has caused the price of the product to fall.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois is correct in his description of the effect on the public mind. Let me also point out that the American Medical Association has said there is no basis whatsoever for the assertion that dairy products cause excess cholesterol and heart disease or strokes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator take the word of the American Medical Association on these matters?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do indeed give great weight to the word of the American Medical Association in matters affecting medicine.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator should be very careful before he does that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. My father was a doctor. I think it is an excellent association. He was a member of the American Medical Association, and very proud of it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The second point is that it is now possible to manufacture oleomargarine without paying the former punitive tax, and as a result people are getting more of their fats from vegetable fats rather than animal fats. I think this is to the good. Is the Senator going to say that, innately, butter is superior to oleomargarine?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In Wisconsin one has to consume a piece of cheese with every piece of pie, and it is almost a sin to use oleomargarine; but we use oleomargarine in Chicago. We like it. Physiologists and food chemists tell us it is as good as butter. So I say to my good friends from Wisconsin and Vermont—and they are my good friends—do not fight against progress. Do not, with your affection for the cow, bar the American consumers from protecting themselves from heart attacks, paralytic strokes, and getting the equivalent in nutrients and vitamins from vegetable oils rather than from butterfat.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the second reference in 5 minutes by the Senator from Illinois to the affection of the Senator from Vermont for a cow. I am reminded of an incident that happened long ago when a tourist, possibly from Chicago, was traveling through my State. He stopped and talked to a farmer, and asked the farmer, "Is it true that Vermont has more cows than people?" The farmer said, "Yes. The census shows that." The tourist said, "Why do you have more cows than people?" The answer was, "We like cows." [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that statement bears out what I said—that the Senator from Vermont prefers cows to people.

Mr. AIKEN. No. We welcome people, too, but we do have affection for our cows.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is not going to cow me by that bull.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President——

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it seems to me this might be a proper place to ask a few questions, or does the Senator prefer that I not interrupt his prepared statement?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is quite all right.

Mr. BIBLE. A number of Nevada farmers have indicated they have some questions about the pending legislation. I know that the Senator in charge of the bill will be able to answer these questions. I received a letter from the Nevada Farm Bureau.

The letter points out, first, that if the proposed legislation is adopted, the dairy producers will be under complete regulation for the first time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is absolutely incorrect. They would not be under any more regulation than they are at the present time. Regulation would not be affected. All that would be affected would be distribution of the milk revenues in order areas so far as the farmers are concerned. At the present time they receive a blend or average price, made up of the amount that goes for fluid purposes and the amount that goes for manufacturing purposes.

Under the proposed legislation they would receive one price, representing the fluid price for that which goes into fluid consumption, and the manufacturing price for their excess production. This would, if approved in a referendum, discourage farmers from producing excess milk, particularly in the Chicago and New York areas, where the surplus production is concentrated. However, they can produce as much or as little as they wish, and they can add cows or cut back on cows, as they wish. No regulation is involved.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. President, I yield to the majority leader at this time, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request. It appears that debate on the Proxmire bill will require some time this afternoon. It is my understanding also that two or three further amendments will be offered, but they cannot be brought up until tomorrow.

Therefore, at this time, having tried to touch all bases on both sides—and perhaps not being too successful in doing so—I wish to propound the following unanimous-consent request:

That beginning with the convening of the Senate tomorrow there be a time allocation of 1 hour on each amendment and 1 hour on the bill, with the usual procedures and conditions in effect.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Mr. McCARTHY. Does that apply to amendments which have been submitted or that may be brought up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. To all amendments.

Mr. HOLLAND. With the customary provision relating to germaneness?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have so stated.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the time on the bill be made 2 hours?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I amend my request to provide for 2 hours of debate on the bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. May it be understood that the proponent of the amendment will control half of the time, and the Senator designated by the majority leader will control the other half?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the usual procedure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the usual procedure is that the proponent of the amendment controls half the time, and the Senator in charge of the bill controls the other half, if he is opposed to the amendment; otherwise another Senator controls that half of the time. Usually it is assumed that the committee is opposed to amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The majority leader controls half the time. I ask that the time for debate on the bill be made 2 hours.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Wisconsin indicate that he will oppose every amendment that will be offered?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, indeed.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective upon the convening of the Senate on Thursday, October 10, 1963, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to add something to my answer to the Senator from Nevada. There is a very small, limited requirement in the bill that has not been in effect before. The order may provide for reports to be kept. The bill provides:

> The order may provide for such reports and the keeping of such books and records by producers and by the person or persons to whom he may dispose of milk as the Secretary may prescribe and upon request of the Secretary such person or persons shall make required records available for inspection.

That means that if a farmer is in a marketing order that votes for the two-price system—and only if it votes for it—if the order further requires that records be kept, the farmer may have to keep records. It would not affect the whole industry, however.

Mr. BIBLE. As to those producers within a marketing area, if I understand the Senator from Wisconsin, if the producers within the area vote to come under the provision of the law, the Secretary of Agriculture may then prescribe rules for keeping books and records. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. Do I further understand that the Secretary can also prescribe penalties for noncompliance?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are no penalties in the bill. He cannot provide penalties.

Mr. BIBLE. What happens if the producer does not keep books and records?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are no penalties imposed on the farmer if he fails to do so. There may be other ways of obtaining enforcement, as through specific enforcement or injunction, but there are no penalties. We believe the provisions of the bill would work without providing any penalty, without imposing any fine or imprisonment, because of the manner in which the marketing orders have been operating to date. Obviously, if there is so little discipline under the system that farmers refuse to cooperate in something in which they believe, the system would break down, and the next year there would not be this kind of system. There is no penalty provided in the bill. Some people may feel that this is a liability. We feel it is desirable that we at least try it for a year without a penalty being imposed.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator's answer is that there is no penalty; that would carry with it the additional statement, I am sure, that the Secretary is not authorized within his own discretionary power to impose any kind of penalty. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. Of course it might be difficult to determine a producer's allotment if he kept no records as to his production or sales in various markets.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe only 3 percent of the milk is produced under marketing orders. Let us assume that two-thirds of the producers voted to come under the terms of the Senator's bill. If someone in that group violated it, it would seem to me that the penalty would really operate within the marketing order itself, in that some action would have to be taken. He could not continue to receive the premium price for fluid milk, and be treated the same as everyone else with respect to the remainder.

Mr. PROXMIRE. His failure to keep records might make it very difficult to determine what his rights were. That is just a practical problem.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is concerned with keeping records. Suppose the producer produced more?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would be difficult to determine his rights, if he would not show what the facts were.

Mr. BIBLE. The answer would have to be that the bill would be self-policing. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. The only restriction is with respect to keeping records. However, the overwhelming majority of farmers keep records. They must keep records if they wish to stay in business. Therefore enforcement provisions are not necessary because virtually all farmers keep records.

Mr. BIBLE. This would apply only to a marketing area and when and if people within the marketing area by a two-thirds vote agreed to accept it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. I believe what the Senator has said would be helpful in answering the Nevada State Farm Bureau.

I should like to ask one further question, and I would appreciate the Senator's thoughts on it. The Nevada State Farm Bureau states:

> We are also worried about the provisions in the bill to give the Secretary of Agriculture a great deal of decision-making authority. He has the power to set support prices from 0 to 90 percent of parity.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is not a provision in the pending bill. That was in the Ellender bill, and that bill is not before the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. As I understand, the range is from 75 to 90 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. That remains unchanged in the present bill, as compared with previous legislation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the assistance of the able Senator from Wisconsin. I am sure this information will be helpful in answering my friend in the Nevada State Farm Bureau.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

In effect, the proposed amendment, in providing for a two price plan, would permit an individual producer to receive a good price for his proportionate share of the milk used for fluid consumption, and a separate, but lower price for all other milk delivered into the market.

This would be a desirable change for several reasons. First, it would tend to retard excess production, since individual farmers would no longer be required to increase production in order to maintain their income in the face of the constantly decreasing blend price, and might well find it to their advantage to decrease production.

Second, it would permit each individual farmer to produce at an economic level. With the pressure for increased production alleviated by this legislation, an individual farmer could pattern and adjust his production level to his individual needs, rather than being compelled by the actions of others to increase his production.

And third, one farmer's production would in no way affect the price and income received by another farmer.

At present, if other farmers who are under the marketing order increase their production, the price goes down. But in this proposal S. 1915, the farmer would not have to plead that he had to increase production in order to keep up with other farmers. Under the blend pricing system an individual farmer has little or no control over either the blend price he receives for his milk or his total income. Management decisions to increase production by others direct any individual farmer's effort. In order to maintain his income he must increase production as the price decreases.

Under the proposed legislation, however, any producer can control his own price and income. This is so because his allotment guarantees a high price for a specified quantity. Then to attain his income and economic objective he produces only that amount which maximized his returns. Other producers can adjust either upward or downward to suit their particular levels, but they will in no way affect any other producer's effort.

EXAMPLE OF HOW BILL WORKS

An example can best demonstrate the weaknesses of the present system and how this bill will stop the increases in dairy production.

Assume a farmer's herd produces and he markets through the marketing order 200,000 pounds of milk in a particular year. Assume that half of this milk—as in the New York-New Jersey area—goes into fluid or class I purposes and half goes into excess or manufacturing purposes. Assume further for simplicity purposes that the price for fluid milk is $5 per hundred and the price for manufacturing milk is $3 per hundred. Assume finally that the farmer has a base of fluid milk of half his production or 100,000 pounds.

Under both the present administration of the law and the proposed bill the farmer would receive $8,000 for the milk he marketed; that is, 200,000 pounds multiplied by $4. Under the present law he would receive a $4 blend price for each hundredweight he marketed. But under the proposed bill he would receive $5 per hundred for his first 100,000 pounds or base and only $3 a hundred or $3,000 for the second hundred thousand he marketed.

The incentive to reduce production and especially the incentive not to increase production shows up sharply when we see what happens under the present law and the proposed bill if the farmer decides to change the amount of his production.

Under the present law if the farmer cuts back production by 10,000 pounds—or about one cow—he loses the blend price or $400 in receipts. Under the proposed bill if he cuts back production 10,000 pounds he loses the class III or manufacturing price of only $300. Hence there is a significantly larger incentive under the bill for the dairy farmer to reduce his production.

SHARPLY DISCOURAGES INCREASED PRODUCTION

The incentive is likely to work even more sharply for the farmer contemplating an increase in production. Under the present law, if the farmer increases his production he receives the blend price of $4 per hundred or $400. But under the proposed bill if he increased production by 10,000 pounds he would receive only $300. He would not get $400; he would get only $300.

The reason this proposed legislation is likely to be so decisive in discouraging additional production is because the overwhelming majority of farmers throughout the Nation cannot cover their costs at $3 per hundred; and they know it.

The result is that the vast amount of farmers who take out pencil and paper to decide whether or not to add another cow and an additional 6,000 or 8,000 pounds of annual production to their herd will find that the addition will cost them money if the additional production only brings them the manufacturing price—in this case $3—and not the blend price—in this case $4.

PRESENT NATIONAL COST OF EXCESS PRODUCTION

Much of the evidence concerning the need for dairy legislation relates to excess production and the cost of the program to the Federal Government. It is true that production in the past few years, as well as now, is in excess of market needs.

During the marketing year 1961–62 the Federal Government was required to purchase 10.6 billion pounds of milk, on an equivalent milkfat basis, produced in excess of our needs. Last year the Department of Agriculture was required to purchase 8.9 billion pounds, and the estimates are that this year the Government will be required to purchase 8.8 billion pounds in excess of needs. The Government would be required to purchase 8.8 billion pounds because of an overproduction of milk on our farms.

IMMEDIATE COST SAVING

If this bill is enacted the Department of Agriculture estimates that production will be cut by about 600 million pounds and that there will be a net savings to the Government of approximately $26 million in the first year. That is a conservative estimate because it is based upon the assumption that it will require longer than a year for the marketing order areas to take advantage of the law and for the law to become fully effective. If we had asked for an estimate over a longer period, I think the result would have been quite different.

LONG-TERM SAVINGS FAR GREATER

In the subsequent years the savings on a cumulative basis will be substantial. This is another very desirable feature of the bill; that is, the feature of gradualism. There will be no sharp adjustment which could have a tremendous adverse economic and market impact on the entire dairy industry, to say nothing of consumer interests. It might also be well to point out here that consumer interests are fully protected under the law, and that any reductions in production would create absolutely no upward pressure on consumer prices. All we are doing here in this regard is to reduce the cost to the Government and save the taxpayers money.

It is also true that the income of dairy producers is pitifully small. For example, the Department of Agriculture reports that the average return per hour earned by milk producers on grade B, eastern Wisconsin farms in 1961 amounted to only 34 cents per hour. In 1960, this average return amounted to only 11 cents.

That is what these farmers earn, although they have greatly increased their efficiency and their investment. In 1961, they earned 34 cents an hour, and only 11 cents an hour in 1960. The income of these farmers is held down because of the excess production encouraged by the blend price in order areas. Anything we can do to cut down on excess milk production will be a step forward toward improving incomes of these producers.

The most important single point about this bill is that it corrects what many consider to be an obvious paradox, which has resulted from the way the law has been administered by the Department of Agriculture. Under the Department's interpretation that the establishment of a uniform blend price is required in all cases, farmers are compelled to produce more and more, and yet every pound of milk delivered into the market in excess of market needs causes a lower price, or causes the Federal Government to step in and buy more milk with the taxpayers' money. This is in spite of the fact that the principal purpose of the law was to assure that farmers would receive a good price for milk; a price which would approach the parity price for milk.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and its predecessors, the Agricultural Adjustment Acts of 1935 and 1933, insofar as these acts are related to milk, actually grew out of the needs of milk producers for assistance in achieving and maintaining some degree of bargaining power over the prices they received for milk.

The characteristics of milk itself contributed to producers' bargaining difficulties. Because of its bulky and perishable nature, milk must be moved promptly to market. Because milk is produced every day of the year, farmers necessarily must continue shipping it to market, even when market prices are not satisfactory.

Further, the production of milk varies widely with the seasons, and the demand varies from day to day. Because of its perishable nature, milk cannot be stored to balance the peaks and valleys of supply. The industry, therefore, is compelled to produce a reserve to make sure that the supply will be sufficient at all times. Milk which is not needed for fluid use is manufactured into dairy products.

HISTORICAL PROBLEM

As early as 1910, producers in a number of markets had banded together into cooperative associations for the purpose of gaining bargaining power over prices for their milk. Impetus was given to the cooperative movement by the Clayton Act of 1914 and by the Capper-Volstead Act of the early 1920's, and producers concentrated on solving their problems through cooperative efforts.

During the early years, the cooperative associations attempted to bargain with milk dealers, or handlers, for a flat price for all milk, regardless of use. However, the pressure of reserve supplies, normal to the fluid milk industry, led to a breakdown of the flat price plan. Some handlers refused to take this excess milk from producers at the flat price, because it had a lower value when converted to manufacturing uses. Handlers with excess milk attempted to dispose of it by increasing consumer sales. Such handlers would offer fluid milk to all or some of their customers at prices lower than those of competitors. Then they would lower the flat price paid to producers to recover any loss on such reduced prices.

In an effort to promote stability in milk markets, cooperatives next developed the classified price system. This system was in effect in a number of the largest markets in the country by about 1920. Along with the classified price plan, various pooling arrangements were used.

Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] were here just now. I hope he will have an opportunity to read these remarks because I believe they constitute a more detailed historical answer to his question about why there is a price difference between fluid milk and manufacturing milk—particularly fluid milk which is used for manufacturing purposes.

These cooperative-sponsored price plans succeeded, or failed, according to the extent to which producers were able to organize the supply of milk under control of the cooperatives. General economic conditions were also influential factors. During the 1920's industrial activity in the cities was at a high level; cooperatives attempted to include in their membership all of the producers in the market, and the voluntary plans of the cooperatives were relatively successful.

But there were advantages in remaining outside of these pricing arrangements. Some producers and handlers could not be persuaded to join the marketwide programs. When the economic depression of the early 1930's struck, the voluntary plans failed to maintain satisfactory prices.

In the early 1930's, Congress authorized emergency aid programs for many segments of the economy. Such programs also were undertaken to assist milk producers. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, a program of licenses was developed. All milk dealers in a given market were required to pay producers on a classified price basis, and to pool the returns to farmers either on a handler or marketwide basis. Later, the act of 1935 provided for marketing orders instead of licenses.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, under which marketing orders are regulated today, is largely a restatement of the provisions relating to marketing agreements of the act of 1935.

BASIC LAW NEVER AMENDED

It might be well to point out that the substantive provisions of this act as they relate to milk marketing agreements have not been amended since the act was passed. This is the first time that the Senate will consider a substantive amendment to that act.

A detailed analysis of the bill is set out at page 8 of the committee report, and I will discuss here only its principal provisions. The bill provides for apportioning sales in the highest use classification or classifications, plus necessary reserves, among producers on the basis of their deliveries during a representative period, with due allowance for abnormal conditions, hardship cases, and producers who operated during only part of the representative period. Producers who delivered milk, but not under the order, at the time the allotment provisions became effective, would receive allotments on the same basis as those who were at that time delivering under the order. The allotment provisions would therefore not be a barrier to the movement of milk from any part of the country into the order market; and any milk producer anywhere in the country could market his milk under the order on the same basis, insofar as the allotment provisions are concerned, as any other producer. Producers who did not market their milk in the order area prior to the date of the order would, however, continue to be subject to any provisions which might be included in the order under existing section 8c(5)(D). Under that section a producer who was not regularly delivering milk to the regulated market prior to the effective date of the order may be required to take the lowest class price for the first 2 to 3 months after he begins delivering to the regulated market.

In other words, Mr. President, we were very anxious to provide in this bill that no barriers would be erected. One of the objections made to that—by those who, I believe, have not read the bill very carefully or studied the committee report or the hearings—was that the bill might constitute a basis for erecting barriers against the flow of milk. We were very careful to make sure that the bill would not do that. I was particularly careful, because those concerned in both Wisconsin and Minnesota—Republicans and Democrats, alike—have fought extremely hard against the barriers that interrupt and interfere with the free flow of milk, because such barriers cost our producers a great deal and are, we believe, inequitable and unfair.

ENTRY OF NEW PRODUCERS PROVIDED FOR

Equitable provision is made for new producers entering production after the effective date of the allotment provision. Allotments may be transferred only if the Secretary deems such action in the best interests of the public, existing producers, and prospective new producers. Allotments may be adjusted from time to time.

Producers would receive the lowest class price for milk delivered in excess of their allotments. The remainder of the amounts required to be paid by handlers into the pool would be distributed to producers pro rata on the basis of their allotments. Thus for his allotment milk the producer would receive his share of the amount required to be paid for milk needed for fluid use, plus adequate reserves, and for his excess milk he would receive the lowest class price.

In order to prevent a producer from delivering his allotment milk to the regulated market at the higher price provided therefor, and then dumping his excess milk on markets normally supplied by other producers, the order may provide for reducing allotments or payments from the pool in such cases.

The order provisions provided for by the bill must be separately approved by producers to become effective, and may be separately terminated. Thus they may be disapproved or terminated without affecting the remainder of the order.

The remaining provisions of the bill provide for reports and records, review of allotments, and matters of a technical or clarifying nature.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate an editorial supporting this bill. The editorial was published in one of the oldest and most widely circulated and highly regarded dairy publications in the Nation—Hoard's Dairyman, which is published in Fort Atkinson, Wis. A very good friend of mine who, I believe, supports the bill and is a very astute student of dairy economics and of the dairy farmers' problem, has argued that the bill would not do much for the manufacturing milk producer who is in a market order area and does not produce milk for fluid purposes. I believe that is wrong. An overwhelming majority of the farmers in Wisconsin produce milk for that purpose.

Let me read the brief editorial from Hoard's Dairyman which I believe answers the charge that the bill would help only the relatively small number of farmers—who, incidentally, produce half the milk in this country—who produce milk under marketing orders:

> It is well known that we have supported strongly a class I base program. The opposition recently has argued that manufacturing milk producers would not benefit; in fact, would be discriminated against. Others have said that even Federal milk order producers would take a decrease in net income. Here, specifically, are the arguments:
>
> National Creameries: "The bill has nothing in it which will alleviate the depressed conditions of manufacturing milk producers."
>
> Farmers Union: "It discriminates against manufacturing milk producers * * * offers little incentive to curtail production in order areas."
>
> We, of course, would not support the bill if we were not convinced that manufacturing milk dairymen would benefit. And, we contend, the record is overwhelmingly on the side of class I bases. There are several markets in the United States where cooperatives have been strong enough to make a class I base program work outside the existing Federal milk order.
>
> We selected six of these markets, those with which we are familiar, and averaged their performance. These markets balance supply and demand to an 85 percent class I utilization. In contrast, all Federal order markets had only 61 percent class I utilization last year.
>
> What does this mean to manufacturing milk dairymen? Simply this: If all milk orders had 85 percent class I use, there would have been 14½ billion pounds less milk dumped from Federal orders on the manufacturing milk market. Recall that Government surplus purchases last year were about 10 billion pounds.

In other words, what they are saying is that on the basis of the experiments which a number of cooperatives have made—including, incidentally, one in Milwaukee—it has been found that they are so able to manage their market that 85 percent of the milk produced for them goes into fluid uses. If that provision could be applied nationally in other marketing orders, there would be a reduction in production of 14½ billion pounds of milk, which would be not only good for the manufacturing farmer but also good for the taxpayer.

I continue to read from the editorial:

> We contend that this "dumped milk" was produced at a fictitious price because farmers produced for the blend and not the manufacturing price, which the extra milk was really worth. And the people who were really hurt were manufacturing milk producers. Were it not for the dumped milk, manufacturing milk prices would be a great deal higher than they are today.
>
> But, says another critic, farmers would have to cut back production in order markets, take a loss in net income.
>
> American Farm Bureau: "If the farm price for fluid uses remains unchanged, the average farmer's gross income would drop when he cut his milk production. His fixed costs of production would continue whether or not he produced excess milk. This would cause a decline in his net income."
>
> What happened in the six markets using class I bases? In July, the average producer shipped 13.4 percent more milk. At the same price, his gross income would be 13.4 percent higher * * * and his net, obviously, even greater.
>
> How does this come about? Simply because farmers retire and go out of business in class I markets, too. In these markets, 7.9 percent of the dairymen retired or sold out and the dairymen who remained picked up their class I bases. Or, a new dairyman could get the base just as easily as one already on the market.
>
> We do not contend that passage of the class I base bill and its use will immediately put dairymen in Utopia. But we do agree with those dairymen who have used and are using class I bases (Hoard's Dairyman round table, Jan. 10, 1963). This marketing procedure benefits all dairy farmers. Given an opportunity to work, we can look to the future with confidence as well as hope.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 25, it is proposed to strike the period following the word "effective" and insert ": *Provided*, That if any dairy farm of such a dairy farmer has been transferred to another person and no allocation based on deliveries from such farm has been issued when milk is first delivered therefrom as producer milk under the order, such transferee then operating the farm shall be provided any allocation for which the said dairy farmer would otherwise have been eligible based on deliveries from such farm."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to clarify the clear intent of the bill, not only on the part of the author, but all members of the committee, and I believe probably also the opponents of the bill. The bill would probably be interpreted by the Secretary of Agriculture in the way expressed in the amendment anyway. The amendment will make it clear.

The bill provides that a farmer producing milk anywhere on the date an allotment provision is incorporated in an order can obtain an allotment at any time that he begins delivering milk under the order. He might begin shipping milk to the order market a year after the order becomes effective, but he is still entitled to an allotment on the same basis as if he had been delivering to the order market on the day the order became effective.

The amendment provides that when such a farmer sells his farm to another farmer without having availed himself of this right, his successor in interest will have the same right to an allotment, if he should decide to ship to the order market. The farmer who buys the farm then will not be left without an allotment, but will have the same right to an allotment as his transferor. Otherwise, the value of the farm might fall drastically. At least it would drop very sharply if a farmer could not sell his farm as a dairy unit, particularly if the farm was organized to produce and sell milk for fluid purposes.

The necessary equipment is very expensive. The only basis on which a farmer might recover his investment would be if he could sell the farm to another farmer who might wish to sell milk in the marketing order area.

The amendment provides that a farmer buying such a farm would have the same opportunity to obtain an allotment and sell his milk under any marketing order that his seller would have had as a producer of milk on the date the order became effective.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. If Mr. X bought a farm from Mr. Y, would Mr. X continue to have the same allotment that Mr. Y had or would he receive a new allotment? Would the determination be within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator presents a case in which X would not have had an allotment before?

Mr. KEATING. I am assuming that Mr. X buys the farm from Mr. Y, who has an allotment. Does Mr. X get the allotment which Mr. Y had, or is Mr. X in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture as to what allotment he shall have?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amendment relates only to the case in which Y did not have an allotment, but had a history which would entitle him to an allotment if he should begin shipping to the order market. The problem would arise only if the farm were sold after an order providing for allotments had become effective. There might be a period of a few days or a week or a year after the order became effective before a producer might decide to ship to the order market, and assert his right to an allotment. He might well never ship to that market. In the meanwhile, if the farm were sold, the buyer would have no history at all. The man from whom the farm was bought and who would have a history would normally expect to have an allotment. Then the history would be transferred. That would be the effect of that particular sale. The history would be transferred. The new owner could obtain an allotment if he decided to ship to the order market.

Mr. KEATING. Would the transfer of history apply only before allotments had been made?

Mr. PROXMIRE. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. KEATING. Would the transfer of history apply only before allotments had been made?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. If the seller of the farm obtained an allotment on the basis of his history, the purchaser could not also obtain an allotment on the basis of the same history. The Secretary might permit the transfer of the allotment, but there would not be two allotments on the basis of the same history.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the amendment of the Senator would not in any way deal with the problem of Mr. X, a new man going into the dairy business, and buying a farm from a man who previously had an allotment. Mr. X would not acquire that allotment when he bought the farm.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. Under the bill there is authority for the Secretary to transfer allotments in such cases. The ambiguity arose when the farmer had history entitling him to an allotment, but the allotment had not been made. But the bill is very clear that if farmer X should buy from farmer Y, and farmer Y had an allotment, the Secretary would have authority to provide for the transfer of the allotment under such circumstances, and for the sale to the new man.

Mr. KEATING. I understand that he has such authority, but has he not also the authority to fix a new allotment? Can he not do either one of two things—transfer the existing allotment or give the purchaser a new allotment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, yes.

Mr. KEATING. So the prospective purchaser would be left at the mercy of the Secretary of Agriculture, who would determine whether he would get the allotment that the former owner of the farm had or would get a new allotment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. Any Secretary of Agriculture—Benson, Freeman, or any other Secretary—it seems to me, would be very likely to issue regulations which would enable the Department to administer the program on the basis of history. That would be the fair and equitable way. It would be inconceivable that a Secretary would arbitrarily discriminate against a new buyer and prevent him from getting the full value of his farm by giving him a tiny allotment that was not in proportion to the allotment which the seller had.

Mr. KEATING. I would hope that the Senator is correct in his appraisal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course, that has nothing to do with the amendment which I have offered. It concerns the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Some of the misapprehension which has been voiced to me about the bill arises from the provision which would give the Secretary of Agriculture discretion as to the amount of allotment which the purchaser shall have.

I was wondering why it was not provided that when a farm is sold the allotment shall go with it, without giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to change the allotment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is quite possible that the new owner might not want the allotment. That happens with respect to many farms. In many cases a farmer sells a farm and the buyer—who perhaps is his son—has a factory job he wants to hold, and therefore wishes to go into handling beef cattle and does not wish to do much farm work, or wishes to get out of dairying and do something else with the land. The seller may have moved his cows to an adjoining farm and be continuing in the dairy business. Under those circumstances any automatic transfer would be unfortunate and unnecessary.

Mr. KEATING. I can appreciate that; but if the buyer continues dairying I think it would be better to provide that he would have the same allotment as the man who sold him the farm. I understand that the amendment which the Senator has offered relates only to the period of time before an allotment has been made.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The difficulties and complications were so many that the committee felt that the decision should be left to the Secretary of Agriculture. A farmer might sell his cows to one person, as often happens, at an auction, and sell the farm to somebody else. The farmer might sell some of his cows to one farmer and some to someone else. It is a difficult and complicated situation to attempt to cope with by a fixed and rigid law.

It seems that any Secretary of Agriculture—certainly those about whom I know anything—does his best to administer programs honestly and fairly, particularly in view of the fact that the dairy farms ordinarily are small units. This does not involve big operators. A big operator would still be a tiny factor in the total picture.

Mr. KEATING. In any event, the amendment does not relate to the transfer of allotments, but relates to the transfer of a farm before an allotment has been granted, or to what the Senator has described as a transfer of history.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Is it the Senator's intention to attempt to dispose of the amendment this evening?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to do so. I know of no Senator who would object to it. In my judgment, it is really a technical correction. If there is any objection, of course I shall be happy to hold it over. It involves no inconvenience to hold it over until tomorrow. There will be a session on the bill tomorrow, anyway, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. KEATING. Has the Senator cleared this amendment with the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. I shall be happy to hold it over. I believe the Senator from Vermont will approve it, but if it is considered sufficiently significant it can be held over.

Mr. KEATING. I am informed that the Senator from Vermont is at the White House now attending some conference. I know nothing about his position. On his behalf I believe I should request that the Senator hold it over until tomorrow.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is satisfactory.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, for months the Senate Committee on Agriculture has had dairy legislation under consideration.

A number of bills were introduced early in the session. Among them was S. 398, a bill introduced by me, which provided for a class I base plan, and in addition, proposed price supports for manufacturing milk and butterfat at from 0 to 90 percent of parity.

Hearings were held on all bills. Subsequently, a compromise bill was developed. Hearings were again held, this time on the compromise plan and S. 1317.

The results of this continuing effort is S. 1915, a bill introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. This bill provides for inclusion in milk marketing orders of a provision under which each producer will be allotted his proper share of the market for milk needed for fluid use, including necessary reserves. Then, for milk delivered by the producer in excess of his allotment, he would receive only the surplus use price, that is the lowest class price. The remainder of the amount required to be paid by handlers for milk purchased by them would be divided pro rata among producers upon the basis of their allotments, subject, of course, to adjustments for quality, location, and certain other factors.

I might add, that in my opinion, the Secretary already has this authority, although past departmental opinions have questioned it.

Under milk marketing orders handlers are required to pay different minimum prices for milk depending on the use to which they put the milk. Handlers' payments are pooled and producers are then paid a uniform price, subject to certain adjustments.

Section 8c(5)(B)(d) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides that such uniform price shall be subject to adjustment "equitably to apportion the total value of the milk purchased by any handler, or by all handlers, among producers and associations of producers, on the basis of their marketings of milk during a representative period of time." While this provides for an adjustment in the uniform price, the adjustment is one which would equitably "apportion the total value of the milk purchased."

I contend, and many others contend, that the law therefore provides, in effect, authority for apportionment of the total value of the milk on the basis of history. The main purpose of a marketing order is to assure the market of the amount needed for fluid consumption, plus necessary reserves, and to assure farmers a fair price for meeting those needs. The type of plan contemplated by the bill will contribute to carrying out this purpose.

Under the authority of section 8c(5)(B)(d) the Secretary has provided for so-called base-excess plans under which each producer receives a base amount, based on his marketings during a representative period; and the total value of the milk is then apportioned so that the producer receives a higher price for milk delivered by him within his base amount and a lower price for milk delivered in excess of his base.

The Department for many years has questioned whether this authority can be used to achieve the principal objective of the law, and suggested that it must be restricted to plans designed to minimize violent seasonal fluctuations in milk production. But, the language of section 8c(5)(B)(d) contains no reference to violent seasonal fluctuations and contains no suggestion that it is to be restricted to the elimination of such fluctuations.

The Department's question as to the broader use of this authority is based not so much on the law as on a statement in the committee reports, which is quoted in the committee report on S. 1915. The quoted language could not, and does not appear to have been intended to, limit the clear language of the law. It is discussed fully in the committee report on S. 1915; and I believe that the existing law now authorizes inclusion in marketing orders of the provisions contemplated by S. 1915.

The main purpose of the bill is to remove any doubt as to the Secretary's authority, to encourage him to use it, and to suggest some policies that might be followed.

If a plan along the lines provided by the bill were put into effect in a market, it would tend to retard the excess production of milk. The Department of Agriculture also reports that it will reduce Government costs slightly and improve farm income slightly. These are desirable features, and for these reasons I support the bill.

However, I feel compelled to state that this bill falls far short of correcting the fundamental problem facing the dairy industry. That problem, of course, results from a Government guaranteed price with a no restrictions whatsoever on production. Naturally under such favorable conditions, production has increased substantially, and the Government has to pay the price. By "Government", I mean the taxpayers of this Nation.

The dairy price support program has been one of the most costly programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. The realized losses by the Government on this program since its inception through May 31, 1963, exceed $2.7 billion. I realize that milk is an important commodity, and that these expenditures have represented only about 5 percent of the income received by milk producers; but this is still a very costly program.

While we usually speak of the dairy problem in terms of the surpluses of manufactured dairy products acquired under the dairy price support program, the milk marketing order program which started 30 years ago, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act certainly has been a contributing factor.

Federal orders were established to provide for the orderly marketing of fluid milk, geared to the market's needs. They were not designed to encourage the production of surplus milk. The important thing they were to accomplish was to permit the carrying of the small quantity of reserve supply which is so necessary to the efficient operation of a market without allowing this reserve supply to set the price for the whole market. The marketing orders accomplish this by providing a minimum price for fluid milk, commensurate with the higher cost of producing milk which will meet fluid milk quality requirements. They set a separate minimum price for the reserve supplies consistent with the manufacturing uses to which they are put. It was never intended that these pricing arrangements should be used to encourage the marketing of ever-increasing amounts of surplus milk.

The objective of the bill that I introduced last year and again this year is exactly what the objective of the act has always been, that is, to provide a good price for milk needed to meet fluid requirements, including the reserves necessary thereto; but my bill would have been mandatory. It would have required allotments whenever supplies were excessive. I believe that producers in Federal order markets would be better off under the provisions of my bill than they are at present or will be under the measure we are now considering. I believe a base plan of the type I suggested would have been an effective instrument in reducing surpluses, and as it did so, it would reward those dairy farmers who had reduced their production. There is no logic whatsoever in encouraging the production of $3 milk in an area where producers need $5 to $6 to cover the cost of producing milk.

However, it soon became apparent during the hearings that my bill was too severe for any serious consideration. There was too much active opposition to it by major segments of the industry. As a matter of fact, even after the Department of Agriculture proposed less stringent language it was still thought too severe by some.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that my bill was unacceptable.

In its place, however, we have a bill, S. 1915, which I believe will be helpful, over a period of years, in reducing production in market order areas. As a result we anticipate that there will be some savings to the taxpayer, and at the same time a slight increase in income to farmers.

I am a realist, therefore, I have given up hope on my bill. Instead, I support S. 1915, the measure now before the Senate, because it will accomplish some good.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hart in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

SEPARATION OF INTELLIGENCE AND OPERATIONAL FUNCTIONS IN THE CIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the assessment of intelligence and the carrying out of covert or paramilitary operational activities are two very different functions. These days we often hear the words "conflict of interest." But, if there was ever a conflict of interest, it is when the same group of men, first, collect intelligence and make an assessment of the intelligence they have collected and coordinated, and then, secondly, proceed to carry out an operation on the basis of the selfsame intelligence they have collected and assessed. The temptation to trim the intelligence or, at least, their assessment of it, to suit the operation is well nigh irresistible.

An excellent example of the tragic results that can result from the failure to separate the assessment of intelligence from operational activities was demonstrated at the Bay of Pigs 2½ years ago. If one result was drawn, if one lesson was learned, from that affair, it was that the responsibility for intelligence collection and assessment must be separated from the responsibility for carrying out operational activities.

I remember being among the small group of public officials who publicly took a stand prior to the Bay of Pigs, warning that an invasion would be unlikely of success since the majority of the Cuban people at that time favored the regime, a conclusion derived from my own visit to Cuba following my election in 1960 and a conclusion which I announced publicly after my return. After the Bay of Pigs, a board was set up and the general impression was that there would be drastic overhauls in our Central Intelligence Agency, including a separation of responsibility between those who gather and assess intelligence as opposed to those who carry out operational activities.

In fact, not only does the centralization of responsibility for the gathering and assessment of intelligence and the carrying out of subsequent operations rest under the same roof here in Washington, but the chiefs of station in the field appear to be carrying on these dual and conflicting responsibilities.

In this connection, too, we all recall President Kennedy's instruction to our Government personnel abroad on May 29, 1961, when he said that only the American Ambassador should be responsible for all American Government activities abroad. The President instructed that each Ambassador be fully informed about the activities of all agencies of the American Government in the country to which he is assigned. Yet, I must say that the Ambassador who is both completely at ease and fully informed about all the activities conducted by American Government people in the area of his assignment and aware of all the messages home is indeed a rare bird.

I fully realize that the Central Intelligence Agency is in general run and manned by remarkably brilliant, dedicated, and responsible individuals and that it has scored many successes. I also realize that, being an intelligence organization, the Central Intelligence Agency is in the defenseless position of being attacked for its public failures but unable to discuss freely its successes.

The question where there is doubt in my mind is whether the total number of successes outweigh the total number of failures; whether our American national interest in totality has been helped or hampered by the Central Intelligence Agency. And, when this determination is made, I believe we must separate the intelligence and assessment functions from the operational functions.

My own personal view is that a complete, fair assessment would show that the United States would have, on balance, gained greatly as the result of its intelligence collection and assessment activities. But I also believe that, on balance, the U.S. national interest may well have lost more than it has gained from its CIA operational activities, particularly if one takes into account the lives and the dollars that have been lost in the carrying out of these activities. And I believe that an objective appraisal will show that when decisions to carry out operational activities have gone sour, the reason for clouded judgments has simply been that the same group assesses the intelligence and then proceeds to carry out the operation.

Actually, in South Vietnam, where, as the public press has set forth, we have had an excellent and very able Central Intelligence Agency chief of station, we might find ourselves in a better position if there were a greater separation between collecting and assessing of intelligence on the one hand and the carrying out of the subsequent operations on the other. We might not then be playing quite the same role we now do where the United States is helping finance and arm the South Vietnam regime's special forces, which carry out the persecution, beating up, and abuse of political opponents. I do hope that, in order to improve our situation in South Vietnam and throughout the world, the administration will make more positive steps to separate the responsibilities for the gathering and assessment of intelligence from the carrying out of subsequent operational activities.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a well thought-out editorial from Tuesday's Washington Post illustrating the necessity of such a separation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR MAN IN SAIGON

The recall of the CIA chieftain in South Vietnam should not be an occasion for recrimination. It should be an occasion for some useful reconsideration of the general role of an intelligence agency in foreign affairs. Ambassador Lodge is reportedly concerned about the prevailing arrangement that makes the CIA both an intelligence-gathering organization and an operational agency in the field. Mr. Lodge is not alone in his concern.

In theory, within the CIA, the intelligence and operational activities are kept separate. In practice, the two functions cannot be kept apart so easily; experience has shown that agency operatives in the field have a tendency to use intelligence to support an operational decision. The result, too often, is that Washington receives neither impartial intelligence nor benefits from operations based on a hard-headed perception of reality.

Clearly the CIA is at a disadvantage in any public debate of its activities; the agency cannot speak for itself. Success often goes unnoticed; failure just as often may lead to an exaggeration of the CIA's responsibility. This is the price that secrecy exacts. But public concern in the agency's performance is legitimate and should not be equated with an attempt to smear or to impeach the motives of any CIA official.

What is sorely needed is a thorough and fair overall study of the intelligence community. Such an inquiry ought to deal with rivalry between the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency. It ought to draw on experience in other countries where intelligence and operational activities are lodged with separate organizational entities. And Congress should take the initiative in launching such a study.

For too many years, Members of Congress have closed their eyes to the need for legislative scrutiny into intelligence operations. Yet who else can do the job? The public lacks the facts; the administration has a record to defend; the Agency cannot be expected to study itself. Enough has come to light to justify an impartial inquiry, which might properly be conducted by a special legislative commission drawing on Members of both Chambers and upon private citizens of stature and experience.

If an investigation should discover no grounds for changing the present arrangement, public apprehension would be lessened. If an investigation should disclose need for basic changes, then the country might be saved from future embarrassment. In either case, the United States would be the gainer and Congress would have discharged a duty that it has been far too reluctant to perform.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding, and recall to his mind that I was a cosponsor with him in the previous Congress of a resolution that would have gone far in this direction, establishing a joint committee for supervision of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I was pleased to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island. There are special problems regarding the Central Intelligence Agency. I join him in expressing the hope that the Agency itself may support changes such as he recommends, and that the administration may respond not only to the criticisms about the Central Intelligence Agency and some of the more or less obvious indications of its operational failures, but what I think are some of the inadequacies of the whole structure of intelligence gathering and intelligence interpretation, and determine its action based on such information and interpretations.

If such action is not forthcoming from the Agency and such support is not forthcoming from the executive branch of the Government, Congress should move on its own initiative to try to improve the general operations of the Agency.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, at the proper time tomorrow, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] I shall call up an amendment to the pending legislation, Amendment No. 193.

There is widespread unrest and uneasiness and concern among dairy farmers. In my opinion such concern on the part of dairy farmers is wholly justified. They find themselves in an economic situation which continues to grow more and more distressing. Dairy farmers are not receiving the benefits or returns from their work which are justified. Nor are they receiving the benefits of the Government program which was designed to insure at least a reasonable return to them for what they contribute to the general economy and general welfare.

There is little hope for improvement in this situation unless Congress takes steps to reduce the surplus which depresses the dairy market and takes some steps to insure that dairy farmers will receive something approaching a fair return, or at least a fairer return, in the way of payment for that which they produce.

The legislation being sponsored today by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] takes one very limited step toward that objective, but, in my judgment, it falls far short of what is needed.

Of the major farm commodities which are under mandatory price supports, only the dairy industry shows a decline in the support prices received today as compared to 3 years ago.

In 1960, the average support price for wheat was $1.78 a bushel. In 1963, the average support price was $2.

In the case of corn, in 1960 it was $1.06 a bushel. In 1963 it is $1.25 a bushel.

In the case of cotton, the price per pound for upland, middling one-inch, was $0.3242 in 1960. In 1963, it is $0.3247.

In the case of peanuts, the 1960 average price support was $0.1006. It is $0.112 in 1963.

In the case of rice, it was $4.42 in 1960. In 1963, it is $4.71.

In the case of flue-cured (11-14) tobacco, it was $0.555 in 1960. In 1963 it is $0.566.

In the case of milk for manufacturing purposes, the average support price in 1960 per hundred pounds was $3.22. In 1963 it is down to $3.14.

In my opinion, the producers of nearly all farm commodities deserve a higher income and a better price for their commodities. But it is clear from the comparative position of dairy price supports and dairy income that dairy farmers have more reason for dissatisfaction and greater need for remedial legislation—and that Congress, therefore, has a greater responsibility in this area.

The proposed legislation should be considered not only as dealing with the dairy industry, but also against the whole broad background in our approach to what is called the "farm problem."

Some commentators through the years have referred to what they call the farm bloc, and in recent months have observed that the farm bloc is "gone" or has disintegrated. I believe it is misleading to refer to a farm bloc, since there is no such organized bloc in Congress.

Of course, Members of Congress have a particular concern and a particular responsibility for farmers who produce specific crops in their districts or States.

However, the record of Congress over the past 25 years shows that many important pieces of farm legislation were enacted with the active support of Members of Congress from urban districts and urban States. In other words, farm legislation was not "put over" by adding up a farm bloc of sufficient votes to pass its legislation, or placed on the statute books by a kind of log-rolling operation. Rather, it was in response to recognition by a majority of the Members of Congress of a justification and a need for this type of legislation, even though it applied primarily to the agricultural sector of our economy and to farmers.

There have been some partisan differences, of course, with respect to the correct approach to farm legislation. However, this is true with respect to almost every issue that comes before Congress. We should not enact legislation on a "bloc" basis. Congress should take problems as they come and review them and determine whether legislation is needed. The judgment should be based ultimately on whether legislation is in the national interest, and what is demanded by justice. If we were to act only when the States represented by a majority of the Members of Congress were directly benefited, much of the legislation in the way of development of water resources, and of other important conservation undertakings, which characterized the last 50 years of our history, would never have been initiated.

It is said that many Members of Congress are now indifferent to farmers and farm problems, particularly since the wheat program was rejected. I do not know whether it is true. Perhaps action on the pending dairy program may afford the first real test. Certainly I hope it is not true because the problems and difficulties of dairy farmers are serious and need attention.

The dairy program is not the same as the wheat program. Each must be dealt with separately. Each represents a particular approach to a specific problem.

In the case of the dairy industry, we are faced with the problem of continuing surpluses. The dominant influence upon the dairy industry and upon dairy prices today is the tremendous surplus of dairy products, for which there is no ready market. It acts to drive prices down toward the minimum support level, which currently is $3.14 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk. The surplus is so great that last year it cost the Government nearly $500 million to maintain prices even at this near substandard or subsistence level.

In the last marketing year, the surplus of milk was 8.9 billion pounds of the 118 billion pounds marketed, or about 7.5 percent.

In April 1962, the price support level dropped to the minimum of 75 percent of parity set by law, from $3.40 per hundred to $3.11. It was predicted by some a year ago that the surplus problem would take care of itself because the 30-cent drop in support price would discourage production.

At best, that was a theory. Even if it were sound as a theory, it would be a questionable way to bring about adjustment in the production of milk. It shows little concern for the welfare of thousands of dairy farmers who individually have no way of bringing supplies in line with demand. It would represent a kind of squeeze-out theory for bringing about an adjustment in American agriculture.

In any case, this approach has failed, as many who discussed it at the time said it would fail. Despite bad weather and the sharp drop in price supports, milk production during the first 7 months of 1963 was less than 1 percent below that of the same period last year.

The estimates of the Department of Agriculture indicate that the surplus for the present marketing year will be 8.8 billion pounds, or almost identical with that of last year, and that the net cost to the Government will be $453 million.

The unfortunate fact is that the present dairy support program has broken down. It is extremely costly. It has proved inadequate in solving the problem of surpluses, and inadequate in meeting the problems of the dairy farmer.

The committee bill, which has been discussed this afternoon, would permit dairy producers in a Federal marketing order to amend their orders to eliminate the blend price system.

The bill would permit an allotment of class 1 sales for fluid milk to dairy producers in Federal orders. Thus a producer could retain his share of the premium price class I sales even if he did not expand production or if he cut back on production.

The amendment we intend to propose tomorrow is not in opposition to the committee bill or a substitute for it. Rather, the adoption of our amendment would make the committee proposal effective within the Federal marketing orders themselves. Without our amendment, I have serious doubts as to whether the program which is recommended in the committee bill would have any very significant effect.

I regret that the bill reported by the committee is limited to the class I base allotment plan. It fails to meet the very serious problems which are disrupting the dairy industry, both inside and outside marketing orders.

The committee bill is enabling legislation. It is not mandatory. The adoption of its provisions by producers in any Federal order market must be preceded by a hearing and a producer referendum.

In the absence of any incentive, such as provided by the surplus reduction payments provided in our amendment, there is little evidence that producers would rush to amend their orders. And if the orders are changed, it is equally unlikely that many producers would reduce production unless they received incentive payments to do so. At best, the committee bill gives some promise over a period of years of removing the incentive to expand, but it is insufficient by itself to meet the present problems. I doubt very much that it would have a significant effect upon the more serious problems which may arise in the future.

The committee program will not reduce the surpluses of milk appreciably in the next year. The Department estimates show that it would reduce surpluses from 8.8 billion pounds to 8.2 billion pounds, a relatively small reduction. The committee program will not produce any substantial increase in net dairy income.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his amendment. I shall certainly support it. It adds strength and substance to the bill and helps it to do a substantial job.

But it is not true that there is a distinct possibility that the committee bill, although it can be improved by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, could provide a significant reduction in production over the years? In other words, can we not assume that if this program succeeds in three or four instances, after a while other marketing orders will adopt it? Does it not seem logical that gradually the excess production which has plagued us from the marketing orders, and which is so huge now, would be substantially reduced if farmers no longer have the incentive that they have under the blend-pricing system? Is it not true that this might, over a time, result in a significant improvement?

I realize that the Senator from Minnesota is not satisfied—neither am I—with taking a long time to solve a problem which is of immediate, in some cases urgent, concern to farmers. It would be much more satisfactory if the action could be taken more promptly.

My reason for interrupting the Senator at this point is that while I share his view—and his amendment would be a great improvement, and I shall vote for it—is it not true that the committee bill, too, might afford an opportunity to provide a substantial improvement for the dairy farmer?

Mr. McCARTHY. It would almost certainly result in some improvement. The question is whether it would be a significant improvement. A second question would be, How much time would it take to bring about the improvement which we are seeking? At best, it would apply to less than 50 percent of all the milk which is being produced in the country, and it would directly affect only 187,000 dairymen, leaving some 600,000 outside and beyond its reach—except indirectly those outside might expect to benefit somewhat as a result of limitations that might occur within the marketing order itself.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would have this indirect effect, which could be highly important. Hoards Dairyman points out the experience which six dairy cooperatives had with this proposal, and has enabled them to increase class I fluid utilization from a 61-percent national average to 85 percent, and if that should become the rule, it would diminish the production of manufacturing milk by some 14 billion pounds, and thus completely solve our surplus problem and create a demand-supply situation that could sharply increase the price for manufacturing milk. I certainly do not anticipate that it would go that far, but I think it points to the possibility that there could be a significant indirect effect on the 600,000 farmers. I share the concern of the Senator from Minnesota for the 600,000 farmers, because in Wisconsin, as well as in Minnesota, the overwhelming majority of farmers produce milk for manufacturing purposes and are not under marketing orders.

Mr. McCARTHY. I suggest that it might not help 600,000, because the economic pressure by that time would have forced thousands of them to the wall. But it could affect the industry as a whole. This kind of squeeze-out might result in an adjustment of supply and demand, although, in my judgment, it would require legislation somewhat more effective and permanent than that which regulates the market at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator does not mean to say that it would not be of help to the 600,000.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Some of them might drop by the wayside before the program could become effective.

Mr. McCARTHY. And it would have an effect, indirectly, but it would be too little and too late for many. But in itself it seeks a positive good. I do not mean to say that it should not be passed. But as the Senater indicated, we might also pass a somewhat more comprehensive bill before we finish with dairy legislation at this session of Congress.

The committee bill is enabling legislation; it is not mandatory. There would be no compulsion except that compulsion which is accepted by two-thirds of the members of any marketing order who decide to impose that kind of limitation upon themselves.

In the same way, the amendment which I propose is in no way compulsory. No individual member would be bound by the vote of any other percentage or any other number of dairy producers—neither two-thirds nor 50 percent nor 90 percent. Each dairy farmer who might participate under the program provided by my amendment to the bill would be acting solely on his own initiative.

I should like to note the need of dairy producers who are outside marketing orders today.

The most serious limitation in the committee bill is that it provides direct benefits only for producers in Federal order markets. They are a minority of the Nation's producers. As I stated earlier, some 187,000 producers sell in the 83 Federal order markets, but another 600,000 or more dairy producers market outside Federal orders, and these dairymen market more than 50 percent of the milk produced in the Nation. If we were to establish an order of priorities, we should take care of those who are outside marketing orders, who have nothing available to them in the way of protection except the 75-percent support which is in the basic law.

This production goes largely for manufacturing purposes. It does not generally bring the premium prices which are guaranteed in Federal order markets for class I sales for fluid use. The price of manufacturing milk in many areas is that of the minimum price support for this type of milk, which is currently $3.14 a hundred pounds.

I do not believe we should be content with a bill which ignores the welfare of the majority of dairy farmers.

Mr. President, the situation is similar to that which existed in the case of feed grains before Congress enacted the Emergency Feed Grains Act in 1961. The immediate need is for a program to reduce the surplus which undermines the market and to restore some degree of balance to the dairy market. At the same time, there is a need to raise the income of dairy farmers.

The amendment which we propose would provide a program of incentive payments to reduce the surplus and, at the same time, improve the net income of dairy farmers.

The amendment provides for two kinds of surplus reduction payments:

First, producers in Federal order markets who agree to cut back production 10 percent or more would be paid reduction payments of up to $2.50 a hundred pounds on the amount they reduced their marketings. This provision would provide an incentive to make the committee proposal effective. Producers could retain their share of the class I sales, and receive the price agreed upon under the marketing order, and they would be assisted in making the adjustment in cutting their "excess" production, which goes for manufacturing usage.

Second, producers outside Federal market orders would be given production payments of up to 50 cents a hundred pounds on the manufacturing milk they marketed if they agreed not to expand production.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it is directed, in part, to criticism which the Senator makes of the Proxmire bill, in that the Proxmire bill affects only dairy producers who are under Federal marketing orders. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. MUSKIE. How many producers are under Federal marketing orders?

Mr. McCARTHY. In the 83 marketing orders now in existence, there are about 187,000 separate dairy producers.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am interested in asking my next question for this reason: The dairy farmers of Maine sell under two different arrangements; under State law there is a Maine price-control feature and dairy farmers who sell under the Maine law have the advantage of the higher price on the market than do the Maine dairy farmers who sell on the so-called Boston market or under a blended price. So I am interested in any amendment—and I believe the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is such an amendment—which would improve the lot of both groups of farmers—those who sell in the Boston market under the Federal marketing order and those who sell in Maine under State law. Therefore, I wish to know whether the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would be of any benefit to Maine dairy farmers who are not selling under the Federal marketing order; and if so, why?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know the percentage of milk that is marketed under Maine law and sold as fluid milk; but about 42 percent of milk produced in Maine is marketed under the Federal marketing order. In addition, there is some measure of protection given under the State law; and this would mean that about 60 percent of the milk production in Maine could benefit from my amendment. It is possible that the 42 percent marketed in Federal orders would be eligible for some kind of benefits under the committee bill, although those producers might not respond to it. We believe the bill would put many of them in a position in which they would be hard-pressed to decide whether to participate in the referendum and agree to the limitation or not, especially in the absence of the provisions in my amendment, which would provide for a $2.50 reduction payment in addition to the provisions of the committee bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. I have not had a great deal of reaction from Maine dairy farmers on either the bill of the Senator from Wisconsin or the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, but such reaction as I have had has been favorable to the amendment, and—I say with all due respect to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin—rather indifferent to his bill. This is why I am interested in having the Senator pinpoint the distinction between the two.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is my judgment that it would be difficult for participants in the Federal marketing orders in almost all areas of the country to weigh the possible advantages or the possible disadvantages of the referendum being proposed to them. In view of the rejection by the wheat farmers, in their referendum, of the plan offered to them—although I thought the evidence rather clearly argued for its acceptance in the referendum, in view of the evident advantages—it is my judgment that in many of the marketing order areas the choice would be such a difficult one that the disposition would be to say: "Let us not bother with the referendum. Let us go on producing as we have been, for the blended price."

The purpose of our amendment is to provide an incentive for cutting production. This would be true in the case of those producing under Federal marketing orders. The amendment provides surplus reduction payments to assist them. The committee bill does provide some incentive for reduction in the marketing order areas, but the amount would depend upon the price determination; and the decision would be a very difficult one to make, I believe.

In addition to the effect on production for sale outside the marketing order areas, my amendment provides two other incentives: One is an incentive to hold the line, and not expand production; the other is an additional payment to those who reduce their production to 95 percent of their historic base.

Mr. MUSKIE. As I understand, both groups of dairy farmers in Maine would be provided with an incentive of some kind, under his proposal, to cut production or at least to hold the line.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. Under the committee bill, if two-thirds of the dairymen producing under the Federal marketing order agreed to allocate the class I share of the market, this restriction would be imposed upon the other one-third.

But outside of that, those who are interested in participating under the program provided by my amendment would find no compulsion of any kind. If a dairyman wished to expand his production or if a newcomer wished to go into the dairy industry, he could do so freely, and he would receive only the present price support, which is 75 percent of parity. If, however, a current producer agreed to maintain his present level of production, the amendment would give him an incentive payment of 20 cents per hundred pounds for manufacturing milk simply because he held the line; and if he agreed to produce only 95 percent of his base, he would be paid surplus reduction payments of approximately 40 cents a hundred.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his explanation.

From the point of view of the taxpayers, I understand that the result of the Senator's amendment would be to cut the current surpluses of milk, to reduce the cost to the Government, and to increase the net increase of dairy producers. Is this a fair evaluation?

Mr. McCARTHY. It should be the objective of both the committee bill and of my amendment to the committee bill. The estimates are that under the committee bill the costs would be reduced approximately $26 million or $27 million, on an annual basis.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The first year.

Mr. McCARTHY. That would accompany an increase of approximately $7 million a year in dairy income. The estimates are that the committee bill and my amendment would reduce the Government's cost approximately $37 million a year, and the net income of the dairy farmers, both those under the marketing orders and those outside the marketing orders, probably would be increased by $150 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to comment on the remarks of both the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

In the first place, I stress the point that under the committee bill there will be no loss. Under my bill, if those in the marketing orders do not want them, they will be in the same position as the one they are in now, for they do not have to approve allotments. They will have a choice, whereas at present they do not have one. Representations have been made to me from every section of the country—from New England, from the Northwest, from the South, the Middle West, and the East—by dairy farmer representatives who insist that their farmers are enthusiastic in wanting the committee bill. Only an hour ago, I heard from a gentleman in New York who told me that on the basis of the study made by the Grange, they found that an overwhelming majority of the dairy farmers want the bill the committee is reporting. On that basis, if they really want this bill—and those representatives know their farmers quite well—the chances are they will vote for allotments in the referendum, and that will be bound to help the dairy farmers who are not in the marketing order areas, and it will be bound to have the effect of reducing the production of excess milk. Therefore, it is sure to help the farmers in Maine who are producing manufacturing milk, because they are in competition with those in marketing order areas who produce the excess milk, and they are bound to be benefited. Any substantial reduction in the production of manufacturing milk will improve the price. The ones who have registered their position are the ones who under the marketing orders would be directly and immediately affected.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. I believe it is a good amendment. However, I wish to emphasize my belief that there is merit in the committee bill; and if the McCarthy amendment is not adopted, I believe there will still be sufficient merit in the bill to recommend its approval.

Mr. MUSKIE. As I understand the difference, the McCarthy amendment would add to the bill some additional incentives.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. There is now an incentive, under the bill; but the Senator from Minnesota makes an excellent case for his point that there are no direct incentives for all dairy farmers to reduce their production. There is an incentive for farmers who produce 50 percent of the Nation's milk to reduce production but not for all dairy farmers in a State to reduce. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota provides that incentive.

Mr. MUSKIE. In Maine the division as between dairy farmers who sell under the Maine law and those who sell under the Boston law on the Federal level is such that the first group has had greater influence over the years with respect to the Maine law than the second group has had. The first group is a little larger than the second.

I am interested in knowing the extent to which the Senator from Wisconsin has heard from dairy farmers outside the Federal marketing orders—from Maine, New England, or other areas of the country—and what their reaction has been.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The vast majority of farmers in both Minnesota and Wisconsin are outside the marketing order. Their position has been one of very strong support for the McCarthy amendment. That is what they are interested in. By and large, they are not particularly interested in the committee bill, because those farmers would not be directly and immediately affected by it. Most farmers in Wisconsin who are in marketing order areas are very enthusiastic about the bill. I believe that if the situation were explained to the other farmers, they would be enthusiastic for both bills. I think they would benefit indirectly.

Mr. MUSKIE. I appreciate the enlightenment which both of my distinguished colleagues have given me on these measures.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, under the terms of the amendment which we are proposing, producers outside the Federal market orders would be given production payments of up to 50 cents per hundred on the manufacturing milk they marketed if they agreed not to expand production. The amendment also provides that the Secretary could establish different levels of payments. He could make one level of payments at 20 cents per hundred for those who hold the line and do not expand their marketings of manufacturing milk, and he could offer a higher level—40 cents per hundred—for those who agreed to cut back by 5 percent.

Under the amendment both types of payments would be for a limited period, until April 1, 1965. The program would be entirely voluntary. Each farmer could choose to enter or not. It would involve no referendums. As I indicated, no farmer would be compelled to respond to the program by virtue of a vote of two-thirds of his fellow dairy farmers, 50 percent of them, 30 percent, or 99 percent, but each would make his own decision. Anyone who wished to go into the dairy industry or to expand his present operation could do so and receive price supports under existing law.

The Department of Agriculture in its views and estimates, said:

> At the same time, should legislation provide only for class I base plans in Federal orders, the results would be so limited that neither the necessary reduction in total national milk production nor the much-needed improvement in total dairy income would be achieved.

The Department has also reported on the bill which I introduced—S. 1961. If the amendment we intend to offer were adopted, the program would then be the same as provided in this bill.

The Department has given its approval to this bill. In the report Secretary Freeman stated that the passage of my bill would—

First, increase the income of dairy farmers; second, reduce Government costs; and, third, reduce Government stocks of surplus dairy products.

It could be added that it would not have the immediate effect of raising prices to consumers in any way. It could be anticipated that it would have the effect of reducing the cost of dairy products to the consumer. The Secretary said that—

> It could also lead to improvement in the performance of milk marketing orders by reducing the incentive to market milk in excess of the quantities needed for fluid purposes.

Thus, passage of S. 1961 would be a decided improvement over the present situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Department report on my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 20, 1963.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of August 1 for a report on S. 1961, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage adjustments in milk marketing and for other purposes.

This bill would authorize two significant changes in our existing dairy price programs:

(1) Base excess pricing plans designed to encourage surplus adjustment in Federal milk marketing orders, and

(2) A program of incentive payments to encourage surplus adjustment to be operated in conjunction with the dairy price support activities under the Agricultural Act of 1949.

Section 1 of the bill would authorize provisions in Federal milk marketing orders under which each producer under an order might be allocated a pro rata share of the sales of milk in the marketing area for the higher valued fluid uses, including a portion of the reserves which are essential to the market, in proportion to his deliveries during a prior representative marketing period. Such provisions would make specific allowances for allocations to new producers and to dairy farmers who were not producers under an order at the time the initial allocations were made. Order provisions would also prescribe the terms upon which allocations or marketing history might be transferred among producers and the manner in which individual producers might obtain a review of their allocation or base.

Section 2 of the bill would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make payments to dairy farmers to encourage adjustments in the marketing of milk and butterfat so as to reduce the amount of surplus dairy products acquired by the Government under the dairy price support program. This section provides for two types of payments:

(1) Payments on milk marketed for manufacturing usage of up to 50 cents per hundredweight to producers who agree to restrict their marketings to the same level they marketed in a prior period or to some percentage of that level; and

(2) Payments to producers under Federal milk marketing orders of not to exceed $2.50 per hundred pounds for each hundred pounds by which they reduce marketings from the level they marketed during a prior period.

The bill further provides, with respect to the payments on milk for manufacturing usages, that more than one level of payment may be established for producers outside the Federal milk marketing orders. This would authorize making payments at one level to those producers who did not reduce but restricted their marketings to the level of the prior period, while a higher level of payment, not to exceed 50 cents per hundredweight, might be made to producers who did reduce their marketings by some given percentage. Payments to producers under Federal milk marketing orders would be at a uniform rate for each hundred pounds reduction in marketings. Payments in either case would be established at such levels as the Secretary determined appropriate to accomplish the objective of surplus reduction within the prescribed limits.

This bill would not improve the dairy price support program as much as the proposals presented before your committee on April 3 of this year and still preferred by this Department. Nevertheless, the bill would (1) increase the income of dairy farmers; (2) reduce Government costs; and (3) reduce Government stocks of surplus dairy products.

It could also lead to improvement in the performance of milk marketing orders by reducing the incentive to market milk in excess of the quantities needed for fluid purposes. Thus, passage of S. 1961 would be a decided improvement over the present situation.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Department, by request, made an estimate of the present program as compared to the committee bill and to my bill (S. 1961).

The Department estimates show that a surplus reduction payment program as provided by my amendment would, first, cut the surplus by over 50 percent, from 8.8 billion pounds to 4.2 billion pounds; second, increase the net income of dairy farmers by $150 million; and, third, reduce Government costs by $37 million as compared to costs under the existing program.

I ask unanimous consent that the Department table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The estimated program results of S. 1915 and S. 1961 for 1963–64 compared to present program are as follows:

Item	Unit	Present program		S. 1915 class I base plan	S. 1961 McCarthy program with 20- and 40-cent payments [1]
		1962–63 marketing year	1963–64 marketing year		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Support level, by purchases	Hundredweight	3.11	3.14	3.14	3.14
Milk production	Billion pounds	125.5	125.5	124.9	120.9
Marketings (milk equivalent):					
Fluid milk and cream	do	54	54.4	54.4	54.4
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	64	64.0	63.4	59.4
Total	do	118	118.4	117.8	113.8
Commercial demand (milk equivalent):					
Fluid milk and cream	do	54.0	54.4	54.4	54.4
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	55.1	55.2	55.2	55.2
Total	do	109.1	109.6	109.6	109.6
Surplus [2]	do	8.9	8.8	8.2	4.2
CCC purchases:					
Butter	Million pounds	355	350	320	113.5
Cheese	do	140	140	145	180
Nonfat dry milk	do	1,270	1,200	1,150	848
CCC purchase price:					
Butter	Cents per pound	58	58	58	58
Cheese	do	34.6	35.6	35.6	35.6
Nonfat dry milk	do	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4
CCC net expenditures, purchases (gross)	Million dollars	511	484	458	296
Reduction payments: [3]					
Quantity (milk equivalent)	Billion pounds	----------	----------	----------	2
Rate per hundredweight	Dollars	----------	----------	----------	2
Total	Million dollars	----------	----------	----------	40
Production payments: [4]					
Quantity (milk equivalent)	Billion pounds	----------	----------	----------	37.3
Rate per hundredweight	Dollars	----------	----------	----------	0.20-0.40
Total	Million dollars	----------	----------	----------	111
Total outlay	do	511	484	458	447
Sales proceeds	do	31	31	31	31
Total net program expenditures	do	480	453	427	416
Dairy farm cash receipts:					
From marketings	do	4,836	4,871	4,865	4,775
Payments	do	----------	----------	----------	151
Total receipts	do	4,836	4,871	4,856	4,926
Effect on net producer income	do	----------	0	+7	+150

---

[1] 20-cent payments to manufacturing milk producers who do not exceed their base period marketings and 40-cent payments to those who reduce 5 percent. This estimate assumes 50 percent of manufacturing milk producers participate with 20 percent reducing 5 percent to receive the higher payment. Variations in the percentage of producers reducing do not significantly effect program cost though larger participation would significantly increase net producer income.

[2] Milk equivalent milk fat basis.

[3] Payment on reduction below base in Federal order markets.

[4] Payment on manufacturing grade milk.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Mr. Herschel D. Newsom, the master of the National Grange sent me a copy of his letter to Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the committee, and I should like to conclude by quoting from it. The Grange has given continuous support to my dairy proposal. The same is true of the Farmers Union and some other farm and milk marketing organizations.

The letter of Mr. Newsom of the Grange covers the whole case most adequately. He states:

> Since the injury to the economic position of those who produce almost half the milk in the Nation as a result of Federal legislation, as it applies to the Federal market orders, it appears to us to be a matter of justice that prompt measures be taken by the Federal Government to alleviate the distressing situation that exists in the nonregulated markets, especially in the great Wisconsin and Minnesota area. This appears to us to be a matter of elemental justice.
>
> We would, therefore, strongly urge the adoption of that section of the McCarthy bill that makes provision for the unregulated markets. We would, however, make the provision that the total of the income derived from the market plus the subsidy payment should not exceed the total of the 1962–63 level of prices for these unregulated markets, plus 50 cents. This, then, would phase out the payment program as the market situation improved.
>
> To my knowledge, this is the first time that legislation has been proposed which would try to solve the problems that face those in both the regulated and unregulated markets. We believe that the combination of remedies proposed by the combination of the Proxmire and McCarthy bills will help to bring an end to the long-time warfare between the manufacturing and class I areas of the Nation. The improvement in the supply-demand situation resulting from this legislation will be of inestimable value in our attempts to prevent the exploitation of dairy farmer producers by those who prefer to make the continuation of unmanageable surpluses and farm bankruptcy the major provisions of agricultural policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 24, 1963.

The Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Grange supported the principles of the dairy legislation which you introduced at the beginning of this session, as you will recall. You were taking a very practical approach toward bringing the Federal market orders into reasonable balance in their supply and demand situation.

We are glad, however, to support now the measure as reported out by your committee, because it contains several of the basic principles which we believe to be sound and feel strongly, therefore, that the enactment of this measure would be a very substantial step in the proper direction, though it would, in our judgment, clearly be short of serving some of the objectives earlier discussed by us with your committee.

The situation in several of our Federal orders is more critical, in my opinion, than is realized by some of our contemporaries. We simply want you to know, therefore, that we will, with yourself, watch for opportunities to implement additional proposals made by you. We, however, strongly support the measure which your committee will take to the floor of the Senate to allow these Federal orders and their producers to go through the slow processes, of themselves initiating the necessary amendments to the existing marketing orders and getting them adopted through the regular hearing processes.

In the meantime, the situation in the Federal orders continues to become more and more acute. The overall increase in production in 71 comparable Federal order markets has been above the 1962 comparable period of January–July by 541 million pounds, while class I milk sales increased only 372 million pounds.

In the New York-New Jersey market (the most critical situation in the Nation), milk production from January–July this year is up 4.1 percent over last year (182 million pounds) and 5.1 percent over 2 years ago, compared to an increase in class I sales of only 1.9 percent over last year (61 million). The result is an increase in surplus of 221 million pounds in just the first 5 months of this year in this one market, and it is now 25–30 percent over supplied with milk.

The rapid adjustment which everybody who opposes dairy legislation was pointing to at the first of the year has now been reversed. CCC purchases jumped from 40.6 percent in March to 158.9 percent in April of the 1962 level. July was up 84.1 percent of the 1962 level. Furthermore, CCC purchases for January–July, although below 1962, were above those for the same period for all other years except 1953 and 1954. Cheese purchases in July amounted to 22 million pounds, 4 million above last July's acquisition.

The January–July total of acquisitions of nonfat dry milk this year was 728 million pounds compared with 971 million for the same period in 1962. Part of the credit for this decline, however, must go to the payment-in-kind program, which moved more than 80 million pounds of nonfat dry milk through the commercial export market during January–July this year.

Uncommitted stocks of butter and butter oil representing the quantity of Commodity Credit Corporation, rather CCC holdings, were 432 million pounds at the end of July, 66 million pounds above a year earlier. Those who point to the decline in Government cold storage holdings of butter, which are down to 343 million pounds compared to 419 million in July of 1962, must remember that this year's figures do not reflect the large amounts of butter that have been converted to butter oil.

The estimated amount of butter oil held by the Government was about 130 million pounds butter equivalent in July. This gives us a total of all stocks of butter held by the Government of 473 million pounds, including the butter equivalent, and this is a gain in holdings of 119 million pounds from January 1 to the end of July.

It should, therefore, be clear that if the situation, which continues to be critical in the Federal market order areas, is going to be materially improved by the proposed legislation in S. 1915, that it will be necessary to adopt as an amendment to this legislation the second section of the McCarthy bill, S. 1961. The National Grange believes that the adoption of this legislation would speed up the adjustment of the Federal marketing order areas to the demand situation, improve and stabilize farm income, be a material savings to the taxpayer, and make a substantial contribution to the stability of the total agricultural marketing picture.

Under existing legislation, in which the blend-pricing system in effect subsidizes the production of surplus milk in Federal orders, great harm has come to the producers of milk for the manufactured market in those areas which depend alone for the manufactured milk market for the sale of their milk.

We are convinced that the implementation of the Proxmire bill will improve this situation in the unregulated markets. The information which comes to our office indicates that producers in these areas are in such serious trouble that many of them will be substantially injured if this improvement in Federal marketing orders is substantially delayed. The record also shows that these people have not been responsible for the surplus production which is at the root of our current problem.

Since the injury to the economic position of those who produce almost half the milk in the Nation as a result of Federal legislation, as it applies to the Federal market orders, it appears to us to be a matter of justice that prompt measures be taken by the Federal Government to alleviate the distressing situation that exists in the nonregulated markets, especially in the great Wisconsin and Minnesota area. This appears to us to be a matter of elemental justice.

We would, therefore, strongly urge the adoption of that section of the McCarthy bill that makes provision for the unregulated markets. We would, however, make the provision that the total of the income derived from the market plus the subsidy payment should not exceed the total of the 1962–63 level of prices for these unregulated markets, plus 50 cents. This, then, would phase out the payment program as the market situation improved.

To my knowledge, this is the first time that legislation has been proposed which would try to solve the problems that face those in both the regulated and unregulated markets. We believe that the combination of remedies proposed by the combination of the Proxmire and McCarthy bills will help to bring an end to the longtime warfare between the manufacturing and class I areas of the Nation. The improvement in the supply-demand situation resulting from this legislation will be of inestimable value in our attempts to prevent the exploitation of dairy farmer-producers by those who prefer to make the continuation of unmanageable surpluses and farm bankruptcy the major provisions of agricultural policy.

We appreciate your own deep concern and intelligent interest in this problem. Your assistance in trying to accomplish these worthwhile legislative goals merits, and will generate gratitude from increasing numbers of dairymen across America as your real purpose becomes better known and understood. The Grange will work toward such understanding.

Respectfully yours,
HERSCHEL D. NEWSOM,
Master.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to put myself on record tonight as favoring the adoption of the McCarthy amendment to the bill, making a national dairy program a reality. There is an urgent need for such a program. Minnesota farmers are receiving $3.14 per hundred pounds for manufacturing milk, which reflects a price support of only 75 percent of parity.

According to Department of Agriculture studies of typical farm costs and returns, dairy-hog farms in southeastern Minnesota have an average investment of $48,960 in land, buildings, equipment, and livestock. Their net income, less than $3,000, gives them a return of less than 50 cents an hour for their family and hired labor.

We in the Senate who represent States where the biggest volume of manufacturing milk is produced are in the minority. Therefore we need the understanding and support of our colleagues in areas where dairying is not a major enterprise, as well as in areas to benefit from the provisions of S. 1915.

The dairy legislation before us today will have little, if any, effect in States where manufacturing milk is produced. The provisions of the McCarthy amendment are urgently needed by manufacturing milk producers in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and other States where milk is produced for processing—cheese, nonfat milk, and butter. The combination of S. 1915 and this amendment constitutes the kind of a package that will benefit all dairy producers—those in Federal market order areas and in manufacturing milk areas. To pass dairy legislation for either of these areas is to deal with the problem of excessive production of manufacturing milk in piecemeal fashion.

S. 1915 would authorize producers in Federal order areas to amend their orders so that class I bases could be established for individual farms. The established procedure for amending market orders would be retained under the provisions of the bill. This procedure will mean that up to 2 years will be required to amend Federal orders with no noticeable reduction in excess production in the interim.

Mr. President, I recognize the desirability of individual farm bases for class I milk in Federal order areas. I would not deny dairy farmers, operating under Federal orders, legislation they believe to be constructive and worthwhile in their areas. My colleague [Mr. McCARTHY] fully agrees with this position. His amendment still would permit the establishment of class I bases in Federal order areas.

It is important that the Members of the Senate bear in mind that the passage of a bill which would deal only with the Federal milk order markets would leave out dairy farmers who produce 60 percent of our total milk supply.

The 186,000 dairy farmers who market their milk under a Federal order are well outnumbered by the 242,000 other commercial dairy farmers whose production goes into manufactured dairy products. Besides these 242,000 dairy producers for whom milk production is the principal source of income, there are a million and a quarter more dairy farmers to whom dairy income is important, even though some other commodities may be of greater value.

These figures indicate that it would be a mistake to legislate only for the 186,000 producers under the Federal milk orders and to ignore the income problem of a million and one-half other producers.

In my State of Minnesota, we have less than 4,000 dairymen who produce for the milk order markets at the Twin Cities and twin ports and we have 81,000 other producers who would not benefit in any direct way from the adoption of a limited bill, such as the so-called class I base plan.

In fact, if the figures were carefully examined, it would be seen that there are only a very few States in which the manufacturing milk producers do not outnumber the fluid milk producers.

A further measure of the importance of income protection on manufacturing milk is the fact that, even in the Federal order markets, an average of about 40 percent of the milk is in excess of fluid needs and must find a use in manufactured dairy products.

So, only about 30 billion pounds of milk produced in the Nation qualified for class I pricing under Federal orders—that is about 25 percent of the total of 118 billion pounds being marketed annually. Some 88 billion pounds of milk production, or about 75 percent of the volume, would not benefit from a Federal order class I base program.

Still another important thing to consider is that, in addition to being many times more numerous than the milkshed producers and accounting for a greater share of the Nation's milk volume, the manufacturing milk producers have, over the years, had a tighter cost-price squeeze.

Facing up to the intolerable buildup of carryover of nonfat dry milk, butter, and cheese—a problem just as much that of market order areas as manufactured milk areas—prompts the need for the Senate today to view the need of dairy producers everywhere for a workable, sound means to national supply adjustment and increased income.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, for his very thoughtful and constructive approach to dairy legislation this year. He provided the foundation for the action which has transpired with his eloquent appeal of August 17 last year for a constructive and helpful attitude on the part of the dairy industry in working out the details of a national dairy program. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] said at that time:

> The bill that I am introducing is intended as a starting point for discussion. * * * I am hopeful that the milk producers and their representatives and others in the milk industry will come in with suggestions for improvements in this legislation or alternative, workable proposals. I am hopeful that the industry will do everything in its power to put its house in order before drastic legislation becomes necessary. * * *
>
> While the bill that I have introduced may not be the ultimate solution to our problems, certainly it does point the way for a voluntary reduction in supplies by offering producers a lower price for milk and cream which are neither needed nor necessary, and which, as the Secretary of Agriculture has pointed out, cannot even be given away. I feel certain that the farmers of this Nation do not want their Government to spend huge sums of money in order to support the price of milk, which cannot be used. * * *
>
> There is no doubt but that the hearings will result in renewed efforts by those who are sincerely interested in agriculture to develop a sound, workable program.

Mr. President, no Member of the Senate is as knowledgeable on the subject of the problems of dairy producers as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana who has served as chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee for 26 years.

The major significance of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], is that it is an attempt not only to recognize but to bring together the major provisions of dairy bills before the Senate this year. It is a well-conceived blueprint for the dairy industry. It provides for a class I base plan and a voluntary program for manufacturing milk areas. All that is needed for the Senate to support a national dairy program is the adoption of the amendment before the Senate to establish a program for manufacturing milk areas.

The program is voluntary. It retains the present general price support level of 75 percent of parity. It strengthens the class I base plan by making it possible for producers under market orders to cut production and receive incentive payments of up to $2.50 per hundredweight on the amount by which they reduce their marketings.

In manufacturing milk areas, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish a program of incentive payments for dairy producers who agree not to expand production over their last year's production and producers who agree to cut their production by 5 percent from last year's production. Incentive payments would be adjusted depending upon the route an individual producer chooses. Producers reducing their production would receive a somewhat higher payment. Provisions of the amendment which apply to market order areas and to manufacturing milk areas would be effective until April 1, 1965.

Mr. President, the package of legislation available to dairy producers upon the adoption of the McCarthy amendment would cut Government expenditures from $484 million—the cost of the current program in the 1963–64 marketing year—to $447 million, a reduction of $37 million. At the same time it would raise the income of dairy farmers by $150 million. As compared to the 1963–64 marketing year and the present program, butter purchases would be cut from 350 million pounds to 114 million pounds; nonfat dry milk from over 1 billion pounds, to 848 million pounds.

Price supports to dairy producers were reduced to 75 percent of parity over 17 months ago. Since that time there has been no significant adjustment in production. The level of production in the first 7 months of 1963 was less than 1 percent below that in the same period of 1962. The surplus of milk in the 1962–63 marketing year was 8.9 billion pounds of the 118 billion pounds marketed. The total net program of the Government was $480 million. For the 1963–54 marketing year it is anticipated that a further surplus of 8.8 billion pounds can be expected at a net cost of $453 million to the Government for price support purchases.

When Secretary Freeman voiced his views on the legislation now before the Senate, he estimtaed that the class I base plan would cut Government expenditures by only $25 million, while raising farm income only $7 million.

In a letter to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry dated August 20, Secretary Freeman said S. 1961, which as the Senator from Wisconsin, who is handling the proposed legislation knows, is the same as the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] to the bill, would:

> First, increase the income of dairy farmers; second, reduce Government costs; and, third, reduce Government stocks of surplus dairy products.
>
> It could also lead to improvement in the performance of milk marketing orders by reducing the incentive to market milk in excess of the quantities needed for fluid purposes. Thus, passage of S. 1961 would be a decided improvement over the present situation.

The time has come for the Senate to pass a dairy program for all dairy producers—a national program.

Surplus milk in New York State is the same as surplus milk in Minnesota or Wisconsin. Overproduction of such milk in Minnesota works to the detriment of the producer in New York, and vice versa.

I urge a vote in behalf of the amendment because it would increase the income of dairy producers; it will reduce Government costs, and it will reduce Government stocks of surplus dairy production.

I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for his tenacious performance in reference to dairy legislation, as well as with relation to many items of proposed legislation. The Senator from Wisconsin, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has given many hours, days, and weeks to the preparation of helpful and meaningful legislation not only in the field of general agricultural commodities, but specifically in relation to dairying.

The dairying industry is costly. It is complex. The dairying industry is fundamental to a progressive agriculture and to an effective agriculture. Dairying is a part of soil conservation. Dairying is one of the most important areas of our entire agricultural economy. To have legislation such as is now on the books is to accept inadequate legislation. It does not do the job. It piles up surpluses and leaves the income level of dairy producers too low.

The legislation now on the books increases the cost of the program to the taxpayer and puts the Government of the United States into the storage business far more than it ought to be. The program advanced today by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and by my distinguished colleague [Mr. McCARTHY] would improve the situation considerably. I join in support of their efforts.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the pending measure would establish an allotment system for milk production. While it is true that the system would be subject to referendum, and that compliance would not be compulsory, I think it is clear that the legislation contemplates a new program for farmers which seeks to limit production by means of artificial incentives or controls.

Farmers have recently rejected, by a clear and decisive vote, a wheat program designed to limit production through allotment controls. The vote against it was decisive throughout the country, and was overwhelming in my State. In view of this recent demonstration of farmer hostility to Government supply-management programs, I think it is untimely to consider other legislation based upon quota or allotment systems.

Mr. President, the bill now before us applies to milk production. Pending in the Agriculture Committee is another bill which would impose a system of acreage allotments on potato production. It is strenuously opposed in my State. Until such time as there is evidence of a change of mind by the farmers, I shall oppose farm bills which have the effect of putting or keeping the Federal Government into the supply-management business.

Accordingly, I intend to vote against amendments which would strengthen the control features of the pending measure, and against the bill itself.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WE ARE POISONING THE AIR

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is extremely difficult for the average citizen to understand how fast the problem of air pollution is growing in this Nation today and how inadequate are our efforts to deal with it. That is why it is so important to bring this message to the public in layman's terms that are readily understood by all. I know of no better example of this than the article by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] entitled "We Are Poisoning the Air," which appears in the current issue of Look magazine.

In forthright fashion, the article points up the seriousness of the air pollution problem to our health and economy, the inadequacy of existing programs at all levels of government, and the need for specific clean air legislation at the Federal level.

As chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, I can attest to the great contribution the Senator from Connecticut has made to the Senate's consideration of these and other problems of environmental pollution. His is not a new-found interest. While he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the budget for air pollution control programs doubled. His ultimatum to the automobile industry to install blowby devices as standard equipment in new cars will be long remembered. And his calling a national conference on air pollution which was held last December helped set the stage for an all-out effort in behalf of air pollution legislation by the administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "We Are Poisoning the Air" be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE POISONING THE AIR

(By ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, U.S. Senator from Connecticut)

Must we Americans always wait for disaster before we do something about dangers we have been aware of for years—even decades?

Ever since the 1940's, we have seen the need for tighter drug regulations. But it has taken the terrible tragedy of thalidomide—babies born without limbs—to get action. Now, we are ticking off the years of growing danger in another field—pollution of our air.

What major disaster will it take to get action against this menace? We have already seen some tragedies. But perhaps because they were isolated, we have not yet been forced to act.

In 5 days of dense, choking smog, during October 1948, 43 percent of the people of the heavily industrialized community of Donora, Pa., were made ill by the smoke and poisonous gases that streamed from factory smokestacks. The town's death toll: 20.

In November 1953, New York City suffered a similar "temperature inversion"—a lid of warm air overlaid cooler, heavier air at ground level. For 10 days, the stagnant mass trapped the metropolitan area's pollutants, and "smaze" hung over the city. By the time it blew out to sea, more than 240 people were dead.

The full cost of the New York disaster was not realized until years later, when death records for the period were compared with those of years before and after the 10-day "smaze." The only factor to which the investigators could attribute the increased mortality rate was air pollution.

The problem is not confined to the United States. A doctor who visited London last December hardly recognized the city. Gray-brown fog, heavy and smoky, lay thick on the ground. An acrid smell of sulfur and smoke almost overwhelmed him. He noticed a metallic taste in his mouth, an irritating tickle in his nose and throat, and his eyes smarted.

There was little traffic on the streets. The few people who were out wore scarves or surgical masks or held handkerchiefs to their faces. Lighted advertising signs could scarcely be read at a distance of 100 feet. A London bobby, framed by the fog, a handkerchief clasped to his face, stood in front of a newsstand with a large chalk sign that read: "Smog Deaths Rise."

The doctor coughed, and shivered with the cold. But he knew he was lucky; he was neither asthmatic nor prone to respiratory ills. Others were less fortunate. The death toll from what the experts called a "minor skirmish with air pollution" in London was first put at 106. Then, in February of this year, city Health Officer J. A. Scott, after examining hospital records and death certificates, gave the final official count. The "killer smog" had taken 340 lives.

This disaster struck 3,000 miles away. But at almost exactly the same time, a stagnant air mass over the Northeastern United States caused a steady, alarming increase in pollution levels from Richmond to Boston. If we had not been lucky—if this mass of contaminated air had not been blown out over the ocean in time—the United States might have suffered the worst air-pollution calamity in history.

There have been noticeable air-pollution episodes in many cities of the country. In New Orleans and in Weirton, W. Va., thousands of people have become sick from breathing dirty air. Even in Washington, D.C.—a city without much industry, but with automobiles and homes and government offices—the sulfur dioxide level was more than 0.3 parts per million of air for more than 8 hours on February 6 of this year. In Los Angeles, which has an infinitely more acute pollution problem, a "smog alert" goes into effect when sulfur dioxide levels reach 3 parts per million of air. Then industries burning sulfur-laden fuel oil must switch to natural gas.

If a sensible man knew that someone was pumping filthy waste matter into the air of the room where he was sitting, he would not stay there. He would not let his wife or child or even his dog stay. If he had no other choice, he would at least open the windows to clear the air.

We cannot abandon our smog-darkened cities, of course. So we continue to breathe the polluted air, and unless it is disastrously dirty, we usually don't even know what we are doing to our lungs. This dirty—"polluted"—air makes our livestock ill and so reduces meat and milk production, stunts and sometimes destroys our crops. It corrodes buildings, bridges, monuments, and structures of all kinds. By reducing visibility, it creates traffic hazards and poses a threat to air navigation.

Expert estimates of the high price we are paying for filth in the air today run into billions of dollars a year. Some of our metropolitan centers suffer damages of up to $100 million a year. The daily average of airborne pollutants in one of our largest cities is 25,000 tons. The U.S. Public Health Service, which directs the Federal Government's modest anti-air-pollution program, estimates that polluted air costs every man, woman, and child in this country something like $65 a year—and the cost is going up. Increased cleaning and laundry bills, the destruction of stone and metal building materials, depressed property values, higher home-maintenance expenses and a host of other economic losses contribute to the ever-rising cost.

That $65 total obviously does not include the most important cost—the cost to our health. We do not have any realistic figures for the medical and hospital care of people made sick by breathing—day in and day out, year in and year out—air that is simply not fit to breathe. Neither do we know exactly how many people each year die of air pollution. But many scientists feel that dirty air may have a good deal to do with aggravating heart conditions and respiratory diseases such as asthma, chronic bronchitis, emphysema and lung cancer—particularly among older people. Surgeon General Luther L. Terry said recently that "there is strong circumstantial evidence" that airborne sulfur compounds "trigger outbreaks of upper respiratory infections." Ironically, our superlative technology, increasing industrial output and rising standard of living are the real culprits.

As more people crowd together in bigger cities and drive more millions of automobiles and trucks, contamination of our air becomes more serious—sometimes critical. We burn fuels in many ways to produce the power and goods necessary to our high standard of living. Usually, we do not burn any fuel completely. Our factories and automobiles throw chemical compounds into the air. Acted upon by sunlight, they produce new compounds more damaging and toxic than the original wastes. So we turn our precious atmosphere into a vast dump for gases, fumes, and dusts. We have created sewers in the sky.

We know a great deal about the causes of air pollution. But what are we as a nation doing about it? Right now—almost nothing. More than 107 million Americans live in communities that are troubled by polluted air, according to the Public Health Service. Yet only 15 States have comprehensive air-pollution-control programs, and not more than 6 actually carry on effective enforcement operations. There are only 85 cities and towns that spend $5,000 or more a year on air-pollution-control programs, yet over 6,000 communities are troubled by dirty air.

Often, we face an interstate problem. Air has no respect for State lines; the winds know no artificial boundaries. According to the 1960 census, 38 million Americans live in population centers—like Chicago and New York—that are really interstate in character. All of these people are affected by air pollution, but no really adequate interstate agency exists to protect them.

For a little more than 8 years, the Federal Government—chiefly through the U.S. Public Health Service—has been trying to help meet the threat of air pollution. Federal money, facilities, and manpower have been used for research, to help train scientists, engineers, and technicians in the specialized skills needed in the field of air-quality measurement and control, and to give technical help to local agencies and industry. Much valuable information has been assembled.

The facts are in. We know what poisons the air we breathe. We also know many ways to help clean our atmosphere. For example, we know how to remove solid particles of filth from the air by trapping them with filters, by spinning the air and letting centrifugal force do the job, or by electrifying the particles so that they will be drawn to and held on charged metal plates. If the pollutant is a gas, we have ways of "cleaning" it with a spray of water, cooling it so the unfit substances will condense and be washed away, or burning it to render it harmless.

I have introduced in the U.S. Senate legislation that will help us safeguard our precious air supply. My first bill, the Clean Air Act of 1963, would put teeth into the Federal air-pollution program. It would:

1. Establish an air-pollution research and development program on a national scale.

2. Set up a 10-year, $74 million program of grants to State, local, and regional agencies to help them in developing, initiating, or improving their own programs for the prevention and control of air pollution.

3. Establish Federal enforcement measures against air pollution, patterned after the enforcement procedures of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

A similar bill passed the House of Representatives in July; Senate hearings on my bills and proposals by Senators MAURINE B. NEUBERGER and CLAIR ENGLE began September 9. I am hopeful the Senate will complete action on the Clean Air Act of 1963 in this session of Congress.

If we are to clean up our air, a large part of the job must be done by private industry. But we can't simply point the finger at private industry and say, "You are causing some of the pollution—do something about it." The purchase and installation of equipment to control pollution is a big expense—bigger than some private industries can bear alone. Unlike many capital outlays that ultimately produce new profits, these costs serve the health and safety of all the public. There must be some public sharing with private enterprise of the economic burden of these expenditures, and I have introduced two other bills that would help private industry to control air and water pollution.

The first of these bills would lessen the economic impact of the cost of pollution control to industry through tax relief. The second would make inexpensive credit available to small firms that might otherwise have difficulty financing purchases of pollution-control equipment.

Time was when there seemed to be no harm in dumping wastes into our rivers and streams or letting them pour into the air. People were not harmed, so it seemed; anyway, a smoky mill town was a sign of new prosperity. In those days of innocence, words like "air pollution" and "smog" were novel, strange, almost meaningless to most of us. We had some general notion about smoke-control projects in St. Louis and Pittsburgh. A little later, we heard about the Los Angeles smog, and one of our popular comedians defined "smog" this way: "A nasty rumor started by tourists who insist on breathing." But smog—or polluted air—is no joke nowadays. It is a threat to our economy, to our health, and to our lives. The air we breathe is free. But if it is filled with filth, it's no bargain. We've delayed long enough. Let's act. Let's clean the air.

TESTIMONY BY VALACHI ADDED EVIDENCE OF NEED FOR TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the recent testimony of the criminal mobster, Valachi, has given added evidence of the need for our truth-in-lending bill, S. 750. Valachi's testimony indicated that moneylending, next to gambling, was the most profitable source of income to the criminal syndicate. His testimony indicated that on personal loans he was able to get 20 percent interest for 12 weeks. On a loan of $1,000 for 12 weeks, $1,200 would be repaid at $100 per week. The real annual rate of interest was therefore over 150 percent, and on renewals, the real rate of interest was even higher. I am informed that this practice is true of the criminal syndicates in other cities, as well as New York.

The passage of the truth-in-lending bill, S. 750, would bring these activities out in the open and would require these loan "sharks" to furnish borrowers with information as to what they were actually charging. Furthermore, any willful violation of the law by the syndicate would make them subject to Federal criminal prosecution and sentence, and thus give the Justice Department an added handle by which they could put these men where they belong. This would serve in much the same fashion in these matters as do the internal revenue laws.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief colloquy?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the Senator from Illinois for making such a marvelous fight for the truth-in-lending bill and for his alertness in taking advantage of the notorious national statement. What struck me about the statement was that the Valachi rate of interest of about 150 percent is not unusual. Many people who listened to that testimony would say, "Only a member of Cosa Nostra would think of charging that." The Senator will recall that the testimony before the committee for the past several years, culminating in the testimony in New York, has shown that this is a typical interest rate. In some cases, as I recall, the rate of interest was 300 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. 340 percent in one case.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct. In many cases it has been above 200 percent, and often above 100 percent. It is really a great national shame. It could well be corrected by the legislation proposed by the Senator from Illinois. As the Senator says so well, if Congress can enact Federal legislation affecting this situation, there will be Federal enforcement agencies at work. That is the kind of thing which will really bring Valachi—and others who are a little more legal in their actions—to account, because the Federal Government will enforce its laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. He has been a mighty reinforcement in this battle. I hope that many of the responsible opponents of the bill will wish to dissociate themselves from certain others of the opponents.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I commend both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Wisconsin for their comments on the bill about which the Senator from Illinois has spoken. I did not know the Senator intended to speak on that subject, but as he was speaking there came to my mind an interesting conversation I had with my wife the other day, when I said, "I do not see any monthly bills coming in from such-and-such a department store in the District of Columbia." She enlightened me as to why there were no bills coming from that department store.

Do Senators know what I learned? I learned that the store charges 6 percent interest per month on unpaid accounts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is almost incredible.

Mr. MORSE. Six percent a month. She said, "Of course, I have stopped doing business with them."

Last night I conducted public hearings on a minimum wage bill for the District of Columbia. The great Washington Board of Trade provided a long chain of non sequiturs typical of its lack of social conscience in opposition to a fair minimum wage bill for the District of Columbia. They not only presented an executive vice president but also, as a second witness, a young lady connected with one of the large department stores.

I sat there appalled that in 1963 an official representative of the Washington Board of Trade and an official representative of a great department store in the District of Columbia were opposing $1.25 an hour as a minimum wage for breadwinners in the District of Columbia.

I thought of the conversation with my wife and the usurious interest rates which are being charged, apparently quite commonly, in the District of Columbia on credit accounts. Of course, it is said, "If you do not want to pay it, you do not have to take credit." That is exactly what we are doing. We can do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Six percent a month is 72 percent a year.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

I suggest to the Washington Board of Trade that they need a little housekeeping in regard to sweeping out some of the improper business practices which prevail in the District of Columbia.

I will tell the Senator my response to those two witnesses when they got through. It was, "No questions." I would not think of dignifying that kind of testimony by wasting any time questioning such testimony.

This situation is related to the Alliance for Progress. We are hammering away at Latin America—and rightly so—saying, "We cannot be of assistance in Latin America unless you do something about your usurious interest rates." We think they are shocking. I think so. Interest rates of 13 to 30 percent are legal in many Latin American countries.

We had better take a look at some of our own. Exploitation of the poor is not limited to Latin America. It is common in the United States, to our everlasting shame.

This is an example of what I mean.

I did not mean to discuss this matter, but that is what the Senator from Illinois always does to me. He always opens up a new vista because of his great wealth of understanding in many fields. I am very glad he has made the comment he has made, in the hope that the bill can be passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Oregon, who always speaks on the side of the people.

I see present in the Chamber the great junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I know he will be pleased that the attorney general of New York, a member of his great party, Mr. Louis Lefkowitz, has endorsed the truth-in-lending bill. So we have been finding support in what hitherto have been unlikely places. I know that my friend from New York, who has as high an estimation of Mr. Lefkowitz as I do, will be deeply impressed by the support of the attorney general of New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator for his tribute to our great attorney general, who has been in the forefront of the fight for the protection of the consumer in the conduct of his office and has taken a leading role in that direction. I am glad to know from the Senator of his support of this specific legislation. I can assure the Senator the views of Mr. Lefkowitz will carry great weight with the Senator from New York when he reaches the point of studying the legislation, which I assume the Senator from Illinois will shortly report from his committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish I could say that, but inside the committee we are running into the usual bipartisan alliance against progress which impedes us very much; but we are hoping this ice jam may break under the rays of truth.

Mr. KEATING. I was not sure of the legislative situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true that thus far we have been unable to get the bill out of committee because of the bipartisan alliance against progress.

Mr. KEATING. Would the Senator's bill take care of the difficulties cited by the Senator from Oregon? Would it require that the interest rates may be made clear?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would require that the interest rate be stated, not in monthly terms, but in annual terms. So it would be stated as 72 percent.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, a bill from a department store instead of showing the interest as 6 percent, would have to show it is at the rate of 72 percent a year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. That would have a wholesome effect.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to be helpful to the Senator from Oregon in any of his domestic problems.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator have his checkbook with him?

Mr. KEATING. Except that I would not want to pay his bills.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN RELATION TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak a few minutes on the Latin American crisis in U.S. foreign policy.

I spoke earlier this afternoon in colloquy with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and said that as an accommodation to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who is in charge of the pending bill, I would withhold until the close of the day the completion of my observations.

I do not know of anyone who is sure of what State Department policy is toward recent developments in Latin America. Certainly I do not know of any member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate who is sure. I am not sure that the State Department is sure. I am only hoping that the remarks that I have been making on this subject may be helpful to the State Department in crystallizing policy either along the lines of views I have been expressing or clear-cut opposition to those views, because this is a situation which we cannot have both ways.

If the State Department plans to do business as usual with military juntas in Latin America, it had better be prepared to do business with Communist dictators there, too, because that is what we will spawn down there if we go along with military overthrows of civilian governments.

The history of the postwar era in Latin America is entirely contradictory to the theory that military coups are the preferred alternative to Communist takeovers. The fact is that military governments do more to encourage Communist takeovers than do any of the failings of Juan Bosch, or Romulo Betancourt, or any of the other elected presidents who are threatened by their own military forces or who have already been deposed.

The world of Batista, with its suppression of freedom, its assassinations, its political murders, created the climate that enabled the Communists of Cuba to gain power. In Venezuela and in Colombia, it was military-sponsored dictators whose terroristic regimes gave rise to street riots, demonstrations, and the other manifestations of popular rebellion that the Communists are trained to capitalize on and ride to power.

There is not a man in the Department of State who has any idea of how a military coup, once it is accomplished, will turn out. At its very best, it may reestablish constitutionalism. At worst, it will lay the groundwork for a Communist takeover. I am at a complete loss to understand what there is in either of these possible outcomes that justifies our support of such a coup.

The overthrow of Batista, Rojas, and Jiminez in the late 1950's convinced North and South America alike that it was time to try constitutional government as an alternative to military repression.

Now we are hearing that the bad old days may not have been so bad after all. The State Department's spokesmen are talking about going back to a policy that clearly failed before and had to be junked.

They are kidding themselves if they think they can do better with military juntas than with elected governments in Latin America. If they think civilian governments are risky, surely they should know from history that military juntas are infinitely more risky.

To date, there is only one Communist government in Latin America, and it followed a Fascist, military-backed dictator. Whatever the failings of the democrats in Latin America, none has yet given way to a Castro.

It is the military juntas, with their rigidity and their history of clinging to power regardless of the cost to the people of their country, that are the real breeding ground of communism in Latin America.

The real answer to Secretary Martin is that military governments do not even provide any security against communism. A military coup, with all the repressions that go with it, fosters and creates the instability that gives the Communists their greatest opportunity. The State Department has no way whatever of knowing whether a military coup will eventually return control to civilians, as in Peru, or become increasingly dictatorial, as in Guatemala. The Department is playing a far more dangerous game in playing along with a military coup than in playing along with constitutionalism, even if the danger of communism were the only consideration.

I also want to forewarn the State Department that it had better watch out that it may not be guilty of some false assumptions in regard to Peru and the Argentine, for we have no way of knowing how successful the apparent trend toward civilian control following a military coup may be in those two countries.

That does not justify a military coup in either country, or, in my opinion, our recognition of it. That recognition cannot be squared with the statements we made at the time the Alliance for Progress program was initiated. But there are many who hold to the point of view that in both Peru and the Argentine the civilian governments will be only as successful as the military powers in the background are willing to permit them to be, and that their reforms will go only as far as that residual military power allows them to go.

That is the danger that always exists when a government comes into power with a military coup; and when it comes into power through a military coup it is also very difficult to throw off the cloak of suspicion that enshrouds it.

It is extremely important, as shown in an article dealing with Venezuela that I shall cite in a moment, that we now make crystal clear to all South America that the Dominican coup and the Honduras coup will never have American support.

The Honduras coup has an interesting difference from some of the coups. The Honduras coup occurred a very few days before a scheduled national election. It was pretty well known that the leading candidate for President—almost everyone agreed that he would be elected—was campaigning on a proposal to bring the Honduran military under civilian control.

There is a novel situation in Honduras. Under the Honduran Constitution the military has gained autonomy. The candidate for President was of the opinion that if they were going to have really true constitutional processes in Honduras and a constitutionalism in which the people really were the masters, and not the servants, of their Government, they could not have an autonomous military authority in the country above the Constitution. So he was proposing in his campaign that the military be brought under civilian control.

The military realized that the people were supporting that position and that this candidate was going to be elected.

One of the sad things about Latin American dictatorships is that they are the product of the American military system by way of training. Of course, they were armed with American weapons under the military aid program. That is known all over Latin America and elsewhere in the world. Therefore it is said to us, when we go there as representatives of the United States, at various international conferences, "Your hands are dirty; they are not clean. The United States must assume its full share of responsibility for subjugating freedom in various parts of the world by use of American military weapons and by the training of military personnel through the American military training program." It is a pretty difficult argument to answer.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was struck this morning by the article in the Washington Post, which documented this matter in some depth, and pointed out that in both Honduras and the Dominican Republic, and, in other military coups in South America, these men received their training in this country. The article listed the names of the men and where they received their training in this country.

I wonder whether there is some possibility, either by being selective in our training, or perhaps in being careful that our training also provides some indoctrination in democratic principles, to some extent, of seeing to it that men who are trained in this country understand that this country believes deeply in the fundamental importance of civilian control of the military and in constitutional government, and that we feel that the military exists for the sole purpose of defending the people in a particular area and in promoting freedom and constitutional processes.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. We must follow the course of action which the Senator outlines. We must stop giving military aid anywhere where there is not complete civilian control of the military, and where we are not completely satisfied that the military aid is not going to be used to subvert freedom. I believe we have a responsibility to do that.

The State Department is playing a far more dangerous game in playing along with the military coup than it would play if it supported constitutionalism, even if the dangers of communism were the only consideration. For example, communism grew far stronger under the Jiminez dictatorship in Venezuela than it was either before or after that regime. As I pointed out the other day, the failure of military governments to forestall communism was the whole reason for turning to constitutionalism supported by the Alliance for Progress.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article published in this afternoon's Evening Star, for October 9, 1963, entitled "Latin Coups Force Decision on U.S." I wish first to read a brief excerpt from the article:

> On one side, Venezuelans hear a State Department spokesman declare that the United States is inclined to support the Venezuelan-Costa Rican call for a hemispheric foreign ministers meeting over the illegal military takeovers. They see the United States suspend diplomatic relations and hear Secretary of State Rusk announce withdrawal of U.S. economic and military aid missions from the Dominican Republic and Honduras.
>
> But on the other side they read excerpts of what amounts to a policy statement by Assistant Secretary of State Edwin Martin in Sunday's New York Herald Tribune implying that military coups are not always a bad thing in Latin America and citing the eventual democratic outcome of military takeovers last year in Argentina and Peru as examples.
>
> In the eyes of President Betancourt no third way exists for the United States. His inflexible position is dictated by far more than an abstract devotion to democratic processes.
>
> Mr. Betancourt himself is deeply engaged in a deadly struggle against both Communist terrorism and a restive military for the survival of civilian democracy in this oil-rich country on the Caribbean rim of South America.
>
> Whatever the public denials, officials here live with the fear that the Venezuelan military will use the same anti-Communist excuse as the Dominican and Honduran military to veto the national elections due here December 1 and in the name of law and order prevent a civilian successor to Mr. Betancourt from being installed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN COUPS FORCE DECISION ON UNITED STATES

(By George Sherman)

CARACAS, October 9.—The prevailing view in this key capital is that the United States stands at a decisive crossroads in its policy toward Latin America.

It is a crossroads dramatically marked by military coups d'etat during the past 2 weeks in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

In the view of high Government officials here, one road now leads to U.S. recognition and eventual accommodation with accomplished military facts and the other to U.S. support of throwing a hemispheric "cordon sanitaire" around the new and "illegal" regimes.

The Venezuelan Government is already far along the second road. The standing policy of President Romulo Betancourt is strongly to condemn military seizures of power and automatically to withdraw diplomatic recognition. But at this point the confused picture transmitted here from Washington is that the United States is attempting to stagger down both roads at once.

On one side, Venezuelans hear a State Department spokesman declare that the United States is "inclined" to support the Venezuelan-Costa Rican call for a hemispheric foreign ministers meeting over the illegal military takeovers. They see the United States suspend diplomatic relations and hear Secretary of State Rusk announce withdrawal of United States economic and military aid missions from the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

But on the other side they read excerpts of what amounts to a policy statement by Assistant Secretary of State Edwin Martin in Sunday's New York Herald Tribune implying that military coups are not always a bad thing in Latin America and citing the eventual democratic outcome of military takeovers last year in Argentina and Peru as examples.

In the eyes of President Betancourt no third way exists for the United States. His inflexible position is dictated by far more than an abstract devotion to democratic processes.

Mr. Betancourt himself is deeply engaged in a deadly struggle against both Communist terrorism and a restive military for the survival of civilian democracy in this oil-rich country on the Caribbean rim of South America.

Whatever the public denials, officials here live with the fear that the Venezuelan military will use the same anti-Communist excuse as the Dominican and Honduran military to veto the national elections due here December 1 and in the name of law and order prevent a civilian successor to Mr. Betancourt from being installed.

This fear comes out in an unbending determination that the United States should join in making an example of the two new military governments. At times officials show more emotion than logic in expounding their views. They are not at all sure a foreign ministers meeting would insure a peaceful transition back to civilian constitutional government or how it would control the havoc bound to result in the countries isolated by hemispheric economic and diplomatic sanctions.

SEE PROVIDING INCENTIVE

They will sit and listen quietly to the argument that limited U.S. diplomatic recognition and economic aid to military governments once they clearly hold power—can be a powerful weapon for obtaining definite commitments on new elections and restoration of constitutional governments. They are even willing to admit that this U.S. policy of democratic promises paid dividends this year in Argentina and Peru, where the military establishments handed over power to the newly elected authorities.

But in the end the Venezuelan argument always comes back to a simple black-and-white issue: the United States must draw a line here and now to deter future military coups d'etat in Latin America. They say that without firm and unyielding opposition to new regimes—whatever the consequences in the Dominican Republic and Honduras—the military establishments all over the southern continent will have an incentive to follow suit.

ASSUME U.S. POWER

The important ingredient in this argument is an unconscious assumption that the United States has the power to make and break governments in the hemisphere. Few Venezuelan officials seem to have thought through how the use of this power in concert with the smaller countries of the hemisphere against undemocratic governments would fit into that most sacred of all inter-American principles—nonintervention.

Even the least suggestion here that the United States might in fact have to intervene in Venezuela to preserve the Betancourt government against the military causes a storm of indignation from all sides. Officials uniformly maintain that the leaders of the Venezuelan military are dedicated to maintaining democracy and have repeatedly proved their loyalty to the civilian government.

No evidence other than a flood or rumors currently exists to disprove this contention. Nevertheless, responsible observers still do not rule out the possibility that within the next 2 months Venezuela may be a key country where the United States will once more be called upon to make an example for Latin America.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the other day I put into the RECORD an article and a personal letter which I received from the deposed President of Guatemala, who was a victim, in the recent past, of a military coup in Guatemala. We need to refer to it frequently, because in both the letter that he wrote to the New York Times, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in the much longer personal letter which he wrote to me, which I also inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he points out that the propaganda of the militarists, and the argument that they used with which to fool the people, and the alibi that they present—and I have heard it in the halls of Congress in recent days—is that the coup was necessary because the deposed President was soft on communism. If there was any elected President who was not soft on communism, it was President Ydigoras. Yet the excuse was used even in his case.

To the military mind, of course, any democratic proposal is interpreted as being soft on communism. Democratic Presidents are for land reform in Latin America. That is being soft on communism in the eyes of the military juntas. Tax reform is being soft on communism in the minds of the military in Latin America. Let us not forget that the military are usually of the class of the oligarchs. Let us not forget that in most instances the high officers of the Latin American military come from the families of the oligarchs. It is a matter of caste. It is a matter of social and economic prestige. The undeniable fact is that the Latin American military caste system has continued to foist upon the mass of the Latin American people terrible economic restrictions and exploitations which have led to the poverty, disease, and degradation that characterize so many million people living in Latin America.

The United States must stop supporting it. The United States must make perfectly clear that it is not going to support the military caste system of Latin America. The military caste system offers no hope for economic freedom in Latin America. If we continue to support the military caste system of Latin America, we will continue to impose on the mass of Latin American people deprivation, feudalism, and economic exploitation. To overcome that we made a great show to the world that we were offering Latin America the Alliance for Progress program.

Before I conclude these remarks, I wish to point out what the commitments of the President of the United States were at the time. I stand squarely behind those commitments. I am only asking the State Department to stand by them. The weaseling that has been coming out of the State Department in the past 96 to 120 hours cannot be squared with the promises of the President to support democratic regimes in Latin America.

I now invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "Recommended Reading," published in the Washington Post of October 8, 1963. I do not want to cause any heart attacks in the editorial rooms of the Washington Post, but I wish to commend the editors of the Post. The Washington Post has been doing a grand job, in keeping with the highest responsibilities of free journalism in this country, in the articles and editorials it has been publishing on the entire Latin American situation. I recommend the high level of journalism of the Washington Post on this subject to American journalism generally. If the press will only live up to its educational responsibilities that go along with the guarantee of a free press, public opinion will be much more enlightened than it is in regard to the facts about U.S. foreign policy in Latin America.

The editorial begins:

> Assistant Secretary Martin's animadversions about the difficulties of democratic governments in Latin America, on the nobility of some of the military regimes that have had to liquidate them and on the inability of the United States to do anything about it—in any case—are not likely to prevent more military coups. They are more likely to encourage them.
>
> Those who speak for this country ought to be staying that we will not deal with unconstitutional regimes, that we prefer even inefficient elected governments to the most competent military government. It is one of the weaknesses of elective systems that they occasionally turn up an administration that is riddled with nepotism, reeking with privilege, saddled with graft and crippled by sheer incompetence. When that happens, the citizens ought to turn to the constitutional means of providing a legal alternative at the first opportunity. They ought not turn to a military regime for an instant remedy.

The editorial continues:

> There is a great deal of truth about Latin America's past in Secretary Martin's remarks. But this administration was going to change the bad old past of military dictatorships. It was not to be an administration that looked with complacency and resignation on military coups.
>
> Before the election, Mr. Kennedy said that this country should "strengthen the cause of freedom throughout all Latin America"; that we should not allow Latin America to be "unsure of our stand on native dictators as well as Communist dictators."

Mr. President, I wonder how the people in the Dominican Republic react to the words of the President at this hour. I wonder what the people of Honduras and Guatemala think about the words of the President at this hour, with respect to what has happened to them under a military coup. I wonder if they are not asking the question—and rightly—whether we intend to deliver on the President's words that we should not allow Latin America to be "unsure of our stand on native dictators as well as Communist dictators"; or his words, as the Post editorial continues:

> That we ought to "make the American Revolution the chief import of Latin America"; that our policy in Latin America should "precede events and not follow them"; that the Eisenhower administration "lacked the leadership and the vigor to act"; that "we ought to eliminate all despotism in Latin America"; that we have let Latin Americans think we are "more interested in stable regimes than free governments."

I cannot weigh the recent remarks of the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, Mr. Martin, and reach any other conclusion than that he is saying, in effect, that we are more interested in stable regimes than in free government. Of course, I do not believe his policy will even result in stable regimes for long.

When Assistant Secretary Martin talks about "good" military juntas and "bad" military juntas, I repeat what I said earlier this afternoon: There are no "good" military juntas, by the very nature of the beast. It is a beast that devours freedom. It is a beast that pounces upon a democratic government and destroys it.

Stability cannot possibly be established unless one wants to say that there is a stable democratic government after it has been devoured and put inside the military junta.

The impression that the State Department has left with me, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and has left with some other Senators with whom I have talked today, who listened to the discussion of the Committee on Foreign Relations this morning, and who listened to the Martin briefing the other day before the Committee on Foreign Relations, is that the Department is playing with the idea that it is more interested in military junta regimes and their front-men civilian stooges in Latin America than in free government.

The editorial continues with the words of the President:

> More interested in fighting against communism than in fighting for freedom.

It is interesting, when we talk with American military personnel who give us briefings, to observe how the Communist bugaboo has taken over their thinking, and how so many of them, apparently, are perfectly willing to follow in support of military dictatorship at the cost of freedom, because they have victimized themselves with the propaganda that if military juntas are not supported, the countries will go Communist.

The Washington Post editorial concludes:

> The President made some good speeches about Latin American affairs, during the campaign. Assistant Secretary Martin ought to read them.

Mr. President, I recommend it. It is sorely needed in the Department of State in these critical hours.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Latin Policy Defense Brings Added Discord," published in the Washington Post of October 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN POLICY DEFENSE BRINGS ADDED DISCORD

(By Murrey Marder)

The Kennedy administration's efforts to justify its Latin American policy in the face of a series of military coups took on added dimension yesterday—and discord.

A high-ranking official said that the large number of fledgling democracies that have developed in Latin America in the last few years have meant there are more vulnerable governments in office.

With these young democracies attempting social and economic reforms, he said, tensions have been intensified, and the old order is fighting to retain its prerogatives.

The official said in a background discussion of foreign policy that, in a comparative sense, the kind of military coups that have taken place in the last 2 years represent progress.

The progress, he said, is reflected by the fact that in recent military takeovers, the Latin military regimes have been more civilized than their predecessors. Instead of old-style dictatorial methods, the official said, the new regimes recognize a responsibility to the people and a necessity to return to constitutional government.

This does not mean that the United States favors or condones military coups, the official emphasized. But he said the changing pattern, nevertheless, represents a gain during a transition stage of pain, difficulty and turmoil in altering historic patterns.

Under the rules of the background conference the official could not be identified. But the views were an amplification of the policy expressed in public on Sunday by Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. In discussing military coups, Martin said that some have produced beneficial results, in Argentina, Peru, and elsewhere; he said democracy cannot be imposed by "fiat."

ALLIANCE UNDERCUT

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, yesterday criticized Martin's argument and rationale, charging that it undercuts and destroys the entire premise of the Alliance for Progress.

Martin has done just what he denied doing, delivered an apology for military coups and strong-man rule in Latin America, charged MORSE, who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin America.

The Martin policy, said MORSE, would be a throwback to 1957 policy "when U.S. support of Fascist governments caused millions of Latin Americans to look to Fidel Castro instead of to the United States for deliverance from poverty and violent repression."

RESULTS FAR FROM IN

MORSE said that even in the best of cases cited by Martin—Peru and Argentina—the results are far from in. MORSE said that in Guatemala, which Martin mentioned, there does not even appear to be any election in sight, nor, similarly, does there appear to be any return to constitutional processes in sight in Ecuador.

Even so, these are the exceptions, said MORSE, and Mr. Martin does not mention the general rule that the more common result is that the longer military regimes stay in power, the more rigid and more cynical they become.

"We should have it clearly understood from the officials in charge of Latin American affairs," said MORSE, "that the military faction that seizes power in Latin America is, in the same stroke, taking its country out of the Alliance for Progress, so far as U.S. economic and military aid are concerned."

SEES SMOKESCREEN

All U.S. aid to the Dominican Republic and Honduras has been suspended, and the aid missions recalled. But MORSE said yesterday, "One can only assume that Mr. Martin has laid down the typical diplomatic smokescreen of shoulder-shrugging preliminary to recognition and aid to the new dictatorships of the Dominican Republic and Honduras."

But informed sources last night said that officials of the Agency for International Development are urging the administration to make a very tough stand on withholding aid to the two countries, as a warning to others.

There have been claims in both the Dominican Republic and Honduras that a dominant reason for the military coups there was what has been called a dangerous softness of the constitutional regimes on communism. But American official sources said that in neither case was that the true major reason for the coups, which also involved mixtures of military, political, and economic opposition and desire to maintain threatened positions of privilege.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is a fascinating article. I had something to say about it in my discussions with the Secretary of State this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations. On Monday, I made a highly critical speech dealing with Assistant Secretary Martin's article that was published in the Sunday Washington Post and the Sunday New York Times. It was a most unfortunate article. It has performed a great disservice to our country. It has created much confusion and misunderstanding throughout Latin America.

The article, the repercussions of which are reflected in the story published this afternoon in the Washington Star, came from a correspondent in Venezuela who reported on the perplexity and the confusion that exist there today because of doubt as to what America's policy really is in regard to military juntas. As I told the Secretary of State this morning, the Martin article could not possibly produce anything except confusion and misunderstanding.

This article is supplemented today by an article which I believe does great disservice to the foreign policy of the United States. The latter article also emanates from the State Department. It is important for us to consider the implications of the article, for this is the first statement to come from the State Department, following my criticism of U.S. policies in regard to the Dominican Republic and Honduras, and also in regard to the general problem, throughout all of Latin America, raised by the coups in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras.

This article is by Murrey Marder, one of our most able reporters:

> The Kennedy administration's efforts to justify its Latin American policy in the face of a series of military coups took on added dimensions yesterday—and discord.
>
> A high-ranking official said that the large number of fledgling democracies that have developed in Latin America in the last few years have meant there are more vulnerable governments in office.

In that anonymous statement, the high-ranking official proceeded to cover some of the points I raised in my speech in the Senate in criticism of the policies of the State Department in regard to Latin America.

This morning I said to the Secretary of State, "What is the matter? Why do you not attach the name to this 'high-ranking' State Department spokesman? If it is you, the Secretary, say so. If it is the Director of Aid, Mr. Bell, who attended the hearings this morning, say so. If it is the Under Secretary, Mr. Ball, tell the American people who the 'high-ranking' official spokesman is. If it is the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Martin"—who I suspect is the official involved, although I do not know that—"use his name."

Mr. President, we are not going to strengthen the lines of relationships between the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with such anonymous attacks. I hope it will not be necessary for me to make that criticism again to the Secretary of State. I want him to know that I can take anything he or anyone else in his Department dishes out. However, when the State Department purports to make an answer to criticisms made by me, when speaking as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, the American people need to know the source of the answer.

I say to the Secretary of State that under our system of checks and balances, Congress should have an opportunity to place responsibility on the individual on whose shoulders it belongs.

Let me say to the journalists of America that this is a very interesting example of managed news; it is not an example of the exercise of freedom of the press. It is the kind of news release tactic that we would expect in a nondemocratic society, but not in a democratic society. Any time anyone in the State Department wishes to criticize me or any other Senator, he should come out into the open and should identify the criticism with his name.

But the article goes on, as follows:

> The official said in a background discussion of foreign policy that, in a comparative sense, the kind of military coups that have taken place in the last 2 years represent progress.

Imagine that, Mr. President. Here we find that an official of the U.S. Department of State, in the face of the position we have taken in the Alliance for Progress, and in the face of the promises the President of the United States made, when he was a candidate for the Presidency in 1960, to support constitutional systems, not military dictatorships, had the audacity to say that the kind of military coups which have taken place in the last 2 years represent progress.

Instead, they represent retrogression. Military coups represent a beastly, devouring attack on the organs of democracy.

I read further from the article:

> The progress, he said, is reflected by the fact that in recent military takeovers, the Latin military regimes have been more civilized than their predecessors. Instead of old-style dictatorial methods, the official said, the new regimes recognize a responsibility to the people and a necessity to return to constitutional government.

But, Mr. President, what has happened to the Constitutions, under the coups? What has happened to the Presidents, under the coups? What has happened to the congresses, under the coups? They have been destroyed. Their power has been destroyed, and the congresses have been ended. The Presidents and all the other executive officers have been thrown out, and those in charge of the coups have announced that the Constitutions are no more.

In the case of Guatemala, we hardly drew a deep breath before we decided to keep the aid going to the junta that overthrew President Ydigoras. All indications are that conditions in Guatemala are deteriorating. It was in March, in the case of Guatemala, that we should have slammed shut the door on military juntas. Our failure to do so was probably an encouragement to the conspirators in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I have listened with much interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and I wish to commend him for the leadership he has given, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs, in connection with matters relating to American foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere. The Senator from Oregon knows that I share his misgivings about the military coups d'etat that have occurred in recent months in Latin America.

I believe there are ways in which we can modify the foreign-aid program so as to put the military forces of Latin America on notice that penalties attach as a matter of law when military power is abused and constitutional governments are deposed.

I know that the Senator from Oregon has one such amendment under consideration. I wish him to know that in his effort to secure the adoption of that amendment he will have the full support of the senior Senator from Idaho. I commend him for his work and for the splendid speech that he is making on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Idaho very much. I wish the RECORD to show, and I desire to have the people of Idaho and the Nation know, that for several years the Senator from Idaho has been one of the most effective leaders in the Committee on Foreign Relations in a serious attempt that has been made to do exactly what he has pointed out. He stood for the military aid that is necessary actually to maintain internal security and avoid a Communist coup. But he has also stood for placing limits on the amount of such aid because of the danger of building up an all-out-of-proportion military strength not needed to meet a threat of a Communist take-over, but used so frequently as weapons for the staging of military coups. He has also been one of the leaders in trying to place the type of restrictions he is talking about now on the granting of military aid.

We must do it also with respect to economic aid. The military leaders must understand that both military and economic aid are at an end if they are followed by devouring attacks upon the organizations of constitutionalism in Latin America. In my judgment, such progress as we have made—and we have made some—is due in no small measure to the statesmanship of the Senator from Idaho. As his colleague on the committee, I thank him from the bottom of my heart for the great assistance he has been to me.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, going back to the article of Mr. Marder, he said:

> This does not mean that the United States favors or condones military coups.

Of course not. That is what we would call very good footwork on the part of the "high spokesman" for the State Department, whoever he may be. He puts a little tiptoe dancing into his act as a change of pace. He said that it does not mean that the United States favors or condones military coups. However, he had just finished pointing out that there are good coups and bad coups. I do not know what worse nonsense a spokesman for the State Department could engage in. He said:

> The changing pattern, nevertheless, represents a gain during a transition stage of pain, difficulty, and turmoil in altering historic patterns.

Mr. President, I ask that Senators listen as the article continues, attributing the statements to this high State Department spokesman:

> Under the rules of the background conference the official could not be identified.

I ask the American people, "How much stock should you take in such an anonymous statement?" The Department's tactic in conducting this kind of interview was the tactic of propaganda. It placed every word he had to say under suspicion.

That is not the way information should be given to a free people. That kind of press interview cannot be reconciled with a free press in our country. The American people are entitled to know who he is. They are entitled to make clear to him that no matter who he is or what position he occupies, he is a servant of the American people and not their master, nor does he have the right to prostitute his position in the manner that he did in that kind of interview; for this is illegitimacy as far as information service is concerned. He ought to come clean and admit that the State Department officials are disturbed, as I happen to know they are, about some of the criticisms they have been receiving from a half dozen or more U.S. Senators in the last few days. They are not going to answer us successfully with that kind of prostituted journalism.

So I said to the Ambassador and to the Assistant Secretary of State, both by the name of Martin, "I think we have reached the point where the people of the Dominican Republic must learn that so long as that military coup is in power"—and it is still in power behind a facade of three so-called civilian councilmen out in front who have no more power than the military gives them—"and so long as the constitutional system remains subjugated, they will get no assistance from the United States."

The point was raised, "But that might play into the hands of the Communists."

So far as the people are concerned, it does not make any difference whether they live under a Fascist regime or a Communist regime so far as individual rights are concerned. A police state is a police state whether it is Communist or Fascist. If we were to add up the brutalities and cruelties of the police states of communism and the police states of Fascism, it would be difficult to draw any line of demarcation between them so far as human suffering and loss of human rights are concerned.

The article continues:

> But the views were an amplication of the policy expressed in public on Sunday by Edwin M. Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. In discussing military coups—

That is some basis for my suspicion that probably the "high spokesman" in discussing military coups was Martin himself. Referring to the article of last weekend, the author indicated that Martin said "Some have produced beneficial results, in Argentina, Peru, and elsewhere; and he said "democracy cannot be imposed by fiat."

I also wish to advise Mr. Martin that democracy cannot be developed either by recognizing military coups or military takeovers and then supporting them with American money.

When we had the briefing by Martin and Martin the other day before the Committee on Foreign Relations, I put to them the proposal that in these circumstances I believe we have reached the point at which we must serve notice on all the rest of the military throughout Latin America that if they stage a military coup, they will cut themselves off from the United States in respect to any form of relationship with the United States—military, economic, and diplomatic.

I do not "buy" the military alibi, "if we do not support these military takeovers, the Dominican Republic and Honduras may go Communist." We have Batista's legacy to remind us of that fallacy.

In the Dominican Republic the people did not know freedom for 31 years until Bosch was elected. No one questions the fact that there had been a perfectly proper election.

In Honduras there was a democratically elected President, a man about whom I formed a favorable impression when I was one of the congressional aids who accompanied the President to the conference at Costa Rica earlier this year. I saw President Morales in action. I talked to him, and had an opportunity to observe him or to "size him up," as we say.

The impression was created with me that he was a constitutionalist, that he was a civilian leader, that he believed in democratic processes, that he was carrying out the duties of an executive. He, too, as President, supported the position taken by the candidate for the Presidency who was admitted to be far out in the lead, that the military should be brought under civilian control. We have let him down. When we let him down, we let down all freedom in Latin America and increased the danger of more military coups with more eventual Communist takeovers, as I said at the beginning of this speech. That is regrettable.

I sincerely hope that the State Department will clarify its position on this matter. I said to the Secretary of State this morning, "It is not enough to answer that you have cut off military aid and economic aid."

We have a rather extensive Peace Corps operation in the Dominican Republic. Members of the Peace Corps are probably closer to the Dominican people than any other mission we have. This is not something to be done without suffering, hardships, and heartaches. It will be necessary for the people of the Dominican Republic also to understand that the price of freedom comes high—but it is worth it.

I said to the Secretary, "I think you should bring back the Peace Corps." That perhaps would dramatize to the common people more than anything else that we mean business when we say we are not going to support a country so long as a military junta is in direct or indirect control.

Yesterday I spent as much time as I could, prior to being called to the floor to handle the vocational education bill, with the man who would be Ambassador to the United States if President Bosch were still in power in the Dominican Republic, Ambassador del Rosario. When I was called to the Chamber, I left him with my administrative assistant and with my legislative assistant. They conferred with him for 2 hours or more. With his complete approval, that conference was taken down in shorthand. It is being transcribed. It will be submitted to him for any editing for accuracy he wishes to make. Then, as I made clear to the Secretary of State this morning, I shall be glad to discuss the contents of the transcript with him.

Because he may very well speak on the subject later, another Senator also had a conference with this Ambassador. He agreed with me this morning when I said to the Secretary of State: "Mr. Secretary, if only 10 percent of what Ambassador del Rosario told us was factual, we cannot justify American foreign policy in the Dominican Republic."

Some days ago I submitted to the Secretary of State a memorandum dealing with allegations that I considered involved gross misconduct on the part of American business interests in the Dominican Republic. That was before I had the conference with the legitimate Dominican Ambassador to the United States.

The Secretary of State assured me this morning that the letter I sent containing a long list of requests for information would be responded to as rapidly as the information I asked for could be gathered, but that the Department would not wait until it got all the information. They would give it to me on the installment plan, which I appreciate very much.

There can be no misunderstanding of my position with respect to my appraisal of the Secretary of State. I believe that the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, is one of the most dedicated public servants with whom I have ever worked in my many years in the Senate. He has an extremely difficult assignment. He cannot possibly be aware at all times of all the details and all the phases of American foreign policy. He must delegate responsibility. He has to rely upon his subordinates. He has been involved in recent weeks in European and Russian matters.

I do not want to have anything in my two speeches today indicate any lack of confidence on my part in Secretary Rusk or any criticism of Secretary Rusk as Secretary. I am critical of what has been coming out of the State Department. I only seek to have the Secretary take cognizance of it, evaluate it, and announce what his policy will be. I hope it will be a policy that can be justified on the facts.

I am satisfied there have been American business interests and individuals in Latin-America so antigovernment that they gave support to anti-Bosch movements in the country. They helped finance the campaign against him, and prior to the coup they worked very closely with the military junta.

Let me say to American business interests abroad: "You cannot justify that course of conduct. You cannot expect the American people to come to your assistance financially and, if a crisis develops, with the expenditure of American blood, if you yourselves are in any way involved in a cause-to-effect relationship that produced the crisis."

I shall say no more about that this afternoon. I shall have more to say after I receive from the State Department the information for which I have asked.

I think there is also involved in our problems with the Latin American countries, and the formulation of American foreign policy in respect thereto, the necessity of our announcing to American business interests what our position is going to be if they work counter to the established American foreign policy in Latin America. If they are going to work counter to the established American foreign policy in Latin America in relation, for example, to the Alliance for Progress program, I am not interested in their crying on the American taxpayer's shoulder for relief. I am certainly not in favor of giving them any assistance, either. They must recognize that we are all in the policy boat together. When that policy has been formulated and clearly stated, no American businessman in any foreign country can ever justify permitting himself to become involved in any way in opposition to an existing constitutional form of government.

In the Washington Post for today, October 9, there is an excellent editorial on the Latin American situation, entitled "Using the Sponge." I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Using the Sponge

After the strong man with a dagger, Lord Acton admonished, comes the small man with a sponge. The maxim applies with peculiar force to the Dominican Republic, where those responsible for the overthrow of President Juan Bosch have every motive for sponging up the pages of the past. Of course, Mr. Bosch had imperfections as a President; he may have been almost as bad as some of the less illustrious incumbents of our White House. But the white-haired President seems hardly recognizable as a man in some of the stories that depict him as a cunning monster.

The fact is that in the Dominican Republic Mr. Bosch had powerful enemies from the moment he was sworn in as President. The main opposition party, which had presided over the preceding provisional government, felt cheated of victory when Mr. Bosch won his election. Military men, used to virtual veto power over civilian authority, resented Mr. Bosch's presumption that he was their superior. Some business interests were hostile from the outset because they regarded Mr. Bosch as a leftist.

It comes as no surprise that these interested parties should seek to justify the overthrow of a constitutional President. But it is disquieting that U.S. officials should place more stress on how impossible Mr. Bosch was as President than on the grievous rupture of the Dominican Republic's evolution from arbitrary rule. In South Vietnam another regime holds power that many U.S. officials feel is "impossible." Yet in the larger interests of winning the war against communism, the United States is swallowing its doubts and is working with Mr. Diem.

Doubtless there were problems in Santo Domingo before the coup. But there were no widespread demonstrations against the regime, and no one could fairly complain that Mr. Bosch was repressive. It would be a sad circumstance if the only impossible governments the United States could support effectively were autocratic and unpopular tyrannies. No doubt, if President Betancourt were overthrown tomorrow in Venezuela, some of the same apologists for passivity would be quick to argue that he, too, was impossible—just look at the disorder in Caracas.

Mr. MORSE. In part, the editorial reads:

It comes as no surprise that these interested parties should seek to justify the overthrow of a constitutional President. But it is disquieting that U.S. officials should place more stress on how impossible Mr. Bosch was as President than on the grievous rupture of the Dominican Republic's evolution from arbitrary rule. In South Viet-Nam another regime holds power that many U.S. officials feel is "impossible." Yet in the larger interests of winning the war against communism, the United States is swallowing its doubts and is working with Mr. Diem.

Doubtless there were problems in Santo Domingo before the coup. But there were nc widespread demonstrations against the regime, and no one could fairly complain that Mr. Bosch was repressive. It would be a sad circumstance if the only impossible governments the United States could support effectively were autocratic and unpopular tyrannies. No doubt, if President Betancourt were overthrown tomorrow in Venezuela, some of the same apologists for passivity would be quick to argue that he too, was impossible—just look at the disorder in Caracas.

Mr. President, that editorial goes to the heart of the problem.

We must make up our minds which side of the fence we are on. We must make up our minds whether we are for democratic, constitutional government, or whether we are going to support the overthrow of constitutional governments by military juntas who say that they do it because the governments they overthrow, although constitutional, were soft on communism.

That old red herring is pretty well known to many of us. It is not limited to the Dominican Republic. It is not limited to Honduras. During my service in the Senate it has been dragged across the floor of the Senate time and time again. It has smelled its way on to political platform after political platform in American campaigns for the past 13 years or more.

It is about time to make perfectly clear that we are not going to formulate American foreign policy on the basis of the old red herring that we can justify supporting a dictatorship because the government it overthrew, although perfectly constitutional, elected in a free election, selected by the people under an election system that has never been open to question, was soft on communism.

That Barnum and Bailey bunkum has no place in the news releases of the State Department, and I hope we shall hear no more of this kind of apologia coming from the Department of State. Neither do we need any more sending up of trial balloons to see if silence will prevail in the Senate if a high, undisclosed, anonymous spokesman for the State Department sends one up and says, "After all, not all of the juntas are so bad."

There are two other articles which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record in making my case this afternoon: One from the Washington Post of this morning entitled, "Naive Honduran Rule Abetted Military Plats," and one in the same paper entitled "Leaders of Latin Juntas Were Trained in United States," to bear out what the Senator from Alaska pointed out in his brilliant address today.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Arms, Inaction Helped—Naive Honduran Rule Abetted Military Plots

(By Dan Kurzman)

Tegucigalpa, Honduras, October 8.—The military coup that overthrew the democratic Government of Honduras last Thursday was rooted, like most Latin American coups, in military ambition, rightist greed, government naivete and U.S. indecision.

These factors, in potent combination, made a coup inevitable. Under the deposed regime of President Ramon Villeda Morales, the military enjoyed a constitutional position perhaps unique in the world. It was not directly responsible to the executive branch of the government, but only to itself and, in limited degree, to the legislature.

Military leaders were jealous of their autonomy and feared that they would lose it after elections that were scheduled for later this month. The presidential candidate of Villeda Morales' Liberal Party, Modesto Rojas Alvarado, was strongly favored to win, and the military was convinced that he would seek to reduce its power.

That Rojas would do just that, appeared, in military eyes, to be reflected in the refusal of the Villeda Morales government to let the army supervise the elections in accordance with the constitution.

Ironically, the United States, which tried to discourage the coup, is to a considerable degree responsible for having paved the way for it. In 1954, the Honduran Army was weak, disunified, and severely lacking in political influence. But with the pro-Communist Guatemalan regime of Gen. Jacobo Arbenz consolidating its power, the United States poured arms into neighboring Honduras for use by Guatemalan Gen. Castillo Armas, who eventually invaded his Red-controlled country and ousted Arbenz.

But in order to disguise this interference in Guatemala's internal affairs, the United States signed a military assistance treaty with Honduras which called for the importation of the arms, as a byproduct. The treaty also provided for the establishment of a strong Honduran Army. Col. Oswaldo Lopez Arellano, became chief of the armed forces, a job from which he finally catapulted into his present position as head of the military government.

Until the very day of the coup, the United States was a helping friend, as attested by the Alliance for Progress handclasp emblems painted on military trucks that have carried political prisoners to jail since the coup.

REDS, CORRUPTION BLAMED

In an interview, Lopez said that corruption and Communist infiltration in the government were factors in the coup, but he made it clear that the threat to the army's position was the principal element.

Like most modern Latin American military leaders today, he does not appear to oppose democracy as such. He is only opposed to it in the measure that it endangers military influence and privileges.

Nor was the military immune to efforts by rightist politicians, mainly of the Nationalist Party, to exaggerate these dangers for their own purposes.

The rightists were horrified by Liberal Party attempts to push through communistic social and economic reforms. Most Honduran businessmen favored a coup, and their sentiment was shared by U.S. businessmen here.

"Maybe now things will be more efficient," a representative of one American firm said.

Significantly, the buildup of the armed forces with American aid was started under and nurtured by a Nationalist Party regime—a fact that the Nationalists have not let military leaders forget.

If the military lacks comprehension of democracy, democratic leaders appear to have been equally ignorant of the realities of military power. Rodas, like President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic, who was ousted in a similar coup 2 weeks ago, virtually dared the military to take action.

CIVIL GUARD WAS ISSUE

With incredible naivete, Rodas, in his campaign speeches, constantly emphasized that, as president, he would build up the strength of the Civil Guard, presumably a Liberal Party police arm, at the army's expense. This force was created by Villeda Morales in 1959 as a counterpoint to the army when it was suspected that the latter, particularly because of its autonomous nature, could not be trusted.

Unlike Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt, the Honduran leaders would not compromise with the military.

In view of these factors, anything the United States might have done short of using force, may have been futile. Nevertheless, many observers here think the tough statement issued by Secretary of State Dean Rusk announcing severance of diplomatic and economic relations apparently for a prolonged period, was much too long in coming.

U.S. officials here tried to persuade the military not to launch a coup, but, handicapped by the examples of America's soft action after other coups, particularly in the Dominican Republic, it was hard to convince the army leaders that the United States meant business.

LEADERS OF LATIN JUNTAS WERE TRAINED IN UNITED STATES

(By John G. Norris)

Most of the professional military men responsible for toppling four Latin American democracies this year are graduates of U.S. military schools, a survey showed yesterday.

Since April, military juntas have ousted the elected governments in Guatemala, Ecuador, Dominican Republic, and Honduras and taken power into their own hands.

The new strongman of Honduras, Col. Osvaldo Lopez Arrello, who took over last week with the backing of the armed forces, is U.S.-trained. He spent the years 1942–45 at U.S. Air Force bases and schools.

Two ranking officers of the Dominican Republic army, who were reported behind the ouster of President Bosch last month, have attended U.S. military schools. Maj. Gen. Victory Elby Vinas Roman, the defense minister, is a graduate of the U.S. Armor School, Ft. Knox, Ky., the Army here said.

The Dominican Embassy said that Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, director of training for the Dominican armed forces, is a graduate of the U.S. Army School in the Panama Canal Zone.

The senior member of the four-man junta in Ecuador that deposed the President in July, Vice Adm. Ramon Castro Jijon, is a 1949 graduate of the U.S. Navy General Line School, Monterey, Calif., the Navy Department here said. Admiral Castro also attended a shorter course in antisubmarine warfare tactics at the U.S. Navy base at Key West.

Another member of the Ecuadorian junta, Col. Guillermo Freile, former commander-in-chief of the navy, graduated from the U.S. Air Force Command and Staff College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., in 1960.

The Ecuadorian Embassy said that the two army members of the junta have not attended U.S. military schools. Col. Marcos Gandara, former director of the war college, studied in Spain and Italy, and Col. Luis Cabrera, former army commander-in-chief, took Chilean military courses.

Col. Enrique Peralto Azurdia, who headed the coup that deposed the democratic government in Guatemala in April, has not attended any U.S. military schools, according to the Guatemalan Embassy here. His chief of staff, Col. Miguel Ponciano, trained at U.S. Air Force schools in 1946–47.

There has been dispute over the effects of the long-standing program of inviting Latin American officers to attend U.S. military schools. Supporters of the policy have argued that not only does it orient a powerful group in Latin America toward the United States, but that the association of the military men from south of the border with the democratically imbued U.S. armed forces will in time indoctrinate them in democratic ways.

This concept was shaken last year in Peru when critics stressed that three of the four military commanders who staged a coup were trained in U.S. military schools. Its supporters stressed that changing the Latin American tradition of the coup d'etat was bound to take years, and they now note that the Peruvian junta carried out its promise to hold elections, which put a constitutional government in power.

Argentina military chiefs similarly have used their influence to restore elective government, though, like their counterparts in Peru, they still hold considerable behind-the-scenes power. Washington is keeping close watch to see what the four juntas set up this year do in this regard.

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying that I have made a speech this afternoon that has been more in the nature of a somewhat rambling conversation with the Senate and the American people than a formal address. But it is necessary that there be a great deal of talk in America on this subject, a great deal of turning over in our thoughts of the various questions about American foreign policy.

I sincerely hope that our great Secretary of State will not limit himself to briefings before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. I good naturedly and most respectfully recommend to him that he engage in some high level briefing in the State Department on United States-Latin American policy. The American people need to know, and know quickly, what the crystalized policy is going to be in respect to these dictatorships. I do not want to see us make the mistake we made in Guatemala. Guatemala is a bad example for us. We did not make a good record there. We went along with that coup; and up to the very moment that I speak, we have no assurance of any elections in Guatemala in the foreseeable future; and there is certainly no return to democratic government in Latin America.

That is the pattern we must avoid if we are not to do exactly what the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] said in his speech today was likely to happen, for the Alliance for Progress is at the crossroads.

Mr. President, all of American foreign policy, at least in Latin America, is at the crossroads. The American people have a right to ask the State Department, in the first instance, and, if it becomes necessary, the President of the United States himself, "Which fork in the road are you taking?"

I fervently plead and pray that the road we will go down will be the road that will lead to unqualified support of constitutional governments in Latin America.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY JUNTAS AND DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note that the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is chairman of our Latin American Affairs Subcommittee, and who has done such an outstanding job in that subcommittee, has spoken this evening with respect to certain developments in Latin America, and policy positions of the Government relating to those developments. I should like for a few moments to make a statement concerning certain disturbing reports which I have read in the press.

Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post reports the disturbing news that a number of the leading military men responsible for overthrowing constitutional governments of the Dominican Republic and of Honduras during the past 2 weeks are graduates of U.S. military schools. According to this report, the principal plotter behind the Dominican coup, Lt. Col. Wessin y Wessin, is a graduate of the U.S. Army School in the Panama Canal Zone. The principal military hatchetman behind the attack on the constitutional government of Honduras, Col. Lopez Arrello, was trained in U.S. Air Force schools. These are but two of the most important leaders in the coup d'etats of the past 2 weeks who received their training in military schools in the United States. This pattern was also characteristic of the military leaders who overthrew the Governments of Guatemala, and Ecuador early this year. It is most disturbing and raises some basic questions about our whole military assistance program.

I might add that in the instance of Peru, the officer who arrested the President of Peru, President Prado, who was such a good friend of the United States, and who stood with us at every critical moment of our history in recent years, was trained at the Fort Benning Tank School, and rode in an American tank up to the gates of the palace.

At the time this was very disturbing to me, and it is still very disturbing to me. I protested vigorously on the floor of the Senate not only that action by the officer of the Peruvian army and the use of American-made equipment, but also, of course, the action of the overthrowing of a constitutionally elected president of a great people and a fine country.

The basic premise on which we have been operating on is that by training Latin American military leaders in U.S. military schools we would be not only imbuing in them a friendship for the United States but also instilling in them an appreciation of constitutional government and free institutions. It has been assumed that the experiences of the Latin American military leaders in the military schools, combined with the influence of the friendships formed with American military leaders, would leave them sympathetic to a democratic political tradition which makes military leaders subordinate to the decisions of civilians.

The experience of the past 2 weeks, combined with the earlier experience in Peru, Ecuador, and Guatemala, suggests that the assumptions should be questioned. The present evidence seems to indicate that in too many cases we have not been able to indoctrinate military leaders with the virtues of free democratic government, and the necessity of adherence to civilian authority. We have been able to teach the Latin American military how to use tanks and airplanes and have apparently not been able to convince them of the wisdom of the Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution. They accept our military technology and technical training, but apparently little of the political tradition of democracy.

This raises some question about the adequacy of the programs of our military schools. What do we teach the Latin American military leaders in these schools? Is the program in these schools confined to the teaching of military tactics, strategy, and the use of weapons? Or do our programs also include something in the field of philosophy, the social sciences and the humanities, something in the field of political science, economics, sociology? Is the curriculum designed not only to teach them the techniques of modern warfare but also the fundamentals of free constitutional government? I do not know what the answer to these questions is. But I do know that the time is long overdue to closely scrutinize these programs, and to review completely our program for training Latin American military leaders in U.S. schools.

There has been far too much evidence recently that our military assistance program in Latin America has in too many cases merely generated more military power to be used for domestic political purposes; to be used not for preserving internal security or defending the nation against external threats, but for consolidating and strengthening the position of the military in the society as a whole.

I wish to be very careful in my remarks. I am happy to say that in some countries this has not been the case; that, for example, some time ago in Brazil the military did insist upon the protection of constituted authority. It is fortunate that in other areas this has also happened. The reason why I rise to make these remarks is that there is the danger of the spread of this plague, these coup d'etats by the military, through other areas of Latin America where there is social, economic, and political instability.

I wish to say for the benefit of my colleagues, for the RECORD, and also for the benefit of our administration, that the fight that is being made on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, as he speaks out courageously and forthrightly on this subject is one that is in our national interest, in the interest of the continuation of an effective foreign aid program, and in the interest of an effective American foreign policy. We might just as well let the people of America know that we do not intend to bail out the military juntas with American dollars, American goods, or American manpower.

I wish to say on the floor of the Senate today, as was said earlier in committee that the time has come to insist that these juntas be removed from our political and economic patronage. It is time to insist that we will withdraw not only our military aid and economic aid, but all our programs of support until these illegal governments are purged of the plotters and a constitutional government is restored.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not mean to interrupt the Senator, but I would be less than appreciative if I did not rise quickly to say that I appreciate very much his kind reference to me. I wish the RECORD to show that it is the courage and forthrightness of the Senator from Minnesota, along with such men as I have already referred to, like the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in the Foreign Relations Committee, who made perfectly clear to me that in my position as chairman of that subcommittee I had no alternative but to do what I can to try to bring out these facts, in the hope that we can get them weighed and evaluated in the State Department, and bring about whatever changes in our foreign policy are necessary, so that the administration of the Alliance for Progress program will keep faith with our great President's promises with regard to it when he initiated the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I know the Senator has said on several occasions that unless action is taken, and unless we make it crystal clear to these military gun-toting would-be dictators that they are going to be denied any benefits from this country, this plague, this sickness will spread, and the Alliance for Progress will be doomed to failure.

I support the Alliance for Progress. The Senator from Oregon has supported it. He has been one of the architects of it in terms of legislative effort to make it a meaningful force in the Western Hemisphere.

But I predict that unless there is clear, unequivocal, rejection of help for juntas, the funds for the Alliance for Progress will be in serious jeopardy. I regret to have to say this, but I have said it privately to officials in the Government, so why not say it publicly? I will take a back seat to no one in the Senate in supporting the foreign aid program. But when I see what is happening in South Vietnam, what is happening in Korea, and what is happening in Latin America, how can we ask the American people for more and more aid unless we demand, to the best of our ability, that the principles we enunciate as the guide for these programs be adhered to, so far as we are concerned.

Therefore, I speak up, not as an enemy, not as an opponent of American foreign policy, or of our foreign aid program, but as a friend—a true friend.

The kind of training that goes into our military assistance program is one that merits our serious and thoughtful examination. It raises some question about the adequacy of the programs of our military schools. What do we teach the Latin American military leaders in those schools? Are the programs of those schools confined to teaching military tactics, strategy, and the use of weapons? Or do the programs also include instruction in the fields of philosophy, social science, and the humanities? Do they teach something in the fields of political science, economics, and sociology? Do they teach of Jefferson? Do they teach the principles that are the basis of our constitutional system and their constitutional system? Is the curriculum in the military schools designed to teach not only the techniques of modern warfare, but also the fundamentals of free constitutional government? I do not know what the answer to these questions is; but I do know that the time is long overdue to scrutinize these programs closely and to review completely our program for training Latin American military leaders in our schools.

So far as being able to add appreciably to the military power of the United States or the Western Hemisphere by our military training programs in Latin American countries or for Latin American military leaders, that is subject to some controversy and dispute. We do not really increase the military power of the United States by training a substantial number of Latin American military officers. What we seek to do is to train men for the responsibility of leadership within a free society.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The point which the Senator from Minnesota makes is extremely important. The Senator from Oregon made it brilliantly a short time ago, when we had a short colloquy on the subject. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. This is a subject about which I said something earlier: that is, that we should indeed insist on training in constitutional responsibility; training in civilian control; training in the subordination of the military to the elected officials, and so forth.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota also agree that we should impose some conditions concerning the kind of men who are sent to American military schools for training, and about the kind of system which that particular country may follow in selecting its military leaders in their own training systems?

The point which the Senator from Wisconsin is trying to make is that any short course in democracy, no matter how good it is, and lasting a period of only a few months at a military school, may not "take" unless it is backed up by an understanding on the part of the country itself that the men it sends there will be men who have had some grounding—at least, elementary grounding—in the importance of democracy and the importance of military subordination to civilian authorities, and that there will be a followup on this basis. In other words, it must be an integrated program, not simply based on a course or two. Such courses as are given are very important; I do not mean to demean them. But they would probably be inadequate to provide the kind of appreciation on the part of those people of the overwhelming importance of civilian control and constitutional government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's point is well made. I would hope that as the RECORD is studied by officials of our own Government, these suggestions, these proposals, and these observations will not only be given consideration, but will be given constructive and affirmative consideration. We have had enough evidence to the contrary. We have had enough evidence to indicate that what has been taking place has not been good enough. Therefore, we have a right to expect some improvement. I suggest that the proposals made by the Senator from Wisconsin surely merit acceptance and support.

Mr. President, there has been far too much evidence recently that our military assistance program in Latin America has in too many cases merely generated more military power to be used for domestic political purposes; to be used not for preserving internal security or defending the nation against external threats, but for consolidating and strengthening the position of the military in the society as a whole.

I digress to say that the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], on past occasions, together with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in committee pointed this out. I am sure the Senator from Oregon at times has been a bit discouraged because the Senator from Minnesota did not always come around to the point of supporting some of the suggestions he made. But I wish to make it clear now that when the military assistance items come up for consideration under the Alliance for Progress, there will be a brandnew look at each one of them, because in too many instances military assistance has not assisted freedom or democracy or the people of the countries to which it has been given. All too often it has assisted some military clique to throw out elected governments. All too often, elected governments have been thrown out simply because they were trying to carry out reforms that the U.S. Government has demanded of our Latin American neighbors under the terms of the Alliance for Progress. The men who were thrown out of office by the military were often the first victims of the bitter antagonism, opposition, and animosity of the most reactionary, radical, rightwing groups in their own country. All too often the men who were tossed out of office by the military juntas were the very men who had led the reform program that the U.S. Government had insisted upon. That surely was true in the case of President Bosch and also in the case of President Villeda-Morales, of Honduras.

I might add that President Villeda-Morales was a moderate man. I know him. He would be considered in this body as a middle-of-the-roader. He would be considered, certainly, as a man of the center, not of the left of center.

But he was apparently too progressive for some of the forces that were at work in Honduras. I think I know why. It was because he was trying desperately, in that little country, which has many serious social and economic problems, to make the Alliance for Progress work. In so doing, land reform laws had to be passed. In so doing, corruption had to be curtailed. When one starts to do those things in some countries, there are certain forces that will conspire to get rid of the reform government.

The record ought to be crystal clear in the instance of the Dominican Republic. It will be to the eternal credit of Juan Bosch that he is honest, that he insisted upon honesty in his government. It has been said that he was not a good administrator; that he did not have much political finesse or political know-how. But one thing that he did should be noted carefully: He kept a good watch on the treasury; he refused to let the burglars come in and run off with it. He refused to let certain military officers take money on the side for contracts for planes, tanks, and guns.

I think the American people would like at least one quality above all others in the leaders they seek to help in the countries they seek to help, and that is integrity—collective integrity and personal integrity. Juan Bosch offered that, among his many fine qualities.

I know also that the President of Honduras, too, was attempting to bring better order and better accounting into the government of his country.

Mark my words, Mr. President—and I sound this warning note tonight: Unless the juntas are stopped, severe penalties will be imposed—namely, our assistance and our recognition will be cut off.

So I believe the United States should at once let all the world know that it does not intend to tolerate any coup d'etat in Venezuela, where freedom is being tested as in few other places in the world.

I can just hear people starting to say again that President Betancourt has many limitations, and he does not know how to deal with the left, does not know how to deal with the right, and has a background that some people do not like. But, Mr. President, the only people who have a right to pass judgment on the character of these men are those who elect them or defeat them in the election process.

President Betancourt is an avowed friend of the United States of America, and this Government had better make it crystal clear to every would-be admiral, general, colonel, sergeant, or whoever it might be, that we will not tolerate for 1 minute, a coup d'etat or a military junta in Venezuela. Make no mistake about it, Venezuela has a great interest in American economic assistance, American trade. We are the market for their oil. We are their market for many other products. More importantly, we are a friend of freedom in Venezuela, a country which once was ruled by a ruthless dictator. Each one of the countries that suffered the anguish, the pain, the disease of dictatorship, takes time to recover. It takes the help of a good friend to stand by them so that they will have a chance to recover, so that they will have a chance to build strong democratic institutions.

You cannot build a strong democratic institution, Mr. President, if you have terror from the left, or obstruction and reaction from the right, compounded by military officers or a military group threatening the very existence of constitutional government.

It is to the credit of the military in Venezuela that it is cooperating with their President who is their commander in chief; and I wish to commend them for that. I hope that the responsible military officers in that country will remember that for the future welfare of Venezuela and the relationships between our country and theirs, that responsibility to the constitution, responsibility to civilian authority will do more to promote a prosperous Venezuela, a strong Venezeula, and a free Venezuela than anything they can do.

In the light of recent events, it certainly makes no sense to pour heavy hardware into Latin American countries whose economies cannot sustain such exorbitantly expensive military establishments. Their national security is not strengthened by it. Any possible external military threat to the security of any Latin American country can and will be repulsed by the United States. Any country that is attacked from the outside can be confident of assistance by other American States as well as the United States. And if there is such a military threat arising in the hemisphere, as there was in the case of Cuba last fall, we can be certain that the United States will take the action necessary. We proved last year our ability and our determination to defend this hemisphere both north and south against any external military threat. And yet many Latin American nations continue to devote large sums of money to armaments.

What this area needs is an effective arms control agreement. That is what it needs—arms control, not an arms buildup. We should be promoting that, we should be promoting a completely nuclear-free zone in Latin America. We should be promoting as a matter of national policy a reduction of all unnecessary military items—air forces—and navies that are not needed for internal security purposes. They cannot afford them. We are having trouble affording them, Mr. President. And what is more, when we send military equipment to one nation, we must send it to another; and thus we promote antagonisms.

The current situation in which many countries compete for military forces which are too large for their immediate needs and are too expensive to be maintained without outside assistance is deplorable.

I believe it is time, after the events of the past 2 weeks, to initiate a general review of the question of arms assistance to Latin America.

Before we vote Alliance for Progress funds, Mr. President, I can assure the Senate right now, as one member of that committee, that I shall join with the persistent, the able, and the intelligent and brave member of the Senate committee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in carefully reviewing the military programs. I believe that he will find that he has enough allies in the Senate to get that kind of review that is needed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's remarks, but I should like the RECORD to reflect how good the Senator from Minnesota makes me feel. The announcement I have just heard means that the Senator from Minnesota, taking that position it means that we are going to win. We are going to win.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We will at least make an honest effort. I believe there are a sufficiently large number of Senators aroused to succeed in the demand for a review of our programs.

And it is not enough for the United States alone to undertake the review. It must be done by the Latin American countries as well, for that reason it should be done through the OAS. If we were to do it alone, it would be ineffective. If we deny certain countries military assistance and are not supported in this policy by the hemisphere as a whole, the individual country could easily obtain military equipment elsewhere. That is why I say we should make this whole matter of arms reduction in Latin America a matter of national policy. This is a matter requiring some hemispheric agreement and quickly. If we have made some progress in the past 2 years in equipping Latin American governments to counter internal security threats from the left, and some progress in providing the legal means for assisting governments harassed by such threats, we have still to cope with the problem of internal threats from the right, particularly from rightist military coups. This is a problem which we cannot solve by ourselves. Unless the Latin American nations are willing to address themselves to it, freely elected constitutional governments will continue to be subject to overthrow from irresponsible military cliques.

Mr. President, in the disturbing pattern of events in the past weeks, there was one event which took place last Friday which I find encouraging. On Friday, October 2, 1 day after the coup in Honduras, the U.S. Government not only suspended diplomatic relations with Honduras but immediately announced the withdrawal of its entire military aid mission and its entire economic aid mission. At the same time, it announced the withdrawal of the AID mission and the military mission from the Dominican Republic. This decisive action, although it came too late in the case of the Dominican Republic, should serve as a clear indication of U.S. policy toward dictators and toward military cliques who topple elected governments. It should be a warning to those in similar situations in the future that if they move against freely elected constitutional governments which are supported by the United States, we will cut them off from all military and economic assistance immediately. Had this precedent been set before and consistently applied, the trend of recent history in the Caribbean may well have been different. However, I am hopeful that the policy represented by our recent actions in cutting off aid will not represent merely a passing reaction to the situation of the moment, but rather a firm policy which will guide our future as well as our present dealings with Latin American governments. Certainly the events of the past 2 weeks indicate that actions speak louder than words. The action of the U.S. Government in cutting off the two military cliques in the Dominican Republic and Honduras is an indication of our determination to follow a policy of supporting the development of constitutional government under the Alliance for Progress. It indicates that this Government means what it says when it insists that the Alliance for Progress is not only designed to achieve economic development, but also the development of free democratic political institutions in this hemisphere. We have done well, in the case of the Dominican Republic and Honduras, to have cut off military and economic assistance, and to have withdrawn our military and economic AID personnel. We should not restore either until significant measures are taken to return to constitutional government in those two countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following articles and editorial published in today's issue of the Washington Post: "Leaders of Latin Juntas Were Trained in United States"; "Naive Honduran Rule Abetted Military Plots," and an editorial entitled "Using the Sponge" printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADERS OF LATIN JUNTAS WERE TRAINED IN UNITED STATES

(By John G. Norris)

Most of the professional military men responsible for toppling four Latin American democracies this year are graduates of U.S. military schools, a survey showed yesterday.

Since April, military juntas have ousted the elected governments in Guatemala, Ecuador, Dominican Republic, and Honduras and taken power in their own hands.

The new strongman of Honduras, Col. Osvaldo Lopez Arrello, who took over last week with the backing of the armed forces, is U.S.-trained. He spent the years 1942–45 at U.S. Air Force bases and schools.

Two ranking officers of the Dominican Republic Army, who were reported behind the ouster of President Bosch last month, have attended U.S. military schools. Maj. Gen. Victory Elby Vinas Roman, the Defense Minister, is a graduate of the U.S. Armor School, Fort Knox, Ky., the Army here said.

The Dominican Embassy said that Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, director of training for the Dominican armed forces, is a graduate of the U.S. Army school in the Panama Canal Zone.

The senior member of the four-man junta in Ecuador that deposed the President in July, Vice Adm. Ramon Castro Jijon, is a 1949 graduate of the U.S. Navy General Line School, Monterey, Calif., the Navy Department here said. Admiral Castro also attended a shorter course in antisubmarine warfare tactics at the U.S. Navy base at Key West.

Another member of the Ecuadorian junta, Col. Guillermo Freile, former commander-in-chief of the Navy, graduated from the U.S. Air Force Command and Staff College, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., in 1960.

The Ecuadoran Embassy said that the two army members of the junta have not attended U.S. military schools. Col. Marcos Gandara, former director of the war college, studied in Spain and Italy, and Col. Luis Cabrera, former army commander in chief, took Chilean military courses.

Col. Enrique Peralto Azurdia, who headed the coup that deposed the democratic government in Guatemala in April, has not attended any U.S. military schools, according to the Guatemalan Embassy here. His chief of staff, Col. Miguel Ponciano, trained at U.S. Air Force schools in 1946–47.

There has been dispute over the effects of the longstanding program of inviting Latin American officers to attend U.S. military schools. Supporters of the policy have argued that not only does it orient a powerful group in Latin America toward the United States, but that the association of the military men from south of the border with the democratically imbued U.S. Armed Forces will in time indoctrinate them in democratic ways.

This concept was shaken last year in Peru when critics stressed that three of the four military commanders who staged a coup were "trained in U.S. military schools." Its supporters stressed that changing the Latin American tradition of the coup d'etat was bound to take years, and they now note that the Peruvian junta carried out its promise to hold elections, which put a constitutional government in power.

Argentine military chiefs similarly have used their influence to restore elective government, though, like their counterparts in Peru, they still hold considerable behind-the-scenes power. Washington is keeping close watch to see what the four juntas set up this year do in this regard.

NAIVE HONDURAN RULE ABETTED MILITARY PLOTS

(By Dan Kurzman)

TEGUCIGALPA, HONDURAS, October 8.—The military coup that overthrew the democratic government of Honduras last Thursday was rooted, like most Latin American coups, in military ambition, rightist greed, government naivete and U.S. indecision.

These factors, in potent combination, made a coup inevitable. Under the deposed regime of President Ramon Villeda Morales the military enjoyed a constitutional position perhaps unique in the world. It was not directly responsible to the executive branch of the government, but only to itself and, in limited degree, to the legislature.

Military leaders were jealous of their autonomy and feared that they would lose it after elections that were scheduled for later this month. The presidential candidate of Villeda Morales' Liberal Party, Modesto Rodas Alvarado, was strongly favored to win, and the military was convinced that he would seek to reduce its power.

That Rojas would do just that, appeared, in military eyes, to be reflected in the refusal of the Villeda Morales government to let the army supervise the elections in accordance with the constitution.

Ironically, the United States, which tried to discourage the coup, is to a considerable degree responsible for having paved the way for it. In 1954, the Honduran army was weak, disunified, and severely lacking in political influence. But with the pro-Communist Guatemalan regime of Gen. Jacobo Arbenz consolidating its power, the United States poured arms into neighboring Honduras for use by Guatemalan Gen. Castillo Armas, who eventually invaded his Red-controlled country and ousted Arbenz.

But in order to disguise this interference in Guatemala's internal affairs, the United States signed a military assistance treaty with Honduras which called for the importation of the arms, as a byproduct. The treaty also provided for the establishment of a strong Honduran army. Col. Oswaldo Lopez Arellano, became chief of the armed forces, a job from which he finally catapulted into his present position as head of the military government.

Until the very day of the coup, the United States was a helping friend, as attested by the Alliance for Progress handclasp emblems painted on military trucks that have carried political prisoners to jail since the coup.

REDS, CORRUPTION BLAMED

In an interview, Lopez said that corruption and Communist infiltration in the government were factors in the coup, but he made it clear that the threat to the army's position was the principal element.

Like most modern Latin American military leaders today, he does not appear to oppose democracy as such. He is only opposed to it in the measure that it endangers military influence and privileges.

Nor was the military immune to efforts by rightist politicians, mainly of the Nationalist Party, to exaggerate these dangers for their own purposes.

The rightists were horrified by Liberal Party attempts to push through "communistic" social and economic reforms. Most Honduran businessmen favored a coup, and their sentiment was shared by U.S. businessmen here.

"Maybe now things will be more efficient," a representative of one American firm said.

Significantly, the buildup of the armed forces with American aid was started under and nurtured by a Nationalist Party regime—a fact that the Nationalists have not let military leaders forget.

If the military lacks comprehension of democracy democratic leaders appear to have been equally ignorant of the realities of military power. Rodas, like President Juan Bosch of the Dominican Republic, who was ousted in a similar coup 2 weeks ago, virtually dared the military to take action.

CIVIL GUARD WAS ISSUE

With incredible naivete, Rodas, in his campaign speeches, constantly emphasized that, as president, he would build up the strength of the civil guard, presumably a Liberal Party police arm, at the army's expense. This force was created by Villeda Morales in 1959 as a counterpoint to the army when it was suspected that the latter, particularly because of its autonomous nature, could not be trusted.

Unlike Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt, the Honduran leaders would not compromise with the military.

In view of these factors, anything the United States might have done short of using force, may have been futile. Nevertheless, many observers here think the tough statement issued by Secretary of State Dean Rusk announcing severance of diplomatic and economic relations apparently for a prolonged period, was much too long in coming.

U.S. officials here tried to persuade the military not to launch a coup, but, handicapped by the examples of America's "soft" action after other coups, particularly in the Dominican Republic, it was hard to convince the army leaders that the United States meant business.

Using the Sponge

After the strong man with a dagger, Lord Acton admonished, comes the small man with a sponge. The maxim applies with peculiar force to the Dominican Republic, where those responsible for the overthrow of President Juan Bosch have every motive for sponging up the pages of the past. Of course Mr. Bosch had imperfections as a president; he may have been almost as bad as some of the less illustrious incumbents of our White House. But the white-haired President seems hardly recognizable as a man in some of the stories that depict him as a cunning monster.

The fact is that in the Dominican Republic Mr. Bosch had powerful enemies from the moment he was sworn in as president. The main opposition party, which had presided over the preceding provisional government, felt cheated of victory when Mr. Bosch won his election. Military men, used to virtual veto power over civilian authority, resented Mr. Bosch's presumption that he was their superior. Some business interests were hostile from the outset because they regarded Mr. Bosch as a leftist.

It comes as no surprise that these interested parties should seek to justify the overthrow of a constitutional president. But it is disquieting that U.S. officials should place more stress on how impossible Mr. Bosch was as president than on the grievous rupture of the Dominican Republic's evolution from arbitrary rule. In South Vietnam another regime holds power that many U.S. officials feel is impossible. Yet in the larger interests of winning the war against communism, the United States is swallowing its doubts and is working with Mr. Diem.

Doubtless there were problems in Santo Domingo before the coup. But there were no widespread demonstrations against the regime, and no one could fairly complain that Mr. Bosch was repressive. It would be a sad circumstance if the only impossible governments the United States could support effectively were autocratic and unpopular tyrannies. No doubt, if President Betancourt were overthrown tomorrow in Venezuela, some of the same apologists for passivity would be quick to argue that he, too, was impossible—just look at the disorder in Caracas.

THE SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I support the President's decision to permit the private grain trade in the United States to sell wheat to the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries for hard currency; that is, for dollars or gold. I commend President Kennedy for this forthright and courageous act.

This decision was made after many conferences and discussions with Members of Congress and others. The entire matter has been widely discussed in the press and on radio and television. The President based his decision in part on factors I will list at the conclusion of my remarks—points I have made in repeated speeches in the Senate since September 16. These are factors listed by the executive branch of our Government as the basis for the President's decision announced at his news conference today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record a list of these considerations. I hope this will help Members of Congress and the American public to better understand why the decision was made.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Sale of American Wheat to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

I. ADVANTAGES OF PERMITTING THE COMMERCIAL SALE OF WHEAT TO THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE

A. Foreign policy considerations

1. Will demonstrate once again to the Soviet leaders that peaceful agreements with the United States which serve the interests of both parties are possible, and that a continuation of the presently improved climate is in their economic interest.

2. Will demonstrate to the world the superiority of free agriculture and free enterprise over the Communist collectivist system.

3. Will require the Soviet Union to divert its limited reserves of gold, dollars, and foreign exchange from military and industrial developments to food.

4. Will be in keeping with a longstanding American tradition of sending food to hungry people, whether their governments are free or friendly or not. In 1922, under the Harding administration, Herbert Hoover's American Relief Administration fed 18 million Russians, though many of our Americans complained.

5. Will improve the standing of the United States in the eyes of the Russian people, who are reported to be apprehensive about coming food shortages, price increases, and lower quality diets.

6. Will help avoid whatever harsher internal policies the Kremlin might need to impose on the Russian people during a period of food shortages, and will maintain the Soviet consumer's level of expectation and demand.

7. Could lead to increased trade, increased opportunities for contact, increased exchanges of individuals and information.

8. Will not be diverted to Cuba or Red China, under terms of the export license to be issued. Cuba's wheat import requirements appear to be fulfilled by the Australian and Canadian deals.

9. Will not be used for manipulation in world markets, where American and Canadian surplus stocks will remain large while the Soviets' needs remain pressing.

10. Will be known to the Soviet people through the Voice of America broadcasts, which have not been jammed for several months.

B. Domestic economic considerations

1. Will permit American farmers and the American economy to share in the gains which other nations have been reaping for many years in sales of wheat and flour to the Communist bloc. The increase in farm income alone is estimated to be around $100 million.

2. Will benefit our balance of payments, without (in view of Soviet need for this wheat to make good their own commitments) displacing any of our regular wheat export markets. The Russians will either pay in gold or sell gold for dollars in the London market, thus increasing support of the dollar and decreasing the pressure on our gold.

3. Will reduce CCC surplus stocks, reducing Federal budget expenditures more than $200 million on a sale of 150 million bushels.

4. Will bring added income and employment to American shipping, longshoremen, and railroad workers as well as grain traders, millers, and farmers.

5. Would strengthen farm prices in the United States.

6. Will be conducted through the normal competitive channels of the private American grain trade in the same manner as all other such exports are handled, with the forces of competition and supply and demand, and the Government's control over CCC prices and export licenses and subsidies, curbing any prospect for excessive profit.

7. Would not reduce our ability to export to other, more friendly customers or reduce U.S. stocks to a dangerous or undesirably low level, in view of the 800 million bushels or more expected to remain in our carryover.

C. Consistency with U.S. and allied policy

1. Is consistent with U.S. trade with Soviets and Eastern Europe since World War II.

Our exports to U.S.S.R. in the last year of the previous administration, for example, which were twice as high as they were in 1962, included synthetic rubber, steel sheets helicopters, farm machinery, and textile machinery.

2. Is consistent with U.S. sales of agricultural commodities (mostly cattle hides and tallow) to the Soviet Union for many years, under the last three administrations. Since we have been sending to the Soviets agricultural commodities not in surplus, it is obviously desirable to allow the export of those, such as wheat, that are in surplus. While distinct foreign policy reasons motivated our sale of subsidized farm commodities to Poland in exchange for local currencies, that practice also indicates the logic of selling such commodities behind the Iron Curtain for dollars.

3. Is consistent with our longtime insistence that we are willing to trade with the Soviets in consumer goods.

4. Would not require us to accept similar offers, if any, from Red China, North Vietnam or North Korea, inasmuch as transactions with those regimes involve a different statutory (Trading With the Enemy Act) and diplomatic (nonrecognition) framework. Foodstuffs are not embargoed from Cuba now.

5. Would not weaken our effort to restrict free world shipping and trade with Cuba and Communist bloc, inasmuch as we have never sought to restrict East-West agricultural trade and it is presently flourishing in most other countries.

6. Cannot, for example, be criticized by the French, who have extensively sold farm commodities to the Communist Chinese as well as Eastern Europe, or by the West Germans, who do an extensive trade with the Eastern Zone they do not even recognize. Both nations bought American wheat last year and then sold wheat flour to the Communist Chinese, which is hardly a better use of our wheat than our selling it directly to the Soviets.

7. Is consistent with the recent actions of Canada and Australia, who also sold subsidized wheat to the Soviet Union, and of other allies who are selling subsidized wheat flour to bloc nations.

8. Involves no real subsidy to either the Soviet Union or the U.S. exporter. The only actual subsidy, if any, is the difference between the world price and the price paid to the higher cost American wheat farmer under our farm price support system—and this amount is paid regardless of where and whether the wheat is sold. Thus the loss to the taxpayers is reduced whenever we can sell wheat abroad for dollars—and this obviously can only be done at the world price. We have been vigorously seeking new export markets for our wheat—and would require the Soviets to pay the full world price like any other commercial buyer.

II. THE DISADVANTAGES OF NOT PERMITTING THIS TRANSACTION

1. Will permit Soviet propagandists to exploit among other nations our unwillingness to reduce tensions and relieve suffering.

2. Will convince the Soviets that we are either too hostile or too timid to take any further steps toward peace beyond the test ban treaty; that we are more interested in exploiting their internal difficulties, and that the logical course for them to follow is a renewal of the cold war.

3. Will not prevent the Soviets from obtaining additional wheat from other free nations—including additional deals with Australia, Argentina, and smaller Middle Eastern suppliers—enabling the farmers, grain dealers, railroads, ports, and longshoremen in those countries to obtain the profits which would otherwise have come to the United States.

4. Will not prevent the Soviets and Eastern European nations from obtaining our own wheat indirectly in the same manner as they are presently—by purchasing from West Germany, France, and others, flour made out of American wheat.

5. Will not impair the Soviet cold war effort, inasmuch as their essential domestic requirements can probably already be filled by the purchases concluded with Canada and Australia.

III. THE STATUTORY FRAMEWORK OF THIS TRANSACTION

This sale is not prohibited by any act of Congress and does not require the consent of the Congress.

1. Although in July of 1961, at the height of the Berlin crisis, the Congress included in the Agricultural Act of 1961 a declaration of policy against the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities to unfriendly nations, (a) Congress has made no attempt to give a binding effect to such a statement of intent, although it had many opportunities to do so; (b) discussion of this particular amendment on the House floor indicated that many Members could well have assumed that it applied only to Public Law 480-type sales on long-term credit or for soft, local currencies, and not to commercial sales for dollars or gold; and (c) such a statement of congressional intent was more pertinent to the United States-U.S.S.R. climate which prevailed at the time of its adoption than to today's cautious search for ways of reducing tensions.

2. The Johnson Act—which prohibits American loans to nations in default on old obligations to American creditors—does not apply to ordinary commercial credit transactions incident to the sale of goods.

3. Neither the Battle Act nor the Export Control Act prohibits the commercial sale of foodstuffs to any country; and this transaction would not be under Public Law 480.

IV. THE MECHANICS OF THE TRANSACTION

The United States does not, as a rule, engage in state trading; and this Government's participation in this transaction is thus limited to: (a) A formal Commerce Department announcement informing the grain trade that export licenses will be made available under specified terms for the shipment of wheat and other agricultural commodities to and for use in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; and (b) Wheat exported to the U.S.S.R. will be drawn from surplus CCC stocks by the grain trade when the trade's own supplies are exhausted. We must be prepared to take care of our domestic needs, as well as our normal commercial exports and our Public Law 480 commitments.

Our private grain traders would negotiate on amounts and price with the Soviets. At present we envision the sale of 3 to 6 million tons (roughly 100 to 200 million bushels) of wheat for shipment from the United States during the next 6 months, payment to be made either in cash (dollars or gold) upon delivery, or, as in the Canadian agreement, a minimum of 25 percent cash on delivery, and 25 percent each 6 months thereafter for 18 months, with interest.

The Soviets will be treated like any other cash customer. Our grain trade exporters would sell at the same world price and by the same methods as they sell to all other nations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, October 10, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 9 (legislative day of October 3), 1963:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Anthony J. Adaschik
Chester W. Allen III
John W. Allin
Jess W. Anderson
George R. Armstrong
James R. Barrett
Harry J. Benson
Wilbur L. Benz
Robert J. Brady
John C. Clary
Michael L. Cline
Phillip C. Craig
Richard M. Czaplinski
Alfred S. Dansker
Marvin E. Davenport
Robert K. Dawson
Ralph E. Dillen
Roland E. Dukes
Braxton C. Ellis
Michael H. Erskine
Herbert E. Fish
Thomas H. Grayson
Alan E. Hardtarfer
James B. Hawkes
Jared N. Heindel
Charles H. Hoffman
Bruce A. Hopkins
William R. Joa
James E. Kennedy
Donal L. Knutson
William T. Lehman
Bruce Luxford
Hugh H. MacDonald II
Leonard A. Magazine
James S. McLeish
Phillip L. Middleton
Don A. Miller, Jr.
Richard W. Minnich, Jr.
Carl M. Mullen
David J. Mundhenke
Arthur J. Oleary
Ernest H. Pomerantz
Dennis L. Prewitt
Thomas O. Pugh
John R. Riley
Halary S. Sawicki
Thomas J. Schmiege
David R. Schneider
Robert W. Sharp, Jr.
Philip K. Sherman, Jr.
William B. Sims, Jr.
Luther F. Sitten
Dean K. Smith
Phillip V. Starnes
Yasuto Tana
Richard A. Tudor
Haskell T. Waddle
William R. Weigel
Mark H. Weston
Fredric C. Zimmerman

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David J. Hammer
Charles E. Johnston
Russell Meyer

Ward G. Gypson (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Milledge E. Granger, Jr., OC–1, USN, to be a permanent ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensign in the line of the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants, lieutenants (junior grade), and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James H. Blake
Richard D. Kentala
Thomas N. Salmon
Stephen W. Stamper
George C. Strong

Walt W. Magnus (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Alvin S. Morrison
Robert J. Stepnick
Eugene J. Weigel, Jr.

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants, lieutenants (junior grade), and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ernest B. Bass, Jr.
John W. Canal
Robert B. Carmody
Milton C. Clegg
Thomas L. Hurst
Edward P. Leonard

Joseph S. Mach
Richard W. Mohr
Paul W. O'Shields
Charles T. Stefl
Frank E. Zotter

The following-named enlisted personnel to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William J. Snittjer
Jerry L. Johnson
Allen O. Woods
Larry W. Johnson
Samuel C. Bazzell
Jason A. Wilson
Robert R. Sonntag, Jr.
Frederick F. Briand
Gary R. DeLisle
Harold D. Cash
Robert Peck
Kenneth L. Postel
James D. Schweitzer
Bob L. Ozment
Donald K. Bain
Richard L. De Vault
Thomas E. Thomas
James D. Smith
Edgar P. Webb
Austin A. Eckmyre, Jr.
William H. Strohl
Harold J. Stanton
Jack T. Lewis
Elwin J. Hays
Francis L. Windholz
Zachary M. Davies
Lawrence F. Raymond
Ralph E. Anderson, Jr.
Charles B. Alexander
George H. Gregory
Myron J. Hickey
William F. Mullins
Elvin L. Schlegel, Jr.
Ronald J. Coutts
Earl R. Wooll
Archie R. Howell
Richard A. Robinson
Robert M. Dotson
Leonard J. Hmel
Wesley B. Combs
Robert E. Gillett, Jr.
Edward D. Prout
Charles M. Butts

In the Marine Corps

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Charles C. Abbott
Roger L. Ackerman
Andrew G. Anderson, Jr.
George T. Armstrong
Albert G. Ayre
Thomas C. Bache, Jr.
William E. Bartels, Jr.
Dan P. Beckner
Robert A. Beeler
Robert R. Beers
Carl E. Beimfohr
Leonard G. Bethards
Edward A. Bishop
Edward L. Bonham
Donald E. Borders
Leslie W. Boyer, Jr.
Dennis F. Brandon
Jonathan C. Brooks
Robert P. Brown
Eugene G. Buglewicz
John G. Burns
Charles L. Carl
Anthony V. Carrano, Jr.
Frank J. Casa
Richard M. Cavagnol
John A. Cegalis
John T. Chapman
James D. Cleary
John R. Clickener
David P. Cotellesse
Arthur O. Cravets
Gary W. Cunningham
John L. Daniewicz
Stephen M. Day
Bruce H. De Woolfson, Jr.
Paul D. Dolwick
Thomas C. Donatell
Mitchell O. Driskell
Karl F. G. Dupuy
William G. Duroe
Kendall Ellingwood, Jr.
George R. Emerson
David E. England
Douglas B. Eskridge
George K. Eubanks
Richard J. Evans
Jerry J. Farro
Joseph A. Fernandez
William A. Forney
John D. Forter
William C. Foster
Laurence V. Friese
David E. Fritz
David P. Garner
Jeffrey R. Gilbert
Robert A. Goldberg
Arthur D. Graff
John P. Grattan
Richard H. Griffin
Peter D. Haines
James L. Hall
Edward M. Hamilton
Henry S. Harrison
John H. Hartman
Frederick L. Hatton
Jack C. Hawk
William T. Henderson
Robert F. Henricksen
Donald R. Hess
Jerry T. Hewitt
John T. Hill
Patrick E. Hollands
Russell L. Holman
Mark W. Howe
Larry G. Hutcheson
Robert F. Itnyra
Anthony A. Johnson
Lawrence R. Johnson
William C. Joiner
Frederick K. Jones
Arthur E. Joyce
Edward J. Kabala
David M. Kahl
Richard R. Kane
William M. Kay
Dennis S. Kennedy
William G. King
Shelton F. Lankford
Lewis C. Larson
Peter E. Laux
Antone J. Lazos
John P. Leidy
William C. Leigh III
George P. Levendis
Jimmy L. Lindsey
John C. Listerman
Peter H. Lowry
William T. Lowther
Herbert G. Lyles
Thomas MacBain, Jr.
Thomas E. MacDermant
Douglas L. Marshall
Glen H. Martin
Malcolm R. Massie, Jr.
Charles G. Mason
John M. McCoy, Jr.
Thomas E. McMahan
Edward A. Miller, Jr.
Ernest M. Miller, Jr.
Gerald L. Miller
Byron J. Moody
Roger A. Murray
Emmett E. Noll
James R. O'Bryan
Anthony M. O'Connel
John J. O'Connell
James R. O'Reilly
William A. Parker
Richard A. Partin
Charles H. Paul
James C. Perso
Douglas W. Pickersgill
Lawrence A. Price, Jr.
Robert J. Puskar
John N. Rachac
William Rankin
Thomas C. Rauwald
Joseph M. Reber
Mark A. Rehrauer
Clarence O. Reynolds, Jr.
Kevin G. Rick
Leonard H. Ronnie, Jr.
Herbert G. Roser
David R. Russell
Robert W. Saum, Jr.
Paul J. Schiller
Harvey T. Schmit
Timothy P. Schwartz
George J. Shartle
John D. Singer III
Jerry W. Smith
Charles S. Snell
Robert F. Soneson
Larry J. Statham
Thomas W. Steele
Louis C. Stengel III
John M. Stevens
David E. Strong
David H. Stoughton
John J. Tedesco, Jr.
Jack C. Thompson
David L. Tinder
Robert E. Tscham
Robert A. Van Houten
Richard H. Voigt
James A. Vollendorf
Dwight A. Wallick
James A. Wegge
James F. Wells
William K. Westling
John J. Whitehouse
Charles G. Williams, Jr.
Mansel M. Wood
Joseph D. Wright
William E. Wright, Jr.
Richard B. Zey
Richard T. White, Jr.

The following-named (meritorious noncommissioned officers) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Harris R. Angell, Jr.
Allan F. Ayers
Ronald E. Banks
Edward C. Brown
Charles O. Burke
Russell E. Cazier
William A. Detki
Terry G. German
Jerry M. Giles
George T. Greig
Alvin W. Hansen, Jr.
John V. Hayslip
William R. Herder
Rodney P. Kempf
James L. Klingerman
Melvin P. Krone
David R. Laughlin
Robert L. MacDougall
James M. Macevitt III
William H. McKinley
David K. Neilson
Lionel Parra, Jr.
Lowell W. Patak
Ido E. Pistelli
David E. Saarela
John L. Schensnol
Raymond A. Stewart, Jr.
James R. Walker

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for temporary promotion to the grade of captain, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David L. McEvoy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Centennial Roadside Park Is Tribute to Growth and Expansion of West Virginia State Road Commission Development Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginia's proximity to major centers of population in the Eastern United States makes it ideally suited as a vacationland and recreation area for millions of Americans. Consequently, citizens of the Mountain State are vitally concerned with the development of tourism, recreation facilities, and parks. Aid from the Federal Government has helped this growth and improvement, particularly through the ARA, which approved a grant and loan of nearly $24 million in June of this last fiscal year.

On Sunday, October 6, it was my pleasure to participate in the dedication ceremonies of West Virginia's Centennial Roadside Park on U.S. 219, in Tucker County. The 500 persons in attendance were addressed by Gov. W. W. Barron and State Road Commissioner Burl A. Sawyers.

Taking part in the program were Rev. Andrew Mann, of Thomas; Master of Ceremonies Joe Gilmore, of Parsons; the American Legion Post No. 22 Color Guard; the Parsons and Davis Mountaineer High School Bands; the Boys Forestry Camp Choir, directed by the Reverend Harry Atzenhoter; and State Senator Kenton J. Lambert, of Parsons. Distinguished guests present were Representative Harley O. Staggers and State Senator Dallas Wolfe. Both men spoke. Also introduced was Commissioner Hulett Smith, of West Virginia's Department of Commerce.

I request that my remarks at the dedication of the State's 100th roadside park be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT STATE CENTENNIAL PARK DEDICATION NEAR PARSONS, W. VA., U.S. 219 IN TUCKER COUNTY, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1963

A few days ago I was privileged to address a conference gathering of 1,500 officers, members, and guests of three important parks organizations. The groups assembled were the American Institute of Park Executives, the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, and the National Conference on State Parks.

The consensus of recreation specialists from all States of the Nation was that for those of us concerned with the preservation, utilization, and development of this Nation's vast potentials in recreational resources, this is a decisive time * * * a time of moving forward.

This State centennial park, in its location of scenic grandeur, demonstrates one of the appropriate ways in which West Virginia is moving to meet the challenge of this era of rapid population increase and the greater mobility of our citizens.

We are bringing into focus the important part that the roadside park system of our State bears to the requirement that government and private enterprise must provide more abundantly and more expeditiously the recreational and facility needs of traveling Americans.

Population statistics underscore the fact that there is more and more gravitation to urban centers. The 1960 census revealed that 70 percent of the people of the United States dwelt in cities. Forecasters predict that by 1980 the population will be nearly four-fifths urban. There is a further forecast that there will be a growth of 70 million in population between 1970-80 and that metropolitan areas will absorb all of this total national increase.

These are startling statistics. They make it clear that more and more Americans will be traveling, seeking the beauty and inspiration of out-of-doors and the recreational and rest opportunities it can provide.

West Virginia has abundant natural attractiveness for the tourist and we are reasonably close to population centers. We have no excuse for being inaccessible. This means that we must constantly improve and expand our public roads system, adding to it both recreation and scenic highways as well as the interstate freeways.

It is clear that usage of public recreational facilities is skyrocketing everywhere and that the time for imaginative planning is imminent.

I congratulate Governor Barron and Road Commissioner Sawyers and others of the State administration for not only having done imaginative planning, but, indeed, for the forward thrust of actual development of such facilities. Also, I commend the State administration's cooperative action with the Federal Government to finance and begin moving on other important projects. I refer in particular to the impending Blackwater Falls expansion and that projected for three other State park areas downstate, as well as the Cass Scenic Railroad and the Highland Scenic Highway.

In all of these developments—as in many others which will follow in the future—there have been and will continue to be complex problems to be solved. One of the most important and difficult of these is the question of conservation versus use.

Involved, of course, in recreation areas and scenic highway planning and development, as in all public recreation programs, there is the need to conserve for future generations the priceless gift of unspoiled natural areas. These must be protected for their significance to the history and heritage of the State and the Nation.

There is the challenge to provide more and more areas of developed recreation where water and woodland are enhanced through the addition of public access and facilities which must be attractive to sportsmen, sightseers, and fun-seeking families.

Admittedly, it is a big order to satisfy the requirements of conservation and recreation development in the same "package." But there must be a middle course which can effectively provide for both preservation of natural treasures and full recreational opportunity for all. There must be a blending of methods to satisfy the desires of the wildlife enthusiasts and the recreation seekers, and the best interests of timber industry progress. Above all, we must not succumb to desires of a few to isolate ourselves in our own natural wonderland. We must share it with those who would be our visitors. It is a requirement of good neighborliness. Beyond this consideration, our economic well-being demands that we establish tourism as one of our major facets of commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Caradine R. Hooton, D.D., director, the National Temperance League, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at this perplexing moment in contemporary life, we would have in our hearts an altar where we confess our sins, renew our vows, and ask Thy blessing upon our life and work. Be Thou the source of clear understanding, that all communications with mankind may be creative exchanges of good will.

Remove from our minds all fearful anxiety and every variety of prejudice, 'til constructive reason may give us the vision of our common duty.

As we assume disciplined responsibilities for the tranquillity of the world, give to us new responsiveness to the simple teachings of Thy word. Help us to overcome all devastating inner influences, that our penchant for service above selfishness may become a power for peace at home and abroad.

O God of love, O King of peace,
Make wars throughout the world to cease;
The wrath of sinful man restrain:
Give peace, O God, give peace again.

In the name of our Redeemer, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 9, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 242. An act to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; and

H.R. 7179. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. PROXMIRE, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 1915, the so-called dairy bill, upon which there is limitation of debate and control of time.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, is an amendment pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]—No. 220.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, provided that it is agreed that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available under the limitation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF CONSERVATION RESERVE CONTRACTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that despite the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate turn to consideration of Calendar No. 533, Senate bill 1588, to remove the $10 million limitation on programs carried out under section 16(e)(7) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for 1964 and subsequent calendar years. I understand this bill is noncontroversial, and can be disposed of very shortly.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether that is the bill the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is interested in.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I understand he is now on his way to the Chamber.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this bill, as amended by the committee substitute, first authorizes extensions of conservation reserve contracts through 1965; and, second, increases the limit on annual payments under the cropland conversion program to $20 million. The conservation reserve contracts subject to extension would be those expiring in 1963 and 1964, and those which expired in 1962, and were extended for 1963, under the authority of section 16(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the reason for the extension and for the increase in the amount of the ceiling?

Mr. TALMADGE. In response to the question of the Senator from Illinois, if I may give some details, let me point out that the Department of Agriculture was gravely concerned regarding the expiration of the conservation reserve contracts in excess of 7 million acres which expire this year, and something in excess of 2 million acres next year. Approximately 60 percent of that land formerly was in the production of feed grains and wheat.

The Department of Agriculture was gravely concerned that the land would go back into the production of those commodities, which previously had been produced on it, and would, therefore, further aggravate the surplus. The Department sent our committee a bill to authorize what it calls a pilot program or a land use program that has been in effect this year, and upon which there is a ceiling of $10 million. It would authorize a farmer who saw fit to convert his land to pasture land to receive a payment of approximately $5 to $7 an acre on the average and to graze animals on the pasture.

We held hearings in the committee. We had there representatives of the Department of Agriculture; and representatives of the Farm Bureau, representatives of the Grange, and representatives of the cattle industry appeared. All were in accord in stating that they desired the retirement of this land from production in order to curtail the mounting surpluses; but there was considerable disagreement as to the land use or pasturage part of the program, which some feared would increase the production of cattle, to the detriment of those now in the livestock industry.

Our committee met; and, after considerable discussion, we reached agreement that the best possible legislation which we could hope to get through Congress this year, in view of the controversy, was a compromise between the two programs, one to increase the ceiling for the program of land use or land adjustment from a maximum of $10 million a year to $20 million a year, and at the same time to authorize the extension for 2 additional years of these contracts which are expiring from the conservation reserve program.

We made the suggestion to the committee, the committee unanimously agreed to it, and it was reported to the Senate in that form. It received the unanimous vote of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the proposal increase the payment per acre?

Mr. TALMADGE. It would not. In fact, it might decrease the payment, because if some of the farmers who now have land under the conservation reserve contracts should see fit to convert to the so-called land use portion, their payments would be decreased from an average of $12 to $14 per acre to $5 to $7 per acre.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is present. I should like to hear what he has to say about the proposal.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator from North Dakota is a member of the subcommittee that held hearings on the bill (S. 1588). His great wisdom in all fields of agriculture contributed greatly to the deliberations and the solution of the controversial problem that came before our committee.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I thank the Senator from Georgia. For a long while the people of my State have been interested in extending the conservation reserve contracts. I have been pressing for this kind of legislation for more than a year. As the Senator has already explained, the bill would extend present soil bank contracts. I believe the bill represents a pretty fair compromise. It would increase the amount of money available for the administration's land retirement program, which is also a sort of compromise. I do not know whether the bill will satisfy all conflicting interests of the people who are concerned about the proposed legislation, but I believe it represents a compromise which should be passed by the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is probably the best one that our committee would agree to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And it had the unanimous support of the committee?

Mr. TALMADGE. It had the unanimous support of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There are being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1588) to remove the $10 million limitation on programs carried out under section 16(e)(7) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for 1964 and subsequent calendar years which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That section 109(a) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, if the producer makes application therefor, to extend until December 31, 1965, any conservation reserve contract entered into under this subtitle B which is scheduled to expire either on December 31, 1963, or December 31, 1964, or which expired on December 31, 1962, and was extended until December 31, 1963, under the authority of section 16(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act."
>
> SEC. 2. Section 16(e)(7) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590p(e)) is amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia the nature of the amendment before the Senate.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is the amendment which was reported by our committee to extend the conservation reserve contracts.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the amendment an amendment to the bill as reported?

Mr. TALMADGE. No, it is a committee substitute amendment. The Senator will recall that the committee could not agree to the proposal that was sent to us by the Department of Agriculture. It drafted a substitute. The Senate now has before it the committee substitute.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my understanding that the Department does not enthusiastically approve the committee substitute.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The bill has not yet been read a third time, has it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota whether or not a proposal in the form of an amendment was submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I understand that he is en route to the Chamber, and that he has an amendment to the bill which he would like to propose. I had not been advised that any Senator wished to propose an amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I doubt that the Senator from South Dakota has a further amendment, because the provision in the bill which would extend the soil bank contracts is exactly the same as the proposal contained in the amendment that he offered on the floor of the Senate to the agriculture appropriation bill about 2 weeks ago. So he would be getting exactly what he proposed in his amendment to the agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest to the majority leader that there be a short quorum call until the Senator from South Dakota can reach the Chamber. Then we can determine whether or not he has an amendment that he would like to offer.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe that is a good idea. The point has just arisen. None of us had any idea about it. I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief quorum call without the time necessary for the call being charged under the time limitation agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill (S. 1588), now under consideration, may be forgone at this time, that the action of the Senate in agreeing to the committee amendments may be vacated, and that the Senate return to the consideration of the unfinished business. I make that request because a development has come up with relation to an amendment about which the leadership knew nothing until a few minutes ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed under the 2-hour limitation on the bill may be restored to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the time consumed will not be charged to either side.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on my amendment, which is pending, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

THE HOLY ALLIANCE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, during the 19th century, Czar Alexander of Russia took the lead in forming an alliance with the emperors of Austria and Prussia. Although their regimes represented all the sins of the day, the emperors named their association the Holy Alliance. Thus fortified the three rulers easily dominated the news headlines of the day.

In our own time, a recent public opinion survey indicates that the best known American is Miss Elizabeth Taylor. If one is to judge from the recent spate of magazine covers, Miss Taylor's leading competitors in the news are Great Britain's Christine Keeler and Vietnam's Madam Nhu.

Perhaps the time has come for a new holy alliance to be formed. Certainly, these three young ladies of distinction have a common bond.

Miss Keeler has recently sent tremors through Her Majesty's Government and has singlehandedly "bagged" the Minister of War.

Miss Taylor appears in her notable role as Cleopatra, the old "Serpent of the Nile," who shook the mighty Roman Empire.

Madam Nhu has snared Uncle Sam in the jungles of southeast Asia and no less an authority than her father has described her as Vietnam's "strongest headline catcher."

Recognizing the remarkable accomplishments of these noted ladies, there is a serious question as to which of the three could best lay claim to Czar Alexander's role as leader of the alliance.

What is really at stake here is not so much the degree of holiness as the problem of maintaining harmony within a union composed of such spirited members.

It would never do to jeopardize the longstanding congeniality of the Anglo-Saxon family by inviting an open leadership test of strength between Miss Taylor and Miss Keeler.

So perhaps Mrs. Nhu, who happily bears the title, "Madam," is the proper leader of what may come to be known as the "Nhu Holy Alliance."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] from the time on the amendment.

BISHOP LEO RICHARD SMITH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is with deep regret that I learned this morning of the death of Bishop Leo Richard Smith of Ogdensburg, N.Y. Bishop Smith's untimely passing is a great loss not only to the proceedings of the Ecumenical Council which he was attending but also to the people of all faiths who knew him when he served in Buffalo and as Bishop of Ogdensburg. Bishop Smith was only 58 years old, and it is sad indeed that his career of service to the church and humanity was cut short.

A native New Yorker, Bishop Smith studied at academic institutions in New York State and served both in Buffalo and as a member of the papal family in Rome. His service in Buffalo and in Ogdensburg where he was installed just last year won him a warm place in the hearts of all his parishioners and won him the respect and reverence of the people of Buffalo and Ogdensburg.

Mr. President, New York has lost a venerated citizen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin two or three questions.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute for morning business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no morning hour.

Mr. JAVITS. May I have 1 minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 minute.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to my colleague for yielding to me.

I wish to say a word about the sale of wheat to Russia. I made a speech in the Senate on October 3 in which I said that the wheat deal should be a one-shot operation, and that if the President approved it because he thought it would not hurt the national interest that would be all right with me.

Mr. President, again I make the same point that I made on October 3 by way of warning. We should not back into a general trade relationship with the Soviet Union under cover of the wheat deal. The President has made that very clear, and I support him fully in that position. I hope the American people will not be diverted from that idea and will not mistake the wheat deal for anything but what it is—a single, one-shot enterprise.

If we are to have trade negotiations—and I think it is desirable that we should—it must be on the basis of the Soviet bloc taking care of their economic and other responsibilities. If they expect to get credit from either private or public sources in the United States, they should undertake to give some political concessions which will materially reduce tensions in the world. Specifically, they would refer, in my opinion, to Berlin or Cuba.

It must be made clear to the American people what we are doing and why, that the wheat deal is a one-shot deal, and that trade negotiations with the Soviet bloc—which could very well be good for all concerned—would be conducted only on the basis of a quid pro quo in consideration of the great benefits which could flow from a material acceleration of trade. We are talking constantly, of course, of nonstrategic goods.

I hope this situation will be made clear to the people. I believe that so far the President has proceeded in the right direction.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has decided to sell surplus wheat to Red Russia. I hope he is right in his judgment. My fear, however, is that time will prove his judgment to be wrong. I am of the belief that friendly people throughout the world will be disturbed by the constant embraces that are now occurring between our country and Red Russia.

I cannot help but think of one of Aesop's fables, which is probably now 2,500 years old. In that fable is told the experience of the rustic who, on a cold winter day, saw a starving and practically frozen snake. He picked up the snake, took it to his bosom, warmed it up, and fed it. The snake, resurrected, survived. The snake subsequently bit and killed its savior.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was at the White House yesterday, and in the discussion that followed I believe the President acted with a great deal of courage in agreeing to sell wheat to Russia. My good friend from Ohio states, in effect, that other people in the world may lose confidence in us in some way because we are trading with Russia. I am sure my good friend realizes that in the past 5 or 10 years, while we have been holding an umbrella, militarily, over Western Europe, our allies have been selling wheat, flour, and other goods to Russia. Today the trade between Western Europe and Russia and her satellites is at last becoming one of the mainstays of free Europe's economy and growth.

Why should we in this country permit the countries of Western Europe to be our brokers?

Why should we allow West Germany, for example, to buy our wheat at good prices, mill it into flour, and sell it to the Communist nations? Russia gets the wheat, the West Germans get the profit, and we wind up holding the bag. In my opinion, we should deal directly with Russia, get closer to the Russian people and show them what a failure the policy of their leaders has been, and replenish our gold supply at the same time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I oppose the sale of our wheat to the U.S.S.R.; but the action by the President of the United States in announcing on yesterday that he would permit this sale has been subjected to unfortunate criticism by those who think he acted too rapidly. One of the best aspects of the President's action was that he was careful in making the decision. I disagreed with it, and disagreed strongly, but the President consulted with Members of Congress extensively, with the appropriate committee members, with officials of the State Department and Agriculture Department. He took his time to get all the facts before he made his decision.

While I disagreed with the action of the President, one who criticizes should be very confident of his sources of information when he thinks the President has made a mistake.

I called for concessions to freedom—not just Russian gold—before we made this kind of deal. It is obvious that the announcement of any concessions by the Soviet Union at this time would be extremely difficult for them to do and probably would make such arrangements impossible. However, it is conceivable, if not likely, that some such concessions were made with respect to Cuba, Berlin, or elsewhere in the world.

I hope and pray that that is the situation. I share the position which has been so well stated by the Senator from Ohio, that this action may have been a mistake. I hope and pray it will not prove to be. I hope events will prove the President to have been correct.

I do hope, however, that somebody, somewhere, somehow, will inform the country and the Congress how much was involved. The New York Times of this morning reported that $250 million in wheat was involved. The Washington Post reported that $375 million was involved. The Wall Street Journal reported that $435 million was involved. This conflict of figures, it seems to me, is confusing everybody interested in the situation. I hope we can have some enlightenment on the facts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. The wheat sale to Russia will aggregate $250 million. The sale of wheat to three of her satellites—namely, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria—will amount to about $50 or $60 million. It may be that corn and other feed grains will be sold, in addition to the wheat.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I shall yield in just a moment.

While the majority leader properly criticized Chancellor Adenauer for his criticism of our actions, on the ground that West Germany had been trading with East Germany, the fact is that Mr. Adenauer was right when he stated that the German experts—who are very knowledgeable in this matter—say this is not something that is a one-shot situation for Russia, that they will very likely come back to us again and continue to do so for a long time. He feels that the free world should consider using its food bargaining power and strength for obtaining some concessions from the Soviet Union. In view of the fact that West Germany has heretofore been selling wheat to East Germany, this offers a good opportunity to obtain collaboration and agreement from other countries in the free world which can be constructive.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The question whether Russia can get enough wheat is a moot question now. Of the approximately 110 nations in the world—all but the United States—will sell wheat to Russia or any other food commodities to Russia and many are selling wheat to Russia.

About 10 years ago we had a similar policy. We refused to sell wheat to Russia. In order to overcome a situation like that, which is necessary for any military power, Russia broke up millions of acres of new virgin land. This enabled her to supply all her own needs and to become a wheat exporting nation until this year.

Now Russia has embarked on a program of fertilizing her land more, as we have been doing in this country for years, and by means of which we have been able to increase our production by one third or more. Germany and other European countries are selling Russia fertilizer plants, fertilizer which Russia uses on her land. In addition, they are working on a program of great expansion of irrigation projects to produce more food. Russia can easily provide all the food she needs. If she cannot, she can get it from the other countries of the world.

We would be far better off militarily, in my opinion, to have Russia more dependent upon us for at least a part of its food supply. Any nation that is dependent on another nation for a part of its food supply cannot be as cocky or quite as independent as it can be if it produces everything it needs.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President of the United States and the administration have on occasion, been accused of fiscal irresponsibility, and have also been accused of doing nothing to bring about a reduction of the tremendous storage of agricultural commodities. These general allegations have been directed against the administrations of both parties over the years.

I believe that some of the accusations which have been leveled against the President and the administration have been answered by the action undertaken yesterday by the President of the United States.

What is involved in the President's announcement is a major sale of wheat for hard cash on the barrelhead in a transaction through private business channels. Our gold stocks are going down; our wheat stocks are going up. They are going up at an immense cost to the taxpayers in government price supports and in storage facilities. We are lectured by other nations, especially in Western Europe, on the danger of selling wheat to the Russians while they sell them not only wheat which they have purchased from us, but flour and strategic commodities.

I think the President has made a courageous decision and a wise decision. It is a decision which I hope will be widely supported in the Congress, by the farmers, and by all Americans. It is a decision for commonsense because of some of the following reasons:

First. In the field of fiscal responsibility, it will bring into the United States in gold or dollars about $250 million. It will thereby reduce the gold drain.

Second. It will reduce our surplus in wheat now being held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in so doing reduce costs to the Government and be a saving to the taxpayers. Incidentally, in the agriculture appropriation bill which passed the Senate over a week ago, approximately $2.7 billion was voted for supports of various kinds.

Third. In my opinion, it will firm up the price of wheat which under present estimates will bring $1.15 to $1.25 a bushel next year, instead of this year's approximately $2.

Fourth. This wheat will not be diverted to Cuba or Communist China under the terms of the export licenses to be issued.

Fifth. This wheat will not be used for manipulation in the world markets.

Sixth. The wheat sale will be known to the Soviet people through the Voice of America broadcasts. I note on this morning's news ticker that the Soviet Union itself has informed the Russian people of this proposal.

Seventh. It will bring added employment to American shipping, longshoremen and railroad workers, as well as grain traders, millers, and farmers.

Eighth. It will be conducted through the normal competitive channels of the private American grain trade.

Ninth. Up to now the Soviet Union and Eastern European nations have been obtaining American wheat indirectly by purchasing from West Germany, France, and others, flour made out of American wheat sold to those countries in ever-increasing quantities.

In other words, the Russians are going to get the wheat anyway, in one way or another. As the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. Ellender], has said, at the moment these Western countries are acting as brokers in the sale of American wheat and reaping profits, while we bear the cost.

This matter was discussed by the President with many Members of the Congress from both parties and was also discussed by the Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce with the appropriate committees of both Houses.

To repeat, I think the President has made a courageous and a wise decision. It is, in my opinion, a decision for commonsense and for peace.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record at this point an editorial entitled "Wheat," published in the Baltimore Sun of Sunday, October 6, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wheat

If Russia wants to buy wheat in this country, at world prices for dollars and gold, it is in the national interest that the wheat be sold. Any other conclusion would be illogical, even foolish.

As to logic, surely it makes good sense to dispose of a portion of our most mountainous nonstrategic surplus under an arrangement which would significantly ease the chronic deficit in our balance of payments, would strengthen farm prices in the United States, would cut the expenses of handling surplus wheat (some 1 billion bushels are now in storage), might provide a new nonexplosive lever in diplomatic maneuver and, as a byproduct, would demonstrate once more our willingness to reach world accommodations in any way that does not endanger the national security.

As to not being foolish, Russia can get wheat in other ways, if it must. One way is to get it in the form of flour from other Western nations—flour ground from America wheat sold to those nations, which can mill it and take a middleman's profit. (The efficient millers of West Germany, whose Chancellor says he opposes the sale of Western wheat to Russia, can bring in grain from abroad at low prices, grind it and sell the flour on the world market; and reports from Bonn say that in the present situation arrangements have been made for 250,000 tons of German-milled flour to go to the Soviet Union.)

Opposition in this country to selling wheat to Russia is based mainly on two considerations. The first is that we would in effect be selling a subsidized commodity to an unfriendly nation—against the sense though not the binding requirements of Congress, as expressed in the Agricultural Act of 1961. The Agricultural Department contends, however, that sales to Russia for world prices would compare favorably, in terms of returns, with sales and donations to friendly nations. The second is in the main political, and in Republican ranks is apt to take the ambivalent form of support for the project without formal approval.

This political aspect appears to worry President Kennedy more than in our opinion it ought to. American business interests are generally favorable, along with Middle Western grain interests. Good sense is good sense, and the President should press ahead. For one thing, time grows short, if indeed as Senator Humphrey suggests it is not already running out.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield myself 1 minute.

With some of what the majority leader has said I agree. We should keep one thing in mind, however. We have the only surplus wheat that is available in the world. We have immense bargaining power. If the Soviet Union must get wheat, it must get it from us. Perhaps the Germans and Canadians would like to sell the Russians more wheat, but they do not have it to sell. Therefore, I make the argument that we should take advantage of the monopoly position that we have, and drive the hardest bargain we can for the sake of freedom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. First, let me say, with regard to the sale of wheat, not only to Russia, but to other countries in the world as well, to which we have not sold previously, the President gave assurance yesterday that the same policy applicable to the sale of wheat would also be applicable to the sale of other commodities which we have in surplus.

It has been said that the Russians and other Eastern European countries desired to purchase feed grains. There has been no restriction against the sale of feed grains. Exports of feed grains have not been subsidized, because the world price has been as high as or higher than our own price. Therefore, it has not been necessary to subsidize it. In the event the same policy is applied to other surplus commodities, I point out that the commodities most likely to be affected, and for which the market would be broadened, would be cotton, powdered milk, and butter, which we hold in surplus in the Commodity Credit Corporation, and which would have to be subsidized to be sold on the world market.

It might also apply to soybean oil. There has been no restriction against the exporting to those countries of commodities which we do not hold in surplus and of which we are short. I merely point out that any expansion of this program would most likely apply to cotton and dairy products.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on the pending amendment I yield myself 2 minutes.

The bill provides that a farmer producing milk anywhere on the date an allotment provision is incorporated in an order can obtain an allotment at any time that he begins delivering milk under the order. He might begin shipping milk to the order market a year after the order becomes effective, but he is still entitled to an allotment on the same basis as if he had been delivering to the order market on the day the order became effective.

The amendment provides that when such a farmer sells his farm to another farmer without having availed himself of this right, his successor in interest will have the same right to an allotment, if he should decide to ship to the order market. The farmer who buys the farm then will not be left without an allotment, but will have the same right to an allotment as his transferor. Otherwise, the value of the farm might fall drastically. At least it would drop very sharply if a farmer could not sell his farm as a dairy unit, particularly if the farm was organized to produce and sell milk for fluid purposes.

The amendment has the approval of the Department of Agriculture, although it would require the Secretary of Agriculture to protect the purchaser who buys a farm and needs the history in order to sell what he produces.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the Senator from Wisconsin two or three questions about the bill. If a dairy farmer sold his farm, and the purchaser did not continue in the production of milk, could the seller then retain the allocation to which he might be entitled? Could he transfer it to someone else or sell it separately? What would become of it under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the dairy farmer wished to transfer his allotment, aside from transferring his dairy herd or farm, the transfer would be governed by regulations to be specified by the Secretary of Agriculture. There is nothing in the bill to bind the Secretary of Agriculture, except that he must base his regulations upon the best interest of the public, existing producers, and prospective new producers. It would be up to him to decide what would be equitable under various circumstances and provide appropriate regulations. Presumably, the Secretary would do his best primarily to provide as much freedom as possible in the transfer of allotments, but also to prevent any traffic in transfers of allotments, and to prevent the building up of large units, which might insure the public interest or family farming.

However, I presume that the Secretary would do his best to permit such a transfer by the owner of a dairy farm.

Mr. AIKEN. In the event a milk marketing order area voted to impose quotas for selling Class I milk, who would make the allocation of such quotas?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Under the bill, the allocation would be made by the Secretary, subject, of course, to a referendum, which would require the approval of two-thirds of the farmers involved.

As the Senator from Vermont has said, the marketing administrator might actually do the work, on behalf of the Secretary, who would have power under the law.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary has already advised us that under the Proxmire bill, in his estimation, the income of dairy farmers throughout the country would be increased about $7 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that that was for the first year. In the first place, that is a conservative estimate. Second, I hope that the income would be increased far more than that on an annual basis after 3 or 4 years had elapsed. But the Senator is correct. The Secretary said that the income of the dairy farmers would be increased about $7 million. That is the only estimate we have before us.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the Secretary's estimate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Wisconsin or someone else stated that there would be no increase to the taxpayer or the Federal Government in the cost of administering the program. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield myself another 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. All the personnel and facilities involved in establishing a market order are already in existence. The decision to be made under the new provision would involve little, if anything, in the way of personnel, office space, or anything else that would involve additional cost.

Mr. AIKEN. There are 83 milk marketing orders in the country. I am satisfied that the addition of allocations and allotments would entail considerably more work and expense. But, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, this program would be administered through the office of the Milk Market Administrator in each of the areas. Will the Senator from Wisconsin advise us who pays the expenses of the office of the Milk Marketing Administrator?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Before I answer that question, I should say that the Secretary of Agriculture also estimated that there would be a sharp reduction in the Government's costs under this program. He estimated that the cost under the program would be in the area of $25 million. The Secretary is a thorough, intelligent, able man. He took into account the additional cost of administering the program which I believe would be fairly small, but nevertheless might very well exist. With that in view, he said there would be a net saving of $25 million to the taxpayer.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct; he said there might be a net saving of $25 million to the taxpayer, assuming that the Secretary's figures are correct. However, the cost of administering milk programs is paid for through assessments on handlers, not through assessments on the taxpayers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is any additional cost of administering, such costs would be collected from the handlers in the area in which the allocation provision applied.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The assessment is on the handlers.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the handlers of course might pass the cost on to the consumer, so that the consumer might pay for it in the form of increased price.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Some may say that the cost is paid by the handlers, others may say by the consumers. It does not appear, however, that there should be any increase in cost by reason of the bill. All of the administrative machinery is already set up. The bill provides only for an additional provision in any order.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from Wisconsin tell us on what the Secretary based his estimate of a $7 million increase in income to the farmers of the country? Would that be contingent upon all 83 milk marketing orders having imposed allotments?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure not.

Mr. AIKEN. How do we know?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think any calculation would disclose that if 50 percent of the milk produced in this country—that is all the milk now under marketing orders—were produced under the class I base system, the opportunity for increasing the income of the farmers involved who produced milk for marketing orders would be greatly increased. Of course, the indirect effect on those producing manufacturing milk, because of a diminution of supply and a greater increase in price, would be beneficial and far more than a minor amount.

Mr. AIKEN. The statement of the Senator from Wisconsin is that the indirect effect upon producers of manufacturing milk, would serve the principal objective of the bill. The Secretary says that, in his opinion, the enactment of the bill would result in an increase of $7 million in income to the farmers of the country. But the cost of administering the program would be paid by the handlers. I suspect that eventually through lower minimum prices, or otherwise, that cost would be passed on to the producers or consumers. The producers might well end up with less net income.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure the competent Secretary of Agriculture and his staff would take this fact into account and give us the net figure with respect to the total effect of the program, including the cost to the handlers, which might be in some manner reflected back to the producer.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary never gave us the basis of his estimate of an increase of $7 million in net income.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is true. The Senator from Vermont may think that is excessive; I think it is conservative. At any rate, I trust the Secretary to give us the most accurate figures he can, and to take into account the full effect on the program. The Senator from Vermont makes a good point. It may conceivably have been overlooked by the Secretary of Agriculture, although I doubt it, in view of his competence.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Wisconsin is as much interested in the producers of manufacturing milk as I am interested in the producers of the highest grade milk for table use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Whereas the Secretary states that the net increase to the farmers would be $7 million, according to his estimate, it is entirely possible that the increase to the manufacturing areas, those farmers who produce milk under less sanitary conditions, would be far above the $7 million; whereas producers who supply milk under the strictest requirements would sustain a substantial loss. Thus, the income would be transferred from one type of producer to another.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Wisconsin has a tremendous number of farmers who produce fluid milk. Thousands of those dairy farmers are asking for this bill. Furthermore, unless the farmers who produce milk for fluid purposes act by a

2 to 1 margin to approve the referendum, it will not have any effect at all. The situation would be the same as it is now. So they can suffer only if they vote against their own interests.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is magnanimous of milk producers to want to increase the income of manufacturing milk producers of the Senator's State. Wisconsin has substantial numbers of both types of farmers.

But unfortunately—or fortunately, perhaps—in the New England area, the New York and Northeastern area, we have very few producers who produce manufacturing milk only; and naturally we are looking out for our own people. I would not want the job that the Senator from Wisconsin has, of having both.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The farmers who produce milk for fluid milk use are placed in a very strong position, because it will be up to them to decide whether the provisions of this bill go into effect. The farmers who produce only for manufacturing purposes do not have this discretion. So the farmers of Vermont who, as the Senator says, produce overwhelmingly for fluid purposes, as do the farmers of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York are the ones who are really in a strong position. It is up to them to decide whether the bill goes into effect; because those who produce fluid milk and are in the marketing order area are the only ones who have the vote, the decisive opportunity.

As I understand it, that is why the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is designed to take care of the manufacturing milk farmer. As the Senator from Vermont knows, that is a separate amendment which is very largely for those outside the fluid milk area.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that the producers of manufacturing milk only, face a much more difficult situation than the producers of milk which has to meet the fluid milk requirements, even though a substantial part of that goes into manufacturing.

What I rose to say, Mr. President, is that I see no objection to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin, although I do have an objection to his bill. I do not see how it is going to increase farm income, unless we take income away from some farmers and give it to others, unless they decide to add the compensatory payment provision which is proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, if I need them, on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that he raises a fundamental question. We all tend to say we have a bill that will save the taxpayer money, and will increase farm income, and that there will be no increased cost to the consumer. But where does the money come from? We should be honest, and should state what we believe the full situation will be for everyone. The fact is that this increase in income will come, I believe, primarily from giving the fluid milk producing farmers the opportunity to organize their dairy herds more efficiently and economically. It will be possible for them to cull out their low producers and to reduce their production, and yet get this high fluid price. If they reduce that production now, under present law, they lose the blended price. If they reduce production under the bill, they will lose only the manufacturing price, which is far less. Therefore, they will increase their income by reducing their costs. In this way their increased income does not have to come out of the consumer or the taxpayer or another farmer. It seems to me this is one logical explanation.

Yet eventually—and I believe the Senator from Vermont shares this view with me—if the farmer is going to get a higher price, he must get it not only from increased efficiency, but also from a modest increase in price to the consumer. Wages have been going up all over the country, but farm prices have not; and I believe a modest increase, especially in the prices of cheese and other manufacturing products of the farmers, over the years—it certainly will not come at once—is perfectly proper, so that the farmer will get a proper income—which is what American free enterprise is all about. He should get it in the marketplace, not from the taxpayer. That is what this bill is designed to accomplish.

Mr. AIKEN. The consumer has really had a break on the price of food. Milk is probably the most economical food that can be purchased today. Milk and sugar have been among the lowest in cost. Of course, we know that the price of sugar is going up rapidly. But in the case of milk, we know that the spread between the price received by the farmer and the price paid by the consumer has become unreasonable. However, I do not know how the consumer would take to an increase in price. Nevertheless, I believe the consumers are getting a break in the price of milk today, because they get so much more for their money in the quality of milk than they used to get. In the past, they sometimes caught typhoid fever from drinking milk; but that is now eliminated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Department of Agriculture economists, committee economists, and members of the Senate Agriculture Committee all agree that there will be no increase in the consumer price for fluid milk from this bill.

This bill will accomplish the objective of farm policy, without taking it out of the hide of the consumer.

Mr. AIKEN. Again I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for looking after the local producers of his State. I should also like to see them get better incomes; but I do not want to see them get that increase in income at the expense of the producers in my State. However, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both sides yield back their remaining time?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield back the balance of my time, unless another Senator wishes to avail himself of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], I call up our amendment which is at the desk, and ask that it be read.

The amendment was read, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a program of surplus adjustment payments to dairy farmers would result in net savings to the Government under the Dairy Price Support Program, the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized to make payments to dairy farmers who agree to restrict their marketing of milk and butterfat during any one or more marketing periods as determined by the Secretary to the quantity of milk marketed by them during the base period, or a percentage thereof: *Provided, however,* That no payment shall be made with respect to marketings after the 1st day of April 1965. Payments hereunder shall be made only with respect to milk marketed for manufacturing usage and shall be at such rates not to exceed 50 cents per hundred pounds of milk or milk equivalent as the Secretary determines appropriate to effectuate a restriction on the marketing of surplus milk and butterfat. Payments shall be made to producers who agree to limit their marketings or who agree to reduce their marketings on the quantity of milk that they market and different rates of payments may be established for individual producers according to the amounts by which they restrict or reduce their marketings: *Provided, however,* That payments to producers marketing their milk under Federal milk marketing orders shall be made on the quantity by which they reduce their marketings from their base quantity, at such rates, not to exceed $2.50 per hundred pounds of reductions in marketings, as the Secretary determines. Such payments may be made at such times, in such areas, and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the Government and accomplish the objective of surplus reduction.

(b) The Secretary shall establish a marketing base for each producer in the continental United States, excluding Alaska, who desires to enter into an agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. Such marketing base shall be the number of pounds of milk, or the number of pounds of milkfat, or such units of dairy products as the Secretary may deem appropriate for the administration of this subtitle which is the lower of (i) the producer's marketings during the marketing year ending March 31, 1963, or (ii) the Secretary's estimate of what would be marketed in a marketing year by the producer based on the rate of his marketings when he enters into the agreement with Commodity Credit Corporation, adjusted for seasonal variation. In establishing a marketing base, the Secretary may make such adjustments in the producer's marketings as he deems necessary for flood, drought, disease of herd, personal

> health, or other abnormal conditions affecting production or marketing, including the fact that the producer may have commenced production and marketing after April 1, 1962. A producer's marketing base for the marketing year shall be apportioned by the Secretary among quarterly marketing periods thereof in accordance with the producer's prior marketing pattern, subject to such adjustments as the Secretary determines necessary to enable the producer to carry out his herd management plans for the marketing year. The quantity thus apportioned to a quarterly marketing period shall be the producer's marketing base for such period.
>
> (c) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as are necessary for the enforcement and the effective administration of this Act and may require buyers, processors, and handlers of milk and butterfat to furnish reports with respect to purchases and utilization of milk and butterfat.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll; and the Chair points out that this time is being charged to that available to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, yesterday I discussed at some length the provisions and purpose of this amendment.

I think the central questions involved in this debate on dairy legislation are clear.

First, are we going to drift along with the present inadequate program?

The net costs of this program to the Government for the last marketing year were $480 million. The estimated costs for the present marketing year are $453 million. This great expenditure does not provide dairy farmers with a fair, adequate, and proper income. It is used to maintain the price of milk for manufacturing purposes at 75 percent of parity, which currently means $3.14 per hundredweight. That is a price which most dairymen will tell us is not adequate to meet the cost of production. It is a substandard return on investment and on the labor of the dairy farmers.

Dairy farmers perform one of the most demanding tasks in the whole agricultural economy of our Nation. Production is required on schedule every day of the year.

Under the present program large surpluses have accumulated. Even though the support price was cut back about 30 cents per hundred in April 1962, production declined less than 1 percent the first 7 months of this year compared to the same period last year.

The surplus in the last marketing year was 8.9 billion pounds of the 118 billion pounds marketed, and the estimate for this year is 8.8 billion pounds.

This surplus hangs over the dairy market and keeps dairy farmers from receiving a fair return.

It creates a great cost to the Government in the handling, processing, and disposal of the surplus. There is practically no market for it. Most of it, therefore, must be stored until it deteriorates or until in some way it can be given away.

Surplus feed grains and wheat and several other commodities can be stored rather easily and at relatively low costs. Milk surpluses must be processed within a few hours of production. The processing is extremely costly.

The second question we ought to ask and which we ought to undertake to answer is whether we are going to take a very limited step, such as is provided by the committee bill, to improve the dairy situation, or whether we will take this opportunity to do something really significant and worthwhile.

The committee bill will directly affect only the 187,000 farmers who market under Federal orders. It might not affect any of those if they do not choose to participate in the program, but at most 187,000 farmers would be affected. That would leave the more than 600,000 other dairy producers without any recourse.

Those 600,000 are without the protection which the other 187,000 enjoy under the marketing orders. These 600,000 dairy farmers who are most in need of some protection, aid, and support are not given any attention. The 187,000 in Federal order markets are at least offered a very limited program, although I consider it to be, even in terms of their particular needs, an inadequate program.

The committee bill has been recommended as giving promise over a period of years as a possible means by which Federal marketing order producers may be encouraged not to expand, and the possible means with which the surplus is now being produced under the marketing orders may be brought under some kind of reasonable control. I hope that it will have that effect, but I have grave doubts as to whether it will be effective.

Legislation should not provide only for class 1 base plans. If we are to enact dairy legislation, we should try to reach out and do something for all the dairy farmers. That is the effect of the amendment which I am offering. It includes all the benefits which are offered by the committee bill for those who produce under class 1 marketing orders.

In addition, it offers some help and assistance to men who produce outside of the marketing orders. It would also benefit those who produce within the marketing order.

The committee bill (S. 1915) is enabling legislation. Before producers in a Federal order could remove the blend price provision, a hearing and a referendum would be required. Even if approved, no producer would be required to cut back production. In fact, to make the committee bill effective in relation to the present surplus problem, it is necessary to add what our amendment provides—a program of surplus reduction payments.

The committee bill would, according to Department of Agriculture estimates, bring about only a minor drop in surpluses—from 8.8 billion pounds to 8.2 billion pounds.

It would increase net farm income by only $7 million. And it would lower Government costs only from $453 million to $427 million.

The pending amendment provides a voluntary program of incentive payments.

It would open up the program to the more than 600,000 dairy producers marketing outside Federal orders.

According to Department estimates, it would, first, cut the dairy surplus from 8.8 billion pounds to 4.2 billion pounds; second, increase the net income of dairy farmers by $150 million; third, cut Government costs by $37 million, compared to the existing program.

Mr. President, the program provided in this amendment is consistent with the recommendation made by President Kennedy in his farm message to the Congress on January 31 of this year.

The President stated:

> New dairy legislation is urgently required for the benefit of both the farmer and the taxpayer * * *. Under the present law surplus stocks of dairy products, especially butter, continue to pile up in Government warehouses in shocking quantity.
>
> It is imperative therefore that the Congress apply the same successful principles of voluntary supply management to the dairy industry and enact a program under which only producers who cooperate by reducing their marketings would receive, through market prices and payments, a return on their marketings substantially greater than the noncooperators who choose not to join the program. Such a program would not only improve the income of cooperating farmers but also reduce Government costs.

The program offered in this amendment, when taken together with that which is included in the committee bill, now before the Senate, would accomplish these objectives. It would be a decided improvement over the present situation. It would reduce the costs to the Government. It would reduce the surpluses. It would increase the income of the dairy farmer.

The program which is provided in the amendment has the support of the National Grange and the National Farmers' Union. In his letter commenting on the program, Mr. Herschel Newsom, master of the Grange, stated:

> To my knowledge, this is the first time that legislation has been proposed which would try to solve the problems that face those in both the regulated and unregulated markets. We believe that the combination of remedies proposed by the combination of the Proxmire and McCarthy bills will help to bring an end to the longtime warfare between the manufacturing and class I areas of the Nation. The improvement in the supply-demand situation resulting from this legislation will be of inestimable value in our attempts to prevent the exploitation of dairy farmer-producers by those who prefer to make the continuation of unmanageable surpluses and farm bankruptcy the major provisions of agricultural policy.

Mr. President, as I stated yesterday, this proposed legislation is not—and ought not to be considered—a farm bloc proposition. Farmers have special problems just as do other groups in the economy. And among farmers, dairy producers have problems that are different from those of wheat farmers, cotton farmers, or peanut growers.

The judgment of the Congress as to whether this legislation is needed, whether the present law ought to be modified, is ultimately one which must be based upon considerations of justice and considerations of the national interest.

We do not have a single farm program or a single farm problem. Rather, over the years we have developed a variety of programs, each of which is designed to meet a special need.

Price supports are mandatory for some crops and optional for others. Some commodities have no direct price supports at all, but are benefited by support programs in other commodities, as is the case with livestock and feed grains. Among support programs, some are by way of direct loans to individual producers and others are through market purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation, as is the case with milk. There are direct subsidies, such as with wool. We pay for diverting acreage, as in the feed grains program. We help to stabilize the market through purchases for the school lunch program. We pay export subsidies. We move surpluses through Public Law 480. We permit various types of marketing orders and agreements which have significant effects on the market and on supplies.

No one of these methods is perfect, and all of them need continuing review as market conditions change, as world conditions change, as methods of production change, and as new crops come into production. Adjustments are necessary, and what we propose in the way of dairy legislation will need some change and some adjustment in the future.

The two proposals—the Proxmire bill and the amendment I am offering to that bill—I believe offer a constructive step, a worthwhile step, which the Senate should support.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on his amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. What are the objections to the amendment? Are there any serious objections?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know of any serious objections to it. I do not know why anyone should object to a program which would reduce the cost of the farm program to the Government, raise farm income, and reduce surpluses. There have been some vague objections on principle. Some people are opposed to the direct payments to farmers. There are direct payments in the wool program, and what amounts to direct payments in the feed grain program, and what amounts to direct payments in the sugar program. No one seems to object to those on principle. But some of the same spokesmen who accept those programs and endorse them say that direct payments in regard to milk somehow are a violation of principle. That is the only kind of objection I know which can be made to my proposal.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I indicated yesterday, the legislation which was first considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was laid aside because of an inability to agree on its provisions. The bill which is before the Senate now is a compromise.

When the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 was enacted, there were provisions devoted exclusively to milk marketing. Under those provisions, in order to provide consumers with wholesome healthful milk, pasteurized milk, the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized to set minimum prices for producers of that milk in a marketing area, if they desired it. There is no doubt that at the inception of the program it was understood that the milk which was to receive the high price because of the imposition of the requirement for sanitary conditions was the milk which was to be used for direct consumption. It was never felt that this price would induce increased production.

However, as time passed, there was developed a system of blend prices, whereby the high price for class I milk was averaged with the low price received for manufacturing milk. This practice has resulted in forcing farmers to produce excessively in order to maintain their income. This is so because as the proportion of manufacturing milk increased the blend price decreased. That resulted, in my estimation, in bypassing the intent of the Congress as expressed in the act of 1937.

The bill before the Senate would make it plain that in marketing areas the Secretary of Agriculture shall see to it that quotas based on history are made available to all milk producers who produce milk for direct consumption, and that for their effort such producers of milk are paid the minimum price fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture. As to all milk produced in excess of the amount needed to fill the requirements for direct consumption, the producers would receive the regular support price, which today amounts to $3.14 per hundredweight. There would not be a single blend price applicable to all the milk delivered.

The program, because of the blend price, not only invites but almost requires that more milk be produced than is necessary to fill the requirements for direct consumption. In many milksheds, the production of milk has increased by leaps and bounds. Instead of the producers in the milksheds producing milk for direct consumption, as was intended, much is produced for manufacturing purposes. For example, as was stated yesterday, only 39 percent of the milk produced in the Chicago milkshed is for direct consumption. The remainder, or 61 percent, is used for making butter, cheese, dried milk, and other dairy products. Of course, the Government has been required to purchase much of the excess milk products.

In the New York area, the milk produced for direct consumption constitutes 49 percent, and 51 percent of the milk is used for the manufacture of cheese and other dairy products, much of which is purchased by the Government.

I contend that this was never intended by the original Act of 1937. I repeat: What we seek to do is merely to compensate at a fair price those who install in their dairies the necessary sanitary machines, those who produce the milk so that it can be sold directly to the consumers under certain standards set by the Government.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that in the past 4 or 5 years, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have been trying to reduce the enormous costs of the various programs. It will be recalled that last year Congress passed a law that would have had the effect of reducing costs under the wheat program. Unfortunately, the farmers rejected that proposal. But, price supports in the future will be available only to those who comply with allotments. However, the fact remains that, under the program enacted last year, the minimum of 55 million acres provided under the law on which the Government had to pay a subsidy, whether the wheat was needed or not, was stricken from the law.

We tried the same procedure in respect to corn and other feed grains. As a result of the programs the Congress has adopted, we were able to reduce surpluses of corn and other feed grains from some 90 million tons to 50 million tons at present.

An earlier effort was made to reduce costs for cotton. We succeeded in doing that for 2 or 3 years, but because the program was not administered as Congress had intended, the cost of that program has not been reduced to the extent that was expected.

The milk program has been one of the most costly farm programs on the statute books. I wish to read into the RECORD some of the costs involved. I have a table in my hand which indicates the cost of the program from 1953 through 1963.

The CCC net expenditures—the losses that had to be made up by the Congress on milk purchases—in 1953–54 were in excess of $400 million. That same year, under section 32 expenditures, the sum of $74 million was spent, for a total of $474.6 million, for the milk program in 1953–54.

That amount has gradually increased from year to year.

In 1961–62 the net expenditures under the CCC purchase program were $529.9 million. The cost for the military and veterans milk program was $25.9 million. Under section 32, the cost was $47.1 million. The total was $602.9 million during the year 1961–62.

In addition, there was a special milk program, which, in the year 1961–62 aggregated $89.2 million, for a total in 1961–62 of $692.1 million.

What the committee has been trying to do is have laws enacted that will decrease this enormous cost to the taxpayers.

I point out that since the inception of this program the total cost to the taxpayers over a 10-year period from sales through the military program, the section 32 program, CCC expenditures, and the special school milk program, has been $4,034 million.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table to which I have been referring.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Annual net expenditures for dairy programs, fiscal years 1954–62*

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	CCC net expenditures [1]	Military and veterans milk program [2]	PIK [3]	Sec. 32 expenditures [4]	Total (excluding special milk)	Special school milk	Grand total
1953–54	$400.6			$74.0	$474.6		$474.6
1954–55	221.0	$1.0		24.4	246.4	$17.2	263.6
1955–56	218.0	7.3		39.0	264.3	45.8	310.1
1956–57	206.0	16.4		75.6	298.0	60.4	358.4
1957–58	195.4	30.4		123.7	349.5	66.3	415.8
1958–59	99.3	23.0		106.2	228.5	74.3	302.8
1959–60	149.9	23.6		35.1	208.6	80.5	289.1
1960–61	170.4	25.3		82.1	277.8	84.3	362.0
1961–62	529.9	25.9		47.1	602.9	89.2	692.1
1962–63	440.1	24.8	$6.7		471.6	93.9	565.5
Total	2,630.6	177.7	6.7	607.2	3,422.2	611.8	4,034.0

[1] CCC purchase and other costs (processing, repackaging, transportation, storage, and handling), less proceeds from sales (including sales to sec. 32).

[2] CCC reimbursements to military agencies, Veterans' Administration, and other participants.

[3] Amount of PQK certificates issued by CCC on exports of nonfat dry milk.

[4] Sec. 32 expenditures for purchases from CCC and direct purchases in the market.

NOTE.—Excludes Government costs of activities under titles 1 and 2 of Public Law 480.

Mr. ELLENDER. Something must be done to curtail these expenses.

I believe that in time the bill before us will cause this huge expense to the taxpayers to decrease.

I hesitate to oppose the amendment of my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], but, in my opinion, that amendment would result in increasing the cost, instead of decreasing it, for the simple reason that the amendment provides two methods of payment to the milk producers, both of which have been rejected by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in past years.

What the McCarthy amendment seeks to do is to pay to milk producers outside the marketing areas up to 50 cents a hundred pounds not to produce more milk than the range which the Secretary of Agriculture will fix.

The proposal does not provide what the range will be. It reads:

> Payments shall be made to producers who agree to limit their marketings or who agree to reduce their marketings on the quantity of milk that they market and different rates of payments may be established for individual producers according to the amounts by which they restrict or reduce their marketings.

It does not state from what amounts. But here we would be going into the field of paying compensation payments to all producers of milk outside the marketing areas. As I said, these payments could be as high as 50 cents a hundred pounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senater has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

Under the present law, the milk producers who produce milk for manufacturing purposes receive a support price of $3.14. The proposal would make it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to raise that amount by 50 cents a hundred pounds, or $3.64 a hundred pounds.

I contend that such direct payments to the farmers would increase the cost of the program.

In addition to the payments to be made to milk producers outside the marketing areas, my good friend has provided for a payment of as much as $2.50 a hundred pounds to producers within marketing areas who agree to reduce production.

The same principle of paying farmers for not producing would be applied to milk that is now applied to corn, and other feed grains. The program is based on the assumption that since it costs the Government $4.50 a hundredweight for the processing of milk which is produced in excess of our needs and purchased by the Government, the Government will save $2 by paying $2.50 to the farmers not to produce.

That may be true, but in my judgment the cost of administering the program will amount to many more millions of dollars than is now the case, because the amendment would cover every milk producer in the country. It seems to me that with our past experience we had better try a method whereby we can more or less control production rather than invite its expansion.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has labored many hours trying to devise ways and means of coping with the milk surplus situation. However, up to now we have not come forth with any bill which is satisfactory to the producers and all the others who handle milk products. I have tried in vain to get all interests in the milk industry to come to the committee to try to iron out differences. Up to now they want the program as it now stands.

The best we could do in the committee was to present the bill that is now before the Senate. The bill does not materially change the present law, except that it makes certain that those who produce milk for direct consumption will be paid a higher price than those who produce milk for manufacturing purposes.

There are many areas where producers cannot produce milk for $3.14 a hundredweight. They will be discouraged from doing it. They will be encouraged to produce good milk for direct consumption, as was intended by the law of 1937. The Senate should adopt the bill as reported from the committee, and vote down the so-called McCarthy amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield. First I should like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has stated that there has been an inability to obtain support for some sort of common understanding. What is the attitude of agricultural organizations on the pending bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know of any serious opposition to it. The Grange wants the McCarthy amendment. I believe that the Farm Bureau has declared that if the bill before the Senate is passed it will be the opening wedge to fix quotas. I cannot agree with that, because of the past history. The quotas would be fixed in the various marketing areas, not all over the country. The Farmers Union is in favor of the McCarthy amendment. That is about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about the distributors and processors?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe they are very much opposed to it.

Mr. McCARTHY. They are very much in favor of anything that will result in increased production.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. We are trying to make it possible for the law of 1937, which we enacted, to work as we intended it to work. It is my considered judgment that after a few years, if the pending bill is passed, the losses resulting from the dairy program will be considerably reduced.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the sole purpose of the proposed legislation were to increase the producer's income, and no consideration were to be given to other factors, such as the effect on taxpayers, consumers, and the Government's operations, the McCarthy amendment would accomplish this purpose. For that reason I have been resisting the temptation to support it, and do not intend to vote for it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator cannot resist the temptation, did he say?

Mr. AIKEN. I am resisting the temptation to support the Senator's amendment. If he wanted to increase farm income only, the McCarthy amendment perhaps would accomplish that end. However, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, there would be a great deal of expense to the Government connected with it. Under the McCarthy amendment an additional expense would be forced on the Government, whereas under the Proxmire amendment any additional cost would be charged to the producer. Therefore there would be no additional cost to the taxpayer.

However, I feel that the McCarthy amendment should not be approved, for two reasons. The first reason is that it provides for payments up to 50 cents a hundredweight for those who produce manufacturing milk and maintain or reduce their production. The amendment is so worded that unless the Secretary showed gross discrimination in the payments among various producers, a producer who reduced his production by 5 percent would be paid approximately twice as much per hundred as one who reduced it by 10 percent.

However, the Senator from Minnesota has included a provision which would allow the Secretary to discriminate among producers. I do not believe that should be done.

Another provision would authorize the payment of $2.50 a hundredweight to producers within a marketing order area who reduce their production. No doubt that extra income would be very welcome to many of them. However, it lays itself open to violation. A person might dispose of 10 cows to a neighbor, and one would be paid for milking the cows, and the other for not milking the cows.

In order to get the payments, producers within a marketing area would have to submit to such allocations and terms and conditions as the Secretary determined he wanted to impose upon them. In other words, in order to get $2.50 for reducing the production of milk in a marketing area, the producers would have to put themselves completely at the mercy of the Secretary.

I do not believe our farmers want to do that. If we were faced with the question of voting solely to increase the overall farm income of the dairy farmers of this country, our problem would be simplified. The McCarthy amendment might have that result, but there are disadvantages to it, which so far outweigh any possible advantages that I am resisting the temptation to support it, and I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. ELLENDER. How much time have I remaining?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New York, if there is no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I find myself in opposition to the pending amendment to provide compensatory payments for reduced production. I look upon the amendment as a proposal of forced reduction, using voluntary methods initially. It would pay the farmers for not producing milk. I do not believe that is sound procedure. In the long run it would not benefit either the farmer or the fellow who has not been mentioned here today so far, the consumer.

The amendment is an attempt at production control and regimentation of the farmer. It is advanced as a voluntary measure. On a voluntary basis, there is little prospect that production would be reduced or that the taxpayer would be subjected to payments for reduced production and supports. If there is to be an economic saving through production control, it will necessitate mandatory controls, which are bound to be a followup to this proposal. Such controls, in general, are anathema to most of the dairy farmers of the country.

Under a voluntary reduction of milk production through incentive payments, the consumer is bound to be subjected to higher prices at the market. Even today, the consumer is paying 2 cents a pound more for butter than he was 9 months ago, without any benefit accruing to the producer.

A utilization of class I base allocations will inevitably lead to a demand for an increase in fluid milk prices. I appreciate the need of the dairy farmer for increased income; but I foresee any projected attempt to increase class I prices as resulting in lower consumption by the public and in no net gain of income to the farmer.

The amendment involves, inevitably, regimentation, regulation, and control, which are implicit in so many of our other farm programs, practices which Congress has never seen fit to extend to the dairy industry.

I shall have to oppose the bill itself, but the amendment goes way beyond the bill in proposing payments for not milking cows, not having cows, and forcing a reduction in production. It is contrary to the general principles upon which dairy farmers have traditionally operated in this country. We have limited rather strictly the areas in which we indulge in the luxury of paying for not producing items. I do not believe it is in the interest of the economy to extend those practices now to the dairy industry.

We should take a hard look at our entire agricultural program. In my judgment, what is desperately needed is the establishment of a Joint Congressional Study Commission on Agriculture, to enable the development of new directions for our Nation's farms and farmers. A consideration of different aspects of the farm problem in isolation is not helpful in reaching a solution of the entire problem.

I think the amendment now under consideration makes a bad bill even worse. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator in control of the time yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when we are discussing milk legislation, I always think of the great New England writer Henry David Thoreau, who lived in the days when it was not uncommon to water the milk. It was Thoreau who coined that amusing phrase that the circumstantial evidence is very strong when one finds a trout in the milk.

I say it is not circumstantial evidence, but prima facie evidence, when we have a report from the Department of Agriculture that states that the McCarthy amendment would be a decided improvement over the present situation.

The esteemed chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. Ellender] is more knowledgeable on farm legislation than, perhaps, any other Member of the Senate with whom I have had the pleasure to converse on the subject; so I respect his opinion.

I suggest that the amendment which I am proud to cosponsor with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] makes the case a little stronger, and does away with the trout-in-the-milk kind of evidence, for we can take it on the authoritative evidence of the Department that the application of the amendment would reduce dairy surpluses from 8.8 billion pounds to 4.2 billion pounds. If the law now in effect has allowed surpluses to creep ever onward and upward, as they seem to be doing, it is time to take a new look at the situation. Perhaps the incentive payment plan is what is needed. It seems to me that this bill is somewhat analogous to the feed grain bill. This is based upon my knowledge of the State of Oregon, which has a sizable dairy industry.

Since the beginning of my political career, I have been associated with legislation affecting the dairy farmer, and with the consumer in his relation to the dairy farmer. The dairy industry of Oregon has been adversely affected by the national dairy surplus. About half the milk now produced in Oregon is made into manufactured dairy products. The price for manufacturing milk is very low. Although Oregon dairy farmers adjusted their production downward by 3 percent in 1962, their income decreased correspondingly because their prices did not improve. Yet their costs of farming remained the same. Because there was a national surplus, their prices could not improve.

The situation confronting Oregon dairy farmers is similar to that which faces dairymen generally. There has been little improvement in income this year, and I see little prospect that the incomes of dairy farmers can be improved under the present program.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] and me would authorize incentive payments on manufacturing milk to dairy farmers marketing under Federal orders who adjusted their marketings downward to more nearly the market demand for fluid milk. It also would authorize income payments on manufacturing milk to dairy farmers outside Federal orders who restricted their marketings. These payments would be effective in reducing the national dairy surplus. At the same time, they would be in addition to the prices received for milk or butterfat.

The amendment would authorize large enough payments to farmers who agreed to reduce their marketings to more than offset the loss of income from the reduction in marketings. The payment provisions, therefore, would represent a means of reducing the surplus, reducing Government purchases and costs, and increasing dairy farm income.

I am not greatly impressed by the argument that a great deal of power would be put in the hands of the Secretary. We have heard that argument before. We know that the Secretary's interests are really the interests of both the farmer and the consumer. If we are to be fearful of a member of the Cabinet under the great democratic system of this country, we have no faith in Government.

I can only cite the statistics which the Department of Agriculture has supplied and which are shown in the material supplied by the Senator from Minnesota.

It seems to me that rather than to build up further the vast surplus of butter and milk, we should support the McCarthy amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I desire to make one or two statements in conclusion. It has been said by some of the opponents that the amendment will result in an increased cost to the taxpayers, according to the projections that have been made, almost to infinity.

The only reply I can make to that argument is that the best sources of information we have in regard to matters of this kind are the Government departments; and all the analyses made by the Department of Agriculture experts and by other experts lead to the conclusion that my program will cost the taxpayers less. I believe this statement should stand on the record, unless Senators who have prophesied great increases in cost can call up their own witnesses or their own experts and can show that their statements are to the contrary. In that case, we would have to set against their statements—which I can only conclude would be based on some kind of subjective judgment—the conclusions of the Department experts. These experts say that my program, if adopted, would have the effect of reducing the cost to the Government by some $37 million, as compared to the cost of the present program.

In addition, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has stated, if Senators are concerned about increasing the income of the dairy farmers—and I would think all Senators should be concerned, and particularly those of the opposition who either are going to go about the country now or are preparing to go about the country to talk about the parity index and its decline and the importance of increasing the prices the farmers receive for their products—I believe that Senators should be concerned to reverse the trend of declining prices. I believe they should be willing to take action which, even if it does not give the dairy farmers parity of income, at least would improve their relative economic position.

My final point is that I do not believe we should let ourselves be directed by the argument that we cannot get agreement among those who are interested, or that we cannot get agreement in the industry as to what kind of dairy program we should have. Congress is here to legislate. I recall that in 1961 the administration proposed that we go out to the farmers all over the country and have them develop a program, and then have that program come back to Congress and we would decide whether we would accept it.

This approach was denounced by a great majority of Senators. They said: This is not the way to operate; it is not the people out in the country, or the organizations, or the producers who have the responsibility of developing a program. They said that Congress does not have a passive role, that under the Constitution it was not intended that Congress should stand idly by and approve what was finally presented to them by some kind of consensus developed out in the country.

Here we are with a dairy program submitted to the Congress for action. The argument is made that we should not approve it because not everyone in the industry approves of it. I should say that is a direct contradiction of the arguments made when this approach was suggested at the beginning of 1961.

Putting aside the question of whether the industry agrees—although I do not believe they will ever agree, because there are two kinds of dairy industries at the present time, and it would be almost impossible to get both of them to agree—we should proceed on the basis of these facts: that we do have a surplus of over 8 billion pounds of milk produced in this country; that the program I propose would cut that surplus significantly to 4.2 billion pounds and would reduce the role of the Government in the business of handling, storing and trying to get rid of this great surplus. At the same time, it would reduce the cost of the overall program to the taxpayers. It would in no way increase the cost of dairy products to the consumer.

If Senators will study the program, they will not be saying that the consumer is going to bear the cost of the program, because the consumer will not bear that cost.

Finally, the program proposed in this amendment would increase the net income of dairy producers by $150 million.

I submit that these are four good and sufficient reasons to vote the adoption of the amendment and the passage of the bill as thus amended.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

DAIRY LEGISLATION NEEDED

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, half of all the correspondence I get on farm legislation includes an appeal to simplify it and make it easier for the farmer-producers to understand.

Whenever the Senate debates a farm bill, my sympathy for farmers rises to a peak in this regard, for we are always confronted with a complexity of arguments, ranging all the way from economic to philosophical, which tend to obscure the real issues involved.

There are one or two basic facts in the dairy situation which should be kept in mind.

In the 1962–63 milk marketing year, farmers produced 118 billion pounds of milk, of which 8.9 billion pounds were surplus to our needs. The Treasury of the United States paid out $480 million to take out of the market butter, cheese, and dried milk solids, to adjust supply and demand.

Recent estimates indicate that production this year will run approximately the same as last year, possibly a little less, and that we shall have around an 8.8 billion pound surplus, with Government costs running $450 million or more.

There are fundamentally two schools of opposition to the proposed dairy legislation.

One group advocates that we do nothing at all about this drain on the Treasury and the critically low income of dairy farmers. The other group says, in effect, "Let's do a little, but not very much."

I wish to identify myself, Mr. President, with those who want to do all that can be done to adjust the dairy situation, improve the dairy farmers' income, and reduce Government costs.

Studies and testimony which have been presented in connection with Senator PROXMIRE's class I quota system, as embodied in Senate bill 1915, indicate that it will reduce the surplus by 500 or 600 million pounds. While this is a minor fraction of the total, it will help; and the bill should be enacted.

An analysis of Senator McCARTHY's supplemental proposal of payments for voluntary reductions in production indicates that the plan would reduce the surplus of dairy products by 50 percent, would increase producer income approximately $100 million, and would reduce Government costs by $37 million.

This analysis has not been seriously challenged; it has only been countered by vague charges of Government dictation and loss of freedom. This is a false issue. There is no loss of freedom so long as the program is voluntary and the producers may decide whether they will increase their milk production, hold it stable, or reduce it for payments which will subsequently save the Government the larger expense involved in buying dairy products off the market.

The real issue involved in the Proxmire and McCarthy proposals is whether we shall make changes in an existing dairy program which will reduce the Government's $450 million expenditure and improve farm income, or whether we shall refuse to do so.

I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] for the intelligence, energy, and effort they have put into bringing their proposals to the Senate floor and giving the Senate an opportunity to vote for a better and less costly dairy program. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of both of these bills.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the amendment before us will provide an opportunity for dairy farmers to secure a return for their capital investment, labor, and management comparable to the income received by other like industries on investment and management.

If we look back over the development of this country, we find that much of it occurred by exploiting different things at different times. Early in our history our people exploited our land and water resources; and we are still paying to restore them. At another point, our people were exploited through low wages and sweatshop working conditions. In recent years in agriculture, we have embraced efficiency to the point that dairy farmers, as well as other types of farmers, have been and are being exploited.

We are now at a crisis; and the question is what to do about it.

In 1947–49, one farmworker produced enough food to feed 14 people. Currently, one farmworker produces enough food to feed twice that number. We accomplished this because of increased production efficiency; and I think all will agree that we have not rewarded farmers for this outstanding production. At this stage of our development we must provide a program, particularly for the dairy industry, which will insure the survival of our family farm structure in agriculture. We must also take into consideration the degree of economic stability necessary in order to persuade young people to stay on the land and to permit an adequate return for their work, capital, and management. For example, a 40-cow herd constitutes a family-size farm. With the proper equipment, this calls for a $60,000 or $70,000 capital investment. Beyond this type of dairy farm, capital investment exceeds $100,000. This is certainly a staggering aspect of the prospects faced, not only by young people, but also by many farm families who are well established in dairying.

The thinking of Wisconsin farmers on these problems can be summed up in two main points:

First. The present program of Government expenditures for processed dairy products has become a tremendous financial burden, and is of negligible benefit to the manufacturing milk producers, who are receiving a price based on only 75 percent of parity.

Second. Milk used in the manufacturing of dairy products is not limited by local, State, or regional factors. A national approach is necessary. We need a dairy program which will operate in the interest of all dairy producers. It is not enough simply to perfect programs already in existence in fluid-milk-producing areas.

I believe the McCarthy amendment combined with the Proxmire bill is a sound step in the right direction. The program it would provide would be voluntary. It retains the present general price support level of 75 percent of parity.

It incorporates the class I base plan, which permits producers to amend their Federal marketing order, so as to cut back on production of surplus milk used for manufacturing purposes without losing their share of the premium price of fluid-milk sales.

Producers under Federal orders who agree to cut production 10 percent or more would be paid production incentive payments of up to $2.50 per hundred on the amount they reduced marketings. This provision would be effective through April 1, 1965.

The Secretary would be authorized to establish a program of direct payments for dairy producers outside of Federal marketing orders who agree not to expand production. The maximum direct payment would be 50 cents per hundred on their marketings of milk for manufacturing purposes. The Secretary could make one level of payments for producers who hold the line and a higher level for those who agree to cut production by 5 percent. This provision would also be effective until April 1, 1965.

This approach would make possible individual decisions and judgments, leaving farmers a choice in determining the course of action best for them. This is a program which would operate nationally on a voluntary basis, and would provide for direct payments to farmers who will produce at a level of marketing in the 1961–62 marketing year. It will accomplish the long-range objective of substantially improved incomes for dairy farmers, as well as short-term needs for income improvement. Also of special concern is the consumer interest. I believe this proposal would reduce retail prices for the products processed from manufacturing milk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators in charge of the time yield back the time which remains?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Bartlett
Burdick
Clark
Douglas
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Randolph
Smathers
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—56

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La
McClellan
McIntyre
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—17

Allott
Byrd, W. Va.
Dodd
Eastland
Engle
Gore
Johnston
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Metcalf
Miller
Moss
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower

So Mr. McCARTHY's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, in behalf of myself and my colleague from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 6, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Sec. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to issue, within sixty days after the enactment of this Act, recommendations with respect to minimum standards for milk for manufacturing purposes, and shall include in such recommendations sanitation standards equivalent to those recommended by the United States Public Health Service for grade A fluid market milk (contained in a publication of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Milk Ordinance and Code"). Any recommendations issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall supersede any recommendations heretofore issued by the Department of Agriculture on the same subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need, up to 15 minutes, in order to explain the purpose of the amendment. I wish to present the background of the dairy situation as we find it today.

Senators will recall that during the Korean war the production of dairy products was encouraged to the maximum extent. As a result, a couple of years after the conclusion of that war the Government was in possession of nearly 1½ billion pounds of dairy products, somewhat evenly divided among butter, cheese, and powdered milk. After 1954 we started working off that surplus. By the first of the year 1961 the Government owned no cheese, owned no butter, and owned only a reasonable amount of powdered milk.

In 1961 things changed somewhat. The support price for manufacturing milk was raised substantially, to $3.40 a hundredweight. That encouraged production in the manufacturing areas. There was very good weather that year, which helped to increase production across the country. There were also two "scares" which tended to reduce the consumption of milk. The first "scare" was the result of some people saying that milk would be so full of strontium 90 that everyone who drank milk would die. The other "scare" resulted from some saying that a person would have heart trouble if he drank milk. As a result of that combination, but primarily because of the increase in the support level to $3.40 per hundredweight for the manufacturing milk, at the end of 18 months the Government found itself in possession of almost as much dairy products as it had 2 years after the Korean war.

I remind Senators that in March of 1961 production and consumption of dairy products in this country were almost exactly in balance, and the Federal Government did not own a pound of butter or a pound of cheese. During the next 18 months the Government accumulated a great deal of butter, cheese, and powdered milk. After the summer of 1962, when Congress made it plain it was not going to accept the administration's recommendations for Goverment control of the dairy industry, the situation began to improve. Since that time the production of milk has been dropping gradually. For the past 10 months the production of milk in the United States has dropped below the production of the corresponding months of the previous year. People got over being frightened. Consumption increased.

Now we show a substantial improvement in the dairy industry compared to the situation a year ago, or 6 months ago, or even 2 months ago. The Government is now buying almost no butter. Whatever cheese is bought, the Government promptly disposes of it. Consumption by the public is still increasing. Production by the farmers is decreasing. It will be only a matter of months before the situation will be in good balance again.

Prices have increased somewhat above those of the past year, but not as much as we should like to have them increase, because the Commodity Credit Corporation still holds some 300 million or more pounds of butter, though not much cheese. That depresses the market.

In my State, as an example, farm income for the first 7 months of this year, from dairy products—milk—was up 1½ percent compared to a year ago. If there is no deleterious legislation passed, the increase in prices for the next year for all uses will be much greater, and there will also be an increase in consumption.

The Proxmire bill, besides increasing farm income $7 million a year, as the Secretary has stated was his best estimate, would have other effects, too.

I have made inquiry as to what basis the Department of Agriculture used for estimating an increasse of $7 million in income this year. I find that the estimate of a $7 million increase was based on an anticipated reduction in operating cost. In other words, if not so much is spent to produce, more is left. I am not sure that is exactly the case. Nevertheless, that is what the Department says.

A bad effect of the Proxmire bill would be to transfer production of dairy products from farms and areas which now produce under the highest sanitary requirements in the country to areas which have the lowest sanitary requirements for the production of milk.

I have in my hand a sheet listing 83 requirements which a milk producer in New England must meet before he can put his milk on the Massachusetts or Connecticut market, or the markets of other States. I will describe a few of them.

The producer must have his cattle tested for every conceivable form of disease known to cattle.

Mr. President, this is proper. I am not objecting to such requirements. I am reading them to show the conditions the milk producer in most of the Federal order areas must meet in order to put any of his milk on the market.

With reference to the milking barn, he must have adequate lighting, so many square feet of natural lighting, or so much artificial lighting for each cow.

The barn must be as well ventilated as a dwelling house.

The floor construction cannot be of planks or mud. It must be of concrete or some comparable material.

The barn must be kept clean. The walls and ceilings of the cowbarn must be painted biennially or whitewashed annually.

The yard where the cows have recreation must be graded so no water of any kind can stand upon it.

All manure must be disposed of promptly, at a certain distance from the barn, and be completely inaccessible to domestic animals.

There are similar requirements for the milkhouse itself, very strict requirements as to lighting, ventilation, and screening.

There are requirements today for a cow stable to have modern toilets installed and strict prohibitions against old-fashioned customs.

The water supply must be up to standard. It must be water of the proper temperature. It cannot be water taken from ponds. It must be spring water or artesian water. In our part of the country there is a limitation on certain chemical content.

Not long ago I was advised that many of the farmers in Vermont were told they had to have a new source of water, or they could not send their milk to the Boston market and other markets in southern New England, the reason being that the water showed a little too high sulfur content.

It did not make any difference that the people raised on those lands lived to be 90 or 100 years old and that the babies who had drunk the water had grown up successfuly, but they could not give that water to the cows, because it had a certain chemical content.

Living up to these requirements costs money.

There is a requirement for modern plumbing, not only for the milkers, but for the cows who must have drinking bowls readily accessible.

We have pushbutton stable cleaners now, in place of the old scoop shovels. Many things have changed.

All utensils must be cleaned and sterilized.

Milk must be stored in a place not close to the stable. It has to be as sanitary as the average Washington restaurant, or more comparable, the modern hospital more than anything else.

Before milking, the cow's udders must be washed, and just before milking they have to be rinsed with a bactericidal solution.

The flanks, bellies, and tails must be cleaned before milking, and brushing must be completed before milking.

The milker's hands have to be washed, and rinsed with a bactericidal solution, just as a doctor does before he takes a gall bladder or kidney out of a patient.

I shall read one more requirement, and then I shall ask to have the entire list of

83 requirements inserted in the RECORD in connection with what I am saying.

A modern dairy barn, to meet the requirements of city markets today, must have surroundings clean, free from insect breeding, and rodent harborages. If anyone does not know what a rodent harborage is, I will tell him that it is a harbor for rats, or a rathole. To qualify a producer to send milk to the city markets, such harborage must be absent.

All this costs money. It costs a great deal to qualify a producer for the sending of milk to consumers in city markets.

I ask unanimous consent to have the list printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

New England uniform dairy standard—Dairy farm inspection report—Vermont Department of Agriculture, Montpelier

SIR: An inspection of your dairy has this day been made, and you are notified of the violations marked below with a cross (X).

COWS

- 1. Cows, Health: (15)
  - Date last tuberculosis test (a) __
  - Date last brucellosis test (b) __
  - Evidence on file (c) __
  - No extensive induration of udders (d) __
  - No cows giving abnormal milk (e) __
  - Other tests required (f) __
  - Diseased animals removed from herd (g) __

MILKING BARN

- 2. Lighting: (1)
  - Adequate natural and/or artificial light properly distributed (a) __
- 3. Air space and ventilation: (1)
  - Well ventilated (a) __
  - No overcrowding (b) __
- 4a. Floor construction: (1)
  - Floor areas concrete or other impervious and easily cleaned material when required; in good repair (a) __
  - Graded to drain (b) __
  - Other barn portions separated (c) __
- 4b. Floor cleanliness: (2)
  - Cleaned as required (a) __
  - No swine or fowl (b) __
- 5. Walls and ceiling: (1)
  - Painted biennially or whitewashed annually or other satisfactory finish (a) __
  - Clean; in good repair (b) __
  - Ceiling tight if storage overhead (c) __
  - Feed room or bins dust-tight with door or cover (d) __
- 6a. Cowyard, grading, and draining: (1)
  - Graded to drain (a) __
  - No pooled wastes (b) __
- 6b. Cowyard, cleanliness: (1)
  - Cowyard clean and loose-housing areas properly maintained (a) __
  - No swine (b) __
- 7. Manure disposal: (4)
  - Fly breeding minimized by approved disposal methods (a) __
  - Stored inaccessible to cows (b) __

MILK HOUSE

- 8a. Floors: (1)
  - Smooth concrete or other impervious material in good repair (a) __
  - Graded to drain (b) __
- 8b. Walls and ceilings: (1)
  - Approved material and finish (a) __
  - Good repair (b) __
- 8c. Lighting and ventilation: (1)
  - Adequate natural and/or artificial light properly distributed (a) __
  - Adequate ventilation (b) __
  - Doors and windows closed during dusty weather (c) __

New England uniform dairy standard, etc.—Continued

- 8d. Screening: (2)
  - All openings effectively screened and doors open outward and self-closing; unless flies otherwise kept out (a) __
- 8e. Miscellaneous requirements: (2)
  - Used for milk-handling purposes only (a) __
  - Milk house operations not conducted elsewhere (b) __
  - No direct opening into living quarters or barn except as permitted by regulations (c) __
  - Adequate water-heating facilities (d) __
  - 2-compartment stationary wash and rinse vats of adequate size (e) __
  - Wastes properly disposed of (f) __
- 9. Cleanliness and flies: (3)
  - Floors, walls, windows, shelves, tables and equipment clean (a) __
  - No trash or unnecessary articles (b) __
  - Necessary fly-control measures used (c) __

TOILET AND WATER SUPPLY

- 10. Toilet: (5)
  - Provided; conveniently located (a) __
  - Constructed and operated according to standards (b) __
  - No evidence of human defecation or urination about premises (c) __
  - Clean; no direct opening into milkroom (d) __
- 11. Water Supply: (5)
  - Safe sanitary quality (a) __
  - Adequate in quantity (b) __
  - Easily accessible (c) __

UTENSILS AND EQUIPMENT

- 12. Construction: (3)
  - Smooth, heavy-gage material, noncorrodible, surface non-absorbent, non-toxic, easily cleanable; joints and seams flush (a) __
  - Good repair (b) __
  - Straining, single-service pads used (c) __
  - Small-mouth pails (seamless, if new) (d) __
- 13. Cleaning: (5)
  - Cleaned after each usage (a) __
  - Must look and feel clean (b) __
- 14. Bactericidal treatment: (5)
  - All milk containers and equipment subjected to approved bactericidal process (a) __
- 15. Storage: (2)
  - Left in treating chamber or bactericidal solution until used or stored properly above floor (a) __
  - Single-service articles properly stored (b) __
  - Equipment and utensils not exposed to toxic substances (c) __
  - Returned milk cans promptly stored (d) __
- 16. Handling: (1)
  - No handling of milk-contact surfaces after bactericidal treatment (a) __

MILKING

- 17. Udders and teats; abnormal milk: (4)
  - Milking done in barn or milking parlor (a) __
  - Udders and teats clean (b) __
  - Rinsed with bactericidal solution just prior to milking (c) __
  - Abnormal milk excluded, and properly disposed of (d) __
- 18. Flanks: (2)
  - Flanks, bellies, and tails of cows clean at time of milking (a) __
  - Brushing completed before milking begun (b) __
  - Clipped when required (c) __
- 19. Milkers' hands: (2)
  - No infections on hands or arms (a) __
  - Washed; then rinsed with bactericidal solution before milking and upon recontamination (b) __
  - Clean and dry while milking (c) __
  - Hand-washing facilities, including soap, water, and individual clean towels convenient to milking operations (d) __

New England uniform dairy standard, etc.—Continued

- 20. Clean clothing: (1)
  - Clean outer garments (a) __
- 21. Milk stools and surcingles: (1)
  - Clean; stored above floor in clean place (a) __
  - Stools of easily cleanable construction, no padding (b) __
- 22. Removal of milk: (1)
  - Immediate removal to milk house or straining room when required (a) __
  - Straining done in milk house or straining room, not in barn unless can protected by well-fitting cover and protected from manure and splash (b) __
- 23. Cooling: (5)
  - Can milk cooled to 50°F. within 2 hours (a) __
  - Bulk milk cooled to 40°F. within 2 hours (b) __
- 24. Vehicles and surroundings: (1)
  - Vehicles clean (a) __
  - Constructed so as to protect milk (b) __
  - No contaminating substances transported (c) __
  - Surroundings clean, free from insect breeding and rodent harborages (d) __

Mr. AIKEN. These requirements do not take into consideration such factors as bacterial count limitations, butterfat content, or many other requirements that have been with us for a long time.

Speaking of the bacteria count permitted in milk, I want to show the difference between requirements for producing milk for a manufacturing plant and producing milk for a fluid milk market.

I do not believe there is any State where milk produced for fluid human consumption can be sold with more than 200,000 bacteria per milliliter. My own State has a limitation of 100,000. I think all New England has a limitation of a bacterial count of 100,000 for raw milk and 20,000 for pasteurized milk.

In contrast, if a producer is producing milk for the manufacturing market, in many States the bacteria count can run as high as 10 million, in contrast to the 100,000 permitted in an area where it is proposed to reduce the production of milk.

Some of the States have a limitation of 3 million bacteria count. The border line is 10 million.

If the bacteria count is over 100,000, it is rejected in New England, New York, Chicago, and most of the city markets of the country.

Not only is there this difference in the bacteria count requirements for the sale of milk, in contrasting the fluid milk market with the manufacturing milk market, but in the manufacturing milk areas in many States the producers are permitted to have up to 3 milligrams of sediment.

I am not going to describe the sediment. Nevertheless, they are permitted to have up to 3 milligrams of sediment. No one can tell me that that does not affect the taste of the milk. It does. I know. I have experienced the addition of sediment from a cow's foot.

The effect of the bill—I will not say what it proposes to do—would be to transfer the production of milk to a considerable extent from areas having the highest sanitary requirements to areas which now have virtually no sanitary requirements.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **AIKEN**. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

I hope that the Senate will take into consideration the investment required to produce milk for the fluid market, and compare it with the investment required to produce milk for manufacturing plants.

I feel there is no need for legislation at this time. That is the opinion of the largest dairy cooperatives in the Northeast, including Lehigh Valley, and others.

Therefore I am proposing my amendment, which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to recommend minimum standards for the production of milk for manufacturing purposes which would be comparable to the sanitary requirements now in effect for the production of milk for fluid use.

It is possible that if the amendment becomes law and put into effect, there might be a shortage of milk. There are some producers who undoubtedly could not afford to qualify for the production of clean milk. We had some of them in New England. Twenty-five years ago there were 16,000 farmers producing milk for the Boston market. Today there are 8,000. However, the 8,000 who quit the business are living better today than they were when they got a $75 a month milk check.

It is in the interest of the consumers of the country to insist that the milk used for the manufacture of butter and cheese, condensed milk, and other dairy products be of a high sanitary grade. That is what I am asking the Senate to approve at this time.

I do not say that it can be fully put into effect in 1 year, but the time is coming, and the time must come, when the consumer will know that every kind of dairy product he is using is of the highest sanitary quality. We not only have sanitary requirements in Vermont, but we also have dietary requirements. The diet of the cows is as carefully planned, to give the highest quality milk, as is the diet of human beings.

Mr. **PROUTY**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **AIKEN**. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. **PROUTY**. First I should like to say that I know of no one in this country who is better qualified to discuss this particular problem and who has done more to resolve some of the difficulties being experienced by our dairy farmers than my senior colleague from Vermont. He and I live in a dairy producing area. We are concerned with the welfare of the dairy farmers in our State and, for that matter, elsewhere, but we also feel that we have a responsibility to the consuming public, the people who drink the milk produced in Vermont and other areas.

As I understand the Senator's amendment—and I was very happy to be able to cosponsor it with him—that is what he is trying to do, to protect the health and welfare of the consuming public.

Mr. **AIKEN**. That is correct.

Mr. **PROUTY**. I commend my colleague very highly for his effort.

Mr. **AIKEN**. I thank my colleague from Vermont. He comes from one of the hundred leading milk producing counties in the United States. Every quart of milk that is put on the market from his county can be drunk in the dark, because it meets the very highest sanitary standards.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. **AIKEN**. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President I join in everything the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] said about the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. The senior Senator from Vermont is an extraordinarily able man and particularly well versed and expert in the field we are discussing today. GEORGE AIKEN's name is synonymous with wisdom and ability in agriculture, particularly in the field of dairy farming.

At the same time, I am puzzled by the amendment. First, as I understand it—and I hope the distinguished Senator from Vermont will correct me if I am in error—no hearings were held on the amendment. The committee gave no consideration to it. The Senator from Vermont did not offer the amendment before the committee, although it had been considering dairy legislation all year, and held extensive hearings on the dairy bills in March and in May.

The Senator from Vermont is the ranking minority member of the committee.

This amendment would require the Secretary of Agriculture to issue recommendations with respect to minimum standards for milk for manufacturing purposes and include in those recommendations sanitation standards equivalent to those recommended by the U.S. Public Health Service for grade A fluid market milk. Such recommendations would supersede recommendations heretofore issued by the Department of Agriculture on the same subject.

On June 26, of this year, the Department of Agriculture for the first time recommended minimum standards for manufacturing milk for adoption by State regulatory agencies. Those recommendations represented the Department's best judgment as to what the standards ought to be. They are advisory only. The States are under no compulsion to adopt them. If the Department is now required to issue different recommendations, which do not represent its best judgment, the recommendations will lose much of their value as a guide to the States.

It is not necessary for manufacturing milk to meet fluid milk standards. As pointed out by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] at page 196 of the hearings, the fluid milk producers in some places have to pass about the same sanitation tests that an approved hospital would, and the Senator doubted whether any restaurant in the city of Washington or the U.S. Capitol could qualify under any circumstances as a place for producing milk.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, the Aiken amendment would require the Department of Agriculture to revise within 60 days the recommended minimum standards of quality for manufacturing milk. These recommendations were issued just 4 months ago following several years of negotiations and discussions among the Department of Agriculture, State departments of agriculture, and representatives of various industry groups. The amendment would require that the new standards issued be equivalent to the standards recommended by the Public Health Service for grade A fluid milk.

Even if the Department's recommended standards were revised to a level equivalent to standards for fluid milk, such standards would not be binding on any milk producers or milk processors unless adopted by individual States and enforced by the States.

It is not likely that States would adopt such standards because a standard which is appropriate for milk going into fluid usage might well prove excessively burdensome and unnecessary for manufacturing milk. Fluid milk must meet exceptionally high standards because it must remain fresh and free from deterioration for as much as a week or more in the fluid state. Manufacturing milk, on the other hand, is typically processed within 1 to 2 days after production and may be subjected to extreme forms of processing which change its flavor and impede any further bacterial growth.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a press release issued June 21, 1963, by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, announcing the availability for State adoption of minimum quality standards for manufacturing milk.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 21, 1963.

MINIMUM QUALITY STANDARDS FOR MANUFACTURING MILK MADE AVAILABLE

Uniform, minimum quality standards for milk used in manufacturing dairy products and minimum requirements for dairy plant operations are now officially available for voluntary State adoption, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced today.

The standards were proposed 4 years ago and have been formulated throughout a series of conferences with marketing officials of State departments of agriculture and with representatives of the dairy industry. Interested persons were given opportunity to file their views, many of which have been incorporated into the standards as they appear in final form.

The standards, according to dairy specialists of USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service, provide for farm inspection and certification, platform inspection of the raw milk supply, plant approval and licensing, and plant quality control service.

The standards were developed to promote better care and sanitary practices in the production of milk, to assure that processing methods and practices are adequate to attain higher, more uniform quality and greater stability in finished dairy products, and, as a result, to increase consumer acceptance of these products.

Responsibility for administering and enforcing the standards when adopted by a

State, would be wholly with the State department of agriculture or other appropriate State agency. Milk graders, bulk milk collectors and dairy manufacturing plants would be licensed by the State regulatory agency administering and enforcing the program.

The standards, as they apply at the farm, have been designed so they can be met by small as well as large dairy farmers, with a minimum financial outlay.

Farm certification covers largely the health of the herd, sanitary practices, and methods of handling the raw milk. Both the farm requirements for milk and the dairy plant specifications are aimed chiefly at improving sanitation and care in the production and handling of milk and dairy products.

At the manufacturing plant, the standards put emphasis on the premises, facilities, equipment used, processing methods, sanitation, laboratory control tests, and packaging and storage of the products.

The "Minimum Standards for Milk for Manufacturing Purposes and Its Production and Processing" is scheduled for publication in the Federal Register of June 26. Copies of the standards may be obtained from the Chief, Standardization Branch, Dairy Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there might be some merit to the amendment if it could be applied across the board, to class A milk and to manufacturing milk, and if there could be the same uniform standard and the same uniform price.

The amendment would set the same standard for manufacturing milk, priced at $3.14 a hundredweight, as would be applied to class A milk, which in the New England market, is approximately $5.79 a hundredweight; in the North Central States, $4.13 a hundredweight; in the South Atlantic area, $5.31; and in the Middle Atlantic area, $5.03 a hundredweight.

There would be merit in the amendment if there could be the same price structure. If the Senator were to modify his amendment to provide one price for both, without any reduction in the price for manufacturing milk, I would be an ardent supporter of the amendment.

If we are to have the same standard set for manufacturing milk as for class A milk, the price should be the same. There is considerable merit in having the same standards set. Many producers of manufacturing milk do meet that high standard. If we are to make the same high standards applicable across the country, there should be no price differential. Frankly, I do not believe we are prepared to do it at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has hit the crux of the difficulty, because if the amendment is adopted and if the recommendations by the Department of Agriculture become the requirement in the various States, which would be the only purpose of the amendment, it would mean that the farmers producing manufacturing milk would have to buy additional equipment and make substantial investments in order to improve the sanitation quality of their milk production, but at the same time would not get a price for their milk sufficient to repay them for the investment, and it would mean ruin for them.

The Senator will agree with me that the Department of Agriculture is an honest department, regardless of which Secretary or which administration is in office.

It is very careful about the sanitary requirements. The Department of Agriculture will not recommend standards that are too low, standards that endanger the public health. I have not heard stated a single case, either by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] or anyone else, of anyone eating contaminated cheese, or of an outbreak of some public health menace because of unsanitary cheese, dried milk, ice cream, or any other manufactured dairy product.

If we impose unnecessary requirements on farmers, we shall really have a rich man's amendment. It will mean that if particular farmers do not have the capital to buy equipment to improve the quality of their milk which is really unnecessary, they will go out of business. They will be out of luck.

For example, the bacteria count recommended by the Public Health Service calls for a standard plate count not in excess of 200,000. The Department's recommendations for maximum bacteria plate count in the case of manufacturing milk is 3 million. That is perfectly adequate for milk which is going through a manufacturing process and is stricter than some State requirements.

The only direct effect of this amendment is to require the Secretary to make a recommendation that does not represent his best judgment. It is difficult to determine what the indirect effects might be. Possibly it would put pressure on State authorities to adopt regulations which do not represent their best judgments, and which would impose unrealistic, oppressive, and unnecessary standards for manufacturing milk, standards which the Senator from Vermont has said the U.S. Capitol itself could not meet.

Another possible indirect effect would be to put pressure on the Secretary of Agriculture to adopt these standards for its grade labeling program and its inspection program with respect to commodities approved for sale to CCC, so that many of the present manufacturing milk producers who cannot afford the costly equipment necessary to meet the extremely strict requirements for fluid milk will be squeezed out of business. This would appear to be an anti-poor-farmer amendment designed to give their market to the more wealthy producers.

Fluid milk and cream is very perishable. Bacteria multiply in it rapidly if extreme care is not taken. Manufactured products are entirely different. They are not so perishable, do not have the same problems at all, and there is no need for them to meet the same requirements.

Fluid milk must stand up without drastic heat treatment for as much as a week or more. Manufacturing milk is subjected to manufacturing processes within 1 or 2 days at the most, and these processes alter the flavor of the product and render it less perishable. Therefore much more drastic sterilization procedures can be applied to manufacturing milk; and a plate count of 3 million for manufacturing milk compares favorably with a plate count of 200,000 for fluid milk, while a plate of 200,000 would be entirely unnecessary for manufacturing milk.

Even the Public Health Service has not said that anything like a 200,000 count for manufacturing milk is needed.

So on the basis of all the evidence and testimony, this proposal would be an unnecessary burden on the farmer. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has implied, it would mean an increased cost to the consumer. He would be paying for something that was unnecessary.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Wisconsin has touched upon this in his answer, but I wish he would be a little more categorical. Is he saying that, so far as manufacturing milk is concerned, it is not necessary, in the public interest or for health purposes, to have the same standard that is required in the case of fluid milk?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is exactly correct. He has expressed my argument completely in 2 sentences. That position has been supported by the Department of Agriculture. There was not a bit of evidence before the Committee on Agriculture, although it held more hearings this year than in many years, showing the need for this amendment.

I have a compilation of the sanitary requirements in the only States that have such requirements. Only 25 States have sanitary requirements. In the State of virtually every Senator now in the Chamber, this proposal, if the requirement were made effective, would mean ruin for thousands of farmers. It would mean that they would either have to go out of business or somehow get the kind of capital that would be required to buy the expensive equipment necessary to meet the expensive standards.

This would be true in Iowa, the State having the largest farm production, the States that probably produces more farm products than any other State. Iowa has excellent, adequate safeguards for the production of milk. Nevertheless, the burden on the manufacturing farmers would be heavy.

The situation would be especially true in Kentucky, Minnesota, and Mississippi, States that have sanitary standards. In half the States there are no standards.

I agree with the Senator from Vermont that there should be standards and that they should be as strict as necessary. That is why the Secretary of Agriculture is recommending minimum standards this year for the first time. If this kind of amendment had been offered a year ago or 6 months ago, before the Secretary had acted, the amendment might have served as a catalytic agent to force the Secretary to take this kind of step. But the Senator's amendment is offered 3 months after the Secretary has made recommendations for the first time in history, recommendations that will be considered strong by most dairy farmers.

I have great admiration, respect, and affection for the Senator from Vermont. There is no finer Senator. No Senator is more expert in this field. But I oppose his amendment. Frankly, if this amendment were placed in the bill, although I am the author of the bill, and it is very important to our farmers that it be passed, I should certainly vote against the bill, because the amendment of the Senator from Vermont would kill the bill, in my view, and cause far more difficulty and danger for the industry in Wisconsin than if the amendment were not included.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The Senator from Wisconsin said that no hearings had been held on the amendment. I think we all know the difference between bacteria counts of 200,000 and 10 million. The Department of Agriculture has recommended reforms in the laws of the 25 States which have laws relating to the processing of milk. Practically all the other States are producing milk under stricter requirements for the production of fluid milk. But the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture are soft and inadequate, and the States are not even adopting them.

The Department of Agriculture recommends a reduction to 3 million in the bacteria count for manufacturing milk. That is a pretty good allowance compared with the 100,000 which must be complied with for fluid milk.

As for applying sanitary requirements across the board, I hope the time will come when the people can be certain, whether they drink milk, eat ice cream, or use butter or cheese, that the milk from which those products were made was produced under adequate sanitary conditions.

It is true, and it is regrettable, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, that if the requirements for higher sanitary standards for the production of manufacturing milk were put into effect, many producers could not afford the cost of improving their dairies to qualify for producing for the market. However, I think most producers, even in the manufacturing States, could qualify. They have seen the handwriting on the wall. They know they will have to improve and make their dairies more sanitary.

But if this is to be done, should we say that they must be allowed to continue to produce and sell milk having a 10-million bacteria count, merely because some of them were unable to qualify under the same sanitary provisions?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that on June 26 the Secretary of Agriculture recommended a bacteria count of 3 million? And is it not true that this would represent a marked advance and would be a notable change, in view of the fact that 25 States have no requirements, and that few States have anything like a 3-million bacteria count standard? The action by the Secretary represents a great advance in milk production.

Mr. AIKEN. It would represent progress if no State in the Union permitted more than a 3-million bacteria count. Let me tell the Senator a story.

A few years ago, before the Senator became a Member of this body, I received a very plaintive complaint from a manufacturer in Wisconsin. A manufacturer there had been providing the Navy with canned milk. His contract had been canceled, or not renewed, and it had been awarded to another State. Wisconsin permits a 2-million bacteria count for processing milk. The other State permitted a 10-million bacteria count. The contract went to the other State. Wisconsin was very sad because it lost that contract.

I took the matter up with the Navy Department, and the officials there said perhaps the milk did smell worse and taste worse, but that it was sterilized and, therefore, the boys in the Navy would not catch any bad disease from it. That is true; I do not believe people are likely to catch a disease from eating products made from milk with a 10-million bacteria count—although they might become a little ill if they knew what the bacteria count was and stopped to think about it.

We have made great progress in that respect. Our cheese manufacturers and our creameries are clean. The conditions existing on the farms where the milk is produced have resulted from very lax sanitary requirements. I should like to say that a good many of these farmers in Vermont went out of business if they did not have sufficient money to buy equipment to qualify for the production of high-grade milk, but I believe everyone is living much more comfortably than they were when they were struggling along.

I have received quite a lot of correspondence from the State of Wisconsin. A few years ago a farmer in northern Wisconsin wrote me saying:

> I have only five cows. How in the world do you expect me to support my family with the price of milk being what it is today?

The only answer is, he could not possibly do it. But we have got to make a move sometime. With the people in the marketing order areas producing fluid milk under strict regulations, and with consumers eating other dairy products, they have a right to know that the milk used in that production is of the same high standard.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and I yield back the rest of my time.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for himself and Mr. PROUTY. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]; and then I shall yield back the balance of my time, if the Senator from Vermont will yield back his.

DAIRY PRODUCT IMPORTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall not get into any discussion of the merits or the demerits of this amendment; but I wish to call attention to a release by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, in regard to a limitation on dairy imports. I believe that is important at this time. I call it to the attention of the Senate, and I commend the Secretary of Agriculture for it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the release in question.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, October 9, 1963.

SECRETARY FREEMAN ANNOUNCES INTENDED CURBS OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

For some time the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been working with other agencies of the U.S. Government with regard to the problem of imports of certain dairy products which have become a matter of concern to U.S. dairy producers, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today. These products include Colby cheese, Junex, and frozen cream.

After discussions with the supplying countries, he announced, the following steps will be taken which should satisfy the concern that imports of these products might suddenly increase to much higher levels:

(a) The three largest exporters of Colby cheese to the United States have informed the United States of their intention to limit their shipments of this product to the U.S. market in fiscal year 1963–64 to a total of 11.2 million pounds. The limitations are: 6,720,000 pounds for New Zealand; 3,360,000 pounds for Australia; and 1,120,000 pounds for Ireland. Shipments from these countries account for 98 percent of receipts from all exporting countries. Shipments from other exporters are not expected to exceed current levels in 1963–64. As a result of these efforts, it is anticipated that total imports of Colby cheese during the current fiscal year are expected to be reduced about 10 percent below the 12.8 million pounds of this type of cheese imported in 1962–63.

(b) Australia is the only country which during 1963 has been making shipments of Junex to the United States. (Junex is a butterfat-sugar product containing not more than 44 percent butterfat.) The Australians have indicated that no further shipments of this product will be made to the United States during the remainder of calendar year 1963 and that for calendar year 1964, they will limit their exports to 2,240,000 pounds. This means that imports of this product during calendar year 1964 will be reduced below the expected calendar year 1963 level by about 33 percent.

(c) New Zealand is the only country which has been shipping frozen cream to the United States. Shipments during the present calendar year are expected to total about 1 million gallons. For calendar year 1964, New Zealand has indicated it will limit its exports to 1½ million gallons, which is the amount of the low duty quota which has been bound under the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) at a tariff rate of 15.6 cents a gallon.

The effect of these decisions by the supplying countries should be to place a limit on total shipments of these products that are now entering the United States at the specified levels and to relieve the concern of some U.S. dairy producers that imports of these products could increase sharply. However, the United States sees no alternative to a section 22 action if imports from all sources were to increase substantially above the amounts indicated, Secretary Freeman said.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the release states that—

> The three largest exporters of Colby cheese to the United States have informed the

> United States of their intention to limit their shipments of this product to the U.S. market in the fiscal year 1963–64 to a total of 11.2 million pounds.

This is a reduction.

The release also states that—

> Australia is the only country which during 1963 has been making shipments of Junex to the United States—Junex is a butterfat-sugar product containing not more than 44 percent butterfat. The Australians have indicated that no further shipments of this product will be made to the United States during the remainder of calendar year 1963, and that for calendar year 1964 they will limit their exports to 2,240,000 pounds.
>
> * * * * *
>
> New Zealand is the only country which has been shipping frozen cream to the United States. Shipments during the present calendar year are expected to total about one million gallons. For calendar year 1954, New Zealand has indicated it will limit its exports to 1½ million gallons, which is the amount of the low duty quota which has been bound under the GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—at a tariff rate of 15.6 cents a gallon.

As I said, I commend the Secretary of Agriculture for being concerned about the ever-increasing imports of dairy products; but at the same time I wish to call his attention to the fact that we in the beef-producing area are concerned about the ever-increasing rise in the imports of manufactured meats and the imports of boneless beef and veal, which rose from less than 1 percent of total U.S. manufactured beef and veal products in 1939, to 5 percent in 1962.

Australia supplied 56 percent of U.S. manufactured meat imports in 1962; and New Zealand, 20 percent. Ireland, Nicaragua, and Guatemala are also increasing their imports.

In 1962 the United States took 79 percent of Australian beef and veal exports, and over 90 percent of New Zealand's boneless beef exports in the last 3 years. I call attention to this situation, because it affects the price of beef products and livestock products in the United States.

Again I urge that the Secretary of Agriculture give consideration to this matter.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time, after I say that I am delighted to hear the good news given us by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] on the sensible position taken by the Secretary of Agriculture on dairy imports. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and I have been aware of this situation for a long time; and this news is refreshing and encouraging to us, and it will be very welcome news to the State of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], on behalf of himself and Mr. PROUTY. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 188 Leg.]

YEAS—16

Aiken
Bartlett
Bennett
Boggs
Case
Cotton
Fong
Hickenlooper
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
McIntyre
Pell
Prouty
Smith
Williams, Del.

NAYS—63

Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Long, La.
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Mechem
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Allott
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Dodd
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Gore
Johnston
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
Metcalf
Miller
Moss
Muskie
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower

So the amendment offered by Mr. AIKEN for himself and Mr. PROUTY was rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the question of passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes from the time on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 2 minutes.

RUSSIAN DEBTS OWED TO UNITED STATES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on October 7, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a June 30, 1963, report of the Secretary of the Treasury showing as of that date Russia owed us a balance of $621,420,405.56, since the end of World War I. I stated that that did not include what Russia owed us after World War II.

During World War II, we furnished Russia $11 billion of military aid. After the war she agreed to repay only $321,600,000 of that vast sum and, so far, we have received on that debt only $110,800,000. And yet we are going to furnish millions of bushels of wheat to Russia, at a cost of about 50 cents per bushel less than what that CCC surplus wheat has cost our taxpayers to help feed an army of 4,580,000 men, which is about twice as large as ours and includes at least 13,000 soldiers in Cuba sent there as a threat against us and maintained in violation of a solemn agreement last October to remove them.

REDUCTION OF EXCESS MARKETINGS OF MILK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1915) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not approve the bill. I do not believe it would be good for the farmers of the country. If the farmers should receive an extra $7 million of income in a year, as the Department estimates, that would be good, but I question whether that result will be achieved. At the same time, the cost of administering the program would be charged against the handlers, who would pass their increased costs on to the consumers. I do not believe it is good to transfer the production of milk, or a part of it, from areas now producing under the highest sanitary standards to areas now meeting the lowest sanitary standards.

In order to make the law work, it would be necessary to amend it in a year or two to provide for complete Government controls. The bill proposed by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] was an infinitely better bill for the dairy industry and the country than the pending bill. I hope the bill will be defeated.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Who yields time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the bill for several reasons.

First, it constitutes an invasion by Government into the rights of the farmers to be free in the operation of their dairies. If the bill is passed, it will impose regulations and, in a measure, constitute Government control of what should be the farmers' freedom.

The bill, if enacted, would in the future restrict the entry of new producers into the farming business.

The bill, if passed, would place in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture rights and controls over the farmers with which he ought not be vested.

Finally, the farmers of the United States on the wheat control referendum vigorously declared that they wanted to be free. They repudiated the proposal that they could be benefited by controls which the Congress wished to impose upon them. To me that declaration by the farmers is applicable to the provisions of the pending bill. The bill would restrict the freedom of farmers. On the wheat proposal the farmers said, "We do not want restrictions. We want the right to be free, to plant in accordance with our judgment." This bill is in complete conflict with that expression made by the farmers not more than 3 months ago.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, with the utmost of good will and in the finest of spirit, the dairy farmers in New York have learned to look with a little skepticism upon proposals advanced by our midwestern friends, including those who operate the Department of Agriculture. In the past we have often found ourselves the victims of legislation, rather than the beneficiaries.

I have tried to follow the progress of the pending legislation very closely and I have listened intently to the arguments advanced by the proponents of S. 1915. By doing so, I hoped I might find the one element that would permit me to cast aside my doubts about the intentions of the Agriculture Department concerning New York dairymen. As a Senator from the second largest milk producing State in the Nation, I would like to join in legislation which would benefit the dairymen and help resolve one aspect of the vast agricultural problem of this Nation.

In recent weeks I have heard from hundreds of dairy farmers in my State both for and against the bill proposed today. The wishes of the dairy farmer must be considered since they are directly affected by it. Those with whom I have met or who have written to me oppose this legislation by a margin of about 10 to 1. While a Member's mail may not be a completely accurate reflection of sentiment on a given issue, this overwhelming expression against the two-price plan certainly is significant.

It is apparent that conditions in the dairy industry are far from ideal. Dairy farmers are caught in the same squeeze of increasing costs and decreasing profits which other segments of the economy are experiencing. And what happens to the dairy industry in New York is bound to have an impact on the whole economy of a State in which this industry is of such vital importance.

If I believed that this bill would improve the situation and increase the real income of New York's dairy farmers, it would have my full support. But I am concerned that this bill is a trap for the farmers in my area. The bait is attractive, but once caught up in this scheme of regulations and controls and quotas, they would not find the prospects appealing, either personally or economically.

The inroads of midwestern milk in the New York-New Jersey marketing area, the limitations on production, the redtape, and regimentation which would inevitably result from the regulations of this system would entangle the dairy industry in the same costly web in which our Nation's grain producers have long been engrossed. I will never believe that any bureaucrat from the Department of Agriculture can make better decisions about what is good for New York dairy farmers than can the farmers themselves. And certainly not so long as it is under its present leadership.

Prior to mechanization, New York farmers had a habit of refusing to throw away their old milk pails until they were convinced that the new ones did not leak. Today, they are reluctant to modify the milk order pricing system until they are convinced the income from their milk will not be diminished.

I hate to be a skeptic, but I cannot help but feel we have been handed a leaky milk pail. I would like to think that the midwestern agriculture experts downtown are interested in doing things for the New York farmer. But I am continually gripped by the memory of all the things they have done to him.

Now these same experts have expressed their desire to discard the existing blend price system of payments to dairymen and replace it with a new two-price proposal. This program is advanced as a method to decrease the production of milk and thereby increase the income of the dairy farmer.

According to the committee report on this measure, this legislation is needed because—and I am quoting from the report—

> Farmers are compelled to increase production in order to maintain their income.

It seems a little incredulous to me that the need for this bill can be based on such a statement when the Department of Agriculture admits that milk production declined by 9 percent during the first half of 1963. It strikes me as rather blatant doubletalk that dairymen are so compelled to increase production that they produced 9 percent less milk between January 1 and July 1 of this year.

In recent months there has been considerable talk about the dairy situation, particularly the cost of the dairy program to the Federal Government. I have personally felt that dairy farmers would make the necessary adjustment if they were left alone and there were no threat of production quotas being made. The USDA dairy situation report of September 3 provides evidence that this point of view is substantially correct. This report indicates that milk cow numbers were down 2.8 percent from a year ago, and it is expected this decline will continue during the following winter months. Milk production declined again in June and July. This is the eighth straight month in which milk production has been below that of the previous year.

The USDA reports that because of lower production and increased commercial demand, Commodity Credit Corporation purchases for the first 7 months of this year in terms of milk equivalent were down about 25 percent from a year earlier. Butter purchases were down about 18 percent, cheese purchases 60 percent, and nonfat dried milk 20 percent. It is expected that this situation will continue throughout the rest of the year, so that the cost to the Federal Government could be as much as 25 percent below last year.

Because of this substantial improvement in the supply-demand situation in the dairy industry, it raises a real question as to the need of this particular legislation before the Senate. I am concerned that farmers might suddenly decide to increase their production as a result of the talk of base plans being in a Federal milk marketing order.

In the absence of evidence to the contrary, I am convinced that the need is felt only by certain people who want to break down the regional milk marketing order system, ultimately to open up the New York order market for wide-scale dumping of midwestern milk. Once the dike has been opened and midwestern milk dealers become part of the New York-New Jersey market, there is some question as to who will be the courageous man with his "finger in the dike" for New York milk producers.

Concern that S. 1915 is a device for invading markets by producers from other areas is candidly admitted by the Senator from Wisconsin in a letter to Mr. Robert J. Williams, of the Wisconsin Dairies Cooperative, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 30.

In the letter, the Senator wrote:

> Furthermore, the bill spells out the way in which producers from other areas can enter a market where the base plan is in effect. This, of course, is not done under the present law and would be, it seems, quite an advanced step for those who believe they are producing milk for manufactured milk purposes but who actually would like to deliver milk to federally regulated markets.

The committee report itself clearly expresses the intent to provide for the movement of milk from one marketing area to another. On page 8, the report states, in even stronger language:

> The committee wanted to be sure that the allotment provisions would not be a barrier to the movement of milk from any part of the country into the order market; and that any milk producer, producing milk anywhere on the date an allotment provision becomes effective under an order, would not be precluded from marketing his milk under that order on the same basis as producers marketing their milk under that order on that date.

Surely, this concern for the invasion of the New York-New Jersey market by midwestern milk is not the product of the imagination.

The greatest natural advantage enjoyed by the New York dairy industry is the proximity of its markets. One-fourth of the population of the country lives within an overnight drive of most New York farms. With this historical advantage, the dairy industry presently accounts for approximately 70 percent of New York's $1 billion agriculture business.

So if the dairymen of the Empire State are zealous in their efforts to protect the regional milk marketing system, it is because their livelihoods and the economic health of the entire State depend upon it. The marketing order is not without imperfections, but it is working—and that is really saying something during these days of unworkable agriculture schemes. In addition, milk supplies in relation to fluid milk requirements are in better balance in the New York-New Jersey market than in most other markets.

The milk marketing orders have been sensible regional arrangements. They have kept price and production in line in given areas on an orderly basis. They have been responsive to local economic factors. They have promoted orderly marketing conditions. And this has been accomplished with a limited amount of Federal intervention.

However, the two-price plan would change all that. The Federal Government, under the new plan, could assume its customary role as the master manipulator. For the very first time, fluid milk producers would be subject to direct Federal regulation. The Secretary of Agriculture would also be given wide discretionary authority over the activities of individual dairymen within regional order markets.

Dairy farmers for the first time would have to keep whatever records the Secretary of Agriculture required. These records would be subject to inspection by the USDA marketing order officials. Presumably, failure to carry out the Department's regulations would mean that the severe penalties provided in the law would be applied.

One of the things that has disturbed me in this legislation is the allocations that would be made to individual dairy farmers under the base plan approach. These allocations or quotas would be given to a producer based on the amount of milk he sold for class I usage during some given period. The Secretary of Agriculture is given the discretionary authority to determine whether these quotas would be transferable or not.

If the quotas are transferable, they certainly would have value. If they are not transferable, they would in effect freeze the dairy industry in the hands of the present milk producers.

Another point which disturbs me deeply about this situation is the provision for the entrance of new producers. By this I mean young farmers who might want to start in the dairy business. The effect of the language in the bill appears to give considerable discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in determining the provisions for any new producer to obtain a quota. As I understand it, any quota given to new producers would have to be either taken from the existing producers who have quotas or as a result of an increase in the amount of class I milk sold in the market.

I have always felt that if an individual wanted to enter the dairy business he should have the freedom to do so. The effect of the system proposed in S. 1915 is to provide that a young farmer who wishes to enter the dairy business will have to buy his way in. He will either have to buy an existing quota or take whatever quota is given to him by the Secretary of Agriculture. Neither of these approaches appears to be satisfactory to me, and could lead to just the kind of scandal we faced when the Billy Sol Estes scheme for buying up quotas was exposed.

Even if producers were initially benefited by the two-price plan, the entrance of milk producers from other marketing areas would reduce the quotas available to current market producers. While there is no assurance that the two-price system would reduce production, it is certain that the entrance of producers from other market areas would reduce the income of current producers. This carries the dairy farmer round and round the mulberry bush, but with no improvement in his economic position.

The fact that the two-price plan, if it passed, will be presented to dairymen supplying each marketing area for a vote in a referendum is of little or no comfort. I believe the New York dairy farmers would be given a Hobson's choice in casting their ballots. Their only alternative to a affirmative vote would be the risk of sacrificing their traditional market.

We know—and I think my colleagues from the Midwest will agree—that there is a great deal of overlapping of market areas and there are substantial movements of milk from market area to market area. The Supreme Court decision in the Lehigh Valley case which knocked out compensatory payments made it very clear that intermarket movements of milk are a fact of life.

Under these conditions, is the New York dairyman going to vote to retain the blend price order when he knows that dairymen in other order markets may be approving two-price and thereby putting him at a disadvantage in his own market?

What is to stop a milk producer in a two-price order market from producing his full allotment and accepting the higher price and then, rather than taking the lower price for his excess fluid milk, shipping it into the New York market and receiving the more favorable blend price?

The only answer I can find is a discretionary clause starting on page 4, line 15, of the bill. It provides:

> In the case of any producer who during any accounting period delivers a portion of his milk to persons not fully regulated by the order, provision may be made—

I repeat—

> may be made for reducing the allocation of, or payments to be made to, such producer.

In other words, if the Secretary of Agriculture does not feel disposed to impose these penalties, they will not be meted out. And if New York dairymen voted to keep the blend price order while the two-price system was accepted in the Midwest, the midwestern producer would have, in effect, a three-price choice—the favorable price for his allotment, the lower price which he might choose to ignore, and the New York blend price which would be more than adequate compensation for excess milk dumped on the New York market.

I submit that the New York dairyman would have no choice but to accept the two-price order for his own protection—even if he were opposed to it. In the final analysis, the overall result would be the forced acceptance by dairymen everywhere of a single nationwide Federal milk marketing order.

This is not the first move in the direction of regimentation of the American dairy farmer. The Secretary of Agriculture tried it with the National Milk Sanitation Act but we were able to thwart him at that time. This bill is a more subtle attempt but I am convinced the goal is the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, what the dairymen need is assistance leading to increased milk consumption and solution of the problems surrounding dairy imports and exports. With regard to consumption, I would hope for Secretary Freeman to undertake a campaign such as that pursued by Premier Mendes-France a number of years ago to emphasize the nutritional value and increase the consumption of dairy products.

Imports of dairy products continue to be a major problem to the dairy industry. Cream imports, Colby Cheese, and Junex imports in the first quarter of 1963 were more than double that of a year earlier. The Secretary of Agriculture should have a deeper concern about the import of these dairy products which have the effect of displacing domestic sales.

Equally important is the need for trying to expand the exports of dairy products. The quotas, tariffs, and other import restrictions imposed by foreign countries on U.S. dairy products are frequently arbitrary and are much more severe than any restrictions we impose on foreign countries. How much better it would be if the Secretary of Agriculture devoted the same time and energy in breaking down these foreign restrictions as he has spent trying to build up unwanted domestic restrictions. It would be much more in the interests of the dairy farmers throughout America, if our Government expanded export markets for all our dairy products instead of pitting one region against another in their own country, as this bill would do.

I am opposed to this move to break down regional marketing orders. I believe this bill is an opening wedge to do just that. In the interest of the great dairy industry of my State which would be injured severely by any such breakdown, I must oppose this bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I will take only 2 minutes. It has been agreed by both the opponents and proponents of the bill that there will be an increase in income during the first year, though a small one, and that the price of milk to the consumer will not go up. In addition, the taxpayers will benefit because the cost of the program will be reduced. The argument has been made against this bill that we do not have a dairy problem. Mr. President, the taxpayer must wonder what we are spending our money on if we have no dairy problem. The fact is that the taxpayers will have to pay $453 million to buy excess dairy commodities during this marketing year. The Government now owns 385 million pounds of butter, 58 million pounds of cheese, and 455 million pounds of dried milk that was produced in excess of our needs. We have not made a substantive change in the Agricultural Act since 1937, when it was put on the books. This bill marks the first change in a bill that has burdened the taxpayer without nearly adequate help for the dairy farmer in 26 years.

Dairymen are pleading with us to give them an opportunity. That is all they ask for. They are asking for a class I price system as an alternative for the blend price system which, they have shown, requires them to produce excess milk. There are no restrictions or controls or mandates contained in the bill, as has been maintained by the distinguished Senators from Ohio and New York. None, not any.

There are no penalties in it. Contrary to the New York Senator's argument, no dumping is permitted. At page 4, lines 14 to 21, the bill specifically prohibits it. There is nothing in it which interferes in any way with the farmer's freedom. I would not vote for it if there were.

The bill had the support of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by an 11 to 4 vote, an overwhelming vote. The President wants it. The administration wants it. The Department of Agriculture wants it. I hope we will pass it.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. All time has been used on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 189 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Bartlett
Beall
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Clark
Cooper
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Gruening
Hart
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Pearson
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—33

Aiken
Anderson
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Cannon
Case
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Edmondson
Fong
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
McIntyre
Mechem
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smith
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—22

Allott
Bayh
Byrd, W. Va.
Dodd
Eastland
Engle
Goldwater
Gore
Hartke
Hayden
Johnston
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Metcalf
Miller
Moss
Muskie
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower

So the bill (S. 1915) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of section 8c(5) the following new subparagraph (H):

"(H) Notwithstanding any other provision of the section, providing:

"(i) for allocating, or providing a method for allocating, to each producer under a marketing order, a share of the total sales of milk received from producers classified in, and subject to the minimum price or prices applicable to, the highest use classification or classifications under the marketing order and such reserves of producer milk as may be found essential thereto, which share shall be determined on the basis of total deliveries of milk made by each such producer during the year 1962, or such other representative period as the Secretary may prescribe in the order as more appropriate, due allowance being made in the provisions of the order for (a) abnormal conditions, (b) hardship cases, and (c) producers under the order engaged in milk production at the time provisions hereunder are incorporated in the order but who did not produce milk during all or part of the representative period. Dairy farmers who were producing and marketing milk prior to the date when provisions hereunder were incorporated in the order and who were not on such date delivering milk as producers under the order shall upon becoming producers under the order be provided, with respect to milk delivered under the order, allocations on the same basis as those who were producers under the order when such provisions become effective: *Provided*, That if any dairy farm of such a dairy farmer has been transferred to another person and no allocation based on deliveries from such farm has been issued when milk is first delivered therefrom as producer milk under the order, such transferee then operating the farm shall be provided any allocation for which the said dairy farmer would otherwise have been eligible based on deliveries from such farm. Provisions shall also be made for allocating to any new producer under an order who was not engaged in dairy farming prior to the incorporation in the order of provisions hereunder an equitable share of the allocated sales on such terms and conditions as prescribed in the order, due consideration being given to the current and prospective supply conditions in the regulated market. The application of allocations hereunder shall be subject to such provisions as may be incorporated in the order under section 8c(5)(D). Allocations to producers under this subparagraph may be transferable under an order on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed if the Secretary of of Agriculture determines that transferability will be in the best interest of the public, existing producers, and prospective new producers. The allocations or bases hereunder may be adjusted from time to time or new allocations or bases may be established by amending the order or under provisions incorported in the order;

"(ii) that in distributing to producers the amounts of money required to be paid by handlers on milk each producer shall be paid (1) for milk delivered by him which exceeds his allocation at the lowest class price specified in the order and (2) for milk delivered by him within his allocation a blend price, based on utilization in such higher class uses plus reserve, representing his pro rata share of the remaining funds available for current distribution to producers under the order, after the computation has been made under (1) hereof. The payments under (1) and (2) above shall be subject to adjustments prescribed in the order under section 8c(5)(B) or other provisions of the Act and to such provisions as may be incorporated in the order under section 8c(5)(D);

"(iii) in marketing orders where individual handler pools are approved as provided by subparagraph 8c(5)(B)(i) the provisions of this subparagraph may be applied to each handler individually and to the producers delivering milk to such handlers;

"(iv) in the case of any producer who during any accounting period delivers a portion of his milk to persons not fully regulated by the order, provision may be made for reducing the allocation of, or payments to be received by, any such producer to compensate for any marketings of milk to such other persons for such period or periods as necessary to insure equitable participation in marketings among all producers;

"(v) the order may provide for such reports and the keeping of such books and records by producers and by the person or persons to whom he may dispose of milk as the Secretary may prescribe and upon request of the Secretary such person or persons shall make required records available for inspection;

"(vi) the provisions authorized under this subparagraph may be made applicable to a regulated handler's own production of milk;

"(vii) order provisions under this subparagraph shall not become effective in any marketing order unless separately approved by producers in the same manner provided for the approval of marketing orders. Disapproval of order provisions under this subparagraph shall not be considered disapproval of the order or of other terms of the order. Order provisions under this subparagraph may be terminated separately whenever the Secretary makes the determination with respect to such provisions as is provided for the termination of an order in section 8c(16)(B);

"(viii) any producer for whom an allocation or base is established under the authority of this subparagraph may obtain a review thereof as prescribed by the order and rules and regulations thereunder, which shall constitute the exclusive procedure for review thereof and section 8c(15)(A) of this title shall not apply thereto. Under such order, rules, or regulations any officers or employees of the Department or any committees or boards of producers under the order created for the purpose may be vested with authority to perform any or all functions in connection with such review proceedings, including ruling thereon. Committees or boards created for this purpose shall be deemed agencies of the Secretary within the meaning of subsection 8c(7)(C) and section 10 of this title. The ruling upon such review shall be final if in accordance with law. The producer may obtain a judicial review of such ruling in accordance with the provisions of section 8c(15)(B) of this title; and

"(ix) the provisions of section 8a(5) shall not apply to any producer in the application of this subparagraph or regulations issued pursuant thereto."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

MEMORIAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Conservative Council-Syracuse, of Syracuse, N.Y., protesting against the ratification by the Senate of the nuclear test ban treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly (Rept. No. 561).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following executive reports of nominations by the Committee on Armed Services were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Willis Moore Hawkins, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

By Mrs. SMITH:

Brig. Gen. Louis Overton Gravely, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the U.S. Army;

Brig. Gen. Ralph Sheldon Phelps, and sundry other officers of the Army National Guard, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army; and

Big Gen. John Samuel Anderson, and sundry other officers of the Army National Guard, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nomination of Rear Adm. Charles E. Weakley, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral in connection with his contemplated assignment as Commander, Antisubmarine Warfare Force, Atlantic Fleet, and the nomination of Vice Adm. Edward N. Parker, to be placed on the Navy retired list in the grade of vice admiral. I ask that these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations placed on the Executive Calendar are as follows:

Rear Adm. Charles E. Weakley, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving; and

Vice Adm. Edward N. Parker, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I also report favorably 5,109 promotions and appointments in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force in the grade of colonel, or Navy equivalent, and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Thomas W. Amis, and sundry other officers, for promotion and appointment in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2228. A bill to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2229. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit pension and profit-sharing plans to provide contributions or benefits on a nondiscriminatory basis for certain self-employed individuals without special limitations on the amount of contributions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 2230. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2231. A bill to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to deductions for depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

INQUIRY INTO FINANCIAL OR BUSINESS INTERESTS OF ANY OFFICER, EMPLOYEE, OR FORMER EMPLOYEE OF THE SENATE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted a resolution (S. Res. 212) to inquire into the financial or business interests of any officer, employee, or former employee of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in ful when submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, which appears under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL BANK MEETINGS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks. I ask unanimous consent that a letter transmitted to the Vice President by the Secretary of the Treasury, explaining the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the latter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2228) to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter presented by Mr. ROBERTSON, is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., October 2, 1963.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of proposed legislation to change the requirements for the annual meeting date for national banks together with a comparative type of changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed legislation.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 5145 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 71), national banks are required to hold their annual shareholders meetings on such day in January of each year as is specified therefor in the articles of association. The proposed legislation would modify the present statutory provision to permit national banks to hold their annual meetings on any day of the year specified in the bylaws. Section 5149 of the Revised Statutes, the provision for procedures when the annual meeting of shareholders comes on a legal holiday, is also modified to reflect the change.

The statutory requirement that national banks hold their annual meetings during the month of January is burdensome to many banks. The first few weeks of each calendar year are the busiest from the standpoint of the internal operations of the bank. Being required to prepare for the annual shareholders meeting, in addition to the many other tasks that must be carried out during the first part of the calendar year, can prove to be a serious problem for bank personnel. Many banks have great difficulties in preparing adequate information on the activities of the previous year to report to the shareholders in time for an annual meeting in January. Therefore, the necessary data and information may not always be available for the perusal of the shareholders. This unnecessarily restrictive requirement should be eliminated from the law. National banks should have the same freedom of choice to fix their annual meeting date as do other corporations.

The Department believes that the proposed legislation is in the best interest of the banking industry and the Nation and urges its enactment. It would be appreciated if you would lay the draft bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

PERMANENCE AND SIMPLIFICATION OF GUIDELINE DEPRECIATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would simplify the administration of guideline depreciation and make the shortened lives provided by it permanent.

Two measures to reduce unemployment and to stimulate investment in productive plant and equipment have been initiated by Congress and the administration in the last 2 years—the investment tax credit and the liberalization of depreciation known as the guideline methods.

They are well designed and are approved and accepted by the Treasury Department and industry. In spite of this, they are only partly effective.

The decisions of the Treasury have proven sound in principle. However, the results of the year 1962 indicate that industry and especially small business has not yet fully availed itself of the opportunities for growth, replacement, and rehabilitation which guideline depreciation offers. Firms using guidelines accounted for only about one-half of total depreciation.

In the Survey of Current Business for July 1963, which gives, in some detail, the results of guideline depreciation for the year 1962, the Commerce Department has this to say:

> The reserve ratio test was most frequently cited as a reason for not adopting guidelines by manufacturers and by the nonrail transportation companies in the survey.

Uncertainty and complications arising from the administrative decisions of the Treasury are preventing the full operation of the intended liberalization, and therefore preventing new investment in plant and equipment sorely needed to further stimulate the economy.

The bill I introduce provides for the use of guideline lives as a matter of right, rather than a mere administrative allowance, and provides for the simple administration of the principles outlined by the Treasury.

The difficulties, both for the taxpayer and the Internal Revenue Service, of attempting to administer a procedure which calls for a strange mixture of judgment, prophecy, and higher mathematics on the part of both taxpayer and revenue agent would be avoided.

Most significant, the passage of the proposed legislation should have little or no adverse revenue effect. As long as guideline depreciation is operating, the revenue effect cannot be changed during the 3-year transition period. As the bill I am introducing closely approximates the results of the 1962 revenue procedure, there will be no different revenue effect than the continuation of the present system.

The purpose of the legislation is to give an assurance of certainty and continuity to the best features of guideline depreciation and to make the administration of the depreciation deduction simple and positive rather than to reduce taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2231) to amend section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to deductions for depreciation, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REMOVAL OF FINANCIAL LIMITATION ON PROGRAMS UNDER SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 221)

Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1588) to remove the $10 million limitation on programs carried out under section 16(e) (7) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for 1964 and subsequent calendar years, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FORMULA FOR QUOTA LIMITATIONS ON IMPORTS OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the bill (S. 2185) to impose quota limitation on imports of foreign residual fuel oil, introduced by me on September 26, 1963, is being held at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held for additional sponsors for an additional week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 WITH REFERENCE TO UNRELATED BUSINESS TAXABLE INCOME—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] may be added as cosponsors of S. 749, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with reference to unrelated business taxable income, which I introduced on February 7, 1963, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers].

This bill would exempt a labor organization which maintains a retirement home for its aged members, such as that established by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America in Lakeland, Fla., from the payment of Federal taxes on income which is used exclusively for the operation of such a home and which is derived from an agricultural operation located on the retirement home property and purchased with the proceeds of retirement fund assessments made and collected from active members of the labor organization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Florida for permitting me to join with him and his colleague the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] as a cosponsor of the bill.

This bill is a life-or-death matter for the Carpenters' Home at Lakeland, Fla., which for many years has been maintained by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners for the benefit of its aged and infirm members. This is an excellent facility, Mr. President, which has room for between 300 and 400 occupants, plus a fully staffed 90-bed hospital. It is financed by a per capita tax paid out of the pockets of the brotherhood's membership, and by earnings from citrus groves located on the Florida properties. A recent Internal Revenue Service ruling, however, held that these latter earnings were not exempt from the income tax, thus placing in jeopardy the continued existence of this fine home. The bill which has been introduced by the distinguished Senators from Florida would in effect overcome the administrative ruling and restore the tax exemption with respect to the income used to operate the home.

Trade unionism in America performs few more humanitarian functions than assuring to its members a dignified setting in which to spend their later retirement years, without going on Government handouts of any kind. Naturally, a large number of local carpenters' unions and their individual members in the State of New York take great pride in the Lakeland home and have written me to express their grave concern lest it be taxed out of existence. After giving careful study to the provisions of S. 749, which would apply generally to all labor organizations, otherwise tax-exempt, which use so-called nonrelated income to maintain retirement homes and similar institutions, I am convinced it is a sound measure in the broad public interest and I am, accordingly, delighted that the Senators from Florida have acceded to my request to become a cosponsor of the bill.

I would just like to say to the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] that he and his colleague the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] can count on my full cooperation and support in achieving enactment of this measure as soon as possible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to have the Senator from New York and the Senator from California join as cosponsors with my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. Smathers] and myself.

COMMISSION TO STUDY FEDERAL LAWS GOVERNING POLITICAL ACTIVITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh] may be added as a cosponsor at the next printing of S. 2103, the bill the Senator introduced to establish a bipartisan commission to study Federal laws governing political activity by Federal officers and employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SALE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL PRODUCE TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Resolution 211, which relates to the wheat investigation, at its next printing, which was submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL AND RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of October 8, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill and resolution:

S. 2220. A bill to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians or dentists: Mr. McIntyre and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. Res. 210. Resolution to recommend that at least 50 percent of grain sold to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be shipped in U.S.-flag vessels and that ships in violation of Presidential embargo in relation to trade with Cuba be barred from participation: Mr. Allott.

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS UNDER FHA MORTGAGES—NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 2226

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on October 3, 1963, I announced that the Subcommittee on Housing will hold hearings on October 17 and 18, 1963, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, on S. 1200, a bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by FHA-insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under FHA-insured mortgages.

Since that time, another bill, S. 2226, has been introduced dealing with the same subject. Under the circumstances, I should like to announce that S. 2226 will also be a subject of these hearings.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON GOLD MINING REVITALIZATION BILL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the gold problem, like the poor, always is with us—except that with gold we go steadily from very bad to much worse. On a number of occasions since I have had the honor to represent the largest State of the Union here in the Senate, I have stood on this floor and tried to point out to my colleagues and our Nation the dangerous and absurd situation in which our national gold supplies continued to flow out to foreign nations and foreign operators and all the while we have adequate resources of gold within our lands and the skilled miners with the know-how to produce it.

On all of these occasions there has been pending, or in the offing, legislation which would have enabled our once productive gold mines to reopen and our gold miners to go back to work. I refer, of course, to the successive bills which would have authorized increased prices for newly mined domestic gold and would thus extend to our gold mines and our gold miners the principle that has become an accepted part of our way of life with respect to our farms and farm products, and, in the form of tariffs and quotas, in much of our industrial activity.

However, uniformly, our internationally oriented civil servants in the Treasury and State Departments have viewed with great alarm any proposal that the Government of the United States should take action to help the gold miners of the United States by increasing the price the Government itself fixed as a depression measure nearly 29 years ago. Whether under Republican administration or under Democratic administration these civil servants have been so tender of a possible—and possibly fancied—reaction by unnamed bankers in Switzerland or England or some place that they have been willing to let our once prosperous American gold mining industry go the way of the Dodo bird.

In an effort to avoid arousing the fears, real or imagined, of these officials that the United States was going on a "two-price system for gold," several Senators from both parties joined me in sponsoring a gold revitalization bill that does not even mention the word "price." I refer to S. 2125, introduced on September 9, 1963. This measure would authorize payments to domestic gold producers based on the difference between costs of production as they were on January 1, 1940, and costs of production today.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I announce that public hearings will be held on S. 2125 on Wednesday and Thursday, October 23 and 24, at 10 a.m. in the Interior Committee rooms, 3110 New Senate Office Building. The subcommittee will welcome the attendance and participation of any Members of the Senate interested in increasing our dwindling gold supply and putting our gold miners back to work.

JOINT UNITED STATES–SOVIET EXPLORATION TO THE MOON

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on September 20, President Kennedy made a speech before the United Nations in which, among other things, he invited the Soviets to join us in a joint exploration to the moon. Some people have jumped to two conclusions: First, that this offer of cooperation in space is a new and different policy and second, that this offer somehow justifies the reduction of our own space efforts. Neither could be further from the truth.

The actual truth is that the United States has always stood ready to cooperate in the peaceful exploration of space with any and all nations. This desire is stated as one of the principle objectives of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. Furthermore, this desire was expressed in House Concurrent Resolution 332 also passed by the Congress in 1958. It is difficult to understand how the record could be more clear than it is on this issue.

But if we are going to cooperate with the Soviets, or anyone else, we must do so from a position of strength. We must continue with our efforts to be second to none in our space capability. It would simply be disastrous if we consciously relegated ourselves to a secondary—or worse—position on the flimsy grounds that we have made an offer—an offer that has not been accepted, by the way—of cooperation with a specific nation on a specific project.

One of the leaders who has understood these two points is, of course, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON. Not only does he understand these points as the Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, but he understood them years ago when he was chairman of the Senate Space Committee and also the Preparedness Subcommittee. To illustrate my point, I ask unanimous consent that four speeches made by the then majority leader in 1957 and 1958 be placed in the RECORD at this point. I invite my colleagues to read them again and to keep them in mind when it comes time to vote on NASA's appropriations in the near future.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATE MAJORITY LEADER LYNDON B. JOHNSON BEFORE THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED JEWISH APPEAL, NEW YORK CITY, N.Y., JUNE 8, 1957

THE OPEN CURTAIN

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, I am here tonight with a basic premise in my mind. It is that you—the members of the United Jewish Appeal—are men and women who have dedicated your lives to helping your fellow man.

I do not assume this lightly—merely from the desire of a speaker to flatter his audience. It rests upon your enviable record.

I raise the point only as a predicate to the remarks which I plan to make tonight. This is the place and you are the people to whom I wish to define a new proposal.

THE WORLD WE LIVE IN

Never before in history have people been so badly in need of help. And the only kind of help that will serve today is the kind that the people supply for themselves.

There is no need to recite once more the realities of the modern world. We are all only too familiar with them—the cold war, the armaments race, atomic fallout, international misunderstanding.

Most of these factors have appeared before in history. There have been "cold wars." International misunderstanding has been a normal state of affairs for centuries. There is nothing new about an armaments race.

But for the first time, we now face the prospect of destroying ourselves—not as the result of an armaments race but merely by indulging in the race.

THE ATOMIC RAIN

For several weeks our newspapers have carried daily headlines about the effects of atomic fallout. The scientists disagree as to the amount of damage that is being done to humanity by our nuclear test explosions.

But even the most conservative state flatly that there is "some risk."

I am no nuclear physicist. I do not pretend to have the scientific knowledge that would entitle me to pass judgment on genetics or the effects of strontium 90.

But I do know that the experts are talking about my children and your children. And it gives me no comfort to be told that some scientists think the risk to them is "slight."

NO MONOPOLY

It is even less comforting to assess the probable future of the armaments race even assuming that our children escape the fallout danger—whether slight or tremendous. If it continues, the future is bleak.

The intercontinental ballistics missile with a hydrogen warhead is just over the horizon. It is no longer just the disorderly dream of some science fiction writer.

We must assume that our country will have no monopoly on this weapon. The Soviets have not matched our achievements in democracy and prosperity; but they have kept pace with us in building the tools of destruction.

With such weapons in a divided world, there will be little choice. We will return to the caves of our remote ancestors and burrow underground like the prairie dogs of west Texas.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES

There are reasonable alternatives to this unreasonable prospect. They are alternatives which are available to mankind—providing that mankind will adopt them.

Our present situation could have been avoided. Twelve years ago—when we had a monopoly on the atomic bomb—the United States offered to share the secrets of the atom with the entire world.

We asked in return only reasonable guarantees that the atom would never again be used in warfare. This offer had no parallel in history—and it would have converted the atom from an implement of death to an implement of life.

Two years later, this plan was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations. It was blocked only by the Soviet Union and its satellites.

There is no point in reliving the past. I am not going to waste your time and my time in proving that the Soviets were wrong. Free people who have had access to the truth are already aware of the facts.

We live in the present. We no longer have a monopoly on atomic power. But there is a sound reason for recalling the events of 1946 and 1948. One aspect of those events may point the way to the future.

The Russian people have never had an opportunity to weigh the free world's proposal for the control of atomic energy. They were never informed about it openly and frankly. They never knew that Stalin provoked an arms race that, if continued, must end in the total elimination of mankind.

Today humanity is a great deal closer to self-destruction than it was 10 years ago.

THE THREAT AND THE HOPE

And yet, because we are close to the threat, we may also be closer to hope. I do not foresee any quick Utopian solutions. A happy ending to the atomic-hydrogen menace will not be easily found.

But I am convinced, to borrow Churchill's phrase, that if we cannot see the beginning of the end, we can at least see the end of the beginning.

There are pathways of peace and progress open to all humanity. The statesmen of the world have one overriding duty—to help light those paths.

Where lie the signs of hope? They lie in the realm of reason.

THE CHALLENGE

The challenge is truly immediate. It involves actions that can and must be taken this year, now—during the remaining 206 days of 1957.

Our basic need goes by the technical name "disarmament." That long, rather dull-sounding word represents a host of complicated problems. The answer—even a beginning to the answer—represents the hope of all mankind.

We must initiate action on five objectives, each contributing to our crusade for disarmament:

1. Controlled education of military forces by all countries.
2. A start on a mutual "open skies" foolproof inspection system.
3. A frank and open search for a method of suspending tests of the bigger nuclear weapons, under airtight conditions which give full protection against violations.
4. A reduction of everyone's stockpile of nuclear weapons and means for delivery under copper-riveted methods of mutual inspection.
5. And this is the key to ultimate hope: A worldwide agreement—backed by absolute safeguards—that no nation will make any new fissionable materials for weapons purposes—neither the three present nuclear powers nor those who may soon have the capacity.

LET THE PEOPLE JUDGE

How do we launch this program? We do so in the only way possible—in the only way that accords with American traditions.

We must create a new world policy. Not just of "open skies"—but of open eyes, ears, and minds, for all peoples of the world.

I call for the "open curtain." Let truth flow through it freely. Let ideas cleanse evil just as fresh air cleanses the poisoned, stagnant mass of a long-closed cavern.

Mankind's only hope lies with men themselves. Let us insist that the case be submitted to the people of the world.

A few years ago this would have been utterly impractical. But great events have recently stirred the world. We must seize the hopes they suggest. We must not be blinded to those hopes by rigid reflections of the past.

Only 4 years ago the brutal Stalin died. Only a year ago the world learned that the new Russian leader, Khrushchev, had found it necessary to expose the depths of Stalin's

evil. And only 6 days ago Khrushchev took advantage of America's facilities to come into our homes and state the Communist case.

I am glad that he did so. I have complete trust and faith in our people.

They will not be contaminated by open Communist propaganda.

We should welcome this example of direct argument.

But we must—I think—go much further than this. Let us take Khrushchev's technique and turn it back upon him. Let us use the program as the means to open the Iron Curtain.

As he has used our TV screens for his appeals, let us demand to use his screens for our appeal—the appeal of truth undefensive and undismayed.

We should ask Khrushchev to provide us with Sovietwide uncensored radio and TV facilities. We should call on him to allow spokesmen of our own choosing to come into Russian homes and state our case—the American case—to the Russian people.

THE PATH OF PEACE

Once again we will place our feet on the path of constructive activity. We will look forward with joy rather than with dread to our children's future.

We live in a world where over two-thirds of the people are "ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished." When the madness of the nuclear arms race is halted, mankind's creative efforts can be turned to their relief. We shall survive this century only if we find how to substitute human dignity for human degradation.

The people in this room tonight are dedicated to the cause of helping—rather than destroying—humanity. You have worked through the years to bring a measure of security and a measure of decency to your fellow humans.

SANCTUARY

You have been associated with many humanitarian causes—and one of them is creating a sanctuary for the oppressed. That sanctuary, Israel, stands today—permanent and enduring—in the midst of what was once desert.

Creating that sanctuary meant that rivers had to be dammed; fields had to be tilled; houses had to be built; the resources of nature had to be tapped.

These are the tasks to which all of humanity should be dedicated.

We have had enough of oppression and wars; of trouble and turmoil; of the frustration of every normal human impulse. We have seen noble impulses thwarted and turned to ignoble ends. We have watched the fruits of genius warped and turned into the paths of destruction.

This is not the work of the people of the world. It is the work of the small groups of selfish and twisted men who withhold from their fellow human beings the indispensable tool of freedom—the truth.

As you go about your humanitarian work, I want to leave you with one thought tonight.

You are people who seek to build; not to tear down. And when doors are opened so the people of the world can find the truth for themselves, we can all turn to building—building a better life for ourselves and our children.

The people can be trusted. It is time the case be turned over to them.

Statement of Democratic Leader Lyndon B. Johnson to the Meeting of the Democratic Conference on January 7, 1958

Members of the conference, for this presentation this morning, I shall divide my own remarks in two parts.

I shall, briefly, summarize certain of the findings which have been made thus far by the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee. Other members of the subcommittee will, in greater detail, deal with specific areas of the investigations.

In all candor, however, I cannot begin these remarks with a simple recapitulation of the work we have done. Illuminating as such might be, I realize—as I know all members realize—that we have, thus far, barely begun a work that will occupy and dominate the Congresses of freemen for lifetimes to come. It is, therefore, of first importance, that—no matter how feeble our understanding—we strive to establish perspective.

Our security may very will depend, above all else, on how well and how quickly we grasp such perspective.

Let us begin with this fact: the ground beneath us when we last met has been, largely, swept away. How much is gone, how much remains are questions no man can answer with authority.

The peril of the hour is obvious.

Less obvious, but of far greater importance, is the fact that beyond the peril lies a potential for peace that exceeds any ever before within man's reach.

Since August 30, when the first session of this Congress adjourned, the human race itself—without regard to flags or philosophy—has multiplied its capabilities to infinity.

The exploitation of these capabilities by men of selfish purpose holds the awful threat of a world in subjugation.

The mastery of such capabilities by men wholly dedicated to freedom presents, instead, the prospect of a world at last liberated from tyranny, liberated in fact from the fear of war.

What this Congress does will, at best, be only a small beginning on what must ultimately be done—and will be done in decades and perhaps even centuries ahead. But, small as our effort may be in the long view of history, we can see that lack of sufficient effort on our part would be compounded throughout the ages ahead into a failure of tragic proportions.

We cannot, in the months of this session, assure the Nation's superiority: the era we have entered is too young, its ultimate dimensions too far beyond our vision, for us to anticipate so fruitful a result from our labors.

We can, however, by hesitation, by dissension, by narrow partisanship do much to build an insurmountable barrier about ourselves and perpetuate our relative inferiority.

Responsible men have no choice.

We must work as though no other Congress would ever have an opportunity to meet this challenge, for, in fact, none will have an opportunity comparable.

We must, furthermore, bring to this opportunity a freshness, an originality, a diligence far exceeding our previous standards, for many of the concepts and ideas and rules which have applied to our actions in the past are no longer pertinent and applicable.

Let me expand this by dealing first with certain general facts which have been established in the short time of our hearings:

1. Our national potential exceeds our national performance.

2. Our science and technology has been, for some time, capable of many of the achievements displayed thus far by Soviet science.

3. That the Soviet achievements are tangible and visible, while ours are not, is a result of policy decisions made within the governments of the respective nations. It is not—as yet, at least—the result of any great relative superiority of one nation's science over the other's.

The heart of the matter then is the national policy of each of the two great world powers, for this fact stands higher than all others: We could have had what the Soviets have in the way of technical achievements if it had been the aim of our Government to employ our resources and capabilities in comparable pursuit of comparable goals.

From this, we deduce these matters of importance:

First, it is obvious that the Soviet valuation on the significance of control of outer space has exceeded that of our officials.

Second, it is equally obvious that our valuation has been based on factors other than the fullest realization of our scientific capability.

In essence, the Soviet has appraised control of space as a goal of such consequence that achievement of such control has been made a first aim of national policy. We, on the other hand, have—or so the evidence suggests—regarded other goals and aims as having a higher imperative.

Which nation is correct?

If our policy is correct in the approach that has been taken, then the Soviet is ludicrously wrong, and some might dismiss the sputniks as playtoys.

If the Soviet policy is correct in its approach, however, then we face the judgment that our own position may be tragic.

At root, this Congress must—before it does much else—decide which approach is correct. If the Soviet is wrong, then we would be wrong to undertake any sort of great acceleration solely to produce counterparts for the visible Soviet achievements. If the Soviet is correct, then we would again be wrong to limit our response to nothing more than a stride-for-stride matching of their progress.

From the evidence accumulated, we do know this: the evaluation of the importance of control of outer space made by us has not been based primarily on the judgment of men most qualified to make such an appraisal.

Our decisions, more often than not, have been made within the framework of the Government's annual budget. This control has, again and again, appeared and reappeared as the prime limitation upon our scientific advancement.

Against this view, we now have on the record the appraisal of leaders in the field of science, respected men of unquestioned competence, whose valuation of what control of outer space means renders irrelevant the bookkeeping concerns of fiscal officers.

The testimony of the scientists is this:

Control of space means control of the world, far more certainly, far more totally than any control that has ever or could ever be achieved by weapons, or by troops of occupation.

From space, the masters of infinity would have the power to control the earth's weather, to cause drought and flood, to change the tides and raise the levels of the sea, to divert the gulfstream and change temperature climates to frigid.

The meaning is, to my limited view, quite clear.

We have, for many years, been preoccupied with weapons.

We are, even now, concerned with what some currently regard as the ultimate weapon. But, when we perfect such a weapon for ourselves we may still be far behind.

The urgent race we are now in—or which we must enter—is not the race to perfect long-range ballistic missiles.

There is something more important than any ultimate weapon. That is the ultimate position—the position of total control over earth that lies somewhere out in space.

This is the future, the distant future, though not so distant as we may have thought. Whoever gains that ultimate position gains control, total control, over the earth, for purposes of tyranny or for the service of freedom.

Where do we now stand?

Let me summarize briefly the work of your committee.

Our staff has spent more than 50 days in intensive preparation for hearings which now have filled nearly 3,000 pages of transcript. Thirty-four witnesses have been heard before the committee. In addition, the staff has conducted 150 to 200 interviews with individuals concerned with the missile and satellite programs. Searching questionnaires have been sent to industrial organizations, leading scientists and engineers, and leading educators.

An effective, comprehensive and important job has been done. Credit of the highest order is due each member of the subcommittee of both parties. Seldom have I seen men work with greater dedication; the debt due them is great. Likewise, the effectiveness and thoroughness of the committee's work is a direct result of the splendid direction afforded by our counsel, Mr. Edwin L. Weisl and his partner, Cyrus R. Vance. Mr. Weisl and Mr. Vance are distinguished New York lawyers, members of the firm of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett, and we are fortunate in securing their services.

From this committee effort, the essential findings developed thus far are these:

The Sputniks now orbiting around the earth are not military weapons, but have a military potential.

Whatever their military potential may be, the present significance of these satellites is this:

First, the Soviet ability to put satellites of this size in orbit indicates a rocket ability far beyond any capacity we have developed; and, second, the satellites have gathered for the Soviet vital information about outer space which we do not have and which is decisive for any nation seeking to enter the space age.

Our primary effort to put a satellite into the skies ended in humiliating failure. It is my opinion the humiliation could have been avoided: It was unfair to the dedicated scientists who are trying to do a difficult job and it reflected unnecessarily upon our scientific capabilities.

The people must have the truth, good or bad, but truth begins with perspective. It is not a proper perspective to reflect the responsibility for our lack of a satellite upon the men at work now in Florida. They are neither the source nor the cause of our failure.

Beyond the satellites, our committee has learned facts in open sessions about Soviet capabilities which are far more disturbing in relation to our present security.

First, the Soviets have almost as many Army divisions as all the nations of the free world combined, and a great proportion are highly mechanized.

Second, Soviet air strength is probably close to our own.

Third, Soviet submarines now number 500, while ours total 110, and there is evidence that they have some with missile capability.

Fourth, the Soviets are building 100 submarines annually, while we are building fewer than 10.

Fifth, there is no certain evidence of a Soviet nuclear submarine, but they have launched an atomic icebreaker, and nuclear submarines, if not now in existence, will be soon.

In the field of the intercontinental and shorter range missiles, the facts again are not comforting. The capacity to launch a one-half ton satellite is interpreted by our scientists as evidence of the capacity to launch an ICBM against our cities. Other problems than the problem of propulsion are involved, however. We cannot fully appraise Soviet capacity in this regard. The safe assumption is that they have solved or will solve such problems as remain.

In part the answers that have been given to the committee are these:

1. Strengthen our strategic air force, about which Senator SYMINGTON will tell you more.

2. Accelerate and expand our research and development programs.

3. Speed up the development and manufacture of the intermediate and intercontinental missiles now being worked on.

4. Strengthen our educational system.

5. Provide a top-level, non-service-connected military planning staff for the Secretary of Defense.

6. Establish a new, advanced weapons development agency outside of the Defense Department to reduce the lead time in the production of new weapons—which, incidentally, according to evidence presented at the hearings, is over twice as long as the lead time required by the Russians.

7. Streamline the decisionmaking process.

8. Accelerate the nuclear submarine program.

9. Eliminate all overtime limitations.

10. Increase cooperation with our allies particularly in the exchange of information.

11. Build shelters and store food and machinery as a precaution against Russian attack.

12. Build as quickly as possible an early warning radar system capable of detecting missiles.

13. Increase our interchange of scientific information between the free nations.

14. That we must begin to do all of these things with a strong sense of immediacy and urgency.

The question in your minds, I am sure, is whether or not there has been progress in actions taken during the past few weeks. I believe it is fair to say that some progress has been made since the inquiry began.

The President has named Dr. Killian as his personal scientific adviser. Also, the President has designated the Pentagon's special assistant on missiles as a "missile director," although in candor it must be said that it is difficult to define his powers.

The Secretary of Defense has been active:

1. He has removed the overtime restrictions.

2. He has restored research and development funds.

3. He has speeded up development and production schedules for missiles.

4. He has ordered both Jupiter and Thor into production.

5. He has reinstated a previously canceled launching pad for the Titan intercontinental missile.

6. He has established a new agency to develop advanced weapons.

7. He has ordered the Army into the satellite project.

These actions—as all, I am sure, will agree—constitute only a beginning of what eventually must be done. We can hope that the rate of acceleration will be adequate to the great challenge before us.

Our problems have been listed. The suggestions about our future course have been listed. The actions taken have been listed. All of these relate to matters which are, essentially, military in character.

It is fundamental, I believe, that however urgent these military problems may be we are faced with the unchanging problem of building a strong country, not a strong military force alone.

In this perspective, we cannot ignore the problems of 3 to 4 million unemployed workers.

We cannot ignore the grave problems of our farmers.

We cannot ignore the problems of our schoolchildren.

We cannot ignore the problem of housing.

We cannot ignore the problem of credit.

We cannot ignore the soft spots in our economy which are bringing some of our most vital industries into a difficult and troublesome climate.

We cannot ignore the growing problems of small business.

We cannot ignore the issue of conserving our natural resources.

These problems—and many more—must occupy our attention, and it becomes all the more imperative that we seek and reach answers of lasting durability for the road ahead.

One final question, the most important of all: Where do we go? What should be our goal?

If, out in space, there is the ultimate position—from which total control of the earth may be exercised—then our national goal and the goal of all freemen must be to win and hold that position.

Obviously, attainment of that goal is no overnight thing. It may not come within our lifetime. Until it does, we must continue to have weapons—but we must recognize both their limits and their potentially short life.

With weapons, whatever their form, our ultimate gain is likely to be stalemate—such as we have had during the atomic age. But our position must remain flexible. We must forego a fixation on weapons as the ultimate of security. For, if we do not, we may build the space age's first—and last—Maginot Line.

Total security perhaps is possible now, for the first time in man's history. Total security—and, with it, total peace. This potential we must not underestimate.

Within the short weeks since October 4, man has become master of horizons far beyond our imagination. We must respect this mastery, and from that respect we must, more than ever, seek to bring all men together in cooperative effort. The goals now within reach of the human race are too great to be divided as spoils, too great for the world to waste its efforts in a blind race between competitive nations. The conference table is more important now than ever it has been, and we should welcome to its chairs all men of all nations.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON OF TEXAS BEFORE A MEETING OF CBS AFFILIATES, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am here today to speak to a group which has a grave responsibility for informing our people.

In the Chambers of the Senate of the United States, I am the designated leader of the majority party. That is a title of which I am proud but one which carries with it responsibilities that would cause any man to be humble. But it is a designation which, for this occasion, I have left behind.

I am not here as a Democrat.

I am not here as a leader of the Senate.

I am here as an American.

In this town, we have the habit of dividing all things by lines of affiliation: the offices, the jobs, the various positions, and sometimes even our judgments.

At this hour in our history, I, for one, believe that there are certain facts which cannot be divided along such lines and certain judgments we must reach and decisions we must make together, as Americans, and as Americans only.

Even as we sit here at these tables there orbits in the sky above us—around and around this earth—the most compelling fact of our times.

The sputniks out in space have only one meaning.

There is no Democratic meaning.

There is no Republican meaning.

There is, in truth, no narrow American meaning.

In all history, mankind has never faced so great a challenge—or so great an opportunity. If outer space is allowed to become the province of the earth's imperialists, then the freedom we have fashioned at so high a price shall fall into eternal jeopardy.

If, however, free men set their sails for this new world as our forebears did when this continent was opened, then we have the opportunity of adding a new dimension to freedom—and, with it, the very real prospect of reaching our goal of total peace.

These are exciting thoughts, exciting goals.

We would be out of character with our American heritage if we were not stirred by what we can now see on ahead in this new age.

We would be even more out of character—both as Americans and as freemen—if we should lose this hour of opportunity in preoccupation with partisan thoughts of who is to receive the credit and who is to receive the blame.

Facts are not partisan, and the facts are these:

For a decade now, the free world—led by the United States—has summoned up its resources and resourcefulness to contain the most powerful and most ruthless aggressor ever to appear among the governments of the earth.

The physical containment has, in large part, succeeded.

It has succeeded, I should say, until now.

Today no responsible man can say or would say continued success of our past policies is assured.

There is now abundant evidence that a pattern of history is repeating. We, like the dynasties of ancient China on down to the Republic of France, have built a wall against aggression, but now we find that we are the imprisoned.

The Soviet has, dramatically, leaped over our wall.

More importantly, we are awakened to the reality that advances of Soviet technology and science have made our wall of security a relic of another age.

Let me cite for you certain specifics, certain facts which all of us, as Americans, must sit down and consider together.

These are not facts of my invention. These are facts testified to by our military leadership coming before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

First. The Soviet has under arms nearly as many divisions as do all the free nations combined.

Second. The Soviet air strength is probably close to that of our own.

Third. The Soviet submarine armada now numbers 500, while ours totals only 110.

Fourth. The Soviet shipyards are building 100 new submarines annually, while we are building fewer than 10.

Fifth. The Soviet capacity to launch a one-half ton satellite into space indicates the capacity on their part to launch long-range ballistic missiles against our cities from Soviet soil.

Sixth. The Soviet has now the capacity to launch, from land bases or from its submarines, shorter range missiles against our installations at home and overseas.

These are military facts. They are important. I would mislead you if I did not say that there are more, more which in time I believe should become public knowledge.

What is the sum of these facts?

The facts of comparative strength between the two strong powers do not add up to disaster—but they do, clearly, total up to peril.

For the moment, the stalemate is not clearly broken. The Soviet striking power is great and growing greater, but our retaliatory power is great, also. This the Soviet knows, as we know.

The Soviet, however, also knows—as we must come to know—that the rate of growth of their striking power far exceeds ours.

We are behind but we are not yet hopelessly behind. Our peril becomes a disaster when we fall so far behind that there is no hope of recovery. It it to the prevention of that disaster all freemen must now dedicate their efforts.

How is such disaster to be prevented?

Some, looking back to the past, will answer only that the Nation must retool its productive capacity, get ready for a massive effort, and move forward to match the Soviet sputnik for sputnik, missile for missile, sub for sub.

If war were inevitable, I would join in such a call.

But no man who looks beyond the moment will suggest that war is the inevitable consequence of mankind's new adventure into space. I, myself, am confident that it is not.

Space may well be the sea in which the human race will someday find an island of peace.

To reach that island, we need more than weapons.

We need, in fact, to free ourselves of the bonds of a weapon psychology.

Our greatest need in this hour is to unleash the pioneering spirit and the daring and brilliance of our people and set this Nation's course on the pursuit of peace.

We cannot, of course, ignore the need for weapons now.

We need a faster rate of production for our missiles, far faster than any yet permitted or any yet envisioned.

We need continued production of our proved long-range bombers for our Strategic Air Command.

We need an acceleration of our submarine production.

We need these things now, for this reason:

In the past, we have had the time to mobilize and build our strength while others fought—on their soil—the wars we were eventually to enter and help provide the margin of victory.

We shall not have such time again.

Our own soil is within the target range of a hostile nation for the first time in the American experience.

For the next 10 years or more, we must be ready every night for any challenge that might come before morning. There is no other way.

Behind the security that such strength affords, though, we must do more than content ourselves with a stalemate We must lay aside the illusion that a nation is strong merely because its military strength equals that of its adversaries.

If we can now buy time, and I believe that we can, we must make certain that we make proper use of what we purchase.

This means, as I see it, that we must change our ways—and those changes will make this both a happier land and a better world.

We have had since the end of World War II much time.

The evidence is indisputable that we have not used that time to full advantage.

What has been wrong? Why have we lagged?

Why do we stand now in a posture of relative weakness?

When such a question is asked, as it should be asked, there is an ever-present danger that we shall frame our answers in terms of credit and blame.

To do this now could well be fatal.

There is little question that wrong decisions have been made.

These errors are not divided along any partisan lines.

Furthermore, there is little doubt that such decisions, picked out of the context of the past, may seem glaringly wrong today, but at the time many of them met with majority approval.

As Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons on June 18, 1940: "If we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."

I say that such must be our creed at this hour.

It is with that creed before us that we must proceed, as responsible men, to assess the position of free men in the world today.

I see no gain in picking petty quarrels with the past.

I, myself, am willing to draw a line at the here and now, and measure responsibility in terms of what is done for the future rather than in terms of what was done in the past.

From this base, I believe we can take a more honest look at the problems we face.

What are those problems? Let me call them as I see them.

First and foremost, I believe that we are paying too high a price for conformity.

Ours has been, always, a nation built by the greatness of men's hearts and spirits and minds. America's vigor has come from the originality, the freshness, the vision of our people—all our people, not merely an intellectual elite.

For a decade now, we have seen growing a climate of contempt for these values. We are paying a price for that.

Our investigating committee has found, in some most striking examples, that this has been at the heart of some of our preparedness difficulties.

The fight to build for this Nation an atomic submarine is a record of the persistence against great odds of one man, Admiral Rickover, who believed that it could be built. Because he was more determined to perform than to conform, this brilliant man was—on numerous occasions—shunted into obscurity and his services to the Nation were very nearly lost.

This past few days, in our committee room, I sat 2 feet away from a great Army general and watched him choke back the tears of deep emotion. He told us that his decision to retire from service was final. He said he could not speak freely and he could not support a policy which meant placing American troops in the range of enemy missiles without adequate weapons of defense.

Over and over again, I have heard—and our committee has heard—the leading military men of this Nation come before us and say that a conventional system has cut back on our programs for unconventional developments.

Over and over, we have heard them say that we are not, even yet, doing all that we could and should be doing to move forward in this hour of challenge.

This is not the road to strength. This is not the road America should travel.

We must turn to the dedicated men of vision and welcome them into the councils of respect and dignity.

We must provide a climate in which the men and women of our universities, our research centers, our career services, our world of journalism and communications can make a full contribution of their talents.

Let me make this point clear.

It is not true that the abilities of Soviet science far exceed those of our American scientists.

As free men, who respect the freedom of man's mind, we must not allow political policies to chain our most priceless resource.

As we face this problem of removing the fetters from our capacity, we must also remove the fetters of tradition from our policy.

Our defensive strategies, in a military sense, are undergoing reappraisal and reexamination.

It would be a mistake to stop there.

Our foreign policies require the same reappraisal.

So, also, do our domestic policies and values.

We have, for long, held a position of strength in world affairs. That position is no longer secure. We must not be so inflexible that we can imagine no changed policy to cope with a changed position.

Domestically, likewise, each of you as businessmen know that our economy is now undergoing a period of change. This change is not merely a cycle through which we are passing. There are new problems, new challenges arising to the very functioning of our system.

Channels of distribution are undergoing change.

Changes are evident in consumer demand and consumer taste.

Profoundly important population shifts are continuing.

We must not wait for calamity before undertaking a cure.

Just as we erred in our estimate of what Soviet gains might mean in the realm of technology, so can we err by complacency in our estimate of what domestic losses might mean in the realm of our economic health.

These things I mention only briefly, to emphasize that in this challenging period we need more, far more, than a purely military response to the Soviet challenge.

We need the marshaling of our resources, physical and mental, such as we have never had before.

We need imagination and freshness.

We need force and boldness in our leadership.

We need, further, I believe, to look beyond the danger evident now to see the horizons of peace in outer space.

I am no scientist and I do not pretend to be.

But the brilliant men of this age—the brilliant minds of America—tell us things that we cannot ignore.

Out in space, there is the power to control the earth's weather, to change the climate where we live, to alter the tides and direct the Gulf Stream on a different course.

From space, snapshots can be taken of your backyard.

The whole technology of communication can be changed.

It is a fascinating, daring, exciting world.

The frontier it opens for human advancement exceeds any man has ever faced.

Surely we cannot, as leaders of free men, ignore it.

Surely we cannot, with this opportunity before us, fail to see that this affords us the one clear course to recapture the initiative for freedom.

Here is an opportunity to bring men together in common cause as never before.

Here is an opportunity for us to sponsor the flourishing of mankind's genius.

Before this session of Congress ends, I am hopeful that we shall be able to establish in our Government a proper agency for direction of a new national effort in this realm.

I am hopeful, also, that we shall be able to provide a program for the enlargement of our research activities, making the laboratories and the equipment available to draw the best from the minds of our people.

I am hopeful that, furthermore, we shall be able to foster the strengthening of our total educational process, not to produce an army of technicians, but, rather, to pour forth legions of broadly educated men and women.

As we do these things, I trust that in our relations with other nations we shall be imaginative, and that we shall make it evident that America's free world leadership is not sterile.

We should, certainly, make provisions for inviting together the scientists of other nations to work in concert on projects to extend the frontiers of man and to find solutions to the troubles of this earth.

Our President, holding as he does the esteem of men throughout the world, has a rare opportunity to lead in this labor boldly and forcefully, and in the vigorous pursuit of peace he will find the Nation undivided in his support.

Further, it would be appropriate and fitting for our Nation to demonstrate its initiative before the United Nations by inviting all member nations to join in this adventure into outer space together.

The dimensions of space dwarf our national differences on earth.

If we are to win space as the outpost of peace, all men may—and should—share in that endeavor.

We, with our great resources and our great abilities, must not allow the leadership to slip from our grasp.

The world in which we live is a world in which danger abounds.

There is no greater danger, though, than for us to shrink from the responsibilities of the hour.

Ahead, if we move with speed, if we move with daring, we shall find fulfillment of our quest for peace.

If we are to reach such a goal, our response must begin now. This, more than we realize, is the year of decision, the year our course is set.

In such a year, we need be responsible men, loyal to our Nation, faithful to freedom, strangers to partisanship, and friends with the imagination that has been so much a part of our heritage.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LYNDON JOHNSON IN COMMITTEE 1 ON OUTER SPACE AT THE UNITED NATIONS

I come today with one purpose. I am here to express to you the essential unity of the American people in their support of the goals of the resolution offered now in their name.

This resolution is presented, as our system requires, by the representative of the executive branch of our Government. I speak here today at its request.

The executive position in the United States is held by the Republican Party through the mandate of the people.

I am here as a Member of one House of the legislative branch in which the majority position is held—also at the mandate of the people—by the Democratic Party, of which I am a member.

These are distinctions.

They are not—on this resolution—differences.

On the goal of dedicating outer space to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind, there are no differences within our Government, between our parties, or among our people.

The executive and the legislative branches of our Government are together. United we stand.

There need be no differences among us here.

The very opportunity of the issue before this assembly is to erase the accumulated differences of our earth's long and troubled history and to write across the vastness of space a proud new chapter of unity and peace.

Men have not faced such a moment of opportunity before.

Until now, our strivings toward peace have been heavily burdened by legacies of distrust and fear and ignorance and injury.

Those legacies do not exist in space.

They will not appear there unless we send them on ahead.

To keep space as man has found it and to harvest the yield of peace which it promises, we of the United States see one course—and only one—which the nations of earth may intelligently pursue. That is the course of full and complete and immediate cooperation to make the exploration of outer space a joint adventure.

There is, I emphasize, no other course.

In saying this, I express no personal belief alone—but, rather, I convey to you the conviction of my countrymen and the force of the American decision which has already been established.

The American people—through their elected representatives in the Congress—have spoken their aims and their purposes. The will of the people is now fixed in our laws and our policies.

The end is peace.

The means to that end is international cooperation.

This is—and this will remain—the American decision.

Eleven months ago, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee submitted to the full Senate a report on an exhaustive inquiry into the satellite and missile program of the United States. In that report, the bipartisan membership of the Subcommittee made this unanimous declaration:

"The immediate objective is to defend ourselves, but the equally important objective is to reach the hearts and minds of men everywhere so that the day will come when the ballistic missile will be merely a dusty relic in the museums of mankind and men everywhere will work together in understanding."

On July 29 of this year, the Congress in an act signed by the President established in the executive branch an agency under civilian control to guide and direct our national efforts in the exploration of space. By the act creating this agency, Congress embedded in the permanent law of the United States the following declaration of policy:

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

Further, in the same section of that act, Congress stated as a firm objective of the national efforts the following:

"Cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations in work done pursuant to this act and in the peaceful application of the results thereof."

Subsequent to that, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, introduced before that body a resolution expressly requesting the President of the United States to submit to the United Nations the question of international cooperation in dedicating outer space to peaceful purposes only.

That resolution received the earnest support of the full membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and it was adopted unanimously by the full membership of the House of Representatives.

In the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable Theodore Green likewise accorded to the resolution the most serious study and recommended without dissent that it be adopted. The Senate of the United States—like the House of Representatives—gave to the resolution the unanimous support of the Senators of both parties. Thus, it is a matter of record that the sense of the full membership of the Congress of the United States is that this question should be here on the agenda of the nations of the world. It is also the congressional view that this organization should assume the responsibility of leadership in promoting international cooperation in the exploration of outer space.

This is the American decision, expressed firmly in the resolutions of policy by the elected representatives of the people and established solidly by them in the cornerstone law of our Nation's space effort.

The resolution before this assembly now embodies fully the will of the Congress and the will of the people whom the Members of the Congress serve.

Thus I can—and I do—commend it to you for adoption. The record already made assures you the continuing support of the

Congress for the cooperative endeavors toward peaceful uses of outer space which the resolution contemplates.

The full dimensions of the promise of space are now beyond the scope of our knowledge and our imagination. To presume that we have more now than merely a glimpse of those dimensions would be both a vain and, perhaps ultimately, a fatally limiting error.

At this moment, the nations of the earth are explorers in space, not colonizers. Hence, it is proper that this assembly should provide—first—the means for the United Nations to encourage and inspire that exploration.

That is contemplated in the form of this resolution which would create an exploratory ad hoc committee of representatives of member nations to carry out the following tasks:

First, to inventory the activities and resources of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international bodies relating to peaceful uses of outer space;

Second, to determine areas of international cooperation and programs which could be undertaken under auspices of this organization by member nations without regard to their present stage of economic or scientific advancement;

Third, to consider the future form of internal organization in the United Nations which would best facilitate full international cooperation in this field; and

Fourth, to survey the nature of the legal problems which may arise in implementation of this joint adventure among the nations of the earth.

These are essential first steps. Until these explorations are conducted, orderly procedure to the broader horizons beyond will not be possible. Thus, to impede this first step is to impede all progress toward the goals of peace which men of faith believe exist in the realms of space.

While these are first steps, they are decisive steps and we cannot be unmindful of the precedents which, if established now, may influence or even control the longer steps ahead.

We of the United States have recognized and do recognize, as must all men, that the penetration into outer space is the concern of all mankind. All nations and all men—without regard to their roles on earth—are affected alike by what is accomplished over their heads in outer space.

If nations proceed unilaterally, then their penetrations into space become only extensions of their national policies on earth. What their policies on earth inspire—whether trust or fear—so their accomplishments in outer space will inspire also.

For nations given to aggression and war and tyranny on earth, unilateral success in space technology would only multiply many times over their threat to peace.

Thus, it is the interest of nations dedicated to peace and freedom that the opportunity of space not be perverted to the end of aggression and control over earth by the aggressors.

Recognizing this as true, men of peace will recognize fully the necessity to proceed without delay on the first step which is here proposed.

Today outer space is free. It is unscarred by conflict. No nation holds a concession there.

It must remain this way.

We of the United States do not acknowledge that there are landlords of outer space who can presume to bargain with the nations of the earth on the price of access to this new domain.

We must not—and need not—corrupt this great opportunity by bringing to it the very antagonisms which we may, by courage, overcome and leave behind forever through a joint adventure into this new realm.

What man has done, thus far, has been the result directly of international cooperation on an informal basis by men of science through the years.

The success, further, of the formal cooperation undertaken in observance of the International Geophysical Year foretells the high promise offered by enlargement of our goals and intensification of our support and efforts.

We know the gains of cooperation. We know the losses of failure to cooperate.

If we fail now to apply the lessons we have learned, or even if we delay their application, we know that the advances into space may only mean adding a new dimension to warfare.

If, however, we proceed along the orderly course of full cooperation, we shall by the very fact of cooperation make the most substantial contribution yet made toward perfecting peace.

Men who have worked together to reach the stars are not likely to descend together into the depths of war and desolation.

It is the American vision, I believe, that out of this fresh start for humankind which space affords man may, at last, free himself of the waste of guarding himself against his ignorance of his neighbors.

Barriers between us will fall as our sights rise to space.

Secrecy will cease to be. Man will come to understand his fellow man—and himself—as never he has been able to do. In the infinity of the space adventure, man can find growing richness of mind, of spirit, and of liberty.

The promise of this moment of opportunity is great.

We of the United States believe that this assembly will honor the moment and fulfill the opportunity—and all mankind will be the beneficiary of your courage.

BIRD BANDING IN NORTH AMERICA

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, at approximately noontime on Saturday, September 7, 1963, a young dove flew into a picture window of my residence here and broke its neck. I was saddened because it was a lovely, beautiful bird—and I have a great affection for birds.

I picked the dove up in the hope that the warmth of my hands would relieve the shock and that it would recover. Quite often birds fly into the picture window and are stunned but recover when held gently in one's hands for a short time. I hoped for such recovery on this time. But it was not to be.

I noticed that the dove had a leg band and after determining that it had died, I removed the band on which was stamped "Write F. & W. Serv. 703–97968 Wash D.C. U.S.A." I did and the Fish and Wildlife Service replied that the bird was an immature mourning dove that had been banded and released 3 months earlier on June 8, 1963, about 15 miles northeast of my residence.

It was interesting to me that this young bird had flown 15 miles from its point of release 3 months earlier. But of greater interest was the information that the Fish and Wildlife Service sent me. Because I think it will be of interest to many Americans, I ask unanimous consent that this information be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bird banding in North America is under the general direction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, with the cooperation of the Canadian Wildlife Serivce and participation by State and provincial game departments and many licensed and qualified volunteers. Reports of banding and recovery are the means by which information is obtained on migration routes, distribution to wintering and breeding grounds, mortality, and other subjects important in regulation and management.

Also of interest are such extreme age records as that of the Caspian tern recovered 26 years after banding, a ring-billed gulf and osprey taken after 21 years, and a Mallard and a pintail with known ages of more than 20 years. Among the longest intervals between banding and recovery for the smaller land birds are 14 years for purple martin and blue jay and 13 years for chimney swift.

Wild birds banded in North America have been recovered as far away as Siberia, Africa, France, and the mid-Pacific. Following are several records which illustrate why the pintail is particularly famous as a traveler:

Band No.	Date banded	Where banded	Date recovered	Where recovered
506–65268	Sept. 7, 1951	Labrador, Canada	Sept. 25, 1951	Southern England.
39–681629	Aug. 27, 1939	Kenmare, N. Dak., United States	Jan. 10, 1940	Colombia, South America.
41–679296	Aug. 16, 1949	Tulelake, Calif., United States	Nov. 15, 1949	Cook Islands, New Zealand.
48–628113	July 19, 1950	Innoko River, Alaska, United States.	Nov. 24, 1951	Delaware City, Del., United States.
506–09151	Oct. 21, 1951	Maui Island, Hawaii, United States.	Sept. 10, 1952	Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
526–38885	July 30, 1953	Brooks, Alberta, Canada	Feb. 15, 1957	Miyagi Prefecture, Japan.
506–12252	Dec. 9, 1951	Aransas County, Tex., United States.	May 18, 1954	Evekinot, U.S.S.R.

In the past about 11 million birds have been banded, and a half a million are being added each year. More than 800,000 recovery and return records are now available for study. Unless otherwise indicated, the bird is a wild bird which has been trapped, banded and immediately released again. The following terms are used to indicate the age and locality of hatching: N—nestling banded in the nest; LOC—young bird of the year hatched in immediate vicinity; IM—young bird of year, location of hatching unknown; SUB—subadult; and A—adult.

Of course, the success of such a program depends upon people who report recovered bands. May we suggest how you can help in this and insure getting accurate facts on banded birds found or taken? Give concise statement as to date found, where, and how obtained. Write down all letters and numbers just as they appear. If the bird is alive, release with band still attached. If dead or badly injured, remove the band, flatten, tape to your letter and send it in for our examination. We will return the band if you request it. Record numbers and facts in case the band and/or letter is lost. Mail report direct to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bird Banding Office, Laurel, Md., United States of America. All letters are acknowledged, but this may take several weeks owing to the pileup at certain seasons.

Please do not send in the band pertaining to the present report unless (1) it is specifically requested or (2) you note a discrepancy between the number on the band and the one on this report. Make certain that the date and locality are accurate. If an error is noted, kindly correct and return this report and a revised one will be sent you.

The agencies and individuals participating in this work thank you for your cooperation.

Bird Banding Office,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record Senator Muskie's report on the activities to date of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of which he is chairman. This report was prepared for presentaticn to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations at its 15th meeting held here in Washington last month.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Progress Report to the Advisory Commission on the Activities of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, September 27, 1963

(By Hon. Edmund S. Muskie, chairman)

Today the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations is legally 14 months and 2 weeks old. Organizationally, it has enjoyed a somewhat shorter lifespan of 1 year and 24 days. Despite this, we have taken seriously our mandate "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relations * * * including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations."

The subcommittee's activities are divided into two major categories—legislative and research, or investigative. Under the former, we have thus far dealt with three legislative recommendations that were either initiated or strongly approved by the Advisory Commission.

The first of these, S. 855, introduced last February 19, implements the Commission's June 1961 recommendation that certain Federal grants-in-aid be reviewed by metropolitan area planning bodies. Hearings on this measure and Senator Case's somewhat more ambitious metropolitan planning bill, S. 915, were held May 21–23. Testimony was heard from 22 witnesses, including Senators Case and Williams of New Jersey; our own Bill Colman; representatives of the Area Redevelopment Agency, Bureau of Public Roads, Public Health Service, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency; spokesmen for the American Municipal Association, National Association of Counties, American Institute of Planners, and various regional planning authorities; and many interested private citizens.

Official reports of 10 governmental departments, as well as statements on behalf of 17 private organizations, were received and made a part of the hearing record. All but two of the witnesses who testified during the 3 days favored the general objectives and basic approach of S. 855. Approximately half of them supported the bill as introduced; the remainder offered various amendments which in the opinion of the sponsors would strengthen the legislation. The subcommittee, after holding three executive sessions on the subject, is now in the process of circulating a marked-up bill and a draft report among the subcommittee members. It is much too early to predict the fate of this measure, but the active participation and cooperation of the subcommittee's minority members indicate significant bipartisan interest in this measure.

S. 815 is a bill that would permit Federal agencies to restore to the States certain jurisdictional authority now vested in the United States which could be better administered by State authorities. The bill, introduced in this Congress by Senator John L. McClellan, chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on February 18, was submitted as an administration bill and at the request of the Attorney General of the United States. It is identical to legislation originally drafted by the Government Operations Committee staff with the cooperation of the Justice Department in order to implement recommendations outlined in the "Report of the Interdepartmental Committee for the Study of Jurisdiction Over Federal Areas Within the States." In its June 1961 "Report on State and Local Taxation of Privately Owned Property Located in Federal Areas: Proposed Amendment to the Buck Act," the Advisory Commission supported the retrocession of legislative jurisdiction in such areas to the States and indicated its approval of a similar bill then pending before the 86th Congress.

Hearings on S. 815 were held on August 20, 21, and 22. Some 20-odd witnesses testified, including Nicholas Katzenbach, Deputy Attorney General of the United States; Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah; Hon. Thomas B. Finan, attorney general of the State of Maryland; Edward J. Ennis, general counsel for the American Civil Liberties Union; Clarence Mitchell, director, Washington Bureau of the NAACP; and our Assistant Director on Taxation and Finance, Laszlo Ecker-Racz. Official reports from 19 governmental departments were received and made a part of the hearing record. Every witness, save one, and all reports and statements submitted for the record favored enactment of the bill. The final transcript of the hearings is now at the Printing Office. An executive session on this measure is scheduled for early next month. Although the Senate, as you know, enacted a similar measure on two previous occasions, I felt that since hearings had never been held, such proceedings were necessary to make a complete record on the bill. This we have done and we are now in position to weigh effectively the arguments of those who favor and those who fear this legislation.

The third major measure that concerns all of us is the latest to be introduced—S. 2114—which implements the Commission's June 1961 report, "Periodic Congressional Reassessment of Federal Grants-in-Aid to State and Local Governments." Twenty-nine other Senators joined with me in sponsoring this measure. Given the diverse geographic, ideological, and political backgrounds of these cosponsors, it would seem that this bill has an auspicious future. Hearings will definitely be held, although no specific time has been scheduled.

I wish to gratefully acknowledge the valuable assistance which the Commission has given us in these various legislative undertakings. My only regret is that the Commission has been unable to develop a report on the future disposition of Ellis Island that would meet with unanimous approval of all parties interested in this momentous intergovernmental relations problem.

In the realm of research and investigation, the subcommittee has engaged in various undertakings. We have studied and analyzed other congressional proposals and reports of the Advisory Commission so that they will get the careful consideration they deserve. In June, we joined with the distinguished chairman of the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman Fountain, to sponsor 3 days of joint hearings on the manifold problems confronting the governments in the New York metropolitan region. Inasmuch as both our subcommittees have been charged with the task of investigating and studying intergovernmental relations between the United States, the States, and municipalities, it was fitting that we should journey together to New York and examine the extraordinary intricate intergovernmental system that serves the 17 million citizens residing in that area. These hearings have just been printed and all of you soon will be in receipt of a copy. This is not the time or place to give my impressions of what we learned in New York except to note that I now believe more firmly than ever that the pressures generated by the emergence of a metropolitan America indeed constitute the most important single problem in the field of intergovernmental relations.

With a view toward procuring an expert analysis of the present condition of metropolitan planning in America, the Subcommittee contracted last June with the Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies for such a study. I understand their research has progressed quite favorably. During the summer months interviews were conducted in some 12 representative metropolitan areas possessing areawide planning agencies. The Center's staff is now in the process of analyzing this and other data relating to metropolitan planning. It is too soon to anticipate the kind of report we will receive in December. At the same time, we have been assured that facets of S. 855 in addition to more general problems relating to orderly metropolitan development will be examined in this study. Their final report should prove of interest to all of us.

Finally, the subcommittee has continued to process the questionnaire it distributed last year. With vigorous follow-up action, the number of responses was increased by more than 50 percent over the initial tally. The staff has updated the answers to the simple-response questions and is now completing the even more difficult task of tabulating and analyzing the 50-odd open-end questions that were not covered in our activities report last April. The final results of the entire questionnaire are now under final review by the subcommittee staff and a committee print containing our findings will be published sometime next month.

Such, in brief, is the broad outline of our legislative and research activities to date.

NEEDED REAPPRAISAL OF U.S. POLICY ON BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Wednesday, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], addressed the 89th annual convention of the American Bankers Association here.

In his address, the Senator from Virginia delivered an incisive analysis of our balance of payments deficit and the question of international liquidity. He pointed out that stopgap measures taken to relieve these problems are not sufficient, and do not really go to the heart of the matter.

Urging a searching reappraisal of U.S. balance-of-payments policies, Senator Robertson said that any sensible and sound approach must be accompanied by a reduction in military and economic spending abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOLLAR AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, Democrat, of Virginia, before the 89th annual convention of the American Bankers Association, Washington, D.C., October 9, 1963)

It is a great honor to participate with you in this celebration of the 100th anniversary of the National Currency Act and the dual banking system. The theme of your conference, "Progress Through Service—A Century of Commercial Banking," is focused on the future rather than on history. So I wish to discuss with you one of the most serious challenges facing the United States today—the balance of payments deficit and the question of international liquidity.

My conclusions are simple and easy to state. I am concerned that the administration so far, despite ingenious actions to borrow time and fend off crises, has emphasized short-term stopgaps without going to the roots of the payments problem. Second, we cannot allow the longer range question of a possible shortage of international liquidity to interfere with prompt and vigorous action to right the payments balance. Third, I agree generally with the administration's view, recently stated again only last week at the meetings of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, that the international liquidity question deserves the most careful and comprehensive study by Fund member governments. However, I am convinced further, that these studies should be undertaken immediately, and that they should also include comprehensive congressional studies.

Policy decisions on the balance of payments and the international monetary system involve high politics; they vitally affect the future of our vaunted free enterprise system, our foreign policy, our national defense, and our economic prosperity and stability. It is not enough for us to discover technical solutions in these areas. The ultimate issues are those of national goals and interests.

THE POSTWAR ERA

We have much cause for optimism in postwar trade and investment experience. The amazingly swift recovery of industrial Europe and Japan after World War II was helped much by the Marshall plan, and resulted in wholesale dismantling of exchange controls and other artificial barriers to trade and capital flows created by depression and war. Since 1950 the growth in world trade and investment has been unparalleled. And this Nation's part in that growth has been impressive.

Today, the dollar is the leading international currency. The United States is the world's largest exporter and importer of goods, services, and capital. U.S. banks and financial institutions have played a major role in achieving this result, and can continue to play such a role in the future.

A nation that has a key currency and is a world banker must have a sound monetary system, adequate credit facilities, and prudent fiscal and monetary policies. Otherwise, other nations are not going to be willing to hold its currency as part of their reserves or carry on trade and investment through its use. Our willingness to buy or sell gold at $35 per ounce is a key element of our monetary system. Also, we have the credit facilities. We have broad money and capital markets, a substantial and free foreign exchange market, and private financial institutions with world-wide correspondents, financial know-how, and the ability to move funds in large amounts from nation to nation quickly and cheaply.

This vast machinery for promoting economically sound growth of private world trade and investment is a powerful instrument to foster a free enterprise and market system throughout the world. American financial and business know-how is a great revolutionary force promoting peaceful world technological change; as such, it is part of the great historic American revolution of freedom. To foster increased freedom of movement in world trade and investment is and should continue as a long-range goal of national policy. In the seamless web of freedom, an open world market in goods and capital, no less than in ideas, promotes the historic values for which this country was founded and has always fought.

A nation that is a world banker must also maintain sound monetary and fiscal policies. Otherwise, foreign private and official holders of its currency—in other words, its creditors on short term—will anticipate inflationary declines in its value, exchange restrictions, or devaluation; will lose confidence; and will be less willing to hold it. This is where the United States faces a dilemma. A balance-of-payments deficit such as ours means either a loss of gold or a rise in holdings by foreigners of our currency. So the deficit adds to the pressure for sound monetary and fiscal policies. Now, the classic solution to a payments deficit is to tighten credit, reduce Government spending, and thus assure stability in the currency.

But the dilemma in today's wage and tax environment is that such policies may also tend to dampen economic production and increase unemployment, and that seems to many to be too high a price to pay.

Before commenting on the administration's payments policies, I should say a word or two about future prospects. There are many signs that world trade and investment can be entering an era of enhanced freedom that may match or outdo the "golden era" of mid-19th century Britain. First, there is the European Common Market and the 1958 return to free convertibility of European currencies. The Common Market has moved faster than expected toward European unity, not only in tariff policy but in mobility of workers, capital, supply of services, and business location. Since 1957 export trade between the Common Market countries and third countries has expanded faster than world trade. Second, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 allows the President to agree with other countries to reciprocal tariff cuts on broad classes of goods. The "Kennedy round" of such negotiations, set for the spring of 1964, may see both tariff and nontariff trade barriers reduced, despite the current "chicken battle" over tariffs on U.S. poultry exports to Europe. Finally, world trade and investment will be increased if only part of the ambitious plans of less developed nations to grow faster are realized.

The threat to higher world trade and investment totals, with all they could mean for enhanced living standards and the spread of free institutions, is the possibility that nations might retreat to the restrictive trade and exchange practices of the thirties. Splits between NATO allies, the attempt by a single European nation to turn the Common Market to its own aggrandizement, further inroads by the Communists, or marked failures of U.S. foreign policy could possibly trigger such a movement.

Failure to solve our payments problem, or a shortage of international liquidity that promotes instability or inhibits trade, would also increase that threat. In 1931 it was the failure of the Kredit Anstallt in Austria, producing excessive demands for sterling in London, that brought down the gold exchange standard and brought on the world's most severe depression in modern times. Such an event today if unchecked would also play havoc with the postwar European move to unity, the increased community of interests among Atlantic nations, and other constructive historical tendencies now at work. And it would play into the hands of our Communist enemies.

Today's gold exchange standard is still exposed to shocks of confidence. But it also has defenses against such shocks not available to London in the twenties, thanks to the recent work of central bankers and finance ministers of the Atlantic countries. The question that remains is whether this system of defenses built to fend off crises is also adequate to support the growing levels of trade and investment without some new method of providing borrowed reserves to countries with balance-of-payments deficits.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

It is no news that the United States is such a country. We have been lending long, and borrowing short. Our total asset position is strong; our assets abroad exceed foreign assets here by an estimated $28 billion. But we have had a balance-of-payments deficit for 12 of the last 13 years. Up to 1958, these deficits were no problem. They actually furnished the badly needed dollars to finance the expanding world trade I have described. But since 1958 we have lost gold faster, and the deficit has been a problem.

Over the 13-year period, the deficits have amounted to $26 billion. To finance them, we have sold about $8 billion of gold and foreigners have taken the rest in an $18 billion increase in their short-term liquid claims on us. The current gold stock of about $15.6 billion leaves less than $3.5 billion of free gold above the $12.2 billion required to back our money supply of currency and demand deposits. Claims of foreigners and international agencies on our gold now total nearly $25.5 billion.

Throughout this period, surplus after surplus of commercial exports of goods and services has not been big enough to cover the deficits of government and capital transactions. At first the administration predicted that the deficit would be erased by 1964. Now, it says the deficit has been reduced. But in fact there has been little improvement, if special Government transactions to improve the figures are excluded. On the contrary, this year so far has seen a sizable worsening of the deficit. And Secretary Dillon testified this summer before the Joint Economic Committee that even at a lower rate we cannot afford this imbalance for more than a year or two.

The administration appears to be relying on a recent Brookings Institution study for much of its optimism about the future improvement of the deficit. That study tried to forecast the deficit for 1968, based on assumptions in part given by the Council of Economic Advisers. The study was widely reported as concluding that by 1968 the basic balance will have moved into a surplus position.

However, a closer study of the report itself casts considerable doubt upon this interpretation. In the first place, the authors emphasized that their forecasts were no more than highly speculative guesses. Second, they left out of their definition of "basic" balance all short-term capital flows, which have been averaging $1.2 billion in the last 3 years. Third, the assumptions used in the study are open to question.

The President's July 18 statement of administration policy places major reliance on increased short-term interest rates and a further exports expansion drive. The tax cut is counted on to prevent output and employment from suffering. The impact on the balance of payments of military and foreign aid spending is to be further reduced. More military assets abroad are to be sold, and more military aid funds are to require purchases in the United States, even at prices up to 50 percent higher than those abroad.

More and more foreign economic aid spending is to be tied to U.S. purchases. And private capital outflows are to be checked by a proposed new tax on foreign securities sales.

In my opinion, these measures ease without curing. I am convinced that our balance-of-payments policies require searching reappraisal. They should be accompanied by an equally searching reappraisal of Government spending policies which will, in the current fiscal year, reach an all-time high and include new programs with "escalator clauses." The two are intimately related. To avoid a needed rethinking of Government spending policies at home, we are letting the balance-of-payments problem push us away from freedom of trade and investment, away from private enterprise in world trade, toward more Government in foreign economic affairs, and towards more tying of private exports to Government spending abroad, with all the dangers this may bring. Already, instead of reducing Government spending abroad to the minimum, we plan to tax private investment abroad. And already, the administrator of foreign aid is arguing that we can't cut foreign aid because that will reduce our exports.

In March of this year on the floor of the Senate I urged a reexamination of the Government's foreign spending. I proposed a cut in defense spending requests of $1.2 billion, including withdrawal of a division of U.S. troops from Europe. And I proposed a cut in foreign aid spending requests of $1.8 billion. As I said earlier, pressing problems of priority lie at the bottom of the payments question. Despite the skillful innovations of Federal Reserve and Treasury technicians in arranging our debts abroad to cut down the drain on our gold stock and defend us against crises, these defenses are not impregnable and do nothing in themselves to answer the pressing questions of policy we face.

Take exports, for example, where our promotion campaign has had few concrete results. There is a long list of possible measures. These include cuts in ocean freight rates and export taxes, restudy of our antitrust laws regarding exporters, and increased technical assistance. There is a vast area of nontariff restrictions on trade to negotiate away. There are the restrictions on tourist spending by our trading partners which prevent travel here. It is time to urge and help Europe to develop its own capital markets.

Government spending, indeed, is the link between the balance of payments and domestic prosperity. As I said in March, a tax cut is long overdue, if it goes along with more restraint in Government spending. The administration argues that "more after-tax money means more buying power for consumers and investors." But this is true only if that money retains its value. What boots it to grant a tax cut of $11 billion now, and then to turn around and borrow it back, and possibly more, through budget deficits? Cuts in Government spending would yield the same after-tax money.

THE QUESTION OF INTERNATIONAL LIQUIDITY

The Brookings Institution study of the balance of payments in 1968 also looked ahead to ask whether the international payments system is adequate to permit continued economic growth and world trade and investment expansion. The study concluded that unless fundamental changes are made, a shortage of international reserves will choke off that growth.

This question is so important that I must ask you to bear with me while I give you some figures to illustrate it. The Brookings study expects world trade to grow by 35 percent from 1961 to 1968, which is not unreasonable, since it is less than the 50 percent increase during a comparable period during the 1950's. The study expects payments imbalances—swings into surplus or deficits by particular nations—to grow in about the same proportions as the overall growth in world trade.

Now, at the end of 1961, the monetary gold stocks and foreign exchange reserves of central banks and governments stood at $61.2 billion. To support the expected growth in trade, and in the swings of trade, the world's gold and foreign exchange reserves, according to the study, must be increased by more than $21 billion. In other words, by 1968, total gold and foreign exchange reserves would have to amount to about $83 billion. However, by 1968 extra gold supplies from new gold production will add not more than about $5 billion. And if the United States solves its payments problems, U.S. dollar deficits will supply only about $3 billion more. In other words, by 1968 the world will be short by $13–$14 billion of the $83 billion of gold and foreign exchange reserves needed. The world will face a money squeeze.

The Brookings study concludes that our payments deficit is not the principal problem we face; rather the problem is "the basic inadequacy of the international monetary mechanism in relation to the requirements of the free world."

The Brookings study favors setting up a new super central bank, with its own new currency unit which the bank would create and lend to various countries, giving them plenty of time to finance protracted deficits in their balances of payments. The dollar as an international standard of value would be abandoned. The new super central bank with powers of money issue would replace the dollar as the free world international reserve.

As a close student of banking and currency, who for 30 years has been responsible to the American people and the U.S. Constitution to pass on grants of power in this vital field, I want you to know that I would approach any such scheme with the most extreme caution. And I would urge upon my colleagues in the Senate, both present and future, that they do so as well, in the interest of safeguarding the future soundness and and prosperity of the American economy and the welfare of the people.

The first grave danger of such schemes is that they have a worldwide inflationary bias. The second is that they bargain away part of this Nation's sovereignty over the money power, granted to the Congress in the Constitution, and would hand it over to a new breed of international central banker.

I disagree flatly with the Brookings study conclusion that "the present problem is not primarily a balance-of-payments problem." Just how would it promote our national interest for a superbank to give us the means to go on running Government budget deficits in periods of prosperity such as the present—and to go on running a payments deficit without giving any more thought to expanding our exports, keeping our wages and prices in line with competitors, and insisting with our European friends that they reduce their own trade restrictions, and share more of our common defense and aid burden? How could such an institution as a superbank resist becoming an engine of inflation under the combined pressure of some future allied nations bent upon some future schemes of aggrandizement? I am glad the President made clear both in his July 18 statement and last week before the Fund the sharp separation between our payments problem and the liquidity question.

Then we come to the question of sovereignty. We are living today in a world where General de Gaulle, for example, envisions a "Europe of nations," opposes the transfer of national sovereignty to supranational institutions, opposes the idea of Atlantic partnership, and seems to seek to turn the Common Market to the ends of France. Some observers have called this "a tragic betrayal of the most creative enterprise since World War II." However we view De Gaulle's objectives, we must face the fact of his ideas and actions. Can we seriously imagine that some grandiose world economic conference could achieve success in dealing with the international monetary system by creating a new superbank under these circumstances?

Having said all this, however, I want to make it crystal clear that we cannot afford to jeopardize the future prospect of moving forward in world trade and investment by neglecting the international liquidity question. This is why I favor immediate study of the question by the member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

Furthermore, I am convinced that comprehensive studies of this question should be undertaken by the Congress.

Such studies should explore fully the size and nature of possible liquidity shortages and should carefully appraise all the alternatives for dealing with them. Moreover, in my opinion, the Congress needs to appraise the experience of free world central bankers in their growing practice of continuous and informal consultation and collaboration.

We all remember Clemenceau's famous quip, that war "is too serious a matter to be left to the military." We may paraphrase it to say that our monetary system is too serious a matter to be left to economists and central bankers. This in no way derogates the splendid technical work of the Treasury and Federal Reserve experts who have led the way in building defenses for our gold and dollar exchange standard. But if we are to gain and keep the understanding and support of the Congress and the American public of new developments and problems in this difficult but vital field, questions of policy and national sovereignty require the most thorough and comprehensive airing before action is taken. Certainly the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has a vital interest in this entire area and will follow developments in it with the keenest concern. I urge upon American bankers a similar interest and concern.

A NEW APPROACH TO CAMPAIGN FINANCES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Dr. George Alexander Heard, recently inaugurated as chancellor of Vanderbilt University, is one of this Nation's truly distinguished political scientists.

Last Sunday, in an enlightening and provocative article in the New York Times magazine, Professor Heard analyzed our irrational campaign financing processes and provided us with a clear blueprint for realistic campaign financing reform.

Because of Professor Heard's status as a political scientist and, in particular, because of his distinguished service as Chairman of the President's Commission on Campaign Costs, his views on this subject are entitled to great respect. I was particularly gratified to note Professor Heard's support not only for contributions but also for a matching incentives plan for Federal aid as embodied in S. 1595:

> When he sent up his tax proposals this year, the President hinted that he might be looking for an additional approach. He called attention to a matching incentive plan that had been mentioned but not recommended in the report of the Commission. Senators Maurine Neuberger (Democrat)

and CLIFFORD CASE (Republican) subsequently embodied such a plan in a bill they introduced in Congress.

Under a matching incentive plan, small contributions raised from the public by approved political committees would be deposited with the U.S. Treasury. There they would be matched by an equal amount from Federal revenues and the combined total made available to the commiteee making the original deposit. The money would be used only to meet approved expenses, payments being made by Government checks direct to the providers of the goods or services.

Limited to small gifts of perhaps $10 per person per year, the plan would spur party fund-raising by insuring that the amount of money the parties received would still be determined by the number of voluntary contributions they succeeded in attracting. Payment by Federal check would also make sure the money got where it was supposed to go. The safeguards built into Government fiscal operations—and the unusual scrutiny to which these funds would be subjected—would prevent any partisan administration of the system.

Further advantages are that Congress could limit the amount of money to be matched and control the uses to which it was put. The scheme would not restrict the parties' freedom to raise and spend other moneys, however, nor would it prevent individuals from contributing as much as they do now. And the plan could also be used to aid candidates for other offices besides President—an advantage that might increase its acceptability in Congress.

The matching incentives plan and other election reforms are needed now, but Professor Heard makes it quite clear we are not going to get them unless and until we recognize the hazards to democratic institutions inherent in the present incoherent system of election financing.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Heard be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW APPROACH TO CAMPAIGN FINANCES

(By Alexander Heard)

President Kennedy has again asked Congress for legislation to encourage private donations to presidential election campaigns. He wants to give political contributors a break with their income taxes by making gifts of up to $500 a year to a presidential campaign deductible from taxable income. (This concession is like that a taxpayer now gets when he gives to educational and religious causes.) As an alternative, contributors, like those who do not itemize their deductions, would be permitted to take a tax credit—to be subtracted from the amount of tax owed—of one-half the total of their political gifts up to a maximum credit of $10 per year.

Although attitudes on Capitol Hill are discouraging, the favorable editorial comment these proposals evoked and Mr. Kennedy's persistence with them are proof that the problem they were designed to meet is still very much alive.

Raising campaign funds has been a pressing difficulty for generations, but it assumed new dimensions in 1960 when expenditures reported by Democratic and Republican national campaign groups rose 55 percent over the total recorded 4 years before. Most telling of all, nearly one-fourth of the $20 million spent in 1960 had to be put on the cuff. At the end of the campaign, the Republicans owed $700,000 and the Democrats an unprecedented $3,820,000.

The burden of raising such sums weighs heavily on the political parties and the methods they use are often open to serious objections. They must rely, for example, on individuals and organizations with special political interests for large amounts of cash.

In setting up a bipartisan Presidential Commission on Campaign Costs in 1961 to recommend appropriate legislation, President Kennedy again expressed his conviction that "it is not healthy for the democratic process—or for the ethical standards in our Government—to keep our national candidate in [the present] condition of dependence." Other recent presidential candidates agree with him. Messrs. Dewey, Eisenhower, Nixon, Stevenson, and Truman all endorsed the Commission's unanimous 12-point report, which recommended, among other measures, tax incentives of the kind Mr. Kennedy has been trying to get Congress to introduce. (Both national party chairmen gave the report their blessing, too.)

They are all concerned about the ways presidential campaign funds are collected—and procedures have changed markedly in recent decades. Today, there are five main methods:

1. Fundraising dinners: First used systematically in the 1930's, they are now the rage. The cash-and-calorie circuit, as someone called it, yields huge profits for both parties. During his first 2 years in office, President Kennedy attended 21 fundraising affairs that grossed around $9,200,000. They included two $1,000-per-plate dinners and one $1,000-per-person cocktail party ("one grand drink") along with a flock of $100 meals and two lucrative Washington "galas" featuring Democratic faithful from the entertainment world. Republicans have reaped hefty yields from banquets held simultaneously across the country and linked by closed-circuit television. In 1960, they grossed $7,700,000 from two such sets of dinners alone.

2. Gift solicitations: These are normally conducted by Republicans with all the paraphernalia of a United Giving drive (in this, they are traditionally more thorough than their rivals). Although both parties welcome small contributions, gifts of $500 or more ordinarily account for two-thirds of the income received by national campaign groups from individual givers.

3. Sustaining funds: Both national committees are trying to build up a dependable income from regular $10 donations. Since 1957, the Democrats have persevered with mail solicitations that now bring in about $500,000 a year. The Republicans, beginning last year, attracted around $700,000, but neither party has enough of these "dues-paying members" to meet the cost of even routine operations between elections.

4. Collections by other groups: Many organizations support the party of their choice with cash contributions—labor organizations, for example, being especially helpful with Democratic party finances.

5. Quotas: These are assigned by national party committees to State party committees, who proceed to raise money in various ways and pass some of it up the line. The quota system is important because it establishes the dependence of national campaign activities on State and local fundraising, which, in recent years, has paid from one-third to more than one-half the cost of national operations.

As a result of these prevailing practices, Presidents and presidential candidates grow dependent on persons who can come up with large sums of money—either their own or from others. George E. Allen once noted that few American politicians are corruptible for a lesser favor than votes, but while this is true, providers of campaign funds can usually command ready access to public officials. This in itself can constitute a powerful asset in the tigerish competition of American politics and even a President or his associates might one day find it easier to say "yes" than to frustrate a faithful supporter.

The problem also exists in State and local elections. For decades, Senators and Congressmen have tried, without success, to introduce reforms in their own election finances. Outcries in the press are heard from time to time, as they were after the revelation earlier this year that John A. O'Donnell has made campaign gifts to Members of Congress while lobbying for the Philippine war-claims legislation, but Congress has done nothing either to improve its own campaign financing or to tackle the problem of presidential election funds. It ignores even the authoritative, bipartisan recommendations from the best qualified source of all—the candidates, all of them, who have run for President on both party tickets since World War II. Why?

Congressional inaction stems from three different roots. In the first place, most politicians and special-interest groups operating successfully under existing conditions naturally do not want to see them changed. Under the President's plan, campaign contributions, to be eligible for income-tax deduction or credit, would have to be made to the national committee of a party whose presidential candidate appeared on the ballot in at least 10 States or to a State committee designated by the national committee, one in each State. Many State and local politicians see this as a threat to the present distribution of political power.

They usually oppose moves that might substantially increase the fund-raising ability of national committees at their own expense, and they usually oppose steps that might centralize control over party funds—and the tax-incentive proposals threaten to do both.

The lack of positive support from labor leaders for the President's tax incentives may be because contributions to labor political committees would not be eligible for such benefits. And if the money-raising capacity of the parties is improved, the relative importance of labor's help to Democratic candidates could diminish, thus weakening its tactical position. Some leaders of volunteer political committees which campaign alongside the regular party committees are also wary of any move that might strengthen the official organization—as are those unhappy about the leadership given their party.

Opponents of the tax-deduction proposal, moreover, point out that well-to-do contributors would gain an unfair advantage. Given the graduated income tax, the net cost of a political gift would go down as the taxpayer's income went up. In contrast, people with smaller incomes taking a standard tax deduction would gain no benefit at all. On the other hand, opponents of a tax credit fear it would give a powerful weapon to leaders of mass organizations who could use it to dragoon their followers into making campaign contributions. In both cases, the threat of a shift in political power is sensed.

The second cause of congressional inaction lies in the fact that even when the necessity for reform is conceded—or cannot be ignored—the means of reform prove to be controversial.

For example, some persons who share the President's desire to reform campaign finance are opposed to cluttering up the tax structure further with yet another deduction and credit. Moreover, there are still those who believe that taxation should be used solely to raise revenue and not as a tool of social or political reform. Others object because they view the diversion of taxes as contributing to a greater Federal deficit, or because they are opposed in principle to an indirect Federal subsidy of campaign expenditures.

The third main source of legislative inertia is the lack of political sex appeal in the whole issue of campaign finance. There is little popular concern and few political activists in or out of Congress feel that their interests are sufficiently affected to make them push for public support of reform. It is, therefore, both commendable and courageous of President Kennedy to take a determined initiative in this lonely sphere. He is the only President in recent history to concern himself seriously with the matter.

For those seeking change, the solution obviously has to be sought at two levels: First, wider public understanding and interest must be awakened, and second, the search must continue for legislative proposals that will accomplish the desired objectives with the least opposition. Of the two, the first is more important, but it depends in part on what the President does about the second. If his present recommendations founder, where can he turn?

Most of the proposals advanced in recent years fall under five general headings: cutting campaign costs; improving party soliciting; introducing bipartisan and nonpartisan fundraising; and adopting indirect or direct, government subsidies.

To reduce costs by significantly shortening the presidential campaign is impractical. On the other hand, increased free broadcast time, such as the candidates enjoyed in 1960, would lighten the financial burden appreciably. (About $4,500,000 in free network time was given to candidates for all offices that year.)

The parties can obviously do much to improve their own solicitation campaigns. Also, anything that enhances the idea of political giving as a civic duty is obviously desirable. Placing collection boxes at supermarket checkout counters seems to be one of the specific suggestions.

Nonpartisan and bipartisan fundraising plans take various forms. Some industrial concerns encourage their employees to give to the party of their choice by arranging automatic deduction from wages. The Internal Revenue Service, following a recommendation from the Commission on Campaign Costs, ruled last year that certain expenditures for impartial political activities of equal benefit to both parties (TV debates, for example) can be deducted as a business expense. A nonpartisan foundation has been proposed that would receive tax-deductible contributions and use the money to inform the electorate about campaign issues and personalities.

Most discussed of all the proposals in recent years have been those for indirect or direct Government subsidy, partly, perhaps, because ample precedent for both can be found in the States and in foreign democratic nations. The direct subsidies suggested have ranged from outright payments of cash to the parties (Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Harry Truman) to the provision of federally financed campaign services—broadcast time, postal mailings, transportation, and so on.

The objections include many of those already prompted by the idea of tax incentives—an indirect subsidy—but there are others as well. Some argue that to ease financial burdens in this fashion would lead to less popular participation in party affairs. The need to get out and scramble for funds and the general atmosphere of financial strain surrounding campaign operations contribute, it is said, to a more meaningful involvement of ordinary citizens in the parties. If adequate funds were assured from outside, party bureaucracies might develop that would be impervious to the wishes of the rank and file—rich and poor alike. In addition, opponents claim that public money would not get where it was supposed to go, and that the party in power would surely be favored.

When he sent up his tax proposals this year, the President hinted that he might be looking for an additional approach. He called attention to a "matching-incentive" plan that had been mentioned but not recommended in the report of the Commission. Senators MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, and CLIFFORD CASE, Republican, subsequently embodied such a plan in a bill they introduced in Congress.

Under a matching-incentive plan, small contributions raised from the public by approved political committees would be deposited with the U.S. Treasury. There they would be matched by an equal amount from Federal revenues and the combined total made available to the committee making the original deposit. The money would be used only to meet approved expenses, payments being made by Government checks direct to the providers of the goods or services.

Limited to small gifts of perhaps $10 per person per year, the plan would spur party fund-raising by insuring that the amount of money the parties received would still be determined by the number of voluntary contributions they succeeded in attracting. Payment by Federal check would also make sure the money got where it was supposed to go. The safeguards built into Government fiscal operations—and the unusual scrutiny to which these funds would be subjected—would prevent any partisan administration of the system.

Further advantages are that Congress could limit the amount of money to be matched and control the uses to which it was put. The scheme would not restrict the parties' freedom to raise and spend other moneys, however, nor would it prevent individuals from contributing as much as they do now. And the plan could also be used to aid candidates for other offices besides President—an advantage that might increase its acceptability in Congress.

For any congressional action to result, however, public concern must first be aroused; a persistent political education program is necessary. A few individuals and organizations, like the Citizens' Research Foundation in Princeton and the American Heritage Foundation in New York, have been working on this problem for years, but more is needed. The President's Commission on Campaign Costs recommended that Mr. Kennedy call a White House conference on campaign finance to focus attention on the problem and to consider solutions. It seems clear that until the campaign is stepped up to reach a wider audience through many channels of public education and information, the sponsors of legislative change will get nowhere.

DEMOCRACY AND NOT A MILITARY DICTATORSHIP IS THE ANSWER TO COMMUNISM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it was gratifying to hear President Kennedy state unqualifiedly at his press conference yesterday that there would be no recognition of the usurping juntas in either the Dominican Republic or Honduras. Only by adhering to this policy firmly and irrevocably and insisting that these governments restore the constitutional and democratic processes which they overthrew will it be possible to carry out the purposes of the Alliance. Moreover, unless we achieve this result U.S. prestige and influence in Latin America will sink to a new low.

I have received a copy of a statement which I understand has been sent to every Member of the Senate, to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, to all the Latin American Ambassadors, and others, from a very knowledgeable citizen, Fritz W. Ellis, who states very clearly what the situation is and what our attitude must be in regard to the Dominican Republic and Latin America. And quite rightly he concludes that "democracy, and not a military dictatorship is the answer to communism." I ask unanimous consent that this statement, which is in the form of a letter addressed to President Kennedy, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MURRAY, UTAH,
October 5, 1963.

Re Dominican Republic.
Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am an American citizen; however, I have lived a good part of my life in Latin America, and I am bilingual, being equally fluent in Spanish as in English. I was last in Central America about 3 years ago, where I was engaged in geologic exploration for a well-known American mining firm. I consider myself well informed on Dominican affairs, past and present, because of family and friends living there who were active in the deposed government of Juan Bosch. I know how the vast majority in Latin America think, and their voice is seldom heard.

If the military clique in the Dominican Republic appeared to be rash, and flagrantly flaunted their arrogant and insolent disdain of world opinion, to say nothing of the utter contempt for their country and people, it was only because they were positive that Washington would look upon them with favorable eyes. Had they thought otherwise, they never would have dared to court Washington's wrath. And why should they assume our Government would be happy over their brutal rape of that most unfortunate of nations? Simply because in the past, our policy has been not only to favor and encourage ruthless military dictatorships, but in many cases finance them from beginning to end. The Dominican Republic is a perfect example. The Trujillo era, which lasted 32 years and was the most sadistically cruel regime in all of Latin America's history, certainly had the blessing of Washington and Rome (receiving decorations from both), till the very bitter end, when Trujillo became such a source of embarrassment to us that he had to be done away with. The present military hierarchy and bosses of the Dominican Republic are the very ones whom Trujillo relied on to carry out his horrendous crimes. Those butchers, who for fear of their own lives lest in a democratic government the people one day would choose to call them to account for their many crimes, were positive of receiving a hearty welcome and congratulatory embrace from Washington, because that's the way it's always been in the past. Certainly the majority of the U.S. press was unjustly critical of Juan Bosch, and more anxious to print all the lies and misrepresentations of facts than they were to print the truth. Weren't these all "go ahead" signs for the usurpers of the Dominican Republic to again continue their systematic parasitic looting of the poor nation which for once in a lifetime finally not only achieved a free and democratic election, but had as its leader a truly great lover of democracy and of his fellow men?

The Dominican Republic, for 7 months, traversed from the ridiculous to the sublime; from a government of corrupt swine to the epitome of democratic beauty and freedom. The Trujillo regime broke the back of a long abused people. President Bosch's government was in the process of restoring his people's dignity and manhood. The Trujillo clique robbed, killed, and filled the jails. Bosch allowed no graft, nor injustice nor persecutions of any kind, and his dedicated aim in life was and is to rebuild his nation, educate his people, and free his country through the process of true democracy. Once again martial law is the order of the day. Once again the jails are full. Again graft and corruption are standard operational procedures. Once again the red herring of communism is used as bait in hopes of blinding the American public and to secure American recognition and help. Once again, are we in the United States going to sit idly by and watch our last hope for saving Latin America, perish for all time?

To most in the United States, the fate of the little Dominican Republic is just another Latin American revolution. The ideal situation would of course be that we in the United States not only be fully aware of these matters, but that we take an active interest and rise with indignation when ever one of our smaller neighbors and brethren is cruelly abused. The important point, however, is not what the average American thinks. What is vitally important is what the average Latin American thinks and knows. Because of our past performances in south of the border Nations, Latin Americans no longer give us the benefit of any doubt. To the overwhelming majority there is no question but that we again had our finger in the pie. To this vast majority, the Alliance for Progress means that the rich politicians and the military get richer and stronger, and the poor become more oppressed. How many Cubas do we need to wake up to reality? Why are we so hesitant in action? Is it by any chance, as all Latin America is saying, that we are waiting to see if the Dominican affair quiets down a bit, so that we can then recognize them and continue our financial help? Because if that is so, then truly we are doomed as a nation * * * then to all of Latin America the Statute of Liberty will no longer imply freedom and democracy, but rather a symbol of infamy and deception and complicity in crime. For when we allow the parasites of this world to unlawfully overthrow men like Juan Bosch on the pretext of being soft on Commies, and in turn permit the little groups of disgusting swine to appear as the so-called champions of freedom and democracy, we then are identifying ourselves and cooperating with those forces which oppress and destroy. If what we call "democracy" is to Latin America, oppression, and what we call communism seems to them their only source of freedom, it then follows logically that communism will easily triumph.

We must show the world, and especially to Latin America, our unequivocal indignation, and our eager desire to help the righteous. We must take sanctions against the usurpers of democracy. We must refuse all help to the military in the Dominican Republic, and use all of our influence and power with the rest of Latin America and the world, to bring about the downfall of the militarists and the lawful restoration of President Juan Bosch, or, let us make no mistake about it, the Dominican Republic will ultimately and in a short time become a communistic nation.

We once said that the Dominican Republic was going to be our showcase for Latin America, and proof of the practicality of the Alliance for Progress and of the democratic process of government. The time is running short for us, and we are losing all opportunities in which to make amends. We cannot afford to sit idly by any longer and permit military takeovers. Neither will the laws of nature allow us to go unpunished for our negative reaction. For democracy, and not a military dictatorship, is the only answer to communism. We must act now.

Most respectfully and sincerely yours,
FRITZ W. ELLIS.

PULASKI DAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, tomorrow America celebrates the anniversary of the heroic death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Polish patriot and American Revolutionary soldier. In 1777, Pulaski came to America, at age 29, already an experienced leader of the rebellion against foreign domination of Poland. His dedication to freedom led him to enlist in George Washington's army "to hazard all for the freedom of America." As a leader of this Nation's first cavalry, General Pulaski distinguished himself by his gallantry and his devotion. After courageous service at Brandywine and a score of other bloody battlefields, this brave man fell mortally wounded while leading a cavalry charge during the seige of Savannah.

Pulaski's bravery and his service to the cause of freedom in his native Poland and in America have fully earned the tributes paid to his memory by generations of Poles and Americans. His example of gallantry and perseverance in the face of difficulty and defeat has been an inspiration. One hundred and eighty-four years have passed since General Pulaski's heroic death, yet his strength and conviction live on. They live on here in America.

My visit to Poland in 1962 showed me that courage and faith are as alive in Poland today as they were in the 18th century. Communist domination by their leaders cannot suppress the desire for freedom which burns within the hearts and souls of the Polish people.

We in the United States have a continuing obligation to the people of Poland. We must keep open the channels of cultural, scientific, and educational exchange between our peoples. We must support current programs of U.S. aid which benefits the people of Poland. And we must continue to let it be known that our best efforts will be used to increase freedom among the Polish people.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski sacrificed his life for freedom during the American Revolution. His life and death provide men and women throughout the world with inspiration and courage in our modern struggles—for independence, for personal liberty, for human dignity, for all.

Mr. President, I believe the significance of this day stands out clearly for all of us here in the Senate and for all Americans.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM P. WILSON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the National Guard Association of the United States, meeting in its annual convention in Philadelphia, Pa., this week honored a distinguished Mississippi soldier.

The association awarded its rare Distinguished Service Medal to Maj. Gen. William P. (Pat) Wilson, the Adjutant General of Mississippi.

The award and the accompanying citation praised General Wilson for his long years of performance of "exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service" as a member of the National Guard for 44 years.

It has been my distinct pleasure to know Pat Wilson for nearly 40 years. We attended Mississippi State University together, and I have known him as a man of sterling character, patriotic devotion to duty, his God, his country, and fellow man.

For nearly a half century, this outstanding officer has been an inspiration and a leader to officers and enlisted personnel of all ranks. I think this recognition by the National Guard Association is a well-deserved honor, and I am most happy to add my sincere congratulations to General Wilson and to share this recognition with my fellow Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached newspaper account of General Wilson's career, printed in the Clarion-Ledger of Jackson, Miss., on October 6, 1963, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL WILSON GIVEN GUARD'S TOP AWARD

The National Guard Association of the United States has awarded its rare Distinguished Service Medal to Maj. Gen. W. P. Wilson, of Jackson, Mississippi's adjutant general.

The medal was presented by Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, chief of staff of the New Jersey National Guard and newly elected president of the association, this week in Philadelphia, Pa.

The ceremony was part of the annual States dinner of the association with representatives of all 50 States in attendance.

A citation accompanying the medal praised General Wilson for performing "exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service" as a member of the Mississippi National Guard, the U.S. Army National Guard, and the Guard Association for more than 44 years.

General Wilson, a former schoolteacher and football coach, has been Mississippi adjutant general since 1947 and has been credited with reorganizing it following its Federal service throughout World War II.

He has been associated with the military since 1918 when he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in infantry.

He returned to the National Guard following World War I service and became a captain in field artillery in 1933.

He went into Federal service in 1940 as a major and as battalion supply officer of the 114th Field Artillery of the 31st Division.

SEES ACTION

Wilson participated in military campaigns of North Africa, Italy, France, Germany, and Austria as a lieutenant colonel and commander of the 932d Field Artillery Battalion.

He was wounded and captured on May 5, 1945, and returned to the United States the following August.

He was promoted from colonel to brigadier general when he became adjutant general in 1947 and was raised to major general 3 years later.

The citation noted that he participated with distinction and rendered invaluable service to the National Guard Association as a member of several committees and its executive council.

PEARL HARBOR NAVAL SHIPYARD SAFETY RECORD

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is a matter of great pride for me to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which recently appeared in the Pearl Harbor Shipyard Log, noting the fact that the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard has attained first place in industrial safety among all naval shipyards. This is a record that merits high praise and recognition for the more than 10,600 civilian employees at Pearl Harbor Shipyard and support facilities in Hawaii. These are the men and women who maintain Pearl Harbor Naval Base as the hub of our farflung naval forces in Asia and the Pacific—the first line of our defense in this vast ocean.

In my statement before the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee last June, I paid the following tribute to the civilian personnel of Pearl Harbor Shipyard:

> They are as fine and efficient a team as anywhere in the Nation. They take great pride in their work. They take great pride in working at Pearl Harbor. As one who worked as a supply clerk at Pearl Harbor, I can speak from personal knowledge on this. I well recall the old E-flag flying over the base during World War II attesting to the high standards of efficiency and effort of these employees. Such loyalty and efficiency and devotion to duty still exist at Pearl Harbor.

Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard employees worked more than 3 million man-hours without a disabling injury. This is a notable record, notwithstanding the fact that a disabling injury occurred at the shipyard on October 1, ending 130 consecutive safe days.

The safety record at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard attests to the efficiency and productivity of the work force there. It reinforces all the words of praise that have been uttered over the years for the outstanding job that has been and is being performed at that shipyard.

I ask unanimous consent that the article titled "Pearl's Safety Record Tops Among All Naval Shipyards," which appeared in the October 4, 1963, issue of the Pearl Harbor Shipyard Log, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEARL'S SAFETY RECORD TOPS AMONG ALL NAVAL SHIPYARDS

Working more than 3 million man-hours—130 consecutive days—without a disabling injury boosted Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard to first place in industrial safety among all naval shipyards.

Pearl Harbor's leadership in the field of safety extends back over the past 5 years, during which the shipyard worked 44 million man-hours with a disabling injury frequency rate of only one disabling injury per million man-hours.

The frequency rates of the Navy's 10 other shipyards for the same 5 years range from 1.1 to 6 disabling injuries per million man-hours, thus making Pearl the safest shipyard in the Nation.

Records of disabling injuries and man-hours, adjusted monthly by all naval shipyards in accordance with their accident experience, are used to determine how well each shipyard's safety program is working. Pearl's present stretch of 3,141,200 accident-free man-hours speaks well for the shipyard's program.

Commenting on the shipyard's current record, Safety Superintendent John Clement said, "There are both optimistic and pessimistic views regarding such long periods of safety in a shipyard. Our past shows that, on the average, 1 man will be disabled for every million man-hours worked, yet we are now well over 3 million safe man-hours. From a statistical point of view, therefore, chances are that a bad accident will occur soon.

"On the brighter side is the proven fact that this shipyard can work 3 million man-hours without a disabling injury, and there is no real reason why we can't start today and work another safe 3 million. In reality, the sensible approach is for everyone to remember safety and practice it to the best of his ability, every minute and every hour of every day."

WYOMING'S COLORFUL HISTORY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as we are constantly reminded by the daily drama that unfolds on our television screen, Wyoming has a colorful history in the finest tradition of the "Wild West."

Along with the efforts of our entertainment media to make that history more exciting than it often was, we have the more realistic accomplishments of the National Park Service to preserve some of the historical landmarks of the West so that today's citizen can obtain an idea of life as it really was on the old frontier.

Such is the case at Fort Laramie, Wyo. There the Park Service, aided by the generosity of Mrs. Charles Hill of Denver, is refurbishing an historic frontier post.

Mr. President, an article describing the restoration process appeared in the September 15 issue of the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING SHRINE RECALLS ERA OF INDIAN WARS

(By Robert Pearman)

FORT LARAMIE, WYO.—The sounds of the hammer and the saw, heard almost daily, are reminders that they are busily engaged in rebuilding "Old Bedlam." The building, the two-story officers' quarters at old Fort Laramie, was given its name in recognition of the nightly uproar created by its occupants in the era of the Indian wars.

"Old Bedlam" is being restored to the way it was on Christmas night, 1866, when a half-frozen, half-starved civilian, John Phillips, interrupted a festive party with the news of a massacre.

Phillips, a miner, had ridden 4 days and 236 miles through raging blizzards and hostile Indians to bring word that Col. William Fetterman had led 80 men to their deaths at Fort Phil Kearny on December 21. The horse Phillips rode collapsed and died from exhaustion, but Phillips lived to receive a $300 payment for delivering the message requesting troops to relieve the beleaguered outpost on the Bozeman Trail.

"Old Bedlam" is situated on the Fort Laramie National Historic Site. The site is 3 miles southwest of the town of Fort Laramie in southeastern Wyoming.

RESTORATION MEASURES

Old Bedlam was near collapse when Fort Laramie came under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service in 1938. Some restoration measures were taken in the 1940's, and the full-scale restoration prorgam, begun in 1961, should be completed this year.

Built from pine timbers cut near the post, Old Bedlam bears some resemblance to a southern plantation house in that it has wide verandas and pillared porches. Wooden pegs hold the main beams in place, and nails were used only for the siding and shingles.

Two mountain men, William L. Sublette and Robert Campbell, established Fort Laramie in 1834 and named it Fort William in honor of Sublette. In the next few years, the outpost changed hands and names, as ownership was shuffled among the fur traders, including Jim Bridger and Tom Fitzpatrick.

Before it was purchased by the Government in 1849, Fort Laramie had already played host to a colorful assemblage of American traders, trappers, Indians, and French-Canadians. The adobe walls of the fort were a welcome sight to the weary emigrants bound for a place called Oregon.

Between 1843 and 1863, about 200,000 emigrants stopped here. Also, the first band of Mormons, led by Brigham Young, rested at Fort Laramie on their way to Salt Lake Valley. Too, the fort was a division point on the stagecoach line and a relay station for the Pony Express.

The abandonment of the crumbling adobe structures and the erection of new buildings followed the purchase of the fort by the Government in 1849.

When the fort was abandoned as a military post in 1890, the soldiers left 65 structures, most of which were auctioned to homesteaders at bargain prices.

ORIGINAL BUILDINGS

Eleven original structures, all of which are being restored by the National Park Service, can still be seen at Fort Laramie, where the standing ruins of 10 others and the outlines of many more are readily discernible. Old Bedlam, the magazine, and the ruins of the original guardhouse all date from 1849-52. Also preserved are the cavalry barracks, the commissary warehouse, three officers' quarters of the 1870-84 period and a guardhouse used in the fort's last years.

The effort to save Fort Laramie began in 1930. In 1937, the State purchased the site and donated it to the Federal Government. It was proclaimed a national monument in 1938 and redesigned a national historic site in 1960.

The fort is open the year around without charge. Attendance has grown steadily from 35,600 in 1958 to 63,600 last year.

Mrs. Charles S. Hill of Denver, whose grandmother crossed the plains in a covered wagon and stopped at Fort Laramie in 1859, agreed 4 years ago to endow the National Park Service with the funds to refurnish nine buildings at the fort. Under this project, three buildings already have been refurnished and opened.

Frontier posts were constantly being remodeled, and Fort Laramie was no exception. Seemingly, as soon as one commander's project was completed, another one was waiting.

CONSTANT CHANGE

Photographs of the post at different periods reveal that it was undergoing constant change that could have been effected only by a great deal of toil on the part of the troopers. Their attitude toward these proceedings is apparent in one of their songs:

"A dollar a day is damn poor pay, but 13 a month is less."

Few men who served at Fort Laramie could have regretted its passing. They arose on frosty mornings to find the hairs of their blankets tipped silver by their breath. They learned to curse the monotony and discomforts of frontier soldiering.

Their diet was sometimes hardtack, turned dark by age and so hard that it could scarcely be broken by a metal tool. In the winter, the soldiers used rifle butts to break the ice for their horses.

DUBIOUS TREATY

In 1851 and 1865, treaties were signed here to guarantee both the rights of the Indians and the protection of the overland caravans. On the latter date, unfortunately, there was a vast difference between the treaty signers, who camped outside the fort awaiting a handout, and the Sioux and Cheyenne, who lurked in the lonely, uncharted wilderness, oblivious and scornful of the treaty paper.

The result was more than a decade of war, murder, and massacre.

MISSION WEST

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is all important that we maintain a balance in our efforts to preserve our natural heritage while at the same time obtain a proper benefit from natural riches.

Such an application of the best of conservation and utilization is described in an editorial, "Mission West," printed in the September 25 issue of the Riverton Ranger. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mission West

President Kennedy's western mission is keyed to conservation. He makes the journey to save America's natural heritage, to preserve the past and protect the future.

Such goals are particularly important to a State like Wyoming where so much of the land area is federally controlled.

Preserve Wyoming just as it is? Many features shouldn't be changed. But mineral resources that our State needs to progress and that the Nation will cry for in later years must remain available. Timber resources ravaged by beetle and mistletoe need be harvested to make room for a new tree crop for future generations to use and enjoy.

Leave Wyoming just as it is? Does that mean people should stand back and do nothing while souvenir hunters carry away the Indian writings at Castle Gardens; while California entrepreneurs haul away the fossilized rocks from the Red Desert by the truckload; while the wilderness is destroyed?

Certainly not. There needs be a balance struck to allow Wyoming to experience some developments, while keeping our State as a western playground for ourselves and for some of the 200 million American vacationers who will be looking for signs of the Old West in another few years.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL SHAFTO

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Wyoming has just lost the services of a valued citizen who has made a basic contribution to the welfare of his State and to the cause of organized labor. The only consolidation we can obtain from this loss is that we suffer for the Nation's benefit.

I speak of the decision of Mr. Paul Shafto, president of the Wyoming AFL–CIO, to take a job in the Labor Department. The country will surely benefit from his good services just as surely as he will be missed in Wyoming.

Mr. President, the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press carried an excellent editorial on Mr. Shafto's abilities and accomplishments in its September 26 edition. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Vital Leadership

Because Wyoming has been a predominantly agriculturally based State—because it has a small population, labor has not been a major category in its makeup. But what there is of it has been vital and active, and has played a significant role in the State's social and economic scene.

To say that labor has done nothing for Wyoming is to beg blindness. For it has done many important things, and has meant many important things.

One of the reasons for this is Paul Shafto, president of the Wyoming AFL–CIO, who has announced he will leave Wyoming to take a post with the U.S. Department of Labor.

Shafto has for years been a major figure in the Wyoming labor picture. He has given labor a vital leadership, and a militant, yet intelligent leadership. He has given labor a composed leadership. Passage of the Wyoming right-to-work law undoubtedly left a deep scar, but during the debate on the issue, Shafto maintained the kind of leadership that kept labor opposition within bounds.

Perhaps some felt the attack should have been more wide open, or more militant. But labor fought the battle wisely—by that we mean they maintained its reputation and its perspective.

Shafto has been a gentleman in representing labor in Wyoming. He has practiced a strong policy of public relations. He built for Wyoming labor a good reputation.

Paul Shafto will be missed. We can only hope that his successor, whoever that might be, will be of equal stature.

APPLE HARVEST IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, from all the memories of my boyhood in New Hampshire, none is more vivid than that first bite into a newly harvested autumn apple. The snap of the skin, the splash of juice on the face, the sweet flavor—and sometimes the stomach ache from partaking a little too heavily of this delightful nectar.

New Hampshire is a small State. I am sure there are other States with more apple orchards, but none more beautiful than in New Hampshire. I am sure there are other States which harvest more apples, but none more tasty than those grown in New Hampshire. I am sure there are other Senators here with similar memories, but none sweeter than mine.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New Hampshire Department of Resources and Economic Development, telling of a billion-apple harvest, be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Billion Apples Being Harvested in New Hampshire

Concord, N.H., October 7.—With over a million bushels of top quality apples—and that's over a billion individual apples—being harvested in the Granite State right now, New Hampshire is ready to join in the national observance of Apple Week, October 10–19.

Dr. C. A. Langer, extension horticulturist and well-known apple specialist, points out that apples will never be better than right now at harvesttime when they are rushed from the orchards to shelves of some 100 roadside stands and the counters of many fine markets and shopping centers all over the State. However, he adds that firm tangy apples will be available practically year-round from the 15 controlled atmosphere storages scattered throughout the State and which are being filled with selected grade A apples this month.

The majority of the orchards are located in Hillsborough, Rockingham, and Merrimack Counties, but many tasty apples are raised in orchards as far north as Campton in Grafton County and Madison in Carroll County.

McIntosh, the favorite eating apple of many, leads with the greatest production volume. This variety is tops right now for eating and tart applesauce. It is followed by red and yellow Delicious for fall eating; Cortlands for cooking and salads; Spys for winter eating and cooking; and the well-known standby for general winter use, the Baldwin.

National Apple Week will be observed in New Hampshire with special emphasis on apples and apple dishes in many well-known eating places; displays and apples for all in several banks; and with special displays and sales attention to fresh top quality New Hampshire apples.

THE SOVIET FISHING OFFENSIVE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the farflung operations of Soviet fisheries reveal the vigor of their efforts to turn the riches of the seas to good account. Hopefully the increasing interest in new ship construction, commercial fisheries development, and oceanography in the United States will revive our own lagging interest in this vital resource. I have been disturbed at the reports I have received from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries about the operation of the Soviet trawler fleet off our New England shores, and ask unanimous consent that an article from the Christian Science Monitor of September 27, 1963, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Soviet Fishing Watched

(By John Allan Long)

Gloucester, Mass.—A soft September breeze brushed aimlessly against the tattered cords of an old fishing net.

It was a Soviet net, fishermen said. They pointed to its undersize mesh and said they had picked it up off the ocean floor out on Georges Bank, off the coast of New England.

Occasionally some curious fisherman would happen by, place the toe of his brogan beneath its mesh and carelessly toss part of the net over so another side would catch the air to dry.

When it was dry, officials from the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries would stretch it out and measure its length and breadth and, most carefully, its mesh size.

Fishermen estimated the mesh at about one-half inch, a good 4 inches below the normal 4½-inch mesh regulation for catching haddock or cod. This was evidence, said the fishermen, that the Soviet trawlers were breaking international regulations.

But the Bureau men called the evidence circumstantial. Wouldn't stand up in a court of law, they kept saying. There is no proof that the net came from a Soviet vessel, they tell the fishermen, or, if so, even whether they used it to catch for haddock or cod, the only fish under the mesh regulations.

The job of investigating reported violations of fishing regulations as set up by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries (ICNAF) is charged to the men of the Resources Management Division of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Three or four times a month a Coast Guard plane with the Bureau's law enforcement agents aboard flies out over the fishing ground within the boundaries of ICNAF but only off the New England coast.

With precision they photograph the fishing trawlers, looking for the types of net used and the size, amount, and species of fish caught. Each foreign vessel is identified by a number and its activities are recorded and followed while it is off this coast.

If a foreign vessel is found sidestepping regulations they are reported to the State Department and to ICNAF officials. If a U.S. trawler, which is registered to catch haddock or cod, is caught even with an undersize net aboard they are apprehended and are subject to stiff fines.

Bureau agents point out that it is not unusual or unlawful for Soviet vessels to have aboard a net containing an undersize mesh. The Soviet Union fishes primarily for herring and whiting which are not regulated by net size.

Fishermen who brought up the net recently found here. or other similar nets brought into New England ports in recent months, say that for the net to be lost it had to be snagged on the ocean floor. This means the vessel using that net was bottom-water trawling, the method used by U.S. fishermen to catch haddock and cod. Herring is generally a middle-water fish.

This may be true, say Bureau officials, but herring occasionally are found on the bottom. In addition, a fisherman is also allowed a maximum of 10 percent of haddock and cod each in his catch of other fish to remain within ICNAF regulations. There is no way to determine, they say, whether or not the trawler was catching or exceeding its 10 percent quota while trawling on the bottom.

What nations are represented in the massive fleets of trawlers fishing off the New England coast?

In 1962, the latest year for complete ICNAF figures, Canada, Norway, Poland, Soviet Union, and U.S. trawlers were all spotted fishing on Georges Bank east of Boston, and further north in the Gulf of Maine.

There was only token fishing by Norway and Poland in 1962, but an interesting comparison between 1962 and 1961 can be drawn to illustrate the increasing extent to which the Soviet Union is fishing off the New England coast.

In 1961, Soviet trawlers caught a total of 68,000 tons of herring in this area, according to Herbert W. Graham, chairman of the Scientific Advisers for this sector of ICNAF.

Last year the figure increased over twofold to 151,000 tons. With an addition of some 56,000 tons of whiting and other fish, their overall total exceeded 207,000 tons.

A corresponding total for U.S. fishermen, including about equal tonnage of haddock, whiting, herring, and scallops, was 376,400, as compared with 351,000 tons in 1961. Canadian fishermen reported a total catch off this coast of almost 55,000 tons, most of which included scallops.

It is significant to note that the U.S. total catch represents the bulk of groundfishing done by New Englanders, though some fishermen will travel to Nova Scotia on occasions.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union also is fishing extensively in other areas throughout the world, including farther north in the North Atlantic waters. The same is true with the other countries recording a catch off the New England coast last year.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of New Jersey. Mr. President, next Saturday, October 12, many countries and many of our States will commemorate the anniversary of the discovery of our country by Christopher Columbus. On this occasion, it would be fitting for all of us to consider action to give national recognition to this great day in our history through declaration of the day as a legal public holiday throughout the Nation.

The Federal Government should not lag behind the great majority of the individual States in paying tribute to the courageous navigator, to whose vision and determination the world owes the discovery of the American continents. At present, there are but 13 States, out of our 50, that do not observe October 12, either as Columbus Day or under some other name that commemorates the achievement of Columbus, such as Discovery Day or Landing Day.

We all honor the name of Christopher Columbus. He is a hero we can proudly hold up as an example for our American youth. He is held in particular veneration, of course, by many fine national, patriotic, and religious groups. Declaration of Columbus Day as a legal public holiday would be a step gratifying to these great numbers of our citizens and encouraging to their efforts to associate their national and religious heritage with their patriotic dedication to America.

Mr. President, at least 16 foreign countries, most of them in this hemisphere, observe Columbus Day, or Discovery Day, as a legal holiday. In addition, there are widespread civic and unofficial celebrations in other countries, such as Canada and Italy, where nationwide or governmental observance is not provided. It would be a valuable symbol of brotherhood with our Latin American neighbors for us to join their celebration of Columbus Day, and at the same time an appropriate opportunity to further the constructive efforts of the Organization of American States, the Alliance for Progress, and other efforts in which we are joined with our neighbor countries to the south.

Mr. President, I have been proud to join the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware in sponsoring S. 108, which would make Columbus Day a legal holiday. I hope that when October 12 comes again next year S. 108 will be law, so our citizens throughout the Nation can join together in tribute to the valiant Italian explorer who conquered the challenges of man and nature to first reach the shores of the New World.

ATTACKS ON CONGRESS ASSAILED

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Attacks on Congress Assailed," written by William S. White and published in a recent edition of the Washington Evening Star. The article is well written, historically sound, informative and learned.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PASSING SCENE—ATTACKS ON CONGRESS ASSAILED

(By William S. White)

This country could one day face nothing less than a consitutional crisis in the incessant degrading now going on of Congress as an institution expressly charged by that Constitution to go its independent way.

This curiously uninformed and almost hysterical attack upon Congress has, of course, been going on for some years. Almost invariably it comes from leftwing so-called intellectuals and political scientists who seem not to have the faintest notion that that thing up on Capitol Hill was deliberately set up to be no President's stooge but every President's checkrein.

Still, none of the past howling from these quarters has been remotely comparable to its present shrill volume. Members of Congress from either party who dare go onto some television panels must be prepared actually to apologize for the fact that Congress is performing its constitutional function.

PRESIDENT SATISFIED

They must actively defend the gall of the place in refusing to abdicate its sworn duties by giving automatic—and instant—assent to whatever is asked of it by the administration. Careful inquiry into this or that bill or proposal, which is the root reason for Congress' very being, is presented by eager critics as blind and irresponsible obstructionism. Final and outright congressional refusal of this or that program is described as hardly short of treason to "the people's welfare."

Sometimes, indeed, the attitude of the interrogator suggests that a Member of Congress is in the dock on a criminal charge: Explain at once—as soon as you have quit hitting your grandmother with that spade—what ugly motive has caused Congress not to do such and such. Is it true that Congress is full of louts and conspirators against the good life?

Pundits and professors fill the egghead magazines, and don't wholly neglect the daily press, with automatic assumptions that Congress is invariably wrong or stupid, or perhaps actually evil, in any contest with a President—so long as he is a liberal President. It is only fair to say, parenthetically, that the present President who is the intended beneficiary of the screaming, John F. Kennedy, does not welcome such juvenile "support." He has read the Constitution and is satisfied with it the way it is.

The most exasperating thing of all, perhaps, is that all this nonsense comes, with rare exceptions, from people whose actual knowledge of a single reality in Congress is as patently and absurdly limited as, say, my knowledge of nuclear physics.

A whole new meaning for words—and a whole new system of unthink—would be required to grasp their approach to public affairs. When, say, a Senator votes his convictions and proper State interests, after prolonged study of the right thing to do, he is a matchless hero if he goes with the administration and a knuckleheaded cretin if he goes the other way. The more time and care he puts into his decisions the more intolerably wrong they are—for the screamers take a very dim view of time-wasting debate. The higher his earned respect from among the most informed of all critics, his colleagues, the less respect he gets from the reformers—unless, of course, his record is agreeable to their notions of the moment.

ATTACKS GOVERNMENT

And this is in fact a pointless "unless." For, as might rationally be expected, no Member becomes a great man of Congress by spending all his time denying the proper independence of his own place in order to run after some President as a docile stooge.

At bottom, this business is an attack on no less a thing than representative government. This is so because Congress is the only part of the Government which is literally and precisely representative in structure and character.

What the screamers, therefore, are really reaching for, whether they know it or not, is a kind of people's republic where public policy would be exclusively in the hands of a President who, though quite democratically and lawfully elected, would thereafter be under no real check at all.

NEED FOR EFFECTIVE CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two recent articles reporting important statements on the need for effective civil rights legislation from outstanding church leaders be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The first of these articles, Mr. President, is taken from the August 31, 1963, issue of the New York Times and reports an action taken by the Methodist Conference on Human Relations at a national meeting of 1,100 delegates representing 10 million Methodists. That statement called for Federal and State laws "that will open all facilities serving the general public to all persons without regard to race." Equally as important it called upon all of the churches within the denomination to make certain that neither their good name nor their funds be used in any way to permit racial discrimination. This is a very far-reaching policy and one that should be both commended and copied by others.

The other article, Mr. President, taken from the July 8, 1963, issue of Christianity and Crisis, is an excellent statement on the importance of congressional action on civil rights. It is typical of the growing sentiment among churchmen of all faiths. This statement is not based upon self-interest. It is not based upon group interest. It is based upon national interest and upon moral grounds. What we do here in the weeks immediately ahead is going to be watched closely by these good people. They have chosen the standard of their measure. It is not put in terms of dollar limits or the number of stores in the chain or the type of public service. It is put in terms of equal treatment of all citizens without regard to race. I hope and pray that we will have the good sense to write a bill that will meet this test.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1963]

METHODISTS BACK CIVIL RIGHTS PLAN—WOULD BAN DISCRIMINATION BY THOSE SERVING PUBLIC

CHICAGO, August 30.—The Methodist Conference on Human Relations called today for Federal and State laws "that will open all facilities serving the general public to all persons without regard to race."

Support for such a policy, a major issue in pending civil rights legislation in Congress, was contained in a statement approved at a national meeting of 1,100 delegates representing 10 million Methodists.

The statement took the form of a far-ranging message to the denomination's churches that urged church units to employ their economic power to aid integration and advocated that the 135 church-related colleges, including many in the South, be opened to all races.

In urging that Methodist schools, colleges, hospitals and other institutions be opened to all races, the document proposed "that the name of the church and funds from its budget shall be withdrawn from any institution pursuing a policy contrary to this recommendation."

The message also stated, "We are proud that Methodist youths have participated in nonviolent demonstrations in behalf of racial justice all over the land."

Spokesmen explained that the suggestions are advisory. They will be submitted on a petition to the Methodist General Conference, the top legislative body of the denomination, which will meet in Pittsburgh next spring.

The message proposed:

That "investment funds, such as those of the board of pensions, be used to help achieve integrated communities."

That church units develop "a program of investment only with companies having nondiscriminatory policies" and buy goods and make contracts only with companies that do not discriminate in hiring.

That members "work toward full integration of schools" and assist in voter registration.

That bishops "prepare the grounds" for assigning pastors and district superintendents without regard to race.

That the 1964 general conference of the church take further steps to merge the central jurisdiction, which is virtually all Negro, into the five regional jurisdictions.

"We cannot prevent another person from approaching the altar of God because of his race without being guilty of grievous sin," the message declared.

The message was approved by a show of hands at the closing session of the conference.

[From Christianity and Crisis, July 8, 1963]

THE MOUNTING RACIAL CRISIS

The simplest explanation for the increasingly urgent demonstrations of the Negroes against disfranchisement, segregation in school and church, lunch counter and public conveyance, and against every public custom that affronts the dignity of the human being, is that the Negro feels—as we all ought to feel—that a century is a long time to wait for the elimination of the "American dilemma."

Discriminations against a race in the present historical context are as offensive to the conscience of man and as unbearable to the victims of discrimination as slavery was in its day. If we recognize that the present situation is more unbearable to the victims of injustice than it is offensive to the conscience of men, we are confronted by the hardness of the human heart, even among those whose hearts have been softened by human sympathy and the stirrings of conscience. Try as we will we cannot feel the pain of others as vividly as they do.

If we should still find it a mystery that this burst of resentment has come in a period in which the ice of the long winter of injustice is breaking—after the Supreme Court decision on segregated schools has given unmistakable evidence that the law of the Nation is now unequivocally on the side of justice and during an administration that has shown more concern for racial justice than any previous one, despite the Southern base of the regnant party—we have only to consider that social revolt is not, as Marx thought, motivated by pure desperation. It is motivated by both resentments and hopes, particularly by hopes deferred, which "maketh the heart sick."

The Supreme Court had promised integrated schools "with all deliberate speed." Yet a decade has passed without obvious progress. The customs of the Nation, the pride of the dominant race, its fear of competition from a race whose increasing education would refute the dogma of its innate inferiority have inhibited the attainment of justice.

Impatience is due in part to the fact that some Negroes have attained a college education. Thus there is now an articulate core to voice the longings of the voiceless masses. They have performed the same service for their race as the articulate craftsmen performed for the peasants at the birth of democracy in the 17th century. Moreover, they have given evidence, particularly in the realm of sports and the arts, in theater and concert hall, and in the novel that the vicious theory of their innate inferiority is a fraud. Their leaders in these fields have sparked the flame of the present revolt as much as the students did with their original sit-ins at the lunch counters and their freedom rides.

Since the record of the white Protestant Church, except for a few heroic spirts, is shameful, one must record with gratitude that Negro churchmen have been conspicuous among the leaders of the revolt. The Negro church in the person of Dr. Martin Luther King has validated itself in the life of the Negroes and of the Nation.

The impatience of the Negro will not subside until the last vestiges of legal and customary inequality have been removed. Revolutions do not stop half way. The next step has been outlined by the President's new legislative program, which is the natural fruit of the increasing tension of what he has defined as our "moral crises."

The legislative program as proposed seeks to outlaw discrimination in all private commercial ventures on the basis of the 14th amendment and the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. It will not pass without a great political struggle. If successful it might put the legislative capstone on the emancipation of the race. But the retreating white supremacists are increasingly desperate. Their murders, their police dogs and their terror have contributed as much to the mounting tension as the impatience of the Negroes. We are, in short, confronted with the ultimate, or at least penultimate, chapter in the long history of overcoming the American dilemma.

Of course laws cannot finally change the recalcitrant. Their prejudices dictate customs that are at war with the explicit law of the land and the law that is written into the heart. These prejudices are, in the language of St. Paul, "another law in my members warring against the law of my mind." One can only hope that the church will be more effective in restraining and transmuting these vagrant and recalcitrant passions of man than it has been in the past. The contribution of Roman Catholicism is another story.

We Protestants might begin the new chapter in our national life by contritely confessing that evangelical Christianity has failed to contribute significantly to the solution of the gravest social issue and evil that our Nation has confronted since slavery.

R.N.

FEASIBILITY OF ADOPTING THE METRIC SYSTEM OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on Tuesday, October 8, 1963, the White House released the first report of the Consumer Advisory Council which recommends, with other proposals, that a study be made by an appropriate executive department or agency of the desirability and practicability of conversion—by the United States—to the metric system. I applaud this recommendation of the Council, for it adds substantially to the growing weight of opinion that such a feasibility study be made.

Since I first introduced S. 1278 on April 4, of this year, calling for such a study by the National Bureau of Standards, I have received communications of support from many diverse groups and individuals—professors, professional engineers, persons concerned with international trade, editors of magazines, and others. In addition, the Departments of State, Commerce, and Defense concur that such a study would be very useful.

The Committee for the Study of the Metric System of the American Geophysical Union has done notable work in this field. The committee has polled a number of professions with regard to adopting the metric system, and has turned up some rather startling figures. The average of some 19 different groups contacted, who consider such a change advantageous to them, was a very high 94 percent. Those who felt our export trade was suffering because we have not adopted the metric system, was 69 percent; and those who felt such a changeover is inevitable, 70 percent. At this point Mr. President, I should like to have reprinted in the RECORD two documents; one the progress report of the committee and the second, an address by the committee's chairman, Mr. Floyd W. Hough entitled "Why Adopt the Metric System."

There being no objection, the progress report and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE STUDY OF THE METRIC SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Floyd W. Hough, Chairman; Carl I. Aslakson, Finn E. Bronner, John G. Ferris, Helmut E. Landsberg, G. Medina, John A. O'Keefe, Milton O. Schmidt, Lansing G. Simmons, George D. Whitmore, Julius C. Speert and Thomas Dando as alternates; and L. V. Judson, consultant.

At the May 7, 1958, business session of the American Geophysical Union the Bronner resolution was passed unanimously requesting President Ewing to appoint a special committee of the AGU for the study of the metric system in the United States. The resolution, printed in the Transactions of June 1958 (p. 558), directed the committee to report at the May 1959 meeting. Accordingly, the President appointed the special committee noted above.

The committee held its first meeting on October 29, 1958, and has held four subsequent plenary sessions interspersed with a number of partial meetings of working groups. Correspondence was opened with A. H. Hughes of London, deputy chairman of the metric committee of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. The British committee has parallel instructions to those of our committee with the added feature of considering the conversion of their present monetary system to a decimal system. Our committee entertained Hughes at a luncheon during his visit here on December 28. This was followed by an interesting session at which the similar problems of the two countries were discussed. Several members of the committee attended the metric system discussion at the December meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

The various members of the committee have made independent studies on the adoption of the metric system in the United States and submitted reports on such phases as: the effect on industry, the effect on foreign trade, the effect on Government (including State and municipal), the advantages and disadvantages of the metric system, the history of the metric system in the United States and its use in foreign countries, the introduction of the metric system into the schools, publicity programs, best means of making the transition, and proper approach to Congress.

It was early recognized by the committee that an initial poll must be taken to ascertain the feeling of the scientific field on the question of a change to the metric system. Accordingly, a subcommittee was appointed to draw up a suitable questionnaire and a letter to the editor of Transactions (see Trans., pp. 38-39, Mar. 1959); this plan was later extended to include the editors of a number of scientific and engineering journals. An excellent response was made to the committee's request for printing the letter and questionnaire with the result that they have been carried already in the official publications of the following organizations: American Society of Civil Engineers, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Institute of Radio Engineers, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Society of American Military Engineers, American Geophysical Union, and American Society of Photogrammetry.

Two in addition to the above will carry the letter and questionnaire in their next issues. It is felt that these organizations with perhaps 175,000 readers, excluding overlapping membership, should furnish an adequate coverage of the scientific and engineering fields. The replies to these questionnaires are coming in daily and will no doubt continue for some time owing to the recentness of some of the publication issues. To date, we have had about 700 returned. While this number is a small percentage of the readers of the above publications, it should be noted that in all cases the questionnaire was printed in such a manner that it was necessary to cut it out of the magazine, often destroying text material on the opposite side of the sheet. Add to this the necessity to address and stamp an envelope, and we must conclude that the 700 represent only the most enthusiastic of those concerned with the subject. A considerable number of one- and two-page letters have been received with excellent suggestions and encouragement. Furthermore, of the 700 questionnaires received, about 14 percent have indicated willingness to aid financially.

The tabular analysis of the first 577 questionnaires returned, for the computation of which the committee is indebted to personnel of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, is shown in table 1. The tabular analysis is self-explanatory, the nine questions being shown by number at the heads of the columns and the various professions by number at the left.

TABLE 1.—*Analysis of questionnaire*

		Present usage (question 2)				Change advantageous (question 3)			Period for change (question 4)		Use centigrade temperature (question 5)			Export trade now suffering (question 6)			Metric system adaption inevitable (question 7)			Cost of gradual change prohibitive (question 8)			Sponsorship (question 9)				
Profession [1]	Number answering	Metric	British	Other	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Average	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Professional society	Industry	Education	Government	Answering
		Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Years*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
0	79	46	52	2	97	91	9	99	22	97	89	11	100	70	30	59	63	37	99	13	87	96	30	19	16	35	97
1	50	60	39	1	98	94	6	98	21	100	92	8	100	68	32	44	63	37	92	9	91	90	48	18	08	25	92
2	123	74	24	2	99	96	4	99	21	96	98	2	98	56	44	39	71	29	97	3	97	97	39	08	09	43	98
3	3	12	73	15	100	67	33	100	20	100	100	0	100	50	50	67	33	67	100	0	100	100	44	44	11	00	100
4	101	22	76	2	99	93	7	99	21	96	97	3	98	78	22	36	85	15	61	6	94	63	37	15	14	34	99
5	50	37	62	1	98	96	4	100	25	98	98	2	100	77	23	52	62	38	94	8	92	96	42	13	08	37	100
6	35	12	85	3	100	80	20	100	26	100	83	17	100	62	38	60	69	31	100	9	91	97	29	23	09	40	100
7	25	39	61	0	92	92	8	100	18	96	88	12	100	46	54	52	64	36	100	4	96	96	41	15	03	41	100
8	2	35	60	5	100	100	0	100	20	100	100	0	100	100	0	50	100	0	100	0	100	100	17	00	17	67	100
9	14	69	31	0	100	100	0	100	18	93	100	0	100	100	0	50	93	7	100	0	100	93	59	05	16	20	100
10	9	75	23	3	100	100	0	100	20	100	100	0	100	100	0	22	88	13	89	0	100	100	50	11	17	22	100
11	13	48	41	11	100	100	0	100	23	100	100	0	100	100	0	31	73	27	85	0	100	69	40	10	17	33	100
12	2	13	87	0	100	100	0	100	15	100	100	0	100	100	0	50	100	0	100	0	100	100	67	17	00	17	100
13	10	75	25	0	100	100	0	100	26	90	100	0	100	75	25	40	75	25	80	0	100	100	28	03	18	53	100
14	26	37	55	8	100	100	0	100	19	100	100	0	100	63	38	62	67	33	92	4	96	96	32	24	16	28	96
15	3	25	73	2	100	100	0	100	28	100	100	0	100	50	50	67	33	67	100	0	100	100	11	44	11	33	100
16	13	58	42	0	92	92	8	100	16	92	100	0	92	75	25	31	77	23	100	0	100	100	58	16	06	20	100
17	11	39	60	1	100	100	0	100	22	100	100	0	100	100	0	45	60	40	91	20	80	91	46	06	16	33	91
18	8	66	34	0	100	100	0	100	21	100	100	0	100	100	0	50	63	38	100	0	100	100	39	09	14	39	100
	577	47	51	2	98	94	6	99	22	97	95	5	99	69	31	46	70	30	90	6	94	90	39	14	12	35	98

Key to professions:

0 Others (including not identified)
1 Physics
2 Chemistry
3 Mathematics
4 Civil engineering
5 Electrical engineering
6 Mechanical engineering
7 Geology
8 Aerodynamics
9 Medical
10 Pharmacology
11 Research scientist
12 Metallurgy
13 Biology
14 Photogrammetry
15 Geography
16 Meteorology
17 Teaching
18 Oceanography

The full committee agreed that it would advocate strongly a transition period of not less than one human generation, or 33 years, between the passage of a bill by the Congress and the effective date when the metric system would become the only official system of weights and measures in the United States. It is felt the smooth transition afforded by this 33-year period will remove much of the opposition which has defeated all previous bills on the adoption of the metric system. It will provide ample time for the schools to adjust to the metric system, for almost all equipment in English units to become obsolete and to be replaced by equipment in metric units during this period, and for trades and professional personnel now using the English system exclusively to be retired and to be replaced by the younger generation thoroughly schooled in the metric system. With the impetus of a bill having passed Congress, the committee feels that the changeover to the metric system would be rapid in much of the economy and that 10 or 15 years would see the transition perhaps as much as 80 percent complete. The remaining legal period for the English system would avoid economic loss to certain owners of heavy equipment not yet obsolete and would carry the older personnel on to retirement.

As indicated by the above list of organizations whose publications have carried the letter and questionnaire, the attached analysis of the replies represents the opinions almost entirely of scientific and engineering personnel. A much larger poll remains to be taken of industry, labor, agriculture, women's organizations, as well as the legal, medical, teaching, and other professions. It is believed that this can be done largely in the same inexpensive manner as that used in polling the scientists and engineers. There will be certain clerical, postal, and analysis expenditures, however, for which an item has been requested in the 1960 budget. The committee hopes to raise needed additional funds from those persons who have indicated on the questionnaires that they are willing to assist financially.

Problems to be considered in the near future include the question, extent, and mode of cooperation with the existing committee of the AAAS, and any similar metric committees in the United States and Great Britain. Close cooperation by all U.S. interested committees is essential to provide proper support for an early bill before the Congress assuming that the results of the completed study indicate the desirability of such action. The committee is considering the advisability of espousing a national nonprofit corporation consisting of all interested bodies, with representation from all walks of life, in order to conduct a thorough and unbiased study of the entire problem. Such an organization would be in the best position to obtain the necessary financial support and its prestige would be an invaluable asset in the handling of the appropriate bill before the Congress.

In view of the very high affirmative reaction in regard to the metric system, some 94 percent of the questionnaires already analyzed from a large coverage of the scientific and engineering personnel in the United States, the committee presented the resolution, published on page 141 of the June 1959 issue of the Transactions. This places the American Geophysical Union squarely on record as urging an end to the present confusion of two legal systems and the adoption of the metric system as the only official system of weights and measures in the United States, effective 33 years after passage of appropriate action by the Congress.

The committee recognizes that there are many economic problems in our changeover to the metric system. It does not believe that a 5- or even 10-year period such as has been proposed in the past, is adequate for this change; it does feel that a proposal to convert over a 33-year period is entirely practicable. It should be a smooth transition with little attendant hardship or economic loss. It appears that the leading Nation of the world can no longer fail to take the necessary steps to rid itself of its self-imposed isolation in the present nonstandardization of its weights and measures with respect to most of the nations of the world any more than it can afford political isolation in this modern age of science and technology.

TABLE 1 (revised)[1].—*Analysis of questionnaire on the metric system*

		Present usage (question 2)				Change advantageous (question 3)			Period for change (question 4)		Use centigrade temperature (question 5)			Export trade now suffering (question 6)			Metric system adaption inevitable (question 7)			Cost of gradual change prohibitive (question 8)			Sponsorship (question 9)				
Profession[2]	Number answering	Metric	British	Other	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Average	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Professional society	Industry	Education	Government	Answering
		Pct.	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Years*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*	*Pct.*
0	133	37	59	5	95	82	18	98	22	94	85	15	95	65	35	59	65	35	98	16	84	96	26	21	14	39	95
1	149	68	29	3	99	93	7	99	22	97	95	5	98	67	33	41	65	35	95	08	92	91	35	13	19	33	96
2	150	74	24	2	99	96	4	99	21	96	98	2	99	61	39	43	72	28	97	05	95	97	38	10	10	43	98
3	16	30	59	11	100	80	20	94	24	100	80	20	94	50	50	38	31	69	100	00	100	100	24	17	24	36	88
4	179	24	73	3	98	90	10	99	21	96	94	6	99	72	28	38	80	20	72	07	93	72	37	16	14	33	99
5	121	41	56	2	97	90	10	100	25	97	97	3	98	68	32	55	63	37	98	08	92	98	35	13	11	41	99
6	84	15	80	5	98	81	19	100	24	95	88	12	98	64	36	60	72	28	99	13	88	95	27	19	09	45	98
7	39	45	55	------	92	92	8	100	18	95	92	8	100	58	42	49	64	36	92	03	97	92	34	15	04	4	00
8	38	16	83	------	92	82	18	100	26	92	86	14	92	76	24	45	46	54	92	03	97	92	33	07	10	50	89
9	19	72	27	------	100	100	------	100	21	95	100	------	100	100	00	37	84	16	100	00	100	95	46	04	14	36	00
10	9	75	23	3	100	100	------	100	20	100	100	------	100	100	00	22	88	13	89	00	100	100	50	11	17	22	00
11	31	48	44	8	94	100	------	94	23	100	100	------	100	92	08	39	77	23	84	08	92	77	35	13	13	39	00
12	11	27	73	------	100	100	------	100	22	91	100	------	100	50	50	18	64	36	100	10	90	91	39	17	00	44	00
13	13	77	23	------	100	100	------	100	22	92	100	------	100	83	17	46	82	18	85	00	100	100	21	02	13	63	00
14	27	37	55	7	100	100	------	100	19	100	100	------	100	65	35	63	68	32	93	04	96	96	31	27	15	27	96
15	7	44	56	1	100	86	14	100	29	100	100	------	100	25	75	57	43	57	100	00	100	100	08	23	23	46	00
16	22	48	50	2	95	91	9	100	18	91	95	5	95	57	43	32	73	27	100	05	95	100	42	16	12	30	95
17	13	34	57	9	100	92	8	100	23	100	100	------	100	100	00	46	58	42	92	17	83	92	38	13	13	35	92
18	19	73	26	1	100	100	------	95	18	100	100	------	100	86	14	37	72	28	95	00	100	95	32	09	21	37	00
	1,080	45	52	3	98	90	10	99	22	96	94	6	98	68	32	46	68	32	92	08	92	91	34	15	13	39	97

[1] This is a revision of table 1 of the "Progress Report of the Committee for the Study of the Metric System in the United States," published in the Transactions of September 1959, p. 257. This revision includes the analysis of the answers to 1,080 questionnaires received to Nov. 1, 1959, including the 577 which were the basis of the original table 1.

[2] Key to professions:

0 Others (including not identified)
1 Physics
2 Chemistry
3 Mathematics
4 Civil engineering
5 Electrical engineering
6 Mechanical engineering
7 Geology
8 Aerodynamics
9 Medical
10 Pharmacology
11 Research scientist
12 Metallurgy
13 Biology
14 Photogrammetry
15 Geography
16 Meteorology
17 Teaching
18 Oceanography

WHY ADOPT THE METRIC SYSTEM?

(By Floyd W. Hough, F. ASCE)

This country should seriously consider and probably adopt the metric system of weights and measures as a replacement for our heterogeneous English units. Technically the metric system is simpler to use because it is decimal and requires little translation. Commercially the metric system is essential so that the United States can compete with countries able to supply drawings and goods to metric standards.

Following a period of nearly three decades of relative dormancy there is renewed interest in a change to the metric system. This interest is due at least partly to international competition in trade and to greater contact with countries using the metric system.

Bills were introduced in the recent U.S. Congress to provide for a study of the desirability and practicability of adoption in the United States of the metric system of weights and measures. The bills were not considered, perhaps because of the politics of an election year, but it is expected that similar measures will be presented to the next Congress.

The question immediately arises as to why the metric system of weights and measures should be considered superior to the so-called English system. The metric system, introduced by the French in 1791, is fundamentally based on a single unit of length, the meter. This unit was originally defined as a ten-millionth part of the earth's meridional quadrant. Even the kilogram, the fundamental unit of mass, was derived from the meter in that it was defined originally as the mass of pure water at maximum density contained in a volume represented by the thousandth part of a cubic meter. In 1875, the International Metric Convention, signed by 17 countries including the United States, set up the International Bureau of Weights and Measures at Sèvres, France, and made it the custodian of the international standards.

About this same time, the meter was standardized so that it now has no continuing relationship to the earth's meridional quadrant or the former meter of the Archives, but is defined, rather, as the interval between the line markings under certain physical conditions of a platinum iridium bar known as the International Prototype Meter. Likewise, the kilogram was redefined simply as the mass of the International Prototype Kilogram. Each nation adhering to the International Metric Convention was furnished a National Prototype Meter and a National Prototype Kilogram, which are compared from time to time with the International Standards at Sèvres. The U.S. Bureau of Standards is the custodian of these two national standards. On October 14, the 11th International Conference on Weights and Measures adopted a new definition for the international meter in terms of wavelengths of orange-red light produced by burning of the gas known as KR-86.

The United States has debated the question of the metric system at intervals since its introduction by the French. Numerous bills for the adoption of the system have been before the Congress since George Washington forwarded to it a copy of the French report for study. Three highly significant actions have been taken:

1. The metric system was legalized for use in the United States in 1866 by an act of Congress.

2. The United States, in 1875, as mentioned above, became a signatory to the International Metric Convention.

3. The Secretary of the Treasury, in 1893, approved the Mendenhall Order, which recognized the International Prototype Meter and Prototype Kilogram as the fundamental standards on which the yard and pound are based.

The metric system is inherently a decimal system. The so-called English system of yards and pounds has been decimalized to some extent but is not so used generally.

Engineers have done away with the troublesome inch in favor of decimals of the foot while architects, for instance, continue to employ fractions of the inch. (Purdue University this year graduated a class of mechanical and aeronautical engineers who had been trained to work entirely with decimals of the inch.) Some grocers now use pounds and decimals thereof, although the great majority are partial to the ounce. Most scientists and professional engineers use the metric system primarily but it is not unusual to find metric units and English units on the same page of a technical report, necessitating a mental conversion between the two systems.

Decimals are generally conceded to be far simpler to use than fractions. Suppose, for instance, it is desired to determine the area in square feet of the floor of a room that is 30 feet 9⅝ inches by 15 feet 3¼ inches. These dimensions, so stated, do not lend themselves readily to multiplication. On the other hand, the product of these same dimensions measured as 9.389 meters and 4.655 meters, respectively, is easily determined as 43.706 square meters. A similar problem in volume is even more of a contrast than the problem of area.

A highway engineer from Hawaii submits the following problem in English units and an equivalent one in the metric system:

ASPHALT NEEDED FOR A UNIT OF ROAD

Computed in English units:
1 mile of road 24 ft. wide
5,280 × 24 = 126,720 sq. ft.
0.35 gal. of asphalt per sq. ft. is to be applied.
Taking the average specific gravity of asphalt at 1.4,
1.4 × 8.345 (weight of 1 gal. of water) = 11.70 lb. per gal. for asphalt
11.70 × 0.35 = 4.1 lb. per sq. ft.
126,720 × 4.1 = 519,000 lb.

$$\frac{519{,}000}{2{,}240} = 232 \text{ long tons}$$

Three multiplications, one division, and reference tables were required.

Computed in metric units:
1 km. of road 8 m wide = 8,000 m^2
14 liters per sq. meter is to be applied.
14 × 8,000 = 112,000 liters*
= 112,000 dm^3
112,000 × 1.4 = 156,800 kg.
= 156.8 metric tons

Two simple multiplications were required.

* 1 liter = 1 cu. decimeter (dm^3) = 1 kg. for water. In the metric system the specific gravity is the weight of 1 liter of the material.

The relative simplicity of solving this highway problem in metric units points up, in part, the outstanding advantages of the metric system: (1) That all five unit types—length, mass, area, volume, and capacity—are interrelated and are based directly and solely on the two fundamental units, the meter and the kilogram; (2) that these relationships are entirely decimal in character. On the other hand, in the English system, if it may be termed a system, there is little usable relationship among these five unit types, and customarily it is not decimalized.

In the educational field lies, perhaps, one of the greatest benefits which would accrue from our eventual abandonment of the English units in favor of the metric. Teachers of mathematics will agree that fully 25 percent of the child's time, and the teacher's as well, could be saved in arithmetic courses if the simple interrelated metric decimal units were substituted for the English. Such monstrosities as proper fractions, improper fractions, numerators, least common denominators, greatest common devisors, and mixed numbers could be laid to rest with the celluloid collar and the oxcart. There can be no doubt among those familiar with both systems that the change from English units to metric would appreciably relieve the teaching load in our grade schools and high schools in all curricula that involve both mathematics and the sciences.

In the matter of international trade, we are clearly at a disadvantage. Britain and the United States are isolated with respect to weights and measures. About 90 percent of the world's population is living under the metric system, or their Governments are in the process of changing over to it. It has been called Russia's not secret weapon. It is believed that the preference in South America for European imports may be due, in no small way, to their use of a common language in the metric system of weights and measures.

One correspondent writes, "My 25 years of diversified experience in engineering, architecture, construction, and university teaching in Europe and America had often let me wonder why this country with its otherwise progressive and revolutionary ideas in the fields of engineering, science, and industry had not switched a long time ago to the kilogram-meter system. Anyone who knows something about the metric system will admit that the English system is cumbersome, terribly time consuming, and less safe against calculation errors. How elegant (and safer) is the shifting of the decimal point only in the metric system."

Another says, "It has long disturbed me personally that of two systems of units—one reasonable, convenient, and practical, and one completely irrational—residents of this country must use the latter. I am convinced that the only reason there is such complacency about the British system in this country is that the general public is not aware of the complexity of the system under which they live."

In view of the necessity for simplification and speed in its field operations, the U.S. Army in 1947 adopted the metric units as basic to its design of the Universal Transverse Mercator and the Universal Polar Stereographic grid systems. (See "A Conformal and World-Wide Military Grid System," paper No. 2813, ASCE "Transactions," vol. 121, 1956, p. 633.)

Further, in 1957, following 10 years of experience with the meter as the unit of measurement in place of the previous national "yard," the Army published regulations to the effect that all U.S. Army weapons and related equipment will be converted to the international meter for the measurement of linear distances, this conversion to be accomplished by January 1, 1966. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is solidly committed to the metric system, including, of course, all the defense agencies of Great Britain and the United States. The same has long been true for the Russian bloc.

The American Geophysical Union became actively interested in this problem of weights and measures following its meeting in May 1958. A special committee was appointed for the study of the metric system in the United States. This committee subsequently conducted a poll through the medium of eight of the leading scientific and engineering magazines of the country. The response was decidedly in favor of the metric system. Of the 1,080 completed questionnaires returned from 18 professional categories, 90 percent desired a changeover from the English to the metric units and the average transition period recommended was 22 years. A partial analysis of these questionnaires is given in the accompanying table 1, taken from the December 1959 "Transactions" of the American Geophysical Union.

The committee pointed out, in its letter to the editors accompanying the questionnaire, that bills for the adoption of the metric system exclusively in the United States have been more than once presented to Congress, but that they have not been enacted into law, the principal reason being that in each case the proposed effective date followed too soon after passage of the bill. An early effective date would undoubtedly work a severe hardship on the adult population not familiar with the metric system, and it would make obsolete a prohibitive number of everyday items pertaining to weights and measures.

A solution would appear to be to make the metric system the only official system of weights and measures in the United States, effective in one generation (33 years) after the passage of the legislation. Following this action by Congress, the grade schools and high schools would begin immediately to teach children the metric along with the English system and, during the transition period, would place more and more emphasis on the metric system. At the end of the transition period the English system would still be taught, but the emphasis would be just the reverse of what it is today.

A long transition period would result in a smooth change. In a generation most items of equipment involving weights and measures normally become obsolete or are worn out and replaced. Also, persons engaged in professions and trades now using the English system exclusively would normally retire during this period and would be replaced by a new generation fully trained in the metric system.

When we recall that our founders saw fit to break away from the British nightmare of pounds, shillings, pence, guineas, and florins, and set the new country straight with a decimal monetary system, it seems strange that they retained the equally atrocious British system of weights and measures. Perhaps the pace of the times, unlike that of today, did not demand the efficiency and precision in calculations with which we are faced and which will become even more exacting in the years ahead.

Clearly, there is now in the United States a revival of interest in securing a better system of weights and measures following a period of some three decades of complacency. In this electronic age of accelerated progress and ever closer ties with other nations, it is imperative that something be done about the inexcusable complexity and nonconformity of the so-called English system of weights and measures. It must not be done overnight; our economy is too expansive. However, by providing a long transition period extending over a generation, we can readily convert without hardship or economic dislocation. We can adopt officially the simple interrelated units first presented to the Congress by President George Washington in January 1795, thus securing for our own country the very considerable advantages of the metric system of weights and measures.

TABLE 1.—*Analysis of questionnaire on the metric system*

[All figures are percentages except where otherwise noted]

Profession [1]	Number answering	Present usage (Question 2)				Change advantageous (Question 3)			Period for change, years (Question 4)		Use centigrade temperature (Question 5)		
		Metric	British	Other	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Average years	Answering	Yes	No	Answering
1	149	68	29	3	99	93	7	99	22	97	95	5	98
2	150	74	24	2	99	96	4	99	21	96	98	2	99
3	16	30	59	11	100	80	20	94	24	100	80	20	94
4	179	24	73	3	98	90	10	99	21	96	94	6	99
5	121	41	56	2	97	90	10	100	25	97	97	3	98
6	84	15	80	5	98	81	19	100	24	95	88	12	98
7	39	45	55	0	92	92	8	100	18	95	92	8	100
8	38	16	83	0	92	82	18	100	26	92	86	14	92
9	27	37	55	7	100	100	0	100	19	100	100	0	100
Total or average for above 9 categories	803	39	57	4	97	90	10	99	22	96	92	8	98
Total or average for full questionnaire	1,060	45	52	3	98	90	10	99	22	96	94	6	98

Profession	Export trade now suffering (Question 6)			Metric system adaption inevitable (Question 7)			Cost of gradual change prohibitive (Question 8)			Sponsorship (Question 9)				
	Yes	No	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Yes	No	Answering	Professional societies	Industry	Education	Government	Answering
1	67	33	41	65	35	95	8	92	91	35	13	19	33	96
2	61	39	43	72	28	97	5	95	97	38	10	10	43	98
3	50	50	38	31	69	100	0	100	100	24	17	24	36	88
4	72	28	38	80	20	72	7	93	72	37	16	14	33	99
5	68	32	55	63	37	98	8	92	98	35	13	11	41	99
6	64	36	60	72	28	99	13	88	95	27	19	9	45	98
7	58	42	49	64	36	92	3	97	92	34	15	4	46	100
8	76	24	45	46	54	92	3	97	92	33	7	10	50	89
9	65	35	63	68	32	93	4	96	96	31	27	15	27	96
Average for above 9 categories	65	35	48	62	38	95	6	94	92	33	15	13	39	96
Average for full questionnaire	68	32	46	68	32	92	8	92	91	34	15	13	39	97

[1] Key to professions (the original questionnaire covered 9 additional categories):

1	Physics	4	Civil engineering	7	Geology
2	Chemistry	5	Electrical engineering	8	Aerodynamics
3	Mathematics	6	Mechanical engineering	9	Photogrammetry

NOTE.—This table 1 is from a progress report of the Committee for the Study of the Metric System in the United States, of the American Geophysical Union.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, these two documents and the tables which they contain, offer ample evidence that our scientific and related professions are overwhelmingly in favor of a feasibility study for the adoption of the metric system in this country. Some may oppose the adoption of this system, but I have yet to hear of anyone opposing a study in depth which would show all the pros and cons with respect to such an adoption. And to add to this, I am informed that the Bureau of Standards is preparing right now for such a study, in the event Congress gives its approval.

I urge that approval, Mr. President, and I sincerely hope that it will be forthcoming in this session of Congress.

BEYOND THE WHEAT DEAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today's New York Times carries an excellent editorial entitled "Beyond the Wheat Deal." This editorial explains in a concise manner why it is in the interest of the United States to allow the sale of wheat to the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries.

As I pointed out yesterday, I strongly support these sales provided they are for hard currency; that is, dollars or gold, and provided they are made by the private grain trade in the United States. President Kennedy made both a wise and a courageous decision in permitting these sales.

Some of the reasons he listed for allowing the sales are that they will increase farm income and strengthen farm prices, reduce our surplus supplies of wheat and thus lower storage costs to the taxpayer, benefit our balance of payments, and improve relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. I discussed these points in detail in a series of Senate speeches beginning September 16.

The Times editorial does not limit itself to the present wheat deal, however. It makes another point—one which I also have long advocated. It states that:

> Much of the present U.S. trade policy toward the Soviet Union is obsolete. For years this country has prohibited sale to the Soviet Union and to Eastern Europe of many goods which the Communist world can buy freely from our NATO allies in Western Europe. It only makes sense that in the wake of the wheat agreement the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is planning to take a careful look at the whole complex of present policies and laws restricting trade with the Communist bloc.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEYOND THE WHEAT DEAL

Both economically and politically, President Kennedy made a convincing case last night when he explained to the Nation his decision to approve the sale of wheat and feed grains to the Soviet Union and other Communist-ruled countries.

The heart of his argument was the vital point he expressed so eloquently in his American University speech last June: the need to find and to act upon those common interests which unite the Soviet Union and the United States and which give hope for improving relations between these two great nations.

The existence of a common interest could hardly be clearer than in the present case. The Soviet Union needs grains because of the shortages caused by its calamitous harvest this year. The United States benefits from selling grain because such a sale helps reduce the burdensome surplus in the Nation's granary (brought about partly by our own foolish domestic agricultural policies) and because this sale will contribute appreciably to improving the U.S. balance of payments. As in any good business or political deal, both sides will gain.

Of course more than economics is involved in all this. The President hinted at the political aspects of the matter when he gave assurances that the Soviet people will know they are receiving American grain, and when he pointed out that the sale helps show the Soviet Union "that peaceful agreements with the United States which serve the interests of both sides are a far more worthwhile course than a course of isolation and hostility."

In all this the President was hinting at the historic experiment, in which he and Premier Khrushchev have been engaged to see whether the cold war cannot be deprived of much of its former virulence and danger, even though important differences obviously remain. President Kennedy reminded us last night that the Soviet Government has for several months now refrained from jamming Voice of America broadcasts. The wheat deal falls naturally into the developing complex of joint measures which began with the nuclear test ban treaty.

What the President said about the grain transaction suggests that much of the present U.S. trade policy toward the Soviet Union is obsolete. For years, this country has prohibited sale to the Soviet Union and to Eastern Europe of many goods which the Communist world can buy freely from our NATO allies in Western Europe. It only makes sense that in the wake of the wheat agreement the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is planning to take a careful look at the whole complex of present policies and laws restricting trade with the Communist bloc.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 535, H.R. 6143, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "College Academic Facilities Act".

Findings and Declaration of Policy

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be assured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities, and that this opportunity will be jeopardized unless the Nation's colleges and universities are encouraged and assisted in their efforts to accommodate rapidly growing numbers of youth who aspire to a higher education. The Congress further finds and declares that this need is so great that it is incumbent upon the Nation to take positive and immediate action to meet it through assistance to institutions of higher education in providing classrooms and other academic facilities, and through assistance to the States in constructing certain public community college facilities.

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Part A—Grants for construction of academic facilities

Appropriations Authorized

SEC. 101. (a) In order to enable the Commissioner of Education (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commissioner") to make grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this part A, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,1964, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

Allotments to States

SEC. 102. (a) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year (1) one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such institutions in all the States; and (2) the remaining one-half shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of students enrolled in grades nine to twelve (both inclusive) of schools in such State bears to the total number of students in such grades in schools in all the States. For the purposes of this subsection, (A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time students and (ii) the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations; and (B) determinations as to enrollment under either clause (1) or clause (2) of this subsection shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect to such enrollment are available to him.

(b) The amount of each allotment to a State under this section shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this part A, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 106(b)(3) and 121(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State by institutions of higher education. Sums allotted to a State for fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the next fiscal year, in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year.

(c) All amounts allotted under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, which are not reserved as provided in section 107 by the close of the fiscal year for which they are allotted, shall be reallotted by the Commissioner, on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable, among the States which, as determined by the Commissioner, are able to use without delay any amounts so reallotted. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for reservation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

State Commissions and Plans

SEC. 103. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this part A shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereafter in this part A referred to as the "State Commission"), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 105, objective standards and methods (A) for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the construction of academic facilities submitted by institutions of higher education within the State, and (B) for determining the Federal share of the development cost of each such project (unless such plan provides for a uniform Federal share for all such projects);

(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part A; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the development cost of the project involved;

(4) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part A, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part A.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $3,000,000 during each of the first two fiscal years of the program under this Part A in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part A, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

Eligibility for Grants

SEC. 104. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this part A only if such construction is limited to structures, or portions thereof, especially designed, and to be used only, for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library, and only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity.

Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities and Federal Share

SEC. 105. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commission shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible construction projects, and the application of such standards and methods to such projects under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria (1) shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part A while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of institutions in the several States, and (2) shall give special consideration to expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant institutions are effectively utilizing existing facilities, provision for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, facilities or institutions according to functional or educational type for priority purposes, and, in view of the national objectives of this Act, provision for considering the degree to which the institution serves students from two or more States or from outside the United States; and in no event shall an institution's readiness to admit such out-of-State students be considered as a priority factor adverse to such institution.

(b) The Commissioner shall further prescribe by regulation the basic criteria for determining the Federal share of the development cost of any eligible project under this part A within a State, to which criteria the applicable standards and methods set forth in the State plan for such State shall conform in the absence of a uniform statewide Federal share specified in or pursuant to such plan. The Federal share shall in no event exceed 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application approved under this part A.

Applications for Grant and Conditions for Approval

SEC. 106. (a) Institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part A shall submit applications therefor at such time or times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such applications shall contain such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make the determinations required to be made by him under this part A.

(b) The Commisioner shall approve an application covering a project for construction of an academic facility and meeting the requirements prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) if—

(1) the project is an eligible project as determined under section 104;

(2) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission;

(3) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, the Federal share of the development cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State (including any applicable reallotment to the State);

(4) the project has, pursuant to the State plan, been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

(5) the Commissioner determines that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials; and

(6) the Commissioner determines that (in addition to the assurance required by section 304 and such assurance as to title to the site as he may deem necessary) the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

(A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for defraying the development cost of the project covered by such application,

(B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the academic facility upon completion, and

(C) that the facility will be used as an academic facility during at least the period of the Federal interest therein (as defined in section 108).

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

(d) No institution which is eligible for a grant under title II shall be eligible for a grant under this part A.

Amount of Grant—Payment

SEC. 107. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this part A, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment (including any applicable reallotment) available therefor, the amount of such grant, which (subject to the limits of such allotment or reallotment) shall be equal to the Federal share (ascertained by him under section 106(b)(3) of the development cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application covering such project or upon revision of the estimated development cost of a project with respect to which such reservation was made, and in the event of an upward revision of such estimated cost approved by him he may reserve the Federal share of the added cost only from the applicable allotment (or reallotment) available at the time of such approval.

Recovery of Payments

SEC. 108. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that, if a facility constructed with the aid of a grant or grants under this part A is used as an academic facility for twenty years following completion of such construction, the public benefit accruing to the United States from such use will equal or exceed in value the amount of such grant or grants. The period of twenty years after completion of such construction shall therefore be deemed to be the period of Federal interest in such facility for the purposes of this part A.

(b) If, within twenty years after completion of construction of an academic facility which has been constructed in part with a grant or grants under this part A—

(1) the applicant (or its successor in title or possession) ceases or fails to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

(2) the facility ceases to be used as an academic facility, or the facility is used as a facility excluded from the term "academic facility" by section 121(a)(2), unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for waiving the application of this paragraph to such facility or use,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from such applicant (or successor) an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal grant or grants bore to the development cost of the facility financed with the aid of such grant or grants: *Provided*, That the authority to waive the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not apply to any case in which a facility (A) is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship or (B), although not used for a purpose described in clause (A), is used primarily for any part of a program of a school of divinity (as defined in section 122(a)(2)). Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated.

Administration of State Plans

SEC. 109. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part A, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this part A, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 103(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part A until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Part B—Loans for construction of academic facilities

Lending Authority

SEC. 111. The Commissioner may, in accordance with the provisions of this part B, make loans to institutions of higher education or to higher education building agencies for construction of academic facilities.

Loan Limit for Any State

SEC. 112. Not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in this part B in the form of loans shall be used for loans to institutions of higher education or higher education building agencies within any one State.

Eligibility Conditions, Amounts, and Terms of Loans

SEC. 113. (a) No loan pursuant to this part B shall be made unless the Commissioner finds (1) that not less than one-fourth of the development cost of the facility will be financed from non-Federal sources, (2) that the applicant is unable to secure the amount of such loan from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this part B, and (3) that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

(b) A loan pursuant to this part B shall be secured in such manner, and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by the Commissioner; and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall not be less than a per annum rate that is one-quarter of 1 percentage point above the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(c) In order to enable the Commissioner of Education to make loans to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this part B, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making such loans the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

General Provisions for Loan Program

SEC. 114. (a) Such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, except with respect to administrative expenses, shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized (1) to prescribe a schedule of fees which, in his judgment, would be adequate in the aggregate to cover necessary expenses of making inspections (including audits) and providing representatives at the site of projects in connection with loans under this part B and (2) to condition the making of such loans on agreement by the applicant to pay such fees. For the purpose of providing such services, the Commissioner may, as authorized by section 302(b), utilize any agency, and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such applicant or from the Commissioner, and shall, if a Federal agency, credit such amounts to the appropriation or fund against which expenditures by such agency for such services have been charged.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part B, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part B;

(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this part B without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this part B from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

(3) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any property in connection with which he has made a loan pursuant to this part B; and, in the event of any such acquisition (and notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States), complete, administer, remodel and convert, dispose of, lease, and otherwise deal with, such property: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

(4) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired or owned;

(5) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

(6) subject to the specific limitations in this part B, consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this section; and

(7) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this part B such other covenants, conditions, or provisions (including provisions designed to assure against use of the facility, constructed with the aid of a loan under this part B, for purposes described in section 121(a)(2)) as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this part B will be achieved.

Part C—General provisions for loan and grant programs

Definitions

SEC. 121. As used in this title—

(a)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the term "academic facilities" means structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs, of an institution of higher education, and maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities.

(2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or (B) any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for athletic or recreational activities, other than for an academic course in physical education or where the Commissioner finds that the physical integration of such facilities with other academic facilities included under this title is required to carry out the objectives of this title, or (C) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (D) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

(b)(1) The term "construction" means (A) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of initial equipment therefor; or (B) acquisition of existing structures not owned by the institution involved; or (C) rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement (including the acquisition and installation of initial equipment, or modernization or replacement of built-in equipment) of existing structures; or (D) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

(2) The term "equipment" includes, in addition to machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as an academic facility, including necessary furniture, except books and except items of current operating expense such as fuel, supplies, and the like; the term "initial equipment" means equipment acquired and installed in connection with construction as defined in paragraph (1) (A) or (B) of this subsection or, in cases referred to in paragraph (1)(C), equipment acquired and installed as part of the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of an existing structure which structure would otherwise not be adequate for use as an academic facility; and the terms "equipment", "initial equipment", and "built-in equipment" shall be more particularly defined by the Commissioner by regulation.

(c) The term "development cost", with respect to an academic facility, means the amount found by the Commissioner to be the cost, to the applicant for a grant or loan under this title, of the construction involved and the cost of necessary acquisition of the land on which the facility is located and of necessary site improvements to permit its use for such facility, but excluding any cost incurred before, or under a contract entered into before, the enactment of this Act. There shall further be excluded from the development cost—

(1) in determining the amount of any grant under this title, an amount equal to the sum of (A) any Federal grant which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this title, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a grant under this title, and (B) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant; and

(2) in determining the amount of any loan under this title, an amount equal to

the amount of any Federal financial assistance which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this title, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a loan under this title.

(d) The term "Federal share" means a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application for a grant for the construction of an academic facility under part A of this title.

(e) The term "higher education building agency" means (1) an agency, public authority, or other instrumentality of a State authorized to provide, or finance the construction of, academic facilities for institutions of higher education (whether or not also authorized to provide or finance other facilities for such or other educational institutions, or for their students or faculty), or (2) any corporation (no part of the net earnings of which inures or may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual) (A) established by an institution of higher education for the sole purpose of providing academic facilities for the use of such institution, and (B) upon dissolution of which all title to any property purchased or built from the proceeds of any loan made under this title will pass to such institution.

TITLE II—PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE

Authorization of Funds

SEC. 201. For the purpose of this title there is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for each of the five successive fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1963.

Allotments to States

SEC. 202. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. Such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for such year as the product of—

(A) the number of high school graduates of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The allotment to any State under this section for any fiscal year shall be available until the end of the succeeding fiscal year for payment to it of the amount certified, not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the allotment was made, by the State agency as the Federal share of the cost of constructing public community college facilities under the State plan approved pursuant to section 204.

(c) For purposes of this title—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be .75, and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of school construction in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate; and

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

Matching Requirements

SEC. 203. Payment of the full Federal allotment to a State shall be contingent upon the matching of Federal funds by State or local funds, or both, as follows: Each State shall match the Federal allotment by an amount equal to the product of (1) the number of high school graduates in the State and (2) the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State per high school graduate of the State: *Provided*, That in no case shall the State matching payment be more than twice the Federal allotment. To the extent that a State's matching payment falls short of the matching requirement, its Federal allotment shall be proportionately reduced.

State Plans

SEC. 204. (a) Any State desiring to accept the benefits of this title shall submit a State plan for carrying out the purpose of this title. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) designates the State agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State;

(2) contains satisfactory evidence that such State agency will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this title;

(3) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds under this title and to assure proper application of non-Federal funds used in connection therewith;

(4) provides for the establishment of standards, in accordance with the purpose of this title, for locating, planning, and constructing public community college facilities;

(5) provides for affording to every applicant, whose application for funds for a construction project under the State plan is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency; and

(6) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a); or

(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under section 205 to the State or withhold further payments for any project designated by the Commissioner as being directly affected by such failure, as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended; except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment of any amount already reserved under section 205(a) with respect to any public community college facilities project not directly affected by such failure. After notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 205(a) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

Payments to States

SEC. 205. (a) Upon a certification by a State agency—

(1) listing a public community college facilities project (or projects) approved by it during a fiscal year under a State plan approved under section 204; and

(2) setting forth the estimated cost of each such project, the amount of the Federal share of such cost, and such further description of such project as may be required by the Commissioner in order to carry out the provisions of this title,

the Commissioner shall reserve, subject to the requirements of section 203, an amount equal to such Federal share of such cost out of the State's allotment for such fiscal year. Payment of such amount shall be made by the Commissioner to the State, upon request of the State agency, through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, at such time or times and in such installments (in advance of the incurring of cost or otherwise) as the Commissioner may determine. Such payments shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project (or projects) for which such amount has been reserved. The Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved upon request of the State agency and receipt of an amended certification from such agency, but only to the extent such change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this title.

(b) If any project with respect to which payments have been made under this section is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with the regulations of the Commissioner, the State which certified such project shall be liable to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amounts as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

Definitions

SEC. 206. As used in this title—

(1) The term "public community college" means an educational institution, or branch thereof, in a State, which (1) is under public supervision and control, (2) is organized and administered principally to offer educational programs, of not more than two years' duration, beyond the high school level, (3) has as one of its major purposes the provision of a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree upon the student's transfer to an institution of higher education, and (4) if a branch of an institution offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.

(2) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" includes the preparation of drawings and specifications for public

community college facilities, erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facilities.

(3) The term "public community college facilities" means structures, or portions thereof, especially designed, and to be used only, for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library, and related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, utilities, and land (including interests in land and land improvements).

(4) The term "high school graduate" means a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or similar means) from an approved school for successful completion of four years of education beyond the first eight years of schoolwork, or for demonstration of equivalent achievement. For the purposes of this title the number of high school graduates shall be limited to the number who graduated in the most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The interpretation of the definition of "high school graduate" shall fall within the authority of the Commissioner of Education.

(5) The term "national base" means with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of (A) the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in section 201, divided by (B) the number of high school graduates.

(6) The term "State agency" means the agency designated by a State in its State plan in accordance with section 204(1).

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

SEC. 301. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however,* That the requirements of this paragraph (5) shall be deemed to be satisfied in the case of an institution applying for assistance under this Act, if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon completion of the project for which such assistance is requested, or upon completion of that project and others under construction or planned and to be commenced within a reasonable time, the institution will meet such requirements. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(b) The term "high school" does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

(c) The term "nonprofit educational institution" means an educational institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(d) The term "public educational institution" does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

(e) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Federal Administration

SEC. 302. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of any of his functions under this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but not to exceed $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The provisions of section 1003 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 shall apply to members of such committees.

Judicial Review

SEC. 303. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under part A of title I or under title II or with his final action under section 109(b) or 204(c), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

Labor Standards

SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant or loan under title I or a grant under title II except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such grant or loan will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a-5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be; but, in the case of any nonprofit educational institution, the Commissioner may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Commissioner determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Method of Payment

SEC. 305. Payments under this Act to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or loan, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Administrative Appropriations Authorized

SEC. 306. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

Federal Control Not Authorized

SEC. 307. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to inquire of the majority leader about the program for the rest of today, and also for Friday and the remainder of the week.

EXTENSION OF CONSERVATION RESERVE CONTRACTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, let me say that it is anticipated that at approximately 12:15 tomorrow, with the concurrence of the Senate, we shall lay aside the pending bill, and shall take up Calendar No. 533, Senate bill 1588, the amendment of the so-called Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for 1964 and subsequent calendar years. It is my understanding, and I now propose a unanimous-consent agreement to that effect, that Senators who are interested in this bill are willing to agree to a 1-hour limitation, or 30 minutes to a side; and I make that request at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who proposes to submit an amendment, has given his consent to this arrangement; and I believe it is agreeable to all other Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct—1 hour on all amendments and on the bill. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective at 12:15 p.m., on Friday, October 11, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1588) to remove the $10 million limitation on programs carried out under section 16(e)(7) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for 1964 and subsequent calendar years, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table and on final passage of the bill shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders or some Senators designated by them: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the majority leader will yield further, let me say I understand that when action on Senate bill 1588 is completed, the Senate will resume the consideration of the aid to education bill; and it is my further understanding that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has two or three amendments to offer, and there may be other amendments. So I wonder whether the majority leader can assure the Senate with respect to the consideration of amendments and any rollcalls on Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There may be a yea-and-nay vote on the soil conservation bill, although the indications are that there will not be. But if it will be of any assistance—I shall do this only with the consent of the distinguished chairman of the committee, who will be handling the bill—I shall be willing, if he will be, to consider a unanimous-consent agreement to have the Senate start voting on the amendments after the convening of the Senate on Monday, with 1 hour on each amendment. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. ERVIN. That would be all right on each amendment; but there will be considerable debate on the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. How about 1 hour on each amendment and 4 hours on the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. I am not sure about that. In other words, the general debate will probably take longer than that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be plenty of time for debate tomorrow, because the Senate will be in session for some hours then, and most of the debate then will be on the bill.

Does the Senator have a suggestion to make?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may respectfully suggest to the majority leader——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 1½ hours on each amendment and 4 hours on the bill, and that the time limitation become effective beginning at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And with the regular provisions included?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Let me ask the majority leader what is intended for Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Debate on this bill, because I understand there will be a great deal of debate, for many Senators are interested in it. I know the distinguished Senator from New York is.

However, I point out that, as always—and this bill is no exception—the leadership finds itself in a bind, and this is the best arrangement we can make and still have it of benefit to the majority of Senators. Unfortunately, we are requested to do or not to do this, or that, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday—although no Senator asks for special consideration on Sunday. So this is the situation with which we are confronted, and we must try to work out some arrangement.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana modify his request to the extent of having it provide for 6 hours of debate on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. Mr. President, I modify my request accordingly.

Mr. KEATING. It is my intention to attend the Senate's session on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from New York is in the Chamber every day of the year.

Mr. KEATING. But I have very important plans for Tuesday. I wonder whether we could dispose of the amendments on Monday, instead of just debating the bill then. I do not believe I have ever interposed an objection to a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New York is correct; he has not done so. I would not blame him for interposing objection at this time. If he does, it will be thoroughly understood, and it will just be one of the facts of life with which we shall have to live.

Mr. KEATING. When the distinguished majority leader puts the matter that way, I cannot bring myself to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. KEATING. I do not believe that one Senator should, for his own convenience, object. So I shall have to cancel this engagement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator from New York wishes me to do so, I will do my very best to see that he gets a live pair, if he cannot get back in time.

Mr. KEATING. If the votes will be taken later in the day, I believe I can get back in time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senator that there will be votes later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there objection to the modified request?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall not take it upon myself to object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair restate the proposed agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from Montana to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Chair put the question and have it voted on, and then state what the agreement is? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed agreement, as modified? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That effective on Tuesday, October 15, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1½ hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I respectfully request the Chair now to state the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement is that there will be 1½ hours on each amendment and 6 hours on the bill, with the time to be equally divided, and subject to the regular provisions.

Mr. ERVIN. To take effect when?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Beginning at noon on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, the agreement will give us today and Monday for general debate; is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct—both on this bill and on other bills.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

AUTHORIZATION TO STUDY AND INVESTIGATE FINANCIAL OR BUSINESS INTERESTS OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, we in America are extremely fortunate in that we have one of the best forms of government ever conceived by mankind.

But that form of government will stand only so long as its public officials respect the integrity of their offices and it can hold and maintain the confidence of the American people.

In recent weeks we have seen publicized rather serious charges of questionable transactions by an employee of the U.S. Senate.

The Senate, which has never been reluctant to call to task officials of the executive branch when questions were raised concerning the propriety of their conduct, has an even greater responsibility to examine these charges that are being made against one of its own employees.

To ignore these charges would be a reflection on the integrity of the entire membership of the U.S. Senate.

The Senate employee against whom the charges were made was given ample opportunity to appear in person to answer these charges but he rejected this invitation and instead submitted his resignation.

But these questions still remain and they must be answered. The Senate and the country have a right to know to what extent public interest has been ignored.

I will not repeat the multitude of rumors circulating the Capital, none of which should be accepted as factual until proven, but none of which are so unimportant that they can be ignored without being fully checked.

All of these allegations can and should be submitted to a committee of the Senate and to the Department of Justice for their examination. The record must be made clear that the Senate does not consider this case closed merely by the resignation of an employee.

The integrity of the U.S. Senate is at stake.

Mr. President, with the consent of the leadership, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have stated, following which I shall ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). The resolution submitted by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 212), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation with respect to any financial or business interests or activities of any officer or employee or former officer or employee of the Senate, for the purpose of ascertaining (1) whether any such interests or activities have involved conflicts of interest or other impropriety, and (2) whether additional laws, rules, or regulations are necessary or desirable for the purpose of prohibiting or restricting any such interests or activities. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall ask for immediate consideration of the resolution. Other resolutions are pending in the Committee on Rules and Administration, among which is the resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), submitted by the Senators from New York [Mr. Javits and Mr. Keating]. There are other resolutions, from other Senators, all of which can be appropriately studied. These resolutions deals not only with employees, but also with Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To those the Senator named, the distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. Javits and Mr. Keating], I should like to add the name of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], who for well over a decade, if not for almost two decades, has introduced similar proposed legislation, and also other Senators on this side of the aisle.

There is no man of higher moral principles, of greater personal integrity, than the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. Every Senator knows of his deep and righteous concern for any question which might affect the fiscal integrity of the U.S. Government. Time and again, he has acted to extirpate anything which might reflect adversely upon it.

He is entirely within his rights, of course, in submitting the resolution which he proposed. In doing so, I am sure he has in mind this same crusade for integrity with which he has so long been identified. I would agree with the Senator that the subject to which his resolution is addressed clearly needs study.

In this connection, I would read to the Senate a letter dated October 4, 1963, which I sent by safe hand to the able and highly respected chairman of the Rules Committee. He is, as I am sure the Senator from Delaware would appreciate, a Senator no less concerned than any other Member with the integrity of this institution.

Hon. B. Everett Jordan,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Washington, D.C.

Dear Everett: As you are no doubt aware, questions have been raised in the press as to possible conflicts of interest of Senate employees.

This unfortunate situation seems to me to have arisen in part at least because we have not as a body clarified the matter of possible conflicts of interest of Senate employees in their official capacities and their private financial interests and activities. Let me make clear that I do not refer to Senate employees on the personal staff of any Member of the Senate, each of whom is fully competent to arrange these matters within his own office in accordance with law and the Senate rules. But what I have in mind are the staff employees of Senate committees and subcommittees, who are now quite numerous, and the officers and agents of both the majority and minority structures as well as nonpartisan officials of the Senate as a whole.

I know that you, Everett, and the other members of your committee have the high interests of the Senate always in mind and will study this question and make whatever recommendations in connection therewith you deem appropriate. Please be assured of my full support in any efforts which you may make in this connection.

With best personal wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Mike Mansfield.

I have every confidence that on the basis of his own understanding, this letter and this resolution which is being considered on an immediate basis, the chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee will have his group proceed to a study of the question which was first raised on October 4 and which the Senator from Delaware raises today. Indeed, I am informed by the distinguished chairman [Mr. Jordan] that he has already begun preliminary consideration of the question. In any event, I wish to express again my deep respect for the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his high-minded concern in this matter and to express again my admiration for his ever-zealous defense of the fiscal integrity of the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, obviously this subject has had a good deal of consideration by the leadership. There have been quite a number of consultations. With respect to the matter to which the pending resolution is directed, our whole hope has been to find an equitable, fair, and thoroughly judicious approach. I fully concur in the contents of the resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. I join the majority leader in saluting him for his vigilance and for the jealous regard that he has for the integrity of the Senate and its operations. I would be glad to concur in, and even be a cosponsor of the resolution, but we felt that that was unnecessary. But I trust without too much more ado the Senate will adopt the resolution, and that the Committee on Rules and Administration, by itself or through a subcommittee, will then impress its will upon the contents of the resolution and take whatever action may be necessary.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. In response to what the majority leader has stated, the letter to which the Senator has referred was delivered to me by hand on Monday morning, I believe, I immediately communicated with the majority leader by telephone and personally. We discussed the subject. I drafted a statement which I should like to read:

The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration is, of course, interested in any facts bearing on possible conflicts of interest and will determine whether or not new or revised Senate rules are advisable.

On Tuesday of this week I had some discussions with members of the staff of the Committee on Rules and Administration relating to this subject. As yet we have taken no action, but the subject is under study. I assure Senators that it is already being considered, and that the purposes of the resolution will be carried out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader, the minority leader, and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, not only for their remarks here today, but for the excellent cooperation they have given in arriving at what we think will be a proper method of determining the necessary answers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. In a moment I will yield to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. But I wish to make a brief statement at this point. I heartily endorse the resolution just adopted. I hope that similar expeditious action can be taken on proposed legislation that I have had pending before the Senate year after year. It is pending again. That proposed legislation deals with conflicts of interest on the part not only of employees of the Senate, but Members of Congress and members of the executive branch as well.

That likewise is important. We ought to put in order the house of our employees, and we ought to put in order the house of the Congress itself, as well as the house of the executive branch of the Government. There should be the same concern on the part of all of us for the elimination of conflict of interest on the part of members of the executive and legislative branches.

I therefore raise my voice again in plea for early action on the proposed legislation which I have introduced year after year, which would call for a public accounting and a public disclosure of the sources of income and business associations of all Members of Congress, as well as all those in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, before going to another subject?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I join the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon in urging early consideration of the various proposals, including those which my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I have submitted to deal with the problems of legislative ethics.

Congress is constantly laying down regulations for the conduct of those in the executive branch, telling them what they should and should not do. It is not right for us to exempt the legislative branch from the rules and regulations we have imposed upon the executive branch. There is no justification for this double standard and it has undermined confidence in our good faith.

The measure which we have introduced relates both to Members of Congress and employees, and we have been pressing for action on this proposal for many years.

Mr MORSE. I believe it would be proper, when the Senator finishes his remarks, to have a copy of that measure printed in the RECORD, along with a copy of my bill.

Mr. KEATING. I agree.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. I shall conclude in a moment.

Regardless of any particular episode, we shall be constantly confronted with such situations unless we come to grips with the problem. It always seems to require prodding from some unfortunate experience of some kind to insure action. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon has brought up this subject. I hope the prod is now sufficient to cause action to take place.

I recognize that there are differences between the executive and the legislative branches. The identical rules cannot apply to the two, but the standards and principles involved are the same. We can devise a code of ethics or a set of rules to govern our conduct and the conduct of our employees, not merely for the purpose of punishing those who do not live up to the code—and I would hope that would never happen—but also for guidance. There are many borderline cases, which always raise questions. We need guidelines and machinery such as the professional associations have, to guide Members of Congress and their staffs as to what is appropriate and proper. If we had such guidelines, I am sure a vast majority would live up to them.

I am glad the Senator has raised this point.

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree with the Senator from New York more completely.

EXHIBIT 1

S. CON. RES. 5

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. (a) One of the most vital concerns of a free and representative government is the maintenance of moral and ethical standards for their representatives which are above cause for reproach and warrant the confidence of the people. The people are entitled to expect from their elected representatives in the Federal Government and the employees of the legislative branch a standard above that of the marketplace, for these public servants are entrusted with the welfare of the Nation. Yet these standards must be practical and should be fairly representative of the people who elect their representatives. Some conflicts of interest are clearly wrong and should be proscribed by sanctions in the criminal law; however, many are composed of such diverse circumstances, events, and intangible and indirect concerns that only the individual conscience can serve as a practical guide. But there are many possibilities of conflict in that shadowland of conduct for which guidance would be useful and healthy, but for which the criminal law is neither suited for suitable. Therefore, the Congress finds that a Code of Ethics is desirable for the guidance and protection of its Members and the officers and employees of the legislative branch of Government, establishing the standards of conduct reasonably to be expected of them.

(b) It is also the purpose of this resolution to provide for a thorough study and investigation to determine necessary and desirable changes in existing conflicts of interest statutes applying to Members of Congress and to officers and employees of the legislative branch, and to develop a comprehensive Code of Ethics for the guidance of such Members, officers, and employees, by which the purposes of this resolution may be more fully assured in the conduct of the public business in the legislative branch.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Ethics (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee).

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of seven Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to undertake a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which the policy objectives set forth in section 1 of this resolution can further be assured. In the conduct of such study and investigation the joint committee shall, among other things, determine to what extent existing conflict of interest laws or regulations applicable to the legislative branch should be strengthened and it shall recommend a comprehensive Code of Ethics in the formulation of which it shall have considered the following subjects:

(1) Outside employment or professional or business activity by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch;

(2) Disclosure by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties or the use thereof for personal advantage;

(3) Use of their official position by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for themselves or others;

(4) Dealing by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch in their official capacities with matters in which they have a substantial pecuniary interest;

(5) Conduct by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch which gives reasonable cause for public suspicion of violation of public trust; and

(6) Other matters concerning official propriety and the integrity of the public service as it relates to Members of Congress, officers or employees of the legislative branch.

(b) The joint committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the result of its investigations together with such recommendations for the establishment of a Code of Ethics covering the legislative branch as it may deem advisable.

Such report shall be submitted no later than March 31, 1964, and the committee shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its final report.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

HEARINGS, SUBPENAS, DISBURSEMENTS, EMPLOYEES

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said joint committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed one-half by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House.

(b) The joint committee shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable, subject to the limitations of its appropriations. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of such departments and other agencies of the Government as it may deem appropriate.

LIMITATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE'S POWERS

SEC. 5. The joint committee shall have no power of enforcement with respect to any Members of Congress or officer or employee of the legislative branch, and such power is reserved with respect to its Members, officers, or employees to each House or to any committee thereof which has been designated to carry out such functions.

INTERIM CODE OF ETHICS

SEC. 6. For the purposes of guidance for Members of Congress and officers and employees of the legislative branch during the period during which the joint committee is considering the provisions of an appropriate Code of Ethics for Members of Congress and officers or employees of the legislative branch, the Congress hereby adopts the following standards as a guide to such Members, officers, or employees:

(a) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch should have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect or engage in any business transaction, or professional activity or incur any obligation of any nature whether financial or moral, which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties in the public interest; nor should any Member of Congress, officer or employee of the legislative branch give substantial and reasonable cause to the public to believe that he is acting in breach of his public trust.

(b) In addition to the general rule set forth in paragraph (a), the following standards are applied to certain specified transactions:

(1) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should accept other employment which will tend to impair his independence of judgment in the exercise of his official duties.

(2) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should accept employment or engage in any business or professional activity which will tend to involve his disclosure or use of confidential information which he has gained by reason of his official position or authority.

(3) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should disclose confidential information acquired by him in the course of his official duties or use such information for other than official purposes.

(4) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should use or attempt to use his official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for himself or others.

(5) A Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should not by his conduct give reasonable cause for belief that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor in the performance of his official duties, or that he is affected by the kinship, rank, position, or influence of any person or political party.

(6) A Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should endeavor to pursue a course of conduct which will not give reasonable cause for belief that he is likely to violate his trust.

(7) Any Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, having a financial interest, direct, or indirect, having a value of $10,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, should file with the Comptroller General a statement setting forth the nature of such interest in such reasonable detail, and in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General. As used herein, the term "regulatory agency" shall include such agencies as shall be designated by the Comptroller General, which list shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable.

S. 148

A bill to require Members of Congress, certain other officers and employees of the United States, and certain officials of political parties to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in securities and commodities

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives (including each Delegate and Resident Commissioner); each officer and employee of the United States who (1) receives a salary at a rate of $10,000 or more per annum or (2) holds a position of grade GS-15 or above, and each officer in the Armed Forces of the rank of colonel, or its equivalent, and above; and each member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party shall file annually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of—

(1) the amount and resources of all income and gifts (of $100 or more in money or value, or in the case of multiple gifts from one person, aggregating $100 or more in money or value) received by him or any person on his behalf during the preceding calendar year;

(2) the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by or to him and any other person and the amount of each liability owed by him, or by him together with any other person as of the close of the preceding year; and

(3) the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year to any person who received anything of value on his behalf or subject to his direction or control or who, with his acquiescence, makes payments for any liability or expense incurred by him.

SEC. 2. Each person required by the first section to file reports shall, in addition, file semiannually with the Comptroller General a report containing a full and complete statement of all dealings in securities or commodities by him, or by any person acting on his behalf or pursuant to his direction, during the preceding six-month period.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the reports required by the first section of this Act shall be filed not later than March 31 of each year; and the reports required by section 2 shall be filed not later than July 31 of each year for the six-month period ending June 30 of such year, and not later than January 31 of each year for the six-month period ending December 31 of the preceding year.

(b) In the case of any person required to file reports under this Act whose service terminates prior to the date prescribed by subsection (a) as the date for filing any report, such report shall be filed on the last day of such person's service, or on such later date, not more than three months after the termination of such service, as the Comptroller General may prescribe.

SEC. 4. The reports required by this Act shall be in such form and detail as the Comptroller General may prescribe. The Comptroller General may provide for the grouping of items of income, sources of income, assets, liabilities, and dealings in securities or commodities, when separate itemization is not feasible or not necessary for an accurate disclosure of a person's income, net worth, or dealings in securities, and commodities.

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act or who willfully and knowingly files a false report shall be fined $2,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 6. (a) As used in this Act—

(1) The term "income" means gross income as defined in section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code.

(2) The term "security" means security as defined in section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 77b).

(3) The term "commodity" means commodity as defined in section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 7, sec. 2).

(4) The term "dealings in securities or commodities" means any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, disposition, or other transaction involving any security or commodity.

(5) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, trust, estate, association, corporation, or society.

(b) For the purposes of any report required by this Act, a person shall be considered to be a Member of the Senate or House of Representatives, an officer or employee of the United States and of the armed services as described in the first section of this Act, or a member, chairman, or other officer of the national committee of a political party, if he served (with or without compensation) in any such position during the period to be covered by such report, notwithstanding that his service may have terminated prior to December 31 of such calendar year.

SEC. 7. The Comptroller General shall have authority to issue, reissue, and amend rules and regulations governing the publication of reports, or any part of them. He shall prescribe fees to cover the cost of reproduction. In formulating such rules and regulations, he shall seek to maximize the availability of reports for purposes of informing the public and agencies and officials of the Federal and local governments, and to minimize use of such records for private purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, submitted by me and my colleague [Mr. KEATING] on January 16, 1963.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 5

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. (a) One of the most vital concerns of a free and representative government is the maintenance of moral and ethical standards for their representatives which are above cause for reproach and warrant the confidence of the people. The people are entitled to expect from their elected representatives in the Federal Government and the employees of the legislative branch a standard above that of the marketplace, for these public servants are entrusted with the welfare of the Nation. Yet these standards must be practical and should be fairly representative of the people who elect their representatives. Some conflicts of interest are clearly wrong and should be proscribed by sanctions in the criminal law; however, many are composed of such diverse circumstances, events, and intangible and indirect concerns that only the individual conscience can serve as a practical guide. But there are many possibilities of conflict in that shadowland of conduct for which guidance would be useful and healthy, but for which the criminal law is neither suited nor suitable. Therefore, the Congress finds that a Code of Ethics is desirable for the guidance and protection of its Members and the officers and employees of the legislative branch of Government, establishing the standards of conduct reasonably to be expected of them.

(b) It is also the purpose of this resolution to provide for a thorough study and investigation to determine necessary and desirable changes in existing conflicts of interest statutes applying to Members of Congress and to officers and employees of the legislative branch, and to develop a comprehensive Code of Ethics for the guidance of such Members, officers, and employees, by which the purposes of this resolution may be more fully assured in the conduct of the public business in the legislative branch.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Ethics (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee).

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of seven Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to undertake a thorough study and investigation of the ways and means by which the policy objectives set forth in section 1 of this resolution can further be assured. In the conduct of such study and investigation the joint committee shall, among other things, determine to what extent existing conflict of interest laws or regulations applicable to the legislative branch should be strengthened and it shall recommend a comprehensive Code of Ethics in the formulation of which it shall have considered the following subjects:

(1) Outside employment or professional or business activity by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch;

(2) Disclosure by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch of confidential information acquired in the course of official duties or the use thereof for personal advantage;

(3) Use of their official position by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for themselves or others;

(4) Dealing by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch in their official capacities with matters in which they have a substantial pecuniary interest;

(5) Conduct by Members of Congress or officers or employees of the legislative branch which gives reasonable cause for public suspicion of violation of public trust; and

(6) Other matters concerning official propriety and the integrity of the public service as it relates to Members of Congress, officers or employees of the legislative branch.

(b) The joint committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the result of its investigations together with such recommendations for the establishment of a Code of Ethics covering the legislative branch as it may deem advisable. Such report shall be submitted no later than March 31, 1964, and the committee shall cease to exist thirty days after the submission of its final report.

(c) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

HEARINGS, SUBPENAS, DISBURSEMENTS, EMPLOYEES

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said joint committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed one-half by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half by the Clerk of the House.

(b) The joint committee shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems necessary and advisable, subject to the limitations of its appropriations. The joint committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, and facilities of such departments and other agencies of the Government as it may deem appropriate.

LIMITATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE'S POWERS

SEC. 5. The joint committee shall have no power of enforcement with respect to any Members of Congress or officer or employee of the legislative branch, and such power is reserved with respect to its Members, officers, or employees to each House or to any committee thereof which has been designated to carry out such functions.

INTERIM CODE OF ETHICS

SEC. 6. For the purposes of guidance for Members of Congress and officers and employees of the legislative branch during the period during which the joint committee is considering the provisions of an appropriate Code of Ethics for Members of Congress and officers or employees of the legislative branch, the Congress hereby adopts the following standards as a guide to such Members, officers, or employees:

(a) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch should have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect or engage in any business transaction, or professional activity or incur any obligation of any nature whether financial or moral, which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties in the public interest; nor should any Member of Congress, officer or employee of the legislative branch give substantial and reasonable cause to the public to believe that he is acting in breach of his public trust.

(b) In addition to the general rule set forth in paragraph (a), the following standards are applied to certain specified transactions:

(1) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should accept other employment which will tend to impair his independence of judgment in the exercise of his official duties.

(2) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should accept employment or engage in any business or professional activity which will tend to involve his disclosure or use of confidential information which he has gained by reason of his official position or authority.

(3) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should disclose confidential information acquired by him in the course of his official duties or use such information for other than official purposes.

(4) No Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, should use or attempt to use his official position to secure unwarranted privileges or exemptions for himself or others.

(5) A Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should not by his conduct give reasonable cause for belief that any person can improperly influence him or unduly enjoy his favor in the performance of his official duties, or that he is affected by the kinship, rank, position, or influence of any person or political party.

(6) A Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government should endeavor to pursue a course of conduct which will not give reasonable cause for belief that he is likely to violate his trust.

(7) Any Member of Congress, or officer or employee of the legislative branch of the Government, having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of $10,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency, should file with the Comptroller General a statement setting forth the nature of such interest in such reasonable detail, and in accordance with such regulations as shall be prescribed by the Comptroller General. As used herein, the term "regulatory agency" shall include such agencies as shall be designated by the Comptroller General, which list shall be published in the Federal Register as soon as practicable.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the leadership is handling this matter as it should be handled. We all understand the total implications of what is being done, and why. I join my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] in emphasizing the responsibility we have as Senators for our own conduct as well as our responsibility for the conduct of legislative employees. This, I believe, is the main thing the country wants to hear from us: What are we going to do, not only about those who work here, but also about ourselves? That is the subject of Senate Concurrent Resolution 5.

I am rather proud that my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] and I submitted the resolution at such an early date in the year, which was rather forehanded about what needs to be done in this field. Our proposal would establish a joint committee on ethics to develop a code of ethics for the Senate and its employees, and also would provide an interim code of ethics pending the adoption of a permanent code based on the joint committee's recommendations.

Others have lived through these problems and dealt with them in the way they should be dealt with; namely, by providing a standard to which all may repair.

This must be done internally, because this is a legislative body. We must provide the means for its enforcement. The resolution would provide for a joint committee to administer and to enforce the code of ethics. The Congress has complete authority over its Members, and has a right to enforce its authority on every one of us; and we all should be subject to reasonable standards of ethics.

This proposal would go a long way to buttressing confidence in the legislators in the public mind, and such confidence is indispensable to the conduct of a free government.

Mr. President, what our colleague has done is most statesmanlike. It requires an incident of this character to awaken us all to our responsibilities and needs, and in that respect it can be a blessing as well as a trouble to us all.

I hope very much that the Committee on Rules and Administration will go much further than merely considering the situation which has been presented to it on a factual basis, and that it will make its findings and will recommend a permanent code of ethics for the Congress based upon the recommendations and suggestions contained in the proposals we have submitted and that which the Senator from Oregon has introduced. I have little doubt that other Senators have proposed similar legislation.

I thank my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, for yielding.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for an insertion in the Record?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of those of my colleagues—and I believe this includes nearly all of my colleagues—who are interested in the subject of congressional reorganization to a column by Mr. William S. White which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of October 9; to a copy of a letter with respect to that column which I have written to the 40 newspapers in Pennsylvania which carry Mr. White's column; to a column entitled "Complaint Against Congress" written by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post of October 3; and to an article, written by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, entitled "The Big Slowdown" under the byline of "Inside Report" which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald.

I make no further comment on Mr. White's article because I think the insertions will speak for themselves. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Oct. 9, 1963]

(By William S. White)

Washington.—This country could one day face nothing less than a constitutional crisis in the incessant degrading now going on of Congress as an institution expressly charged by that Constitution to go its independent way.

This curiously uninformed and almost hysterical attack upon Congress has, of course, been going on for some years. Almost invariably it comes from leftwing so-called intellectuals and political scientists, who seem not to have the faintest notion that that thing up on Capitol Hill was deliberately set up to be no President's stooge but every President's checkrein.

Still, none of the past howling from these quarters has been remotely comparable to its present shrill volume. Members of Congress who dare go onto some television panels must be prepared actually to apologize for the fact that Congress is performing its constitutional function.

They must actively defend the gall of the place in refusing to abdicate its sworn duties by giving automatic—and instant—assent to whatever is asked of it by the administration. Final and outright refusal of this or that program is described as hardly short of treason to the people's welfare.

Sometimes, indeed, the attitude of the interrogator suggests that a Member of Congress is in the dock on a criminal charge.

Pundits and professors fill the egghead magazines, and don't wholly neglect the daily press, with automatic assumptions that Congress is invariably wrong or stupid, or perhaps actually evil, in any contest with a President—so long as he is a liberal President. It is only fair to say, parenthetically, that the present President, who is the intended beneficiary of the screaming, John F. Kennedy, far from welcomes such juvenile support. He has read the Constitution and is satisfied with it the way it is.

The most exasperating thing of all, perhaps, is that all this nonsense comes, with rare exceptions, from people whose actual knowledege of a single reality in Congress is as patently and absurdly limited as, say, my knowledge of nuclear physics.

A whole new meaning for words—and a whole new system of unthink—would be required to grasp their approach to public affairs. When, say, a Senator votes his convictions and proper State interests, after prolonged study of the right thing to do, he is a matchless hero if he goes with the administration and a knuckleheaded cretin if he goes the other way. The higher his earned respect from among the most informed of all critics, his colleagues, the less respect he gets from the reformers—unless, of course, his record is agreeable to their notions of the moment.

And this is in fact a pointless "unless." For, as might rationally be expected, no Member becomes a great man of Congress by spending all his time denying the proper independence of his own place in order to run after some President as a docile stooge.

At bottom, this business is an attack on no less a thing than representative government. This is so because Congress is the only part of the Government which is literally and precisely representative in structure and character.

What the screamers therefore are really reaching for, whether they know it or not, is a kind of people's republic where public policy would be exclusively in the hands of a President who, though quite democratically and lawfully elected, would thereafter be under no real check at all.

October 10, 1963.

Editor, the News,
New Castle, Pa.

Dear Sir: May I comment on William S. White's attack in his column printed on Wednesday, October 9, on those of us who believe deeply in the need for thoroughgoing congressional reform.

Mr. White refers to a "curiously uninformed and almost hysterical attack upon Congress" which, he states, has been coming for some years from "left-wing, so-called intellectuals and political scientists."

The most exasperating thing to Mr. White "is that all this nonsense comes, with rare exceptions, from people whose actual knowledge of a single reality in Congress is as patently and absurdly limited as, say, my knowledge of nuclear physics."

One wonders where Mr. White has been during the last several years and whether he reads anything except perhaps his own column.

Among those outside of Congress who have been intensely critical of its failure to perform its constitutional functions because of its outmoded rules, procedures and customs are: Walter Lippmann, James D. Reston, Roscoe Drummond, Marquis Childs and Peter Edson, to name only a few of the highly regarded and widely syndicated columnists who take this position.

Among the Senators who sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, introduced by me last January and calling for a study in depth of the present inadequacies of the Congress are such "hysterical" and ignorant "screamers" to quote Mr. White, as Senator Thomas Kuchel of California, the Republican Whip, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, the Democratic Whip, Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, President of the Republican Senatorial Conference, Senator Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey, and his colleague, Senator Harrison Williams, Democrat, Senator Hugh Scott, Senator John Sherman Cooper, Senator Paul Douglas, and some 22 other Senators.

A similar group of able and experienced Members of the House of Representatives is working toward the same end of comprehensive congressional reorganization.

The fact of the matter is that practically everybody in Washington knowledgeable about congressional performance, with the exception of Mr. White and a few diehard ultraconservatives of both parties, is agreed that the present conspicuous failure in our American Federal form of Government has been the inability of the legislative branch to measure up to the challenges of our times with the same success as the executive and judicial branches.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 3, 1963]

COMPLAINT AGAINST CONGRESS

(By Walter Lippmann)

This is one of those moments when there is reason to wonder whether the congressional system as it now operates is not a grave danger to the Republic. There are two great measures before Congress, and in all probability Senator GOLDWATER was right when he said the other day that "the President has to make up his mind whether he wants the civil rights bill or a tax cut, because he cannot get them both."

This situation is a reflection on the Congress. For the truth is that the two measures are not competitive but complementary. If the tax bill can do what its advocates believe it can do, that is to say, stimulate business and reduce unemployment, it will reduce some of the pressures which are making it so difficult for the leaders of the Negro people to continue to be moderate, nonviolent, patient, and reasonable.

The civil rights bill promises the Negroes the chance to vote, better schooling, and an end to humiliation in public accommodations. But the tax bill promises the Negroes jobs. They need them. The rate of unemployment among Negroes is a little more than twice as great as among the whites. The Negroes, therefore, have an acute interest in a measure that promises to overcome the sluggishness of the economy. Today for example, the Negro rate of unemployment is over 11 percent; during 1951–53, when the economy was booming, Negro unemployment was less than 5 percent.

Anyone who is serious about dealing with the Negroes' grievances must, therefore, be distressed to find that he has to choose between the tax bill and the civil rights bill. A competent Congress, which was equal to the realities of our time, would see that the two measures are closely related and would act on them accordingly.

But there is something more in all this than the lack of serious and realistic understanding of what is at stake. This Congress has gone further than any other within memory to replace debate and decision by delay and stultification. The President first announced his plan to seek a reduction of taxes in order to stimulate the economy on August 13, 1962. That was over a year ago. A tax bill passed the House last week. But the Senate has not even begun to hold hearings.

The reason for this delay is that there is a considerable body of strong opinion in Congress and in the country which is opposed to any tax cut until spending is cut down. Though I happen to think that it is impossible to balance the budget when the economy is running so much below capacity, and that an attempt to deflate now would produce a recession, the views of the opposition to a tax cut are honorable and deserving of respect. The issue, which is real, should be debated for as long as it takes to debate it thoroughly. But there should be a rollcall and a decision at the end of the debate.

I do not see how a modern government can be conducted successfully if on a major issue, such as fiscal policy, the Executive is refused for more than a year a debate and a decision. If Congress agrees with Senator BYRD, it ought to debate and then to defeat the tax bill. What is becoming alarming and intolerable is a Congress which will smother and stultify rather than debate and decide.

This is a furtive and degenerate form of the filibuster. In my view, the open filibuster—that is to say protracted debate—can normally be justified and accepted as a way of mitigating the absolutism of numerical majorities. If I were a Senator, I would be very loathe to vote for cloture. But I would vote for it now because the times are not normal and a critical emergency exists.

The national security requires, I believe, the passage in the near future of a civil rights bill which constitutes a declaration by the Federal Government that all the remaining badges of slavery and servitude are outlawed.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 10, 1963]

THE BIG SLOWDOWN

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Congress is beginning to look like a sitdown strike.

Well known, of course, is the plight of the big Kennedy bills—civil rights and tax reduction—whose perils are mirrored in the headlines every day.

Not so familiar, however, is the fact that Congress is way behind on everything. It hasn't even appropriated operating funds for the Voice of America, the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Justice Department, and half a dozen other agencies whose new budget year started on July 1.

Here it is mid-October, and the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill is still in a pigeonhole of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Not a single hearing has yet been held for the U.S. Information Agency, which is trying to compete abroad with the Soviet Union and Communist China. Not a single penny has been appropriated to the Commerce Department, which is trying to organize a new export expansion program in hopes of reducing the payments deficit.

Last month the subcommittee that handles appropriations for the State-Justice-Commerce Departments held 4 days of hearings on the Commerce Department. For the export program, the Department is asking a 100-percent increase, a good part of which the House has already voted. After the 4 days of hearings, Subcommittee Chairman JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, shut up shop to get ready for the Cosa Nostra serial, featuring Mr. Valachi.

Presiding over the Valachi hearings, as Senator MCCLELLAN is now doing in his capacity as chairman of the Investigations Subcommittee, is probably more fun than presiding over an appropriation bill. The State Department's foreign building program can't compete with murder.

But indefinite postponement of appropriating funds for these Federal agencies is a risky business. Year after year, Congress finds it too exhausting to pass the appropriation bills by each June 30, the end of the fiscal year, for the ensuing 12 months. So it resorts to a subterfuge, known as the "continuing resolution," permitting the agencies to continue spending at the same level as the previous year.

This is fine in a static world. But in a world of change, it can make things difficult. The State Department, for example, is trying to find $14 million to build embassies and other buildings in the new countries of Africa. It is also trying to hire 129 new people to carry out its end of the export expansion program.

The Voice of America, disturbed over increased Communist penetration of Latin America and Africa by various propaganda media, is asking for more money. It may be debatable whether the extra funds are all needed for foreign buildings or to expand U.S. exports or to improve the Voice of America. But until Congress tells the agencies what they can do, all these programs are in limbo.

This is because the "continuing resolutions" that have now become so fixed a part of the appropriation process automatically limit spending to the rate of the previous year, without regard to the new requirements.

Beyond that, of course, is the confusion of this whole process on the new 1964–65 budget. All Government agencies are now giving the Budget Bureau their spending estimates for the year starting next July 1. After the Budget Bureau prunes them down, these estimates are the figures that make up the new budget sent to Congress in January. This new budget is being made up right now. The agencies which Congress has failed to finance for the current fiscal year—starting July 1963—are in a ridiculous situation. They have to tell the Budget Bureau what they need for next year before they even know how much Congress is going to give them this year, one-third of which is now gone by.

Northern politicians suspect that the unprecedented delay in appropriations this year is just the first stage of a general southern-inspired slowdown that will eventually blossom in a Senate filibuster against the civil rights bill. Mr. Valachi came along at just the right time.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN RELATION TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, President Kennedy's press conference statement relative to military takeovers in Latin America is a disappointment. It still does not set forth any American future policy on the subject. Apparently the President is seeking to put an umbrella over the policy conflict between Assistant Secretary Martin's view that some coups are acceptable and the assumption of the Alliance for Progress that it is designed to promote constitutional government. If so, then he is as much as admitting that we have no policy, that in Latin America we stand for nothing and are all things to all people.

It is not enough for him to say we are opposed to military coups if he at the same time endorses Secretary Martin's apology for coups.

Before Congress proceeds with another cent of money for the Alliance for Progress we should know what the policy of the United States toward these coups is going to be. If it is intended that we do business with illegal governments, as we are doing right now in Guatemala, then I think the Alliance for Progress is serving no useful purpose and might as well be dropped.

If it is intended that the Alliance for Progress continue in its intended course of supporting economic and social change through constitutional processes, then the President has to make it clear that illegal seizures of power in Latin America will not receive any American economic or military aid so long as they or their civilian stooges remain in power. That is the only policy statement that will make clear our intentions, and they urgently need to be made clear in Latin America, as well as in the United States.

The administration is playing with disaster in trying to travel down these two divergent roads at the same time. Everyone in a position of power in Latin America knows that the Assistant Secretary in charge of Latin American affairs circulated a policy statement to State Department officials within Latin American countries that differentiates between so-called good and bad coups, and saying that we will judge each one on its merits. Secretary Martin's policy statement is an invitation to military juntas to take over if they only will not be crude and too bloody about it. He makes it pretty clear to every potential junta colonel that the United States will make no objection to an illegal junta if it maintains a respectable facade.

That policy is totally different from one that cuts off American aid to any and all coups that overthrow constitutional governments. The President cannot have it both ways. Until he makes a decision between one policy or the other, the common people of Latin America, their constitutionalists, and their military, will continue to be confused and divided. The American people, including our official representatives in Latin America, and the Members of Congress who are supposed to put up the money for economic and military aid will not know whether the United States is willing to see military governments take over or not.

In a letter I received today from the great leader of freedom in the Caribbean, Jose Figueres of Costa Rica, he tells me:

> It is a waste of time, money, and health to try to do anything wholeheartedly until the U.S. Government adopts a uniform policy toward social reform through elected governments.

His letter reads in full, as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Congratulations on your stand on the Dominican and Honduran crises.
>
> In the New York Times, October 5, page 1 continued, Tad Szulck says that the U.S. military mission encouraged the coup in Santo Domingo.
>
> This is what is happening everywhere. The military call communism any social reform, and act independently.
>
> It is a waste of time, money, and health to try to do anything wholeheartedly until the U.S. Government adopts a uniform policy toward social reform through elected governments.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> JOSE FIGUERES.

As long as Mr. Martin's policy statement remains as the last word on this subject—and it still does, although the President has spoken—Latin American colonels are on notice to go ahead but in a civilized manner. I shall not support any further aid program in Latin America that is conducted on that basis, and I shall do my best to prevail upon other Members of Congress and the American people to join me. The United States is either for constitutional government or it is not, and there is no way to reconcile support for constitutional government with Mr. Martin's statement that some coups are satisfactory and represent progress.

All military coups are bad. There cannot be any good ones, because any military coup destroys constitutional government. The past statements of the President, both in the campaign of 1960 and at the time he enunciated the great Alliance for Progress program, clearly imply—and have been generally so interpreted and restated over and over again, not only in this country but in Latin America—that the Alliance for Progress program will be made available to constitutional governments. That means we cannot treat military juntas or alleged civilian governments set up as stooges of military juntas, as though they were constitutional governments.

As a great defender of the President of the United States on almost all issues, I most respectfully plead again that a clear-cut statement be sent to Latin America that there will be no aid whatsoever, at any time, so long as the government is operating under the control of a military junta that overthrew a constitutional government.

Such an unequivocal position will make clear in Latin America, to potential junta colonels, that if they execute a coup they will lose support of the United States. Such an unequivocal statement also will make clear to the Communists that the United States is not going to give support to any form of totalitarian government that sets up a police state operation in Latin America by overthrowing a constitutional government.

TRUTH IN LENDING—INTEREST CHARGES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one correction of the RECORD for yesterday that I want to make before I turn to a matter that is of great concern to my friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]; and I apologize to him for taking this much time.

Yesterday I made a mistake in discussing the interest rate that is charged on charge accounts by some stores in the District of Columbia. My good wife put me straight on the matter when I got home last night. I had quoted her, or referred to an understanding or interpretation I made from a conversation I had with her. She pointed out to me that I was dead wrong. That puts me in a pretty bad position from two standpoints. In the first place, I never like to make a statement that is not factually correct. Second, I never like to seem to be misquoting my wife.

The statement I made will be found on page 19116 of the RECORD of yesterday. In a colloquy with my good friend the Senator from Illinois, I said:

> I did not know the Senator intended to speak on that subject, but as he was speaking there came to my mind an interesting conversation I had with my wife the other day, when I said, "I do not see any monthly bills coming in from such-and-such a department store in the District of Columbia." She enlightened me as to why there were no bills coming from that department store.
>
> Do Senators know what I learned? I learned that the store charges 6-percent interest per month on unpaid accounts.

She informed me that what she said was not that she did not like paying 6 percent, on a monthly basis, on charge accounts, but that she objected to paying the concealed interest that many of the stores in the District of Columbia charge. She pointed that I overlooked the fact that she said the interest rate had been a 3-percent interest rate—which would, of course, make it 36 percent a year, and not 72 percent a year. She pointed out that some of the stores that had been charging 3 percent have reduced the rate to 1½ percent—which still makes it 18 percent a year. There are still stores, I have learned today from what I consider to be reliable sources, charging 3 percent a month—which makes the interest 36 percent a year.

I wish the RECORD to be correct. Whereas I was talking about 6 percent, the figure is actually 3 percent in regard to a few stores, and 1½ percent with respect to a larger number; but, in any event, the burden of my argument is the same: an 18-percent interest charge is still usurious, a 36 percent is even more unconscionable. As I said yesterday, the Board of Trade of Washington, D.C., is opposed to a minimum wage in the District of Columbia of $1.25 an hour for wage earners, breadwinners, as their witnesses have testified before my committee. I therefore say that the Board of Trade ought to do something about the interest rate of 18 percent and, in such instances as it may exist, of 36 percent. I am glad to make that correction for the RECORD.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I should like to inform Senators briefly of the procedure I intend to follow as floor leader on the higher education bill.

Because of the parliamentary situation which confronts us in the consideration of this exceedingly important legislation to provide assistance to institutions of higher education in the financing of construction of facilities, the first issue which ought to be met is whether the Senate will accept the bill as reported from committee or whether it prefers the House version of the bill.

The ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the very able and distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], is opposed to the adoption of the committee amendment which is in the nature of a complete strikeout of the

House provisions and the substitution therefor of the committee version of the bill. It is my understanding that the Senator from Vermont at the appropriate time will present his arguments in favor of his position to the Senate and that he will ask for a vote upon his proposal to lay before the Senate the House text of H.R. 6143.

I assure Senators that for my part, as floor leader of the bill, I shall try to cooperate with my very good friend from Vermont in bringing into focus this first issue so that the matter may be fully debated and voted upon in an orderly fashion. Until that first issue is met, the discussion of other amendments to the bill would be, in my judgment, premature.

If the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the minority leader are in agreement with me—and it is my understanding that they are—I feel that as Senators debate the bill the proposal of the Senator from Vermont should be our first order of business with respect to it.

I should now like to yield to the Senator from Vermont to have him make such observations as he would like to make on my suggested procedure. Then I shall be glad, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, to submit a unanimous consent agreement, or the Senator from Vermont may submit it in his own right.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to my distinguished friend from Oregon. I believe he understands that I would be precluded from offering an amendment in the form of a substitute without unanimous consent. I would be delighted to have my distinguished subcommittee chairman make the motion in my behalf if he desires.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator wishes to present it, that is agreeable to me.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the rules of the Senate, I be permitted to offer a substitute as an amendment to H.R. 6143, which will be in the nature of a substitute and will contain the exact language of the House-passed bill, H.R. 6143.

Mr. MORSE. As chairman of the subcommittee, I am in complete agreement with this procedure. The leadership of the Senate is in agreement with it. I ask whether it is parliamentarily in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That may be done by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, when H.R. 6143 is debated, one of the principal issues before the Senate will be whether the Senate should approve the bill in the form in which it was reported by committee or in the form that it passed the House of Representatives.

I shall urge the Senate to adopt the House-passed higher education bill so that the measure can be sent directly to the White House, with the certainty that there will be a higher education law this year.

The Senator from Oregon will contend for the committee-reported bill which, if approved, must go to conference. I am afraid that if it does go to conference, it may become bogged down there, or difficulty might be encountered in the House Rules Committee or in the House itself.

Both the Senator from Oregon and I are deeply interested in getting a higher education bill this year but he and a majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare differ with me on two points. I have fears that we may not get a higher education bill if we have to go through the conference procedure. We failed last year and I think we must recognize the possibility of history repeating itself.

The second difference we have is with respect to the type of bill that Congress should approve.

I believe that the House bill is preferable because it provides grants and loans for the construction of facilities intended for use in undergraduate education and the colleges and universities themselves will decide whether they want to build a facility for the English department, foreign language department, the science department, and so forth.

The bill reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare permits grants for the construction of academic facilities only if they are used for the sciences or engineering or for use as a library.

I fear that the Senate bill advances some disciplines at the expense of others.

One thing should be made absolutely clear, and that is that under neither bill could funds be used for the construction of buildings utilized for sectarian instruction or worship. Neither bill would permit aid to a department of divinity or theology.

Aside from the practical legislative considerations the real issue is whether we should aid the arts and humanities as well as the sciences and engineering or simply vote to aid the sciences and engineering.

The issue is not a question of grants versus loans, because both bills would authorize grants and loans to public and private colleges, whether church-related or not.

My basic view is that a grant for the construction of an international relations building is as constitutional as a grant for the construction of a science building. Both fields are important. The Senate bill would allow grants for one but not the other.

I shall present the case for the House bill in detail tomorrow but did want the Senate to know what I have in mind.

If I am not successful in having the House bill adopted, I have every intention of supporting the committee-reported bill. And the Senator from Oregon has my assurance that I will help him steer a bill through conference if his approach is preferred by the Senate.

Before concluding, I should like to read into the RECORD two of many telegrams which I have received from college presidents and other educational authorities. The first one reads:

> I am in full agreement with your proposal to pass House higher education bill. Senate bill would increase present imbalance of aid to sciences and in the long run further weaken the humanities and social sciences. Thank you for this opportunity to express my views.

The other telegram reads:

> I support your view that approval of House version of higher education bill will not only increase chances for timely passage of this legislation but that the additional flexibility of House-passed version will increase value to education and thus to the Nation.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a memorandum indicating the chief differences between the House-passed and Senate committee versions of H.R. 6143.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM: CHIEF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE HOUSE AND SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE VERSIONS OF H.R. 6143

1. The Senate version is a straight 5-year program, with authorizations for each year.

The House bill provides authorizations for each of the first 3 years of the 5-year program.

2. The dollar amounts differ in each bill, as the following tabulation shows:

[In millions]

	Senate committee version	House version	House if 5-year authorizations made
Construction grants	$1,150	$835	$1,415
Construction loans	600	360	600
Total	1,750	1,195	2,015

3. The Senate version of the bill requires that the grants and loans provided may be used only on facilities for the instruction in the natural and physical sciences, engineering, and libraries. The House version has no such limitations.

Both bills have additional limitations against use of funds for sectarian purposes, recreational facilities, facilities for which an admission charge is made, athletic facilities.

Both bills provide specifically that the funds must be used for classrooms, laboratories, and libraries.

4. The House bill includes in the definition of community college a 2-year institution which provides instruction leading toward a bachelor's degree or is an institution which provides "technical" instruction for technicians and semiprofessionals in technological fields.

The Senate version specifically requires that any community college must have as one of its main purposes the 2-year preparation of students for continuing toward a bachelor's degree.

5. The Senate version provides a total authorization of $250 million for community colleges ($50 million per year).

The House version provides a minimum of $50,600,000 per year for grants to community colleges.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] has always been of great assistance to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as a whole. In my judgment, it would not have been possible to report as good a bill as the Senate is now considering—and I think it is a good bill—had it not been for the cooperation of the Senator from Vermont and my other colleagues on the committee.

Later, in a week or two, the Senate will be considering S. 569, the Prouty-Keating bill, which extends the so-called forgiveness provisions of title II NDEA loans to teachers in private schools and to college and university teachers. For those who take special teacher training in modern foreign language institutes or other institutes under NDEA even though they teach in the private schools, S. 569 would permit payment of the stipend benefits now accruing to public elementary and secondary school teachers. S. 569 is typical of the educational statesmanship of the Senator from Vermont.

I am sorry that I do not agree with the Senator from Vermont on this particular amendment, as the majority of my colleagues on the committee do not agree with him. We all know that in the marking up of a bill there is much give and take in the ironing out of differences, so that finally a bill can emerge which commands a majority. That is exactly what happened in this case. The committee gave due consideration to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont and decided that the bill we are presenting, for the many reasons I shall set forth following the speech to be made by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], is the bill that we believe the Senate should pass.

Nevertheless, although that is the one major difference between the chairman of the subcommittee and the majority of my colleagues, and the Senator from Vermont, I know that I speak the view of every member of our committee when I say that the Senator from Vermont is a great friend of education, and has been highly constructive in helping us to hammer out education legislation and put it in such desirable form that it might be reported to the Senate for the consideration of the entire body.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed the text of the committee amendment and that it be followed by an excerpt from the committee report, pages 7, 8, and 9 contrasting the Senate and House provisions of H.R. 6143 and by tables found on pages 10 and 11 of the committee report setting forth the estimated allotments under title I–A and title II of the committee version of the bill.

There being no objection, the amendment and the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. —

An act to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "College Academic Facilities Act".

Findings and Declaration of Policy

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be assured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities, and that this opportunity will be jeopardized unless the Nation's colleges and universities are encouraged and assisted in their efforts to accommodate rapidly growing numbers of youth who aspire to a higher education. The Congress further finds and declares that this need is so great that it is incumbent upon the Nation to take positive and immediate action to meet it through assistance to institutions of higher education in providing classrooms and other academic facilities, and through assistance to the States in constructing certain public community college facilities.

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Part A—Grants for construction of academic facilities

Appropriations Authorized

Sec. 101. (a) In order to enable the Commissioner of Education (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Commissioner") to make grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this part A, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

Allotments to States

Sec. 102. (a) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year (1) one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such institutions in all the States; and (2) the remaining one-half shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of students enrolled in grades nine to twelve (both inclusive) of schools in such State bears to the total number of students in such grades in schools in all the States. For the purposes of this subsection, (A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time students and (ii) the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations; and (B) determinations as to enrollment under either clause (1) or clause (2) of this subsection shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect to such enrollment are available to him.

(b) The amount of each allotment to a State under this section shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this part A, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 106(b)(3) and 121(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State by institutions of higher education. Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the next fiscal year, in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year.

(c) All amounts allotted under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, which are not reserved as provided in section 107 by the close of the fiscal year for which they are allotted, shall be reallotted by the Commissioner, on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable, among the States which, as determined by the Commissioner, are able to use without delay any amounts so reallotted. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for reservation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

State Commissions and Plans

Sec. 103. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this part A shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education in the State, or, if no such State agency eixsts, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereafter in this part A referred to as the "State commission"), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 105, objective standards and methods (A) for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the construction of academic facilities submitted by institutions of higher education within the State, and (B) for determining the Federal share of the development cost of each such project (unless such plan provides for a uniform Federal share for all such projects);

(3) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this part A; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan, of the development cost of the project involved;

(4) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

(5) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this part A, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part A.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $3,000,000 during each of the first two fiscal years of the program under this part A in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this part A, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

Eligibility for Grants

Sec. 104. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this part

A only if such construction is limited to structures, or portions thereof, especially designed, and to be used only, for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library, and only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating urgently needed enrollment capacity.

Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities and Federal Share

SEC. 105. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commission shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible construction projects, and the application of such standards and methods to such projects under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria (1) shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this part A while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of institutions in the several States, and (2) shall give special consideration to expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant institutions are effectively utilizing existing facilities, provision for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, facilities or institutions according to functional or educational type for priority purposes, and, in view of the national objectives of this Act, provision for considering the degree to which the institution serves students from two or more States or from outside the United States; and in no event shall an institution's readiness to admit such out-of-State students be considered as a priority factor adverse to such institution.

(b) The Commissioner shall further prescribe by regulation the basic criteria for determining the Federal share of the development cost of any eligible project under this part A within a State, to which criteria the applicable standards and methods set forth in the State plan for such State shall conform in the absence of a uniform statewide Federal share specified in or pursuant to such plan. The Federal share shall in no event exceed 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application approved under this part A.

Applications for Grants and Conditions for Approval

SEC. 106. (a) Institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this part A shall submit applications therefor at such time or times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such applications shall contain such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make the determinations required to be made by him under this part A.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application covering a project for construction of an academic facility and meeting the requirements prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) if—

(1) the project is an eligible project as determined under section 104;

(2) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission;

(3) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, the Federal share of the development cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State (including any applicable reallotment to the State);

(4) the project has, pursuant to the State plan, been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

(5) the Commissioner determines that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials; and

(6) the Commissioner determines that (in addition to the assurance required by section 304 and such assurance as to title to the site as he may deem necessary) the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

(A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for defraying the development cost of the project covered by such application,

(B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the academic facility upon completion, and

(C) that the facility will be used as an academic facility during at least the period of the Federal interest therein (as defined in section 108).

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

(d) No institution which is eligible for a grant under title II shall be eligible for a grant under this part A.

Amount of Grant—Payment

SEC. 107. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this part A, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment (including any applicable reallotment) available therefor, the amount of such grant, which (subject to the limits of such allotment or reallotment) shall be equal to the Federal share (ascertained by him under section 106(b)(3)) of the development cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this action may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application covering such project or upon revision of the estimated development cost of a project with respect to which such reservation was made, and in the event of an upward revision of such estimated cost approved by him he may reserve the Federal share of the added cost only from the applicable allotment (or reallotment) available at the time of such approval.

Recovery of Payments

SEC. 108. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that, if a facility constructed with the aid of a grant or grants under this part A is used as an academic facility for twenty years following completion of such construction, the public benefit accruing to the United States from such use will equal or exceed in value the amount of such grant or grants. The period of twenty years after completion of such construction shall therefore be deemed to be the period of Federal interest in such facility for the purposes of this part A.

(b) If, within twenty years after completion of construction of an academic facility which has been constructed in part with a grant or grants under this part A—

(1) the applicant (or its successor in title or possession) ceases or fails to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

(2) the facility ceases to be used as an academic facility, or the facility is used as a facility excluded from the term "academic facility" by section 121(a)(2), unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for waiving the application of this paragraph to such facility or use,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from such applicant (or successor) an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal grant or grants bore to the development cost of the facility financed with the aid of such grant or grants: *Provided*, That the authority to waive the application of paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not apply to any case in which a facility (A) is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship or (B), although not used for a purpose described in clause (A), is used primarily for any part of a program of a school of divinity (as defined in section 122(a)(2)). Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated.

Administration of State Plans

SEC. 109. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this part A, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this part A, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 103(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this part A until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Part B—Loans for construction of academic facilities

Lending Authority

SEC. 111. The Commissioner may, in accordance with the provisions of this part B, make loans to institutions of higher education or to higher education building agencies for construction of academic facilities.

Loan Limit for Any State

SEC. 112. Not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in this part B in the form of loans shall be used for loans to institutions of higher education and higher education building agencies within any one State.

Eligibility Conditions, Amounts, and Terms of Loans

SEC. 113. (a) No loan pursuant to this part B shall be made unless the Commissioner finds (1) that not less than one-fourth of the development cost of the facility will be financed from non-Federal sources, (2) that the applicant is unable to secure the amount of such loan from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this part B, and (3) that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

(b) A loan pursuant to this part B shall be secured in such manner, and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by the Commissioner; and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall not be less than a per annum rate that is one-quarter of 1 percentage point above the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(c) In order to enable the Commissioner of Education to make loans to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this part B, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the three succeeding fiscal years, for making such loans the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

General Provisions for Loan Program

SEC. 114. (a) Such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, except with respect to administrative expenses, shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized (1) to prescribe a schedule of fees which, in his judgment, would be adequate in the aggregate to cover necessary expenses of making inspections (including audits) and providing representatives at the site of projects in connection with loans under this part B, and (2) to condition the making of such loans on agreement by the applicant to pay such fees. For the purpose of providing such services, the Commissioner may, as authorized by section 302(b), utilize any agency, and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such applicant or from the Commissioner, and shall, if a Federal agency, credit such amounts to the appropriation or fund against which expenditures by such agency for such services have been charged.

(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this part B, the Commissioner, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this part B;

(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this part B without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this part B from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

(3) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any property in connection with which he has made a loan pursuant to this part B; and, in the event of any such acquisition (and notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States), complete, administer, remodel and convert, dispose of, lease, and otherwise deal with, such property: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

(4) enter into agreements to pay annual sums in lieu of taxes to any State or local taxing authority with respect to any real property so acquired or owned;

(5) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations, upon such terms as he may fix;

(6) subject to the specific limitations in this part B, consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this section; and

(7) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this part B such other covenants, conditions, or provisions (including provisions designed to assure against use of the facility, constructed with the aid of a loan under this part B, for purposes described in section 121(a)(2)) as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this B will be achieved.

Part C—General provisions for loan and grant programs

Definitions

SEC. 121. As used in this title—

(a)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the term "academic facilities" means structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs, of an institution of higher education, and maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities.

(2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or (B) any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for athletic or recreational activities, other than for an academic course in physical education or where the Commissioner finds that the physical integration of such facilities with other academic facilities included under this title is required to carry out the objectives of this title, or (C) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (D) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

(b)(1) The term "construction" means (A) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of initial equipment therefor; or (B) acquisition of existing structures not owned by the institution involved; or (C) rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement (including the acquisition and installation of initial equipment, or modernization or replacement of built-in equipment) of existing structures; or (D) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

(2) The term "equipment" includes, in addition to machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as an academic facility, including necessary furniture, except books and except items of current operating expense such as fuel, supplies, and the like; the term "initial equipment" means equipment acquired and installed in connection with construction as defined in paragraph (1) (A) or (B) of this subsection or, in cases, referred to in paragraph (1)(C), equipment acquired and installed as part of the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of an existing structure which structure would otherwise not be adequate for use as an academic facility; and the terms "equipment", "initial equipment", and "built-in equipment" shall be more particularly defined by the Commissioner by regulation.

(c) The term "development cost", with respect to an academic facility, means the amount found by the Commissioner to be the cost, to the applicant for a grant or loan under this title, of the construction involved and the cost of necessary acquisition of the land on which the facility is located and of necessary site improvements to permit its use for such facility, but excluding any cost incurred before, or under a contract entered into before, the enactment of this Act. There shall further be excluded from the development cost—

(1) in determining the amount of any grant under this title, an amount equal to the sum of (A) any Federal grant which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this title, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a grant under this title, and (B) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant; and

(2) in determining the amount of any loan under this title, an amount equal to the amount of any Federal financial assistance which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this title, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a loan under this title.

(d) The term "Federal share" means a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application for a grant for the construction of an academic facility under part A of this title.

(e) The term "higher education building agency" means (1) an agency, public authority, or other instrumentality of a State authorized to provide, or finance the construction of, academic facilities for institutions of higher education (whether or not also authorized to provide or finance other facilities for such or other educational institutions, or for their students or faculty), or (2) any corporation (no part of the net earnings of which inures or may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual) (A) established by an institution of higher education for the sole purpose of providing academic facilities for the use of such institution, and (B) upon dissolution of which all title to any property purchased or built from the proceeds of any loan made under this title will pass to such institution.

TITLE II—PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE

Authorization of Funds

SEC. 201. For the purpose of this title there is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for each of the five successive fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1963.

Allotments to States

SEC. 202. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. Such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 201 for such year as the product of—

(A) the number of high school graduates of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The allotment to any State under this section for any fiscal year shall be available until the end of the succeeding fiscal year for payment to it of the amount certified, not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the allotment was made, by the State agency as the Federal share of the cost of constructing public community college facilities under the State plan approved pursuant to section 204.

(c) For purposes of this title—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be .75, and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of school construction in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate; and

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

Matching Requirements

SEC. 203. Payment of the full Federal allotment to a State shall be contingent upon the matching of Federal funds by State or local funds, or both, as follows: Each State shall match the Federal allotment by an amount equal to the product of (1) the number of high school graduates in the State and (2) the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State per high school graduate of the State: *Provided*, That in no case shall the State matching payment be more than twice the Federal allotment. To the extent that a State's matching payment falls short of the matching requirement, its Federal allotment shall be proportionately reduced.

State Plans

SEC. 204. (a) Any State desiring to accept the benefits of this title shall submit a State plan for carrying out the purpose of this title. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) designates the State agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State;

(2) contains satisfactory evidence that such State agency will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this title;

(3) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds under this title and to assure proper application of non-Federal funds used in connection therewith;

(4) provides for the establishment of standards, in accordance with the purpose of this title, for locating, planning, and constructing public community college facilities;

(5) provides for affording to every applicant, whose application for funds for a construction project under the State plan is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency; and

(6) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a); or

(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under section 205 to the State or withhold further payments for any project designated by the Commissioner as being directly affected by such failure, as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended; except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment of any amount already reserved under section 205(a) with respect to any public community college facilities project not directly affected by such failure. After notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 205(a) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

Payments to States

SEC. 205. (a) Upon a certification by a State agency—

(1) listing a public community college facilities project (or projects) approved by it during a fiscal year under a State plan approved under section 204; and

(2) setting forth the estimated cost of each such project, the amount of the Federal share of such cost, and such further description of such project as may be required by the Commissioner in order to carry out the provisions of this title,

the Commissioner shall reserve, subject to the requirements of section 203, an amount equal to such Federal share of such cost out of the States allotment for such fiscal year. Payment of such amount shall be made by the Commissioner to the State, upon request of the State agency, through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, at such time or times and in such installments (in advance of the incurring of cost or otherwise) as the Commissioner may determine. Such payments shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project (or projects) for which such amount has been reserved. The Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved upon request of the State agency and receipt of an amended certification from such agency, but only to the extent such change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this title.

(b) If any project with respect to which payments have been made under this section is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with the regulations of the Commissioner, the State which certified such project shall be liable to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amounts as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

Definitions

SEC. 206. As used in this title—

(1) The term "public community college" means an educational institution, or branch thereof, in a State, which (1) is under public supervision and control, (2) is organized and administered principally to offer educational programs, of not more than two years' duration, beyond the high school level, (3) has as one of its major purposes the provision of a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree upon the student's transfer to an institution of higher education, and (4) if a branch of an institution offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.

(2) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" includes the preparation of drawings and specifications for public community college facilities, erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facilities.

(3) The term "public community college facilities" means structures, or portions thereof, especially designed, and to be used only, for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library, and related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, utilities, and land (including interests in land and land improvements).

(4) The term "high school graduate" means a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or similar means) from an approved school for successful completion of four years of education beyond the first eight years of schoolwork, or for demonstration of equivalent achievement. For the purposes of this title the number of high school graduates shall be limited to the number who graduated in the most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The interpretation of the definition of "high school graduate" shall fall within the authority of the Commissioner of Education.

(5) The term "national base" means with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of (A) the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in section 201, divided by (B) the number of high school graduates.

(6) The term "State agency" means the agency designated by a State in its State plan in accordance with section 204(1).

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

SEC. 301. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however,* That the requirements of this paragraph (5) shall be deemed to be satisfied in the case of an institution applying for assistance under this Act, if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon completion of the project for which such assistance is requested, or upon completion of that project and others under construction or planned and to be commenced within a reasonable time, the institution will meet such requirements. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(b) The term "high school" does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

(c) The term "nonprofit educational institution" means an educational institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(d) The term "public educational institution" does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

(e) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Federal Administration

SEC. 302. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of any of his functions under this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but not to exceed $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. The provisions of section 1003 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 shall apply to members of such committees.

Judicial Review

SEC. 303. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under part A of title I or under title II or with his final action under section 109(b) or 204(c), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

Labor Standards

SEC. 304. (a) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant or loan under title I or a grant under title II except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such grant or loan will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be; but, in the case of any nonprofit educational institution, the Commissioner may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the cost of construction and the Commissioner determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Method of Payment

SEC. 305. Payments under this Act to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or loan, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Administrative Appropriations Authorized

SEC. 306. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

Federal Control Not Authorized

SEC. 307. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

Grants for construction of academic facilities (graduate and undergraduate)

Provision	H.R. 6143 as reported to the Senate	H.R. 6143 as passed by the House of Representatives	
	TITLE I–A	TITLE I	TITLE II
Use of funds	Construction of academic facilities (graduate and undergraduate) to be used only for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library.	Construction of facilities primarily intended for use in undergraduate education.	Construction of academic facilities for graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers.
Assistance provided	Grants for construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities for teaching, research, or administration plus maintenance, storage, and utility facilities. "Construction" includes erection of new facilities, expansion of existing facilities, and acquisition of facilities not owned by institution involved. Grants may be used for necessary site improvements or acquisition of land.	Same as Senate bill	Same as Senate bill.
Period	5 years	do	Do.
Amount	$180,000,000 per year. In addition to the sums authorized for each of the last 4 years, there are authorized funds equal to those authorized but not appropriated in the preceding years.	$230,000,000 for 1st 3 years; such sums as Congress authorizes for final 2 years. (At least 22 percent of funds allotted to State for any 1 year must be used for construction of public or other nonprofit junior and community colleges and technical institutes). In addition to the sums authorized for the 2d and 3d years, there are authorized funds equal to those authorized but not appropriated in the preceding years.	$25,000,000 for 1st year; $60,000,000 annually for next 2 years; such sums as Congress may authorize for final 2 years.

Grants for construction of academic facilities (graduate and undergraduate)

Provision	H.R. 6143 as reported to the Senate	H.R. 6143 as passed by the House of Representatives	
	TITLE I-A	TITLE I	TITLE II
Allocation of funds or grant limit.	State allotment: Based on higher education enrollment and grades 9-12 enrollment.	Same as Senate bill	Grants in 1 State cannot exceed 12½ percent of total funds appropriated that year.
Matching requirement.	Federal grant cannot exceed ⅓ of the cost of the project.	do	Do.
Grantees	Public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education. But no institution eligible for a grant under title II (public community colleges) is eligible for a grant under this title.	Public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education.	Public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education and cooperative graduate center boards.
Limitations	No grants for facilities intended primarily for charged admission events, or specially for athletic or recreational activities; used for sectarian instruction or worship; used for programs of a school or department of divinity.	No grants for facilities intended primarily for charged admission events, or specially for athletic or recreational activities; used for sectarian instruction or worship; used for programs of a school or department of divinity; used by school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, podiatry, nursing, or public health.	No grants for facilities designed primarily for charged admission events, or specially for athletic or recreational activities; used for sectarian instruction or worship; used for programs of a school or department of divinity; used by school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, podiatry, nursing, or public health.
State plan	Required (State commission must approve projects and set priorities).	Same as Senate bill	Not required.
Advisory committee	May be appointed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.	do	Advisory Committee on Graduate Education in Office of Education. Chairman: Commissioner. 1 representative each: Office of Science and Technology, National Science Foundation. 8 appointees: at least 3 from humanities field, 1 of whom is from a graduate school of education.

Grants for community colleges

Provision	H.R. 6143 as reported to the Senate	H.R. 6143 as passed by the House of Representatives
	TITLE II	TITLE I
Use of funds	Construction of public community college facilities only	Same as title I above. (NOTE.—Construction of public and other nonprofit junior and community colleges and technical institutes.)
Assistance provided	For erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library. Grants may also be used for preparation of drawings or specifications, for acquisition of land, for related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, and utilities.	Same as title I above.
Period	5 years	Do.
Amount	$50,000,000 per year	At least 22 percent of the funds allotted to a State for any 1 year for the construction of undergraduate facilities. (See title I above.)
Allocation of funds or grant limit	State allotment: Based on number of high school graduates and an "allotment ratio" derived from income per person in the State compared with income per person in all the States.	Same as title I above.
Matching requirement	State matching varies by formula based on high school graduates and State allotment; State share cannot exceed ⅖ of project cost.	Do.
Grantees	The States	Do.
Definition of eligible institutions	"Public community college" is defined as an institution which is organized and administered principally to offer programs of not more than 2 years' duration beyond high school and has as 1 major purpose, a 2-year program, acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree.	"Junior colleges" and "technical institutes" are defined as institutions which principally provided (1) a 2-year program, acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree or (2) a 2-year program for technicians and semiprofessionals in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences, and related technological fields.
State plan	Required (State must designate a State agency to administer the plan).	Same as title I above.
Advisory committee	May be appointed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.	Do.

Loans for construction of academic facilities

Provision	H.R. 6143 as reported to the Senate	H.R. 6143 as passed by the House of Representatives
	TITLE I-B	TITLE III
Use of funds	Construction of undergraduate and graduate academic facilities in public or other nonprofit institutions of higher education.	Same as Senate bill.
Assistance provided	Loans for construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities for teaching, research, or administration, plus maintenance, storage, and utility facilities. Erection of new facilities; expansion, rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of existing facilities; and the acquisition of existing structures not owned by the institution involved.	Do.
Period	5 years	Do.
Amount	$120,000,000 per year. In addition to the sums authorized for each of the last 4 years, there are authorized funds equal to those authorized but not appropriated in the preceding years.	$120,000,000 per year for 1st 3 years; such sums as Congress may authorize for 2 succeeding years. In addition to the sums authorized for the 2d and 3d years, there are authorized funds equal to those authorized but not appropriated in the preceding years.
Interest rate	Not less than ¼ percentage point above the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt. (Currently 3⅜ percent plus ¼ percent equals 3⅝ percent.)	Same as Senate bill.
Loan limit	Loans in 1 State cannot exceed 12½ percent of total funds appropriated for that year.	Do.
Matching requirement	At least ¼ of cost from non-Federal sources.	Do.
Borrowers eligible	Public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education; and higher education building agencies.	Do.
Limitations	No loans for facilities intended primarily for charged admission events, or specially for athletic or recreational activities; used for sectarian instruction or worship; used for programs of a school or department of divinity.	No loans for facilities intended primarily for charged admission events, or specially for athletic or recreational activities; used for sectarian instruction or worship; used for programs of a school or department of divinity; used by school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, podiatry, nursing, or public health.

ESTIMATE OF TITLE I—STATE-BY-STATE ALLOTMENTS

The following table shows the estimated allotments, on a State-by-State basis, of $180 million for academic facility construction grants under title I of the Senate amendment:

Distribution of $180,000,000 under the provisions of title I–A, H.R. 6143, grants for construction of academic facilities

	State allotments		
	Distribution of $90,000,000 on basis of total high school enrollment, 1959–60	Distribution of $90,000,000 on basis of students [1] enrolled in institutions [2] of higher education, 1959–60	Total amount
Aggregate United States (excluding Canal Zone)	$90, 000, 000	$90, 000, 000	$180, 000, 000
Alabama	1, 736, 605	1, 333, 011	3, 069, 616
Alaska	75, 448	42, 621	118, 069
Arizona	680, 168	812, 693	1, 492, 861
Arkansas	962, 148	780, 811	1, 742, 959
California	7, 471, 905	9, 850, 232	17, 322, 137
Colorado	868, 850	1, 254, 207	2, 123, 057
Connecticut	1, 271, 497	1, 194, 778	2, 466, 275
Delaware	212, 292	154, 441	366, 733
Florida	2, 245, 707	1, 771, 357	4, 017, 064
Georgia	1, 945, 194	1, 403, 679	3, 348, 873
Hawaii	383, 264	263, 194	646. 458
Idaho	405, 976	348, 102	754, 078
Illinois	4, 802, 100	4, 576, 881	9, 378, 981
Indiana	2, 391, 471	2, 484, 568	4, 876. 039
Iowa	1, 484, 425	1, 656, 101	3, 140, 526
Kansas	1, 132, 372	1, 445, 266	2, 577, 638
Kentucky	1, 402, 973	1, 260, 443	2, 663, 416
Louisiana	1, 616, 396	1, 584, 200	3, 200, 596
Maine	505, 380	367, 778	873, 158
Maryland	1, 487, 482	1, 308, 133	2, 795, 615
Massachusetts	2, 513, 157	3, 490, 288	6, 003, 445
Michigan	3, 997, 104	3, 922, 297	7, 919, 401
Minnesota	1, 880, 349	2, 089, 577	3, 969, 926
Mississippi	1, 108, 024	1, 017, 359	2, 125, 383
Missouri	2, 094, 380	2, 218, 373	4, 312, 753
Montana	371, 062	373, 814	744, 876
Nebraska	710, 304	855, 747	1, 566, 051
Nevada	$139, 592	$98, 648	$238, 240
New Hampshire	311, 967	346, 034	658, 001
New Jersey	2, 861, 375	1, 824, 749	4, 686, 124
New Mexico	514. 245	416, 735	930, 980
New York	7, 934, 040	7, 723, 103	15, 657, 143
North Carolina	2, 473, 857	2, 013, 374	4, 487, 231
North Dakota	367, 359	423, 371	790, 730
Ohio	4, 658, 244	4, 271, 733	8, 929, 977
Oklahoma	1, 331, 162	1, 628, 955	2, 960, 117
Oregon	1, 002, 832	1, 122, 343	2, 125. 175
Pennsylvania	5, 661, 310	4, 814, 295	10, 475, 605
Rhode Island	402, 114	492, 905	895, 019
South Carolina	1, 233, 160	904, 538	2, 137, 698
South Dakota	370, 164	425, 106	795, 270
Tennessee	1, 793, 308	1, 701, 957	3, 495, 263
Texas	4, 456, 462	4, 921, 180	9, 377, 642
Utah	557. 659	1, 002, 285	1, 559, 944
Vermont	206, 270	292, 341	498, 611
Virginia	1, 787, 902	1, 480, 449	3, 268, 351
Washington	1, 550, 532	1, 705, 458	3, 255, 990
West Virginia	1, 056, 400	793, 550	1, 849, 950
Wisconsin	2, 109, 415	2, 026, 280	4, 135, 695
Wyoming	183, 614	174, 451	358, 065
District of Columbia	297, 988	920, 645	1, 218, 633
American Samoa	7, 536	1, 667	9, 203
Canal Zone			
Guam	29, 519	8, 271	37, 790
Puerto Rico	933, 816	603, 959	1, 537, 775
Virgin Islands	12, 127	1, 667	13, 794

---

[1] The number of degree-credit students enrolled in institutions of higher education is equal to the sum of (1) the number of full-time students and (2) the full-time equivalent of part-time students. It is assumed that 30 percent of the total part-time enrollment for the 1st quarter, 1959–60, is equivalent to full-time enrollment.

[2] Excludes U.S. service schools.

ESTIMATE OF TITLE II—STATE-BY-STATE ALLOTMENTS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The following table shows the estimated allotments, on a State-by-State basis, of $50 million for junior and community college construction grants:

Estimated Federal and State share for public community college construction under the provisions of title II, H.R. 6143, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

	Federal share [1]	State matching share [1]	Total amount	Federal share as a percent of total amount
Aggregate United States (excluding Canal Zone)	$50, 000, 000	$88, 215, 806	$138, 215, 806	36. 18
50 States and the District of Columbia	49, 420, 582	87, 634, 926	137, 055, 508	36. 06
Alabama	1, 178, 247	1, 461, 047	2, 639, 294	44. 64
Alaska	24, 478	48, 956	73, 434	33. 33
Arizona	331, 652	581, 031	912, 683	36. 34
Arkansas	715, 940	841, 126	1, 557, 066	45. 98
California	3, 334, 279	6, 668, 558	10, 002, 837	33. 33
Colorado	445, 616	891, 232	1, 336, 848	33. 33
Connecticut	531, 209	1, 062, 418	1, 593, 627	33. 33
Delaware	73, 754	147, 508	221, 262	33. 33
Florida	1, 173, 341	1, 992, 304	3, 165, 645	37. 06
Georgia	1, 206, 192	1, 636, 444	2, 842, 636	42. 43
Hawaii	203, 610	407, 220	610, 830	33. 33
Idaho	267, 017	405, 527	672, 544	39. 70
Illinois	2, 235, 483	4, 470, 876	6, 706, 314	33. 33
Indiana	1, 367, 938	2, 657, 537	4, 025, 475	33. 98
Iowa	970, 052	1, 729, 689	2, 699, 741	35. 93
Kansas	660, 798	1, 196, 888	1, 857, 686	35. 57
Kentucky	983, 117	1, 294, 179	2, 277, 296	43. 17
Louisiana	1, 038, 579	1, 415, 337	2, 453, 916	42. 32
Maine	330, 692	517, 484	848, 176	38. 99
Maryland	677, 650	1, 355, 300	2, 032, 950	33. 33
Massachusetts	1, 404, 415	2, 808, 830	4, 213, 245	33. 33
Michigan	2, 283, 701	4, 567, 402	6, 851, 103	33. 33
Minnesota	1, 241, 282	2, 255, 602	3, 496, 884	35. 50
Mississippi	790, 280	829, 547	1, 619, 827	48. 79
Missouri	1, 167, 422	2, 323, 303	3, 490, 725	33. 44
Montana	$230, 434	$397, 746	$628, 180	36. 68
Nebraska	455, 375	844, 453	1, 299, 828	35. 03
Nevada	46, 716	93, 432	140, 148	33. 33
New Hampshire	188, 037	341, 797	429, 834	35. 49
New Jersey	1, 343, 353	2, 686, 706	4, 030, 059	33. 33
New Mexico	278, 537	429, 350	707, 887	39. 35
New York	3, 283, 509	6, 567, 018	9, 850, 527	33. 33
North Carolina	1, 588, 133	2, 102, 494	3, 690, 627	43. 03
North Dakota	276, 510	379, 746	656, 256	42. 13
Ohio	2, 642, 070	5, 284, 140	7, 926, 210	33. 33
Oklahoma	849, 955	1, 330, 046	2, 180, 001	38. 99
Oregon	567, 579	1, 135, 158	1, 702, 737	33. 33
Pennsylvania	3, 517, 356	7, 034, 712	10, 552, 068	33. 33
Rhode Island	222, 861	440, 709	663, 570	33. 59
South Carolina	844, 196	997, 219	1, 841, 415	45. 84
South Dakota	261, 951	387, 883	649, 834	40. 31
Tennessee	1, 203, 952	1, 577, 028	2, 780, 980	43. 29
Texas	2, 417, 823	4, 055, 397	6, 473, 220	37. 35
Utah	349, 304	578, 090	927, 394	37. 67
Vermont	139, 562	221, 761	361, 323	38. 63
Virginia	1, 021, 621	1, 614, 810	2, 636, 431	38. 75
Washington	810, 705	1, 621, 410	2, 432, 115	33. 33
West Virginia	756, 843	1, 064, 319	1, 821, 162	41. 56
Wisconsin	1, 298, 077	2, 505, 309	3, 803, 386	34. 13
Wyoming	99, 938	199, 876	299, 814	33. 33
District of Columbia	89, 486	178, 972	268, 458	53. 33
American Samoa	2, 080	2, 085	4, 165	49. 94
Canal Zone				
Guam	19, 412	19, 439	38, 851	49. 97
Puerto Rico	550, 567	551, 976	1, 102, 543	49. 94
Virgin Islands	7, 359	7, 380	14, 739	49. 93

---

[1] Based on total public and nonpublic high school graduates, 1959–60, and State allotment ratio.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the understanding that I will not lose my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POPULATION CONTROL IS RECEIVING SERIOUS ATTENTION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, man, at last, is facing the population problem. He is beginning to talk about the population menace confronting mankind now—not tomorrow. More important, he is starting actively to find ways to solve the population problem.

Two grim specters beckon mankind toward oblivion today: One offers instant and wholesale death by nuclear means. The alternative guarantees eventual starvation when the human population exceeds the food supply. I am convinced that both challengers will be bested. Certain positive steps substantiate my belief.

First. Man this year is taking his first international step to control the atom.

Second. Man this year, particularly through the efforts of hard-working scientists, appears to be taking the necessary first step which will permit many who are concerned to resolve the birth control problem by acceptable means.

There is an urgency involved in the need to discuss population control.

As the Senate debates the upcoming foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills, attention must be given to the problem, literally overwhelming, of the world's rapidly expanding population.

It does us little, if any, good to provide economic or technical assistance to nations which show no concern for their population explosion.

Granted, we can help a developing nation grow more food by teaching its citizens better use of their land. But when such new skills simply keep that nation's burgeoning population merely alive, and no more, that part of the world will have taken a step backward—with our assistance.

Mixed in with the great problems surrounding population control are issues involving religion, family mores, customs reaching back hundreds or thousands of years, ignorance, poverty, and, of course, man's own pride in creation. Nevertheless, I am hopeful these issues can be resolved.

I believe that future historians assessing the events of the 20th century will have ample reason for citing 1962, 1963, and 1964 as life-saving years in mankind's evolution, for in these years this Nation and others and the United Nations have taken steps heretofore undreamed of. Yes; population control is getting serious attention.

True, in this century and before there was concern. Thomas Malthus worried about food supply. Margaret Sanger nearly half a century ago spoke frankly about the need for birth control despite strong and sometimes violent objections.

Here in the U.S. Senate population control is receiving serious consideration. The Committee on Foreign Relations has voted its approval of an amendment to the foreign aid bill which would authorize birth control studies and "technical and other assistance" to countries receiving foreign aid from the United States. This committee and its chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], rightfully deserve commendation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the amendment to S. 1276 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FULBRIGHT to the bill (S. 1276): Section 241 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, relating to development research, is amended by adding a new subsection as follows:
>
> "Funds made available to carry out this section may be used to conduct research into the problems of controlling population growth and to provide technical and other assistance to cooperating countries in carrying out programs of population control."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on occasion I have suggested that our foreign aid funds are not wisely spent, but I agree with and support steps tailored to meet the urgency of the massive population problem facing us and our progeny.

Let us not hide in a closet. Let us recognize that our foreign aid program is doomed to failure unless all the peoples of the world realistically confront the population problem. It does little good to say that we in this Nation are not concerned because we are able to support our birth rate. Furthermore, our concern should be shared by the nations whose citizens at this time have the education and means to support their birth rate and provide a decent standard of living. The fact is that most of the world's inhabitants cannot support their present birth rate.

The population problem is complex. It includes politics, religion, food, research, and that word which we now admit exists—sex.

It is appropriate to consider the population problem numerically. Demographers estimate that between 200 and 300 million people lived on earth in the time of Jesus Christ. The number had nearly doubled by 1650. After 1650 it mushroomed.

In the 200 years following 1650, the world's population again doubled. Our population growth of but 200 years had equaled that of the previous 1,650 years. And it required but 163 more years to treble the 1650 figure.

By 1963 man found how to prevent infant mortality, and he learned how to prolong adult life by curing disease. In recent years we have almost eliminated malaria.

I know of no one who would want to return to days of such scourges as bubonic plague, smallpox, or cholera, but as the Population Bulletin of February 1962 states:

> Although the power to defer death is one of the greatest advances in man's long history, it has been the principal factor in the acceleration in the rate of population growth during the past century.

Later in the bulletin it is stated that more than 50 million people are added to the world's population each year. Graphically speaking, that is the rough equivalent of the population of the United Kingdom; of Argentina, Belgium, and Burma combined; of France; of West Germany; or of Italy. It is approximately one-half the population of Japan or double the population of Thailand.

According to the statistics presented at the World Food Congress this year 10,000 people will die of malnutrition or starvation every day, and more than one-half of our plus-billion world inhabitants live in constant hunger. We will solve at least some of this tragedy as we utilize existing tools such as fish protein concentrate. Undoubtedly the information which will be collected at the Harvard University School of Public Health's center for population studies will be helpful.

It is pertinent to mention another factor—another unknown factor—at this time. Available statistics indicate that our population is 3 billion-plus today. But this is only a guess based on often inadequate information. Many nations do not know the extent of their own population—let alone that of their neighbor or of the world. I recall a conversation I had with an engineer who had spent many years in China. He had observed that in that land, cities having a population of less than 50,000 were not even included in a census. No one bothered to count them.

Counting is important. We must know what we have before we can truly find a solution. Experts contend that the first census occurred in 1655 when the French and British took a nose count of inhabitants in their Canadian colonies. The United States took its first national census in 1790. Today our census-taking skills are invaluable aids in other countries.

A man aware of the value of the census was the late Dr. Harry Krould, Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Human Resources and Social Development Agency for International Development. Dr. Krould in April of this year told me AID was helping in the census taking and analysis activities in Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. These studies included the taking of the census and the interpretations of the findings and the descriptions of what the findings portended. Such demographic studies were supported by AID through grants and pilot studies such as those to teach writing and reading in small African villages.

Dr. Krould stressed that AID did not have the competence to do actual research in family planning, but he added that other sections of our Government were better informed and qualified. Thus any requests for assistance in census taking or family planning could be properly referred.

Requests for demographic aid are first referred to the U.S. Bureau of the Census. As Dr. Calvert L. Dedrick, chief of the international statistics program, explains, populations do not explode, literally, but "suddenly pick up when death rates drop."

Dr. Dedrick said that currently the Bureau of the Census had rendered and is rendering assistance to many nations and is helping Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Nepal to take their first censuses.

In the United States the census has become refined and increasingly useful. We know how many people live in our land. We have data which enable us to break down into minute detail the work in which people are engaged, the type of home in which they live, the number of electrical appliances they own, and so forth. We are so far advanced in the taking of our census that we are apt to forget that in many areas little or no information is available.

Turning to another area, I am happy to see the Catholic Church coming to grips with the population control issue. Much has been said and written about Dr. John Rock's book, "The Time Has Come," in which Dr. Rock presented his thoughtful analysis of the problems and his suggestions as to how the population problem can be resolved. Well known as a writer, Dr. Rock, a Catholic layman, is possibly better known for his work in developing the oral contraceptive which is familiarly known as "the pill."

In his book, Dr. Rock calls attention to the 1930 encyclical of Pope Pius XI, "Casti Connubii" in which sanction is given to the rhythm method of birth control. He discusses the expressed hope of Pius XII in October 1951 that the licit—rhythm—method can be perfected. He notes that Dom Gregory Stevens, O.S.B., S.T.D., of the Catholic University of America, speaking before a research meeting of the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference stated:

> Indiscriminate procreation is no moral ideal but mere irresponsibility, for the family must take prudent provision for the future welfare of the children both spiritually and physically.

Dr. Rock believes Catholics and non-Catholics can work together if a public policy of toleration which accepts the fact that differences exist between the religious groups on birth control.

Consider his observation that:

> The basis for an equitable public policy on birth control lies in an honest and forthright examination of where family planning fits appropriately into publicly financed programs. Instead of attempting to draw distinctions which are untenable, Catholics would be better advised to sit down with their Protestant and Jewish colleagues and work out the details of a sound public policy for all publicly financed programs—hospitals, health departments, welfare services, foreign-aid programs, and medical research.

Possibly the most important single paragraph in the 204 pages which comprise "The Time Has Come" is:

> I envisage the eventual resolution of doctrinal differences only after the expansion of the armamentarium of birth control.

Realistically, the author adds:

> This will include not merely refinements of current methods but also entirely new approaches which will fit into normal reproductive physiology, as do the oral contraceptives discussed in the next chapter. It is not unrealistic to expect that among these techniques there will be effective methods which all religious groups can accept.

And he reiterates that such new methodology can come about "only through expanded research."

Dr. Rock believes the end to the perennial battle over birth control is eminent. It will come, he writes, when "courageous national leadership which has the wisdom to recognize the community of interest uniting men of all faiths" also has "the power to insist that ancient stereotypes must be discarded for the common good."

Dr. Rock believes there is still time for this Nation to use its resources and skills and develop a constructive program to help mankind bring its overabundant fertility under rational control.

Here in Washington, D.C., a population study center has opened its doors at Georgetown University, a Catholic institution. Its purpose has been described by Mr. George Barrett of the New York Times:

> Working with non-Catholic research centers, the Georgetown group will explore the population problem, including ways to try to perfect the rhythm system. One major goal is to help development of what scientists are now calling the "kitchen test" formula by which a woman can easily and instantly pinpoint the period of 4 or 5 days each month that she is fertile.

The Georgetown University population study center opened officially in July 1963. The Georgetown center today is the fruition of the dreams of many. Had not the Reverend Edward B. Bunn, president of Georgetown University, given his approval, little could have been accomplished. Today, under the direction of Dr. Benedict J. Duffy, the center affords great hope to us.

The first man to see the need for the center was the late Dr. Donald J. O'Connor, a far-sighted individual, an outstanding economist, a man I came to know and admire, and with whom I worked when I was Governor of Alaska on some of Alaska's economic problems. Don O'Connor also was an economic adviser to the Governor of Puerto Rico, prior to his death some 3 years ago.

With Dr. Ben Duffy, O'Connor worked to establish the center. He learned that funds for birth control research could be obtained from the Ford Foundation. He told Father Bunn, and received his approval. A grant was awarded for work on demography and medical aspects. That work was not immediately undertaken for a number of reasons, one being the death of Dr. O'Connor.

Today, by coupling Ford Foundation and Georgetown moneys, $225,000 is available for what now will be, it is hoped, a productive 3-year study. It was my privilege recently to visit the center, in company with Mrs. Donald—Gertrude—O'Connor.

As the New York Times observed editorially on August 9, 1963:

> A worldwide ferment is going on in all institutions. The church's readiness to keep its own thinking under constant reexamination has been demonstrated in many fields by Popes John XXIII and Paul VI.

The Associated Press from Vatican City, on October 9, 1963, reported:

> A leading Roman Catholic progressive said last night the Vatican Ecumenical Council will redefine the church's position on birth control but not this year.
>
> Leo Josef Cardinal Suenens, archbishop of Brussels, said birth control would be reached eventually, as part of the 17th and last scheme—or topic—considered by the council which will recess this session December 4.
>
> "And the council will give an answer," Cardinal Suenens said.

A number of Catholic theologians have in recent months made more clear the feeling of their church as it refers to birth regulation.

The Reverend John A. O'Brien, in writing for Ave Maria and the Christian Century, advises that:

> Contrary to widespread belief, the Catholic Church does not forbid birth regulation. For any serious reason a married couple is exempt from the normal obligation of parenthood for a long time and even for the whole duration of married life. Furthermore, the church teaches that the primary end of marriage is not merely procreation but also the education of offspring. This means more than food, clothing and shelter: It means the ability to provide a suitable education and thus open to the child the cultural heritage of the race. In short, it means responsible parenthood.

Father O'Brien, in his article, reminds us that similar thinking was expressed by Father William J. Gibbons, S.J., professor of sociology at Fordham University, at a meeting of the Catholic Sociological Society in St. Louis, in September 1961.

Father Gibbons then said that Catholics in the United States have been oversold on procreation, and undereducated on the responsibilities it entails.

Other prominent Catholic scholars have commented in a similar vein.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the full text of the O'Brien article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY PLANNING IN AN EXPLODING POPULATION

(By Rev. John A. O'Brien)

How are we to deal effectively with the problem of a population increasing with a speed unprecedented in history? It is especially acute in the underdeveloped countries where the population is exploding, if not like bombs, at least like giant firecrackers. This is the question confronting not only the United States but also the other nations of the free world.

New developments and a more penetrating analysis of the pluralistic nature of the society in which we live offer well-founded hope for the cooperative action so desperately needed to solve this problem on both the national and international levels. Let us first examine the large area of agreement and see if the differences cannot be further narrowed without compromise of conscience.

Contrary to widespread belief, the Catholic church does not forbid birth regulation. For any serious cause a married couple is exempt from the normal obligation of parenthood for a long time and even for the whole duration of married life. The method sanctioned is rhythm, the use of the infertile or safe period. If the currently available means for predicting or ascertaining the time of ovulation—taking the basal temperature, and the glucose test of the cervical mucus—are carefully employed, the method is estimated to achieve a high degree of reliability. Pope Pius XII expressed the hope that further research will increase still more its effectiveness.

Furthermore, the church teaches that the primary end of marriage is not merely procreation but also the education of offspring. This means more than food, clothing, and shelter: It means the ability to provide a suitable education and thus open to the child the cultural heritage of the race. In short, it means responsible parenthood. This is the note that is being sounded with increasing frequency and vigor by Catholic prelates, priests, educators and lay leaders.

This was the keynote sounded by Father William J. Gibbons, S.J., professor of sociology at Fordham University, at a meeting of the Catholic Sociological Society in St. Louis in September 1961. He declared that Catholics in the United States have been oversold on procreation and undereducated on the responsibilities it entails. He believes that too many Catholics think they are being virtuous if they merely refrain from using contraceptives. He points out that the size of the family "should take into account the physical and mental health of the parents, their economic condition, and the society in which they live. When you are faced with such problems as overcrowding, lack of work opportunities, and the rest, you need to retreat."

Similarly, Dr. Robert Odenwald, formerly professor of psychiatry at the Catholic University, points out that in the past too many Catholics have tended to follow, almost blindly, the Biblical command to "increase and multiply." But in the light of the new knowledge and because of changing social and economic conditions, "the accent today is rightly placed on responsible parenthood."

"If cogent reasons indicate a limitation of family size," says Msgr. John A. Goodwine, theological censor for the New York Archdiocese, "there should be no difficulty in admitting that the avoidance of pregnancy would be within the bounds of reason and morality." He remarks that the significant change in Catholic thinking on family size that has taken place in the last dozen years "does not seem to be sufficiently understood."

Similar, too, is the note sounded by Dom Gregory Stevens, O.S.B., professor of moral theology at the Catholic University. Pointing out that the common notion that the church favors "absolutely a high birth rate" is false, he says: "Indiscriminate procreation is no moral ideal but mere irresponsibility, for the family must make prudent provision for the future welfare of the children both spiritually and physically. The church considers the primary goal of the natural institution of matrimony to be that of responsible parenthood."

To help parents realize their responsibility, Dom Stevens points out that they "must take into account the present and foreseeable future conditions of society. This is demanded for the sake of the children themselves as well as for the common good which all are strictly bound to promote as a matter of what St. Thomas called general justice."

Equally concerned that married couples understand their responsibility in the light of a soaring population, Father Charles J. Corcoran, C.S.C., for many years professor of theology at Holy Cross College, Washington, D.C., warns: "It is unfortunate that in the debates on family limitation, many Catholics forget that the right use of marital rights implies more than the willingness to procreate a child. It implies not only the willingness but also the ability to provide for the child's material and spiritual welfare. Correctly understood, this grave responsibility should serve as a potent check on an undisciplined, even if biologically proper, use of sex."

Reflecting this new emphasis upon parental responsibility, Dr. John J. Kane, professor of sociology at the University of Notre Dame, states: "Recent and tremendous social changes in the fields of education, economics, and family life place greater strains on American parents than they have perhaps ever faced in the past. Children's expectations have risen dramatically and parents' hopes of meeting such expectations are perhaps stronger than ever. All of this means that the very large family patterns typical of the early part of this century can no longer be realized by most parents if they hope to meet their real responsibilities. * * * Considerable thought will have to be given * * * to the practice of some type of family limitation in the majority of cases."

Equally explicit is the conclusion reached by Father John L. Thomas, S.J., sociologist of St. Louis University and a recognized authority on marriage and the family: "Granted present nuptiality rates, age at marriage, and advances in health care, no country can long make reasonable provision for its population increase unless a good percentage of its couples take some effective steps to regulate family size."

The stress placed by Catholic theologians, sociologists, and psychiatrists in America in recent years is mirrored in the writings of their European counterparts. In a recent scholarly work, "Love and Control," Leo Josef Cardinal Suenens, archbishop of Malines, points out that conjugal love should be guided by reason and a clear consciousness of the duties of parenthood: Procreation should not be a matter of blind instinct. "One of the first and essential things to consider," he says, "when they (married couples) evaluate their circumstances in life is the education and training to give their children."

Father Stanislas de Lestapis, S.J., professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris and the Vatican's representative at the United Nations World Population Conference in Rome in 1954, says that "there is, in principle, a right, or better, a duty to practice a form of birth limitation based on careful thought. * * * There is an optimum number for each family, and each family alone can judge what it is."

The Belgian demographer, Father Clement Mertens, S.J., of St. Albert College in Louvain, calls attention to the "increasing awareness among the leaders of the church, and among theologians, moralists, and others, of the problems which large families now have to face. And there is an increasing awareness of the problems countries have to face where the population is increasing quickly." He acknowledges that instructions on birth regulation on the pastoral level is not without risks and difficulties.

Nevertheless, he points out: "Risks and difficulties do not justify inertia. * * * It is the duty of the ecclesiastical authorities in each country to face the problem and see that competent laymen, especially in the best universities, proceed with research which will permit them to cope with different given situations, according to regions or social classes, and to adopt means which will reach a solution."

Probably no other country in Europe has felt so acutely the pressure of population as Holland. This is reflected in the candor, understanding, and sympathy with which the Dutch bishops have discussed the difficult problems facing married couples today. Speaking on a television program in April 1963, Bishop William M. Bekkers of 's-Hertogenbosch explained that not everyone can reach at once the ideal in marital virtue.

"Those who have entered Christian matrimony," said Bishop Bekkers, "have received from God and under His blessing a mandate of life which is focused first on leading one life together in conjugal love, and second on founding and building together a good family. Science and its discoveries have enabled man to regulate human reproduction. The birth rate now falls within man's responsibility. One can even say that birth regulation, which is quite different from (contraceptive) birth control, is a normal part of the total task of a married couple."

Bishop Bekkers then pointed out that only the married couple is in a position to determine the number of offspring they can properly rear and educate. This is within the competence of their conscience, and no outsider can interfere with their decision. A physician or a spiritual adviser must respect the private conscience.

Recognizing the imperfections of the rhythm system, the bishop said: "Not even the rhythm method is without objections. For many people the rhythm method is a solution, but we also know that it causes insuperable difficulties for many others. We understand that there are situations where one cannot consider all Christian and human values at the same time. In that case the church does not immediately think of egoism or luxury.

"She knows that married couples, in well-intentioned love for each other and for their families, sometimes take steps which cannot be considered right steps in the eyes of the church. But the church also knows that what one person can reach cannot always be reached by others. She wants to give room for a gradual, perhaps slow and imperfect growing, like that which is possible in all other areas of life—in charity, honesty, and piety."

These scholars are but echoing the thoughts expressed by Pope Pius XII on the Feast of the Epiphany in 1957: "When the infant comes into the world, he must have a home to receive him, a home capable of providing him in good health, and to assist him in acquiring those faculties of mind and heart that will enable him to take his proper place in society when the time comes."

Similar is the emphasis placed by Protestant churches in recent years upon responsible parenthood. In a statement on "Responsible Parenthood" issued in 1961 by the National Council of Churches, responsible parenthood is described as weighing "the claims of procreation and the situation of the family in society. In determining the number and frequency of offspring the parents should give careful consideration to the following four factors:

"(1) The right of the child to be wanted, loved, cared for, educated, and trained in the discipline and instruction of the Lord (Ephesians 6: 4). The rights of existing children to parental care have a proper claim.

"(2) The prospects for health of a future child, if medical and eugenic evidence seem negatively conclusive.

"(3) The health and welfare of the mother-wife, and the need for the spacing of children to safeguard them.

"(4) The social situation, when rapid population growth places dangerous pressures on the means of livelihood and endangers the social order."

The statement tells parents to remember "that having children is a venture in faith, requiring a measure of courage and confidence in God's goodness. Too cautious a reckoning of the costs may be as great an error as failure to lift the God-given power of procreation to the level of ethical decision."

Probably no religious faith places greater emphasis upon the responsibility of parenthood than Judaism. Reflecting this stress, Rabbi Albert M. Shulman, chairman of the Commission on Marriage, Family and the Home of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, says: "Parents have the serious obligation of regulating the size of their family so they will be able to provide properly for the health and education of their offspring. Procreation should not be a matter of blind instinct but of intelligent and careful planning. This is not only a social obligation but also a moral and religious one."

Reechoing the note sounded by Jewish religious leaders, Rabbi David H. Wilce declares: "The concept of the sanctity of life is enhanced and the holiness of marriage is given a new dimension when parenthood is freely elected, when children are born wanted, and when family size is determined by conditions of health and well-being for the individual family and for society."

The factors listed in the statement of the National Council of Churches and of Jewish religious leaders are much the same as those which Catholic theologians and sociologists are likewise stressing in their description of responsible parenthood. Here then is a vast area of crucial and strategic importance, where Protestants, Catholics, and Jews are in substantial agreement. Here they can work together, with each group following its conscience, to achieve the same important goal.

Here is a key which, if properly used, is capable of opening the door to constructive action in solving the population problem on the national and international levels. That key embodies the two crucial elements to make it work: the prudent regulation of births and the clear consciousness of the responsibility they entail, which is but another name for family planning.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, is the worldwide ferment to which the New York Times has referred editorially, confined only to the Catholic Church? It is not.

In July 1959, came the so-called Draper report: the third interim report of the President's Committee to Study the U.S. Military Assistance Program advocated that U.S. technical assistance in population control be given to countries requesting such aid.

On October 4, 1962, the Gallup poll found that 72 percent of U.S. adults think birth control data should be available everywhere; 21 percent do not; 7 percent have no opinion.

On April 28, 1963, former President Harry S. Truman, in writing on foreign policy, in the Washington, D.C., Post, said:

> There is, of course, the added problem of exploding populations, a very touchy subject in some quarters, but there are two choices we can make. Either we increase the output of food and other necessities to meet all new demands, which I feel certain we should be able to do, or else we shall have to adjust matters by some acceptable method to control the rate of the population growth.

In June 1963, the World Food Congress, at Washington, D.C., sponsored by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, heard from the historian, Arnold J. Toynbee, of the United Kingdom, who addressed the plenary session attended by representatives of 104 nations on the subject, "Man and Hunger—The Perspectives of History." In discussing freedom from hunger, Dr. Toynbee says:

> In the long run the campaign cannot be won unless the planet's hundreds of millions of wives and husbands voluntarily decide to regulate the number of human births. This is, I believe, one of the major challenges that confront mankind in our time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my comments, the full text of Dr. Toynbee's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on July 5, 1963, the Ford Foundation announced it was giving India $5 million for family-planning and health programs.

On July 6, 1963, the Christian Science Monitor reported that the Ford Foundation had given $24,200,000 for work in research and experiments in birth control, approximately half of which has been made available in 1963.

On July 6, 1963, the Ford Foundation announced the establishment of a new population department.

Only this year was the Institute of Child Health and Human Development created as one of the National Institutes of Health. Its first year fund is to come from the budgets of other Institutes, and is to total, so I am advised, $34 million. This sum amounts to approximately 18 cents for each person in our Nation.

When I testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee which was considering HEW funding earlier this year, I said:

> Our world population growth is staggering * * * the newly created Institute of Child Health and Human Development will help mankind solve this population problem which presents challenges as grave to us as do the atomic or hydrogen bombs.

The taxpayers of this Nation have spent substantial sums on research. Some examples include: Foot-and-mouth research, $31,177,000; brucellosis, $6,829,000; breeding, disease and quality investigations on tobacco, $9,167,000; construction of a national animal disease laboratory, $13,200,000; cancer—public health service and national cancer institute, $629,457,564; cancer—Atomic Energy Commission, $38,093,000; atomic energy, $29,729,800; development of M-14 rifle, $6,352,000; space, $9,903,200,000.

When we want to do something, the funds with which to try are found.

We need a vastly expanded research budget to find contraceptive methods acceptable to all.

Our national budget costs, roughly, $100 billion. Such a sum is wasted if we bankrupt ourselves to feed and help an ever-increasing world population.

The Ford Foundation and other private groups cannot be expected to carry the world's burden.

Fortunately, the move to make the world's burden the world's is gaining momentum. The policy of the United States on this important issue has undergone a radical and welcome change with the coming of the Kennedy administration.

On December 10, 1962, Mr. Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, summarized U.S. policy on world population growth during debate in the United Nations on a major resolution calling for an intensified program of international cooperation in the population field. Deputy Assistant Secretary Gardner has referred to December 18, 1962, as marking "a turning point in the recognition by the international community of the world population problem." The United States cast 1 of the 69 affirmative votes. There were 27 abstentions. Not one negative vote was cast.

Mr. President, because of the importance of this resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Gardner's statements of December 10 and 13 and the full text of the General Assembly resolution. I ask that they be printed at the close of my remarks, as exhibit 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on May 4, 1963, Richard Gardner participated in the American Assembly's forum on "The Population Dilemma," which was held at Arden House, in Harriman, N.Y.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of Assistant Secretary Gardner's remarks, and I ask that they appear at the close of my remarks, as exhibit 3.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Secretary Gardner has clearly expressed the policy of the United States in the United Nations, and has carried our policy to listeners outside the United Nations.

The United Nations is undertaking a monumental study to collect information concerning the particular problems confronting its member nations as it seeks to implement resolution 1838 of the 17th General Assembly when the Secretary General was requested "to conduct an inquiry among the Governments of states members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies concerning the particular problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the June 28, 1963, request of the Secretary General to our Nation for such information appear as exhibit 4 at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in April of this year, the monumental study of the National Academy of Sciences was made public. The comprehensive study on world population was entitled "The Growth of World Population."

I shall at this time quote the full text of the introductory letter of Academy President Frederick Seitz:

> The problem of uncontrolled population growth emerges as one of the most critical issues of our time since it influences the welfare and happiness of all the world's citizens. It commands the attention of every nation and society; the problem is no less grave for the technically advanced nations than for the less developed.
>
> If we are to meet this challenge, we must make use of the knowledge that science and technology can bring to bear on the social, cultural, and biomedical questions involved.
>
> I hope that this report of the Committee on Science and Public Policy of the National Academy of Sciences will serve as a stimulus to thought and action. It is addressed not only to other scientists but to people generally, since all must bear the ultimate responsibility.

The report by the Committee on Science and Public Policy, of the National Academy of Sciences, is the product of a panel of eminent U.S. scientists who met in the fall of 1962 to—as Chairman George B. Kistiakowsky writes in the foreword—"review and summarize the findings of others on population growth and its findings of others on population growth and its consequences."

The Panel members were assembled in view of the growing "public concern over the effects of uncontrolled population growth."

The National Academy has expressed the hope that the report will "contribute to a broader understanding of the consequences of rapid population growth and, through a recommended course of action, to its eventual control."

As the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have earned commendation, so have the men who contributed to the Academy's study. They are:

Panel on Population Problems: William D.McElroy, chairman, the Johns Hopkins University; Willard Allen, the Washington University; Bernard Berelson, the Population Council; Ansley Coale, Princeton University; Harold Dorn, National Institutes of Health; Clement L. Markert, the Johns Hopkins University; Warren Nelson, the Population Council; and Albert Tyler, California Institute of Technology.

Committee on Science and Public Policy: George B. Kistiakowsky, chairman, Harvard University; Philip H. Abelson, Carnegie Institution of Washington; Lawrence R. Blins, Stanford University; H. W. Bode, Bell Telephone Laboratories; Frank Brink, Jr., the Rockefeller Institute; Melvin Calvin, University of California; Leo Goldberg, Harvard University; A. L. Lehninger, the Johns Hopkins University; Donald B. Lindsley, University of California; Saunders MacLane, University of Chicago; William W. Rubey, University of California; H. L. Shapiro, American Museum of Natural History; Richard E. Shope, the Rockefeller Institute; T. M. Sonneborn, Indiana University; Alvin M. Weinber, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Robert E. Green, Executive Secretary, National Academy of Sciences.

The committee feels that all nations are committed to achieving a higher standard of living for their people—adequate food, good health, literacy, education, and gainful employment. The committee believes that the current rate of population growth is "an important barrier to the achievement of these goals."

How are these goals to be implemented?

According to the National Academy of Sciences report:

> This problem can be successfully attacked by developing new methods of fertility regulation and implementing programs of voluntary family planning widely and rapidly throughout the world.

Stressing that the problem can no longer be ignored, pointing to the need for sociological and biomedical sciences research, the report asserts:

> Other than the search for lasting peace, no problem is more urgent.

Five major recommendations were made by the scientists who consider their implementation "essential for needed expansion and strengthening of activities in the fields of science that are concerned with population problems."

> 1. Support of graduate and postdoctoral training in demography and in social and biomedical sciences concerned with population problems should be increased.
> 2. Research laboratories for scientific investigation of the biomedical aspects of human reproduction should be expanded.
> 3. International cooperation in studies concerned with voluntary fertility regulation and family planning is highly desirable, and the U.S. Government should actively participate in fostering such cooperation, working in coordination with appropriate agencies of the United Nations system whenever possible, and with other intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations whenever appropriate.
> 4. Programs in the United States for the training of family planning administrators should be improved and enlarged.
> 5. A committee should be established by the National Academy of Sciences for the purpose of stimulating and coordinating programs directed toward the solution of problems of uncontrolled growth of population.

As we know, birth rates can be lowered in a number of ways. An illuminating discussion is contained in the study. Take for instance, this sentence on the practice of contraception:

> Given the prevailing conditions of life in the less-developed areas, only the simplest methods can be employed.

The importance of developing contraceptive procedures to meet the personal and cultural needs of all peoples is discussed as is the importance of attention given to the biomedical factors.

The need for "simpler and less-demanding methods than are now available—methods consonate with weak motivation, inferior educational attainment, ignorance of biological processes, and other cultural differences. Development of better methods of this kind requires greater knowledge, which can be acquired only through biomedical research."

Mankind's exasperating lack of information on the reproductive process in human beings is acknowledged in the report.

Just as the National Academy's report is helpful, so is the Public Health Service survey of "Research on Reproduction Related to Birth and Population Control." Recently appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze acted wisely in making public this report which had been withheld. In its 29-page introduction the reader learns that as of December 1962, "approximately 400 research projects have been cataloged which can be viewed as likely to provide scientific information which may be applicable to birth control."

On page 23 is found this statement:

> What is clear is that at least 14 companies have taken some interest in birth control research, and that the commitment of funds by industry to this type of investigation is large and growing at a rapid pace.

As the Public Health Service study observes:

> The major sources of support for research potentially related to birth control are the NIH, the AEC, the Population Council, the Ford Foundation, and the pharmaceutical industry.

As man seeks to meet the population control problem he learns how very little he knows about the human reproductive cycle. If we can accept available data, it appears that our National Institutes of Health is spending approximately $3 million on reproduction research today.

A great deal of praise is due my able colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his efforts to arouse further public discussion on the problem of population control.

His excellent speech of August 15, 1963, a pioneer presentation of this subject in the Senate, firmly approached the problem and his suggestion that the time has come to speak out is proper.

On August 15 I was privileged to cosponsor Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, which the diligent Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced. That resolution, in part, urges President Kennedy to step up population growth research at our National Institutes of Health.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 be reprinted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas the expected growth of world population, if it does no more than continue at its present annual rate of 2 percentum,

will double the number of inhabitants of the world, from three billion to six billion, by the year 2000; and

Whereas the application of public health measures, and the introduction of modern medical life-saving, and life-prolonging techniques have contributed to a doubling of the annual rate of population growth within the past eighteen years, and may be expected to increase it even further; and

Whereas much of this population expansion will occur in the underdeveloped countries of the world, whose inhabitants do not now have sufficient food, clothing, shelter, or the means to industrialize their economies to supply these needs, and who can therefore least afford to share their already scarce resources with the billions waiting to be born; and

Whereas the prospect for such countries, where increases in the gross national product will be largely offset by population increases, is not the prompt reduction of individual deprivation and misery, but rather the indefinite perpetuation of inadequate standards of living; and

Whereas the consequence of this uncontrolled rise in population is to doom to disappointment and angry frustration the newly awakened expectations of the underprivileged peoples of the world, and thus to heighten the threat of civil strife and world war; and

Whereas the means exist, or can be discovered by further research, to permit those who are charged with the responsibilities of parenthood to exercise freedom of choice, according to the dictates of their own consciences and within the precepts of their ethical and religious convictions, in determining the number of children which they wish to bear, and for which they are willing to accept the obligation of support and education; and

Whereas there is no significant body of responsible opinion among the adherents of any major religious, ethical, or ideological persuasion which advocates the total abnegation of free choice in determining family size; and

Whereas in his summary address to the recent and historic World Food Congress, Doctor B. R. Sen, Director General of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, declared that "the time may soon come when not only the nation to which the individual belongs, but also the world as a whole may have to take a more direct and more dynamic role in assisting family planning measures through social education and hygiene"; and

Whereas the Committee on Science and Public Policy of the National Academy of Sciences, the Nation's principal scientific body, in a recent report on "The Growth of World Population" declared, "Other than the search for lasting peace, no problem is more urgent"; and

Whereas President Kennedy has given public support for increased research in fertility and the whole reproductive cycle, and has stated that the results of this research should be made available to the people of the world, so that each may exercise his own judgment; and

Whereas the United States, in a statement before the United Nations, has acknowledged the need for more facts about alternative methods of family planning which are consistent with different economic, social, cultural, and religious circumstances, and has formally declared a policy to "help other countries, upon request, to find potential sources of information and assistance on ways and means of dealing with population problems"; and

Whereas the Secretary General of the United Nations has sent an inquiry to all United Nations members, including the United States, asking for the views of each government concerning problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal interaction of population growth and economic and social development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be urged speedily to implement the policies of the United States regarding population growth as declared before the United Nations, by inaugurating substantially increased programs of research within the National Institutes of Health and by taking steps to make the results of such research freely available to countries requesting such assistance.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to create a Presidential Commission on Population which shall be charged with the duty to inform, after investigation, the Government and the American people of the nature of population problems at home and abroad, with respect to the implications for all aspects of American life, and the relevance to our efforts, in cooperation with international agencies and other nations, to promote economic and social progress throughout the world, and to make such recommendations as may be appropriate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield to a pioneer in the field so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Alaska for his kind words. He was present in the Chamber when I spoke and gave immediate support to what I had to say. I suspect that it was merely an accident of time that I made my speech before he made his. It is a source of great comfort to me that we stand shoulder to shoulder in this effort.

With respect to the resolution which the Senator has cosponsored with me, I invite his attention to the fact that it has been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where I hope in due course we can receive from the administration an indication of its support for the adoption of the resolution. Accordingly, we could, perhaps early next year, anticipate hearings on it. I agree with the commendation which the Senator from Alaska has given to so many of the brave individuals who really "broke the sound barrier" by bringing the problem out into the public domain.

The one who I believe should have great credit, in view particularly of his religious background, is the President of the United States, who has been candid and forthright. He has not only given a green light to Mr. Gardner in the position which he took on behalf of the United States at the United Nations, but has spoken out in press conferences and in other public utterances in support of the general position which the Senator from Alaska and I have taken. I feel confident that in due course we shall receive from the administration a favorable report on the resolution. If and when we do, we shall urge the able and distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is the leading Member of the Senate in terms of the effective work he has done for the health of the Nation over a long career, to hold hearings and hopefully bring the resolution forward for favorable action on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania. I wish to associate myself with his words of commendation of President Kennedy, who has helped greatly by allowing the Assistant Deputy Secretary of State to present the views which are so necessary to a further understanding of this important problem. I feel that not only are we on the eve of a breakthrough, but that a breakthrough has taken place.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania has been an extremely important factor. He has been the principal factor in bringing the subject to the attention of the most celebrated, deliberative body in the world—which has been very deliberate in dealing with the subject. I think the date on which he made his masterful major speech on the issue and his subsequent insertions mark an epic. I congratulate him. He deserves the highest of praise of all who realize how important the problem is and the courage and enterprise which is required to approach it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to suggest to the Senator that there is a great deal of undue political timidity in dealing with the problems. I suspect, particularly, in the light of the position taken by so many eminent Catholic laymen and theologians, that one need not have any political timidity in advocating research into the problem of population control. When I ran for reelection in Pennsylvania last fall, it is true that I did not speak out with the same candor that I have since I have been given a new 6-year lease on life. Nevertheless, my views on the subject were pretty well known.

As the Senator knows, there is a rather substantial Catholic population in my State, I received no adverse criticism of any consequence because I was advocating positive research and discussion in this area. Many of our colleagues who are inclined to hold back in that area need really feel no serious concern that what they do will have an adverse effect on their political life. I wonder if my friend from Alaska concurs in that view.

Mr. GRUENING. I certainly do. I believe the atmosphere has changed completely in the past year or two. As the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows, since he asked to have the articles printed in the RECORD, the New York Times published on 3 consecutive days a detailed series of front page articles, which would not have been done 5 or 10 years ago. It is done now, and I believe it is very gratifying. After all, there is no subject that free people should not be free to discuss. This subject is vital to the health, welfare, and happiness of the human race. It is tragic that it was not discussed much earlier.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to go on record as being strongly of the view that members of the Catholic church, for whom I, as a Unitarian, have the highest regard, are just as much interested in vital national and international problems as are members of any other denomination or religion. I am sure that the history of the past year or two would indicate that that is correct. It is a wonderful thing that so many Catholics have interested themselves in this vitally important problem. They are much to be commended, more so than the rest of us, because they had further to go. But I welcome their support in the effort, and I am convinced that without that support we would not get very far. I am sure we will receive such support to an increasing degree as time goes on.

Mr. GRUENING. I am in full agreement with the last comments of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I believe that the Catholic church is showing great wisdom and open mindedness in making discussions and experimentations in this field possible, and supporting them, as the evidence which I have cited and which the Senator from Pennsylvania cited in his speech makes clear.

Mr. President, the problem of population control is receiving serious study in many areas. In Chile, for instance, the Government is giving support to birth control clinics because of the high rate of abortions and maternal deaths from abortions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a New York Times news story of October 8, 1962, reporting this may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1963]

CHILE SUPPORTING BIRTH CONTROL TO CURB ABORTIONS AND DEATHS—PROGRAM OF CATHOLIC NATION DESCRIBED TO SEMINAR IN FAMILY PLANNING HERE

The high rate of abortions and maternal deaths from abortions in Chile has given impetus to Government support of birth control clinics, a Chilean public health authority reported here yesterday.

Even though the country is about 90 percent Roman Catholic, there will soon be nine birth control clinics operating under Government auspices at the first phase of a national plan, Dr. Guillermo Adriasola said.

He spoke in the Fifth Avenue Hotel at a family planning seminar for Latin American leaders sponsored by the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Dr. Adriasola, who is professor of maternal and child health at the University of Chile's School of Public Health, said that Chile had learned that overpopulation must be solved. He said the Chilean population was growing annually by 2.2 percent while food production was increasing only by 0.9 percent.

Dr. Adriasola said that induced abortions occurred in 35 to 40 percent of all pregnancies in Chile and that 40 percent of all maternal deaths in the country each year were caused by such abortions.

During a press conference, Dr. Adriasola, who was the speaker at the evening session of the conference, said that Chile's program was the foremost program in South America.

He said that the National Public Health Services of Chile had created a National Committee for Family Protection. Patients will be recruited largely through hospitals, emergency services, and public health stations where women are treated for health problems caused by abortions.

In 1961, he said, there were 49,195 admissions to hospitals in Chile because of abortions and it was estimated that for every hospital admission there were 2 cases not registered.

One of the compelling needs in Chile, as in other Latin American countries, is to find the simplest, most efficient method of birth control, Dr. Adriasola said. There will be a systematic attempt to conduct research into the most effective methods now being used, he said. This type of research has been lacking so far in Chile, he said.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in our own country debate has raged in Chicago, Ill., over birth control, welfare funds, and the politics of Illinois. An article in the June 20, 1963, the Reporter magazine, by Hal Bruno, discusses the situation, and I ask unanimous consent that it appear in the RECORD at the end of my remarks as exhibit 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, many groups in this country are bringing to our attention the need for population control. They deserve praise. Some which come to mind are the Population Council, the Population Reference Bureau, Resources for the Future, Inc., the Planned Parenthood Association of America, the Ford Foundation, the Brookings Institution, the Princeton Office of Population Research, the Russel Sage Foundation, the Center for International Economic Growth, the Milbank Memorial Fund, the Rockefeller Foundation, Population Research and Training Center of the University of Chicago, and the International Population and Urban Research of the University of California. And individuals who have responded include, of course, Margaret Sanger, Frank Boudreau, of the Milbank Foundation, Walter F. Wilcox, Warren S. Thompson, and Robert Cook.

Victor Hugo in 1877 wrote:

> An invasion of armies can be resisted; an invasion of ideas cannot be resisted.

Modern man has paraphrased it to: "There is one thing stronger than all the armies in the world and that is an idea whose time has come."

As Dr. John Rock says, "the time has come."

EXHIBIT 1

MAN AND HUNGER: THE PERSPECTIVES OF HISTORY

(By Arnold J. Toynbee, United Kingdom)

The freedom from hunger campaign is one of three major educational campaigns on which the human race is engaged in our time. The other two are, of course, the campaign against war and the campaign against disease. War, pestilence, and famine have been the three traditional scourges of the human race. They have been nature's brutal ways of keeping the human population of our planet within limits. Man, however, is unique among nature's creatures on the face of this planet in his relation to nature. Man is not condemned by his nature to be completely and permanently at nature's mercy. He is not just nature's passive product, instrument, plaything, and victim. To a greater extent than any other of his fellow living creatures, man has the power to react against nature. To some extent, man can impose his own will on nature. He can at least partially substitute for nature's way a way of his own that he has chosen for himself. But he can have his own way only on one condition. If his own human, and humane, way is to prevail, it must be a way that, like nature's brutal way, fulfills nature's intractable ultimate requirements.

Man's choice is thus a choice between alternative means of obeying nature's laws. For instance, man can abolish premature human mortality caused by war, disease, and famine. We have already won a decisive victory over premature death through disease. We hope to win a still more complete victory over premature death through war. We are now waging the present campaign against premature death through famine—and, short of outright death, against the loss of strength and energy and happiness that undernutrition and malnutrition inflict. We intend to win this campaign too. Yet, if we were to win all these three campaigns and were to take no further action, our three victories would quickly turn into a major defeat on all three fronts. If we left it at that, we should not have reckoned with the reproductive mechanism that nature has implanted in our race, as well as in all the other races of living creatures.

Every species has the biological capacity to increase in numbers ad infinitum; and therefore its multiplication is bound to be checked sooner or later. The physical volume of our planet is limited, and the capacity of the planet's surface for producing food for living creatures is limited proportionately. Even if the human race were to succeed in breaking the bounds of its native planet, it would reach a limit to its food supply somewhere at some date, supposing that it succeeded in abolishing war and pestilence without taking any further steps.

We should then have regulated our human death rate without having regulated our human birth rate to match. We should still have left it to nature to keep the growth of the universe's human population within limits; and nature would then limit this by reimposing on man her own brutal set of checks in the shape of famine, pestilence, and war. Therefore, if we are to defeat these three scourges, not just momentarily but definitively, once for all, we have to win a fourth victory. We have to conquer one of our most intimate and most deeply ingrained habits, traditions, and prejudices. We have voluntarily to regulate our birth rate to match the regulation of our death rate that we have already been achieving.

Unless and until we do regulate our birth rate voluntarily, the removal, or even the reduction, of any one of nature's three methods of limitation will have the effect of increasing the danger of seeing our population growth limited by one or other of nature's methods that we have not yet brought under control. This is evident today, now that we have succeeded in reducing, to a remarkable degree, the incidence of premature death through disease. We have still not yet got rid of premature death through war. Within the lifetime of people still alive, we have seen the world's population reduced by two world wars in which the slaughter has been on an unprecedented scale. Even since the end of the Second World War, local wars in Korea, Indo-China, Algeria, Cyprus, the Congo, and the Himalayas have been taking their toll of men in the prime of life. Yet, in spite of the continuance of war, the conquest of premature death through disease, thanks to the triumph of preventive medicine and public hygiene, has been enough, by itself, to set our race's population growth soaring at an unprecedented rate. Today mankind's future is at stake in a formidable race between population growth and famine.

It is true that, in our freedom from hunger campaign, we have a mighty ally in science. The application of science to food production happily promises, as we know, to increase our food supply vastly. But science cannot increase our food supply ad infinitum, and it is also powerless to distribute the product to the hungry mouths that need it. This cannot be done without political cooperation on a worldwide scale. So science, by itself, cannot insure that man shall win this campaign for freedom from hunger. Nor can science and politics insure it together, supposing that politics were to mend its ways and were henceforth to do its utmost toward seconding science's efforts. In the long run the campaign cannot be won unless the planet's hundreds of millions of wives and husbands voluntarily decide to regulate the number of human births.

This is, I believe, one of the major challenges that confront mankind in our time. In at least one respect, it is a more difficult challenge to respond to than the challenge to abolish war. War could perhaps be abolished effectively by agreement among the small minority of the human race that has a monopoly of political authority. This minority is small, even in an increasingly democratic world; and it is likely, I believe, to remain a relatively small and manageable one, however democratic the world may eventually become. But the regulation of our race's birthrate requires voluntary and effective action by a majority of the planet's adult men and women. To educate our politicians may not be easy, but to educate the non-political-minded mass of mankind is going to be a still more difficult task.

One way of trying to educate ourselves is to recall our past experience. Of course, we must not expect that past experience will provide us with a blueprint for planning the future. Still, our experience of the past gives us the only light on the future that we have. We must therefore make the most of it that we can. I imagine that this was what the Director General had in mind when he did me the honor of inviting me to deliver this address on the perspectives of history in which we have to look at our current problem of man and hunger.

By far the greater part of human history is shrouded in obscurity. Even our archaeologists and our palaeontologists, who have been doing such marvelous detective work in our time, have been able to reveal to us no more than a few glimpses of our race's more distant past. Here we are still largely in the realm of guesswork. Yet I suppose we can guess, with some confidence, that, since our ancestors first became human, most human beings have been hungry for most of the time. The toll that hunger must have taken from human happiness and human achievement is appalling to contemplate. Happily, this thought brings with it a converse thought. There must be a huge unrealized potential of human energy and creativity which would be released for the service of human welfare if the hunger that has been coeval with humanity were to be abolished by a definitive victory in our freedom from hunger campaign.

We may also guess that the situation in which we find ourselves today has, in essence, existed since the beginning. The present race between the increase of population and the increase of food supply is not something entirely new. What is new is the present sharpness of the acceleration of the pace. The tempo of human life is now sharply accelerating in all fields of human activity. Yet even this acceleration is not something new. It has been gradually getting up speed since life made its first appearance. The faster the pace, the more conscious we are of the problem; that is the difference, and it is a fortunate one, because our consciousness of the problem stimulates us to grapple with the problem and to make a serious effort to solve it.

In the course of human history, man has taken an increasingly active and positive line in his struggle to keep himself fed. He has passed over from passive food-gathering to active hunting and fishing; he has passed on beyond that from feeding on plants and animals in their state of nature to the domestication of them and the deliberate planned breeding of them to satisfy his wants. Each of these technological revolutions has brought with it, as its reward, a sudden big increase in mankind's food supply. The present big increase through the application of modern science is only another term in this long series. Today we are hearing, with apprehension, the thundering tramp of our population increase threatening to overtake the mighty advance that science has been enabling our food supply to make.

This threat, on the part of unregulated reproductive nature, to cancel the effects of human ingenuity and forethought in the technological field, is also not something new. The invention of hunting and fishing and the subsequent invention of agriculture were each, in turn, counterbalanced by increases in population which devoured the margin of food supply over numbers with which man's technological prowess had promised to endow him. We have been godlike in our planned breeding of our domesticated plants and animals, but we have been rabbitlike in our unplanned breeding of ourselves. While we have triumphantly domesticated so many other species of living creature, we have improvidently left our own species in a state of nature in this vital matter of reproduction. We have continued to breed up to the limit with a lack of control that we have never dreamed of allowing to our domesticated animals and plants. Our self-imposed penalty has been to continue, with very few exceptions, to live in nature's way—to live, that is, just, and only just, above the starvation line—in spite of our unique human achievement of creating a manmade abundance of food.

This behavior of ours in our dealings with the problem of famine is disconcertingly perverse; and unfortunately we have shown the same perversity in our dealings with the problem of war. One of nature's three brutal ways of keeping the members of any species of living creature within limits is to make the individual representatives of this species serve as a prey both for each other and for other species. Human beings, like the rest of nature's creatures, have been exposed by nature to this scourge, as one way of reducing their numbers. But, unlike other creatures, man has the capacity to upset nature's arrangements. Already, part way through the Paleolithic age, man had been released from the fate of being a prey for nonhuman forms of life on the face of this planet. He had established a decisive permanent ascendancy over lions and tigers. The only fellow creatures of ours over which man failed to establish his ascendancy until our own times were bacteria. Man failed to master these because he remained unaware of their existence. As soon as he discovered the existence of bacteria, he was able to make them, too, into targets for human weapons; and, once discovered by man, bacteria have proved hardly more capable of resisting human attack than lions and tigers and other big game that are visible to human eyes without the aid of a microscope. This recent partial conquest of the bacteria that used to prey on us with impunity is a major part of what we call the conquest of disease by preventive medicine.

Thus, part way through the Paleolithic Age, man had relieved himself of his original fate of being a prey for nonhuman creatures visible to the human eye. Apart from bacteria, the only living creatures that now still had the power to prey on human beings were other members of the human race.

In mastering the nonhuman forms of life, man was dealing with creatures that, unlike himself, are not rational. These nonhuman adversaries of his could therefore be mastered by man only through the use of brute force. They were not amenable to argument or persuasion. So, in his struggle with them, the only use that he could make of his reason was to forge, with it, artificial weapons that were immeasurably more potent than the natural weapons of his nonhuman opponents and competitors. As we know, the human reason, applied to the generation of overwhelming physical force, proved brilliantly successful; and this would have led one to expect, a priori, that human reason would be still more successful when used for dealing, not with an unreasonable creature, such as a tiger, but with a partially rational creature, namely man himself. When the human reason had invented spears and bows and arrows for subduing tigers and lions, why could it not enable its human possessors to come to terms with each other without the use of force? In an encounter in which both parties were more or less rational human beings, how could they fail to see that it would be to their mutual advantage to refrain from using against each other the armed force that was the only recourse open to them in their struggle with lions and tigers? How could they fail to see that, as between human beings, rational agreement, opening the way for peaceful cooperation, was not only possible but was infinitely preferable to the use of organized violence?

In our relations with each other, we have, indeed, achieved peaceful cooperation within limits. We have created human society. But, so far, sociality has not been achieved over the whole field of the relations of human beings with each other. In some of our relations with each other we are still applying our reason, not to cooperating with each other, but to employing, against each other, the organized violence that is the only recourse open to us for dealing with nonhuman wild beasts.

Man is the most potent of all living creatures in virtue of his partial rationality; and, when man applies his glimmer of reason to making weapons, he can invent artificial weapons that are far more deadly than any of the natural weapons that nonhuman nature has evolved. Thus man has rescued himself from the fate of being food for tigers, but has subjected himself to the far more devastating fate of being food for cannon and for atomic weapons. This has been a most unprofitable exchange. The human race's prospects of survival were considerably better when we were defenseless against tigers than they are today, when we have become defenseless against ourselves.

I have dwelt on man's self-inflicted scourge of war because this brings out the vein of perversity in human nature which has made human history so tragic a story up to date. This perversity in ourselves is our arch enemy. We encounter it and have so far been worsted by it—in our dealings with all the problems with which we have to contend. This perversity is obviously the crucial obstacle to the abolition of war. Less obviously, perhaps, but no less truly, it is the crucial obstacle to the abolition of hunger.

By "perversity," I mean an irrational and immoral resistance to acting in accordance with the light that is given to us human beings, alone among living creatures, by our distinctively human faculties of reason and conscience. By yielding to our perverse impulses we are playing into the hands of unregenerate nature. We have to contend with unregenerate nature in her external forms—such forms, I mean, as lions and tigers and floods and droughts. But we also have to contend with her in ourselves where she shows herself in her ugliest form. Within each one of us, unregenerate nature takes the form of the subhuman, inhuman element in human nature with which Man's reason and conscience have to carry on an unending inner struggle.

To play into nature's hands unnecessarily is folly. It is also criminal. It is a kind of high treason committed against our own humanity, and this on one of the biggest issues with which mankind ever has been, or (perhaps) ever will be, confronted.

Let me state this issue again in terms of our freedom from hunger campaign. The issue, here, surely is: Are we going to claim, or are we going to renounce, a human privilege that we can enjoy thanks to our possession of reason and conscience? Man, alone among living creatures, has the choice of regulating the size of his population voluntarily, by his own action; and, if once he allows himself to exercise this power that is in his hands, there can be no doubt, surely, about the principle on which he will act. Our aim will be the responsible aim, the moral aim, of doing our best to insure that every human being whom we bring into the world shall have the best life that we can give to him or her. By "best" I mean, of course, best in the spiritual sense, regarding physical welfare as being a means to spiritual welfare, and not as being an end in itself.

Maximum welfare, not maximum population, is our human objective. To breed up to the limit made sense for man only in an age in which he was still a victim of the same maximum mortality that afflicted, and still afflicts, his undomesticated nonhuman fellow creatures. In an age in which man has already gone far toward conquering disease and has perhaps come within sight of conquering war, to breed up to the maximum has become the surest way imaginable of undoing our victories over disease and over war. It would defeat us by delivering us into the hands of famine and inviting famine to bring war and pestilence back in its train.

Yet the greater part of the human race is still showing reluctance to regulate its birth rate. This unwillingness to deal rationally with the population problem is condemning mankind to continue to run its age-old race with hunger; and the reduction of the death rate, which we have now achieved, is making the race harder for us to win. The reduction of the death rate is, in itself, one of the finest achievements of the human reason. It ought to be an unmixed blessing; but, so long as it coexists with a persistent failure to regulate the birth rate to match, the reduction of the death rate threatens to turn into a curse instead of a blessing. It is making our race with famine harder to win; and this is the more serious because, in running this race, we are handicapped by the present inequality between the different sections of the human race in respect of this vital matter of food supply.

It has become a commonplace that the rich countries are growing richer while the poor are growing poorer. This is perhaps true of most of the various kinds of production in which wealth consists. It is certainly true of the production of food; and food is the basic form of wealth. A human being who is short of food will find that all other forms of wealth are valueless to him. This point was made, long ago, in the story of Midas' touch.

The technology that is the source of the rich countries' productivity is now generating in these countries, a surplus of food production. The rich countries themselves cannot consume their own food surpluses; the poor countries, that have a shortage of home-grown food, cannot afford to buy from the rich countries the surpluses that these cannot use. Most of the countries that are now producing food surpluses are countries with a Western civilization, situated in the Temperate zones. Tropical countries with a food surplus are exceptional. Thailand is the conspicuous exception that proves this rule.

This regional inequality in food production is not a new phenomenon. The earliest seats of civilization were regions in which food was produced in comparative abundance. Ancient Iraq, ancient Egypt, and the river valleys of ancient Peru are cases in point. Of course, even in these exceptionally productive regions, the production of food was abundant only by comparison with those other agricultural regions—and they were the majority—that produced no surplus at all. The surplus produced in the productive river valleys was still small when measured by the size of the population. It was enough only to relieve a tiny privileged minority from the common task of wringing the community's subsistence from a reluctant Nature. Even in these relatively favored communities, the great majority of the population was still living hardly above starvation level after it had surrendered its slender margin of food production, over and above its own bare needs for its own subsistence, in order to maintain the privileged few in a state of leisure.

A majority of the privileged minority no doubt abused their privilege by misusing the leisure that had been won for them by the toil of the majority of their fellow men and women. They spent the surplus on making war or in indulging in luxury and frivolity. Only a minority of the privileged minority made some return to society for the precious leisure which society had bestowed on them at so heavy a cost. Yet the fruitful use of leisure by a minority of a minority is the source of the civilization that has been achieved by part of the human race within the last 5,000 years. All the progress of civilization, both spiritual and material, have been the work of a few people who have been released from the whole-time drudgery of running the race between population increase and starvation.

This minimum amount of leisure, which has done so much for the human race during these last 5,000 years, will be in danger of being wiped out if population continues to increase at its newly accelerated rate. Yet, in our time, we cannot afford to lose the leisure that a food surplus makes possible. So far from being able to do without it, we need far more leisure than ever before, and therefore need a far larger margin of food production.

In our time, we have to aim at nothing less than a modicum of leisure, not just for a minority, but for everybody. This is, first and foremost, a requirement of social justice. One of the odious features of civilization, up to date, has been the monopolization of its amenities by a privileged minority, when the surplus on which this minority has lived has been produced by the majority's hard labor.

In our time there is also an imperative practical need to give everybody at least enough leisure to make it possible to discover whether he or she has any special gifts that would be of value to society. Ability is the only capital that mankind has ever had or ever will have, to offset our human physical weakness and nakedness; and today we cannot afford to leave any human being's ability undeveloped and unused. In a generation in which the population of the world is going to double or triple, technology and organization will be, more than ever, our lifelines; and organization and technology of the complexity that is going to be required will demand an ever larger supply of first-rate engineers, administrators, psychologists, researchers, inventors.

This means that the proportion of the human race's man-hours that are spent on these non-food-producing services must be in a higher ratio than ever before to the man-hours spent on merely keeping body and soul together. But we shall not be able to achieve this necessary shift in the allocation of human activities unless we can release a much greater proportion of mankind's working time than in the past from the task of merely keeping mankind fed. This, in turn, means that we must aim at stabilizing the planet's population at a figure that will allow a substantial part of our time and energy to be spent, not on keeping ourselves alive, but on making human life a more civilized affair than we have succeeded in making it so far.

It was, no doubt, the ability of a minority who had time to think, plan, and direct that originally made possible the reclamation of those river valleys that were the earliest seats of civilization. In those countries in the past, as in the Temperate Zone countries today, the surplus of food was not a free gift of nature. It was the reward of a conquest of nature by man. These river valleys, in their state of nature, were covered with jungle and swamp that were inhospitable to human life. It took imagination and skill, as well as hard work, to break in these uninviting landscapes. It has been the same story in the valley of the River Po in northern Italy, which has been broken in since the 2d century B.C., and in the green belt of North America, which has been reclaimed from the virgin forest only in the 19th and 20th centuries of the present era. There have been few regions in which nature has been propitious for food production without having had to be broken in. The loess belt in northern China and the black earth belt in the Ukraine and in western Siberia may be examples of this. If so, they are exceptional cases.

If one examines the economic structure of ancient empires, one finds, in one case after another, that they depended on the surplus food production of some particular province of theirs. This productive region may have amounted, in area, to only a small fraction of the empire that it supported economically. But, without this local economic support, the empire would have collapsed, and in many cases it did collapse if and when it was deprived of this support through the loss of the key province. In the past, again, it was almost impossible for an empire to maintain a capital city, adequate to its political and administrative requirements, anywhere except in the immediate neighborhood of a food-producing region that provided a surplus over and above the requirements of the local cultivators themselves.

Since the beginning of the history of civilization, statesmanship has been trying to find ways and means of conveying the surplus food of surplus-food-producing areas to areas with no food margin or with a food deficit. The ways and means have to be physical, in the first place. The surplus food has to be transported. In the second place they have to be economic or political or both. The surplus food has to be either bought or commandeered, if it is to reach the mouths that need it. To buy requires economic purchasing power; to commandeer requires political and military power.

A Chinese scholar, Ch'ao-Ting Chi, has written an illuminating history of China in terms of the relations between the political structure, the location of the capital city, and the location of the food surplus producing area from which the capital city has drawn its food supply.

Without effective physical means of communication, a local food surplus is useless. It might as well not be produced if it cannot be transported from its place of origin, where it is superfluous, to places where it is needed. This has been one of the limiting factors in the territorial expansion of states. The obvious limiting factor here is an external one; namely, the military and political capacity of adjoining states to hold their own. But there is also an internal limiting factor in the territorial expansion of states;

namely, the limit of their technological and administrative capacity to distribute the food surplus produced in one of their provinces to the remainder of their territory, or at any rate to their capital city. In China, for instance, there has been an alternation between periods in which this subcontinent has been divided up politically into a number of separate local states and periods in which it has been united politically in a single empire. The periods of political unity have been periods in which the problem of transferring food surpluses has been dealt with successfully.

In our present day world this problem is acute; and here we have another disconcerting example of our human perversity. In our time, technology has solved, at last, the physical problem of transport. The annihilation of distance has been a triumph of human skill that is comparable to the contemporary reduction of the death rate. We have stultified the reduction of the death rate by failing to regulate the birth rate to match. We are stultifying the annihilation of distance by failing to unite into a single community the whole of mankind, as the whole of China has been united into a single state, and as the whole Mediterranean Basin was united once, for a short time, in the Roman Empire.

In our age our revolutionary improvements in the means of communication are making unification on a literally worldwide scale possible at last, for the first time in human history. Yet we are depriving ourselves of the benefits of this technological triumph of ours by dividing up the surface of our planet into a larger and larger number of smaller and smaller states, each of which is, at least officially, sovereign and independent. At the same time we are increasing the economic barriers between states. In the past, the most serious hindrances to the international circulation of goods were customs duties. In our time we have reinforced this ancient manmade obstacle by inventing new and more effective obstacles, such as quotas for imports and the manipulation of currencies. The battle between increasing technological efficiency in the circulation of goods and increasing political obstruction to their circulation is not a new battle; its history can be traced right back to the dawn of history. What is perhaps new in our time is the intensity with which this old battle is now being fought.

This is a battle which mankind can no longer afford to leave undecided. We have to win it, because a victory in this field offers us our only chance of being able to keep hunger at bay during an interim period during which, at best, we are going to be pressed hard by the menace of famine. At best, it will take several generations to educate the majority of wives and husbands into voluntarily regulating the number of births. This change will necessarily take time because it involves a break with an immemorially old habit; and this habit, which now threatens mankind with disaster, still has prestige, because in the past it once made for our race's survival. During this interim period, we must look to the application of science to tide us over, and science may indeed be able to come to our rescue if it is not hamstrung by politics. Science will, however, be frustrated, as I have suggested already, if the surface of this planet continues to be divided up into the territories of more than 100 sovereign independent states, each of which remains free to pursue a policy of its own about the production and distribution of food, however selfish and however shortsighted a state's food policy may be.

Perhaps you have in your hands this FAO pamphlet called "Statistics of Hunger" which I am holding up at this moment. If you have it, please open it and look at chart 1, showing the distribution of the population of the world according to daily intake of animal protein and according to daily intake of calories. You will see that the lowest intake—a perilously low intake—is concentrated in eastern Asia. And then look at chart 4, "The Shape of Things to Come." You will see that the same region, eastern Asia, in which the food shortage today is most acute, is also the region that is going to have by far the largest population increase of any by the end of the present century. By the year 2000, eastern Asia, by itself, is going to have a much larger population than the whole of the rest of the world put together. By A.D. 2000, the population of eastern Asia is going to exceed the population of all the rest of the world by a figure that will be about equal to the estimated population, in A.D. 2000, of Europe, including the whole of the Soviet Union.

The prospect opened up by a comparison of these two charts is sufficiently appalling, considered by itself, without taking any political factors into account. In chart 4 of this FAO pamphlet it is pointed out that the food situation, predicted for the year 2000, calls for a world food production increase of about 200 percent, 40 years from now, if adequate diets are to be provided for the whole population of the world at its estimated figure at that not very distant date.

Well, now, to get a realistic picture, we have to add the current political situation to the present and future food situation. You can see the political ingredient to the situation at a glance if you look again at Chart 1. In this chart, the present political divisions of the world are displayed, and the size of countries is shown, not in terms of actual areas, but in proportion to population. Keep your eyes on that chart. You will see that in terms of population, eastern Asia already exceeds all the rest of the world put together, and this by a figure that is appreciably greater than the present figure for the population of the whole of North America. You will also see that about three-quarters of the huge population of eastern Asia is accounted for by two countries only; namely, India and China. The combined population of India and China is immense, and it is grievously underfed.

Now what have India and China been doing to solve the food problem? They have been diverting resources that they cannot spare from their imperatively urgent identical task of increasing their food production. They have been diverting these resources to the wholly unproductive enterprise of fighting each other for the possession of strips of territory whose contribution to the world's food supply is, and always will be, infinitesimal. This is a tragedy. Chinese and Indian thoughts and efforts ought to be concentrated, not on making war, but on producing food. I do not apologize for singling out one pair of countries for your attention. This is not invidious, because India and China are not peculiar. They are a fair sample of the human race of which they constitute, together, so large a quota.

This is perhaps too gloomy a note to end on. The facts of human behavior often seem to leave the human observer of human affairs no alternative to despair. When one has been almost driven to despair by the spectacle of folly and crime, it is a good thing to right the balance by reminding ourselves that, throughout the course of history, as far as we have a record of it, dancing on the edges of precipices has been one of mankind's favorite occupations. For human beings, this is, of course, a very dangerous game. Human feet are not nearly so well suited for this exercise as the feet of flies or lizards. Moreover, the danger has greatly increased as a result of the recent great increase in human power. Till lately, mankind was so feeble that it hardly had the strength to topple itself over the edge, however near to the edge it might be standing. Indeed, it is only since the invention of the atomic weapon in 1945 that race suicide has come within sight of becoming feasible.

We have now exposed ourselves to the risk of committing mass suicide by fighting an atomic world war. Fortunately, an awareness of the revolutionary change, since 1945, in the nature of war seems to have spread quickly and widely and to have made quite a deep impression. Already a spirit of caution and self-restraint, which was conspicuously absent in the past, has made itself felt in the conduct of international relations. It is perhaps not foolishly optimistic to hope that, now that we are at the edge of the atomic precipice, we may forbear to advance any further and that we may even back away a little from the abyss. The peril of atomic mass suicide is dramatic. On the other hand, the size of mankind's stakes in the race between population growth and hunger is not so easily discernible. To appreciate it, one must be sufficiently at home with statistics and charts to be capable of having one's imagination stirred by them. The facts and diagrams in the FAO's freedom from hunger campaign do appeal to the imagination. But I fancy that, till now, the effect has not been so great as the effect on our imagination of our knowledge of what an atomic war would mean. This is, no doubt, one of the reasons for our present campaign. The gravity and urgency of the problem of feeding the world's rapidly increasing population has to be brought home, not to the experts, who do not need educating, but to the masses, who do need this. For us human beings, the dangers to our survival are the most dangerous when we are unaware of them. They are the most dangerous of all when our blindness is at least partly willful, as it so often is.

As soon as human beings face a danger, there is always some hope that they may bring their practical ability into play for overcoming it; and, since our practical ability is great, our chances are good, if only we allow our danger to jolt us out of our habitual perversity. This is why a campaign to educate ourselves in the problem of hunger is so important today.

If we are to master the problem of hunger, what have we to do? I see two principal points on our agenda. I have discussed both of them already; but, in concluding this talk, I will mention both of them again because, to my mind, they are fundamental. Both of them are educational projects, and both will take time and effort to carry out, because both will call upon human beings to break with habits that have become ingrained in us by long practice of them, and we tend to cling to ingrained habits irrationally.

The first piece of urgently necessary education is in the political field. We have to persuade ourselves to give to the interests of the human race as a whole a decisive priority over the interests of one's own particular section of it. Unless we can bring about this revolutionary redistribution of loyalties, we shall not be able to get the whole human race, over the whole surface of the planet, to administer itself as a single worldwide unit for the purpose of producing and distributing food; and, unless we can attain this political objective, we shall not be able to give science a chance to enable us to keep the world's population fed while our second piece of educational work is being carried out.

Our second educational task is to persuade wives and husbands voluntarily to regulate the birth rate to match the already achieved reduction of the death rate. This piece of sexual education seems likely to prove more difficult than the companion piece of political education, and this for two reasons. In the first place, a much larger number of people have to be educated before this campaign can produce practical results. In the second place, family affairs are a much more intimate side of human life than politics are. In asking people to change their habits in this field, one is running a greater risk of finding the way blocked by irrational prejudices. This piece of education will therefore take time; and, in order to find the time, we shall have to forge ahead with our piece of political education. Since this is the easier task of the two, we may hope to carry it out more quickly.

The existence and activities of FAO are an antidote to pessimism. I do not believe that the governments of the world's local states would have been capable of calling anything like FAO into existence in the times before 1914. The idea would hardly have occurred to them; and, if some unofficial human being had suggested it to them, many of them would have found it repugnant, because they would have seen in it a covert attack on local sovereignty. On this point, I fancy, the predicted growth of the world's population within the next 40 years is going to have a radical effect, if what actually happens turns out to be anything like what has been forecast. By the time when the world's population has doubled or trebled, I believe that the world's hungry peoples are likely to compel their governments to thrust upon FAO a considerable part of the executive authority and responsibility, in regard to food, that today is still being jealously retained in the local governments' hands.

Meanwhile, FAO is actively preparing itself for its increasingly important future role. This is, I should guess, part of the significance of our present freedom-from-hunger campaign.

EXHIBIT 2

POPULATION GROWTH: A WORLD PROBLEM—STATEMENT OF U.S. POLICY

(By Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs)

(NOTE.—The following two statements were made by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, in Committee II (Economic and Financial) of the U.N. General Assembly during debate on the item "Population growth and economic development," together with the text of a resolution adopted in plenary session on December 18, 1962.)

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 10

The United States welcomes the initiative of the cosponsors of the resolution now before us[1] in drawing further attention to the subject of population growth and its relation to economic development. This is a subject of transcendent importance for the United Nations and all its members.

There are today some 3 billion people in the world. It required hundreds of thousands of years, from the beginning of life on earth to the beginning of this century, to reach 1½ billion. Within the last 60 years we have doubled that number. According to United Nations estimates we will double that number again to 6 billion by the end of this century.

It is obvious from these statistics that the world's population is not merely growing in absolute numbers. The rate of population growth has increased at an extraordinary pace. The annual growth rate has doubled from 1 percent in 1945—itself an unprecedented high in world history—to 2 percent today. It is expected to go even higher. But even if the present rate of growth of world population is maintained at its present level, the numbers we have to contemplate are staggering.

Whether the growth of world population continues at its present rate, whether a reduction in that rate is brought about by increases in the death rate or decreases in the birth rate, and whether, to reduce the birth rate, measures are found which are consistent with the economic, cultural, ethical and religious circumstances of the members of the United Nations—these are all questions of paramount importance.

The resolution before us is entitled "Population Growth and Economic Development." The United States agrees with the sponsors of this resolution that the impact of population growth on economic development and of economic development on population growth is a subject deserving of increased attention. Our governments are pledged under articles 55 and 56 of the charter to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the United Nations for "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations"—including higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and universal respect for, and observance of, human rights, and fundamental freedoms for all.

In the opinion of my Government progress toward these high aims of the United Nations Charter cannot be measured merely by increases in gross national product. The object of economic development is the welfare and dignity of the individual human being. We must concern ourselves, not with aggregate statistics, but with progress made in assuring each person a full and satisfactory life—adequate levels of personal consumption, including food and housing, health and education, and also satisfaction of those political, cultural, and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men.

If the condition of the individual, and not gross statistics, is to be the measure of our progress, then it is absolutely essential that we be concerned with population trends. Population changes are one of the most important single factors determining our progress or lack of progress toward the high aims of the United Nations Charter. So long as we are concerned with the quality of life we have no choice but to be concerned with the quantity of life.

Experience of California

We believe these statements are true not just for some but for all nations. My own country, blessed though it is with abundant resources and high living standards, recognizes the fundamental importance of the population factor in its efforts at economic and social development.

Within the United States our local, State, and Federal Governments are all devoting attention to population trends as part of their planning for the improvement of individual welfare. This is true in areas of great wealth as well as in areas less fortunately endowed. For example, California, a region which has one of the highest living standards in the entire world, has been obliged to pay increasing attention to population trends. The total population of the State, now something over 17 million, is increasing at an average annual rate of about 3.8 percent. It has approximately doubled its population every 20 years over the past century. About 60 percent of the present growth results from migrations; natural increase adds almost 250,000 new residents annually out of the total annual growth of about 600,000 persons.

Three aspects of California's rapid population growth are shared with other regions of the United States and with other countries of the world. First, it involves large-scale internal migration—the movement of about a third of a million people annually from other parts of the Nation—rather than international migration. Second, population gains are concentrated in the urban areas, which account for about 90 percent of the growth, so that 86.4 percent of the State population was reported as urban in the 1960 census. Third, the high growth rate has posed many problems for government—the need for more schools, highways, and hospitals, for example, must be considered in terms of the ability to finance construction and operation—and there must be more jobs to provide employment needed to support the new residents.

Faced with these problems, the State government has turned to the analysis of its current population and projected gains as a basis for planning its programs for action. It is also examining the social and economic implications of rapid growth rates in order to employ its human and material resources most effectively in the future. Because an adequate water supply is vital to continued growth, the State is engaged in a multibillion-dollar project of dams, reservoirs, and canals, the largest State-financed water project ever undertaken in the United States. A master plan for higher education has been prepared and accepted, and planning for highway needs over the next 2 decades is well advanced. And a comprehensive study of the economic basis for future growth and development is now underway.

The California experience demonstrates the importance of continued study and analysis of population growth at every level of economic development. The population of the United States as a whole is growing at about 1.7 percent a year—somewhat below the world average—with no foreseeable end in sight. We have come to recognize that this growth has both advantages and disadvantages and that we cannot fail to take account of it in seeking a better life for our citizens, specifically in planning for such things as medical care, education, conservation of natural resources, recreation areas, public housing, and urban transportation.

Population problems of developing countries

Population trends are clearly important for high-income countries in the advanced stages of economic development. As many speakers in this debate have already indicated, population questions may be even more significant for countries in an earlier stage of economic development.

There are at least two reasons why this is so:

In the first place, the rate of population growth in a great many less developed countries is much higher than in developed countries—about 70 percent higher on the average. In many less developed countries the rate of population growth exceeds 3 percent a year. About 80 percent of the one-half billion growth in world population in the last decade took place in the less developed areas. In the years ahead the highest rates of growth will continue to be in these areas. It is estimated, for example, that, if present rates of growth were to continue, between now and the year 2000 the population of North America would grow from 200 to 300 million, while the population of South and Middle America would grow from some 200 to 600 million.

This extraordinary differential in the rates of growth between more developed and less developed countries reflects some important differences in historical experience. In the countries that are now more developed the effect of improved medical and public-health services came only gradually over many years, while in the case of the newly developing countries these services have recently developed very rapidly with decisive and overwhelming impact. Furthermore, the gradual effect of improved health services in the case of more developed countries came simultaneously with industrialization and rapidly rising living standards which tended to reduce the birth rate and slow the rate of population growth. However, in the case of the newly developing countries modern medicine and public health have not only hit all at once; they have hit before industrialization and rising living standards have had the effect—as has been the case in many countries—of reducing the rate of population growth.

---

[1] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.657 and L.709.

Thus, while all countries are concerned with population trends, the population problems of the newly developing countries are of a new and different order from those encountered now or in the past by the more developed countries. For there is little immediate prospect that the factors which reduced the rate of population growth in developed regions such as Europe will take effect in the less developed countries in the immediate future.

In the second place, rapid population growth is obviously of greater concern to countries in an earlier stage of economic development. The problem for developed countries is to increase already relatively high per capita income levels and to devote increasing portions of already large national savings to services such as medical care, health, and housing. But less developed countries whose economy is at the subsistence level may be able to save little or nothing at existing income levels for improvements in social infrastructure.

It is all many of the developing countries can do to enlarge the total economic product as fast as the added people. Yet they have not merely to provide additional facilities for increased population but to create new and adequate facilities for the existing population as well.

For newly developing countries, the problem of population growth is not, as some people think, the problem of avoiding starvation or finding standing room. It is the problem of finding sufficient savings after current consumption needs are met to assure a tolerable rate of progress toward modernization and higher standards of living based on self-sustaining economic growth. In some of the world's poorest areas population increase is outpacing the increase in gross national product. As a result there are no resources available for capital formation and no increases in living standards. The prospect is for more and more people to share less and less income.

Just 1 year ago the General Assembly set as its goal for the United Nations development decade the attainment by 1970 of an annual growth rate of 5 percent a year in aggregate national income in each of the developing countries. The achievement of this goal will require enormous efforts. It has been estimated that in the decade of the 1950's the developing countries overall had a growth rate of 3 percent a year and a population growth of 2 percent a year, with annual per capita increases in income of 1 percent a year. Making the generally accepted assumption of a capital-output ratio of 3 to 1, these countries will have to increase their savings and investment from 9 to 15 percent in order to achieve the goals of the development decade. This is obviously a formidable task at present levels of population growth.

Assuming that the goals of the Development Decade are achieved, prospective increases in population will greatly dilute the impact of overall increases in income on individual levels of welfare. For example, gradual progress toward the 5 percent annual growth goal during the development decade would by the end of this decade increase a $100 per capita income to $123 in a country with a 2 percent rate of population growth and to $111 in a country with a 3 percent rate of population growth.

Obviously there is much that we do not know about the relationship of population trends to economic and social development. But from an examination of these and other facts one conclusion seems inescapable—that in certain less developed countries it may be virtually impossible at the present time, even with maximum external assistance and maximum self-help, to bring about a rate of economic growth which will provide the rate of improvement in individual living standards which the country seeks to attain and which, more fundamentally, is essential to the exercise of the individual's human faculties.

Summary of U.S. policy

These are facts which the members of the United Nations must take into account in considering the subject now before us. Let me turn now from these facts to define the policies of my Government on this important question. I can summarize these policies as follows:

1. The United States is concerned about the social consequences of its own population trends and is devoting attention to them.

2. The United States wants to know more, and help others to know more, about population trends in less developed countries where present levels of population growth may constitute a major obstacle to the realization of goals of human economic and social development.

3. The United States would oppose any effort to dictate to any country the means to be employed in dealing with its population problem. The population policy of any country must be determined by that country and that country alone.

4. While the United States will not suggest to any other government what its attitudes or policies should be as they relate to population or the adoption of specific measures in its implementation, the United States believes that obstacles should not be placed in the way of other governments which, in the light of their own economic needs and cultural and religious values, seek solutions to their population problems. While we will not advocate any specific policy regarding population growth to another country, we can help other countries, upon request, to find potential sources of information and assistance on ways and means of dealing with population problems.

5. The United States believes that there is a great need for additional knowledge on population matters. There is a need for more information about the actual size and composition of existing populations and about future population trends—and both private organizations and governments as well as international organizations can help to provide it. There is a need for more facts about alternative methods of family planning that are consistent with different economic, social, cultural, and religious circumstances. There is a need for more facts about the impact of economic and social development on population trends and of population trends on economic and social development.

6. The United States believes that the United Nations and it affiliated agencies can have a significant role to play in the population field. My government has actively supported the demographic work of the United Nations from the very early days of the organization and wishes to commend particularly the Population Commission, the Population Branch of the Bureau of Social Affairs, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Economic Commission for Africa, and the Regional Demographic Research and Training Centers for their excellent work. It is the hope of the United States that these valuable efforts will be substantially expanded.

Role of the United Nations

Let me close with more specific observations about the role of the United Nations. The United States believes that member countries should be able to obtain from the United Nations and its agencies such assistance as they may need and request in connection with their efforts to deal with their population problems. We believe that the United Nations should focus its efforts on three areas: First, the encouraging and assisting of member governments to obtain factual information on the demographic aspects of their economic and social development; second, the training of nationals of members for demographic work; and third, the promotion of full and responsible discussion of population problems.

In the area of demographic information there is much that remains to be done. The demographic section of the Secretariat was downgraded from a division to a branch in the Secretary-General's 1955 reorganization and its staff substantially reduced. It is time to consider whether the resources being devoted to this subject in the Secretariat are adequate to the needs. We should also consider ways to strengthen the demographic staffs of the regional economic commissions. The commissions are in a particularly good position to extend effective assistance to member governments in the context of the problems of particular regions.

In the field of demographic training much more should be done to train nationals of member governments so that they may acquire the demographic information on which to base sound economic plans. This would include the training of people in census taking, in the making of population projections, and in analyzing the economic and social consequences of demographic statistics. We welcome the establishment by the United Nations of regional demographic research and training centers in Bombay, Santiago, and Cairo and would support the establishment of further centers if they were desired by the countries concerned.

In the field of discussion the United States will continue to play an active role in the work of the Population Commission and the regional commissions of the United Nations. Moreover, we look forward with great interest to the Asian population conference scheduled for 1963 and the world population conference later on.

With experience in these forms of collaboration, the needs of individual countries and the present and potential resources of the United Nations would become better known and future collaboration more fruitful.

These, in sum, are the views of the United States on population growth and economic development. We consider the resolution now before the committee to be broadly consistent with these views. We are, accordingly, prepared to give it our support.

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 13

The United States wishes to explain its affirmative votes on the first and second amendments submitted by France, Gabon, Lebanon, Liberia, and Spain.[2] In our view these amendments did not constitute significant changes in the substance of the resolution, and we have supported them in the interest of accommodating the views of the widest possible number of members.

The United States also wishes to explain its abstaining vote on the third amendment submitted by France, Gabon, Lebanon, Liberia, and Spain to delete operative paragraph 6 of the resolution on population growth and economic development.

In the opinion of the United States, operative paragraph 6 does not add or subtract from the authority which the United Nations already possesses as a result of resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council concerning the granting of technical assistance upon request to member nations. In our view, the paragraph is therefore superfluous.

While the United States believes that the authority to lend technical assistance in all aspects of population problems already exists, we also believe, as I stated earlier in the general debate, that assistance by the United Nations should emphasize those three areas in which there appears to be broad agreement among members; namely, the encouraging and assisting of member governments to obtain factual information on the demographic aspects of their economic and social development; the training of nationals of members for demographic work; and the promotion of full and responsible discussion of population problems.

---

[2] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.709/Rev. 2.

It was in the light of these considerations that the United States decided to abstain on the amendment to delete operative paragraph 6.

The United States wishes to explain its votes on the various parts of operative paragraph 6 of the resolution. The United States voted for the phrase "as well as other aspects" because it believes that the United Nations should assist members who wish help in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies in all aspects of their economic and social development. The United States abstained on the phrase "and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by governments, for national projects and programs dealing with the problems of population" for the same reasons it abstained on the amendment to delete operative paragraph 6.

The United States voted for the resolution as a whole because of the importance we attach to the relation between population growth and economic development and because we regard the resolution as broadly consistent with the views of the United States as put forward in our intervention during the general debate.

Text of resolution[3]

The General Assembly, considering that rapid economic and social progress in the developing countries is dependent, not the least, upon the ability of these countries to provide their peoples with education, a fair standard of living, and the possibility for productive work;

Considering further that economic and social development and population policies are closely interrelated and may be carried out simultaneously to secure maximum benefits;

Recognizing that the health and welfare of the family is of paramount importance, not only for obvious humanitarian reasons, but also with regard to economic development and social progress, and that the health and welfare of the family require special attention in areas with a relatively high rate of population growth;

Recognizing further that is is the responsibility of each government to decide its own policies and devise its own programs of action for dealing with the problems of population and economic and social progress;

Reminding states members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies that according to recent census results the effective population increase during the last decade has been particularly high in many low-income less-developed countries;

Reminding member states that in formulating their economic and social policies it is useful to take into account the latest relevant facts on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development and that the forthcoming World Population Conference and the Asian Population Conference might throw new light on the importance of this problem, especially for the developing countries;

Recalling General Assembly resolution 1217 (XII), which, inter alia, invites member states, particularly the developing countries, to follow as closely as possible the interrelationships existing between economic and population changes, and requests the Secretary-General to insure the coordination of the activities of the United Nations in the demographic and economic fields;

Recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 820 (XXXI) which contains provisions aiming at intensified efforts to insure international cooperation in the evaluation, analysis, and utilization of population census results and related data, particularly in the less-developed countries, and which requests the Secretary-General to explore the possibilities of increasing the amounts of technical assistance funds which may be made available for these activities;

Recognizing that further studies and research are necessary to fill the gaps in our knowledge about the causes and consequences of demographic trends, particularly in the less developed countries;

Recognizing that removals of large national groups to other countries may give rise to ethnical, political, emotional, and economic difficulties;

1. Notes with appreciation the report of the Acting Secretary General, entitled "The United Nations Development Decade, Proposals for Action"[4] which, inter alia, refers to the interrelationship between population growth and economic and social development;

2. Expresses its appreciation of the work on population problems which has up to now been carried out under the guidance of the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council;

3. Requests the Secretary General to conduct an inquiry among the governments of states members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies concerning the particular problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes;

4. Recommends that the Economic and Social Council in cooperation with the specialized agencies, the regional economic commissions and the Population Commission, and taking into account the results of the inquiry referred to in paragraph 3 above, intensify its studies and research on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development, with particular reference to the needs of the developing countries for investment in health and educational facilities within the framework of their general development programs;

5. Further recommends that the Economic and Social Council report on its findings to the General Assembly not later than at its 19th session;

6. Endorses the view of the Population Commission[5] that the United Nations should encourage and assist the governments, especially of the less developed countries, in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies of the demographic aspects, as well as other aspects, of their economic and social development problems;

7. Recommends that the second World Population Conference pay special attention to the interrelationships of population growth with economic and social development, particularly in countries that are less developed, and that efforts be made to obtain the fullest possible participation in the Conference by experts from such countries.

EXHIBIT 3

THE POLITICS OF POPULATION: A BLUEPRINT FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

(Address by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Before the American Assembly on the Population Dilemma at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., May 4, 1963)

December 18, 1962, marked a turning point in the recognition by the international community of the world population problem.

On that day the United Nations General Assembly concluded the first debate in its history devoted entirely to the subject of population. It adopted, with 69 affirmative votes (including that of the United States), 27 abstentions, and not a single negative vote, a major resolution calling for an intensified program of international cooperation in the population field.

Except for the members of the Soviet bloc, all of whom abstained, countries of every major political, economic, cultural, religious, and geographic identification were among those voting in the affirmative. In the presence of an issue of such incalculable importance to the future of mankind, the many divisions which are so characteristic of debates on most international problems dissolved, giving way to a broad consensus on the importance of the population problem.

It may be useful for this first American assembly devoted to the subject of population to consider in some detail the significance of these recent developments in the United Nations. Specifically, there are at least four questions that come to mind:

Why was the population problem on the agenda of the United Nations?

What exactly did the United Nations decide to do about it?

What did the United Nations debate reveal about international attitudes to this question?

What program of international cooperation in population should we be seeking in the future?

I

The short answer to why population was on the agenda of the United Nations at the 17th General Assembly was that the Government of Sweden, supported by a number of other countries, decided to put it there. But obviously this is not a satisfactory answer. Ten years earlier, a full-scale debate in the United Nations devoted entirely to the population question would have been unthinkable. The wide support that developed in the interim for the inscription of an item on the population question and for a resolution calling for action to deal with it reflected a growing international appreciation of the significance of the population question for the future of mankind.

Until very recently, at least, Western thought has been characterized by an optimistic faith in the inevitability of progress. Despite two terrible wars, a great depression, and the revolutionary ferment which is currently shaking our civilization, many of us still cling to the assumption that the fate of man on earth is destined to improve as time goes on.

This confident assumption is somewhat undermined by the realization that despite all the progress of science and technology in recent years there are more people living in misery and deprivation today than there were at the turn of the century. Of course, there are also more people enjoying adequate living standards. But the increase of the underprivileged has probably exceeded the increase of everyone else. Whether such a development can be considered progress is, to say the least, an open question.

To be sure, some people cite as evidence of progress the upward trend of aggregate statistics. But progress cannot be measured merely by increases in gross national product.

---

[3] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.657, as revised; adopted in plenary session on Dec. 18 by a vote of 69 (United States) to 0, with 27 abstentions. In a separate vote (34 to 34, with 32 abstentions (United States)) the following phrase was deleted at the end of operative paragraph 6: "and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by governments, for national projects, and programs dealing with the problems of population."

[4] U.N. doc. E/3613.

[5] U.N. doc. E/3451, par. 15.

The object of economic development is the welfare and dignity of the individual human being. We must concern ourselves, not with aggregate statistics, but with the progress made in assuring each person a full and satisfactory life—adequate levels of personal consumption, including food and housing, health and education, and also satisfaction of those political, cultural, and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men.

If the condition of the individual, and not gross statistics, is to be the measure of our progress, then it is absolutely essential that we be concerned with population trends. So long as we are concerned with the quality of life we have no choice but to be concerned with the quantity of life.

There are today some 3 billion people in the world. It required hundreds of thousands of years, from the beginning of life on earth to the beginning of this century, to reach 1½ billion. Within the last 60 years we have doubled that number. According to United Nations estimates we will double that number again to 6 billion by the end of this century.

It is obvious from these statistics that the world's population is not merely growing in absolute numbers. The rate of population growth has increased at an extraordinary pace. The annual growth rate has doubled from 1 percent in 1945—itself an unprecedented high in world history—to 2 percent today. It is expected to go even higher. But even if the present rate of growth of world population is maintained at its present level, the numbers we have to contemplate are staggering.

Whether the growth of world population continues at its present rate, whether a reduction in that rate is brought about by increases in the death rate or decreases in the birth rate, and whether, to reduce the birth rate, measures are found which are consistent with the economic, cultural, ethical, and religious circumstances of individual countries—these are all questions of paramount importance.

It was considerations such as these which led to the inscription of the population item at the 17th General Assembly. But the inscription of this item did not reflect just a generalized concern with the population problem; it reflected a particular concern for the dilemma facing the less developed countries.

The nature of this dilemma can be succinctly stated. For reasons which are well known, the rate of population growth tends to be higher in the less developed countries than in the developed countries—about 70 percent higher on the average. In many less developed countries the rate of population growth exceeds 3 percent a year.

About 80 percent of the one-half billion growth in the world population in the last decade took place in the less developed areas. In the years ahead the highest rates of growth are likely to continue to be in these areas. It is estimated, for example, that if present rates of growth were to continue, between now and the year 2000 the population of North America would grow from 200 to 300 million, while the population of South and Middle America would grow from some 200 to 600 million.

It is bad enough that less-developed countries tend to have a faster rate of population growth than developed countries. But the problem is compounded further by the fact that the less-developed countries are less able to cope with the consequences of rapid population growth.

The problem for developed countries is to increase already high per capita income levels and to devote increasing portions of already large national savings to services such as medical care, health, and housing. But less-developed countries whose economy is at the subsistence level may be able to save little or nothing at existing income levels for improvement in social infrastructure.

It is all many of the developing countries can do to enlarge the total economic product as fast as the added people. Yet they have not merely to provide additional facilities for increased population but to create new and adequate facilities for the existing population as well.

For newly-developing countries the problem of population growth is not, as some people think, the problem of avoiding starvation or finding standing room. It is the problem of finding sufficient savings after current consumption needs are met to assure a tolerable rate of progress toward modernization and higher standards of living based on self-sustaining economic growth.

In some of the world's poorest areas population increase is outpacing the increase in gross national product. As a result there are no resources available for capital formation and no increases in living standards. The prospect is for more and more people to have less and less income.

Just a year and a half ago the United Nations General Assembly set as its goal for the United Nations development decade the achievement by 1970 of an annual growth rate of 5 percent a year in aggregate national income in each of the developing countries. The achievement of this goal will require enormous efforts.

It has been estimated that in the decade of the 1950's the developing countries overall had a growth rate of 3 percent a year and a population growth of 2 percent a year, with annual per capita increases of income of 1 percent a year. Making the generally accepted assumption of a capital-output ratio of 3 to 1, these countries will have to increase their savings and investment from 9 to 15 percent of gross national product in order to achieve the goals of the development decade. This is obviously a formidable task at present levels of population growth.

Assuming that the goals of the development decade are achieved, prospective increases in population will greatly dilute the impact of overall increases in income on individual levels of welfare. For example, gradual progress toward the 5-percent annual growth goal during the development decade would by the end of this decade increase a $100 per capita income to $123 in a country with a 2-percent rate of population growth and $111 in a country with a 3-percent rate of population growth.

Obviously there is much that we do not know about the relationship of population growth to economic and social development. But from an examination of these and other facts one conclusion seems inescapable—that in certain less developed countries it may be virtually impossible at the present time, even with maximum external assistance and maximum self-help, to bring about a rate of economic growth which will provide the rate of improvement in individual living standards which the country seeks to attain and which, more fundamentally, is essential to the proper exercise of the individual's human faculties.

In the light of these hard realities it was scarcely surprising that a large part of the impetus to discuss the population problem in the United Nations came from the less developed countries themselves. In recent years, a growing number of these countries have adopted population policies of one sort or another—policies in accord with their particular economic, social, cultural, and religious circumstances.

In July 1962, shortly before the opening of the 17th General Assembly, the Cairo Conference of Developing Countries, including countries from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, unanimously adopted a declaration which contained the following significant statement:

> "Countries that suffer from the pressure of population on resources available should accelerate their rate of economic development, and in the meantime take appropriate legitimate measures to deal with their population problems."

It was against this background of growing concern that the United Nations General Assembly began its historic debate on the population problem.

II

While the resolution on "Population Growth and Economic Development" was the first of its kind ever passed by the General Assembly, the United Nations had not previously been inactive in the population field. In the 17 years of its existence the United Nations has—

Established a population unit in the Secretariat (now the Population Branch of the Bureau of Social Affairs);

Created the Population Commission, a group of government representatives meeting once every 2 years;

Held a World Population Conference under U.N. auspices in 1954;

Encouraged regional economic commissions located in the less developed areas—the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Economic Commission for Latin America, and the Economic Commission for Africa—to become increasingly active in the population field; and

Organized regional demographic research and training centers in Bombay, Santiago, and Cairo, to provide advisory services to countries of these regions.

Through activities such as these, the United Nations has been making a major contribution to an understanding of the population problem:

In the field of information, it has encouraged and assisted member governments to obtain factual information on the size, composition, and trends of their populations and the interrelation between population growth and economic and social development.

In the field of training, it has helped develop a whole range of skills in the demographic field—in census taking, population projections, and economic analysis.

In the field of discussion, it has promoted a full and responsible exchange of ideas on all aspects of the population problem.

These contributions of the United Nations should be not be underestimated. When the Population Commission met for the first time in 1947, demographic statistics, including census and vital statistics, were so incomplete that it would scarcely have been possible to speak knowledgeably of world population trends or world population problems. It is easy to overlook the fact that if it were not for the devoted labors of the population and statistical sections of the U.N. Secretariat, both operating under the guidance of the Population and Statistical Commissions, we would even now not be able to discern the outlines of the world population problem or the problems of most major regions.

Seventeen years of slow, careful accumulation of basic factual information helped lay the groundwork for enlightened consideration of the economic and social implications of population trends. At this conference there are a number of people who played significant roles in the development of this important work.

Building on this solid record of achievement, the General Assembly resolution on "Population Growth and Economic Development" was designed to increase the level of U.N. involvement in the population field.

The resolution called for action under five main heads:

First, the Secretary-General was requested to conduct an inquiry among member states concerning the particular problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes.

This inquiry will help focus the attention of responsible officials in all countries on the implications of population trends for economic and social planning, open up channels of communication between policymakers and local demographic experts, and encourage governments without competent experts of their own to seek outside assistance. Such assistance will be available not only from the United Nations but from various foreign governments and private institutions—in the case of the United States from such agencies as AID, the U.S. Census Bureau, the Ford Foundation, and the Population Council.

Second, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations was asked, in cooperation with the Specialized Agencies, Regional Economic Commissions and the Population Commission, to "intensify its studies and research on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development with particular reference to the needs of the developing countries for investment in health and educational facilities."

The intensification of studies and research called for under this section will involve not only a substantial increase in the program of work of the population section at U.N. headquarters, the demographic staffs of the Regional Economic Commissions, and the regional demographic research and training centers, but also correlative studies in the educational and health fields conducted in cooperation with UNESCO and the World Health Organization.

Third, the Economic and Social Council was directed to report its findings with respect to all of the foregoing to the General Assembly not later than at the Assembly's 19th session in 1964.

Fourth, United Nations agencies were asked to encourage and assist governments, especially of the less developed countries, "In obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies of the demographic aspects as well as other aspects of their economic and social development problems."

Fifth, the World Population Conference scheduled for 1965 was requested to pay special attention to the interrelationships of population growth with economic and social development particularly in countries that are less developed.

As noted earlier, the resolution containing these five action paragraphs was approved overwhelmingly with no negative votes. A good deal of controversy developed, however, over another section not included in the resolution as finally adopted which read: "And that the United Nations give technical assistance as requested by governments for national projects and programs dealing with the problems of population."

This section was widely interpreted as calling for United Nations technical assistance in the actual implementation of family planning programs. It was approved by a narrow margin in committee but in the plenary, where a two-thirds majority is required on important questions, it failed of adoption by a vote of 34 in favor, 34 against, with 32 abstentions.

As a practical matter, the defeat of this paragraph did not alter the authority already possessed by the United Nations as a result of previous resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council to grant technical assistance upon request to member nations.

The momentum generated by the General Assembly resolution was maintained at subsequent meetings of the United Nations which have taken place in the last few months.

A resolution on intensification of demographic studies, research, and training introduced by the United States in association with Japan and the United Arab Republic was unanimously adopted by the Population Commission in February and the Economic and Social Council in April. This resolution spelled out some of the practical implications of the General Assembly resolution and contained other important provisions as well.

Among other things, the resolution—

Invited the Regional Economic Commissions to intensify their demographic work;

Requested the United Nations to accelerate preparation of technical manuals for use in demographic work, hasten revision of certain basic demographic publications, and study the use of electronic computers in the analysis of demographic data;

Requested adequate budgetary provision for this and other work; and

Urged the developed countries to consider the value to the developing countries of initiating or expanding research on the interrelationship between population trends and economic and social development, research related to population such as on health and education, training of experts in the less developed countries in demography and statistics, and providing technical assistance to the developing countries in census taking, vital statistics, and utilizing demographic data in social and economic planning.

Since the passage of the General Assembly resolution the U.N. Secretariat has also begun work on the inquiry to member governments.

This inquiry will take the form of a questionnaire which will be sent to each member of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies. When the answers to this questionnaire are compiled and analyzed and laid before the General Assembly in 1964, the United Nations will have before it the most comprehensive information yet assembled on the attitudes and policies of governments on the population problem.

III

The debate in the General Assembly which preceded the passage of the resolution on "Population Growth and Economic Development" provided a striking illustration of the unique value of the United Nations as an international forum. It was an enlightening experience for all of us who had the privilege to participate on behalf of our respective governments. It is tempting to describe this fascinating debate in detail, but time will permit only a brief (and inevitably oversimplified) summary of the principal viewpoints which emerged.

The first viewpoint was represented by the Government of Sweden and the other sponsors of the resolution—Ceylon, Denmark, Ghana, Greece, Nepal, Norway, Pakistan, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, and United Arab Republic. These supporters of the resolution argued that population growth posed grave problems for economic and social development and that urgent action was required to deal with it. They advocated a major increase in United Nations activity in the population field—including technical assistance in the field of family planning. Support for this viewpoint was expressed by most Moslem countries (e.g., United Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, and Pakistan), some countries of Asia (e.g., India, Nepal, Thailand, Malaya, and Japan) and some countries of Africa (e.g., Ghana, Guinea, and Uganda). This viewpoint found only scattered support in Latin America.

A second viewpoint was put forward by Argentina and Ireland, with support from a few other countries, principally in Latin America. These countries questioned the existence of a population problem, challenged the right of the United Nations to discuss it, and were particularly outspoken in opposing a U.N. program in family planning financed from technical assistance funds to which they were contributing.

A third viewpoint was expressed by a substantial number of countries including France and other countries of continental Europe, some French African countries and some Latin American countries. These countries conceded the existence of population problems in some areas but argued that action by the United Nations should be deferred pending further study. This group opposed the controversial technical assistance section and took the initiative in introducing the proposal for an inquiry on member countries' population problems.

A fourth viewpoint was that expressed by the members of the Soviet bloc. During the General Assembly debate, the Soviet Union and some of its satellites expounded the traditional Communist position that Western discussions of the population problem were based on "neo-Malthusian fallacies" and that population problems ceased to exist under communism.

This Communist line was poorly received by the Assembly. At least one representative of a less developed country chided the Soviets for favoring planning in all sectors of economic life except the human sector—the one most important in its implications for economic and social growth.

The negative Soviet statement in the population debate was followed by a significant shift in the Communist line. When it came time to vote, the Soviet bloc did not oppose, but merely abstained, on the General Assembly resolution.

What is even more surprising, the Soviet representative at the recent meeting of the Economic and Social Council commended the United Nations for its work in the population field, agreed that population growth is an urgent problem for less developed countries, and announced the willingness of the Soviet Union to provide technical assistance in the demographic field.

This change in the Soviet position on population in the United Nations follows reports of increasing resort in recent years to birth control and abortion within the Soviet Union and some other bloc countries and of Khrushchev's personal interest in a recent publication stressing the economic dangers of overpopulation.

The recent discussions at the United Nations may signal a new era of Soviet propaganda on the subject of population. Whether because of internal problems, or a desire to cultivate the favor of less developed countries, or both, the Soviet Union now appears ready to exercise leadership in action programs in the population field.

As for the United States, our position in the United Nations debate is already known to you. We made a strong statement underlining the importance of the population problem, the need for more knowledge about it, and the necessity for each country to determine its own population policy in accordance with its economic, social, cultural, and religious circumstances.

More specifically, we expressed support for the resolution on "Population Growth and Economic Development" in its original form, which included the controversial section on technical assistance. We abstained, however, in the separate vote on this section for two reasons:

First, because it was superfluous, neither adding nor subtracting from the authority already possessed by the United Nations to grant technical assistance upon request to member nations;

Second, because of our belief that, in the light of the views expressed in the General Assembly debate, United Nations activity should emphasize those three areas in which there was broad agreement among the members; namely, information, training and discussion in population problems.

I shall have more to say about this second consideration in a moment.

IV

What conclusions can we draw from the United Nations debates on the population problem? What forms of international cooperation should we be seeking on this subject in the years ahead?

I believe we can identify an emerging consensus on the subject of population. My review of the recent United Nations debate has emphasized the differences between the member countries. Yet this debate—just as recent discussions within our own country—also revealed a large measure of common ground.

To begin with, the desire for increased knowledge about population trends, particularly in relation to economic and social development, is now nearly universal. We have passed, almost without noticing it, from a period in which the major uncertainty concerned the existence of the world population problem, to a period in which the major uncertainty is what can and should be done about it.

Moreover, even in the matter of what should be done about the population problem, it is possible to see—

That there is no significant body of responsible opinion among people of any major religious, ethical, or ideological persuasion which advocates totally unplanned or unregulated fertility, although there are sincere differences of opinion about the means which are morally permissible and the effectiveness of the means which are available; and

That there is virtually universal agreement on both ethical and practical grounds, that decisions about responsible parenthood can be made only by individual parents themselves in the light of their responsibilities to their children and their society, and to the moral values which govern alike parents, children, and societies.

The time has come to develop out of this consensus a blueprint for international cooperation which takes account of the politics as well as the economics of the population problem.

The fundamental concept in such a blueprint should be the principle of free choice.

Despite the growing consensus on the matters already mentioned, differences continue to exist between religious groups on specific methods of family planning. When it comes to implementation of population policy, the views of all groups should be respected. Participation in programs of family planning should be contingent upon the agreement of the country concerned.

As we noted in the Assembly, the United Nations already has authority to grant technical assistance in the population field upon request to member governments. From a practical point of view, however, it is unnecessary to earmark United Nations funds for those particular activities in the population field on which members are seriously divided. The potential resources of the United Nations both in terms of funds and personnel for the implementation of family planning programs are minuscule compared to the resources in member countries. In the pluralistic society of the free world there is a wide variety of sources of assistance from governments, foundations, universities, and even private business firms as well as international organizations.

All of these have something to contribute in the field of population. All can make more substantial contributions in the future than has been done in the past. What we need is an international division of labor, taking account of the comparative advantage, from the political as well as the economic and technical point of view, of the different sources of potential assistance.

The following is a rough blueprint of a program of international cooperation which the United States will be supporting in the months ahead with respect to the key elements of the population problem:

1. Information and analysis

There is, as noted earlier, a need for more demographic information and analysis, particularly on the interrelation between population growth and economic and social development. Since there is universal agreement on this need, all governments and international organizations, as well as private institutions, can play a significant role.

The United States will continue to support the expansion of United Nations activities in the demographic field. Moreover, the Agency for International Development will respond to requests for assistance from developing countries in preparing, executing, and analyzing population censuses, and in utilizing demographic data and analyses in social and economic planning. It will do this both by making United States advisers available and by training experts from the developing countries themselves.

2. Medical research

There seems to be widespread agreement on the need for more knowledge about the basic life processes which govern childbearing. As President Kennedy pointed out at a recent press conference, we need to know more about the whole reproduction cycle, and this information should be made more available to the world so that everyone can make his own judgment.

Paradoxical as it may seem, we need more knowledge on how to overcome both involuntary childlessness and involuntary parenthood through measures which are consistent with different religious, cultural, and economic circumstances. We need particularly a great deal more study of human fertility and reproduction.

We support studies to this end through our own National Institutes of Health. Moreover, we favor the conduct of such studies through the United Nations, specifically through the medical research program of the World Health Organization.

3. Health and social services

The major obstacle to the implementation of family planning policies in the less developed countries is the lack of a network of health and social services to implement policy at the village level. The development of such an institutional infrastructure is desirable for its own sake as well as for the implementation of family planning policies. It commands widespread endorsement and should be the object of intensified efforts by governments and private institutions as well as by U.N. agencies.

4. The implementation of family planning programs

This is the only area in which major disagreements exist and will continue to exist for the foreseeable future. Countries seeking help in the implementation of family planning programs should have access to the wide variety of sources of assistance available throughout the world.

While the United States will not advocate any specific family planning policy to any other country, we can help other countries, upon request, to find potential sources of information and assistance on ways and means of dealing with population problems. The provision of materials for this purpose can best be done by those governments whose citizens are not divided on this question, by private foundations, and by business firms.

The implementation of this blueprint in the years ahead will require flexibility and imagination. The members of this Arden House conference have distinguished themselves in arousing the world's concern with the population problem. The further challenge is to devise programs of action founded on the principle of free choice which make sense in political as well as in technical and economic terms.

EXHIBIT 4

UNITED NATIONS,
New York, June 28, 1963.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations and has the honor to refer to resolution 1838 (XVII) of the General Assembly, in which, among other things, the Secretary-General was requested "to conduct an inquiry among the Governments of States Members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies concerning the particular problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes."

The General Assembly recommended, in the same resolution, that the results of this inquiry be taken into account by the Economic and Social Council in intensifying its "studies and research on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development, with particular reference to the needs of the developing countries for investment in health and educational facilities within the framework of their general development programs" and that "the Economic and Social Council should report on its findings to the General Assembly not later than at its 19th session." A copy of the resolution is transmitted herewith; the records of the pertinent debates in the General Assembly and the Second Committee are published in documents A/C.2/SR.866 to 869, 874–5, 878 and A/PV.1197.

The Secretary-General recognizes his obligation to formulate this inquiry objectively, so as to obtain meaningful information on the questions of interest to the General Assembly and to permit comparative analysis of the governments' responses. With these considerations in view, the Secretary-General has prepared an outline of the inquiry, of which three copies are transmitted herewith. The items in this outline are presented as examples of aspects of the problems covered by the General Assembly's resolution which may be important in various countries. Each government is invited to submit a statement covering those points in the outline which the government considers pertinent and appropriate in the circumstances of its country. Each government is invited also to give information on any additional points which, in the view of the government, should be taken into account in a comprehensive statement on the problems to which the resolution of the General Assembly refers.

As the above-mentioned resolution calls for a report by the Economic and Social Council to be submitted to the General Assembly at its 19th session, the Secretary-General intends to prepare a report on the results of this inquiry for consideration by the Economic and Social Council at its 38th session. In order to allow sufficient time for the analysis of responses and preparation of the report, it is requested that the statement of His Excellency's Government be transmitted to the Secretariat by November 30, 1963, at the latest.

POPULATION GROWTH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Resolution adopted by the General Assembly (17th session) at its 1197th plenary meeting on December 18, 1962[1])

The General Assembly,

Considering that rapid economic and social progress in the developing countries is dependent not least upon the ability of these countries to provide their peoples with education, a fair standard of living and the possibility for productive work,

---

[1] Official records of the General Assembly, 17th session, supplement No. 17, document A/5217.

Considering further that economic development and population growth are closely interrelated,

Recognizing that the health and welfare of the family are of paramount importance, not only for obvious humanitarian reasons, but also with regard to economic development and social progress, and that the health and welfare of the family require special attention in areas with a relatively high rate of population growth,

Recognizing further that it is the responsibility of each government to decide on its own policies and devise its own programs of action for dealing with the problems of population and economic and social progress,

Reminding states members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies that, according to recent census results, the effective population increase during the last decade has been particularly great in many of the low-income less-developed countries,

Reminding member states that in formulating their economic and social policies it is useful to take into account the latest relevant facts on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development, and that the forthcoming World Population Conference and the Asian Population Conference might throw new light on the importance of this problem, especially for the developing countries,

Recalling its resolution 1217 (XII) of December 14, 1957, in which the General Assembly, inter alia, invited member states, particularly the developing countries, to follow as closely as possible the interrelationship of economic changes and population changes, and requested the Secretary-General to insure the coordination of the activities of the United Nations in the demographic and economic fields,

Recalling Economic and Social Council Resolution 820B(XXXI) of April 28, 1961, which contains provisions for intensifying efforts to insure international cooperation in the evaluation, analysis, and utilization of population census results and related data, particularly in the less developed countries, and in which the Council requested the Secretary-General to explore the possibilities of increasing technical assistance funds for assistance to governments requesting it in preparing permanent programs of demographic research,

Recognizing that further studies and research are necessary to fill the gaps in the present knowledge of the causes and consequences of demographic trends, particularly in the less developed countries,

Recognizing also that removals of large national groups to other countries may give rise to ethnic, political, emotional, and economic difficulties,

1. Notes with appreciation the report of the Secretary-General on measures proposed for the United Nations Development Decade [2] in which he refers, inter alia, to the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development;

2. Expresses its appreciation of the work on population problems which has up to now been carried out under the guidance of the Population Commission;

3. Requests the Secretary-General to conduct an inquiry among the governments of states members of the United Nations and members of the specialized agencies concerning the particular problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes;

4. Recommends that the Economic and Social Council, in cooperation with the specialized agencies, the regional economic commissions, and the Population Commission, and taking into account the results of the inquiry referred to in paragraph 3 above, should intensify its studies and research on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development, with particular reference to the needs of the developing countries for investment in health and educational facilities within the framework of their general development programs;

5. Further recommends that the Economic and Social Council should report on its findings to the General Assembly not later than at its 19th session;

6. Endorses the view of the Population Commission [3] that the United Nations should encourage and assist governments, especially those of the less developed countries, in obtaining basic data and in carrying out essential studies of the demographic aspects, as well as other aspects, of their economic and social development problems;

7. Recommends that the second World Population Conference should pay special attention to the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development, particularly in the less developed countries, and that efforts should be made to obtain the fullest possible participation in the Conference by experts from such countries.

Outline of Inquiry on Problems Resulting From Reciprocal Action of Economic Development and Population Changes Pursuant to Resolution 1838 (XVII) of the General Assembly

I. GENERAL VIEW

A brief statement of salient facts and views of the Government with regard to the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes may be presented. This may be supported by a brief analytical summary of recent levels and trends of the basic demographic indicators on the one hand and economic and social indicators on the other, and may include the Government's views on the importance of their interrelations for economic and social development of the country.

II. DEFINITION OF PROBLEMS

Any problems resulting from the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes, which the Government considers important and relevant, may be stated with reference, inter alia, to the following aspects, so far as they are considered to be pertinent and appropriate in the circumstances: [1]

1. Fields of development to which such problems relate—Some illustrative examples are: Agricultural development and food supply, industrial development, development of transportation and communication facilities, manpower, employment, unemployment, and underemployment, distribution of manpower among sectors of the economy, training, literacy and education, housing, urban development, social welfare, health.

2. Scope of the problems: For example, they may be of national scope, limited to certain regions of the country, limited to certain types of communities (e.g., urban or rural communities), limited to certain groups of the population (e.g., social, cultural and ethnic groups).

3. Time reference of the problems: They may be existing at the present time, foreseen in the future (with time period specified).

4. Main demographic factors involved and areas and directions of their impact. For example, one or more of the following factors may be pertinent: Size, density, and geographical distribution of population, rate of population growth, age structure, and other aspects of population composition, fertility, mortality and morbidity, international migration, internal migration and urbanization.

5. Major economic and other factors involved: Such factors may include, for example, capital requirements, sources of capital, and investment patterns, natural resources and factors affecting their development, technology and factors affecting its development, availability of personnel with special training and skills, factors affecting productivity of labor, conditions of international trade and balance of payments, social, institutional and cultural factors, external assistance.

III. AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION

Main types of information available to the Government on the reciprocal action of economic development and demographic factors and on any resulting problems mentioned in section II may be outlined, as far as they are considered pertinent, with reference to statistical information and analytical studies.

A. Statistics:

1. Types of pertinent statistical data available (other than basic statistical series reported routinely to the Statistical Office of the United Nations and specialized agencies) may be specified.

2. Any major gaps and deficiencies observed in these statistics may be mentioned.

3. Degree of reliability of the statistics may be indicated.

B. Analytical studies:

1. References may be given to reports of principal relevant studies.

2. Topics and scope of major projects of relevant research underway or being planned may be stated.

3. Organizational arrangements for such research may be outlined with reference to the Government agencies having responsibilities for such research, if any; nongovernmental institutions engaged in such research; and arrangements for the use of findings of such research by policymaking, planning, and action bodies.

4. Any major present gaps in pertinent information derived from such research may be noted, and difficulties in overcoming such deficiencies may be indicated.

C. Steps, if any, being planned or contemplated for obtaining information now lacking pertinent to problems of the types outlined in section II, through development of statistics and analytical studies.

IV. PROBLEMS OF ACTION

Information may be given on any types of action which the Government may have sponsored or supported, or action contemplated or planned, relevant to any problems mentioned under section II, so far as such information is considered appropriate and pertinent to this inquiry.

A. Types of action:

1. Objectives of such action.

2. Whether aimed directly to influence demographic factors, nondemographic factors, or their interrelations.

3. Specific forms and organization of action.

4. Whether of national, regional, or local scope.

5. Whether of long-term or short-term design.

---

[2] United Nations publication, sales No. 62.II.B.2.

[3] "Official Records of the Economic and Social Council," 31st sess., supp. No. 3 (doc. E/3451, par. 15).

[1] It is not intended that responses under this heading of the outline should necessarily follow this order of listing of the points. The Government is invited to present a statement in the form found most convenient and effective for defining the problems, if any.

6. Whether incorporated in broad economic and social development programs and plans or devised specifically to deal with particular problems.

7. Budgetary provisions for such action.

B. Assessment of the effectiveness of action taken up to the present time.

V. EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE

The response may include any comment which the Government may wish to make on the utility of demographic and other activities of the United Nations, as well as other external assistance, relevant to problems such as those outlined under sections II, III, and IV.

A. United Nations activities: The Annex outlines the present demographic activities of the United Nations (other than statistical activities). Comments may be made, if the Government wishes, on the utility of these activities and suggestions for their development or modification to enhance their effectiveness.

B. Other external assistance or cooperation.

Other remarks and suggestions (if any) considered by the Government to be pertinent to the subject of the inquiry.

ANNEX—OUTLINE OF PRESENT DEMOGRAPHIC ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS (NOT INCLUDING STATISTICAL ACTIVITIES)

A. Studies aimed at improving information on the trends of population, their interrelations with economic and social factors, and resulting problems. Among the topics of such studies carried out by the Secretariat at headquarters, secretariats of the regional economic commissions, and the staff of regional demographic research and training centers provided under the technical assistance programs, are:

1. Population estimates and projections. Projections for the world, regions, and countries, of total population, sex and age groups, economically active population, urban and rural population, school population, households, etc.

2. World and regional surveys of major aspects of the demographic situation, such as growth and distribution of population, conditions and trends of fertility, mortality, international and internal migration, urbanization, population structure, demographic aspects of manpower and dependency, etc.

3. Studies of interrelations of population trends with factors of economic and social development, such as—

(a) Survey of existing knowledge of determining factors and economic and social consequences of population trends as shown by findings of existing studies in various parts of the world;

(b) Studies of relationships of population growth and structure to manpower and supplies;

(c) Studies of implications of population trends for needs for investments in educational and health facilities and other aspects of economic and social development;

(d) Studies of factors affecting fertility in various cultural and economic settings, in cooperation with national or local agencies and institutions;

(e) Studies of demographic aspects of rural-urban migration and urbanization in various areas, in cooperation with national or local agencies and institutions.

B. Technical publications on methods of demographic analysis and projections, aimed at assisting Government agencies and nongovernmental research institutions in carrying out national and local demographic studies pertinent to problems of developmental planning and policymaking, such as—

1. Manuals on methods of projecting population by sex and age groups, urban and rural population, school population, economically active population, households, etc.

2. Manuals on methods of analysing and evaluating results of population censuses as aids to development planning and policymaking.

3. Statements of general principles and guidelines for national programs of population projections and analyses of population census results.

C. Technical assistance, upon the request of Governments of developing countries, for national and local studies of population trends, their interrelations with economic and social factors, and resulting problems of developmental planning and policymaking, through—

1. Services of regional demographic advisers available upon request to Governments of countries in Asia and the Far East and similar services planned to be provided in the future in other regions;

2. Services of demographic experts provided upon the request of Governments under country programs of technical assistance.

D. Training in methods of demographic research for personnel from developing countries, through:

1. Regional demographic training and research centers established in Asia and the Far East, Latin America, and north Africa, and similar centers being planned for tropical Africa and Central America.

2. Fellowships for advanced training in demography at institutions in other regions of the world.

E. Scientific and technical conferences and seminars on problems of population and related questions of research, such as—

1. World Population Conference to be held in 1965.

2. Asian Population Conference to be held in India in December 1963.

3. Seminar on Population Problems in Africa held in Cairo in 1962, and similar regional seminars held previously in Asia and the Far East, Latin America, and Southern Europe.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Reporter, June 20, 1963]

BIRTH CONTROL, WELFARE FUNDS, AND THE POLITICS OF ILLINOIS

(By Hal Bruno)

CHICAGO, ILL.—As a successful businessman, Arnold H. Maremont is in the habit of bluntly stating exactly what is on his mind and solving problems by a direct, head-on approach. To his surprise, this same practice in public life created bitter political confusion that finally cost him his job as chairman of the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Maremont's purpose was to "force the dialogue out in the open," hoping that public debate on the State's complex welfare problems would cause disgruntled taxpayers to understand the basic issues involved. With knowledge and understanding, he reasoned, they might approve some of his proposed solutions, notably a State-supported birth-control program for recipients of public aid.

The politically explosive combination of a public-welfare debate and birth control, however, would have been dangerous in the hands of the most skilled politician, and Maremont is an amateur. After 9 months of turmoil, Maremont was fired by the State legislature, while monthly checks for people on relief were delayed and Chicago had to prepare emergency plans to avert mass hunger in the Negro neighborhoods. Maremont's birth-control program appears to be dead and the welfare budget remains a political issue for both parties.

It all began last August, when Democratic Governor Otto Kerner named Maremont to head the Illinois Public Aid Commission. For months the IPAC had been on the verge of insolvency, and the State legislature was playing politics with the Governor's request for emergency appropriations to finish the biennium. An election was coming up in the fall, and every State senator or representative had a reason for being for or against the welfare bill—depending upon his party and district. In general, Chicago Democrats, whose constituents include a sizable number of people on relief, were anxious to get it passed; downstate and suburban Republicans, thinking of a "taxpayers' revolt," ripped into the entire public-aid program and its $300 million annual cost. The previous IPAC chairman had quit in frustration and anger.

Arnold Maremont stepped in with an impressive background. The 59-year-old Chicago industrialist had built his family's small automotive-parts company into a multimillion-dollar corporation. He had a business reputation for being tough and smart, and he was appointed in the expectation that he would not tolerate waste or inefficiency in the welfare administration. Though he is a person of definite and outspoken opinions, Maremont did not surround himself with yes men. His close associates call him Arnold and he expects them to speak their minds, whether on business matters or on the modern art Maremont collects and uses to decorate his 12-story office building on North Michigan Avenue. In addition to being a patron of the arts, Maremont has been involved philanthropically in civic campaigns for mental health and civil liberties. He once was director of the Anti-Defamation League's Chicago chapter. His first venture into public life came as a businessman-supporter of Franklin D. Roosevelt in the election of 1944.

Last year Maremont made an unsuccessful bid for the Democratic nomination to run against Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. In his usual blunt fashion, Maremont just walked into party headquarters and asked for the nomination. He didn't get it, but he established himself as a potential candidate for office.

Friends tried to warn Maremont that the IPAC job was no spot for a man with his political ambitions and temperament. The first thing he did was to open the IPAC board meetings to the press and public. They always had been open in theory, but in practice the board met first at a closed luncheon to thresh out any differences of opinion and rehearse for the public session. Maremont decreed that everything should be aired at the public meeting, explaining, "My purpose was to force the dialogue out in the open and give people a chance to understand the conflicts."

Maremont admits that he was not aware of the conflicts at the start and, in fact, had not given much though to welfare problems or birth control until he suddenly became the IPAC chairman. "I was impressed with how ignorant I was," Maremont told me. "The first thing I learned is that the public does not understand public assistance, its philosophy, or the program itself. Our laws are unrealistic, written by do-gooders with no understanding of public-assistance problems in a major city."

At times he clashed with the professionals who had years of experience in welfare work, but even his critics within the public-aid program concede that Maremont displayed a willingness to learn. His philosophy is that public assistance is meant to help a poor family maintain minimum standards of health and decency; but he also wants them to know that their monthly check is an act of charity by the taxpayers, not something to be exploited. He hired a former FBI agent to knock cheaters off the rolls, trimmed the IPAC's staff, eliminated duplication, and claims to have saved an estimated $54 million in his 9 months as chairman of IPAC.

THE ANSWER SEEMED OBVIOUS

Maremont was determined to get at the roots of the public-aid problem. Illinois welfare expenditures had jumped from $285 million in the 1955–57 biennium to $628 million in 1961–63, and the figures are expected to continue to rise steadily. Maremont soon identified the fundamental causes as an out-of-control birth rate and unemployment caused by racial discrimination and lack of education. Three out of four relief recipients in Illinois are Negroes, and almost half of the welfare budget is for the aid-to-dependent-children program. The taxpayers' wrath has been focused on ADC because of certain well-publicized abuses and the high rate of illegitimacy among families on welfare. On one of his speaking tours around the State, Maremont declared: "He (the taxpayer) feels that he is stoking the coals not of his problem but the Negro problem. I believe this is one of the great shibboleths of our time—that public aid is a Negro problem. It is not a Negro problem. It's a white problem that has been forced upon the Negro, who has become the blunted object. Moreover, it is the Negro child upon whom the most suffering, the greatest indignities, and the most severe infliction has been made."

To Maremont and others, the answer seemed obvious: education and birth-control programs for relief recipients. Plans for expanding the adult-education and vocational-training programs were included in the proposed $700 million IPAC budget for the next biennium. Maremont was convinced that without a birth-control program they would be ineffective. He concluded that "the most important element in public aid is to help these people control the births of children they don't want. It's immoral to bring unwanted, illegitimate children into the world. People go around repeating clichés, not understanding the problem, without compassion. I came to these conclusions when my nose was rubbed in it."

Since 1957, IPAC had been paying doctors' fees if a welfare recipient asked for family-planning medical advice. Maremont gave his endorsement to a further step that had been proposed before he took over as chairman. The new policy would have the IPAC also pay for any "prescription" the doctor might recommend—meaning birth-control devices. Maremont estimated the program would cost $600,000 a year, but would save $1.2 million a year just in ADC medical bills.

He cited figures for a 6-month period which showed that 78 percent of the babies born to ADC mothers at Cook County Hospital were illegitimate. Calculating that it costs the State $7,000 to raise an ADC child from birth to the age of 17, Maremont claimed the birth-control program would save $47 million in 17 years for just 1 year's births. Maremont soon became known as "that birth-control man."

Opposition and support quickly formed on religious lines. Msgr. George J. Casey, the vicar-general of the Roman Catholic archdiocese, charged that the program interfered with the rights of individuals, would "foster irresponsibility and a breakdown in public morals," and ignored the convictions of many and "the true obligations of social justice toward minority groups." Summing up, he wrote: "We voice no objection to the non-Catholic's practice of birth control if this truly be the dictate of his conscience. However, we do object most vehemently to the use of public funds to subsidize the operation of an organized campaign of artificial birth control. We do object most vehemently to making birth control the endorsed public policy of the Welfare Department of the State of Illinois."

On the Protestant side, the Illinois Council of Churches supported Maremont, stating: "We recognize that the commission faces certain dilemmas, especially in its birth-control program. On the one hand it faces the possibility of being called an accessory to immoral practices and, on the other, of being an accessory to the birth of many children who will be stigmatized as illegitimate and will most certainly be handicapped in their social environment and educational opportunities; and so add to the problem the commission is trying to help solve * * *. We support the commission's program as by far the lesser of two evils."

With incredibly bad timing, Maremont picked the middle of an election in the country's largest Roman Catholic archdiocese to begin implementing his birth-control program. Mayor Richard J. Daley, a devout Catholic who had approved Governor Kerner's appointment of Maremont, said that he was personally against the program. Benjamin S. Adamowski, Daley's Republican opponent, grabbed headlines by filing an injunction suit to stop the Maremont program on grounds that it was illegal and "subsidized immorality with the taxpayers' money." Daley won the election but 2 days later the Democratic attorney general—whose office was supposed to defend Maremont and the IPAC in court—filed a brief supporting Adamowski's suit. Attorney General William G. Clark contended that the birth-control program violated Illinois laws and would make the State "an accessory to sexual promiscuity and prostitution." Clark also ordered the State treasurer and State auditor not to pay any bills to doctors or druggists taking part in the program.

Maremont hired his own lawyer, vowing to carry the birth-control case to the Supreme Court. Meanwhile, the State senate passed a bill restricting the plan to married women living with their husbands, thus eliminating 80 percent of the women collecting ADC payments. The birth-control program could have little effect without including the mothers who were divorced, separated, widowed, or never married.

A PIECE OF HIS MIND

With the election over and the birth-control program a shambles, the Illinois Legislature was ready to consider Maremont's appointment as the IPAC chairman. For one reason or another, mostly political timing, the senate had never confirmed Maremont. So Maremont journeyed to Springfield to face a senate where opinion about him was now divided by religion as well as politics. Nevertheless, he was confirmed on April 25 and at once set out to push a $47-million emergency appropriation through the legislature to enable the IPAC to get through the last 2 months of the current biennium.

The Republican majority in the senate wanted to impose ceilings on the amount a welfare recipient could pay for rent and the maximum a family could receive each month. The IPAC officials argued that ceilings were unrealistic, since rent and cost of living vary from city to city and month to month. Emboldened by his confirmation and impatient at the delays, Maremont called a press conference and angrily told the reporters: "Republicans in the senate are a small group of willful men who are deliberately and callously holding up checks for 450,000 relief recipients. Republican senators are getting even with the Negroes on ADC because Negroes helped to elect Mayor Daley and are generally Democratic. Republican senators are anti-Negro and have set out on a program to injure Negroes. If the recipients were white, there would be no problem. The Republicans want the backing of white citizens who feel taxes are high, and they are using the Negro to get this support. It is cruel and inhuman, and smacks of Hitlerism."

Within an hour Democrats in Springfield were scurrying for the safety of "no comment" and a delegation of angry Republican senators called on Governor Kerner to demand Maremont's resignation. Kerner refused, and the Republicans went back to the senate, where they voted to change their own rules and reconsider Maremont's appointment. A typical reaction was that of on downstate Republican who called Maremont "an irresponsible, vicious, and unmitigated liar." Some Chicago Democrats privately conceded that Maremont's evaluation of Republican motives might be correct, but his charges were intemperate and politically unwise. Maremont could expect no help whatever from his party on this one.

He backed down only an inch the next day, saying he did not mean a "blanket indictment" of all Republicans and that his remarks might have been interpreted in a manner he didn't intend. Then Maremont quoted an unidentified Republican legislator as once saying, "If the Negroes want their checks, let 'em go to Mayor Daley." He repeated his accusation that the Republicans were "playing politics with the poor people on relief" and ended by saying that his charge was "not meant to be a general attack—except on those men who felt the pinch for its candor and accuracy."

The legislature adjourned for a long weekend, with the Republican leadership determined that Maremont must go. Support for Maremont was not coordinated, and only one important Democrat stood up for him. "We all make mistakes; that's why there are erasers on pencils," Mayor Daley solemnly observed. "We all ask for forgiveness in our prayers. I hope the entire matter can be worked out."

Maremont had several conferences with Governor Kerner and asked the senate to give him a hearing when they reconvened. His request was turned down, and Maremont was secluded in a Chicago hotel suite when the legislature met in Springfield. The Governor attempted to phone him—supposedly to ask for his graceful resignation—but Maremont would not accept the call. Kerner then sent a message to the senate, questioning the legality of the rules change and praising Maremont's performance as IPAC chairman. But Kerner's last paragraph read: "Nevertheless, I personally regret the statements that he made and because of his actions I believe his future benefit to the Public Aid Commission has been impaired."

That did it. Democratic opposition was a routine gesture as the senate on April 30 voted 34–17 to recall Maremont's confirmation, followed by a 34–0 Republican vote against him. The Democrats didn't even vote on the deconfirmation, and one Republican expressed the belief that the senate would have been unanimously against Maremont on a secret ballot.

In Chicago, Maremont called a press conference to deliver his final statement, which he had spent the afternoon preparing. Insisting that he himself was not the issue, he said: "While the senate Republicans clamored for the ouster of one man, the real heart of the matter has been overlooked. The issue is nearly a half million people on public aid in the State of Illinois. What will happen to them? The speed with which the senate has acted over mere words should be applied to provide money for May relief checks.

"For weeks, the Republicans in the senate have refused to appropriate the necessary funds for these checks; yet, they took just a few minutes to fire me. * * * As things now stand, the problems of the people on relief still remain. They are anonymous, unorganized, and without lobbyists or pressure groups. The only persuasion left which can help to solve their problem and meet their needs is the pressure of aroused public opinion."

Maremont promised to continue fighting as a private citizen and thanked Mayor Daley for his public support. At the end, a reporter asked why he hadn't thanked Governor Kerner. Maremont stalked out of the room.

PANIC IN THE SLUMS

With Maremont disposed of, the senate turned to the emergency appropriations for May and June. By the first week in May, IPAC had received about half of the $47 million needed to finish the biennium, but the senate still refused to pass $28 million required for the aid-to-dependent children and general-assistance programs. Republicans demanded that their schedule of maximum rents and payments be written into the next biennial welfare budget. Governor Kerner reluctantly accepted the principle of ceilings but asked that exact amounts be determined later. The senate insisted that the scale be set immediately, and there was a difference of $23 to $112 a month—depending upon family size—between the Republican ceilings and what the IPAC thought a family could live on. The Republicans also wanted a $90 rent limitation, while IPAC officials argued that 10,000 ADC families in Chicago already were paying more than that.

The issue remained deadlocked for 2 more weeks, while May relief checks failed to reach 8,000 families whose names happened to be at the beginning of the alphabet. By the end of the month funds for all of the 267,000 persons living on ADC and 80,000 collecting general assistance would have been cut off. Some of Chicago's slum neighborhoods were on the verge of panic. Private citizen Arnold Maremont told a reporter: "It's becoming increasingly clear that what I said at my press conference 2 weeks ago is true * * * this is a deliberate attempt to injure innocent Negroes."

In slum areas, settlement houses appealed for donations of canned goods, neighborhood merchants extended credit, landlords delayed eviction of destitute tenants, and the public utilities promised Mayor Daley they would maintain service despite unpaid bills. The mayor accused Republican Senators of inflicting "government by caucus" at the expense of poor children and pledged that no one would go hungry in his city. Surplus commodities were requested by IPAC from the Department of Agriculture, which rushed supplies of dried milk, rice, chopped meat, corn meal, beans, peanut butter, wheat, and flour to Chicago. There was some confusion in the first day's distribution plan, but within 48 hours a month's supply of food was being handed out to crowds lined up at 30 neighborhood centers.

On May 16, Governor Kerner and IPAC officials accepted compromise ceilings. Beginning July 1, Illinois' maximum ADC payments will range from $80 a month for an adult and 1 child to $220 a month for 10 or more children. There will be a $90-a-month rent ceiling that can be raised by approval of the legislature. Welfare officials say they can work with these ceilings; but there will be hardships in the larger ADC families, some of whom will have their monthly allotments cut almost in half. The rent ceiling will create serious problems in Chicago and the legislature has opened an investigation of alleged gouging by slum landlords. For a good measure, the senate passed a bill abolishing IPAC as a semiautonomous agency, making it a regular State department directly responsible to the Governor. While Republicans proclaimed a victory for the taxpayers, the IPAC rushed May relief checks to thousands of worried families.

The long-range effects of the Maremont affair and Illinois' welfare crisis have yet to be determined. The $700 million requested by IPAC for its 1963–65 budget has been trimmed to $638 million by the legislature, and there are gloomy predictions that expanding relief rolls will put the IPAC in the same old trouble before the end of the next biennium.

As for Maremont, political observers are divided on whether his criticism of the State senate or the birth-control issue caused his downfall. In the past, the Illinois legislature has been called worse things than bigoted without a ripple of reaction. Some say it was the anti-Negro charges, but others maintain he really is a martyr to the cause of birth control. Probably it was a combination of everything—Statehouse politics, the frustrating welfare dilemma, birth control, and the heated open dialog Maremont himself was so eager to establish.

Although it may seem that little was accomplished in the Illinois welfare controversy, Maremont does not agree. He believes that much good resulted from making the public aware of the basic welfare problems—unemployment and a runaway birth rate. "I'd do it again tomorrow," Maremont said recently. "If I dramatized this problem for the country, then it wasn't all in vain."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me, so that I might have an opportunity to make these remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to accommodate the Senator from Alaska.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to an exposition on H.R. 6143, the higher education construction bill pending before the Senate. I make my speech tonight at the request of the majority leader, because he holds to the point of view that the speech should be in the RECORD as printed tomorrow so that it may be read over the weekend by Senators who wish to familiarize themselves with the recommendations set forth in the bill.

The unanimous-consent agreement the Senate has entered into to limit debate makes it highly desirable that Senators understand the proposals contained in the bill and the differences between the pending bill and the bill as passed by the House.

At the outset I express my judgment that the bill offers to the Senate its best opportunity to contribute to a solution of one of the major critical domestic problems confronting this Nation.

SECOND INSTALLMENT OF PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in bringing to the floor H.R. 6143 is delivering the second major installment of the President's recommendation for assistance by the Federal Government to all areas of our American educational structure. The provisions of the bill which are of benefit to undergraduate institutions, graduate institutions, and to our junior and community colleges, reflect the great concern which was made manifest to the committee in this and preceding sessions of the Congress.

We are not bringing to the Senate a startlingly new concept. After all, President Lincoln signed the act which created our magnificent land-grant college system, whose centenary was celebrated last year. Federal aid to higher education, I repeat, is no new proposal.

Even the very format of the committee proposed version of H.R. 6143 was hammered out in conference in the 87th Congress after both Senate and House had approved in principle the provision of financial aid to our universities and colleges. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, the conference report which had been signed by a majority of both Senate and House conferees, was not acceptable to the House of Representatives in the closing days of the 87th Congress.

SCHOLARSHIP TITLE NOT INCLUDED

One major objection to that conference report, which was voiced during floor debate in the House, was that it contained a student loan proposal—admittedly a compromise from the Senate approved scholarship provisions of S. 1241 and H.R. 8900 of the 87th Congress. The committee took notice of that difficulty and resolved that even though as individual Senators, it is our conviction that a major way to strengthen American higher education is the provision of a liberal scholarship program, we ought not let our views, strongly held though they may be, jeopardize in 1963 the best chance to get facilities construction underway before the student inundation of our colleges reaches unmanageable proportions. The argument which appears on page 3 of the committee report and which consists of a State-by-State listing of college enrollments in 1962 and the estimated enrollments for 1965 and 1970, in my view, is unanswerable.

CONFERENCE CONSIDERATIONS

Mr. President, I wish to speak to the House of Representatives for a moment at this time because I think there is no doubt that there will be a conference on some higher education legislation. All Senators know that, once there is a conference, the conferees will seek to arrive at a fair and reasonable, conscionable compromise of differences between the two bodies.

We decided against putting into this bill a scholarship and student loan proposal, as was done last year, although there is no doubt that there were sufficient votes in the committee to do so. We could have put in a student assistance program by an overwhelming majority vote of the committee. I am also satisfied that, as happened last year, this year we could pass a student assistance program in the Senate as a section of the bill.

There were some who said to me, "Senator, we think we ought to retain that section for bargaining purposes in the conference with the House." It was my position that to do so could be considered to be a reflection upon the intelligence of the House conferees, because they know we could have done exactly what I have said. I hope they will take note of the fact that I raised this point in the debate at the beginning of our discussion. I hope the conferees on the part of the House, when we finally go into our meeting, will appreciate the fact that the Senate did not include in the bill a student assistance program, although I am perfectly satisfied we could have done so and had it passed both by the committee and by the Senate.

Therefore I hope the conferees will understand that we have already made a concession to them, because we knew they would be coming to that conference in the same position they found themselves in last year, except that it would be even more difficult because of the action that was taken by the House of Representatives on the conference report last year. Because of that history I am convinced that the House conferees could not accept this year a student scholarship assistance program.

Therefore, in effect, what we said as a committee was that we were not willing to participate in an empty gesture on scholarship assistance.

I want the House conferees to take note of the fact that I have raised this point at the very beginning of the debate, because I do not want to hear them say in conference, when we get to the matter of marking up a conference bill, "Well, we have conceded on this point, and you have receded only on a smaller number of points."

We are all mature in the legislative process. I am pleased and proud to report that my colleagues on the committee are not going to take the time of the Senate for debate on a title which could easily have been added to this bill, but which we all would have known at the time we adopted it in committee, to be a title which would have been dropped in conference, anyway. Therefore, I hope our House associates in conference will appreciate the position that I took, as chairman of the subcommittee, supported by my colleagues on the committee. We have not encumbered the bill with legislative deadwood.

We have put in the bill only what, in the opinion of the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate committee, we think constitute sound legislative proposals, which we strongly urge upon the Senate for adoption, and, which following Senate passage, we can urge the conferees to accept.

STUDENT AID BADLY NEEDED

It is particularly difficult for me to yield on the scholarship and student loan proposals. I hope in not too many years ahead there will be a change of attitude in the House and that a majority of the Members of the House will see the importance of a student assistance program. We can go ahead with a school construction facility program—which is what this bill really adds up to; we can build the finest of physical school facilities across this land; we can man them with the best faculties, but if we deny to tens of thousands of young people the opportunities to go to college because they do not have the economic resources which make it possible for them to attend, then all of those fine buildings will have failed to fulfill their real, and desirable purpose.

As one who taught college students for 21 years, I just cannot yield to anyone in my interest for the welfare of the individual student. This young man or woman is the most important element in the educational process. He or she is the end the whole educational process is supposed to be seeking to serve.

I think it is a calamity that we have so many young men and women who could contribute so much to the welfare of our country if they were educated, who do not obtain it. They are being denied an education, and, from the standpoint of the welfare of the country, they are being denied the opportunity to give their country the benefit of their educated talents.

Yet, all we can do, in the face of the insurmountable legislative obstacle at the present time, is increase our efforts many, many times over to try to get private agencies, foundations, corporations, private businesses, individual wealthy people, to contribute more than they ever have before to a voluntary student assistance program.

I know it will never be done in sufficient amount, but every student that is added to a privately supported student assistance program represents a great and needed addition to the intellectual powerhouse of America.

At this late hour I do not wish to dwell at too great a length on this point, although it is a vital one. I only wish we could multiply the number of individuals of financial means in this country, who would adopt for financial support a young man or woman who wants to go to college, but who cannot go to college because of financial reasons.

I know that every person of wealth, every foundation, every business, has many requests for so-called charitable contributions. I know many are limited in the total number of contributions they can make. But, may I say, this is a great need and a more important need than many other fine, general welfare areas we support. I do say, also without fear of contradiction, that any money any American citizen lends or grants to any individual student will return, in dividends to the economy and welfare of this country, many, many times the value of any dividends they would get out of blue chip stocks or bonds, as far as real values are concerned—with the word "real" underlined and used in its dictionary sense.

I make this plea, and I leave it to the judgment of those who can contribute to scholarship funds but who may not have been doing so.

INCREASE IN STUDENT POPULATION

Mr. President, I have earlier referred to a table showing the numbers of students who will be seeking admission in the coming decades to our colleges. Some may point out that the rate of increase is dropping but this is highly misleading unless the actual number of students involved is taken into consideration. For that reason, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have alluded be printed.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total fall college enrollment

State	1962	Projected [1]	
		1965	1970
50 States and the District of Columbia	4,174,936	5,220,000	6,959,000
Alabama	47,654	59,581	79,430
Alaska	3,878	4,849	6,465
Arizona	43,736	54,685	72,902
Arkansas	30,878	38,607	51,469
California	551,524	689,582	919,311
Colorado	52,640	65,819	87,746
Connecticut	59,092	73,884	98,498
Delaware	8,979	11,228	14,969
Florida	89,802	112,282	149,688
Georgia	56,228	70,303	93,724
Hawaii	12,999	16,255	21,670
Idaho	13,912	17,393	23,187
Illinois	230,115	287,715	383,566
Indiana	111,861	139,859	186,452
Iowa	64,928	81,181	108,226
Kansas	59,900	74,897	99,848
Kentucky	53,361	66,717	88,943
Louisiana	66,692	83,384	111,163
Maine	15,025	18,787	25,045
Maryland	65,110	81,406	108,526
Massachusetts	155,647	194,606	259,438
Michigan	182,827	228,594	304,748
Minnesota	89,301	111,656	148,853
Mississippi	41,163	51,469	68,616
Missouri	96,851	121,093	161,434
Montana	14,997	18,750	24,997
Nebraska	36,379	45,487	60,641
Nevada	4,761	5,951	7,933
New Hampshire	13,176	16,474	21,963
New Jersey	101,419	126,804	169,048
New Mexico	20,839	26,053	34,732
New York	395,174	494,093	658,697
North Carolina	84,387	105,512	140,662
North Dakota	16,026	20,040	26,716
Ohio	202,374	253,034	337,330
Oklahoma	63,697	79,642	106,173
Oregon	51,948	64,952	86,591
Pennsylvania	214,244	267,874	357,115
Rhode Island	22,699	28,381	37,836
South Carolina	35,142	43,937	58,574
South Dakota	16,409	20,515	27,349
Tennessee	72,844	91,079	121,420
Texas	216,641	270,871	361,109
Utah	38,940	48,687	64,907
Vermont	11,123	13,906	18,539
Virginia	65,944	82,450	109,917
Washington	77,491	96,888	129,165
West Virginia	33,700	42,136	56,173
Wisconsin	87,403	109,281	145,686
Wyoming	7,707	9,636	12,846
District of Columbia	51,155	63,961	85,269
U.S. service schools	14,214	17,774	23,695

[1] Assuming that enrollment in each State will be distributed in same proportion as in 1962.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on pages 4 and 5 of the committee report there are quotations which dramatize this fact situation. I refer particularly to the statement of a most distinguished educator, Dr. Logan Wilson, who is president of the American Council on Education. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks this excerpt from the committee report be printed.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Today, and looking ahead to the next two decades, our colleges and universities are confronted with a permanent increase in the college-age group of the population. At present, colleges and universities depend for financial support on State and local tax moneys (in the case of public institutions), on private philanthropy, and on student fees. They will continue to do so, but, realistically speaking, there are limits on the amount of increased revenue that these sources can produce. Moreover, we cannot expect the

> traditional sources of financial support for colleges and universities to provide additional revenues at a rate of increase commensurate with the rate at which the need for college classrooms will increase. Hence the urgency of the need for substantial Federal assistance for construction of college academic facilities.
>
> It lies with this committee, with the Senate, and with the Congress as a whole to make a decision now that will determine the future course of American higher education. The longer this decision is postponed, the greater the danger that we shall waste potential resources of trained manpower, and the greater the danger that we shall impair the ongoing enterprise of American colleges and universities.
>
> * * * I am glad you emphasized the fact that this is not a temporary phenomenon. This will go on for at least two decades. A colleague of mine made this quite graphic by saying that between now and 1980, to accommodate these students, we would need to double the size of every existing institution of higher learning and establish a thousand new institutions with an average enrollment of 2,500 students.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the concluding paragraph of the excerpt from Dr. Wilson's testimony deserves to be emphasized over and over again. He is saying:

> Between now and 1980, to accommodate these students, we would need to double the size of every existing institution of higher learning and establish a thousand new institutions with an average enrollment of 2,500 students.

Mr. President, I do not know what better case I can make for need.

PROOF OF CONSTRUCTION NEED

In debate on many legislative proposals we say that the burden of proof is on those of us who advocate the proposal. I am perfectly willing, and, in fact, delighted, in behalf of my committee, to assume that burden of proof, assisted by the members of the committee, as I will be assisted during the debate. The first responsibility of assuming a burden of proof in debate is to show the need for the bill. If I have not shown it by the presentation of these irrefutable statistics and by the testimony of Dr. Logan Wilson, then a case cannot be made.

However, they make the case just by reading them.

I repeat again, between now and 1980, to accommodate the student needs in higher education in the United States, we will have to double the size of every existing institution of higher learning and to establish a thousand new institutions with an average enrollment of 2,500 students.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. Brewster in the chair) comes from the great State of Maryland. I am somewhat familiar with the institutions of higher education in that State. I am sure he will not controvert me when I say that if we had to leave it to the State of Maryland, first, to double the size of the University of Maryland in the short span of time between now and 1980; second, in addition, to double the size of every other State institution of higher learning in the State of Maryland; and then third, further to require Maryland to increase by its proportionate share the 1,000 needed new institutions of higher learning with an average enrollment of 2,500, that the net result of such an expansion would be a financial burden which would be very difficult for the State of Maryland to assume on its own. It is true in my State of Oregon, and it is true in every other State in the country.

FEDERAL FUNDS NECESSARY

We must face the fact that if we are going to stop the current terrific waste of brainpower in this country we must provide financial aid. We must also face the fact that if we do not provide these facilities, we are responsible for an indescribable loss to the welfare of this country, through the loss of that brainpower. In my view, we cannot escape the fact that if we are going to meet the obligation that is pressing down on us in the field of higher education, the Federal Government will have to assume a greater share of the cost of academic facilities.

That is what this bill is all about. The bill is a first step in the direction of the assumption by the National Government of the responsibility for greater Federal sharing with the States of the cost of educating the youth of this land. I respectfully submit that as my main argument on the need for the bill. I leave it to my colleagues in the Senate as to whether or not I have sustained my burden of proof on this issue with these undeniable figures pertaining to need.

NEEDS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The testimony of Dr. Donald E. Deyo, president of the American Association of Junior Colleges, regarding the construction needs of the junior and community college segment of American education is likewise most impressive. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed the excerpt from the committee report on pages 5 and 6 which illustrates the need for construction assistance to this vital and growing part of the higher education community.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> We know, for example, that capital expenditures for public junior colleges rose from $41 million in 1960–61 to $55 million in 1961–62, an increase of 32 percent. In 20 States recently sampled, the aggregate State share of appropriations for operating expenses of junior colleges, will be approximately $81 million for 1962–63, a gain of a little more than 41 percent over comparable appropriations 2 years ago. In response to a survey conducted by the U.S. Office of Education, public junior colleges reported they would need approximately $82 million a year during the next 5 years just for expansion of existing plants to accommodate anticipated increases in enrollment. In light of the number of new institutions being established each year, estimated capital outlay requirements would, of course, be substantially higher.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these statements alone, in my view, buttress beyond doubt the fact that a need exists. There is much additional testimony in our hearing record which corroborates and sustains this point of view. To detail it extensively at this point would be but to weary Senators with statistics. I will adduce but one more instance of the urgent pleas which were made to the subcommittee by referring to the testimony of the president of Rutgers University, Dr. Mason Gross, who testified on behalf of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The excerpt from his testimony may be found on page 5 of our committee report and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> While our associations and others have repeatedly called attention to this approaching enrollment bulge, and while State universities and land-grant colleges have made almost desperate efforts to prepare for it, they are far behind in meeting the need for classrooms, laboratories, and libraries.
>
> We believe that 1963 is the fateful year, representing the last clear chance to provide these facilities in time to accommodate those who wish to and should utilize them. Even should appropriations for the construction of these buildings be available early in 1963, the buildings themselves could not possibly be completed before the end of 1964.
>
> Putting it in its simplest terms, unless funds for academic facilities construction become available in 1963, there will be many of the youth of the Nation who will not be educated at the college and university level.
>
> Our associations do not suggest that the Federal Government should or could be the sole source of these funds. On the contrary we believe that Federal support is relatively minor when compared with the support which has come and must come from State governments, municipal governments, individuals, business enterprises and voluntary associations. But Federal action is critically important now—in 1963—for without it higher education cannot meet the challenge of the future. Of greater importance—the Nation cannot either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, again I wish to underline the concluding sentence of the testimony of Dr. Gross:

> "Federal action is critically important now—in 1963—for without it higher education cannot meet the challenge of the future. Of greater importance—the Nation cannot either."

ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

Basically, it is my conviction that the need has been demonstrated that construction of academic facilities is vitally important and authorization for such construction assistance in the form of matching grants cannot be delayed without serious effects upon our national economy—because it is the national economy and the national defense far more than the fate of the colleges and the universities or even of the students—which is at stake.

Our economy is grounded upon the principle that the fruits of scientific research shall be brought through improved technology as quickly as possible to the American public. There has been in the last two decades in the words of witnesses before the committee "a veritable explosion of knowledge." Unless we can learn to live with and come to terms with the technological revolution we are undergoing, there are going to be vast social disjointures which will strain, almost to the breaking point, the fabric of our political and legal institutions. The social problems of automation are but one aspect of this situation. Unless we can train well and quickly the men and women who will be making the judgments in our business communities, in our labor unions, in our legislatures, in the executive departments of the Government, including Defense, in the Congress and the courts, we may not be able to harness the energies which knowledge enables us to command.

What are the legislative alternatives today which face the Senate? We have before us H.R. 6143 in two versions. Most of the differences between the two versions of the bill are purely formal and, in my judgment, in these areas, agreement on terminology can be obtained, with comparative ease.

There is one class of differences, however, between these two versions of the bill which is of major importance and of high constitutional significance. It is a delicate question because it involves basically the church-state problem, but it is a nettle which must be grasped surely and quickly.

The issue is the form of the assistance which can be provided to our private church-related institutions of higher education in the light of the Constitution of the United States. The committee reported bill proposes that there be specific purposes identified for the construction for which the Federal Government will advance one-third of the monetary cost. The House bill proposes that, with the exception of divinity schools, the Federal Government advance one-third of the cost of the construction of all academic facilities.

Mr. President, here is the issue. I would get it before us. The House bill is an across-the-board grant bill. The Senate bill is a categorical grant bill. The House bill would make general grants to private institutions of higher education, including colleges and universities affiliated with the religious denominations.

The Senate bill would allow to the private institutions of higher education, including those affiliated with religious denominations, only categorical grants for specific purposes which are related to defense objectives.

That is the great difference. There is a great difference of opinion between the Senate and the House on this point. Who is going to suffer if we do not reconcile the difference by adopting a bill that can go through both Houses? The young men and women of America who are potential college students will suffer but the country will suffer more.

As I said up in Somerville, outside Boston, the other night, I wish private college administrators would take a long hard look at the problem which confronts the country and the Congress. Some private educational leaders are taking the position that they do not want to settle for anything less than general grants. If they do not settle for less than general grants, in my judgment, there will be no legislation. If there is no legislation, I find it difficult to escape the conclusion that the responsibility for the lack of legislation will rest more upon the shoulders of those who are demanding more than they can get than upon the shoulders of those who say, "But we can get this much, and this much will help so much."

LIMITED MONEY AVAILABLE UNDER EITHER VERSION

As I have said to these academic leaders, and as I mentioned in my speech the other night, at Somerville, Mass., the undeniable fact is that if we pass the Senate bill, each institution involved would get just as much money as it would have any chance of getting under the House bill.

By that I mean that if we passed a general grant bill, there would be no more money available than if we passed a categorical grant bill. Only a limited amount of money would be available in any event. No private church affiliated college has any chance of getting all the money it would like to get. No public university or college has any chance of getting all the money it would like to get. So let me talk about this from the standpoint of a hypothetical.

Suppose the Senate bill were passed. Private college X, a Catholic university, or private college Y, a Presbyterian university, or any other university, might submit its application for its share of what could be made available for a building or buildings on its campus. Does anyone think that under the Senate bill any one of those universities would have much of a chance of getting anything more than a physics building or a chemistry building or a library building? Such structures could be obtained under the Senate bill, and they are costly buildings. But they would have such a building. If the private Catholic university or private Presbyterian university or any other religious university, received the matching grant money for the physics building or the chemistry building or the library, we all know that its own funds would be available for other buildings, such as an economics or business administration building or a liberal arts building or a social science building, or for that matter—and we have to honestly admit it—for a strictly religious building.

That is my answer to those social scientists from whom we are receiving telegrams these days, saying, "We are for the House bill, because we think the Senate bill discriminates in favor of the natural sciences, engineering, and the libraries." The Senate bill does not discriminate at all, if we review again the hypothetical I have just given. Under a general grant bill or a categorical use grant bill, the same limited amount of money would be available.

The only ones who would be cheated by standing firm on the contention that either they shall get a general grant bill or else there will be no legislation at all are the potential students and the public. That would not be right or fair. To me, it is a matter of fairplay.

So I plead again, from the floor of the Senate, as I have pleaded from platform after platform and at banquet table after banquet table in recent years to my friends among the private school educators in religious colleges: "Please do not make that mistake again. Face up to the fact that you will be eligible to receive some amount of money under either bill. If you accept the categorical use concept you stand to put the gain to immediate help. If you hold firm for across-the-board grants, you run the risk of great delay and possible loss in the Senate. Since then the majority opinion, in my judgment, is that the general grant bill cannot be squared with the Constitution."

Many fine lawyers disagree with those of us who hold to that point of view. Not one of us will know for a certainty until the Supreme Court decides the issue, and I shall comment on that possibility in a moment.

But I wish to set forth tonight in these remarks the issue as it really exists in connection with the proposed legislation. An attempt to pass the House bill will be lost in the Senate. Pass the Senate bill, and every private religious university and college in the country will be eligible for the same amount of money that it would have any chance of getting under a general use bill; and the beneficiaries of that compromise will be the tens of thousands of young men and women throughout the country who otherwise would be denied a college education. I hope that many of the private school educators will reconsider their position and cease to press what some Senators consider a shortsighted, and intellectually stubborn point of view on this question.

In fairness, I must also report there is some good news. I am pleased with the number of private university educators who have been making known to me in recent weeks that they have come to see the fairness of my position and are willing to support it.

Let us enact the Senate bill, then we can postpone until future years, after we have seen the operation of a categorical-use law, the question as to whether some future Congress ought to modify the law on the basis of whatever the existing public opinion at that time may be. What it will be then is not for me to say. Who knows whether public opinion will change? I do not know whether it will or not, but I do know that American public opinion at present is not ready to accept the proposal for a general grant bill.

I am a strong believer in making progress in keeping with principle. We will be making progress in keeping with principle through enacting the bill before the Senate.

JUDICIAL REVIEW CONSIDERATIONS

On the constitutional point in connection with judicial review, I shall say only this. There are those in the Senate who will have serious misgivings about going as far as the committee version of the bill. In any event, I do not think it a wise or prudent course to multiply the difficulties of such Senators and of those who can support the categorical approach but cannot support an across-the-board approach. I cannot support a general grant approach. I hold to the point of view that a general grant of Federal funds to a university with religious ties to do with the money whatever it wants to do with it cannot be squared with the doctrine of separation of church under our constitutional system.

The Supreme Court may someday hold to the contrary; but there is no decision of the Supreme Court that has been rendered to date that, in my judgment, indicates that I am wrong in the view of constitutional law which I have just expressed.

As the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare knows, and as some of the advisers of the President know, I simply do not share their point of view on this constitutional question. I do not share the view that there is some difference between elementary, secondary, and higher education in respect to the power of the Federal Government, through Congress, to appropriate funds by way of general grants to religious schools.

The fact that we have compulsory education in elementary and secondary schools has nothing to do with the Constitution, and has nothing to do with the constitutional issue of whether the Federal Government, through Congress, can appropriate general grants to the religious schools at any level. To me, that has always been a fallacious argument, irrelevant to the constitutional issue before us. It is a very simple issue: Under the separation-of-church-and-state doctrine, does the Federal Government, through Congress, have the constitutional authority to appropriate for general grants to church-connected schools money coming from the pockets of all the taxpayers? My answer is "No." It does not have that authority, because if it sought to exercise it, it would be definitely mixing church with state, and that would be in violation of the first amendment.

Mr. President, I find it difficult to read the recent decisions of the Supreme Court on the so-called religious issues, including the dicta in some of those decisions, and not reach the conclusion that I have reached.

Senators know that I never keep an argument under the table or sweep it under the rug. The legislative process involves a duty on the part of those who have such a responsibility as mine—in carrying out my duties as the Senator in charge of the bill—to face the political realities that confront us.

I am a fairly good counter of noses; and there are not here sufficient votes to pass the general grant bill. There would not be sufficient votes to do that, even if my vote were for it—and my vote is not for it. In fact, the affirmative votes available in the Senate would fall by a substantial margin to equal the number required in order to pass such a bill. I have so notified, in various conferences, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the White House that this is my considered judgment.

So what do I have to do, as the Senator in charge of the bill? I have to take into account the political realities and the legislative realities here in the Senate. I am making the plea for the passage of the bill on the grounds that it is a good bill which will accomplish much for the youth of this country. I am further saying that it will accomplish, as a categorical use grant bill, as far as private colleges are concerned as much as a general grant bill would accomplish for them.

COMPARISON OF PROVISIONS

Let me review again the principal features of the two versions of the bill.

Under the committee version of the bill, the area of construction assistance which could be provided would be limited to academic facilities used in connection with the natural and physical sciences or engineering, or for use as a library.

Under the House version of the bill, construction could be authorized for fine arts studios, philosophy and literature classrooms, and for facilities devoted to instruction and research of a sociological nature.

I, as well as many members on the committee, recognize the utility and the value of the disciplines which lies outside the field of mathematics, and the natural sciences. They are an indispensable part of a modern institution of higher education. They deserve and should receive the full support of the States and of the institutions in which they are located, but I respectfully would point out that to authorize a broad grant program, unrestricted by congressional guidelines in these areas, in my view raises serious questions of a constitutional nature.

I have no such reservations regarding the categorical grant, the special purpose grant, or if you will, the defense related grant. Precedent for such categorical grants does exist. The National Science Foundation in 1950 was given such authority by its organic act, and that authority has been exercised without challenge. It will be asserted that such authority also exists by virtue of other statutes in the broader field. I cannot acquiesce in such a view as, for example, when it is alleged that the grant which accompanies the fellowship holder, under authority of title IV of the National Defense Education Act, is a broad and unrestricted across-the-board grant. It is my view, and has been so stated in committee reports on amendments to NDEA from time to time, that such grants are legally attached to the fellowship and flow to the institution through the conduit of the student. Such payments to the institutions of higher education are in the same class constitutionally speaking, in my view, as the payments which were made to colleges and universities for the GI bill of rights of World War II, and subsequent statutes. They are covered, if you will, by the constitutional umbrella of the individual benefit doctrine which also permits us to expend school lunch money in connection with the operations of that program in our private and parochial elementary and secondary schools.

There is a second and a practical argument which I would call to the attention of Senators in this connection. As Secretary Celebrezze told us in our hearings:

> To provide for additional students, replace obsolete structures, and modernize usable buildings, institutions of higher education should invest an average of $2.3 billion annually. Expenditures currently fall short of this by $1 billion annually.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the Congress of the United States in the near future will be willing to appropriate the full $1 billion deficit needed, but if we appropriate the $300 million provided for in the committee bill, $180 million annually for matching grants and $120 million in loans, it is my judgment that this money could be usefully employed in constructing the limited categories of academic facilities specified in the Senate version of the bill.

In turn, this Federal money would free for other institutional needs money from other sources which would be available to our colleges and universities. What I am saying is that I do not believe the broader scope of the House bill would mean one dollar more in Federal money for the colleges and universities.

Why, then, should we dilute our Federal effort in the scientific and technological fields by adopting an across-the-board grant policy which is open to serious controversy on constitutional grounds?

There are those in the Senate who will have serious misgivings about going as far as the committee version of the bill. In any event, I do not believe it is a wise and prudent course to multiply the difficulties of such Senators and of those who can support a categorical approach but cannot support an across-the-board approach.

In my view, we are too close to obtaining substantial and much needed financial assistance to higher education to run the risk of losing it through overreaching. There are enough perils in the enactment of educational legislation at every step of the way at best. Why then should we compound our difficulties unnecessarily. Perhaps at a later date, when the constitutional question has been clarified by the Supreme Court, it may then be possible to greatly expand the proposals of aid to higher education. Fortunately, there is an indication that such a clarification may not be unduly long delayed.

I am particularly pleased, in view of the point I am now going to make, Mr. President, that the distinguished and very able Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is presiding over the Senate at this time.

I am informed that in the State of Maryland a case or controversy has arisen which is now being litigated and which strikes to the heart of the constitutional matter I have raised in the last few minutes.

I do not wish to comment on it unduly at this time, since it is undergoing litigation. I say only that it concerns the questions of grants which have been made by the State of Maryland to church-related colleges, for the construction of science buildings and other facilities, by means of a State law identical in principle to the bill we are offering the Senate as Federal legislation.

I have no doubt, since Federal constitutional questions have been raised in connection with that suit, that the matter will be pressed in the Federal courts and that thus the long-needed clarification of the constitutional issues can be obtained. It is a source of great satisfaction to me that the matter is now in the process—as it should be—of settlement by the courts. In view of this, I would hope that the pending legislation will not have attached to it by way of amendment either the expansion of the grant purposes such as is envisaged by the approach of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, or by the attachment of a judicial review provision such as I understand may be offered by the most distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. President, I had better say now—because if I do not, others will say it for me, and I say it because it would only be fair to say it—that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I last session introduced a piece of legislation which dealt with loans to elementary and secondary private nonprofit schools. S. 1482, as it was introduced on March 29, 1961, in the 87th Congress, contained a section on judicial review.

The Senator from Pennsylvania and I had worked out section 6 of that bill relating to judicial review with the Attorney General of the United States and also with the Solicitor General of the United States. We believe that the language we used then will stand the test of litigation—although no one can be sure. The Presiding Officer knows, as do other Senators who are lawyers, that the real legal problem which confronts us on this point in the law is to get the case before the courts, and to find that the issue we have raised is sufficiently substantive in nature that the courts can justify taking jurisdiction.

MASSACHUSETTS AGAINST MELLON

In the landmark case, the Supreme Court held that the interest of a taxpayer was so de minimis that the taxpayer's suit which was brought should not come within the jurisdiction of the Court, or would not support the action of the Court in taking jurisdiction of the case. So for many years it has been taken for granted, in the legal profession, that a taxpayer's suit would have no standing in court. But the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I have taken the position that as yet no legislation has sanctioned the institution of a taxpayer's suit, and that quite a different legal situation would exist if the taxpayer were to proceed on the basis of legislative sanction or authority.

So, in the judicial-review section that we worked out with the Department of Justice with respect to the Clark-Morse bill on loans to private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, we provided that either a school adversely affected by a decision of the Commissioner of Education, or a taxpayer in the district in which the school was located would have, by legislative sanction, the right to bring an action to test whether the supplying of loan funds to a religious school violated the first amendment.

That is still my position in regard to that bill of 2 years ago. But I suppose there will be those in the Senate who do not hear me tonight or who do not read what I have said tonight and who, during the course of the debate, will try to represent that I am in some kind of inconsistent position when I rise to oppose the Ervin amendment.

I can almost hear them say, "Well, that was good enough for the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Oregon in the elementary and secondary school cases. Why do not you welcome it with open arms in this case?"

Mr. President, I have two reasons. The first reason is the practical legislative one that confronts me as the Senator in charge of the bill. I believe that such an amendment in connection with the pending bill may very well defeat the bill. I do not propose to sacrifice the great values of H.R. 6143 which will accrue to young men and women who are potential students in our country if we can succeed in getting this legislation passed through both Houses of Congress. I do not propose to sacrifice those great values by going along or urging the adoption or agreeing to the adoption of an amendment that in my judgment would kill the bill.

Second, I wish to say that in respect to higher education, in my judgment, the amendment is unnecessary in view of the pending Maryland case. I do not rely entirely on my own legal judgment on this point. I have checked with distinguished constitutional lawyers on the question and they share my point of view. I am satisfied that in all probability the Maryland case will go all the way "upstairs," as we lawyers say. It will finally be determined in that great temple of justice within a stone's throw of where I speak—the U.S. Supreme Court. I believe that we owe a debt of gratitude to the party litigants who are bringing on the Maryland case.

So my main answers to the Ervin amendment are the two that I have made. In my judgment, first, the amendment would jeopardize the bill; second, the amendment is not necessary.

Mr. President, that completes my opening statement on the bill. It may be that there are other Senators who wish to speak on the bill tomorrow. I am sure that there will be a considerable number on Monday. Under the unanimous-consent agreement we come to a vote on Tuesday. When we cast our votes, I hope that no Senator will ever forget that each and every vote that is cast is of vital importance to tens upon tens of thousands of young men and women in our country whose very future will be dependent upon each one of those rollcalls.

If one wishes to evaluate votes in the Senate in terms of social and economic consequences, I do not know any listing of votes that we will cast in this session of Congress which will have a greater impact on the future of our country than the votes which will be cast on the higher education bill.

I sincerely hope that I have been helpful tonight in my presentation of the explanation of what is included in the bill. To those Senators who may have some doubts as to how they should vote on it, I wish to say that I will be available, the staff of the committee will be available, and my colleagues on the committee will be available to step out into the cloakrooms at any time with any Senator who is in doubt as to the meaning or the import or the application of any segment of the bill. I wish my colleagues to know that all we on the committee seek to do is to provide each Senator with every bit of information he may need, so that when he comes to cast his vote, he can cast it with a feeling of confidence that he knows what he is voting for.

AUTHORIZATION FOR MEMBERS OF STAFF TO BE PRESENT IN THE CHAMBER DURING DEBATE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all staff members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, majority and minority, concerned with debate on H.R. 6143 be permitted to be on the floor during the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF IN OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on October 4 and 5, 1963, in Portland there was held a regional meeting of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf. It was attended by representatives from all of the Pacific Coast States. I should like to take this opportunity to extend to all those who participated my best wishes for what I am sure was a most helpful and productive session.

In connection with this meeting I have noted that Hattie Harrell, the director of the Tucker-Maxon Oral School in Portland, Oreg., was the chairman of the planning committee of the association for the Pacific Northwest regional meeting and that she is the author of an excellent article entitled "The Education of the Deaf in Oregon," which appeared in the September 1963 issue of the Volta Review.

Mr. President, because in my judgment her description of the facilities provided in our State for the education of the deaf might be helpful to Senators from other areas, I ask unanimous consent that the article and the brief biographical sketch of Miss Harrell be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDUCATION OF THE DEAF IN OREGON

(By Hattie Harrell)

(Hattie Harrell, who is chairman of the planning committee for the Alexander Graham Bell Association Northwest Regional Meeting, is director of the Tucker-Maxon Oral School in Portland, Oreg. She has been a teacher of the deaf for a number of years, and prior to assuming her present position, she had taught in the Georgia, Louisiana, Rochester, Wright Oral, and Clarke schools for the deaf, and at the John Tracy Clinic. She organized the Birmingham (Ala.) Junior League Speech and Hearing Center and was director of it for 3 years before moving to Portland. Miss Harrell trained as a teacher of the deaf at the Alabama State School and studied at Clarke School for the Deaf. She has also studied at Columbia and Johns Hopkins Universities. Miss Harrell is a member of the Auxiliary Board of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf.)

Oregon does offer its deaf boys and girls advantages not found in all States. A bird's-eye view of what the various organizations are doing for children whose hearing is impaired gives an indication of the scope of the programs, and the various organizations and schools involved.

OREGON STATE SCHOOL

The Oregon State School for the Deaf at Salem is a residential school founded in 1870. It now admits children at 4 years of age or younger, provides education through the eleventh grade and offers training in a variety of vocations. The school has a teacher training program which is offered in conjunction with Monmouth College. Under the U.S. Vocational Rehabilitation Administration the Oregon State School has been designated as one of the two centers for training in counseling for the deaf.

TUCKER-MAXON ORAL SCHOOL

The Tucker-Maxon Oral School in Portland was founded in 1948 by five families, each having a deaf child. These parents opened this private, nonprofit, oral school so that their children could be enrolled as young as three and a half years of age, could be kept in small and graded classes, would not be exposed to manual signs or finger spelling and could continue to live at home.

In the beginning the school was operated, with five pupils and one teacher, in the home of the family which first envisioned the school. The school was moved twice before 1953, when its own special purpose building was erected—the gift of Mr. and Mrs. Max D. Tucker.

This past year another building was added, which houses several classrooms and a full-sized gymnasium. Today the school has an enrollment of 37 pupils. There are seven teachers and the director, who is herself a trained and experienced teacher of deaf children. The well-established program takes the pupils through the eighth grade. Following graduation these children attend a high school in the Portland public school system.

HOSFORD DAY SCHOOL

Hosford Day School for the Deaf, a department within the Portland public school system, was opened approximately 55 years ago. It is operated in a wing of one of the schools for hearing children. Children may be enrolled at 4 years of age and may continue through the grades. In instances where it is thought advisable, children are integrated into classes with hearing children for specified studies.

After graduation these children also enter public high school where there is a coordinator to assist all deaf pupils. Some children whose impairment is not severe are able to attend school with hearing children because of the program of speech and lipreading therapy made available to them through the public school system.

PORTLAND HEARING AND SPEECH CENTER

The Portland Center for Hearing and Speech offers training for children between the ages of 2½ and 4 years of age who have hearing impairments. The center also offers guidance to parents of children much younger—as early as the impairment is recognized.

PRESCHOOL FACILITIES

Two facilities providing assistance to preschool-age deaf children are the Eugene Center for Hearing and Speech in Eugene, and the Junior Service League Kindergarten in Medford. The Junior Service League Kindergarten, founded several years ago by the league to aid acoustically handicapped children, has a trained teacher of the deaf on duty regularly. Assisting her is another trained teacher who serves part time without remuneration. Members of the league serve regularly as volunteer assistants.

UNIVERSITY MEDICAL SCHOOL DIAGNOSTIC SERVICE

The Crippled Children's Division of the University of Oregon Medical School in Portland makes available a diagnostic service for the many types of impairments in children (including hearing). It also provides treatment for a number of these impairments. It is to this center that doctors and agencies may refer children whose disabilities are not readily diagnosed. The children are given complete examinations by various specialists who pool their findings and opinions in the endeavor to make a diagnosis that will lead to proper guidance for the parents.

STATE TESTING PROGRAM

The program of hearing testing conducted by the Oregon State Health Department throughout the State makes possible the early detection of hearing impairment. With proper referrals, correction, or improvement is often possible.

COORDINATING AGENCIES

Another aspect of the services for the deaf in Oregon is the manner in which all schools and agencies coordinate their efforts. We have what we call the Coordinating Council for the Deaf. Several times each year the heads of our schools and agencies meet to evaluate what is being done for the deaf in our State and attempt to devise ways and means of improving our services to them.

STATE SPEECH AND HEARING CONSULTANT

Last, but certainly not least among the services for the hearing impaired children of Oregon, is the consultant for hearing and speech disabilities employed by the State department of special education. This consultant is fully trained in both speech therapy and the education of the deaf. All agencies notify this consultant of all deaf children who come to their attention. The consultant confers with the families to advise and/or assist in whatever manner is possible.

RECESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, October 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, October 10, 1963:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Philip Elman, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1963. (Reappointment.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

Maj. Gen. Fred M. Dean, 1450A, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1963

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 6: 33: *Seek ye first the kingdom of God.*

Most gracious and merciful God, may we stand in the noble tradition of those who have a vision of the magnificent heights to which the human race may ascend.

Inspire us to believe that the kingdom of righteousness is slowly and surely being established no matter how great the welter of confusion in which we are living and laboring.

Help us to hasten the dawning of that day when out of the world's tragedies and tyrannies there shall emerge a civilization that has in it the Master's spirit of peace and good will.

Grant that we may be supremely confident that we can master those dark moods of cynicism and defeatism, which frequently haunt us, for we have not been created for failure but for victory.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, October 8, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 3306. An act to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 4955. An act to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MORSE, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. JAVITS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7179) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the committee report on the independent offices appropriation bill under consideration today, in commenting on open space land grants, states:

> The National Capital area has already received substantial grants under this program. The committee directs that no part

of the funds provided be used for additional grants in this locality.

This directive, if carried out by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, would discriminate against the Maryland and Virginia suburbs in the National Capital region. The Committee evidently feels that the Washington area has received more than its share of grants. I would like to point out that the report made no mention of the fact that two other metropolian areas in the country have received as much or more funds under the program thus far than the Washington metropolitan area. If the funds under this program are to be apportioned among the various metropolitan areas, standards should be written into the Housing Act for this purpose. It is extremely unfair to single out one of the fastest growing regions in the country, where there is a great need now to preserve open space land, and deny that region the right to participate in a national program because it has the foresight to provide the local funds needed to preserve open spaces. It is a matter of pride to me that Maryland jurisdiction has put up $5,583,097 in local funds to match the 20 to 30 percent Federal grants.

The directive in the committee report could have a detrimental effect on proposed open space projects in the Washington metropolitan area. It is my hope that this discriminatory language will not affect the future of soundly conceived open space projects in this area.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MADAM NHU

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, in reference to Madam Nhu's visit here, I received a letter this morning from a gentleman in New York whom I do not know, but he has a good suggestion and I thought I would pass it on to the House. He says:

> DEAR MR. HAYS: Why not hire one of America's leading comedians like Bob Hope, Jack Parr, or Jack Benny, to mimic Madam Nhu on TV after each of her speeches, when she is back in her hotel where she can watch.
>
> After two or three first-rate humorous ridicules she will blow up in frustration and go home mad. Her promoters—

I think this is the most significant feature—

> Her promoters will go broke and set a good example for future promotors.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 168]

Albert
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Barry
Bass
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bromwell
Broomfield
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Curtin
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derounian
Edmondson
Feighan
Flynt
Ford
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Hardy
Harris
Healey
Henderson
Hoffman
Kelly
Kilburn
Kornegay
Lankford
Lesinski
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Moore
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Patman
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schenck
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sibal
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tuten
Van Pelt
Vinson
Whalley
White
Wright
Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 330 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1964

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, one-half to be consumed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 8747, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee brings to you this morning the independent offices appropriations bill, covering some 25 or 30 independent agencies. The bill has budget estimates totaling in round figures $14.6 billion.

In the subcommittee, as you well know, we are bipartisan and we try to work together, and we do work together. I think we bring you this bill with just about as much unanimity as it is possible to have with seven men. Perhaps we may have minor differences of opinion in one or two places, but we try to work them out and be together. We are all here and we want you to know we are your servants. We work for you. You tell us what to do. Whatever information you want, you are entitled to it. We are here, the seven of us, and we will do our dead level best to give you any information you want, if we possibly can. I want to tell you, of course, that the seven members, each one of them, know just as much as I do about this bill. So none of us has a monopoly in that respect and we do not claim, of course, to have any monopoly.

I do not think there is too much in this bill to give you too much concern. There will be some matters that the House will want to debate, I am sure. There are two big items provided for in this bill. When I say two big items, of course, there are a good many big items but one of the two big items is the Veterans' Administration which in round figures accounts for about $5,500 million in this bill. That is the largest individual item in the bill. The Veterans' Administration appropriations are made up of some 10 or 12 items. Of course, there is not the slightest disposition on either side of the aisle in the committee to do any harm to the veterans. We are all veteran minded. The veterans have sent out a circular letter pointing out there are some cuts in this bill. I am going to analyze that for you. But they are not hurt and we would not hurt them; and it is not our purpose to hurt them. They do not deserve to be hurt. But out of $5,500 million the big cut here is on readjustment benefits of $34,100,000. Do you know in truth and in fact how much that cut is? That figure looks like a big cut, but in truth and in fact it is not even a 1 penny cut. I repeat—on this $34,100,000 as it is shown in this table—it is not even a 1 penny cut. Let me explain that to you. This money goes into a revolving fund to take care of foreclosed mortgages. This is a revolving fund. They sold mortgages and put the proceeds into this fund and, therefore, they do not need this $34 million that the budget estimated. If they needed it, we would have given it to them. They admit that they do not need it so, therefore, it is not even a 1 penny cut.

Then you see here the item for medical care and the table shows that has been cut $12,500,000. This, my colleagues, is the greatest hospital system in the world with 170 hospitals and I say to you, there is not the slightest disposition on the part of this committee to hamper, hamstring, slow down, weaken, or diminish the veterans' hospital program—not the slightest.

Not the slightest, Mr. JENNINGS. That is one of the great veterans I refer to, the able and distinguished gentleman from Virginia. He is one of the outstanding veterans of this country. And he has done a tremendous job and is a friend of the veterans. So is my able and distinguished friend from Texas, Congressman TEAGUE, chairman of the great Veterans' Affairs Committee. He is one of the able and distinguished Members of this House.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course I will yield to my friend.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my good friend makes you feel almost like a sinner to disagree with him, but I do want to tell this House that the staff of my committee and the committee considered the cuts they made, and we do not agree with the statement the chairman is making. Later on we will present those disagreements.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, if you can make a cut out of that revolving fund, you are doing something. If you want to put $100 million more into it, I imagine the committee would go along with you on whatever you want, because it is not any cut and there is not the slightest desire to do so. These foreclosed mortgages must be picked up, and we intend to pick them up.

Now, getting back to the medical program, they are 170 of the finest hospitals in the United States, and we agree with that. Do you know what your hospital bill is this year? In round figures it is $1.1 billion. Do you know how many employees they have in their hospital system? I am just talking about the hospital system. I am not talking about throughout the agency. In the hospital system there are 130,000 employees. Any day of the week or any month of the year they are bound to have several thousand unfilled jobs. The system just has to be that way. Think about it—$1.1 billion, and we are reducing it $12.5 million. Tell me how much of a cut that is, please. We do not want to hurt the program. They can absorb that in 1 day while standing on one foot. But, anyway, regardless of that, it is not hurting.

This great hospital program in the last 5 years has grown from what? Listen to these figures. It has grown from approximately $750 million to $1.1 billion in 5 years, and we have helped it to grow. Does that sound like we are trying to hurt it? Think about those figures. Think about them. In 5 years. And all of that time there has been a bed limitation of 125,000 beds. There was not an increase of a single bed in that time. There has been efficiency and greater use of the existing beds. It has been worth the money. We are not complaining. We have helped them. I do not believe my veteran friends in this House or throughout the United States would say that they could not take that little bitty infinitesimal cut.

Well, I said I was going to talk 5 minutes. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I do hope that our colleagues will sustain our committee. We have done our best for you. We are your servants and whatever you want us to do we are going to do it and do it with a smile.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today the independent offices appropriation bill for the year of 1964. It might well be regarded as one of the largest and most important appropriation bills to come before the House of Representatives. I say this because it provides for some 26 independent agencies of our Federal Government, and it amounts to more than $13 billion.

At the outset I would like to pay a tribute to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I am sure that you are all aware of his long and valued experience and his vast knowledge of these many and varied agencies. He has given our committee outstanding guidance and leadership. He has been fair and understanding, and it has been a privilege for me as well as an honor for me to serve on the committee during these 11 years.

And may I add a word of tribute to my associates on this committee for their diligence and their untiring efforts in the work of this long drawn out appropriation bill. I am referring to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY], and my colleagues on the Republican side, namely: the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN]. Each and every member has devoted painstaking effort to the task, involving months of hearings and, may I add, some 4,000 pages of testimony.

It is unfortunate that we find ourselves considering this bill in mid-October; think of it—mid-October, when the fiscal year for which these funds are intended actually started July 1. In all probability it will be another month at least before this important appropriation measure becomes a law. In the meantime each and every one of these 26 agencies is required to operate on a basis of a similar period of last year. To my mind, may I say to my colleagues of the House of Representatives, it is not good government and lends itself to bad management. What has actually delayed our reporting of this bill is that specific authorizations are required before certain appropriations can be made, and I hope—I repeat I hope, that in the future we will be in a position to coordinate to a greater degree the legislative or authorizing process in a better fashion.

As I indicated earlier, the funds appropriated in this bill for these several agencies amounts to $13,103 million.

Mr. Chairman, it might be of interest to the committee to learn that this represents a reduction of $1,555 million under the budget estimates. In other words, the original budget request amounted to $14,658 million. It was reduced by more than $1,500 million. This, too, represents a 10.6 percent cut which should measurably aid in achieving retrenchment in Government spending and a narrowing of the gap of our huge annual deficits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, time does not permit a detailed discussion of the services, the operations, and the requirements of each of these independent agencies. I am sure it is not necessary to do so. But, in connection with this overall picture one thing stands out, namely, the total number of people on the payroll. In 1963 these same agencies employed or had in being some 296,000 personnel. In this independent offices appropriation bill a request was made for a total of 305,583 people for personal services. Now, in this bill we have approved a total number of personnel of 296,000, which is a reduction of 9,500 in personnel as compared to the original budget request.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether our distinguished chairman mentioned this, but I think it is interesting to note that one of the things which we had to meet in dealing with this appropriation bill was that of certain obligations which have been incurred by the Congress and by the Government since last year. One of these obligations is known as the pay raise or the pay increase for our personnel. That is an obligation that has to be met. However, we have held the line on total overall personnel. We have permitted the increase in dollars to meet, generally speaking, the pay increase which was authorized and required by law.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee referred to the program of the veterans and the picture of the Veterans' Administration. I want to say here and now that as a veteran and as one who holds the services, the care and benefits for our veterans, to be one of outstanding importance and I would not for a moment be a party to injury, impairing or reducing veterans' benefits or veteran care or veteran services one iota. I believe that we have given full consideration to all these matters and have provided, generally speaking, generously in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee might be interested to know that today in the United States we have a total veterans' population of some 22,275,000 veterans. These veterans range in age from 19 to 100 years.

As the chairman of the subcommittee indicated, we have in the Veterans' Administration 170 veterans' hospitals. This represents the largest hospital system in the world. It provides for the operation of some 122,777 beds, with a total authorization of about 125,000 beds.

In that connection, one of the largest of the items in this bill and one of the largest items in the veterans appropriation, of course, is that of compensation and pensions; 4.7 million veterans or their survivors are receiving benefits today. This amounts to about $3.7 billion.

With reference to the two items the chairman of the subcommittee spoke about; mainly, medical care and that of readjustments benefits, I am here to say if we have erred, if there is a need, if there is a justification, certainly we stand ready—or at least I do—to make appropriate adjustments.

There are a number of important agencies in this bill, and as I indicated, time will not permit a detailed discussion of each and every one of them. One of them which, of course, will attract considerable attention, has to do with civil defense.

The committee found it necessary to reduce substantially the total figure of budget requests for civil defense by virtue of certain factors, one being the overall fallout shelter program and you will remember the House just recently passed a bill authorizing the expenditure of some $190 million for the construction of fallout shelters throughout the country, either in public buildings or in nonprofit and other institutions of that kind. Regardless of the merit of this issue or question, it is fair to say that we could not if we desired to do so bring to you an appropriation of funds to provide for the shelter program because the authorization has not as yet been enacted into law. Therefore to include in this bill, the appropriation of these funds is not possible at this time, at least.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire of the gentleman if it would not have been possible to have provided those funds under a parliamentary arrangement, notwithstanding the fact that the authorization bill has not passed the Senate, by placing a contingency limitation on the funds which would have taken effect in the event it did pass the Senate, and I refer to the authorization bill.

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I say to the gentleman that he projects his question on the basis of parliamentary arrangement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. A legislative limitation on the appropriation bill, making it effective in the event that the authorization bill did pass the other body.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In my opinion it would be subject to a point of order and would not be eligible in the way of approportion of funds until a clear-cut authorization has been made. After all is said and done, we do not know yet what that final authorization will be.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, if the other body changed the authorization bill substantially it would naturally go to conference and it could be adjusted in conference. The gentleman knows of my deep interest in the subject of civil defense. In the face of the House of Representatives passing overwhelmingly the authorization bill the other day, I was hopeful some arrangement might be made that it could be implemented at the will of the House.

I hope that the action of the subcommittee was not directed at the merits of the authorization, and I hope that it was based upon the parliamentary situation as they understand it.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I will have to say to the gentleman from California that in my opinion there is some misgiving within the committee as to the wisdom and the need for this program, but in view of the lack of authorization in the first instance the question and the issue does not come to a final point as to the committee's position in this regard. It is always possible through a deficiency appropriation to provide funds if the authorization becomes a law; but so far as this subcommittee is concerned, we are in the first instance not authorized to include the money for fallout shelters even if we wanted to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his generous yielding of time.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Is the gentleman in a position to state with any affirmativeness whether or not the subcommittee intends to take up this appropriation as a supplemental if the authorization passes in the other body?

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio that this particular subcommittee has no jurisdiction over supplemental appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations has a Deficiency Subcommittee which handles such matters, so it would not be within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. As I understand the position of the subcommittee at this point, it is that these shelters are not authorized, therefore they cannot be included.

Mr. OSTERTAG. At least, that is my position.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, there are so many important items and programs embodied in this independent offices bill that it is rather difficult to know where to start.

For example, included in this bill we have a large Agency known as the Federal Aviation Agency. The Federal Aviation Agency has grown. It has taken on tremendous operations and services. But, I think it is worthy to note that we have included in this bill an item in the appropriation for the Federal Aviation Agency in the amount of $60 million for the development of a supersonic air transport plane. This matter is one looking to the future. While this $60 million is a sizable sum, I want you to know that it is only a drop in the bucket, it is only the beginning of the amounts that will eventually be required in the end for the development of a supersonic air transport plane. The jurisdiction has been determined by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to rest in the hands of the Federal Aviation Agency. The Federal Aviation Agency under its basic act has the authority to embark on such a development. But I should like to call your attention to the fact that we have a unique situation in this development in that it is bigger than private enterprise and private industry, it is one that requires joint effort, joint operation, and joint development if we in the United States are to move forward in the development of such a supersonic air transport plane.

I should like to call to your attention the fact that along with another member of our committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] together with three members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I joined with the Federal Aviation Agency in a conference with the British and the French who have joined hands in an international agreement for the development of a supersonic air transport plane. They are going forward with a similar development under an international agreement. The British are developing the engines and the French are developing the air frames. They not only are putting in Government money, but there you have a unique situation where the Government controls and owns the industry itself. Now if we move ahead with this program, at least it seems to me, it is going to be vital that industry itself plays an important role and contributes to this development and in the end industry and commercial airlines will through royalties return a certain amount of the investment to the Government so that in the end we will have a better and a faster plane than that developed by the British and the French. I might say to you that this is a matter of international competition and trade. Already certain airlines in America are making contracts with the British and with the French. So you can readily see it is vital that we at least give full consideration to this matter and for that reason we of the committee have approved the inclusion of $60 million for the development of the supersonic air transport.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. But at this time there is no agreement by the aircraft industry of this country to make any contribution toward the development of this plane; is that not true?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, I have no definite knowledge of any such agreement but I think the answer to that is that plans with regard to the first phase are under way with a view of such an arrangement.

Mr. GROSS. I think your hearings show it is your hope and only the hope of the members of the subcommittee in dealing with this subject that the aircraft industry of this country will make a contribution of at least 25 percent, but as of this day and hour, apparently, there is no agreement on the part of the industry to make any contribution at all to the development of a supersonic transport plane.

Mr. OSTERTAG. We must, of course, bear in mind that this development is bigger than any single aircraft industry or any group of aircraft industries in America. Therefore, it is essential, and I agree with the gentleman, that if we fail to enter into such an arrangement or plan and if it does not go forward on that basis, then it should not be done.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further in connection with the matter concerning the Federal Aviation Agency, I am disturbed to see that the

Federal Aviation Agency has more than 300 employees overseas. Is this now the beginning of a buildup of an FAA employment empire overseas? What in the world do we have 330 and-some-odd employees overseas for that Agency?

Mr. OSTERTAG. May I say to the gentleman, it is disturbing that the growth and the requirements of the Federal Aviation Agency have developed to this extent, but their responsibilities are now extended by virture of their jurisdiction over navigation and air traffic controls which apply not only here in the continental United States but on the high seas and includes military aspects as well.

Mr. GROSS. Do not the British regulate their air commerce and do not the French and all the rest of them regulate their air commerce? Do they not have inspectors and would they permit us to fly unsafe planes or violate the air commerce laws of their countries? Do they have people in this country inspecting their planes here as we have overseas?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I think, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa, that a part of the problem of the Federal Aviation Agency stems not from the question of invading the jurisdiction of other countries but primarily our own operations in those countries, particularly military.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It seems to me we should give further considerations to what action the House has taken with respect to the appropriation bills. The House has accepted its constitutional authority with reference to the budgets. We were determined that there were going to be some cuts made. I want to congratulate this Subcommittee on Appropriations for having made some real cuts. As the distinguished chairman of the committee has said, nobody has been hurt. Maybe additional cuts can be made. However, I think the House and the Nation should know that the House has really been doing its homework on the bills this year. Up to date we have reduced the budget submission by $3.378 billion. If we sustain this bill, we will cut it an additional $1.555 billion or a total of $4.933 billion. If my anticipation and forecast is anywhere near right, and I hope it is, I would anticipate that we would have additional cuts and that by the time this House adjourns, if it ever does, we will probably reduce this budget somewhere between $7 billion and $7.2 billion. However, I do think both sides of the aisle that have worked on this are entitled to have this fact known, because they have done a good job. It has been a bipartisan effort to reduce the budget. We had hoped for larger cuts in the direction of a $10 billion target. I still think, though, that it has not been brought out adequately to the House and to the Nation that we do have an anticipated reduction of about $7.2 billion in the total budget submitted to the House this year.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I appreciate the comments and observations on the part of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I, too, want to compliment my colleague from New York for the very fine statement he has made. Also, I wish to compliment my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas]. However, you made an observation before and I am in accord with that observation, about the fact that the Committee on Appropriations could not bring this bill before the Congress until mid-October because the authorization bill did not come to it in sufficient time. I agree with this, but I think that the people ought to know that here we are in the middle of October when these bills should be acted upon before June 30. The majority party is in complete control of these matters, and I would like to find out why they have held up all of these authorization bills and have not brought them before this House prior to the end of the fiscal year, June 30, the start of the new fiscal year. Has the gentleman any information as to why?

Mr. OSTERTAG. No. The gentleman from New York has no information as to why. Earlier in my remarks I referred to the same point and on the same subject. I pointed out it was unfortunate that we are so late with appropriation bills, due to the fact that certain authorizations have been lacking, which makes it impossible for us to act. Just a moment ago we were discussing the civil defense. The civil defense bill has not been authorized and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization was just recently adopted. To my way of thinking, it is bad government and is a lousy way to run a railroad.

Mr. BECKER. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman that to operate this way, almost 4 months behind the start of the fiscal year, is irresponsible. We are now only getting to authorize expenses for this 1963–64 fiscal year, as well as the appropriations. I think it is a lack of responsibility on the part of the majority party in control.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to devote some time to the most questionable and controversial and the largest item in this bill, namely, the appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In view of the time that I have consumed but yet bearing in mind that perhaps one of the most important things I might well have discussed is that of the space program and the space funds and recent events, I shall attempt to do so under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the able and distinguished gentleman from Missouri, our boss of the full committee [Mr. Cannon].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this bill was unanimously reported by the subcommittee to the full committee and is now reported by the full committee to the House. And I am supporting it in every particular.

That does not mean, of course, that I approve every item in it. We all know by long experience that any bill, especially a bill so diverse and comprehensive as this bill, will contain matters on which we cannot all reach complete agreement. But in order to secure a bill we take the bitter with the sweet, and so I am supporting some of its provisions with more emphasis than others.

I especially support two notable cuts the committee made in the bill; the cut in the money for the trip to the moon, and the cut in the money provided for shelters.

NASA's budget request of $5,700 million to the legislative committee this year exceeded by over $1 billion the total Federal budget for 1933 and exceeds by $500 million the total receipts by our Government in 1940.

The authorization was cut to $5,350 million and the Committee on Appropriations further cut it to $5,100 million.

We are told that the trip to the moon is expected to cost between $20 and $40 billion. We all know, by long and unhappy experience in estimating appropriations that it is always the largest figure that prevails. So we enter on this collossal project realizing that we will be fortunate if we are able to keep the cost down to a minimum of $40 billion. But we have in this bill cut it down to $5,100 million for the present.

I was amused and surprised to hear the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] say just now that these cuts do not mean anything. Yet in the committee he violently opposed every motion to cut it down and quoted Mr. Webb as saying that if we cut it down to $5,100 million, which we did, it would force a delay of 2 or 3 years in Apollo's program and cost an extra $2 billion to $3 billion.

Now he says it is wholly inconsequential.

Let us consider for a moment what these vast sums mean in terms of service to the people of the United States.

Even $20 billion would wipe out all the slums in every major city in the United States. It could put millions of boys and girls through college. With $40 billion we could build a schoolhouse in every community. We could give a $4,500 residence, or make a contribution of $4,500, on any residence, for every family in the United States. We could forever eliminate every communicable child disease throughout the Nation. We could not only provide jobs for everybody but better jobs. We could endow free hospitals and old folks homes for everybody with $40 billion. Yet they want to spend it on a trip to the moon.

Mr. Chairman, if there were any prospects of achieving anything of real scientific or military value the proposition might be open to consideration but the most eminent authorities, not connected with the various projects, tell us that even if we suceed in putting a man on the moon, which is doubtful, or of bringing him back again which is even more doubtful, nothing of value would be added to human knowledge that can not be obtained by robot "packages" of instruments. And instruments are more accurate than human faculties.

Former President Eisenhower, who commanded the Allied armies said "To spend $40 billion to reach the moon is just nuts."

Dr. Abelson, the first U.S. scientist to split the uranium atom, said, "There are no objects of economic value to be brought back from the moon."

Dr. Vannevar Bush, more responsible than any other one man for the production of the atomic bomb that ended World War II, said the program for a manned moon shot is "unsound and economically unfeasible."

There is no air on the moon. There is no water on the moon. There are appalling radioactive potentialities. The heat in the day is hundreds of degrees above ignition and the cold of the nights is hundreds of degrees below freezing. There are other hazards too numerous to be cataloged.

The appropriation reported out by the committee has been provided largely because of commitments. It is impossible to escape the conviction that the project must eventually be abandoned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 5 additional minutes. We have exactly 5 minutes left and we yield it to our distinguished chairman, with pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. I much appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Texas, and in view of that fact I shall desist from further reflections on his favorite subject, the trip to the moon.

Let us now take up the building of shelters to which we may retire in safety and comfort after the enemy has driven through our military defenses and is subjugating the civilian population to fallout and destructive byproducts attending nuclear warfare.

When this question of shelters first came before us, it was one of the most absurb propositions ever submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. Some 10 years ago, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and I conferred about it and canvassed our committee and cut it down to the barest minimum. As originally submitted it provided for a fire engine in every community and a Federal constructed shelter for every city in the United States. I received a bushel basket of telegrams from mayors of cities asking, "Where is our fire engine?" It would have been a physical impossibility to manufacture enough fire engines to comply with the proposed program. I received as many telegrams saying, "Where is our shelter? We need it to park cars in."

For approximately a decade we cut these estimates to the bone. Only a bare skeleton was left from year to year during periods when war seemed imminent. But recently men have been running around over the country trying to scare people to death and to convince them that survival depended on building shelters. When alarmed people write to me asking advice on the subject I remind them that of all the Members of Congress, both House and Senate, not one has ever constructed a shelter for himself and his family.

Mr. Chairman, history repeats itself. The original confidence man traveled over the country selling lightning rods and there was hardly a country house that did not blossom out in lightning rods negotiated by the clever lightning rod agents. When that enterprise was finally exhausted the fast-talking agent switched to termite exterminator. With an impressive vehicle loaded with paraphernalia he would drive up and ask to look at the underpinning of the house. He would come out with a sample of alarming termite infestation and for a generous fee would make a thorough campaign of extermination which would insure the dwelling against collapse for all time to come. Now the lightning rod agent and the termite exterminator are ready to contract for a fallout shelter constructed according to "Government specifications" that will save the entire family from the effects of any domestic or foreign bombardment. They have an economy model which they will construct for as little as $150. But none of these shelters will ever be needed.

They will never be needed because there will never be another world war. With modern weapons an international war amounts to international suicide. Most of the people would die and all cities would disintegrate within 3 days after hostilities started.

In the meantime the nations of the world have entered into treaties to discontinue air testing of nuclear reagents.

Modern nuclear bombs incinerate in white heat everything within 50 miles. They exhaust all oxygen. Survival in any shelter that could be constructed is hopeless. It would merely prolong for a few agonizing minutes, those who took shelter in them.

For these reasons the committee has cut $259.1 million from the funds asked for fallout shelters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Missouri desire some more time?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it would be an imposition for me to take more time in the presence of this vast and enthusiastic audience.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest, as always, to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Words of wisdom are always welcome in this Chamber, and we can all profit by the advice the gentleman from Missouri gives from time to time.

It is difficult to decide what items to talk about in a bill which involves $13 billion. I dislike to repeat arguments that have been made by those who have preceded me in the debate, therefore I shall just pick out for discussion one or two of the not insignificant programs involved in this bill.

For example, there is a little item of traveling and printing that has not been mentioned. Our committee has been concerned for years about the growing tendency on the part of Government agencies to send their employees all over the world in airplanes and so forth. In our judgment much of this business could be handled by the use of a stenographer and typewriter, or by the use of the telephone.

We have also been concerned by the growth in the dissemination of propaganda and written material that floods our offices from day to day. I am sure every wastebasket on Capitol Hill is filled to overflowing every day with printed material that comes from various Government agencies. So we made an effort to curtail these activities by the 26 agencies over whom we have jurisdiction.

I think the committee today might be interested to know that these 26 agencies sought to spend on travel—and this does not include selectee travel under the Selective Service System—during the current fiscal year $71,500,000. This was an increase of about $8 million over the amount they spent for travel last year. But the committee reduced the request by $9,800,000, or to $61,867,000, which is more than $1 million less than they used for travel last year. I think we perhaps could justify a deeper cut but we did not want to cripple these agencies. We know that a reasonable amount of travel is necessary. We made these cuts after carefully considering the individual requests and after discussing them with the agency heads and witnesses and after urging upon them the importance of curtailing all of the unnecessary travel that is engaged in by Government employees over the course of the year.

With respect to the printing part of the bill, we made a 15 percent cut in printing throughout the bill. That was an arbitrary cut, but we think it is time to begin cutting down on the disposition on the part of these Government agencies to print too much material.

Another item I wish to mention, and which I think is worthy of discussion, was mentioned by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG]. I should like to advert to it also. That is the question of the jobs that are included in this bill. We have all been concerned, I know, with the tremendous increase in Federal employment and in the cost of services performed by these employees. I have with me the report of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which was issued August 30, 1963, the chairman of which committee is the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, Senator BYRD. He reported in that statement that civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government reached an all-time high in fiscal 1963, and that average employment over the period he mentioned was the highest since 1954, when we were coming out of the Korean war.

That report showed a payroll cost in 1963 of $15,346 million, plus, I might add, $334 million in pay for foreign nationals who work for the U.S. Government abroad but whose names do not appear on any regular payroll.

I have prepared some tables which I will include under the authority given me to revise and extend my remarks which will show the constantly increasing payroll costs during the last 10 years and which show that they have gone up from about $9 billion in 1954 to $15 billion in 1963.

(The table is as follows:)

1954	$9,453,000,000
1955	9,621,000,000
1956	10,526,000,000
1957	11,000,000,000
1958	11,455,000,000
1959	12,330,000,000
1960	12,637,000,000
1961	13,648,000,000
1962	14,296,000,000
1963	15,346,000,000

NOTE.—The foregoing costs exclude U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on regular payrolls.

Mr. JONAS. I will include another table which shows the growth of civilian employment by the Federal Government during the decade, just ended. It shows that such employment today, at the end of the fiscal year 1963, was approximately 2,500,000.

(The table is as follows:)

1954	2,436,164
1955	2,367,290
1956	2,364,042
1957	2,394,099
1958	2,347,344
1959	2,352,242
1960	2,386,345
1961	2,372,445
1962	2,443,808
1963	2,493,374

NOTE.—The foregoing figures exclude foreign nationals not on regular payrolls and they averaged 168,281 during fiscal year 1963.

Mr. JONAS. As I said, the above table shows that civilian employment by the Federal Government at the end of the fiscal year 1963 was approximately 2,500,000. But, actually, if you include the 168,000 foreign nationals employed by the Federal Government, the figure goes above 2,500,000 or to 2,661,655.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The testimony before your committee shows that as of November 30, 1962, there were 2,516,000 Federal employees, and the testimony of Mr. Macy, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, shows that by the end of the next fiscal year, June 30, 1964, it is expected there will be 2,571,000 employees on the payroll.

Mr. JONAS. The figure quoted from the report of the joint committee upon which my table is based is the average for the year. You can take any given point in the year, or the end of any month, or the end of the year and the number will vary, as the gentleman well knows, due to attrition and other things. But I have just said that if you add the foreign nationals employed by the Federal Government to the average number of employees on the rolls in 1963, the figure will exceed 2½ million—actually the number is 2,661,655.

Mr. GROSS. It will exceed the figure even without the foreign nationals being added.

Mr. JONAS. I am giving you the 1963 figures cited to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures and the figures show that in 1963 the average number of employees, excluding foreign nationals, was 2,493,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I think this would be an excellent place to point out to the few Members of the House who are present at this time, and to state for the RECORD, that the Federal employees retirement fund is now $38 billion in the red.

Mr. JONAS. And I may add that it is going up every year.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question on this point?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] reported that for the 26 agencies, the total employment was at the level of 296,000 under the committee bill whereas the budget had asked for something like 305,000.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. MEADER. Can the gentleman tell me how much this figure of 296,000 is an increase over the past fiscal year for these 26 agencies?

Mr. JONAS. The 296,391 was the figure for 1963. We did not go back beyond that in preparing our table. We have the figures and I can give them to the gentleman for 1963, the budget request for 1964, and what the committee did with respect to 1964. May I say, the committee was well aware of this increase in employment and this increase in the cost of services, and we undertook to do something about it in this bill. I think we made a substantial contribution to economy and the fact is that last year, the appropriation in this bill for the 26 agencies supported 296,000 employees. They came in this year and requested 305,000 employees, which was an increase of 9,500 employees for just these 26 agencies. We reduced that by 9,501 and there are less than 50 new employees provided for in this bill—43 is the exact number as I recall it.

I would like to say something else for the RECORD. You may think this is an insignificant thing, talking about an increase of 9,000 employees. The records will show that the increase from 1961 to 1963 amounts to 120,929 employees. The average salary for Federal employees today is about $5,700 a year and that does not include the pay increases granted last year. Just multiply 120,929 by $5,700 and you come in with the astronomical figure of $689 million which has been added to the annual payroll costs of the Government solely by reason of adding the 120,000 new employees.

Bear in mind this is a recurring expense. It is not a one-shot proposition. And bear in mind also that it does not involve or include the Government's share of pensions, hospitalization, insurance, and all of the other fringe benefits that are involved. So when you talk in terms of adding 100,000 employees, you are talking about half a billion dollars a year in salary payments alone.

We have made cuts in almost every agency, and while the bill as reported actually is somewhat higher than the totals for last year, all of that increase occurs in the item for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. With respect to that item we also made substantial cuts.

I would like to make one comment for the RECORD about the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. We handle not only the appropriation for NASA but for the National Science Foundation. We have handled that appropriation since the Foundation was created. You will read in the papers, as I have over the last weekend, about how this committee has virtually destroyed the National Science Foundation. Let me just give you the figures. In 1954 the total amount appropriated for the National Science Foundation was $8 million. Last year we appropriated $322 million. This year they came in with a request for $589 million.

I am very glad that the House acted a few weeks ago in creating a special committee to look into the subject of research. We are engaged in research all over the lot, and no one single committee of the House can actually police it. It takes a committee that has jurisdiction over the entire gamut of Government operations really to find out what we are doing in research. I am not opposed to scientific research and I have supported, as has our committee, the rather rapid growth of the National Science Foundation. However, NASA is in the act in a big way. I have with me this morning a copy of one of the news releases, printed matter, distributed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration office containing the text of an address delivered by Administrator Webb on October 4, 1963, before the American Council on Education. On page 4 he proclaims the fact that the NASA charter or the act creating it does not give the organization any authority to sponsor basic research except as it is related to NASA's specific mission.

May I read a few quotations from this speech because they will indicate how far NASA has gotten into this business of supporting research and scientific endeavor, which is the direct responsibility of the National Science Foundation. I am now quoting from the speech:

> The very fact that so much of NASA's basic research is performed in universities indirectly stimulates doctoral and postdoctoral instruction. But NASA has gone beyond this to sponsor a predoctoral training program with the ultimate objective of assisting in the production of 1,000 Ph. D.'s a year.

I certainly do not object to the production of 1,000 Ph. D.'s a year, but I thought that was the direct responsibility of the National Science Foundation. That illustrates the overlapping there is in this field of research and demonstrates the need of a committee charged with the jurisdiction of trying to find out what the facts are and to do some policing. Mr. Webb stated further:

> NASA is now supporting research at every one of the 20 first-rank schools already cited—but also at about 80 others.

So here you have NASA supporting research at 100 educational institutions in the United States. I do not attack that program. I merely say there is a question of overlapping jurisdiction, overlapping effort, and overlapping programs and that some clear-cut policing of this entire research program in which the Government is engaged is very much in order.

In conclusion, may I call the attention of members of the committee to an item in which I have always taken a special interest. I refer to the operation of motor pools by GSA. Since I was the author of the legislation authorizing General Services Administration to establish motor pools, I am always interested in progress reports on how that program is doing and particularly how much money is being saved by use of the motor pools.

The committee was told by General Services Administration that 66 motor pools are now in operation around the country and that annual savings are running now almost $10 million. The actual savings for fiscal year 1963 were listed as $9,459,519. A detailed breakdown appears on pages 1464–1468 of part I of the hearings.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. Evins], a member of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is one of the biggest and certainly one of the most important of the annual appropriation bills considered by the Congress.

This bill provides funds for the many services, programs and activities of some 26 agencies of the Federal Government—agencies which in one way or another affect the lives of all the citizens of our great Nation.

Our Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations held extensive hearings on this bill, hearings that took more than 4 months. The members have taken additional time to study the voluminous testimony—to evaluate it and to consider in great detail the fund needs of the several agencies provided for in this bill.

There are three volumes of hearings. We heard some 450 witnesses. The hearings comprise more than 4,000 pages of testimony.

The total budget estimates for 1964 for all programs of these agencies were between $14 and $15 billion.

The total appropriations recommended in this bill is $13,102,818,700. Our committee has cut these estimates by $1,555,769,300 from the original budget proposals.

We have thus reduced this bill by more than $1½ billion—an overall reduction of 10.6 percent from the amount budgeted. This is a cut above the average cuts in appropriation bills.

The following table which I am including with my remarks, summarizes the budget estimates and appropriation recommendations for each agency in the bill.

Agency or item	Budget estimates, 1964	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with budget estimates
National Aeronautics and Space Council	$525,000	$525,000	------------
Office of Emergency Planning	17,950,000	10,735,000	−$7,215,000
Office of Science and Technology	1,025,000	780,000	−245,000
Disaster relief	20,000,000	20,000,000	------------
Civil Defense (DOD)	346,900,000	87,800,000	−259,100,000
Civil Defense (HEW)	41,361,000	25,000,000	−16,361,000
Civil Aeronautics Board	94,575,000	85,115,000	−9,460,000
Civil Service Commission	111,128,000	110,380,000	−748,000
Federal Aviation Agency	815,100,000	750,610,000	−64,490,000
Federal Communications Commission	16,500,000	15,800,000	−700,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	[1] (15,404,000)	[1] (15,230,000)	[1] (−174,000)
Federal Power Commission	12,675,000	11,850,000	−825,000
Federal Trade Commission	13,028,000	12,100,000	−928,000
General Accounting Office	46,850,000	45,700,000	−1,150,000
General Services Administration	658,106,000	604,539,300	−53,566,700
Housing and Home Finance Agency	430,260,000	235,062,400	−195,197,600
Federal National Mortgage Association	[1] (9,125,000)	[1] (8,750,000)	[1] (−375,000)
Federal Housing Administration	[1] (88,050,000)	[1] (85,265,000)	[1] (−2,785,000)
Public Housing Administration	221,150,000	212,484,000	−8,666,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	25,450,000	24,500,000	−950,300
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,712,000,000	5,100,000,000	−612,000,000
National Capital Housing Authority	43,000	43,000	------------
National Science Foundation	589,000,000	323,200,000	−265,800,000
Renegotiation Board	2,650,000	2,550,000	−100,000
Securities and Exchange Commission	14,400,000	13,775,000	−625,000
Selective Service System	38,140,000	37,840,000	−300,000
Veterans' Administration	5,429,772,000	5,372,430,000	−57,342,000
Total	14,658,588,000	13,102,818,700	−1,555,769,300

[1] Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses.

As this table shows, our committee has made savings of more than $1½ billion.

Our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cannon], has set a goal for our committee a cut and reduction of the President's budget of some $5 billion—and providing the taxpayers with these savings.

The action which our committee has taken on this bill of cutting more than $1½ billion represents a major achievement toward this goal and objective.

The major cuts and reductions have been made in several areas, including $275,461,000 for a proposed giant program of fallout shelters by the Civil Defense Agency.

We have made a cut and reduction of $64,490,000 in the budget request for the Federal Aviation Agency. This agency has been growing enormously in the last few years, and our committee felt it was time for a leveling off in operations and a time for economies.

Some $7 million reductions have been made in the funding requests for modernization of FAA facilities and $17 million for research activities—a cut and reduction of $24 million in this area.

Our committee has made a substantial cut in the budget of the General Services Administration—a cut of $53,566,700.

In connection with the Federal building construction program of this agency, we have provided funds for 27 new public buildings and 6 major renovations of existing Federal buildings.

We have cut $1,100,000 from GSA's budget for acquisition of sites and expenses for planning other buildings. We have cut $13 million for new projects in the District of Columbia. We have denied all funding for new projects in the District.

U.S. COURT FACILITIES

Expenses for U.S. court facilities have been reduced by more than $550,000 and other services and activities of the GSA have been curtailed, thus reducing by $53,566,000 the budgeted requests for the General Services Administration.

NASA AND NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

As indicated earlier, our committee has cut and reduced NASA's budget by $612 million from the President's budget. A $265,800,000 cut has been made in the various programs of the National Science Foundation.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, our committee has made cuts and reductions totaling $1,555,769,300 or a reduction of more than $1½ billion in savings—effected by the actions of our committee.

We feel that these reductions are indeed substantial and that the action of the committee should be sustained.

Among the important agencies for which funds are carried in this bill include:

The General Services Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Veterans' Administration, among others.

Determining the budget and fund needs of these agencies has necessitated a great amount of work in order that your subcommittee could make recommendations to the House.

Much of the credit for the work on this bill is due to the genial gentleman from Texas, our able chairman, Albert Thomas, for the manner in which he has conducted these hearings and for his great work on this bill.

The gentleman from Texas, Albert Thomas, knows the workings of these important Government agencies perhaps better than any single man in this House. His vast storehouse of information is unequalled.

While dealing with the various agencies considered in this bill, Al Thomas often demonstrated that he knew more about the workings, the activities and the budgetary needs of the various agencies than many of the agency's heads themselves.

Albert has a tremendously keen mind, a great insight and a great capacity for dealing firmly and wisely with those appearing before his committee. He is truly an outstanding chairman and it has been a pleasure to work with him on his committee.

There have been some rumors that he is considering retiring after this session of the Congress but this must not occur. We do not want this to happen. The country and his constituents could ill afford to lose such a valuable Congressman, and I want to say to you, AL, that we are expecting you to continue to serve on this committee and in the Congress for many, many years to come.

I want to commend also the other members of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY], and the Republican members of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] ranking minority member, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

It has been a pleasure to work with and be associated with all of them.

This bill, as it comes to you today, represents the best efforts of our subcommittee to insure that these important agencies have sufficient funds to discharge properly their functions and duties but without waste and extravagance.

It is the subcommittee's responsibility, to balance the agencies' requests and needs and to take into consideration not only their fund requirements but also to look at the larger picture and to attempt to balance and allocate available resources in the best manner possible. This we have tried to do in the public interest.

GENERAL IMPROVEMENT

Mr. Chairman, it is in order to note that our independent agencies, as a whole, have shown a general improvement in their operations. We noted some improvement last year and I am pleased to say that this improvement, for the most part, has execeeded that improvement we observed last year.

We have found that the heads of the respective agencies have been diligent in the discharging of their duties and responsibilities.

It is well to remember that these agencies—especially the regulatory commissions—are not agencies of the executive branch but are in a real sense arms of the Congress.

The Congress established them in the first place. They are deputies of the Congress—to administer the laws passed by Congress in the public interest. It is true that there has been a tendency to stray away from their basic ties with the Congress—and in some instances to disregard the fundamental purpose for which they were created by the Congress.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Federal Communications Commission is one of our very important independent agencies and one whose responsibility extends quite obviously to every American who listens to radio or views television.

The great demand for radio and television licenses, plus the limited available frequencies and channels has added to the problems of this Commission. In addition they are confronted with a multitude of ever-increasing technical problems. The successful launching last year of the Telstar satellite, with its potential use in transoceanic radio and television broadcast, poses new problems upon the Federal Communications Commission.

The new and able Chairman of this Commission, E. William Henry, has indicated that he will strive for further improvements in this agency in the communications field in the public interest.

The FCC has encouraged the operations of educational television stations in the ultrahigh frequency range and also is instrumental in encouraging commercial broadcasters to use the UHF channels and has recommended legislation which the Congress recently passed requiring future television set manufacturers to construct receivers that are capable of receiving UHF transmissions.

The budget request for FCC calls for $16,500,000, an increase of $849,450 over the appropriations for 1963. Our committee has cut the Commission's request by only $700,000 as we believe it has a very vital and important public service to render at this time.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Federal Trade Commission has a most important responsibility of assuring fair competition among American business enterprises and of preventing the free enterprise system from being stifled or hampered by monopoly or by unfair or deceptive trade practices. This responsibility to keep competition both free and fair must be carried out by the Commission.

Your committee recommends $12,100,000 in appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission for next year. This is an increase of $627,500 over the amount appropriated for the Federal Trade Commission last year. It is hoped this sum will enable the Commission to continue the excellent work it is presently doing.

Chairman Paul Rand Dixon has demonstrated determination to make this Commission a truly important regulatory agency and have it function as intended by Congress.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The Federal Power Commission administers the Federal Power Act, the Natural Gas Act, and has additional duties under other acts relating to Federal power developments.

Our committee recommends an appropriation to this Commission of $11,850,000 which is an increase of $770,000 over last year and a decrease of $825,000 over the amount requested.

The number of cases and the regulation of rates to be charged for natural gas to the public has continued to mount with this Commission and its workload continues to increase.

Funds contained in this appropriation bill for this agency will help to finance the regulation of the natural gas industry.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The National Science Foundation is charged with the duty of fostering increased interest in science—in promoting the overall advancement of science and raising the general level of scientific knowledge for our country.

The Foundation provides support for basic scientific research across the full spectrum of the science fields—the physical, the life and the social sciences, primarily through grants to colleges and universities.

The Foundation also assists colleges and universities in developing and balancing their programs of research and education in the sciences through grants to the institutions. It also supports through college seminars, special summer courses for students and teachers, and other scientific training programs in mathematics, engineering and basic and applied science.

The budget for this Agency has been growing and we are concerned at the rapid rise in costs for Government research.

Because of these rapid increases, our committee has not approved any of the new programs proposed for 1964. We have provided for cost of the Pay Act increases. For 1964, we have recommended $323,200,000—which is $265,800,000 below the amount requested.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The Federal Aviation Agency is charged with the responsibility of fostering, promoting, and the development of aviation, the management of airspace, the promotion of safety and safety standards, and the regulation of civilian and military aircraft.

The heavy requirements levied on the Federal Aviation Agency, due largely to the phenomenal expanse of civil and military jet operations, has caused this Agency, which only a few years ago was a division of the Commerce Department, to grow until it is now the eighth largest independent Agency of our Government. It has indeed had a rapid rate of growth and progress.

The genial and able FAA Administrator, N. E. "Jeeb" Halaby has made important contributions to improving the overall operation of this Agency. His assignment is a difficult one due to the many new problems created by the jet age and by the increasing complexity of air travel, air control, and airspace regulation.

The total appropriation request for FAA for this year is $815,100,000. The committee has reduced the amount by $64,490,000. We are recommending that $750,610,000 be appropriated.

The requests for assistance to airports is far greater than the funds available. The Administrator has advised that the FAA's current national airport plan calls for establishing or providing assistance for the improvement of some 3,386 airports during the next 5 years. However, the committee is only providing $20 million in this bill to cover the liquidation of existing contracts with municipalities for airport construction under the Federal Airport Act.

The committee is unable to make further appropriations for additional airports until additional authorization has been provided by the Congress for this purpose.

One of the important functions of the FAA is the operation of the Washington National Airport and Dulles International Airport.

During last year, the FAA opened and dedicated Dulles International Airport—a magnificent international showpiece and airport facility.

Some $3,500,000 will go toward the operation of the Washington National Airport and some $3,810,000 will go for the operation of Dulles Airport during the fiscal year.

There exists great interest—both pro and con—in the development of a supersonic transport in the United States with assistance from the Government.

The FAA has been taking the lead in this new advance in aviation progress. Last year the Congress appropriated $20 million for research in this Mach III airliner.

This year we are recommending $60 million for the design phase of the supersonic transport—to be the biggest and fastest airplane ever designed and built.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Civil Aeronautics Board is charged with the economic regulation and promotion of air transportation and the investigation of civil aircraft accidents in the promotion of air safety. This year the CAB is celebrating its 25th anniversary. The Agency has tremendous responsibilities and is doing a commendable job.

Our committee has approved the necessary funds for the effective operation of this agency and has cut and reduced substantially the funds for subsidy payments to air carriers—liquidation of contract authorization. We have approved $75 million of the $83,757,000 requested for this purpose and cut this subsidy item by $8,775,000.

As the committee report indicates, we are recommending further reductions in these costs, consistent with good management and safety.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

For the National Aeronautics and Space Administration this bill provides funds in the amount of $5,100 million for the various programs of our national space agency. The space program under the direction of Administrator James E. Webb is one of the most exciting and most dramatic programs of the Federal Government. It has thus far served the Nation and the free world well.

The space agency has lead our country in bold progress in space exploration during the past 5 years and even more dramatic adventures and explorations are scheduled for next year and the years to come.

We have seen the successful completion of Project Mercury with the 22 orbital mission of Major Gordon Cooper as the final phase of the Mercury program.

We are now looking forward to more advanced manned space explorations such as the Gemini program which will take two men into orbit, and the Apollo program designed to land a man on the moon with a safe return to earth.

In the Mercury program, every American astronaut launched into space has been returned to earth in excellent condition without injury or any physical harm. This is a great testimony to the U.S. space program and to the officials who direct our program.

The total U.S. space effort is not told in the manned space exploration alone. We have excelled in other space activities. We are very definitely the leader in the field of communications satellites, in the field of weather satellites, and other space fields. The Telstar communication satellite continued to function during the year and transmitted important television programs across the Atlantic Ocean. This represents a great breakthrough—and is a monumental achievement in communications technology in the American space effort.

We have thus made great progress and have achieved great momentum in space.

The funds which we are recommending in this bill provide the means to keep our space program on a sound basis. Certainly, a "haste makes waste" crash program is not wise and we are not engaging in a crash program. The committee is funding an orderly program. We have provided the necessary funds to keep the Apollo program on schedule—to send a man to the moon within this decade.

We have not upset the planned time schedule—we are not proposing a stretchout or slowdown because we are convinced that a delayed program will cost more money in the long run.

Testimony received by our committee has established that a "slowdown" or a "stretchout" of the space effort will mean an increased cost of from $2 to $3 billion—or about $1 billion a year due to the overhead and stretchout of work schedules and contracts.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat that the space budget has been cut and reduced by five separate actions since the first of this year.

The original amount requested of the Bureau of the Budget by NASA was $6.2 billion. The Bureau of the Budget cut NASA's budget estimates by $500 million.

There was carried in the President's recommendation to the Congress a funding request of $5.7 billion for this program for the next year.

The House authorizing committee, after extensive and thorough hearings, reduced this amount by an additional $500 million, and the House passed the authorizing bill which was set at a level of $5,213,719,400—or $5.2 billion.

The Senate restored a part of this cut to a total authorization of $5,511,520,400—or $5.5 billion.

The conference committee on the authorizing legislation reduced this amount by an additional $250 million, making the total $5,350,820,400—$5.350. This compromise figure of $5.350 billion represents a substantial reduction from the original proposal of $6.2 billion—a reduction of $850 million or nearly a billion dollars has thus been cut from the original amounts estimated to be needed for this program for next year.

The Appropriations Committee has further cut these estimates by $612 million from the level planned. Our committee is thus recommending an appropriation of $5.1 billion, which is a figure below the budget request and below the House legislative committee and below the Senate legislative committee and below the conference committee.

We have in fact reduced and cut the original estimates by $1,100 million. There are those who feel—sincerely no doubt—that further cuts should be made. However, a compromise must be reached—and with a cut and reduction of more than a billion dollars, I feel that we should stand by the action of the committee and support the committee.

To further reduce the program would result in a loss of momentum. A stretchout and slowdown would mean a $3 billion increase in costs in the long run.

By standing by the committee we can thus effect a substantial savings of money in the long run.

Let me make a few observations regarding the position of those who would slow down, stretch out, and cripple the space program.

In the first place, the Congress in passing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Act has declared as a national policy that our country shall go forward with the exploration of outer space. This policy has been set—this decision has been made. It is a decision for the peaceful exploration of space—not a military or war policy.

Certainly the Department of Defense and the Air Force will receive the benefits of all the knowledge gained from the exploration of space—all the scientific information obtained from the research and development—so both directly and indirectly our Defense Department and the Air Force will materially benefit from the peaceful exploration of space.

A large part of the work NASA is doing of necessity has to be done to develop the military capacity.

There are those who insist that our space program should be a joint effort between NASA—the civilian agency and the Department of Defense.

This may well be a desirable goal and objective but the point is the Congress has already legislated in this field and has already made a judgment and decision that the activities of space shall be devoted to peaceful purposes—Public Law 85-568.

It is estimated that from 75 to 80 percent of the cost of the Apollo program will be devoted to the development of a capability for conducting near earth orbiting operations—which could form a basis for any military system we may require. In other words 75 to 80 percent of the Apollo program can be used for military requirements—hearings, volume III, page 85.

NASA's work in connection with weather satellites and communication satellites can be used as a valuable foundation of knowledge for the Air Force and for defense purposes—for military uses.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, in a speech at the second manned space flight meeting in Dallas in April of this year:

> "We must continue our intensive, nonmilitary effort along the entire spectrum of space and space-related sciences. The primary responsibility for this effort rests with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Its close cooperation with the Department of Defense will not only further its own objective of the peaceful conquest of space, but also help create the building blocks for the future military system which

> may be required to repeat President Kennedy's words, 'to make sure that space is maintained for peaceful purposes.'" (Hearings, vol. III, p. 86.)

As General Power points out, the primary responsibility rests with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its close cooperation with the Department of Defense. This cooperation will create the building block for future military systems. Moreover, as has been pointed out, there is a written understanding and agreement—a signed document by Secretary McNamara, of the Defense Department, and officials of NASA, that there is no duplication of effort and certainly the knowledge gained in space is invaluable to the Department of Defense. Defense and NASA are already cooperating in this program, and it is being closely coordinated.

Mr. Chairman, we have come a long way in the few years since Sputnik I was placed into orbit by the Soviets—when our country was shocked and stunned by the degree in which we were behind in the field of space.

Since then six astronauts, in Project Mercury, have been sent into space and returned safely. Each completed successfully the missions from an engineering and scientific standpoint. Moreover, seven scientific satellites were launched in 1962 and 1963, and each has satisfactorily performed its mission.

The Relay and the two Telstar satellites were successful. Relay is still in operation.

The Tiros weather satellite scored seven successes and no failures. Snycom II, launched July 26, of this year, was completely successful and is a satellite from which telephone communications can be relayed around the world. It is operating successfully as we debate this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, we have achieved great momentum and tremendous successes. The achievements have truly been outstanding. We have come a long way. Our country has been thrilled and gratified at all of the successes from Col. John Glenn to the latest 22-orbital mission of Maj. Gordon Cooper—both of whom addressed the Congress.

And, now that we have achieved and are achieving superiority, there are those who would slow down and cripple the effort and delay if not kill the momentum for America to be first in space.

It is my belief that the total knowledge and total capability of our country's information in space—both from NASA, the peace agency, and the Department of Defense—far exceeds and excels the knowledge of the Soviets.

We have overcome great deficiencies and have gained great knowledge and experience in the space field.

We are fast achieving superiority in space. Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, told our committee that we have had 29 tests of the Saturn I rocket and we are planning during this year to fly this vehicle again, testing its second stage. The Saturn I, to date, has been the most powerful booster known to exist. It produces a thrust of 1½ million pounds.

Funds are contained in this bill to continue development of the Saturn V—the biggest booster yet—a rocket booster which has a thrust of 7½ million pounds. This, scientists say, will give us the capacity to send the first American explorer to the moon.

With our successes and advances, we should not stop now. We are well on our way to our initial goal of being first in space. Let us not slow down the momentum achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat my earlier statement that we have made substantial cuts and yet we have provided in this bill the funds to keep our space program on schedule and on a sound basis.

Let us not take any action which would slow down our efforts and cost billions of dollars in the long run.

I urge my colleagues to support the committee—and our space program—which has heretofore been operated on a nonpartisan basis.

Let's continue to move forward in space and put and keep America first in space.

Mr. Chairman, I have dealt at some length on the appropriations for the space agency because of the amount of funds involved and, also, because it has become somewhat controversial.

There are other important agencies involved in this bill—including the National Science Foundation—for which the committee has made sizable cuts and reductions. In fact, we have not appropriated funds for any of the new programs proposed for the Science Foundation for next year.

We have also held the line on appropriations for the Interstate Commerce Commission and other agencies.

The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration is one of the largest items in this bill.

We have appropriated a total of $5,372,430,000 for all programs and services of the Veterans' Administration. We have the greatest veterans benefit program of any nation in the world. This includes—the world's largest hospital and medical care program for veterans, including inpatient and outpatient treatment and care for our veterans, educational programs, housing and home loans for veterans, readjustment benefits, insurance, compensation and pension, among other benefits. We have not cut any benefit programs for veterans but are recommending appropriations to include these benefits and services for the men who fought to preserve our liberty and freedom—and their widows and orphans and beneficiaries.

We are recommending, Mr. Chairman, a good bill—a measure that has been well considered.

Some want to increase various items of appropriations in the bill—others want to make further cuts and reductions.

I believe the committee, which has given much thought and study to this bill, is on the right course, and, I urge my colleagues to support the committee and pass this important appropriation bill.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I am informed by the staff that there is included in this bill $347,000 for the Oak Ridge, Tenn., Federal Office Building, for design and construction; is that correct? Does that mean that would be the last step before construction?

Mr. EVINS. There is a lump-sum appropriation carried in the bill for design and construction of additional Federal buildings. The Tennessee project is included in the funds for this group. The answer is yes, the gentleman's project is included.

Mr. BAKER. The Oak Ridge Federal Office Building is not in the construction stage, so the $347,000 would be money for design and advance planning?

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is correct. There is design and construction money in this bill and my friend's project is included.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, our next speaker will be our beloved colleague from Massachusetts and member of the committee, Mr. BOLAND, but pending that may I yield to our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am quite interested in this bill because I serve on two committees which have jurisdiction over the agencies covered by the bill—the Veterans' Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I wish to commend my colleague for the careful, detailed work of his subcommittee on this important bill. It has been my experience that the Independent Offices Subcommittee and its chairman, the gentleman from Texas, are thorough and willing to listen at all times to the viewpoint of agency officials and others having an interest in the subject. I wish to commend the gentleman and his subcommittee and to take note of the great amount of work which this bill represents.

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the cuts in the Veterans' Administration budget, particularly those relating to the medical program. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has endeavored to study the implications of these cuts and we are very fearful that they will have a very undesirable effect on the quality of patient care in the VA medical program. Reference has been made that these cuts are small and are only a fraction of the more than $1 billion appropriated for the VA medical program. This is true, but it should also be recognized that the budget for that program has not risen substantially in recent years, even though there has been a sharp increase in personnel costs, medical supply costs, and cost of other services needed to provide adequate care for the veteran patient.

The report of the Committee on Appropriations emphasizes that the amounts recommended by the committee are sufficient to provide program levels in fiscal year 1964 about the same as in 1963. We have studied the cuts recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, and cannot concur that the Veterans' Administration will be able to operate in 1964 at the 1963 level if the budget request is not restored.

Under "Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expense," the following action was taken:

President's budget request	$14,982,000
Committee recommendations	14,510,000
Committee reduction	−472,000

The Appropriations Committee report comments:

1. Provides about same program level as in 1963.
2. Allows for pay increase costs.
3. The sum of $150,000 requested for nursing home study approved within the total.

Our review indicates that the Appropriations Committee purports to provide financing to continue 1963 levels through 1964. However, due to current average salary costs exceeding budget estimate, employment will need to be cut back by 15 to 25 employees from level contemplated by committee.

Holding medical education and training funds to 1963 funding level will result in actual cutback of operating level due to rising costs of tuition, lecture fees, and travel.

Appearing below is a summary of the Appropriations Committee action on medical and prosthetic research:

President's budget request	$33,742,000
Committee recommendations	31,720,000
Committee reduction	−2,022,000

In its report the Appropriations Committee comments:

1. Continues these programs at the 1963 level.
2. Provides for added cost of pay increases.

Our review indicates, first, that amounts requested in budget were tailored to annualization of costs of program activities started in 1963 together with modest provision for expansion of research inquiry into areas of particular interest to the VA medical mission.

Second, due to annualization factor committee action not only will halt any new research activities but will require cutback from present employment level of up to 150 employees.

The major item in the Veterans' Administration appropriation which provides for hospital operation and medical care of patients is the appropriation "Medical care." Appearing below is a summary of the Appropriations Committee's action on the medical care appropriation:

President's budget request	$1,087,688,000
Committee recommendations	1,075,186,000
Committee reduction	−12,502,000

The Appropriations Committee report comments:

1. Amount recommended provides for the operation of 121,486 beds in 1964.
2. Provides for increase of $27,013,700 in pay raise costs over 1963.
3. Provides for continuing the present employment level in 1964.
4. Provides for added costs of pay increases.

In our review we find:

First. Appropriations Committee action purports to provide continuation of 1963 operational levels through 1964 by allowing costs of pay increase over 1963 appropriations.

Second. However, 1964 has 2 more workdays and 1 more calendar day than 1963. To continue at 1963 operating levels will require $7.1 million more than committee provides. Absorption of this amount represents 930 employees below the 1963 level programed in the 1964 budget.

Third. Appropriations Committee action provides nothing to meet expense of staffing additional facilities or treatment modalities not fully operational in 1963 or not to be opened until 1964. Committee action will delay meeting of these workload demands or require reductions from present employment and patients cared for at other hospitals in system by up to 450 employees and 1,200 patient load.

Fourth. Summary: Appropriations Committee action will result in cutback from programed 1964 levels of approximately 1,380 employees and 1,200 patient load or a combination of these with newly constructed facilities not being staffed for an undetermined period of time.

I am most concerned about the cut of $8,246,000 in the VA appropriation for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.

Beginning in fiscal year 1961, after considerable work on the part of members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the closest liaison with the White House, we were successful in working out a 12-year modernization, replacement, and repair program for the domiciliary and hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration. This was to be in increments of $75 million a year and represented quite an achievement in view of the long-standing objection by the Bureau of the Budget to any adequate financing for this particular item in the Veterans' Administration budget. We were also able to get more adequate funds for deferred maintenance.

It is absolutely essential in my judgment, and I believe I speak for the unanimous Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that this program be maintained unimpaired and we must have some assurance to that effect.

It is well to recall at this time that the Appropriations Committee has not always followed the recommendations of the Budget Bureau or acted favorably on the agreement which I have described above. For example, in the 86th Congress, the subcommittee cut the $75 million for this item to $39,100,000. It became necessary on the House floor to restore that to the full $75 million and this occurred on April 20, 1960, by a yea-and-nay vote with 218 yeas to 155 nays. Again, in the 87th Congress, the subcommittee reduced the request from $75 to $70 million, and on June 7, 1961, the teller vote of 116 to 45 restored the full $75 million allocation.

I am seeking a commitment from the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices that the reduction in this item at this time to the level of $72,754,000 is not an effort to reduce the overall effect of this 12-year program and that he and his colleagues are in accord with this long-range modernization and repair program and will see that it is met.

Mr. Chairman, in order for the record to be clear on this point I insert in the RECORD a table showing the history of this particular item in the Independent Offices Appropriations:

VA estimate to Bureau of Budget	Bureau of Budget estimate	House-reported version	House-passed version	Senate-reported version	Senate-passed version	Law
$88,005,000	$20,159,000	$30,159,000	$30,159,000	$33,159,000	$33,159,000	Public Law 86-255, fiscal year 1960 ($31,159,000).
75,000,000	75,000,000	39,100,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	Public Law 86-626, fiscal year 1961 ($75,000,000).
75,000,000	75,000,000	70,000,000	75,000,000	77,500,000	77,500,000	Public Law 87-141, fiscal year 1962 ($76,250,000).
75,000,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	75,500,000	78,500,000	78,500,000	Public Law 87-741, fiscal year 1963 ($77,000,000).
81,200,000	81,000,000	72,754,000 (H.R. 8747)	-----------	-----------	-----------	

The Appropriations Committee has recommended an amount of $72,754,000 for the construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities. This is a reduction of $8,246,000 from the Veterans' Administration appropriation request of $81 million. If this reduction is not restored, it will have a serious effect on the Veterans' Administration's planned construction program. There is a planned program for modernizing and replacing our facilities which are outdated and obsolete. This program will cost approximately $1.3 billion and will take a minimum of 15 years to complete the financing. The appropriation request of $81 million is the fourth increment which was planned and is under development now for the award of specific contracts in this fiscal year. Included in this program are funds for the award of construction contracts for a new 480-bed hospital at Gainesville, Fla., a 1,040-bed addition at Long Beach, Calif., a 500-bed hospital at Oteen, N.C., and a 480-bed hospital at Temple, Tex. In addition, funds are included in this request for the planning of new facilities at Long Island, N.Y., Los Angeles, Calif., and San Juan, P.R., and for modernization and improvements at existing facilities totaling $31 million.

The major part of this request is for the construction of new facilities. It is important that the program proceed with these facilities as rapidly as possible in order to maintain a sufficient number of operating beds that will be lost during the modernization phase of our program.

The Veterans' Administration is exerting maximum effort to provide these new facilities as soon as possible to meet the needs for the medical care of the veterans. A reduction below our request of $81 million will seriously affect the planned schedule in fiscal year 1964 and subsequent years.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended this reduction based on the assumption that VA can provide more economical construction. The Veterans' Administration has done much to hold the line and reduce costs of hospital construction and we will continue to do everything possible to reduce construction costs. Some of the actions taken to date are:

First. Reduced the total square-foot areas to a minimum through the detailed review of room sizes.

Second. Reduced story heights and thereby reduced building volume.

Third. Used large block design to save on expensive perimeter walls.

Fourth. Reduced building sites to a minimum.

Fifth. Installed vinyl plastic wall covering in lieu of ceramic tile.

Sixth. Used exposed utilities and painted masonry walls for research and other selected areas.

Seventh. Constructed less expensive low-rise psychiatric facilities.

Eighth. Used dry-wall construction in lieu of plaster walls.

At the same time, the Veterans' Administration is incorporating in its construction the latest advances in medical technology and laborsaving systems, all of which tend to increase the initial construction cost.

Although the estimates on which the appropriation request is based are not contractor estimates, they are based upon previous contract awards and do represent realistic costs.

The $81 million as requested is for the attached list of projects for either construction or preliminary development. If the reduction of $8,246,000 is sustained, some of these projects must be eliminated for development or construction during fiscal year 1964.

Mr. Chairman, in order that Members may have some idea as to the magnitude and complexity of the VA hospital and construction program, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a summary of the Veterans' Administration program for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.

The summary follows:

Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities—projects for which funds are requested in 1964

[Thousands of dollars]

Project location and description	Total estimated cost	Appropriations		
		Through fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964 request	Future request
Replacement hospitals:				
Gainesville, Fla.: 480-bed new hospital, including 200 GM&S beds, 40 TB beds, and 240 NP beds to meet increasing demands for beds in State of Florida. No outpatient clinic. No laundry. To be located near and affiliated with University of Florida	9,595.0	802.0	8,793.0	----------
Long Beach, Calif., phase II: Phase I provided for construction 561 new beds to replace part of the beds located in cantonment-type construction. Under phase II it is planned to replace the remaining 1,040 beds with permanent new construction and modernize certain existing buildings for supporting facilities. Upon completion of this phase there will be a total of 1,601 beds, 1,461 GM&S including 205 spinal cord, 120 TB, and 120 NP. The hospital also provides for outpatient treatment	17,087.6	1,035.0	16,052.6	----------
Long Island, N.Y.: 1,000-bed new hospital, including 240 GM&S beds and 760 NP beds, to replace approximately 800 overcrowded beds presently located at the Northport, Long Island, N.Y., Hospital and to provide 200 beds to meet the increasing demands for GM&S treatment in this area. The site for this hospital has not yet been selected	26,827.0	----------	1,600.0	$25,227.0
Los Angeles, Calif.: 1,040-bed new hospital, including 800 GM&S beds and 240 NP beds, to replace 840 obsolete and overcrowded beds at the existing VA Center, Los Angeles, Calif., and to provide 200 additional beds to meet the increasing demands for GM&S treatment in this area. It is planned to locate near and affiliate with the University of Southern California Medical School	23,525.0	750.0	1,000.0	21,775.0
Oteen, N.C.: 500-bed new hospital, including 440 GM&S and TB beds and 60 NP beds, on existing site to replace present obsolete facilities	9,737.0	937.5	8,799.5	----------
San Juan, P.R.: 720-bed new hospital to replace our existing 200-bed hospital and to reduce a substantial number of contract beds. The new hospital as proposed will include 400 GM&S beds, 40 TB beds, 240 NP beds, and 40 beds for the Department of Army requirements. The plans are to locate the hospital adjacent to the University of Puerto Rico Medical Center on a site to be donated by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico	21,097.0	----------	700.0	20,397.0
Temple, Tex.: 480-bed new hospital, including 240 GM&S and TB beds and 240 NP beds, on existing site to replace present 800-bed World War II cantonment-type hospital	10,435.0	750.0	9,685.0	----------
Subtotal	118,303.6	4,274.5	46,630.1	67,399.0
Modernization:				
Bedford, Mass., phase VII: This project provides for modernization of bed buildings 62 and 70 and addition to sewage disposal plant. This is part of a continuing program for overall modernization of this hospital. Previous projects have provided for modernization of 6 bed buildings, construction of new admission and treatment building, and miscellaneous ancillary facilities. Future work will consist of modernizing bed buildings 8 and 9 and miscellaneous other work. An overall plan for remaining work is being developed	635.8	----------	57.8	578.0
Coatesville, Pa., phase VII: This project provides for alterations for chapel, new TEC building, new elevators, replacement of boiler plant, and automatic fire sprinklers in 12 buildings. This is the final phase for overall modernization of this hospital. Future work will provide for air conditioning of this hospital	3,520.5	298.0	3,222.5	----------
Danville, Ill., phase IV: This project provides for construction of a new 240-bed NP buildings to replace beds presently housed in nonpermanent buildings. Previous projects provide for a new A&T building of 180 beds, modernization of building 58 for 235 GM&S beds, and miscellaneous ancillary facilities. Future work will consist of 2 new 240-bed NP buildings, 40-bed foster home building and additional supporting ancillary facilities	2,616.8	340.0	2,276.8	----------
Danville, Ill., phase V: This projects provides for construction of two new 240-bed NP buildings to replace beds presently housed in nonpermanent buildings. Previous projects provide for 2 new NP buildings for 420 beds and modernization of building 58 for 235 beds. Future work will provide for a 40-bed foster home building and additional ancillary facilities	5,252.8	----------	5,252.8	----------
Fort Meade, S.Dak., phase IV: This project provides for construction of a new 240-bed NP building to replace beds presently housed in nonpermanent buildings. Previous projects provide for 168 beds in new construction and improvements in ancillary facilities. Future work will provide for a 20-bed foster home unit and modernization of some existing buildings for ancillary facilities	2,502.7	292.0	2,210.7	----------
Hines, Ill., phase I: This project provides for phase I of an overall modernization and/or replacement of facilities for a total of approximately 1,700 beds. The scope of this project and future work required will be determined by a master plan which is currently being developed	25,000.0	----------	1,000.0	24,000.0
Louisville, Ky.: This project provides for addition of 180 NP beds, to replace beds which will be lost by modernization of the Lexington Hospital, consolidation of outpatient clinic with the hospital, increased research space, and various other adjustments in space to meet current medical criteria	6,500.0	135.3	254.7	6,110.0
Northport, N.Y., phase I: This is the 1st phase of an overall modernization of this hospital. Tentative plans provide for construction of a clinical wing as the 1st phase. The scope of this project and future work required will be determined by a master plan which is currently being developed	4,950.0	----------	300.0	4,650.0
Palo Alto, Calif, phase III: This project provides for alterations to existing DH&K building No. 104 for special services and a new TEC building. Previous projects provide for new DH&K building and modernization of buildings 101, 105, 110, 137, and 205. Future projects will provide for modernization of buildings 106, 111, 113, 202, 203, 208, and 307	1,475.0	185.8	1,289.2	----------
Palo Alto, Calif., phase IV: This project provides for modernization of patient buildings 111, 113, 208, and 307. Previous projects provide for new DH&K building, alterations to old DH&K building for special services, new therapeutic exercise clinic building, and modernization of buildings 101, 105, 110, 137, and 205. Future projects will provide for modernization of buildings 106, 202, and 203	485.0	----------	44.0	441.
Perry Point, Md., phase III: This project provides for new boiler plant, new special activities building, connecting corridors, modernization building 17-H for DH&K and PM&R, and rehabilitation of utility distribution system. Previous projects provide for modernization of patient buildings and improvements to sewage disposal system. Future work will consist of further improvements to building 9-H, alterations to building 80 for foster home care, and air conditioning of buildings not included under this project	5,485.8	300.0	5,185.8	----------
Perry Point, Md., phase IV: This project is the final phase of the modernization program and provides for improvements to building 9-H, alterations to building 80 for foster home care, and completion of air conditioning program. Previous projects provide for modernization of patient buildings, new boiler plant, new special activities building, connecting corridors, modernization building 17-H for DH&K and PM&R, and rehabilitation of utility distribution system	2,077.8	----------	188.9	1,888.9
Portland, Oreg.: This project provides for addition of 505 beds including 240 psychiatric beds, consolidation of outpatient clinic with hospital, increased research space, and various other adjustments in space to meet current criteria	15,844.0	----------	700.0	15,144.0
Roanoke, Va.: This project provides for a new canteen building which is necessary to relieve a very unsatisfactory condition in canteen operations, presently located in a quonset hut, prior to complete modernization of the hospital. Future work will consist of complete modernization	310.0	220.0	90.0	----------
San Francisco, Calif., phase III: This project provides for modernization of building 7 for canteen, chapel, and recreation, modernization of building 8 for mental hygiene clinic, alterations and additions to building 12 for research and expansion of parking facilities. Previous projects provide for alterations to DH&K building 6 and addition to building 2 for clinics. Future work will consist of modernizing buildings 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6	1,365.5	124.0	1,241.5	----------

***Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities—projects for which funds are requested in 1964*—Continued**

[Thousands of dollars]

Project location and description	Total estimated cost	Appropriations		
		Through fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964 request	Future request
Modernization—Continued				
Seattle, Wash.: This project provides for addition of 250 beds, including 30 psychiatric beds, consolidation of outpatient clinic with hospital, increased research space, and various other adjustments in space to meet current criteria	6,265.0	----------	400.0	5,865.0
Tuskegee, Ala., phase V: This project provides for alterations to building 38 for a chapel and construction of a physical medicine and rehabilitation building. Previous projects provide for modernization of patient buildings and additional ancillary facilities. Future work will consist of construction of a new TEC building and air conditioning of the entire hospital	990.8	99.6	891.2	----------
White River Junction, Vt., phase II: This project provides for completion of modernization of this hospital by alterations and additions to existing buildings. Previous projects provide for construction of new administration building and miscellaneous alterations	3,500.0	185.6	132.4	3,182.0
Subtotal	88,777.5	2,180.3	24,738.3	61,858.9
Other improvements:				
Albany, N.Y.: This project provides for alterations to establish an intensive treatment unit in order to furnish better treatment for critically ill patients	26.5	----------	26.5	----------
Albuquerque, N. Mex.: To provide for alterations to building 3 to permit relocating pulmonary disease service in a closer proximity to applicable clinics	185.0	----------	185.0	----------
Baltimore (Fort Howard), Md.: This project provides for replacement of present obsolete ammonia, brine refrigeration system with modern freon equipment to insure safe dependable cold storage, conversion of ice storage refrigerator for storage of frozen foods, and renovation of 6 walk-in refrigerators	47.4	----------	47.4	----------
Chicago, Ill.: To provide for installation of a trash incinerator to eliminate present unsightly, unsanitary, and hazardous conditions involved in the accumulation of trash for disposal by contract	56.0	----------	56.0	----------
Clinton, Iowa: To provide for installation of fly ash collector equipment to eliminate the discharge of fly ash from boiler plant into surrounding community	85.9	----------	85.9	----------
East Orange, N.J.: To provide for installation of a water-softening plant to eliminate present small units used on a rental basis and cost of descaling pipes and equipment. Based on present cost of rental equipment and descaling required, cost of project will be amortized in about 4 years	38.3	----------	38.3	----------
Fargo, N. Dak.: To provide for relocation of cystoscopic room adjacent to surgical suite in order to improve working conditions which will reduce surgical risks and provide anesthesia best suited to individual type of patient	25.7	----------	25.7	----------
Fargo, N. Dak.: To provide for new utility shops building and conversion of building 3 to machine storage. The engineering division now occupies 6 quonset huts which have passed their useful life expectancy	162.6	----------	162.6	----------
Indianapolis, Ind. (TB): To provide for consolidation and modernization of X-ray department in order to increase operating efficiency	47.4	----------	47.4	----------
Kerrville, Tex.: To provide for replacement of obsolete electrical equipment with modern equipment and switchgear required to meet present-day electrical demands	50.8	----------	50.8	----------
Madison, Wis.: To provide for expansion of canteen to meet increased workload as result of shift in hospital from TB to GM	60.5	----------	60.5	----------
Montrose, N.Y.: To provide for installation of elevators in existing shafts of buildings 3, 4, and 12, in order to provide service from ground floor to 1st and 2d floors necessary to meet increase in age of the type of patients being cared for	158.7	----------	158.7	----------
Mountain Home, Tenn.: To provide for construction of an elevated water storage tank in order to assure adequate water supply for fire protection and other uses	100.8	----------	100.8	----------
Oklahoma City, Okla.: To provide for establishment of an audiology clinic as part of the overall program to establish VA operated clinics	22.4	----------	22.4	----------
Salisbury, N.C.: To provide for conversion of a present 35° refrigerator room to a 5° deep-freeze room to overcome a shortage of frozen food space	15.7	----------	15.7	----------
Spokane, Wash.: To provide for alterations to establish an intensive treatment unit in order to provide better treatment for critically ill patients	16.9	----------	16.9	----------
Topeka, Kans.: To provide for construction of a new chapel to replace present makeshift facilities	167.0	----------	167.0	----------
Wilmington, Del.: To provide for alterations to presently unused space on 8th floor to a 35-bed nursing unit to help meet increasing need for beds in this general area	144.3	----------	144.3	----------
Automatic elevator controls: Provides for conversion of elevators from manual to automatic controls in order to increase efficiency and reduce operating costs at the following hospitals. It is estimated that the cost can be amortized in 5 to 6 years:				
Ann Arbor, Mich. (4 elevators)	112.0	----------	112.0	----------
Boston, Mass. (8 elevators)	224.0	----------	224.0	----------
Brooklyn, N.Y. (6 elevators)	168.0	----------	168.0	----------
Chicago, Ill. (research) (6 elevators)	168.0	----------	168.0	----------
Chicago, Ill. (W.S.) (4 elevators)	112.0	----------	112.0	----------
Durham, N.C. (3 elevators)	84.0	----------	84.0	----------
Iowa City, Iowa (4 elevators)	112.0	----------	112.0	----------
Little Rock, Ark. (4 elevators)	112.0	----------	112.0	----------
Louisville, Ky. (4 elevators)	112.0	----------	112.0	----------
Oklahoma City, Okla. (4 elevators)	112.0	----------	112.0	----------
Omaha, Nebr. (4 elevators)	112.0	----------	112.0	----------
Philadelphia, Pa. (4 elevators)	112.0	----------	112.0	----------
Pittsburgh, Pa. (GM) (6 elevators)	168.0	----------	168.0	----------
Safety and fire protection projects: To provide automatic fire sprinklers and other safety measures in various rooms and buildings to eliminate fire hazards at the following stations:				
Albuquerque, N. Mex. (building 2; exit B-20)	55.4	----------	55.4	----------
Denver, Colo. (building 17)	11.3	----------	11.3	----------
Fayetteville, N.C. (building 3)	13.9	----------	13.9	----------
Fort Lyon, Colo. (buildings 4, 7, and 8)	10.4	----------	10.4	----------
Indianapolis, Ind. (TB) (buildings 1 and T-107)	12.6	----------	12.6	----------
Kerrville, Tex. (building 2)	4.6	----------	4.6	----------
Northampton, Mass. (buildings 1 and 25)	36.5	----------	36.5	----------
Tuscaloosa, Ala. (buildings 38, 39, 40, and 41)	42.0	----------	42.0	----------
Communication facilities: To provide space for housing a communications electronic switching center. Information from the industry indicates that more efficient and effective service may be obtained through use of recently developed electronic switching techniques and equipment. Space to house such equipment, feasible for installation in 1964, may be provided in 1 large or 2 small switching centers. These requirements and the location are under study	75.0	----------	75.0	----------
Administrator's discretionary fund: To provide for unprogramed or urgent projects costing less than $300,000 each which in the judgment of the Administrator should not be delayed by the time required to obtain Presidential approval	500.0	----------	500.0	----------
Subtotal	3,881.6	----------	3,881.6	----------
Research facilities:				
Birmingham, Ala.: To provide for constructing a research addition containing 17,000 net square feet of space	1,158.2	----------	1,158.2	----------
Boston, Mass.: To provide for constructing a research addition containing 18,000 net square feet of space	1,216.9	----------	110.6	1,106.3
Bronx, N.Y.: To provide for converting 16,280 net square feet of space for research	751.1	----------	68.3	682.8
Minneapolis, Minn.: To provide for constructing a research addition containing 20,000 net square feet of space	1,475.7	134.2	1,341.5	----------
Minor research projects: To provide for miscellaneous minor research projects at various stations. Projects to be developed on basis of urgent needs	321.4	----------	321.4	----------
Subtotal	4,923.3	134.2	3,000.0	1,789.1
Restoration of funds: To restore funds used to finance the air-conditioning program	2,750.0	----------	2,750.0	----------
Total	218,636.0	6,589.0	81,000.0	131,047.0
Net appropriation request	----------	----------	81,000.0	----------

Mr. Chairman, Members will recall that the House passed H.R. 8009 on September 17, which provides for nursing care for veterans in Veterans' Administration facilities and also authorizes other steps in this general field.

Shortly after the Subcommittee on Intermediate Care of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported this bill favorably to the full committee and before the full committee acted, the President submitted a memorandum to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Veterans' Administration, authorizing that agency to activate and operate facilities in the amount of 2,000 nursing care beds, this figure to be in addition to the 125,000 hospital beds presently authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I include as part of my remarks at this point the text of that memorandum to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, this being dated August 12, 1963:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 12, 1963.

The changing characteristics of our veteran population, particularly those who served during the first world war, are resulting in an adverse effect on the acute medical programs administered by the Veterans' Administration. Nearly 1 million war veterans are aged 70 and over. The number will increase 50 percent by 1966.

Older veterans account for one-third of your hospital admissions and they comprise the bulk of the long-term-care patient load. Many have attained maximum benefits of hospitalization but attempts at community placement have been unsuccessful because of the lack of facilities, inadequate financial resources, absence of family ties, and other reasons. Retention of these patients in facilities designed for acute care is costly and places an undue strain on the 125,000-hospital-bed limit under which you are now operating.

In order to relieve this situation, I authorize you to activate and operate facilities and beds for 2,000 nursing-home-type patients in addition to the 125,000 hospital beds presently authorized. This will provide arrangements more consistent with patient requirements and improve utilization of acute care facilities. The higher patient turnover will also defer the need for increasing present bed levels. Existing buildings best suited for this purpose and appropriately located throughout the country according to your judgment, should be utilized. No construction, other than for necessary conversion of existing facilities, is authorized.

This authorization is to enable the Veterans' Administration to gain firsthand knowledge and experience in the operation of beds specifically designated for patients requiring attendant-type services. It will be possible to evaluate a full range of care from domiciliaries through acute medical care, restoration centers and nursing-home care where out-placement is not possible.

I am sure that as a part of your administrative studies, cost control systems will be established so that direct cost comparison will be definitive; also that you will continue to work toward the development and utilization of community and private resources in the best interest of the veteran and the Nation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

All of these events transpired subsequent to the hearings of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations, and thus the bill which we are considering today does not reflect any funds for the 2,000 additional nursing care beds authorized by the President on August 12. It is my understanding that thus far the Veterans' Administration has not submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which would be the initial step in this case, any drawings, specifications, or decisions as to the location of nursing care beds at any one of the 168 Veterans' Administration hospitals located throughout the country.

I call this matter to the attention of the Members of the House, realizing that from a practical point of view it is too late to adequately consider this question in the House. I would urge, however, that when hearings are held on this bill in the Senate and when it is considered in executive session, that serious consideration be given at that time in the other body to adding appropriate funds to take care of the 2,000 additional nursing care beds authorized by the President. Failing some action along this line in the other body, a supplemental appropriation is the only other route available, and inclusion of appropriate funds in the regular appropriation would be highly preferable.

The veterans' organizations are unanimous on this subject and there is a general appreciation of the great need which exists in this field. It is an urgent need and one which must be met. I hope that sufficient funds will be added in the other body to accomplish the aims which we all have in mind.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans' organizations recognize the seriousness of the recommended reductions in the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration medical program. I am inserting in the RECORD letters which I have received from the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans, requesting that the VA appropriation be restored to the recommended level. The texts of these letters follows:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We of the Disabled American Veterans are greatly concerned at the reductions made by the House Appropriations Committee in the Veterans' Administration budget for medical care. As you know, the committee recommended a reduction of some $12½ million for this item. In its report, the Appropriations Committee indicated that the recommended appropriation would provide for continuing the present employment level in 1964 and would also provide for the added costs of pay increases becoming effective during the year.

It is our understanding, Mr. Chairman, that 1964, having 2 more workdays and 1 more calendar day than 1963, requires a greater appropriation than fiscal 1963, even to operate at the same level. It is our further understanding that the Veterans' Administration will require an additional $7.1 million to operate at the 1963 level. On the other hand, if they are forced to operate with the funds recommended by the Appropriations Committee, it is our understanding that they must operate with 930 fewer employees than were used during 1963.

Aside from these very practical reasons for increasing the funds for medical care, I would remind you of the action taken by the House of Representatives upon the advice of your committee in providing 2,000 additional beds for nursing care. The President has also issued a memorandum authorizing 2,000 additional beds. It is the considered view of the Disabled American Veterans that, instead of slashing needed funds, the appropriation should be increased to accommodate these projects.

We of the Disabled American Veterans urgently request, therefore, that you utilize all of the facilities at your command to avert this drastic cut in a vital program.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is to express the grievous disappointment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States with respect to the cuts for the operation of the Veterans' Administration for this fiscal year, as contained in the independent offices appropriation bill, H.R. 8747, scheduled for consideration October 10, 1963.

Your attention is particularly directed to the cuts in the medical field for care and treatment of disabled veterans and the construction and renovation of medical facilities.

If the $12.5 million cut in medical care is allowed to stand, it will cause a serious impairment of the necessary care and treatment of sick and disabled veterans. With the average age of World War I veterans now approaching 69 and World War II veterans 45, there is an increasing number of veterans needing medical care. If the amount requested by the Veterans' Administration is not approved, either the patient load or staffing levels will have to be reduced.

The $8.2 million cut in the construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities will cause a serious setback in the 15-year $1.3 billion renovation program developed by the House Veterans' Affairs and Appropriations Committees and commenced by President Eisenhower in 1959 to make the VA hospital system of 169 hospitals the finest in the world. While it may affect this fiscal year's operation, a deep cut of over $8 million is a default on the completion of this program as scheduled.

The costs of operating Veterans' Administration programs have remained fairly constant over the last decade, while most all other Federal programs have increased by leaps and bounds. The Veterans' Administration has submitted a request for the minimum funds necessary to carry out veterans programs for this year. The Veterans of Foreign Wars wants you to know of our deep concern respecting these cuts in veterans programs, which if allowed to stand will seriously impair the care and treatment of our war veterans.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1963.

To all Members of the House of Representatives:

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: We are deeply concerned with the reduction of fiscal year 1964 budget recommendations for the Veterans' Administration as contained in H.R. 8747 (H. Rept. 824). House action is scheduled for Thursday, October 10.

House Report 824 cites reductions for the VA in five items totaling $57,342,000.

At this time we address ourselves to the reductions for the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery, which strike at the heart of VA services. Specifically, the restorations sought, follow:

Medical administation and miscellaneous operating expenses	$472,000
Medical and prosthetic research	2,022,000
Medical care	12,502,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	8,246,000
Total	823,242,000

While we are conscious of the rising costs of Government, we call your attention to the fact that the cost of operating the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery is directly related to the costs of war. It is not a new program. It is one of the oldest programs operated by the Federal Government. It is a substantial percentage of the total cost of operating the VA. And these costs, in terms of the gross national product, have been uniform, percentagewise, since the Spanish-American War.

Our small staff, in its periodic visits to hospitals, has reported on at least 19 hospitals, where the directors have made serious criticism about the lack of operating funds for fiscal 1963, and pessimistic estimates of the conditions they would have to meet in 1964, even if the full budget recommendations were granted by the 88th Congress. The reductions recommended in House Report 824, will, we believe, make the difference between operation of VA's hospitals and domiciliaries on a tight, if moderately adequate budget, and a shortage of personnel and diminished services to our sick and disabled veterans.

The problem is here and now. We ask only that reductions in Government operations not apply to the cost of care for the sick and disabled. Remember that most of these sick and disabled are aged and aging. Their admittance to VA hospitals is rigidly screened. We know they would not be there if they had means to go elsewhere for care and treatment.

I sincerely urge your support in the restoration of the above cited funds.

Respectfully submitted.

DANIEL F. FOLEY.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to our colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] 10 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to pay tribute to the chairman of this committee as has been done by my colleagues on the committee. I do not think there is a better master of cutting through the cascade of verbiage that accompanies budget requests than the gentleman from Texas. I do not know of any committee chairman of the Committees on Appropriations or for that matter any of the authorizing committees who labors so hard and with so much ability as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

I want to pay tribute to those colleagues who serve with me on this committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHIPLEY].

As has been said, Mr. Chairman, this is a big budget of some $14 billion and it involves some 26 agencies. These agencies touch most the lives of the people who live in the United States and, certainly, touch a great number of the businesses that operate in this Nation. As one who has served on this committee for some 8 years, I am impressed by the dedication of the men who run these agencies. Whether these men have been appointed by Republican administrations or by Democratic administrations, as I have sat there over the past 8 years, I think I can say and I know I am joined in this observation by my colleagues, that this group of people is a magnificent group dedicated to making their agencies work and to make this country a better place in which to live. They have a tremendous responsibility in running these agencies, and they do it in a magnificent manner.

It is not possible because of the number of agencies in this budget to deal specifically with all of them. I would like to make a few comments on some of the observations that have been made by members of the committee, particularly the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] who talked about Federal employment. He pointed out some of the figures and the costs involving increased payrolls which run into some $612 million.

It is interesting to note in the number of increased jobs requested for all of the agencies, of some 9,500 jobs we gave them only 43. If you take the average payroll for the average civil service employee and multiply that by the number of jobs we have saved, 9,500, we come up with a total saving in this bill of $54 million alone just on personnel. In a sense, this saving is a recurring saving.

Another item that the gentleman from North Carolina dwelled on was the item with respect to the budget of the National Science Foundation. This is a very great agency of this Government. This agency is charged with the responsibility of building up our knowledge in the field of physics and in developing scientific knowledge and developing a personnel skilled in these various scientific fields, thus giving the incentive to our country to move ahead in these fields.

This agency was started in 1951. The first appropriation for the National Science Foundation was $225,000. Last year this committee gave the National Science Foundation and the Congress approved, a budget of $322,500,000. This year in 1964, the National Science Foundation came in with a request for $589 million. I do not know what the percentage of increase is, but it must run around 85 percent—an absolutely fantastic increase. Well, they got $700,000 of the increase, so now for this year they are going to operate with $323 million instead of $589 million. I think this is good judgment and I think it is sound procedure.

I think if you will read the budget hearings, which embrace a number of pages on the National Science Foundation, you will come to the conclusion that this committee did the right thing here. We thought the National Science Foundation was moving too fast and too far in this area. There was all of this great clamor for more scientific knowledge and all of this great clamor for more people with technical and scientific ability and physicists and mathematicians which all developed since 1957. We have made fantastic strides in this area. This committee and the Congress have contributed significantly to the progress that we made in the scientific fields and in building up the knowledge in science, in physics, and in mathematics. We have done an extraordinary job, but I think it is time to pause and reflect. All of the arguments have been that we have not been progressing rapidly enough. For the past 6 years since 1957 I think we have done an extraordinary job. We are catching up in the fields in which we ought to catch up with Russia or any of our adversaries.

The other item which gives the committee a lot of concern and I am sure gives Congress and the Nation much concern is the $5.1 billion budget for NASA. This is the item for NASA. For the first time in many a year—and NASA is now 5 years old—this is the first time in its 5 years we have asked them to slow down their programs a bit. At least we are making them cognizant of the fact that they have to take another look at the programs that they recommend to Congress. This Congress cut them back $612 million, from the original budget recommendation of $5.7 billion down to $5.1 billion.

It is very easy, you know, for scientists and physicists and those with a knowledge of outer space and inner space to come before a committee and snow you under with words on what they need. But the fact of the matter is that this committee and the authorizing committee of the House and the Senate have done an extraordinarily good job this year.

There are some who say that we are legislating in ignorance and in darkness in this area. There are some who say we are legislating on the faith of the legislative committee, the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House and the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee of the Senate. Over the past month or so there has been more written about NASA by Max Lerner, Walter Lippmann, and Claire Booth Luce and John Troan of the Washington Daily News and a plethora of other writers who are concerned about the direction in which we are headed. This is good, and it has contributed, I think, to a very valuable dialog on where this agency should go and what it should be doing.

However, we have not been legislating in the dark. We have not been legislating in the shadows or on faith. No committee of the Congress has given a fuller hearing or done a better job with respect to NASA than the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. I forget the number of weeks during which they had NASA before them, but it did embrace many, many hours and many, many pages of testimony. They did a fine job.

So these are the people we place faith in, and I think they are the people we have to place some faith in. These are the people who know more about this agency and their programs than any other Members who serve in this House. They certainly know more about the direction in which we are headed and the job that NASA has to do and the programs in which NASA is engaged They certainly know more than a lot of writers who write about NASA. I think we ought to place some faith in their judgment, and we did. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] pointed out, we reduced this budget to $5.1 billion. It is $100 million below the original authorization of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House. As has been said here and will be said many times, the question of going to the moon is national policy. We established the policy in 1961 as a result of the recommendations of the President of the United States. During that year 1961 the first authorization bill following the President's recommendation was passed by this House 401 to nothing—401 to zero. As a matter of fact, within a few days before the President sent his message to the Congress we put $70 million more in the budget for 1961 for NASA because all of us were concerned about the Nation's relative position in space.

All of us were happy when we got all of these fantastic accomplishments and great successes in space, and we cheered. But now comes time to pay the bill and we want to walk away. It is like the man who walks into Paul Young's Restaurant, which is one of the finest in Washington, sits down and has a fine meal. The tab comes around, and he does not want to pay the bill.

Of course, this is expensive, what we are doing here. It is necessarily expensive. But this is our policy. This is what the Congress said we ought to do and we are doing it. But there is one thing I think we have done in this committee. We have asked NASA to slow their programs down a little bit. And this is not going to hurt. We are not in a race with Russia. We do not want to destroy our own Nation in any race. We do not want to destroy our taxpayers in a race. But we think they ought to slow it down a bit, and they have. There are oodles and bundles of money in here for construction facilities. They can stand this $612 million reduction and they can stand it with ease. They can stretch out some of their programs without hurting them too much.

NASA has just ended its first 5 years under the legislation we passed in 1958. Can we afford to neglect the positive side of the picture? Can we expect these technicians and astronauts and administrators to sweat for preeminence in space in an atmosphere exclusively critical? I would like to read into the Record a brief list of major accomplishments of the space agency.

Mercury—six manned flights, all successful.

Mariner—midcourse correction of spacecraft flight at a point 2½ million miles from the earth so that we were able to receive back scientific data on Venus.

Orbiting Solar Observatory—over 1 year of successful operation with vast improvement of data received on solar activity as measured above the earth's atmosphere.

Communications satellites—two Telstars, one Relay, and two Syncoms successfully placed in orbit with tremendous scientific and technical information received on which to base a commercial or military communications satellite system.

Space booster reliability—19 consecutive successful flights with the Delta booster and 4 out of 4 successful development launches of the Saturn first stage, our largest and most complex booster.

Let us extend our congratulations to the agency, to the other agencies and military departments who have supported the program and also to the Congressmen on both sides of the aisle who have had the foresight to keep America preeminent in space. Let us make sure we stay there.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 169]

Albert
Ashley
Barry
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Cameron
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Curtin
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Derounian
Diggs
Dingell
Edmondson
Feighan
Flynt
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fuqua
Gary
Gray
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kornegay
Lankford
Lesinski
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
Olsen, Mont.
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rivers, S.C.
Roush
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schenck
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sibal
Smith, Calif.
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tuten
Van Pelt
Vinson
Whalley
Wickersham
Zablocki

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 8747 and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 329 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] has 42 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag] has 39 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my distinguished friend on the minority side will yield me some time now.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman].

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleagues in extending my compliments to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] and to the members of the committee who have done such a wonderful job in trying to separate the wheat from the chaff in looking at a $13-odd billion bill. Mr. Boland, Mr. Shipley, Mr. Evins, Mr. Jonas, and Mr. Ostertag have been great teachers and I have learned a lot. I have tried to obey the rules that are applicable, insofar as I could, that apply to younger Members of this body, new Members. However, I had not been taught to surrender my commonsense.

My remarks in the time that has been allotted to me are devoted exclusively to the space program. I cannot yield until I have completed my remarks, because the time is running short.

As we go on with this debate here trying to determine how much to vote for space this fiscal year, there are several facts that I believe are basic to our deliberations. What are they?

First. We are opening the door now upon the space age.

Second. Communism's goal of world domination by force remains unchanged.

Third. This Nation is on the verge of national bankruptcy.

Now, the existence of these facts requires the most serious and careful and deliberate consideration by the Congress in appropriating huge sums of money for the future. While the space program is properly a governmental function, it is all-fired expensive. It takes years to plan and develop, and the road and the path that we take today is a path that rapidly passes a point of no return and is going to involve spiraling costs in years to come.

Is our present program on the right road? In fact, what road is it on? I wonder if even its stanchest advocates know just where the space program is headed?

In the course of our hearings I asked the Administrator of the space program, Mr. Webb, whether NASA was working with the Air Force to have a missile system inside of these capsules that are going to fly out, and to make sure that we of the committee understood that what he said was not solely directly reflective of NASA policy but also of the White House and of administration policy, Mr. Webb testified, "No, the policy of this Government is not to put weapons in space. That was stated by the President and reiterated by Mr. Gilpatric."

I was shocked by this statement. And since it was made I have taken it upon myself with my colleagues and other Members of this great body to investigate to see whether this was so; and if so, what our policy was to be over future years. And from what I found out I am satisfied that it is the policy of this administration not to provide a weapons system in space. In fact, the emphasis is all in the other direction, on a scientific study of far outer space, on a manned lunar landing and return, on things that were we in fact one world at peace would and should, of course, be U.S. policy within the limitations of our ability to pay for it.

But, Mr. Chairman, the world is not at peace. At best, the situation in which we find ourselves at this very hour, today, is an uneasy armed truce between the remaining free nations of the world and international communism, fanatically dedicated to the destruction and overthrow of all free governments everywhere in the world. As the greatest and I hope still the strongest of the remaining free governments, the United States of America is communism's No. 1 target.

Since before I was born we have maintained peace in the world by being strong, by deterring would-be aggressors through our ground, naval, and aerial strength. When we failed to be strong—when we became too interested in the comforts of life at home as in 1938 and 1939—as we remained aloof to Hitler's Mein Kampf, to the click of storm troopers' heels marching through Europe—there came a time at which we knew we would have to fight a madman who dreamed of world conquest by an allegedly superrace and would use force to accomplish it.

Our effort then was a monstrous burden, its costs were staggering, our sacrifice real, and the burden upon our debt resulting from the costs of war and the costs of foreign aid following that war approaches 180 billions of dollars of the $308.5 billions that is the national debt today. Had there been no Munich, had we taken a greater interest in what was happening within Germany and assisted others in that nation to deal firmly with its Hitler, there would probably have been no war. Although there are those who say that every 20 years or so there has been a war, I do not believe this need be true forever as rational men and women of courage and foresight are willing to sacrifice some material advantages now to keep the peace.

Mr. Chairman, Adolf Hitler was a boy scout next to any genuine Communist in whatever land and of whatever national origin. All the vodka-drinking and gladhanding exchanges of diplomacy must not blind us to the tenets, beliefs, and goals of world communism which, distinct from the nationism of Hitler's race supremacy, is an international conspiracy crossing national boundaries and appealing to subversive communism from the Cape of Good Hope to Nome. The single, fanatical, consuming desire and objective of every single Communist in this world is to see the day when the United States of America will lie prostrate, if necessary to this end our cities devastated, our people largely returned to dust so that our inability to thwart Communist world conquest becomes a dismal reality.

Communist tactics remain unchanged. From a Trojan horse in one land to espionage, sabotage, subversion, deceit, hypocrisy, world propaganda, and the encouragement of conflict and hatreds between groups within this land, this thoroughly malignant evil is the scourge and curse of all mankind.

There is only one way to be sure for ourselves and generations of Americans to follow us that we shall still have a national sovereignty and this is to stay strong.

We must stay strong in space in this, the space age. We do not stay strong by going to the moon.

As challenging, glamorous, interesting, and even fascinating as may be the scientific and technological research and development required to perfect a manned lunar landing and return, such an operation is virtually without military significance.

Oh, yes, as one of my colleagues said, there will be some sloughoff to the military of scientific learning, but we will need to have capsules capable of orbiting, whether lunar or terrestrial. Why not terrestrial orbit first? Why not build them so that they can have weapons installed as weapons become needed in space? Why not integrate within the modular mockup at least a capacity for a bomb? A capacity to observe other objects in space at close hand? A capacity to shoot down and to destroy other objects in space if they are hostile to this Nation?

It has been said that we must be careful not to get into an arms race in space with the Soviet Union. What a joke. What colossal naivette. What gross short-sightedness. Does anyone in this Chamber think for 1 minute that the Communist space program is not military? Does anyone believe that, should the Communists be able to place a manned capsule in terrestrial orbit in inner space a few hundred miles above the earth, its capsule will not have the capacity to bomb or the capacity to maneuver in and out of fixed orbit, or the capacity to destroy other objects in space? Of course it will.

And, Mr. Chairman, what if all this should be accomplished by Soviet space technology in inner space while we are still developing a capacity to land a man on the moon? What if such Communist space vehicles might be produced in quantity, changeable in orbit and virtually immune from American interception? What if accompanying such developments the Soviets perfect an entirely new and as yet unknown method of warfare in space?

They have a 100-megaton bomb. We know this. They know how to trigger it. They have tested it in the atmosphere. We never even built such a thing, much less triggered it, and we just promised that we will never do so, or try in the test ban treaty with Communist nations. Couple the 100-megaton bomb, whose area of destruction involving an equivalent of 100 million tons of TNT defies imagination in its horror, and which I might observe undoubtedly can disrupt all communications for quite a period of time based on electronic impulse, with Soviet military emphasis in space and I say, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to defer and stretch out our moonshot program so that funds will thereby be available to concentrate on achieving and assuring a capacity for continued American military control of inner space. This has been our policy in years past on the ground, on the seas, under the seas, and in the atmosphere. As we enter the space age there is no occasion to change this policy, for in truth and in fact it is the insurance policy for our survival as a Nation, and we are short of money.

At the appropriate time, I shall offer an amendment to reduce the Apollo program by $550 million and our lunar and planetary exploration program by $150 million. Even with and after such reductions there will still be billions devoted by us to space but let there be no mistake about the effect and the intended effect of such an amendment. It will defer, it will stretch out, it will delay a moonshot program and this we should do. It is in the public interest. We will go to the moon when we can and if we can but let us do first things first.

In foreign aid we have found to some people's dismay that money is not patriotic and that dollars do not buy friends. Neither in space will or should dollars be used to buy tenuous prestige at the expense of national security in space. The entire emphasis, direction, and development of our space program should be changed so that for the immediate present our target becomes the development and perfection of a manned vehicle in inner space that contains a weapons system, can be moved in and out of orbit, can rendezvous in space, and has a hunter-killer capacity.

The funds that would be saved by stretching out our moon program must be saved if we are to stay financially solvent and still perfect an inner space program of military significance. If we could have both; if we could afford both; if we were not on the verge of national bankruptcy I would not be here pleading with you today. But unfortunately money is short. There is not enough to go around, this moonshot business—even the most conservative projections indicate will cost us $20 billion if all goes according to plan.

And to do what? The plan is literally to put a man or men on the moon in a so-called lunar excursion module and bring him home again. For what? For a handful of moon dust. There is no life on the moon. It is reliably reported that the temperatures range from 250 degrees below zero to 250 degrees above zero. Nor is there even any atmosphere on the moon. So why do we want to go there? To prove to the world that we can do it, all the while going grossly further and further into debt. And, I might say, as the Communists know, further and further away from the financial ability to wage a sustained and continued all-out military effort in the event of a national emergency?

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there is a tremendous segment of American industry that is vitally affected by changes in our space program. Some of these contracting companies have become propagandists for NASA and the moonshot. Propagandists, I might add, helped with taxpayers' dollars in contracts held by them involving hundreds and hundreds of millions, many without competitive bidding. And not an insignificant factor in this situation is that the dispensation of these contracts unfortunately has often been determined on the basis of political considerations. Not the least of these have been geographical location at tremendous cost.

Our space program must not become a works project for administration-preferred politically advantageous areas. It must not become a crash program seeking to prove the mistaken thesis that we can spend our way to prosperity. It must not become a glamorous carnival sideshow that steals our resources while the mailed fist of Communist military might in space proceeds unchallenged.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is only frosting on the cake compared with the problem of our national survival. We in this House here and now, for the safety, security and solvency of this country, must subordinate and put aside local selfish concerns as we view this problem of space policy in long-range perspective. There is no indication whatever from the President that under his leadership American space policy will be changed in the direction of emphasis upon national security.

The other day an administration spokesman suggested that I listen to voices in high places in the Government who knew better about such things than Congressmen from New Hampshire, or from Arizona, or from California. I observed in reply that unfortunately of late voices in high places in the Government of this country have shown that they have political axes to grind even at the expense of the national security, that the military has been muffled, promotions tendered and offered on the basis of acquiescence in political policies or silence. The great conflict that has raged for decades in this country, whether we should have civilian or military control of the Defense Establishment or a unified military service, has even yielded of late to the spectacle of the Secretary of Defense taking to national television to justify a surrender of another piece of the national security by the man who appointed him.

Mr. Chairman, let us continue to try to be first in space. But let us be first in space at the right place and at the right time. The right place right now is not 250,000 miles out in the year 1970 with a civilian in a pressure suit on the moon. The right place right now is a man in a navigable armed maneuverable inner space vehicle with a capacity for interception and destruction of enemy objects in space. If the present administration declines within the framework of existing space enabling acts which permit such a change, to reorient our space objectives, according first priorities to those things that should come first right now, the Congress must act to protect the American people. The first way that it can tangibly act is to deny to the Apollo program, the manned lunar landing program, the appropriation of funds that at present we desperately and urgently need for other stated objectives.

I would hope that as time passes the standing committees of this House will see fit to recommend a legislative redefinition of space priorities to emphasize as a matter of congressional intent the urgent need to assure continuing American military capabilities in space. The appropriation of funds at the levels requested for a moonshot at this juncture, with the national debt what it is, with our balance-of-payments deficit what it is, with an operating deficit in the Government of the United States what it is, with the prospect of increasing it by billions through the tax reduction, and with the imminent risk that our foreign creditors may precipitate a run on our gold reserve, impels me as a member of the Appropriations Committee to describe the manned lunar landing program as daytime moon madness. I am not alone in this conviction. It is shared by the man who was President of the United States when the basic legislation was enacted. I am convinced that it is shared by an overwhelming majority of men and women throughout this land who are taxpayers and who have to pay the bill. We can go to the moon at our leisure as the national fiscal picture permits without doing it on borrowed money. This is what we should wait to do. This is what this House in the protection of the best interests of the strength of our economy should insist upon by its action here today.

Mr. Chairman, this moonshot business is heady wine. Like moonshine in the hills, it goes to the head. It affects judgment because of its glamour. NASA, with a virtual blank check, has managed to develop one of the greatest propaganda mills in the history of this country. Just look at the mail you get at your desks and see what you have coming in, and read the papers.

Its zeal is understandable, even pardonable. Nothing in the appeals I am making here today is intended as critical of the Space Administration itself. What I am asking is that as a matter of fund control we change our space policy. The space people are enthusiastic. They are capable, they are brilliant Americans. But it is here in Congress, here in this House, because the administration is not going to do it, that we are going to have to establish these priorities. It looks like the only way we can do it is through the appropriations process. A shift of the emphasis in our space program from manned lunar flight to manned inner space flight does not mean any the less need for a manned flight center. It may even mean more manned flights, but the flights will have a direct security significance and a real meaning to this country. It will not just be an experiment in something that may never be able to be accomplished and that means little of real value even if it is successful.

We cannot afford to continue in space with outboard motors while the Soviet Union develops PT boats. We cannot afford a process that in the building of airframes in space modules fails to integrate a capacity for weapons or a bomb bay. I return again to a statement printed in the minority view in the report which is before you. If this country continues with its present space policy the best we are likely to see by 6 years from now, in 1970, is the possibility, and it is only a possibility, of an American lunarnaut, clad in a moon suit, standing on the edge of a moon crater holding a handful of moon dust that cost the American taxpayers $40 billion, and all the while wondering how he can get back to a place where he can get out of his suit and live again. And all this while some 250,000 miles below him, back near home above the United States, a Soviet Communist cosmonaut, married or single, revolves around this country in a manned and armed space capsule, equipped, maneuverable, and virtually secure from interception. This is a scarcely tenable defense posture. In fact, the contingency is a very real responsibility of this House to prevent.

Finally, it is no answer to say that such contingencies have been considered by prior Congresses.

This is the 88th Congress. This is the fall of 1963. This is the time when we are in a financial hole right up to our necks and we are on the edge of national bankruptcy. This is a time when there are enemy bombs, planes, and missiles in this hemisphere. This is a question for this Congress and I say that we must act now to protect the security of the American people in our space programs. This is our responsibility. It cannot be delegated, it cannot be avoided and I am confident as we face this problem, considerations of the pork barrel and of the political party will be laid aside.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] for his minority views. I join with him in recognizing our need for developing the military use of space, contrary to the administration and announced goals, which do not include space weaponry.

There is absolutely no excuse as I see it for spending $1,226 million more this year than last year. Nor is there any virtue in our proclaiming that we have reduced the spending of $1,555 million below the President's budget requests. We have increased spending from $11.8 billion in 1963 to $13.069 billion in this bill.

There it is, the same old pattern—so much more money is asked this year over last year that Congress can cut the budget $1.5 billion yet end up spending $1.2 billion over last year. We spend more and call it a reduction. We spend more and brag about savings. As the report says "The total for the bill is $1,555 million less than the budget estimates." To me such a presentation is duplicity. It is strictly political, to impress the unknowing constituent. We can talk both ways, for economy because we cut spending estimates. Yet we can proclaim our dedication to increased Federal activity because we spend even more than last year.

In this appropriation bill we find joined the space program and public buildings construction. There is no priority of spending, as we continue to deficit finance.

We claim the need for space spending and then we add on urban renewal, research studies on mass transportation, more Federal buildings construction. There should be a priority on spending established.

Twenty-six executive agencies and offices receive appropriations in this bill in totally unrelated fields. Yet each agency becomes absolutely essential. There is no priority. We spend more than we can afford. We charge it to the future.

If space exploration is absolutely essential and I would so agree, because of our life or death struggle with communism, then we should cut back elsewhere. Certainly then we can eliminate some of the spending in housing and home finance, urban renewal, and many other agencies, so that we at least balance the year's budget.

The Dallas Federal Building is not included and responsible Dallas people are not asking for deficit financing and inflation as the price for constructing this building. However, as we see other public buildings included we are on sound ground, as taxpayers, that a priorities system be established.

There is time yet for us to put our Federal finances in order. Let us balance the budget by cutting back nonessential expenditures—then let us reschedule the public works projects in a priority system based on merit. Certainly, we can cut back spending by eliminating Federal aid to communism. There is no need for subsidy in a wheat deal—there is no moral justification for aid to Yugoslavia, Poland, Cuba, or other satellites, nor should we distribute aid through the U.N.

There still remains some question in my mind about the manner in which we appropriate for Federal buildings. Once we invest in a Federal building buying site and plans, then we should protect the investment. Once started, the project should not be dragged out. This is expensive. The project should be finished quickly, thereby substantially cutting the total cost. This is true in the case of one Dallas Federal building.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to one of the most able speeches I have heard in all my 25 years in Congress. Never have the Members of this House listened to a more convincing and factual speech than was first delivered by our well informed, able colleague, Lou Wyman, of New Hampshire, a member of the Appropriations Committee for Independent Offices.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you noted that we could hear a pin drop every second of the time Mr. Wyman spoke, which is the finest compliment that can be paid to a speaker in this House.

I shall not attempt to add to or take from the salient points made by Mr. Wyman. I shall only say that I endorse every word, and trust that every Member here today will ponder and heed his words of knowledge and wisdom and that all will profit thereby, including the highest officials of NASA and the President of the United States.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Weaver].

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, the major role of national security in the space program has been clouded in the hearings of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. It has been difficult to define clearly the mutual roles of NASA and the Department of Defense in the development of our national security in its relationship to space.

Moneys allotted this year are set forth basically for nonmilitary and scientifically oriented programs of NASA. The question of how much national security is involved has never been specifically clarified.

It is the opinion of a minority that our space goal be directed primarily toward national security, and secondarily to peaceful development of outer space. By so doing our military space program can then be given proper perspective, new emphasis, and new direction. At the same time, the benefits of space technological advancement will accrue for peaceful development of science and industry.

We recognize that there is a technological war with communism, and we feel that our space program must now be given proper perspective in relation to our military space mission.

We, therefore, recommended as a minority of the Science and Astronautics Committee—Representatives Roudebush, Pelly, Rumsfeld, Weaver, and Gurney—that this and future budgets be evaluated to place emphasis on national security. Thus, the military role in space through the Department of Defense can be properly and fully implemented.

We feel that a clear definition of space age duties and roles of the Department of Defense and NASA is necessary to develop an effective program. The cold war we are engaged in with the Communists can only be properly waged if our space program progresses with national security as its prime goal.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague] who is chairman of the legislative subcommittee who handles this program, 7 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a congressional district in the United States where there is less space money being spent than in my district. I think the gentleman from New Hampshire completely misses the point of going to the moon. For many years we tried to reach the South Pole. I do not think anyone expected us to find anything at the South Pole except ice. But many Members of this body have been to the South Pole and they know that it took the best military equipment that we have in this country to get to the South Pole. It is not a question of getting to the moon to find out whether there is a lot of dust there or whatever it is. Every single achievement and everything that we learn in going to the moon has a military significance. Suppose before World War I the British had not learned to dominate the sea and the air? What would have happened to this country? Suppose in World War II the United States and the British had not been able to dominate the air and the sea—where would we have been? If we had not dominated the air in Korea, where would we have been?

It seems to me that our space program is nothing more than an extension of our military objectives, of dominating the different areas of this world and unless we dominate space, it will not be used for peaceful purposes.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. If there is going to be military value in a trip to the moon, how is that going to be possible if it is done jointly with Russia?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would say to the gentleman that I disagreed with the President's suggestion and I wrote and told him so. I asked for clarification. I have heard from the President. It was an interim report. He told me he would make a full report. There may be many areas where we may be able to cooperate, but for goodness' sake I hope we never reach the point of trying to get into a capsule together and go to the moon together. As the gentleman knows, there are other areas where there can be cooperation and I hope that is what the President was talking about.

Mr. Chairman, there are many areas in our space program that are working with the military. Today the military controls the whole tracking area. The military does all the recovery work. There is the School of Aviation Medicine at San Antonio and the School of Aviation Medicine at Pensacola, Fla., in connection with the Navy. They do practically all of our research work in our space medicine program. All astronauts except two are military. So, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New Hampshire completely misses the point. What we want is the knowledge that we will have by knowing that we are able to reach the moon.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. I wonder if the gentleman has read page 197 of the hearings, volume 3, where the following occurred:

> Mr. Wyman. What is the big job you referred to?
>
> Mr. Webb. To go out with men to carry equipment which can be changed in flight and which can take advantage of human observation and exploration.
>
> Mr. Wyman. Would you include a maneuverable space capsule?
>
> Mr. Webb. Yes. We have this Gemini.
>
> Mr. Wyman. I understand that, but are you working with the Air Force to have a missile system inside this capsule?
>
> Mr. Webb. No. The policy of this Government is not to put weapons in space. That was stated by the President and reiterated by Mr. Gilpatric.

Has the gentleman read that testimony and would he care to comment on it?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the history of the space program. First President Eisenhower went to the United Nations and made a speech about the peaceful uses of space. Then President Kennedy went to the United Nations and made the same type of speech. This Congress passed a bill where we casually mentioned the military. Now today we have a military setup, whatever you want to call it, right there in their office in the space agency where they know every move that the civilian space agency makes. Maybe it is best to talk about space for peaceful purposes as far as the international situation is concerned, but I believe at least 90 percent of the Members of this House, who I think know about the space program, know it does pertain to the national security of our country, and that is the reason why most of them support it. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the Gemini program and of the joint cooperation between the space agency and the military.

Mr. WYMAN. I want to make it clear, when I suggested that I was going to offer an amendment, it was not to have any effect on the Gemini program at all. Would the gentleman say that the Soviet program was devoted to peaceful purposes, also?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would be most foolish if I said yes to that.

Mr. WYMAN. If the Soviet program is not devoted to peaceful purposes, should we not develop capsules with capacity in space to meet the challenge if it should come on?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think the gentleman, if he will read the hearings that were held before our subcommittee we had the Defense Department representatives, will find that every member of that subcommittee said what the gentleman is saying.

Mr. WYMAN. The funds devoted to the Apollo program are not directly devoted to the military concept, are they?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think every single thing we do in the Apollo program will be contributing to the military. There will be others, such as identifying a hostile satellite, which will not pertain to peaceful purposes, but everything we do in the Apollo space program will advance our military knowledge.

Mr. WYMAN. Is it not a fact that possible effectiveness of the Apollo program cannot even be determined for 6 years, which is perhaps 1970?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think so.

Mr. WYMAN. In the meantime would it not be possible with the reorientation of our space program, to have capsules in inner space that can be manned and armed?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think we will have capsules in inner space and Gemini will be a great contribution to this.

Mr. WYMAN. Is there military significance in the sense of a direct approach in the Gemini rendezvous program? If there is I cannot find it. Gemini is a basic step—like Project Mercury. It is not touched by the pending amendment as I believe the gentleman knows.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, and I think the Department of Defense is begging the question. I told them so in our committee hearings.

I want to say in closing, if we want space for peaceful purposes, unless we are up there to dictate it, we will not have space for peaceful purposes, so we have to get up there.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. I appreciate the gentleman's point that the moonshot will require a great deal of thought, but I believe I have more appreciation for the point of the gentleman from New Hampshire that in a military sense if an emergency should occur we should need not knowledge but you need stations in inner space.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would agree with the gentleman completely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish not to consume more than 4 or 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague from New Hampshire who came here in January and has been with us on our committee since then. I speak, I know, unanimously for both sides of the aisle, Mr. OSTERTAG and Mr. JONAS on the other side in saying that we are delighted to have him. The same thing goes for these able and distinguished gentlemen on this side. He has a brilliant mind. He attends to his business and works hard. He is a clear thinker, and my guess and hope is he will be here a long time. We want him to stay on our subcommittee. He does more than carry his own load. I will tell you that. He has made a very eloquent speech on two points. One, economy. Cetrainly I am going to agree with what he said on economy. This bill itself proves we agree. And he helped to carry out this bill. And so he lived up to what he is preaching. And so this subcommittee, when we came in here with a reduction of $1.5 billion, proves that our record for economy is pretty good, is it not?

The other matter concerns the military. I have been here a long time. There is a whole lot I do not know, and I hope to learn a little as I go along. But you cannot separate this program from the military, and this was never intended.

The great argument ought to have been made 2 years ago when we had a record vote on this floor establishing policy. That is when this great argument should have been made. There were great arguments made against the program then, but on the record vote those arguments were denied. There is nothing new in the arguments.

Do you realize that 22 percent of every dollar that NASA spends is spent by the military? It is a blank check, if you please, by NASA to the military, to buy hardware to serve in the programs, both NASA and military.

Do you recall, about 14 or 15 months ago that Mr. Webb, Administrator of NASA, and Mr. McNamara, head of the Department of Defense, had a meeting and signed articles of agreement for cooperation between the two organizations? Do you realize that Mr. McNamara's crowd allocated $1 billion—listen to this—for one item, a booster using solid fuels? And he says he is going to live up to that allocation. Everything they do is pointed to it.

We are talking about what ought to be done.

I am no scientist and my able and genial friend is not a scientist. He is one of the best lawyers Harvard ever produced. He is excellent; there is none better. But he is not a scientist and neither am I. So I am going to have to rely on what the scientists tell us. And they say that we had better learn to crawl before we start running.

Let me spell that out to you. We had better crawl before we start running if we want to save some heartbreaks, some time, and save hundreds of millions of dollars. We had better know what it is all about before we start building weapons systems. And that is what my able friend from New Hampshire is really talking about, weapons systems to be put in space. Let us learn to operate in space before the military develops the weapons systems. That is their job, nobody else's. They are the experts on the weapons systems. Let us not do as the military and the Atomic Energy Commission did not long ago with a project lasting several years; spend $1 billion—and listen to me now—$1 billion trying to develop an airplane powered by atomic energy. And we have not done it yet.

Now, why did they make the failure? Let us go to the scientists. Do not listen to me, I do not know anything about it. All I did was moan and groan and do a little fussing because we did spend the $1 billion and did not get the results. But what do the scientists say? I will take Dr. von Braun. Give credit where credit is due. He taught us about all we know in this country in this field, and I go further and say that he taught American industry just about all they know in this field. Dr. von Braun is in charge of a great installation at Huntsville and his assistant is Dr. Debus, at Cape Canaveral. I believe they say if the homework, namely, pure research had been done first, before they started to build that airplane and that motor, they would have succeeded. They got the cart before the horse.

Let us not do it here, gentlemen. Time is too valuable and money is too valuable. This crowd has done a magnificent job. They are on the right path. There is not the slightest friction between the Department of Defense and the Space Administration. If the Defense Department does not know what it is doing here, they are wrong in other fields too, are they not? If they are wrong here, let us not give them the $50 billion in other fields every year to protect us. Let us be reasonable about this.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking so much of the time of the Committee. I thank the members of the Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to our beloved and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, for going out of his way in order to yield me a few minutes on this stupendous appropriation bill. I want to say that I think the subcommittee has done a good job in cutting down on the appropriations that were proposed. I wish they had done a better job. I know how difficult it is. I know they are aware of our very critical financial situation and that they are doing their best to try and cut down these appropriations so that in the course of time we might have a much needed tax reduction.

But, Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to record my own opposition to what I regard as the fantastic project of going to the moon. I have never been able to see it. I read a great deal about it. I am not a scientist and so I do not know the science of the thing. But I do not believe that the scientists know the science of the thing. There is not anyone here yet who tells us if we start out we will ever get to the moon. After we spend this $40 billion nobody knows whether when we get to the moon anybody will be able to land on the moon. After we probably spend some more billions of dollars, nobody knows if we land a man on the moon that we will ever hear from him any more or that he will ever be able to get off the moon. After spending all this money, if he does get off and he does get back, which is extremely doubtful, no one knows whether he is going to know anything when he gets back any more than he did before he went there.

I just think we are getting down to the point of being ridiculous about throwing away the taxpayers' money, and I cannot help but say that.

I listened to the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], today. He should be able to convince everyone in this body that we should not undertake this moonshine trip. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] who has just preceded the chairman of the committee. He has made one of the most logical and informative statements I have heard on this subject, and I hope his amendment will prevail.

On the whole general scientific program the waste in our various programs of scientific exploration has been fantastic. You can read the report of the National Science Foundation and various other types of reports, and practically every agency in the Federal Government deals with subject of science. Of course, they have an advantage over us because they have Ph. D.'s, and so forth, and everybody says they know all about it. I do not think some of them know any more about it than we common people know about it.

I would hope that this committee would go further and cut down on that. I want to call your attention to something to illustrate the fantastic waste in these programs. With reference to this moonshot, here is an article that appeared in the Washington Post on October 4. It carries the headline of a "$100-Million Bungling in the Moon Shot Bared." Who bared that? Do you know who did? It was done by your agency, the General Accounting Office. And it was admitted by the agency. They just wasted $100 million of your taxpayers' money that your people are paying out. That agency did it through carelessness and inadequacy in their calculations. That is proven by the investigation of the General Accounting Office and admitted by the agency.

Let us come down to earth. That moon has been up there a long time and we have had no invitation to go up there to the moon. Why not stay home and do some of the necessary things that are so vital to our people? Nobody has ever shown any indication that this thing is going to do any good at all from the standpoint of national defense. I have not heard anybody say in this debate, and I have listened to most of it, anything about what conceivable concern this could have with national defense. Of course, I understand, and I think the whole motive of this thing is a race with Russia to get to the moon. If Russia wants to do something foolish why should we race with them? Let Russia do it if they want to do it. But so far as defense is concerned, there has not been one scintilla of evidence to indicate there was any value in any way, shape, or form from a military standpoint. I do not believe you will ever get there if you spend these millions of dollars. I do not think you will be able to land a man on the moon, and after he gets there most likely he will not be able to get off, and after he gets off I doubt if he ever gets back again, and if he does he will not be able to tell you anything useful about it anyway.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House is entitled to some information that we have about the General Accounting Office report, and may I pass it on to you?

First, let me say in my humble judgment, perhaps one of the finest jobs of administration I have seen in the last 10 or 12 years has been by this very humble, distinguished North Carolinian named Jim Webb.

It is a tremendous job to take these distinguished scientists and hold them together. They are just like 100 lawyers in a room. You will get 100 different opinions. But he has welded this program together. Of course, there have been some mistakes. What pattern did anybody have to go by? They have been plowing in virgin soil all the way.

The program that our able Judge SMITH mentioned I think is absolutely true. This program was started by whom? Not by the space agency. It was started by the Department of Defense. I do not mention that to be critical of anybody. I am giving you the facts, is all. The space agency took it over from the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense made the contract, not the space agency. There is some slippage in it. The booster itself is fueled by what? Liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen at temperatures below minus 400°. Is there any pattern to go by? No. If you want answers from research and development you have to have the money to pay for it. Of course, there is waste in research and development. That is where you learn.

Look what we have recently done, and I have not heard anybody cry about it. We spent $1 billion—listen, again—$1 billion developing the B-70 bomber. One billion dollars. And it is not developed yet, and it has been announced that we have abandoned it—$1 billion.

Of course, there is a lot of slippage in any research. I do not say that to make it right but I say it is a part of research and development.

Mr. Chairman, again I apologize, but I thought the House ought to have that information.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this appropriation bill. I desire to talk specifically to the NASA appropriation, nearly 40 percent of the total figure in the bill.

One might observe that my position would surely not be otherwise, since Cape Canaveral, the major launching area for the space program, is in my district.

However, I support this program on its merits. I firmly believe that it is essential to the future of this Nation that we have a strong space program. I believe it essential that we gain preeminence in space, and stride ahead of our rivals, the Communists, in all phases of this program.

There has been criticism this year of the Apollo program, the moon project. It seems of late that the criticism is mounting. There are worthy protagonists on both sides of the argument.

I would put in a word of caution here. There is a danger that the space program of this country may be tainted by a red herring of catch phrases, "moon madness," "junket to the moon."

It should be pointed out, emphasized, and always remembered that the basic ingredients in the purpose of this program is the development of powerful engines, big reliable boosters, sophisticated spacecraft, man-in-space flight time, and, of course, the absolutely necessary development of techniques and technology, in the space field.

Actually most of the knowledgeable opponents of the Apollo project have in mind the same objectives. They question the means of attaining the objectives.

They say we should go the route of close-to-earth space, manned orbital platforms, or space stations. Do this first and then go on to the moon and beyond.

Some of our colleagues have made this point today.

I heartily support the soundness of mastery by this Nation, of close-to-earth space. I firmly believe that we should have a strong space platform program now. We should have had it long before now.

However, the fact that you need a new room on your house, to house a growing family, is no reason to abandon a present dwelling house.

Neither should this Nation, in a possible change of enthusiasm about the moon mission, cripple the only major space program which will enable us to take a long stride down the road toward the goal of preeminence in space.

Development of engines, boosters, spacecraft, and the byproducts of their development require leadtime of many years. It is not possible to abandon this kind of a program, or change it, without loss of years of work and effort, and the waste of billions of dollars invested therein.

I do support the careful scrutiny of our space effort by this House, through our committees, Space, Armed Forces, and Appropriations, and perhaps a special committee for this purpose, to make certain that our goals are sound, to the end that we may make the soundest progress, with expenditures which lie within our financial capability.

It has troubled me for some time that the military space program does not have a more rigorous manned flight program. As military operations over the centuries spread from land, to sea, to air, there can be no doubt that space will be the next military area. The nation which masters this first, may master the world.

I believe it is essential to national security to forge ahead, without delay, with a strong, vital military man-in-space program.

But the need for forging ahead in the military area is no reason to cut down on the single, strong, man-in-space program we now possess—Project Apollo.

Should we do so, I firmly believe the end result would be to jeopardize our forging ahead of Russia, in the basic ingredients of space progress, engines, boosters, spacecraft, man-flight time, and space technology.

This Nation should examine its space policy, and insure that our goals and objectives are sound.

In the meantime we should support the program, which will permit us to take any direction which seems wise.

I support the $5.1 billion appropriation of the House committee for the NASA program of fiscal 1964 and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to our able and distinguished chairman of the Space Committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, hindsight is always good and you can always criticize those things that you do not understand. That, I think, is what has been done and what I have heard on this floor today. It is very easy to criticize biological aspects of programs that are set up by this Nation through the National Science Foundation because you do not understand them. But, thank God, about 20 years ago a scientist had the courage to look at the mold on bread. Now what good does it do you to look at the mold on a piece of decaying bread? You could laugh that out of court. But he looked at this mold and if it were not for Dr. Fleming, we never would have penicillin—laugh that one off. And you could go right on down the list.

A great deal has been made of the GAO report. This GAO report was requested by the Karth subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics last year to verify and support its findings. The Karth subcommittee report is far more complete and far more comprehensive than the GAO report. What did it find? You were told that the Centaur program around which this is built was an old ARPA project. Before you had a Department of Science in DOD, there was an Advance Research Project Agency. This was one of the projects it started.

It was started on a shoestring, but it was making a breakthrough. It was designed to use liquid hydrogen as the booster or, rather, the fuel for a booster. Liquid hydrogen must be held at a very low temperature. Liquid hydrogen is highly volatile, and when they designed the canister to hold it and the shield between it and the oxygen, they use the best techniques they then knew, but the weld proved to be porous and liquid hydrogen penetrated through the weld and when the missile got up it exploded.

Now we can all look back and say, "You should have done better." As I read history, the doctor who treated George Washington on his deathbed bled him. I am not a doctor, but I believe they would most likely have given him, under today's techniques, a transfusion of blood. Yet can we criticize this man who acted in the best of faith and with the best technique, using the best techniques of the day? That is what they did when they built Centaur. But coming out of Centaur with the experience and the knowledge we gained there we now use liquid hydrogen. We have learned to correct the mistakes in the welds that took place there. We now know how to use liquid hydrogen and will continue to use liquid hydrogen in our missiles.

Sure, laugh this off. Say it is a waste. Now, we are not racing Russia to the moon. What do you think of that? And we are not putting a man on the moon for the sake of putting a man on the moon to find out what is there and to see whether it is made out of green cheese or blue cheese or anything else. This is part of the technique in exploring outer space. The data that we get from this is the data that allows us to go on in this exploration. Oh, you say, what payoff does it give? Answer me in dollars what this is worth. A few years ago a hurricane started toward the coast of Texas. Through the Tyros satellite we were able to find out about when and where it was going to hit and give the people in that area 6 days notice. There were three lives lost. In 1904 a hurricane of the same intensity hit Galveston, Tex., almost where this one hit and there were 8,000 lives lost. Can you measure this in dollars and cents? Can you measure the fact that we have put a Synchrom 22,500 miles in space over the spot that we want to put it so that it can be part of a communications system around the world? Can you criticize the weather satellites? You cannot do it. You cannot do it with respect to the things that come from space.

Let me say this to you in closing: Thomas Edison was a great man. He said that the Wright flying machine was a gimmick and a gadget. It would be a plaything of rich men.

And the man who is quoted on the plaque up there over the Speaker's desk, said in debate in the Senate, on a bill to appropriate money to survey a route to the Pacific coast for a railroad:

> Mr. President, what do we want with these worthless wastes, these deserts covered with cactus, with impenetrable mountains, covered to their base with snow? Mr. Chairman, I will not vote one cent to bring the Pacific coast one inch nearer to Boston than it now is.

I am certain that some of my western friends over here on the left do not subscribe to what the great Daniel Webster said, and I hope that we in our day and generation will be a little wiser than Daniel Webster when we try to penetrate the veil that hides the future from us and go into this on a solid, scientific basis.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman; I appreciate his courtesy.

The problem is whether Congress favors the moon exploration program or not as a basic policy. If a Member is against the moon exploration program he ought to vote against the whole appropriation, rather than vote to cripple it, as this will dislocate the planned program, lengthen the time, and in the end cost more in both time and money.

The second point is this. I compliment the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices on its fine judgment and on the budget figure for the space budget and NASA that it has in its judgment decided. It is a coincidence that this figure is within $5 to $10 million of my own figure arrived at by months of work and study that I have talked over with many Members, as well as those on the House Appropriations Committee that in my considered opinion should be the result.

At this particular figure, of $5.1 billion, the House Appropriations Committee gives us for NASA a figure that with economy, that organization can live within the budget, and in my opinion it will not delay or hold up the Apollo program which is the moon flight, as well as research and development programs. I disagree with Administrator James Webb when he says that this figure would hold back the moon flight several years and would cost $1 billion or more for each of 3 years. After years of experience in space, my judgment is that this budget is tight and economical, but that it presently can be lived with, and an efficient program for fiscal 1964 can be carried out by NASA. The NASA agency should operate efficiently and economically, and if a real need can be shown for deficiency funds, as a senior member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, I will be glad to study and consider the request for additional necessary funds from NASA, and can assure my full support and cooperation.

My feeling is this, that the United States should have programs for peaceful uses of space as well as military programs. In research and development in space there is no one, no person in front of or behind the Iron Curtain who can tell whether the result is military or peaceful use. To me, the cislunar area, the area between the moon and the earth, is a strategic area. We in the United States and the free world cannot permit any nation or adverse group to obtain a complete superiority in any strategic field. If we feel that space is a strategic field and I strongly believe it is, we should not cower in our tepees, but we should know what is going on out there, and know how to operate and survive under space conditions. We need to know what is going on in space, be able to inspect vehicles in space, and protect ourselves against attacks in or from space, as well as pursue the peacetime purposes in space which I predict will be of immense benefit for human progress as well as economic gains.

We have already received tremendous benefits out of the peacetime uses of space, such as storm, hurricane, and flood warnings and predictions with very elementary Tiros satellites. We will be able soon to tell from the amount of snow cover on mountains and large inaccessible areas what the prospects for water for irrigation would be upon melting. With the Notus satellite we will be able to tell within 100 to 1,000 feet where every ship and plane is in the world, as such programs and succeeding advances are made. Think of the benefits of safety and efficiency of that. If we maintain the open skies policy as suggested by President Eisenhower, we can have orbiting satellites and vehicles that will open up the whole world so a concealed attack will be impossible. We will be able to tell about any troop concentration anywhere on any continent, or ship concentration in the Atlantic or the Pacific by the hour. When the U.S. Navy puts by the 10 millions, various possibilities and variations into their computers and works these computations in conjunction with the satellites, we will be able to tell you what is happening all over the world and can predict actions days ahead.

I urge you strongly, that with the gains already made and in certain prospect in the peacetime uses of space we ought not to cripple the program.

The gains from the use of space are many. I cite a few real benefits: Stimulated business enterprise by creation of new industries; new jobs, weather prediction, and modification of communications; increased health, improved education; strengthened national economy and a host of long-range values which may ultimately make the immediate benefits pale into relative insignificance.

It is reasonable that if any Member is against the moon program and feels it is foolish, he should vote against the appropriation completely, not just a crippling or bloodletting amendment that would in long effect, destroy or make inefficient the space program. This figure in this appropriation is a very carefully set figure, and my compliments to the chairman, the gentleman from Texas, ALBERT THOMAS, and my hat is off to this bipartisan independent offices subcommittee that came up with this figure. My considered opinion is that it is an excellent figure, with reasoned judgment. It is a sound figure that I personally can back as one of the senior members of the House Space and Aeronautics Committee, and strongly recommend the budget of $5.1 billion for our peacetime U.S. space activities be adopted by the House of Representatives. It will show both responsibility and courage.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with respect and admiration to the discussion of space and economics to which the House has been treated this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring the discussion back to earth for a very brief time to discuss a terrestrial problem which may seem insignificant, but which has real importance in its impact on the procedure followed by the House. The committee has been wrestling with these celestial problems of space with astronomical figures and perhaps it has overlooked an injustice which may be done as a result of its report.

Mr. Chairman, I have such respect for the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee that I feel this must be inadvertent. But it is the kind of an injustice which, if it were allowed to go unchallenged, might well set a very bad precedent that would prejudice every Member of this House.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to the statement which appears on page 14 of the committee report in which there is reference to open space land grants under the Housing and Home Finance Agency section of the bill. The report states as follows:

> It is noted that the National Capital area has already received substantial grants under this program. The committee directs that no part of the funds provided be used for additional grants in this locality.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us know that so great is the respect for this committee throughout the executive branch of Government that these words in this report will be considered legislative history and may be binding upon the executive branch. This means that not only the District of Columbia and the city of Washington, the National Capital, but the States of Maryland and Virginia are going to be prejudiced in the administration of this program. I can tell you that the facts do not justify this sort of prejudice. It is true that Washington, D.C., has during fiscal years 1962 and 1963 received eight grants which total some $2.8 million. But on the other hand Chicago, Ill., has received six grants which totaled much more than that in dollars; the sum of $3.5 million. New York and northern New Jersey have received 11 grants which have totaled almost $2½ million.

So there is no reason, in fact, to discriminate against the National Capital area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if a committee—any committee—can put this kind of direction into a report and deprive one of the States of the Union, in this case two States of the Union, of the benefits of a Federal program, unchallenged from the well of this House, I think we are not following the regular order of procedure upon which this House operates.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that there can be some legislative direction adopted during the course of this proceeding which will undo the serious potential damage which is contained in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that at some point in these proceedings we can put a stop to what could be a very dangerous precedent, threatening the interest that all of us have in our own parts of the country and working serious damage to national programs which should be of general effect and of general benefit to every State of the Union.

A review of the information which is available will show that the National Capital area should not be excluded in any way from this program.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, during the course of this afternoon there have been most appropriate and proper recognition and compliments directed to the chairman and the members of the subcommittee that have recommended this appropriation bill to us. I can only further echo those compliments and add to them that certainly the preciseness of the report that is before us and the eloquence, the detail, and the wisdom that has been displayed in debate this afternoon can only further attest to the diligence with which they have approached their assignment. Surely they have done honor to both the committee and to the Congress.

I want to take a brief moment to direct attention to one particular part of the committee report that is before us. I refer particularly to page 9 and the language that refers to the Federal Power Commission, and here again I should like to extend a compliment to the members of the subcommittee. I note that the last sentence of that paragraph reads:

> The Commission is spending too much time in empire building and trying to expand its jurisdiction.

With this I heartily agree, and I want to note a specific case in point.

On July 22, this year, the Commission issued an order to show cause why respondent should not be required to comply with the requirements of the Federal Power Act. This was directed to three very prominent REA cooperatives. One, the Minnkota Cooperative, in Grand

Forks, N. Dak., the Dairyland Power Cooperative, in LaCrosse, Wis., and the South Central Rural Electric at Lancaster, Ohio.

It seems unique to me, in view of the detail to which this was gone into in the hearings, that we should find that the Commission should enter into an entirely new field and extend their jurisdiction when supposedly they were not able to take care of the assignments they now have. So to that degree, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me and to those of us who exercise some fear of the long hand of the Federal Government reaching out into every phase of society, that the Commission might better continue to care for the assignments that have been practiced during the past several years and to leave out the areas in which there is a real question as to whether or not they have any jurisdiction to begin with.

I call to your further attention that the Secretary of Agriculture as of September 4 directed his attention and intervention to the steps that were taken to regulate and to cause these cooperatives to submit their records to the Power Commission in order that they might in this manner exercise their further authority.

It has been quite adequately pointed out, I think, that should this policy be adopted, it can then be cause to expand it into the entire broad area of the REA. I call to your attention the extent to which this would require additional personnel and that it would be a threat to the future of this organization that has served America and the rural people so well.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I want to commend the gentleman on the fine job he has done on this bill. I notice that in the appropriation for the Civil Aeronautics Board in regard to the feeder lines of the country that appropriation has been reduced from the requested amount by approximately $8 million. Can the gentleman tell me if this will adversely affect our feeder airline operations in the country over the coming year?

Mr. THOMAS. The answer to the gentleman's question is "No." We try to urge the feeder airlines to be as economical as they can, but at the end of the year whatever the bill is, it is a debt and we will pay it. So the gentleman may go back and tell his airlines to be economical, the gentleman is going to see that they get their bill, and he can quote us and we will back him up in it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I recall that a similar colloquy took place last year when this bill was before the House. The gentleman from Texas made practically the same statement then that he makes now. At that time he said the figure set by the committee was more or less an educated guess, and that if the committee had guessed too low, nonetheless this constitutes an obligation on the part of the U.S. Government and the committee would submit an additional amount in a supplemental appropriation bill. As I recall, earlier this year it did become necessary to provide additional funds for this purpose in a supplemental appropriation bill. I am very happy to hear the gentleman say, and I quite agree with him, that the cut as proposed in this bill will not necessarily impair the service of the local service airlines. I am glad to be given the assurance that he still recognizes this as an obligation on the part of the U.S. Government.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the able and distinguished gentleman from Mississippi for his contribution. He is a leader on this side of the aisle and I think also on the other side in the field of aviation. He is one of the experts in the field of aviation in the House.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I call attention to the language on pages 38 and 39 of the bill, which prohibits the transfer by the National Science Foundation of funds for research. We for many years have been receiving a transfer of $258,000 to the Library of Congress to aid in some publications. As I interpret this, your restriction would have no effect on that.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is 100 percent correct. It would have no application, because you are dealing with an item of printing and binding.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret and deplore the decision of the Committee on Appropriations to deny any funds for the new fallout shelter program developed by the Office of Civil Defense of the Department of Defense. The committee action on H.R. 8747, the appropriations bill under consideration today, allowed but $87.8 million of a civil defense budget estimate of $346.9 million, amounting to a reduction of $259.1 million, or about 75 percent.

This reduction of $259.1 million wipes out completely the $190.6 million authorized in H.R. 8200, which passed the House on September 17, 1963, and is now before the Armed Services Committee of the other body.

The House Appropriations Committee action also does the following: Reduces the civil defense budget estimate for operation and maintenance by $12.2 million; denies requests for funds to procure shelter supplies for 20 million spaces beyond the 50 million now funded for supplies and equipment; and reduces the civil defense budget request for research and development from $15 to $10 million, which is less than the $11 million appropriated for civil defense research and development in fiscal year 1963.

Not only does the action of the Appropriations Committee cut into going programs and prevent the best use of available shelter and other civil defense resources; it contradicts the will of the House recorded after deliberation and debate in the enactment of H.R. 8200.

In my considered opinion, we have always done too little and too late in civil defense. Quite a few years have passed now since the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Military Operations, under my direction, made known to the Congress and to the public the basic need for an effective civil defense program. Our first report on the subject, entitled "Civil Defense for National Survival," was submitted to the Congress on July 27, 1956. Since that time we have issued seven more reports on civil defense, examining into many ramifications on the subject and emphasizing the need for responsible and responsive Government action to help protect our people in case of nuclear attack.

Also, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—I might say a charter member since that committee was formed in 1946—I have given concentrated study and attention to the problems of biological and environmental effects of nuclear radiation, including the effects associated with peacetime bomb testing programs and nuclear war under given attack hypotheses.

My studies have convinced me that protective measures are feasible and necessary and can be made available, providing we are willing to plan and fund and build and maintain shelter systems and other basic requirements of civil defense. Shelter systems are the most basic of all since they are necessary to protect people from deadly fallout radiation and from other weapon effects.

The case for civil defense rests not upon any hope or expectation that we have within our reach or can devise complete protective measures. Many millions would be killed by nuclear attack, but it is also true that many millions could be saved by protective measures of relatively modest cost. This is not my opinion alone, but it is shared by all who have given serious, objective study to the problem.

I might call to the attention of the House the fact that civil defense problems recently have been examined in a comprehensive and systematic way by a group of scientific and other experts—about 60 in number—under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences, in a summer study project known as Project Harbor. Members will recall some years ago the basic study of civil defense known as the East River project. Now, in the study directed by the National Academy of Sciences, some of the best minds in the country have taken another cool, dispassionate look at the whole array of civil defense problems. We may look forward in the near future to the results of Project Harbor as presented in reports to the Department of Defense, parts of which undoubtedly will be made public. I have every confidence that the findings of Project Harbor will reaffirm what many of us believe—that civil defense is a vital component of the national defense and must be given active and serious attention by the responsible authorities—military and civilian—on a par with other defense systems.

Bear in mind that civil defense, whatever else you may have thought or said about it, is a weapon system just as surely as a missile or an antimissile or some other defense system. For civil defense is a means of saving American lives, and it burdens the enemy and confounds his strategy just as surely as the weapon system that tries to shoot down his planes or missiles.

As a weapon system which can save American lives and help to thwart enemy objectives, civil defense may be considered a form of insurance in the same sense as all weapons are insurance—instruments which we hope never have to be used but which we must keep ready at hand. And in these times when men of good will look hopefully for a ray of light in the international scene, for a lessening of tensions that breed war, through a test ban treaty and other means of mutual forebearance, civil defense would offer added insurance—against failure of the opponent to honor his commitments.

At the beginning of 1960, when President Eisenhower was preparing so hopefully for the summit meetings, and civil defense was hardly a popular concern, I pointed out to him in a letter that "progress in disarmament does not obviate the need for civil defense. In fact, the need for civil defense grows greater because it is the only ultimate insurance against enemy cheating." Then, a year later, when President Kennedy took office, I wrote him a letter including these words:

> I am one of those who believes firmly that an effective civil defense is indispensable, not only to make credible our willingness to counter new aggressive action against free world areas outside the continental United States, but to provide a means of national survival if deterrence fails. In a letter to President Eisenhower last year I even went so far as to suggest that civil defense has a role to play in disarmament, since it is the ultimate protection against defective arms control systems or cheating on the part of the potential enemy.

In terms of cost, civil defense really is not an expensive weapon system, considering a national defense budget of almost $50 billion a year. To deploy antimissile defenses at major population or military centers could cost possibly $20 billion. For that sum of money, and with less technical difficulties, we could have a very respectable civil defense system in the United States. Although planning and funding for civil defense shelters is a complex task, the technical requirements for shelter building are much better known and the know-how much more widespread than the requirements for building antimissile defenses.

Of course the Congress is not proposing to spend anything like $20 billion for civil defense. The bill reported by the Armed Services Committee and passed in this House on September 17 was an authorization bill for $190 million—a modest start for a modest program. Still it was a historic occasion, in a sense, because this was the first time since 1951, when the original Civil Defense Act was passed, that this body of Congress was willing to take a new step forward in civil defense policy. The way was prepared for this step by President Kennedy's decision to transfer civil defense functions to the Department of Defense and to give personal attention and budgetary support to this new segment of defense activity. A national shelter survey was instituted and shelter spaces were identified, marked with distinctive signs, and provided with essential supplies and equipment.

The national shelter survey was a start, but it did not do more than provide a modest portion of the national shelter requirements. The next step was to develop a program by which the Federal Government would assist local institutions, such as schools and hospitals and Government structures, through incentive payments, thereby encouraging local efforts to build fallout shelters. A ceiling on the Federal share of the proposed financing was set at $2.50 per square foot or $25 per shelter space of 10 square feet. This was the major ingredient of H.R. 8200 which came before the Armed Services Committee for authorization and before the Appropriations Committee for funding.

By enacting H.R. 8200 as the authorization bill, this House made a policy determination that we should at least make a start toward providing minimum fallout protection for all the people of the United States.

I had the privilege of appearing before the Armed Services Committee, which held hearings on H.R. 8200 under the direction of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. The chairman and his subcommittee were patient, diligent, objective and dedicated; they brought to their tasks an understandable skepticism but came away convinced that something had to be done, that the Congress must carry its share of the responsibility for protecting American lives.

The hearings and House Report No. 715, which was approved by the Armed Services Committee and submitted to the Congress, demonstrate not only hard work on the subcommittee's part, but a respect for facts, a willingness to learn, an appreciation of the enormity of the need, a sensitivity to the practical obstacles to fulfillment of the need.

There was intellectual humility in the committee's report, which candidly confessed that its members made a complete turnabout-face in civil defense—a turnabout from skepticism or disbelief to full conviction that a civil defense program should be undertaken. The observation was made, also, that if every Member of the House had the opportunity to sit and listen or read with the members of the Armed Services Subcommittee, they too would become convinced of the importance and necessity of embarking on the recommended civil defense effort.

There was not only intellectual humility, but spiritual humility in the expressions of the chairman and others of the committee that "they did not want to play God." They would not arrogate to themselves the decision to grant their fellow Americans a chance to save their lives, the decision to dispose of American destiny in case of nuclear attack.

There is wisdom and insight in this view, and it should be given heed by those who hold great power in this House, for with great power goes great responsibility; and in matters of life and death of people—of a whole nation—of a whole civilization—judgments how to proceed ought to be not based upon arbitrary whim, or personal predilection, but on collective deliberation and common consent. This is another way of saying that the House should be afforded an opportunity to pass on the civil defense provisions of the appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, we are caught in a parliamentary time trap. The appropriation bill including civil defense has come to the floor of the House before the authorization bill for civil defense was considered by the other body. Many problems weigh upon the Congress, and the times are out of joint with regard to so many things.

Let not the record be confused, however. If we are estopped from voting on that portion of the civil defense appropriation bill which is not yet supported by a separate authorization, that is one problem. If however, the House is denied the effective opportunity to work its will on the appropriation for this important program because the Appropriations Committee has decreed otherwise, then I tremble for the future of this country, and I make this plea to those who have the power to dispose: "Do not try to play God."

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I should like to refer back to the feeder airlines problem. I recall distinctly the gentleman's statement on the floor a year ago, but out in Minnesota the feeder airline problem has become complicated by reason of a cutback in the subsidies. From four flights daily in that area they have been cut to two flights daily, so we are now in the situation where two flights a day almost means the same as taking all service away. Just where the blame lies I do not know. Perhaps this is a policy of the CAB. There is some inference now that there is a lack of funds, but that has not been my information, after checking.

Mr. THOMAS. To reply to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, one of the valuable Members of this House, I cannot think by any stretch of the imagination that there would be a lack of funds, because after all this is a debt we recognize, and we have supplied the money for it. Perhaps it could be under the rules and regulations of the CAB. The Board does have jurisdiction over routes, rates, and fares. The use it or lose it program—it could be that. Is business falling off in the town, do you know? We will work with you and we assure you if it is a question of more we will be glad to cooperate with you. And will you come back and talk with our colleagues here, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr.

WYMAN] and myself and our other colleagues here, and we will work with you.

Mr. NELSEN. I would like to make this comment. Very recently we have had notice of Federal funds being allocated for the building of these terminals in airstrips. So it does seem rather inconsistent in this period of infancy, shall we say, of air travel in these areas where Federal money is being spent for terminals and subsidy programs for feeder airlines to cut back so the program cannot get started. I appreciate the gentleman's statement that he will do what he can.

Mr. THOMAS. If there ought not to be any cutback, we will work with you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would like to correct the gentleman on one point—there is no authority in the Federal Airport Act for Federal money to go into the building of airport terminals.

Mr. NELSEN. Then I stand corrected on that point as I recall Federal funds are limited to control tower facilities and landing strips, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Appropriations Committee, and particularly the subcommittee, for the job they have done in the reductions in the 26 agencies requested budgets in this bill, H.R. 8747.

However, with all these cuts, there is still much fat and excess in this bill. As was pointed out earlier in this debate, these 26 agencies have added some 120,000 new employees at a salary cost alone of $689 million in the last 2½ years. We see travel funds in the amount of almost $62 million in this bill. We find funds for mass transportation, urban renewal, and open space land grants, to mention but a few, in this bill.

I approve of the committee's action in the cuts made in our civil defense appropriations, and particularly in the field of fallout shelters. As I pointed out earlier this year, in the debate on the fallout shelter bill, we now have 104 million public fallout shelter spaces identified in this country and we are gaining 4 million new public shelter spaces each year as a cost-free byproduct of private commercial construction. When we have a good program that is getting better, I am pleased, indeed, to see that this committee has seen fit not to initiate another new Federal aid program for this purpose.

Although, the committee has initiated some economies in this bill and has in fact, made some sizable cuts in the requests, I can not in good conscience support many of the other large and, I believe unnecessary, expenditures that are left in the bill. This bill appropriates $1,233,167,400 more than was appropriated for these same agencies last year. In view of our national financial situation, I do not believe we can afford this kind of expenditure and I must, therefore, oppose this appropriation bill.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the tremendous work which has been undertaken by the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in carefully analyzing the budget requests and the spending of the independent agencies. The distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, and every member of the committee deserve the deep gratitude of the House for their diligent efforts to make the independent agencies more efficient and provide the taxpayers of America with "real value" for tax dollars.

The 10-percent across-the-board cut in the appropriations for public building construction in this bill has a severe impact on the proposed Cleveland Federal Office Building because it is the largest, and I might say, the most needed building in this program. The present Federal building in Cleveland was constructed at the turn of the century and is primarily used as a courthouse, having very little accommodation for Federal agencies. As a result, Federal offices are scattered in 31 locations throughout the city. In addition, it is extremely inconvenient to the public. The scattering of Federal offices is inefficient and does not provide adequate safeguard and security to Federal records and Federal business.

At the present time $1.38 million is spent annually on leased space in private buildings scattered throughout the downtown Cleveland area. Every indication points to rising rentals. Records of the General Services Administration have established full justification for the immediate construction of the Cleveland Federal Office Building.

While I am fully aware of the objectives of the committee in appropriating less than the budget requests, I feel that this cutback has much more serious effect upon the larger buildings which face a larger cutback.

The plans for this building have now been completed at a cost of $1,126,000. The site has been acquired for the sum of $1.275 million. If the General Services Administration fails to receive suitable bids for the construction of this building within the limits of the appropriation as recommended by the committee, it could result in the need for a costly resubmission of bids or a costly redesign of the building.

It is my hope that the quality of the building will not suffer. While Federal buildings are built to last for 50 years, our experience is that they must last a century or more. The prospect for the future appears to be in the direction of rising prices. If the construction of this building should be delayed through these circumstances, it is conceivable that the 10-percent cut might be totally offset and exceeded by rising costs.

I am grateful that the Independent Offices Subcommittee has included the Cleveland Federal Office Building in its appropriations for fiscal 1964 and hope that this project may commence construction without delay in accordance with the quality of completed plans.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I have not been in full accord with the workings of the Federal Aviation Agency and its Administrator, Hon. Najeeb Halaby, in many areas, but I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Halaby for the work he has done in the field of noise abatement.

I wish to have the record show that in the 1960–61 budget the prior administration had spent only $106,000 for noise abatement, $90,000 of which was for research on the sonic boom. Prior to 1960, little or nothing had been done in the field of noise abatement by the former Civil Aeronautics Administration and then its successor, the Federal Aviation Agency.

The present administration in fiscal years 1961–63 has spent over a million and a half dollars and for fiscal year 1964, for various noise abatement programs, $400,000. Though this is a far cry from that which is needed to give to the people the peace and quiet to which they are entitled, great strides have been made in this very complex problem.

I know the Administrator will continue this work in the field of air safety and noise abatement. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will recognize this serious problem and provide necessary funds for proper research, for I believe that the final solution must rest with the source of the noise; that is, the jet engine.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of fundamental questions which are of the deepest concern to many Members of Congress and to me which have been raised by the NASA hearings in the last 2 years. I believe that we should seek comprehensive answers to these questions to enable the Congress to do a more intelligent job.

How can Congress assess the probability of success of the lunar program? The systems are unbelievably complex, extremely expensive, and in every case without exception represent a host of new technical approaches and techniques.

Can Congress even evaluate the basic techniques to be used? Does it make sense to use the Earth orbital system or is it more logical to use the lunar orbital method? Which has the least technical problems? Which has the highest costs? Are experiments planned on the Moon? Are they planned to reap maximum benefit?

What about the next steps? Should we be planning now for voyages to the other near planets? We will be asked to make decisions on this sometime in the future. Are we really well enough informed to make those decisions?

Are the experiments proposed adequate to assure a high probability of success? Because of the great expense very few preliminary tests are planned. Is this planning adequate?

Is the lunar program just a technical "tour de force" or will it increase our world stature commensurate with its costs?

I do not know the answers to these questions. How many of us are sufficiently familiar with these matters so that we can vote intelligently on these issues?

We must make wise and informed decisions not only because whatever we do is going to cost billions of dollars, but especially because the defense of our country depends on our making wise and informed decisions. Hoping to achieve a more objective appraisal of these complex and important matters, and because I believe that such information is imperative and essential to the decision-making process I have introduced a bill in the House, H.R. 8066, to establish in the legislative branch of the Government the Congressional Office of Science and Technology of the Senate, and House of Representatives.

Such a new congressional service would advise us in a timely, unbiased and objective way on these paramount issues of our day and time. My bill is similar to one previously introduced by Senator BARTLETT of Alaska seeking to establish a Congressional Office of Science and Technology—COST.

The Government does not lack scientific information. The information provided Congress, however, is not as objective as that provided the President by the Bureau of the Budget and his scientific advisors. Since the Congress must appropriate the funds, it needs to have advice which is no less sound, objective, impartial, and free from special pleading as that provided the President, or to the decision-makers in industry. It may be doubted that this is the case at the present time.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, as the Appropriations Committee annually considers the accomplishments and planning of the various agencies while scrutinizing budget requests, one cannot help but be particularly impressed by the record being compiled by one of the younger elements of the Government: the General Services Administration.

In its scant 14 years as manager of property and provider of basic services, GSA has been amply demonstrating the wise foresight which led to the creation of this central management arm of Government back in the year 1949 on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission. GSA was formed to increase management efficiency and achieve economies—and it has been doing just that.

In a study prepared for the Joint Economic Committee last April, savings and economies resulting from the establishment of GSA in the first 13 years of its existence were estimated at $3.9 billion. With the further development of the agency, a sum equal to that is expected to be saved over just the next 5 years.

The GSA record is good and the Federal Government is particularly fortunate to have at the helm of this important agency of Government an astute and tireless administrator, Bernard L. Boutin, who is making it an even more effective management agency.

A few examples will illustrate what GSA is doing in saving dollars for the Federal Government:

First. In reductions in public utilities and communications costs through the operation of the newly established Federal Telecommunications System, consolidation of switchboards and execution of areawide contracts, an estimated $33.5 million will be saved in fiscal 1964.

Second. The transfer of excess personal property and real property among Federal agencies for reuse avoids expenditures for procurement of replacement items. An estimated $579 million worth of such property will be utilized and maintained in the Government system in this fiscal year, thereby obviating the need for new procurements.

Third. Large volume buying of supplies and materials for distribution through the GSA supply system, including buying under the consolidated contract system, will save an estimated $283 million this fiscal year.

Fourth. The expansion of the motor pool program is achieving economies through better utilization of vehicles. Savings through motor pool operations are estimated at $9.5 million this fiscal year.

Fifth. An Executive Order No. 11035 strengthened the hand of GSA in achieving improved overall control of utilization of Federal office space. Testimony in the recent hearings will point out improvements made in the use of space so far, and further improvements can be counted upon under this new directive as time goes on.

I might add that although I agreed in committee to the recommended levels of appropriations for this agency, I have some apprehensions after further reflection that we may have been inordinately severe in the reduction we made in operating expenses in the Public Buildings Service account. I say this with the realization that the substantial reduction we made very likely would require a cutback in needed maintenance and minor repair services and thus result in a decline in employee efficiency and a buildup of future requirements for major repairs. It is also likely that the reduction would require the cancellation of needed leases.

The other accomplishments of GSA over the past 14 years in helping make Government more efficient and more economical are many, but I will not go into them now. Let it suffice to say that under energetic direction, the General Services Administration is fulfilling its potential as the central management agency of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

Executive Office of the President

National Aeronautics and Space Council

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the National Aeronautics and Space Council, established by section 201 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2471), including hire of passenger motor vehicles, reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem, $525,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time, first of all, to ask the gentleman if there is money anywhere in this bill for a study of any kind—a preliminary study or in any way to carry on mass transportation studies?

Mr. THOMAS. There is $5 million which exhausts all the authorized funds. They have a bill pending before the Committee on Rules and they are seeking a rule for that bill. So we gave them all the unused authorization of $5 million.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Am I correct in saying that $5 million is for the Boston, Mass., transit system?

Mr. THOMAS. I think there are 2 or 3 dozen localities in the country that are interested in it. You know, this was a two-part program—one was a loan and one was a grant program. Many localities like it. This was one of the backdoor spending programs and this body cut out the backdoor spending. But to answer the question of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, this is $5 million and that is all the money authorized.

Mr. GROSS. Where do we find it in this bill?

Mr. THOMAS. On page 33 under Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any relationship between the two?

Mr. THOMAS. It may be that you might have to ride to get home.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman: Is there money in the bill for a new radio hookup to be handled by the President or someone appointed by him, as a substitute for conelrad, a radio network over the country?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from Iowa is now talking about civil defense. They did away with conelrad and they substituted another form. They think it is more effective than conelrad. You recall that the conelrad system was the system where all the radio stations got together and in a simulated or theoretical bombing attack, they would all go off the air.

Mr. GROSS. How much did conelrad cost us?

Mr. THOMAS. I believe the cost was $1.5 or $2 million. Something like that.

Mr. GROSS. How much for this new setup?

Mr. THOMAS. It does not cost any more, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. How much to start? I want to see if you will agree with me that your hearings show it will cost $150 million before you get through with it.

Mr. THOMAS. There is $150,000 in the bill for the Federal Communications Commission to insure a state of readiness throughout the communications industry. Whether this will be any better than conelrad, I do not know. The reason why they had conelrad was they were afraid if you left all of the radios on, an incoming bomber or missile would get on a beam and follow it in. So they cut it out. What this will add I do not know, frankly. They think it is so important that they are going to do a little experimenting on it.

Mr. GROSS. I get the impression it is going to cost $150 million before you get through.

Mr. THOMAS. No, nothing like that.

Mr. GROSS. With the fallout shelters that would be provided the selected radio stations and all the rest of gingerbread that goes with it?

Mr. THOMAS. My friend is making an understatement if we are going to talk about fallout shelters.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about fallout shelters for the radio stations in this network to be controlled by the President. That is what I am talking about. I am limiting it to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. How far off am I?

Mr. THOMAS. I think you are way off. We are not going to let them spend any large amount of money like that unless the House tells us to.

Mr. GROSS. That brings me right back to the gentleman's statement of awhile ago about the great economy to be found in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Wait a minute.

Mr. GROSS. I ask the gentleman to wait just 1 minute. I have only a little time left.

Mr. THOMAS. We will give you more if you want it.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you. The bill is $1.5 billion below the President's asking price, but it is $1.233 billion above last year, and you call that economy, I ask my friend from Texas? If you spend $50,000 more in your own personal living expenses over what you spent last year, would you think that was economy? Or does it become a different matter when it revolves around the business of spending taxpayers' money instead of our own money? I would like to know where you find the economy in this bill that you talk about.

Mr. THOMAS. We took out $275 million from this program.

Mr. GROSS. Based on the asking price you cut out $1.5 billion. But that is the asking price. The true criterion of economy is how much you reduced spending over what you spent last year. That is the only criterion of real and true economy.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, fallout shelters are a new program. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. GROSS. I am not talking about fallout shelters or any other one provision in this bill. The fact remains you are spending $1.233 billion over what was spent last year. If that is economy, I will eat the paper the bill is printed on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read.

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point, with all points of order reserved on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if you do this and we then run into a fast limitation of debate on this bill, it can be bad when we come down to certain items.

Mr. THOMAS. I will give my distinguished friend my word of my earnest cooperation whenever he wants it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not going to be fast on the trigger about cutting down on debate?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from Iowa and I will get together.

Mr. GROSS. There are two or three amendments here that are very important.

Mr. THOMAS. We are going to work with the gentleman. Let us get through. We shall work with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WYMAN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the chairman if this will in any way affect an amendment which I have pending.

Mr. THOMAS. Not a bit in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against any provisions in the bill? If not, the Chair will receive amendments.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYMAN

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Wyman: On page 36, in line 11 strike out "$3,926,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,226,000,000", and in line 12, immediately after the period, insert the following: "Of the amount appropriated by this section not more than $597,400,000 may be used for Project Apollo, and not more than $124,400,000 may be used for the lunar and planetary exploration program."

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that this amendment is not a general amendment similar to language that is in the bill before us which cut some $250 million from the authorization and left it to NASA to apply the cut where they wanted to. This amendment would apply specifically a $550 million reduction to Project Apollo which is our far outer space project and $150 million reduction to lunar and planetary explorations.

What does this mean in terms of what is before us for action?

There is $254 million in this bill for lunar and planetary exploration—you cannot find it in the appropriation bill before us unless you look for it real closely in the authorization, Public Law 88–113 of this session, section (a). When we come back to the House committee Report No. 591 of July 25, 1963 you find that in this lunar and planetary exploration project there is $90 million for a Ranger project involving unmanned lunar investigations. It has not worked yet, but it has value in the long run. This is substantially unaffected by this amendment in NASA's discretion and the Surveyor Lander spacecraft is being developed to accomplish the first soft landings on the moon without a man in it. This has some $28 million more. It too can be unaffected in NASA's discretion.

But there is a lot of money in here for Mars and Venus fly-by. That is fine in terms of scientific technology and it would be all right if we had unlimited funds. But while Mars is supposed to possibly have some life on it; nobody knows, Venus is supposed to have an 800° temperature. I cannot see any earthly significance, short as we are of funds at this time to presently pay with borrowed money for fly-bys of Mars and Venus. This amendment would save $150 million out of this lunar and planetary total. It would not hurt except for a slight reduction to the Ranger or Surveyor program.

In the Apollo program I have been interested in what has been said by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], and by the chairman of our subcommittee, the suggestion that in some way our meteorological studies, Telstar or Syncom or others, are affected by what is proposed to be reduced in this amendment, or that the booster engine in the Saturn launch will be harmed. These are not affected.

This amendment would stretch out the long-range, far-distant space ventures to the moon. It would defer to a greater present need for these funds for inner space concentration with emphasis on a manned capsule that can change orbit and that has a weapons system and bomb-bay capacity.

We must stay in a position of being able to have these funds to develop a hunter-killer capacity in inner space.

Although it was suggested by one of the gentlemen who spoke here that there was a policy of liaison between Defense and between NASA, let me tell the members of the committee that it is under orders from this administration that they shall not put missiles into space. They are not even to integrate a weapons system in our capsules while the Communists are for sure. How stupid can we be in our long-range space policy?

Mr. Chairman, in case anyone has any doubts about this, two or three remarks which I think are most significant appear at page 113 of the hearings:

> Mr. Wyman. Getting back to the hunter-killer capacity, is it not a fact at the present time that it is not at the policy level—our American policy—to develop a hunter-killer capability in space?
>
> Mr. Webb. That is right.

Then on page 114 of the hearings there is the following which was stated by Dr. Dryden:

> If the Defense Department has a project for a hunter-killer space vehicle, NASA would support it by every resource at its command. I think we ought to make that perfectly clear.
>
> Mr. Wyman. It takes a policy to have a project.

Dr. DRYDEN. It is not our business to set up the defense project.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the slough-off and fallout of technical know-how and scientific learning from this tremendously expensive space program for a lunar landing is not enough, not anywhere near enough. The moon funds to the extent of $700 million should defer at the present to imperative security requirements to take the path toward a hunter-killer capability in inner space. In the space age we simply must have a space program that protects our people against Communist aggression.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the most knowledgeable man in America, if not the world, on the subject of rocketry and outer space, and so forth, is Dr. Wernher von Braun who is now living in my State at Huntsville, Ala., and who is in charge of the great George Marshall Space Center. Dr. Braun is the most brilliant scientist in the profession. No man has made a greater contribution to the American space effort than he.

Mr. Chairman, about 10 days ago Dr. von Braun came to my office. I enjoyed his conversation about this subject for about an hour and a half. I asked him if, in his opinion, it were possible to put a man on the moon and what scientific value would be derived therefrom. He said in answer to my first question that unquestionably such a project was feasible and possible and that there would be more military benefits from such a project than scientific or civilian benefits.

Then I asked Dr. von Braun if he would write me a letter which I could use in our committee or use on the floor of the House in an effort to keep the funds in this bill from being cut.

I would like to read, Mr. Chairman, one of the finest letters that I have read on this subject. It is dated October 2, 1963, and written by Dr. von Braun from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDREWS: In recent weeks the national press has carried a number of articles about the objectives and the cost of our lunar landing program that have produced a grossly distorted picture of the real situation. I am greatly concerned about the possible summary effect of some of these out-of-focus commentaries on the forthcoming deliberations of the House Appropriations Committee on the NASA budget for fiscal year 1964. Both as a citizen and as a NASA official deeply involved in the lunar landing program, I am taking the liberty of addressing this letter to you in the hope that you will make your weight felt to avert what I would consider a major national calamity.

The basic dilemma of our national space program is that outer space, all by itself, is neither an objective nor a program. It is rather, as President Kennedy so aptly put it, "a new ocean on which we must learn to sail." To sail this ocean is costly and requires a well-laid-out program that must be steadily supported over a number of years. In support of this program major manufacturing, testing, and launching facilities are necessary which require years of construction and additional years of personnel buildup and training for activation and operation. Obviously, such a program cannot be turned on and off like a faucet.

On May 25, 1961, President Kennedy said in his budget message to Congress that he thought this Nation should commit itself to landing an American on the moon and bringing him back alive before this decade is out. The President also said that in this space effort we should "go all the way or not at all." When the 86th Congress supported the President's challenging suggestion by about $1 billion for fiscal year 1962 and subsequently well over $2 billion for fiscal year 1963 for the Gemini and Saturn/Apollo manned spaceflight programs, a huge facility construction and manpower buildup program was initiated to lay the basis for an effective implementation of the plan during the remainder of this decade. This program is now moving forward with great momentum and with a large measure of success.

At the present time, prime contracts valued at almost $5 billion have been placed with numerous industrial firms throughout the country. Major industrial or Government facilities have been activated in Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Virginia, not to mention the numerous subcontractor facilities located throughout the country which support the space effort. As a result, the NASA manned spaceflight program today is a thriving enterprise employing hundreds of thousands of people all over the United States and this country is rapidly becoming the leading spacefaring nation.

Unfortunately, it seems that in recent months a many-pronged campaign has been launched to undermine the stanch determination with which the program has been supported for the past 2 years. Headlines such as "20 Billion for a Stunt" or "$40 Billion To Pick Up a Handful of Lunar Sand" are in vogue today. Even more damaging are implications that the very objective of a lunar landing was ill-conceived and is indeed detrimental to the support of a far more important military space program designed to protect our national security.

Please allow me to address myself to these arguments.

It is not said that space is of no military significance; on the contrary, space has a military significance as is amply demonstrated by the fact that an ICBM must travel through space above the atmosphere to its target. Even beyond this, space will have continued and possibly increased military significance. But as military planners know only too well, it is impossible to predict with any degree of certainty what forms military operations in outer space may take, as long as the body of practical experience in manned spaceflight is limited to a few hours of orbiting time logged by only a handful of astronauts. History has shown repeatedly that a large body of experience must be gained in a new form of transportation before substantial military use can be made of it. For example, the forms of early military operations in the air, such as the World War I type dogfight were conceived only after many pilots, in exploratory and peaceful pursuit, had developed a feel for that new ocean opened up by the Wright brothers. Motor vehicles and ships went through a similar evolution. What we need at this time in our manned spaceflight program, therefore, is not the pursuit of premature and unsubstantiated military schemes, but simply more overall experience in spaceflight. Such general experience will undoubtedly become very useful for sound military decisionmaking also. This view, incidentally, seems to be shared by most of the responsible planners in the Department of Defense.

What, then, is needed? We need to continue the uninterrupted establishment of a challenging technological program which brings the scientists and engineers both within NASA and DOD, as well as throughout the country, to grips with the technical problems of advanced manned spaceflight missions. At the same time, such a program would give an ever-growing number of civilian and military astronauts an opportunity to gather practical experience in operations in outer space. Lest anyone think that with the establishment of NASA our Military Establishment has been given the short end of the stick, I should like to point out that 14 of the 16 NASA astronauts are military officers.

In my opinion, the lunar landing objective set by President Kennedy is an ideal mechanism to establish such a broad space capability program. Unlike military space objectives, which at this time so obviously lack clarity in definition and objective, the goal is crystal clear: Everyone on earth knows what the moon is; everyone knows what this decade is; and everyone can understand an astronaut who returned safely to tell the story. An objective so clearly and simply defined enables us to translate the vague notion of conquering outer space into a hard-hitting industrial program that can be orderly planned, scheduled, and priced out. It establishes that sorely needed, firm, nonvacillating goal which alone can serve as a basis for a long-range plan. I think the American people should be told that this goal per se is not the overriding consideration, but that the lunar landing was chosen as a goal toward which all parts of the program can be focused, matched, and integrated. Another goal could possibly have been picked instead, but since it embraces all vital elements of a true national spaceflight capability, the moon offered the best choice.

To land a man on the moon and bring him back in this decade, the following major elements are required:

A rocket such as our Saturn V, which is capable of placing the equivalent weight of a fully loaded, commercial jetliner into orbit, must be developed. And it should be remembered that Saturn V really doesn't care what those 120 tons of orbital payload are made of. Payload capability will always be the key to any space capability. Thus, if and when the need arises for any heavy military space payloads, Saturn V will be ready to carry them;

The huge manufacturing and static test facilities required for the development of such a rocket must be constructed;

An earth-orbit rendezvous technique, such as developed in conjunction with our Gemini program, which can be used just as well to inspect potentially hostile satellites, must be brought to perfection;

A spacecraft such as Apollo with a capability of sustaining three astronauts for several weeks in outer space, and reentering the atmosphere at speeds far in excess of low-orbit speeds, must be developed;

Facilities to launch such large, manned space vehicles must be designed and constructed;

A global network of communications, tracking and command links required for the execution of intricate orbital and deep-space maneuvers, must be laid out around the world;

Auxiliary equipment such as space suits, space electrical power generating systems, life support systems, etc., that are basic elements to any major scientific or military space capability, must be created;

And, finally, a vehicle capable of landing, in helicopter fashion, on the lunar surface must be developed, which is a separate unit entirely independent of the Saturn launch rocket or the Apollo spacecraft.

Within NASA's Gemini and Saturn/Apollo programs, only the last item on this list, the so-called Lunar Excursion Module, is specifically designed for the landing on the moon. All other elements of these programs create what we as a nation most urgently need independent of our lunar landing effort: A national manned spacefaring capability, to sail the new ocean, as the President said.

The resources being spent within the Saturn/Apollo and Gemini projects to activate manufacturing, test, launch and support facilities throughout the United States is like a capital investment into the next few decades of space exploration, both military and civilian. Should the need arise, they will always be available to serve our national security. A mere byproduct of this investment, but a universally understandable and visible goal will be the capability of lunar landing and return.

Statements to the effect that we are wasting billions on a useless, wild moon chase at the expense of our national security are therefore simply not based on the real facts.

It is also sometimes forgotten that virtually every penny of our manned spaceflight program is not spent on the moon but right here on earth. This program not only creates new jobs and new challenges, it also has a beneficial fallout effect in literally hundreds of ways on our industry, transportation and communications systems, medicine and science in general.

The present NASA progress to develop a manned spaceflight capability is not a crash program. It is a fast-paced, economically managed program which can give us the space power we need at the lowest possible cost.

Some critics of our national space program have stated that the funds allotted to space should be diverted to activities such as cancer research, increased development and production of consumer goods, better care for underprivileged people in this country and the rest of the world, projects such as waterways, hydroelectric dams or plants to convert salt water into fresh water. I'm most certainly in favor of all of these and many more worthwhile causes. But I am sure, Mr. ANDREWS, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee you know full well that the facts of life are such that, regardless of how strongly anyone would try to accomplish this, any funds taken out of the space program would not find their way into any of these channels.

Let me now shortly discuss the budget situation in fiscal year 1964. The total NASA submission to the Congress was approximately $5.7 billion, of which about 70 percent was intended for the manned spaceflight program. The figure passed by the Senate Authorization Committee was approximately $5.5 billion; that of the House Authorization Committee about $5.2 billion. The compromise figure finally settled on in conference was approximately $5.35 billion. The share of the manned spaceflight program in this trimmed-down figure is already so marginal that it will be necessary to cut quite a few engineering corners and accept the accompanying risks to make the "decade" deadline to the moon. Nevertheless, we still think we can make it if adequate funds are provided in following years. However, it is my personal conviction that any further cuts in the fiscal year 1964 budget simply mean that we as a nation will have to back out of our publicly stated commitment and admit defeat, as far as the target date of "this decade" is concerned.

What else would happen if NASA had to absorb a major additional slash in the fiscal year 1964 budget? Unless the lunar landing project, and with it the development of a national spacefaring capability were altogether abandoned, the taxpayer will most certainly not save money in the long run because a stretched out lunar landing program would come to an even greater total cost. To continue the program on a sharply reduced budget, we would have to drastically cut back the level of effort in most of our contractor plants, and the resultant layoffs of personnel would undoubtedly reverberate throughout the Nation. We would find the countryside scattered with half-completed facilities which we could not afford to staff and which would sit there as monuments of our halfheartedness in the face of one of the greatest challenges ever presented to us.

I beg and urge you, Congressman ANDREWS, to come to the rescue of a worthwhile national cause which is in grave danger of defeat simply by a tragic misunderstanding of its real long-range significance.

Very sincerely yours,

WERNHER VON BRAUN,
Director.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the whole question of outer space, the Space Agency, the man-to-the-moon flight, and matters of that kind, have commanded most of the attention here today. I do not know that it has been made clear just what is in this bill, or rather, what changes face you dollarwise in connection with this entire space program.

May I point out first of all that the budget estimate which was originally submitted to the committee amounted to $5,712 million.

You will recall that the House by virtue of the recommendations of the space committee authorized approximately $5,200 million. The other body subsequently changed that figure and it was eventually compromised at $5,350 million. In this bill the committee in its wisdom arrived at a figure of $5,100 million which is $612 million below the budget estimate and is about $250 million below the authorization of the law.

I might say too that in my judgment, the committee might well have cut deeper. I believe there has been every reason to believe, without impairing the program and without taking issue as to the question of military versus peaceful aspects of outer space exploration—without taking apart or issue with the wisdom and the desirability of a man to the moon expedition—the point remains that since the time the committee met and decided on this figure a number of developments have been revealed. You will remember the President's recent United Nations address in which he made the proposal of a joint venture to the moon with the Soviet Union. To my mind, the President would go from competition to cooperation, if his proposal happened to be accepted. First of all, I might say to you that I take a dim view of the prospects of any joint venture of this kind. Even in the testimony before the committee, the space authorities, men like Dr. Dryden who has represented our country in these international information agreements with other nations including the Soviet Union, said that any attempt of this kind would be impracticable, it would be risky, and it would not be workable. Of course, there is always the problem of the Soviet's failure to keep their word. I do not believe it is possible or feasible to enter into such a project jointly with the Soviet Union in a program of this kind any more than we could enter into an agreement for joint construction and building and developing of missiles. But the point remains that the race to the moon has pretty much collapsed by virtue of the President's own proposal. Since that time, and since that figure was approved by the committee, there have been developments and revelations with regard to the Nimbus program, which is a weather satellite and one in which the Weather Bureau has changed its course. There has been a cancellation of a certain amount of money with regard to the use of funds for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, as has been referred to here today on the floor of the House, the General Accounting Office issued a report which deals with certain programs, such as the Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle development program. It was held out as wasteful, extravagant and mismanaged.

In the opinion of GAO, NASA did not provide best data on payload capability to DOD—which had responsibility for developing an Advent—for Atlas-Centaur. They believe delay in reviewing contractor's payload quotations and reducing them after they appeared to be in error, contributed to prolonging development of Advent for which funds were being spent at $4 million a month.

Last but not least, NASA's own report in which they themselves concede that there has been shoddy workmanship in the space business and that the Mercury capsule had 720 things wrong when checked at Cape Canaveral. These statements in this report were made by high officials of NASA; namely, Mercury's Operation Chief, Walter Williams, and the Director of the Manned Space Flight Center, Dr. Robert L. Gilruth. All of these things, while they relate to the past, do have a bearing on what can and what should be done in the future.

It seems to me that without impairing the program, by overcoming waste and extravagance and by dealing with the contracts—and mind you in this whole question of contracts, only 5 percent of the space agency's contracts are let by competitive bidding and that 49 percent are negotiated, with the others on a sole-source basis, which might be cost plus—it seems to me that by virtue of tightening the belt with better management and better contracts and by eliminating waste and extravagance we could and should provide less money than the $5.1 billion in this bill today. I think that such a change is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, might I ask the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] a question as to the effect of his amendment?

Mr. WYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Your amendment that strikes out $550 million from the Apollo program as well as the

$150 million in lunar and planetary exploration, from the Ranger and the Surveyor landing program in effect cuts off, blocks, and defeats the Apollo program, does it not? It is the equivalent of stopping the Apollo program, is it not?

Mr. WYMAN. No; if the gentleman is asking me the question.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Why does it not?

Mr. WYMAN. It does not. In the first place, if the gentleman will look at the statement of the managers on the part of the House filed on August 26 by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] he will find the total amount approved for Apollo is $1,147,400,000. This amendment is so worded it says that of the amount appropriated by this section not more than $597 million may be used for Project Apollo and not more than $124 million for the lunar planetary exploration, and I specifically said that the Ranger and Surveyor projects will in all substance not be touched.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thought you said you were taking out $90 million from the Ranger and you were taking out about $28 million from the Surveyor landing program.

Mr. WYMAN. No.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. As well as on the Venus and Mars program.

Mr. WYMAN. No. If the gentleman will examine the House committee report, he will see what I mean.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Are you leaving the Ranger program alone and are you leaving the Surveyor landing program alone?

Mr. WYMAN. The Ranger program would have a small reduction of perhaps $10 million as against $90 million, and Surveyor would be left alone, but the Mariner program would be cut out. That is the Mars flyby.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Thank you for your answer. I might say to you the Mariner program so far has been the Venus research program. It is the one program we have been so tremendously successful on in the research of outer space, and the Russians have failed on their own Venus probe. If I had been the author of any program it has been my continued firm sponsorship in keeping the money in the budget for the Mariner-Venus program. This program has been the one where we—the United States—were able to have really the first star shot. So really we are the first people or the first astronauts. Orbiting the earth and moon probes are now suburban in character.

The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] said that his amendment does not kill the Apollo program, which then makes the issue, which is best, to take what the Subcommittee on Appropriations has set as the figure. Every member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics on both sides said this should be done, that we should proceed at the rate set by the Appropriations Committee. Likewise, every scientific research person and engineer on the NASA program says that this is the rate at which we should proceed if we are going ahead with the moon flight, and have adequate and efficient research programs in space.

Does the gentleman have any engineering, scientific or research advice as to what effect this amendment will have on the Apollo program? How long will it delay it—2 to 3 years? How would it affect efficiency? Will it increase the cost? In my opinion, it will extremely lengthen the time. And secondly, it will have an effect of not only $700 million on the program, but because facilities lie idle, schedules cannot be met, bills cannot be paid; it will cost several billion dollars more in the long run. What is the gentleman's judgment?

Mr. WYMAN. My opinion is that this will, as I said previously, stretch out this program longer than is contemplated at the present time, because we need the money to be used in space for security purposes. We need the money in inner space. That is the whole purpose of our amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I say that in the last 5 years the military has spent $4 billion on space projects. In the last 5 years NASA has spent $5 billion. So there is adequate military recognition in space, and NASA and the military spend about 22 percent of their total budget in supplying boosters, installations, services, and so forth. I have been in the Navy Reserve and I have been one of the space enthusiasts here, having introduced the first resolution for a Joint Committee on Space in the Congress some years ago, so I am certainly interested in military operation and cooperation in space projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the place where we must change space policy is on the authorization bill and in the authorization debate and not on the appropriation bill. Once we are debating an appropriation bill, if we legislate as the gentleman wishes by cutting funds in order to change the policy between agencies, from a peacetime program to a military program, then we are indirectly subverting the rules of the House.

I have worked with the military people. I have been in the Navy Reserve all these years and have been very much interested in space. I have heard no military man say that there should be such a procedure as that which the gentleman from New Hampshire recommends on a high policy level. Secondly, I would say to the gentleman that between NASA and the Department of Defense people there has been cooperation on 89 separate projects. They have been working to decide which one should be handled by the military and which one should be handled by the peacetime agency. And I want to congratulate them that they are coming up with proper decisions and settlement among themselves as to these projects.

And I say to the gentleman from New Hampshire that when the military and the civilian people at the working level have decided where, when, and how these projects shall be handled and what shall be the division between the peacetime and the military, why should we in Congress, without that scientific knowledge, upset it?

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYMAN. I will tell the gentleman why. We are short of money. We are really short of money. We are on the verge of national bankruptcy.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Let me stop the gentleman there. Why does the gentleman offer his opinion as a newcomer in space against both the military and the peacetime experts who have been working for years on these jobs and dividing these projects and programs between themselves by agreement?

Mr. WYMAN. Because I think I am real close to the man on the street, and I think the man on the street as he looks at our fiscal crisis and what we are trying to do with our moon program, demands that we cut it back. And I would like to say this further to the gentleman. I would favor a reduction in the moonshot program on account of the fiscal emergency, without any consideration of the military.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes, but you would say this—that if we had the money, you would be for the moon program too. You said that earlier. So, to you it is only the question of the money. But you are not saving the money as you simply want to transfer it from peacetime to military purposes.

Mr. WYMAN. If money was no object at all—it is not only the question of money. It is a question of keeping our ability up to be able to meet the Communist challenge when this sort of thaw in the cold war gets freezing again.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In other words, the gentleman from New Hampshire feels it is an overall budget problem and if we had the money you, too, would be for the program?

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman is asking me a question, I cannot resist this observation: If the revenues of the U.S. Government were matched by its expenditures, including exploration of the moon and outerspace and all the scientific wonderments of the universe, I would be as fascinated as many people are, too. This is heady wine, however, and when we are living on borrowed funds, we had better watch our security or we will be too weak to meet the challenge later on.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I will say to the gentleman from New Hampshire that that is a good statement by the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania say that the gentleman from New Hampshire is a little inconsistent in this whole debate?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. No, I think he is consistent, but I think he is wrong in his recommended basic policy change.

Mr. BOLAND. I think he is inconsistent too. Let me say that he argues or he predicates his whole argument upon the fact that the military ought to be in the business of space, that we ought to develop a weapons system. So he now wants to reduce this budget by $700 million, $550 million in the Apollo program and $150 million in the planetary program, but he would like to take $550 million out of the Apollo program and apply it to the military and let them develop a weapons system. So, where is the savings which he asks for here? I would say the gentleman is inconsistent. He argues in one vein that we ought to save money and in the other vein he says we ought to take the money out of NASA and give it to the military with which to develop a weapons system.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. This House cut the military budget to the extent of $1.8 billion or $1.9 billion when the Defense Department budget came here. So, when we are already cutting the military budget, why did not the gentleman from New Hampshire then vote for the increase in the military budget rather than just knocking money out of the basic space budget?

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman well knows—I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania asked me a question—as the gentleman well knows, the basic NASA legislation authorizes the administration, through the Space Council and through the coordination and liaison with the military, at the proper time to change the whole program.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the basic issue involved in the controversy presently before the House is a question of priorities. We all recognize the fact that our national resources are limited. Therefore, the question arises—and I think this is the question which the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] is attempting to bring before the House—Which activity deserves the highest priority? I think the gentleman from New Hampshire is arguing for a reassessment of our national civilian and military space objectives.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have more than a passing interest in military history. Such history reveals the incessant search by one party for an advantage over another. Always the second party reacts to an advantage which might accrue to the first. As a result, offensive developments have always been followed by a defense against them.

The spear caused the development of the shield as a defense. The airplane caused the development of antiaircraft guns. The missile and atomic energy have caused the development of the antimissile missile and the principle of deterrence and mutual deterrence.

Mr. Chairman, throughout history the slightest shift in a stalemate or a balance of power has been decisive. One famous person—I do not recall his name—said if we had complete disarmament, the decisive weapon of world war III could be a thing as simple as a dagger.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are now in this position. We have been met by the Russians in atomic power, we have met the Russians and surpassed them in missile power, and we have now reached the point where we are basing a policy, rightly or wrongly, upon the principle of mutual deterrence, nuclear stalemate, call it what you will. But we are now at the point where one simple breakthrough can be decisive.

A year ago in Cuba the installation of a few dozen missiles and the deployment of 12,000 or 13,000 men upset the balance of power and almost caused a nuclear war. What would a breakthrough today by the Russians, such as the utilization of their present ability to place a bomb in orbit, do to this delicate balance of power? Could it not be decisive?

I think we should ask ourselves the question: Where is the next threat? Is it Venus? Is it Mars? Is it on the Moon? Or is it in so-called inner space? I think we should then ask ourselves the question: Are we meeting that possible threat?

Mr. Chairman, we are not.

Some say it is senseless to talk about a bomb in orbit because it is easier to do the job with an ICBM. There is a defense today against the ICBM. Mutual deterrence is our defense. But there is no known defense today by which the United States can intercept an orbiting bomb. At this time we know that Russia has the thrust to orbit a bomb and extra fuel with which to maneuver. By accelerating or decelerating at will, the orbital pattern of such a bomb can be changed to deceive any defense now under development. And to the present, our national military space objectives have not included the development of a defense against such a threat.

Of course, it is easier to use an ICBM to carry a bomb at this time. But suppose we allow the Russians this breakthrough, and do not develop a defense. Is it not possible and probable that it could be developed and expanded to a point so that the breakthrough will become decisive? Do we dare believe that Russia will not utilize this psychological advantage and the edge at some future conference table that goes with it?

I submit, let us go to the moon if we will; I hope we can. But I also submit that at this very moment we are allowing a military space gap to develop, which is tantamount to inviting national suicide. I think it is time that the Kennedy administration, that made so much of a missile gap in the year 1960, begin to look at the military space gap that is with us at this very moment, and should try to do something about it. It is time to reassess objectives and review priorities.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I might say just very briefly in answer to what the gentleman who just concluded his statement said, that while we probably have no system of defense against satellite attack, there is no one in this world who has a system of offensive attack either. However, I have great confidence in the military of this country and in the Department of Defense, and would assume they are working in that direction so that if there ever is a system of offense in this area we would be the first to have perfected a system of defense.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARTH. I yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. The Defense Department gets about $1.7 billion a year for research in this field. If it cannot find the ability to get what it wants, we will have to develop that ability.

Mr. KARTH. I thank the gentleman. We should not swat gnats when there are bigger things in the offing we should be looking to. I think we should evaluate what the motion to recommit is going to do to the space program. I think the consequences are substantial and let me say I think they are twofold. This motion to recommit will either decimate completely the space program or else have the effect of expanding, if you will, over a long period of time a program that under those conditions is not going to cost $2 or $3 billion more, in my opinion, but maybe $7, $8, or $10 billion more.

So if the gentleman's interest is economy then I suggest he get on the right side of the issue and not offer his motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, the $155 million of the $700 million involved in the motion to recommit is directed against the space sciences portion of our total space program. This means that if the motion to recommit should pass we in all probability will not have an unmanned lunar program. I submit for your consideration the fact that if we do not have an unmanned lunar program we cannot possibly have a manned lunar program, unless indeed we want to take a lot of chances with people's lives, other than our own.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KARTH. I will not yield. The gentleman has had about 30 minutes today and I am struggling for 5.

I will say in all sincerity, and I mean this most deeply, that the surveyor program, the lunar orbiter program, the ranger program, these programs are absolutely essential to the manned lunar program, or to the unmanned program, for that matter, beyond the 150-, 200- or 250-mile range from the earth.

If you adopt this motion, then for all practical purposes you can go back to your constituents and say, because I think this will be a fact, "We have voted against all of the space programs, manned and unmanned." Those are the consequences, I feel, after considerable study on the subject. I think we ought to ask the question, Why is the space program important? I know we have been answering this question in part all day long. It is a good question. Unfortunately, I think too many people have given the wrong answers and some have given only partial answers. Some consider that it is important exclusively from the military standpoint. Some people feel it is important exclusively from the prestige standpoint. Some people feel it is important exclusively from the race-with-the-Russians standpoint. The fact of the matter is, it is a little of all of these, but it is even more than that.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **THOMAS**. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes. He is one of the leaders in the House in this field.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **MEADER**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. **KARTH**. For a question, yes.

Mr. **MEADER**. Did I understand the gentleman to say that all those who voted for the Wyman amendment could go home and tell their constituents they had voted against the entire space program?

Mr. **KARTH**. I personally think so, manned and unmanned, yes; either that or you have voted, if you intend to stretch the program out, for an increased cost of from $7 to $10 billion. You can tell either story, but it will need to be one or the other if you desire to be accurate.

Mr. **MEADER**. Does the gentleman realized if the $700 million in the Wyman amendment were removed from the NASA appropriation there would still be $4,400 million, which is $729 million more than they had last year?

Mr **KARTH**. I cannot yield further at this point. I think I have answered the gentleman's question. I know how much would be left.

This is like saying if we had never started a program in this country, then, because we had never started it we should never have it, because if we started it at all and thereafter continued the program we would be spending more money than at some time in the past. It is ridiculous reasoning, and I suggest maybe a little bit archaic.

When we ask, "Why is the space program important?" we too often think in terms of physical acts, that is, reaching the publicly announced objective, as one Member said, of gathering a handful of moon dust.

Mr. Chairman, seldom do we think of it in terms of advancing technology and what advancing technology really means. Why do we live the good life in the United States of America today that we do live? It is primarily because of the advance of the state of the art, the basic and applied research and the exhaustive development processes we have gone through for many, many years in many different disciplines.

Mr. Chairman, this reminds me of a story and I understand it is a true story. I understand that when the *Triton* submarine which was one of our first nuclear-powered submarines, made a trip around the world in a submerged state and up-periscoped at or near the Philippine Islands, they saw a Filipino fisherman fishing from a fishing boat identical to the fishing boat that his father and his father's father had used. He was using the same identical kind of fishing paraphernalia but he was having worse luck. He was having worse luck because there are more Filipinos and other people fishing in the same waters because the population has expanded. But his technology had not advanced, so really there were fewer fish to catch and what was left were harder to catch. So here was a man who was really living a worse life than that which his forefathers had lived. I just make that little comparison with how we live in this country today. That fisherman knew nothing about the solid state physics that went into the making of that submarine. He knew nothing about the nuclear fission process or the cryogenics sciences that we have involved ourselves in. He did not understand about that, and if he did he probably would have been scared to death. But that is the reason he was living the life he was living and that is the reason—because we do understand it and because we do research and because we do advance the state of the art—that is the reason we live a better life in America today than any other peoples on the face of the earth. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am shocked at the lack of understanding of the purposes for research. Some people have said, "Why should we spend exorbitant amounts of money studying the honey bee?" I think that is a fair question. The honey bee has been with us a long time. But some people forget there is a very important fruit industry in this country and that if it were not for the honey bees, we probably would not have any fruit to eat. So we must learn more about the honey bee, its habits of moving, its migratory habits and the other things it does, what kills it and what saves it. So they complain about this research. I say that all of this great space program that we are involved in today is not a matter of physically landing a man on the moon that is so important. What is important, Mr. Chairman, is developing the technology and developing the expertise so we can do the job of advancing the state of the art. That is what is important. That is why this country is great and that is the only way that this country is going to become even greater.

The **CHAIRMAN**. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, Soviet Marshal Biryuzov says the Russians today have the ability to put a satellite in orbit armed with a high-yield nuclear warhead. Of all the witnesses before our committee from the agencies that deal with this subject, not one has denied that the Russians do have the ability to put this kind of high-yield warhead in orbit and release it. What they do admit is that we have no present ability to detect whether this warhead is up there or not. And they admit we have no present ability to get it out of there, to explode and destroy it. We have no way of getting it out of orbit. We would have no way of getting at this threat to our security.

Now what the gentleman from New Hampshire is saying is that we do not have the money to spend for this moondoggle and at the same time provide the detection system, the ability to detect whether they have a warhead—or warheads—in orbit and also provide the means of exploding the warhead if it is there. This is what the gentleman from New Hampshire is talking about—that there is not enough money to go around, and I commend the gentleman for the excellent speech he has made in support of his amendment.

The financial problems that are bearing down on this Nation are being compounded by the accelerated and extravagant program to get to the moon and these problems will not be solved by starting the printing presses and printing more money. Is that a fair summation, I ask the gentleman from New Hampshire, of his position?

Mr. **WYMAN**. It is a fair summation, and I would add this: Research is important, as the preceding speaker just said, but it is also important for us to stay alive. Rather than researching with respect to the moon we ought to be making sure that we are doing something about the problem you just stated. That is my position in seeking to do it with the motion that is before the House, which, incidentally, is not a motion to recommit.

Mr. **GROSS**. I agree with the gentleman, and while I have every respect for Dr. Wernher von Braun and believe he is a great scientist, when a letter is read from him, as it was on this floor today, this is in the nature of taking testimony from a prejudiced witness insofar as the moon program is concerned. I do not believe the gentleman from Alabama, in reading his letter, quoted a single word from Mr. von Braun with respect to the busted condition of the U.S. Treasury, the imminence of bankruptcy in this country and the inability to stretch the dollars to do all of the jobs that are necessary to protect our security. This is where the letter falls short of meeting the arguments made on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. **GUBSER**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS**. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. **GUBSER**. I am sure the gentleman knows that the surveillance satellite systems which have been under development and which are essential to the type of defense which the gentleman suggested have been cut to the bone even though Congress appropriated the funds for the development of these systems. It seems to me we need to readjust our priorities.

Mr. **GROSS**. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] talks about the moon program in relation to the development of bigger boosters to put vehicles into space. Let me say to the gentleman from Florida that the Russians have not gotten to the moon, yet they have greatly outdistanced us in the production of powerful propulsion vehicles.

Mr. **GURNEY**. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS**. Certainly.

Mr. **GURNEY**. Let us talk about the business of getting up there in space and the sophistication of it. I am on your side. The reason why I support this program is because I want to do it. We have just finished a very simple, model-T kind of exercise in space called Project Mercury. You have been talking about sending a man up into space and getting out of the vehicle and examining what is there, inside.

Mr. GROSS. No. I have not said anything of the kind, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me rephrase it this way, then.

Mr. GROSS. I am not that experienced that I would say we would have to send a man into space to try to smell out whether a Soviet satellite is armed with a nuclear warhead. There may be other methods, I do not know.

Mr. GURNEY. May I suggest it is one of the steps you have to take.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment will reduce the item for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by $700 million. The Appropriations Committee recommendation is already $612 million below the amount requested by the administration.

The two objectives sought by this amendment are economy and the improvement of our defense posture. While I agree that these are among the most worthy of objectives, I submit that the enactment of this amendment would actually waste money and weaken our military posture.

It is conceded that if the amendment passes, the lunar program and most of the rest of the space program will be stretched out. But has our colleague fully considered, as both the Authorization Committee and the Appropriations Committee have, what the cost of this stretchout would be. The Administrator of NASA has stated repeatedly that a stretchout of 2 or 3 years will increase the cost of the space program perhaps $2 or $3 billion.

In order to understand this point, we must remember the remarks of Congressmen MILLER, MARTIN, FULTON, and TEAGUE who have studied the testimony carefully and concluded that the Apollo program is not a crash program.

Money cannot be saved by stretching out major research and development effort, such as our manned space flight program, after it has progressed this far. Facilities are partly constructed, contractors have been selected, and the buildup of personnel is well advanced under plans laid out many months ago. If we reduce the amount of funds available to put these organizations and facilities to work, the operating burden will continue over a longer period of time and the total cost will be higher.

It is possible that some of the Congressman's anxiety about the cost of the program would be allayed if he were to review the testimony and projections of the responsible officers guiding this program. The official projection for the cost of manned lunar landing in this decade is $20 billion. Congressman WYMAN's estimate, based I believe upon unofficial speculation, is $40 billion. As I have previously indicated, Congress can make this speculation a prophesy by stretching out the program so that it will cost much more. I tend to think that we will not be this irresponsible.

Turning to the military question, to the best of my knowledge, not one nickel of the money that is being spent in the NASA program is being taken from approved military space projects or could otherwise be spent on any critical or valuable approved military program in space. To suggest that by cutting this program, money would be free for improving military spacecraft is misleading.

The fact is, if we cut this program further, we could be jeopardizing our military posture in space. Congressman WYMAN has stated that the lunar program is virtually without military significance. Every evidence is to the contrary. An estimated 75 to 80 percent of the cost of the Apollo program will be devoted to development of competence in near-earth operations. About 2,000 man-hours of earth-orbital flight will precede the lunar missions.

The responsible planners of the Department of Defense and people such as Wernher von Braun, have testified that the major military need at this time is substantial and overall experience in space flight. The knowledge and experience gained, and the equipment and facilities developed for the Gemini and Apollo programs will be essential for the design, construction, and operation of any manned weapons system in space, if such should be required.

We have some distance to go in our research in space before we will know how to develop a weapon system, or even just what kind of a weapon system we might want. The most sensible way to provide for our security is to conduct a research and development program that will build a capability in terms of facilities and skills that will insure U.S. preeminence in space and will enable us to make whatever decisions may be required by the conditions that develop in the future. In fact, the Air Force and NASA are cooperating in the Gemini program, in which both civilian and military pilots will learn to rendezvous and dock this two-man spacecraft with an unmanned target spacecraft in earth orbit. NASA and DOD are cooperating in this program. The military is active in the coordination of this program with NASA. How can this suggested cut do anything but reduce the United States to a bad second in space? Since the military is using much of the information derived from this program, how can a lag help our military posture?

It has been suggested that we might relax our position in space as a result of President Kennedy's offer to cooperate with the Russians on the lunar program. For good reasons, the Congress has just passed a record $47 billion Defense Department budget even though the United States and the Soviet Union have actually concluded a test ban agreement. In other words, we moved toward peace from a position of strength. The same thinking applies to the space program.

As President Kennedy wrote to the chairman of our committee, we have made previous offers of cooperation to the Soviet Union which produced only limited responses and results. The Russians have given no indication of their intention other than the statements of their cosmonauts recently that they will land on the moon first. Are we going to stop producing rockets and developing spacecraft, throw thousands of people out of work; severely hurt or ruin many companies and damage many sections of this country on the expectations that the Russians are going to change their international posture immediately and drastically?

The amendment would reduce the unmanned lunar and planetary exploration effort by $150 million. Such a reduction would result in a serious imbalance in the overall NASA space program. The purpose for developing a balanced space program has been to provide this Nation with preeminence in all aspects of space exploration. Proceeding in this manner will place this country in a position of world leadership from the standpoint of science as well as that of technology. Knowledge and experience gained in the areas of science including unmanned lunar and planetary exploration as well as that gained in the development of the space vehicles necessary to conduct such exploration will, through their engineering and scientific accomplishments, have an impact on the potential capability of this Nation to operate in space.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Again I think we should get this space program in its proper perspective. As a matter of fact, I find myself in the peculiar position that I agree with my colleague from New Hampshire, as I stated before, and I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from California that we must get on with the military development of space. But let us hark back a little bit about what the gentleman from Iowa just said which has to do with military sophistication in getting men in space. This business is a building-block business. We are in the model T stage of this business, and we have a long, long way to go. Project Mercury was a hard and difficult thing to do. We learned a good deal from it. The next step is Project Gemini, a two-man spacecraft. It is going to be extremely difficult to perform the techniques involved in this, which involve rendezvous and docking in space. We are taking the step that the gentleman from Iowa was talking about, and requesting that we do, that is what we are doing in this program. All of the techniques and technology we are going to learn will benefit the military applications of space later on.

I am 100 percent for a stronger military program in space. I think the Department of Defense has been derelict in not pushing it harder. I sincerely hope the Armed Services Committee of this House gets on with the job next year. But at the time time I hark back, and I say again and again, and I pound this point home because it is a fact, that here we have an ongoing program which does develop the engines and the boosters and the spacecraft, the technology and the techniques in the space program, in the NASA Project Apollo program, and this is why it is so important. And if we cut it back at this point and cripple it, all of the techniques that we can later apply in their military aspects we will lose. That is why it is so important to go on at this point.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Would not the gentleman say, that, had this Nation in 1962 made a decision to use an earth orbit as opposed to a lunar orbit in our approach to moon exploration, there would be considerably greater military fallout or military implications from the space program than there are going to be from our current program?

Mr. GURNEY. That is one of the strong arguments in fact of a close-in to earth program; and yes, I think probably the military fallouts of that kind of program would be important.

Mr. RUMSFELD. It seems to me that there has been a great deal of talk about the military implications of our space program. Certainly, if there are two possible races, both of which will result in prestige, both costing billions, both resulting in great scientific and space competence, but one, the moonshot, going some 200,000 miles into space and is a race we could afford to lose, but the other involving an earth orbit by a space platform and with a space plane and the utilization of inner space from a military standpoint, and is a race we cannot afford to lose from a national security standpoint, that this country should direct itself toward inner space and not place our top priority in the direction of the moon. As was said earlier in the debate, we should crawl before we run. I want to commend the able and hard working gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gurney] for yielding and also for his effective work in this area.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with the gentleman, or with the gentleman from New Hampshire, in that we should examine carefully the objectives of this Nation in space. This I agree with. But I do not think that an appropriations bill here today is the place to do it. I think we should do this with a committee such as the Armed Services Committee, or the Space Committee, or maybe even a select committee, to find out what our objectives are and properly orient them.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think the gentleman should tell the House that our subcommittee in every way we could tried to nudge them into going more into the military aspects of space.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the chairman of our Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight. That is exactly so.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman].

The moon race—or as some call it, moon madness—is based upon the idea that our prestige is at stake. We have, therefore, involved ourselves in this adolescent contest.

To compound the nonsensical nature of this project, some of the top people in NASA admit that we are not sure that we have actually become involved in a race with the Soviets. Top military men in the Pentagon have also expressed their concern. No military advantage is attached to a moon landing. The President himself has suggested a joint venture between our country and the Russians in this specific area.

For an American to set foot on the moon is a proper objective of national policy. But the question is not whether we should accomplish this objective, but how it should be done and what priority should be given. Should the attainment of this goal be given first priority and all other human needs of this planet bypassed?

The area of space which is important to us is known as inner space. This is the area extending out some 500 miles. This is the area where the Soviets have placed in orbit their powerful satellites. The nation which wins the race to the moon will undoubtedly control newspaper headlines for a few short weeks—but the nation that controls inner space will control the world for eternity.

Already this country is $305 billion in debt. A few days ago this body voted to reduce taxes by $11.1 billion. We paid lipservice at that time to the need for a reduction in spending if taxes were to be cut. This project will cost between $20 to $40 billion. Is it not about time that we stop for a moment and place first things first?

I am in complete agreement with General Eisenhower when he branded the $40 billion moonshot as "nuts." I will gladly support the appropriation of any amount needed for a military space program to insure the safety and security of the country. I will support a reasonable expenditure, within our means, to promote an orderly exploration of space for peaceful purposes.

The amendment by my colleague from New Hampshire reduces the NASA appropriation by $700 million. This reduction would eliminate only a part of the funds requested for manned outer space. This Congress appropriated $3.6 billion in fiscal 1963. We are now asked to appropriate $5.1 billion. If this amendment is adapted NASA will still have available more money for fiscal 1964 than was provided in fiscal 1963. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to propound a unanimous-consent request. We have been debating this amendment for about 1 hour and 5 minutes. I think the debate has been excellent and on a high level. It brings freshly to mind the arguments that have been made pro and con for the last year. Certainly it has been worthwhile.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this has to do only with the paragraph and a limitation of debate on the paragraph to which the Wyman amendment applies; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am sure the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee does not want to confuse anyone or prevent anyone from participating in this discussion. But there are other amendments, as I understand it, which may possibly relate to this paragraph, and I would suggest that the gentleman's limitation be to this particular amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to comply with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Daddario] for approximately 1 minute.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that we do have today both a civilian and military space program. The important question is how large will each of these programs be and what will come from them as they develop in assisting the security and well-being of the country.

The greatest effort is in the civilian sector for the Congress has already decided that we will travel the road of control by a civilian agency. Our language in passing the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 insisted that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. Yet the argument over military participation still comes up year after year. For instance, when the Von Braun team was transferred from the Army to NASA at the request of President Eisenhower in 1960, these issues were raised.

However one may feel about this question, the fact is that today the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has developed over the course of 5 years a governmental, industrial and academic research effort which did not previously exist and which was sorely needed. This capability can now be called upon in various ways.

Those of my colleagues who are concerned about our military competence in space should remember that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is the successor to and carries on the work of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which was established in 1915 to carry on experimentation in scientific problems of flight. The information which NACA developed was used time and time again in development of military aircraft. The work which is being done on a supersonic transport, on short or vertical takeoff and landing aircraft, and in other areas of aerodynamics is vital to military performance. The Whitcomb "area rule" provided an increase in speed of almost 25 percent in aircraft design, and has been applied in modern fighter aircraft. Knowledge gained through this research program which falls within NASA's jurisdiction has been available for the design of the TFX. The tradition to develop a competence useful to both civilian and military needs already exists in NASA.

We of the Science and Astronautics Committee have constantly sought to develop the strongest possible cooperation between NASA and the Department of Defense. We feel this to be necessary and as a result of our activities, there is effective liaison today, and it is our hope that it will become better in the time ahead. The Committee on Science and Astronautics has devoted a great deal of attention to this question, and its care is evident in the meticulous and detailed review of the requests of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for budgetary support. You will recall, that in House report 591 on the authorization bill, the committee insisted that emphasis be placed on greater coordination between our military and civilian space programs.

I should like to take the question of biosciences for special attention. The House Committee on Science and Astronautics held hearings on space medical research on June 15 and 16, 1960, before a special investigating subcommittee. Following these hearings I made a special survey of military research programs in the life sciences and the way in which we could make a truly coordinated effort to build a harmonious relationship between the civilian and military programs and secure one unified program. The text of my report was published in part 3 of the 1962 NASA authorization hearings and is available to the Members who wish to refresh their memory.

Following this report, developments have taken place. A special White House committee studied the comprehensive nature of our bioastronautics research. Efforts have been made to secure coordination through the Aeronautics and Astronautics Coordinating Board and other panels which are concerned with coordination. Without question, there is a capability both in facilities and personnel within the Air Force and other defense agencies which may be put to use. I should point out that a major review of some of the NASA programs is now in existence.

To insure the integration of the space medicine/bioastronautics programs of the Air Force and the NASA, designed to meet the approved flight program requirements of the X-20, Gemini, and Apollo programs and to make maximum use of facilities and technical resources supported with public funds, the Air Force and NASA have worked out a detailed program which has been signed and is being put in effect. In recent weeks a series of visits has been underway to exchange and encourage the interchange of information and of useful work.

Without question our defense programs require greater medical knowledge of man's capabilities as he goes faster, farther, and higher in space. The result of our coordinating activities has been increased attention to the value of work being done by the defense facilities and an increase in their capabilities. For instance, the School of Aerospace Medicine at Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex., has been completing a $6 million construction program which makes it the most modern and well-equipped bioastronautics research center in the country. I would like to call attention to the recognition of this capability as stated on page 398 of part 3 of the appropriations hearings. Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of the Space Agency, states that with reference to research grants with the Department of Defense.

> The bioastronautics is a very good example of the capability they have that ought to be used. It is a unique kind of capability. You do not have very many private bioastronautics people, and rather than separate a new activity internally or to build one some other place you use the governmental agency.

This comment of Dr. Dryden's is in striking contrast to the recommendations we on the Science Committee heard 3 years ago and I believe it fully substantiates the careful attention which ought to be paid to the full use of existing resources for such research. I believe that the Space Administration is sharply aware of the insistence which the Committee on Science and Astronautics has placed upon such programs and how vital the Congress feels such coordination and cooperation among the various agencies of Government can be to insure that a fully effective, national space program be pursued.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a few of the contracts and grants into which NASA has entered. There has been a good deal of talk about economy and about the military implications of the space program. Let us look at some of these items.

For instance, Mr. Chairman, there is the sum of $92,615 for a contract on the problems of States with agrarian economies in contributing to the major scientific and technical needs of the space age. I am reading from a most revealing book entitled, "Grants and Research Contracts, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, July 1, 1963."

Then, Mr. Chairman, there is a contract with the University of Puerto Rico on "Spanish Language Instructional Materials for the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Grades."

Then there is another study under a contract in the amount of $65,812 to United Research, Inc., entitled "Study of Future U.S. Transportation Needs." Then there is a contract in the amount of $40,000 on the "Conduct Development of Specific Space Related Teaching Materials Designed to Serve as Guides and Supplements to Classroom Instruction." There is a contract with the National Science Teachers Association entitled "Develop and Publish a Series of Six Paperback Books Which Will Be Arranged To Help the Elementary Schoolteachers Enrich the Science Program." There is a contract in the amount of $300,000 to Washington University on the subject of "Analysis of the Impact of Space Activities on the National Economy, and Establishment of the Methodology for Determining Space Program Effects on Regional Economic Growth." There is a contract with the University of Colorado in the amount of $117,562 on the subject of "Socioeconomic Analysis of the Effects of the Expansion of Space and Space-Related Activities on Local Communities."

Mr. Chairman, it is beyond me how these contracts and grants can parade under the title of space exploration. I urge all Members of the House to read carefully this book listing NASA grants and research contracts—July 1, 1963. In both subcommittee and in full committee, I offered amendments to cut many of these unrelated grants and research contracts but unfortunately for the taxpayers, the amendments failed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] for 1 minute.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to draw the attention of this House to the fact that the minority on the Science and Astronautics Committee—six members—pointed out here a number of weeks ago that we have the wrong objective in the entire space program at this time. The administration has been talking international prestige. The Congress must talk national security. The Soviets have a military-oriented program. We have a civilian-oriented program. Do not let anybody get you confused here on the floor today about that fact.

Mr. Chairman, I will say that our military is being phased out of our space program. It is time that we put it back in. We must eliminate this prestige goal used as a political diversion from the Bay of Pigs fiasco and come back to the basic goal, national security. Dollar for dollar our space program will then help guarantee our national security.

Mr. Chairman, this is the message that I want to get over to the Members of Congress and emphasize the statement by six members of the Science and Astronautics Committee, Representatives ROUDEBUSH, PELLY, RUMSFELD, WEAVER, GURNEY, and WYDLER.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, many Members on the floor this afternoon have raised the question: what is the reason for going to the moon? Will a man be able to land on the moon? What will we find when we get there? What is the man who gets there going to bring back?

On day after tomorrow we celebrate October 12. Four hundred and seventy-one years ago Christopher Columbus had very little idea what he was going to find when he set forth on his voyage. I hope we have as much faith in NASA, our astronauts, and the space program as Ferdinand and Isabella had in Christopher Columbus that day.

We have heard a great deal of talk about the strength and security of our Nation. History teaches us that those nations are strong which have the courage to press forward in new and untried fields—whether in exploration, research, technology, and all phases of new development.

Mr. Chairman, let us today have the courage and confidence to press forward with this program, and accordingly, I appeal to my colleagues to defeat the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that someone will be able to explain what seems to me to be an apparent contradiction. It has been argued vigorously and repeatedly in debate that information material to military defense and our national security will come out of the Apollo shot. If that is so, how can the President of the United States suggest that we cooperate in going to the moon with the Russians, which would necessarily give them access to that information?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe there has been a great deal of confusion on the floor today as to what would really happen if this amendment is agreed to. If the amendment goes through it is going to close down this program.

Mr. Chairman, this program has never been a partisan one. The space agency, NASA, was set up during the Republican administration. Those of us on the committee supported it and this is the first time that partisan politics has crept into this program. It has crept in today.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I cannot yield to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of personal privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman to imply that the matter of partisan politics has been injected into this debate. I resent the implication in deliberations upon a national problem of vast security considerations.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the gentleman is supersensitive. If the shoe fits he can wear it. I said it was projected into the space program when the authorization bill passed; 125 Republicans voted against that, if that is what the gentleman wants to know on what I base my assumption.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I compliment my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This has been a most informative debate. It has been conducted on a very, very high level. I want to commend everybody.

Let me see if I can bring this thing to a vote. We do not question anybody's sincerity. I know my distinguished friend from New Hampshire is as fine a man as there is on the floor, and we want him to stay on that committee a long time. But I am going to respectfully ask everybody on both sides of the aisle to vote against his amendment.

This program has been cut already by your committee a little better than $600 million. He wants to add another cut of $700 million.

Let us do away with the program and dump it. That is about what it will amount to as testified by the experts. Who are we to believe? I am no engineer. I am no scientist.

They say with the cut already in here it is going to slow down the program, it is going to cost us another billion or two dollars. Add another cut of $700 million and what are you going to do?

My genial and handsome young friend says in one breath he is for the program and wishes we had enough money to do it. He wants to carry it on. But in the next breath he admits it is going to cost a whole lot more money.

Let us be consistent. Let us let our experts run this program. Let us not substitute our layman's judgment for theirs. They have done a magnificent job. They say they are on schedule in point of time, they are on schedule in point of expenditure, and that expenditure is going to be $20 billion, not $30 billion. Let us not increase that figure. I respectfully ask you to go along with the committee.

It has been testified time and time again that there is 100 percent coordination between the space agency and the Department of Defense. There is no competition. They are going along. As Dr. von Braun and these other great scientists say, let us have our basic research before we start. Then have a weapon system and it will work.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote down this amendment. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 47, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PELLY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pelly: Page 37, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:

"No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any Communist, Communist-controlled, or Communist-dominated country, or for expenses of any aeronautical and space activities (as defined in sec. 103(1) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958) which are primarily designed to facilitate or prepare for participation in such a joint manned lunar landing, except pursuant to an agreement hereafter made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate as provided by section 205 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I will reserve the point of order and I would like to discuss it with my able friend, the gentleman from Washington, later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] reserves the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the funds appropriated by this bill for NASA so that they could not be used for expenses of participating in collaboration with the Russians or any Communist country in a joint venture to land living persons on the moon.

On page 22 of the committee report accompanying the independent offices appropriations bill for 1964 reference is made to the Apollo program and to the President having suggested recently before the world that lunar programs and technical and operation objectives be shared with the Soviet Union. The report states that the President's statement of such a possibility infects the entire Apollo program with fiscal uncertainty.

Mr. Chairman, when the President of the United States makes a speech to the United Nations as did President Kennedy recently his words must be taken seriously. This is what the President said:

> Why, therefore, should man's first flight to the moon be a matter of national competition?
>
> Why should the United States and the Soviet Union, in preparing for such expeditions, become involved in immense duplications of research, construction, and expenditure?
>
> Surely we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries—indeed of all the world—cannot work together in the conquest of space, sending some day in this decade, to the moon not the representatives of a single nation but the representatives of all of our countries.

The new chief of the moon-shot program, Dr. George E. Mueller, a day or two ago was quoted by the Christian Science Monitor as having said:

> All the President has asked for is that we see where we can cooperate in a moon program.

He said further that he was enthusiastic about doing that.

After his U.N. speech the President wrote a letter to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas], in which, according to the newspapers, the President told Mr. Thomas that his proposal for an international effort is not in conflict with this country's own program. He furthermore defended his proposal for a joint effort with the Soviet Union saying "an energetic continuation of our strong space effort is essential, and the need for this effort is, if anything, increased by our intent to work for continuing cooperation if the Soviet Government proves willing."

Mr. Chairman, in proposing this amendment I do not intend that its adoption constitute an expression, one way or the other, as to the advisability or objection to the President's proposal. I have an opinion on that matter but this is not the place or time to debate that issue. My amendment to restrict the use of funds from being used for any joint lunar project is to assure that no such joint venture will be undertaken without specific approval of Congress. Administrator James E. Webb on September 25, in a speech before the Tex Midcontinent Oil and Gas Association stressed that the President's call for a joint moon venture was not a change in policy. He said that as a first step in a joint effort to reach the moon the Soviets and ourselves could cooperate on choosing a landing site and base of exploration, and, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to wake up some morning and find out that by executive agreement or otherwise an arrangement has been worked out without Congress having had full and ample opportunity to investigate the merits and demerits of such an arrangement.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that under section 205 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act, the administration, under the foreign policy guidance of the President may engage in a program of international cooperation in connection with the NASA program, which, of course, can only be lawfully done pursuant to agreements made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. However, my concern is that under some vague language calling for international cooperation in an agreement duly approved by the Senate, the administration might use this broad authority to engage in a cooperative scientific venture of exploring space and landing persons on the moon. What my amendment would do would be to spell out that there would have to be a specific agreement approved by the other body covering the landing proposal and cooperative steps leading to that objective. In other words, time and again there have been executive branch interpretations which to me violated the intent of Congress. For example, this recent wheat sale is contrary to what many Members of Congress intended and I am anxious that while the policy of coexistence with communism in various areas is under consideration or in the minds of the executives that the Congress declare itself formally as to the meaning of the Space Act as far as international cooperation is concerned. Let me clarify my position, Mr. Chairman, I am not asking for the House to express its view on cooperation with Russia in going to the moon. I am not arguing the issue of joint exploration of space or international cooperation. All this amendment does is give assurance that there will be no interpretation of a general international agreement made by the President covering cooperative scientific research with Communist nations which could be construed to give authority for joint space exploration unless such a program was spelled out in an agreement and specifically approved by the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to adopt my amendment.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. I think it would be appropriate to advise the House that the language to which the gentleman has referred to is not the language of the report of the majority of the subcommittee but the individual views of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN].

Mr. PELLY. Well, then I will state that this language is in the report, but it will make no difference so far as my amendment is concerned whether it is in the report or not.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked my distinguished friend to yield. The gentleman was certainly nice enough, and I do appreciate his courtesy. He is one of the able and distinguished Members in this House and we all have a very, very high regard for his intelligence and his ability. He is a fine legislator. We understand the gentleman's point of view and, certainly, I am not going to fall out with him on that account. But here is the thing that puzzles me. If the gentleman will read with me the language found in his amendment beginning on the fourth line from the bottom:

> Except pursuant to an agreement hereafter made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate as provided by section 205 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

That language puts this Subcommittee on Appropriations right into the middle of foreign affairs—and it is not in our field. It puts an extra duty on us. It puts us in the middle of foreign affairs. I am trying, Mr. Chairman, to talk about the question as to whether this is subject to a point of order. I think it would involve us in matters outside of our jurisdiction.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman pause for a moment to let me ask him this question?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. PELLY. Is it not a prerogative of the great committee on which he serves to spell out how we are going to spend our money and where we will spend it?

Mr. THOMAS. If we do not legislate. If we limit it, that is something else. But then we come in here and talk about "except," and we require duties outside the prerogatives of this bill. We require the Senate to do something and we require the President of the United States to do something. I am not quarreling with my able and genial friend, but are we not getting a little bit out of our field here as a Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. PELLY. I think the gentleman misconstrues the definition of the word "except." This would simply comply with the existing basic statute which covers an agreement which might be arrived at for international cooperation for science or for weather information or some other arrangement which had been agreed to by the President and approved by the Senate. My amendment would clarify the existing authority under that law.

Mr. THOMAS. That is just the point, my able, and genial friend. The word "except" requires the President of the United States to exert his jurisdiction over it and then it requires the Senate to do it. I do not mind taking it to conference with the right to throw it out if we find the need for doing so, but I will first insist on the point of order.

Mr. PELLY. If the gentleman will let me ascertain what he means, I am sure I can satisfy the gentleman. I hope he will accept this amendment. If it was truly as he indicates in the field of foreign affairs, then I would not quarrel.

Mr. THOMAS. May I do this——

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PELLY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. THOMAS. Let us first ask the Chair for a ruling, and if he rules it in order, then, with your permission, we will take it to conference and, if we get in trouble, we will throw it out.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say to him that so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, from the committee or elsewhere, we strongly favor the purpose and intent and the principle embodied in the gentleman's amendment. I think we all ought to realize that the amendment of the gentleman from Washington is designed to place a limitation on the expenditure of these funds so that no part of them can be used for a joint venture with the Soviet Union in a moon flight operation unless it has the consent of the Congress or is ratified by the Senate. I have discussed this matter with top people in the space agency, with such men as Dr. Dryden, who expressed an opinion that no such venture would or should be entered into or be in effect without the consent of Congress. If it is a matter of science as compared with other informational sort of agreements that are now in force or effect, then the point of the gentleman is well taken, and I think it is a very desirable amendment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PELLY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question that comes up in your amendment is whether or not you are barring joint operations or whether you are barring also mutual exchange of information or weather facts, or the results of research and development in Space projects and items of that kind.

Mr. PELLY. I would say to the gentleman that is a very good question. This simply spells out very clearly that none of these funds should be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly between the United States and any Communist-controlled or Communist-dominated country.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So that your amendment, then, limits the policy to joint operation and joint participation rather than an exchange of information, which, of course, would benefit both sides?

Mr. PELLY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. For example, if we know from our space projects that in the Van Allen magnetic belt there are certain hazards that would cost men their lives we in the United States want to exchange that scientific development, and make that public. Under the statute of 1958, where Congress said that our scientific developments for peacetime uses shall be made available for the public and for the world progress for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution and ask for a vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bolling). Does the gentleman from Texas insist on his point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand that the gentleman from Texas was making a point of order against this amendment. But I would simply say that this is purely a limitation on funds. It does not call for any additional personnel or responsibilities on the part of an agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Washington a question. What is the reason for the inclusion of language at the end of the amendment reading:

> Except pursuant to an agreement hereafter made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate as provided by section 205 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958.

The Chair, to make it clear why he is asking the question, has examined section 205 of that act. That says:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

> SEC. 205. The Administration, under the foreign policy guidance of the President, may engage in a program of international cooperation in work done pursuant to this Act, and in the peaceful application of the results thereof, pursuant to agreements made by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The problem the Chair is considering is why there is any need to include the language at the end of the amendment unless in some way it changes existing law?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I would say that it does not change existing law but simply follows it. But, in order to clarify this matter I ask unanimous consent to strike from the amendment the words from "except pursuant to an agreement" to the end.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Pelly: Page 37, after line 17, insert the following new paragraph:
>
> "No part of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act shall be used for expenses of participating in a manned lunar landing to be carried out jointly by the United States and any Communist, Communist-controlled, or Communist-dominated country, or for expenses of any aeronautical and space activities (as defined in section 103(1) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958) which are primarily designed to facilitate or prepare for participation in such a joint manned lunar landing."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. That partially cures it, but it does not cure it by any means. I read:

> Or for expenses of any aeronautical and space activities (as defined in section 103(1) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958) which are primarily designed to facilitate or prepare for participation in such a joint manned lunar landing.

Somebody is going to have to spend a whole lot of time on this.

You are placing a tremendous burden upon somebody to do what? "To primarily decide or prepare for participation in a joint moon landing."

Mr. Chairman, there are four or five conditions contained in this. It is extra duty. Somebody is going to have to make that decision. It is purely legislation, and I hope the Chair does not, and I said to my distinguished friend from Washington a while ago, we will take it to conference and I know the gentleman will give us the liberty of throwing it out if we get in trouble and get too far into foreign affairs.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] has gone further than he intended.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out what section 103 of the act says:

> (A) research into, and the solution of, problems of flight within and outside the earth's atmosphere, (B) the development, construction, testing, and operation for research purposes of aeronautical and space vehicles, and (C) such other activities as may be required for the exploration of space.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this goes much beyond what the gentleman intends and cuts off all funds. Therefore, it is equivalent to striking out the title.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair has examined the amendment and the Chair is of the opinion that it is a proper limitation. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 99, noes 93.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Thomas and Mr. Pelly.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 110.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYDLER

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Wydler: On page 36, in line 17, strike out "$680,000,000" and insert "$676,100,000" in lieu thereof; and in line 18, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the establishment of an Electronic Research Center."

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at a time that we are appropriating money we do not have and will have to borrow, I do not think we should appropriate money that we are not sure we are going to spend.

This amendment is simple. It reduces the amount appropriated by $3,900,000, and provides that no funds shall be spent to establish an Electronic Research Center. Why not? Because we are not sure we need one.

The authorization bill that passed the House does not really authorize this center but makes it a subject of further report and study by the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Right now we do not know what the committee may do with that request for a center. I believe it is a shame that a great space agency is involved in this demeaning type of argument, but they have refused to let me see the files concerning this proposed center.

This $3,900,000 request is just a start, because this center is finally going to cost $61 million to build. It will employ 2,000 people at the time it is completed, and will have a yearly operating cost of $77 million.

On something this important I think every Congressman should have a chance to be heard, and every State in our Nation, every area, and district should have an opportunity to present its case. That is the purpose of this amendment.

You are going to be told that this matter is taken care of by what we put in the authorization bill. That bill in effect leaves the final decision to the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, which constitutes just 5 percent of the membership of this body. As a member of the committee I have confidence in the chairman and the other members, but I have grave doubts about the procedures set up in that bill.

The authorization bill provides that no funds can be expended for the Center until a report is submitted by NASA and first, each committee has sent a notice of no objection or, second, 45 days have passed.

Now I put it to you. Forty-five days are going to pass no matter and whatever else may happen in the world so it is obvious what it means is that 45 days after submitting their report to our committee, they can go ahead with this Center. That may not be what is intended, but that it what the bill says that we are considering now.

I ask you to ask yourselves—why are we authorizing the Center in this very unusual manner? We are going to allow the authorization of an enormous undertaking without taking any action in the committee. In other words, we can go ahead with this Center without an affirmative vote on the committee. That does not seem to me to be the proper way to do committee business.

I believe all the Members of the House should pass on this when the facts are in. We do not even have the report yet, and you are being told to appropriate money today. Of course, there is a distinction between an authorization bill and this, which is your appropriation bill, and I do not think we should be appropriating money before we have a report.

Now I ask you one final question. What is the rush about this Center? It is not really going to operate until 1970. We will not have our committee consideration of the matter until next spring. Can this matter not be a part of next year's appropriations? Or if it is so essential at that time, can we not have a supplemental appropriation? No one here on the committee or in this House has yet suggested that we could not do it in that way.

I am proposing this amendment to give you, every Member of this House, in your area, a chance to be heard. I have written NASA. I have asked them whether they are going to hear from other areas. I wrote them 2 months ago, but to this date I have yet to receive an answer to that question.

I ask you to support this amendment because it is right, it is sensible and it is logical and because it will give your area a chance to be heard. In my opinion, this is not a partisan matter. Members on both sides of the aisle are both for and against it. The only partisanship, it seems to me, is whether the executive department is going to control this matter in the last instance or whether we in the Congress are going to control it. So I ask you to vote "yes" on this amendment to make sure that we here in the Congress as a whole will have the final say on the need for and the location of this Center.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter that has been acted on and defeated before, at the time that the authorization was approved by the full Committee of the Whole in August. This amendment, precisely the same or identical with what the gentleman is offering today, was defeated in the Committee of the Whole by a vote, I think, of 116 to 50. So we have been up the hill and now the gentleman wants to take us up the hill once more. The fact of the matter is that the officials of NASA came before the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House and appeared before the Science Committee of the other body. They justified this item and both committees put it in. NASA asked for $5 million in this budget to get a look at the sites and the planning and expenses for this electronics research center. The House committee reduced the item to $3.9 million recall. It went over to the other body. The other body put in $5 million and deleted the language of the House which provided that they ought to come back with another survey. The managers on the part of the House went to the conference and agreed with the other body that the other body would put the language back in. They stayed with the figure of $3.9 million. The language in the authorization bill says that NASA shall come back to the Science Committees of both branches with a detailed study in respect to the necessity for and the location of this electronics research center. Now a lot has been said about this center by a lot of people. The gentleman from New York included some of the objections in his letter which he sent to all of the Members of the House. If anybody has made this a political football, he has done so. There has been some criticism to the effect that it is being put in Massachusetts only because of the election of a Senator from Massachusetts last November. Let me say to the Members of this House, I have been sitting on this Appropriation Committee and specifically the committee that considers the budget requests for NASA for some years now and I recall long before NASA ever was, the National Advisory Committee on Astronautics asked for this kind of center so that our Government could have some competence in electronics and research work.

The fact of the matter is this does give us competence, something which we are now lacking. It is not a political football but is something which will enable us to save money, to save money in this area of space and to save money in the area of defense.

I think we ought to vote this amendment down. We have been over this ground before and defeated it. We ought to defeat it now.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the Committee to excerpts from the hearings before our subcommittee detailing the electronics research center and some of my questioning of officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

Electronics Research Center

MISSION

In fiscal year 1963, NASA is taking initial steps toward the establishment of the Electronics Research Center in the Greater Boston area. In the fiscal year 1964 construction of facilities estimates, NASA is requesting authority and funds to acquire land and to design the Center. This new Center is planned to strengthen advanced research and technology in the important field of space electronics, in order to provide a capability to anticipate and understand problems in this crucial field prior to the initiation of development projects. The new Center will act as the focal point of the agency's electronics and related physics research and will establish an in-house competency based on intimate theoretical knowledge and related practical experience. The Center's activities will be directed toward—

(1) Expanding the frontiers of electronics and related physics research with the prime motive of deriving concepts, techniques, components, and systems for utilization in space exploration, missions, and applications.

(2) Providing objective, mature and knowledgeable advice and direction to the other NASA Centers on the fundamental electronics and related physics aspects of their respective missions and projects.

(3) Establishing a team of experienced scientists and engineers, informed on the nature of the technical problems to be encountered in space, to pursue potential solutions to be extracted from electronics and related physics research. The group will furnish invaluable assistance in maximizing the yield of the efforts of the Nation's vast and capable electronics research and development industry.

The Center staff will include experts in the fields of electronics, physics, space guidance, control and information theory, computation and data processing, space electric power, and space flight mechanics. The scientists and engineers assigned to planned laboratories will conduct and direct research in the fundamental disciplines of electrostatics, microwave radiation, inertial sensing, optics, solid state physics, and energy conversion. Technique and component advances will be refined to demonstrate instrumentation applications and systems utility or feasibility for communications, data processing, control, and guidance systems. The basic and original research conducted will also provide the background and substance for close liaison and scientific exchange with the university research community, other Government research and development laboratories, and industrial research organizations, particularly those having an interest in or activity pursuing space-oriented electronics and related physics research and development.

Man's ventures into space for longer periods and greater distances, his desire for additional and refined knowledge of the universe about him, and his goal of utilizing space for peaceful applications, all require refinements in sensors, instrumentation, computation and data processing systems if the more stringent performance and long-operational-life goals of the future are to be met. The efforts of the Electronics Research Center are planned to assure that the electronics and related disciplines are fully exploited to assist NASA and the Nation in meeting its goals.

LOCATION

This Center is planned for the Greater Boston area.

FACILITY LOCATION

Mr. Thomas. Does an installation of this type have to be close in?

Dr. Kelley. We would like it close to an electronics research oriented university-industry research complex—we would like to have it as close to the university environment——

Mr. Thomas. That is what I had in mind. You don't want to get too far out, do you?

Dr. Seamans. We would like to have it sufficiently close to the Greater Boston area that the people in this center will have direct access to MIT, Boston University, Boston College—to mention a few of the universities in that area.

Mr. Thomas. You have no business getting out more than 12 miles, do you?

Mr. Boland. The doctor has written a report for the Space Committee on where it will be located.

Is there any area in the United States where the university-industrial complex electronics is as closely situated and as compact as it is in the Boston area?

Dr. KELLEY. There is a lot of electronics capability throughout the country, but when you say electronics research, in our judgment this is the No. 1 area in the country.

Mr. THOMAS. I don't think there is any argument about that.

Mr. BOLAND. Do you now have any inhouse competency in this area?

Dr. KELLEY. Yes, we do. We have it scattered throughout almost all of our field centers.

EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. BOLAND. Would this help to reduce the cost somewhat over the years with respect to the whole NASA program, if this Center were established?

Dr. KELLEY. Very definitely, because then we can get the components and hardware for future space flight developed in time that we can reduce failures, costly delays, and so forth.

Mr. BOLAND. Does this give NASA an ability to more effectively evaluate contracts which will be made with private industry and to have a greater knowledge of precisely what is in the contract?

Dr. KELLEY. This is one of the fundamental purposes of the Center, so that we can exercise the capability in industry and universities to the best advantage.

Mr. BOLAND. How long has NASA been thinking about the establishment of an electronic research center.

Dr. DRYDEN. This was talked about from time to time for application to airplanes.

Mr. BOLAND. This goes back long before November of any particular year, doesn't it?

Dr. DRYDEN. Yes. This problem has been up several times.

Mr. THOMAS. The only problem you gentlemen have had is a question of locating. It is not a question of necessity. You have reached the point where it is a must. The only problem you have is a question of location, isn't it?

Dr. SEAMANS. A year ago last January I gave Dr. Bisplinghoff a specific assignment of looking at the matter of location from the standpoint of either a new center, or whether we expand one of our present centers. We did look into both of these possibilities and felt it would be much preferable to have a new center and locate it in the Boston area.

Mr. BOLAND. Could I explore this just a little bit further?

ACTION OF AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES

The House reduced this item by $1,100,000, but this wasn't realy a reduction. Isn't this the advanced design carried somewhere else in the budget?

Mr. WYATT. That's right.

Mr. BOLAND. $1.1 million was for advanced——

Mr. WYATT. We have $2 million budgeted for advanced design and said we could bring it back to that figure.

Mr. BOLAND. And the Senate restored the $1.1 million?

Mr. WYATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOLAND. The House's objection to your getting into this as quickly as you desired was based on the fact that you people failed to make a case before the authorization committee. Can you make the case here?

Dr. DRYDEN. We did submit a document to the Senate committee which was later also made available to the House. The objection was that we had not set up a formal board to actually visit and listen to the chambers of commerce all over the United States and build up a considerable record of making this choice. We felt that our own contacts have been wide enough to know that there are only about three areas that come close to meeting these conditions. The other two are in California, and we have this one in the Boston area. Other areas of the country have parts of this competence, but they do not pull together the electronic research capabilities, plus the university capabilities.

Now, the present situation is that there is language in the House which will require, apparently, an area survey prior to getting down to the job of—if we come out with the same conclusions as we think are very likely—working with local site survey committees.

The Senate position is not completely clear as a result of some remarks of the Senate chairman on the floor when the bill was being considered.

As of the present moment, in this case, until the authorization bill is through the Congress, we have some difficulty in making specific plans as to whether we will proceed immediately to the site survey in the Boston area, or whether we have first to go through an area survey.

Mr. BOLAND. You are due to report back under the House version of this bill by February 1 of next year?

Dr. DRYDEN. That's right.

Mr. BOLAND. Now, how long does this hold this program up?

Dr. DRYDEN. Three or four months.

Mr. BOLAND. Is time of essence? Would it be well to get into this thing as quickly as we can?

Dr. DRYDEN. We would prefer it.

Mr. BOLAND. Both the House committee and the Senate committee have 45 days in which to study it and if at the end of 45 days they make no report, you can go ahead, or if they reject it within the 45 days, this means further delay of another month and a half, so you would not actually get started in this until well into spring of next year?

Dr. DRYDEN. Were these provisions not in the bill, we would be making site surveys in the Boston area now.

INCREASING DEMANDS ON ELECTRIC FACILITIES

Mr. BOLAND. May I ask whether or not there are any existing facilities within the Federal Establishment now that can do what you want to do with this kind of a center?

Dr. KELLEY. That is a point we considered in reviewing the various alternatives to our solution to this problem and specifically the one that comes to mind is the Department of Defense.

We find that everybody's electronics requirements are increasing. There is a demand on the market for people. There is a demand for facilities. Wherever we did this we would have to add capability, whoever did it would have to add new people and new facilities.

Now, it seemed to yield much greater efficiency if we were able to centralize this, where we combine the people and the facilities and have what we call in a management sense a critical mass, such as the nucler people——

DOD POSITION ON ELECTRONICS CENTER

Dr. DRYDEN. There is a position of the Department of Defense on this. I have forgotten whether it was the House or Senate Space Committee who wrote to the Department of Defense on this very point and there is some correspondence which I would like to see in the record at this point if you have no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have that.

(The information supplied follows:)

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND
SPACE SCIENCES,
July 29, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the recent markup of NASA's budget request for fiscal 1964, a question arose as tc the future usefulness of an electronics facility to be located in the Greater Boston area.

The point was raised that it might be wise to look upon this new laboratory with a little broader perspective than just a laboratory to implement NASA's electronic needs.

It was pointed out that perhaps this facility, together with the Government, industry, and educational environment in this area, could, in the future, with the proper coordination between the Department of Defense's electronic capabilities and NASA's electronic capabilities, make a major contribution to the entire Government's operations in the field of electronics research and development and serve an extremely useful purpose in the future for military space as well as civilian space programs.

The committee felt that this point was important enough to request Department of Defense comment as to whether it feels that such a complex could prove extremely useful to the military and defense needs in electronics in the future, as well as NASA's needs.

I would, therefore, like to have such comment by the Department of Defense and an answer as expeditiously as possible in order that it would be available to the committee in connection with the deliberation of NASA's 1964 request in the Senate.

Sincerely,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE,
RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1963.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Thank you for your letter dated July 29, 1963, offering us the opportunity to comment on the usefulnes of NASA's proposed electronics research facility to our defense military electronics research and development effort.

In considering this possibility we have reviewed the electronic research and development facilities and technical resources currently available within the Department of Defense and the adequacy of this existing capability to advance electronics technology and develop new devices and systems needed to meet the demands of our current and foreseen military space and weapons systems program requirements.

At present there are a number of laboratories, both within the military services and nonprofit institutions outside the Defense Department, actively engaged in electronic research and development. While these resources are considered adequate to support the Department's needs in the electronic research and development area, it is recognized that NASA has a very major requirement for the most advanced kind of electronic technology in their civilian space programs. It is also recognized that a substantial part of these electronic technical requirements are very similar to those involved in our own military space and other military systems developments. Accordingly, we would expect that much of the research carried forward by NASA in the proposed facility would serve a useful purpose for the Department of Defense.

Sincerely,

HAROLD BROWN.

Mr. BOLAND. Is this facility also useful to other agencies of the Government? Could this not be a useful center for the DOD? Isn't this something really the Government should have in order to do the job it has to do in the electronics field, to do it a little better than we are doing it now?

Dr. DRYDEN. I would think so.

Mr. THOMAS. There is a $250 million a year computer rental bill alone. Anything looking toward cutting that down is bound to be useful and will improve the quality of it, too.

NO RELOCATION OF PRESENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. Ostertag. This has nothing to do with the location but deals with the whole purpose.

When the electronics research center is finally developed into a fullbloom operation, you are going to have a big electronic center. You are not without electronics research now. The whole question is: What does this do to your program as it exists? Is it a transfer? Is this going to reduce some of your operations in other places where this work is now being done, or is it going to supplement it? I don't think it is quite clear as to whether or not this is more on top of what you have. What is the picture going to look like?

Dr. Dryden. Let me answer this: It's supplemental. I don't think we should say that this is a laboratory where we are going to move a lot of things that are already going on. The things that are going on are in very specialized areas.

For example, all through our business we use electronic instruments. So every laboratory has a section concerned with, if you like, the invention, the development, the calibration, the maintenance of electronic instruments and the wind tunnels and airplanes, and so forth.

There are specialized competencies in the tracking area associated with Buckley's work, which probably will remain where they are, close to the customer, rather than moving it away. This is a question that perhaps isn't entirely settled at the moment. Some things might be moved to the laboratory, but I don't want to give you the idea the bulk of it will be of that nature. It is a competence of a type that we do not have presently in any of our laboratories.

Dr. Seamans. The work at Marshall directly relating to the large vehicle must remain there. They must have the team of people who are taking over all the responsibility for the Saturn, just as the people at Houston must be responsible for the Apollo and there will be no attempt to manage the specific electronic developments for those two programs out of this research center. The research center would be a resource that could support for example Marshall and Houston, if they run into difficulty on these programs, but primarily they are to do the longer term work so that we will have in the years ahead the kind of new techniques.

Mr. Thomas. This is purely a research center. It is just what you said it is, isn't it? It is not an operational center to replace any existing facility?

Dr. Seamans. That's right.

Dr. Dryden. They will do a program by contract on advancement of technology within industry that will be far larger than the program that is carried on now.

Dr. Seamans. This will be done throughout the whole country. This Center will contract for technique work and advanced work throughout the whole country.

Mr. Ostertag. Electronics research is electronic research.

You say you have some at Marshall and you have some at other points or sources?

Dr. Dryden. They are developing specific equipment for the specific projects that they have.

NATURE OF WORK TO BE DONE

Mr. Ostertag. Yet you say it is going to supplement. Then how is it coordinated?

Dr. Dryden. Well, it is in the same manner as our Lewis Research Center, which is a propulsion research center primarily. It supports development projects both in NASA and outside. So this Electronics Research Center, by being the head of the immediate program will be prepared to support the specific developments in the electronics area.

Mr. Ostertag. There is no duplication?

Dr. Dryden. No.

Mr. Ostertag. Yet it is supplemental in that it is a broader aspect of electronics research which may or may not be applicable for electronics research that is being carried on in your other centers. Is that a fair statement?

Dr. Gilruth. If I may say a word: The type electronics research this Center will do that is of greatest importance is improvement of components. Now, if there is some better way of making a relay—there are thousands of relays in a spacecraft and out of these thousands of relays there is always one chance in a certain number that one will fail to close when it is supposed to or will close when it shouldn't. They are very reliable devices now, but you have to use so many of them that the total percentage when you get them all together you have a fairly good chance something will fail.

If there is a better way to build a relay than we are building now, this would have a tremendous payoff in the total Nation's program.

Now, industry can't afford to do this kind of research because if they did develop a better one, all their other competitors will use it and their development costs would sort of go down the drain.

Now, this is the kind of work the Government can and must do and if this Center does this kind of work, I think the payoff would be very great and it will not compete with anything else that is going on.

Dr. Seamans. Furthering what Dr. Gilruth has said, we know our solid state devices, solar cells and transistors for example, fail in orbit. We know the failure rate is related to radiation in space, but we really don't completely understand the mechanism by which the failure occurs. We must develop a better understanding of that phenomena. This will be the mission, one of the missions, on this Center.

Mr. Ostertag. What is the basic reason for the committee reserving on this project further study up until February? It was not a question of location, was it? Is that the main reason?

Mr. Boland. You have a few other reasons—the competency of the Federal Government to do the job, the competency of NASA to do it, whether or not this is something that we should do, and the question of location.

Mr. Chairman, I hope when you plant this site, you plant it right in the middle of MIT, Harvard, and "electronics road."

Mr. Thomas. Let us go get some lunch and come back at about 1:20, when we shall go into other subjects.

Mr. Thomas. Gentleman, the committee will please come to order.

Mr. Jonas had some questions he wanted to ask about the new electronics laboratory.

PREVIOUS REQUEST FOR ELECTRONICS CENTER

Mr. Jonas. Dr. Dryden, you said you had been thinking about such a center for how many years?

Dr. Dryden. In the NACA days, there was actually a committee vote once that we ought to set up an Electronics Center. That, of course, was under different circumstances. As far as the Space Agency is concerned, in the early organizational studies of the Center, some consideration was given to it.

Mr. Jonas. We can boil it down to this: When did you first ask the Bureau of the Budget to approve a request for money for it? What was the year of your first request?

Dr. Dryden. The first request was this year.

CONSIDERATION OF EXPANSION OF OTHER FACILITIES

Mr. Jonas. Dr. Seamans, you said the decision was made to undertake to build this Center instead of expanding present centers. Is that correct?

Dr. Seamans. Yes; I did.

Mr. Jonas. What present centers did you have in mind?

Dr. Seamans. We considered, for example, a plan to expand the Langley Research Center. Dr. Thompson, who is here, actually came up with his people and reviewed with us what would be involved in organizing Langley so it could take on not only its present responsibilities, but also add this electronics capability.

Mr. Jonas. Would it not make sense to use one of your present research centers, with all of the scientific personnel that you have there and with overhead facilities already in place, instead of embarking on a program as extensive and as expensive as this one will be?

Dr. Seamans. It would involve adding roughly the same amount of facilities. It would involve adding the same number of people; namely, 2,000 additional people.

Mr. Jonas. You mean you would have had to acquire 2,000 acres of land at Langley?

Dr. Seamans. I am not sure we would have to add all that land, but we would have to add research facilities, which are the major cost of the Center. Of the $55 million, approximately $3 million is for land and the rest is for special facilities and for the housing of the additional people.

Mr. Jonas. You do not mean living quarters?

Dr. Seamans. By housing, I mean the laboratory, office, and work space for the people.

LARGE LAND REQUIREMENT

Mr. Jonas. Why do you need 1,000 acres? That is a tremendous acreage. You must visualize a tremendous facility to require 1,000 acres.

Dr. Seamans. The primary reason for the large amount of land is for an antenna range, which does take a large amount of space, where you need a large, clear area. In our experience, for example, at Houston, we originally were thinking in terms of 1,000 acres, and we have gone to 1,600 acres at Houston to provide not only the room for the buildings, but also an expanse of land for an antenna range there.

Mr. Jonas. Do you think you can get 1,000 acres of clear land in a metropolitan area?

Dr. Seamans. We go to the metropolitan area in order to get close to the universities, which we would like to do if we can get such space. Then we would have outside of the metropolitan area, somewhere out in the vicinity of Route 128, additional land which would be just for the antenna-type measurements.

CONSIDERATION OF NORTH CAROLINA RESEARCH TRIANGLE

Mr. Jonas. Would you consider a free site donated to you by the State of North Carolina in the research triangle, which is an area surrounded by Duke University, the University of North Carolina, and North Carolina State College, with a computer capability already at the university, a reactor capability at State college, and fine engineering and physics departments? Would you consider an area such as that, instead of a metropolitan area such as Boston or New York City, with the tremendous cost of land?

Dr. Seamans. We certainly hold that university triangle in very high regard, and are familiar with the research activities in the area, but we did feel that the Boston area would give us the greatest possible support for this new activity.

Mr. Jonas. You visualize a cost of $56 million for construction and 2,500 people.

Dr. Seamans. I think we said 2,100 people.

OPERATING COSTS AND EXPANDED ELECTRONIC PROGRAMS

Mr. Jonas. What will your operating costs per year be?

Dr. Kelley. Personnel and operations costs will be approximately $28 million. I can give you an exact figure for that in a moment.

Mr. Jonas. $28 million a year?

Dr. Kelley. Yes, sir. That is when we get up to the full complement of 2,100 people. When we are in the building, it will be approximately $28 million a year with 2,100 people.

Mr. Jonas. Dr. Seamans, what will we be spending, aside from this center, for electronic research in our other centers, in addition to that $28 million?

Dr. Seamans. In order to carry out our study, we did take a careful look at the work going on in our various centers. We have that summarized in tabular form, and I will ask Dr. Kelley if he can summarize it.

Dr. Kelley. Yes, sir. We have a program right now of electronic research of about $25 million. That is excluding some flight projects that we are doing. I am talking about the research which is done in the laboratory. We would expect from the electronic research part of the program that this would add an additional $25 million to the electronic research budget line item for a total of $50 million by about 1968-69.

Mr. Jonas. I may not understand you. You say your projected cost of operations of this center we are talking about now will be $28 million per year?

Dr. Kelley. That is for salaries and operations.

Mr. Jonas. We are now spending $25 million on electronic research in our various existing centers.

Dr. Kelley. That is a research and development figure, most of which is spent out of house. They are different budget figures.

Mr. Jonas. We are spending that amount, though, are we not?

Dr. Kelley. Yes.

Mr. Jonas. And you would expect to double that and spend $50 million?

Dr. Kelley. We would expect to double the present R. & D. We would double both, sir. We would spend approximately $28 million additional for personnel and operations, and approximately $25 million additional for the research and development line item. Most of the research and development goes out of house. We would essentially double the total program.

Mr. Jonas. You mean the present program?

Dr. Kelley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Jonas. You did not mean you would double the $25 million you are spending on research and development now?

Dr. Kelley. We would double that figure. We do double the $28 million figure.

Mr. Jonas. You would then be spending how much?

Dr. Kelley. We would be spending $50 million for research and development, and then 2 times $28 million for personnel and operations, $56 million.

Mr. Jonas. You would be spending $56 million plus $50 million?

Dr. Kelley. Yes, sir.

Mr. Jonas. It does not look to me as if the comment of the distinguished chairman when he opened the hearing on this subject is quite justified, when he said this was designed to save money. That is not the purpose of it, is it?

Dr. Kelley. This is the money that we spend in the research program. The leverage that this exerts against the total program is quite extensive.

Mr. Jonas. I got the impression as you had answered previous questions that we were going to pull together a great deal of research in this field and put it in this Center and save $37 million a year, or some figure such as that.

PRESENT ELECTRONICS BUDGET

Dr. Dryden. The money would be saved in development. What is the present total expenditure for electronics equipment?

Dr. Kelley. We spend about $2 billion of our budget for electronics.

Mr. Jonas. You do not expect to reduce that with this Center?

Dr. Kelley. We expect to increase the reliability of that $2 billion worth, not only the reliability of that, but as reliability in electronics affects the total vehicle reliability.

Dr. Seamans. Dr. Gilruth pointed out this morning the importance of reliability of electronics components, relays, transistors, tubes, if we can increase the reliability of our large vehicle spacecraft.

Mr. Jonas. I am not questioning the advantages of research in establishing reliability. I am just questioning and trying to get you to justify to my satisfaction the expenditure of this sum of money for construction and then operating costs, when we have a capability already in place.

Dr. Dryden. If the Saturn V blows up, it is $120 million, as you heard this morning. If that research will save one flight——

Mr. Jonas. That is not any answer to my question whatsoever. You can always blow up a Titan or a Saturn but you cannot charge that up to the fact that we do not have an Electronics Research Center, can you?

Dr. Dryden. I think in many cases you can.

Mr. Ostertag. Dr. Dryden testified this morning that this was supplemental to what exists, rather than——

Dr. Dryden. I did not say any research money would be saved. I said the money would be saved in the overall program.

USE OF CENTER'S CAPACITY

Mr. Jonas. I understood the doctor to say we would not even use the full capacity of this Center for NASA, but that you would contract part of this capability out to private industry. Is that correct?

Dr. Seamans. Yes. Of the figure that Dr. Kelley is referring to in his research and development funding, roughly $26 million or $27 million will go out on R. & D. to be handled out of this particular Center. It would go out to contractors and universities throughout the country.

Mr. Lingle. You would use the full capacity, though, sir. This would be contracts in addition to the full capacity of the Center, just as other Centers now contract out.

Mr. Jonas. I may have misunderstood Dr. Dryden. I thought he said some of the capability of this Center would be made available to private industry on a contractual basis.

Dr. Dryden. Other governmental agencies.

HOUSE SPACE COMMITTEE POSITION

Mr. Ostertag. Dr. Dryden, the Science and Astronautics Committee held exhaustive hearings with your agency on this whole program, the whole gamut of space and your activities, your services, your problems. When it came to this Research Center, as I understand it, they explored it quite exhaustively, and I would like to quote from their report, in part, on this very subject. I quote:

"An exhaustive review of the necessity for this project by the committee revealed that a specific site had not been selected, coordination with other Federal agencies having a like capability had not been properly effected, preliminary planning in general had not been in accordance with good management practice, and the need for the Center was not conclusively proven as essential. Consequently, the committee determined that expenditure of funds authorized for this project shall be contingent upon the result of further study by NASA. The committee desires that NASA report back to the committee the results of this more detailed study on or about February 1, 1964. The report shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following aspects."

Then they quote the various aspects.

The point is that these are the things which disturbed the other committee. I am not arguing against it. I am merely saying these were factors which had not been cleared.

Apparently you people are testifying to us that they are reasonably clear.

Dr. Dryden. By the time of the Senate hearings, you will produce this volume that Dr. Kelley has, which I think has been made available. Was this sent to you? You should have seen it.

Dr. Kelley. We can make it available.

Dr. Dryden. I understand it has not been made available to the Appropriations Committee. It ought to be. This was the statement before the Senate in their review of the project, which did not question the advisability of the project.

SENATE COMMITTEE POSITION

Mr. Boland. May I insert in the record this point from a report from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate as a result of this hearing and as a result, I presume, of the testimony which was adduced by the committee? The Senate committee (reading): "took considerable testimony with respect to the nature of and need for the proposed Center. While the committee agrees that it is necessary to have furnished a detailed study of the geographical location of the proposed Center prior to the expenditure of any funds by NASA, it feels that NASA has justified properly the need for and the nature of the proposed Center."

I presume this conclusion of the Senate committee was the result of the presentation made by NASA to the committee. I appreciate the gentleman's comment about the justification before the House, and I appreciate the House committee's position on it, which was a good one, but I am sure when NASA appeared before the Senate it answered the questions in prolonged detail that the House was interested in. I am sure they are in the justifications there. The Senate apparently approved it.

Dr. Dryden. This volume was prepared in further justification before the Senate after this criticism was made by the House.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPLIED TO SENATE COMMITTEE

Mr. Ostertag. What changed the picture between the time of the House hearings and study and investigation of this whole matter, and the time that the Senate took action? There is reference to the potential use of other Federal agencies which is not clear. Was that clear at the time of the Senate consideration?

DOD VIEWS ELECTRONICS RESEARCH CENTER

Dr. Dryden. I mentioned before, and permission has been given us to insert in the record, the views of the Air Force on this subject.

Dr. Seamans. Also, I believe the views of Dr. Harold Brown, from the Department of Defense.

Mr. Jonas. Could you summarize the views?

Dr. Dryden. There is nothing new. We prepared a more complete justification.

Mr. Jonas. Can you tell us what the views are? I do not want to wait to read the record when it comes down.

Dr. Seamans. Dr. Brown's view, expressed in his letter, was that there was ample justification for an additional research center for electronics, and he was sure it would be of value not only to NASA but to the Department of Defense.

Mr. Jonas. What did the Air Force say? They have a similar installation, I understand.

Dr. Dryden. The letter was generally similar. I cannot quote it.

Dr. Seamans. I am not familiar with that letter.

Mr. Jonas. Is it proposed to abandon the Air Force's activity in this field and use yours?

Dr. Seamans. Certainly not.

Mr. Jonas. Why do we need two?

Dr. Dryden. Volume of business, if you like. We just referred to the amount of money spent for electronics in space. The Defense Department, of course, has a very large expenditure in the missile field, in the airplane field, in the fire control field, in the communications field.

RELIABILITY—DIFFERENCES IN RESEARCH

Mr. Jonas. But this is a research center. Is not the research you will do the same kind of research that the Air Force needs to have done?

Dr. Dryden. When you say "the same kind," it is working in the same general areas. Mr. Gilruth referred to the biggest difference. Whereas in the ballistic missile business you can afford to have 10 percent of the missiles blow up, you cannot afford that in space. You must have much higher standards of reliability. There must be much better equipment. It is parallel to the situation Mr. Gilruth described on the Atlas, where we cannot take an Atlas off the line. As I recall it, every part for a manned Atlas was stamped separately and went through the factory with special treatment. Of course we paid for that. The additional reliability will cost more money. What you will save, as I have indicated, is the failure of an electronic component which would destroy a Saturn V which costs you $120 million.

How much are you justified in spending on research and quality control and inspection to avoid such losses? By such procedures in a much smaller way in the Delta vehicle, we have gotten to the point where 19 out of the last 20 went successfully. I can assure you this is not accomplished just by taking the stuff off the shelf and firing it. It has taken a special program of quality assurance to accomplish that result.

So, this is a kind of electronics which demands much higher standards of reliability, even perhaps than in the telephone business. When we went into Telstar, we thought the experience of the telephone company would make it possible for them to show us up, to some extent, by building a satellite which had a longer life. At the moment, Relay has a longer life than Telstar. Relay was made under contract by RCA as a result of competition in which we made the selection.

I think that is accidental, and two samples are not enough to say, but it did turn out that even the great experience of the telephone company in making long-lived components did not enable them to make the first satellite to last for years.

Mr. Thomas. Doctor, you have made a very compelling statement. Of course, we are all concerned to avoid any semblance of extravagance. There is a tremendous amount of expenditures going on in this Government in this field, in this agency alone, in the neighborhood of $1¾ billion, almost $2 billion a year. That is hardly any more than 50 percent, if 50 percent, of the total expenditures of this Government a year in this field.

Who knows if any one of three research institutions will ever come up with any quick answer to the problem or make any improvements. Look what we are doing in industry, private medicine, and Government in the field of cancer. We must have 15 or 20 or 25 research institutions, all doing the same thing. Certainly, we cannot say that is extravagant. The answers have not been found. Perfection has not been reached.

My guess is, if we were to have a half dozen of these Research Centers you would not reach perfection in 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years.

Would you say there is any extravagance in this? That is what we are concerned with. What is your best estimate?

Dr. Dryden. As a matter of fact, some Senators recommended two or three such Centers.

(Off the record.)

Mr. Thomas. Any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members will be highly impressed with the hearings on this matter before our subcommittee. There is no question but that NASA fully justified its position.

And, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am proud of the way that the junior Senator from Massachusetts has acted in this matter. He has done and is doing what every Member of this Congress should do when a justified project has the possibility of going into his State. He is carrying the ball in this matter for our great State and is carrying it in a proud and effective manner.

Again I say that this amendment ought be voted down.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to propose a unanimous consent request that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes and reserve the last 2½ minutes to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I did not like that 2½ minutes. Would you make it 1 or 2? Let us get it in nice round figures, if the gentleman will.

Mr. THOMAS. Two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to speak on this particular item, which, of course, was contained in the authorization bill when it passed the House some time ago. I did not think it was appropriate that somebody from Massachusetts, and not on the committee, should get involved in this particular debate. The Massachusetts delegation preferred that the proposal stand on its merits rather than taking a pork barrel approach to the subject. Excepting for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], the former Speaker of the House, who was a member of the committee, all of us, when the authorization bill went through the House, refrained from participating in debate. It seems to me the fair thing is to let the agency itself decide where this facility should be built. This morning I understand there was distributed to our colleagues, although I myself did not get a copy of it, a letter from the gentleman from New York who just offered this amendment which had as its prime theme the fact that this project might be available for your area. I think there is only one thing that is important here, and that is the national interest. The Congress has left it to be decided by the agency. That is the way we left it, and that is the way we should leave it today. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one question. Does the gentleman know how the astronauts got to the House Chamber this afternoon and who paid the expenses to bring them to Washington, accompanied by their wives?

Mr. THOMAS. I will give all the information I have, and I have some understanding. About 3 or 4 months ago they were awarded an honor and they appear today in the city of the District of Columbia because of that. It is unrelated to this bill. They were invited.

Mr. GROSS. It is purely coincidental?

Mr. THOMAS. About 3 or 4 months ago they were given an honor or a medal, and they were here today and I invited them to come over to my office. They live in my town. I am not going to violate the rules of the House. Let us see if they are still here.

Mr. GROSS. It was purely coincidental that they came to the House Chamber during the time that the moonshot amendment was being discussed.

Mr. THOMAS. It was not coincidental. They were awarded a medal here, and were invited to be here 3 months ago.

Mr. GROSS. I say it was purely coincidental that they came to the House Chamber at this time; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. I guess so; that is a big word.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The astronauts jointly were awarded the Collier Trophy, the greatest trophy in the astronautics field. This award was made last May. I happen to sit on the committee that helps to make the award. The medal was given them by the President today at the White House. The National Aeronautics Association, one of the greatest associations in the country, tendered them a luncheon at the Statler Hotel. They were down there and, like many other visitors in Washington, I presumed they wanted to see the Congress in session.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may say a word or two on my time, I just wonder if it was as coincidental as was the stocking of the House office buildings with cans for water and boxes of dehydrated food before the vote on the fallout shelter bill, and removal of the stuff the day after the bill was voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated. I believe that any of my colleagues who are bringing politics into this particular issue are merely dragging a red herring across the issue. If any statements have been made—and I know of none—that a Member of the other body said that this

Research Center was going to be located in Massachusetts, it should have no influence upon this branch of the Congress. We should look at the issue objectively and see whether the project has merit, and if it has merit we should vote for it.

Assuming it is true that this particular Research Center is going to be located in Boston, Mr. Chairman, I ask you and the Members of this House where in the United States you could find a finer place, where in the United States could you find more talent than there, where you have the greatest scientific university in the country? I do not think any city can claim similar distinction. We have MIT, Boston College, Harvard, Boston University, Tufts, Northeastern, and many other universities, located in the vicinity of Boston. But the issue here, Mr. Chairman, is not whether this Research Center is to be located in Massachusetts, California, Michigan, or any other State. The issue here is whether the establishment of a research center for NASA has merit and whether the money should be appropriated for that here today.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this came out of the Committee on Science and Astronautics by a unanimous vote.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear that from my friend from California. Certainly this is in the interest of national defense and it should be passed on here today without this amendment, without this crippling amendment, and by a unanimous vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] to close the debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully ask my colleagues to vote down this amendment. I have a high regard for our distinguished friend from New York [Mr. Wydler], but I ask you to vote down the amendment.

It takes money, in round figures about $4 million, out of the bill. But if there is anything on earth needed more than this research laboratory, frankly I do not know what it is.

This is a research laboratory in electronics.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence clearly shows that the Federal Government, your Government—and you are paying the bill—now is spending $250 million a year for what?

Our able colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] subcommittee passed a bill dealing with this subject about 2 or 3 months ago in the House of Representatives involving $250 million a year for rental of ADP equipment. This is data processing equipment. That is what it is. However, that is only a small part of this electronics field. It only involves $250 million on ADP computing machines for records and so forth. But this Government is spending—listen to this—$2 billion a year in this entire field of electronics.

Gentlemen, this laboratory is necessary. Let us learn something about this field in order to cut down the cost. I do not want to get mixed up in the location of it. If it were put up to me to make the decision—but frankly it is not—I would go right to the center where the business is located now. And, where is it located? It is located at Boston. They started there 20 or 25 years ago. Someone told me that when some of my friends from North Carolina got the textile business, then these people went into the electronics business. Gentlemen, it looks as if it is about to pay off now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of the committee to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wydler].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LANGEN

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Langen: On page 16, line 13, strike out "$11,850,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$11,750,000."

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present an amendment at this time that surely everyone can agree with. It sustains the position that I took in the well of the House a few moments ago and I think carries out the direction as identified in the committee report in which they have indicated that the Federal Power Commission has been spending too much time in empire building and in trying to expand its jurisdiction.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, by the elimination of these funds we further eliminate the opportunity to expand their personnel by 12 new positions.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the lateness of the season and in view of the fact that they have amplified their desire to move into fields of authority that are questionable in the first place, it occurs to me that a savings might well be made here in the best interest not only of our national economy but in the best interest of REA that serves the country so well.

The amendment merely provides for a reduction of $100,000 in the appropriation to the Federal Power Commission for the 12 new positions. In view of the statement I made during general debate, it is neither necessary or appropriate for the Commission to expand its authority of regulation into new fields where their authority is questionable. I call to your attention again the order of the Commission of July 22, 1963, to the three REA co-ops to show cause why respondents should not be required to comply with requirements of the Federal Power Act. This move has been opposed by the Secretary of Agriculture. This show-cause order could establish precedent for further regulation of REA's throughout the country by the Commission. There has been to my knowledge no request or complaint to justify their action. REA's throughout the country have served rural America well, and the show-cause order is uncalled for. The House therefore has the opportunity to serve the best interests of rural America and our economy by the adoption of this amendment. I have previously introduced legislation that would preclude this expansion of authority.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I should be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Thomas].

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished colleague who serves so ably on the Committee on Appropriations and who is well and favorably known to every Member of this House and is certainly one of the outstanding Members of this House, as I understand the gentleman's amendment it seeks to reduce the Federal Power Commission appropriation by $100,000 in order to take off the 12 new employees that we granted?

Mr. LANGEN. The gentleman from Texas is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if there is no objection on the part of members of the committee on the other side of the aisle, we will accept the amendment.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the committee.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question regarding the language of the bill on page 5, and I will read it:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters.

I recognize that the bill authorizing the extension of fallout shelters has not been cleared by the other body and therefore a point of order would be lodged against any appropriation therefor in this bill.

Judging by the language contained herein, is the subcommittee opposed to and would not continue any appropriation for fallout shelters?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot give anything but an honest answer to my distinguished friend. Of course, that is really a moot question because there is no authorization, but answering the gentleman's question, it is "Yes."

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, a few short weeks ago—September 17 to be precise—the House in its wisdom performed a distasteful task. By an overwhelmingly wide margin, we approved the authorization for a modest extension to the fallout shelter program.

It is interesting to recall some of the people who rose in support of this measure. The distinguished Speaker of this body told us that civil defense is "the fourth arm of our national defense." The chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], said that the bill provided "a sensible, cheap way to protect millions and millions of Americans." The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr.

Hébert], chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, recalled how nearly all of the members of his committee had been, when the hearings commenced, against expansion of the fallout shelter program, only to be convinced otherwise after hearing the testimony of over 100 defense experts.

Mr. Chairman, without wanting to sound like an alarmist, the House action today in scuttling the fallout shelter program will be, I predict, the final deathblow to any future deployment of either the Nike-Zeus or Nike-X anti-missile-missiles systems. This, I can assure you, is not a prediction based upon empty speculation on my part. Rather, it is founded upon the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations last February when, responding to questions from the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], Mr. McNamara said:

> I personally will never recommend an anti-ICBM program unless a fallout shelter program does accompany it.

Resulting from this startling testimony, I have since then taken it upon myself to study in great detail the interrelationship of our anti-ICBM and civil defense programs. In a recent letter to me, Secretary McNamara underscored his February testimony when he said only after we complete our shelter survey, stocking and marking, as well as initiate a shelter development program "should we then consider other major programs to limit the effects of possible attack." This sentiment has been repeated to me on dozens of occasions within past weeks by top officials of the Department of Defense.

In fact, one of these Pentagon officials, whose name will have to go unmentioned, advised me within the past 48 hours that the action taken in the committee bill "represents a stab in the back by both the White House and the Defense Secretary."

He realized, as do I, that while this is a congressional action, absolutely no administration leadership has been in evidence in this regard. You will recall the anguished screams that were expressed by the administration earlier this year when the supplemental appropriations to the accelerated public works program were eliminated by the same Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for the measure before us today. By the telegrams, letters, and various pressures that were in evidence then, one might have thought the country was facing its Armageddon. Needless to say, nearly all of the appropriations were restored on the floor. Gentlemen, we know that there are ways and means available to any administration to foreclose against the possibility of a 100-percent appropriations cut in an important program. When such a cut takes place without a whisper of White House discontent, we all know pretty much what the real story is.

Technically, it must be conceded that appropriations for the recently enacted civil defense authorization bill would be subject to a point of order, in that the other body has not as yet acted on the authorization bill. However, such is not the real reason of the commitee for its action, as the chairman so candidly admitted.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to pay my respect to the distinguished Speaker, who has been the only member of the leadership or the administration who has publicly expressed his misgivings over the committee action.

Make no mistake about it, the record shows the true facts of the matter. Do not be too surprised if, next year or at some time thereafter, the Secretary of Defense comes before us with the news that he is junking the anti-ICBM program because "You fellows did not give me what I wanted in the way of civil defense." There is a strong suspicion in some quarters that the Secretary has been looking for just such an excuse for some time, and that by today's action, we are doing his dirty work for him,—as well as leaving this Nation naked and defenseless to the threat of any nuclear attack.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, coming on the heels of the test ban treaty and the obvious receptiveness of the administration to the present warmth in the Kremlin, I do not want to share responsibility for thus letting down our guard at home. The blame, or praise, for junking a defensive system for our people at home must be borne by the administration.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 57 insert the following new section after line 9:
>
> "SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to conduct or assist in conducting any program (including but not limited to the payment of salaries, administrative expenses, and the conduct of research activities) related directly or indirectly to the establishment of a national service corps or similar domestic peace corps type of program."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that I have offered to every appropriation bill that has been brought in so far. It will not cost the taxpayers a dime; in fact, it can very well save them money.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I can go along with our able and distinguished friend from Iowa. We have no objection, and we will accept the amendment. There are no funds in this bill for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, In taking this time I want to explain in connection with a motion to recommit, which is not debatable and cannot be discussed, that there will be a motion to recommit, but it will be a very different proposal than the proposal that was offered in the Committee of the Whole. It will be $500 million less. It will call for only a $200 million reduction in research and development funds—not $700 million. It will be a motion that will simply seek to change the figure in line 11 on page 36 from $3,926 million to $3,726 million, and it will leave to NASA itself its application within research and development. It will not be applied to any particular program.

It is a reduction that is believed to be warranted in connection with a $5 billion program in a single year with a provision that the moneys may remain available until expended. With the Government Accounting Office disclosing recently a certain measure of inefficiency and waste. With the critical fiscal situation we face at least this much in the way of pressure of good housekeeping on NASA is warranted. It certainly will not cripple anything. But it will give us a little more careful housekeeping in a program that is so vast and extensive that there are very few that can understand all its ramifications. It will also require closer contract supervision by this agency. I hope the House will support this small reduction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PUCINSKI

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI: On page 14, line 23, strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$500,000."

Mr. PUCINSKI. Today we are being asked to appropriate $60 million for the development of a civil supersonic aircraft, more commonly referred to as the SST. This nebulous project will not cost the American taxpayer just $60 million but rather a minimum of $1 billion and it is conceivable that the total cost may exceed $1½ billion.

The reasons advanced for the development of this missile designed to shoot the traveling public to their destination, rather than fly them at the present turtle's pace of 600 miles per hour, are as thin as the air that the proposed SST will fly in. Apparently the primary reason for the SST is that our world leadership is losing ground since the British and French Governments have decided to build the Mach 2.2 Concorde. But what they do not tell you about the Concorde is that while it is supposed to take an hour and a half off the flight time between England and the United States, it will lose an hour because it will have to land at Gander. It cannot make it all the way from England to the United States without a stop for refueling. I doubt, therefore, Mr. Speaker, whether the Concorde will be anything more than an advertising gimmick for most airlines in its present form.

None of the money here is appropriated to deal with sonic booms, which are one of the biggest problems with SST's. Think this through seriously. I cannot think of anything that will change the lives of millions of Americans more than sonic booms with the advent of the supersonic jet age. We in the large cities know about jet noise but you gentleman who live in rural areas, who think this is not an important problem to your community, I tell you that not only your constituents but that their livestock are going to be very seriously affected by sonic booms. You can tell a human being what sonic booms are, but how do you explain this frightening phenomenon to animals on a farm? You will witness a serious effect on their behavior with the advent of sonic booms and a serious drop in their productivity.

I say this country and the world are not ready for a $60-million appropriation for this purpose. My district lies just east of O'Hare Field, the biggest airfield in the world. I believe I know something about subsonic jet noise. But unbearable as subsonic jet noise is, I tell you supersonic jet noise is vastly worse.

The city of San Francisco has threatened to bar the operation of supersonic jets into that area because supersonic jets produce 16 decibels more noise than our present-day subsonic jets.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot stress too much how seriously all of our lives will be changed with the advent of the supersonic jet age. It appears to me that until vastly more research is completed on sonic booms and their impact on human beings and property, this $60 million will be just a downpayment on a vast boondoggle.

The FAA recently asked all of our Nation's aircraft manufacturers to submit their views on supersonic aircraft and what share they are willing to assume in developing such an aircraft. All replies were to be submitted by September 9. But not one single aircraft designer or builder responded. Now I do not think the taxpayers should be burdened with this whole debt and the whole cost of designing a supersonic jet. If this country wants a supersonic jet, I think we ought to sit down with the carriers and with the designers and find out how much they are willing to put up and how much we are going to put up and what will be the long-range effects. If we really want to go into supersonic operations, then after doing that we can think about making a $60-million appropriation. It is obvious that our airlines are so much in debt because of their recent conversion from props to jets that they are not interested in another series of vast expenditures for supersonic jets when their present aircraft are operating at less than 60 percent capacity.

Mr. Chairman, I say to those Members who are concerned about economy, here is a good chance to save $60 million for the taxpayer. I have left $500,000 in the bill for the FAA to continue this research and to find out just exactly where we stand.

Responsible authorities have studied this problem of sonic booms. Dr. Bo Lundberg, from Sweden, one of the most prominent scientists in the world, has very serious doubts about what will happen in the civilized world if the supersonic jet continues along certain lines. I think this subject needs a great deal of attention. I do not think we ought to rush into it. You know what is going to happen as well as I know what is going to happen. If you go ahead and appropriate $60 million, they are going to tell you that you are so far out on the limb with this initial investment that you will not be able to stop. I say our American-built RB–70 is a good start in supersonic aircraft for America. We are now building three of them and we will be able to learn a great deal from these RB–70's and then, I believe, will be the time to think about giving the FAA $60 million for further research on the supersonic aircraft.

Another argument in support of the SST goes something like this: "It will revitalize and invigorate the U.S. aircraft and engine manufacturing industries and American air carriers, and will enable these valuable resources to maintain and strengthen their skills in the national interest."

Of course the aircraft and engine manufacturing industry will be invigorated—anyone involved in a $60 million handout which ultimately will grow into a billion-dollar-plus handout would naturally be invigorated.

It has been suggested that after the SST has been fully developed we then sell them abroad resulting in a $1 billion transaction and thereby stemming the flow of gold from the United States. Even if there is a $1 billion market abroad for supersonic jets, I do not see how we can profit if it will cost the taxpayer $1½ billion to develop them.

It is highly possible that we will have to increase our foreign aid to some of these countries in order that they can afford to buy one of these SST's from our manufacturers.

We must realize that private industry differs from the Federal Government in that they are opposed to spending which is designed to ultimately bankrupt them. The major airlines of this country have recently gone through a transitional period from conventional type planes to jets, causing a terrific financial strain which has proved disastrous to some, Northeast Airlines in particular. The SST could lead to the financial ruin of others coerced into buying, the same as Northeast.

Let us not get caught in this speed trap. We can progress without stampeding. Dulles International Airport is a perfect example of getting the supply ahead of the demand—Dulles is 10 years ahead of its time—let us not make the same mistake twice.

If the aircraft and engine industry felt that this project were as sound as the proponents would have you believe, then why have they not undertaken this project among themselves. Because they do not feel that it is economically feasible and they know the public doesn't desire such travel now, nor do they feel the public will 10 years hence. Let the aircraft and engine industry be the barometer as they have been so successfully in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment so we can save the taxpayer $60 million.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late and I do not want to get into any argument with my able and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois. But I do wish to point out to my good colleague, for his information, that there are now several bidders who want to get this work. This problem has been worked out carefully on both sides of the aisle and insofar as the committee is concerned, they are one hundred percent for it so that we in the United States can have the leadership in the field of civilian aviation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask that this amendment be voted down.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, civil aviation, obviously, is on the edge of a new era. Supersonic technology, which until now has been restricted to high performance military aircraft, is being translated to meet civilian transportation needs. The British and French, in a joint effort that brings into play the national treasuries of both countries and the great technical skill of their Government-controlled industries, are in the detailed design stage on a supersonic transport that they are calling the *Concorde*. I had the privilege of meeting British and French officials and discussing this matter with them personally earlier this year. I was very impressed with their program.

Two U.S. airlines, have now placed tentative orders or reserved the option to place orders for this airplane.

In addition, it is my understanding that a supersonic transport development program is underway in the Soviet Union. One recent report seemed to indicate that this would be a faster plane than the British-French model, although speed in itself, of course, is not enough to insure aircraft superiority or even make it competitive in the world market. The fact is, the Russians have never produced a good, competitive airliner despite their intensive efforts to enter the world civil aviation picture in recent years.

At any rate, it is apparent that supersonic transport is going on at a vigorous pace overseas, and this development effort is a distinct challenge to U.S. leadership in international civil aviation, with the manifold advantages this has brought to this country over the years. This leadership has meant a great deal in terms of dollars, jobs, prestige, and high speed transportation to meet the Nation's needs in peace and war.

The proposed U.S. SST development program would rise to this challenge from overseas. The President, in calling for this program a few months ago, cited several significant benefits to the Nation from this development. He said that the plane, providing extremely swift travel for the air passenger, could be an "efficient, productive commercial vehicle" that would prove profitable to the manufacturer and operator and help ease the Nation's balance-of-payments problems. Aircraft and aeronautical products are major exports for this country; the income to the Nation from sales of SST's, according to FAA studies, could be some $3 or $4 billion. The program, in like manner, could provide perhaps 45,000 jobs for skilled workers in the American aviation industry, itself a vital element in the overall strength of the Nation.

For air travelers, the airplane could well be the finest air transport ever built—safe and comfortable, approaching the ultimate in high speed transportation over reasonable long trips. These trips, I am advised by technical experts, could be as short in range as about 1,500 miles or less—the distance between some major city-pairs within the United States—or as high as 4,000 miles nonstop in the initial version of the U.S. airplane. The range would allow the transport to serve more than 85 percent of the longer-range air transport routes of the world. It might well be that later in-service developments could increase this range considerable, as has been the case with the current generation of subsonic jet airliners.

For the aviation manufacturers, this program of Government assistance provides a really historic opportunity to maintain their free enterprise nature while at the same time meeting the great technical and economic challenge of the supersonic transport era. They simply could not do so without Government help. Under the terms of this program, the Government would play a significant management role without affecting the essential characteristics of the manufacturers involved nor disturbing, to an undue extent, the normal relationship between manufacturers and their customers, the airlines.

For the airlines, this program would produce a potentially money-making vehicle, superior to the oversea hardware, to provide service as the next generation of jetliners. By the time this supersonic plane is ready to carry passengers, I understand, the lines will be quite ready for the next round of equipment purchases. The using airlines would, as you know, reimburse the Government's development costs under a royalty arrangement over the life of the airplane.

One of the President's most telling points was this. He pointed out that supersonic development will once again, in the arena of international life, enable the United States to demonstrate the technological achievements that can be accomplished under a democratic, free enterprise system.

Thus, in dollars-and-cents terms, and perhaps, in less tangible terms, the supersonic transport program is an essential and very promising national effort. Considerable research has already been done on it both within the Government agencies that have aeronautical competence and resources and in our great aviation engine industries. The time has now come to move forward boldly with development of an airplane to keep the U.S. banner flying high in the airlanes of the world.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to attempt to make an argument against this amendment.

We will not learn any sooner until we get started. The British and the French have been engaged in the construction of one of these very high-powered, high-speed planes going from 1,400 to 1,500 miles an hour for 6 or 7 months. We think it is a billion-dollar market. Let us not give up our leadership in this field.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The distinguished chairman says it is a billion-dollar market. Well, will the chairman deny this will cost us at least $1 billion to $1.5 billion to develop this plane?

Mr. THOMAS. I think the cost will be anywhere from $750 million to $1 billion. They say there will be a $6 billion market. I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GROSS. With all of the speed we have in present-day aircraft we have an airport out here known as Dulles Airport, which is in this bill, running in the red every year. I do not see any hope that it will be out of the red for perhaps another 10 or 15 years. If we get these planes to go any faster and more people have to spend $10 to get to Washington by taxicab from the airport, they will have fewer and fewer passengers despite all of this expenditure you are talking about.

Mr. THOMAS. I have gone out there for $2 and it was a very good ride.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask that this amendment be voted down. The members of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle have studied this, particularly the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. Also, bear in mind that the X-15 on which you spent $40 million in research and development is the basis of this plane now.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PUCINSKI) there were—ayes 70, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call the attention of the committee to the language on page 18 of the committee report, which reads:

> The Committee again recommends that the $1,722,000 previously appropriated for technical services at Bay Pines, Fla., remain earmarked for this project if and when the Administrator deems it in the public interest to begin such construction at that place.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this money was earmarked way back in 1958. Since that time the influx of veterans in Florida has been quite substantial. As a matter of fact the waiting list at that hospital is probably as large as at any in the United States of America. Some 611 veterans are waiting to get in this veterans' hospital. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] and many others have been down there and visited it. I think they agree that it is one of the most beautiful and outstanding sites for a veterans' hospital in the United States. There are a quarter of a million people to be served by that hospital.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], who was kind enough to visit the facility last year if he does not believe, in view of the fact that this has been on the griddle now and money has been appropriated for over 2½ years, that the money should be spent for technical services to get it underway, and that it is much needed.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comment of the gentleman concerning my visit to Bay Pines Hospital near St. Petersburg, Fla. I made a special trip there to see for myself because I was aware of this very problem that the gentleman has mentioned. Our committee in the past, and again now, has asked that this money be earmarked and held exclusively for Bay Pines. This is a beautiful hospital. I cannot for the life of me understand why the Administrator and the Veterans' Administration are not moving forward in the development of this institution.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not believe under the circumstances, and in addition the fact that last year the other body specifically instructed the Administrator to spend this money in this calendar year, that it should be done. We have 2½ months left. I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] if the gentleman does not believe that the needs of this area justify going ahead with this project?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say to my able and distinguished friend that he lives in a great State, a growing State, a State with a lovely climate and a lovely location. I will say to the gentleman that the language is pretty strong.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, indisputable figures and incontestable statistics lead me to again challenge VA Administrator Gleason to explain why he is holding up the Bay Pines Veterans' Administration Hospital program.

Although $1.722 million has been appropriated for architectural and engineering services at this VA facility, the Veterans' Administration, without an explanation that will hold water, has refused to expend the funds and move forward with the program. The result is undue suffering and anguish for thousands of veterans dependent upon this facility.

There is a waiting list of 611 veterans who are in need of medical care but are unable to get it at Bay Pines because of its limited facilities.

The average daily patient load at Bay Pines is 636 veterans, an increase of nearly 50 percent over the last 5 years.

While 82 percent of the applicants for admission to Bay Pines reside in the three counties of Pinellas, Hillsborough, and Manatee, 47 percent, way over half, reside in Pinellas County alone.

Converting these percentages to actual figures: Bay Pines serves the needs of over 254,000 veterans in 21 Florida counties. Pinellas County, wherein Bay Pines is located, leads the list with 57,678 veterans.

To hold this important project up is inexcusable.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with a recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with a recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WYMAN. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Wyman moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 8747) to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following instruction: On page 36 in line 11, strike out "$3,926,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,726,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 145, nays 192, answered "present" 2, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—145

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair

Alger
Anderson
Arends
Ashbrook

Ashmore
Auchincloss
Baker
Barry

Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Cunningham
Dague
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Findley
Foreman
Fountain
Gathings
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Haley

Hall
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Herlong
Hoeven
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Morse
Morton
Nelsen
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff

Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wyman
Younger

Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Weltner

White
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

Wright
Wydler
Young

NAYS—192

Addabbo
Andrews
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Clark
Colmer
Corman
Cramer
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Forrester
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.

Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Leggett
Libonati
Mahon
Matsunaga
Matthews
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Mosher

Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nix
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Poage
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
Schweiker
Secrest
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Trimble
Udall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Conte

Halleck

NOT VOTING—93

Albert
Avery
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Broomfield
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Cameron
Celler
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Elliott
Feighan
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fuqua
Green, Pa.

Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hays
Henderson
Hoffman
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kornegay
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Mills
Moore
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Norblad

O'Brien, Ill.
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Saylor
Schenck
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sibal
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tuten
Van Pelt
Vinson
Whalley
Wickersham
Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Albert against.

Mr. Conte for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Collier for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Curtis for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Saylor for, with Mr. Elliott against.

Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. Martin of California for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Hoffman for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Hardy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Curtin.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Short.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Cameron with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Moss with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Berry.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Lankford with Mr. Ryan of New York.

Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Thornberry.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Zablocki.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Lennon.

Mr. McDowell with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Vinson with Mrs. Sullivan.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Senner.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. If he had been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH]. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. ASHLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 32, not voting 98, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—302

Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Colmer
Conte
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Young

NAYS—32

Abbitt
Abele
Alger
Anderson
Ashbrook
Beermann
Bruce
Clancy
Derwinski
Devine
Findley
Foreman
Goodell
Gross
Hutchinson
Johansen
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kyl
Laird
McClory
McLoskey
Morton
O'Konski
Rich
Rumsfeld
Schadeberg
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Tuck
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—98

Albert
Avery
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Bow
Broomfield
Buckley
Burton
Cahill
Cameron
Celler
Chelf
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Cooley
Corbett
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Edwards
Elliott
Feighan
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fuqua
Green, Pa.
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hays
Henderson
Hoffman
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kornegay
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Moore
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
Patman
Pilcher
Powell
Quie
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Saylor
Schenck
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sibal
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Tuten
Van Pelt
Vinson
Whalley
Wickersham
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Albert for, with Mr. Curtis against.
Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
M. Elliott for, with Mr. Saylor against.
Mr. Del Clawson for, with Mr. Collier against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Ryan of New York.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Selden with Mr. Edwards.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Senner.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Thornberry.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Short.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Martin of California.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Quie.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Ford.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Friedel with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Michel.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Lankford with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Sibal.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Denton with Mr. Van Pelt.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Lennon.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Pilcher.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Long of Maryland.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed and include extraneous material and tables.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, 88TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include the latest tabulation showing the down-to-date status of the appropriation bills of the session accompanied by comparisons with budget requests and last year's appropriations.

The table discloses a reduction of $184,869,965 below the budget requests on the supplementals for fiscal year 1963.

Four regular bills for fiscal year 1964 have been finally processed and sent to the President—Interior, Treasury-Post Office, Labor-HEW, and Defense. They involved budget requests for appropriations totaling $61,918,577,000 and were reduced below that figure by $2,229,557,000. In the aggregate they are also below total comparable appropriations for fiscal 1963 by $339,000,000.

Two bills, Agriculture and Legislative, are in conference.

Three bills, including the bill passed on the floor today, are in the Senate.

Three regular bills remain to be reported to the House—the military construction bill, the foreign aid bill, and the public works bill. They involve budget requests of about $11,314,000,000. We continue to mark time awaiting disposition of the authorization bills which, under present rules, must precede the appropriation. And of course there will be the usual closing supplemental bill; amounts to be considered are not yet in hand.

The appropriation bills, 88th

[Does not include back-door appropriations or permanent appropriations [1] under previous

Bill No.	Title	House							
		Budget estimates to House	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Amount reported compared with budget estimates	Date passed	Amount as passed	House action compared with—	
								Budget estimates	Amount reported
	1963 supplementals								
H.J. Res. 284	Supplemental, Agriculture	[2] $508,172,000	Feb. 26 (No. 35)	$508,172,000		Feb. 27	$508,172,000		
H.R. 5517	Supplemental	1,641,507,106	Apr. 5 (No. 198)	988,756,506	−$652,750,600	Apr. 10	1,438,691,506	−$202,815,600	+$449,935,000
	Public works acceleration	(500,000,000)		(..........)	(−500,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)	(+450,000,000)
	All other	(1,141,507,106)		(988,756,506)	(−152,750,600)		(988,691,506)	(−152,815,600)	(−65,000)
	Total, 1963 supplementals	2,149,679,106		1,496,928,506	−652,750,600		1,946,863,506	−202,815,600	+449,935,000
	1964 appropriations								
H.R. 5279	Interior	998,009,000	Mar. 28 (No. 177)	929,690,200	−68,318,800	Apr. 2	922,625,200	−75,383,800	−7,065,000
	Loan authorization	(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	
	Contract authority	(17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)	
H.R. 5366	Treasury—Post Office	6,146,842,000	Apr. 1 (No. 179)	5,997,026,000	−149,816,000	Apr. 4	5,997,026,000	−149,816,000	
H.R. 5888	Labor—HEW	5,759,489,000	Apr. 25 (No. 246)	5,449,988,000	−309,501,000	Apr. 30	5,449,981,000	−309,508,000	−7,000
H.R. 6754	Agriculture	6,368,755,000	June 3 (No. 355)	5,979,457,000	−389,298,000	June 6	5,979,457,000	−389,298,000	
	Loan authorizations	[3] (855,000,000)		[3] (855,000,000)			[3] (855,000,000)		
H.R. 6868	Legislative	[4] 148,580,245	June 6 (No. 369)	[4] 140,038,919	−8,541,326	June 11	[4] 140,038,919	−8,541,326	
H.R. 7063	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary	2,159,891,900	June 14 (No. 388)	1,851,269,900	−308,622,000	June 18	1,851,269,900	−308,622,000	
H.R. 7179	Defense	49,014,237,000	June 21 (No. 439)	47,092,209,000	−1,922,028,000	June 26	47,082,009,000	−1,932,228,000	−10,200,000
H.R. 7431	District of Columbia	(289,581,800)	July 8 (No. 499)	(284,286,800)	(−5,295,000)	July 11	(284,286,800)	(−5,295,000)	
	Federal payment	34,868,000		32,868,000	−2,000,000		32,868,000	−2,000,000	
	Loan authorizations	(8,000,000)		(8,000,000)			(8,000,000)		
H.R. 8747	Independent Offices	14,658,588,000	Oct. 7 (No. 824)	13,102,818,700	−1,555,769,300	Oct. 10	13,102,718,700	−1,555,869,300	−100,000
	Total, 1964 appropriations	85,289,260,145		80,575,365,719	−4,713,894,426		80,557,993,719	−4,731,266,426	−17,372,000
	Total, all appropriations	87,438,939,251		82,072,294,225	−5,366,645,026		82,504,857,225	−4,934,082,026	+432,563,000
	Total, loan authorizations	(876,000,000)		(869,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		(869,000,000)	(−7,000,000)	
	Total, contract authority	(17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)			(−17,500,000)	

---

[1] Tentatively estimated in January budget at about $11,500,000,000 for fiscal year 1964.

[2] Shifted from budget for 1964, which was reduced accordingly.

[3] Includes $360,000,000 for Farmers Home Administration loans currently made from loan repayments in lieu of former practice of public debt borrowings from Treasury.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (THE TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET)—2 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1964 VERSUS 2 MONTHS OF FISCAL 1963, WITH COMPARISONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include the usual tabulation and budget receipts and expenditures for the last 2 months.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I include for the information of Members and others the usual tabulation of budget receipts and expenditures in the first 2 months of fiscal year 1964 with comparisons.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

In contrast to budget expenditures which tend to recur more evenly throughout the fiscal year, the normal pattern of budget receipts shows September, December, March, and June as peak months; and receipts in the first half—July to December—of the fiscal year are usually lower than in the January to June second half.

Budget revenues were officially estimated at $86,900,000,000 in last January's budget for the current fiscal year 1964, which, if realized, would exceed fiscal 1963 revenues by $543,000,000. That is the last official budget estimate; the Secretary of the Treasury updated the figure to $88,800,000,000 in testimony on the tax bill which, if realized, would mean a $2,443,000,000 increase over actual fiscal 1963 revenues. In any event, in the first 2 months of the fiscal year—a low collection period, actual budget revenues amounted to $10,837,000,000, slightly higher than the corresponding 2 months of last year.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures were officially projected in the budget last January at $98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 which, if held to, would represent an increase of $6,212,000,000 over the fiscal 1963 budget expenditure. On a straight monthly basis, it would mean an average of $8,233,000,000 per month, in contrast to which the expenditures in the first 2 months, July and August, averaged $8,083,000,000 which in turn compares with $7,896,000,000 in the same period last year; the national defense average was up $113,000,000 over a year ago and all other items—nondefense—were $74,000,000 higher.

But in recent testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury informally presented a revised estimate of $98,000,000,000 budget expenditures for fiscal 1964, in contrast to the original estimate of $98,802,000,000, but supporting details are not available. This would represent an increase over fiscal 1963 of $5,410,000,000. Expenditures in the first 2 months, July-August, were $375,000,000 higher than those for the same 2 months last year; both defense and nondefense were up.

The table also discloses that the House has cut $4,731,266,426 from the budget requests considered in the nine regular bills it has thus far passed for fiscal 1964. Characteristically, the Senate has been reversing some of the cuts. But the earlier outlook for final congressional reductions on the order of $5,400,000,000 on regular bills for 1964 remains valid.

In reading the tabulation it is to be noted that approximately $12,000,000,000—using a very round amount because it fluctuates—of appropriations for 1964 recur automatically under permanent law and thus are not in the table since there is no annual action by the Congress. The principal item is for interest on the national debt, tentatively estimated in the January budget at $10,020,000,000; it will probably be higher than that.

The table follows:

Cong., 1st sess., as of Oct. 10, 1963

legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

Senate							Conference			Public Law	
Budget estimates to Senate	Date and report number	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Senate action compared with—		Date filed and report number	Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date	Number	Date approved
					Budget estimates	House action					
$508,172,000	Feb. 28 (No. 9)	$508,172,000	Mar. 4	$508,172,000				$508,172,000		88-1	Mar. 6
1,652,300,456	Apr. 24 (No. 155)	1,486,096,841	May 1	1,488,683,841	−$163,616,615	+$49,992,335	May 6 (No. 275)	1,467,430,491	−$184,869,965	88-25	May 17
(500,000,000)		(450,000,000)		(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)		May 31 (No. 290)	(450,000,000)	(−50,000,000)		
(1,152,300,456)		(1,036,096,841)		(1,038,683,841)	(−113,616,615)	(+49,992,335)		(1,017,430,491)	(−134,869,965)		
2,160,472,456		1,994,268,841		1,996,855,841	−163,616,615	+49,992,335		1,975,602,491	−184,869,965		
998,009,000	May 22 (No. 181)	979,093,400	May 28	979,693,400	−18,315,600	+57,068,200	July 11 (No. 551)	952,456,500	−45,552,500	88-79	July 26
(13,000,000)		(6,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)			(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		
(17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)				(−17,500,000)		
6,146,842,000	May 3 (No. 168)	6,074,216,250	May 8	6,069,466,250	−77,375,750	+72,440,250	May 28 (No. 353)	6,045,466,000	−101,376,000	88-39	June 13
5,759,489,000	Aug. 1 (No. 383)	5,494,627,250	Aug. 7	5,495,827,250	−263,661,750	+45,846,250	Sept. 25 (No. 774)	5,471,087,500	−288,401,500		
6,368,755,000	Sept. 12 (No. 497)	6,046,738,340	Sept. 30	6,047,988,340	−320,766,660	+68,531,340					
[3] (855,000,000)		[3] (880,000,000)		[3] (880,000,000)	(+25,000,000)	(25,000,000)					
182,218,450	June 25 (No. 313)	168,273,069	June 26	168,273,069	−13,954,381	+28,234,150					
49,014,237,000	Sept. 17 (No. 502)	47,371,407,000	Sept. 24	47,339,707,000	−1,674,530,000	+257,696,000	Oct. 7 (No. 812)	47,220,010,000	−1,794,227,000		
68,469,550,450		66,134,355,309		66,100,955,309	−2,368,595,141	+529,818,190		59,689,020,000	−2,229,557,000		
70,630,022,906		68,128,624,150		68,097,811,150	−2,532,211,756	+579,810,525		61,664,622,491	−2,414,426,965		
(868,000,000)		(886,000,000)		(886,000,000)	(+18,000,000)	(+25,000,000)		(6,000,000)	(−7,000,000)		
(17,500,000)					(−17,500,000)				(−17,500,000)		

[4] Excludes Senate items.
[5] Prepared by Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

NOTE.—Totals reflect amounts approved and comparisons at latest stage of congressional action on each bill.

As in past budgets, the original January budget expenditure—disbursements—estimate of $98,802,000,000 for fiscal 1964 represented a composite of, first, estimated disbursements in fiscal 1964 from appropriations made in prior years—$42,353,000,000, or approximately 43 percent, and therefore not directly affected by current congressional action on the 1964 appropriation bills; second, $1,202,000,000 estimated first-year expenditure in fiscal 1964 associated with proposals for new legislation; third, roughly $11,781,000,000 estimated to be expended from permanent appropriations recurring automaticaly under prior law and therefore not required to be voted on in the current session; fourth, thus leaving only about $43,466,000,000 of the total $98,802,000,000 original spending estimate for 1964 subject to direct action in the appropriation bills of the current session.

EXPENDITURES FOR DEFENSE, SPACE, AND INTEREST—AND ALL OTHER PROGRAMS

Both the State of the Union and Budget messages emphasized that the expenditure estimates and programs for fiscal 1964 were so constructed that the total proposed administrative budget expenditure for all programs other than national defense, space, and interest was slightly below the fiscal 1963 level—as then forecast—for such programs. The original net budget estimate for fiscal 1964 for such other programs was $29,066,000,000. In the meantime, actual expenditures in fiscal 1963 for comparable purposes did not go as high as forecast in last January's budget, with the result that the $29,066,000,000 stands as an increase of $1,747,000,000 over fiscal 1963 rather than being below that year. In the first 2 months—July and August of fiscal 1964, expenditures were $5,233,000,000—about $200,000,000 below the corresponding expenditure in July–August of last year.

SURPLUS OR DEFICIT

Whether the budget deficit is the $9.2 billion informally projected by the Secretary before the Ways and Means Committee, and mentioned in the President's letter of August 19, or some other amount, fiscal 1964 represents the 28th year of budget deficits in the last 34 years. And the President advises that the next budget, for fiscal 1965, will also be in the red. And no assurance is at hand that the fiscal 1966 budget will be balanced. We have not had a balanced budget since fiscal 1960. In summary here are the official administrative budget figures of the last 3 years:

[In millions of dollars]

	From July 1, 1961, to date	For 3 fiscal years 1962–64
Fiscal 1962 (from July 1, 1961)	6,378	6,378
Fscal 1963	6,233	
Fiscal 1964 (2 months to Aug. 31, 1963)	5,331	6,233
Fiscal 1964 (estimate mentioned in President's Aug. 19 letter)		9,200
Total, as above	17,942	21,811

And in total, actual budget expenditures in the fiscal closed on June 30 last, and now informally projected by the Secretary for the current fiscal year 1964, compare with certain earlier years as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget spending	
	Over fiscal 1961	Over fiscal 1954
Fiscal 1963 actual:		
National defense	+5,249	+5,757
Other than national defense	+5,826	+19,296
Total, 1963 over	+11,075	+25,053
Fiscal 1964 current estimate: Total, 1964 estimate over	+16,485	+30,463

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, after 2 months of budget operations in the current fiscal year 1964 the total public debt, both direct and guaranteed, stood at $307,208,749,449.59 and compares with certain earlier dates as shown in the following table:

	Federal public debt—direct and guranteed				
	Fiscal 1954	Fiscal 1961	Fiscal 1962	Fiscal 1963	Fiscal 1964 (at Aug. 31, 1963)
1. The debt at end of period ... billions	$271.3	$289.2	$298.6	$306.5	$307.2
2. Amount per capita	1,670.0	1,575.0	1,600.0	1,619.0	1,619.0
3. Average for a family of 4	6,680.0	6,300.0	6,400.0	6,476.0	6,476.0

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the following table elaborates more fully the receipt and expenditure situation:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the traditional administrative budget), 2 months of fiscal 1964 versus 2 months of fiscal 1963 and comparisons with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 2 months (to Aug. 31, 1963)			Budget estimates for all of fiscal 1964 compared to actual results for all of fiscal 1963			Estimates over 1963—	
	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1963	1964 compared to 1963	Budget estimates for 1964 [1]	Informal Treasury revision [2]	Actual, 1963	Original estimates over 1963	Informal Treasury revision and 1963
1. Budget receipts (net)	$10,837	$10,655	+$182	$86,900	$88,800	$86,357	+$543	+$2,443
2. Budget expenditures (net):								
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	8,625	8,398	+227	55,433	(3)	52,743	+2,690	(3)
(b) Other than national defense	7,543	7,395	+148	43,369	(3)	39,847	+3,522	(3)
Total expenditures, net	16,168	15,793	+375	98,802	98,000	92,590	+6,212	+5,410
3. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−5,331	−5,138	−193	−11,902	−9,200	−6,233	[4] −5,669	[4] −2,967
4. Average monthly expenditure:								
(a) National defense	4,312	4,199	+113	4,619	(3)	4,395	+224	(3)
(b) Other than national defense	3,771	3,697	+74	3,614	(3)	3,320	+294	(3)
Total monthly average	8,083	7,896	+187	8,233	8,167	7,715	+518	+452
1. Dividing net budget expenditures on the basis emphasized by the budget message of January 1963:								
(a) National defense	8,625	8,398	+227	55,433	(3)	52,743	+2,690	(3)
(b) Space	556	322	+234	4,200	(3)	2,552	+1,648	(3)
(c) Interest	1,754	1,640	+114	10,103	(3)	9,976	+127	(3)
(d) All other expenditures	5,233	5,433	−200	29,066	(3)	27,319	+1,747	(3)
Total expenditures, net	16,168	15,793	+375	98,802	98,000	92,590	+6,212	+5,410

[1] As per original budget, Jan. 17, 1963.

[2] Given by Secretary of Treasury to Ways and Means Committee in connection with tax bill.

[3] No breakdowns available.

[4] That is to say, these 2 estimates represent a projected deficit in fiscal 1964 higher, by $5,669,000,000 and $2,967,000,000, respectively, than the deficit actually experienced in fiscal 1963.

Sources: Monthly Treasury statement for Aug. 31, 1963; budget for 1964; and monthly Treasury statement for June 30, 1963.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA AND HER COMMUNIST SATELLITE NATIONS

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, with the administration obviously following a softer line toward communism, I was not at all surprised to hear the President's announcement last night that he had approved the sale of subsidized agriculture commodities to the U.S.S.R. and other Eastern European Communist satellite nations. By so doing, he ignored and negated the declared policy of this Congress toward such trade as expressed in my amendment in the Agriculture Act of 1961.

The Agriculture Act of 1961, Public Law 87-128, August 8, 1961, which President Kennedy signed into law, states in its declaration of policy:

> SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to (c) expand foreign trade in agricultural commodities with friendly nations, as defined in section 107 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1707), and in no manner either subsidize the export, sell, or make available any subsidized agricultural commodity to any nations other than such friendly nations and thus make full use of our agricultural abundance.

Section 107 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, to which the act of 1961 refers, reads as follows:

> SEC. 107. As used in this act, "friendly nation" means any country other than (1) the U.S.S.R., or (2) any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement. (7 U.S.C. 1707.)

Since the President has seen fit to ignore this policy as set forth by the Congress, can we now expect him to ignore other policies which have been and will in the future be set forth by the Congress of the United States? Whenever the time comes that the President of the United States can ignore the declared policies of the Congress at will, representative government will cease to exist in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree completely with the President when he says that trading with an avowed enemy of the United States is "in our interest." The Communist conspiracy still exists and its goal of world domination remains unchanged.

I further disagree with the President when he states that the sale of subsidized agriculture commodities to the Soviet Union and her satellites "does not represent a new Soviet-American trade policy." It is quite true that we have been trading with the Soviet Union and her satellites in nonsubsidized agriculture commodities but we have not been selling them subsidized agricultural commodities.

Therefore, the sale of subsidized agricultural commodities is a new trade policy and the American taxpayer will be required to pay an additional subsidy to the exporter who sells this wheat to the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a statement made by the President which needs some explanation. The President said:

> While this wheat, like all wheat sold abroad, will be sold at the world price, which is the only way it can be sold, there is in such transactions no subsidy to the foreign purchaser, only a savings to the American taxpayer on wheat the Government has already purchased and stored at the higher domestic price which is maintained to assist our farmers.

I agree with the President that the export subsidy is not paid to the foreign purchaser, however, the foreign purchaser gets the benefits to be derived from such a subsidy. Every single bushel of wheat that will be sold to the U.S.S.R and other Communist satellite nations will require an export subsidy to be paid to the exporter—not the farmer—of approximately 60 cents a bushel. Last year this export subsidy averaged 67 cents per bushel. The U.S.S.R. and the other Communist satellite nations will reap the benefits of this subsidy by being able to buy American wheat at the 60 cents per bushel lower price. In other words, the Russians will be buying American wheat at 60 cents a bushel less than we Americans can purchase it. The American taxpayer will not only be paying a subsidy to increase the price of this wheat but he will also be paying a subsidy to decrease the price of it. The sale of the 150 million bushels of wheat as mentioned by the President would, in addition to the subsidy already paid, cost the taxpayers an export subsidy of approximately $90 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is already admitted that a portion of the wheat sold by Canada to the Soviet Union has been shipped to Cuba. How, then, can the President make the statement that this wheat will be used only in the Soviet Union and her Eastern European satellites? What would prevent Mr. Khrushchev from selling Russian wheat to Cuba, Red China, and North Vietnam and replacing it with American wheat—subsidized by American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, when this transaction was first discussed we were advised that these sales would be made for cash payable in gold or in dollars. We now find the President obtaining a legal opinion from his brother's department to the effect that the Johnson Act does not apply when credit is advanced to a government in default in the payment of its obligations to the United States. The Johnson Act makes it a criminal offense to make any loan to a foreign government, political subdivision, organization, or association, except a renewal or adjustment of existing indebtedness while such government, political subdivision, organization, or association is in default in the payment of its obligations, or any part thereof, to the United States. According to the ruling by the Justice Department an indebtedness by the Soviet Union and her satellite countries for a period up to 18 months will be considered as "credit" rather than a "loan" and, therefore, not violative of the Johnson Act.

Mr. Speaker, anyone remotely familiar with the economic race which has been going on between the Soviet Union and the United States would advise you that there is little prospect for continued sales of agriculture commodities to the Communists and that we are now only temporarily bailing communism out of one of the economic areas where they presently admit they are not competing. This administration is not only bailing them out now but has authorized the shipment of fertilizer plants to the Soviet Union which will help make certain that the Soviet Union will not suffer from short supplies in the future. In fact, I am advised an export license has been issued by the Commerce Department for $9.5 million worth of modern equipment to be used to obtain potash for fertilizer.

Much has been said by the administration to lead us to believe that this sale was approved primarily for commercial reasons. If this be the case, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the administration succeeded in driving a very hard bargain. I am advised that today wheat is selling in Russia for around $2.50 a bushel in American dollars. This means that Mr. Khrushchev will make a sizable profit on our wheat when he buys it in the United States at the low world price and sells it at the high Russian price.

Mr. Speaker, only time will reveal the wisdom of such dealings. Since the President has taken us down this road, I pray that it will prove to be the right one.

THE TAX REDUCTION—REVISITED

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, this House and its leadership on both sides of the aisle are to be congratulated for the wisdom displayed in passing the recent tax reduction measure. Those who hailed the action as the most significant to be taken by this body in the last few years are certainly not wide off the mark. However, it is helpful, I think, to look upon what we have wrought after the heat of debate has cooled and the pressure for passage has receded. It is to be expected that in the ardor of advocacy some overextension of enthusiasm will be displayed. In the effort to win adherence some "puffing" of the product is inevitably present. Such was the case for the tax cut program. It is not what its most ardent supporters claimed, that is, a patent medicine which will cure all our ills from unemployment to juvenile delinquency. Nor will it issue in the dire days dismally predicted by those who see deficit spending as a decadence worse than the decay of Rome.

Seen objectively, Mr. Speaker, the tax cut, if approved by the Senate, will give the sustaining power for a prolonged slump-free growth. If we are correct in this expectation, then the recovery period commenced in 1961 could expect to continue into 1966 and thereby establish the modern record for sustained healthy expansion. Chairman WILBUR MILLS cut through to the core of the purpose to be served by the tax measure, when he told the House the tax reduction would contribute to the country's base of "aggregate demand." This aggregate demand is the foundation, after all, of all economic growth. Government contributes to it either by spending or by tax reduction. With the need for growth in that basic demand the relief of tax burden seems far wiser than the alternative—more spending. What the Members must further see in this "core of truth" is that the level of Government participation in aggregate demand cannot be reduced at this particular time without reducing the effort of the tax cut. Our position on Government spending should be to fight against increased spending and elimination of wasteful or unproductive spending.

It is our belief, Mr. Speaker, that it was unfortunate to overemphasize the correlation between the tax cut and employment and other so-called side benefits. We could very well reach 1966 with a continued history of good business, fair wages, and honest profits and still be facing a problem of 5.8 percent unemployment. The impact of automation, the problem of the undereducated and subskilled worker, the unhappy circumstance of the Negro labor market are problems that could and may still persist. We hope it will not be heresy to observe that the avoidance of recession over the years immediately ahead is more important to more people than the admitted serious problem of unemployment. After all for at least 94 of 100 Americans now in the labor market and yet to enter that market the continuation of expansion and growth will bring job security and good times. If it is not sacrilegious, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the TV ad for a certain underarm application. The announcer in a candid delivery explains "our product won't guarantee your success with the opposite sex or assure you advancement in your job, but it will keep you fresh and after all that is quite enough, don't you think?"

My point is the tax cut has not all the powers once attributed to snake oil and we will disappoint the public and embarrass ourselves if we lead the American public to expect more than can be delivered. On the other hand what reasonably can be expected is of great importance and should not be lost in a flurry of criticism because we have not issued in the millennium.

ARA'S POINT FOUR FOR AMERICA

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, nearly everyone who writes and talks about the Area Redevelopment Administration and its activities seems to concentrate only on the direct loans that agency makes for industrial and commercial enterprises. Occasionally someone refers to the public facility loans and grants that are provided to depressed communities in order to make possible the creation or expansion of a company. But rarely do I hear any reference to another important program administered by ARA, namely, its technical assistance activities. This part of ARA, in my opinion, is just as important as its loan and grant activities.

In many of America's depressed areas, the final goal of new, permanent employment cannot be realized until such areas have the answers to problems that must be solved first—problems involving technical knowledge and know-how.

For example, what is the feasibility of exploiting an area's natural resources to create, say, a new chemical processing plant? Does it make sense for a large industrial urban complex, traditionally dependent on heavy manufacturing of a single product, to divert its spatial, financial, and human resources into, say, research and development projects? How can several thousand areas located near the intersection of two major turnpikes be developed for recreational and tourist attractions?

In and around my own city of Pittsburgh, local and State organizations—both public and private—have turned to ARA for such assistance. They stand ready to implement the technical knowledge outcome of such technical assistance—and I should emphasize that ARA does not grant technical assistance unless implementing, action organizations have been created to exploit that knowledge. Given ARA's assignment, that of creating jobs, it does not finance knowledge merely for the sake of knowledge. For any economic development agency, knowledge exists for the sake of action.

In early April of this year, ARA entered into a $19,400 contract with the reputable firm of Steelman & Hendrix to make a feasibility study on the possibility of establishing grain milling operations in the Pittsburgh area. If the findings are favorable, they could lead to the establishment of private enterprises employing several hundred people in this type of industry. The sponsor of the investigation is the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of Pittsburgh, an organization of industrialists, bankers, and economic developers capable of acting immediately on favorable feasibility reports.

ARA also approved a technical assistance grant which will cover the cost of the study to determine the potential of the region for the expansion of the chemical industry in the region, both in terms of the expansion of plants now operating in the area and also the introduction of new chemical operations. ARA retained Singmaster & Breyer, a well-known firm of chemical industry consultants, to complete the study which had been requested by RIDC. This study is in four phases and is designed to provide specific information on the products and the market for products that are now produced in the region or which might be produced through the operation of chemical plant facilities. The study will have two phases planned for completion before the end of 1963, and the latter two planned for completion by the spring of 1964.

A final example consists of an ARA-financed technical assistance project which is now ready to be exploited by public and private groups in and around the Clearfield-DuBois area, outside of Pittsburgh. This concerns the development of the area around the Clearfield interchange, known as Otocsin. The study is already completed, and the Community Planning Services, Inc., have submitted a comprehensive development plan, including more than a dozen specific projects that will expand and create employment in the growing industry of tourism and recreation for the exploding population of the Pittsburgh area—financed with private investments.

Without ARA's technical assistance, Pittsburgh would still be arguing and speculating about whether or not its economy could or should establish grain milling operations, or whether new chemical operations should be introduced.

Without ARA's technical assistance, the depressed areas around Clearfield and DuBois and the action agencies interested in those areas would have no clear-cut directions in which to develop the otherwise vague potentials of the interchange and reservoir regions so close to Pittsburgh.

YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members of Congress and millions of Americans across the country, I am deeply disturbed at the invitation extended by the administration to Yugoslav Dictator Tito. The various peoples of the prewar Kingdom of Yugoslavia who migrated to the United States following the war, rather than to remain enslaved under Communist tyranny, have presented us with evidence concerning true conditions in that Communist country.

May I also make it clear that I feel President Kennedy's ruling that Yugoslavia is not a part of the international Communist conspiracy and is eligible to receive U.S. military aid is a tragic error.

Any military assistance we provide the Red government of Yugoslavia merely serves to perpetuate Communist control over the people of that nation, and further serves to strengthen the cause of world communism.

Yugoslavia, a prewar exporter of food, must now import. Yugoslavia which enjoyed steady development of political freedom, now has a rubberstamp Parliament, and a rigidly controlled press, radio, and TV, just as in other Communist countries.

Clear documentation of the views held by American citizens who have firsthand knowledge of the Tito tyranny should receive proper attention. Many Members of Congress have received an official communication from the Serbian National Defense Council of America, expressing its views on the subject of Tito's visit, which I insert into the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

SERBIAN NATIONAL DEFENSE
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill.

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: It has been officially announced that the Yugoslav dictator Tito is coming to Washington. In the name of the members of our organization we would like to ask you to do everything in your power to prevent this visit.

We feel that Tito's visit to the White House would only damage the prestige of the United States in the world, reaffirm Tito's role of a missionary of communism in the underdeveloped regions, and deliver additional grievance to the suffering Yugoslav people.

We feel that this visit has been poorly evaluated and that its consequences were not properly taken into consideration. The United States has nothing to gain from such a visit and has a lot to lose. We can confidently predict that in Eastern Europe and in Yugoslavia specifically the image of the United States would sink to a new low.

The U.S. policy toward Yugoslavia and the invitation to Tito is a flagrant violation of the principles for which this country stands. As American citizens and anti-Communists, we ask you to use your influence to prevent this shameful and damaging visit.

DR. UROSH L. SEFFER,
*President, Serbian National
Defense Council of America.*

The Central Committee of the Macedonian Patriotic Organization, representing the Macedonian people of North America, issued a statement on the occasion of President Tito's visit to the United States, which I insert into the RECORD at this point.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
MACEDONIAN PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATION,
Indianapolis, Ind.

A STATEMENT ON THE OCCASION OF PRESIDENT TITO'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Together with many other Americans, the members of the Macedonian Patriotic Organizations consider it a moral responsibility to make known their views relative to the announced "semiofficial" visit to the United States by President Tito of Yugoslavia.

The attention that our high Government officials must give to this notorious leader of the evil Communist conspiracy will be but one more fruitless addition to the many previous efforts expended in dealing with this fanatic adversary of our American way of life. The sad history of the past and present relations between his dictatorial regime and our democratic government clearly contradicts the premise of those who cherish the hope that some good may result from his visit here and from our continued aid to his government.

We even venture to say that Marshall Tito is coming to this country not as a friend but as a Trojan horse. As in the past, the egocentric dictator from Belgrade will continue his struggle not for the preservation but for the obliteration of the American way of life. To us, it is evident that this Moscow-trained conspirator will remain faithful to the principles of the Communist doctrine. He proved this recently by the warm welcome he accorded his ideological brother, Nikita Khrushchev, whose visit to Yugoslavia resulted in exuberant manifestations of fraternal cooperation.

Only one deduction can be made from the reciprocal avowals of closest collaboration that ended the more than friendly visit of these two famous Communist tyrants: that further American aid to Tito is worthless to the cause of the Western democracies and can result only in bitter and costly disappointment.

Although we do not wish to elaborate on the tragic fate of our enslaved brothers and sisters—the Macedonian Bulgarians, Arumanians, etc.—suffering under the cruel domination of Tito's dictatorial regime in Macedonia, it is appropriate that we mention their heroic struggle for freedom and national independence. They and the other oppressed national groups in Yugoslavia are true and faithful friends of the United States. They continue to consider our country as a mighty champion of human liberties; and, because of their concept of the greatness of America, the courtesies that will be shown to their oppressor during his visit here are bound to blur somewhat this noble image.

The record of this deceitful and arrogant visitor and of his Communist camarilla in Belgrade is a mockery of every noble effort that is made in the name of a lasting peace. To recognize a leader who has propagated death and destruction is to turn our back on the universal principles which acknowledge as man's birthright those inalienable human rights for which our forefathers fought and died.

M. D. Chaneff,
President.
Peter G. Atzeff,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, further evidence of the views held by American citizens on this subject is a letter addressed to the President by the Croatian Guardians of Liberty of Chicago, which I also include here as part of my remarks.

Croatian Guardians of Liberty.

John F. Kennedy,
President of the United States of America, White House, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: An official invitation was extended to Josip Broz Tito to visit Washington, D.C., the capital of the free world.

This news has visibly upset all U.S. citizens of Croatian descent and we vehemently protest a visit to the United States of a bloodthirsty tyrant, who killed so many Croatians numbering in hundreds of thousands, who persecuted the Catholic Church and murdered more than 1,500 priests, imprisoned and put in concentration camps hundreds of thousands of men and women just because they are not Communists, therefore we protest against Tito's coming to the United States and we beg you to cancel this visit.

We cannot believe that Tito's visit would be of any value to the United States. We fear that the prestige of this country would greatly suffer because of the visit of Tito, a hardcore, rockfast and steadfast Communist.

The entire world recognizes communism's threat to the liberties and freedom of all men; that it is an insidious enemy that wants to destroy all mankind and centuries of culture.

Tito's visit to the United States and the White House would not only arouse the bitterness of the citizens of Croatian descent, but also all citizens of those nationalities which are behind the Iron Curtain and which are beginning to shake their chains.

His visit in Washington would affect the record of our great country among all the downtrodden nations in the world which look to United States as the symbol of freedom and justice.

Tito is a hardhearted Communist and the servant of the Kremlin, his actions and words on so many occasions have proven this fact.

Tito will never abandon the Kremlin nor fight against her. Thus of what value is the visit of Tito to the United States?

Tito, murderer and dictator has no reason to step on the free and democratic soil of the United States.

Respectfully yours,
Torlo Saban,
President.
Marijan Dugandzic,
Secretary.

The history of the last 22 years, Mr. Speaker, shows the tragic error of appeasing communism, of accepting the promises of its dictators. We have no more reason to have faith in the utterances of President Tito of Yugoslavia than we had of Stalin or Khrushchev. The tragic foreign policy errors of the present administration can only lead to international disaster.

FUNDS FOR NATION'S RIVER BASINS

Mr. **OLSEN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **OLSEN**. Mr. Speaker, the navigable streams of the United States constitute a major national resource. The waters that flow through our major river basins provide a means of inexpensive transportation; serve as the coolant for steam electric plants; provide for irrigation and domestic supply; generate hydroelectric energy; and serve as a recreational outlet for millions of Americans.

On the negative side, these same waters have caused annual disasters costing millions of dollars as they have rampaged over natural banks, flooding towns and farms and carrying to the sea irreplaceable topsoil.

This negative side has been diminished by the superlative efforts of the Corps of Army Engineers. The massive flood control program, a system of dams, dikes, and levees, has harnessed much of the Nation's river resources. But still there is a great deal to be done. Today the annual flood, as perennial as the spring thaw, is no real threat, but the great flood, the flood that occurs every 30 to 50 years, the flood that destroyes lives, factories and all within its path, is yet to be fully controlled. That annual flood from the spring thaw in Montana has not been harnessed to its multiple uses. Indeed, the private power company does not store and use that flood at all—that water flows wasted to the sea.

In Montana particularly, in addition to the annual flood, the great flood that occurs every 30 to 50 years can also be controlled with sufficient investment in river projects. Because we have the technology to construct these projects, each year Congress analyses the work that has been done with the money authorized previously, and, where necessary, authorizes further funds to continue the work in progress.

The present Congress has before it legislation to authorize the funds to continue work in a number of the Nation's river basins. This bill, H.R. 6016, once passed the House, but the other body, in its wisdom, felt that there was a necessity to begin consideration of future projects other than those presently being constructed. The bill, with Senate amendments, was returned to this House where it now rests.

There are a number of reasons why this legislation has not yet been acted on, but I do not intend to delve into those. The reasons are moot at this point. What is important, and it is of grave importance, is that several of the Nation's river basins are in dire need of additional authorizations so that work may be continued. Since the beginning of this fiscal year, the corps has been operating on continuing resolutions of the Appropriations Committees, but even these continuing resolutions are of no use if the basin authorizations are completely depleted.

In the Los Angeles River basin, the corps ran out of Federal funds at the end of July and has continued work only because some local funds have been available. The work has not been on as broad a scale as previously and cannot be continued without immediate Federal funds.

According to estimates made by the corps prior to the end of fiscal 1963, 30-day notices would have to be sent to contractors working in the Ohio basin on October 15. If that is the case, and there is no reason to doubt the sagacity of the corps, all work will cease in that basin on or about November 15.

In Texas, the Brazos River program will be out of funds as of December 1, notices to contractors being mailed the first of November.

In Florida, the central-southern project will also close down on December 1.

The Arkansas River development, unless additional money is authorized, must shut down on the first day of the new year.

The Columbia River program, not in as serious difficulty as others, has until February 1 before construction must shut down. Also, operations in the White River basin will suspend on that date.

If, as some have said, this legislation is passed over until the next session of this Congress, all of the major river basins are in serious trouble. And, even if the forecast that this bill will be one of the last pieces of legislation is correct, several basins will have shut down and others will be on the verge.

This is a serious problem from many aspects. A shutdown of construction in some of these areas, especially during job-slack winter months, could have a serious and adverse economic impact on the localities involved. If the contractors are forced to close down and move operations to more profitable locations, months will be lost before full work can be resumed. In areas where construction must be dependent on low water levels, delays in the fall and winter months can mean much longer losses of vital time due to higher spring runoffs.

Time is running out for the Congress to act in order to avoid critical delays and the adverse economic implications of projects shut down. H.R. 6016 must be moved ahead in order that construction can continue and the needs of the Nation's river basins can be met. So I do not speak today just for the problem of Montana, old and grave as it is. I speak out for the many river basins, and the millions of lives and their fortunes so dependent upon continuing river basin control and development. If these Federal water resource development, conservation, and flood control projects do not go forward, then virtually all water resource programs are at an end, because very few of the States have any programs. The State of Montana has no water resource program whatsoever developing Montana's water. The Nation's undeveloped water resources, like Montana's, are continuing to go wasted to the sea.

SIGN PRAYER PETITION

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of "Citizens for Public Prayer," a vigorous group of loyal, God-fearing Americans of Rutland, Mass., in my district, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excellent compendium and handbook on public reverence and the advisable means of recapturing it in this Nation as soon as possible.

This admirable and exceptionally well prepared and brilliantly written tract is designed to promote and accelerate action on a pending bill providing for a constitutional amendment in effect to nullify the recent prayer decision of the Supreme Court.

That the country and the religious world were very deeply shocked and aroused by these incredible decisions is quite obvious.

What next? Will it be another decision to cancel out the words, "In God We Trust" from our money and from American life, official and otherwise? Or one that will wipe out the pledge of allegiance, eliminate chaplains in the armed services, abolish the celebration of Christmas, Easter, and other feast days sacred to an overwhelming majority of the American people?

There is one very practical way by which these dire results can be avoided, and the nullification of the prayer decisions can be accomplished, and that is to secure early favorable action on the pending discharge petition by my distinguished, able colleague from New York [Mr. MILLER], allowing a vote of the House on legislation moving toward a constitutional amendment. Such action would ensue when a majority of the Members of the House sign their names to the above petition.

As one of the first to sign this petition and to urge my colleagues to do so, I again express the hope, and urgently request, that every Member of the House who believes in God and the constitutional right to pray to Him in public, as well as in private, will promptly sign this petition.

I ardently and sincerely support the valid rights of minority groups in this country and am anxious to see them protected at all times.

But no minority, no court or forum should be allowed to deny the right of the American people to pray to their Creator in public or in private. The right to keep God in American life where He has been enshrined since this Government first began, yes, from the early settling of this great country, must be guaranteed by law.

I pledge to this fine group of Americans and all those cooperating with them every assistance I can render in this great cause, and I hope the American people will become really aroused to the crucial need for immediate action to preserve one of the most precious blessings of our American heritage—the right to honor and pray to the living God, who has bestowed such immeasurable blessings upon us, and upon our great Nation since the day it was born.

Wake up, America! Do not sit by while Communists, atheists, agnostics, materialists, bleeding hearts, and their unwitting dupes tamper with and imperil the very foundation stones, sacred beliefs, and shrines of our great majestic Nation.

Let us keep America as a stronghold of spiritual belief and enlightenment for all. The Supreme Court might well lend its great prestige, dignity, and influence to this end.

Citizens for Public Prayer,
Box 1776, Rutland, Mass.,
September 25, 1963.

Action Memorandum No. 1

(Herewith a basic summary of our position and some of the arguments and techniques we feel are appropriate to it. This material may be used in any way you feel best. Inclusion of our address in each public statement involving us will be appreciated. However, no one is authorized to speak officially for us without our express permission.)

When and for what purpose were you organized?

1. We were organized at the geographic center of Massachusetts on July 11, 1963.

2. We believe that the Federal Constitution as it now stands is actually in accord with our position on "public reverence."

3. In view, however, of the Supreme Court's two "prayer decisions" there is no other legal way to maintain our position on "public reverence" than through an amendment to the first amendment of the Federal Constitution spelling out once and for all the constitutionality of "public reverence" in our schools and elsewhere in our national life.

4. Our purpose is to promote such an amendment.

What precisely is the amendment you seek?

1. We leave the exact wording of amendment to the Congress which must, in the first instance, propose it to the people of the United States.

2. We are well aware that great care must be exercised to write an amendment which will at once achieve our purpose and protect dissenting minorities.

3. It would seem that the type of amendment proposed to the Congress in the early months of 1963 by Episcopal Bishop James Pike (California) would be best. His Excellency suggested that the word "establishment" in the first amendment be further spelled out to mean rather Government support and maintenance of any sectarian institution or organization of religion than Government support of a basic "public reverence."

What is the nature of your organization?

1. We are essentially a clearinghouse and focal point for the effort first to have an amendment placed before the American people and then to carry such an amendment once it is so placed.

2. We are entirely nonsectarian.

3. We are entirely nonpartisan.

4. We are located physically in the heart of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but our scope and interests are national.

5. We meet monthly in the middle Massachusetts area.

Are you in any way involved with other proposals for amendment affecting the Supreme Court and now before the American people?

We are in no way involved with such other proposals. Our total concern is with the passage of a so-called prayer amendment.

What action do you suggest to other Americans who want such an amendment?

1. We suggest action in Washington. The proposal for amendment must be moved out of the House Judiciary Committee where we understand it is now bottled up. It must then be placed before the full House. Petitions, singly and collectively, to Members of Congress in this regard are urgent now.

2. We suggest action in State capitols. To assist in maintaining public focus on amendment and in helping to move the Congress, it is urgent now that State legislatures be asked to go on record in favor of giving the American people the right to vote on a prayer amendment.

3. We suggest action locally. For the same reason, it is urgent now that councils, mayors, selectmen, local school boards, local school-associated organizations (such as the PTA), and local veterans' groups be asked to go on record in favor of giving the American people the right to vote on a prayer amendment.

Do you favor local school board or State board of education defiance of the Supreme Court "prayer decisions?"

1. We do not technically favor defiance even of the Court's interpretation of what is indeed "the law of the land."

2. On the other hand we do feel that local and State units involved with education should continue to dramatize and spotlight their dissent from these decisions.

3. As when the Dred Scott decision 100 years ago was also the Supreme Court's interpretation of what was "the law of the land," so too now it is not wrong for American citizens in every legal way possible to indicate how dissatisfied they are with the "prayer decisions."

The Supreme Court majority in both its "prayer decisions" said that it was not antireligious and that religion should still occupy a prominent place in the United States. How do you feel about this fact?

1. We respect and applaud the words. We question that the basic precedents set down by the Supreme Court majority in the "prayer decisions" can do otherwise than seriously harm "public reverence" across America.

2. We concur, again with all respect for the persons and institution of the Supreme Court, with the opinion of Mr. Justice Stewart dissening from the second "prayer decision" that whatever the words the fact remains that "religion is placed at an artificial and State-created disadvantage."

3. In a letter published in "The New York Times" (July 7, 1963) Henry P. Van Dusen, president of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, expressed our feeling exactly when he said this:

> The corollary in both law and logic of the Supreme Court's interdictions is inescapable: prohibition of the affirmative recognition and collaboration by Government at all levels with all organs of religion in all relationships and circumstances.

Is school prayer really important enough to justify an amendment?

1. Clearly what is involved here is as much precedent as specifics. Even if one is willing to abandon school prayer the "prayer decisions" have, as Dr. Van Dusen indicates above, placed a sword of Damocles over every other instance of "public reverence" in the United States. This would include "In God We Trust", the words "Under God" in the pledge of allegiance, chaplains, etc. Unless a stand is made here and the trend indicated in the "prayer decisions" is once and for all reversed through constitutional amendment, there is no telling how far the process will go.

2. For ourselves, however, we believe that prayer is important before a school day. Alternatives, such as classes in comparative religion, are difficult to spell out and to put into effect (as we shall note in more detail below). The brotherhood of prayer, boys and girls of differing faiths standing side by side on the threshold of that place where they learn the life sciences is a valuable experience. Even admitting that prayer sometimes becomes routine, the fact of this experience is, in our judgment, of great significance. By it a habit of ecumenicism is established and religion is placed in direct relationship to the life sciences.

A number of alternatives have been proposed. What do you think of them?

1. In the first place, it should not be necessary for a basically reverent people to have to resort to subterfuge in the matter of "public reverence." There is no valid reason, in our judgment, why the opening prayer cannot remain in effect.

2. The moment of meditation? This is, of course, better than nothing. But can we honestly expect young children to meditate intelligently?

3. Students meeting voluntarily before classes? This, again, is better than nothing; but can we expect this effort of most of our young people? It may catch on for a time here and there but there is clear danger that it will not survive and may even be discouraged as it poses a problem of precise opening time for classes, etc.

4. Verses from "The Star Spangled Banner," patriotic readings? Again these are better than nothing. But why must we try to preserve "public reverence" among our children by resorting to what are, quite obviously, subterfuges?

5. Classes in comparative religion? We can see the possibility of classes in religion as art, to some extent as history. But we feel it would be extremely difficult to introduce religion into classes as the reverent and spiritual thing it is. Would we not, in trying to set up such classes in most public schools, run into even more serious difficulties between the faiths than presently exist in the matter of opening prayer?

The official organ of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston, "The Pilot" has called the second "prayer decision," "tyranny of the few." Do you agree?

We agree completely. "The Pilot" editorial said further: "To secularize public school and public life for the sake of sensitive minorities, is to encourage in the name of justice the tyranny of the few. This, alas, is precisely what the latest Supreme Court decision has accomplished.

Admittedly the area of religion as a public experience is a difficult and delicate one. Certainly rights of dissenting minorities must be protected. But here as in every democratic decision, the majority must rule. To base our habits of "public reverence" on what the few prefer rather than on what the majority deem necessary to our collective welfare is not an extension but a very real perversion of the democratic process.

There are honest men of religion who differ with you.

1. We are well aware of this. They have a right to their opinion. We feel, earnestly, that they have not correctly analyzed the reach of the "prayer decisions."

2. There is in any case a difference between accepting the "prayer decisions" as a calming influence on our pluralistic society and resisting the effort for amendment. We feel that at least some of those who may have counseled acceptance of the "prayer decisions" might very well now agree with us in our constitutional push toward amendment.

3. While we recognize honest men of religion among our opponents, we cannot but feel that ranged against us also are forces and persons in America whose purpose is to diminish if not to abolish religion as a factor in American life.

Doesn't religion belong in the home, heart, and church rather than on the lips in the school?

1. There is no doubt of a great need in America to strengthen religion in the home, heart, and church.

2. But we do not accomplish this need by wiping it off the lips of our children in public school.

3. We concur fully with those who would push religion as an individual and domestic experience, but at the same time we must not silence religion in the schools. We challenge those who have said that these "prayer decisions" in fact strengthen religion in home and church to prove their point.

What are some of the arguments in support of your position?

1. "There seems little doubt about the intentions of the secularists, humanists, and atheists in following up their recent victories with attempts to drive all vestiges of God and religion out of American public life * * *. The Supreme Court has found that there is no place for God in our public schools. And it remains to be seen whether it will also find that there is no place for God elsewhere in public life. Again, despite the Court's protestations to the contrary * * * we fear the worst." "RC Catholic Free Press," Diocese of Worcester, Mass.

2. "What the Supreme Court has done, in the name of protecting us from the establishment of religion by the State, is to establish secularization—atheism if you will have it bluntly—as the one belief to which the State's power will extend its protection." "Wall Street Journal," June 19, 1963.

3. The Gallup Poll published early this month showed 70 percent of the American people are opposed to the "prayer decisions," 24 percent favor them, and 6 percent are uncertain.

Give the American people a chance to vote on a "prayer amendment."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the acting majority leader if he knows and can tell us at this time the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Monday is District Day. There are eight bills scheduled for consideration. They will be printed in the RECORD but will not necessarily be considered in the order in which they appear in the RECORD.

H.R. 5337. To increase the partial pay of District of Columbia educational employees on leave.

H.R. 5871. To modify District of Columbia judges' retirement benefits.

H.R. 6413. To provide additional standard sizes for milk and ice cream containers.

H.R. 4333. Discharge of parolees from supervision.

H.R. 7441. Amendments regarding dangerous and unsafe buildings.

H.R. 8313. To repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act.

H.R. 8355. To amend the District of Columbia Life Insurance Company Act to increase capital requirements.

H.R. 7882. Regarding exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week, the program is as follows:

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day.

Following the disposition of the Private Calendar, we plan to call up the bill, H.R. 6237, to amend section 503, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States. That bill will come up under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

House Resolution 540 authorizes additional travel authority for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Conference reports may be brought up at any time, any further program will be announced later.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am beginning to wonder what the situation will be as to Thanksgiving Day or Christmas. Will the distinguished acting majority leader give us any help on plans for Thanksgiving and Christmas?

Mr. BOGGS. I would not care to make that type of long-range prediction.

I think most of us feel we will be here for quite a while. Maybe New Year's.

Mr. GROSS. How is the situation? Let us get close up on it. What about after Wednesday of next week? Is there anything at all?

Mr. BOGGS. I just announced the program and indicated that if there are any further bills to be considered, they will be announced on Monday.

Mr. GROSS. Which would not give us a great deal of time if there is any real heavy legislation on the docket for next week. Evidently we are going into another foot-dragging operation next week from the looks of this. I hope that some day someone soon can tell us what we may look forward to for Thanksgiving and Christmas and New Year's.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

NEED FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRAVEL OF THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Travel Organizations which is the national trade association of the U.S. travel industry, was represented recently at the conference called by me and Representatives Richard T. Hanna, Democrat, of California, and William B. Widnall, Republican, of New Jersey, for the purpose of discussing the serious balance-of-payments deficit which confronts us.

I received the following memorandum today from Mr. James C. Gross, Acting Director of the NATO group, commenting on the problem as it affects the travel industry and in the affirmative action being taken by the House Committee on Banking and Currency to do something about it.

> The National Association of Travel Organizations, representing all elements of the U.S. travel industry applauds the action of Representative Wright Patman, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee in establishing a subcommittee on tourism under the chairmanship of Congressman Claude Pepper.
>
> Chairman Patman's action responding to President Kennedy's message to Congress on July 18 concerning the balance-of-payments problem offers the only mechanism in Congress to give concentrated attention to the travel industry's problems as they affect the U.S. balance of payments.
>
> In so doing the Committee on Banking and Currency gives recognition to the fiscal implications of the third largest industry in the United States—travel. This industry is outranked only by manufacturing and agriculture.
>
> The serious problem confronting our Nation—that of more travel dollar outflow from the United States than inflow of travel dollars—caused by more U.S. citizens' visiting other countries than nonnationals visiting the United States is not a short-lived one. Therefore, any solution is not an easy one. When President Kennedy invited the National Association of Travel Organizations to launch a massive, nationwide "See the USA" program in early 1964, the White House set the pace for a positive, internal, travel promotion program.
>
> The "See the USA" program will benefit all those either directly or indirectly allied to the travel business in the United States, thus, not only helping alleviate the balance-of-payments problem but helping the general economy of our Nation.
>
> Travel is a service business and employs millions of workers. In some instances highly skilled workers are not needed. Therefore, the more we can motivate our citizens to travel the more demand for services will be placed on those businesses serving the traveler. As a result, more service-type jobs will be created thereby aiding the general economy of the Nation.
>
> The U.S. Travel Services' program designed to invite nonnationals to visit the United States is an important ingredient in easing the balance-of-payments problem. The National Association of Travel Organizations has given the USTS complete support and will continue to do so.
>
> However, the great massive travel market is here in the United States. The job needed to be done to help both the balance of payments deficit and the overall U.S. economy is one which will set in motion positive U.S. travel promotion that will entice U.S. citizens to see the United States—those who already travel and those who do not travel. The "See the USA" program will do just that.
>
> The entire travel industry will have to gear up to the job to be done. Congress working through this subcommittee can blend its efforts in lending leadership and support on behalf of the Presidential request and the U.S. travel industry in not only recognizing travel as an industry, but giving it the legislative support it so sorely needs.
>
> The National Association of Travel Organizations looks forward with anticipation in cooperating with the travel subcommittee and respectfully urges that an adequate appropriation be set aside for a very necessary travel survey and other activities of the subcommittee.

PROHIBITING TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on September 17, I introduced a bill in the House, H.R. 8464, to prohibit certain vessels which engage in trade or commerce with Cuba from entering ports of the United States. The purpose of this legislation, as you know, is to assist in blocking controls against Cuba by imposing restrictions on those captains, vessels, and corporations from foreign nations who do business with Castro by preventing them from calling at U.S. ports. It is heartening to me to know that United States-owned and controlled oil companies have volunteered to refrain from furnishing bunkers to vessels and aircraft determined to be in the Cuban trade. Free world shipping available for service to Cuba has dropped nearly 70 percent in the first 8 months of 1963 as compared to the same period in 1962, I have been informed by the State Department. Free world ships paid only 28 calls to Cuba in August, a marked decrease over the 45 calls made in July, and the lowest monthly figure since March.

The State Department advises me that the earlier increases were related to the seasonal export of sugar, and many ships arrived in Cuba in ballast. As a result of cooperative action, a great many responsible firms have been getting their ships out of Cuban trade as soon as existing charters expire. Shipping to Cuba has thus become more and more restricted to the small firms having commerce with the United States and firms with vessels under long-term charter to the Sino-Soviet bloc. It is this shipping that my bill is designed to affect.

Greece once had many ships in the Cuban trade and has taken strong steps to withdraw them. The number of Greek ships going to Cuba in August decreased two-thirds of the number calling in July. The royal decree which was issued by the Greek Government on March 20, 1963, prohibiting Greek-flagged vessels from carrying cargoes to Cuban ports, except under preexisting charters, certainly accounted, to a large measure, for the results, the State Department advises me. I was pleased to be informed by the State Department that as a further measure in reducing shipping in the Cuban trade, Greece on September 25 banned the ships sailing under her flag from carrying cargo from Cuba. Under the decrees issued by the Greek Government, ships violating such decrees would be subject to criminal penalties and violating ship captains subject to loss of license.

The purpose of my remarks, today, is to call attention to the House of a further restriction imposed by the Greek Government under date of October 4.

The Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service has issued a statement which says:

> The Royal Greek Embassy announces that the Greek Government has taken additional executive measures designed to curb all shipments by Greek vessels to and from Cuba.
>
> By virtue of a royal decree issued on March 12, 1963, Greek vessels are prohibited from carrying cargo of any kind to Cuban ports, with the exception of ships under long-term charter contracted prior to the promulgation of that decree.
>
> A royal decree issued on September 21, 1963 banned all vessels flying the Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo from Cuban ports. Exception is only being made for sailings based on charters contracted prior to the promulgation of this decree.
>
> These executive measures are supplementing the solemn pledges taken in October 1962 by the Associations of Greek Shipowners of New York, London, and Athens as well as by the Greek Federation of Maritime Unions, to abstain totally from transportation of any cargo whatesover to and from the island of Cuba.

We are all aware that continued United States isolation efforts are making Cuba increasingly expensive to maintain for the Communists. The Soviets are spending between $200 and $300 million annually in order to keep the Cubans supplied with food and materials basic to the economy.

The continued isolation of Cuba is showing its effect in making the Soviet investment in Cuba extremely costly.

I am hopeful that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will report my bill favorably because I believe that it is consistent with U.S. policy in imposing these severe economic restrictions on those countries continuing to do business with Communist Cuba.

I would also commend attention of the House to the following editorial that appeared in a recent issue of the Miami Herald with regard to my bill:

[From the Miami (Fla.), Herald]

A Way To Stop Ships to Cuba

> A get tough bill to impose penalties on shipping companies doing business with Communist Cuba has been offered by Representative Claude Pepper.
>
> The measure bans all ships of any such company from entering any American port until the President proclaims that Cuba is no longer Communist dominated.
>
> The Miami Congressman's proposal joins three others in the House and at least one in the Senate demanding stronger action against the suppliers of Castro and his Soviet bosses.
>
> They indicate a rising resentment over apparent temporizing with the Communist occupation.
>
> Powerful support for action by Congress was given recently by Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute.
>
> Mr. Casey said the Government's present policy of blacklisting individual ships that carried cargo to Cuba is "less than a half-way measure."
>
> "It is high time," he wrote Congress, "that we arrested the steady buildup of economic power in Cuba with the help of our traditional friends."
>
> Representative Pepper's bill would make it clear we intended to do that. It would be a sharp prod to the Government which seems to get nowhere with its anti-Castro measures.

GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to an important and, in my opinion, realistic memorandum from the President of the United States to the heads of executive departments and agencies with respect to Government patent policy.

With the memorandum the President is issuing for the first time, a comprehensive statement of the Government's policy with respect to the disposition of inventions developed in the course of Federal research and development contracting.

I am favorably impressed with the overall tone and objectives of the statement. This is a most complex and difficult problem and one which has been under intensive investigation since 1959 with respect to its relation to the space program by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and more particularly, the Special Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions which I had the privilege of chairing.

Our study of this issue, during which we heard from hundreds of competent and qualified witnesses, has resulted in our twice reporting legislation to the House calling for a truly flexible policy which will effectively protect the rights of the public and the equities of the industrial community under Government contracts. The House, in 1960, overwhelmingly approved the recommendations of the Science and Astronautics Committee in passing legislation to amend the patent provisions of the 1958 Space Act. In so doing this body went on record as favoring policies with respect to the disposition of rights in inventions which would speed and improve the national space program by granting the National Aeronautics and Space Administration a greater flexibility in negotiating its research and development contracts and assure that agency uninhibited access to the best scientific and technical talent available with a minimum of delay.

The President and his advisers have taken due recognition of the investigations and reports of our subcommittee. In addition the advice and counsel of executive agencies has been sought and given careful consideration.

The President's policy—issued for the guidance of executive departments and agencies—will protect the equities of the parties to Government research and development contracting. It will provide for the flexibility so necessary to the successful accomplishment of the differing missions and statutory responsibility of the departments and agencies engaged in research and development.

More important it provides for a "licensing policy with necessary exceptions"—which I hope will be implemented by executive agencies without delay.

The policy statement recognizes the common ground so many have worked so long and hard to identify in this controversial issue, first that a single presumption of ownership does not provide a satisfactory basis for governmentwide policy and second that the Government has a responsibility to see that there is optimum utilization of the technology resulting from some $15 billion worth of federally funded research and development so as to provide for continued economic growth and expanded employment opportunity.

I would particularly commend the President's Statement of Government Patent Policies to the agencies of Government now evolving areas of scientific and technical investigation and to the committees of Congress who have before them legislation to authorize new or expanded programs of Federal research and development. I am confident that this equitable policy will garner increasing support as it is put into practice and becomes generally known to the industrial research community.

We in the Congress have an awesome responsibility with regard to the President's policy and the overall Government patent policy issue. There are still on the books statutory provisions requiring restrictive patent practices in the space program which in the opinion of the Science and Astronautics Committee:

> Damage small business, cost the taxpayer money, dilute the national effort to be first in space and waste the products of scientific research as a result of the reluctance to market new inventions without the necessary patent protection.

Congress is free to work its will on matters of patent policy legislation and has now the added advantage of a positive statement of policy from the executive branch.

I ask that the President's memorandum and attached Statement of Government Patent Policy be included at this point in the Record.

Following Is the Text of a Memorandum From the President Addressed to the Heads of the Executive Departments and Agencies on Government Patent Policy With Statement Attached

Over the years, through executive and legislative actions, a variety of practices has developed within the executive branch affecting the disposition of rights to inventions made under contracts with outside organizations. It is not feasible to have complete uniformity of practice throughout the Government in view of the differing missions and statutory responsibilities of the several departments and agencies engaged in research and development. Nevertheless, there is need for greater consistency in agency practices in order to further the governmental and public interests in promoting the utilization of federally financed inventions and to avoid difficulties caused by different approaches by the agencies when dealing with the same class of organizations in comparable patent situations.

From the extensive and fruitful national discussions of Government patent practices, significant common ground has come into view. First, a single presumption of ownership does not provide a satisfactory basis for governmentwide policy on the allocation of rights to inventions. Another common ground of understanding is that the Government has a responsibility to foster the fullest exploitation of the inventions for the public benefit.

Attached for your guidance is a statement of Government patent policy, which I have approved, identifying common objectives and criteria and setting forth the minimum rights that Government agencies should acquire with regard to inventions made under their grants and contracts. This statement of policy seeks to protect the public interest by encouraging the Government to acquire the principal rights to inventions in situations where the nature of the work to be undertaken or the Government's past investment in the field of work favors full public access to resulting inventions. On the other hand, the policy recognizes that the public interest might also be served by according exclusive commercial rights to the contractor in situations where the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position and where there is greater likelihood that the invention would be worked and put into civilian use than would be the case if the invention were made more freely available.

Wherever the contractor retains more than a nonexclusive license, the policy would guard against failure to practice the invention by requiring that the contractor take effective steps within 3 years after the patent issues to bring the invention to the point of practical application or to make it available for licensing on reasonable terms. The Government would also have the right to insist on the granting of a license to others to the extent that the invention is required for public use by governmental regulations or to fulfill a health need, irrespective of the purpose of the contract.

The attached statement of policy will be reviewed after a reasonable period of trial in the light of the facts and experience accumulated. Accordingly, there should be continuing efforts to monitor, record, and evaluate the practices of the agencies pursuant to the policy guidelines.

This memorandum and the statement of policy shall be published in the Federal Register.

STATEMENT OF GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

BASIC CONSIDERATIONS

A. The Government expends large sums for the conduct of research and development which results in a considerable number of inventions and discoveries.

B. The inventions in scientific and technological fields resulting from work performed under Government contracts constitute a valuable national resource.

C. The use and practice of these inventions and discoveries should stimulate inventors, meet the needs of the Government, recognize the equities of the contractor, and serve the public interest.

D. The public interest in a dynamic and efficient economy requires that efforts be made to encourage the expeditious development and civilian use of these inventions. Both the need for incentives to draw forth private initiatives to this end, and the need to promote healthy competition in industry must be weighed in the disposition of patent rights under Government contracts. Where exclusive rights are acquired by the contractor, he remains subject to the provisions of the antitrust laws.

E. The public interest is also served by sharing of benefits of Government-financed research and development with foreign countries to a degree consistent with our international programs and with the objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

F. There is growing importance attaching to the acquisition of foreign patent rights in furtherance of the interests of U.S. industry and the Government.

G. The prudent administration of Government research and development calls for a Government-wide policy on the disposition of inventions made under Government contracts reflecting common principles and objectives, to the extent consistent with the missions of the respective agencies. The policy must recognize the need for flexibility to accommodate special situations.

POLICY

SECTION 1. The following basic policy is established for all Government agencies with respect to inventions or discoveries made in the course of or under any contract of any Government agency, subject to specific statutes governing the disposition of patent rights of certain Government agencies.

(a) Where—

1. A principal purpose of the contract is to create, develop, or improve products, processes, or methods which are intended for commercial use (or which are otherwise intended to be made available for use) by the general public at home or abroad, or which will be required for such use by governmental regulations; or

2. A principal purpose of the contract is for exploration into fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare; or

3. The contract is in a field of science or technology in which there has been little significant experience outside of work funded by the Government, or where the Government has been the principal developer of the field, and the acquisition of exclusive rights at the time of contracting might confer on the contractor a preferred or dominant position; or

4. The services of the contractor are:

(i) for the operation of a Government-owned research or production facility; or

(ii) for coordinating and directing the work of others, the Government shall normally acquire or reserve the right to acquire the principal or exclusive rights throughout the world in and to any inventions made in the course of or under the contract. In exceptional circumstances the contractor may acquire greater rights than a nonexclusive license at the time of contracting, where the head of the department or agency certifies that such action will best serve the public interest. Greater rights may also be acquired by the contractor after the invention has been identified, where the invention when made in the course of or under the contract is not a primary object of the contract, *provided* the acquisition of such greater rights is consistent with the intent of this section 1(a) and is a necessary incentive to call forth private risk capital and expense to bring the invention to the point of practical application.

(b) In other situations, where the purpose of the contract is to build upon existing knowledge or technology to develop information, products, processes, or methods for use by the Government, and the work called for by the contract is in a field of technology in which the contractor has acquired technical competence (demonstrated by factors such as know-how, experience, and patent position) directly related to an area in which the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position, the contractor shall normally acquire the principal or exclusive rights throughout the world in and to any resulting inventions, subject to the Government acquiring at least an irrevocable nonexclusive royalty free license throughout the world for governmental purposes.

(c) Where the commercial interests of the contractor are not sufficiently established to be covered by the criteria specified in section 1(b), above, the determination of rights shall be made by the agency after the invention has been identified, in a manner deemed most likely to serve the public interest as expressed in this policy statement, taking particularly into account the intentions of the contractor to bring the invention to the point of commercial application and the guidelines of section 1(a) hereof: *Provided,* That the agency may prescribe by regulation special situations where the public interest in the availability of the inventions would best be served by permitting the contractor to acquire at the time of contracting greater rights than a nonexclusive license. In any case the Government shall acquire at least a nonexclusive royalty free license throughout the world for governmental purposes.

(d) In the situations specified in sections 1(b) and 1(c), when two or more potential contractors are judged to have presented proposals of equivalent merit, willingness to grant the Government principal or exclusive rights in resulting inventions will be an additional factor in the evaluation of the proposals.

(e) Where the principal or exclusive (except as against the Government) rights in an invention remain in the contractor, he should agree to provide written reports at reasonable intervals, when requested by the Government, on the commercial use that is being made or is intended to be made of inventions made under Government contracts.

(f) Where the principal or exclusive (except as against the Government) rights in an invention remain in the contractor, unless the contractor, his licensee, or his assignee has taken effective steps within 3 years after a patent issued on the invention to bring the invention to the point of practical application or has made the invention available for licensing royalty free or on terms that are reasonable in the circumstances, or can show cause why he should retain the principal or exclusive rights for a further period of time, the Government shall have the right to require the granting of a license to an applicant on a nonexclusive royalty free basis.

(g) Where the principal or exclusive (except as against the Government) rights to an invention are acquired by the contractor, the Government shall have the right to require the granting of a license to an applicant royalty free or on terms that are reasonable in the circumstances to the extent that the invention is required for public use by governmental regulations or as may be necessary to fulfill health needs, or for other public purposes stipulated in the contract.

(h) Where the Government may acquire the principal rights and does not elect to secure a patent in a foreign country, the contractor may file and retain the principal or exclusive foreign rights subject to retention by the Government of at least a royalty free license for governmental purposes and on behalf of any foreign government pursuant to any existing or future treaty or agreement with the United States.

SEC. 2. Government-owned patents shall be made available and the technological advances covered thereby brought into being in the shortest time possible through dedication or licensing and shall be listed in official Government publications or otherwise.

SEC. 3. The Federal Council for Science and Technology in consultation with the Department of Justice shall prepare at least annually a report concerning the effectiveness of this policy, including recommendations for revision or modification as necessary in light of the practices and determinations of the agencies in the disposition of patent rights under their contracts. A patent advisory panel is to be established under the Federal Council for Science and Technology to—

(a) Develop by mutual consultation and coordination with the agencies common guidelines for the implementation of this policy, consistent with existing statutes, and to provide overall guidance as to disposition of inventions and patents in which the Government has any right or interest; and

(b) Encourage the acquisition of data by Government agencies on the disposition of patent rights to inventions resulting from federally financed research and development and on the use and practice of such inventions, to serve as basis for policy review and development; and

(c) Make recommendations for advancing the use and exploitation of Government-owned domestic and foreign patents.

SEC. 4. Definitions: As used in this policy statement, the stated terms in singular and plural are defined as follows for the purposes hereof:

(a) "Government agency": Includes any executive department, independent commission, board, office, agency, administration, authority, or other Government establishment of the executive branch of the Government of the United States of America.

(b) "Invention" or "invention or discovery": Includes any art, machine, manufacture, design, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, or any variety of plant, which is or may be patentable under the patent laws of the United States of America or any foreign country.

(c) Contractor: Means any individual, partnership, public or private corporation, association, institution, or other entity which is a party to the contract.

(d) Contract: Means any actual or proposed contract, agreement, grant, or other arrangement, or subcontract entered into with or for the benefit of the Government where a purpose of the contract is the conduct of experimental, developmental, or research work.

(e) "Made": When used in relation to any invention or discovery means the conception or first actual reduction to practice of such invention in the course of or under the contract.

(f) Governmental purpose: Means the right of the Government of the United

States (including any agency thereof, State, or domestic municipal government) to practice and have practiced (made or have made, used or have used, sold or have sold) throughout the world by or on behalf of the Government of the United States.

(g) "To the point of practical application": Means to manufacture in the case of a composition or product, to practice in the case of a process, or to operate in the case of a machine and under such conditions as to establish that the invention is being worked and that its benefits are reasonably accessible to the public.

SALE OF SURPLUS AMERICAN WHEAT TO RUSSIA—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 163)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed:

OCTOBER 10, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In view of previous expressions of congressional interest and concern, it is appropriate that I report to the Congress the reasons for this Government's decision not to prohibit the sale of surplus American wheat, wheat flour, feed grains, and other agricultural commodities for shipment to the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries during the next several months. These sales would be concluded by private American grain dealers for American dollars or gold, either cash on delivery or under normal commercial credit terms.

The Commodity Credit Corporation in the Department of Agriculture will sell to our private grain traders the amount necessary to replace the grain used to fulfill these requirements; and the Department of Commerce will grant export licenses for their sale, with the commitment that these commodities are for delivery to and use in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe only. An added feature is the provision that the wheat we sell to the Soviet Union will be carried in available American ships, supplemented by the vessels of other countries as required. Arrangements will also be made by the Department of Commerce to prevent any single American dealer from receiving an excessive share of these sales. This decision, which was communicated in advance to the appropriate leaders of the Congress and the Western Alliance, had the unanimous support of the National Security Council.

The attached opinion from the Department of Justice makes it clear that this decision neither requires nor is prohibited by any action of the Congress. The executive branch in reaching this conclusion has not been unmindful of the July 1961 amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1961 expressing the sense of Congress at that time to be in opposition to the export of subsidized agricultural commodities to unfriendly nations. Congress has made no attempt to give a binding effect to such a statement of intent, although it had many opportunities to do so in its subsequent consideration of related legislative measures. Moreover, it is pertinent to recall that this general declaration of policy was made in July of 1961, at the height of the Berlin crisis. The author of the amendment argued that the policy it expressed was appropriate "in view of the world situation."

Other statutory provisions with respect to which questions have been raised include those of the Johnson Act, the Battle Act, the Export Control Act and Public Law 480. As noted by the opinion of the Department of Justice, it is long-settled policy that the Johnson Act—which prohibits American loans to nations in default on earlier obligations to American creditors—does not apply to ordinary commercial credit transactions incident to the sale of goods. Neither the Battle Act nor the Export Control Act prohibits the commercial sale of foodstuffs to any country; and the transactions covered by this decision would not be under Public Law 480.

In view of this statutory framework, there is no reason why the Soviet Union should not be treated like any other customer in the world market who is willing and able to strike a bargain with private American merchants. While this wheat, like all wheat sold abroad, will be sold at the world price—which is the only way it can be sold—there is in such transactions no subsidy to the foreign purchaser. Rather there is a recovery for the American taxpayer on wheat which the Government has already purchased at the currently higher domestic price which is maintained to assist our farmers and is still paying storage on. Although the losses incurred in maintaining the domestic price support program are not deemed realized as a bookkeeping matter until a sale occurs, thereby giving the impression to some that it is the export which is subsidized rather than the production, the net result of export transactions is to reduce the loss to the taxpayer by the amount of the world market price.

I am not, therefore, aware of any reason why our grain trade exporters should not be allowed to sell surplus commodities to the Soviet Union and Eastern European nations at the same world price and by the same methods as they sell to all other nations. The United States has never had a policy against selling nonstrategic goods, including agricultural commodities, to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe—on the contrary, we have been doing exactly that for many years. Our exports to the U.S.S.R. in 1960, for example, included drugs, chemicals, food-processing equipment, farm machinery, and textile machinery, as well as such agricultural commodities as cattle hides and tallow. Having for many years sold to the Soviets farm products which were not in surplus, it would make no sense to refuse to sell those surplus products, such as wheat, on which we must otherwise pay the cost of storage. While distinct foreign policy reasons motivated our sale of subsidized farm commodities to Poland in exchange for local currencies, that practice also indicates the logic of selling such commodities behind the Iron Curtain for dollars.

Such sales, moreover, have obvious benefits for the United States. The sale of 4 million metric tons of wheat, for example, for an estimated $250 million, and additional sums from the use of American shipping, will benefit our balance of payments and gold reserves by that amount. Assuming they do not pay in gold directly, the Soviets are expected to sell gold for dollars in the London market, thus increasing support of the dollar and decreasing the pressure on our gold supply.

In addition, such sales will strengthen farm prices in the United States and bring added income and employment to American shipping, longshoremen and railroad workers as well as grain traders and farmers. It should be emphasized that the sales to be approved under today's decision will be conducted through the normal competitive channels of the private American grain trade in the same manner as all other such exports are handled, with the forces of competition and supply and demand, and the Government's control over CCC prices and export licenses and subsidies, insuring that the benefits of this trade will be distributed widely throughout the economy.

Wheat, moreover, is our number one farm surplus today—to the extent of about 1 billion unsold bushels. The sale of around 150 million bushels of wheat would be worth hundreds of millions of dollars to the American taxpayer in reduced budget expenditures. In view of the 700 million bushels or more expected to remain in our carryover, and the Soviet need to use this wheat for domestic consumption, these benefits will be obtained without displacing any of our regular wheat export markets, or reducing our ability to export to other customers or reducing our stocks to a dangerous or undesirably low level.

In short, these sales will permit American farmers and the American economy to share in the gains which other nations have been reaping for many years in sales of wheat, flour, and other farm commodities to the Communist bloc. In recent weeks, Australia and NATO allies have agreed to sell 10 to 15 million tons of wheat and wheat flour to the bloc, including an arrangement to sell several hundred thousand tons of wheat flour which might well be made in large part out of wheat exported by this country to West Germany. We would certainly be foolish to halt the sale of our wheat when other countries can buy that wheat from us today and then sell it as flour to the Communists.

These transactions are not inconsistent with existing U.S. policies on trade with Cuba and the Communist bloc. We have never sought to implement those policies by restricting East-West agricultural trade or embargoing the shipment of foodstuffs to Cuba.

Our country has always responded to requests for food from the governments of people who needed it, so long as we were certain that the people would actually get it and know where it came from. In 1922, under President Harding, Herbert Hoover's American Relief

Administration fed an estimated 18 million Russians. I am confident that the Russian people today will know that they are receiving American wheat; and to the extent that their limited supplies of gold, dollars, and foreign exchange must be used for food, they cannot be used to purchase military or other equipment.

These transactions advertise to the world, as nothing else could, the success of free American agriculture. They demonstrate our willingness to relieve food shortages, to reduce tensions, and to improve relations with all countries; and they show that peaceful agreements with the United States which serve the interests of both sides are a far more worthwhile course for our adversaries to follow than a policy of isolation and hostility.

For this Government to tell our grain traders that they cannot accept these offers, on the other hand, would accomplish little or nothing. The Soviets would continue to buy wheat and wheat flour elsewhere, including wheat flour from those nations which buy our wheat—their propagandists would exploit among other nations our unwillingness to reduce tensions and relieve suffering—and their leaders would be convinced that we are either too hostile or too timid to take any further steps toward peace, that we are more interested in exploiting their internal difficulties, and that the logical course for them to follow is a renewal of the cold war. Moreover, even if the Soviets should encounter difficulties and delays in obtaining these commodities from other countries, it would appear that their most vital requirements can already be largely met by the purchases they have concluded with Canada and Australia.

While this Nation should not be unwilling to explore the possibilities of the ways in which these transactions could lead to increased trade, increased opportunities for contact, and increased exchanges of individuals and information, this particular decision with respect to sales to the Soviet Union, which is not inconsistent with many smaller transactions over a long period of time, does not represent a new Soviet-American trade policy. That must await the settlement of many other matters. But, as I stated to the American people last evening, it does represent one more hopeful sign that a more peaceful world is both possible and beneficial to all.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. BEERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely shocked and disappointed on hearing the President's message to the Speaker of the House.

In my opinion, President Kennedy's approval of the wheat sale to Russia helps promote the world Communist movement. If it is wheat customers we want, let us help Gen. Chiang Kai-Shek free China and the expatriates liberate Cuba.

If these two moves were made, they could add 600-odd million customers to free world trade and that, in turn, might let the American farmer produce at full capacity.

It is unthinkable that we use American surpluses to help an enemy who has promised to bury us. The wheat sale will only strengthen the hold of Khrushchev over some 200 million enslaved people.

What we should be doing is exploiting the Soviet weakness instead of strengthening it. The inability to produce food is a sign the Communist system might be breaking up.

Therefore, it would be better if the United States withheld wheat to let Russia stew in her own juice. Meanwhile, we could concentrate on helping the nations that are friendly to us.

Mr. Speaker, I know the sale is being excused on the basis that if the United States does not sell Russia, other countries will. But, I am sure if we took a firm stand against communism, instead of pursuing the appeasement policy of accommodation we are now embarked upon, then these countries would respect that stand and follow the U.S. lead. As it is now, our policy toward communism has our friendly countries bewildered to the point that they are convinced it is every country for itself.

The sale will be no comfort to the American taxpayer either, when he realizes that he is going to underwrite it at a cost of $138 million. The day the President approved the sale, the U.S. Department of Agriculture quoted No. 2 Winter wheat on the domestic market at $2.31½ per bushel. The sale to Russia will be made at the world price which is about 56 cents cheaper, or $1.76. That 56 cents represents the per bushel subsidy supplied by the American taxpayer. Multiply that by 248 million bushels and it equals approximately $138 million. That is the size of the taxpayer's stake in this sale.

In addition, I wonder what the American housewife's reaction will be when she learns that her Russian counterpart is able to buy wheat products at the equivalent of 56 cents per bushel cheaper than she can.

I would much prefer the United States using wheat reserves to cement relations with free world countries, or advance the cause of freedom, rather than selling it to the Communist bloc. I was extremely disappointed when the President approved the sale without asking Russia for a unified Germany and an all-out withdrawal from Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to my personal views, I would also like to present the following joint statement released today:

> The undersigned, as individual Congressmen and as members of the House Committee on Agriculture, regret deeply that the President has seen fit to approve the sale of subsidized wheat to the Soviet Union.
>
> We oppose this action because we believe trading with the enemy is morally wrong.
>
> With the President's announcement we have destroyed our position of moral leadership. How can we hope to stiffen free-world resistance to communism? How can we expect other countries to cooperate in our embargo of Cuba?
>
> We oppose this action because it will help to strengthen the Communist regime. In selling wheat to them, we are helping them to meet a strategic shortage. It will ease their agricultural problems and permit Khrushchev to keep Soviet workers in defense plants who might otherwise be needed in the fields.
>
> We oppose this action because it clearly is in direct contradiction to the expressed will of the U.S. Congress, as embodied in the Latta amendment in the Agricultural Act of 1961. This amendment expresses the firm opposition of Congress to the sale of tax-subsidized farm commodities to Soviet Russia.
>
> We oppose this action because we believe the vast majority of American farmers, like the vast majority of all Americans, are unwilling to sell out a high moral principle, even for solid gold.

This statement was signed by the following: CHARLES HOEVEN, PAUL DAGUE, CLIFFORD MCINTIRE, DON SHORT, CATHERINE MAY, DELBERT LATTA, RALPH HARVEY, PAUL FINDLEY, RALPH BEERMANN, and EDWARD HUTCHINSON.

THE HONORABLE CLYDE DOYLE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two letters, from the widow and daughter of former Congressman Clyde Doyle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of life we know that death is ever present. During my more than 20 years in the House of Representatives, along with other Members, I have experienced the shock and sorrow of losing many close friends and colleagues.

On March 13, 1963, my friend and colleague, the Honorable Clyde Doyle, passed away. He was a close friend of mine. I know that he had many friends in the House of Representatives. His friendly attitude, his studious attention to every legislative problem, and his dedication to the welfare of our Nation were the attributes and qualities which endeared him to all of his colleagues and friends.

We knew him as a working Member of the House of Representatives. His family knew him better than any of the Members of Congress. They knew him as a father and as a husband.

Recently I received letters from his widow, Lydia Doyle, and his daughter, Dorothy Doyle Stanton. I am asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks these two letters, because they describe with love and intimate knowledge the attributes, the qualities, and the noble motives of my friend, the Honorable Clyde Doyle, U.S. Representative from the 23d Congressional District of California.

The letters referred to are as follows:

MY HUSBAND, CONGRESSMAN CLYDE DOYLE

During the last 6 months I have read and reread the beautiful tributes to Clyde that you, his colleagues, gave at the congressional memorial meeting for him, and I have meditated many sleepless nights, enveloped in the warmth of his continuing love. Yet I am still unable to put into words much of what 49 wonderful years with him taught me or how his ideals are still guiding me. His code of ethics based on these ideals is well summarized in a poem which he, and probably many of you, have found inspiring:

> "Four things you must do
> If you would make your record true;
> To think without confusion clearly,
> To love your fellow men sincerely,
> To act from honest motives purely,
> To trust in God in Heaven securely."

I was about to say that Clyde and I met in high school. While this is true, our acquaintance and friendship really began in a religious setting, for it was there that I saw his purpose and his drive most clearly revealed, and it was there that I became interested in where this young man in a hurry was going.

Since it is difficult really to understand a person without knowing something about his background, I shall fill in, as suggested, the biographical sketch of Clyde which Congressman SHEPPARD so fully outlined, with characteristic incidents helpful in interpreting the man whom you knew in Congress.

Clyde was born in Oakland, Calif., in 1887. His Irish father, who was brought to this country as a baby, was a highly skilled blacksmith with several shops in San Francisco. He invented the still-used "Good Enough" horseshoe in days when good horses were the pride of aristocrats. Clyde's mother, a former teacher, was a devoted, loving homemaker. During Clyde's early youth, his father lost all of his savings in two bank failures at a time when he was too old to begin again. The older children had all married and established homes, and they also had suffered financially, and so it was up to Clyde to care for his parents and to get an education on his own. Though merely a boy then—a carefree boy riding happily over the Berkeley hills on his pony—he was suddenly faced with the serious problem of deciding what he was to become, how he would reach his goal, and how he would care for his parents. For the immediate future, he went to Seattle, where he lived briefly with his sister, Hessie Lorene, and her husband, the Reverend Tom Wiswell. Soon he rejoined his parents in their new home in Los Angeles.

Here, as a boy of 14, he undertook the formidable task of supporting them and of continuing his education. He swept out offices, sold papers on street corners, and worked at any employment available, at the same time carrying more solids than most schools then allowed. At this time and under these circumstances, he learned how best to use every precious moment, and he discovered the value of deep concentration and of speed reading. Often a cup of coffee was all that he could afford for breakfast, sometimes embellished by a doughnut supplied by a kind vendor who knew about his circumstances. Yet he never lost his courage or his friendly smile or greeting.

Here in Los Angeles he was to meet the man who probably had the greatest influence on his life—Judge Curtis D. Wilbur, Juvenile Court Judge for Los Angeles County and later Secretary of the Navy. Judge Wilbur was his Sunday school teacher, his lifelong friend, and his inspiration. Patterning his life after the life of this great man, he decided to become a lawyer. Fortune, however, was to play some bitter tricks, forcing him to take several detours before he reached his goal.

In 1907, Clyde and his parents moved to Long Beach, where he finished high school. Working mornings and evenings and carrying his usual heavy academic load, he still found time to become student body president, a champion debater, a baseball pitcher, a track man, and a singer in the high school quartet. In addition, he continued his youth group activities in connection with his church.

After graduating from high school, he saw opportunities ahead, but he also encountered heartaches, for his duty to his parents made it necessary for him to give most of his time to earning money. Cheerfully and lovingly he turned aside from his goal to become temporary YMCA secretary until an older man qualified to fill the position could be found. Shortly thereafter he became boys' secretary of the Y, and later, under his friend, Judge Wilbur, probation officer in Los Angeles County. At this time he learned at first hand the ruthless ways of big city life on the adventurous teenage boys of the city streets.

Later, while acting as head of Juvenile Hall until a trained superintendent could be found, be became better acquainted with the so-called "bad boys." His reputation for success in working with boys was growing, and he was soon named boy's director at the Junior Republic for Boys at Chino. There, on a big farm, he supervised the work program, the educational program, the government, and the religious life of the boys. With a new perspective gained in this work, came hope, for here he saw boys from broken homes and the bad environment of city streets given a new outlook on life and a chance to become good citizens. Many of these boys did become good, responsible men. Many of them have kept in touch with Clyde through the decades that have passed.

To this experiment in boy rehabilitation in 1914, Clyde brought his bride, Lydia Yeomans Doyle, to the little cottage on the hill built by the loving hands of the boys trained in the carpenter shop under the supervision of their instructor. Studying boy life at first hand together, the two Doyles learned that most, if not all, boys want to become respected adults and that it is, in some cases, wrong environment or failure to be understood that starts a boy in the wrong direction.

At Clyde's farewell party after three interesing and challenging years at the Republic, the many testimonies of both boys and instructors revealed his influence on them. One instructor said, "Personally, I have often been amazed at Mr. Doyle's knowledge of the most trivial characteristics of the boys in my industry. Mr. Doyle has always set an example for both citizens and instructors with his never-changing cheerfulness and unruffled manner. He was always 'oil to troubled waters'."

Clyde's superintendent commented on his characteristic—"Are you happy?" "Cheer up," and "Let's go"—as a valuable asset in dealing with both instructors and boys. Mention was made of the fact that the boys who made errors in outside competitions would often be crushed until Clyde's cheery "Better luck next time," made them play their hearts out and win for him. In response to these tributes and many more, Clyde replied with thanks and appreciation and then challenged the boys: "Don't you fail by underestimating your own possibilities. Realize the fact that you can make good, and that no one can in the long run be a better man than you are."

He then explained that his last detour was over, now that he had enjoyed 3 years with them instead of the 2 years he had come for. "Now," he said, "I have got my release and I am going to make good. I am going to realize my ambition to become the best lawyer possible. I want to make good as a lawyer in order to be in a stronger position to be a friend to man. I don't know what it will be, but I know, fellows, that the way will be open and there will be some place * * *. But please remember this, fellows: If in any way Mr. and Mrs. Doyle can ever be a help or friends to you, count on us." And they have.

One sunny day we said goodby to our little honeymoon cottage on the hill and drove in our buggy behind Sir John, an old racehorse and a good Doyle pet, to our new adventures in Long Beach. Since there were no hotels on the way and travel by buggy was slow, we camped out in a field by the roadside for the night, and as 1916 automobiles whizzed by at 30 miles per hour, we dreamed of the day when we, too, might be fortunate enough to own one.

My parents, who lived in a large house alone, made an apartment for us upstairs, where we began again the struggle for an education. From the surrounding 5 acres, my father brought us fruit, vegetables, eggs, and an occasional chicken, and we varied diet with fish which we caught from the pier on weekends.

By taking day and night courses and cramming the hours between 4 a.m. and 11 p.m., with study and classes, Clyde managed to complete the 4-year course in 3 years, and 1 year before he graduated, he passed the bar examination. On weekends while he was in school, he worked for the Haskell & Keeler law firm, and later, after graduating, he worked with the same firm full time, finally becoming a partner. Eventually he headed his own law firm.

Forced by financial conditions to delay the beginning of a family, the Doyles were overjoyed to welcome the first "little Doily"; as Clyde called each of his children, in April 1917, the year that he graduated from law school. Within 18 months, Clyde, Jr., an only son, arrived. And after an interval of 8 years, Dorothy, our 6½-month baby, premature because of a fall that I had, came, bringing with her many anxious moments for us as she fought to live.

Remembering his pledge to become a friend of man, Clyde gave his services without cost to many churches, to the YWCA and other social agencies, and to scores of needy individuals. He was asked by the PTA to conduct a study of recreational needs in the city of Long Beach, and in line with this request became head of a committee representing every civic club in the city. After studying all the recreational programs in the cities of the country, the committee drew up a plan—the first of its kind—to coordinate the school and civic recreation programs of Long Beach and to provide support for the coordinate program from a small portion of the city budget and the school budget and personnel. Clyde carried the responsibilities of chairman of the recreation commission until he ran for Congress nearly 15 years later.

During these years of civic work, Clyde became convinced that the way to prevent juvenile delinquency was to keep youth so busy creatively in supervised city playgrounds that they would have neither the time nor the inclination to get into trouble. He became convinced also that no boy is bad and that only a boy who had been misled very early in life became a delinquent. Even after he went to Congress, his interest in boys led him to find time to think about their problems and to wonder how he could help them, and to do many thoughtful things for them individually and collectively.

Always happy in his civic services and law practice, Clyde did not plan for himself a career in politics. But in 1944, a letter from Clyde, Jr., who was then fighting in the Aleutians, prompted him to respond to a third demand that he run for Congress. The letter urged him to "put on a political uniform" and to fight for the high principles of our democracy that our men in service were called upon to fight for. After winning a seat in the House, he placed great emphasis on the school programs in his district. He wrote hundreds of personal letters to school children, talked to many assemblies, and sent thousands of picture postcards from the Nation's Capital to children, believing, as he stated to those who remarked about the hours spent in such extra work, "You never know when some little thing you do may arouse in a young person a greater love of our country or more interest in it." To schools, clubs, and civic organizations, he presented flags which had flown over the Capitol because he believed that reverence for our country was increased by our devotion to the flag. In all of his travels for the "Watch Dog" Investigating Committee for the Armed Services, he looked up California men in service and listened to their problems.

Related above are some of the details of the background and of the thinking which made this quiet, happy man with boundless energy the man whom you all knew as Congressman. As he threw himself with the same devotion to duty into his congressional work, he quietly resolved to use any talent that God had given him in the service of his beloved country. His daily prayer as he walked up to Congress from his office was, "God, give me clear thinking so that I can make right decisions."

Clyde's choice of the Armed Services Committee was natural, for both the 18th and the 23d Districts, which he served at different times, had large interests in the Long Beach Naval Shipyard. He became a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, however, not because it was a natural choice for him, but rather because both Sam Rayburn and John McCormack requested him to, saying that he was not an extremist in any way and so would be a "balance wheel" for the committee.

During his early years in Congress, Clyde fought a battle in this committee in an effort to do away with its practice of refusing to allow witnesses, while they were testifying, to have counsel. To him, this practice was undemocratic. While he believed firmly in individual rights, he also believed just as firmly in the need to protect our country from all subversive activities. As always, without fanfare he quietly acted on principle, no matter what the cost. His work in writing a code of procedures for this committee and for the outlawing of one-member hearings was a great contribution to fair hearings. When he was commended for his rules with the reservation that perhaps they did not go far enough, he would contend that he would rather make progress slowly but soundly than undertake too much and fail.

One of Clyde's great contributions probably brought him his greatest disappointment. This was his bill to give men with less-than-honorable discharges who had committeed no great misdemeanor a chance to earn honorable discharges, though without the full benefits of that honor. Many, if not most, of these men were in their adventurous teens during the time of their service, and the charges against them did not involve crime but merely explosions of daring youth away from home trying to prove their manhood. Given a chance to rehabilitate themselves by earning honorable discharges without full benefits, they would be able to wipe out the stigma of less-than-honorable discharge which was a block to success and happiness for them and their families. With his many years of experience working on the problems of youth, Clyde was able to understand these men and the gravity of their problem. After listening to thousands of pleas from them from most areas of the country, he became more and more convinced that they must be given a chance to earn honorable citizenship. And so he introduced his bill in the 86th Congress, certain that the cause was consistent with the principles of this democracy.

Clyde fought hard for this bill, and it was for the purpose of continuing his fight that he decided to return to Congress the last time despite his plan to retire. Businessmen had told him that they did not interview for jobs men who had less-than-honorable discharges, but that they would interview any of them who wiped out the stigma on their records by earning honorable citizenship. The services had told him that, alerted to this injustice by his fight for a chance for these men, they had corrected the situation. One of the service branches still opposes the bill on the grounds that the situation has been corrected. But Clyde's concern was for the thousands of men already discharged from whom the stigma of less-than-honorable discharge has not been removed by these remedial measures.

In both the 86th and the 87th Congresses, Clyde introduced bills which passed the House unanimously. Neither of these bills, however, was reported out of committee in the Senate, although he had felt that he had enough votes on the floor of the Senate to pass them. So anxious was he to have this legislation become law that he introduced it (H.R. 1062) on the 1st day of this 88th Congress. Unfortunately, the bill (H.R. 1062) had not come to the floor of the House for a vote when he died, and so he did not have the satisfaction of realizing success for his cause. For this legislation—and for the welfare of his country—Clyde gave his life, for he had returned to Congress this last session to complete what he had started. Giving his services joyfully, he never spared himself when he felt the call of duty.

After his love for God, Clyde's first love was for his family, and they were always on his mind, although he was a very busy man. When he was away from home, his notes were brief: "Hello, Treasure. I miss you. I wish you could be here. I'll be home as soon as possible. U.R.A. Joy. Your loving Clyde."

He knew and admired the Members of Congress and considered it a great honor to serve his country as a Congressman. Believing that most of us can become well informed only along a few lines, he studied the men on the committees on which he served paying particular attention, as most of you, his colleagues, do, to those who were the best informed and the most judicial and who had the most integrity. He had confidence in the ability of these men and in their desire to promote sound legislation. After hearing their arguments, he could vote without fear, believing that he was serving the welfare of his country.

I have given you this personal and intimate story of my husband because he still lives on within me as I am sure that he still lives on in many of you, his colleagues, and also because I feel that he is disturbed in his last sleep by a restlessness born of his strong desire to see consummated the legislation to which he dedicated the last years of his life. Only you who have paid tribute to his memory can still enact into law his bill (H.R. 1062). Many of Clyde's friends have told me that they would like to see his bill go through in his name. By seeing that it does, you would temper Clyde's devotion to his country with love and charity for your unfortunate fellowmen who have been stigmatized by our legislative process. Such an action on your part would be, indeed, a living monument to Clyde's integrity, his dedication, and his humility. Such a tribute would be inscribed not on marble, but in our hearts and minds.

"Rest in peace, Clyde Doyle. Your mission has been accomplished, for you have alerted your colleagues to this great need."

I have not tried to give a complete record of Clyde's work in Congress, for I believe that newspaper reports and his biography cover most of that. It is rather my desire to emphasize his last struggle to give these fellow Americans whose indiscretions during their youth have been so costly for them an opportunity to be worthy citizens and heads of good, loyal families of our proud democracy.

Lovingly,

LYDIA DOYLE.

MY FATHER, CONGRESSSMAN CLYDE DOYLE

March 13, 1963, is a day that I shall never forget. Just before midnight the telephone rang in my California home. For some time a sense of foreboding had been hanging over me, a feeling both disturbing and puzzling. Now as I heard my mother's hesitant, choking voice say, "Dad is dead," premonition became reality which gripped me, stunned and trembling. Catching the first plane for Washington, within a few hours I was on my way to mother. On this transcontinental flight I was aware of a particular phenomenon that often occurs in times of sudden death of a loved one now occurring for the third time for me: the world, my world, had come to an end; the light, my guiding light, had gone out.

Through the dimness that obscured everything around me for a time, I slowly became aware of the rustle of newspapers and the voices of other passengers saying: "Not Clyde Doyle. I knew him well. Oh, no. I can't believe it." "He was my Congressman. What will we do now?" "Such a great loss to us all and to the Nation." "Wasn't he on a TV newscast Tuesday night? He looked so well."

The full import of what had happened only hours ago lay heavily on me now as I looked down the aisle at the many newspaper headlines in huge, bold type declaring, "Congressman Clyde Doyle Died." Stopping the stewardess as she passed my seat, I asked her if she would pick up one of the papers for me when they were laid aside, explaining that Congressman Doyle was my father. Her mouth dropped open in amazement, and she said, "I, too, was very fond of your Dad. He happened to be on one of my flights to Washington. Your parents and I became good friends."

This young stewardess was most thoughtful and considerate, even giving me her seat at the back of the plane where I could rest better.

After reaching Dulles Airport, still in the daze that was to last for months, I sat down on a bench with the newspaper across my knees, waiting for mother. While I was trying to comprehend what the shock had probably done to her, a man and his wife stopped to glance at the headlines across my knees. With shock written all over their faces, they exclaimed, "Clyde Doyle. No, not Clyde. He was in the store only yesterday to buy seed for his birds. As usual we had such a wonderful visit."

I looked up to tell them that it was true and that I was his daughter. Visibly shaken, they introduced themselves as the owners of the hardware store in Cherrydale, Va. With warmth and sincerity they asked me to give their love to my mother and offered to help in any way that they could.

These first encounters, so unexpected, on the plane and at the airport with people who loved Dad—people who were strangers to me—made me more aware than ever that he was a part of countless lives.

Now, almost 6 months later, sitting in Daddy's favorite lounge chair in his Arlington home, I am finding my sadness tempered by a measure of contentment as I look out into his beautiful "sunshine and shadow forest" and patio garden, watching perhaps for the last time the birds and the squirrels that he loved so dearly and fed every day fly in for their favorite sunflower seeds.

Reliving in memory the wonderful way of life that he taught us and that he so abundantly lived, I feel a need to put fragments of it into words for my two sons so that they will better understand what he tried to teach them, and also for all others who loved him.

In doing this, I am assisted by a circumstance for which I am very grateful: as our world began to turn on its axis again, we sensed that our guiding light had not been extinguished. The necessity for making numerous quick decisions, the gradual unfolding of our plans for the future, the breaking up of our two small homes and the replacing of them with a larger home so that we could all be together—in these situations and in scores of others that are much more perplexing and complex, we somehow have felt Daddy's smile and nod of approval.

As I look back over more than 30 years of my "life with father," I am first aware of the near perfection of the marriage of my parents. Then I am moved by the incredible amount of love and God-directed activity with which he crammed to overflow his days from the beginning to the last fateful day. I used to call him "our mad Russian" (Rush'en). Of course, he was anything but mad. He was a man in a hurry to do all that he could in his humble, determined way to make a bit smoother the path of life for those who had become stranded along the way.

The wonderment and the excitement of Christmas as Daddy made us feel it when I was a very small child will always be with me. Seeing Santa Claus arrive with his bulging bag, helping him pass out the presents, and being kidded by him was a thrill. And seeing him kiss our mother was an enchanting experience for us all. Nobody could ever tell me that there was no Santa, for I was his helper. Behind those flowing white whiskers, there was real flesh and blood in that red suit. Dad's absence from the festivity was always explained by a telephone call summoning him to a duty or saying that he had been detained at the office, but would be home as soon as possible and that if he did not get to see Santa, we should give him Dad's love. Touched by the thoughtfulness of my sister Lydia Louise, who insisted upon leaving food for the reindeer and a present for Santa, Dad would smile tenderly at her, his blue eyes twinkling with delight. So great was our enchantment that it outlasted Clyde, Jr.'s discovery that Santa was wearing Daddy's shoes.

Only the make-believe was over now. For mother explained that Santa was real because he was the Christmas spirit of loving and giving. Now there was even more fun as I helped Dad put on his pillow, his suit, and his whiskers and added a final touch of rouge to his cheeks and nose. In all Dad's years as Santa he had never been chased around the outside of the house by a very determined boy wanting to find out what happened to Santa after he left our house until his oldest grandson, Danny, chased him one year. It was a very hilarious, breathtaking scene until Santa finally made his escape.

Unable to confine his Santa Claus activities to the family circle because of his delight in the joy of others, Daddy with me as his helper, played Santa for many children outside our home. Courageous little ones at the Christmas parties at the Tichenor Clinic for Crippled Children and the YWCA yearly Christmas festivities for underprivileged children received a large share of Daddy's Christmas spirit and in return gave him delight in their happy faces. Probably at that time the first Santa to arrive anywhere by air, he stepped from Earl Dougherty's plane onto the beach one Christmas Day into a crowd of excited children assembled there under the auspices of the Middough Brothers Clothing Store of Long Beach.

Hoping to instill in us his love of the beauty and the greatness of our country, Dad spent many of his summer vacations conducting family tours in our trailer of the national parks and places of historical interest all over the country. Sitting around the campfire at night, we learned much about the secrets and the mysteries of nature and the life of the wild animals of the forest. Their imaginations quickened by these tales, Dad and Mother made up stories of their own about the animals of the "Sunshine and Shadow Forest" to entertain their youngest, very restless daughter of seven while crossing the country to the 1933 Chicago World's Fair after a park vacation. (Mother has promised to write down these stories for my grandchildren).

Sharing with us his love of the out-of-doors, Dad took us for many weekends, summer and winter, to our small cabin in the mountains, where we fished, hiked, swam, rode horseback and even "packed in" on mule or horseback to the streams and the lakes of the rugged High Sierras. Often after Congress had recessed, accompanied by a few of his closest fishing friends, he would take the entire family out on the ocean near Long Beach for a day of fishing. On those rare and special occasions when he had time for recreation while attending to his congressional duties in Washington, he would lead us on fishing expeditions along the lovely streams of Virginia and Maryland, pointing out what a great source of pleasure, relaxation, and inspiration such beauties of nature area.

Dad's love of nature became a channel for passing along his principles of good Christian citizenship and effective living to the third generation, his grandsons, my Danny and Clyde. During their brief periods in Washington, Danny's year as a page boy in the House of Representatives and Clyde's summer spent recuperating from a long illness, Dad took them with him on his tramps along the forest streams of Virginia, passing along to them with a touch of humor his philosophy of life.

The last fishing trip that Dad took was to Paradise Valley, 10,000 feet up in the Sierras, two summers ago. Danny, Clyde, their other grandfather, their 12-year-old cousin and Dad packed in on horseback 17 miles up a narrow, steep, winding, and rugged mountainside to this peaceful valley of streams for a week of fishing. Around the campfire Dad described the trips like this one that he had taken with his own son and his pals years before.

What a sight it must have been to see them wearily making their way back down those seemingly never-ending 17 miles on horseback—the two triumphant, saddlesore grandfathers past 70 and their three scarcely teenage grandsons. At the age of 73, Dad finally cried, "Uncle" to such trips as this one, though he vowed that this was one to remember always, if not to be repeated.

Dad's great love for all living things, large and small, found expression in his desire to have pets of all sizes for his children, and so we grew up surrounded by creatures of many kinds that became our daily companions—dogs, cats, ducks, chickens, pigeons, rabbits, a huge aviary, and Goldie, our goat. This love extended to all things that grow, as though it was a form of love of life, itself—and so working close to nature in the garden was a source of relaxation all his life. During the war years, he would come home from his work in the block victory garden refreshed and happy, his arms full of garden-fresh red, green, and yellow vegetables and fruits with a flavor no market can provide.

My memories go back to the early days of his law practice and to the terrible depression, when many people in need of legal help had suffered tragic reverses of fortune. Dad could not send away anybody who could not pay. To him a person's worth could not be judged by the amount of money he had. Uppermost in his mind was one thought: "How can I help this man (or woman)?" This problem he finally settled by deciding to take the cases of needy clients on a contingency basis providing a small fee for him if he won and nothing if he lost, which he rarely did.

Many times out of gratitude for his kind consideration, clients presented him with gifts of their trade. One mouth-watering memory is of a client who was a lobster fisherman. After Dad won a difficult case for him, this grateful man provided us with more lobsters for the season than we could eat. More rewarding to Dad, perhaps, than these material expressions of thanks were words of gratitude from those clients, and there were many such who declared that if it hadn't been for Dad, they wouldn't have much today. It was his sympathetic understanding, his encouragement and faith in them, their knowledge that he was their friend as well as his legal advice, they said, that had made it easier for them to rise above their adversities.

Since Dad has gone on his greatest adventure, many persons whom I have met, both in California and in Washington, have expressed to me their warmth of feeling for him. Friends, some of whom I knew and others of whom I did not know, have stopped me on the streets of Long Beach to speak to me about the loss of their treasured friend, unashamed of the tears streaming down their faces. On my trip to Washington to help Mother sell their little forest home, I have had very similar experiences in Cherrydale, Va., where people have stopped me to say that Dad was their friend and that he is greatly missed. All this and the volumes of letters of condolence and the warm, moving testimonials of his fellow Congressmen have led me humbly to know that everywhere my father went he found a new friend—man, woman, or child—who eventually loved him as I do.

An unpretentious man, Dad loved the simple pleasures and the peaceful tranquillity of country life. The temptation to change to a more sophisticated pattern of living after we moved into our lovely colonial home at the top of the golden, rolling countryside of Alimotoe Heights in Long Beach did not come to him (nor to Mother). To them our new home was a place for children to grow as they roamed and explored the expansive open area.

The many young people who came to our home always found an encouraging, helpful friend in Dad, who not only gave them assistance with their problems but joined them in their fun. He led "not so much by precept, but by example." From all over the world we hear from young men and women—and some no longer very young—who say that in our home they learned values that gave greater meaning to life for them. What they do not realize is that they enriched our lives so very much, also.

Many boys worked their way through junior college in our home. Each became, in turn, one of the family, another interesting brother for us and a son for Dad to help with advice and understanding. One of these boys decided to become a lawyer like Dad while he was living with us. Years later when I was visiting in Washington, Mother and I went to the Supreme Court to hear Dad sponsor him for practice before the Court. What a thrill it was for the three Doyles to be present during our friend's hour of achievement.

Many years ago, long before I was even thought of, Dad was first asked to run for Congress. He decided not to give up the practice of law for which he had studied so long and so hard for politics, which he did not consider to be an activity for which he was so well suited. And then there was his community work centered around his youth activities, which he loved and felt he could not forsake. So he stayed with the two things that he liked more than he thought he would like politics—the law and youth work. But another call to run for Congress came to him in 1941 before we entered the war. Again, for the same reason he declined the proffered honor.

The year 1943 was the year of decision for Dad. We were deeply involved in the war; most men were thinking in terms of service to their country rather than in terms of personal desires regarding the work they would do. And so when Dad, in that year, was asked for the third time to run for Congress, he gave the request long thought, and as he pondered, the fateful strings began to tug. Delaying his final decision was a question in his mind: "Am I the right man for this job?"

With the responsibility of making a decision so important to so many people weighing heavily on his mind, after deliberation and prayerful consideration, Dad wrote to Clyde, Jr., who was then a First Lieutenant in the Air Force fighting in the Aleution Islands, asking his advice. Clyde's letter in answer read as follows:

"Dad, war is a hellish business, but we boys have been taught all our lives to preserve our country for life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, love of God, however we want to worship him.

"I don't like all this killing. It's so very wrong. God loves all his creations, and it won't solve anything this way. But if this is the only way now for me, I'll certainly do whatever my country requires of me.

"Somehow I can't really hate these men as individuals. It is totally against my nature. I only hate the evil forces that bring this slaughter of mankind about. After all they are fighting for what they believe in, however wrong, as we are fighting for what we believe.

"This way of settling the world's problems must come to an end, never to be repeated.

"Dad, you can't put on a uniform, but you can go to Congress and fight for a better world there by helping us make better laws so boys like me won't have to shed their blood again.

"It is up to the dedicated men of deep moral and spiritual convictions, the world over, to bring about this longed-for peace and understanding on earth, men who will fight with all that is in them for the principles and ideals our country was founded on.

"So, go to it, Dad. I am with you all the way."

This letter from his own son was enough to tip the scales of Dad's fate. He ran and was victorious.

About 3 weeks after Dad had been sworn into office, we received the first great shock of our lives: the heart-rending news that our beloved Clyde, Jr., was dead, the victim of a plane crash. Burdened with grief and deeply shocked, but with chin up and a courageous smile Dad now vowed to fight doubly hard to fulfill Clyde's faith in him and to help all the boys and their beloved country for which they were giving their lives.

In the gradual unfurling of his life, so much like the slow unfurling in the gentle breeze of the stars and stripes for which he so valiantly fought, is revealed a man who held steadfast to his early dedication to be a friend to man and to find ways, when he was on the ladder to success, to help young men in all walks of life. Never forgetting this pledge, he devoted much of his time and energy to the complex problems of our boys in service.

When Dad was in California between sessions of the last term of Congress, he told me that he would retire after this session. And then later he announced that he would run "just one more time" with a particular goal in mind: to do all that he could to put across his bill that would free thousands of young men and their families from the stigma of a less-than-honorable discharge by giving them the opportunity to earn honorable citizenship. He had introduced this bill in the 86th Congress and again in the 87th Congress. It had passed the House unanimously both times, but had been held up in the Senate committee. Believing that he now had lined up enough support in the Senate to get the bill out of committee, Dad again introduced it on the first day of the 88th Congress, January 9, 1963.

The prospect for success looked promising. But the dream for which he had worked so hard and so long was never to be realized during his lifetime, for his time was so much shorter than he thought.

My intention was to write about my father, but as I do so, I find that it is impossible to think of either of my parents without the other, for they were, and still are, so completely united as one in all ways. So different in personality, yet they were so companionable, for they perfectly complemented each other. Together, before the start of each day, they prayed for God's guidance, "Give us the strength and the wisdom to make wise decisions and to act according to Thy will." In times of doubt about the wisdom of a choice to be made or of grief and disappointment, they found comfort together in declaring, "Thy will be done."

Always supported by his belief in the power of prayer and Christian living, Dad looked forward to the meetings of the Thursday Morning House Breakfast Group, sponsored by the International Christian Leadership. Asked to be president of this group some years ago, he had declined the honor because he felt that his extremely heavy workload at that time would stand in the way of his giving the breakfast group the time and attention that it should be given by its leader. He had finally consented, however, to take over the responsibility and was to become president of the group at Eastertime this year.

While he was the secretary of this group in 1949, Dad made some remarks on the House floor that were quoted in the Christian Leadership News as follows: "More and more do I feel that only as we in Congress remain humble and practice the keeping of an attitude of supplication for help in clear thinking will we do our best work for the American people. As prayer is an entreaty and an earnest request, I am sure that every Member of this great deliberative body recognizes the need of practicing the habit of prayer as part of clearing mental attitudes and removing petty or puny thinking from the field of performance of congressional duties. Humility begets power, and nothing gives ordinary man so much humility as consciously to seek divine guidance."

I have already mentioned the remarkable companionship of my parents, their oneness of thought and spirit. Now I want to say something about their devotion to the welfare of each other. Mother came first in Dad's thoughts, and we children were next. Since he seemed never to have a thought for himself, mother kept constant watch over him to see that his needs were in no way neglected. After the tragic death of my sister Lydia Louise, 3 years ago, and the near passing of mother a short time later, Dad's great delight was in doing unexpected, thoughtful little things around the house for her. His sense of humor helped to lighten the burden of grief. When mother would thank him for some thoughtful attention he had paid to her comfort, he would say, with his sparkling blue eyes twinkling, "Martha (as he jokingly called himself) has been here."

To Dad a task, no matter how humble, should be done joyously, and nothing that must be done was too menial for any man to do, no matter what his station in life happened to be. Nobody, he thought, should lose the common touch. Thrifty, himself, in the use of material goods, he believed that one should not waste money, things—or time. It was without doubt his wise and fruitful use of time and money together with his Christian faith that largely made possible his accomplishments.

After going to Congress, Dad's time out for pleasure was very spare. Without Mother's careful watch to see that he did not use all the 24 hours of the day in work or service, he would have taken no time for pleasurable relaxation. He always said, however, that his work was his pleasure and that he loved every minute of it. Unlike most men, he did not leave his work in his office at the end of the regular working hours. Instead, he brought it home, where he would sit in his lounge chair before a crackling fire, studying or writing to his constituents.

Dad and Mother had dreams of retiring one day, of traveling by trailer all over the country, of editing his diary of daily congressional activities, and of writing things they wanted to publish. Next year they were to celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary by going around the world on a freighter. This was to be the "glorious honeymoon trip" that he had promised Mother over 50 years ago when he had asked her to marry him. So many of the dreams that he had never had either the time or the money for were at last to become realities. Some of these dreams had first come to him in the years of his early youth when he had to earn a living for his aged parents and get an education at the same time. The hardships were all over now, and he could relax and live these dreams with his "treasure," his "Joy Forever," his one and only loving wife.

If God's allotted time for dad had come, as apparently it had, one thing is certain: he had not "rusted away"; he had "just plumb worn out." Just going to sleep and quietly slipping away while he was still in active service would have been his choice of the way to go.

We who miss him every minute are led by our faith to believe that his new adventure is for him a new awakening offering him a new horizon and a new frontier with opportunity for further growth. And so we release him, knowing that love is eternal and still envelopes and guides us. We face the future with smiles and a determination to be worthy of his great love.

He dreamed his dreams for others, and he passionately desired to see them fulfilled, and his great devotion to his country and to his effort to do what he could in this perilous time to preserve freedom and to help our boys who would die for freedom, I believe, would have kept him in his seat next to the Democratic table as long as God and his "great 23d" District willed.

Others who, like us, have lost a dear and precious one of whom memories will never die may understand my tribute to my dad.

His loving twinkling Irish blue eyes I may not see. His cheery "hi hi" is gone forever from our ears. His understanding, "Chin up with a smile," and life's joy ebbed out to sea, no longer the physical ears do hear.

But lo. What have we here? My courage also ebbing out to sea, the tears did fall, I fear.

Was that his understanding "Chin up with a smile" in my inner ear as I bid him my last final fare-thee-well?

As I slowly raise my chin and try to smile, do I feel, more than see, his laughing, twinkling Irish-blue eyes embracing me with a loving smile?

Chin up, with a quivering smile and one tiny tear in my eye, I hear his cheery "hi hi. 'I'm always near. No need to weep and mourn."

And lo with a courageous smile a new and closer relationship is born.

Yes, this wonderful, dear, courageous, dedicated Christian father and statesman will forever be with us in spirit, cheering us on with his "hi hi" and "Chin up with a smile" and his very special greeting for mother," "You are a joy forever."

Recorded in the annals of history he may never be.

Recorded in the hearts of all who loved him, he will always be.

In loving memory, by his daughter,

DOROTHY DOYLE STANTON.

SEPTEMBER 10, 1963.

FEDERAL SALARY LEGISLATION FOR 1963

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I introduced H.R. 8716, a bill to adjust the rates of compensation for most of the officers and employees of the Federal Government. A companion bill, H.R. 8717, was introduced by my distinguished colleague on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL]. From inquiries I have already received, I fully expect that there will be considerable discussion of these bills in the press and in the Halls of Congress. Therefore, I take the time of the House to outline and comment on their provisions. In my judgment, this legislation is necessary and is clearly justified.

I am beginning to suspect that one feature of my bill may not go unnoticed. This is the section increasing the salary of Representatives and Senators from $22,500 to $35,000. While this particular provision may receive the most attention, it is actually a small part of the legislation, both in cost and in importance. There are approximately 2½ million civilian employees of the Federal Government. This bill will affect the compensation of nearly all of them and its provisions reach from the lowest paid maintenance employee to the members of the President's Cabinet and the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. The bill is intended to provide a logical, rational, interrelated pay structure for the entire Federal civilian establishment. In a real sense, it is companion legislation to the recently passed pay increase for the members of our armed services.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD a brief summary of the provisions of this bill, as prepared by the staff of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee:

SUMMARY OF EMPLOYEE, EXECUTIVE, LEGISLATIVE, AND JUDICIAL FEDERAL SALARY BILL (H.R. 8716, BY MR. UDALL, AND H.R. 8717, BY MR. BROYHILL OF VIRGINIA)

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN GENERAL

Title I, cited as the "Federal Employees Salary Act of 1963," adjusts salaries of classified, postal field service, Foreign Service and Veterans' Administration medicine and surgery employees to apply the "comparability" principle for all but those in supergrade and equal level positions. The provisions are the same as in H.R. 7552 and H.R. 7627 recommended by the administration.

The bill establishes new pay schedules (to replace the second-phase schedules of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962) effective the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1964. The average classified increase above the present 1964 schedule is 4.7 percent, with higher percentage increases for grades 7 and above to correct the artificially depressed rates in such grades resulting from the $20,000 ceiling fixed by the 1962 law. This provides comparability for classified grades 1 through 15 and equal levels in the other schedules, but not for supergrade levels. However, supergrade rates maintain the internal alinement pattern for grades 1 through 15.

The classified salary range is $3,305 to $25,500. The postal salary range is $3,820 to $25,445. Veterans' medicine and surgery and Foreign Service top salaries are $25,000, except that the Chief Medical Director, Deputy Chief Medical Director, chiefs of mission, career ambassadors, and career ministers would be covered by title II, Executive Salaries.

The postal section improves the means of fixing salaries of postmasters, using revenue units for a fiscal year, instead of the present receipts for a calendar year, based on 1958 postal rates. Fourth-class postmasters will be paid a pro rata part of PFS level 5 salaries, based on hours of service required by the public need.

EXECUTIVE SALARIES

Title II, cited as the "Federal Executive Salary Act of 1963," fixes higher salaries for Cabinet officers and other officials in the executive branch but substantially below rates recommended by the Randall Panel. All positions within this title are divided into 6 salary levels, in place of the 14 present executive salary levels.

Level I includes the 10 Cabinet officers at $40,000 per annum. Present salaries are $25,000, and the Randall Panel recommends $50,000.

Level II includes the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of State; the Administrators of AID, HHFA, NASA, and VA; chiefs of mission, class 1 (now $27,500); the Directors of the Bureau of the Budget, Central Intelligence, and FBI at $38,500 per annum. The top present rate (except as noted) is $22,500, and the Randall Panel recommends $45,000.

Level III, at $36,500, includes the Deputy Attorney General, the Deputy Postmaster General, and all other Under Secretaries; the Secretaries of the military departments; the Administrators of largest agencies and administrations; the Deputy Administrators of VA, AID, HHFA, and NASA; the Deputy Directors of the Bureau of the Budget and Central Intelligence; Chiefs of Mission, class 2 (now $25,000); the Chief Medical Director in VA; and the chairmen of various commissions and boards. Top pay, except as noted, now is $21,000, and the Randall Panel recommends $40,000.

All other executive positions would be placed by the President in level IV, V, or VI, for which maximum salary rates would be $33,000, $30,000, and $27,500, respectively. Rates now range from $19,000 to $22,000, and the Randall Panel recommends $35,000, $33,000, and $30,000, for these respective levels.

Positions expected to be included in level IV are such as Assistant Secretaries of executive and military departments, members of boards and commissions, and deputy heads of large agencies.

Level V is expected to include heads of principal services and other positions which the President deems of equal responsibility.

Level VI is expected to include heads and board members of smaller agencies, deputy heads of other agencies, and other positions which the President deems to be of equal responsibility.

The Vice President's salary is increased from $35,000 to $50,500.

The necessary conforming changes in existing law and repealers are contained in section 205 of the bill.

Section 206 authorizes the President to fix the salaries of 2 Peace Corps positions; 5 FAA positions; chiefs of mission, class 3 and class 4; all career ambassadors and career ministers; 30 NASA positions; and 4 U.S. Attorney positions at appropriate rates not exceeding the maximums for levels IV, V, or VI of this title. These positions now may not exceed the $20,000 top classified salary rate, except for the chiefs of mission, class 3, who receive $22,500.

All of the numerous other positions now in executive pay levels will be placed under the Classification Act of 1949.

Section 210 contains savings provisions prohibiting the reduction of any rates by reason of enactment of this bill.

LEGISLATIVE EMPLOYEES AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Title III, cited in section 301 as the "Federal Legislative Salary Act of 1963," increases salaries of legislative employees in appropriate relationship to classified increases, as was provided in our committee pay bill (H.R. 9531, 87th Congress) last year.

Section 303 provides increases, comparable with increases for executive branch officers, for the officers of the agencies in the legislative branch (including the top officials in the United States General Accounting Office, the Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office) and for the officers of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Section 304 fixes the Speaker's salary at $50,500 and the salaries of Senators, Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico at $35,000. The Randall Panel recommends $60,000 and $35,000, respectively.

The Randall Panel also recommends that the allowances of the Speaker and the Vice President be increased from $10,000 and $15,000, the amount of the salaries of Members "deductible for income tax purposes to offset their living expenses" be increased from $3,000 to $5,000, and that per diem in lieu of subsistence for Members in official travel status be increased from a maximum of $16 (or $30) to $50. No such provisions are in the proposed bill.

Section 305 requires that any person appointed to the staff of a Member of Congress must render actual service in the Member's Washington or district office.

JUDICIAL EMPLOYEES AND FEDERAL JUDGES

Title IV, cited as the "Federal Judicial Salary Act of 1963," increases salaries of employees in the judicial branch generally in proportion to classified salary increases provided by title I.

Section 403 increases the salary of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court from $35,500 to $50,500, and salaries of the Associate Justices from $35,000 to $50,000. The Randall Panel recommends $60,500 and $60,000 for these respective offices. Circuit judges' salaries would be increased from $25,500 to $40,500, and other Federal judges would be granted comparable increases.

APPOINTMENT AND SERVICE LIMITATIONS; EFFECTIVE DATE

Title V, section 501, prohibits nepotism in certain appointments to positions in the Government unless full disclosure of the relationship is made a matter of public record.

Section 503 makes the proposed new salaries effective the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, because the salary levels in the bill for the principal officers of the Federal Government in all three branches are based, in large part, on the recent recommendations of the so-called Randall report, which I shall discuss further in a few moments. I should also like to print at this point a comparison of the present salaries of top officials with the salaries proposed by the Randall Commission and the salaries provided for by my bill.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a table containing these figures at this point in my remarks:

Comparison of salary rates for legislative, judicial, and executive officials—Present and proposed

	Present rate	Randall report	Proposed rate
Title I, classified and postal employees, etc., cost $508 million.			
Title II, Executive, cost $6.7 million:			
Vice President	$35,000	$60,000	$50,500
Level I, Cabinet (10 offices)	25,000	50,000	40,000
Level II, immediate subcabinet level (10 offices)	22,500	45,000	38,500
Level III, Deputy and Under Secretary level (46 offices)	21,000	40,000	36,500
Level IV	19,000	35,000	33,000
Level V All other executives, to be assigned by President [1]	to	33,000	30,000
Level VI	22,000	30,000	27,500
Title III, Congress:			
The Speaker	35,000	60,000	50,500
Members, cost $6.9 million	22,500	35,000	35,000
Legislative employees, cost $7.1 million.			
Title IV, Judges, cost $7.2 million:			
Supreme Court:			
Chief Justice	35,500	60,500	50,500
Associate Justices	35,000	60,000	50,000
Circuit Courts	25,500	45,000	40,500
Court of Claims	25,500	45,000	40,500
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals	25,500	45,000	40,500
Court of Military Appeals	25,500	45,000	40,500
District Court	22,500	35,000	35,000
Customs Court	22,500	35,000	35,000
Tax Court	22,500	35,000	35,000
Judicial employees, cost $3.6 million.			

[1] The President will place positions in levels IV, V, and VI in accordance with standards set forth in the bill. For example, Assistant Secretaries of executive departments are expected to be placed in level IV.

I might say as a personal aside that I have been warned by several of my colleagues and by some of my friends in Arizona that the sponsorship of this bill may have disastrous political consequences for me. I fully recognize that there are risks involved but I feel so strongly the need for legislation of this kind that I accept these risks. My decision to sponsor this legislation is based on three principal factors:

This first reason is that last year, the Congress established for the first time a rational, logical machinery for the regular and annual adjustment of pay schedules in the postal and classified services. It was decided that the old system of irregular increases, usually rushed through under pressure in election years, should be abandoned. In place of this system, the Congress determined that the guiding principle of pay in the classified and postal service should be comparability. This means, in essence, that the Federal Government should give comparable pay for comparable skill and responsibility to that paid by private enterprise for similar duties. Under the machinery of the 1962 act, the President, based on recommendations of the Civil Service Commission, and on studies of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, recommends the adjustments necessary to retain comparable pay schedules. Unless Congress keeps faith this year, this machinery will, for all practical purposes, have been abandoned without a trial.

The second main reason for my sponsorship of this legislation is the crying need I see for better management of the affairs of the Federal Establishment. Our Federal budget this year is crowding $100 billion and, whether we like it or not, budgets of something near this size will continue. The Federal Government operates a Defense Establishment spending some $55 billion a year. It holds lands and other resources worth hundreds of billions of dollars.

It operates a space program, a program of public roads and public works, a large and important Federal aviation agency, and dozens of other activities which directly affect the lives of all Americans. A successful army needs not only brilliant and dedicated generals; it needs well trained, experienced majors, lieutenants and sergeants to carry out the strategy agreed upon. It is in the lower executive ranks where many of the most important day-to-day decisions are made and where essentially it is determined whether we have effective economic administration or not. It is in the intermediate and lower executive grades of the Federal Government where our present pay scales are most inadequate. In most instances, we not only do not have comparability with private enterprise pay, but in the upper executive levels particularly, the Federal Government pays less than one-half of the salaries paid by private enterprise for similar responsibility and skill. It has long been apparent that the present salary levels of the Members of Congress, the Cabinet, and the Federal judges are a rigid ceiling which prevent the establishment of proper salary levels for the Federal officials in key executive positions.

My third reason for sponsoring the features of my legislation which would raise the salary levels of the Members of Congress, the Federal judges, and Cabinet members, and heads of the major Federal agencies is that the present salaries are fixed at unrealistic and ridiculously low figures which do a great injustice to those in the Federal Government having the most burdensome responsibilities of all.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss some of these factors in a little more detail. Successful managers in private industry learned a long time ago that it is simply a good investment in sound management to pay substantial compensation to the men who carry heavy burdens and must make major decisions. The result is not waste but savings.

The same principle should apply in the Federal Government. Our present practices result in a situation where the police chief of Chicago, charged with protecting the lives and properties of the citizens of one city, is paid a salary of $30,000, yet the Secretary of Defense, whose decisions ultimately affect the lives and security of all of the American people, is paid $25,000 a year. This, despite the fact that the Secretary of Defense presides over an establishment spending each year some $55 billion of tax money and employing uniformed and civilian people totaling more than 3 million. It is absurd to me to ask a man to take on this crushing burden at a salary of $25,000. The same could be said of the responsibilities of the members of the U.S. Supreme Court whose present pay—$35,000—is much less than thousands of successful attorneys in our major cities. The comptroller of the city of New York is paid $40,000 a year. The Secretary of the U.S. Treasury is paid $25,000. The Director of the FBI, who is charged with heavy and burdensome responsibilities involving our national security and who heads a law enforcement organization of nearly 14,000 skilled and dedicated technicians, is paid $22,000.

Most of my colleagues would readily agree that the salaries I have just mentioned are utterly inadequate and yet Congress has very properly refused to raise these salaries until such time as the compensation of its own Members is adjusted. This vicious circle goes on to affect the assistant secretaries in our Cabinet departments and their assistants and their major bureau chiefs. Going down the scale, the failure to raise congressional pay depresses the maximum salaries which can be offered to lawyers, doctors, scientists, space technicians, and many others in key executive and managerial positions throughout the range of the Federal service.

Perhaps an example will help. The manager of Los Angeles International Airport is paid $40,000. Recently, the Federal Government opened Dulles International Airport here in Washington under the management of the Federal Aviation Agency. The taxpayers have invested in this facility more than $100 million, yet the Federal pay structure is such that the maximum pay available for the executive manager of this installation is $16,000. If the person selected is good and efficient, it is almost certain he will be hired away within a very short time. If he isn't, he will make mistakes and one bad decision could cost much more than an adequate salary. I could cite dozens of similar examples in regard to other specialists in the space program, in the Defense Department, and in other technical and scientific agencies of the Government. Every year dozens of our best skilled technicians and managers are hired away by private enterprise.

A recent news story indicated that a distinguished Senator who had held positions of great trust and responsibility, and had been nominated by one of our political parties for the Office of Vice President of the United States, died after some two decades of Federal service leaving an estate of $20,000. Some 10 years ago, a great public servant who was an outstanding Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, died leaving an even smaller estate. No one should contemplate becoming wealthy while working for the Federal Government but I believe that pay scales for top officials should prevent situations of this kind. While the Federal Government cannot pay the huge salaries received by our great industrial leaders, we should not be afraid to give really substantial compensation which will attract the very best brains and talents in our country. This goal has not been achieved and the result is a tendency for the timid, the mediocre, and the insecure to stay in Federal Government while the bold, younger executive with a future leaves Government service for a higher paid position in private enterprise. A young executive with an obvious management potential can join one of the great corporations and look forward to earning many times what he would make if he continued in Government service. We are all familiar with the fact that Robert McNamara took a cut of something like $375,000 when he left his job as president of the Ford Motor Co. to become Secretary of Defense. What we may not realize is that one can survey recent reports of our large industrial corporations and find thousands upon thousands of instances where salaries of $50,000 to $150,000 are paid to upper level management officials. Here are just a few examples:

The president of the Duquesne Light Co. in Pittsburgh, Pa., makes more money per year than the total salaries of the Chairman and all four members of the Federal Power Commission, which has jurisdiction over hundreds of such utility companies from coast to coast.

The president of the American Tobacco Co. makes more per year than the combined salaries of the Secretaries of Defense, State, Treasury, Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

The president of Standard Oil of New Jersey makes even more than that—enough to pay the entire Cabinet plus, say, a Secretary of Urban Affairs and some other secretary we haven't even thought of yet.

The chairman and chief executive of the Ford Motor Co., Henry Ford II, testified some months ago before the Ways and Means Committee in support of the tax bill. His salary last year was approximately equal to the total combined salaries of that entire committee of 25 members, one of the most powerful and important bodies in the United States.

The president of one utility company in Arizona makes more money than the combined salaries of Senators CARL HAYDEN and BARRY GOLDWATER, and his own Congressman, our colleague, Representative JOHN J. RHODES, of Phoenix.

Fortune Magazine regularly compiles lists of the top 500 corporations in the United States. Let us look at the company at the very bottom of that list, the smallest of the 500. The Pitney-board. Let us forget even the third-tion. Let us forget for a minute the president and the chairman of the board. Let us forget even the third-highest-paid executive and drop down to level 4 in Pitney-Bowes salaries, the executive vice president. Last year this man made $53,893, more than double the salary of the Secretary of Commerce.

But let us look further at this corporation at the bottom of the Fortune list of 500 corporations. Its top four executives last year made an aggregate of $320,000. How does this compare with the pay of Senators and Congressmen? Well, I might just point out that these four executives made more than the combined salaries of the eight Senators and six Representatives comprising the congressional delegations of Maine, Vermont, Rhode Island, and Delaware.

Surely we can all agree that among the most important jobs in the United States are the 10 positions in the President's Cabinet. By the decisions these men make our entire economy must stand or fall. One might assume that these men, who will allocate the expenditure of something like $100 billion this year, would be compensated on the same scale of magnitude as the top executives in private industry. However, from a study of the annual reports of corporations listed on the New York Stock Exchange, I estimate that in this sector of the economy alone you will find more than 10,000 executives whose salaries exceed those of our top 10 Cabinet officers. Furthermore, this does not take into consideration tens of thousands of corporations listed on other exchanges, unlisted or private, doing business across the country.

An indication of the number of salaries exceeding those of our Cabinet members can be found in the records of the Internal Revenue Service, which in 1960 reported there were 125,000 persons in this country whose adjusted gross incomes, after deductions of every description and capital gains exemptions, were $50,000 or more. In other words, our economy compensated 125,000 persons at a rate more than double that of our top 10 Cabinet officers.

Please understand, I am offering these facts and figures, not in criticism of our private corporations, but to show the great disparity between the salaries paid Federal executives and executives in private industry. I do not for a minute suggest that Cabinet members or Congressmen or Supreme Court Justices should receive salaries in the extreme heights available in private industry, but I do suggest that the gulf should be narrowed if we hope to get and retain top talent in Government.

The failure to raise congressional, Cabinet, and judicial pay not only affects the executive and managerial levels of the Federal system but depresses the entire Federal pay structure and does an injustice even to postal clerks and letter carriers.

The 500,000 letter carriers and mail clerks who operate our great postal system, the world's largest enterprise, are underpaid by any objective standard. These men and women make a lifetime career of the postal service and should receive salaries comparable to positions requiring the same kind of skill and responsibility in private industry.

During the last years of the Eisenhower administration, the President asked Clarence Randall, formerly head of the Inland Steel Corp., to head a commission to recommend salary levels for Members of Congress, the Cabinet, and the upper levels of the Federal Government. Mr. Randall's report was an impressive document. Recently, President Kennedy asked Mr. Randall to update his committee findings and he did so with the help of a committee which included such outstanding Americans as former Supreme Court Justice Stanley Reed, General of the Army Omar Bradley, Marion Folsom, of the Eisenhower Cabinet, and others. The executive, judicial, and congressional salaries provided for by my bill are based on the findings of the commission and, in fact, my salary levels are in most instances less than recommended by the Randall panel.

The September 15, 1963, edition of the New York Times magazine carried an article by Mr. Randall summarizing the work of that panel.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I will include the article by Mr. Randall in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Our country was founded on the theory that democracy works best when able, ambitious young men from any level of life can aspire to be President, serve in the Congress, or in some high position of government, if they can prove their merit. The kind of pay scales we now have are likely to result in having a Congress in which this kind of person can be found only if he serves at a sacrifice to himself and his family. Some feel that honor is adequate pay—something like heading the community chest. I cannot imagine, however, that this is the way we want to run our country. Congress should not be limited to men who are wealthy or to political hacks who find the level of pay more than they could earn in private employment.

The Members of Congress should be paid a salary which would make it possible for the recognized leaders in a community to seek the office and be assured of compensation somewhat similar to that which they might expect in positions of leadership in their own communities. This is not the case today.

Mr. Speaker, let me discuss in a little more detail the $35,000 which my bill provides for the Members of Congress. I think my colleagues fully recognize, although the general public may not, the almost impossible burden of serving in the Congress.

Until recent years, Congress was in session ordinarily from January through June or July. The Members had time to attend to their private business affairs, to practice law, or otherwise supplement their income. It is expected this year that Congress will have a 12-month session and every indication is that long sessions will be the rule in coming years.

At the same time he is being deprived of the time to pursue his private business interests for supplemental income, the Congressman is required to maintain 2 homes, to live in Washington, where living costs are substantially higher than most other places, 9 months of the year, to provide travel expenses for himself and his family if they are not to lose touch with their district, and to have his family and personal life disrupted by the demands of an average 500,000 people he is elected to serve. Perhaps I could express it better this way: If standard of living and economic well-being were the sole considerations, a Congressman would be far better off with a $15,000 junior executive position, living all year in Terre Haute, Tucson, or Tallahassee, than he would be at a $22,500 salary living in Washington most of the year but dividing his time between there and Arizona. To express congressional salary in terms of living standards and economic well-being under such conditions, one must discount the gross salary figure by 30 or 50 percent.

In my bill, the salaries paid to Senators and Congressmen would remain the same as those paid U.S. district judges. This traditional relationship is maintained even though most Members of Congress feel that congressional pay should be the same as the Federal circuit judges or the U.S. Supreme Court Judges.

Members of Congress have had no pay increase since 1955, despite the substantial increases in the cost of living and despite the fact that pay for other members of society has been increased several times. For example, the pay increase I propose for the Members of Congress amounts to some 55 percent. The typical post office clerk since 1955, and including the pay raise I would provide for him in my bill, has had a total increase of 55 percent.

It must be remembered that all the Members of Congress receive the same salary. Those who serve as chairmen of some of our most important committees receive $22,500. The chairman of a major House or Senate committee may deal with the appropriation of billions of dollars of public money. The decisions he makes may affect the security, welfare, and economic well-being of millions of Americans for years to come. In addition to presiding over the flood of legislation presented to his committee, the chairman must pay attention to the demands of at least 400,000 individual constituents and he must be careful, if he wishes to continue to serve, to visit his State or district often and to keep in close touch with its problems and its people.

It is heartening to me to note that many State and local governments have recognized the need for adequate pay in their top positions of responsibility. Let me cite some of the salaries paid by State and local governments. In my own State, there are two city managers and two local school superintendents who are paid substantially more than the Members of Congress. In the city of Los Angeles, there are 19 officials, including 7 associate school superintendents, who receive more pay than the Members of Congress. The superintendent of schools of Chicago is paid $48,000 per year. The taxpayers of these city and State governments do not consider this a waste of public funds but an investment in good government and in efficiency. In the State of New York, there are more than 200 State judges with salaries greater than those paid Federal district judges in New York and the salaries range upward to $39,000 a year.

Last year Congress created the Communications Satellite Corp., a quasi-public agency, to develop satellite communications. When the board of directors of that corporation hired its first president, his salary was fixed at $100,000, nearly five times the pay of Members of Congress. There was hardly a word of criticism. Why? Because most people recognize that top pay is necessary to attract top talent in industry.

Legislation of the kind I have sponsored has had wide support. It is supported now by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and by President Kennedy and his administration. Similar recommendations were made by President Eisenhower. The great Hoover Commission in its studies of efficiency in the Federal Government recommended drastic increases in Federal executive pay as a means of maintaining the strength of the Federal Establishment. My bill has been endorsed by the American Bar Association, the National Civil Service League, and by many business and professional groups.

All right, I have given some of the reasons why executive, congressional, legislative, and judicial salaries should be increased. I have indicated some of the support for these increases. Granted all this, can we afford them? I believe we can.

The total yearly cost of the salary increases my bill provides for Members of Congress, our Federal judges, Cabinet officers, agency heads, and other top executives, plus the additional pay provided for the key executive and managerial skills in the top four grades of the classified system, amounts to $49 million.

This is five one-hundredths of 1 percent of this year's budget. It would run the Defense Department for less than 8 hours.

This is the kind of management investment the board of directors of General Motors would approve almost without discussion. In my opinion the Federal Government has a stake in good management too, and it can ill afford not to make such an investment in its greatest asset—the skills and experience of its top executives.

Mr. Speaker, I include a summary of the annual cost of these proposed increases, plus those for all other levels of Government, in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

Summary of annual cost

Title I—Classified and postal employees, etc	$508,000,000
Title II—Executive	6,700,000
Title III:	
Members of Congress	6,900,000
Legislative employees	7,100,000
Title IV:	
Judges	7,200,000
Judicial employees	3,600,000
Total	539,500,000

One often reads sensational newspaper stories which would suggest serious and shocking abuses in connection with the staff and payrolls of Members of Congress. I am happy to testify that the great and overwhelming majority of my colleagues are above any reproach in this regard. Yet, I concede that there have been instances of staff pay practices which the public may properly resent and I believe the public has a right to demand that work be performed by employees of the Federal Government for the pay they receive. Accordingly, my bill has two special features designed to meet in part some of these criticisms.

Under my bill, no person having power to appoint subordinates in the executive or judicial branch of the Government will be able to employ his child, spouse, brother-in-law, son-in-law, cousin, or other close relative without specifying in the instrument of appointment the precise relationship, the rate of pay, and so forth. A record open to the press and public of all such appointments will be required. I believe this provision will discourage and control most of the complaints with regard to the employment of relatives. Secondly, under present law there is no requirement that staff employees of a Member of Congress perform their duties at any particular place. There have been a few reported instances where a Member of Congress employed a staff assistant who had his regular residence at some place far removed from Washington or the Member's home State. My bill would prohibit the payment of salary to any congressional staff member unless his duties are actually performed in Washington or in the Member's home State office, unless the Committee on House Administration waives such requirement.

Finally, I would say that I recognize that this is a subject on which there are very honest and very sharp differences of opinion and I respect the right of any citizen to differ with me and to criticize me as severely as he chooses. I fully expect that the introduction of this bill will bring down upon me considerable ridicule and criticism, but I feel very strongly about the necessity for the changes provided by my bill and I am perfectly willing to defend my position before those who elected me and before anyone else who wishes to discuss constructively these serious problems.

The Members of Congress are an outstanding, dedicated group. They have many hard and difficult decisions to make. One of the most difficult features is that the Members of Congress are the only persons in the entire Federal Establishment who have the responsibility of fixing their own pay. This responsibility is doubly burdensome if the Member happens to serve, as I do, on the committee which has jurisdiction over Federal salaries. I would only urge that my colleagues in discussing this problem face it objectively and responsibly and make their decisions in a fair and reasonable manner, trying to allow for their direct and personal involvement in the decisions to be made.

In its report the Randall Commission made this observation:

> We are convinced that our top salary structure no longer provides positive encouragement to men and women of the highest ability, dedication, and conviction about the American way of life to accept Federal appointments in either the executive branch or the judiciary, or to seek Federal elective office with assurance that the financial demands upon them can, in most instances, be met from their salaries.

Later the Randall panel made this observation:

> Our country cannot afford to depend only upon rich men to run its affairs. Neither should we place excessive reliance on business executives on leave of absence who are both expected to, and want to, return to their companies after short periods of public service. Both may render valuable, unselfish service, but, as we stated in our report to you in February 1962, "it seems to us bad public policy to make it difficult for others of comparable ability to serve the Government."

In short, the Randall Commission held, and I hope the Congress will agree, that service in the Congress, in the Judiciary, and in the top positions of the executive agencies should not be limited to the wealthy or the incompetent.

Passage of this long-overdue salary reform legislation will help insure that this is never so.

[From the New York Times Magazine, Sept. 15, 1963]

U.S. PROBLEM: LOW PAY FOR TOP JOBS

(By Clarence B. Randall)

One of the great new freedoms that come to a man in retirement is the right to stick his neck out. Released from institutional responsibility, he can say exactly what he thinks at all times. Furthermore, when the brickbats are thrown, they bounce off better than they did in earlier years. I know, because plenty of them have been coming my way of late, thrown by both old friends and new enemies, by the business community and the press.

This furor was all triggered when the Bureau of the Budget in Washington recently released to the press the report that I had submitted to the President in behalf of the so-called Pay Panel, the committee which the President had appointed to review salaries in various departments of the Federal Government, and which he had asked me to chair. Our report contained a series of recommendations for pay increases. Among these were proposals to raise the annual pay of Cabinet officers from $25,000 to $50,000, the salary of Congressmen from $22,500 to $35,000, and of Supreme Court Justices, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House from $35,000 to $60,000.

This provoked the storm. One of my favorite newspapers, the Chicago Tribune, honored me with a blistering editorial. "What," asked the Tribune, "have these people ever done for us?"

Two things bothered me about this uproar. First, most of those who were savage in their attacks had quite obviously not read the report. Second, their behavior reminded me unhappily of my own earlier years, when I am afraid I, too, sounded off occasionally in hot anger before I had studied in depth the subject upon which I was expressing positive opinions.

What disturbed me most was the fact that almost without exception the press failed to list in full the names of the other members of the committee. Here they are:

Gen. Omar Bradley; John J. Corson, of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University; Marion B. Folsom, of the Eastman Kodak Co.; Theodore V. Houser, former chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Robert A. Lovett, of Brown Brothers Harriman; George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Don K. Price, Jr., of the Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University; Robert Ramspeck, former Member of Congress from Georgia; Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice (retired), of the U.S. Supreme Court, and Sydney Stein, Jr., of Stein, Roe & Farnham.

Every man in that group not only had won distinction in his own walk of life, but had seen at firsthand over many years the intimate operations of our Government. And we were unanimous in our recommendations. I have served from time to time on other such groups, but never before have I seen men of such diverse backgrounds arrive at such solid consensus as was the case here.

Why did we do what we did?

Take the case of the Cabinet officer first. He must move to Washington at his own expense, maintain a home suited to his responsibility, do much entertaining for which he is not reimbursed, accept no outside income whatever, not even for speaking engagements, and stand ready to liquidate whatever investments he may have if he is charged with conflict of interest.

I would be the first to agree that it would be unwholesome in a high degree if compensation in Government were set at such levels that men sought appointments as a matter of financial advancement, but it seems equally clear to me that it is wrong to keep the compensation at such a low level that only rich men can be persuaded to accept the responsibilities.

The present administration has put an emphasis on youth, and many able young men were recruited for the public service. Already a disconcerting number have left, returning to private life for "compelling personal reasons." Naturally, I have never talked to a single one of them about it, but I feel very certain that in many cases the financial sacrifice required was beyond their resources.

Nor do I understand why we permit the basic salaries in our Federal Government to be established and maintained at levels below those prevailing in our State and municipal units.

At the present time, a member of the Cabinet who as a Secretary heads one of the departments which are so vital to our national welfare and safety, receives $25,000 a year. Contrast this with the figures given in our report for States and cities.

The State of California has 135 positions which pay more than $25,000 a year; Illinois has 93, Pennsylvania 165, and New York 432.

New York pays its Governor $50,000, plus the use of the executive mansion, and the mayor of New York City receives $50,000. Los Angeles pays the general manager of its water and power departments $40,560, Florida pays the director of its Inter-American Trade Exposition $50,000, and in Boston the general manager of the transit authority receives $40,000. In Chicago the salary of the superintendent of schools is $48,500.

Turning to other fields for comparisons, we found that in the United States there are 81 college presidents who are paid in excess of $25,000. Among the large charitable foundations there were 17 instances in which the principal full-time officer received in excess of $35,000. A member of the Federal Reserve System's Board of Governors receives only $20,000, but in the Federal Reserve banks themselves there are 79 officers who are paid more than that. In private industry on a sampling of 1,157 corporations engaged in manufacturing we found that the median salary figure for the highest paid officer was $91,000.

Naturally, such comparisons must not be controlling in this sensitive and significant problem, but they are nevertheless challenging. As panel members we were fully committed to the philosophy that there can be no money equivalent for the deep inner satisfaction which comes to a man who is privileged to give a period of dedicated service to his country, but we also believe that those who do not serve should share the sacrifice of those who do.

So far I have discussed merely the problem of an appointed officer, using a member of the Cabinet as an illustration. Obviously, however, similar situations exist outside of the executive branch. A Justice of the Supreme Court serves for life yet is paid far less than most of the members of the bar who present their cases before him. A Member of Congress has to maintain two homes and two offices, one of each in his district and in Washington; he is sharply limited in the number of trips which he may make at public expense between the two places. Yet the doctrine of the "consent of the governed" and the public welfare in a democracy clearly require the closest possible relationship between the people and those who represent them in Congress.

The most pressing problem, however, the one which has been largely overlooked so far in discussion of the pay panel's report, and the one which gave us the deepest concern, is the plight of the senior career officer in Government, the man who gives his entire life to the public service.

The compensation of his chief puts a ceiling upon his own salary. Not only that, but there must be several grades in between for the lesser appointive officers just below the top. In the executive branch there must be intermediate pay levels below the rank of Secretary for a Deputy Secretary, an Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries, before the point is reached where the appointive positions stop and the career grades begin.

For all practical purposes, therefore, unless a change is made in the salary of the Cabinet Secretaries, no career officer who enters the Government service upon leaving college, and who gives his entire life to it, can ever hope to earn more than $20,000 a year, no matter how great the responsibility which he bears or how competent his performance. Not only is this unfair to the individuals on the basis of comparison with other vocations which are open to them, but it places a severe limitation upon our Government when it comes to the recruitment of personnel.

That these levels of compensation are presently inadequate is graphically illustrated by the number of occasions on which such career men who are approaching the senior levels are hired away by industry. To businessmen Washington is a happy hunting ground for talent these days, and it takes a dedicated public servant indeed to resist an offer of doubled pay just at the time when his children are ready for college.

Yet sometimes he does just that. I knew personally of a case where a career man who was earning about $14,000 a year was offered the presidency of a corporation with a salary of $50,000 if he would leave the Government. He turned it down. He was occupying a post of great sensitivity at the time and felt that duty to his country had to be the controlling motive in his life. One of the directors of the company had spoken to me about the matter in advance, and I had prophesied that this would be the result. He persisted, and when he was turned down, he found the refusal completely incredible.

During the past 15 years, and under three successive administrations, I have been privileged to observe at firsthand the work of our senior career officers, and to do so not only in Washington, but in many of the remote parts of the world. They are the backbone of our Government, and their quality determines in large measure its effectiveness. Among them are some who are careless in the performance of their duties, and some who are mediocre, as there are in business. But there are many, I am proud to say, who are simply superb, equal in every way to the best whom I have known in industry, in the professions, or in any of the other walks of life. It is the merit of these outstanding men that the pay panel seeks to recognize and reward in order that more like them may be persuaded to enter the Government service.

What will all this cost? Not over $20 million a year—even if everything that the pay panel has recommended is put into effect.

Large as this sum seems, it would hardly be rated as a good typographical error in computing the cost of sending a man to the moon.

I do not intend by this to criticize the space program, but it does seem to me that in establishing our priorities in the allocation of our public funds, nothing should have precedence over what may be required to secure and keep in the Government service the best of brains and character that can be found in our country.

COLUMBUS DAY, 1963

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting and proper that all citizens of the United States of America should pause on Columbus Day 1963 to honor Italy as well as Christopher Columbus, the first of so many sons of Italy who have come to our shores.

Christopher Columbus is indeed a symbol of the essence of the Italian spirit that has continually stressed new discoveries from the days when Roman legions sought new barbarisms to bring within the power of Pax Romana.

The world is a better place to live in and the progress of Western civilization has been greatly advanced and enriched by the painters of Italy who discovered new ways to capture light and movement; by the sculptors of Italy who transformed rock into flesh; and by the architects of Italy who have filled a planet with grace and comfort. But, of course, we need not stop with the past to see the impact of Italian discoveries on our present and our future.

No men did more to make the world modern than did those voyagers on the unknown seas of physics, Marconi and Fermi. No men charted a more profound map of the universe of esthetics than Toscanini, Verdi, and so many other Italian musicians, including Puccini, who found in our Golden West the inspiration that turned the dreams and hopes of so many of his countrymen westward, to America.

All of these men made great discoveries. But in a democratic society it is not enough to mark the works of the great. We must never forget that the most important discoveries were made individually: by each of the many millions who discovered in America full scope for the development of their splendid potential.

Countless Americans of Italian birth or extraction have made lasting contributions to the American way of life. Some of them may not be as known as Christopher Columbus, John and Sebastian Cabot, and Amerigo Vespucci. One of these discovered America. The other two were sailors who discovered Greenland, Newfoundland, Labrador, and the east coast of North America, while the third succeeded in having the entire continent named after him.

I would like to add a few words on behalf of a few others who were not as well known even though their contributions were most significant.

Let me mention Giovanni Verrazano, a Florentine navigator who discovered the harbor of New York and the mouth of the Hudson River about 100 years before Henry Hudson. Then Philip Mazzie, who settled in Virginia in the period of the Thirteen Colonies, and although many people knew that he introduced the culture of grapes in America, few know that he was an intimate friend of Thomas Jefferson. How many know that the third Governor of Maryland was a man by the name of William Paca? This American of Italian heritage was a Member of the First and Second Continental Congresses and was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence.

A Venetian musician and composer by the name of Philip Tragetta was a friend of Presidents James Madison and James Monroe. It was Tragetta who established the American Conservatory in Philadelphia.

The very first collegiate institution on the Pacific coast, the College of Santa Clara, was founded by Father Gregoria Mengarini, a Roman missionary and educator.

A man by the name of Peter Caesar Alberti was officially known as Peter Caesar, the Italian. Alberti established the first tobacco plantation in Brooklyn, and to the greater glory of our Nation raised a large family.

The roots of Americans of Italian extraction go back not to the turn of the century but to the very founding of our country. They sustained her in time of need and offered their labors and ingenuity and their talents to help make it the land of the free and a glorious nation in the family of nations.

The greatness of our country stems from the parts played in the contributions of so many peoples—people of all races, creeds, and national origins—who helped make this the greatest Nation in the world. No one has a monopoly on Americanism. Americanism does not imply race, color, creed, or national origin. Americanism means an equality of opportunity, respect for your fellow man, adherence to the Golden Rule.

Perhaps the greatest single exhibition of the enrichment of this land by the sons of Italy is seen in the history of our wars. Americans of Italian descent were among the first to go over the top in Flanders and among the last to yield to overwhelming force in Corregidor.

The graves of Italo-Americans grace the soil of a thousand battlefields, where they fell fighting for America and for the same love of freedom that motivated Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Cavour.

In conclusion, we should all be thankful for the many millions of Americans of Italian birth and descent who continue to prove that they are first in the arts of peace as they are foremost among those who defended America during time of war.

A POWERFUL ANTIDOTE TO SPREADING EUPHORIA: A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of our signing the nuclear test ban treaty countless Americans are being steadily engulfed by a spreading euphoria in the cold war. Many have already jumped to the groundless conclusion that this event has signaled the beginning of the end of the cold war. Responsible officials in the administration and numerous private analysts are becoming increasingly concerned about this untoward development. They rightly fear its psychopolitical consequences upon our general cold war posture.

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR CONGRESS

We in Congress have an excellent opportunity—indeed a duty—to provide a powerful antidote to this spreading, contagious euphoria. We can and should establish in this session a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. With this euphoria giving rise to much unthinking talk about a nonaggression pact with the Warsaw Pact regimes, the time has arrived for positive action on our part to check what may develop into a major diplomatic disaster for us and the free world. We can furnish such a check by concentrating our efforts on the captive nations and people in Eastern Europe and Asia.

MAJORITY IN RULES SUPPORT A SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker, one of the most mystifying aspects of this legislative action for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations is that despite the expressed support by a majority of our members in the Rules Committee, not one step has been taken in this session to consider the measure. There are 40 resolutions before the Rules Committee, calling for the creation of this special committee.

REPEATABLE QUESTIONS DESERVING ANSWERS

On this whole issue there are certain repeatable questions deserving specific and honest answers. Why in the light of these facts and more has action been blocked in the Rules Committee? When in view of the preponderant interest by our members in such a committee will fair consideration be given to the 40 resolutions? Who, indeed, is opposed to this measure so strongly that even the opportunity is denied our members in Rules to vote on it? How do we explain all this to our respective constituents who for 2 years have persistently urged the passage of this measure?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, these are questions worthy of repetition and deserving of specific and honest answers. The supporters of this measure shall keep repeating these basic questions until we receive specific and honest answers to them. Naturally all of them can be quickly resolved by a fair and immediate decision on this measure in the Rules Committee.

THE DOBRIANSKY ARTICLE IN NATO'S FIFTEEN NATIONS

How important and vital the captive nations are to our security and to world freedom is shown in a recent article published in the August–September issue of NATO's Fifteen Nations. Written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, the article is entitled "Soviet Russian Imperio-Colonialism and the Free World." A careful reading of this article by our Members will convince them of the necessity of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

I insert it in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

SOVIET RUSSIAN IMPERIO-COLONIALISM AND THE FREE WORLD

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

No matter how one views it, Moscow knows best the true character of communism. After all, it has successfully manipulated the ideologic deception for over 40 years. Like the czars, who with their more limited ideologic smoke screens of religious orthodoxy and racist Pan-Slavism were also quite adept in the art of conquest, the present Russian empire builders have managed to keep their intended victims in a state of doubt and confusion as to the real threat facing them.

The Russian totalitarians bank heavily on the permanence of this state of doubt and confusion. In fact, it is a necessary condition for the success of their cold war efforts. As they doubtlessly see it, those who are divided in thought and conception are prime candidates for divided action; and such action in the context of the total struggle is tantamount to inaction, indecision, and slow defeat in the cold war. Centuries of continuous Russian cold-war activity substantiate this fundamental truth. It is not the product of any Communist innovation.

So long as millions in the free world interpret the struggle as a conflict between social systems—between communism and capitalism—Moscow's expansionist interests are well served. This misconception, fanned by Moscow's own propaganda machine, has lent philosophical dignity to Soviet Russian totalitarianism, has bred countless recruits for its subversive work in all quarters of the globe, and, above all, has blinded the targeted victim as to both the nature of the enemy and the opportunities to defeat him in the cold war. In earlier stages of Russian imperial history, the supposed conflict was between religious systems, then later between races; in this century of phenomenal economic growth and a materialist interest affecting all parts of the world, it is painted in terms of social systems.

The center of so-called world communism has been exceptionally adroit and skillful in this prime task. Seizing upon opportunities with courage and fixed determination, it has built an empire that far surpasses the wildest dreams of the past czars. What Alexander I had failed to accomplish in the Western Hemisphere, Khrushchev achieved in captive Cuba; and the end of Russian entrenchment in Latin America is certainly not in sight. In Asia and Africa the same task is being methodically performed with indubitable long-term consequences. Massive weapons, counterinsurgency operations, and economic aid designed to contain Soviet Russian aggression will not stop Moscow's primary form of aggression—its planned assault of half-truths, false conceptions, and a projected image upon minds the world over.

We in the free world have yet a long way to go before a complete understanding of this traditional Russion cold-war strategy is realized. Most of us, including those in the highest official quarters, have never bothered to investigate the long history of the Russian Empire; and if some have, the chances are that their exclusive dependence on Russian sources has precluded patient inquiries into the histories of Russia's victims. How the empire in its present form came to be what it is serves as the basic clue to this indispensable understanding, but general conceptions about the Soviet Russian empire first being formed in the 1940's show how little we have developed this clue. This repeated failure has always benefited imperio-colonial Moscow. It thrives on protracted intellectual neglect.

In a recent address at American University in Washington, D.C., President Kennedy called upon Americans to reexamine their attitude toward the Soviet Union. Actually, this summons applies to all peoples in the free world. By all means, let's reexamine our attitudes, but with facts, not fiction. In the short run, the likelihood of an intelligent reappraisal leading to a redoubtable free-world strategy for victory in the cold war is dim, indeed. And there is no better proof for this prediction than the untold development of our encounter with Moscow over the captive nations since July 1959. The highlights of this unique development readily underscore all of the above observations.

THE 1959 RUSSIAN ERUPTION

Few of us will forget the explosion that occurred in Moscow immediately after the U.S. Congress had legislated the Captive Nations Week Resolution in July 1959. Never before did a Russian chief of state react so violently and for so long against an official document as has Khrushchev against this resolution. The question that continues to puzzle many diplomats and analysts is "Why this vehement reaction to a congressional resolution?" "For," they would add, "It wasn't the first resolution of its kind against communism and for the captive nations."

Before answering this, lets view some aspects of this initial phase. Significantly, in his first tirade against the resolution, Khrushchev kicked back with a centuries-old but spurious Russian retort. Speaking to a Soviet-Polish friendship rally in Moscow just moments before the airport arrival of Vice President Nixon, he denounced the resolution as "a direct interference in the Soviet Union's internal affairs."[1] This must be borne in mind to appreciate the resolution's novel features.

Of course, the argument on interference in "internal affairs" has consistently been applied by Moscow to other parts of its empire. For example, in the U.N. General Assembly meeting in Paris in 1951, Vishinsky used it tirelessly with reference to Hungary during the extensive debate on the Kersten provision in the U.S. Mutual Security Act. That provision aimed to attract defectors from behind the Iron Curtain. Last year Khrushchev used it with regard to Cuba. In short, what becomes part of Moscow's empire, including the vast non-Russian territories in the U.S.S.R., becomes an "internal affair."

In the course of Nixon's tour in the Soviet Union, Khrushchev let it be known that the resolution pierced the false image of the Soviet Union as the leader of world communism. As Nixon himself puts it in his book "Six Crises," the resolution was "the major Soviet irritant throughout my tour." Khrushchev staged a whole series of antics, shaking his finger at Nixon, shouting, pounding, dubbing the resolution and then, in Nixon's words "he spelled out what he meant in some earthy four-letter words."[2] On the Moskva river the Russian leader conducted "fine river rallies," to use Mikoyan's phrase, in order to convince Nixon that there are no captives in the Soviet Union.

All this evidence and more points to the essential meaning of the resolution. Moscow quickly grasped its meaning, if much of the free world didn't. For the first time an official act by a free world government identified the nature of the cold war enemy as Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. The act penetrated the veneer of communism and laid bare the last remaining, major, imperialist power in the world. It placed the Soviet Union in its true light, an empire within an empire, made up of more captive non-Russian nations than exist in Central Europe. Briefly, the resolution seriously threatened the image projected by Moscow in every quarter of the globe and opened up possibilities for cold war operations that in time would destroy the impact of Soviet Russian propaganda.

How little this was understood in the United States can be gleaned from these examples. One report stated, "U.S. officials are somewhat puzzled and slightly annoyed, but also amused, by Soviet irritation over President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week."[3] The resolution predicates the presidential proclamation. Another report was captioned, "That 'Captive Nations Week' Has Many Diplomats Puzzled."[4] What truly puzzled this writer were the numerous queries received from various parts of the country on the whereabouts of Idel-Ural, Turkestan and Cossackia in the U.S.S.R. Only a relative few seemed to know about these captive non-Russian areas mentioned in the resolution. Yet, these important states are located in the front yard of the cold war enemy.

THE RESOLUTION HAUNTS K'S VISIT

If Khrushchev was merely irritated by the resolution or, as it is now called, Public Law 86–90, then one is extremely hard put to explain subsequent events. Considering the unprecedented character of Moscow's first reaction and the innovative features of the law itself, the effect was unquestionably much deeper than this. The Russian leader, who has gained a reputation for his ebullient confidence, his boasts and threats, is found ranting "This resolution stinks." He was so preoccupied with it that it continued to haunt him. And, in cold war terms, for good reasons.

A month before his visit to the United States, Khrushchev had an article published in an advance issue of Foreign Affairs, a periodical of a group in New York. Once again he attacks the resolution. He also uses the familiar Russian rhetoric paralleling the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. In an attempt to mislead the reader he writes, "It would be interesting to see, incidentally, how would Americans have reacted if the Parliament of Mexico, for instance, had passed a resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona, and California be liberated from American slavery."[5]

---

[1] UPI, Moscow, July 23, 1959.

[2] Nixon, Richard, "Six Crises," New York 1962, pp. 252.

[3] AP release, July 23, 1959.

[4] The Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., July 26, 1959.

This point did not go unchallenged. When the Russian Premier arrived in Washington in September 1959, and was received in several governmental circles, I prepared a set of questions for Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, to elicit Khrushchev's answers at a tea given by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. On this point the Senator asked him: "In your article in Foreign Affairs you mistakenly compare Texas, Arizona, and California with certain non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Would you be willing to stage, under U.N. auspices and control, free voting conditions to determine whether the nations of Lithuania, Ukraine, and the Caucasus want to remain in the U.S.S.R. or be independent and whether the residents of comparable Arizona, Texas, and California want to remain in the United States of America or be completely independent States? Let's compete in ideas and action." Following the closed meeting, Senator DIRKSEN informed the press that on this and other concrete questions "Khrushchev took a fifth amendment stand."[6]

During his entire stay in the United States, the Russian boss posed as a dauntless competitor in ideas and coexisting action. However, when he was pressed on these vital issues, he cringed. Early in the visit the White House passed the word that the guest was not to be confronted by "embarrassing questions"—in effect, the great advocate of competitive coexistence was to have a clear field for his propaganda effort. And on matters of peaceful coexistence, disarmament, the tremendous strength of the U.S.S.R., and the horrors of nuclear war, he did his work well.

Nevertheless, from start to finish, from Washington to Camp David, the big competitor was haunted by the resolution. Just last year the present Governor of the State of Pennsylvania, the Honorable William W. Scranton, testified on this as follows: "I think anybody who was connected with this visit in any way will tell you that this particular resolution made more of an impression on Chairman Khrushchev and he invected against it at a greater rate almost daily while he was here than any other single thing that America was doing in the cold war."[7] The Governor, attached to the Department of State then, accompanied Khrushchev on the tour and was at Camp David.

In the following months, both in 1959 and 1960, Moscow continued its barrage against Public Law 86–90. For example, Khrushchev himself railed into it again on October 31 in the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet, slurring it as an "appeal for interference in other peoples' affairs." Moscow even found it necessary to order the publication out of London of a new series of pamphlets titled "The Fifteen Soviet Republics, Today and Tomorrow." These have been distributed in massive volume throughout the free world to exhibit the paradise of coexisting nations in the U.S.S.R. But Khrushchev wasn't through yet; he chose a new course of tactical diversion in the United Nations—which almost seriously backfired.

K'S 1960 TACTIC IN THE U.N.

One of the chief motives behind Khrushchev's dramatic appearance—and antics—in the U.N. General Assembly in September 1960, was to divert free world attention from the reality of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, particularly in the U.S.S.R. itself. With finger, shoe, and tongue he hammered away at the theme of Western imperialism and colonialism, while his puppets decried the resolution. As to be expected in this unfolding pattern of events, he seized the offensive while, on the whole, Western delegates played the typical defensive.

However, the Prime Minister of Canada, John G. Diefenbaker, deviated, and in his address raised the simple questions, "What of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia? What of freedom-loving Ukrainians and other eastern European peoples?"[8] By merely raising these pointed questions the Canadian Prime Minister threw the Soviet and puppet representatives into a state of pandemonium and confusion. They believed this was the opening shot of a counteroffensive designed to lay bare before the world the brutal facts of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism within the U.S.S.R. itself. Khrushchev was so shaken by this that on October 4 he even permitted his Ukrainian puppet, Nicholas V. Podgorny, to address the U.N. for the first time in the Ukrainian language.

Apparently the only organ that captured the full meaning of these events and what suddenly transpired in Ukraine itself was the Swiss daily, the Neue Zuricher Zeitung. In its November 20, 1960 issue a detailed report, titled "Colonialism in the Soviet Empire," covers the unusual campaign staged for several days in Ukraine against the Diefenbaker statement. Protest rallies in all cities, continuous Radio Kiev broadcasts, declamations by officials, writers, academicians and others proclaiming their "freedom and independence"—even Communist Party opposition in Canada—marked the frenzied campaign. "The whole event," states the report, "merits also full attention because for a short time the Soviets (Russians) themselves certified in a striking manner on what weak feet stands their federal system and how highly vulnerable, from the viewpoint of foreign relations, they are on this point."

ONLY A LOST OPPORTUNITY

Upon his return to Kiev, Podgorny gloated that the Western maneuver was "choked in the germ stage." Actually, no plan existed to have warranted the expectation of subsequent stages. Few understood Khrushchev's maneuver against the background of the resolution and the successive events it precipitated. The complete pattern of these significant events was scarcely noticed. Too late, too little, and too piecemeal was President Kennedy's United Nations challenge in September, 1961: "Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every part of the globe." In effect, another opportunity was lost to advance the interests of the free world in the cold war.

But the battle over the resolution has not ceased, and additional opportunities will be in store as further understanding of its contents is realized. At the Communist Party Congress in October 1961, Khrushchev again assailed the resolution. Yet, even at this late date, fact and fiction were mixed in Western commentaries. For example, Stewart Alsop wrote: "When I was in Moscow during the October Party Congress, Khrushchev once again violently denounced the innocuous Captive Nations Week Resolution which Congress passes every year to attract minority votes."[9]

This comment is a gem of fact, illogic, and fiction. The obvious fact is Khrushchev's violent denunciation; the illogic is the supposed innocuousness of the resolution; and the fiction concerns Congress passing it every year to attract votes. The resolution is explicitly self-renewing. Also, passed in an off-election year, it has had nothing to do with minority votes.

What will in time produce this full understanding is the annual observance of Captive Nations Week by the American people. Each year since 1959 the week has been viciously attacked by Moscow and its puppets, and the unknowing naturally ask "Why?" In July 1962, for instance, Izvestia ran a lengthy editorial condemning the week as "unbridled anti-Soviet and anti-Communist slander."[10] In the same year we witnessed the scandalous publication by UNESCO of the book "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," a mass of half-truths and bald fabrications. To answer the "whys" of such events Congress and Americans across the country discuss the captive nations within the framework developed here, as a strategic free world instrument in the cold war. Inevitably, the real enemy will be better understood, the resolution will be intelligently implemented, and genuine progress toward victory in the cold war will be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I must reemphasize the fact that the establishment of a special House Committee on the Captive Nations is of such importance that regardless of the known State Department roadblock to our consideration, a resolution should be approved so that the House could work its will.

May I remind the Members of the dedicated efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], on behalf of this cause. Certainly, responsible Members of the House serving on this committee would accomplish much that would be of practical benefit not only to the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain but also to all people of the free world earnestly striving for a world of true peace and freedom.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, there is a moral question that we must reemphasize in maintaining an interest in the captive nations. Soviet colonial exploitation of these lands, unfortunately, is hardly recognized. I am especially pleased, however, that the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in an editorial of Monday, September 30, saw fit to direct editorial attention to the Soviet exploitation of Eastern Europe, and I insert this editorial into the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

LAX CONSCIENCE OF MANKIND

Once more the U.N. has been subjected to Soviet pontification and a Russian demand for an end to all colonialism by 1965.

Mr. Webster has defined colonialism as "the system in which a country maintains foreign colonies for their economic exploitation." How does our erstwhile champion of anticolonialism score on this point? Last spring it was embarrassingly plain and equally poor.

The Rumanians had openly balked. They no longer wanted to play the role assigned to them by the planners of COMECON, the

---

[5] Khrushchev, Nikita S., "On Peaceful Coexistence," Foreign Affairs, October 1959.

[6] "The Ukrainian Bulletin," New York, Oct. 1–5, 1959.

[7] "Hearings on the Captive Nations," Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 1962, p. 195.

[8] U.N. General Assembly, New York, Sept. 26, 1960.

[9] Alsop, Stewart, "The Berlin Crisis: Khrushchev's Weakness," Saturday Evening Post, Dec. 16, 1961.

[10] Izvestia, July 17, 1962.

Soviet-organized, Soviet-run, involuntary economic corporation set up by Moscow as the opposite of the Common Market.

According to the big plan, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union were to provide heavy industry, while the other states were to concentrate on agriculture with Rumania something of a bloc bread basket.

But being the "banana republic" of the Balkans held little appeal for the proud and pragmatic nationalist Gheorghe Gheorgiu-Dej, who is Rumania's party boss.

His intransigence at the time of the China split won him minor concessions, but he took pains not to push the mother country too far.

Even Fidel, who has made a career excoriating monopolists and exploiters, has been forced to trek to Moscow for his 5-year plans. This summer he returned to Cuba, slowed the island's industrialization and, under Khrushchev's orders, put his nation back along the road to the sugar economy.

But the exploitation can come in simpler forms. In the 6 years after 1955, the Soviets swindled their colonies in Europe of some $6 billion by merely forcing them to pay premium prices for Russian goods and paying the satellites less than value for what they produced. Attila would have marveled at the bloodless methods of modern plunder.

The U.N. states have never censured the Russians for this heinous exploitation. Yet these same hypocritical U.N. states can be counted on—once again this session—to wax hot and indignant at Portugal and taunt that tiny nation with raucous insults for clinging to Angola.

This is one reason why we can never seem to share the enthusiasm and optimism of those hermits from reality who insist that the glass building off 42d Street houses the "conscience of mankind."

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there is sufficient evidence that our foreign policy defects which have marked conferences with the Russians since the Teheran-Yalta-Potsdam period, and in other so-called summit meetings, are based on a lack of sufficient knowledge of true conditions in the Communist area, as well as the true aspects of the captives of communism.

As evidence of original lack of knowledge but a growing awareness of the true facts, I submit the public reappraisal of former Vice President Nixon. A recent article by Columnist David Lawrence discusses Mr. Nixon's latest views on the subject of Eastern Europe, which I insert here as part of my remarks:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Oct. 7, 1963]

EASTERN EUROPE'S FEARS LINKED TO U.S. DIPLOMACY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—America's foreign policy is going through a critical stage. There is a growing feeling that, in order to reduce tensions, secret diplomacy has taken over, and that important concessions have been or will be made to the Soviets.

The peoples of Eastern Europe are reported to be most apprehensive about an American tendency to grant such concessions—as, for example, on the sale of wheat—without achieving anything in return.

Thus, former Vice President Nixon, in an article in this week's issue of the Saturday Evening Post, says flatly that, while the signing of the test ban treaty may have decreased the danger of war, "the danger of defeat without war has been substantially increased."

Mr. Nixon writes that "a great new Communist offensive is being launched against the free world, an offensive without resort to war, an offensive all the more dangerous because it is so difficult to recognize and to meet effectively." He adds:

"I believe that we are now entering a period of the greatest danger of Communist expansion in the free world since immediately after World War II."

Mr. Nixon, who has just returned from a trip to Europe, says that an American foreign-policy adviser there said to him: "If the Kennedy administration had not watered down the captive nations resolution as it did this year Khrushchev might never have agreed to the test ban."

Mr. Nixon doesn't believe that such an assumption is correct, but he asks, "was the test ban worth the price we paid? Did we sell out freedom for expediency?"

The former Vice President is well aware that during the Eisenhower administration, the people of Hungary revolted against Soviet rule and did not get the support they had hoped to receive from the United States. He admits that mistakes were made in 1956, when the Budapest revolution erupted. Conceding that it is easy to second-guess, he now believes that more should have been done than was done. He blames in part the fact that the British and French chose this very same time to use armed force in the Suez situation, while America felt that on principle it had to protest and rely on the United Nations. But he ruefully remarks that "Khrushchev did what he always does—uses the UN when it helps him and ignores it when it hurts him." And "We ended up with a debate in the UN; the Hungarian freedom fighters ended up without a country." Mr. Nixon now outlines a policy that he thinks should have been followed:

"First, we should have recognized the anti-Communist Nagy government promptly. This would have deprived Khrushchev of the legal argument that the Communist Kadar government had 'invited' the Soviet forces to come in.

"Second, when Khrushchev refused to withdraw his troops from Budapest, we should have broken off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.

"Third, we should have permitted the organization of 'volunteers' in free countries to help the freedom fighters. This is the action the Kremlin has taken in corresponding situations.

"Fourth, when the puppet Kadar government was set up in place of the free government, we should have recognized a government-in-exile. Such a government-in-exile by itself could not have changed the situation. But it would have been a symbolic rallying point not only for Hungarians, but for people throughout Eastern Europe who admired their courage and shared their ideals of freedom."

Mr. Nixon does not reveal how much of the foregoing program he advocated in the inner councils at the time. He says about the current situation, however, that it would be "shockingly immoral for the United States to do anything directly or indirectly which would give the impression that we accept Khrushchev's price—namely, that in return for 'peaceful coexistence' we would draw a line down the middle of Europe and accept as permanent the Communist enslavement of 97 million Eastern Europeans."

A good deal of uneasiness prevails on Capitol Hill concerning the possible changes in American foreign policy. There have been hints right along that some kind of "deals" were being made behind the scenes. When Khrushchev agreed to dismantle the missile bases in Cuba, for instance, there were rumors about side agreements. This was repeatedly denied by the administration.

Now the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty has been followed by discussion in the press of proposals for the sale of wheat by America to Communist-bloc countries, without any corresponding concessions to the United States in the cold war.

The issue is hardly partisan. Though there are many Republicans who have criticized the trend of the Kennedy administration policy, there are lots of Democrats who have done the same. The fear seems to be that the Russians will persuade the State Department to agree to a nonaggression treaty as between the Warsaw Pact countries and the NATO countries. The idea advanced is that a kind of status quo could then be attained. But, at the same time, those who are familiar with Eastern European affairs say it could be just a starting point for the complete abandonment by this country of the peoples in Eastern Europe who have depended so much on the moral support of the United States in their crusade for freedom.

I believe it is fair to say that if Mr. Nixon had as much knowledge of the propaganda situation behind the Iron Curtain at the time of the Hungarian revolt, the course of history would most certainly have been changed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of the House to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and myself in asking for favorable consideration by the Rules Committee of a special Committee on the Captive Nations.

THE DEBATE ON FEDERAL FISCAL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has called the proposed Revenue Act of 1963 the most significant piece of legislation to come before the Congress in 15 years.

This is an understatement if it is the intention of the President to change our basic Federal fiscal policy deliberately to incur further deficits through cutting revenues without cutting expenditures on the theory that this will produce increased economic growth from whence additional Federal revenues will be derived to make up for the planned deficits and alleviate unemployment.

However, the President recently has in effect stated that he is not advocating such a novel fiscal policy; he has stated that he intends to exercise even tighter control over expenditures. Furthermore, the President has accepted the amendment placed in the tax bill stating that it is the sense of Congress that rigid expenditure control be imposed.

The issue in the debate on the tax bill before the House of Representatives boiled itself down, not to a difference of opinion over a novel fiscal policy, but to a question of how expenditure control, which everyone agreed was necessary to make the tax cut meaningful, was to be brought about. In light of this development it is now clear that the proposed Revenue Act of 1963 is by no means the most significant piece of legislation to face the Congress in the past 15 years. Indeed, it has already been relegated with the tacit approval of the President to at least second place, if not lower, in significance in one session of a single

Congress, the 1st session of the 88th Congress. The civil rights bill has been given priority.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased with the caliber of the debate in the House of Representatives on the tax bill. Overall it was on a very high plane and much good came from it. However, the debate off the floor of the House has in many instances taken a very low level. I called to the House's attention by remarks on the floor appearing on pages 17340–17341 of the Congressional Record of September 18, 1963, a despicable editorial appearing in one of our great newspapers just before the debate began. Regrettably, this was not an isolated example of the low tactics being employed by some overzealous advocates of what they deemed to be President Kennedy's tax and fiscal policy proposals.

On October 9, 1963, another example of this low-level-type debate was called to my attention. This time it was in the nature of a letter to the editor appearing in the Washington Post signed by, of all persons, a full professor in one of our most respected institutions of learning, Harvard University. It is certainly a sad day for public debate in America when the ethics of "gutter" politics is employed by distinguished professors of political science and deemed sufficiently meritorious by one of America's leading newspapers to print it in prominent display.

I wish I could say that these are isolated examples of the caliber of public debate being carried on in America today outside the Congress by those in prominent and powerful public positions. Regrettably it is becoming so commonplace that people just shrug it off. Many people wonder why I still get excited about it and continue to protest.

A few weeks ago I said in one of my speeches of protests on the floor of the House that I felt that the root of this trouble lay in the school of neo-Machiavellian political scientists which seems to be so dominant in our universities and colleges today. I pointed to Dr. David B. Truman, of Columbia University, whose text books on political science are so widely used throughout our colleges and universities as a symbol or leader of this modern school of political thought which I think is so degrading, and, in its cynical attempt to be realistic, so unrealistic. Seymour Harris, professor of political science, at Harvard, has established himself as a neo-Machiavellian. However, he seems not content to just teach this questionable doctrine, but he seeks to practice it.

I am setting out in the Record a copy of the letter of Seymour Harris which appeared in the October 9 Washington Post. I am also including the reply I sent to the Washington Post. I trust the editors of the Washington Post will print my reply even though it is now set out in the Congressional Record. After all, the readership of the Congressional Record differs markedly from the readership of the Post:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 9, 1963]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: KILL THE TAX CUT?

I refuse to believe that the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, the party that in every great crisis has sacrificed partisan gain for the welfare of the country will now follow, for purely partisan reasons, the advice of Congressmen Byrnes, Curtis, and also the able, and I believe mistaken, senior Senator from Virginia and try to kill the President's tax program.

For once in our history, management, labor and professional economists have agreed almost unanimously to support a tax cut. At the Ways and Means Committee hearings only two out of 200 witnesses opposed the tax cut. Here is the one and only major attack on unemployment, on growth, and on cutting Government deficits eventually, on which there is agreement, and to lose this advance for partisan gains would be an unforgivable denouement.

The major thrust of these critics of the tax cut is that it must be accompanied by guarantees on curbing expenditures. But have expenditures been so large? In the 3 last Eisenhower years (fiscal years 1958 to 1961), expenditures rose by $10 billion as compared to $17 billion (estimated) under Kennedy 1961 to 1964. The nondefense (and space) rises were $10 billion for Eisenhower and $11 billion for Kennedy. Without any new programs or extension of old, and with prices rising by 1½ percent, population by 2 percent, and wages by 3 percent per year and built-in expansion in many programs (e.g., veterans, aid to State and local government), it is almost unbelievable that the President could have actually deflated nondefense expenditures in stable dollars. Yet they have actually declined in fiscal year 1964 plans by several percent per capita.

Let us consider the net cost of a stillbirth of the President's tax program. A major goal has been to reduce unemployment to 4 percent. I doubt that even the President's tax program will bring unemployment down to 4 percent by 1966, and it certainly will not with drastic reductions in expenditures or even with absolute stability in expenditures. In fact then unemployment would probably rise.

In order to keep unemployment from rising in the next 3 years we shall need an increase of gross national product of about $133 billion.

A tax cut of $10 billion, according to various estimates, will increase gross national product by 1966 from $25 to $60 billion per year, or say $40 billion. Hence, the tax cut will yield 30 percent of the rise of gross national product needed to keep unemployment from rising.

If any criticism is to be directed against the President's fiscal program, it may be that on purely economic consideration, it is not enough. The economics surely point to a larger tax cut and to a greater rise in spending. Yet in view of the difficulties confronting the President in getting through even this moderate program accompanied by retrenchments in nondefense spending, it must be clear to the liberals that the President, taking large political risks even with this modest program, was wise not to be even more audacious. A smaller cut would not have helped much, a larger one would have attracted hostile treatment in the Congress.

Then is there no way out of our unemployment fix? Until the public and the Congress become adequately educated on modern economics, we are not likely to have the kind of fiscal policies that will solve the unemployment problem, at least temporarily aggravated by structural maladjustments.

In one area we could do more. It costs perhaps one-tenth as much to get an additional job by treating structural unemployment directly as through the deficit route. I believe we could eliminate 500,000 unfilled vacancies and cut down perhaps 40 percent of our excess unemployment through adequate educational, vocational, manpower training, youth and area development programs. One billion dollars might well provide as much as 500,000 additional jobs. The only limitation on the yield is set by the level of unemployment. At 6 percent unemployment, unfilled vacancies are limited. Hence the need of depending primarily on the demand approach.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS,
Littauer Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University.
CAMBRIDGE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1963.
EDITORS, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: I read the letter by Seymour Harris, using his title "Littauer Professor of Political Economy," Harvard University, published on your editorial page of Wednesday, October 9, 1963, under the heading: "Kill the Tax Cut?"

Mr. Harris degrades his professorship and the cause of honest scholarship by the highly unethical tactics of debate he employs in his letter. He accuses the Republicans, Congressman Byrnes and myself by name, of taking a position on the tax bill "for purely partisan purposes" and implies that this partisanship goes to the extreme of sacrificing the welfare of the country for partisan gain.

Ad hominem argument such as Mr. Harris employs, of the most scurrilous sort, destroys the possibility of further meaningful debate. If the position an opponent espouses is insincere, narrowly partisan to the extent that he would advance it against the welfare of his country what indeed can be said in rebuttal on the points that do relate to the issue, not to the character of the opponent?

Mr. Harris again hits below the belt when he states: "For once in our history, management, labor, and professional economists have agreed almost unanimously to support a tax cut." This is another argument ad personam and not to the issues. It also is a false statement. There is by no means unanimity on the economic theory of cutting taxes with heavy deficits already in existence as a method of stimulating the economy.

Mr. Harris' letter says: "At the Ways and Means Committee hearing only 2 of 200 witnesses opposed the tax cut." Even if the facts were true, this is a false argument. The overwhelming majority of the witnesses were not appearing before the Ways and Means Committee to discuss the pros or cons of the fiscal and economic policy involved in a tax cut in context of deficits and increased expenditures. They were testifying on technical aspects of the bill.

Fortunately, the debate on the tax bill on the floor of the House was conducted on a higher plane than the one to which Mr. Harris would reduce it.

The debate over whether we should embark upon a new and untried fiscal theory, which led President Kennedy to state that this was the most important measure to come before the Congress in 15 years, has moved forward. Indeed, the debate has moved forward to the point where the promoters of the new fiscal theory beginning with the President now deny in effect that they are advancing a new theory. They have hit the sawdust trail to pledge allegiance publicly to the concept of strict expenditure control in order to make the tax cut feasible.

The political issue now is simply over whether the President's pledges and the Congress' formal statement put in the bill at the last minute by the Democratic leaders of its sense that there be expenditure controls are sufficient to insure expenditure control. The Republican position is that the Presidential pledge and the congressional intent should be tied to some statutory requirement, words are not enough. There now is no open controversy over whether there should be expenditure reforms if the tax bill is to have its hoped for economic benefits.

However, letters and statements like that of Seymour Harris create considerable suspicion over whether the new theory of planned deficit financing which requires that there be no decrease, but rather an increase, in Federal spending to go along with the tax cut, has indeed been abandoned even though honest public debate for this position has been abandoned. These letters and statements must be weighed in relation to the following question: Why did the President fight so hard to prevent his pledge to exercise expenditure reform from being put into a form of statutory requirement, and all too mild requirement in my judgment?

I would be happy to debate Mr. Harris, if he will review and take to heart the subject of proper ethics in debate, or any of the economic and fiscal theorists who believe that planned deficits made larger by tax cuts will stimulate an economy so that revenues are increased and unemployment alleviated. I disagree with them. Over a period of months I have tried to spell out my reasons and set forth what I deem to be the facts which support my position. There has been little rebuttal offered. I must confess that almost my sole media to reach the people is the Congressional Record, through no fault of my own, I hope.

I take the position I do, I can assure Mr. Harris, because I do love my country. I do not nor have I ever argued that those who take a position contrary to mine on any subject are so partisan that they would damage their country or are so ignorant they just don't know any better. Indeed, I try never to attack the character or the intelligence of my opponents. I only hit at their arguments. Only by following the established rules of fair debate can we gain the great and needed benefits to be derived from honest debate.

I would conclude by pointing out that what bipartisanship existed in respect to the tax bill followed the line suggested by Congressman Byrnes and myself. Twenty-five Democrat Congressmen joined the Republicans in their position. Only one Republican joined the Democrats. Any objective observer of the push and pull going on to switch or hold votes on a basis other than the merits of the debate knows that this push and pulling occurred on the Democrat side of the aisle. All we Republicans, being out of power, can offer to our party colleagues to get them to come along and certainly all we can offer to our Democrat colleagues, is sweet reason.

Let Mr. Harris advance sweet reason instead of vituperation to support his economic and fiscal theories, then we can move the debate forward.

Yours very truly,

Thomas B. Curtis.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to go on to discuss another unfortunate development which occurred in the debate on the recent tax bill before the House of Representatives.

I want to discuss in some detail the lobbying activities of the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963, the so-called Ford Committee, to try to pressure H.R. 8363 through the House, not through any appeal to facts and arguments but through what we Congressmen have come to recognize as the rougher and more sordid techniques, the techniques that have given that very fine and essential procedure guaranteed by the Constitution—the right to petition the Congress—such a bad reputation. The exercising of the right to petition the Congress, "lobbying" as we generally term it, can be fine and splendid. It can contribute greatly to the process of writing better legislation for our society. However, the employment of improper techniques, and I regard any technique which does other than resort to presenting fair arguments and facts as the pleader sees them, as improper, can destroy the good benefits derived from the lobbying process.

The most powerful lobby in the Congress has become the Federal bureaucracy. In recent years under the influence of the neo-Machiavellian school of political science it has become an employer of the worst techniques yet developed in this important field. The rottenness of the lobbying techniques employed by the executive branch of the Government to force measures through the Congress in complete disregard of the merits of the legislation as developed through orderly congressional hearings and debate, is only one aspect of the low state of representative government today. The fact that the employment of these techniques are not only known, but condoned and, hard to believe, praised and encouraged by leaders in our universities, in the fourth estate, and in other important fields of endeavor including even some of our churches makes the situation one from which our society may not be able to recover.

The Ford Committee was inspired by the executive branch of the Government. It was never a group independent of the executive. Public funds were used contrary to explicit statutory mandates to further the propaganda endeavors of this committee. Indeed, its entire purpose was one of propagandizing the people of the country over the heads of the Congress.

The committee or its guiding executive committee did not seek to appeal to the Members of the Congress on the basis of fair argument or fact. Rather it sought to appeal to the Congresmen through influencing local people in the Congressmen's constituency—people who had little concept of the results of 7 months work in the Ways and Means Committee on the measure, let alone the weeks of work the Joint Economic Committee engaged in going over the theories inherent in this proposed novel and untried fiscal policy.

The entire purpose of the Ford Committee conceived and executed by the Federal executive with the servile acquiescence of the executive group was to go over the heads of the Congress to the people with propaganda, before the Members of the House even had a chance to read the Ways and Means Committee's report and the hearings on the bill, let alone listen to the debate.

The purpose of congressional hearings is to gather together in public the facts and arguments, the wisdom in the society, which pertain to the legislation under scrutiny, so that on the basis of the knowledge adduced and with objectivity, not on the basis of ignorance and with prejudice, the best decision possible can be reached. The Members of the House not on the committee read the majority views, contrast them with the minority views, and listen to the debate of their colleagues who had studied the matter, and participate in the debate themselves, then reach their conclusions on what is best for our society.

The technique of going over the heads of the Congress to propagandize the people will destroy the system of representative government. Not only did those managing and running our newspapers, TV and radio stations, our magazines, and other media for informing the people of the issues of the day, not decry this process, they assisted in making it as effective as they could. Without the media's cooperating with the President this play could never have been executed.

Even now but for the cloak of protection the media has thrown around the lobbying activities of the executive branch of Government the people themselves would know the manner in which congressional process has been corrupted and sought to be rendered useless, and servile to the will of the Executive.

The Ford Committee lined up its membership on a camaraderie basis, and very carefully avoided pointing up to those whom they asked to join what was the basic issue involved in the tax cut proposal. The basic issue was whether a tax cut would be beneficial if there were not at the same time expenditure reform. Indeed, those responsible for gathering the names to be used for the propaganda campaign deceitfully—in light of the subsequent use of the names—put expenditure reform as one of the objectives of the committee along with tax cutting. Many members who signed up did so only because expenditure reform was set out as one of the committee's objectives in all the Ford Committee literature.

Once having gotten these names together, however, the behind the scenes steering committee of which the Secretary of Treasury was one, utilized these names as the base of the propaganda campaign to force through the tax bill with no expenditure reform.

Secretary of Treasury Dillon was certainly aware that the basic issue was whether expenditure reform would be part of the tax cut package. Anyone can read the cross examinations of Secretary Dillon on this point printed in the public hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, as well as in those of the Ways and Means Committee, to see how hard this point was driven home to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Dillon knew full well that the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee were for a tax cut but were insistent from the beginning that it had to be in context with expenditure reform.

In spite of this knowledge, Mr. Dillon in public statements said that the Ford Committee backed the passage of the tax bill, H.R. 8363, without tying it to expenditure reform.

Henry Ford made similar statements. So did President Kennedy. The majority whip, Congressman Boggs, carried forward this questionable lobbying technique by inserting the names of all the Ford Committee members in the Record before the debate on the tax bill began, insinuating that these men were for a tax cut without the Republican motion to recommit, tying it to expenditure reform.

The members of the Ford Committee were not asked nor did they take a position on this one and only key issue. A polling of the members of the committee—at least the 52 members from the State of Missouri—revealed that the overwhelming majority were opposed to a tax cut without expenditure reform.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point the letter I wrote to the 52 members of this committee from the State of Missouri:

> SEPTEMBER 16, 1963.
>
> DEAR MR. —: I am writing to all Missourians whose names appear on the Business Committee for Tax Reduction in 1963. Your name was on the list. Many of you are close and if I may say so dear friends.
>
> The spokesmen for the Kennedy administration, including Secretary of Treasury Douglas Dillon, have stated that you and all the other businessmen on this list are in favor of passage of H.R. 8363, the Federal Revenue Act of 1963, which is designed to cut Federal income and corporate taxes by $11.2 billion, about $7 billion beginning January 1964, and the balance beginning 1965. Your names appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 10, 1963, page 16715.
>
> The committee of which you are a member made it clear, that you favored a tax cut of this proportion, but that you also favored expenditure reform. It was not very clear how the two objectives were to be related.
>
> The issue the Congress must face and the issue that the Ways and Means Committee faced was whether tax cutting was wise without expenditure reform and if this was so whether there had been expenditure reform as of now so that a cut beginning in January 1964 was justified.
>
> In my judgment a tax cut without expenditure reform is foolhardy and will hurt rather than help the economy. In my judgment there has been no expenditure reform, indeed, expenditures have been increased by the Kennedy administration and the proposals submitted by the Kennedy administration call for further increases, not reductions, in expenditures.
>
> I would appreciate knowing if (1) you believe it is wise to cut taxes without expenditure reform, (2) if you believe that there has been expenditure reform.
>
> I am well aware of the public statements of the Kennedy administration, including the President himself, to the effect that the administration is prepared to have expenditure reform and that it is presenting tight budgets. However, in my opinion, the facts do not bear out this allegation.
>
> I am going to impose upon you a bit further by enclosing a copy of a speech I recently made on the subject of tax cutting expenditures and Federal debt along with the Republican minority views, opposing a tax cut at this time, accompanying the committee report on H.R. 8363.
>
> May I ask you to read both of these documents? I do not believe I am being presumptuous in making this request. Your fine name and your reputation have been used publicly by the administration to influence the passage of this legislation. Only three of your number have written to me, and those in a very cursory fashion, giving to me your views on this matter. I have been trying to study and debate this matter in detail for over 13 months, both as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and as the senior Republican of the Joint Economic Committee.
>
> I wonder what representative government means if the leaders of our business community bypass their elected representatives and join the executive in a move to pressure the Congress, not on the basis of discussion, presentation of facts and arguments, but rather on the basis of prestige?
>
> I trust that most, if not all, of you had no knowledge or understanding of the manner in which your names were to be used by those who set up this kind of march on Washington in behalf of cutting taxes in the context of an already burdensome debt with deficits, "planned" on beyond the reasonable foreseeable future.
>
> Inasmuch as the House debate on this matter is scheduled for Tuesday and Wednesday, September 24 and 25, I would appreciate a reply by that date.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> THOMAS B. CURTIS.

I again point out that this illegal and improper pressure lobbying exemplified by the Ford Committee could not have occurred without the cooperation of the newspapers, magazines, TV, and radio. If just the essence of what I am charging here is reported with some diligence to the people we can slow down the growth of this kind of rottenness which is destroying representative government in America.

THE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUST FINANCIALLY SUPPORT THE NATIONAL SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the newspapers in the Nation's Capital have carried accounts of a labor-management dispute which threatens the very existence of the most important living cultural asset in the Federal city. I refer to the strike by the Musicians Union Local 161, American Federation of Musicians AFL–CIO, against the National Symphony Orchestra Association, a strike which already has cost the musicians 1 week of their employment and has cost the Orchestra Association four of its hard-won paying engagements.

The National Symphony Orchestra is now about to start its 33d season as the resident orchestra of the Nation's Capital. This season also marks the 15th anniversary of Howard Mitchell as the music director of this splendid orchestra. In a public statement issued during the current dispute by the musicians themselves they said:

> The musicians are genuinely proud of the fact that the National Symphony, under the devoted leadership of Howard Mitchell, has achieved a position of eminence among the major American orchestras. It is common knowledge that musicians and critics, both locally and nationally, have hailed the orchestra as one of the country's finest. Certainly, it is appropriate that the Nation's Capital should be the home of an orchestra comparable to the finest in other nations.

It is a sad but well-known fact of our cultural life not only in the Nation's Capital but in the country at large that symphony orchestras cannot and do not pay their own way. Therefore, they need the support of gifts and grants—just as do universities, museums, and libraries.

I am told that the National Symphony Orchestra does very well in paying the greatest part of its own way. It earns two-thirds of its annual expenses, a major part of which are the salaries of the musicians. The rest of its annual income must come from annual gifts—this year $420,000 is needed—raised from the general public. The National Symphony Orchestra, unlike older orchestras in our country's larger cities, has no significant endowment fund. It must refinance itself each year by going to the public. It does this with remarkable success, receiving contributions from 24,000 separate individuals which are brought in by an army of 4,000 dedicated volunteer workers.

The musicians of the National Symphony Orchestra through their union recognize the limited capacity to pay of the Orchestra Association and their recently expired contract takes note of the necessity to "recognize the economic and other limitations of the nonprofit, public-supported nature of the association." Nevertheless, the musicians feel that their basic living needs require a higher seasonal income than the National Symphony Orchestra says it can afford to pay. At the present time, almost any Government clerk is paid more than orchestra players with years of training and experience and the finest educational background. The musicians have rejected, through their union, the association's offer to raise their present pay to a level which would bring the seasonal pay of the lowest paid staff musician in the third season of the proposed 3-year employment contract to $5,000. The musicians' present demands would bring the third-year figure to $6,000.

Commenting on this in an editorial, the Washington, D.C., Evening Star said on October 9:

> Now, no one could successfully argue that musicians luxuriate in an aura of overpaid ease. They are specalists who have worked hard to win their positions and must continue to labor hard to hold them. But the economic facts of life are such that, in order to exist at all, symphony orchestras must scrape and dig for every penny.
>
> In the Washington area, a benevolent public has kept the orchestra alive. There is no city government subsidization enjoyed by some orchestras.

The Star's editorial advice to the musicians is:

> Until the day comes when they may have a full orchestral season, musicians must be expected to supplement their incomes elsewhere. As it is they must face up to the hard realities of public fundraising.

Perhaps a question may be raised at this very point made by the Star in its editorial. Why should the musicians be expected to subsidize the National Symphony Orchestra when the municipal government of Washington, D.C., which is controlled by the Federal Government, subsidizes this great orchestra to the extent of only $8,000?

The problems that have arisen between the National Symphony Orchestra Association and its musicians are not unique to Washington, D.C. They exist in greater or lesser degree in all but a few of the wealthiest cities which support long-established and heavily endowed symphony orchestras. These orchestras, for instance, in Boston, New York City, and Philadelphia, pay their musicians nearly twice as much as the musicians of the National Symphony are paid. In addition, their seasons are much longer and run to nearly 50 weeks.

The greatest support that has come to major metropolitan orchestras in recent years has come from grants of public funds for public, free, concerts from State, county, and city governments. In nearby Baltimore, Md., the resident symphony orchestra receives $140,000 a year from such sources, the Los Angeles Symphony receives $155,000, the Philadelphia Orchestra $50,000, the Pittsburgh Orchestra $50,000, and the Cleveland Orchestra $35,000. Even the oldest and richest orchestra in the United States, the one that serves the great metropolitan community in which I live, the New York Philharmonic, gets financial support from the New York State cultural fund. There are a large number of other symphony orchestras which receive financial help from their local governments.

It has been called to my attention that in a recent dispute between the Detroit Symphony Orchestra's musicians and the Detroit Orchestra Association, the dispute was only resolved when the city of Detroit pledged an additional $22,500 to the $50,000 it already gives its symphony orchestra each year. Last year a similar impasse in Chicago was resolved when the mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, pledged to use the prestige of his office to raise an additional $300,000 for the orchestra so the playing season could be extended.

If there is any right or wrong in the crisis that faces the National Symphony Orchestra and this community, the greatest wrong is that of the failure of a federally controlled municipal government which has failed dismally and utterly to provide anything substantial, beyond mere words and fine phrases about the importance of the arts to our life as a people, to financially aid and encourage the development of a significant cultural life for the millions of people who live in the metropolitan area of which the District of Columbia is the center, or for the more than 7 million people who visit the Nation's Capital each year.

The National Symphony Orchestra has done an outstanding job in lifting itself into the highest artistic ranks by its own bootstraps. Through its own initiative and resources, and the contributions of its many friends, it has made the lives of children more meaningful through the presentation of the great classics of our heritage available to them through free concerts in the metropolitan area schools. In most other cities, such concerts are paid for by public funds. Here they are made possible by private gifts.

All of you, I am sure, have noted in the newspapers that the White House itself has intervened in the cultural crisis of the National Symphony Orchestra. It is significant that President Kennedy's adviser on National Capital affairs, Charles A. Horsky, has been given the responsibility of helping the contending parties compromise their differences in this matter. Perhaps it should be recalled that a member of the President's Cabinet, former Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, intervened to help resolve the differences between the Metropolitan Opera Co., of New York, and the Musicians Union there, and his award was universally hailed because it recommended cooperative support of private citizens, and State, county, local governments, and the Federal Government. Let us hope that President Kennedy will as strongly support his adviser on National Capital affairs in this matter as he did his Secretary of Labor for the issue is no less important to this community and to this Nation.

In considering what the Congress and this administration might do in a positive way to help resolve this crisis I would like to call your attention to one of the many remarkable facts about the National Symphony Orchestra. For 8 years this orchestra has enjoyed a longer season than it otherwise would have been able to provide through the remarkable generosity of one individual. I refer, of course, to Mrs. Herbert A. May, who has personally given $800,000 to the National Symphony Orchestra during the past 8 years at the rate of $100,000 a year to create and maintain that outstanding and public-spirited series of free spring concerts called "Music for Young America."

In these repeated acts of generosity Mrs. May is doing what would be done by Government itself in almost any other city of similar size and importance in this and other major countries. Should this proud Capital City do any less on its own? I think not.

At the same time that Mrs. Herbert May has been showing her faith and confidence in the National Symphony Orchestra by these great gifts, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia has shown the full extent of the faith and confidence which its individual members have in music and particularly in the National Symphony Orchestra by recommending an item of $8,000 in the budget of the District of Columbia Recreation Department for this orchestra.

It is not that the municipal government of the city of Washington lacks the power, or sufficient authority, to contribute as much to its resident symphony orchestra as other cities in our country contribute to the support of their resident orchestras.

It is not that the Congress itself is unwilling to appropriate District funds to the National Symphony Orchestra in the District of Columbia recreation budget.

Actually, the basic authority for financial support of the National Symphony Orchestra and other music and art programs in the District of Columbia is amply provided in the legislation passed in 1942 establishing the District of Columbia Recreation Department.

The Congress has not been close-fisted with the District of Columbia Recreation Department, and its budget, which is approved by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia before it is presented to the Congress each year, currently is over $3 million. However, only $25,000 of this is for the arts, and only $8,000 of it is earmarked for the National Symphony Orchestra.

I stand ready to cosponsor with strong supporters of this administration in this House or in the Senate legislation to provide $100,000 a year for the National Symphony Orchestra if it is determined that legislation is, indeed, needed, and I hope Mr. Horsky will look into this matter at once, and that the President will recommend appropriate legislation if it is found that this is the only way the present impasse can be resolved.

However, it seems to me that it is simply a matter of whether this city's federally controlled municipal government has as much faith in the power and influence of music and the compelling necessity to keep the National Symphony Orchestra alive and healthy as President Kennedy, many of his Cabinet officers, and Mrs. Herbert A. May do.

Here, again, President Kennedy's Adviser on National Capital Affairs, Mr. Horsky, can play a key role for who can doubt that if President Kennedy, acting on his advice, recommended the appropriation of $100,000 for the National Symphony Orchestra for free public concerts that the Congress would act as favorably on this recommendation as it has in appropriating $3 million for the other items in the budget of the District's Recreation Department?

All of the elements recognized as necessary for support of the arts in this country are present in this symphony orchestra situation, except support by the local municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Recently, the Federal payment to the District's municipal government was increased from $32 to $50 million, yet President Kennedy did not recommend that one red cent of that increase be earmarked for the arts despite the fact that the Federal Government is by far the largest single employer in the Nation's Capital and that this Federal payment is made in lieu of taxes.

Large employers in other areas such as city and county governments and, in the case of Detroit, for instance, the Ford Motor Co., contributes to music and the arts as a matter of course but this duty and responsibility to support the arts in the Nation's Capital has been consistently overlooked and ignored. In the budget of the municipal government of the District of Columbia now running over $300 million there is provision for practically everything but aid to music and the arts of a realistic and significant amount. There is, of course, lipservice and a token payment but it is certainly not one that we can be proud of.

The enthusiasm which the city fathers in Washington feel for the National Cultural Center is due, not to their deep and abiding interest in the arts but to the fact that they are not being called upon to spend one thin dime to help make it a reality. Instead, citizens throughout the country are being asked to pay $30 million for what some think may prove to be a white elephant.

The disinterest and outright hostility of the city fathers to the preservation of the Capitol and Keith's Theaters, as provided in H.R. 7399 which has twice passed the House unanimously, is due to the fact that the city of Washington probably would have to make certain performance guarantees even if they did not have to contribute one red cent to the operation of either of these theaters.

Actors' Equity Association has generously offered to raise the money to reequip the Capitol Theater, the furnishings of which were recently auctioned off. Walter N. Tobriner, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, was quoted in the Evening Star, of Washington, D.C., on March 16, 1963, as saying he thought it "very desirable to preserve the Capitol Theater as an outlet for events of cultural importance." He suggested that the Federal Government pay for it, however.

I received a letter this morning from the president of the Musicians Union which I would like to include at this point in my remarks:

District of Columbia
Federation of Musicians,
Washington, D.C., October 9, 1963.

Hon. William B. Widnall,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: Doubtless you have heard of the deplorable situation that exists with regard to the preservation of our beloved National Symphony Orchestra.

Several years ago, you and many of your colleagues, with great foresight, recognized that sooner or later the city of Washington would be confronted with the problem of retaining its great National Symphony Orchestra.

Accordingly, you introduced bills to create a municipal arts council to control funds to be derived from apportioning 1 mill out of each tax dollar paid by the citizens to the support of varied cultural activities in the District.

If our symphony is to be saved, emergency measures are necessary now and I urge you and your culturally conscious colleagues to reinstitute legislation to alleviate the present situation and provide ways and means of avoiding a cultural crisis like this in the future.

Now is the time—now or never. Do you agree?

My sincere thanks.

Sincerely,

Sam Jack Kaufman,
President, Local 161, American Federation of Musicians, AFL–CIO.

I would hope that President Kennedy and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia will, therefore, strongly recommend to the Congress an appropriation of $100,000 for the National Symphony on an emergency basis to be included immediately in the District's budget. The concerts produced as a result of this appropriation should be performed free of charge for all of the residents of the metropolitan area of which the District of Columbia is the center and for all of the visitors who come to the Nation's Capital from all over this country.

The spirit and the conviction with which I make this proposal has been best expressed, perhaps, by the Washington, D.C., Daily News in its editorial, "The Music Fades," of October 8 which said:

The Music Fades

It is ironic that just when one of Washington's chief cultural assets—its National Symphony Orchestra—is threatened with dissolution, the Rockefeller Foundation announces a $1 million gift to the National Cultural Center here. And a glamorous Austrian Embassy benefit ("almost $10 million worth of jewels and furs graced the occasion," said one report) brings in another $11,600.

It will be sad, indeed, if the country and the community manage to raise the $30 million needed to complete what the Center's chairman describes as "real estate," only to find that the National Symphony and other Washington groups creating a living culture have, in the meantime, died of financial starvation.

The question is firmly before the community: Will we stand by and let our fine orchestra disband? Will we admit to the rest of the world that the Capital City of the United States cannot afford to pay its musicians a modest $6,000 for a 32-week season?

Since the answer must be "No" to both questions, machinery should be set up immediately to raise—by nickels and dimes, if necessary—a sum that will insure a long and healthy life for the orchestra and a decent one for the men and women whose artistry has made it one of the best in the country.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I was among a group of Members of Congress called to the White House on Wednesday afternoon of this week in connection with the sale of wheat to Russia.

Our advice was not sought. We were simply told what the President was going to say at his press conference Wednesday night. The whole thing was an ex post facto operation.

I strongly question the propriety of selling American wheat to Russia. The proposed deal would be just another concession or accommodation to the Soviet Union in the cold war. It would be a unilateral proposition wherein the United States would grant the concession of supplying the Soviet with subsidized wheat at 60 cents a bushel below the price American farmers would have to pay for the same wheat. No matter how momentarily helpful to our wheat surplus problem and our balance-of-payments dilemma, selling wheat to the Russians would undeniably strengthen them where they are weak; to wit, shortage of grain. Have we waited all these years in the cold war for this weak spot only to now rush in to fill it without demanding anything in return except the price of the wheat itself? If the deal is to be consummated, why does the Kennedy administration not demand concessions such as the withdrawal of all Russian troops from Cuba or the destruction of the Berlin wall? Furthermore, if we sell wheat to Russia, there will be no logical reason why we should not also sell it to Red China and to Castro in Cuba. If we sell wheat to our potential enemies, we may have the satisfaction of getting the gold and dollars in payment, but we most certainly will be surrendering principles in our fight against world communism. Too many people seem to forget that the objective of the Communists is world domination and destruction of the free world. Building up the economy of the Soviet Union by selling them our wheat is not the way to fight this threat.

CASIMIR PULASKI AND THE POLISH CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN LIFE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, October 11 marks the 184th anniversary of the death of Casimir Pulaski, an outstanding champion of human freedom, a man who spent his entire adult life fighting in behalf of liberty, both on the plains of his native Poland and in the American colonies far from his homeland.

Although he was probably the most prominent and the most romantic, Pulaski was by no means the only Pole to contribute to the development of America. Persistent tradition tells of a John of Kolno, a Polish seafarer and explorer who is said to have sailed along the eastern coast from Labrador to the mouth of the Delaware River in 1476, 16 years before Columbus crossed the Atlantic. It is an established fact that when Capt. Christopher Newport dropped anchor off Jamestown on October 1, 1608, the passengers included Michael Lowicki, Zbigniew Stefanski, Jan Mata, Jan Bogdan, Stanislaw Sadowski, and Karol Zrenica. These men, skilled in shipbuilding and in the production of glass, soap, pitch, and tar, helped immeasurably in the development of the infant colony. Within a few years, 50 Poles were living in Jamestown. Other Poles added their efforts to the building of New Sweden, New Netherlands, and other colonies.

In our War for Independence Poles played a prominent part. The exploits and sacrifices of Pulaski are too well known to need repetition. Thaddeus Kosciuszko was an excellent military engineer and an outstanding humanitarian, a forerunner of the movement to abolish slavery in the United States and serfdom in Poland. Fighting by their sides were such new arrivals as Maurice Beniowski, John Zielinski, Matthew Rogowski, Charles Litomski, and Michael Kowacz. The names of descendants of earlier Polish pioneers are to be found on the master rolls of almost every colony.

Poles distinguished themselves also in the War of 1812, the War with Mexico, and the struggle to preserve the Union. In the latter conflict the first Union officer to fall on the field of battle was Capt. Constantine Bledowski, on May 10, 1861, at St. Louis. He was one of the valiant patriots who saved Missouri for the Union. The most famous of the many Poles in the Civil War was Gen. Vladimir Krzyzanowski. He rose from the rank of private and distinguished himself in many battles by his valor and able leadership. In all, over 500 Poles died fighting to preserve the Union.

The first American soldier to fall in France during World War I was of Polish descent. Polish-Americans made significant contributions to the cause of freedom in both world wars.

If the Poles have excelled in deeds of bravery in wartime, their role in the peaceful pursuits of our Nation has been no less marked. In industry, the arts, and the professions, their place in the development of America from colonial times to the present has been a vital one.

Casimir Pulaski lived his life and met his death in the cause of liberty. The world is enriched by his life and his spirit. To him and his countryment, America owes a debt of gratitude.

Today, once again, Poland is crushed beneath the heel of the tyrant. May the deeds of Pulaski inspire us to extend our understanding, sympathy, and aid, to the end that his homeland may have a new birth of freedom.

COLUMBUS DAY, 1963

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, October 12 will soon be here and it is on that historic day that we honor the great navigator of Italian birth, Christopher Columbus. His achievement in sailing into the trackless ocean is more meaningful to us today than it was for previous generations because we face the vastness of the uncharted Atlantic. We shall need the same courage in our explorations that we have exhibited in his.

In the time of Columbus, celestial navigation was in its infancy, although rough estimates of latitude could be made from the height of the North Star above the horizon and its relation to outer space of the Little Dipper. A meridian altitude of the Sun, applied to available tables of the Sun's declination, also gave latitude by the use of a simple formula. But the instruments of observation, a solid wood or brass quadrant and the seaman's astrolabe, were so crude, and the movement of the ship threw them off to such an extent, that most navigators took their latitude sights ashore. Columbus relied almost completely on dead reckoning, the plotting of a course and position on a chart from the three elements of direction, time, and distance.

He obtained his direction from a compass—his time was measured by an hourglass, and he estimated his distance.

In October 1492, on the outward passage, Columbus' fleet made an average of 142 miles per day for 5 consecutive days, and the best day's run, 182 miles, averaged 8 knots. On the homeward passage, in February 1493, the *Nina* and the *Pinta* covered 198 miles a day, and at times made up to 11 knots.

Despite his primitive navigation aids, Columbus found land and successfully returned to Spain. This Italian skipper, sailing Spanish ships, and using Portuguese charts, achieved the most spectacular and most far-reaching geographical discovery of recorded human history on this planet. Perhaps reaching and exploring the other planets will mean that someday Columbus' triumph will be surpassed.

However that may be, the qualities that made Columbus great will have to be possessed by his successors. These qualities are stubborn persistence despite discouragement, indomitable will, faith in the Almighty, and magnificent courage.

As President Kennedy stated in his news conference on Wednesday all Americans of Italian descent have reason to be proud on this historic day.

I hope that all Americans will pause on this holiday and consider the great contributions of the Americans of Italian descent who have distinguished themselves in the arts, in the world of business, government and other characteristic fields of endeavor. Their record has been a great one, and one for which America can be thankful.

LEGISLATION CONFIRMING EQUITIES IN TITLE CLAIMS ON RELICTION LANDS OF THE GREAT SALT LAKE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. LLOYD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill designed to confirm in the State of Utah title to the bed of Great Salt Lake and adjoining lands contained within the surveyed meander line. The Great Salt Lake is renowned for its unique geography and its fascinating history as written in detail upon the slopes of the Great Basin. The lake today is but a token reminder of its golden era when it formed an inland sea nearly equal to Lake Huron in extent, with a maximum depth of over 900 feet. Through a history of rising and subsiding over thousands of years, it has been reduced to a shallow sheet of water about 70 miles long and 50 miles wide, bordered by an extensive and smooth desert plain reaching to surrounding mountain ranges.

The lake has a salinity of approximately 28 percent, the greatest of any naturally formed lake in the Western Hemisphere. This occurs because the lake has no outlet, and thus constitutes the accumulation of mineralization left from evaporation of its giant predecessor. It has been noted that it comprises an American counterpart to Palestine's Dead Sea, which is fed by the River Jordan flowing into it from the Sea of Galilee. The early settlers of the western region observed this geographic similarity and appropriately named the river flowing from Utah Lake into the briny waters of Great Salt Lake the Jordan River.

The same uniqueness which captures our interest and curiosity also creates for this lake the peculiar problems which require the special attention and corrective action of the Congress. As you are aware, whenever a State enters the Union it acquires title to the beds of all navigable lakes and rivers within its borders. This fulfills the constitutional requirement of equality among the States. It is customary that a meander line be surveyed designating the natural limits of the lake and defining measurable boundaries of adjoining uplands. These boundaries, once surveyed and determined, are often subject to slight changes through fluctuation of water levels or shifting courses. Laws must then be formulated and applied which determine title to lands which often are gradually uncovered by an imperceptible recession of navigable waters.

Historically, opinion has widely differed as to which law governs title to lands exposed by reliction. Substantial legal authority has existed over many years for the position that State law governs title to these lands. Recent decisions by the Department of Interior and lower Federal courts, however, have applied the common law principle which automatically vests in adjoining landowners title to lands exposed by reliction, when the adjoining land is owned by the Federal Government. It is expressly conceded that when the Federal Government is not a party to the dispute as landowner, State law is then applicable.

The States generally oppose application of the common law doctrine of reliction on well-reasoned and historically accurate grounds. But resolution of this longstanding conflict between the States and the Federal Government would not be the proper method of correcting the special problem met in determining the boundaries of the Great Salt Lake. The problem is as unique as the lake itself.

The simple fact is that the structure and evolution of the common law and its constitutional corollaries are not designed to cope with the particular problems posed by the Great Salt Lake. To apply them in this instance would work a gross injustice.

I am sure you will be interested to learn of these special circumstances. They stem from a combination of three unique factors: First, the gentle slope of the bed of the lake and its immediate borderlands; second, the extreme variations in the level of the lake, aside from its annual cycle; and third, the lack of identifiable land evidence and almost total inability of the surrounding lands to sustain vegetation along which a proper meander may be run.

Extracts from a recent Interior Department decision appropriately describe these factors and their consequences. Speaking of the slope of the lake bed, it notes:

> The present lake is thus but the residue of the ancient sea, and occupies a shallow depression in the otherwise remarkably flat plain which once was the bed of that sea. The average depth of the lake in 1850 was 13 feet; the average depth is even less today, for the waters have recently retreated to the lowest levels in recorded history.
>
> That the lake is situated in a flat, closed basin accounts for some of its most striking characteristics: the salinity of its waters, the marked fluctuation in height to which it is subject, and the large areas affected by even the slightest rise or lowering of the water.
>
> The level of the lake is thus a function of climate, changes in climate producing changes in levels. Since the shoreline is the contour formed by the intersection of the plane of the level of the lake with the plane of the surrounding land, it follows that changes in level produce changes in shorelines. Except at the southeastern shore of the lake, the surrounding land is extraordinarily flat, and its slope into the lake is very gentle. Thus, a rise of a few feet in the level of the lake may change its contours amazingly, and add hundreds of square miles to its surface area.

Every lake undergoes an annual cycle of varying levels due to changes in precipitation, evaporation, and diversion of inflowing waters. These cycles normally repeat themselves over the same general area, making the overall annual pattern fairly predictable. This is not the history nor forecast of Great Salt Lake, however. After detailing the violent shifts in levels of this unruly lake, the Interior Department decision summarizes by saying:

> The lake since 1850 has risen and fallen many times, within a range of 17 feet; the factors responsible for this fluctuation are still at work, and will cause similar rises and falls in the future.

Surveys which establish meander lines recognize that navigable waters follow an annual cycle of rise and fall but normally leave a definite escarpment in the soil which is generally traceable. The top border of this escarpment is the true position along which the engineer would run the meander line. But here again this western wonder displays its nonconformity, as further observed in the decision referred to:

> The ancient levels of the lake which were of long duration are etched on the sides of ridges and hills, but the levels observed in recorded history have not left any permanent impress upon the soil, either because they were of short duration, or because the surrounding lands, being so flat, presented no resistant surface against the waters; and the soils of an area once covered by the lake are so saturated with salt that it might take many hundreds of years for them to be sufficiently leached to support vegetation.
>
> It therefore follows that customary methods of determining the high watermark, as suggested in the survey manual, are not capable of application to Great Salt Lake. The principle embodied in the manual's instructions is that the annual flux and reflux of a lake carves upon its shores guidelines to the location of the mean high watermark. This is based upon the assumption that each year's cycle is repeated within the same range: that the low and high water levels for 1 year will be about the same as the low and high water levels for any other year, and that marks on the ground will result from, and reflect, the lake's constantly receding from, and returning to, the same levels. But this assumption, as we have seen, is not valid for Great Salt Lake. Similarly, the use of vegetation as a guide to determining the mean high watermark is applicable only in situations where the chief deterrent to the growth of vegetation on hundreds of square miles of land adjacent to Great Salt Lake is due to other reasons, not connected with the location of the shoreline in historic times.

The level of the Great Salt Lake on January 4, 1896, the date on which Utah was admitted into the Union, was at a 30-year low. It has repeatedly risen above that level since then in the course of its numerous fluctuations. In view of the virtual impossibility of determining an appropriate "mean high watermark," as previously noted, it is deemed more equitable that the existing meander line be used in separating the Federal lands from the State-owned lakebed.

Part of the uplands bordering the Great Salt Lake are owned by the Federal Government and part are privately owned lands. If State law should follow the rule that the meander line constitutes the boundaries of privately owned lands bordering the lake, while the common-law rule is applied to federally owned lands, the somewhat indefensible result would be produced that adjacent lands similarly situated would receive different treatment. Should the lake eventually dry up completely, the unequal extensions of ownership resulting from application of different law would surely work an injustice not contemplated by the property laws which, without this proposed legislation, will be applied.

The extraordinary circumstances of this unique lake require only a simple, commonsense solution. The bill which I am introducing is designed to accomplish this end, and I earnestly solicit the support of my fellow colleagues in enacting this measure into law.

U.S. WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, no one favors relaxing tensions between the Communist bloc and the free world more than I. There is no goal more important than securing the kind of peace which will permit all nations of the world to live in harmony with each other.

The United States must assume a leading role in working for the achievement of peace. Every opportunity to promote closer international understanding needs to be fully explored and pursued.

Yet, in moving toward this goal, we should exercise prudence and caution so that we do not unwittingly subvert our own ideals.

The President has just announced his approval of selling millions of bushels of U.S. wheat to Russia. Despite the reasons given by the President, I cannot in good conscience go along with this transaction. I believe it is contrary to the cause of freedom and only further reduces the standing of the United States in the eyes of those who look to us as the first line of defense against international communism.

We have been successfully "romanced" by our Russian adversary. An empire that mocks the blessing of our abundance, that threatens us in Cuba, Berlin, and in other trouble spots, and that is dedicated to a course of communizing the entire world now is to have its own agricultural shortcomings salvaged by the products of democracy.

Conducting a business deal with the Communists should be no different than any other kind of commercial transaction; there should exist an element of quid pro quo, something in return. Regrettably, there is no such consideration in the Kennedy wheat deal. We are giving away something of great value to the purchaser. What the seller receives in pieces of gold can hardly be considered just compensation.

Before any more tension easing deals are made between the United States and the Communist bloc, I appeal to the administration to condition the arrangements on the removal of the Soviet warmaking machine from Cuba, the tearing down of the Berlin wall, the restoration of self-determination to the peoples of the captive nations, and the renunciation of the Khrushchev avowal to bury us.

Mr. Speaker, I detailed my objections to the sale of U.S. wheat to Russia in a letter to President Kennedy a week ago. So that my colleagues may know the background of my position on this matter and be aware of my efforts to block this deal, I am including the text of that letter with these remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1963.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is becoming increasingly apparent that your administration plans to approve the sale of millions of bushels of surplus American wheat to the Soviet Union. I am opposed to this transaction.

Despite the compelling economic arguments favoring such a deal, I believe there is a moral principle involved which transcends all other considerations. Clearly, the United States should not carry on any trade with a government that is dedicated to our annihilation.

If this wheat deal goes through, we will compromise our democratic beliefs. The sale would tell the world that the United States is more interested in the balance of payments than the balance of power.

Why should the United States shore up the Soviet economy and make it easier for the Kremlin to meet its commitments among the Communist bloc nations when the Soviets have given no intention of relaxing world tensions? This could only be termed "trading with the enemy."

We are met on many battlefields with world communism. A Communist-built wall divides Berlin. Russian militarists and their warmaking weapons are camped only 90 miles from our shores. The Communist-supported guerrillas are killing American soldiers in South Vietnam. The once-free people of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Armenia, North Korea, Albania, North Vietnam and other captive nations are enslaved by brutal communism. Even in our own country, there are agents of this atheistic system seeking to overthrow the very Government which permits them the freedom to act so boldly.

Khrushchev has proclaimed he will bury the United States economically. What could play more into his hands, then, than supplying him with economic support in the form of American wheat?

This wheat deal also would hit the American taxpayer in the pocketbook. With the present export subsidy on American wheat running at approximately 60 cents a bushel, this proposed 200-million-bushel sale would amount to $120 million in aid to Russia.

Further, this subsidy makes any such wheat deal plainly contrary to the intent of Congress as expressed in the Agricultural Act of 1961. The policy statement of that act opposes the sale of subsidized farm commodities to unfriendly countries.

It is inconceivable that Russia could be regarded as a friendly nation, and thus, not subject to this trade limitation. Positive actions by the Soviets to reduce the tensions they have created are the only proof I am willing to accept that Russia is friendly to the United States. Words speaking good intentions are not enough.

I believe that we in Congress who serve as the elected Representatives of the American people have a right to be consulted when such a major shift in our foreign policy is being contemplated. Many of us have questions for which no answers have been given. Some of those that concern me are:

1. Where is the policy line to be drawn on U.S. trade with Communist nations? If Russian gold can buy U.S. wheat, why could not Red Chinese gold achieve the same result? Or, for that matter, could the United States properly say "No" to a similar transaction with North Korea, North Vietnam or Cuba?

2. Would not such a sale, by helping the Kremlin keep its commitments to other countries, only work to neutralize the military and economic aid the United States continues to pour into the nations of the free world?

3. If Russia is assured a supply of agricultural products from the Western World, could she not devote her internal resources to more strategic uses?

4. Would not this wheat sale delay final recognition by the Russian people of the shortcomings of Soviet planned production? In other words, would we not be "bailing out" communism?

This proposed wheat sale to Russia is contrary to the national interest and a dangerous step.

Until we see concrete evidence that Moscow will join with us in securing world peace and has abandoned its pursuit of world domination and the ultimate destruction of American liberty and justice, we must not be deluded into helping Russia achieve its present ugly desires.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK HORTON.

IMPROVING VA APPELLATE PROCEDURES

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call your attention to the new look in the adjudication system of the Veterans' Administration. I am especially interested in this because I served on a special subcommittee in the 86th Congress and the 87th Congress which conducted extensive hearings on bills to provide for judicial review of decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

It was astonishing to note at the hearings in the 86th Congress that representatives of the Veterans' Administration assumed an infallibility that is not given to mortal beings and I might say have consistently resisted efforts of the committee to enact legislation making changes in the adjudication system. The following quotation from the hearings in the 86th Congress demonstrates the attitude with which representatives of the Veterans' Administration approached this matter, though I must say that the printed record does not begin to tell the entire story:

> Mr. QUIGLEY. Despite all of those things, and despite your procedures, will you concede that you do, in the final analysis, decide some cases wrong?
>
> Mr. STANCIL. It is possible, sir.
>
> Mr. QUIGLEY. It is possible. You will not concede that it actually happens?
>
> Mr. STANCIL. Yes; I will have to concede it does.

The long pause which preceded Mr. Stancil's final admission that the Board of Veterans' Appeals could possibly decide some cases wrong indicated that he really didn't quite believe they could possibly make a mistake even though it seemed advisable to make such an admission in hearings before the committee.

During the course of the hearings in the 86th Congress the subcommittee protested that decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals did not contain findings of fact and conclusions of law and further charged that decisions of the Board were so vague that it was not possible to tell what facts were found, what rules of law were applied, or why a claim was allowed or denied. Representatives of the Veterans' Administration completely disagreed with the views of the committee in this regard and opposed legislation to require decisions of the Board to contain findings of fact and conclusions of law on the ground that it was not necessary. Nevertheless, the Congress enacted Public Law 87-97, which requires decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals to contain findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated. I must say that this public law has been a disappointment to me because the compliance of the Board of Veterans' Appeals with the requirements of the law is almost imperceptible. In fact, I should say that in most cases that I have seen, the claimant is still left to wonder what facts were found, what rules of law were applied, and why the Board denied his claim.

Fortunately, however, another public law enacted by Congress over the opposition of the Veterans' Administration, has produced results far beyond our most optimistic expectations. I refer to Public Law 87-666. This law provides that appellate review shall be commenced by filing a notice of disagreement. When the notice of disagreement is filed the regional office is then required to review the claim and if this review does not result in allowance of the benefits sought, or withdrawal of the notice of disagreement, the regional office is required to prepare a statement of the case. This statement must contain a summary of the evidence pertinent to the issues with which disagreement has been expressed, a citation of the law applicable to the issues and a statement of the decision including a summary of the reasons therefor. The law also requires that a copy of the statement of the case must be submitted to the claimant and his representative, after which the claimant is given a period of 60 days to submit specific allegations of error of fact or law contained in the statement of the case. By so doing, the claimant completes the appeal and it is submitted to the Board of Veterans' Appeals for a final determination.

Under the old appellate procedure, the claimant could merely sign his name to a form designated, "Appeal to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs" and the claims file would be forwarded to the Board of Veterans' Appeals for final determination of what was called an appeal. Under the old system there was really nothing that could accurately be called an appeal in most cases. The decision from which the appeal was taken usually would not specify the reasons for denial of a claim sufficiently to enable an appellant to point out the error. Consequently there was no way the issues could be stated.

Public Law 87-666 has been in effect since January 1, 1963. Figures I have obtained from the Veterans' Administration disclose that there has been a great increase in the number of claims allowed in the regional offices under this new system. I have been informed that under the old system not more than 1 percent of claims were allowed in the regional offices after the notice of appeal was filed. Under the new system, claims allowed in the regional offices after the filing of a notice of disagreement for this calendar year through August 31 total 17.8 percent. From this it is clear that approximately twice as many claims are now being allowed in the regional offices as were formerly allowed by the Board of Veterans' Appeals after final completion of the appeal. We have yet to learn what percentage of appeals will now be allowed by the Board, but it is clear that if the Board denies every appeal the new system has shown that the Veterans' Administration should have allowed about twice as many claims as they did allow. I am sure the Veterans' Administration would be the last to say they are now allowing claims which should be denied. It seems obvious that the adjudication system which the Veterans' Administration defended so vigorously was in fact an incompetent system.

I think it is also interesting to note that under the new system, appeals were completed by filing a substantive appeal in a relatively small percentage of cases. Substantive appeals were filed through August 31 in only 42.5 percent of cases. This means that for this calendar year there has been a decline of 57.5 percent in the number of cases to be considered by the Board of Veterans' Appeals. The significance of these figures is further demonstrated by the fact that approximately 30 percent of cases in which a notice of disagreement had been filed were closed because of failure of the appellant to respond or were withdrawn by the claimant or his representative. I think these figures conclusively demonstrate that under the old system many appeals were filed because the claimant was not informed as to the facts that had been found in his case and was not informed as to the rules of law that had been applied to it. The high percentage of allowances under the new system demonstrates that the regional offices could not in many cases justify their denial of a claim.

The following tables reveal some interesting information in regard to the operation of the new appeals system and in regard to the work of the Board of Veterans' Appeals from fiscal year 1953 through fiscal year 1963:

Statement of the case (Public Law 87-666)—Report of notices of disagreement

	1963									
	Apr. 30		May 31		June 30		July 31		Aug. 31	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Notices of disagreement received	3,050	------	3,183	------	2,722	------	2,872	------	3,047	------
2. Disposed of by field stations	1,168	------	1,870	------	1,972	------	2,641	------	2,740	------
Distribution of disposals:										
Substantive appeals	552	47.0	811	43.4	786	39.9	1,010	38.2	1,209	44.1
Allowance	240	21.0	377	20.2	348	17.6	404	15.3	411	15.0
Transfer out	49	4.0	71	3.8	51	2.6	43	1.6	(54)	------
Closed failure to respond	153	13.0	342	18.3	597	30.3	991	37.5	913	33.3
W/D claimant or representative	33	3.0	84	4.5	60	3.0	53	2.0	60	2.2
Other reasons	141	12.0	185	9.9	130	7.6	140	5.3	147	5.4
3. Pending end of month	8,236	------	9,549	------	10,298	------	10,634	------	10,941	------
Statements furnished	2,594	31.5	3,107	32.5	3,702	35.9	4,495	42.3	4,949	45.2

NOTE.—"Pending end of month" includes notices of disagreement which have been identified and are in various stages of processing, i.e.:

Awaiting development.
In the process of development.
Statement of case being prepared.
Statement furnished, but veteran has not responded thereto.

Board of Veterans' Appeals

Fiscal year	Average number of employees	Cases disposed of	Average cases disposed of per employee	Appropriation (total)	Cost per case disposed of	Man-hours per year (2,000 per employee)	Man-hours per case disposed of
1953	298	49,658	167	$1,706,865	$35.08	596,000	12.00
1954	288	44,861	156	1,688,214	37.63	576,000	12.84
1955	282	49,106	174	1,754,426	35.73	564,000	11.49
1956	283	44,250	156	1,887,502	42.66	566,000	12.79
1957	266	35,807	135	1,876,797	52.41	532,000	14.86
1958	259	39,419	152	2,067,163	52.44	518,000	13.14
1959	264	36,302	138	2,133,735	58.78	528,000	14.54
1960	264	39,136	148	2,199,083	56.19	528,000	13.49
1961	285	34,698	122	2,629,638	75.79	570,000	16.43
1962	306	35,003	114	2,835,503	81.01	612,000	17.48
1963	333	31,370	94	3,098,434	98.77	666,000	21.23
Total (11 years)	3,128	439,610	141	23,877,360	54.31	6,256,000	14.24
Average per year	284	39,965	141	2,170,669	54.31	568,700	14.24

The first table shows that there have been 4,368 substantive appeals in the first 8 months of this year. There are some appeals before the Board that were started last year under the old law, so this table does not indicate the entire workload of the Board; however, I predict that the new procedure will soon reduce the number of appeals to be decided by the Board to less than 10,000 per year.

The second table shown above reveals that this would be a reduction of more than one-third in the volume of appeals considered by the Board under the old law. I further predict that the new system will eventually result in a substantial reduction in administrative costs. I say this even though the above table shows a 55-percent increase in the cost of operating the Board of Appeals during a period in which the number of appeals disposed of by the Board declined by 18,000. The savings will result from improved quality of adjudication which will reduce the number of repetitious and useless appeals. Revolutionary as the new system is, it will only reduce—not prevent—useless appeals. Prevention of useless appeals, real cost reduction, and real quality in adjudication can come only with judicial review.

In this general connection I find the remarks of Administrator Gleason, as reported at page 605 of the independent offices appropriation hearings on February 4, 1963, extremely interesting. At that time Administrator Gleason said:

> Our compensation and pension employment is estimated to increase by an average of 87 employees in fiscal year 1964. This increase is attributed to recent legislation (Public Law 87-666) which requires that we furnish a statement of the case to any claimant or his representative who expresses dissatisfaction with our initial determination on a compensation or pension claim.

This estimate of 87 additional employees should certainly be read in the light of the two tables I have just referred to. Also, I think it will be of interest to Members of the House that in the months of October 1962 and April 1963 the Committee on Veterans' Affairs made a survey of all claims filed in the 67 regional offices of the Veterans' Administration. The reports of these surveys were subsequently printed as Committee Prints 279 of the 87th Congress and 102 of the 88th Congress. For the month of October 1962 the number of adjudicative personnel on duty was listed at 3,799, and for the month of April 1963 this had decreased to 3,405. The figures speak for themselves.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET RELATIONS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, while under the Constitution the responsibility to advise and consent rests solely with the Senate, I nonetheless spoke out in favor of the Test Ban Treaty. It seemed to me a modest step away from war toward peace; an action that would further remove radioactive contamination and reduce the proliferation of atomic weapons as underground testing is appreciably more expensive.

However, it is essential that we recognize the Soviets are still out to conquer the world. The United States and her allies must not relax or succumb to a sense of euphoria; we must vigilantly improve our inspection techniques to insure the Soviets do not indulge in cheating; we must remain ready in the interests of national security to continue testing in the atmosphere should the Soviets violate the treaty; and continue such tests in our laboratories as are required to develop an antimissile missile.

Further, we should be extremely wary of any nonaggression pact in Europe which would weaken NATO, or of any executive agreements with the Soviet Union which do not require formal treaty approval in the U.S. Senate.

In this connection, I found Mr. Drummond's article "Behind the Thaw" timely and under unanimous consent I include this article in the body of the RECORD.

He reports that Soviet spokesmen are busily engaged in exhorting world opinion to demand that the West join with

Russia in taking further steps in the pursuit of peaceful coexistence.

Mr. Drummond states:

> They are not talking about such modest things as guarantees against surprise attack and wider exchange of people and ideas. No, they are talking about NATO's signing of a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites, creating a nuclear free zone in Central Europe and recognition of the satellite state of East Germany.

Mr. Drummond's article follows:

BEHIND THE THAW: SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

LONDON.—The European experts on Soviet affairs are asking all the right questions about the smiles and soft words which now cloak Kremlin policy.

There is no doubt that we are experiencing a pause that is refreshing East-West relations. If we are to act wisely in this mellow climate and find out whether it is shadow or substance, we must come as closely as possible to answering these questions:

What is the primary cause of the Soviet thaw?

What does Moscow hope to get from the West in the new steps the Soviets are constantly saying both sides ought to take?

How long is the thaw going to last—before it freezes over?

The European Kremlinologists are no more unanimous than their American counterparts. There are too many uncertainties to permit unanimity. But there is a consensus in the answers to these questions. If you rule out the wishful thinkers who are afraid to face reality, the answers come out about like this:

Primary cause—the only new factor to emerge between the time the Soviets rejected the test ban in 1959 to the time they embraced it this summer is the Sino-Soviet feud. This was the overwhelming incentive for the Soviets to sign the test ban and thus demonstrate, as relations with Red China were badly deteriorating, that the Kremlin could reach a significant agreement with the West. Obviously there are additional reasons—Moscow's desire to reduce the danger of nuclear war and ease the strains on the Soviet military budget.

What next? At every forum available to them, Soviet spokesmen are now busily engaged in exhorting world opinion to demand that the West join with Russia in taking "further steps" in the pursuit of "peaceful coexistence." They are not talking about such modest things as guarantees against surprise attack and wider exchange of people and ideas. No, they are talking about NATO's signing of a nonaggression pact with the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites, creating a nuclear free zone in Central Europe and recognition of the satellite state of East Germany.

In the sunshine of Soviet smiles at the U.N., let's not fool ourselves as to what these steps would really mean.

A "nonaggression" pact with Eastern Europe would mean that we would be putting the seal of Western approval on the very aggressions by which the Soviet Union snuffed out the freedom of these once independent nations and rob these people of all hope of future release.

A nuclear free zone in Central Europe would dangerously upset the balance of military power in all of Europe—to the disadvantage of the West.

Any recognition of East Germany's puppet regime means acceptance of the enduring division of Germany, which is the greatest abnormality of all the postwar arrangements.

When the Soviet spokesmen talk of steps like these, they are seeking to obtain by thaw the very one-sided aims they have been seeking to get by threats. This is why we have to be so alert to see that the present thaw is not our undoing.

How long?—Is the new thaw going to last longer than previous thaws? The consensus among the experts on this side of the Atlantic is that the relaxed East-West climate will last until one of two things happen: Either until Red China and the Soviet Union make up their differences—which seems unlikely soon—or until Moscow concludes that there is nothing much it can get by smiles alone.

There could be one other factor which would keep the thaw in being for a least a year; that is, Mr. Khrushchev's decision that he should not rock the Kennedy boat until after the 1964 election, on the ground (whether sound or not) that a reelected Kennedy administration would be less unwelcome to Moscow than any probable alternative.

THE ART AND SCIENCE OF POLITICS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we are all interested in the art and science of politics. Although frequently it is difficult to tell what is political and what is nonpolitical, the following column by Mr. Clifford B. Ward of the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel is interesting upon this point:

GOOD EVENING

(By Clifford B. Ward)

Saying that "up" is "down" does not make it so, and calling President Kennedy's speaking tour through Western States "nonpolitical," doesn't make it so either. One year before he is up for reelection, the President is making a campaign barnstorming tour, trying to gain reelection strength where strength appears to be slipping away.

In itself, the speaking tour is a confession of the fear that the conservative movement up and down the country, which is pushing the candidacy of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER ahead of it, is as powerful as it seems to be.

The explanation for the speaking tour was that the President wanted to take his tax cut proposal to the people. The people don't vote on tax cuts. It is Congress which does, and no one doubts that the tax cuts will be passed. But on his early campaign tour, Mr. Kennedy hasn't talked about tax cuts, but about campaign issues. At Salt Lake City, he warned the people that the United States will never return to isolationism. He was scraping the bottom of the barrel for that one. With soldiers all around the world, some of them dying almost daily in South Vietnam, and with money being spent almost everywhere that money can be spent, even in Ethiopia where Haile Selassie needs a yacht, we have about as much chance to get back to isolationism as Christine Keeler has to regain her virtue.

REVOLUTION BY YOUTH

Unlike the manipulating pollsters, I don't know whether Mr. Kennedy will be reelected or defeated. His campaign tour 1 year early, indicates that Mr. Kennedy himself thinks that his defeat could occur. That should encourage those hoping to unhorse him.

What is taking place in this country is a revolution by youth against the erring ways of their elders in both parties. Not a revolution by the callow youth of beatnik persuasion, but the early maturing youth of men and women in their twenties and thirties, who want to have a country of political freedom and economic opportunity when they hit their maturest strides.

Graybeards, alarmed by what is happening to this country, can indeed philosophically say, "Well it won't make much difference to me personally what happens in 10, 20, or 30 years," but a young man or a young woman has a different view of things. They can look forward to 10, 20, or 30 years with reasonable optimism and they want a return to principles which made the United States great. They are not willing to accept the offer being made to have Americans turn in their stock in the United States and accept some very limited United Nations stock in return.

GOLDWATER'S RISE AMAZING

Youth fights all wars, but youth also leads all revolutions, and the youthful conservative movement in the United States today is a revolution, not of the left, but of the right. And its participants are not dyed-in-the-wool Republicans, nor dyed-in-the-wool Democrats. They'll follow anyone now who espouses their principles.

The oddest thing that has ever occurred in American politics is the rapidly rising star of Senator GOLDWATER. It is the oddest thing because GOLDWATER, although flattered by what is happening to him, did not actually want it to happen. He probably would be glad today if some other man with his ideas and his abilities were around to relieve him of the worries he has that he may be nominated and elected. This fear arises out of the humility of a man who senses the vast responsibilities of the Presidency and who would be asking a lot of divine help if he got it. Among other things, GOLDWATER is a religious person.

All the hatchet work that is being done and proposed with respect to the rising star of GOLDWATER isn't going to work. It takes more than a few electric house fans to counteract a hurricane, and a hurricane is building up.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, we pay tribute today to the memory of one of history's greatest men. Of all the famous and brilliant Italians whose deeds have made an imperishable record in the hearts and minds of men and women through the ages it is Columbus whose fame will last forever. Perhaps his achievement in sailing into the trackless Atlantic is more meaningful to us today than it was for previous generations, because we face the vastness of outer space in the same way that Columbus faced the expanse of the uncharted ocean. We shall be called upon to muster the same courage in our explorations that he showed in his.

Even the varied ethnic pattern of the future United States was foreshadowed in Columbus' voyage. Here was an Italian who used Spanish ships and Portuguese charts. Need it be observed that it is a truly regrettable thing that all

Americans of whatever descent are not permitted to celebrate Columbus Day as a national holiday?

The old world gave its men and its wealth to the new world in those early years of the exploration of the Americas. In our own day we have seized the opportunities that the needs of the old world have offered us, and granted aid and assistance to the countries of the European motherlands. That we have done so partly in order to win allies in the protracted and dire cold war does not lessen the good that such assistance has done its beneficiaries. Thus in some measure we have redressed the balance that began to run in our favor with the expenditures of spirit, energy, and capital that began with Columbus' voyage. If the terrible tensions of the cold war are to be lessened, such assistance must continue.

Poets have always known best how to capture the emotion that is appropriate to particular occasions. Joseph Auslander wrote:

> "What say you, searcher of the seas?
> What word for us, stout Genoese?
> When you set sail, when you unfurled
> Your faith to a derisive world;
> When, to the storm's your grumbling crew
> Added their threat, what saw you through?
> The Lord's voice rose above the roar—
> And you beheld San Salvador!"

The divine assistance which this verse attributes to Columbus' discovery was indeed sought by the Great Navigator. His biographers have noted that Columbus always found more friends and supporters among the clergy than among laymen. The priests seemed to understand him better, because his thoughts and aspirations were permeated with religious emotion. He was particularly dutiful in the performance of his religious obligations. He regularly attended mass and even read the daily office.

Columbus achieved the most spectacular, the most far-reaching, and the most important geographical discovery in the history of this planet. Despite all obstacles, despite primitive navigational aids, despite all hazards, he found land, and successfully returned to Spain. Perhaps reaching and exploring the other planets will mean that someday Columbus' triumph will be surpassed. However that may be, the qualities that made Columbus great will have to be possessed by his successors—stubborn persistence despite discouragement and danger, indomitable will, faith in God, and absolute fearlessness.

Such are the qualities that have been exhibited here in the United States by the countrymen of Columbus, the Americans of Italian descent, whose sufferings and accomplishments cannot be tarnished by any method or by any person. It is appropriate on Columbus Day to note the achievements of Italian Americans. In their early days in this country Italian Americans performed backbreaking and heartbreaking toil in heavy industry and in construction. But through their loyalty to each other and to their families, through their native intelligence and their unflagging aspiration, it was not very long before their children became doctors, teachers, lawyers, judges, legislators, and businessmen. Their achievements are not surpassed by any other group. Their patriotic performance of military duty has been notable indeed—during World War II about 845,000 men of Italian descent served in the Armed Forces of the United States, covering themselves with glory in every battle, in every theater, in every campaign, earning every decoration their country could give.

Nothing could deter Columbus from the performance of his duty as he saw it, and nothing can deter Americans of Italian ancestry from their duty to their country. And these Americans will always be in the forefront of the defenders of the America that Columbus discovered.

And even as Columbus represented the courage and vision of the Old World seeking to extend its economic and geographic frontiers, the same spirit and courage and vision must continue to motivate America as she leads the New World in the fight to establish everywhere new frontiers of true national independence and individual dignity.

CASIMIR PULASKI AND POLISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO AMERICA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, 184 years ago, on October 11, 1779, a great Polish patriot died for a great cause, the freedom of the American colonies from foreign domination.

Casimir Pulaski was a fighter for freedom in his native Poland before he gave his life for the cause of American independence. In his native land he had fought valiantly to free his beloved Poland from Russian domination. His military achievements were heroic, but his forces were finally crushed and scattered, his property was confiscated, and he was forced to flee to Turkey. Finally, he reached France where he learned of the American Revolution. Benjamin Franklin made it possible for him to come to America to aid the colonies in their struggle for independence.

Pulaski and his fellow countryman, Kosciuszko, were among the bravest and ablest of the generals who served the young republic. It does not detract from the credit due to them to say that the story of the Polish contribution to American life goes far beyond the services of any two individuals.

The first known arrival of Poles in America was in 1608. They were brought in by the Virginia Company as experts and instructors in the manufacture of glass, soap, pitch, tar and other products. Their technical skills were of significant value in the development of the young colony.

From that modest beginning more than three and one-half centuries ago, Polish arrivals on our shores have made a distinct place for themselves in our national history.

Today Americans of Polish descent are counted in millions, and they are among the most industrious and patriotic citizens of this great Republic. They have contributed to the building of this country in many ways and in all walks of life. Their influence has been felt in industry, the arts, and the professions.

Nor has the contribution of the Poles been confined to peacetime activities, for they have been tireless defenders of American democracy. As loyal citizens, as courageous and dauntless fighters, they have fought for the preservation of the American way of life in all wars involving this country, and they have gladly made the ultimate sacrifice for its integrity and independence. In this they have followed the heroic precedents set by their illustrious countrymen of our Revolutionary days.

It is difficult to believe that such a gifted, brave, and industrious people, who have produced so many illustrious heroes, could suffer for long under oppressive and detested alien regimes. Yet such has been their tragic lot for centuries and such is their sad lot today.

Since 1939 Poland has suffered under the abominable tyranny of both the Nazis and the Communists. Today the fate of Poland is in the unrelenting hands of the Kremlin and Poland remains virtually sealed to the outside world. All vestiges of genuine democracy have been obliterated.

Under the almost unbearable yoke of Communist domination, Poles have not lost faith in that freedom to which Casimir Pulaski dedicated his life. All Poles are praying for the day when Communist tyranny in Poland will come to an end. We join them in the hope that the day is approaching when they will again, as an independent nation, enjoy the blessings of freedom in their beloved homeland.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE NEW IMMIGRATION PROPOSAL

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, at long last there is an immigration proposal before Congress that makes good sense and will make good law.

For over 60 years there has been a prolonged battle to erase from the statute on the books, the unworkable, unrealistic, discriminatory national origins theory upon which our present immigration law is based. When one considers that out of the whole immigration-quota pie, Great Britain and Northern Ireland receive 65,361 quotas annually, while Greece has a quota of 308, Italy a quota of 5,666, Switzerland a quota of 1,695, India a quota of 100, it is easy to see how such disparity has served neither our interests at home nor a common understanding abroad. Rigid, fixed quotas such as we have today are ill-attuned to rapidly changing conditions, both within and without our shores. Too many, solely on the ground of where they were born, have suffered hardship and discrimination in seeking admission to the United States.

The President's proposal to revise the quota system is flexible and, if enacted, can meet our own needs in relation to the urgencies of our friends and allies. Because Great Britain used only some 20-odd thousand out of the 65,000 allotted to her, we have such backlog demand as 266,184 from Italy, 105,690 from Greece, 52,534 from Portugal, 61,000 from Poland. Consider, too, that of the 17,756 alloted her, Ireland used only 5,500, Sweden used only about half of her allotment, Germany out of 25,814 allotted her used most of it, but some 3,000 were left untouched. The present law does not provide that unused quotas can be assigned to those waiting.

Some of the figures on past immigration give interesting insights into the development of this country. By 1743, 30 years before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, more than a million immigrants and their descendants had populated the Thirteen Colonies. No records were kept before 1820, but between the years of 1821 and 1830 a total of 143,459 immigrant arrivals was recorded. In the 1840's 1,713,251 immigrants came to this country. In the 1860's there was some 2 million and in the 1870's there was almost 3 million.

Then the restrictions began in 1882. Congress excluded paupers and criminals, and passed its first racial exclusion act barring the entry of the Chinese. In 1885, contract labor was also shut out. By 1917 a literacy test was required and all Asians were excluded. In 1907 the annual peak was reached with 1,285,349 entries for a single year. And in 1921, this country drastically restricted immigration by establishing the first limitation on numbers of immigrants, and in 1924, the national origins quota system was made permanent. What this did was to establish large quotas for countries of Northern and Western Europe, and ridiculously low quotas for countries from Southern and Eastern Europe, and hardly any for the countries of Asia. The discrimination thus is obvious, and it is this discrimination that the President, in his new proposal, seeks to eliminate.

Make no mistake about it. What the President urges is fundamental reform. Each year, for 5 years, all quota numbers will be reduced 20 percent until the national origins system is abolished completely. This 20-percent reduction each year will go into a reserve pool and will be used to select immigrants on the basis of their skills, their relationship to our needs, the reuniting of families on a priority basis. No one country can receive more than 10 percent of the total quota numbers authorized in any 1 year. Thus, no one country will have an undue advantage over the other, and all peoples will have equality of opportunity to enter the United States within the categories I set forth before. No numbers will go unused. This year, alone, over 68,000 quota numbers were tragically wasted. To further the reunification of families, two additional improvements have been made in the proposal. First, parents of American citizens will have nonquota status and, second, parents of Americans now residing in the United States will be given a preference after skilled specialists and other relatives of citizens.

These are but highlights of the bill. What is important, as the figures of our early immigration show up to 1917, is that our investment in new citizens has always been, as the President puts it, "a valuable source of our strength." Studies have shown that the periods of highest prosperity in the United States coincided with the periods of highest immigration.

I say without fear of contradiction that our present law was based upon fear. A country such as ours has no business with fear, has no business catering to prejudices. We are an amalgam of nations and it is the intermingling of cultures that has given this society a richness and a strength and a vitality which has enabled it to grow and to prosper, and to carry its message of freedom and fairness to every corner to whosoever shall stop and listen.

FAA SHOULD FORMULATE POLICY AND PLANS TO INSURE SAFETY OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 1963, Tuesday of this week, I was startled to read a newspaper announcement to the effect that the Federal Aviation Agency has agreed to assume and take over the responsibility for a greater amount of military traffic. This agreement is to go into effect February 1, 1964. In announcing it, the Administrator, Najeeb E. Halaby, pointed out that in about half of the near-collision reports in recent years military aircraft was involved.

The reason this news story startled me was because as I recalled the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, one of the primary reasons, if not the primary reason, for creating the new Federal Aviation Agency was to vest in that new Agency the responsibilities for a common system of air traffic control, including both civilian and military air traffic. As I recalled that act this common system of air traffic control was to be established and put into effect then, in 1958, not 5 years later in 1963, or 6 years later in February of 1964. So I reviewed the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the House and Senate reports that accompanied the act as it went through Congress. What I found will be recalled and is already known to many of my distinguished colleagues in this House. To some of us who were not here in 1958 these findings may prove of interest.

A series of midair collisions culminating in the collision of 2 airliners over the Grand Canyon on June 30, 1956, in which 128 lives were lost, created grave concern throughout the Nation as to whether air traffic—civilian and military—was being properly regulated. As of that time there was no one Federal agency with the duty of controlling all air traffic and the use of navigable airspace, but controls were being exercised by a number of civilian and military agencies. The Civil Aeronautics Board pointing out this situation stated in a release in July of 1957:

> Growing conflicts between the establishment of airways and actual or contemplated military training and practice areas have made designation of airspace time consuming and contentious * * *. Compromises resulting from the need to obtain unanimous agreement have not always been in the public interest.

On June 13, 1958, President Eisenhower addressed a message to Congress on this subject. In it the President said:

> Recent midair collisions of aircraft, occasioning tragic losses of human life, have emphasized the need for a system of air traffic management which will prevent, within the limits of human ingenuity, a recurrence of such accidents.
>
> In this message, accordingly, I am recommending to the Congress the establishment of an aviation organization in which would be consolidated among other things all the essential management functions necessary to support the common needs of our civil and military aviation.

The words "civil and military aviation" are the crucial ones, for it was in the spirit of creating an agency which would regulate air traffic and be responsible for the safety of both civilian and military aircraft that the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 was recommended to Congress. It was in this spirit and for this express purpose that it was considered and finally passed by Congress and enacted into law.

Soon after the President's message, Senate bill 3880 was introduced—85th Congress, 2d session—to carry out this purpose. Senate report No. 1811, accompanying S. 3880 in its introductory paragraph, states as the reason for creating an independent Federal Aviation Agency: "to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military operation."

And later states:

> The present legislation proposes to clear away this ambiguity once and for all by vesting unquestionable authority for all aspects of airspace management in the Administrator of the new Agency.

House report No. 2360, accompanying the same bill, S. 3880, was equally clear in stating the purpose of this legislation:

> The principal purpose of this legislation is to establish a new Federal agency with powers adequate to enable it to provide for the safe and efficient use of the navigable airspace by both civil and military operations.

And in discussing the division of authority that existed prior to the act, this House report said:

> Clearly an agency is needed now to develop a sound national policy regarding use

> of navigable airspace by all users—civil and military. This agency must combine under one independent administrative head functions in that field now exercised by the President, the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Of course, the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 carried out this intent of Congress by incorporating the objective of a common system of air traffic control. It is no surprise therefore that the act is entitled:

> An act to create a Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety, and to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military aircraft.

And that section 307(a), described as the "heart" of the act by the Senate report, was enacted to accomplish this purpose.

Anyone who has read the act should know these basic facts. Even Mr. Halaby should know them, and presumably he does, for in the section on the Federal Aviation Agency in the U.S. Government Organization Manual for 1963–64 it is stated that one of the purposes of the act is to require the Administrator to consider as being in the public interest:

> The control of the use of the navigable airspace of the United States and the regulation of both civil and military operations in such airspace in the interest of the safety and efficiency of both.

This section in the organization manual is signed by Mr. Halaby.

All of which brings us to an interesting question: In view of the obvious legal requirements that have existed since 1958, requiring the Administrator of the FAA to develop plans for and formulate policy with respect to the use of the navigable airspace and issue rules and regulations in order to insure the safety of both civil and military aircraft, why does the Administrator feel it necessary at this late date to release a news story to the effect that the FAA has agreed to widen its controls over military flights? Why does the Administrator release the news that he is now going to do what he has been required to do by law for more than 5 years?

Now, I do not really expect Najeeb E. Halaby to answer my questions. In fact, Najeeb E. Halaby is a great one for not answering questions. As I stated in my speech from the floor of this House last Tuesday, I wrote a letter to Mr. Halaby on September 23, 1963, in which I asked him some very pertinent questions about other actions of the FAA and he still has not replied. Here it is more than 2 weeks after I asked those questions and there has been no reply. Even to this day there has been no reply, and I can only conclude that Mr. Halaby just does not have the answers, or he has them and he is keeping them a secret.

But then again, there are many things about the FAA and its Administrator that seem to be secret. So, I do not really expect Mr. Halaby to answer my questions. After all, I am only one little, humble Congressman, and Mr. Halaby is a very big man. Still, I can ask these questions. I can even suggest the answers, and the Members of this House and the people can decide between my answers and Mr. Halaby's pregnant silence.

For example, it has been brought to my attention that there have been six midair collisions of military aircraft since the first of July. Think about that for a while. There have been six such collisions in the last 3 months. There was one midair collision of military aircraft on July 2, 1963; there was one on August 2, 1963; there were two on August 28, 1963; there was one on September 14, 1963; and there was one on September 25, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, these midair collisions were not the dramatic type that make headlines all over the country. Each one rated only a small story in the next day's newspapers. They were not like the midair collision over the Grand Canyon in which 128 people were killed. They were not like the midair collision on December 16, 1960, between two airliners over New York City in which 134 people were killed. And they were not like the other crashes of airliners that have occurred since that time, killing numerous persons.

These were midair collisions of military aircraft, some of them involving fighter planes carrying only one or two men. Many of us were probably not aware of the fact that so many midair collisions of this type have occurred recently. I confess that I was not aware of these facts until I checked into them. Mr. Halaby does not issue press releases on these stories. Maybe he does not feel they are as important as the story that he has agreed to assume his responsibilities next February. Nevertheless, these collisions are important, and coupled with the fact that Mr. Halaby has announced that he will exercise more control over military flights next year they force us to make some frightening conclusions.

First. That the FAA Administrator has failed to assume the responsibilities of developing plans and formulating policy with respect to the use of the navigable airspace and insuring the safety of civil and military aircraft and the efficient utilization of such airspace, as was directed by Congress in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

Second. That the press release issued by Najeeb E. Halaby and carried in the newspapers on October 8, 1963, was a dodge and a coverup, a bureaucratic tranquilizer to assure the people that all is well in the area of air safety when all is not well, as is exemplified by the numerous midair collisions of military aircraft that have occurred in the past 3 months.

In conclusion I would like to ask two additional questions, although I am sure that Mr. Halaby will not move himself to answer them, just as he has not answered the questions I raised in my letter of September 23. Yet I believe we would all do well to ponder over these questions:

First. What does Mr. Halaby mean by stating that about half of the near collision reports in recent years involved military aircraft? How many near collision reports have been made in recent years, and in view of the fact that employees who report near collisions are invariably disciplined how many near collisions are not reported? What explains the fact that there have been so many near collisions reported in recent years?

Second. Do we have a common system of civil and military air traffic control?

DEMOCRACY: THE MEASURE OF A MAN

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district has been blessed with many fine people. Among the best is my longtime dear friend, Dr. A. Alan Steinbach, Rabbi of Temple Ahavath Sholom of Brooklyn, N.Y.

Rabbi Steinbach, although born in Baltimore, Md., has been a resident of my district since 1934.

He has earned the degrees of A.B., M.A., and D.D. as well as the ancient and revered title of "Rabbi."

He is an author and lecturer of wide renown not only in religious but also in secular circles. He has been an untiring civic worker, performing pastoral duties far beyond the call of duty.

His activities encompass the nonsectarian National Jewish Hospital of Denver, the World Jewish Congress, Jewish Welfare Board, Central Conference of American Rabbis, Brooklyn Board of Jewish Ministers, New York Board of Rabbis, Association of Reform Rabbis of New York, Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, American Academy for Jewish Research, American Jewish Congress, and American Eugenics Society. He served many of them as president.

Mr. Speaker, he recently delivered a stirring sermon at Temple Ahavath Sholom, where he has served as spiritual leader for almost 30 years.

I commend it to the attention of our colleagues. It follows:

DEMOCRACY: THE MEASURE OF MAN

It is traditionally the function of a sermon to answer questions and to resolve problems. In this discourse I shall reverse that procedure by asking this question: What is the measure of man? How do you assess character and appraise personality? What criteria do you invoke to set an estimate on the value of a person? I think these are reasonable and pertinent questions.

I know I am resorting to cliché when I assert that many men and women gage their fellow man through material lenses: opulence, worldly goods, and the like. Some judge by culture, by education, by an esthetic compass that includes art, music, literature. Others are impressed by the criterion of birth, pedigree, genealogy. It is not uncommon to hear one say, with an implication of reverence, "Oh, he comes from a fine family." Still others react on the basis of unpretentiousness, of modesty, and urbanity. I recall reading in a biography of Albert Einstein, "Er ist so sanft, so demütig"—"He is so gentle, so humble." The Bible itself resorts to this test of character in describing Moses (Num. 12. 3), "And the man Moses was a very humble man."

Again I ask: When you evaluate the quality of a human being, by what components do you measure him?

It is the purpose of this discourse to point out that the criteria by which a human being is measured today have undergone drastic alterations in consequence of four convulsive revolutions in the field of ideas, three of them during the past 100 years and one some two centuries ago. These revolutions have contributed to a progressively more material concept of man. New conceptions become devastating artillery that make a shambles of outdated mores and beliefs. Each of these revolutions has promised a new heaven for man. Whether or not this new heaven has materialized is the issue that will concern us here. Much of the world ferment today may be traced to these revolutions—of this there can be not even a scintilla of doubt.

Every revolutionary movement begins as a thought seed in one man's mind. Some persons are born with scalpels in their brains, to be used for incising sore spots in the corpus of human society. When their ideas are conveyed to others, they are no longer private opinions. They become potential formulas to confront the problems that harass the contemporary world.

Thus, the four revolutions adverted to were not fortuitous occurrences. The central conception behind each of them was sired by a name, a brain, a heart, a tutored, towering mind that gave it birth. Each of these minds was a whole encyclopedia of ideas that had to be shared.

Karl Marx was the progenitor of the first revolution, which was economic. He exploded inveterate prejudices regarding man's status. He was born in 1818 and died in 1883. In point of time it was a brief interlude; yet his socialistic doctrine has provoked wide repercussions, as we shall see. The second revolution was initiated by Charles Darwin (1809–82). He, too, wiped out with volcanic blasts the early concepts regarding the origin of man. The third revolution was psychological, just as the second was biological. Sigmund Freud was its sire, and it is hardly necessary for me to point out that it provoked frenetic reactions and attitudes, even fury and hostility among the various schools of medicine, psychoanalysis and psychiatry. During his life-span (1856–1939) he propounded theories regarding man's psychic and emotional life which modified almost beyond recognition psychological notions and perceptions men had accepted for a long time as sacrosanct. The fourth revolution—which in point of time preceded the other three by a century—was our own American revolution, which triumphed in 1776. No one here needs to be reminded of the enduring contributions to this victory by our Founding Fathers—Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Franklin, and the intrepid galaxy to whom liberty was more precious than life itself.

I

First came the economic revolution whose bible was Karl Marx's "Das Kapital." The exigencies of time and space render it impossible to present more than a scanty thumbnail summary of Marx's theory, known as dialectical materialism. Karl Marx argued that throughout history the state, with power wielded by the privileged few on top, has been a device for the exploitation of the masses below. This dominant privileged class oppresses the great majority and holds them in virtual subjugation. How can this domination by the ruling clique be broken? Only through class war in which the triumph of the masses will become the agency of historical change. The capitalist state, he maintained, contained from the very first the "seeds of its own decay." There will be a transitional period in which the "dictatorship of the proletariat" will expunge capitalism and supersede it with a socialist order and a classless society.

The "heaven" prophesied by "Das Kapital" has in many respects turned into an abysmal hell for millions of helpless human beings behind the Communist Iron Curtain. The callous disregard for human life and for human dignity is an article of faith among the Communists—in Soviet Russia, in Communist China, in Cuba, in East Germany—in all the countries whose ensign is the hammer and sickle. The democratic measuring rod of human value is nonexistent wherever the economic criterion is the supreme touchstone. Such a criterion dehumanizes and brutalizes man. It spawns an atheistic materialism which degrades and truncates man and makes him a puppet at the mercy of heartless, unconscionable, ruthless dictators. Such is the "paradise" created by the first revolution. It is a profligate, debasing measuring rod to apply to man.

II

The second revolution—the biological—which brought its own distinctive answer to the question, What is the measure of man? was initiated by Charles Darwin, an English naturalist and philosopher. This revolution was precipitated by Darwin's theory of organic evolution through natural selection. His "Origin of the Species" and his "Descent of Man" were the scriptures for this movement which provoked implacable hostility on the part of the religious world. Their opposition was quite understandable, because Darwin's theory of man's origin was in direct contradiction to the Biblical account in the book of Genesis.

According to Genesis, man was created full grown by God. According to Darwin, man is the product of an evolutionary process. The first man, said Darwin, goes back unnumbered eons in time to a microscopic bit of slime containing the ameba, a single-celled creature. This first form of animal life, consisting of a naked mass of protoplasm constantly changing shape as it moved and absorbed food, divided its nucleus into two so that each became an independent ameba. The fossil strata reveal that animal life began with this most rudimentary form and rose, over a tortuous trek of millions of years, to the more complex, working its way upward from the invisible protoplasm to the highest organism, homo sapiens. The penultimate peak, according to Darwin, was the appearance of the anthropoid ape as the direct ancestor of man, the ultimate.

It is not hard to understand how devastating were the implications of this revolutionary biological postulate. Man was toppled from the high perch to which the Genesis account had exalted him. If Darwin was right, the Genesis story of man's creation would have to be scrapped. The apostrophe in Psalm 8, "Thou has made him (man) but little lower than the angels," could not be reconciled with the doctrine that man and the anthropoid are uterine brothers sharing a common ancestry. Indicative of the violent reaction to this theory is the following statement made by Disraeli in 1864. "The question is this," he thundered, "is man an ape or an angel? I repudiate with indignation and abhorrence these newfangled theories."

Apart from its cruel blow to man's pride, this second revolution fomented a pernicious consequence that is haunting mankind today; namely, the conception of a superior race. It established the measure of man on the basis of biology. Herbert Spencer made this clear when he wrote, "The survival of the fittest, which I have here sought to express in mechanical terms, is that which Mr. Darwin has called 'natural selection, or the preservation of favored races in the struggle for life.' "

Nietzsche's concept of the superman is a direct corollary of Darwinism. "Man," wrote Nietzsche, "is a rope stretched between the animal and the superman—a rope over an abyss." This idea became a pathological obsession with Hitler. He incarnated it in the Nazi state and proceeded to translate it into his barbaric program of genocide. The 6 million Jews he slaughtered, and the unnumbered millions of other victims who paid the price of his lunacy, bear tragic testimony to the monstrous hell let loose by this racist madness which derived from the Darwinian biological revolution. Never in the annals of man's upward striving has such a plethora of brutalization blackened the chronicle of human history. The criterion of biology has proved to be a malicious device to measure the worth of man.

III

The third revolution—the psychological—received its most powerful impetus from the profound insights and formulations propounded by Sigmund Freud. It was in his Olympian mind that the birth throes of psychoanalysis were first experienced. Here was a new theory, bizarre and at times incredulous, which was based on psychological determinism and therefore in sharp conflict with the dogma that man possesses free will. He presented a dichotomized homo (man) commuting incessantly between two basic instincts: "Eros" (the urge for self-preservation buttressed by ego-love and object-love) and the destructive, or "death instinct." Indeed, he gives the death instinct a place equal in importance to that of the libidinal or creative instinct.

Freud sees man as conditioned and limited by his own nature—by his biological heritage in the id, and by his long cultural history in the superego. Thus, he defers too much to necessity, and in so doing he diminishes man by limiting the scope of his possible human development. Man's behavior, averred Freud, is not of his own making. It is inexorably prompted by compelling motivations over which he has little or no control. He is shackled by a syndrome of compulsive acts, unconscious urges, and concealed primitive instincts which are repressed in the unconscious. Even while denigrating religion, his whole psychoanalytical apparatus proclaimed what is tantamount to a deterministic idolatry: The unconscious is master, and libido is its doting high priest. This is a rather gloomy measuring rod to apply to man.

Freud went even further in raining sledgehammer blows against the ramparts of man's spirituality. In his "Future of an Illusion" (1927) he relegated religion to a Mephistophelian role, and consigned religious faith to the lowly plane of an "obsessive compulsive neurosis." Freud's investigative methodology cannot be taken lightly, nor can anyone deprecate his incalculable influence on the various branches of psychological science and medicopsychological endeavor. But in his excursions in the field of religion, he fell into the cardinal error of applying scientific measurements and analyses which are not valid in this field. Religion is a realm which transcends science, and when Freud approached it with a plow that is effective only for material soil, it was inevitable that he, not religion, was doomed to failure. His obscure conclusions must, therefore, be rejected as a criterion to assess the value of man. Scientists cannot expect scientific answers when they ask theological and metaphysical questions.

It may be true, as Einstein stated, that "Science without religion is lame, and religion without science is blind." The task of synthesis is admittedly very difficult, but it is devoutly to be hoped that some rapprochement between religion and psychoanalysis may be reached. Science and religion are both impressive and beneficent aspects of truth. Each, in its own specific way, is a revelation of God. The psychological revolution will not succeed unless the synthesis of religion and science is consummated.

IV

The fourth revolution—the political—enthroned the idea of freedom and equality as the sine qua non of a civilized society. It voiced democracy's answer to the question: What is the measure of man? At the very heart of the democratic response is the unalterable conviction that every individual at birth is endowed with the right "to be what God made him." This prerogative is man's ineluctable birthright. It is the theme of the majestic democratic symphony whose triumphant chorale wells out of man's basic hunger and need to be himself. The strength and the glory of the democratic system lie in its function to liberate, as a paramount trust, the noblest and the highest of individual genius in thought, in action, in opportunity, and in achievement. Even more, what each generation achieves must be handed down, also as a paramount trust, to succeeding generations. Every individual who derives nutriment from the cornucopia of freedom can strengthen democracy only by paying back something to the common source. This is verily the charter of democracy, the irreducible minimum which must never become obscured.

Democracy is, of course, a political system; politics is its superstructure. But essentially democracy is a faith, a way of life. It is basically moral, spiritual, inward. Its foundations do not derive from its military strength, nor from the totality of its material affluence; they lie imbedded in the fidelities, in the human values, in the ideals and in the qualities of its citizens. When, therefore, one asks how democracy can be preserved inviolate, the formula stands out crystal clear; not through military might, not through economic and industrial progress, which may be possible even in a non-democratic system, but primarily through the spiritual fiber and moral quality of its citizenry.

Every assault on democracy must, of course, be repulsed vigorously, unwaveringly, sacrificially. But we must reiterate that democracy as a way of life cannot be successfully defended by military measures alone. Indeed, it may conceivably be lost by such a method of defending it. There are more compelling considerations. For example, we cannot square the idealism of the Declaration of Independence, which maintains that all are equal before the law, with the recent tragic events in Birmingham, Ala. Nor can we vindicate the claim of our democracy that all are entitled to equal economic opportunity when we are told by President Kennedy that "32 million Americans live on the outskirts of poverty." These are implacable enemies within that breach the democratic wall. These are the malicious foes which gnaw, like termites, at the very vitals of our democracy.

In acknowledging these criteria as the measure of man, one is confronted with the corollary: What can I do to help strengthen our democratic ramparts? I believe four definitive suggestions will prove efficacious.

1. Each of us must become personally and nationally deserving of the fruits of democracy. We must seek to understand democracy by becoming conversant with its history, its objectives, its fundamental philosophy. One must think democracy before one can live democracy. The loftiest concept of self-government must be rooted in man's own mental processes, and then be implemented in his existential philosophy.

2. Since authentic democracy is not afraid of critics, one must not hesitate to exercise the prerogative of constructive criticism wherever there may be shortcomings. The chief guarantee of freedom lies in the minds and hearts of all who share in the national life; therefore, one cannot abdicate one's obligation to serve liberty as well as to enjoy it. The function of a democracy is to assure the free life of the community, and no citizen, if he is to be true to himself and to his country, can in good conscience be derelict in contributing his portion to the common weal.

3. One must accept the reality that liberty is not without its dangers. History has proven that the rule of the majority, which is an article of faith in democracy, can sometimes get out of hand. The rights of minorities are no less sacred and no less binding than the rights of the majority. Constant vigilance and courageous self-searching must be invoked at all times. Despite all hazards and difficulties, when we consider the alternatives to democratic liberty, we must agree that no sacrifice is too great for the preservation of our democratic ideals.

4. Finally, we must never overlook the fact that a democracy has to be fundamentally spiritual. It is not fortuitous that totalitarian governments outlaw religion and relegate it to an inconsequential role. The reason for this is quite apparent: in totalitarianism there is no higher loyalty nor law than the state qua state. The state is apotheosized as the object of worship. Religion vigorously dissents, proclaiming that man's conscience can never be subordinated to the dictates of any human government. It is subject only to the will of God. This is the ultimate meaning and measure of man in a democracy.

V

How does Judaism answer the question: What is the measure of man? It goes beyond economics, beyond biology, beyond psychology. It contains the democratic seed of which our American democracy is the flower.

Judaism's evaluation of man is reflected in the Rabbinic dictum: "When a man walks by the way a band of angels precede him, calling out, 'Give room to the image of God.'" Darwin's theory that man ascended in an evolutionary spiral from the anthropoid is not refuted by liberal Judaism but is countered with the Talmudic maxim: "Beloved is man because he is created in the image of God."

Judaism's answer to Karl Marx's postulate that the world's goods do not belong to a few is contained in the psalmist's declaration: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein."

Judaism affirms that God's divine personality is stamped upon every individual at birth. Every newborn babe is a facsimile of eternity engraved on living clay. A sublime emanation of divinity is locked up within the breast of each of us. What we do with this emanation is a matter of our own free will. Freud denies that man possesses free will, but Judaism proclaims it as an inviolable tenet. If we "give room to the image of God" within us, no height, no lofty objective, no noble enterprise, is beyond our reach.

Judaism's recognition of man's supreme worth in the cosmic economy is pointed up in the rabbinic teaching: "One man is equal in importance to the whole of creation." This is but another way of saying that no proliferation of things, no amount of material acquisitions, no biological or psychological interpretation of man's condition, can compare with the value of human dignity. This we can readily understand as the blueprint for man's perennial upward striving. But perhaps in the final analysis the human understanding cannot fully grasp the complete riddle of man. Alexander Pope's lines seem to have caught this question mark that is man:

"So man, who here seems principal alone,
Perhaps acts second to some sphere unknown;
Touches some wheel, or verges to some goal—
'Tis but a part we see, and not the whole."

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill declaring October 12, Columbus Day, to be a legal holiday.

This Saturday will mark the 471st anniversary of that day in 1492 when Christopher Columbus, an Italian sailor, financed by the King and Queen of Spain, discovered a new world.

Columbus was a man of vision in a world just emerging from the parochialism of the middle ages. His vision was to enlarge the horizons of the known world by discovering a new trade route to India. What he did find was a new world, only vaguely imagined by his contemporaries.

While it may be true that others preceded him, the new land was not populated, cultivated, or utilized until this Genoese adventurer made his voyage and made possible a nation which has become the bastion of freedom, the leader in commerce, and the rightful heir to the vision of the "Admiral of the Ocean-Sea."

Our country has done little to recognize Columbus. There was an exposition in 1892, a commemorative coin, a few scattered statues and that is all. It would be only fitting that this Congress give some further recognition to the great explorer by declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as the grandson of immigrants from Italy, I am most pleased to pay tribute to the memory of the discoverer of our beloved America. Columbus Day is a memorable day for every American but particularly to those of us of Italian descent whose land of origin is that of Columbus.

Christopher Columbus, discoverer of the New World, was first and foremost a sailor. He was born and reared in Italy's Genoa, one of Europe's oldest seafaring communities, and as a boy he made voyages in the Mediterranean where were bred in ancient times the world's greatest mariners. In Lisbon, Portugal, the center of European oceanic enterprise, Columbus worked as a chartmaker by the time he was 24, and shortly afterward he sailed on long voyages under the Portuguese flag. It was then that he conceived the great adventure that only a sailor could have planned and executed. That was to reach eastern Asia, "The Indies," by sailing west.

It took him 10 years to find support for his idea, and of course he never did succeed in it, because a continent stood in his way, a continent which he discovered by accident, and which was named for a man who had had nothing to do with it. Yet we are right in honoring Columbus for doing something that was unintended, because no other sailor had the knowledge, the persistence, and the dauntless courage to find land by sailing thousands upon thousands of miles into the vastness of the unknown and uncharted ocean. He was described by Admiral Samuel Eliot Morrison, the eminent historian of U.S. naval operations in World War II, as "one of the greatest mariners, if not the very greatest, of all time."

Until we reach the planets the achievement of Columbus will remain the most spectacular and most far-reaching geographical discovery in recorded human history. In 1476, when Columbus reached Lisbon, the proposition of sailing west to reach the Orient was at about the same stage as manned flight at the turn of the last century, theoretically possible, but full of practical difficulties. Sensible people admitted that a voyage west to China could be made, a few said it should be done, but no one had dared try it until the young Genoese, Cristoforo Colombo, began obtaining the financing for the men, the vessels, and the equipment he needed to carry out his determination to do it.

After long and weary planning and preparations, by the second day of August 1492, everything at last was ready. That night every man and boy of the fleet received communion at the Church of Palos, which by coincidence was dedicated to St. George, the patron saint of Genoa. Columbus went on board his flagship early in the morning of August 3, and gave the signal to get underway. Before the sun rose, all three vessels had anchors aweigh and with sails hanging limp from their yards were floating down the Rio Tinto on the morning ebb, using their long sweeps to maintain steerageway. This was a fleet of good hope, whose achievements would radically alter world history.

At 2 a.m. October 12, Rodrigo de Triana, lookout on the *Pinta*, saw something that looked like a white cliff shining in the moonlight, and gave the cry of "Tierra, tierra"—"Land, land." Captain Pinzon of the *Pinta* verified the landfall, ordered a gun fired as a signal to the other ships, and shortened sail to allow the flagship *Santa Maria* to catch up. The land sighted was a little island of the Bahamas group. The fleet was headed for the sand cliffs on its windward side, and would have been wrecked if it had held its course. But Columbus expertly ordered sail to be shortened and the fleet to jog off and on until daylight, equivalent to a southwesterly drift clear of the island.

At dawn they made full sail, passed the southern point of the island, and sought an opening on the west coast, through the barrier reef. Before noon they found it, sailed into the shallow bay now called Long Bay or Fernandez Bay, and anchored in the lee of the land.

Here, on a gleaming beach of white coral, the famous first landing of Columbus was made. The admiral went ashore in the flagship's boat with the royal standard of Castile displayed; the captains of the other ships were in their own landing boats which flew the banners of the expedition. And then, according to the log, "All having rendered thanks to Our Lord, kneeling on the ground, embracing it with tears of joy for the immeasurable mercy of having reached it, the admiral rose, and gave the island the name "San Salvador"—"Holy Savior."

Now, more than 500 years after his birth, when the day that Columbus first discovered an island in the New World is celebrated throughout the length and breadth of the Americas, his fame and reputation may be considered secure for all times, though regrettably the day is not a Federal legal holiday in the United States.

Columbus had his faults and defects, but they were largely the defects of the qualities that made him great—his indomitable will, his superb faith in God and in his own misson as the bearer of Christianity to the lands beyond the seas, his stubborn persistence despite neglect, poverty, and discouragement. But there was no flaw at all in the most outstanding and essential of all his qualities, his seamanship. As a master mariner and navigator, Columbus was supreme in his generation. Never was a title more justly bestowed than the one which he most jealously guarded—Almirante del Mar Oceano, Admiral of the Ocean Sea.

On Columbus Day it is appropriate to pay tribute to the achievements of his Italian American countrymen in the United States. At the end of the last century there were about 484,000 Italian Americans here seeking a better life than the one they had known in the disrupted agricultural economy of the Italian peninsula. By 1910 they numbered over 1,343,000.

In those days many of them performed the hardest kind of toil in heavy industry or in construction. But it was not long before their children became doctors, teachers, lawyers, judges, legislators, and businessmen. In their achievements they are second to no other group in the United States. Their patriotism is unexcelled; it has been estimated that some 845,000 men of Italian descent served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Second World War.

As a group, Italian Americans, in a remarkably short number of years, in difficult times, and under severe handicaps, have come to take their place in the leadership of the free American society. That one of this number, Mr. Anthony Celebrezze, has been appointed to head an executive department of the Federal Government whose responsibilities are of crucial importance to our entire population is characteristic of the magnitude of the contribution to our national life made by Italian American political and administrative leaders. An Italian discovered America, and Italian Americans help lead it and preserve its freedom.

By the restrictions of our immigration laws with their unfair quota system we have deprived this country of fresh additions to the strength of its population from countries like Italy. We need more Italian Americans, and we need more Americans from Italy.

As a freshman Member of this Congress I introduced early this year a bill to liberalize the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to remove the ignoble national origins quota based on the composition of the country in 1920. My bill would remove those purely arbitrary racial and nationality barriers to immigration. My bill substitutes a new formula based on equality and fairplay for people of all races and nations.

I am heartened by the recognition given to this problem by the administration. The President urged reform of our immigration statutes in a message to Congress on July 23 of this year. In his message he noted that—

> Because of the composition of our population in 1920 (on which the quota system is based), the system is heavily weighted in favor of immigration from northern Europe and severely limits immigration from southern and eastern Europe and other parts of the world. An American citizen with a Greek father or mother must wait at least 18 months to bring his parents here to join him. A citizen whose married son or daughter, or brother or sister is Italian cannot obtain a quota number for an even longer time. Meanwhile, many thousands of quota numbers are wasted because they are not wanted or needed by nationals of the countries to which they are assigned.

In his short book on the subject, "A Nation of Immigrants," President Kennedy wrote:

> Our policy should be generous; it should be fair; it should be flexible. With such a policy we could turn to the world with clean hands and a clear conscience. Such a policy would be but a reaffirmation of old principles.

I agree entirely, wholeheartedly, and enthusiastically with the spirit and purpose of these statements. I shall do my utmost in their support.

The impressive support that this legislation has received in the Congress and throughout the country evidences, I believe, a growing public awareness of the need for reform in our immigration policy. As a Nation composed almost entirely of immigrants, and as a Nation that has profited and prospered immeasurably from the many nationalities who have come to our shores, we can ill afford to continue for much longer the immigration policies that have critically hindered an infusion of new citizens into the lifeblood of this Nation.

Another piece of legislation whose sponsorship has given me especial pleasure is my bill to make Columbus Day a legal holiday as a tribute both to Columbus and to Italian Americans. Our country owes to Americans of Italian descent the pride of celebrating the great triumph of the discoverer of the New World. But all Americans, whatever their descent, would wish to pay honor to this Italian navigator who sailed Spanish ships by the use of Portuguese charts. The polyglot nature of the discovery is mirrored in the varied origins of the population of the United States.

If Columbus Day were to be made a Federal legal public holiday, the few remaining States which do not observe the day would thus be encouraged to do so. It is, of course, a matter for the States to decide the holidays which they will observe. The Congress and the President may designate holidays only for the District of Columbia, for Federal reservations, and for Federal employees throughout the country, but such a designation of Columbus Day would be of great persuasive effect in influencing the decision of the States in this matter. It is most fitting that in the present turbulent era of our history we set aside a day to honor the great explorer whose courage, vision, and perseverance in reaching his goal set so inspiring an example for us. We need the spirit and the vision of Columbus to carry out our heavy responsibilities as the leader of the free world. As we commemorate the triumph of a Genoese sea captain, let us rededicate ourselves to the principles that governed his life.

A LEGACY OF INSPIRATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, man's most powerful instinct is his own preservation, his own survival. This is the animal in him. But the great blessing of an intellect make him something more than the lesser creatures. This is the man in him.

Man is still a selfish creature, but, occasionally, because of his ability to reason and to think, he finds himself the possessor of something he feels is greater than himself—a cause, a country, or a child, perhaps.

When man finds himself with a purpose, it is to his glory to pursue it. It is not easy to be a great man. It is easier to develop the hard shell of a turtle and crawl in.

All men have the potential of being noble, yet we are still amazed and awed by those who develop it. Count Casimir Pulaski was one of those men.

A Polish native, a nobleman, a general, Pulaski gave his wealth and his life for a principle, that of liberty and freedom for his fellow man.

As a young man in Poland, he and his family watched as their country began to crumble. Russia, Prussia, and Austria were reaching out to dominate her. Submission would have been easier, but his family chose to fight.

In about 1768 his father, one of the country's most able jurists, joined in forming the famed Confederation of the Bar, pledged to Poland's redemption. Because of it, he was arrested and put to death. But Pulaski, determined to pursue the struggle for freedom, carried on and became the life of the Polish movement. With his brother, Francis, he carried the revolt across Poland and into Lithuania. Fortified in the mountains of Galicia during the winter months, he and his compatriots became a terror to the Russians. He became famed as a cavalry officer and as Poland's leading military patriot. His exploits were heroic and temporarily successful.

But as his reputation grew throughout Europe, so did the strength of his adversary.

Pulaski fought valiantly for liberty, for freedom, and for Poland. But the courage of a few men was not enough. His usefulness to his country was at an end. With his forces crushed, his estates confiscated, and death imminent, he escaped into Turkey and eventually made his way to Paris.

Through Benjamin Franklin he learned of America's struggle for independence. By this time, most men would have had enough. But Pulaski, still cherishing the cause of liberty, asked to be a part of the movement. In 1777, he joined the American army as a volunteer.

With Washington in the battle of Brandywine, he fought with valor and distinction. So impressed, in fact, was Washington that Pulaski was made brigadier general in command of cavalry 4 days later. He has been justifiably called "the father of American cavalry."

As a soldier and as a man, Pulaski was colorful, sometimes temperamental, but always bold and courageous. He inspired Henry Wadsworth Longfellow to write a poem. He inspired his men to fight. His inspiration was his conviction to the cause of liberty and freedom.

In 1779, during the famous siege of Savannah, Pulaski charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry. He died there for a country he scarcely knew, but his memory and the cause for which he fought were immortalized. He left us a legacy of inspiration—and a challenge.

PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM: INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMISSION REQUIRED

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, following the congressional investigation of 1949–50, which preceded the enactment of Public Law 841, 81st Congress, reorganizing the business operations of the Panama Canal on a self-sustaining corporate basis, the crucial questions of its major operational improvement and increase of capacity aroused the interest of many thoughtful and experienced leaders of our country. In the forefront among them were a number who participated or were otherwise associated, in the construction of the Panama Canal, and had the benefit of firsthand knowledge.

In 1954, soon after the negotiations between Panama and the United States started for the 1955 Eisenhower-Remon treaty, these leaders submitted a memorial to the Congress which aimed at securing proper action for increasing the capacity and improving the operations of the canal. This memorial, in a brief, concise, direct, and forthright statement summarizes the essentials of what is actually a simple situation that has been obscured by volumes of bewildering technical reports and reams of confusing propaganda. For this reason, it is refreshing to read it.

Understanding the nature of the influences and controls exerted upon routine administrators of the Canal Zone, the record of failures in navigational planning there, so well illustrated by the collapse of the 1939 Third Locks project, and the necessity for a comprehensive inquiry under congressional authorization as the only means for securing information upon which the Congress can base wisely-reasoned decisions, the signers of the memorial urged the creation of an independent and wholly American Interoceanic Canals Commission, to be composed of broad-gauged men of the widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience, and not by persons from routine agencies, all too often engaged in justifying their own group opinions. With minor changes, this memorial is even more applicable today than it was when originally submitted. The qualifications of the signers are such that they cannot be dismissed as uninformed or incompetent.

In the perspective that is now possible, it is unfortunate that the Congress did not promptly adopt their recommendations. The interim repairs and alternations, authorized in view of major operational improvements, were makeshift in character and without adequate merit, delaying the basic and long-overdue solution.

After extensive experience with interoceanic canal problems, informed leadership in the Congress has reached the point where it has no confidence in administrative studies, plans, and recommendations concerning canal problems. To meet the situation, Representatives Bow and Hosmer, Thompson, of Texas and myself, have introduced in this Congress, respectively, H.R. 863, H.R. 5787, H.R. 8563, and H.R. 3858, to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, which should be put to work making the necessary studies for developing a logical Isthmian Canal policy.

Because of the crucial importance of the decisions involved throughout an indefinite future, such task is not a proper function for routine canal administrators as would be authorized under H.R. 80, which is being urged by the Governor of the Canal Zone but one for capable men of independent outlook who cannot be influenced against their considered judgment.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be informed in the premises, I quote the indicated memorial and H.R. 3858 as part of my remarks:

THE PANAMA CANAL PROBLEM

(A memorandum to the Members of the Congress, 1954)

The undersigned, who in various capacities participated in the construction of the Panama Canal, venture to bring to your attention the matters hereinafter discussed:

1. The necessity for increased capacity and operational improvement of the Panama Canal—a much-neglected waterway, now approaching obsolescence—has been long recognized. The traffic volume is the highest since 1914. With the saturation point approaching, it is essential to provide, without further delay, the additional transit capacity and operational improvements required to meet future needs.

2. The two major proposals for increased facilities are:

(a) Improvement of the existing canal by completing the authorized Third Locks project, adapted to include the features of the well-conceived Terminal Lake plan (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 10, page A2449—approved in principle by the Governor of the Panama Canal in hearings on H.R. 4480, 79th Cong., Nov. 15, 1945, p. 9). A total of $75 million was expended on this project, mainly on lock-site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, before work on it was suspended. The Terminal Lake plan provides for removing all lock structures from Pedro Miguel and for regrouping of all Pacific locks at or near Miraflores, thus enabling uninterrupted navigation at the Gatun Lake level between the Atlantic and Pacific locks, with a greatly needed terminal lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal. As thus improved, the modified Third Locks project can be completed at relatively low cost—estimated under $600 million. The soundness of this proposal has been established by 40 years of satisfactory operation of a similar arrangement at Gatun.

(b) Construction of a practically new Panama Canal known as the Sea Level project, initially estimated in 1947 to cost $2,500 million, and which would be of less operational value than the existing canal it was designed to replace, but which, under present conditions, would likely cost several times that amount. The Governor of the Panama Canal (a member of the Corps of Engineers) at that time definitely went on record as advocating none but the so-called Sea Level project for the major increase of canal facilities, which action served to exclude what may be the best solution when evaluated from all angles. This report, under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, was transmitted to the Congress by the President, December 1, 1947, and, significantly, without comment or recommendation. The Congress took no action, and the report was not published.

3. The Terminal Lake-Third Locks project has been strongly urged as the proper form of modernization by experienced civilian engineers who took part in the construction of the present canal. They have spoken from personal knowledge of the original construction. Their views are shared by many independent engineers and navigators who have studied the subject. All these insist that the present lake-lock type should be preserved as supplying the best canal for the transit of vessels which it is economically feasible to construct. They, together with many of the leading atomic warfare authorities, stress the points that the defense of the canal is an all-inclusive Federal responsibility which must be met by active military and naval measures and by industrial planning in the United States, that passive protective features embodied in construction design are inadequate, and that the proper bases for planning canal improvements are capacity and navigational efficiency. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the effective destructive power of the atomic bomb has been tremendously increased since the formal recommendation for a sea-level canal. Any canal, whatsoever the type, can be destroyed by atomic bombing, if permitted to strike.

4. The recent authorization to expend funds for repairs and alterations of present lock structures at an estimated cost of $26,500,000 is, as we believe, makeshift in character, and is without real merit. Consummation thereof, in lieu of fundamental improvements, will inevitably delay the basic and long-overdue solution of the problems involved.

5. In addition to the Panama projects, there are urgent proposals for canals at other locations, some of which have strong support, particularly Nicaragua. In developing a long-range Isthmian canal policy to meet future interoceanic transit needs, these should certainly receive full and unbiased consideration.

6. Transcending personal considerations, but nevertheless to state the matter candidly, we submit that the Third Locks project, as originally planned in 1939 by the Governor of the Panama Canal, has proven most disappointing. We have every reason to believe that the insistently advocated Sea-Level project (which, as a matter of fact, would require tidal locks as well as vulnerable flood-control reservoirs and dikes) would prove to be a monumental boondoggle, costing the American taxpayer billions of dollars. Both of these efforts were directed by routine administrative agencies, and at heavy public expense.

7. We wish to stress the fact that, aside from the A-bomb, the recurrent discussions as to the relative advantages and disadvantages of the lake-lock and "sea-level" types of canal were exhaustively investigated, debated, and considered in 1905–6 when the Congress and the President decided in favor of the lake-lock plan—under which the canal was constructed, and (with the exception of certain operational defects in the Pacific sector) has been successfully operated. The operational defects, we believe, can be adequately corrected.

8. It must be always borne in mind that the greater the cost of increased facilities at Panama the heavier will be the load on the already overwhelmingly burdened American taxpayer; and that also such cost must be reflected in ship-transit tolls, with all that increased tolls imply.

9. We respectfully urge the early enactment of H.R. 1048, 83d Congress, introduced by Representative Thomas E. Martin of Iowa, and supported by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON of Texas who introduced a like measure in the 82d Congress. Both of these experienced and highly competent legislators have been thorough students of interoceanic canal problems, which have grave diplomatic implications affecting all maritime nations and the relations of the United States with all Latin American countries—especially Panama. As to Panama, we would most strongly emphasize that among the features overlooked in the report under Public Law 280, 79th Congress, is the fact that the sea level project recommended in that report is not covered by existing canal treaties and would necessitate the negotiation of a new treaty with a tremendous indemnity and greatly increased annuity payments involved. As evidence of this it may be noted that upon demand of the Panamanian government, and the appointment by it of a commission for the purpose, the U.S. Government has named a like commission, to negotiate various questions, including that of the present annuity of $430,000 (originally $250,000), which Panama insists should be substantially increased. These negotiations began in September 1953 when the President of Panama and members of the Panamanian Commission visited Washington in behalf of the indicated demands.

10. References to the "Governor of the Panama Canal" herein apply to the incumbent Governor at the time of the stated action.

CONCLUSION

Because of these considerations, it would seem to be clear that the indicated Commission should be created without delay, and put to work, so as to develop a timely, definite, and wisely reasoned Isthmian Canal policy. Such a body should be made up of unbiased, broad-gaged, and independent men of the widest engineering, operational, governmental, and business experience, and not of persons from routine agencies, all too often involved in justifying their own groups.

Respectfully submitted.

James T. B. Bowles, Baltimore, Md.; Ralph Budd, Chicago, Ill.; Howard T. Critchlow, Trenton, N.J.; Roy W. Hebard, New York, N.Y.; Herbert D. Hinman, Newport News, Va.; William R. McCann, Hopewell, Va.; E. Sydney Randolph, Baton Rouge, La.; Hartley Rowe, Boston, Mass.; William E. Russell, New York, N.Y.; Caleb Mills Saville, Hartford, Conn.; John Frank Stevens, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Ellis D. Stillwell, Monrovia, Calif.; William G. B. Thompson, New Haven, Conn.; Robert E. Wood, Lake Forest, Ill.; Daniel E. Wright, St. Petersburg, Fla.

THE PETITIONERS

James T. B. Bowles—Chemical engineer; in charge water supplies, superintendent, filtration plants Canal Zone, 1910–14; lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, AEF; director, secretary, and technologist of Crown Petroleum Corp.

Ralph Budd—Civil engineer; chief engineer, Panama Railroad, 1906–09; president, Great Northern Railway; transportation commissioner, the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense; president, Burlington Railroad; now chairman of Chicago Transit Authority.

Howard T. Critchlow—Civil and hydraulic engineer; district and chief hydrographer, Panama Canal, 1910–14; New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development on water supply, construction of dams, and flood control; past president, American Water Works Association; now director and chief engineer, Division Water Policy and Supply (New Jersey).

Roy W. Hebard—Assistant engineer, resident engineer, and contractor, Panama Canal, 1905–11; major, Corps of Engineers, AEF; president, R. W. Hebard & Co., Inc., builders of highways, railroads, waterworks, and divers structures throughout Central and South America.

Herbert D. Hinman—Construction engineer whose first job for the Pacific Division in 1907 was boring to find rock for the locks; assistant engineer in charge construction of the Pedro Miguel locks, and later in the building of the fortifications on the Pacific side; president of Virginia Engineering Corp., engaged in divers heavy construction in Virginia and the Southeastern States.

William R. McCann—Assistant engineer and supervisor of construction, First Division, Panama Canal, 1907–14; engineer, Stone & Webster, Inc.; engineer, Allied Chemical &

Dye Corp.; project manager, Buckeye Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

E. Sydney Randolph—Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1910–46; office engineer, designing engineer, construction engineer, principal engineer, and consulting engineer, handling various projects such as technical supervision of maintenance and lock improvement, Madden Dam and power project, exploration and investigations for additional locks, defense structures, emergency gates, increased spillway capacity, and augmented power facilities; now consulting engineer.

Hartley Rowe—Electrical and construction engineer, various divisions, Panama Canal, 1905–15; engineering and construction, Lockwood, Greene & Co.; member of General Advisory Committee, Atomic Energy Commission; chief engineer, United Fruit Co.; now vice president thereof.

William E. Russell—Panama Canal service, 1905–09, under all three chief engineers, attached to office of superintending architect, and engaged in building construction; attorney, New York City; chairman of the board of several magazines in which he has controlling interests; headed committee for reevaluation of housing in New York State; has been lifelong student of Panama Canal affairs, and of the treaties pertaining thereto.

Caleb M. Saville—Hydraulic engineer; in charge Third Division Panama Canal, 1907–11, investigating foundations for Gatun Dam, flow through spillway, and Chagres River hydrology; manager and chief engineer, Hartford Metropolitan District; now consulting engineer thereto.

John Frank Stevens—Life student of Panama Canal problems; son of first chairman and chief engineer, Isthmian Canal Commission, who planned the construction organization and plant, and was largely responsible for the adoption of the lock-lake type of waterway.

Ellis D. Stillwell—Electrical engineer; served on Panama Canal, 1912–49, assistant superintendent Gatun locks, superintendent Gatun locks, and superintendent Locks Division in charge of lock operations and transits, and responsible for lock maintenance and biennial overhauling.

William G. B. Thompson—Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1905–16, supervising, among other assignments, construction of Balboa terminal; State highway engineer of New Jersey; vice president and chief engineer, Gandy Bridge Co., St. Petersburg, Fla.; with Allied Chemical & Dye Corp. as superintendent of construction and as project manager Kentucky Ordnance Works; now consulting engineer.

Robert E. Wood—Assistant quartermaster, chief quartermaster, and director Panama Railroad, 1907–14; brigadier general, U.S. Army (retired), and later acting quartermaster general; president, Sears Roebuck & Co.; now chairman of the board thereof.

Daniel E. Wright—Civil engineer; Panama Canal service, 1904–18, as municipal and sanitary engineer, central division, extended subsequently to all divisions and to Panama City and Colon; contracting and consulting in Central and South America; with Rockefeller Foundation and U.S. Public Health Service as sanitary expert on various commissions to Middle East, Greece, France, Burma, China, India, Egypt, and elsewhere; captain, U.S. Army, World War I; colonel, U.S. Army, World War II.

H.R. 3858

A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1963".

Sec. 2 (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; and eight members from civil life, four of whom shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as are made the original appointments. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $25,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States $22,500 each.

Sec. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(a) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks Project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(b) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(c) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(d) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(e) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(f) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

Sec. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

Sec. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(a) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(b) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final reports; and

(c) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

Sec. 6. The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission.

Sec. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts, or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a (1946 edition); and may make such expenditures—including those for actual travel and subsistence of members of the Commission and its employees—not exceeding $13 for subsistence expense for any one person for any calendar day; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

Sec. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

CASIMIR PULASKI: SON OF POLAND

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the American War for Independence, which set the stage for our present Republic and Constitution, might well have floundered had it not been for the help of many sons of Poland who brought their love of liberty and freedom to the American colonies. Casimir Pulaski was one of many Polish sons who fought for liberty and independence not only in their motherland, but in other countries as well.

On October 11, 1779, General Pulaski, died and was buried at sea as a result of wounds received in the Battle of Savannah. Prior to this battle General Pulaski had survived dozens of battles in his native Poland fighting for the cause of liberty. In the American War for Independence he engaged in more than a half-dozen major battles. Commissioned a brigadier general by the Continental Congress at the request of Gen.

George Washington, he was described by Benjamin Franklin several years prior to his death as "one of the greatest officers in Europe."

After arriving in America in 1777 at the age of 30, and being commissioned by the Congress, he set about the task of organizing the first American Cavalry, which he financed with his personal funds.

Mr. Speaker, the American people shall be indebted to this son of Poland for as long as the Republic stands. His virtues are common to the Polish people today. We should make no mistake: the Communists have not crushed the desire for freedom in the hearts of the Polish peoples. We pay tribute and honor to this great nation by remembering with thankful hearts of the contributions of her many sons to American independence, especially Casimir Pulaski.

A VETERAN NEWSPAPERMAN IS DEAD

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, among the human resources that make this Nation great, gifted and intelligent newspapermen are some of our most prized possessions. Like everything else of great value, the limitation on their numbers makes them a value that we can ill afford to lose. But this select group has been depleted by one with the death of Maurice W. Leckenby, of Steamboat Springs, Colo.

Here was a reporter with a reputation for having an exceptional ability to find and write the truth. He was a small-town publisher whose integrity and honesty commanded the respect of his fellow journalists throughout the State of Colorado and the Nation.

Tributes to Maurice Leckenby have been the order of the day on the editorial pages of Colorado's newspapers. Undoubtedly one of the finest of such tributes has been written by Leck's colleague and friend, Gene Cervi, publisher of Cervi's Journal in Denver. It follows:

MAURICE W. LECKENBY—A VETERAN NEWSPAPERMAN IS DEAD

(By Gene Cervi)

The Colorado newspaperman who had friends and fun, who was the author of the autobiographical "Put a Hed on It," is dead.

Maurice Wilmot Leckenby died in his sleep September 21 in his home in Steamboat Springs, whose first citizen he clearly was as far as his professional journalism colleagues are concerned. He was born over a printshop in Steamboat Springs and was 62 last February 18.

It would be inaccurate to describe Leckenby as a political figure even though he had been Democratic national committeeman until shortly before a recent stubborn illness got him.

He was primarily a political writer and editor and got on well with leaders of both the Republican and Democratic sides of the many political contests he covered.

For the purposes of a more or less formal obituary, one should report that he was the owner and publisher of the Steamboat Pilot which his father, the late Charles Leckenby, had developed into an outstanding personal organ in more than 50 years of service to his community and his State.

Leck suffered harshly toward the end with emphysema. You just couldn't get him to give up smoking or drinking and he promised faithfully and knowingly regularly to abandon both. And then he would laugh in that wistfully resigned way of his about the many ways in which a man can die and how men and their spirits can be killed by the onslaughts of the competitive world.

Leck loved his friends and had inordinate compassion for his political opposition which, somehow, resists being termed enemies. We traveled many a road to political combat together and he was a good soldier. I made enemies, bitter ones. Leck, no less a fighter devoted to cause, somehow, however, enthralled his opponents. They never got sore at him even when he stood fast in their path of ambition.

His first paying job as a newspaperman was on the old Denver Express, which stood where the Denver Mint Annex is located. His first boss was the late Jack Carberry. Leck was 16. In the 46 years that followed he saw, wrote, and savored the dynamic history not only of Denver, but of the State, the West, and the Nation. In his time, he was a prized staffer at the Denver Post, the Rocky Mountain News and the Associated Press.

The Colorado statehouse never knew the likes of Leck, before or since. He was an incomparable master reporter of the legislature, accurately taking the political pulse of the 100 elected officials who made up what he used to call the "country congress—and are they lower case tonight."

An unusual mark of Leckenby was that he attracted other good newspapermen in sincere fellowship. The aces and stars of reporting, in a day when "star reporter" was the highest accolade journalism could bestow, wanted to be around and work with Leck. His news sources and connections were encyclopedic. In the wonderful years that I worked with him on the News, those glorious inventive years of the great depression, when men were made as well as broken, the rule was that "if Leck can't find out, the information simply isn't available."

Leck had the quality of professional peerage that tempted the late beloved Lee Casey to cajole him into doing his column frequently, or, as we used to say on the News, Casey, "was Tom Sawyering Leck."

At the opening of each new legislation, Leck would go down the list of lawmakers, all 100 of them, seek them out, get to know their views on statehouse issues, and after awhile he could tell you with almost unerring accuracy how key votes would be recorded.

To this day and into the future, the influence that Leck had on his country Congressmen still lives.

His confidantes, persons in high places who sought his counsel, include Senators, Congressmen, Governors, judges, lobbyists, presidential scouts, and visiting correspondents and editorial writers from the big syndicates and eastern dailies.

This generation knows Leck best probably as a country editor. That's because he went home a number of years ago to take over the family newspaper when his distinguished father, one of the principal authors of the Moffat Tunnel legislation, died.

But the truth is that Leck lived and breathed the romance and the glamour that used to be associated with daily journalism before the advent of radio and when the "extra" was an exciting actuality on big stories.

Combative as he could be in news competition, Leck always was good natured about his triumphs, easygoing, slow to anger and never boastful or cruel toward the opposition. Ever-living humor was a hallmark with him. It was expected of him. It was natural and he was forever himself.

His life and times in recent years, however, were filled with sadness and the philosophical resignation that also came to him naturally and without affectation. It was not for himself, but for his brave wife, Esther, seriously ill with cancer of the bone, that he grieved. He longed to take the burden of pain from her and wished that he could carry it himself. There were times when both of them would be in the hospital at the same time, but Leck never failed to toss off the sympathy of friends with a gentle dismissal.

I remember him best in the midst of dramatically breaking news when he was covering it, and in political fights when he was winning and losing them.

There was his coverage of the famous Walter Walker speech that resulted in the historic libel suit that F. G. Bonfils brought against the News, but never lived to see resolved. The Denver Post publisher died within 5 months after the suit was filed.

There was Leck's well-known friendship with Gov. William H. "Billy" Adams and his advice on numerous appointments throughout State government. It broke Leck's heart to see his friend, the late Warden Roy Best, once a darling of the press, assailed and excoriated when unhappy news emanated from the State penitentiary.

Leck was one of the founders of an unofficial, loosely existing state of affairs called the Backers Scratchers League, made livelier than usual when Leck periodically took over at the Pilot when his father went gallivanting out to California or left on those solitary, contemplative retreats into the Arizona desert.

It is said by some competent historians that the quality of Colorado weekly journalism never was higher than when Leckenby and cronies sat down to an all-night poker game, fired those famous Leadville Moon salutes and set the tone of Colorado journalism for the remainder of the year.

It would be grossly unfair to Leckenby to leave the impression that he was a Gene Fowler who stayed home. While Leck had a capacity for lusty living, he was not devoid of deep and characterful concern about "the issues." He leaves an estate measured in nonmaterial values and easily earned the tribute paid him by former U.S. Senator John A. Carroll who said of him when he retired as Democratic national committeeman—"he is one of the few men in Colorado politics who served a cause without trying to enrich himself."

As much as he liked and respected the late George H. Shaw, who won the GOP nomination for the U.S. Senate in 1930, Leck sensed and was drawn to the social views that were the forerunner of the Roosevelt era.

His affinity for the candidacies of Edward P. Costigan, who triumphed over Shaw in that pre-New Deal race, and for Josephine Roche, who would have defeated a then political newcomer for Governor, one Ed C. Johnson, had she been male, attest to his liberal social consciousness.

Leck never was reconciled with Ed C. Johnson politically despite what some latter-day pundits may write.

A measure of what the Democrats of Coloradio thought of their 1934 Governor may be observed in the Democratic primary vote of that historic contest: Johnson, 76,240; Roche, 63,107.

Leckenby was calm and undemonstrative about his convictions, but there was never any doubt about where he stood. He was a man's man. He was gallant. He was my friend. I hope I was his. I loved him and I shall miss him.

THE COMPLEXITIES OF TRADE REGULATION AND ANTITRUST ACTIVITY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when the fact must be faced that the myriad complexities of trade regulation and antitrust activity essential to the survival of competition in our free enterprise economy are such that the Federal Trade Commission requires more funds to do its job adequately than we are providing here today.

For the past 7 months my Subcommittee on Distribution of the Small Business Committee has been studying problems caused the small businessmen of our economy by dual distribution in some 40 industries. From the approximately 2,500 pages of transcript and the very sizable accumulation of exhibits that have been compiled, a pattern has clearly emerged. It is clear that our economy daily grows not only larger but more complex. There is an accelerating proliferation of new industries. Entire new sectors of enterprise spring into being each year. Distribution patterns become more involved, more difficult of analysis.

Numerous violations of existing antitrust laws, particularly the Robinson-Patman Act, have been found in almost all of the industries studied. New trends boding ill for the future of independent business were also present in the vast majority of industries investigated by the subcommittee. These are not mere matters of academic interest, they are matters of economic life or death to the small businessmen involved.

As an example, on Sunday of this week, gasoline was selling for as low as 9.9 cents per gallon, including a 9-cent-per-gallon tax, in a price war at Savannah, Mo. Only yesterday, the following wire was received from the Eastern Institute of Structural Steel Fabricators, Inc., a group of independent small businessmen:

> The Eastern Institute of Structural Steel Fabricators, Inc., representing the majority of the structural steel fabricators to the metropolitan New York-New Jersey area vigorously protest the increase of $3 per ton on structural steel shapes put into effect by Bethlehem Steel and United States Steel without prior notice on Saturday, October 5, 1963. Once again your attention is directed to the unfair advantage integrated companies like Bethlehem and United States Steel through their fabricating division have in softening the impact of such increases made without notice to independent fabricators. The sudden increase results in a serious economic impact on all independent fabricators, including the members of our association, because in the great majority of cases it is impossible to cover such substantial increases in the basic material on jobs in progress and already committed. In the integrated steel companies it is unlikely that their fabricating divisions are not in a position to know sufficiently in advance that there will be an increase in the basic material since they are under the same top management and have available to them sources of information which are closed to all independent fabricators.

Examples such as these could fill literally hundreds of pages of this RECORD.

I do not mean to say that more money alone will solve all of the problems confronting the Federal Trade Commission. As Charles Bartlett pointed out in his column, "Focus on the News," in the Thursday, August 1, issue of the Washington Evening Star, the Commission sometimes tends to pick on little companies, because these cases are less time-consuming and less expensive. Clearly, greater attention must be paid to the big issues, the basic underlying questions.

An example of the kind of activity by the Federal Trade Commission which would be helpful is their proposed study of the Nation's thousand largest corporations. My subcommittee's investigation into dual distribution has convinced me that a necessary condition precedent to the orderly disposition of problems in the trade regulation and antitrust area is a structural study, the orderly amassing of the basic information that would enable officials to accurately determine the trend of industrial concentration. This would enable the appropriate officials to define the problems and then proceed to think in broad terms concerning needed remedies.

It is regrettable that the bill before us prevents the FTC from proceeding with this questionnaire to the thousand largest corporations. The necessity for this questionnaire is well expressed by Mr. Bartlett in the column which I have previously mentioned. At this point, I insert the column, in its entirety, in the RECORD:

BLOCKING FTC'S INDUSTRY QUERY

(By Charles Bartlett)

The Nation's 1,000 largest corporations are expected to be successful in persuading Congress to forbid the Federal Trade Commission to mail out a questionnaire designed to determine the present extent of concentration in industry.

The FTC, empowered by law to require corporations to respond to questions on their operations, has been planning for over a year to send out a detailed questionnaire to the 1,000 largest companies. Its purpose is to secure basic information on the trend of the past decade in terms of mergers, interlocking directorates, and monopolies.

The broad nature of the inquiry raised an immediate charge from business that the FTC was embarked on a fishing expedition in the complex waters of the antitrust laws. Spokesmen for the major industries maintained that the burden of providing answers to 7 pages of questions involving 12 years of operations would be intolerable. All the data could be obtained, many argued, from the Business Census, the corporate tax returns, and from various Government agencies particularly the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The Chairman of the FTC, an aggressive ex-football star named Rand Dixon, responded that the material could not be compiled in Washington in form that would provide the agency with a solid overall picture of industrial concentration. Individual replies to the Business Census are held closely by the Census Bureau and only the total breakdowns by industries are released.

The fact is that officials in the FTC and the Justice Department, although charged with protecting the public against trusts and monopolies, depend for their surveillance on clippings from the daily press and trade journals. Data can be subpenaed on suspicious cases, but the Government does not have the basic information that would enable officials to define accurately the trend of industrial concentration or to think in broad terms about the nature of the problem and its remedies.

PICK ON LITTLE FIRMS

The lack of this information is a factor in the unfortunate hodgepodge which has grown around the whole area of antitrust enforcement. Researching for his book "Competition and Monopoly," Mark Massel found that 20 Federal agencies are involved in upholding 45 antitrust statutes and that the prosecuting agencies tend to pick on the little companies that will consent quickly to the allegations in order to avoid legal expenses. The prosecutors seem to be engaged in a numbers game of which the object is to run up an impressive total of actions, regardless of their economic importance.

On the business side, Mr. Massel found the attitude has become almost totally defensive. Operating people who know the incentive system and could assist the Government to develop a more constructive approach to the antitrust problem are inhibited by their concern with avoiding the pitfalls of the present system. Almost to a man, business leaders say they would like to establish rules they could understand and live by, but they have not been willing to exert the initiative that would encourage the Government to resolve the maze of ambiguities.

The result is an economic guerrilla warfare in which such basic questions as whether industrial concentration is a menace to the public welfare or a desirable result of the competitive process are left unsettled. The economy grows more complex and the big companies get bigger and no one is certain exactly what is happening to the factor of competition.

SEE MISTAKE

Some impartial observers believe the 1,000 largest companies are making a mistake in seeking to block the FTC's questionnaire. The extent of concentrations may well be exaggerated in the public mind and the uncertainty on the actual facts inevitably plays into the hands of demagogues who pit themselves against big business and play on popular fears.

Certainly, if Congress agrees to attach a prohibition against the questionnaire to the FTC appropriations bill, the big corporations will be exposed to a charge that they have wielded political power to avoid a legal inquiry into their operations. Politicians are naturally disposed to accommodate the united wish of the 1,000 largest corporations, but the question will arise as to whether this accommodation was in the national interest.

A key facet of the issue is whether the questionnaire is an undue burden upon the companies. The Budget Bureau worked with industry experts for months to simplify the form, and Government statisticians maintain the responses will not entail excessive expenditures of time and money. Industry officials insist the statistical requirements are almost beyond the range of possibility.

The odds are strong that Congress will kill the questionnaire but the quest for better information on the trends of industrial ownership will continue.

PULASKI DAY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 184th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, the courageous Polish patriot who devoted his short life to continuous battle against political tyranny. As a youth, he fought to redeem his native Poland from Russian rule; later, at the age of 31, he fought and died to free our American Colonies from the foreign tyranny imposed by Great Britain. History has recorded that his daring charges at the enemy lines infused new life and determination into our Revolutionary forces just as our later Polish immigrants infused much-needed skills and enterprise into our growing industrial Nation.

It is all too obvious that after these many years tyranny still blights our world. Unfortunately, political tyranny is not the only enemy to freedom today; the tyrannies of hunger and of ignorance are widespread and must not be forgotten.

Therefore, on this day when we honor Casimir Pulaski, I ask that we in the United States dedicate ourselves anew to the struggle against every form of tyranny.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY BEFORE THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Burke] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to include the address of our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, before the American Bankers Association, Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, October 8, 1963. His remarks on the effects of the tax cut bill which recently passed in the House and is now in the other body are very timely. I believe their is no more important legislation before Congress affecting our economy than the President's tax proposal. I hope the other body moves with dispatch on this much needed bill in order that our economy can be further improved and real steps taken to reduce our unemployment rolls.

The address follows:

Remarks of Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon

It is an honor and a privilege to be with you today, as you reach the climax of this centennial year of the dual banking system. It is certainly unnecessary for me to relate the vast contributions which banking leaders and their institutions have made to the growth of our Nation. Suffice it to say that the American economy could never have achieved the amazing results of the past century, had it not been for the foresight, courage, and sheer competence that has characterized our banking leaders. Service to the Nation has always been high among your objectives, and, today, I want to pay particular tribute to the service which bankers throughout the Nation render their communities and their country in supporting the U.S. savings bonds program. On the occasion of this centennial celebration it seems particularly appropriate to present you with a formal expression of our appreciation. It is a citation which reads as follows:

"The Treasury Department gratefully acknowledges the outstanding leadership and public service support of the American Bankers Association and its members on behalf of the U.S. savings bonds program * * * and offers its congratulations upon the observance of the 100th anniversay of the dual banking system. Given under my hand and seal this 8th day of October 1963."

Mr. Kimbrel, I ask you to accept this token of our thanks on behalf of the association and all of its members.

And now I have an equally pleasant task—this one concerning your newly elected President, Mr. William F. Kelly. Each year it has been our custom to invite the incoming president of the American Bankers Association to serve as a special ambassador of good will for the savings bonds program.

Accordingly, Mr. Kelly, I am pleased to appoint you our special ambassador, in the hope that you will wish to carry on our mission wherever you may travel, in the great tradition of ABA presidents throughout the years.

We are meeting here at a time when our Nation is making critical economic decisions on both the international and domestic fronts. At home, we face the task of closing the deficits in employment, output, and in the Federal budget. Abroad, we face the problem of ending the troublesome deficits in our international accounts. None of these problems is isolated. Each impinges upon the other. It is this interrelationship that I would like to consider with you today.

The most striking characteristic of our balance-of-payments deficit is that it does not fit into the classic mold, in which a pattern of inflation and overconsumption at home brings with it a growing excess of imports over exports. Instead, we have unemployment in manpower, plant, and machines, along with stable price levels, and, in our foreign trade, a sizable export surplus.

It is against that unusual background that we have had to develop new approaches to reduce and eventually eliminate our balance-of-payments deficits while at the same time promoting domestic expansion. In so doing, we have been guided by two principal convictions:

First, that we must achieve our goals by working within the framework of a free market economy, with market disciplines and incentives providing the basic motive force. Only in this way can we arrive at solutions consistent with our own traditions, with freer trade between nations, and with the central role of the dollar as a world currency.

Second, we are convinced that a proper mix of fiscal, monetary, and debt management policies will make it both possible and practical for the United States to achieve our domestic and international goals simultaneously. Indeed, we are convinced that these goals can, and must, be mutually reinforcing.

From the very start of this administration, the central and crucial element in our approach to the payments problem has been our program to provide fresh incentives for American business through tax reductions. President Kennedy made the reduction of business taxes a first and urgent step shortly after he took office. This program was implemented last year with the 7-percent investment tax credit and the liberalized tax treatment of depreciation. These two measures together reduced business tax liabilities last year by an estimated $2.5 billion. The tax program now before the Congress would bring the total business tax reduction to almost $5 billion a year. That, together with individual tax reductions of almost $9 billion a year, will do much to spur our economy forward and will greatly increase both the profitability and the volume of business investment.

I cannot emphasize too strongly how essential the tax program is: The President has called his tax proposals the most important domestic economic measure in 15 years. Your own association has endorsed the tax cut as one of the prime prerequisites for reaching balance in our international payments by increasing business incentives and investment. Tax reduction this year has the enthusiastic support of the business community, of labor, and of our leading economists, who recognize that only by revising our outmoded tax structure and relaxing its grip upon incentives and growth, can we move decisively toward both internal and external strengthening of our economy.

To speak only of our balance-of-payments difficulty, there is no question but that the added investment that will flow from the present tax program—together with the heightened investment already created as a result of last year's tax measures—would further advance the productive efficiency of American industry. Only an efficient, expanding American industry will be capable of rapidly incorporating new technology into new plant and equipment and of maintaining our traditional leadership in the introduction of new products—of nurturing, in short, the very elements that must serve as the foundation of our export effort.

And, as we move toward full employment, with investment expanding under the twin stimuli of greater demand and greater profitability, the call on our capital markets will become heavier, longer term interest rates can be expected to rise, and savings that have been flowing abroad will once more find ample investment outlets here at home.

Only within such a framework of a prosperous and rapidly growing America can we find a sound and permanent solution to our balance-of-payments problems. No one is more aware of that fact than you here today.

You are, however, deeply and rightly concerned by the fact that the initial impact of tax reduction will come at a time when we are experiencing large budget deficits. I would like, therefore, to deal with this question at some length.

First, may I emphasize the fact that, by generating greater economic activity, the tax cut will increase government revenues. I am sure you remember very well how taxes were sharply cut in 1954 and within 2 years revenues exceeded pretax cut levels. Not only was that no isolated instance, but it reflected the consistent experience this country has had with major tax cuts throughout this century. It reflected, for example, the experience of Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon, who said in a statement before the House Ways and Means Committee—and I quote:

"In spite of the very sweeping reductions carried by the 1924 act * * * we will collect in 1925 more money at lower rates than we collected in 1923 at higher rates."

In short, after a brief transitional period, cutting taxes means greater revenue—not less. It was so in the 1920's. It was so in 1954. And it will be so after we adopt this year's tax bill.

But if we are to take full advantage of rising Federal revenues in a more rapidly expanding economy, then both the administration and the Congress must exert a continuing, careful, and judicious control over expenditures. An intensified program of expenditure control is an integral part of the tax bill, which states, in section I, that both Congress and the President must join in taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending, if we are to obtain balanced budgets in the near future.

The President, Chairman Mills, of the House Ways and Means Committee, and the House of Representatives in endorsing their views, have all made it unmistakably clear that, by adopting the tax bill, the Nation will be choosing tax reduction instead of deliberate deficits as the principal means of boosting our economy, that they consider these courses mutually exclusive and will not follow both at the same time, and that, in short, the tax bill represents a major decision to rely upon greater private spending rather than greater Government spending as the prime factor in our economic growth.

The President has emphatically committed the administration to a course of intensive expenditure control, not only by his repeated pledges over the past 9 months, but by his record of efficient administrative management.

Certainly the budget has increased over the past 3 years. But the great bulk of that increase is accounted for by the sharp stepup in our defense and space needs—and by increasing interest costs that are in large part the reflection of responsible debt management policies and of our efforts to stem the outflow of short-term funds.

Outside of the heavy impact of these three items upon our budget, expenditures over the last 3 years have grown only moderately, judged against the needs of our expanding population. One simple fact should make that point abundantly clear: when you include the 1964 budget as submitted by the President, and before any reductions that may occur as a result of congressional action, then—apart from defense, space, and interest on the debt—the total increase in all other expenditures during the first 3 years of this administration will be $4.5 billion, one-half billion less than the increase in these same items during the preceding 3 years from 1958 to 1961—a period during which the Government was not often accused of extravagance.

In the light of that record, we can also take encouragement from the improvement in our immediate budgetary outlook. As you know, the fiscal 1963 deficit dropped from an estimated $8.8 billion to an actual $6.2 billion. Including the effect of the tax cut as approved by the House of Representatives, we now expect the current 1964 deficit to be less than the $9.2 billion forecast last January before allowance for the tax cut, and far less than the $11.9 billion originally foreseen after allowing for the tax cut.

In addition, the President has said that, in the absence of any unforeseen economic downturn or international crisis over the next few months, he expects to submit a fiscal 1965 budget with a deficit smaller than the $9.2 billion originally forecast for this year without a tax cut. In other words, despite the fact that fiscal 1965 tax revenues will reflect a major part of the tax cut—over $7 billion—the projected fiscal 1965 budget will involve a lower deficit than that originally estimated for fiscal 1964 before any allowance for tax reduction.

That much, at least, should be heartening to anyone—whether or not he agrees with every policy or program recommended by the administration. And whether or not one agrees with every cut of every appropriation the Congress has made, we can also take note of the recent prediction by the Honorable Clarence Cannon, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, that this year's appropriations will be held below last year's total for the first time since the end of the Korean war. Appropriations, of course, govern expenditures, as money must be appropriated before it can be spent. Therefore the true and sensible way to measure expenditure control is to look at current appropriation totals rather than at expenditure totals, which are largely predetermined by earlier appropriations.

In any given year some 40 percent of expenditures flow from funds appropriated in preceding fiscal years. For instance, last year, fiscal 1963, we spent $92.6 billion but new appropriations amounted to $101.6 billion, or $9 billion more than we spent. That is why expenditures are increasing this year to some $98 billion and why a moderate further increase is likely in fiscal 1965 even if current appropriations are held below last year's $101.6 billion level.

Expenditure control is, of course, the joint responsibility of the President and the Congress. The President must exercise it in proposing his programs and his budget, as well as in carrying out and administering programs authorized by Congress. He does not, however, have—as some have implied—the latitude to whittle expenditures at will to meet short-run and arbitrary expenditure ceilings. At first glance, for example, it might seem feasible to realize substantial savings through the Commodity Credit Corporation. But CCC sales and purchases depend upon farmers' decisions, the weather, the crops, and other unpredictable or uncontrollable factors. And, to take another example, it would be the worst form of false economy to cancel or delay needed Defense or other programs which involve, as is usually the case, commitments and contracts already authorized, obligated, and well underway.

The only way to assure true control of expenditures is for both the President and the Congress to join in a continuing and complementary effort. That joint and continuing effort is exactly what section I of the tax bill pledges.

We must, however, live with temporary deficits during the period when the tax cut is taking hold. While these deficits are certainly no cause for complacency, neither should we take them as cause for alarm.

I think it is now well understood by informed observers both at home and abroad that deficits need not be inflationary when there is persistent unemployment and excess capacity. That has, in fact, been our experience over the past 6 years. The rapid rise in industrial production costs that characterized the first postwar decade has come to an end. Year-to-year increases in wage rates are now within the range of productivity increases, and overall unit labor costs in our manufacturing industries have actually declined during the current period of business expansion.

But if the short-run prospect is one we can view with sober confidence, this can in no way excuse us from concern over the longer lasting monetary and financial effects of our deficits—and from pursuing with increasing vigor and vigilance policies to assure that we are not today sowing the seeds for future trouble. And that depends on how we finance the deficit. Let me cite briefly from our record.

Since January of 1961, the Federal Reserve has not supplied a single additional dollar of reserves to the banking system for the purpose of facilitating Treasury finance. Commercial bank holdings of Government securities have actually declined by almost $2 billion from January 1961 through August 1963. Over that period the entire deficit has been financed outside the commercial banks.

The total of under-1-year Treasury debt in the hands of the public has increased by only $2.7 billion, or about 3 percent, since January 1961, while the economy has grown by about 17 percent. At the same time the growth in total liquid asset holdings—including not only money and short-term Treasury debt, but also the enormous increases in time and savings funds—has been roughly in line with gross national product, as it properly should be in line with the growing needs of the economy.

Government debt maturing beyond 5 years is now more than $20 billion greater than it was in January 1961—an amount considerably larger than the total increase in our marketable debt. And our debt due in 25 years or more is now $6.3 billion greater. As a result the average length of the marketable debt has been increased from 4 years and 6 months in January 1961 to 5 years and 3 months at the present time—the highest level since mid-1956. This record clearly shows that we have succeeded in financing our deficits in a manner calculated to avoid future inflationary troubles.

We thus have every ground for pushing ahead rapidly with the tax cut in order to improve both our economic performance here at home and our balance of payments. That expanding economic activity and productivity at home is the key to solving our balance-of-payments problem—and that the tax cut is the key to both—was cogently recognized in the balance-of-payments statement of your association earlier this year. It recommended, and I quote:

"The enactment, in this session of Congress, of an across-the-board reduction in personal and corporate tax rates designed to improve the climate for direct business investment in this country, strengthen the prospects for cost-price stability, and restrain the large outflow of private long-term capital."

Your statement clearly underscores the urgency of the tax cut as a measure to sharpen the competitive edge of American business and help expand our exports, as well as a measure to make our economy continually more attractive for both foreign and domestic investment. Of equally great importance, the tax cut will, as the President stated last week before the International Monetary Fund, give greater freedom to monetary policy in meeting our balance-of-payments requirements.

Your balance-of-payments statement also emphasized the need to reduce the dollar drain of Government expenditures abroad. Only a few days after the appearance of your statement, the President in his balance-of-payments message of July 18, announced his approval of a detailed program to reduce our dollar expenditures overseas by $1 billion a year. This program is already underway and will be fully effective by the end of next year.

But these long-term efforts to achieve balance in our international payments are not enough. We must also step up our efforts to keep current deficits to a minimum. Over the past several years, as you know, Treasury debt management policies have played a major role in bringing upward pressures to bear upon our short-term rates, while still maintaining a ready availability of long-term funds. In July of this year, the Federal Reserve reinforced this policy by raising the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. At the same time, regulation Q was revised to permit banks to compete more effectively for time deposits of 90 days or longer. These actions have proved decidedly beneficial in improving the relationship between our rates and those abroad, thus helping to reduce the outflow of short-term capital.

In the area of long-term capital outflows, we have proposed a temporary interest equalization tax on purchases of foreign securities by Americans from foreigners. We took this step with the greatest reluctance. But the situation was grave. During the first half of this year the volume of new foreign security issues purchased by Americans reached unprecedented levels. At an annual rate of $2 billion that volume was well over three times the annual average from 1959 to 1961, and was almost double the 1962 figures. It accounted for substantially all the deterioration in our balance of payments during the first half of this year. And, at the time of our announcement, the volume of new issues in prospect, the large majority for borrowers in countries with strong balance-of-payments positions, was just as forbidding.

The advantage of the proposed tax is that it can achieve the required temporary lessening of foreign demands upon our capital markets while leaving the market mechanism intact. Under the tax, it is the impersonal operation of price—not any artificial or arbitrary force—that would work to curtail our long-term outflows.

This tax, as I said last week before the International Monetary Fund, is a necessary, but temporary, expedient to meet a specific situation that has arisen in large part out of a structural imbalance in the capital markets of the free world. It is not a long-term measure, but an interim step which we must take while our long-term measures become effective and while other industrial countries make the necessary effort to strengthen and improve their own capital markets.

There are clear signs that these two actions, higher short-term interest rates and the proposed interest equalization tax, are having the desired results. The first, preliminary figures indicate that our third quarter deficit will be no more than half as large as the second quarter results. While it will be another 2 months before detailed figures, pinpointing the areas of improvement, are available, only capital flows are capable of such rapid shifts.

Despite this short-run improvement, it is still clear that eventual success in achieving a steady balance in our international payments must rest upon our ability to achieve greater industrial efficiency, to utilize more of our savings at home, and to maintain price stability. Our price performance over the past 5 years, our progress in bringing costs under effective control, and our firm resolve to maintain responsible monetary and debt management policies offer assurance against any resurgence of inflationary pressures.

We cannot, therefore, let anything restrain us from adopting the tax reduction bill this year. We cannot burden down with restrictions the very measure that will free our economy from the burdens of a restrictive tax system—we cannot dally until it is too late over a measure that we urgently need now. Our productive potential is unparalleled. The tax bill will give us the expanding economy and heightened incentives that will enable us to capitalize on that potential and achieve the still greater gains in output and productivity that we can—and must—have. With its enactment, and only with its enactment, can we look forward with confidence to solving our problems of unemployment, unutilized capacity, and budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits.

THE CAPITAL OF CONTRADICTION, AND WORSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the President's formal announcement that he is going to sell wheat to Russia, the announcement just made to the House of Representatives, makes this the capital of contradiction and worse.

On the one hand, we hear that a substantial contribution to winning the war and containing communism in Vietnam, the containment of communism in that part of Asia, is due to the fact that we are depriving the Communists of Vietnam of food.

On the other hand, with the sale of wheat to Russia we are fattening the Communists all over the world. There is no way in the world that the President of the United States can say that wheat sold to Russia may not find its way to Vietnam and to Communists elsewhere who are trying to beat our brains out.

Mr. Speaker, this is the capital of contradiction and it is worse than that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Van Pelt (at the request of Mr. Ellsworth), on account of official business.

Mr. Flynt (at the request of Mr. Stephens), for the balance of the week, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. Cahill (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for October 10 and 14, on account of official business.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina, for 2 weeks, on account of official business (Armed Services Committee inspection trip).

Mr. Kornegay (at the request of Mr. Thomas), for today, on account of official committee business.

Mr. Friedel (at the request of Mr. Garmatz), for Thursday, October 10, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Albert (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for Thursday, October 10 and Monday, October 14, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Udall, for 30 minutes, today.

The following at the request of Mr. Ellsworth:

Mr. Derounian, for 3 hours, on Tuesday, October 15, 1963.

Mr. Brock, for 30 minutes, on Monday, October 14, 1963.

Mr. Battin, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, October 22, 1963.

Mr. Cramer, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, October 23, 1963.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana, for 15 minutes, on Monday, October 14, 1963.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, October 24, 1963.

Mr. Rooney of New York (at the request of Mr. Young), for 20 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Derwinski (at the request of Mr. Ellsworth), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Curtis (at the request of Mr. Ellsworth), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Widnall (at the request of Mr. Ellsworth), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Patman (at the request of Mr. Young), for 60 minutes, on Monday, October 14, 1963, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Weltner (at the request of Mr. Young), for 60 minutes, on Thursday, October 17, 1963, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Fino in two instances.

Mr. Teague of Texas (at the request of Mr. Young) during debate on H.R. 8747 on the subject of space, to follow remarks of Mr. Thomas, and to include charts and tables.

Mr. St. Onge.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Ellsworth) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Horton in two instances.

Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Osmers

Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Boland (at the request of Mr. Young) during debate on H.R. 8747 and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Young) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. Multer.

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Powell.

Mr. Ryan of Michigan.

Mr. Whitener.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama.

Mr. Corman.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 242. An act to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; and

H.R. 7179. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1277. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1278. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a departmental report that it conducted no commissary activities outside the continental United States during the fiscal year 1963, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 596a; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1279. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a request that the case of Yoshio Okuhara, A–4, 188, 325, involving suspension of deportation under the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87–885, be withdrawn and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1280. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a list showing the number of individuals in each general service grade employed by NASA under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended on June 30, 1962, and on June 30, 1963, pursuant to 65 Stat. 736, 758 and rule XL of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1281. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report to the Congress the reasons for this Government's decision not to prohibit the sale of surplus American wheat, wheat flour, feed grains and other agricultural commodities for shipment to the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries during the next several months (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. S. 876. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the American National Red Cross; without amendment (Rept. No. 830). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 4801. A bill to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records: without amendment (Rept. No. 832). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 747. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim November 19, 1963, as Gettysburg Address Centennial Day; without amendment (Rept. 833). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 540. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; with amendment (Rept. 834). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MULTER: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6413. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 835). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7882. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 836). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5337. A bill to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 837). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4333. A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced; without amendment (Rept. No. 838). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5871. A bill to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8313. A bill to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8355. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145), approved June 19, 1934, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7441. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1899, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 544. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8195, a bill to amend section 510 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 843). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1828. An act to amend the joint resolution establishing the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission so as to authorize an appropriation to carry out the provisions thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 543. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 8427, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system for a limited number of employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 845). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1414. A bill for the relief of Jan and Anna Smal (nee Dworzanski); with amendment (Rept. No. 825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Yon Ok Kim, Chang In Wu, and Jung Yol Sohn; with amendment (Rept. No. 826). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Kim Tricia; with amendment (Rept. No. 827). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6624. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Foto Napoli, Salvatore Napoli, Antonina Napoli, and Michela Napoli; without amendment (Rept. No. 828). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6975. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Giuseppe, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida; with amendment (Rept. No. 829). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 3368. A bill to authorize the Administrator, General Services Administration, to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land to the Lexington Park Volunteer Fire Department, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 831). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 8771. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit pension and profit-sharing plans to provide contributions or benefits on a nondiscriminatory basis for certain self-employed individuals without special limitations on the amount of contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 8772. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization of reorganization expenditures of railroad corporations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8773. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 8774. A bill to amend title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 with respect to the acquisition by the Secretary of Defense or his designee of certain housing constructed and insured under section 608 of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 8775. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 8776. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 8777. A bill to confirm in the State of Utah title to lands lying below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake in such State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 8778. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 8779. A bill to amend section 356 of the Communications Act of 1934, to permit cargo ships on voyages between Hawaiian ports to carry radiotelephone in lieu of radiotelegraph installations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8780. A bill to incorporate the Italian American War Veterans of the United States, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 8781. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 8782. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of September 15, 1960, to authorize the appropriation of funds to the Secretary of the Interior to assist the Secretary of Defense in carrying out the purposes of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. VAN PELT:

H.R. 8783. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEAVER (by request):

H.R. 8784. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to owners, management, and to all other employees certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8785. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment in small corporations engaged in manufacturing businesses employing fewer than 250 employees, and for distribution to the owners and management; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8786. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment in small business, for distribution to the owners and management of small business and to all other employees of small business certain amounts of corporate income of small business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 8787. A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for certain special projects and studies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8788. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 8789. A bill to provide for the redesigning of the 5-cent George Washington regular postage stamp so as to incorporate George Washington's immortal words "to bigotry no sanction"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8790. A bill to amend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 by extending its provisions for 2 additional years and providing for certain special projects and studies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 8791. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 8792. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 8793. A bill to provide a particular designation for the proposed dam and lock now under construction known as the Millers Ferry lock and dam, Alabama; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 8794. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 8795. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend to qualified schools of optometry and students of optometry those provisions thereof relating to student loan programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 8796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a manufacturers excise tax on component parts of ammunition and to make available half the additional revenues resulting therefrom, together with half the revenues from the excise tax on pistols and revolvers, to the States for target ranges and firearms safety training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 8797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a manufacturers excise tax on component parts of ammunition and to make available half the additional revenues resulting therefrom, together with half the revenues from the excise tax on pistols and revolvers, to the States for target ranges and firearms safety training programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 8798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit corporations to be small business corporations while owning the stock of certain inactive subsidiary corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 8799. A bill relating to rates of postage on certain materials for blind persons; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8800. A bill to authorize the erection of a statue of Queen Isabella of Spain in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 771. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.J. Res. 772. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 773. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 17th International Publishers Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H. Res. 545. Resolution opposing conditional continuation of military and economic assistance to the Government of South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H. Res. 546. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the exchange and barter of surplus agricultural commodities under the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to return to the State Fort Miles at Cape Henlopen, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 8801. A bill for the relief of Mir Vilayet Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8802. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lilia Lee Janse and her minor children, Margarita Janse, Lilia Gloria Janse, and Doris Janse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (by request):

H.R. 8803. A bill for the relief of Miss Mary Louise Nozet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 8804. A bill for the relief of Thomas Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8805. A bill for the relief of Dr. Zdenek Kubes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 8806. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Paolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 8807. A bill for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8808. A bill for the relief of Vincent Trunzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 8809. A bill for the relief of Amy Ann James; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 8810. A bill for the relief of Arthur Ward Hunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 8811. A bill for the relief of Juraj Mikan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 8812. A bill for the relief of Michael Isa Shihadi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 8813. A bill for the relief of Byanka Neigert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 8814. A bill for the relief of Hannah Robbins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 8815. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Harmon Wallace Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 8816. A bill for the relief of Grace Cordner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 8817. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey an easement over certain public lands in Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 8818. A bill for the relief of Jose Augusto Esteves Rendeiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 8819. A bill for the relief of Tauba Fajga Skowronek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 8820. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Lee and her sons, Tom Lee (also known as Tom Dang) and Enrique Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

354. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Sam C. Hanna, Rochester, N.Y., with reference to his notice of citizen's articles of impeachment, Civil Action No. 9922, incorporated in petition No. 304, U.S. District Court, Western District of New York, together with accompanying papers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, October 11 marks the 184th anniversary of the death of an outstanding champion of human freedom, a man who spent his entire adult life fighting in behalf of liberty, both on the plains of his native Poland and in the American Colonies far from his homeland.

Casimir Pulaski was born in Podolia, Poland, probably in 1748. Of his early life only enough need be said to show the background of his lifelong dedication to the cause of liberty. He became interested in military affairs at an early age and served in the guard of Duke Charles of Courland before he reached the age of 20. In 1768 he joined his father and others in the Confederation of Bar, the purpose of which was to drive the Russians from Polish soil and liberate Poland from foreign domination. They fought valiantly and sometimes successfully for several years but finally, in 1772, their forces were crushed and scattered. Pulaski's property was confiscated and he was forced to flee to Turkey.

By 1775 Pulaski had made his way to France. It was in Paris that this man who had already sacrificed so much for liberty became interested in the American cause. Seeing another opportunity to fight for freedom, the ideal that dominated his life, he decided to cast his lot with that of the colonists.

Bearing a letter from Franklin to Washington, Pulaski arrived in Philadelphia in August 1777. After serving briefly as a volunteer on Washington's staff and participating with distinction at the Battle of Brandywine, he was made a brigadier general and placed in command of the cavalry of the American Army. He may with justice be said to have been the father of the American cavalry.

During the winter of 1777 Pulaski commanded the cavalry at Trenton and later at Flemington, and acted in unison with Gen. Anthony Wayne in scouting for supplies for the famished troops at Valley Forge. Discouraged by the jealousy of his fellow officers and subordinates, he resigned his command of the cavalry in March 1778. During the same year he was given permission to organize an independent corps of cavalry that became known as the Pulaski Legion. After a period of inactivity, which he found distasteful, on the Upper Delaware River, he was ordered in the early part of 1779 to go to the support of General Lincoln in South Carolina.

Pulaski saw action in the defense of Charleston and later in the assault on the British works at Savannah at the head of the combined French and American cavalry. It was there that he received a fatal grapeshot wound, on October 9, 1779. He was carried on board the brig *Wasp* where he died, probably on October 11.

Thus ended in the heat of battle the career of a gallant soldier and courageous champion of liberty on two continents. He was a worthy member of that heroic band of men who came to help our forefathers in their hour of need.

Few men have shown a more steadfast dedication to the cause of liberty or have sacrificed more in its service than this valiant Polish officer. To him we owe the tribute of a grateful republic.

No. 14—Colorado: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to tell the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Colorado, about gambling in that State. Colorado is the center of Rocky Mountain gambling operations, and organized crime profits accordingly.

While only $16 million was bet on Colorado tracks last year, most of the action was strictly illegal. Colorado's share of the figure given to the McClellan committee as representing nationwide off-track betting is a shade under $500 million. This is only half of the total monies gambled each year. The annual gross illegal gambling in that State would probably approach $1 billion.

Based on the percentage that stays in the hands of the gambling syndicates, it is not easy to figure that almost $100 million is available to finance other aspects of organized crime.

Out of this profit comes all kinds of payoffs to keep gambling illegal, unregulated, and uninterfered with—thanks to bluenose gambling laws which have put crime in clover in Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, legalized gambling in the form of a national lottery would knock the props from under the mobs. It would purify the governmental process through elimination of the major source of payoff money. Lastly, it would bring needed revenue flowing into the coffers of our own Treasury.

No. 15—Illinois: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to give the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Illinois, some interesting figures on the extent of gambling in that State.

In 1962, some $343 million was gambled legally on the horseraces in Illinois which gave the State about $23 million in revenue. This gambling activity made this State the third ranking in parimutuel betting in the United States.

However, Mr. Speaker, this is only a small part of the State's gambling story. Illinois' share of national off-track betting figures presented to the McClellan committee stacks up as an amazing $2.8 billion. Gambling is like an iceberg. The part above the surface is only a tiny part of the whole action. On top of illegal betting on the horses, other forms of gambling must be considered. The New York State Investigations Commission would double off-track betting to arrive at total gambling turnover. That makes gambling in Illinois approach $5.6 billion a year.

Throughout the Nation, illegal gambling is the source of the operating revenues of organized crime. The syndicate's share of the total betting turnover in Illinois could very well reach over one-half billion dollars a year. A part of these funds is spent on corruption of the local political and law enforcement process.

If anything, the McClellan hearings proved that crime thrives on illegal gambling. If gambling were legalized, controlled and supervised, it could no longer finance the underworld. Underworld shrinkage would clean up the governmental process.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, a lot of birds can be killed with one stone by a national lottery.

British Guiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, because of my concern over the extension of international communism, particularly in the Western Hemisphere, I have addressed a special television message to my constituents on the threat posed by full independence for British Guiana.

Knowing the interest many of my colleagues have in this situation, I am including a copy of the script which I used in making this broadcast:

SPECIAL NEWS REPORT FOR WHEC-TV, ROCHESTER, N.Y.

(By Hon. FRANK HORTON, Member of Congress, 36th District, New York)

Is a Castro-style dictatorship coming to South America? Is the stage being set for the establishment of the first Communist state on the South American continent?

These are questions which trouble many officials in Washington today. The puzzle centers on British Guiana, a land of swamp and jungle along the northeastern coast of South America. Most of the 600,000 inhabitants of this Minnesota-size country are squeezed into a coastal strip no more than 10 miles wide.

British Guiana is a crown colony that Britain seized in the early 1800's. Since the 1940's, British control has rapidly diminished. Today, it extends only to foreign affairs, defense, and communications.

The domestic government is headed by Premier Cheddi Jagan, a dedicated Communist. Jagan is an East Indian who came to the United States and was trained as a dentist. While here, he married Janet Rosenberg of Chicago. She, also, is an avowed Communist. At one time, Mrs. Jagan was a leader of the Young Communist League in the Chicago area.

Great Britain—largely for financial reasons—is scheduled to give this sugar and molasses producing country its full independence by the end of this year. There is little doubt that under present conditions this action would drive a wedge of Communist subversion between neighboring Venezuela and Brazil.

The only reason holding Britain from divesting itself from the colonial territory is the political instability which would be left behind. There is a deep racial split between the rural East Indians, who give Jagan his support, and the urban Negroes. Because of multiparty elections, Jagan holds power with the votes of only 42 percent of the people of British Guiana.

Under normal circumstances, Britain should be urged to grant independence to this small South American country—this is the goal of the free world. However, until free and honest elections can be guaranteed, a Jagan Communist takeover will be the result.

Already the Jagan regime is serving as a way station for smuggling Communist agents and funds from Cuba and Iron Curtain countries into Latin American nations. Bank records also show indirect financial aid from the Soviets and Cuba for Jagan's government.

President Kennedy told a news conference the British Guiana problem is "primarily a British matter and we should leave the judgment to them." I cannot agree. I think it is a problem for the free world.

The United States should work with Great Britain to find a solution or be faced with further Communist takeovers in this hemisphere. A "second Cuba" providing another base for Soviet missiles in a strategic area and an expanded base for Communist operations in the Western Hemisphere must not be allowed.

Independence should come to the people of British Guiana, but in an orderly and effective manner to insure their freedom. This is the goal of the free world.

Pulaski Day, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 184 years ago tomorrow, at Savannah in the First District of Georgia, a lover of freedom and a courageous fighter died from wounds received battling against tyrannical colonial rule in our country.

Count Casimir Pulaski, a brigadier general in the Continental Army, was by birth a Polish nobleman, but by death one of the bravest of American soldiers.

He fought with great courage at Brandywine, Trenton, and Fleming, and in his valiant charge against the British Tories who occupied Savannah, he was mortally wounded on October 9, 1779. Two days later, this gallant cavalry officer gave his life in the cause of America's freedom.

Today at Savannah, one of the fine coastal fortifications under the management of the National Park Service, Fort Pulaski, bears this great soldier's name and serves as a reminder of his unselfish gift to America.

We owe our freedoms today in great part to men such as General Pulaski, who joined our American Revolution and fought side by side with our citizens to secure the blessings of liberty.

Tenth Annual Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, early in July, my 10th annual questionnaire was mailed to more than 100,000 voters in the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey. Approximately 90,000 on my list are registered voters selected without regard to party affiliation. The remaining 10,000 are leaders in the professions, labor, business, industry, religion, education, and government. This 1963 sampling of grassroots opinion in my district has proved immensely helpful to me in doing my job here as have similar polls in the past 9 years.

Except for mining and important agricultural activities, the Ninth New Jersey District is one of the most diversified in the Nation. Nearly every conceivable type of business and industrial activity is carried on there. Although income levels are well above the national average, occupations are normally distributed among workers, both union and nonunion; proprietors of, and stockholders in, small and large businesses; and the professions. Compared to similar suburban areas, minority groups are in normal proportions. About 80,000 of my constituents commute out of the district each day to New York City and elsewhere in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area to their jobs and businesses. Approximately the same number commute into the district each working day from outside its boundaries.

In addition to receiving more than 30,000 completed questionnaires, about 3,000 of my constituents made extensive comments or wrote letters expressing their views not only on the subjects covered but on other issues as well.

As in previous years, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few brief comments about the results. Because of the recent House debate on the tax bill, Members will be interested to learn voter reaction to the administration's theory that by spending more and taxing less, with resulting huge deficits, we will create jobs and boost the economy. This theory is rejected by five out of every six who expressed an opinion on it. Among the other domestic issues covered, only the farm program had less support. Since my constituents pay for the farm program twice, first in taxes and then at the sales counter, it is no surprise that they oppose it by a margin of 15 to 1.

This year, 68 percent of those responding do not favor the overall record of the Kennedy administration, 22 percent do, and 10 percent are undecided. When compared to my previous polls, these percentages indicate that impressive numbers of voters in my district have lost confidence in this administration in the last 2 years. In response to my 1961 annual questionnaire, only 47 percent of those replying opposed the administration's overall record while 26 percent favored it with 27 percent undecided, while last year the percentage opposed was 59 percent; in favor, 28 percent; undecided, 13 percent.

Foreign policy questions brought some interesting results. Responses to questions about Cuba clearly indicate a strong desire for more positive action by the United States to curb or depose Fidel Castro and his Communist government. Our present Cuban policy is opposed by nearly 5 to 1. Of those opposing, three out of four favor economic sanctions against nations trading with Cuba while nearly half favor U.S. support of a refugee invasion of that country. With respect to Asia, three out of four with opinions on the subject favor our fight to keep South Vietnam out of Communist control. A large majority express opposition to the present level of our foreign aid spending and would stop all aid to pro-Communist nations.

The enactment of strong civil rights laws is favored by two out of three. A majority of those favoring such laws want action in these areas: Voting rights, 92 percent; schools, 73 percent; union membership, 65 percent; employment, 64 percent; denying Federal funds to States practicing segregation, 56 percent; while only a minority favor Federal action in housing, 49 percent; and business establishments, 42 percent.

Concern over school dropouts and unemployment among our youth is reflected in support by a more than 2½-to-1 margin for broad Federal action to assist unemployed and untrained youth. A complete review of public school courses and methods to determine if we adequately prepare our noncollege youth for today's jobs has support by about 5 to 1.

Of course, not everyone replying answered every question listed. The percentages shown for each question in the tables below are based on the tabulation of all the replies received to that particular question or part thereof.

Mr. Speaker, as in past years, many Members of the House and Senate have indicated strong interest in the results of my annual poll. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the tabulated percentages of the replies to my 10th annual questionnaire:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
Do you favor—			
1. The overall record of the Kennedy administration?	22	68	10
2. Our present Cuban policy?	16	77	7
If no, would you favor—			
(a) Blockade of Cuba at risk of war? 34			
(b) Support of refugee invasion? 40			
(c) U.S. invasion of Cuba? 12			
(d) Economic sanctions against nations trading with Cuba? 73			
3. Our fight to keep South Vietnam out of Communist control?	63	22	15
4. Continued strong U.S. financial support of the U.N.?	45	40	15
5. Foreign aid spending at about present levels?	14	81	5
If no, do you favor—			
(a) More spending? 2			
(b) Less? 66			
(c) None? 12			
(d) Stopping aid to pro-Communist countries? 80			
6. Nuclear test ban treaty without foolproof inspection?	12	82	6
7. A $50,000,000,000 program to land a man on the moon by 1970?	23	63	14
8. Broad Federal action to assist unemployed and untrained youth?	65	24	11
9. Complete review of public school courses and methods to determine if we adequately prepare our noncollege youth for today's jobs?	75	17	8
10. $500,000,000 Federal mass-transportation program to aid commuters?	49	35	16
11. Prayer and Bible reading in the public schools?	76	19	5
12. The President's program for tax reduction, tax reform, and higher spending with resulting $12,000,000,000 deficit?	16	71	13
13. The theory of high Government spending, tax cuts, and large deficits as best means of creating jobs and boosting the economy?	15	75	10
If no, do you favor a balanced budget policy?	94	0	6
14. Continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee?	73	17	10
15. Stronger Federal action to prohibit distribution of obscene matter?	74	15	11
16. Present $7,000,000,000-a-year farm program of controls, subsidies, and storage of surpluses with resulting higher consumer prices?	6	90	4
If no, would you favor letting supply and demand set farm prices?	85	0	15
17. Enactment of strong Federal civil rights laws?	59	29	12
If yes, check those areas in which you favor Federal action:			
(a) Schools 73			
(b) Housing 49			
(c) Employment 64			
(d) Voting rights 92			
(e) Union membership 65			
(f) Business establishments 42			
(g) Denying Federal funds to States practicing segregation? 56			

Independence Day of Uganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Uganda celebrated the first anniversary of its independence, and we wish to take this opportunity to send warm felicitations to His Excellency the President, Frederick Edward Mutesa II; and His Excellency the Prime Minister, A. Milton Obote, on this momentous occasion.

Yesterday, Uganda celebrated the first anniversary of its independence not as an independent dominion of the Queen of England but as a sovereign state. The Uganda National Assembly decided in late September that Uganda should sever its last links with the British Crown. Uganda will remain in the British Commonwealth, but the representative of the British Crown in Uganda, the Governor-General, will be replaced by a President of the sovereign state.

When Uganda achieved independence just a year ago, a 60-year period of British protection came to an end. In the 1890's and early 1900's agreements were signed between Britain and the native rulers of Uganda establishing a British protectorate over the territory. Prior to the arrival of the British two very different political systems existed in Uganda as a result of tribal immigrations over about a thousand-year period. The north and east was organized in small villages and clean communities, whereas in the south and west strongly centralized kingdoms, each with a hereditary ruler and native parliament, had developed. Several of these kingdoms have persisted to the present, with the result that the kingdoms of Buganda, Ankole, Bunyoro, and Toro, and the district of Busoga were granted federal status under the 1962 constitution. Under the Federal relationship the kingdoms have wide powers of legislation over local matters and finances, but the central government has full authority for public order and safety throughout Uganda. The Ugandan constitutional arrangement offers an interesting example of the adaptation of the Western federal system of government to African political traditions.

The first year of Uganda's independence has been one of stable political development under the able leadership of Prime Minister A. Milton Obote. Furthermore, the Ugandan economy is sound and the country has a very favorable trade balance. Two agricultural crops—coffee and cotton—account for a large portion of the country's export earnings, but one of the objectives of a 5-year plan initiated in 1962 is to expand Uganda's already growing copper industry and to diversify further the economy. The government, in fact, anticipates an increase in the value of exports from £37.6 million in 1962 to between £43 and £45 million in 1963; it expects an increase in the gross national product from £155.2 million in 1962 to between £163 and £165 million in 1962.

Uganda will need some outside assistance, but the long-term economic outlook for this East African country is very favorable. Unemployment is not a serious problem, and Africanization of the civil service is progressing satisfactorily. Meanwhile, relations with Britain have remained friendly, and Uganda is benefiting from the expertise of British technicians and administrators who have agreed to stay on until Uganda's own population is adequately trained to meet the country's needs.

We congratulate the people of Uganda, Prime Minister Obote, and the other political leaders of Uganda on the first anniversary of their independence. May the future bring increasing political stability and economic development to a country which has already accomplished much in 1 short year of independence.

Fiscal Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, fiscal responsibility is alien to this administration. The promises of the New Frontier to the American taxpayer are hollow and meaningless. In fact, this administration is deliberately misleading the American taxpayer and has no intention of holding down expenditures. It is now seeking to double Federal expenditures for the boondoggling accelerated public works program.

The House Public Works Committee has scheduled hearings October 15 to October 18 on a proposal to increase the $900 million authorization for Accelerated Public Works to $1.8 billion.

President Kennedy told the Nation on TV just before the House tax bill vote that he would hold down unnecessary Federal expenditures. Yet, just a few weeks later, he is trying to double the size of a program that is not justified.

In Wednesday's press conference, Kennedy took great pains to create the impression that the economy is doing wonderfully well under the New Frontier. How can he justify a massive WPA-type program when his own propaganda line is that profits are higher than ever, that the Nation is progressing economically, and that the indicators are up?

Mr. Speaker I call your attention to the fact that APW is just WPA spelled backwards, this program under Kennedy has deteriorated into financing of barbecue pits, picnic tables, and ski resorts. After promising to cut wasteful spending, the New Frontier now tells us we need to double the frills, and the bills, to the taxpayer that such unneeded programs bring.

The President should level with the American people. Either the economy is weak and needs pump-priming WPA-type projects, or it is, as he publicly claimed Wednesday, strong, and, therefore, not in need of Federal make-work.

Such fiscal irresponsibility in the face of a tax cut and mounting deficits will surely bring inflation and its resulting chaos. Just this morning an article appeared in the paper indicating that the President was concerned with price increases. What else can the New Frontier expect from its fiscal policies. Continued Federal spending in the face of anticipated deficits and tax cuts increasing those deficits can only bring higher prices and inflation. You do not have to be a Harvard wizard to figure that out. And, Mr. Speaker, with this comes loss of confidence in the dollar and the demands on our gold are increased because of this lack of confidence.

The New Frontier is taking an unprecedented gamble with our economic system and the American taxpayer better prepare himself for it. A tax cut under these circumstances is indeed foolhardy. This effort by the New Frontier will simply add another $1 billion to the deficit.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I recently mailed a questionnaire to many of my constituents in North Carolina. The questionnaire went to a representative cross section of our people without regard to race, color, or creed in the counties of Gaston, Cleveland, Rutherford, Burke, Catawba, Avery, and Mitchell.

Out of the questionnaires mailed 34 percent have been returned as of this date. This, I am told, is a remarkably high percentage of participation in such polling. Eight issues were listed on the questionnaire. I believe that my colleagues will be interested in learning the results obtained from my questionnaire as the issues listed on it concerned some of the most important legislative matters with which we are confronted.

I include the results of the questionnaire in the RECORD:

1. Do you approve of the administration's civil rights proposals?

	Percent
Yes	12.6
No	84.7
No opinion	2.5

2. On tax cut proposals should Congress:

(a) Cut taxes regardless of the deficit?

	Percent
Yes	22.4
No	76.5
No opinion	1.1

(b) Cut taxes only if spending is reduced?

	Percent
Yes	82.2
No	16.1
No opinion	1.7

(c) Reduce spending, balance the budget, and then consider a tax cut?

	Percent
Yes	88.6
No	9.2
No opinion	2.2

3. Do you favor the administration's proposed Federal aid for mass transportation for cities initially costing $500 million in grants and loans?

	Percent
Yes	5.1
No	83.7
No opinion	11.2

4. Do you think our foreign aid appropriations, which now approximates $4 billion a year, should be reduced this year?

	Percent
Yes	93
No	4.9
No opinion	1.8

5. In view of the continuing Cuban crisis, do you believe the United States should:

(a) Prohibit any ship that trades in a Cuban port from thereafter entering a U.S. port?

	Percent
Yes	77
No	13.7
No opinion	9.3

(b) Take whatever steps are necessary, including military action, to overthrow the Castro regime?

	Percent
Yes	54.2
No	31.6
No opinion	14.2

6. Do you favor increasing your Social Security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home care for those over 65 as proposed in the King-Anderson bill?

	Percent
Yes	16.2
No	80.3
No opinion	3.5

7. Do you favor Federal aid for:

(a) School construction?

	Percent
Yes	18.7
No	78.9
No opinion	2.4

(b) Teachers' salaries?

	Percent
Yes	9.1
No	87.9
No opinion	3

8. Do you favor legislation:

(a) Removing the two-price cotton program whereby foreign mills purchase American cotton cheaper than domestic mills?

	Percent
Yes	87.7
No	6.3
No opinion	6

(b) Restricting textile imports?

	Percent
Yes	80.9
No	10.5
No opinion	8.6

Well Done, Sgt. Kenneth N. Bracken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, indeed to all Americans, a commendable example of the kind of man this country has serving in its Reserve units.

It gives me considerable pleasure to pay tribute to the Nation's "Outstanding Air Force Reserve Airman," S. Sgt.

Kenneth N. Bracken, of Johnstown, Pa. Airman Bracken was chosen for this honor over approximately 500,000 members of various Air Force Reserve units around the country.

All too often, Mr. Speaker, we take for granted the superior job our Armed Forces Reserve units do in contributing their part to our country's defense. However, when we realize that such units as the 9204th Air Force Reserve Recovery Squadron, of Johnstown, Pa., are staffed with men of the caliber of Sergeant Bracken, we can rightfully be proud—and thankful, I might add—of our country's military posture.

I think it altogether fitting, Mr. Speaker that I say a few words about this fine man, if only to expose for others that diligence, ambition, hard work, and imagination are the antecedents of excellence.

Sergeant Bracken was born March 26, 1928 in Johnstown, Pa. He left Ebensburg High School for the Army Air Corps in 1946. His tour of duty with the Air Corps lasted 12 years, during which time he distinguished himself several times. His career in the field of information and special services has brought him superior ratings by his commanding officers, commendations by various public and civic organizations, and a military commendation by the commanding general of the 4th U.S. Army. His career in information was interrupted by a tour of duty with the 5th Regimental Combat Team in Korea.

Although Airman Bracken did not graduate from high school, he has conscientiously continued his education since 1946. He is a graduate of several Army and Air Force schools, he has completed 20 correspondence courses with the USAFI, he has attended several colleges, he has graduated from at least two schools, one a university, and has been certified to teach in the State of Texas. He is presently enrolled in an officer's candidate course.

After leaving the service, Sergeant Bracken worked for several years in the field of journalism as a staff photographer, sports editor, photographic editor, and freelance photographer for International News Photos, United Press, and King Features Syndicate. He has worked closely with civic and fraternal organizations. Because of his father's poor health, he returned to his hometown and started to work in 1959 for the U.S. Post Office, where he was honored for outstanding work in 1962.

Sergeant Bracken has been eminently active in his local Reserve unit, and several times he has been honored by his fellow airmen and local civic organizations.

Last month Airman Bracken and his wife, the former Grace F. Kuwahara, were here in Washington where he received his official recognition as the country's outstanding Air Force Reserve airman. At that time he was a guest of the Air Force Association's convention, a guest of Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force and a guest of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff.

It is not surprising, Mr. Speaker, that the country's top airman should come from the 9204th Air Force Reserve Recovery Squadron. This unit is a fine example of an Air Force Reserve program. The squadron not only attempts to carry out its primary duty as part of our country's defense, but both the squadron and individual members of the group are active in community projects. The spirit of the squadron is excellent. It would not surprise me if in the future the 9204th would again contribute the country's outstanding Reserve airman.

I have brought S. Sgt. Kenneth N. Bracken and his honor to the attention of my fellow Americans because it is my deep hope that he will be an inspiration to countless other U.S. Air Force Reserve airmen around the country.

We are proud of Airman Bracken. We wish him well, but I have the strong suspicion that he will do well in the absence of our good wishes. Well done, Sergeant Bracken.

Orange County Gains Separate Metropolitan Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, Orange County, Calif., which I have the honor to, in part, represent, will be declared a separate metropolitan area by the Bureau of the Budget tomorrow. Truly, it is an honor to announce this historic new chapter in the fabulous story of Orange County's unbelievable progress. It points out once again dynamic growth of our county—growth not only in population, but also in business and industry.

Expressions of confidence such as this do not just happen. There is always a moving spirit and a well-organized effort. This case is no exception. What is exceptional, however, is the broad base of support this project had. From every segment of the Orange County scene, businessmen, civic leaders, officials, private individuals, and organizations pledged their support, and put their shoulder to the wheel to achieve our goal.

It would be impossible to mention all of those involved in the drive to achieve separate metropolitan status for Orange County. Supervisor William J. Phillips, the chairman of the metropolitan area committee, was an outstanding leader. Worth Bernard, the publisher of the Orange County News Magazine of Life, Business, and Industry, fought for many years to bring about the much desired change. He also deserves a well-earned pat on the back.

On April 29 of this year, a large delegation of Orange Countians, headed by Supervisor Phillips and including Worth Bernard, a number of mayors, councilmen, leading businessmen and industry leaders, chamber of commerce officials, and others came to Washington. This delegation convinced the officials at the Bureau of the Budget of the unanimity of support for the change in status. Commenting at that time on the effort, Chairman Phillips very accurately stated "no civic effort has ever before gained such unanimous countywide support."

As a result of the delegation's visit, it was agreed that Frank Cisar from the Bureau of the Budget would come to Orange County to see the situation for himself, and to hold another round of meetings with local leaders.

All this work, and much, much more, has now culminated in Orange County gaining this new prestige and recognition. Certainly the result will be to stimulate greater interest throughout the country in truly "fabulous Orange County."

A great deal of credit goes also to California's fine Senators, THOMAS KUCHEL and CLAIR ENGLE, both of whom played leading roles in securing our new status, as did my colleague from Orange County, JAMES UTT. Naturally, I was very proud to be a part of this truly massive effort.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize two brilliant, hard working men from our Bureau of the Budget. Walter F. Ryan and Frank A. Cisar deserve a very warm "thank you" from all Orange Countians. Their invaluable assistance and foresight will long be remembered by all of us.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, while the contributions made to the development of our Nation by citizens who came here from Poland or who were born in this country and have their ancestry to that land need no detailing in this Chamber, it is appropriate that we acknowledge today the anniversary of the death of a man who, perhaps more than any other, symbolizes this group of fine Americans—Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

The district I represent has many Americans of Polish ancestry. They are active in every field of endeavor—business, social, religious, and political. They contribute to the well-being and the welfare of the community. I consider myself fortunate to have grown up in their midst.

Today has by proclamation been set aside in the cities in my district as a day to honor General Pulaski. This is a day to recall the heroic service to America rendered by that gallant soldier in our war for independence. His service is of special significance to those of us in New Jersey for he commanded Washington's cavalry troops in the Battles of Trenton and Flemmington in our State.

One of the country's early and great highway engineering accomplishments, the vehicle skyway that crosses over a large stretch of industrial New Jersey in my district is named for Pulaski, an indication of the esteem in which he continued to be held 184 years after his death.

While we are aware of General Pulaski's great service in the Revolutionary War, we are sometimes inclined to overlook the fact that earlier in his career, he led military forces of his own country against Russian domination of Poland.

We are mindful that we honor today a man who is revered as a great patriot in two nations—the United States and Poland.

Following brilliant service in campaigns in the North under General Washington in our war for independence, General Pulaski was sent to Charleston, S.C., in 1779 to command troops opposing the British there. Leading his cavalry forces further to the south, General Pulaski led the attack against the British at Savannah, Ga. In that action he was gravely wounded and died a short time later.

His was a gallant death in the cause of his adopted country, and worthy of remembrance on this day by all Americans whatever their descent may be. Polish Americans may take special pride that at the time of the birth of the Republic one of their own was at the head of a heroic cavalry charge against the enemy of a new country dedicated to the cause of freedom. Polish Americans have always made large contributions in life and suffering to American struggles against tyranny. In so doing they are at one with the heroic history of the Polish people and that great Pole and great American, Casimir Pulaski.

Passamaquoddy Project To Benefit Massachusetts Industries and Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, in a special report to President Kennedy, stated that the International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power project and the companion Upper St. John River Hydroelectric Power Development are "economically feasible" and should be constructed for the benefit of the United States. As I have stated on previous occasions, congressional approval of the Quoddy-St. John project will be a giant step forward to bring abundant power and lower electricity to Massachusetts, as well as to the other New England States.

Not long ago, a New England newspaper columnist declared: "Where there is cheap power in large amounts, industry follows." He added that the people of our area are forced today to choose between remaining a potential economic distressed area or developing a major base for industry. This choice faces all of New England.

Too many of us for too long have looked with envy at the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest, with their low-cost Federal power and resulting industrial development. I believe it is time to take a positive approach, by developing our own power resources here in New England.

The road to low-cost power and industry is clear. Construction of the Passamaquoddy and St. John River projects in Maine can inject inexpensive Federal hydroelectric power into our Massachusetts economy. Thanks to the technical improvements in high-voltage transmission, the benefit of "Quoddy" can be spread over a larger area.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has told President Kennedy that, on the basis of his Department's new study, the billion-dollar Passamaquoddy and St. John River power projects will completely pay for themselves, and result in no burden on the taxpayers generally. New recreational areas can be developed in conjunction with power, bringing tourists and profits to the region. I am especially interested in Secretary Udall's recommendation that the project include two high-voltage transmission lines from Passamaquoddy to Boston, bringing the power into the heart of New England.

Just how important is this new power source to Massachusetts? We must consider this question both from the standpoint of the average homeowner and of the workingman whose job may depend upon the health of Massachusetts industry and the rate of its growth.

Federal Power Commission figures show that the residential consumer in Massachusetts pays 33.5 percent more than the average consumer does nationwide.

Manufacturing industries in New England are even worse off than residential users. In 1960 New England manufacturing industries paid the highest electric rate per kilowatt-hour of any in the Nation, 65 percent more than the national average, and 181 percent more than in the eastern south-central region that includes the TVA.

Does this hamper our industries? Obviously it does. A reduction of only one-tenth of a cent per kilowatt-hour in 1960 would have saved our industries $11.4 million. Does it prevent new industry from coming to our area? It has been a factor in many cases, and a determining factor in some. All of us have seen the impact of the Niagara-St. Lawrence projects on upstate New York, we can recall the upsurge in industry in the Pacific Northwest during the great era of dam building and the revitalization of the Tennessee Valley.

Recently, Profs. Thomas P. Bergin and William F. Eagan of Notre Dame polled 5,000 companies which have expanded or relocated in 7 Southern States during the past 5 years. There were 1,800 replies to their questionnaire, giving reasons for their decision in order of importance.

A total of 229 listed electric power as an important reason, and 18 listed it as the most important. I might add that convenience to markets, availability of suitable buildings or sites, and availability of labor were the three most frequently mentioned reasons. Lower labor costs, which frequently is given credit for the new industry of the South, was in first place with only 38 industries, and favorable tax structure was considered most important by only 16.

Massachusetts, as well as the other New England States, can offer convenience to markets, good transportation, skilled labor, and many outstanding plant sites. If we bring Passamaquoddy and St. John River projects into being we can offer low-cost power, too.

Several years ago the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sampled nine counties—again, primarily in the Southeast—to determine what impact a new industry has on a community. The purpose was to measure statistically the effect of 100 new industrial jobs on various other economic and social factors in the counties sampled. Here are some of those effects:

One hundred new industrial jobs meant $590,000 more personal income per year, 4 more retail establishments, $360,000 more retail sales per year, and, most important, 174 more workers employed. In other words, each 100 new industrial jobs also created 74 new jobs in other industries—33 in retail trade, 25 in construction, 14 in professional and related services, plus a few in other types of work.

The great differential in power costs has graphic meaning when stated in terms of the experience of a specific manufacturing establishment. The president of a Massachusetts textile manufacturing company wrote me a few days ago and said very candidly:

> If we expect industry to develop and grow in New England, these power rates must be brought in line with comparable rates charged elsewhere.

He added that "we * * * are almost forced to consider seriously the feasibility and desirability of remaining" in Massachusetts. "In fact," he declared, "we are studying the relative merits of several other locations in the South."

The president of this textile company told me that in 1961 his firm purchased slightly more than 3 million kilowatt-hours of electricity at an average cost of 1.5267 cents per kilowatt-hour. That was 62 percent higher than the average cost of power purchased by the textile industry, nationally, in 1961.

If this Massachusetts textile manufacturer had been able to buy power at the average national rate for his industry, his company would have saved more than $18,000 in 1961. That saving would have amounted to 38 percent of his total power bill, which was $47,000.

This textile company president also told me that his power bill, next to wage and salary costs, is his largest single expense. While I have compared this company's power costs with the national average for the textile industry, the president of this firm was far more specific. He has compared his power bill in Massachusetts with the rate he would pay if his plant relocated in the South. He found that his present power bill is 55 percent higher than it would be in one southern city and 144 percent higher than it would be in another southern city.

Projecting the savings in power costs over a 10-year period, this Massachusetts textile company found it would save a minimum of $240,000 and a maximum of $420,000 on power costs by leaving Massachusetts and relocating in the South.

With planned additions of new equipment, this textile company estimates its annual power costs will be about $70,000. The 10-year savings by relocation will thus be the equivalent of from 3½ to 6 years of free electric power.

Now this is a serious problem for this company, for all manufacturing plants in Massachusetts and for our entire region. We do not want to lose our industry. We do not want to see men and women left without jobs.

To my colleagues from the South, let me say emphatically that neither do we want your region to raise its electric rates.

What we in New England want is action to reduce power rates in New England. We can move in this direction by harnessing and developing our water resources.

With Passamaquoddy as a start, and the New England region's additional 2.6 million kilowatts of undeveloped hydropower as future potential, we will have the tools with which to build a reinvigorated economy. With a real effort to bring electric rates down through integration of this hydro with efficient steam generators—both conventional and nuclear—and an orderly pattern of electric transmission, we can help create the kind of economic climate which will result in new industrial growth, new jobs, and a new spirit of progress.

After all, it was the water wheels of New England which sparked our Nation's first industrial revolution. The 20th century counterparts of these water driven generators can bring a new era of prosperity.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski: Son of Poland, American Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD M. RYAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that on October 11 we pause to recall the anniversary of the death of a great patriot, and to pay tribute to the memory and life of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, one of Poland's unforgettable heroes who sacrificed his life in our own struggle for independence during the Revolutionary War.

Mr. Speaker, liberty is a very strange thing. It has the fascination of its own. Throughout the centuries, men with such patriotic devotion were drawn into its service that the course of history has often been altered by a few men dedicated to the cause of freedom and independence. The pages of history are filled with the names of such patriots, and included among them will forever be found the name of Casimir Pulaski, a native of Poland; so thoroughly inoculated with the spirit of freedom that he joined the forces of our struggling colonies to assist them in attaining this priceless possession.

Because of his great service, as well as that of another great Pole, Kosciuszko, a traditional bond of friendship has long been held by the American people for Poland. And that bond, I hope, will be more firmly cemented through our efforts to destroy the shackles of communism that now bind her brave people and she will again take her rightful place in the family of nations as a free and independent country.

I am glad to have the opportunity of paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Casimir Pulaski who was a great son of Poland and a great American patriot. All freedom-loving Americans are acquainted with the deeds of the Polish hero. They know of his fruitless struggle for freedom in Poland when that country was partitioned by Germany, Russia and Austria. They know of his interest in the cause of American freedom and his arrival to the 13 colonies to fight brilliantly at the side of George Washington. General Pulaski organized cavalry units and trained American men. History has come to call him the father of the American cavalry.

Casimir Pulaski was born in Poland in 1748, the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski who was a member of the Polish nobility. The young man received his education in the local parish school and later was taught the Latin classics. Although born to wealth and ease, Pulaski joined his father in 1769 in the popular uprising against the Russian puppet, King Stanislas. Without resources, without large organization, without adequate arms or men, the heroic band of patriots fought gallantly against ever-increasing odds. Finally the fatal day came, however, when Pulaski had to decide whether to make a final desperate, suicidal stand, and be slaughtered with the remaining forces, or go abroad to seek aid.

He chose the latter course, dispersing his men to await help and another opportunity to resist. He first sought aid for his cause in Prussia, then in Turkey. By that time he was a penniless refugee since the family estates had been ravaged. His father and brother had been killed, and another was being held prisoner. Countless relatives and friends had died for Poland's right to be free.

His path finally led to Paris where he met Benjamin Franklin, a man of similar tastes. Learning of the dire need for trained soldiers and leaders, Pulaski journeyed to the United States where he soon distinguished himself by his personal courage and brilliant tactical knowledge. At the battle of Brandywine, Pulaski demonstrated the value of cavalry so ably and he distinguished himself so well in battle that he was commissioned brigadier general by Congress and given command of the entire American cavalry. General Pulaski proved to be a spirited young commander who fervently believed in the cause for which he was fighting. At the head of his men, in the thick of battle, he fought for 2 long years for our Nation and contributed to the winning of the revolution.

On October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, he bravely charged the enemy lines at the head of his cavalry unit and was seriously wounded. He was removed to the brig Wasp where surgeons were unable to remove the bullet. He died on board on October 11 at the age of 31, ending a career of a gallant and brilliant soldier. General Pulaski died as he had lived—in the midst of a fight for freedom.

Thus General Pulaski inscribed his name in the hearts and memory of every American. His name has become synonymous with freedom—a quality inherent in every person, particularly persons of Polish descent who have known so little freedom during the last 2 centuries.

Americans owe a debt of gratitude to him which can never be fully repaid. Our love and admiration for him is matched only by our love and respect for the country from which he came and whose spirit and love of liberty he typified. We Americans should dedicate ourselves to bring freedom to Poland, Pulaski's homeland, so that it will again be in the sunshine of liberty and independence.

Alabama Trucking Association Receives Safety Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Public Health and Safety Subcommittee it makes me very proud to be able to announce that the Alabama Trucking Association, a non-profit trade association comprised of for-hire and private truck operators and allied industries of the fine State of Alabama, which it is my pleasure to represent, recently received high honors and recognition in meriting an Award of Merit by the Jury of Awards of the American Society of Association Executives at its annual meeting in Dallas, Tex., during September of this year.

To indicate, Mr. Speaker, the great emphasis that the Alabama Trucking Association has placed on safety I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the highway and traffic safety program of the association.

The excerpts follow:

SAFETY PROGRAM OF THE ALABAMA TRUCKING ASSOCIATION

THE PROBLEM

The trucking industry, more than any other, is dependent upon the privileged use of the public thoroughfare for the conduct of its everyday business. The inescapable character, size and sound of commercial motor vehicles is such as to cause unwarranted trepidation on the part of some highway users and citizens. This attitude is unwarranted as borne out by the superior safety performance and record of professional truck drivers, and the lack of factual information and understanding by most people.

THE PLAN OF ACTION

In large measure, the attempted solution of this problem takes the form and method of a public relations effort. The plan, therefore, sought a change in public attitudes which was executed on a double standard of (1) responsible conduct and performance by the industry, its members and employees on the broadest possible basis, and (2) a continuous, concerted action for effective public education of the industry's vital role and importance to all citizens.

Within these goals the following activities have been developed over a period of time which as conducted during the past year 1962 merited the Alabama Trucking Association the highest national "Summa Cum Laude" Award for a State trucking association safety program by American Trucking Associations for the third consecutive year, with the added distinction of the highest point score ever achieved.

The projects and activities constituting this balanced program are briefed following.

SUMMARY FOR PUBLICITY PURPOSES

A year around, continuous program to reduce highway and traffic losses, promote safety and improve public confidence in trucks and the trucking industry, is the entry of the Alabama Trucking Association.

The safety program, founded on management support through a standing association committee, was executed through a council organization of experienced, professional, safety supervisory personnel. The program was additionally advanced by a full-time. technically trained association staff member, and a specially retained safety counsel.

The plan of action begins with performance of good safety practice within the trucking industry, and association members' truck fleets. It is furthered through promotion with public agencies, civic and other groups. It embraces general safety practices, though emphasizing highway and traffic safety. The program was designed to serve the association membership, its members, employees, and customers, the industry as a whole including nonassociation members, public agencies, and the general public.

The program has been successful and has experienced favorable results. "An excellent contribution to the betterment of traffic safety in the State and Nation," was the comment of one national safety authority.

This safety program for 3 consecutive years merited the highest national award of the American Trucking Associations for a State association safety program, and this year received the highest point score ever achieved.

More even than these high honors, this safety program has been a cornerstone of association-industry public relations that has united membership, brought favorable attention and acceptance by public officials, law-enforcement agencies, the press, and the general public.

SERVICES OF THE ALABAMA TRUCKING ASSOCIATION

The Alabama Trucking Association conducts a wide range of activities for the improvement of the trucking industry and its service to the public. It maintains a continuing program of public relations emphasizing information services through news media and other channels to bring better understanding and acceptance of the trucking industry. Its membership is served by information service on industry developments, legislation, taxes, and regulations covering both Alabama, other States, and the Federal and local level. Representation of the industry with other organizations, governmental agencies and regulatory bodies is also provided.

In conjunction with higher educational institutions and State agencies it offers instructional courses and programs to improve employee performance and efficiency of its members. Legal and research services are provided on matters of general industry application, and continuous efforts are directed to advancement of reciprocal recognition between Alabama and the other States benefiting the free flow of interstate trade and commerce.

The association is the exclusive publishing agent for all Alabama intrastate motor carrier tariffs as well as publisher of a monthly magazine, the Alabama Trucker, which serves as both an internal and external medium.

The association has become the recognized leader in Alabama among nongovernmental groups in the field of highway and traffic safety and has received numerous national awards for its public interest safety program. This activity is directed by a full-time, technically trained and experienced staff member, Charles J. Burns, who is director of safety and information.

Mr. Speaker, some of the various projects that the association has in the field of traffic safety are: monthly membership safety service, supervisory personnel training, safety publicity and information material, annual truck fleet safety contest, driver of the year program, cooperative road patrol, Alabama truck rodeo, education activity, special courses on ICC regulations, retention of special safety counsel, participation in official State safety activities, speakers' bureau, arrest report service, safety awards to civic organizations, traffic, speed and noise surveys, highway hazard reporting, school safety shows, fleet safety program assistance, road condition reporting, driver training school, driver license service, driver courtesy campaigns, Alabama teenage driver rodeo, courtesy impromptu truck inspection checks, lights on for safety campaign, holiday safety patrol, truck routing projects, Alabama Press Association Safety Awards, heroism awards, vehicle safety check, national newspaper safety writing contest, "arrive alive" campaign, general safety training, and truck accident investigations.

As you can readily see, Mr. Speaker, the Alabama Trucking Association has gone out 100 percent for safety and I have been pleased to have been a part of this program in the lights on for safety program over the Fourth of July periods by making a radio tape recording encouraging drivers to drive with their lights on during daylight hours. This recording was aired some 1,428 times during the holiday period.

THE RESULTS

While it is difficult to appraise the results of a program of this nature due to the intangibles involved, there have nevertheless been beneficial, demonstrated results. Some of these have been mentioned within each activity description. Some have been specific and statistically accreditable, others very general.

It is important to note that the cumulative results have been significant. The variety of activities provided a continually fresh news angle during the year, that a less number or a series of more similar activities would not have afforded. This built a cumulative effect in reception by the news media, reader interest, general recognition and acceptance, and favorable public attitude throughout the year.

A yet greater cumulative effect resulted from repetition of activities from one year to the next, which brought better identification of the trucking industry with its safety purpose in the public mind. Among recognized safety authorities in the State, the association has attained the posture as the leader in the field of safety among all nongovernmental groups.

The association's safety program has been the cornerstone of its total public relations effort. All other public relations activities have been built upon and rise from it, as has become so evident in press and media relations, law enforcement agency relations, and government relations.

Nothing succeeds like success and the axiom has become a truism among the membership, since the recognition given the association's safety program has had a uniting effect upon membership and has been important in merchandising better safety practices to an ever-increasing number of truck fleets.

This was dramatically characterized when the State highway patrol in need of a tractor-trailer combination for use in special, undercover investigative work was provided the equipment needed by one truckline. Not using the identical equipment needed, this carrier modified one of its own trailers and bought for the purpose the truck-tractor required and turned it over to the patrol on indefinite loan. Not stopping with this, the carrier's safety personnel then trained the police officer in use of the equipment and other necessary information to perpetrate the use, right down to driver slang and mannerisms. This unique project, coordinated by the association, brought the apprehension of persons making illegal sale of harmful barbiturates and amphetamines to drivers of automobiles and trucks alike, and in one case to schoolchildren.

This like the other ample experience of this continuous safety program constitutes genuine results, results beneficial to association membership, to the cooperating agencies, government, the public interest, and thereby, back again to the association members and the trucking industry as a whole. The program will be continued, and as before it will be annually reviewed, revised as needed, and added to, as has been done each year.

The program has already been accorded distinction, honor, and recognition as having merited the highest national award of the American Trucking Associations for a State association safety program. It has further been awarded this "summa cum laude" distinction 3 years consecutively, and last year received the highest point score ever achieved. The recognition and awards received by this safety program, attesting its value in the judgment of experts in the field, while constituting positive results in its own way, had the further effect of calling such attention to the program as to increase and broaden its acceptance and effectiveness thereby bringing greater results in those basic accomplishments of the program.

Proposed Curtailment of Service on New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad recently announced that it will further curtail passenger train service on its lines from New London, Conn., to Worcester, Mass., and from New London to Providence, R.I. If the railroad is permitted to go through with its plans it will mean the elimination of all passenger train service in that area affecting eastern Connecticut, Rhode Island and parts of Massachusetts.

As the Representative of the Second District of Connecticut, which includes the eastern part of the State, I want to express the strongest possible protest in behalf of my constituents over the proposed curtailment of train service. This is not the first time that this railroad company has taken such steps. In recent years it has abandoned no less than 18 passenger trains, all under the excuse of saving money. The people of our area, while dissatisfied with the railroad's actions in the past, tried to understand and to be helpful. This time, however, its action means complete elimination of passenger service.

The action being taken by the railroad will seriously affect the economy and growth of eastern Connecticut. Curtailment of train service will also mean the curtailment of further expansion of this area. Not only will it affect business, but it will also hurt many of our educational institutions of which we in Connecticut are very proud.

Let me cite an example in my immediate community. I reside in Putnam, which is a stopping point on the New London-Worcester line. There are now two stops a day at Putnam, both of which will be eliminated under the proposed curtailment and our area will be left without any passenger railroad service. We have three very fine schools in this vicinity attended by many hundreds of young people from all over Connecticut and nearby States. They are Annhurst College, Marianapolis School, and Pomfret School, the latter two being of secondary level. The rail service is being used by many of the students, as well as their parents visiting them. They will now be deprived of this service.

I am today introducing a bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, which permits a railroad to discontinue passenger train service on its own without consulting State authorities. Prior to enactment of that section in 1958, State railroad commissions or similar agencies would regulate passenger train service. These local agencies were in a better position to understand local needs and to evaluate the effects it would have on the areas in question. Since the enactment of that section, the railroads have taken it upon themselves to curtail service without consulting State authorities and almost completely disregarding the public interest. A situation of this kind cannot be tolerated any further. My bill, therefore, seeks to return control over passenger train service and the regulation of such service to State agencies.

In addition to introducing this bill, I am writing a letter to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission calling for an immediate investigation and public hearings, either in Washington or in Connecticut, on the New Haven Railroad's proposed curtailment of passenger service on all its trunk lines in Connecticut.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a copy of my letter to the Interstate Commerce Commission, also the text of an editorial published in the New London Day on October 7, 1963, and a letter I received from Mr. Daniel B. Fuller of the Chamber of Commerce of Mystic, Conn., objecting to the discontinuance of train service in the area. They are as follows:

[From the New London Day, Oct. 7, 1963]

THE FATE OF 508

Every morning at 7:22 a.m. (Monday through Saturday except holidays), train No. 508 meanders up the track, crosses the Thames River and heads for Providence from New London. In late afternoon it heads back home to New London again. It's a safe guess that few here, outside of railroad men, know the first thing about No. 508.

In fact, the New Haven Railroad's bankruptcy trustees said the Budd unit has so few friends it operates at a deficit. It proposed that the train be discontinued.

All of a sudden, No. 508 hit the headlines. Three U.S. Senators appeared in its behalf, a fourth submitted a plea by proxy. For 6 hours, a Senate Commerce Committee heard testimony in Providence, most of the witnesses demanding the train be continued. No. 508 never basked in such popularity.

Yet, the situation is no joking matter. It illustrates the difficult questions the Nation—particularly the northeastern United States—faces in regard to mass transportation.

It isn't just No. 508 (which would have several cars, not just two, if it really were supported by the public). The problem involves dozens of commuter trains, medium-haul lines serving a string of communities, and the long-haul runs like those linking New London with New York and Boston.

The New Haven seeks to cut its losses by peeling off unprofitable runs and immediately hits a wall of resistance, formidable opposition even though it concerns a relatively minor matter.

But nobody seems to have a clear idea of the total railroad picture. We're told the New Haven will have a chance if commuter operations are subsidized. All well and good. But what about other elements of the service which show signs of deterioration and which, in years to come, will threaten vital rail communications between urban centers like New London and other cities?

If some of the brains and energy expended on the Providence hearing could be channeled into a broader study, or at least on initiating such a study, communities along the line might be better served.

OCTOBER 9, 1963.

Mr. LAURENCE K. WALRATH,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALRATH: I am writing to you to lodge a strong protest against the proposed curtailment or discontinuation of passenger train service from New London to Worcester and New London to Providence, as announced recently by the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

The curtailment of railroad service in those areas, which is to become effective on October 21, 1963, will have a detrimental effect on the economy and growth of eastern Connecticut, as well as other parts of our State and sections of Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

The Second Congressional District of Connecticut, which I have the honor to represent in Congress, is comprised of the eastern half of the State. These railroad lines are vital to the public interests in this area, an area which has grown considerably over the past decade in population and industrial expansion. Discontinuation of railroad passenger service will definitely hurt the future growth and further expansion of eastern Connecticut.

The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has been the recipient of substantial Federal and State financial support during recent years in the form of loans and subsidies reaching into many millions of dollars. This assistance was provided to the railroad not merely for the purpose of its freight service, but also to facilitate its continued passenger service. By discontinuing or curtailing such passenger service, the railroad is defaulting on its obligations to the State and to the various communities which it has dutifully undertaken to serve. If these communities deteriorate economically, as they may do if railroad service is discontinued, it will in the long run also affect freight shipments and the railroad's income from such shipments. Thus, the railroad will find that, rather than having solved a problem, it will have hurt itself by killing the "goose that lays the golden egg."

It is my conviction that before any railroad passenger service is discontinued, a responsible Federal agency such as the Interstate Commerce Commission should carefully examine this situation. The purpose of my writing to you at this time is to urge your Commission to undertake an immediate investigation of the proposed abandonment of passenger railroad service on the New Haven Railroad and to hold public hearings, either in Washington or in Connecticut, where all interested parties will have the opportunity to present their views.

It has been charged in the past that the Interstate Commerce Commission is an agency which is "railroad management-minded." As a Member of Congress, I do not believe in such rash accusations. I feel that the deplorable railroad situation in Connecticut now presents an excellent opportunity for your agency to firmly and quickly step into the picture, in order to provide the public with the necessary protection and to safeguard its needs for railroad passenger service.

In view of the short time left between now and October 21, when the proposed curtailments are scheduled to go into effect, I urge your agency to act without further delay along the lines proposed in this letter.

May I hear from you on this very important matter as soon as possible?

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE,
Member of Congress.

OCTOBER 3, 1963.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: The board of directors of the Mystic Chamber of Commerce, Inc., would like to register its strong objection to the proposed discontinuance of train service between New London, Conn., and Providence, R.I.

The elimination of trains 508–521 and 525 of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad would, in effect, eliminate just about all regular train service to and from Mystic.

Train No. 508 from New London to Providence and further to Boston, is a great help to Mystic people in getting to Boston on business and pleasure trips. We would like to point out that the reason many Mystic people do not board the train in Mystic is that they prefer to drive to New London or Westerly, R.I., where they can leave their cars and have a larger number of trains to select for their return.

Since there is only one train back into Mystic, this is not nearly as convenient as having a number of trains to select for the return to Westerly or New London. It is this train, in particular, that the chamber of commerce feels should be retained.

The writer personally uses the train six or seven times a year, throughout the year and the train is full or nearly full, on every trip.

We therefore ask that the Interstate Commerce Commission refuse to permit the discontinuance of service for trains 508–521 and 525 in the New London, Conn.-Providence, R.I., area, as it would work a hardship on the communities in one of the fastest growing areas in Connecticut.

Thank you for your consideration of this report.

Sincerely,

DANIEL B. FULLER,
Transportation & Traffic Committee,
Mystic Chamber of Commerce, Inc.

Mervyn LeRoy: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, marking a precedent in Hollywood history, Producer-Director Mervyn LeRoy will be honored with an impressive ceremony in Grauman's Chinese Theater forecourt, October 15, on the occasion of his starting preparations for the 75th film of a distinguished career. it was announced yesterday by Eugene V. Klein, president of National General Corp., nationwide theater circuit.

A bronze tablet, commemorating the "Salute" to LeRoy, will be cemented in the Hollywood theater's forecourt, which hitherto has honored the film industry's foremost stars.

Participating in the colorful ceremonies will be many of the top stars who were directed by LeRoy over the past 35 years, since 1928 when he debuted as a director at First National Studios with "No Place To Go," starring Mary Astor and Lloyd Hughes.

Others participating in the impressive event will be representative civic and community leaders.

On the long list of 74 distinguished and popular screen successes bearing LeRoy's name are such milestones in cinematic history as:

"Quo Vadis," "The Wizard of Oz," "Waterloo Bridge," "Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo," "Random Harvest," "Fugitive From a Chain Gang," "Madame Curie," "Oil for the Lamps of China," "Anthony Adverse," "Tugboat Annie," "Little Caesar," "Five Star Final," "Little Women," "They Won't Forget," "Mister Roberts," "Three Men on a Horse," "Gold Diggers of 1933," "The Bad Seed," "The F.B.I. Story," and many others, including his most recent film for Warners, "Mary, Mary."

Stars and "name" players who have been directed by LeRoy include a virtual cavalcade of actors and actresses who helped write motion picture history.

They include such stars as: Clark Gable, Greer Garson, James Stewart, James Cagney, Dick Powell, Marion Davies, Ronald Colman, Judy Garland, Paul Muni, Edward G. Robinson, Alice White, Gloria Swanson, Marie Dressler, Wallace Berry, Joan Blondell, Barbara Stanwyck, Elizabeth Taylor, Spencer Tracy, Frank Sinatra, Rosalind Russell, Robert Taylor, Norma Shearer, Frederic March, William Holden, John Wayne, Loretta Young, and many others, including latter day stars as Natalie Wood and Debbie Reynolds.

Over the past 35 years, Mr. LeRoy has contributed immeasurably toward the development of the motion picture production medium to its present important level in the Nation's economic structure.

Through his artistry and genius, Mr. LeRoy has enriched the lives of Americans throughout our land as well as the lives of people throughout the world.

He has provided much-needed entertainment for a public in need of diversion, and he also has brought great honor to the motion picture industry through his outstanding and widespread efforts on behalf of education and philanthropy.

Address of Hon. Douglas Dillon Before the American Bankers Association, October 8, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 10, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following address delivered by our distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon, before the American Bankers Association meeting in Washington on October 8, 1963.

Secretary Dillon's remarks emphasize the financial responsibility of this administration. The record of cutting unnecessary expenditures without endangering needed programs is impressive; we are still moving ahead. The tax bill will provide further incentive to business when it is enacted and the outlook is good for an improved balance of payments.

Secretary Dillon's address follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION, CONSTITUTION HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1963

It is an honor and a privilege to be with you today, as you reach the climax of this centennial year of the dual banking system. It is certainly unnecessary for me to relate the vast contributions which banking leaders and their institutions have made to the growth of our Nation. Suffice it to say that the American economy could never have achieved the amazing results of the past century, had it not been for the foresight, courage, and sheer competence that has characterized our banking leaders. Service to the Nation has always been high among your objectives, and, today, I want to pay particular tribute to the service which bankers throughout the Nation render their communities and their country in supporting the U.S. savings bonds program. On the occasion of this centennial celebration it seems particularly appropriate to present you with a formal expression of our appreciation. It is a citation which reads as follows:

"The Treasury Department gratefully acknowledges the outstanding leadership and public service support of the American Bankers Association and its members on behalf of the U.S. savings bonds program * * * and offers its congratulations upon the observance of the 100th anniversary of the dual banking system * * * Given under my hand and seal this 8th day of October 1963."

Mr. Kimbrel, I ask you to accept this token of our thanks on behalf of the association and all of its members.

And now I have an equally pleasant task—this one concerning your newly elected president, Mr. William F. Kelly. Each year it has been our custom to invite the incoming president of the American Bankers Association to serve as a special "ambassador of good will" for the savings bonds program.

Accordingly, Mr. Kelly, I am pleased to appoint you our special ambassador—in the hope that you will wish to carry on our mission wherever you may travel, in the great tradition of ABA presidents throughout the years.

We are meeting here at a time when our Nation is making critical economic decisions on both the international and domestic fronts. At home, we face the task of closing the deficits in employment, output, and in the Federal budget. Abroad, we face the problem of ending the troublesome deficits in our international accounts. None of these problems is isolated. Each impinges upon the other. It is this interrelationship that I would like to consider with you today.

The most striking characteristic of our balance-of-payments deficit is that it does not fit into the classic mold, in which a pattern of inflation and overconsumption at home brings with it a growing excess of imports over exports. Instead, we have unemployment in manpower, plant, and machines, along with stable price levels, and, in our foreign trade, a sizable export surplus.

It is against that unusual background that we have had to develop new approaches to reduce and eventually eliminate our balance-of-payments deficit while at the same time promoting domestic expansion. In so doing, we have been guided by two principal convictions:

First, that we must achieve our goals by working within the framework of a free market economy, with market disciplines and incentives providing the basic motive force. Only in this way can we arrive at solutions consistent with our own traditions, with freer trade between nations, and with the central role of the dollar as a world currency.

Second, we are convinced that a proper mix of fiscal, monetary, and debt management policies will make it both possible and practical for the United States to achieve our domestic and international goals simultaneously. Indeed, we are convinced that these goals can, and must, be mutually reinforcing.

From the very start of this administration, the central and crucial element in our approach to the payments problem has been our program to provide fresh incentives for American business through tax reductions. President Kennedy made the reduction of business taxes a first and urgent step shortly after he took office. This program was implemented last year with the 7-percent investment tax credit and the liberalized tax treatment of depreciation. These two measures together reduced business tax liabilities last year by an estimated $2.5 billion. The tax program now before the Congress would bring the total business tax reduction to almost $5 billion a year. That, together with individual tax reductions of almost $9 billion a year, will do much to spur our economy forward and will greatly increase both the profitability and the volume of business investment.

I cannot emphasize too strongly how essential the tax program is: The President has called his tax proposals the most important domestic economic measure in 15 years. Your own association has endorsed the tax cut as one of the prime prerequisites for reaching balance in our international payments by increasing business incentives and investment. Tax reduction this year has the enthusiastic support of the business community, of labor, and of our leading economists, who recognize that only by revising our outmoded tax structure and relaxing its grip upon incentives and growth, can we move decisively toward both internal and external strengthening of our economy.

To speak only of our balance-of-payments difficulty, there is no question but that the added investment that will flow from the present tax program—together with the heightened investment already created as a result of last year's tax measures—would further advance the productive efficiency of American industry. Only an efficient, expanding American industry will be capable of rapidly incorporating new technology into new plant and equipment and of maintaining our traditional leadership in the introduction of new products; of nurturing, in short, the very elements that must serve as the foundation of our export effort.

And, as we move toward full employment, with investment expanding under the twin stimuli of greater demand and greater profitability, the call on our capital markets will become heavier, longer term interest rates can be expected to rise, and savings that have been flowing abroad will once more find ample investment outlets here at home.

Only within such a framework of a prosperous and rapidly growing America can we find a sound and permanent solution to our balance-of-payments problems. No one is more aware of that fact than you here today.

You are, however, deeply and rightly concerned by the fact that the initial impact of tax reduction will come at a time when we are experiencing large budget deficits. I would like, therefore, to deal with this question at some length.

First, may I emphasize the fact that, by generating greater economic activity, the tax cut will increase Government revenues. I am sure you remember very well how taxes were sharply cut in 1954 and within 2 years revenues exceeded pre-tax-cut levels. Not only was that no isolated instance, but it reflected the consistent experience this country has had with major tax cuts throughout this century. It reflected, for example, the experience of Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon, who said in a statement before the House Ways and Means Committee—and I quote:

"In spite of the very sweeping reductions carried by the 1924 act * * * we will collect in 1925 more money at lower rates than we collected in 1923 at higher rates."

In short, after a brief transitional period, cutting taxes means greater revenue—not less. It was so in the 1920's. It was so in 1954. And it will be so after we adopt this year's tax bill.

But if we are to take full advantage of rising Federal revenues in a more rapidly expanding economy, then both the administration and the Congress must exert a continuing, careful, and judicious control over expenditures. An intensified program of expenditure control is an integral part of the tax bill, which states, in section I, that both Congress and the President must join in "taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending," if we are to obtain "balanced budgets in the near future."

The President, Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, and the House of Representatives in endorsing their views, have all made it unmistakably clear that, by adopting the tax bill, the Nation will be choosing "tax reduction instead of deliberate deficits as the principal means of boosting our economy"—that they consider these courses mutually exclusive and will not follow both at the same time—that, in short, the tax bill represents a major decision to rely upon greater private spending rather than greater Government spending as the prime factor in our economic growth.

The President has emphatically committed the administration to a course of intensive expenditure control, not only by his repeated pledges over the past 9 months, but by his record of efficient administrative management.

Certainly the budget has increased over the past 3 years. But the great bulk of that increase is accounted for by the sharp step-up in our defense and space needs—and by increasing interest costs that are in large part the reflection of responsible debt management policies and of our efforts to stem the outflow of short-term funds.

Outside of the heavy impact of these three items upon our budget, expenditures over the last 3 years have grown only moderately, judged against the needs of our expanding population. One simple fact should make that point abundantly clear: when you include the 1964 budget as submitted by the President, and before any reductions that may occur as a result of congressional action, then—apart from defense, space, and interest on the debt—the total increase in all other expenditures during the first 3 years of this administration will be $4.5 billion, one-half billion less than the increase in these same items during the preceding 3 years from 1958 to 1961—a period during which the Government was not often accused of extravagance.

In the light of that record, we can also take encouragement from the improvement in our immediate budgetary outlook. As you know, the fiscal 1963 deficit dropped from an estimated $8.8 billion to an actual $6.2 billion. Including the effect of the tax cut as approved by the House of Representatives, we now expect the current 1964 deficit to be less than the $9.2 billion forecast last January before allowance for the tax cut—and far less than the $11.9 billion originally foreseen after allowing for the tax cut.

In addition, the President has said that, in the absence of any unforeseen economic downturn or international crisis over the next few months, he expects to submit a fiscal 1965 budget with a deficit smaller than the $9.2 billion originally forecast for this year without a tax cut. In other words, despite the fact that fiscal 1965 tax revenues will reflect a major part of the tax cut—$7 billion—the projected fiscal 1965 budget will involve a lower deficit than that originally estimated for fiscal 1964 before any allowance for tax reduction.

That much, at least, should be heartening to anyone—whether or not he agrees with every policy or program recommended by the administration. And whether or not one agrees with every cut or every appropriation the Congress has made, we can also take note of the recent prediction by the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, that this year's appropriations will be held below last year's total for the first time since the end of the Korean war. Appropriations, of course, govern expenditures, as money must be appropriated before it can be spent. Therefore, the true and sensible way to measure expenditure control is to look at current appropriation totals rather than at expenditure totals, which are largely predetermined by earlier appropriations.

In any given year some 40 percent of expenditures flow from funds appropriated in preceding fiscal years. For instance, last year, fiscal 1963, we spent $92.6 billion but new appropriations amounted to $101.6 billion, or $9 billion more than we spent. That is why expenditures are increasing this year to some $98 billion and why a moderate further increase is likely in fiscal 1965 even if current appropriations are held below last year's $101.6 billion level.

Expenditure control is, of course, the joint responsibility of the President and the Congress. The President must exercise it in proposing his programs and his budget, as well as in carrying out and administering programs authorized by Congress. He does not, however, have—as some have implied—the latitude to whittle expenditures at will to meet short-run and arbitrary expenditure ceilings. At first glance, for example, it might seem feasible to realize substantial savings through the Commodity Credit Corporation. But CCC sales and purchases depend upon farmers' decisions, the weather, the crops, and other unpredictable or uncontrollable factors. And, to take another example, it would be the worst form of false economy to cancel or delay needed Defense or other programs which involve, as is usually the case, commitments and contracts already authorized, obligated, and well underway.

The only way to assure true control of expenditures is for both the President and the Congress to join in a continuing and complementary effort. That joint and continuing effort is exactly what section I of the tax bill pledges.

We must, however, live with temporary deficits during the period when the tax cut is taking hold. While these deficits are certainly no cause for complacency, neither should we take them as cause for alarm.

I think it is now well understood by informed observers both at home and abroad that deficits need not be inflationary when there is persistent unemployment and excess capacity. That has, in fact, been our experience over the past 6 years. The rapid rise in industrial production cost that characterized the first postwar decade has come to an end. Year-to-year increases in wage rates are now within the range of productivity increases, and overall unit labor costs in our manufacturing industries have actually declined during the current period of business expansion.

But if the short-run prospect is one we can view with sober confidence, this can in no way excuse us from concern over the longer lasting monetary and financial effects of our deficits—and from pursuing with increasing vigor and vigilance policies to assure that we are not today sowing the seeds for future trouble. And that depends on how we finance the deficit. Let me cite briefly from our record.

Since January of 1961, the Federal Reserve has not supplied a single additional dollar of reserves to the banking system for the purpose of facilitating Treasury finance. Commercial bank holdings of Government securities have actually declined by almost $2 billion from January 1961 through August 1963. Over that period the entire deficit has been financed outside the commercial banks.

The total of under 1 year Treasury debt in the hands of the public has increased by only $2.7 billion, or about 3 percent, since January 1961, while the economy has grown by about 17 percent. At the same time the growth in total liquid asset holdings—including not only money and short-term Treasury debt, but also the enormous increases in time and savings funds—has been roughly in line with gross national product, as it properly should be in line with the growing needs of the economy.

Government debt maturing beyond 5 years is now more than $20 billion greater than it was in January 1961—an amount considerably larger than the total increase in our marketable debt. And our debt due in

25 years or more is now $6.3 billion greater. As a result the average length of the marketable debt has been increased from 4 years and 6 months in January 1961 to 5 years and 3 months at the present time—the highest level since mid-1956. This record clearly shows that we have succeeded in financing our deficits in a manner calculated to avoid future inflationary troubles.

We thus have every ground for pushing ahead rapidly with the tax cut in order to improve both our economic performance here at home and our balance of payments. That expanding economic activity and productivity at home is the key to solving our balance-of-payments problem—and that the tax cut is the key to both—was cogently recognized in the balance-of-payments statement of your association earlier this year. It recommended "the enactment, in this session of Congress, of an across-the-board reduction in personal and corporate tax rates designed to improve the climate for direct business investment in this country, strengthen the prospects for cost-price stability, and restrain the large outflow of private long-term capital."

Your statement clearly underscores the urgency of the tax cut as a measure to sharpen the competitive edge of American business and help expand our exports, as well as a measure to make our economy continually more attractive for both foreign and domestic investment. Of equally great importance, the tax cut will, as the President stated last week before the International Monetary Fund, "give greater freedom to monetary policy" in meeting our balance-of-payments requirements.

Your balance-of-payments statement also emphasized the need to reduce the dollar drain of Government expenditures abroad. Only a few days after the appearance of your statement, the President, in his balance-of-payments message of July 18, announced his approval of a detailed program to reduce our dollar expenditures overseas by $1 billion a year. This program is already underway and will be fully effective by the end of next year.

But these long-term efforts to achieve balance in our international payments are not enough. We must also step up our efforts to keep current deficits to a minimum. Over the past several years, as you know, Treasury debt management policies have played a major role in bringing upward pressures to bear upon our short-term rates, while still maintaining a ready availability of long-term funds. In July of this year, the Federal Reserve reinforced this policy by raising the discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. At the same time, regulation Q was revised to permit banks to compete more effectively for time deposits of 90 days or longer. These actions have proved decidedly beneficial in improving the relationship between our rates and those abroad, thus helping to reduce the outflow of short-term capital.

In the area of long-term capital outflows, we have proposed a temporary interest equalization tax on purchases of foreign securities by Americans from foreigners. We took this step with the greatest reluctance. But the situation was grave. During the first half of this year the volume of new foreign security issues purchased by Americans reached unprecedented levels. At an annual rate of $2 billion, that volume was well over three times the annual average from 1959 to 1961, and was almost double the 1962 figures. It accounted for substantially all the deterioration in our balance of payments during the first half of this year. And, at the time of our announcement, the volume of new issues in prospect, the large majority for borrowers in countries with strong balance-of-payments positions, was just as forbidding.

The advantage of the proposed tax is that it can achieve the required temporary lessening of foreign demands upon our capital markets while leaving the market mechanism intact. Under the tax, it is the impersonal operation of price—not any artificial or arbitrary force—that would work to curtail our long-term outflows.

This tax, as I said last week before the International Monetary Fund, is "a necessary—but temporary—expedient to meet a specific situation that has arisen in large part out of a structural imbalance in the capital markets of the free world." It is not a long-term measure, but an interim step which we must take while our long-term measures become effective and while other industrial countries make the necessary effort to strengthen and improve their own capital markets.

There are clear signs that these two actions, higher short-term interest rates and the proposed interest equalization tax, are having the desired results. The first preliminary figures indicate that our third quarter deficit will be no more than half as large as the second quarter results. While it will be another 2 months before detailed figures, pinpointing the areas of improvement are available, only capital flows are capable of such rapid shifts.

Despite this shortrun improvement, it is still clear that eventual success in achieving a steady balance in our international payments must rest upon our ability to achieve greater industrial efficiency, to utilize more of our savings at home, and to maintain price stability. Our price performance over the past 5 years, our progress in bringing costs under effective control, and our firm resolve to maintain responsible monetary and debt management policies offer assurance against any resurgence in inflationary pressures.

We cannot, therefore, let anything restrain us from adopting the tax reduction bill this year. We cannot burden down with restrictions the very measure that will free our economy from the burdens of a restrictive tax system—we cannot dally until it is too late over a measure that we urgently need now. Our productive potential is unparalleled. The tax bill will give us the expanding economy and heightened incentives that will enable us to capitalize on that potential and achieve the still greater gains in output and productivity that we can—and must—have. With its enactment, and only with its enactment, can we look forward with confidence to solving our problems of unemployment, unutilized capacity, and budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1963

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 10, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, frail children of earth's fleeting scenes, we lift lame hands of prayer to Thee who art from everlasting to everlasting. From the grinding daily schedules which drain our strength and enmesh our hearts and minds, we would for these dedicated moments gaze up and out to the eternal principles which give worth and meaning to all that is said or done here.

Purge our hearts of unworthy entanglements and shabby selfish motives which may mar and blot the future's broadening way. In a world that has become a neighborhood, and which we must make a brotherhood or perish, join us to the increasing legion that across the boundaries of prejudice, intolerance, and hatred, extends the dominion of healing good will. Out of the ruins of mankind's shattered hopes, may Thy kingdom come. Thou who through storm and night art still guarding and guiding, to Thee aloud we cry, God save the state.

We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 10, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, of the Committee on Government Operations, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, limited to the introduction of bills, resolutions, and statements by Senators not to exceed 3 minutes, and not to extend beyond 12:15 p.m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2232. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize relocation payments thereunder in certain additional cases for losses resulting from the displacement of property from an urban renewal area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2233. A bill for the relief of Margaret Rose Owen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2234. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 127. Joint resolution for the relief of certain Yugoslav refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

CREATION OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

Mr. McCARTHY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 213) creating the Select Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. McCarthy, which appears under a separate heading.)

ANALYTICAL RESEARCH EXPERIMENT STATION, FREDERICK, MD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which has been submitted and recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior explaining the proposed legislation be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2234) to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md., introduced by Mr. Brewster, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. Brewster is as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an analytical research experiment station at Frederick, Md.

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

The proposed bill would provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to establish, equip, and maintain a research laboratory at Frederick, Md., to advance the conservation, development, and utilization of minerals by conducting investigations of precise analytical techniques essential to the effective pursuit of metallurgical research and applying newly developed knowledge in the preparation and identification of mineral substances of extraordinary purity and exact composition.

The Department has authority for the establishment of this facility under the act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 959; 30 U.S.C. 8), which directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish and maintain the facilities necessary to the conduct of programs of the Bureau of Mines, and we have utilized this authority many times since enactment. During consideration of the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1964 the House Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, stated that specific authorization should be obtained from the Congress, after consideration by the appropriate legislative committees, for the establishment of a new facility. Under these circumstances, we are submitting the proposed bill for consideration and recommend its enactment.

Extraordinarily pure and precisely compounded substances derived from mineral sources frequently have significantly different properties than similar substances of ordinary or commercial composition. Desirable qualities attainable by achieving new dimensions in purity include unique strength at extreme temperatures, impact resistance in frigid cold, ability to sustain repeated and prolonged shocks and loads, durability in corrosive and erosive environments, and predicted and controlled response to light, magnetism, electricity, and nuclear particles.

For continued progress in this evolving field an urgent need has become evident for developing reliable, precise techniques for the identification and measurement of a few unwanted atoms in an otherwise pure substance. Requirements of new electronic, nuclear and metallurgical applications for materials of transcendental purity demand analytical sensitivity a thousandfold or more exact than obtainable by conventional procedures. Research at the proposed facility in the development of precise, accurate analytical techniques will help the Bureau of Mines keep pace with the increasingly stringent materials demands of the Nation's scientific and defense program.

This need for more rapid analytical procedures to increase productivity and regulate improved quality in the mining and processing of minerals and metals has been accentuated by the trend toward centralized control and automation. Research at Frederick will be aimed at increased speed and ultrahigh precision in analysis of routine samples and toward development of techniques and apparatus for continuously probing and analyzing gaseous, liquid, and solid substances in transit and in process.

The Center will be staffed and equipped to provide—

1. A capability for determining the elemental composition of materials and for development of new techniques of more rapid, accurate, and sensitive analysis.
2. A capability for determining the atomic, and molecular arrangements and crystal structure in the substances being examined and in pure materials and compounds;
3. A capability for measuring thermodynamic, kinetic, and thermoelectric properties of materials of precisely known composition and structures; and
4. A capability for preparation of organic, inorganic, metallo-organic, cermets, and polymeric materials of precise composition.

The availability of optical, electronic, nuclear particle, and analogous highly specialized equipment and virtually sterile laboratory facilities for the first three items will provide an attendant opportunity and capacity for item (4).

The Bureau's effort and corollary activity by industry, and other Government agencies in this scientific field will be strengthened and accelerated by the new research center's abilities for concerted attention to the solution of pressing analytical and determinative problems.

The 87th Congress appropriated funds for planning and designing a facility at Frederick, Md. The funds for this limited purpose were transferred to the General Services Administration by the Department of the Interior. The initial planning and the architect-engineer contract for this project were negotiated and are being administered by the General Services Administration. We plan to utilize the services of the General Services Administration for construction of the buildings in the same manner.

The proposed bill would authorize an appropriation of (a) $2,500,000 for the erection and equipment of a building or buildings; and (b) such sums as are necessary annually for the maintenance and operation of the station. It is estimated that the annual appropriation for the first 5 years will be less than $1 million.

In the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 2d session, which preceded the appropriation, it was stated:

"In the whole materials area the single most inhibiting factor in the development and use of metals and alloys is the inadequacy of known analytical methods and analytical devices.

"Trace analysis, the measurement of a few unwanted atoms in an otherwise pure solid, is the most critical area in the entire spectrum of materials research. Although methods have been developed to allow routine analyses of impurities in quantities of only parts per million, the requirements of new electronic and metallurgical applications demanding ultra-high-purity materials have multiplied sensitivity requirements to mere parts per billion. Products now can be obtained in such pure form that they often surpass the limits of current analytical techniques.

"Without constant honing of the sensitivity and accuracy of established analytical techniques and continued development of new methods we cannot keep pace with the demands imposed by the Nation's scientific and defense materials program. The Bureau of Mines proposes to accent its endeavors in this vital area. An integrated five-point program will be initiated, including improvements of preconcentration methods, utilization of radioactive tracer and activation analysis techniques, application of new scientific analytical instruments such as the recently developed atomic absorption spectrometer and solid analysis mass spectrometer, development of improved measurement instruments, and fundamental investigation of new concepts of impurity detection.

"The Bureau of Mines proposes the establishment of a new center where talents and efforts can be concentrated upon this critical problem and to which research scientists in the Government, private research institutions, and industry can look for solution of analytical problems."

By contributing to the technological advancement of U.S. industry in the preparation and quality control of minerals, metals, and fuels, the Bureau program at Frederick would encourage and sustain U.S. leadership in this important area of our economy. The proposed new facility would help to maintain a preeminent position in minerals production and utilization.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

John M. Kelly,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN YUGOSLAV REFUGEES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution for the relief of certain Yugoslav crewmen who are seeking political asylum in this country. These men are faced with forceable deportation unless Congress acts in their behalf. Before returning these men to a Communist state I feel that a full inquiry should be made into the equities of each case. The joint resolution I am introducing will provide the basis for such a procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) for the relief of certain Yugoslav refugees, introduced by Mr. Keating, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have long held that a joint committee of Congress was necessary to exercise continuing supervision over the Central Intelligence Agency. For whatever reason it appears that Congress is reluctant to create such a joint committee. On a number of occasions while I was a Member of the House of Representatives I introduced bills to create a joint committee on foreign information and intelligence. I have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 61 in this Congress which is similar to the resolutions I have introduced in previous Congresses for the creation of such a committee. A number of other Senators and Representatives have introduced comparable resolutions.

Considerable public attention has been focused upon the Central Intelligence Agency as a result of the problems we are encountering in South Vietnam. Numerous questions have also been raised about the knowledge which we had concerning the recent military takeovers in the Dominican Republic and Honduras.

On Sunday, October 6, the New York Times published an editorial entitled "State Within a State?" concerning the Central Intelligence Agency. The editorial called for the appointment of a joint committee on intelligence.

James Reston, in the same issue of the New York Times, devoted his column to the Central Intelligence Agency and some of the problems it is encountering.

The Washington Post of October 8 called for a congressional inquiry into the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorials be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1963]

State Within a State?

Is the Central Intelligence Agency a state within a state?

President Kennedy's recall of the head of CIA operations in South Vietnam, coming after persistent reports of discord between him and Ambassador Lodge, appears to provide substantial corroboration to the long-voiced charges that our intelligence organization too often tends to make policy.

The CIA is a large and, on the whole, well-organized intelligence apparatus, which knows and employs all the tricks of the trade. But it not only gathers intelligence; it operates saboteurs, guerrillas, and other paramilitary forces. And its operations—particularly if they are not carefully programed, controlled, and directed—tend willy-nilly to influence policy, if not to make it.

The Agency has many extremely able men. But it operates behind the cloak of anonymity and secrecy—and secrecy adds to power. When the same organization collects intelligence and evaluates it, and, at the same time, conducts clandestine operations—and when that organization is as powerful and as well financed as the CIA—there is an inevitable tendency for some of its personnel to assume the functions of kingmakers.

Communist imperialism and the exigencies of the nuclear age have brought us eons away—whether we like it or not—from the era of 1929, when Secretary of State Stimson closed the Nation's only code-breaking organization with the remark that "gentlemen do not read each other's mail." Today we must read the other fellow's mail if we want to survive.

A joint Congressional Committee on Intelligence, so long urged but so often frustrated by congressional pride of place and petty jealousies, should be established to monitor our intelligence services, to safeguard their security and to reduce the dangers secret espionage and covert operations present to a free society.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 6, 1963]

How To Make Things Worse Than They Really Are

(By James Reston)

Washington, October 5.—John McCone, the headman at the Central Intelligence Agency, is discovering in Vietnam, as his predecessor, Allen Dulles, did in Cuba, that running a secret service for a big, gabby country is a very dicy business.

He is now accused publicly of differing with his Government's policy in Saigon, which he denies, and he takes the whole controversy so seriously that he has convinced himself that there is a conspiracy inside the Government and in the press to destroy his Agency.

This is a serious thing if true, for the cold war is in part a war of insurgency and counterinsurgency, and in such a war an effective secret service is increasingly important. But so far as can be determined here, there is no evidence of any conspiracy either by or against the CIA in Vietnam.

AN OLD DISPUTE

There is a jurisdictional dispute between the CIA and the State and Defense Departments. There always has been. State has always been afraid CIA would not restrict itself to the gathering of intelligence but would go beyond that to interpret their intelligence in such a way as to influence or make policy.

Similarly, the Defense Department has always been afraid the CIA would get into the field of actual operations, as it did in Cuba. Thus, State and Defense, jealous of their policy and operations functions, respectively, have always been suspicious of CIA and prone to complain to the press whenever they think they see evidence of encroachment.

These feelings were savagely pressed in the first Cuban crisis. They have been heard again about Vietnam, but the analogy with Cuba is misleading.

No doubt McCone and his headman in Saigon. John H. Richardson, who has now been called home, have strong views about both policy and operations in Vietnam. It would be surprising if they didn't.

The CIA was deeply involved in Vietnam long before the 14,000 U.S. troops were sent there. The CIA helped train the Vietnamese Army. And they were already close to President Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, before President Kennedy made his decision that a major counterinsurgency operation should be launched in Vietnam.

Thus, by the time the Buddhist temples were raided, starting the present crisis, the CIA, State and Defense officials were not only operating in Saigon but were deeply involved emotionally and had different views about how the United States should react to the raids.

The differing views, however, did not always follow the party line of the three government agencies. Some men in State thought a major effort should be made to force changes in the policies and personnel of the Diem government. Others thought that while such changes were desirable, they could not be forced without weakening the war effort. But these conflicting views existed within all three agencies, including the CIA in Saigon, and President Kennedy himself first supported the first line and then the second.

This was not, then, an Alfred Hitchcock spectacular involving the CIA versus the Rest. It was an honest difference over whether a purge of the Diem government was possible and whether such a purge would or would not help the war effort.

M'CONE'S SENSITIVITY

The State Department, for example, against the judgment of some of its own people but with the support of most of its top officials, issued a private directive in support of trying to force a change in the Diem government.

It did not check this out with CIA to see whether CIA's intelligence would show that such a purge could be forced. Nor did it tell the Defense Department about the directive. So CIA and Defense, which in general were not for trying the purge, were not amused.

What is surprising about all this is that McCone should be so surprised and tender about the criticism and the belated efforts of the White House to tidy things up.

This country is always going to be suspicious of any Government secret service agency, especially after Cuba, and it is likely to get all the more suspicious when the spooks see a great conspiracy in the reporting of their activities.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1963]

Our Man in Saigon

The recall of the CIA chieftain in South Vietnam should not be an occasion for recrimination. It should be an occasion for some useful reconsideration of the general role of an intelligence agency in foreign affairs. Ambassador Lodge is reportedly concerned about the prevailing arrangement that makes the CIA both an intelligence-gathering organization and an operational agency in the field. Mr. Lodge is not alone in his concern.

In theory, within the CIA, the intelligence and operational activities are kept separate. In practice, the two functions cannot be kept apart so easily; experience has shown that agency operatives in the field have a tendency to use intelligence to support an operational decision. The result, too often, is that Washington receives neither impartial intelligence nor benefits from operations based on a hard-headed perception of reality.

Clearly the CIA is at a disadvantage in any public debate of its activities; the agency cannot speak for itself. Success often goes unnoticed; failure just as often may lead to an exaggeration of the CIA's responsibility. This is the price that secrecy exacts. But public concern in the Agency's performance is legitimate and should not be equated with an attempt to smear or to impeach the motives of any CIA official.

What is sorely needed is a thorough and fair overall study of the intelligence community. Such an inquiry ought to deal with rivalry between the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency. It ought to draw on experience in other countries where intelligence and operational activities are lodged with separate organizational entities. And Congress should take the initiative in launching such a study.

For too many years, Members of Congress have closed their eyes to the need for legislative scrutiny into intelligence operations. Yet who else can do the job? The public lacks the facts; the administration has a record to defend; the agency cannot be expected to study itself. Enough has come to light to justify an impartial inquiry, which might properly be conducted by a special legislative commission drawing on members of both chambers and upon private citizens of stature and experience.

If an investigation should discover no grounds for changing the present arrangement, public apprehension would be lessened. If an investigation should disclose need for basic changes, then the country might be saved from future embarrassment. In either case, the United States would be the gainer and Congress would have discharged a duty that it has been far too reluctant to perform.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the time has come for Congress, if it will not establish a joint committee or a continuing committee, to appoint a special committee or select committee to conduct an immediate investigation into all the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and its organization, particularly those activities which have been attributed to the Agency in South Vietnam and, at the present time, in Central and South America.

Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which would create a select committee of the Senate to conduct such an investigation and report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1964. I am hopeful that the Senate will take action on the resolution immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Watchdog for CIA," published in the Washington Daily News of October 8, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Watchdog for CIA

Though bad blood among U.S. agencies in South Vietnam is officially denied, the fact remains that the head of Central Intelligence Agency operations in that country has been called home for consultations.

And that this recall promptly follows the return of Defense Secretary McNamara and Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor from an investigation of affairs in South Vietnam.

The facts concerning this intelligence organization are exceedingly hard to come by, and properly so. No reasonable person would expect the CIA to publicize its operation. Any such policy would destroy its usefulness.

But an excess of secrecy, we suggest, is good neither for the country nor the CIA which, under present arrangements, isn't even accountable to Congress.

Even the top-secret Atomic Energy Commission comes under the view of a joint committee of Congress, the members of which committee are able to influence, defend, and interpret the policies of AEC without exposing any of its secrets.

Proposals to establish a similar committee for CIA repeatedly have fuzzed out without action. Congress should be prompted by current events to establish such a committee.

The CIA operation, admittedly highly necessary under present world conditions, is something relatively new for the United States and is accepted reluctantly by a free society. But minimum congressional supervision is essential to public confidence that it operates effectively and stays within the bounds of its avowed mission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 213) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence and to consist of nine Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Central Intelligence Agency and to report its findings and recommendations to the Senate no later than January 31, 1964. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

Sec. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 5. The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duty. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities. and personnel of the various departments and agencies of the Government to the extent that such services, information, facilities, and personnel, in the opinion of the heads of such departments and agencies, can be furnished without undue interference with the performance of the work and duties of such departments and agencies. The committee is authorized to procure, by contract or otherwise, the services of public or private organizations or institutions.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee, in an amount not to exceed $200,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 222)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, intended to be proposed by me, to H.R. 6143, the higher education bill. I ask that it be ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. President, this amendment would add a new title to the bill which would allow an income tax deduction for tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education. It represents a revision of a bill I introduced earlier this year (S. 1236) to allow tax deductions for tuition and fee payments to educational institutions at all levels, whether public or private. The amendment now being sent to the desk differs from my original bill in two major respects. First, instead of a flat $300 per person maximum deduction, it would permit deduction of all tuition and fee payments in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, with no fixed maximum. And secondly, in order to keep the amendment germane to the bill at hand, I have limited its application to payments for higher education only, but still without regard to whether the institution is public or private supported.

In advancing this amendment, I am fully aware objection will be raised that it basically affects the raising of revenue and therefore should not originate in the Senate. I am nevertheless putting it forward now so that it may stimulate renewed discussion of the virtues and feasibility of aiding all levels of education through the income tax structure. I also intend to obtain new Treasury Department reports on this and other tax deduction proposals so that, in the event this particular amendment is withdrawn, defeated, or ruled out of order on constitutional grounds with respect to the higher education bill (H.R. 6143), I shall be prepared to reoffer it as an amendment to the tax bill, where, of course, it would be perfectly in order.

Let me just conclude by saying, as so many have said, that I know of no better way to further investment in higher education and to alleviate hardships to parents and students who these days must bear terrific expense, than by the tax deduction route, and, in my judgment, now is the right time to make a start down that road.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this amendment be printed following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 222) is to insert at the end of the bill, the following new title:

TITLE IV—INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR TUITION AND FEES PAID TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Allowance of deduction

SEC. 401. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. TUITION AND FEES PAID TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year to an institution of highed education for tuition and fees for the attendance of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent at such institution of higher education, but only to the extent the amounts so paid exceed 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income for the taxable year.

"(b) LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees for the spouse of the taxpayer only if—

"(1) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151 (b) for the taxable year, or

"(2) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(c) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS.—Amounts paid for tuition and fees with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117 (a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) DEPENDENT.—The term 'dependent' has the meaning assigned it by section 152 (a).

"(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning assigned to it by section 301(a) of the College Academic Facilities Act.

"(e) TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses)."

(b) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out:

"Sec. 217. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees paid to institutions of higher education.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 402. The amendments made by section 401 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963.

GEOTHERMAL STEAM LEASING HEARINGS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee, of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I wish to announce public hearings on proposed legislation authorizing the leasing of geothermal steam in the publicly owned lands of the United States to be held October 25. Preliminary hearings on geothermal steam leasing held by the subcommittee on July 12 last showed that there were substantial problems and basic differences of opinion concerning this legislation.

At the subcommittee's request, various segments of the geothermal industry have submitted legislative proposals, and it is the subcommittee's intention to consider these proposals and any others placed before the members at the October 25 hearing.

Mr. President, geothermal steam is potentially a very important industrial development for the United States, not only because of the electric energy that can be produced at very low cost from the heat, but also because of the extremely valuable byproducts that are produced at very low cost along with geothermal steam in certain areas. I invite the Members of the Senate and other interested persons to participate in the October 25 hearings.

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I note from press stories today that the Republican leadership of the Congress is going to make the sale of wheat to Russia a major political issue in the next campaign. Where they got all of this authority I do not know, as inasmuch as the question of making this an issue in the next campaign, or even in this session of Congress, was never brought up before the Senate Republican policy committee. This is one political parade I will not be marching in.

Mr. President, I have already inserted in the RECORD many editorials from the North Dakota daily newspapers supporting this wheat transaction. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD additional editorials from North Dakota newspapers.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum, Oct. 7, 1963]

WHY NOT SELL WHEAT TO REDS?

Cecil D. Jahraus, publisher of the Ransom County Gazette at Lisbon, N. Dak., thinks that those who favor a continued ban on trading with Communists countries are fighting a losing battle.

"Whether Russia does or does not intend to buy our wheat, it would seem proper at the moment to relax our past policy in the matter. We haven't made any ideological progress with past international trade policy. The amount of good a switch in policy might do for wheat farmers here in Ransom County is really immeasurable. It could be the eventual solution for a problem which has been haggled over since the days of World War I. Wouldn't it be nice if some day we could worry about some aspect of agriculture besides surplus grain as our biggest economic threat?"

"I'm for it," chimes in Frank Hornstein of the Pierce County Tribune at Rugby, discussing sale of wheat to foreign countries. "Who is kidding whom? Nothing is accomplished by not selling to them, except we all pay more money for storing our surplus and our farmers get less for a bushel. If our righteousness kept the Commies from getting grain or whatever else they need it would make some sense. As foreign aid, we sometimes give food or materials to a friendly nation which in turn has no qualms about processing it a bit and selling it to the Commies. So let's act our age and redefine sin and righteousness—so we can tell it from just plain damfoolishness—like being played for suckers by most of the world."

[From the Ransom County (N. Dak.) Gazette, Oct. 3, 1963]

YOU CAN'T BEAT THEM? THEN JOIN THEM

Are farmers and farm States in agreement with the apparent swing to join Canada in selling wheat and other agricultural produce to Communist-dominated countries?

There are evidently two schools of thought on the subject—as one would expect; and we think the people who favor a continued ban on such foreign trading are fighting a losing battle.

As has been pointed out, the world's food is for the world's people, and if we are charitable we will not deny any people from access to their proportionate share, particularly if they can pay for it in cold hard cash. Russian and Chinese people must eat just as others must, and they should not be denied access to what is literally the bread of life just because they are dominated by the wrong kind of ideological rule.

Whether Russia does or does not intend to buy our wheat, it would seem proper at the moment to relax our past policy in the matter. We have not made any ideological progress with past international trade policy.

The amount of good a switch in policy might do for wheat farmers who are our neighbors, our friends, our economic lifeblood, here in Ransom County, N. Dak., is really immeasurable. It could be the eventual solution for a problem which has been haggled over and debated since the days of World War I. Wouldn't it be nice if some day we could worry about some other aspect of agriculture besides surplus grain as our biggest economic threat?

[From the Washburn (N. Dak.) Leader, Oct. 3, 1963]

SALE OF WHEAT TO RUSSIA RATES ATTENTION

The suggestion that our Nation sell its surplus wheat to Red China, Russia, and perhaps other Communist-bloc nations, has more merit than appears.

While trade with Communist nations, when it would include anything useful in a war machine, should be prohibited by law, food is another matter. We would be failing to live up to our responsibility as a Christian nation if we did not regard even Communists as "one of the least of these, my brethren." We would be little better than the atheists who deny the existence of God and seek, through court decisions, to impress their ideas upon others.

For some moons, the editorial writers for national-circulation magazines and metropolitan newspapers have been lamenting the lot of the American taxpayer whose tax dollars are being used to subsidize agriculture and to pay storage costs for this "back-breaking" surplus. They ignore that the law of supply and demand affects prices; we wonder what the price of bread would be if we only raised as much wheat as is needed in a normal year.

This could even win us friends. Wheat would be far better to send than foreign aid dollars. It could be worked into a battle-of-propaganda victory for us, for once. It could cause some writers to forget the so-called evils in a farm program and to spend more time on exposure of some of the pressing evils of the day.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, all over the farm belt there is widespread and strong support for this sale. I note that even here in the city of Washington two "farm publications," the Washington Evening Star and the Washington Post, have been writing very strong editorials in support of this wheat sale. I think the Washington Evening Star for yesterday, October 10, summed up this whole argument very effectively in its editorial:

> But none of this alters the fact that the wheat deal makes sense. It makes sense with respect to both our domestic and our international interests. And since it does make sense the President did the right thing in approving it—however much he may feel compelled to explain and justify.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these editorials printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 10, 1963]

Wheat Deal

In announcing his wheat deal with the Russians, the President sounded a bit like Shakespeare's lady who doth protest too much.

Mr. Kennedy said he had decided to approve the sale after consultation with the National Security Council and after informing the appropriate leaders of the Congress. The export licenses, he said, would be granted on the basis of commitments that the grain is for delivery to and use in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe only. In other words, there will be many tons of wheat for Russian Communists, and European satellite Communists, but not one grain of it can go to the hungry people who are being held in bondage by the "Bearded One" down in Havana.

The President then made the argument that this deal will ease our No. 1 farm surplus, improve our balance of payments, etc. Finally, he said the United States has never had a policy against selling agricultural commodities to Communists in Russia and Eastern Europe. For years, he added, we have been doing precisely this, with the result (this seemed to be something of an afterthought) that they have had less gold to spend on military equipment.

Assuming all this to be true, which it is, why the elaborate argument in justification of the deal? The answer of course, is domestic politics. There is an election coming up next year and the Republicans will seize upon any club to belabor the administration. In fact, some of them have already taken a few tentative swipes at Mr. Kennedy in this wheat business.

But none of this alters the fact that the wheat deal makes sense. It makes sense with respect to both our domestic and our international interests. And since it does make sense the President did the right thing in approving it—however much he may feel compelled to explain and justify.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 11, 1963]

Red Trade and Self-Interest

Whether viewed from an economic or political vantage point, President Kennedy's decision to approve the sale of wheat, feed grains, and other agricultural commodities to the Soviet Union and other Communist countries of Eastern Europe is an act of enlightened self-interest from which this country stands to gain far more than it can possibly lose.

The economic advantages of selling at least 4 million long tons of wheat to the countries of the European Communist bloc are obvious. The receipts of more than $250 million for wheat and flour and the earnings of the American merchant fleet will strengthen the balance-of-payments position of the United States. In fact, that prospect has already been reflected in the foreign exchange markets where the value of the dollar has become stronger.

An additional $200 million will probably be saved in storage and handling costs by reducing the Government wheat surpluses now held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. And as a result, the farmers will be in a better position to produce for the world markets rather than for Federal storage.

The political advantages that will be derived are somewhat more subtle, but their importance becomes apparent if one asks what would have happened had the President rejected the offers from the Communists. A refusal to sell wheat directly to the Communists or indirectly through other countries would have tarnished the moral image of the United States. It would have strengthened the hand of the Chinese Communists and the hard line opponents of the doctrine of peaceful coexistence within the Kremlin. And if past experience is any guide, the Communist regimes would not have been weakened by the deterioration in the living standards of their people who would be deprived of sustenance.

Some critics are now charging that wheat sales to the Communists at the world price of about $1.79 a bushel constitutes a subsidy since the supported domestic price is about 55 cents higher. But this argument is utterly spurious since the only prices that are relevant in international trade are those which are established in the world markets.

In the longer view, the President's decision could lead to a general expansion of trade and the eventual weakening of autarchical policies within the Communist bloc. But that possibility and the steps that might lead to it lie in the future. Decisions to trade with the Communists must be pragmatically judged in the light of immediate advantages, and by that criterion the President stands on very firm ground.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, recently I was requested by the Topeka Daily Capital to write an article regarding the sale of wheat to Russia. In the article, I stressed the point that it is in our Nation's interests, both from a financial and from a humanitarian standpoint, to sell this grain.

Increased exports of wheat from the United States at the present time would not only aid in reducing our surplus, but would also improve our balance of payments, strengthen domestic wheat prices, reduce the taxpayer's carrying cost of our present surplus, and be the humanitarian thing to do, as well as have an important bearing on our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks, together with a statement adopted by the board of directors of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., on September 18, 1963, at Huron, S. Dak.; and a telegram, dated October 7, from the executive secretary of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers.

There being no objection, the article, the statement, and the telegram were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wheat to Russia

(By Senator Frank Carlson)

Russia's purchase of 239 million bushels of wheat from Canada for $500 million, with a delivery date of next July 31, and her purchase of 58½ million bushels of wheat from Australia, valued at $90 million is of concern to every U.S. wheatgrower from the standpoint of future export markets.

With this sale, Canada has sold practically her entire surplus from the 1963 crop. The temptation, of course, will be for the Canadians to increase their wheat production for future sales not only to Russia, but other countries that need wheat and this means further competition for us.

The last session of Congress spent months writing foreign trade legislation and I believe every realist must agree that despite its idealistic approach to world trade our experience—which is limited—must convince everyone that trade between nations must be realistic and practical. World trade is not only competitive, but it is a cold, calculated business operation.

Russia and Canada are our real competitors in the world trade of wheat. We have never sold wheat to Russia, as her wheat trade has always been on the export side of the market.

Selling wheat behind the Iron Curtain can be an American opportunity to improve our position in the cold war. It can also be an immediate financial gain, in view of our balance of payments.

Russia's original arrangement for payment to Canada for wheat purchased was based on a credit term of 18 months, the first 25 percent to be paid in gold. Now we are advised that Russia will pay the entire amount in gold immediately on delivery.

Our Nation lost $423 million worth of gold from January 1 to August 31, 1963. Our gold reserve has dropped from $24 billion in 1954 to $15.7 billion in 1963.

There are some who will argue that the sale of wheat to Russia strengthens communism, but the facts are that Russia is securing not only foodstuffs, but industrial products from our allies in ever increasing quantities. For instance, statistics for 1962 show that West Germany trade agreements with Russia alone totaled about $700 million. Germany is now the third largest industrial nation in the world. Italy has a 4-year trade agreement with the Soviets for $1.11 billion worth of goods. France has signed a 3-year trade pact with Russia for $100 million in trade. India has a 4-year trade pact with Russia which provides annual trade of $440 million. Japan has a 3-year trade pact with Russia that calls for $365 million. The United States and Russian trade last year was $16 million each way.

I am not advocating the sale of strategic materials to Russia, but I do urge that our Nation give every consideration to expanding our foreign trade with Russia and her satellites in nonstrategic items. We are now selling wheat to Germany, France, and other European countries. Much of this wheat is processed into flour and foodstuffs by these countries and then sold to Russia; therefore, Russia gets our wheat whether we sell it to them or not.

Some are of the opinion that we should not sell wheat to Russia at a subsidized price. The facts are we do not export any wheat in the world market through dollar sales or Public Law 480 that does not carry a subsidy. This is true whether we sell to such Communist countries as Poland, Yugoslavia, or our allies. The present subsidy is about 55 cents per bushel.

The subsidy does not go to the exporter or to the country that buys the wheat. It goes to the American wheat farmer in order to maintain domestic prices above the world market.

At the present time Russia and her satellites, such as Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, and Bulgaria are in the market for wheat. In my opinion, it is in our Nation's interests, from both a financial and a humanitarian standpoint, to sell this grain. Increased exports of wheat from the United States at the present time would not only aid in reducing our surplus, but would also improve our balance of payments, strengthen domestic wheat prices, reduce the taxpayer's carrying cost of our present surplus and be the humanitarian thing to do, as well as have an important bearing on our foreign policy.

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, GREAT PLAINS WHEAT, INC., ON SEPTEMBER 18, 1963, AT HURON, S. DAK.

During the course of the cold war, the United States has refused to sell subsidized farm commodities to "unfriendly" countries. In recent years, however, exceptions were made in the cases of Yugoslavia and Poland. Both countries were offered wheat in exchange for "blocked" currencies, with very little chance of cash recovery.

In the meantime, however, Mainland China has gone on the world market to purchase large quantities of wheat—for cash—from Canada, Australia, and France. Purchases are still continuing.

Canada also has completed large cash sales to other countries including Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. In addition, it has completed one of history's largest grain sales by agreeing to supply 228 million bushels of wheat to Russia for a total price of about one-half billion dollars. Additional, perhaps increased, sales are expected in the future.

The U.S. Government has offered no public protest in connection with such sales. Nor has there been apparent criticism among the people of the United States. On the contrary, there has been widespread relief that our friendly competitors were able to drain off excess wheat stocks. They received admiration for their initiative, and such sales were interpreted as taking considerable pressure off of the world wheat market, thus giving the United States some indirect, if unintended, benefit in working off its own sizable wheat stocks.

The implication is clear: Allied nations are free to negotiate sales to all countries, but the United States is content to stand aloof while reaping secondary benefits.

These sales have strengthen the economies of Canada and Australia, and have been of enormous help to wheatgrowers in these two countries. Canada is nearing completion of a wheat crop that has set a record in acreage and may set a record in total production. Australia also is operating at peak production. Growers in neither country are troubled with acreage allotments which are common to U.S. growers. In fact, Governments of both countries have been encouraging increased production, while keeping carryover stocks in manageable supply.

Meanwhile, greater and greater restrictions have been placed on U.S. wheatgrowers. These restrictions not only limit U.S. growers in their abilities to make full use of their productive resources, but also establish a ceiling on their income opportunities.

U.S. growers have, in effect, been asked to hold a protective umbrella over the interests of wheat growers in other countries.

There is even more serious concern for the future. A world cereals agreement is now being considered for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) meetings at Geneva, Switzerland. Proposals now being advanced by other countries would divide up world markets among exporting nations, with heavy emphasis on history of production and traditional market patterns.

If this proposal is adopted, U.S. wheatgrowers would be allocated a share of the world markets which would utilize only a fraction of their productive capacity. Their marketings opportunities could very well be permanently impaired.

In view of the changing situation, there is a need to reexamine our Nation's policies because of the following conditions:

1. The Nation cannot afford to disregard the welfare of U.S. wheatgrowers who form an important segment of its population and economic strength.

2. The Nation cannot continue to experience an unfavorable balance of payments while denying itself an opportunity to use its wheat production resources to correct the situation. U.S. wheat shipments overseas represent the Nation's largest agricultural export.

3. We cannot sit idly by while other wheat exporting nations build up their production facilities and establish trade relationships which would permanently restrict markets for U.S. wheatgrowers.

4. World pressures have brought about an easing of tensions and have forced an atomic test ban treaty. We can further reduce tensions by making available, under sound business practices, a basic food commodity.

5. While bread is being rationed in many parts of the world, it is difficult to defend a policy of artificially restricting production of a basic food commodity and its movement in world trade.

It is necessary that the United States review its policies if it is to maintain a vigorous economy, to give necessary attention to the interests of its wheatgrowers, to maintain the initiative in world trade, and to assume leadership in advancing the cause of world peace.

DODGE CITY, KANS.,
October 7, 1963.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The executive board of the Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, at a regular meeting in Dodge City, Kans., October 5, 1963, unanimously approved the following resolution which I have been instructed to send to you for your information and consideration:

"We recommend a reappraisal of our Government's position with regard to sale of wheat to Russia. We believe that U.S. wheat should be sold to any purchaser willing to pay in cash, taking into consideration maintaining the security of the United States and the promotion of world peace and understanding."

JIM GUNN,
Executive Secretary.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today is the birthday of the one who for many years was described, with deep affection and esteem, as "the First Lady of the World"—Eleanor Roosevelt. It is therefore most appropriate that on this day the President's Commission on the Status of Women—which she headed—is making its report to the President of the United States.

Eleanor Roosevelt was a big enough person to have many interests, both great and small. Essentially she was concerned with human beings and their opportunities to lead lives of decency and of dignity; and, beyond that, she was concerned with the opportunity of all of us to survive in a world without war.

Among her special concerns, and one which she discussed with some emphasis with President Kennedy, was the necessity of offering to the women of this country the equality of opportunity which we strive to secure for all our citizens: Equality in hiring and promotion, in politics, and in individual development, and perhaps even equality in space.

The report which is being made to the President today represents 22 months of work by dozens of men and women who gave generously of their time and knowledge, to round out a comprehensive picture of where we are today and a series of recommendations for action. The distinguished Senator from Oregon, Mrs. Neuberger, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Mr. Aiken, Representative Edith Green, of Oregon, and, until her death, Representative Jessica Weis, of New York, are among the 24 outstanding Americans who compose the Commission.

The report presents some rather startling figures on employment of women; it notes that in 1961 the earnings of women working full time averaged only about 60 percent of those of men working full time. But I was also struck by the section on the role of women in our political parties. Admittedly, I speak with greater knowledge of the Democratic Party—but I am sure it is also true of my Republican friends—when I say that we in Michigan are proud of the degree to which all levels of party activity are open to all, on the basis of ability. We do not discriminate on the basis of race, nationality, or sex. We would be the first to urge the underlining of the Commission's recommendation in this respect:

> Public office should be held according to ability, experience, and effort, without special preferences or discriminations based on sex. Increasing consideration should continually be given to the appointment of women of demonstrated ability and political sensitivity to policymaking positions.

Mr. President, this is a report which all of us can welcome; and I hope we will take its recommendations to heart and will see to it that they do not go on a shelf, to gather dust.

Mr. President, because I am hopeful that the release may encourage study of the report itself, I ask unanimous consent that the White House release of today, summarizing the report, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Culminating a 22-month study of major aspects of women's activities in American life, the President's Commission on the Status of Women today blueprinted an action program to provide greater opportunities for women to contribute skills and abilities to the Nation's advancement and to remove existing discriminations against women.

Established under an Executive Order on December 14, 1961, with the late Eleanor Roosevelt as chairman, the Commission makes its final report to President John F. Kennedy today on the anniversary of Mrs. Roosevelt's birth.

A formal White House ceremony is scheduled for 4 p.m. for presentation of the document to the President. In a letter of transmittal to President Kennedy, the vice chairman of the Commission, Dr. Richard A. Lester of Princeton University, and the executive vice chairman, Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson, note that the report represents "the results of work" initiated by—and, until her death on November 7, 1962, directed by—the Commission's chairman. They said that Mrs. Roosevelt's "devotion to fuller realization of the abilities of women in all walks of life and in all countries raised the status of women everywhere."

"American Women," the Commission's report, unanimousy agreed to by 24 outstanding Americans, including 5 Cabinet officers, proposes 24 major recommendations for action by Government, education, business, labor and community groups. It calls upon President Kennedy to designate a Cabinet officer "to be responsible for assuring that the resources and activities of the Federal Government bearing upon the Commission's recommendations are directed to carrying them out."

Maintaining that the Constitution of the United States "now embodies equality of rights for men and women," the Commission questions the constitutionality of many State laws which discriminate against women. It urges action at the State level to repeal or modify such measures, and recommends that interested groups launch test cases in the courts leading to Supreme Court review of remaining ambiguities in laws affecting women.

Its recommendations for improving the status of women in the United States include special concern for women in whose families "the unbroken cycle of deprivation and retardation repeats itself from generation to generation." The range of its proposals covers many facets of American life affecting women, child care and home services, health facilities, and such varying opportunities as initial employment, acquisition of graduate degrees, appointment to high political office. Supplementing the formal report of the Commission is a 14-page historical section, "American Women Today," describing major changes affecting women's lives between 1900 and 1960.

EDUCATION AND COUNSELING

Recognizing that "demands upon women in the economic world, the community and the home mean that women often simultaneously fulfill several vital roles," the Commission stresses as a beginning point of all of its recommendations the importance of a high quality basic education, including education in consumer and family responsibilities, for all American girls. But for millions of mature American women whose education—either basic or advanced—was interrupted for personal or economic reasons, the Commission urges a comprehensive program of continuing education geared to the individual woman's needs.

"Greater public understanding of the value of continuing education for all mature Americans is perhaps the highest priority item on the American agenda," the Commission states. "It is of particular importance to women * * *. Abilities must be constantly sharpened, knowledge and skills kept up to date. Continuing opportunities to do this must be widely available and broad enough to include both the person who did not finish elementary school and the highly gifted specialist who must follow the frontiers of learning as they move."

After detailing methods for achieving greater educational opportunities for women at every age and level of educational attainment, the Commission report turns to a variety of problems—and their proposed solutions—for women in home and community life, in employment, in social welfare programs, including social security, in the exercise of personal and property rights and in women's roles as citizens. (A complete list of major recommendations is attached.)

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

In its discussion of means and methods for achieving "equality of rights under the law for all persons, male or female"—which it said is "basic to democracy,"—the Commission reports that it received "divergent viewpoints on these methods," particularly from national women's organizations and labor union groups, among them a proposal for an equal rights amendment to the Constitution. The report then adds:

"Since the Commission is convinced that the U.S. Constitution now embodies equality of rights for men and women, we conclude that a constitutional amendment need not now be sought in order to establish this principle. But judicial clarification is imperative, in order that remaining ambiguities with respect to the constitutional protection of women's rights be eliminated.

"Early and definitive court pronouncement, particularly by the U.S. Supreme Court, is urgently needed with regard to the validity under the 5th and 14th amendments of laws and official practices discriminating against women, to the end that the principle of equality become firmly established in constitutional doctrine.

"Accordingly, interested groups should give high priority to bringing under court review cases involving laws and practices which discriminate against women.

"At the same time, appropriate Federal, State, and local officials in all branches of government should be urged to scrutinize carefully those laws, regulations, and practices which distinguish on the basis of sex, to determine whether they are justifiable in the light of contemporary conditions and to the end of removing archaic standards which today operate as discriminatory.

"The Commission commends and encourages continued efforts on the part of all interested groups in educating the public and in urging private action, and action within the judicial, executive, and legislative branches of government, to the end that full equality of rights may became a reality."

In this connection, the Commission on the status of women declares, the United States should "assert leadership, particularly in the United Nations," to improve the status of women throughout the world, and should demonstrate "its sincere concern for women's equal rights by becoming a party to appropriate" international human rights conventions.

JURY SERVICE; PERSONAL AND PROPERTY RIGHTS

Women became eligible to serve on all Federal juries "only by virtue of the Civil Rights Act of 1957," the report states, adding that the Commission "regards further Federal legislation as necessary" to assure that procedures for selecting qualified persons as jurors shall not "systematically or deliberately exclude any group from the jury panel on account of race, sex, political or religious affiliation, or economic or social status." It calls also for "appropriate action, including enactment of legislation where necessary" to achieve equal jury service in the States. (In 3 States, women still may not serve on juries of the State courts, and in 26 others and the District of Columbia, women who are called on for jury service may claim exemptions not available to men.)

In many specific areas of personal and property rights under State laws, "the disabilities of married women are considerable," the report declares, and urges that State statutes affecting family law and personal and property rights of women should be modernized. The Commission continues:

"State legislatures, and other groups concerned with the improvement of State statutes affecting family law and personal and property rights of married women, including the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, the Council of State Governments, the American Law Institute, and State Commissions on the Status of Women, should move to eliminate laws which impose legal disabilities on women."

WOMEN IN POLITICS

The Commission voices disappointment in the degree of participation by women in the political life of the country in the 43 years since the adoption of the 19th amendment. Women currently outnumber men in the U.S. population by 4 million, "but in terms of registration and election-day turnout, their failure to use their vote converts them into a political minority," the report states. "Additional efforts are necessary to interest and educate women on public issues, prepare them for more constructive activity in the national parties, and stimulate them to seek elective and appointive office.

"In the Federal Congress only 2 of 100 Senators and 11 of 435 Representatives are women. Only 2 women have held Cabinet rank in the Federal Government; only 6 have served as ambassadors or ministers. In Federal judicial office, no women are on the Supreme Court or the courts of appeals. One woman judge serves on the U.S. Customs Court and one on the Tax Court of the United States. Of 307 Federal district judges, only 2 are women."

The report calls for a stronger drive by qualified women to achieve high elective and appointive posts at local, State, and national levels in all three branches of government; and less emphasis on what it describes as "ceremonial" recognition of women in the organizations of the political parties. While the number of women holding appointive posts in the upper levels of the Federal executive branch has increased during the past three administrations, the report points out that the percent of such jobs held by women has remained constant at 2.4 percent. In the States, meanwhile, only 234 of approximately 7,700 seats in the legislatures were held by women in 1962. The formal recommendation of the Commission states:

"Public office should be held according to ability, experience, and effort, without special preferences or discriminations based on sex. Increasing consideration should continually be given to the appointment of women of demonstrated ability and political sensitivity to policymaking positions."

HOME AND COMMUNITY

The fundamental responsibility of women as mothers and homemakers can be undertaken more effectively "when communities provide appropriate resources and when they know how to use such resources for health, education, safety, recreation, child care, and counseling," the report declares. It emphasizes that child care services are needed in all communities and by all kinds of families, and that "failure to assure such services reflects a lack of community awareness of the realities of modern life." It recommends:

"For the benefit of children, mothers, and society, child care services should be available for children of families at all economic levels. Proper standards of child care must be maintained, whether services are in homes or in centers. Costs should be met by fees scaled to parents' ability to pay, contributions from voluntary agencies, and public appropriations."

The report acknowledges that the Revenue Act of 1954 providing allowance of deductions from Federal income tax liability for child care still aids some moderate income and low-income families. "But the limit above which deductions are not allowed has become unrealistic," the report says of the provision permitting deductions only when a couple's joint annual income is $5,100 or less.

Counseling and homemakers' services at the community level are urged "to help families avoid or overcome breakdown or dependency * * * establish a soundly based homelife * * * and meet emergency or other special needs." The report also supports public and private community programs with "comprehensive provisions for health and rehabilitation services, including easily accessible maternal and child health services" and "education to encourage their use."

"Local leadership should be encouraged to assure the needed range of community services by commercial or cooperative enterprises, voluntary agencies, or public programs. Where a cross section of the community participates in policy decisions, the shift from planning for to planning with the persons to be served brings new insights," the report declares.

It urges coordinated and imaginative planning among volunteer agencies and organizations in the recruitment, training, placement, and supervision of volunteers, and increasing the number of potential volunteers by tapping * * * youth, retired people, members of minority groups, and women not presently in volunteer activities.

WOMEN IN EMPLOYMENT

The Commission was instrumental in having the Federal Government revise hiring and promotion practices to assure women equal opportunities in Civil Service employment. It likewise advanced policy changes in the Department of Defense looking toward removal of specific statutory limitations on high officer rank for women in the armed services.

Also at the request of the Commission, the U.S. Employment Service's longtime policy of referring applicants for jobs solely on the basis of qualifications was underscored by a directive instructing State offices to refer qualified applicants regardless of sex and requesting employers using USES to avoid job orders specifying sex except where genuinely warranted. The Commission concluded that at the Federal level, the most feasible tool for directing employers' attention to the importance of equal treatment for women workers would be an Executive order and recommends:

"Equal opportunity for women in hiring, training, and promotion should be the governing principle in private employment. An Executive order should state this principle and advance its application to work done under Federal contracts."

SECURITY OF BASIC INCOME

In noting that some important gaps remain in programs designed to assure security of basic income, such as social security and unemployment compensation, the report cites the example of the 62-year-old widow who receives a benefit equal to only 82½ percent of her husband's primary benefit.

"An aged widow should not have to live on less than her husband would receive if he survived her," the report declares, adding that her benefit should be equal to the amount that her husband would have received at the same age had he lived.

The report also urges a broader definition of dependents of single workers, men and women alike, to meet a genuine social need of many single workers with dependent relatives other than parents.

Another gap, according to the report, lies in the Federal-State program of unemployment insurance. Designed to protect workers against temporary loss of income, this program does not cover workers in small firms, nonprofit organizations, and State and local governments, or household workers and agricultural laborers. Employees in all of these fields except agriculture "are substantially, if not predominantly, composed of women workers," declares the report recommending:

"The coverage of the unemployment insurance system should be extended. Small establishments and nonprofit organizations should be covered now through Federal action, and State and local government employees through State action. Practicable means of covering at least some household workers and agricultural workers should be actively explored."

LABOR STANDARDS

Because millions of low-paid workers who most need protection are not covered by Federal or State wage and hour laws, the report declares that "the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, including premium pay for overtime, should be extended to employment subject to Federal jurisdiction but now uncovered, such as work in hotels, motels, restaurants, and laundries, in additional retail establishments, in agriculture, and in nonprofit organizations." It also calls on States to enact, or to strengthen and extend State legislation, applicable to both men and women to provide minimum wage levels approximating the minimum under Federal law and to require premium pay at the rate of at least time and a half for overtime.

While recognizing that effective minimum wage coverage, with at least time and a half the regular rate for all hours over 8 a day or 40 a week, is the best way to discourage excessive hours of work, the report declares that "the welfare of all workers requires that where special hour protection for women represents the best so far attained it should be maintained and strengthened."

However, it urges exemption of women in executive, administrative, and professional jobs from hour law coverage.

Describing the difficulty of organizing women, especially those in low-paid work who are least able to risk possible loss of earnings in employment solely under State jurisdiction, the report asserts "State laws should protect the right of all workers to join unions of their own choosing and to bargain collectively."

The report proposes flexibility, with health and safety safeguards, in State laws restricting weightlifting and nightwork, and calls on the States to follow the lead of the Federal Government in establishing by law the principle of equal pay for comparable work.

"American Women" is an 86-page, 2-color book containing 21 charts, written by Helen Hill Miller and designed by Frank Guaragna. It has been published by the Government Printing Office and is available from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C., for $1.25.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

The names of the men and women appointed to the Commission, and the posts they occupied at the time of their appointment:

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Chairman (deceased); Mrs. Esther Peterson, Executive Vice Chairman, Assistant Secretary of Labor; Dr. Richard A. Lester, Vice Chairman, chairman, Department of Economics, Princeton University; the Attorney General, Hon. Robert F. Kennedy; the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Orville L. Freeman; the Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Luther H. Hodges; the Secretary of Labor, Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg, Hon. W. Willard Wirtz; the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Hon. Abraham A. Ribicoff, Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze; Hon. George D. Aiken, U.S. Senate; Hon. Maurine B. Neuberger, U.S. Senate; Hon. Edith Green, U.S. House of Representatives; Hon. Jessica M. Weis (deceased), U.S. House of Representatives; the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Hon. John W. Macy, Jr.; Mrs. Macon Boddy, Henrietta, Tex.; Dr. Mary I. Bunting, president, Radcliffe College; Mrs. Mary E. Callahan, member, executive board, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers; Dr. Henry David, president, New School for Social Research; Miss Dorothy Height, president, National Council of Negro Women, Inc.; Miss Margaret Hickey, Public Affairs editor, Ladies' Home Journal; Mrs. Viola H. Hymes, president, National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.; Miss Margaret J. Mealey, executive director, National Council of Catholic Women; Mr. Norman E. Nicholson, administrative assistant, Kaiser Industries Corp., Oakland, Calif.; Miss Marguerite Rawalt, attorney; past president: Federal Bar Association, National Association of Women Lawyers, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Club, Inc.; Mr. William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; Dr. Caroline F. Ware, Vienna, Va.; Dr. Cynthia C. Wedel, Assistant General Secretary for Program, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak during the morning hour, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John R. Reilly, of Iowa, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Willis Moore Hawkins, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE, THE ARMY, THE MARINE CORPS, THE NAVY, AND THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Air Force, the Army, the Marine Corps, the Navy, and the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

McDONNELL HAS NO SUPERIOR IN AIRCRAFT AND SPACE ENGINEERING AND PRODUCTION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently a report was issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which could be construed as criticism of one of the Nation's great corporations, McDonnell Aircraft Corp., of St. Louis, Mo.

I am disturbed at this report. It is almost universally agreed in the trade and among the services, no company in the United States knows more about how to build aeronautical and astronautical equipment than do the people of McDonnell.

Considering the fact there have been scores of failures in nonmanned launchings, and not a single failure in manned launchings, every single one of which was accomplished in a McDonnell capsule, it is all pretty mystifying.

Perhaps the trouble is we are moving our space program too fast. Any industrialist knows everything cannot be perfect when one is moving very rapidly to the point it is characterized as a race.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement on this matter by Mr. J. S. McDonnell, founder of the McDonnell Aircraft Corp., and chairman of the board of directors, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY J. S. McDONNELL, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, McDONNELL AIRCRAFT

I am sure it was not NASA's intent in its 444-page summary report on Project Mercury to be critical of its industrial associates who contributed so effectively and so greatly to the success of the Mercury program. Rather, I think that certain individuals in drafting portions of the detailed reports were making every effort to impress on the minds of everybody the need for still higher standards of reliability (literally out of this world) in the design and fabrication of future spacecraft and associated systems which will necessarily be even more complex than Mercury. It should be understood that the Mercury report describes statistically the history of Project Mercury from its beginning instead of merely recognizing that the entire project was a genuine success with accomplishments greatly exceeding those originally contemplated for this project (e.g., 22 orbits versus the original goal of only 3), the report points out certain areas where Government and industry procedures must be improved to provide the still greater reliability required for future operational spacecraft.

It is a matter of history that there has not been a single new high-performance aircraft developed anywhere in the world, either by private industry or by government, that has not been involved in a tragedy in its developmental flight testing. Yet the team of NASA and American industry batted 1.000 in launching 6 successive astronauts into space and returning them safely to earth in a period of 4 years, 4 months, and 4 days from the day we were selected to build the Mercury spacecraft.

I am confident that those knowledgeable in this field consider that the performance of our company and our team of over 4,000 subcontractors and suppliers was outstanding. This opinion was unequivocally reiterated by Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Robert R. Gilruth, and Walter C. Williams during their press conference at Houston at noon on October 4, 1963. Previously on October 1, 1963, NASA had publicly expressed this by awarding John F. Yardley (our Mercury project engineer and since July 1960 our top manager at Cape Canaveral) the NASA Public Service Award for "his outstanding contribution to the success of Project Mercury, in organizing, training, and directing the first contractor team of aerospace engineers and specialists skilled in the new and rigorous discipline of manned spacecraft preflight preparation and checkout." In citing Mr. Yardley's accomplishments, NASA said in part, "the reliability of Mercury spacecraft systems performance achieved throughout the entire Mercury project reflect great credit upon Mr. Yardley, and his McDonnell aerospace team at Cape Canaveral."

There were equipment failures in flight as everybody knows, but the fact that the program was a resounding success is proof that the backup systems designed and built by our team were satisfactory. It is inconceivable that such an advanced pioneering space vehicle could be built without "discrepancies." The point to bear in mind is that all prelaunch discrepancies were discovered by the highly qualified McDonnell and NASA quality assurance personnel and these discrepancies were corrected before flight. Dr. Dryden stated on October 4 that the quality control in Project Mercury was "as high as was ever obtained in any project I know of."

Since then further significant improvements in design, reliability, and quality control have been achieved in order to provide astronaut safety and mission success for the longer periods in orbit planned for the Gemini spacecraft now in process. We are confident that American industry can and will rise to this challenge and provide the high-quality equipment needed in further space science and exploration.

The new references cited in the 444 page report should not cloud the principal conclusion quoted from the report:

"All elements of Government and industry supporting the project pulled together toward a common goal, with each individual striving to do his best. Without this spirit of cooperation and teamwork, the degree of success experienced in Project Mercury would not have been possible. The success of Project Mercury demonstrated not only the reliability of the equipment but also the effectiveness of the management organization and the working arrangements with the various supporting elements throughout Government and industry."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial, "NASA and the Space Industry" from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of October 8 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Oct. 8, 1963]

NASA AND THE SPACE INDUSTRY

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, under strong criticism for poor management, was guilty last week of another bit of singular ineptness. On Thursday it released a 440-page report charging a long record of defective work on Project Mercury capsules. On Friday it praised the industry-Government team on Project Mercury and sought to soften the implied criticism of McDonnell Aircraft Corp. and other contractors.

Practically all the criticism came from one chapter assembled by an engineer in charge of quality control. This chapter said that half the spare parts delivered by contractors were defective and some capsules had more than 500 defects. Such workmanship, the report said, contributed to a 22-month delay in putting the first astronaut into orbit. Had there been no delay, the United States would have been the first to orbit a man.

There are 50,000 electrical and mechanical connections and 30,000 component parts in a capsule. Defects were to be expected and it is to the credit of the quality control department that nearly all were found and corrected before flight. Although NASA always praised capsule performance after each orbiting, the report said there was an average of 10 malfunctions or failures in each of the 6 flights. This can be taken as an evidence of the reliability of the backup systems.

As James S. McDonnell, of St. Louis, said, the outstanding fact is that the Mercury project was a success; six astronauts were launched and all returned safely to earth in 4⅓ years. NASA has hailed that success on many occasions.

Without question, standards of quality control in space work need to be much higher than in aircraft development. Mr. McDonnell says they are higher; but Gemini and Apollo requirements will be much stricter than those for Mercury. The real question raised by the NASA report is whether these projects ought to be slowed down for the sake of continuing safety in the space program.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article "Dismayed at Criticism—McDonnell

Workers Merit Praise, U.S. Officials Say" by Edward O'Brien in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of October 10, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Oct. 10, 1963]

DISMAYED AT CRITICISM—MCDONNELL WORKERS MERIT PRAISE, U.S. OFFICIALS SAY

(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—The men who work for McDonnell Aircraft Corp. of St. Louis deserve praise and not censure for the quality of their efforts on Project Mercury spacecraft, Government officials agreed at House committee hearing Wednesday.

Dr. George E. Mueller, manned space flight chief for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, called the now-completed Mercury program "a recital of success." House Space Committee members said the same.

Dr. Mueller and other witnesses conceded that while workmanship mistakes were made in building the spaceships, they were fewer than expected and were promptly corrected.

"The payoff after all was in the six manned flights. Our batting average was 1.000," he said.

The House committee called the hearing as a result of news stories last week alleging dereliction among contractors and suppliers on the Mercury ships for orbiting astronauts around the earth.

DISMAY EXPRESSED

The stories were based on a 444-page history of the project issued by the space agency. McDonnell was prime contractor in designing and building the spaceships. It is now working on the more advanced Gemini space program.

Space agency witnesses expressed dismay that their candid listing of quality deficiencies and failures in spacecraft parts had been interpreted as a general indictment of both private industry and the Government agency.

The task of hurriedly developing one-man spacecraft that would weigh only 30 percent as much as its Russian competition was mammoth, space officials told the committee.

The initial quality standards were "very high," flight operations director Walter C. Williams said. As the program went ahead and more was learned, they were made even more exacting, he said.

Yet the rejection record for faulty parts dropped, he said, to one-third to one-half of the first rate. With 100,000 parts in a space ship, he said, it was not surprising there would be some failures.

In most cases, he said, the sub-standard parts were caught in normal pre-installation testing and did not fail in actual flight.

Dr. Mueller, a 1939 graduate from the Missouri School of Mines at Rolla, said, "We were really building a much better spacecraft at the end of the program and we were having less trouble in building it."

Much of the newspaper discussion, Mr. Williams said, dealt with the debris that floated around the interior of the space ship on the first unmanned flight 3 years ago. The debris—flecks of paint and the like—was detected through motion pictures.

M'DONNELL'S ANSWER

Mr. Williams said McDonnell and the Government then realized that the normal industrial process of vacuum cleaning "was not good enough and we had to do something better."

McDonnell's answer, he said, was to tumble the spacecraft and shake the debris loose, much as every mother knows how to do when junior swallows a thimble. The method worked, and so the spacecraft were tumbled repeatedly at St. Louis and at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Mr. Williams said McDonnell had cooperated fully in detecting faults and devising ways to prevent them. When the Mercury program began, he said, the firm had three quality control inspectors to check the work of subcontractors. Now it has 33, as well as 150 inspectors on its own work in St. Louis. The space agency keeps 10 Government inspectors at St. Louis.

Still, Mr. Williams cautioned, "quality is not inspected in—it's built in."

Industry and Government have put "tiger teams" in the field to inspire workmen to build well, he said.

Often, he said, "the man who knows best whether a good job was done is not the inspector but the technician working on the bench."

"We're trying to prove that things can be made to work perfectly," Dr. Mueller said. "I think the results will filter down to all of our society."

Mr. Williams had a postscript of reservation: "We seek perfection but we have to temper it with judgment. If we don't we'll never get anything done."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I do not know who is responsible for this report and the inaccurate implications behind it, but I do know it should not mislead by casting shadows on one of the finest engineering and production accomplishments of our time, the design, production, and successful operation of the Mercury capsule.

Six brave young Americans who risked their lives in this McDonnell equipment would be glad to a test to that conclusion.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate now proceed to consider the amendment which will be offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF CONSERVATION RESERVE CONTRACTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12:15 p.m. having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (S. 1588) to remove the $10 million limitation on programs carried out under section 16 (e)(7) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1964 and subsequent calendar years.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and myself, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after the period in line 19, it is proposed to add a new sentence as follows:

> Notwithstanding any provision of section 16(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590p (e)), none of the additional funds authorized by virtue of the foregoing amendment to section 16(e) of such Act may be used for the purpose of entering into or carrying out any agreement under such section 16(e) which permits or authorizes the use of the land subject to such agreement to be used for grazing purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the amendment which has been read was submitted to the Senate on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The amendment would eliminate from the bill S. 1588 section 2 which is the section in the bill which would extend the cropland conversion pilot program authorized in 1963 then on a pilot basis.

As Senators will remember, the program authorized the pilot program for the use of the diverted acres from cropping to grazing, recreation, or some other permanent use. The section which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I propose to eliminate from the bill would increase the expenditure authorization from $10 to $20 million, thus, doubling the size of the grazing program. Our amendment simply forbids grazing on the extended $10 million of rented acres. I offer the amendment to strike this provision because of the expanded use of these diverted acres for potential grazing areas, which would do a grave injustice to the livestock industry.

Senators will recall that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] I, and about 10 other Senators offered an amendment to the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture which would have had the effect of extending the present soil bank contracts for 2 years.

We are happy that the committee acted expeditiously as promised following the defeat of our amendment and has brought before the Senate a measure, the first section of which is identical with the amendment which we offered to the appropriation bill. But we regret exceedingly that this rider has been added at the end of it, which has an inimical impact upon the livestock industry. The second section contains no restriction on grazing whatsoever. We propose to add such restrictions.

Last year, in section 101 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, Congress added a new section 16(e) to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, which provides for a new cropland conversion program. That program provides for changes in land use. The purpose has been to divert the land from cropping to grazing, recreation, or some other permanent use. This year the Department of Agriculture offered a substitute proposal to permit an acreage equivalent to that on which conservation reserve contracts expire prior to January 1, 1965, to be covered by the cropland conversion program. While all witnesses appearing before the committee favored keeping the acreage from returning to crops, many witnesses opposed the program if the purpose would be to shift it to grazing or to other uses, on the ground that it would result in the overproduction of livestock products.

The livestock industry, and especially the cattle industry, is undergoing enough economic difficulties without the Congress enacting legislation which would compound the difficulties by approving a program which would entice more and more operators into the livestock industry.

The effect of the paragraph of the committee bill which we seek to delete by the amendment would be to shift the costs of the land retirement program from the Government to the shoulders of the livestock industry by doubling the program from $10 to $20 million while it is still in a pilot stage. We have moved sharply in the direction of shifting the costs to an industry which is already suffering from governmental policies; namely, the lax import attitude which we have taken in the matter of restricting the importation of livestock products. In effect, and in fact, what is proposed by the second section which our amendment would delete is a program of Government subsidization of competition for the livestock industry.

I ask Senators, regardless of what kind of State they represent—agricultural or urban—whether they believe it is fair or appropriate for the Government to engage in a subsidy program to subsidize competition for privately owned industry. I appeal to the sense of fairness of Senators on that question, because that is precisely the effect of that section of the bill which we seek to eliminate.

In South Dakota over 70 percent of the agriculture income comes from the livestock industry. I can say that all South Dakotans are proud of those engaged in livestock production and feeding. We all were proud a few weeks ago when one of our leading ranchers drove over 2,000 head of cattle on a 125-mile trail drive from one pasture to another.

It was a drive reminiscent of the old West and was written up in newspapers and magazines across the Nation. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a story which appeared in the Sioux Falls Argus Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., of September 15, this year, which tells in detail about this drive. This is a story of the private enterprise system which we do not want to endanger.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO THOUSAND CATTLE ON THE MOVE IN NEW DRIVE

PIERRE.—South Dakota's broad-backed prairies began trembling under the hoofbeats of nearly 2,000 cattle today as a 125-mile trail drive got under way.

A scene reminiscent of the days of the Old West began unfolding as a dozen cowpokes swung into their saddles to begin what is believed one of the biggest overland cattle drives since the turn of the century.

Fort Pierre rancher Roy Houck is moving the herd from his 15,000-acre summer pasture in Walworth and Potter Counties south to his 50,000-acre Standing Butte ranch in Stanley County.

The drive is expected to take 12 or 14 days, Houck said.

The trail drive promises to be one of the most colorful events in South Dakota in recent years.

Belly-high prairie grass, cowboys and Indians in full regalia will provide the foreground for some of South Dakota's most impressive scenery.

The drive, starting on the east side of the Missouri River, will cross the river at the Highway 212 bridge and wend its way southwest along the Missouri River breaks, through the Cheyenne River Indian Reservation, fording the Cheyenne River, until it reaches its destination at the Standing Butte ranch.

Stock dams and streams along the way will provide water for the cattle.

"Recent rains have made the country nice and green," Houck said. "The cattle will probably hold their weight, if not even gaining some."

PROBLEM CITED

Houck said the toughest part of the drive will occur Tuesday morning when the cattle are moved across the 4,585-foot Highway 212 bridge.

The cattle, used to the prairie turf, get skitterish when their hooves come in contact with hard road surfaces.

Houck said snow fences will be erected on the bridge to channel the cattle through.

"We've got to keep them moving to prevent bunching or stampeding on the bridge," he said.

A band of Indians in full dress will stage a dance Tuesday at the Highway 212 bridge, and, in accord with customs of long ago, Houck will present the Indians with some cattle in return for permission to cross the reservation.

Today, Houck was expected to bring part of the Walworth County herd south some 8 to 9 miles to the Potter County pasture, where they will spend the night.

Monday the herd will be moved about 7 to 8 miles to the Highway 212 crossing. The cattle will be night-herded Monday to keep them close to the bridge.

Houck said he has received requests from riders all over the Nation to participate in the drive. Requests have come from Maine to Texas, and one from California.

"We'll have to judge them on their ability first before we give them an assignment," Houck said.

He added that his insurance company has canceled liability insurance. "We'll have to ask each participant to waive liability," he said.

Trail riders will include members of Houck's family—his two sons, Tom, 32, and Jerry, 29, and his daughter, Kay, 18.

Other riders include Clint Parker, of Agar, former president of the South Dakota Brand Board and former Houck hand; a brother-in-law, Dean Boehmer, Alaska, and several other ranch hands.

Houck, 58, was born and raised in Potter County and went to high school at Gettysburg.

He has always been a rancher, who also served as a former Lieutenant Governor of South Dakota.

He marketed close to 4,000 head of cattle last year and said he plans to market better than 5,000 head this year.

Two other cattle drives have been held in South Dakota the past few years. Rancher Don Hight, White River, drove some 1,800 head 70 miles overland from his ranch to Winner in January 1962.

And Harrold Rancher Bethel Frei drove a herd of about 500 cattle 50 miles to the livestock auction in Highmore last winter.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the past 3 or 4 years the livestock industry, because of competition from imports of beef into this country, has seen its prices depressed to a point that the very economic foundation of this great industry is in danger of being undermined. Certainly, under those conditions, we should not subsidize a new form of domestic competition in addition to the foreign imports from which the livestock industry is already suffering.

On several occasions I have spoken at length on the Senate floor, urging that action be taken by the State Department and the Department of Agriculture to curb these imports and to give some semblance of protection to this great American industry, which must not be permitted to be undermined economically.

I have written to the State Department and the Agriculture Department urging action, but all I receive in reply is that they are watching the situation and hope to expand trade opportunities with our friends abroad. Perhaps they will expand them for wheat, but they have failed miserably over the years in helping the livestock industry with its problem. In the meantime, imports come in.

On October 3 I was advised by Mr. C. W. McMillan, executive vice president of the American National Cattlemen's Association, that:

> The amount of beef being laid into the United States is without question depressing domestic beef cattle prices. In 1962, 11 percent of domestic U.S. consumption was supplied by beef from foreign nations. To date this year, the quantities are about 23 percent ahead of the same period in 1962, itself a recordbreaking year.

The National Livestock Feeders Association was advised by the Foreign Agricultural Service that in 1962 the imports of beef and veal amount to about 9 percent of our domestic production.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the figures which I have received from the Foreign Agricultural Service showing the increase of imports into this country in the first 6 months of 1963, as compared to the same period of 1962.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. imports of meat, 1st 6 months

[Product weight basis]

	1963	1962	Increase	
			Pounds	Percent
Total red meat	651,164,000	552,412,000	98,752,000	18
Total beef and veal	491,107,000	407,198,000	83,909,000	21
Boneless beef and veal	407,339,000	339,660,000	67,679,000	20
Mutton	41,677,000	35,342,000	6,335,000	18
Lamb	10,894,000	5,597,000	5,297,000	95

Source: Foreign Agriculture, Sept. 2, 1963, issue (Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture).

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock and meat products by a significant amount.

I repeat that, Mr. President. I want Senators to understand what we are discussing. Prior to 1958, the United States was a net exporter of livestock and meat products by a significant amount. However, in the past 5 years the relationship has changed and the value of exports has been considerably lower than the value of imports. According to figures obtained from reports of the Foreign Agricultural Service, the dollar volume of exports of livestock and meat products by the United States in 1962 amounted to approximately $320 million; whereas our imports amounted to $670 million, plus around $209 million of wool, making total imports of approximately $879 million. In other words, in 1962 the United States imported nearly three times the dollar volume of her exports in this area. This reversal in export-import balance has come about in the very short period of 5 years. The swing from a net exporter to a net importer has come about primarily from the very significant increase in the importation of manufacturing—boneless—beef, veal, and mutton.

Mr. President, I point all of this out at this time in support of our amendment to eliminate this grazing on diverted acres from this bill, because I feel that Congress should not impose further competition on the livestock industry. The result would be to force it to become a disaster industry, by forcing the livestock industry to take its place in the line coming to Congress for some kind of farm program. When it is left alone, the livestock industry demonstrates its capacity to succeed. It requires appropriate and understanding tariff programs, and requires an opportunity to function without the threat or the actual existence of a program of Government subsidies to its competitors, forcing it constantly to face new kinds of competition.

It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that the administration on the one hand will not take steps in our trade negotiations to protect this great American industry but on the other hand recommends legislative action which will actually bring additional competitive features into being for livestock producers and feeders, weaken their opportunities for success, and perhaps impose further financial hardships on the industry. Just this week I received the October 4 issue of the South Dakota Crop and Livestock Reporter, a report of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Under meat animals it states:

> Meat animal prices in mid-September were 4 percent below a month earlier and 10 percent below a year earlier. Prices for cattle averaged $21.40 per cwt. compared with $21.90 a month earlier and $23.50 a year earlier.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The time yielded by the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 1 more minute.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in conclusion, it seems most apparent to me that with falling livestock prices we should not take any action here which would expand the potential of the difficulties of the livestock industry. Let us adopt this amendment to eliminate the program of additional grazing for livestock competition.

That is all our amendment proposes. It would be possible to have all the other features, and to do whatever else is desired, but the amendment would provide that there be no grazing on the extra acres covered by this extra $10 million if the farmers continue with the land retirement program.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, for himself and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The **VICE PRESIDENT.** The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has so thoroughly and succinctly covered the basic questions involved that I shall not burden the Senate with a repetition.

As I glance around the Chamber, I am extremely sorry that more Senators are not present to become acquainted with the vital economic problems involved in the amendment now pending.

In one breath and in one act Congress attempts to control the production of agricultural products and meat products and things of that kind, because there are surpluses; and in the next breath and in the next act Congress takes steps which tend to increase the surpluses. That does not make sense.

The cattle situation is not good. I believe finished beef on the Chicago or central markets yesterday sold at around $21 or $22 or $23, depending upon quality. One load, I believe, sold for about $24. Anybody who knows anything about the cattle business and the beef business knows the farmers are not going to make much money on that kind of operation. The prices have been going down, yet there has been an increased production.

In the main, I approve the pending bill. I approve the authority to extend the land retirement contracts which will expire this year. They should be renewed. The bill, however, also contains a provision to increase by $10 million the amount of money which would be available for land to be used for grazing.

Yesterday the Senate passed a dairy bill which had as a purpose the reduction of surplus milk production in this country. Now, on the next day, the Senate is considering a bill which would open up more grazing, which would furnish the basis for an increase of dairy animals in this country. That does not make sense.

I support the main part of the bill. So far as I am concerned, I do not advocate changing the situation which now exists. I do oppose the extra $10 million being put into the bill, and our amendment attempts to correct that.

Mr. President, as I interpret it, the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota has offered, in which I have joined, in effect would provide that the land taken with the $10 million extra authorized by the legislation could be devoted to other land uses, but shall not be devoted to grazing. We do not pretend to touch the existing amount of money for land which can be used for grazing. That land can still be grazed, if it is considered necessary, as is being done now. The extra money, which would open up extra grazing land, would be covered by the amendment.

I see no reasonable defense for providing this extra money for opening up extra grazing land in this country while we are trying to reduce surpluses.

At the present time, so far as I can find from the statistics I can gather, there are about 140,000 acres in this country under the present land-use program which would be affected by this particular amendment. About 94 percent of it is already in sod or grass and, under the discretion of the Secretary, can be used as grazing land.

We do not propose to touch it. Only the extra $10 million would be affected by the amendment. We propose that that additional amount be not used to open up land for grazing.

We do not intend by the amendment to curtail anything that now exists, but we propose that the extra $10 million, if it is used, should be put to land uses other than grazing.

That is the nub of the question. That is the heart of it. As I said, I am sorry more Senators are not present to hear what is proposed by the amendment.

To me it is incongruous to attempt to reduce livestock production, curtail surpluses, and do something about bolstering the price of beef cattle, meat, and so forth, on the one hand, and then open up a great deal of land to grazing, which will contribute to surpluses of not only beef cattle, but dairy production, and so forth. It does not make any sense to me.

We do not seek to reduce the authority contained in the present law. We are only attacking the enlargement of the grazing use of the land which would be involved in the extra $10 million.

I hope the Senate will accept the amendment, because I think the rest of the bill is essential, and I believe it should be passed. I am in support of the other provisions of the bill.

I am willing to go along with the proposal for the extra $10 million provided the land is not opened up to grazing. That is the whole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, for all practical purposes, if this amendment were approved by the Senate, the bill would be dead. This was the best possible compromise that could be worked out by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The proposal of my friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], to try to continue and/or extend the period of the soil bank program is a proposal I have been working for for about a year. There were not sufficient votes to bring it out of committee without a compromise. This small compromise made it possible to get the bill out of committee. I do not know whether the House will accept it. I know the House will not accept it without some such provision as this. It is the best possible compromise, and is in the best interest of the cattle business.

I know something about the cattle business.

I may be considered by many as a wheat farmer but the sale of cattle from my farm is 10 times that of wheat. If the $10 million limitations were left stand only about 140,000 acres would be grazed.

With the adoption of the amendment which we offered as a compromise, it would put $20 million into the new program, but the Department of Agriculture thinks this would mean only 300,000 or 400,000 acres. With the $10 million only 140,000 acres would go into grazing and possibly go into the production of cattle. The additional $10 million would mean 300,000 or 400,000 acres.

What are we arguing about is a piddling few acres. If we want to continue the land in the soil bank, we ought to defeat this amendment now and pay more attention to imports, because that is the real problem of the cattle industry; imports are what is ruining the cattle industry.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the fears and apprehensions of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Iowa are wholly illusory. The bill as it originally came from the Department of Agriculture authorized the expansion of the pilot program, which has been effective with respect to land use, with a ceiling of $10 million on it. The ceiling would have been removed entirely. There was some fear and apprehension from the cattlemen that it meant we were bringing into production additional acres of pastureland, and therefore would compound the problems of the cattle industry. But, as was so ably stated by the Senator from North Dakota, the pilot program this year, with an expenditure of $7 million, brought into pasture only 140,000 acres. The committee bill expands the authority for this program by only $10 million.

There are 873 million acres of pastureland and rangeland in use in the United States. So what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are complaining about is an increase of 0.016 percent in this country's pasturelands. It is infinitesimal, and will do absolutely no harm to the cattle industry.

If it were harmful, I would be in favor of the amendment. In my State, there is a growing cattle industry and we want it to grow and continue to make progress. I would take no action to do any harm in that direction.

There are about 25 million acres lying idle in the conservation reserve program. This year contracts on about 7.4 million acres will expire, and next year contracts on about 3.5 million acres will expire. We are authorizing extension of these contracts for a period of 2 years—through 1965—under the conservation reserve program, but in many areas where there are retired acres, the program has dried up towns; it has dried up communities; it has driven people off the farms; it has driven them to towns, to find jobs when there are no jobs available. The land use program adopts a different approach. We want to keep people on the farms. We want to keep the land in production. We want to keep people from going to cities, seeking jobs where there is an overabundance of job hunters. That is the theory of the new land use program.

The committee authorized an increase in that program from $10 million to $20 million a year. As the distinguished Senator from North Dakota said, it is still an experimental program, but it is designed to keep farmers on the land, and not push them off. It is designed to keep land productive and not have it lie sterile. It is meant to keep land from going to weeds. It is designed to keep not only that land from being harmed, but land in the community, and neighboring land. It is designed to give the farmer some opportunity to switch his crops from feed grains and wheat and other products of which there is a surplus into something that we are now importing into the United States. Whether we agree with that or not, I think imports are too high. Last year we brought into the United States 1,250,000 head of cattle. We exported only 19,000 head.

This proposal would give the farmers an opportunity to change the use of their land and at the same time not build up enormous surpluses of wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities for storage in warehouses, the storage charges for which would fall upon the taxpayers of this country.

The program of retiring land and letting it lie sterile has been costing the taxpayers on an annual basis from $12 to $14 an acre. Under the land adjustment program it will cost only $5 to $7 an acre, or less than half.

The taxpayers will gain by the program, and the farmers will gain also. With reference to the cattle industry, let me point out that the pasture will produce only about 50 percent of the pounds of beef per acre that feed grain, wheat, or corn will produce. Therefore, if this land goes back into the production of corn, or into the production of feed grain, it will strike a tremendous blow at the beef cattle industry of our country. However, if it goes into grass, the blow will be lessened a great deal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], as well as the Senator from South Dakota previously, have seen fit to put the finger on the real sore spot so far as the cattle industry is concerned. It is not the bill that does the harm. It goes a long way toward doing what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota tried to do at the time the agricultural appropriation bill was before us. The pending bill is a good bill. I do not see how the cattle industry can be hurt by it. The danger lies in the frozen beef imports from Australia and New Zealand, and also from other areas to a lesser degree.

I hope the amendment will be turned down and that the House will pass the bill in the same form in which it has been reported to us.

Mr. TALMADGE. The imports of live cattle into this country last year amounted to 1,250,000 head. Therein lies the problem so far as production and price are concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And frozen beef also.

Mr. TALMADGE. Frozen beef also. Finally, the bill is the result of compromise. The Department of Agriculture sent the bill to our committee. It met the opposition of the livestock industry. We held hearings on it. Representatives of the livestock industry and agricultural groups of our country appeared and testified, along with representatives of the Department of Agriculture. We finally worked out a compromise, by which we would extend for the next 2 years the contracts expiring on the conservation reserve. We worked out the compromise by which we would expand the new idea of land use, instead of letting land lie sterile, from $10 million a year to $20 million a year. When the question was submitted in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, it received the committee's unanimous vote. The bill comes to the floor with the backing of every Republican member of the committee who was present that day, and of every Democratic member of the committee who was present that day. I regret that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota was not offered in committee. If it had been offered, I am certain it would have met the same fate that I hope it will meet on the floor of the Senate. We want to change the principle of driving people off the farms and letting the land lie fallow and sterile and drying up communities and towns, and driving people into cities where they will be seeking jobs, and where no jobs will be available.

At this time I am delighted to yield such time to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. First I wish to compliment my good friends from Georgia and North Dakota for putting their fingers on the points involved in the bill. As the Senator from Georgia stated, the committee held hearings on the bill, and it was the thought of the Department that all of the 25 million acres of land that were in the conservation reserve should be put into the land use adjustment program. After hearings, it was apparent that the committee would not report such a bill. After considerable debate in the committee on the day the bill was sent to the floor, while I was presiding as chairman of the committee, it appeared improbable that we would report any bill to the Senate. I had promised my good friend from South Dakota that I would do my utmost to have a bill reported. I do not say this boastfully, but I suggested a little compromise, which was adopted. The bill before the Senate today is the compromise, and I believe it is equitable. As was stated, it increases the authorization for the land use adjustment program from $10 million to $20 million.

I wish to point out to my good friend from South Dakota that if the entire $20 million is used, it will take care of only about 420,000 acres of land; that is all. On the other hand, if the committee had voted what the Department desired, it would have meant as much as 7.4 million conservation reserve acres in 1963 going into pasture. Another point that was made very forcefully before the committee is the increase in beef production needed in future years. Today, in order to provide sufficient beef for our present population, we have about 75 million head of beef cattle. By 1970, the record indicates, we will have to have about 25 million more head, or a total of 100 million by 1970, rather than the present 75 million. We ought to look into that need. By the adoption of the bill as reported, the committee will have an opportunity to further study the need for increased cattle numbers and pasture requirements. It is my belief that we will be able to do something about it. Let us not overlook the fact that the cost of extending conservation reserve contracts in the amount of 10.7 million acres for 2 years, will amount to approximately $180 million.

As my good friend from Georgia pointed out, that money can be saved by not renewing the agreement and by just letting conservation reserve contracts expire, and in that way save $180 million for the taxpayers. But, I do not think we want to do that because of the very adverse effect on cattle producers and the possible increase in the production of surplus crops. It is my belief that if we can work out a program that will be beneficial, that will keep this land in use at a cost of half of what we are now paying, it is to our advantage to do it. It is my belief that we can develop in the next 2 years facts and figures to show that it might be wise for us to further develop our pastures throughout the United States in order to provide the cattle which we will need by 1970.

I should like to say to my good friend from South Dakota if he desires an extension of this act and if he desires to take care of the conservation reserve contracts that will expire in 1963, he had better vote for the bill, because I do not believe that the committee will report a bill that will do what the Senator proposes.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I want to see the first part of the bill continued. I want to see these contracts extended for 2 years. Of course, as the Senator knows, we had a spirited debate, and lost the contest when we tried to waive the rule on the appropriation bill. Before the Senator came on the floor, I said I wished to express my appreciation that the committee acted as expeditiously as he had promised it would. The first part of the bill, except the part that we would delete by our amendment, does precisely what my amendment proposed to do when I offered it as an amendment to the appropriation bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. We could not have had the views of the Senator expressed in the bill the committee reported unless we added the $10 million to the pilot program. That was the situation.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Louisiana has told me—I know it is correct—that he had to make a little compromise to get the bill out of committee. Having lost the contest in the lower court, we are now appealing to a higher court. The bill is now before the Senate, and the Senate can use its own judgment as to what it wishes to do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I interpret the intent of the amendment—I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana understands it in the same way—it does not change anything except for the prohibition of grazing on the extra acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It stops grazing only on that acreage.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the amendment very well. As I said, even though we utilized the $10 million, it would only be capable of taking care of a little more than 420,000 acres. That certainly cannot hurt. I repeat: If we want to let the conservation reserve contracts expire and let the 10.9 million acres go into production of corn, and so forth, we can do so.

On page 12 of the hearings is a table indicating that 67 percent of the acreage in the conservation reserve is in row crops and small grain, which means wheat, corn, and other feed grains. Thirty-three percent is in tame hay, summer alfalfa, and so forth. All of that land will go into cultivation if we do not pass the bill as it is before the Senate.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. When the Department of Agriculture officials appeared before the committee as we were taking action on the bill, they claimed that most of the soil bank land that is coming out of the soil bank this year—a large part had already been plowed up and that the rest, representing several million acres, would go into grazing or haying land.

Mr. ELLENDER. A good deal of it was.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum and yield to me?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida. I wish to reserve some of the time before the vote. Will 2 minutes be satisfactory?

Mr. HOLLAND. It will be satisfactory.

The battle within the committee to report the amendment which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had urged as a legislative amendment when the appropriation bill was before the Senate was a real battle. The members of the committee were closely divided. In my opinion, the compromise which was offered by the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER] was by all means the best solution on which we could possibly get together.

My judgment is that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and his friends who are concerned about the relatively few acres which might be added to the grazing potential of the Nation should be aware of this situation. I think it would better serve their general purpose if they withdrew the amendment; because if the amendment prevailed, the vote on the passage of the bill would be very different. There would be a very different situation in the House. I warn all concerned that the emissary of the Department of Agriculture who appeared before the committee was far from warm in approving the compromise, even on the basis which was arrived at.

The passage of the extension of the conservation reserve program as to the nearly 11 million acres which will come out of the reserve at the end of this year and the end of next year is vastly more important than the matter involved in the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. I hope he will not lose sight of his main objective.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] desired to speak, but he is momentarily out of the Chamber.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield as much time on this side as he may desire to the junior Senator from Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota yields to the junior Senator from Colorado as much time as he may desire. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I support the amendment. Although I am not a member of the committee and did not have the opportunity to work with the committee on the various provisions contained in the bill, it seems to me there are at least two points which ought to be made, but which have not been made.

First. The livestock industry is one industry which has not been regulated by Government control; yet it has survived better than any other portion of the agricultural industry. Consequently, anything that might be done to tie the livestock industry to a governmental program of control would tend, over a period of time, to put that industry in the same condition as are the dairy producers, thus affecting another group of farmers and agricultural interests.

Second. One of the problems which the agricultural industry is now facing is the importation of livestock and livestock products from other countries, which has tended to cause overproduction. As a result, so far as this country's requirements are concerned, beef prices have become depressed.

If we expand to any substantial degree the amount of acreage and the number of people who can go into the livestock industry, as would occur under this type of bill, it seems to me we would be compounding the problem.

On the other hand, if we were to adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, we would be supporting the report of the Outdoor Recreation Committee, which is that we make available on the acreage which is withdrawn under this type of program the opportunity for recreational projects on land so withdrawn. Obviously, to the extent that this acreage would be made available for grazing, as opposed to recreation, we would be downgrading that portion of the report. To the extent that we could use the additional acreage which may come within the terms of the bill as proposed by this amendment, we would have an opportunity to fulfill the recommendations of the President and his Outdoor Recreational Committee on the need for different uses for some of the agricultural land so withdrawn.

So it seems to me this amendment works in very well with the projects which have been suggested in the past, both by the President and by the various advisory committees which the President has appointed, and which have reported to us as well as to the executive branch, and that it will work equally as well in preventing any adverse encroachment by Government regulation on the livestock industry.

These two things, I believe, are of substantial importance in connection with the consideration of this bill; and I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment for these reasons, as well as the others which have been mentioned by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I am reluctant to oppose my senior colleague [Mr. MUNDT]; but I previously had some rather serious reservations about the bill as reported from the committee, and I believe the amendment would make it all the more objectionable.

It seems to me that the land use adjustment program which the administration has recommended is more realistic and goes closer to the heart of the problem facing us than does the bill as reported from the committee.

As the chairman of the committee has said, in the committee, we very carefully reviewed the various alternatives, and unanimously reached the conclusion that this compromise proposal was the only measure that we were able to report and that would have much chance of passage by the Senate.

I believe the only basis upon which I can support Senate bill 1588 is on the ground that it gives us an opportunity to have time to make a more permanent adjustment for the land that will be coming out of the conservation reserve.

I am impressed by the estimates which have been made by the Department of Agriculture—namely, that over the next 7 years we shall need an additional 25 million head of cattle to meet the needs of our country for red meat. Even if that estimate should prove to be twice as large as the facts prove to be, we would still be able to absorb, without any problem at all, any grassland that is brought into being under the bill now before us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] such time as he may desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the statement has been made repeatedly that the action of the committee was unanimous. I was not at the committee meeting that morning, and I did not vote. So I sent my proxy to the committee, for I had another committee meeting which I had to attend. My proxy was in support of the extension of the contracts. I also expressed my view that my proxy should be voted against the increase of grazing on these retired acres; but the compromise was reached; and my proxy was not exercised, because the Senator from Kentucky, who held it, was not quite certain how I would vote on that matter.

I support all of the action of the committee, with the exception of the inclusion of the excess acres in the grazing provision. I merely wish to make that clear.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, let me make a correction of the RECORD, by saying that what I meant to say was that the action taken was unanimous on the part of those present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield half a minute to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I wish to state that at the committee meeting, I said I did not know how the Senator from Iowa would vote on the proposed increase.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, unless there are other demands for time on this side, Mr. President, I am willing to conclude my argument with just a few short comments and then have the vote taken, if that is in accord with the desire of the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

It seems to me that the substance of the argument in opposition to the amendment submitted by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], is that the committee did the best it could to come up with the kind of extension on which we voted as an amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill; but being unable to get that particular kind of extension of 2 years out of the committee without sweetening it by expanding the land retirement program, they did the next best thing. I believe that is correct, and I appreciate that they have moved in that direction.

However, I may add that I am never very much impressed when any Secretary of Agriculture or any Department of Agriculture presents the case to us on the basis, "Take it as we want it, or you cannot have it." I had a little experience with that under a Republican Secretary of Agriculture, and now we are getting it under a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture. It seems to me to be very clear that the distinction between the tactical positions of former Secretary Benson and Secretary Freeman is rapidly disappearing, and soon they will be differences without a distinction. Each one wants this his own way. Secretary Freeman says, "I want this wheat bill, or no bill at all. We want to increase the exports of grain products; but if that is to be done, it must be done in my particular way of grading, with different samples and different standards of wheat."

Now he says, "If you are going to have an extension of the existing soil bank contracts, it must be done my way or not at all."

Mr. President, I am not impressed by that. I do not know whether the House will be impressed by it, but I have a sneaking suspicion that before the House gets through with this proposed legislation, it is going to add something very similar to the amendment which the Senator from Iowa and I have proposed.

I believe that the time has passed when Congress will knuckle under to Secretaries of Agriculture who tell us, "It is going to be this way, or it will be vetoed." Some day Congress is going to stand up and say, "We want it our way." Whether that will mean support for an amendment of this kind, I cannot say; but I am not impressed by the argument that the adoption of this amendment will kill the bill.

Neither am I too much impressed by the fact that this is a small increase. Well, it is a 100-percent increase. Percentagewise, that is a large increase. When they say it is not going to hurt anything, if they do this, does that mean it will do any good? I cannot figure how certain numbers of acres of reduced grazing will hurt anything, but will be desirable to the program. And you have got to have them or you cannot accept it for whatever reason it will support. This is it. We have been asked only that grazing be eliminated from this retirement program.

It is asking for the cattlemen the same protection the rice producer has. Rice is eliminated.

It is asking for the livestock industry the same protection the cotton industry has. Cotton is eliminated. It is asking for livestock the same protection against subsidized government competition that is available for peanuts and rice. They are eliminated. What is the reasoning to the livestock industry to clobber it over the head with it an avalanche of imports and then subsidize foreign competition on the domestic front? It is all very well to have exhortations about imports; that has happened again and again. But has Congress taken any action? It has not. Has the administration listened to the Congress? It has not. Have they stopped the imports? They have not. They are getting bigger and more voluminous by the month. What we can do is protect, by this amendment, against new subsidized Government competition from whatever source.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to. If not, I hope the House will put it in, and that the conference will support the position represented in the amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is the distinguished Senator from South Dakota prepared to yield back his time?

Mr. MUNDT. I am, if my adversary on the other side of the argument is prepared to yield back his time.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I have serious reservations to the bill S. 1588 which proposes to extend the soil bank. It is vastly inferior to the land use adjustment program recommended by the Department of Agriculture.

We have 7.4 million acres of land coming out of the soil bank this year, and 3.4 million on which contracts expire next year.

We have not made adequate legislative provision for retirement of this land, or its equivalent, through the land use adjustment program. S. 1588 could be supported only because it contains some authority for expanding the cropland conversion program and because it will enable us to buy time to further extend this program at a later date.

I am convinced that the longtime good of my own State, and of the Nation, lies with the land use adjustment program, sometimes called the cropland conversion program, which Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has proposed.

As I stated in remarks on the reclamation program on Monday, we are going to need a considerable increase in red meat production in the years ahead. We are now consuming about 28 billion pounds a year. The Department of Agriculture estimates consumption in 1970 at 35 to 37 billion pounds. There will be an increase of 3 million consumers a year, and there is an increase in per capita consumption.

Production of livestock products can be materially expanded in South Dakota under existing conditions; it can be expanded even more when the Oahe irrigation project provides us with a source of hay and forage to supplement our range.

My State needs—and the Nation needs—an orderly adjustment of land use to the production of this needed increase in red meat supplies.

Such land use adjustment is enormously preferable to idling the land altogether. Idle land is both a physical and an economic hazard. It constitutes a danger in terms of fires, insects, weeds, and erosion. It is a deterrent to the economic life and growth of the communities where it lies, for it produces no income, trade, or demand for services.

We need to develop a plan for diversion of land to production of needed red meat supplies, carefully timed so it will not create surpluses or depress markets, so all our acres will ultimately serve a useful purpose and not lie as a threat to the communities where they occur.

A decision to abandon the soil bank in favor of the cropland conversion program could be a determination in favor of meat on American tables in the not-too-distant future.

Land under contract in the conservation reserve of the soil bank cannot be used for grazing or any harvest except under special arrangements in an emergency. But in the cropland conversion program, profitmaking use of the land is encouraged, except for crop production, and the Government cost is reduced accordingly.

Misunderstandings that confront us center on the question: Is there good use for this land, or must it be kept idle? Some cattle producers have been led to believe that their prices are threatened by use of the land in question for pasture. On the other hand, reputable economists report that additional pasturage would be in the public interest because beef production should be increased through the years to meet the needs of our growing population.

Briefly, let me summarize what these economists are reporting from their studies.

First, demand for red meat is increasing. The number of consumers is growing by about 3 million persons a year, and beef represents a growing percentage of the food eaten by the average person. By 1970, consumption of red meats could well be 35 to 37 billion pounds, compared with 28 billion in the last 3 years. This means we would need 7 years from now 25 million more head of cattle, an increase of one-third. This would call for an average increase of 5 percent a year—a slightly greater increase per year than we have been making.

Beef as meat on the table has been increasing in amount not only because farmers and ranchers have raised more cattle but very largely because feedlot finishing has expanded. But there is a limit to further increase in production from feedlot feeding. Already two-thirds of our beef comes from feedlots. If we are to have more beef on our tables, we must have more feeder animals. This means we need more pasture for brood cows and heifers and for stocker cattle that will be fed later.

So, to sum up what I have said: demand for beef is increasing; greater numbers of cattle are needed; and more pasture is needed.

How much more pasture is needed?

To keep up with the expanding demand for beef, producers would need to increase pasturage by many more acres than would be available under the cropland conversion program. The increase would be less than we need for 1 year, to say nothing of the increase that is needed over a period of many years. The additional feed from the additional pasture would be a small factor in total production. It would be overshadowed by other factors such as variations in weather and feeding practices. It is certainly nothing for cattlemen to get excited about if they will get out their pencils and do the necessary figuring.

Then why is cropland conversion important to all?

It is important not merely because it is a step in the right direction as far as beef production is concerned but also because the land in question could add greatly to our surplus of grains: Our uses of grain must catch up with our production. We should not let land come into production to add to our surplus of grain if we can help it. The cost to farmers and to taxpayers and to the general economy is far too great.

Let us not use the land for detrimental purposes.

Let us use the land for good purposes, including the purpose of putting beef on the table as we need it in the future.

If S. 1588 to extend the soil bank passes, it should be regarded as interim legislation to provide time to make a more basic and desirable land use adjustment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

That section 109(a) of the Soil Bank Act is amended by adding a new sentence at the end thereof to read as follows: "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, if the producer makes application therefor, to extend until December 31, 1965, any conservation reserve contract entered into under this subtitle B which is scheduled to expire either on December 31, 1963, or December 31, 1964, or which expired on December 31, 1962, and was extended until December 31, 1963, under the authority of section 16(e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act."

SEC. 2. Section 16(e)(7) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590p(e)) is amended by striking out "$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize extension of conservation reserve contracts through 1965, and increase the limit on annual payments under the cropland conversion program to $20,000,000."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ALASKA'S GREAT FISHERY RESOURCES ARE IMPERILED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, Alaskans are very much concerned about the threat to our fisheries which long were our principal resource.

After our greatest national fish resource, the Pacific salmon, which was predominantly an Alaska resource was brought almost to extinction by the mismanagement of the Federal agency placed in charge of it and over Alaskans unceasing protests, as long as Alaska was a Territory, Alaskans had hoped, after statehood, to be able to undertake the arduous task of rebuilding this fishery. And indeed an excellent start has been made, after under Federal mismanagement this resource, in the last year of Federal control, dropped to the lowest point in 60 years—1,600,000 cases from highs of over 6 million cases. A good start was made and last year the pack reached 3,309,797 cases.

Unfortunately a new predator in the form of foreign fishing—Japanese and Russian—threatens a renewed depletion and destruction of this great resource. This was evidenced in this year's disastrously small salmon run in Bristol Bay, which really made that part of Alaska a disaster area. This year in consequence the pack will be lower. Also, the Japanese are unlikely to renew the treaty which limits their fishing and the Russians seem to be without any consideration for international law and conservation measures in our waters which they are invading, their poaches heading out beyond the 3-mile limit as soon as they are spotted, but having meanwhile taken our fish and wrecked our fishermen's crab traps. I hope that the administration will, as I have repeatedly asked, station some faster naval or Coast Guard vessels in Alaskan waters.

An interesting article on this subject by Don Page appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer entitled, "International Fisheries: The Problems Are Complex." I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES: THE PROBLEMS ARE COMPLEX

(By Don Page)

In this world where shifting conditions and shrinking distances are constantly raising new problems and embarrassments for us peoples who inhabit the globe, that fisheries conference going on now in Tokyo is an especially embarrassing event.

The fisheries conference certainly must be embarrassing to the Japanese people.

The Japanese pride themselves on an orderly way of life, with meticulous concern for the rights of others. Yet at the Tokyo fisheries conference a few great monopolistic Japanese fishing cartels are trying to frame a legalistic right to invade and plunder fisheries built and maintained by other peoples. Many Japanese people must be lowering their eyes in humiliation from the spectacle.

In turn, there lies embarrassment at Tokyo for us on the eastern rim of the North Pacific. We Canadians and Americans see our representatives traveling almost halfway around the world to account to another nation for the way we are running our fisheries and to engage in legalistic debate with that other nation, Japan, on why we should be allowed to keep our fisheries.

These are our fisheries. We did build them. We do maintain them.

MUCH MONEY INVESTED

Our Canadian and United States Governments have invested many millions of dollars in their programs to study, protect and conserve our North American stocks of salmon and halibut. Our fishermen, too, have sacrificed the harvest of millions of dollars worth of fish to protect the longtime welfare of these stocks.

If Canada and the United States had not seeded these stocks with their investments and their sacrifices, there wouldn't be enough salmon and halibut left here today to make the Japanese want to move in on the harvest.

The North American salmon is a carefully reared creature. It is a family creature, too. It returns almost invariably to spawn in the same stream where it was born. In the Columbia River, the Fraser River, the streams of Bristol Bay and southeast Alaska and Puget Sound, our two countries—Canada and the United States—pamper the salmon, nurse it through its infancy and rigorously control the catch of salmon off the mouth of these spawning streams to insure that every race of salmon is given the best possible chance to survive and reproduce.

The halibut is not a creature of inland streams. But it lives all its life and in the North Pacific is best harvested on ledges of the Continental Shelf off Alaska and Canada. Some decades ago the halibut of the North Pacific seemed headed for near extinction. Then the United States and Canadian Governments joined in an international commission that studied the halibut, learned how to protect it and by sacrifice of some immediate gains for fishermen, nursed these halibut stocks back to their present flourishing state.

The halibut of our North Pacific waters, like the salmon of North American origin, are there because we, or our forebears, put them there.

A DANGEROUS PROPOSAL

Japanese proposals for high-seas fishing would endanger, might even wipe out, the stocks of salmon and halibut we have planted. In the one area where Japanese fleets now can catch some red salmon of Bristol Bay origin, their narrow mesh nets are sweeping up great numbers of immature salmon.

High-seas net fishing for salmon scrambles our efforts to insure proper escapement to each spawning ground. Our United States and Canadian fishermen are not allowed to fish as the Japanese do, at sea with nets for salmon.

Not many years ago, distance and the nature of the world would have protected such national resources as the salmon and the halibut from raids like the ones proposed by the few Japanese monopolies. Back in the days when the present 3-mile limit to territorial waters was determined by the range of a cannon ball, nations could safely nuture such stocks of fish along their shores, secure from encroachment by foreign powers.

Today technology has wiped out that protection of national resources. Today great fishing fleets can sail anywhere in the world. The traditional 3-mile limit still seems appropriate for ownership of territorial waters and an adequate limit to curbs on navigation. For fisheries, the 3-mile limit is outmoded. Fisheries resources in our age demand the protection of more flexible, thoughtfully considered methods than territorial waters can provide.

New, modern international understandings, vigorously asserted by this Nation, are necessary to guard the rights that once were guarded for us by our own isolation.

Our framing of such international understandings and statements of our rights have been hindered by a lag in awareness of the new set of ground rules imposed on us by the modernization of our world, by apparent lack of understanding by our Government of how important the wealth of our seas will soon become to our national welfare and, frankly, by the same pussyfooting approach that in the years since World War II has put the United States behind the eightball too often in varying fields of international relations.

It is a sad fact that America's stand on its property rights in these homegrown North Pacific fisheries is not so strong as it was a quarter century ago.

Our United States and Canadian claims to these fish and our effort to keep intruders out are not, as the Japanese monopolies would have us believe, an indignity imposed on the defeated Japanese by our conquering forces of World War II. As early as the 1930's Canadian and United States pressure was successfully exerted on England to keep her from sending a fleet of boats to our North Pacific halibut grounds.

And in 1937 when Japanese interests made a grab at North American fishing stocks, sage old Cordell Hull, as U.S. Secretary of State, sent the Japanese a warning note. Hull wrote then:

"Because of the sacrifices and the part that American citizens have played in bearing the cost of conserving and perpetuating the salmon resources, it is the strong conviction * * * on the part of the American public generally that there has been established a superior interest and claim in the salmon resources of Alaska. * * * The fact that salmon taken from waters off the Alaskan coast are spawned and hatched in American inland waters and when intercepted are returning to American waters adds further to the conviction that there is in these resources a special and unmistakable American interest."

THE TRUMAN PROCLAMATION

Later, in 1945, President Harry Truman wrote this:

"In view of the pressing need for conservation and protection of fishery resources, the Government of the United States regards it as proper to establish conservation zones in those areas of the United States wherein fishing activities have been or in the future may be developed and maintained on a substantial scale. * * * The character as high seas of the areas in which such conservation zones are established and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected."

Those statements of 18 and 26 years ago certainly are stronger and more forthright than the abstention principle spelled out in the International North Pacific Fisheries Treaty 10 years ago.

The abstention principle adds the requirements that nations operating the exclusive fisheries shall maintain scientific studies, conservation measures and full utilization of the affected stocks. Japan seized on these requirements to lean over the shoulders of the United States and Canada and demand that they justify all details of their protected fisheries. It was this technical demand that forced our two nations to admit Japanese boats to the Eastern Bering halibut grounds this year. Japan could not prove we were not operating our halibut fishery there efficiently, but we could not, in turn, prove maximum utilization.

Certainly, this is not a strong position for the United States and Canada, letting a third nation sit in judgment on how we are operating our fisheries.

The abstention principle is not, as the Japanese say, too strong. It is too weak. A firmer assertion of our property rights in these home-developed coastal fisheries is in order. There are enough farmers in Asia and in North America for a principle like this to be understood on both continents:

"It is we who have sown the seeds. It is we who must reap the harvest."

TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT AND ALSO HELP SOLVE ONE ASPECT OF CIVIL RIGHTS ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC WORKS ARE IMPERATIVE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, unemployment continues to be the most pressing problem confronting our Nation today. It is tied in closely with another major pressing problem—civil rights. They are related, and the two problems involved can be met in part by taking the same remedial measures.

For this reason I introduced legislation earlier in this Congress which would increase the amount available for the accelerated public works program from $900 million to $2.6 billion, half the amount spent during each year in the last 3 years for foreign economic and other asistance.

In introducing S. 1121 on March 19, 1963, I said it was time for us to do as much for the folks at home as for those abroad and I called for an end to measures which did little to put America back to work. Actually I propose in this needed bill to do only half as much as we have been doing abroad, or even less, since the foreign aid expenditures are annual while accelerated public works legislation spreads over several years.

The bill, S. 1121, is a simple proposal.

Joining as cosponsors are my colleagues, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

I am delighted that the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations has adopted a resolution calling for action this year to extend and expand the accelerated public works program. In the October 8, 1963, statement by the AFL–CIO executive council on this important program, it is noted:

> The need for the continuance and expansion of this program is even more evident than it was last spring.

As the AFL–CIO says:

> A great backlog of public works already exists in areas of substantial unemployment.

That is the case in Alaska. Worthwhile projects are ready to go but no money is available. The till is empty. It is absurd and shocking that that should be so in this "affluent society."

The accelerated public works program has proved its worth. I concur in the opinion of the AFL–CIO that it be continued. And I agree and urge that the Congress appropriate the funds that will insure job-creating stimulus. The AFL–CIO suggests that the funding be $2 billion.

I commend the AFL–CIO for its meaningful statement regarding the need to continue the accelerated public works program. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the council's statement be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 8, 1963

Unless the Congress acts quickly, the Public Works Acceleration Act will die in January. Last spring we urged extension of this act through 1964 because of the continuing high level of unemployment and the prospect that it will not be substantially reduced next year. Today, the need for the continuance and expansion of this program is even more evident than it was last spring.

Although 2½ years have passed since the low point of the last recession, the jobless rate still exceeds 5½ percent of the labor force. Long-term unemployment has not diminished for over a year and is particularly acute among Negroes. Unemployment among young people is on the rise. In the face of these facts and the prospect of high unemployment next year the Public Works Acceleration Act surely should be extended through 1964.

When President Kennedy signed this act in September 1962, one of the most effective programs to alleviate unemployment was launched. Thousands of workers in hundreds of areas of substantial labor surplus have gone to work building useful public facilities of long-term worth. Additional thousands have left the ranks of the jobless to supply material and equipment required for these projects. At a time like the present, when the private sector of the economy is failing to fully utilize the manpower and productive resources of the country, no better program to put people to work and to permanently enrich the Nation could possibly be conceived.

The value of this program to the jobless, to the communities that are obtaining lasting public improvements, and to the Nation's economy is so evident, its termination next January would be a tragedy.

When the AFL–CIO testified in behalf of the Public Works Acceleration Act in 1962, we supported a program limited to 1 year, but with the proviso that it should be extended if the national unemployment rate continued to exceed 5 percent. The unemployment rate has exceeded and does now exceed the 5-percent rate and all evidence indicates this course will continue unless action is taken now.

Therefore, once again we urge the continuation of this program through 1964. Moreover, we urge the Congress to appropriate $2 billion for that purpose so that an increase in its job-creating stimulus will be assured. A Federal effort of this magnitude plus the approximate $1 billion to be added from State and local matching funds would directly create about 300,000 badly needed jobs, in on-site construction and in the production and distribution of materials and equipment. What is more, as the impact of this $3 billion outlay gradually spreads through the economy, it can be reasonably expected that another 150,000 to 300,000 jobs will be created indirectly.

The welfare of the Nation requires not only a continuance and expansion of this program, it requires action now. A great backlog of public works already exists in areas of substantial unemployment on which planning is completed and work could get quickly underway if Federal funds become available. At present, there is a backlog of applications for such public works projects, including over $1 billion of construction, for which funds are not available under current appropriations.

Action is urgent now—to extend the Public Works Acceleration Act through next year, with an appropriation of $2 billion. In assessing the relative value of all legislative proposals to alleviate unemployment, we view continuance of the Public Works Acceleration Act through 1964 to deserve high priority.

DON'T BLAME THE WEATHER, MR. K

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Mr. Khrushchev now tells the world that adverse weather during the past several years has seriously distressed agricultural production and that now he needs to buy wheat from free nations which have produced abundantly. The true facts about the Soviet crop failure, however, are now coming out and as they are brought to light, they reveal that resentment by slave labor, together with agrarian sabotage, are the true causes. This true situation is ably presented in a letter received from Dr. Bela Fabian, which I ask unanimous consent to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 8, 1963.

Senator FRANK LAUSCHE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: The Soviet Union's need for purchasing wheat in Australia, Canada, and now in the United States, did not come as a surprise to those who have been observing the agrarian situation of the Soviet Union during the last decade. One might say, without exaggeration, that in the Soviet orbit, Russia included, there is an agricultural revolution that threatens the mere existence of the Communist regime. Khrushchev may blame the weather for the failure of his crops, or lament over the shortage of fertilizer and irrigation canals, however, he will never admit the real cause for his failure: the sabotage of agrarian workers.

For many years Khrushchev has waged an all-out campaign, the opening up of the virgin lands in Kazakhstan, and adjoining

Siberian territories, and has boasted that the Soviet Union's agricultural production would soon surpass that of the United States.

Since 1954, more than 90 million acres of virgin and fallow land had come under the plow at Khrushchev's demand. In order to cultivate this vast mass of land, Khrushchev has deported more than 6 million young people to Kazakhstan, since 1955. The population of Kazakhstan increased from 3 200,000 in 1939, to 9,300,000 in 1960. Khrushchev calls this internal deportation, "volunteers to Kazakhstan," pretending that the deportees are volunteers who go from their own free will to build socialism in this remote and rugged land. A large number of these so-called volunteers come from various countries behind the Iron Curtain. It is a sad fact, that 7,000 young women, deported to the Soviet Union after the Hungarian revolt in 1956, are still in Kazakhstan.

Khrushchev has sent hundreds of thousands of tractors and combines to the virgin land, where the same fate befalls them as the millions of tractors and other farm machines that are being supplied to collective and State farms throughout the country. Within a few weeks, a large number of these machines break down as sabotaging peasants and deportees ruin or neglect them on purpose. The rusty broken down tractor, covered with snow, left outside in the fields has become the symbol of Soviet agriculture.

An Associated Press report from Moscow, quotes Pravda, which wrote that "thousands of combines and harvesters are out of repair" and broadcast an appeal to neighboring States for spare parts. "Pravda," the report says, "cited one big State farm with 530 combines—of which 225 are out of order. Another smaller farm has 23 harvesters and only 4 can be used."

In Kazakhstan, sabotage has now become so widespread, that some of the larger State farms and collectives were placed under military control.

In 1913, 1 year before the First World War, Czarist Russia's yearly export of wheat amounted to 13 million tons. Today after 46 years of Communist rule, the Soviet Union has to import wheat, and there are fewer cows than in 1913, or even in 1926 or 1939. The Soviet cow's daily average is only four quarts of milk, because agrarian workers willfully neglect farm animals on collective and State farms.

The same applies to the so-called Soviet satellites. While between the two world wars, Hungary exported a yearly average of 500,000 tons of wheat, plus large quantities of cattle, hogs, poultry, and other farm products, this country which once upon a time was a veritable land of milk and honey, is compelled to purchase wheat abroad and is suffering from a shortage of food.

The peasants of the Soviet orbit are convinced that sabotage is the only way of regaining their land which the regime took from them by force, and maybe will help them regain their lost freedom, too. During the long years of Communist oppression, the peasants and agrarian workers have mastered all the tricks of sabotage. By dragging out the time of harvesting and leaving the wheat on the ground, grain will spill out in dry weather, and will rot if soaked by rain. Frost will destroy corn and sugarbeets left in the field or in the ground.

The peasants know that this is the only way to lick the Soviet regime and to eventually get rid of it.

Selling wheat to the Soviet Union and countries under Soviet domination, helps the Communist regime and not the people, because it renders ineffectual their one weapon against the regime. Without wishing to be presumptious, I think that it would be a grave mistake if in the desperate struggle between the oppressor and the oppressed, it would appear as if the United States sided with the oppressors.

Enclosed I am sending you a cartoon, which was published in the New York World-Telegram on October 7, which rather hits the nail on the head with its caption, "When the Whole World Is Communist, Where Will We Get the Wheat?"

The miserable failure of Soviet agriculture shows up the weakness of the regime to the world and may one day become the greatest potential contributor to its downfall. Why give the Communists a boost? Getting rid of surplus wheat may be good for the U.S. economy, but does it justify the saving of communism?

Yours very sincerely,

Dr. Bela Fabian.

AN AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF GRANTS AND LOANS UNDER H.R. 6143 TO CHURCH OWNED, CONTROLLED, OR OPERATED UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the increasing demands from religious institutions for access to the Federal Treasury makes it imperative that Congress establish legal procedures to determine whether grants or loans to support the activities of religious institutions conflict with the first amendment, which provides that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Existing legal procedures give easy access to the courts for those who challenge the constitutionality of State grants or loans to institutions of this nature. This is made obvious by many judicial decisions. Under these decisions, private taxpayers and the Horace Mann League are now challenging in the courts of Maryland the validity under the first amendment, as well as under provisions of the Maryland Constitution, of State aid for construction purposes to four Maryland institutions of higher learning which are alleged to be owned, or controlled, or operated by religious denominations. Articles relating to this suit appeared in the Capital Baptist on September 19, 1963, and the Washington Post on October 11, 1963. It is noteworthy that Leo Pfeffer is one of the counsel for the complainants in the Maryland case. He is probably America's most knowledgeable lawyer in the field of church-state relationships.

The Washington Post for September 13, 1963, contained an editorial rightly commending the bringing of the Maryland case as a "first step toward obtaining a definitive judicial settlement of the question" of the constitutionality of grants or loans of public moneys for construction purposes to private institutions of higher learning operated under church auspices. While I do not share the opinion of the writer of this editorial that there is any distinction between the validity of governmental aid to church-run schools in the primary and secondary levels and church-run colleges and universities, I do share his concern for the desirability of having questions in this field settled by judicial determination.

The Constitution of the United States has two fundamental objectives. The first objective is to define the powers of the Federal Government and to divide them among the legislative, the executive, and judicial departments. The second is to specify the rights of individuals and to make them secure even against the Government itself.

The Supreme Court of the United States has expressly declared on four separate occasions during the past 17 years in cases involving State action that neither a State nor the Federal Government "can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another"; and that "no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion"; and that "neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa."

Unfortunately, however, existing Federal procedural rules make it virtually impossible for any citizens to challenge the constitutionality of Federal grants or loans to support the activities of religious institutions. This is made plain by the decision of the Supreme Court in *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447. A recent Department of Health, Education, and Welfare memorandum conceded this to be true by stating that "there appears to be no realistic likelihood that Federal legislation raising the constitutional issues discussed in this memorandum will be resolved by judicial decision."

Millions of Americans entertain the conviction that the first amendment prohibits the Congress from making grants or loans of tax moneys for construction purposes to colleges and universities owned, controlled, or operated by religious denominations. And yet existing Federal procedures shut the courthouse door in their faces and preclude them from challenging the power of Congress under the Constitution to make such grants or loans.

Millions of Americans entertain the additional conviction that the first amendment was drafted and ratified to enforce Thomas Jefferson's view that it is both sinful and tyrannical to compel a citizen to make contributions of money in the form of taxes to the support of religious institutions whose doctrines he disbelieves. And yet existing Federal procedures nail the courthouse door shut and deny these citizens any opportunity to raise the question in legal proceedings whether Congress robs them of their constitutional right to be free from taxation for religious purposes when it makes grants or loans for construction purposes to colleges and universities owned, controlled, or operated by religious denominations.

It is subversive of constitutional government for us to have no adequate legal procedures to obtain judicial determinations respecting the questions whether Congress is exceeding the powers it enjoys under the Constitution and is robbing all American citizens of a basic liberty when it makes grants and loans for construction purposes to colleges and universities owned, controlled, or operated by religious denominations.

For these reasons, I propose to offer an amendment which will authorize any taxpayer to sue in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers to test the validity under the Constitution of any grant or loan which the Federal Commissioner of Education may propose to make under H.R. 6143 to a college or university which is, in essence, owned, controlled, or operated by any religious denomination.

My amendment is quite different from the procedure involved in Massachusetts against Mellon. Unlike the procedure invoked in that case, my amendment does not undertake to authorize a challenge to the constitutionality of the act of Congress authorizing or making any appropriation. It merely authorizes the challenge of the constitutionality of administrative action which the Federal Commissioner of Education may propose. Moreover, it eliminates the possibility of interminable litigation by providing in effect that any action brought under it must be brought within a limited number of days set by the Federal Commissioner himself.

Besides it prevents the Federal Commissioner of Education from being harassed by law suits throughout the country by stipulating that the action must be brought in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. It forestalls a multiplicity of trials by providing that whenever two or more actions are brought challenging the same proposed grant or loan, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia can consolidate all such actions for the purpose of a single trial and judgment.

My amendment also avoids any injury to any proposed recipient of a grant or loan by prescribing that the amount of the proposed grant or loan is to be held in escrow until the civil action challenging it is decided.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles and editorials from the Capital Baptist and the Washington Post be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill of complaint in the Maryland case and a copy of the amendment I propose to offer to secure judicial review be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, the bill of complaint, and the proposed amendment were ordered printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Capital Baptist, Sept. 19, 1963]

MARYLAND: SUIT FILED TO TEST TAX AID TO CHURCH COLLEGES

Four prominent educators have challenged the constitutionality of Maryland laws that give $2,500,000 of State tax funds to four sectarian colleges for construction of three science buildings, a classroom building, a dining hall and a dormitory.

Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, speaking for the Committee on Constitutional Law of the Horace Mann League, explained the objective of the legal action of the group. He said:

"We are not dealing with the politics of education legislation. We are dealing with the constitutional rights of American citizens and taxpayers to have their funds used for public purposes. Our concern is for tax funds for sectarian use. The politics of it are irrelevant. We have a principle here that is not for sale."

A lawsuit was filed September 10 in the Circuit Court of Appeals of Anne Arundel County at Annapolis, Md., contesting 1962 and 1963 laws passed by the general assembly. The news was released to the public at a press conference in the Horace Mann room in the national headquarters building of the National Education Association in Washington, D.C.

The case comes at a time when there is widespread talk in the Nation that tax aid to parochial schools violates the U.S. Constitution but that church colleges are in a different category and so are eligible for tax aid. The decision in the case could affect pending legislation in Congress that provides for Federal loans and grants to both public and church-related colleges.

Four colleges are involved in the lawsuit. They are: Western Maryland College, Westminister (Methodist); the St. Joseph College of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent DePaul, Emmitsburg (Roman Catholic); Hood College, Frederick (United Church of Christ); and the college of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore (Roman Catholic).

The case was filed by the Committee on Constitutional Law of the Horace Mann League on behalf of 10 residents and taxpayers of the State of Maryland. These 10 persons represent a cross section of the religious groups of Maryland. None of them is an atheist.

Other members of the committee bringing the suit are John L. Buford, superintendent of schools of Mount Vernon, Ill., and a former president of the National Education Association; Willard E. Givens, former executive secretary of the National Education Association and now educational consultant for the Scottish Rites; and William A. Early, former president of National Education Association and presently director of personnel for the public schools of Montgomery County, Md.

The Horace Mann League, an independent organization of educators and other citizens was founded in 1922 and is dedicated to the principles of Horace Mann. He was a famous Massachusetts lawyer, educator, and statesman who is commonly regarded as the father of public education in the United States.

The 1962 and 1963 Maryland laws that are involved provide matching grants from tax funds for the four church-related colleges—$500,000 to Western Maryland College for a new science wing and a dining hall; $750,000 to St. Joseph College for a new science building; $500,000 to Hood College for a new dormitory and a new classroom building; and $750,000 to the College of Notre Dame of Maryland for a new science building.

In its bill of complaints the Horace Mann League charged that the laws are invalid for five reasons:

1. They compel taxpayers to contribute to a place of worship and a ministry.
2. They tax citizens for a religious and therefore a nonpublic purpose.
3. They violate the 1st amendment to the Constitution of the United States, applicable to Maryland by the 14th amendment, by establishing a religion and prohibiting the free exercise thereof.
4. They deprive taxpayers of property otherwise than in accordance with the law of the land.
5. They deprive taxpayers of their property without due process of law.

Leo Pfeffer, nationally known constitutional lawyer in church-state relations, has been employed as chief counsel for the Horace Mann League. Other attorneys are Walter R. Tabler and Melvin J. Sykes, both of Baltimore.

Pfeffer explained the reason for the suit at this time. He said that the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the New York Regents' prayer case and the Maryland and Pennsylvania Bible reading cases made it crystal clear that the use of Federal funds for sectarian institutions would be unconstitutional.

Fuller further pointed out that this is not an issue involving religious conflict but that it is an educational issue. He indicated that this is the reason educational leaders are bringing the suit. He also said that in all probability other similar cases would be brought to the courts since this is a fertile field for legal activity.

Constitutions of 42 of the States prohibit the use of tax funds for sectarian institutions. The other eight States have laws that place some restrictions on the use of tax funds for such purposes.

A press release from the Horace Mann League points out that "it is now contended by some that the prohibition against the use of tax-raised funds for the support of sectarian schools does not apply to colleges and universities, particularly where the appropriation purports to be earmarked for what is asserted to be a nonreligious purpose."

It continued, "Because this alleged distinction between higher and lower levels of education is entirely novel, there have been no decisions on this point in either State or Federal courts. The current action would challenge the assumption of the Maryland Legislature that the Maryland and Federal Constitutions permit the use of tax-raised funds for the construction of academic and other facilities for sectarian colleges."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 11, 1963]

NEW CASES HIT CHURCH-SCHOOL WAR

(By Louis G. Panos)

Two new court cases and the promise of a third have again set in motion a swirl of controversy around church-state-school relationships in Maryland.

In one case, the State government is accused of pressing too close a relationship by lending money for new building construction at colleges with religious affiliations.

In the other, the Prince Georges county government is accused of too cool a relationship by refusing to provide bus transportation to pupils of a church school.

Neither case figures to command the nationwide attention gained by Mrs. Madalyn Murray's successful Supreme Court action against required praying and Bible reading in Baltimore public schools.

But each may add another link to the growing chain of Court opinion on what public officials can legally do for pupils in private schools—or what public services the parents of these pupils can legally demand.

And Mrs. Murray has announced she plans still another test of the law on church-state relationships in the form of a suit challenging tax exemptions on church property.

Of the two new Maryland cases already in the courts, the one of more immediate significance seems to be a suit filed September 10 in Anne Arundel County circuit court by 10 individuals and the Horace Mann League. The league is named after the Massachusetts lawyer whose pioneering efforts in public education more than a century ago made him known as the Father of the Common Schools.

Challenged in the suit are legislative acts of 1962 and 1963 to provide $2.5 million in State money for new building construction at four church-affiliated colleges. The money would come from sale of bonds financed by the State property tax.

The challengers say this violates the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which prohibits laws "respecting an establishment of religion." They say it also violates three articles in the Maryland Constitution, including one against compelling any citizen to contribute to "any place of worship."

The schools involved in the suit, their church affiliations, and the amount authorized for each:

College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore, Catholic, $750,000.

Hood College, Frederick, United Church of Christ, $500,000.

St. Josephs College of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent dePaul, Emmitsburg, Catholic, $750,000.

Western Maryland College, Westminster, Methodist, $500,000.

These are among 12 State grants authorized by the legislature for private colleges since 1951. The first, a $1.5 million grant to Johns Hopkins University, also wound up in the courts.

The State court of appeals upheld the grant, saying the university, although privately operated, performed a public function. There was no religious question involved.

Gov. J. Millard Tawes has questioned the wisdom of using State credit in the construction of buildings not owned by the State. But, again, his comments included the use of State credit even for local public schools and did not go to the church-state aspect of question.

Tawes merely noted that outstanding State debt rose by nearly $61.5 million from 1958 to 1962 and that about 61 percent of this involved construction of property not owned by the State.

Investment bankers and credit men have advised against the use of State credit for such purposes, the Governor said in the message covering his 1962 capital improvements program.

"A note of caution is warranted," he said.

In attacking State grants to religiously affiliated colleges, lawyers for the Horace Mann League did not include in their suit 1959 and 1961 grants to Loyola College and Mount St. Mary's College of Emmitsburg, both Catholic institutions.

"The bonds of those have already been issued," explained Attorney Melvin J. Sykes, who, with Walter R. Tabler, Jr., represents the league. "We did not feel that we should demand the return of money which was given by the State and accepted by the colleges in good faith."

But the outcome of the suit is certain to affect the State's future course in assisting institutions with religious affiliations.

Bill of Complaint in Maryland Case

HORACE MANN LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES, ET AL. *v.* BOARD OF PUBLIC WORKS OF MARYLAND, ET AL.—BILL OF COMPLAINT, SEPTEMBER 10, 1963

1. The corporate plaintiff. The Horace Mann League of the United States of America, Inc., is a nonprofit educational and charitable corporation of Maryland, organized and operated for the purpose of fostering and strengthening the American public school system.

2. The individual plaintiffs are all citizens of the United States and citizens and taxpayers of the State of Maryland; and this action is brought for themselves and all other taxpayers of the State of Maryland similarly situated.

3. The defendant, J. Millard Tawes, is the Governor of Maryland. The defendant, Louis L. Goldstein, is the comptroller of Maryland. The defendant, John A. Luetkemeyer, is the treasurer of Maryland. Said defendants are sued herein as the Board of Public Works of Maryland. In addition, the defendant, Louis L. Goldstein, is sued herein in his official capacity as comptroller; and the defendant, John A. Luetkemeyer is sued herein in his official capacity as treasurer.

4. The defendant, Western Maryland College, located in Westminster, Carroll County, Md., is a Protestant Christian educational institution, organized and founded by the Methodist Church, a Protestant denomination, and is conducted and controlled in whole or in part by said Methodist Church. The said defendant is in whole or in part a place of worship and a ministry of the Methodist Church and is a religious institution engaged in religious activities, including the teaching and practice of the Protestant religion and the denominational tenets of the Methodist Church.

5. The defendant, the St. Joseph College of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent DePaul, Inc., located in Emmitsburg, Frederick County, Md., is an educational institution, organized, owned, conducted, and controlled by the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent DePaul, a religious society of the Roman Catholic Church, in accordance with the dogma and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. The said defendant is in whole or in part a place of worship and a ministry of the Roman Catholic Church and is a religious institution engaged in religious activities, including the teaching and practice of the Roman Catholic religion.

6. The defendant, Hood College of Frederick, Md., located in Frederick, Md., is a Protestant Christian educational institution, organized and founded by the Reformed Church in America, which has since merged with the Evangelical Synod of North America and thereafter with the Congregational Christian Church to form the United Church of Christ, a Protestant denomination, and is now conducted and controlled, in whole or in part, by the said United Church of Christ. The said defendant is in whole or in part a place of worship and a ministry of the United Church of Christ and is a religious institution engaged in religious activities, including the teaching and practice of the Protestant religion and the denominational tenets of the United Church of Christ.

7. The defendant, the College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Inc., located in the city of Baltimore, Md., is an educational institution organized, owned, conducted, and controlled by the School Sisters of Notre Dame, a religious society of the Roman Catholic Church, in accordance with the dogma and doctrines of said church. The said defendant is in whole or in part a place of worship and a ministry of the Roman Catholic Church and is a religious institution engaged in religious activities, including the teaching and practice of the Roman Catholic religion.

8. By chapter 546 of the acts of 1963, approved by the Governor of Maryland on April 30, 1963, the General Assembly of Maryland enacted a bill entitled "An act to authorize the creation of a State debt in the aggregate amount of $500,000 for the purpose of aiding in the construction of a new science wing to Lewis Hall and a new dining hall on the campus of Western Maryland College, in Westminster, subject to the requirements that the said college, on or before January 1, 1965, shall have obtained elsewhere at least an equal and matching sum for the same purposes; and providing generally for the issue and sale of certificates of indebtedness evidencing this loan." By the terms of said act, those defendants constituting the Board of Public Works of Maryland are to issue certificates of indebtedness of the State of Maryland for the designated amount upon the aforesaid condition. The board is directed to advertise the sale of said certificates, and the defendant, treasurer of the State of Maryland, is directed to receive bids for the purchase thereof. The sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is directed to be paid by the defendant treasurer, upon warrant of the defendant comptroller, out of the proceeds of sale, for expenses of the loan. The net cash proceeds are directed to be paid to the treasurer, upon warrant of the comptroller, and expended by the treasurer, upon approval by the board of public works, for aiding in the construction mentioned in the act. The act further provides for the levy of a tax on each $100 of assessable property in the State at a rate to be determined as provided by the act, so that the said tax will be exactly sufficient to produce the revenue necessary to meet the interest and principal payments on the certificates of indebtedness so issued.

9. The certificates of indebtedness for the grant provided for Western Maryland College have not yet been issued. Plaintiffs allege, on information and belief, that the said defendant will meet the requirement of the statute for matching funds by January 1, 1965, as well as all other conditions of the statute, and that the funds provided by the said statute will be paid over and expended in accordance with the statute unless such payment is restrained as hereinafter prayed, by the processes of this honorable court.

10. By chapter 545 of the acts of 1963, approved by the Governor of Maryland on or about April 30, 1963, the General Assembly of Maryland enacted a bill entitled "An act to authorize the creation of a State debt in the aggregate amount of $750,000 for the purpose of aiding in the construction of a new science building on the campus of St. Joseph College of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent DePaul, Inc., in Emmitsburg, subject to the requirements that the said college, on or before January 1, 1965, shall have obtained elsewhere at least an equal and matching sum for the same purposes; and providing generally for the issue and sale of certificates of indebtedness evidencing this loan." The pattern of the statute is precisely the same as that of chapter 546 of the acts of 1963, hereinabove referred to and set out in paragraph 8 of this bill of complaint. The certificates of indebtedness for the loans provided for said college have not yet been issued. Plaintiffs are advised and therefore allege that the said college has met the requirement of matching funds, and that evidence to that effect is in the process of being completed for submission to the Board of Public Works of Maryland, all as required by chapter 545 of the acts of 1963. Plaintiffs allege on information and belief, that the certificates of indebtedness provided by said act will be issued and the proceeds of such certificates paid over and expended in accordance with the act unless such payment is restrained by the processes of this honorable court.

11. By chapter 88 of the acts of 1962, approved by the Governor of Maryland on or about March 23, 1962, there was enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland, a bill entitled "An act to authorize the creation of a State debt in the aggregate amount of $500,000, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of a new dormitory, and a new classroom building on the campus of Hood College, in Frederick, Md., subject to the requirements that the said college on or before January 1, 1964, shall have obtained elsewhere at least an equal and matching sum for the same purposes; and providing generally for the issue and sale of certificates of indebtedness evidencing such loan." The pattern of the statute is precisely the same as that of chapter 546 of the acts of 1963, hereinabove referred to and set out in paragraph 8 of this bill of complaint.

12. The certificates of indebtedness for the grant provided for Hood College of Frederick, Md., have not yet been issued. Plaintiffs allege, on information and belief that the said defendant will meet the requirement of the statute for matching funds by January 1, 1964, as well as all other conditions of the statute, and that the funds provided by the said statute will be paid over and expended in accordance with the statute unless such payment is restrained as hereinafter prayed by the processes of this honorable court.

13. By chapter 66 of the acts of 1962, approved by the Governor of Maryland on or about March 23, 1962, there was enacted by the General Assembly of Maryland a bill entitled "An act to authorize the creation of a

State debt in the aggregate amount of $750,000 for the purpose of aiding in the construction of a new science building on the campus of the College of Notre Dame of Maryland, in Baltimore City, subject to the requirements that the said college, on or before January 1, 1964, shall have obtained elsewhere at least an equal and matching sum for the same purposes; and providing generally for the issue and sale of certificates of indebtedness evidencing this loan." The pattern of the statute is precisely the same as that of chapter 546 of the acts of 1963, hereinabove referred to and set out in paragraph 8 of this bill of complaint.

14. The certificates of indebtedness for the grant provided for the said College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Inc., have not yet been issued. Plaintiffs allege, on information and belief, that the said defendant will meet the requirement of the statute for matching funds by January 1, 1964, as well as all other conditions of the statute, and that the funds provided by the said statute will be paid over and expended in accordance with the statute unless such payment is restrained as hereinafter prayed by the processes of this honorable court.

15. The expenditure of State funds for the issuance of certificates of indebtedness, the proceeds of which certificates are to be turned over to the institutions aforesaid; the levying of State taxes for the purposes of meeting the obligations on such State indebtedness; the payment of the proceeds of the certificates in accordance with the statutes to the corporate defendants, Western Maryland College, the St. Joseph College of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent De Paul, Inc., Hood College of Frederick, Md., and College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Inc.; and the statutes themselves purporting to authorize the said expenditures and payments, are invalid and unconstitutional under the Constitutions of both the State of Maryland the United States of America, for the following reasons:

(a) They violate article 36 of the Declaration of Rights of the Constitution of the State of Maryland, in that they compel the plaintiff taxpayers and all other persons similarly situated, to contribute to a place of worship and a ministry.

(b) They violate article 15 of the Declaration of Rights of the Constitution of the State of Maryland in that they tax the plaintiff taxpayers and all other persons similarly situated for a purpose which is not in the support of the State of Maryland, or of any county of the State of Maryland, or of the city of Baltimore, namely a religious and therefore a nonpublic purpose.

(c) They violate article 23 of the Declaration of Rights of the Constitution of the State of Maryland in that they deprive the plaintiff taxpayers and all other persons similarly situated, of property otherwise than in accordance with the law of the land.

(d) They violate the 1st amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, as made applicable to the State of Maryland by the 14th amendment to said Constitution, in that they constitute in each case a law respecting an establishment of religion and prohibiting the free exercise thereof, by the State of Maryland.

(e) They violate the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America in that they deprive the plaintiff taxpayers and all other persons similarly situated of their property without due process of law.

16. Unless such statutes, and the payments to sectarian institutions in accordance therewith, are declared invalid and unconstitutional, there is substantial likelihood and danger of further and greater unconstitutional expenditure of public funds and unconstitutional use of the State taxing power, as aforesaid, in the future.

17. Accordingly, this action is brought not only for injuctive relief as hereinafter prayed, but also for a declaratory judgment, in accordance with code, article 31A; and the attorney general of Maryland is being served with a copy of this bill of complaint as required for declaratory relief herein by code, article 31A, section 11.

18. The plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

Wherefore, the plaintiffs pray:

(a) That the statutes hereinabove mentioned: namely chapter 546 of the acts of 1963, chapter 545 of the acts of 1963, chapter 88 of the acts of 1962, and chapter 66 of the acts of 1962, be declared null and void, and all payments and acts pursuant to said statutes be declared illegal, invalid and unconstitutional.

(b) That the defendants, J. Millard Tawes, Louis L. Goldstein, and John A. Leutkemeyer, constituting the Board of Public Works of Maryland, and the defendants, Louis L. Goldstein as Comptroller of Maryland, and John A. Luetkemeyer as Treasurer of Maryland, be enjoined by both preliminary and permanent injunction, from taking any action to carry out the provisions of the statutes hereinabove referred to, including but not limited to the issuance of certificates of indebtedness, the issuance of warrants, the expenditure of funds for expenses of issuance of such certificates, the payment of the proceeds of such certificates to the corporate defendants, and the implementation of the taxation provisions of said statutes.

(c) That the corporate defendants be enjoined by both preliminary and permanent injunction, from receiving or attempting to receive funds of the State of Maryland pursuant to the provisions of the said statutes.

(d) That the plaintiffs may have such other and further relief as their case may require.

LEO PFEFFER,
Of Counsel.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

WALTER R. TABLER,
Attorney for Plaintiffs.
BALTIMORE, MD.

MELVIN J. SYKES,
Attorney for Plaintiffs.
BALTIMORE, MD.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 13, 1963]

LEGAL CHALLENGE

Does the Constitution forbid the contribution of public money to private colleges operated under church auspices? The question is more than academic. An affirmative answer would mean that the $1,195 million college construction bill passed by the House last month is invalid. The bill would give Federal grants to public and private colleges alike, including those governed by religious organizations.

This newspaper shares the conviction expressed by President Kennedy that the first amendment forbids governmental support of elementary schools or high schools controlled by churches but does not preclude such aid to church-controlled colleges or universities. The essential differences, as we see them, are that primary and secondary education in the United States is compulsory, while higher education is not; and church-run schools at the primary and secondary levels make religious indoctrination a vital, inescapable part of their curriculum, while church-run colleges and universities make religious indoctrination, at most, incidental and entirely optional.

In short, we think that aid to church-run elementary schools and high schools is aid to religion and that aid to church-run colleges and universities is aid to education. But the distinction is a somewhat subtle one with which some men of learning and conscience strongly disagree. For this reason, we are glad to see that the Horace Mann League, an organization of public school educators, has taken the first step toward obtaining a definitive judicial settlement of the question. It has filed a suit in Maryland challenging Maryland money grants to four colleges under various religious auspices. The process of adjudication is likely to be a lengthy one, and it is well to get it underway. We think the suit serves a most useful public purpose.

AMENDMENT TO SECURE JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CONSTITUTIONALITY OF GRANTS AND LOANS UNDER H.R. 6143 TO CHURCH OWNED OR OPERATED UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

AMENDMENT 216

On page 71 insert the following new section between subsection (c) of section 303 and section 304:

"SEC. 304. Not less than 60 days before making any grant or loan to any institution of higher education under the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice that he proposes to make such grant or loan on a day to be specified in such notice. At any time before the day so specified, any taxpayer of the United States suing in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers may bring a civil action in the nature of an action for a declaratory judgment against the Commissioner in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Notwithstanding any decision, statute, or rule to the contrary, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to entertain, try, and determine such civil action, and to enjoin the making of the proposed grant or loan in case it adjudges that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Upon the bringing of such civil action, the Commissioner shall refrain from consummating the proposed grant or loan and withhold the amount of the proposed grant or loan until the final determination of the civil action. In the event two or more civil actions are brought under the provisions of this section challenging the constitutional validity of the same proposed grant or loan, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may consolidate such civil actions for the purpose of trial and judgment."

Renumber section 304 on page 71 as section 305; section 305 on page 73 as section 306; section 306 on page 73 as section 307; section 307 on page 73 as section 308.

BASIC POLICIES ON EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the time has come when we should analyze the basic policies involving our imports and exports.

It is possible to be influenced by catch words and slogans and end up by accepting an erroneous proposition and one that is lacking in practicalities.

Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, has made a contribution toward clear thinking in a statement by him entitled, "The Tariff and the Law of Comparative Advantage."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article might be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TARIFF AND THE LAW OF COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE

(By O. R. Strackbein, chairman, Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy)

The basic theory of free trade comes to rest on the law of comparative advantage. This law or rather concept, usually cited by economists as the gospel, is really very simple, and not difficult to understand, as economists would have us believe. It is merely hard to swallow as an item of practical diet.

According to its rules, each country should devote its resources of climate, capital, land, labor, etc., to those economic pursuits that provide the greatest return and not waste them, so to speak, on those to which its resources are not so well adapted. It would obtain these other goods from the outside; i.e., from countries that in turn are best fitted to produce them.

Thus not only our own but the whole world's resources would be utilized to the greatest total advantage. There are many examples that can be used to demonstrate the force and logic of this proposition.

Why, for instance, devote acreage in North Dakota to coffee and bananas when wheat does so much better there? Why not let Brazil and Central America provide us with coffee and bananas in exchange for our wheat?

While this is an extreme example it does illustrate the principle. Another example, not so extreme, might be found in wool. Australia does better than we in producing wool at a low cost. Why should we then insist on protecting the wool-growing industry in this country? Turning to industrial products, why should we devote capital and apply labor to the manufacture of cotton goods when Japan can do it so much cheaper, even though that country does not have a superior climate nor even produces raw cotton but imports much of it from this country? Beyond that the skill of her labor does not surpass that of this country's workers. What then gives Japan her advantage?

Turning to minerals, is it no folly to keep our coal mines in operation when imported residual fuel oil, a byproduct of petroleum refining, can be laid down in this country at a price that easily undercuts coal?

Or, using another example, should we insist on making sewing machines in this country when the American housewife can save money by buying a machine made in Japan, Italy, or Germany, even though we are no less adept and indeed perhaps better at manufacturing these machines here?

The law of comparative advantage would require that our providers of capital vacate those industrial, mining, or farming activities in which other countries can outdo us in point of the factors of production and leave the production to them. From these pursuits our capital and land and labor should be diverted into channels that will give a higher return—such as, well, perhaps electronics or plastics or antibiotics, or possibly poultry raising.

The very best use of our money and resources could no doubt be achieved if we could turn the whole aggregate into that one pursuit at which we are the very best—if such a pursuit exists. Then we would be assured of the very highest return from our productive processes. All else we would obtain from other parts of the world.

Immediately, however, we see great difficulties in the way. The idea is good but suffers from a shortage of realism.

Unfortunately, for example, there may not exist any product that would bring such happy results. The automobile, however, comes to mind. Let us try out the theory and see how it fits not only our own economy but the rest of the world.

If we could produce enough automobiles, assuming that we could do this not only better than any other country but better than we can produce anything else in this country, thus exhibiting an absolute advantage, it becomes immediately apparent that we would find it necessary to build a considerable number of automobiles each year. We would need enough to provide adequate income to buy from abroad everything else that we need such as sugar, corn, shoes, oil, fish, housing, clothing, etc.

In 1961 we expended in this country $197 billion for consumer goods, durable and nondurable, including automobiles (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962, table 423). It would indeed require the exportation of a quite large quantity of automobiles, in the magnitude of 100 million, in fact (i.e., about $2,000 per unit), if we were to rely on the production of automobiles alone to bring us enough money for imports, to feed, shelter, move, and clothe us.

Obviously this example represents a reductio ad absurdum but is nevertheless again illustrative of the principle.

Let us move away from the extreme then and say that we were also supreme in producing wheat in relation to other countries and that we could get the highest return from our farmland in yield per acre by planting nothing but wheat, i.e., we enjoyed another absolute advantage. Wheat growing would then share with automobile production the most productive use of our resources. We could then as a people at least ride on the highways and eat bread but we would still find it necessary to import everything else.

To be yet a little more realistic we could add cotton growing to wheat, considering the range of our climate, and homebuilding to automobiles, as other highly productive pursuits. We might even suppose that our advantage in all four of these products was absolute. This is to say our returns from cotton growing might be equal to that of wheat; and we might be no less efficient at homebuilding than at building automobiles; and better at all four than any other country.

We would now have four great lines of production and would begin to achieve diversity of production and division of labor. Yet our productional economy would remain relatively simple.

Up to this point we would not have entered the magic field of comparative advantages.

This zone would be entered only when we ran out of industries and farm operations at which we were in the forefront among the countries of the world as well as at home. Once having run out, however, we would have to choose among possible additional industries to fill out our economy. We might still have an advantage in these additional industries but it would be only comparative and not absolute as in wheat, automobiles, etc.

If we could not find other industries as advantageous to us as these four we should, under the principle, devote all our productive rescurces to the four; but, of course, we would still run into trouble, as we shall see. We might find it necessary to manufacture only 50 million automobiles instead of the 100 million previously needed, since we now had three other products to help bring our purchasing power to the $197 billion level through exports.

Now, instead of the 1¼ billion bushels of wheat we presently produce and the current 14 million bales of cotton, we would no doubt find it necessary to produce about 25 billion bushels of wheat and 100 million bales of cotton to make up for the cut in automobile production from 100 to 50 million. As for houses—we would encounter some trouble because we might find it difficult to export the surplus; for instead of $10 to $12 billion in new housing units per year we would need to build in the magnitude of $50 billion or more.

Unfortunately, the world consumption of wheat falls far short of what our output would be and in the case of cotton amounts to only half as much cotton as we would produce under this assumption. We would therefore be afflicted sorely with a surplus disposal problem, much worse than anything we have contemplated in actuality.

Very well, it is very clear that even though we would enjoy (in the example) an absolute advantage in the four products mentioned we would encounter at least two great difficulties. (1) The world market could not absorb our surplus of wheat, cotton, automobiles, and houses. (2) Even if other countries had a lesser advantage in producing these goods they would nevertheless not relinquish their production to us, (a) because of refusal to be thus dependent on us and (b) because they or some of them were already producing these items since the economic world did not grow up under the guidance of free trade.

Since we would then find it necessary to produce many more items beyond the four in order to avoid accumulation of hopeless surpluses, let us proceed in the knowledge that the principle of comparative advantage would require that we select first only those crops and industries in which we were better than the one next down the line in this country in point of efficiency and not sufficiently below any other country to make imports attractive. After cotton in the agricultural sphere, for example, we might find corn the next best; then oranges, hay, soybeans, tobacco, etc. (This is purely and shockingly hypothetical, and the Department of Agriculture itself might be hard put to it to make such a selection.) With respect to industry we might add telephone equipment, electrical appliances, office machinery, airplanes, electronic computers, farm machinery, again hypothetically. It is doubtful that the Department of Commerce could establish a sequence based on comparative efficiency. Nevertheless the selections must be made if we are not to waste our resources.

As we would become more self-sufficient in step with our diversification it would be unnecessary to produce such large quantities of each product, i.e., we would become less dependent on exports. Possibly 25 million automobiles would now be enough. Wheat production might be reduced to 15 billion bushels and cotton to 50 million bales.

Obviously these quantities would still be too large as measured against world consumption, except with respect to cotton. The 50 million bales would approximate present annual world production. We would, of course, expect to supply the whole world since we were the most efficient producer. Russia, however, might not listen to our theory. With respect to the other items we would still be overproduced in relation to world consumption.

We must therefore seek yet other industries, in each case making sure that every additional selection represented a line of production at which we would be more efficient than other countries of the world and also more efficient than in the production of any other possible product in this country not yet utilized. It would be a serious error to select a product at random, simply hoping that its production would be justifiable or even profitable. The risk that we might not be investing to the highest remaining advantage would be too great. But who would tell us? The Government?

Very well, finally, let us say, we will have found a hundred industries and 50 farm products in which we would enjoy either an absolute or a comparative advantage. Such an assumption, it must be clear, presupposes another assumption, i.e., omniscience. Where does this reside? In the Government, particularly the State Department, which does our tariff cutting?

Of course, the theory of comparative advantage would look to the free play of market forces as a substitute for omniscience. This would assume unfettered competition, however, and no governmental interference with prices and wages; no control over output; no import restrictions, no subsidies and no immigration limitations. The market must be free; the mobility of labor must be unhampered throughout the world; and no artificial props or favors must be supplied to any factor of production. Otherwise the operation of the theory would be faulty to an incalculable degree.

Interferences such as those represented by minimum wage and maximum hour laws, acreage controls, and price supports, tariffs, immigration quotas, control of interest rates, monopoly, etc., would be taboo. Such intrusions into the free play of economic forces would upset the natural balance and mock the free-trade principle. Inefficiencies might be shielded and perpetuated.

In the world as it is and as it developed, innumerable interferences have nevertheless in fact been instituted and exercised.

Countless varieties of controls, prohibitions, regulations and licenses, differing in many instances from country to country, have proliferated over the landscape of history and the end is not yet. More and more, economic planning is being substituted for the free market forces. These numerous and far-sweeping interferences make determinations of relative industry and agricultural efficiency a hopeless excursion into the deep fogs of dubious economics.

How then determine which industry or farm crop enjoys either an absolute or a comparative advantage, free from bias, distortion, political favoritism, or artificial support?

What the economic planners overlook is that we can no longer look to the free play of market forces to assure a "more effective allocation of resources" because the hand of Government has interfered too extensively with these forces. Therefore the benefits of the law of comparative advantage would devolve upon the felicitous exercise of good judgment by the planners rather than the automatic operation of free market forces. And there is the rub.

The economic world has grown up in international compartments, many of them on different levels. The degree of insulation has varied but the international free play of economic forces is a myth far removed from reality. Political interferences have been varied and extensive. In other cases barriers of a score of varieties have been utilized to prevent uncushioned foreign competition.

In this country our tariff (with such exceptions as a tariff for revenue only, as when in the past we levied a duty on coffee) has generally recognized the principle of absolute advantage in foreign production by the provision of a liberal free list. Coffee, bananas, cocoa, tea, and other products that we could only produce at a distinct disadvantage, have been imported on duty-free basis for many years. Also, such minerals as tin, copper ore, asbestos, ores of gold, silver, iron, nickel, platinum, chrome, and cobalt; uncut diamonds, chalk, coal, asphalt, plaster rock, sulfur, etc., are submitted free of duty.

Beyond that certain raw materials such as hides and skins, raw silk, raw furs, wood pulp, pulpwood and newsprint, logs, cork, crude rubber, sisal, jute, essential oils, tanning materials, etc., are treated in the same manner. Tuna fish, shrimp, lobsters, shellfish, agricultural implements, typewriters, needles, shingles, barbed wire are other items on the free list.

Today some 40 percent of our imports represent items on which we levy no duty. Moreover, we have reduced the average duty on dutiable items by some 80 percent since 1934. The average duty is now about 11 percent on dutiable items as against 50 percent before that year.

The industrial and farm products on which we do maintain a duty face different degrees of import competition. It is assumed by the free trade advocates that if the duty on all these products were removed the law of comparative advantages would automatically root out the less efficient industries.

The industries at the bottom of efficiency would be driven out of business and as a result our capital, land and labor would be devoted to the remaining more efficient ones.

As an exercise in blissful theory such reasoning is unassailable. If, however, we are cruel enough to measure the theory by the yardstick of economic and political reality it assumes a different aspect. Several rough boulders lie in the path of the theory and they are well imbedded and not easily moved.

Were it possible to unwind the economic reel back to the beginning of economic time and then rewind it under circumstances of laissez faire, thus leaving the market forces to do their work freely, protecting nothing and no one against the rudeness of those forces, it might be possible to assess the value of free trade and its fruits.

This must, of course, forever remain impossible because we cannot unwind history and then rewind it to suit our fancy.

Therefore the fact is that even though industry and agriculture in this country developed under relatively free market conditions, both nevertheless were either the beneficiaries or victims of various interferences, such as the tariff (throughout our history as a nation), immigration restrictionism (since the early decades of this century), land grants to railroads, various specific subsidies, etc. Then there were interferences in the form of regulations, such as antitrust laws, to assure the freer play of market forces; for experience with monopolies had demonstrated that free market forces themselves could be used by competent manipulators to control other market forces. Therefore to preserve free market forces, the Government stepped in to protect the innocent market forces against market forces that were cannibalistic or at least regarded as predatory.

This was followed in the past three decades with far-reaching interferences by the Government to the point where we can no longer claim to have a free market. We have freedom within rather rigid limitations, with some segments or areas enjoying more freedom than others.

How conceivably unravel the relative degree of efficiency and inefficiencies within and among our industries today? Some industries are highly concentrated and so great in size that individual companies within them are as large as half a dozen smaller whole industries combined. (Compare the automotive industry with book manufacturing, cutlery, luggage, wire, pottery, wallpaper, etc.) Other industries count among their companies huge ones alongside of those classed as medium and others that are small. Yet these small ones may be larger than the large ones of other smaller industries. Yet other industries, because of the limitation of the whole market, can boast only of relatively small companies; for example, makers of clothespins.

Where then is a yardstick of efficiency to be found? Efficient or inefficient compared with what? Should a small company in the textile industry be compared with General Motors or Du Pont? Or should it be compared with a small company of another industry?

But what if the two industries, measured by the law of comparative advantage, are not of the same level of efficiency? May not a small company in an inefficient industry in fact be more efficient (in the sense of management and progressiveness) than another company of the same size in an efficient industry?

Strangely enough the economists who speak of inefficiency of an industry do not provide a bill of particulars. Oh, they may say that management is inefficient, but to say that is only to utter so many words. Wherein is the management inefficient? In finance, administration, production, advertising, sales, storekeeping, accounting, and in what specific operations in any specific department? The economists would rather be much more general in their indictments.

Let us say, for example, that the industry dedicated to handmade glassware is inefficient in the economic sense, i.e., it has not adopted or discovered the technological methods that would bring it to the forefront. Is it not possible that individual companies in the industry could be as efficient managerially as another company that operates in the manufacture of electronics? Obviously this not only could be possible but may be expected to be found in more instances than one.

Yet, without any investigation the glassware industry would be classified as inefficient. By that measure every industry was at one time inefficient. This was true of the cigarette industry, of the carriage industry, the pretzel industry and hundreds of others. Then, not by any schedule but by the magic chance of invention someone discovered a revolutionary mechanical principle and the inefficient industry was sprung to the forefront of efficiency in the sense of jumping into the technological vanguard.

Had such industries been condemned to die in a naked combat with imports before technological invention lifted them out of the list of inefficient industries we would have lost them to our economy. Yet today there are many other such industries that would be unseasonably condemned to death and our economic diversity would suffer.

When will table glassware be made by machinery? It is already so made. Yet there is a consumer demand for the more artistic workmanship and individual design that only handicraft can supply. The same can be said of certain items of pottery and other consumer products. Should industries of this type be doomed, thus sacrificing the skill and artistry that not only add to the choice in household decoration but also give far greater satisfaction to the working artisans than turning a screw or pushing a button? Moreover, other countries continue to make glassware and other products of this type. Are they then more efficient economically than our producers merely because they can undersell us? Evidently not, because they are also technologically in the back waters. Are they then more efficient as artisans, as skillful workers?

How measure this? The only present effective measure is the price at which they can lay down their products in this country. The theoretical economist will jump to the unjustified conclusion that if the domestic industry cannot compete with imports it thereby convicts itself automatically of relative inefficiency. Can this be a proper verdict? The least that could be demanded would be a showing of the relative hourly output of the domestic and the foreign artisans. Unquestionably it would be found that the American artisan would at least equal his foreign competitor.

The principal difference then would be found in the price of labor; and it is here that the American industry would reflect the higher cost. The American worker receives from 3 to 10 or more times the wages of his foreign counterpart (Canada excepted).

Should American industries of this type be sacrificed on the altar of comparative advantage? Must we vacate industry after industry (1) because our wages are higher than the foreign pay even if our artisans are as efficient as their foreign competitors but are condemned as economically inefficient; (2) because for the time being modern technology has not yet erased the demand for the more artistic, warmer and more exquisite product of skilled craftsmen and (3) because our labor must not waste its time with antiquated methods but should be retrained for advanced jobs for which many other workers are already waiting and panting in the pool of futility?

Application of the principle of comparative advantage in practice would, as already hinted, impose a superhuman burden. The American coal industry, already mentioned, is the most efficient in the world in point of output per man-hour because of its behemoth machines developed in recent years. The output per man-hour was doubled in a little over 10 years and the number of mine workers more than cut in half. Yet the industry is counted as "inefficient" in the economic sense because petroleum and natural gas and residual fuel oil are less costly to produce. Therefore, by the theory of comparative efficiency or advantage, the coal industry should go the way of the dinosaur.

Yet, should the industry be abandoned, it would release more than 150,000 coal miners and much capital and machinery. Railroads that haul coal would suffer, etc. Moreover, the competitive fuels are not inexhaustible. In a decade it might become necessary to reopen the coal mines, and that would indeed be a costly undertaking.

Yet such is the imperative of the theory that these ranks would have to be run if we are to be true to it.

What then is the worth of a theory that crumbles if it is touched by the fingertips of reality? Oh, it acts as a guide on a path that cannot in most cases be followed.

The slavish devotion of the free-trade economists to their theories only underlines nothing more clearly than their separation from reality.

Considering the rapid movement of modern technology it should be very clear that the "law" of comparative advantage would have only temporary validity in many fields. Yet it is the very cornerstone of the free-trade structure. Did not Japan enjoy a great advantage in silk production? What happened to this circumstance? Was not our own southern cotton king for many years? Where does it stand today? Did the law of absolute advantage save it? What happened to Chilean nitrates? Where in the industrial ranks is crude rubber today? How long can Australia expect to rest so much of her economic dependence on wool? Yet here were products in which forward advantage once resided, not so long ago. How would free trade have preserved them?

Today we find it necessary to subsidize raw cotton at 8½ cents per pound in order to export it. Where in the scale of comparative advantages does our cotton culture stand today? Where is the economist's prescription? Is the doctrine of free trade not becoming irrelevant in the technological world?

Today it is possible that an American industry may be ruinously menaced by imports of products of a crassly inefficient foreign industry that may enjoy very little of the true economic advantages demanded by the principles of free trade. Such a foreign industry might in fact be hard put to explain its competitive advantage on any ground other than lower wages. This is not an economic advantage of the kind contemplated by Adam Smith. The foreign industry might have less advanced machinery, operate under antiquated methods, and adhere to a more pedestrian pace of production. Should it pay the American scale of wages it might be hopelessly out of the competitive race. Yet an American industry unable to compete with such a foreign industry would be condemned as inefficient.

If the principle of free trade were indeed honestly applied the laws of economics would in reality be violated if such a foreign industry were permitted to subdue the American producer. The law of economic progress would be set back. The very incentive to progress would be smothered and the laurels would go, not to the deserving contestant, but to the economic laggard.

When such unequal competitive forces are thrown against each other the reason must be political or anything but economic; it cannot be justified by the law of comparative advantage or any good principle of free trade.

Such justification is a pernicious practice since it drapes the mantle of supposed respectability over the shoulders of a program that is fast becoming indefensible.

The free market, such as we had of it was good. It was under its dispensation that this country easily gained the industrial leadership of the world; but we cannot restore it by undoing the tariff while binding down free enterprise in other vital sectors, thus making it less competitive.

The visible result of ignoring this fact may be seen in the reluctance of domestic capital to venture at home, preferring in many instances the foreign soil. By confronting our producing enterprises on a broad front with rising import competition that will contest any expanded market for increased domestic output with us, thus pinching down the profit incentive, we are lowering the horizon of our economic growth and enhancing displacement of workers by machinery. The latter theoretically should lead to greater eventual employment but will not do so when industry cannot reap its own reward but is doomed to see its hope of profit dissipated in an uneven battle with imports advantaged by wage rates that would be illegal in this country.

Why we insist on weighting down our producing industries with handicaps that award the greatest cost advantage, namely, lower wage costs per unit of production, to their foreign competitors, is a question that could only be answered by a psychoanalysis of the governmental free trade doctrinaires.

The law of comparative advantage has already been buried beneath a mesh of economic controls. It has been rendered impotent as a usable guide in a world in which technology renders yesterday's advantage obsolete, or springs a chronic laggard industry into the front ranks tomorrow. Why play as if the law still had a meaning outside the field of theory when bushels of domestic legislation contradict its very foundations every year? And when political considerations keep it handcuffed and tethered by a short leash?

This rock on which free trade rests should be sent to a museum as a curiosity of classical economics and as a handy pawn used by pragmatic economists for purposes of their own.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF INDIANS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, my friend and colleague Senator SAM ERVIN, of North Carolina, made a speech September 26 to the Indian Law Committee of the Federal Bar Asociation, entitled, "The Rights of Indians Under the Constitution of the United States." It is an excellent review of the work that the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has been doing in compiling preliminary research on the background and present legal status of the American Indian under the Federal Constitution.

Mr. President, I strongly recommend to the Members of the Senate that they read this important speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech, at this point, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIGHTS OF INDIANS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

(Presentation of views of Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, Chairman of Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate, to the Indian Law Committee, Federal Bar Association Annual Convention, September 26, 1963)

The transition of the American Indian from a member of an aboriginal culture to a 20th century American has placed him in an anomalous legal position.

It is unfortunate, indeed shameful, that ever since the white man first entered his land the American Indian has been treated as a problem—at times a military, social, economic, political or legal problem, or a combination of these. After nearly 400 years of living together we have yet to solve this problem, one which today is chiefly legal.

Nearly 80 years ago a Harvard legal historian, James Bradley Thayer, said the Indians were "a people without law"; and a few years later Chief Judge Cuthbert W. Pound, of the New York Court of Appeals, called the Indians of his State "nationals without a nation." Today, after a generation of citizenship, the reservated Indians could be termed a people with too many laws, subject to the jurisdiction of too many sovereigns. In many instances they are under the concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal, State, county, and tribal governments. The Federal Government alone has concluded nearly 400 treaties with various Indian groups and Congress has enacted more than 6,000 laws concerning them.

Confusion over jurisdiction and the complexity of laws governing our Indian citizens led the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to initiate the first congressional investigation of the rights of these first Americans in relation to each governmental unit under whose jurisdiction they live.

In January of 1961 the subcommittee began compiling preliminary research on the background and present-day legal status of the American Indian under the Federal Constitution. Included in the preliminary survey was a study of the administrative regulations and court decisions which solely affect Indian citizens. In addition, the subcommittee sent out some 2,500 questionnaires to a wide cross-section of people active in Indian affairs and many individual Indians. The replies to the questionnaires were very helpful in revealing the most pressing constitutional problems and aided the subcommittee in establishing geographic areas for field investigations.

In discussing briefly some of the aspects of the subcommittee's study, I will first note several of the cases which describe the Indians' status.

Hearings and staff investigations have been held in Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, and South Dakota, and Washington, D.C. In the course of this inquiry, we have heard the views of hundreds of tribal representatives, Department of Interior officials, other Government agencies, representatives of national organizations active in Indian affairs, and many individual

Indians throughout the country. The subcommittee has published its hearings and various materials concerning its investigations in three volumes. In March of this year, the subcommittee concluded its inquiry into the general area of the constitutional rights of the American Indian, and currently is reviewing the summary report of these hearings and the legislative recommendations. It is my hope that this report will be approved by subcommittee members and the legislative recommendations will be incorporated in bills to be introduced during this session of Congress.

The present relationship between the United States and the Indian tribe was summed up by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals in the case of *Iron Crow* v. *Oglala Sioux Tribe of Pine Ridge Reservation*, as follows: "It would seem that the Constitution, as construed by the Supreme Court, acknowledges the paramount authority of the United States with regard to Indian tribes as quasi-sovereign entities possessing all the inherent rights of sovereignty excepting where restrictions have been placed thereon by the United States itself."

Neither Congress nor the States may infringe upon the basic civil rights of Indians, for they enjoy the same protection in respect to these Governments as all other American citizens.

However, of particular concern to the subcommittee, the Federal judiciary has determined that the guarantee of freedom of worship, speech, and the press, the right to assemble and petition the Government, and due process do not restrict tribal action. For example, in the *Native American Church* v. *the Navajo Tribal Council*, the court held that the Navajos could enforce a tribal ordinance prohibiting the possession or use of peyote on the reservation, even though the ban interfered with the observance of a religion. The court stated: "No law * * * has been found which undertakes to subject the Navajo Tribe to the laws of the United States with respect to their internal affairs, such as police powers and ordinances, for the purpose of regulating the conduct of members of the tribe on the reservation." Additionally, in the case of *Toledo* v. *Pueblo Jemez*, the court held that "deprivation of religious liberties by tribal organizations could not be redressed by action under the Civil Rights Act."

The constitutional amendments which forbid the United States and the States to deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law do not apply to a tribe's conduct of criminal trials. In the case of *Talton* v. *Mayes*, the Supreme Court held that the fifth amendment applies only to the acts of the Federal Government; that the governmental powers of an Indian nation, although recognized by the Federal Government, were not created by it; and that the judicial authority of the Cherokee Nation was, therefore, not subject to the limitations imposed by the Bill of Rights.

Similarly, in *Barta* v. *Oglala Sioux Tribe*, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals held that neither the 5th nor the 14th amendments had any application to action, legislative in character, of Indian tribes imposing a tax on the use of Indian trust land. The court stated: "The 14th amendment places limitations on the legislative action by the State, but the Indian tribes are not States and the Constitution section has no application to the legislative enactments of the tribe."

In the report of the Commission on Rights, Liberties and Responsibilities of the American Indian, established by the Fund for the Republic, it was stated that: "No government of whatever kind should have the authority to infringe upon fundamental civil liberties; government itself must ever be subject to law. Freedom of religion, utterance, and assembly, the right to be protected in one's life, liberty, and property against arbitrary government action and to be immune from double jeopardy and bills of attainder, and the guarantee of a fair trial are not privileges; they are minimum conditions which all Americans should enjoy."

It is, of course, preferable that the tribes themselves assure basic rights to each member, but when this is not the case it is incumbent upon Congress to take action. This realization was, of course, a guiding factor behind the subcommittee's study.

The subcommittee has been particularly concerned with the reservated Indian as subjected to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior. Congress has granted to the Secretary guardianship of Indian lands, which has in effect grown to encompass jurisdiction over all Indian matters. The guardianship limitations on what an Indian could do with respect to land have expanded to include all community problems such as the administration of justice, education, and general welfare; and there is a serious question as to whether or not the Secretary acts constitutionally when he approves tribal ordinances which violate a provision of the Bill of Rights.

In the administration of law and order, the powers exercised by the tribes are derived from their recognized powers of self-government. Unless the Secretary of Interior has established Courts of Indian Offenses pursuant to the Code of Federal Regulations, tribal courts as established by law and order codes approved by the Secretary are operative. There is one exception, however, among the Pueblo Indians where the traditional courts exist. These are not courts in the usual sense of the word but rather courts governed by community custom as interpreted by the tribal council and religious leaders.

Investigation by the subcommittee has shown that there is usually no substantial difference between the other two court systems. Many tribes have modeled their tribal courts after the Courts of Indian Offenses. Although the Indian court system appears analogous to a typical municipal court system, especially with respect to the scope of jurisdiction, there are several differences in the Indian courts which appear to seriously curtail the effective administration of justice on reservations. For example, there is an absence of a reliable and effective appeal system within the Indian courts themselves. More important, perhaps, from the standpoint of cases involving rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution, is the omission of an appeal system from the Indian courts to the Federal courts. This inadequacy has been called to the subcommittee's attention by tribal leaders, individual Indians, and State, and Federal officials.

Recently various State universities in cooperation with the area offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs began conducting Indian tribal courts' conferences. These conferences bring together law professors, tribal judges, and other Federal, State, and tribal officials. In March of 1962, the University of Arizona College of Law conducted a Southwest Indian Tribal Courts Conference. During the discussion of tribal court procedure the following case was cited: A young Indian was arrested for having in his possession beer and whiskey and was held in jail for 2 weeks without trial. The trial finally was held at 8:30 p.m. and lasted until about 1 o'clock in the morning. Although the code called for a fine of $16.50, the court's decision was much more severe. The following quote made by a Bureau of Indian Affairs special officer is taken directly from the conference report: "When he left that courtroom he was divorced, alimony was arranged for, child support and visitation rights were arranged, his car was confiscated, his wages garnished, and he was fined $16.50. This young man did not know any of this was going to happen. He was in court on a criminal charge—one charge—and look what happened to him."

I am certain that your initial reaction was the same as mine—that this must be an exaggerated case but one indeed shocking to the conscience.

In contrast to the unauthorized and harsh sentence in the case just discussed is the punishment authorized for serious crimes coming under the jurisdiction of the Courts of Indian Offenses. The maximum sentence for assault in a Court of Indian Offenses is 5 days; and for felonies such as theft, fraud, forgery, bribery, and perjury the maximum is 6 months. There is a great discrepancy between these sentences and those authorized for the same crimes in the Federal and State courts. Sentences in tribal courts closely resemble those in the Courts of Indian Offenses.

Although jury trial is authorized in most Indian courts, the subcommittee found that either out of ignorance, or habit, or fear of alienating the judges, trial by jury is very seldom requested. Even when a jury is impounded, it differs from the procedures we know. In the Courts of Indian Offenses, for example, challenges for cause as well as peremptory challenges are limited to three. The number of jurors is six in the Courts of Indian Offenses; they are paid 50 cents a day (the pay authorized for witnesses under subpena); and verdicts are rendered by majority vote.

When the subcommittee visited Gallup, N. Mex., in 1961, we found that 23 of 24 groups which were interviewed actually precluded the accused from having any professional legal representation. Even many of the tribes which allowed representation specify that it must be by a tribal member. At a time when the States and all the branches of the Federal Government are increasingly concerned with enforcing the right to counsel in criminal cases at all levels, the Indian court systems present us with an intolerable situation.

In order to insure that the Indian citizen is guaranteed the same protections as other Americans, I expect in the near future to introduce two major bills. The first will concern a model penal code for Indian courts and, the second will concern appellate jurisdiction within the tribal court to the Federal courts. I feel that this legislation should go the full way in assuring to the Indian the same procedural safeguards enjoyed by all other Americans.

Another area of concentration by the subcommittee concerns the approval by the Secretary of the Interior of contracts between tribes and tribal attorneys. The tribal government is required by law to obtain approval of the Secretary of the Interior for all contracts with attorneys before they can become legally binding. Attorneys, of course, are reluctant to render service until that approval has been obtained; and the subcommittee has found that delays by the Department in granting approval have been so protracted that, in effect, tribes, in some instances, are being effectively denied counsel and due process of law.

At the subcommittee's hearings in Sacaton, Ariz., several Yuma Indians testified that their tribe executed a 15-month contract with an attorney, but that, by the time the contract had been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, 13 months had expired and the attorney by then was not available because of other legal work he had accepted during the interim. Mrs. Helen Peterson, then director of the National Congress of American Indians, cited other cases in which approval took from 7 to 13 months.

These and many other examples have convinced the subcommittee that a procedure originally designed to protect the tribes is now working to their great detriment. Therefore, legislation is being drafted which would assure early consideration of attorney contracts.

This great Nation of ours was founded and exists on the principle of a Government of laws, which respects and protects the rights of men no matter how few in number or insignificant in power.

The sovereignty that the Federal Government has allowed the Indian tribes to retain must be looked upon as similar to that which exists in local communities throughout the country. While it is true that the form of government on many of the reservations is much different from that which exists in other communities, the basic functions are the same, and the rights which must be protected from infringement by all governments should be the same. Failure to legislate in this area is a grave omission which must be rectified in order to provide the Indian with the same safeguards as other Americans.

NEED FOR A FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the impression that a detente is occurring in Soviet-American relations gains more acceptance among people, the necessity that we establish and maintain the correct attitude toward the nonmilitary side of our relationships with the Communist powers becomes more impelling.

Communism has not terminated its efforts at world domination. No one in authority should claim it has. Even while we discuss the relaxation of world tension, our own Army is fighting Communists in Vietnam and maintains guard against them elsewhere.

The effort at Communist subversion in Latin America has reached high crescendo, and it continues to be intensified in Asia and in Africa.

The point of my comments is simply this: If the main theater of our struggle for freedom is to shift from the military, where we are well equipped to handle the struggle, to the nonmilitary, there must be renewed efforts to establish within the U.S. Government a facility which is capable of focusing our capabilities on the nonmilitary side of the struggle.

That in large part means the establishment of an institution which can, on the scale which is necessary, train officials of the American Government, representatives of the private sector of our economy whose work is overseas, and the foreign nationals upon whom falls the primary responsibility for developing real freedom within their homelands.

Prof. Sidney Hook, head of the philosophy department at the New York University, recently contributed an article to the IBM Corp. publication, Think. His article commands widespread attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Professor Hook's article, "Why the United States Needs a Freedom Academy," from the September 1963 issue of Think, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY THE UNITED STATES NEEDS A FREEDOM ACADEMY

(By Sidney Hook)

There is now before Congress a bill proposing the establishment of a Freedom Academy in the United States. Such an institution, designed to counter Communist propaganda, would be open to private citizens, Government officials, and students of foreign nations. The author, head of New York University's philosophy department, explains how it would work and why we need it.

Anyone who makes a candid assessment of the prospects of freedom in the world today will find them dispiriting. By "the prospects of freedom" I do not mean the future of the American business system. Although Messrs. Khrushchev and Mao charge the United States with attempting to impose this system on the recipients of American aid, Tito, Gomulka, and Sukarno, who have benefited immensely from American largesse, know how false that charge is.

By the prospects of freedom in this context I mean respect for liberal institutions which enable those who live and work in their communities to express their needs and exercise their uncoerced choice. Only a liberal center can be relied upon to introduce the necessary social reforms without both bankrupting a country economically and at the same time destroying whatever embryonic institutions of democracy exist. But a liberal center cannot arise without liberal institutions.

One of the sad facts of the contemporary political scene is the disproportion between the massive economic and educational aid which the United States has given the relatively underdeveloped countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and the prospects of freedom in these countries. It would require volumes to present an adequate account of why this is so. The responsibility of certain native vested interests, whose social philosophy is limited to the preservation of the status quo at all costs, is often heavy. Although they do not explicitly announce, "Après nous, le deluge," this attitude is a consequence of refusing to recognize that there is no status quo in a world of vast technological and political change, and that either the legitimate aspirations of the people will be met by a dynamic expanding economy, or else Communist demagogy and terror will triumph.

But the tragic facts are that even in countries where attempts are being made to achieve progress toward a liberal center, the obstacles and setbacks to the cause of freedom are many. Among the prime reasons for this is the skillful political warfare being waged by strategically placed Communist groups in almost every sector of their national life. The ultimate strategy of these groups is the conquest of political power. But their day-by-day tactics is to demoralize the efforts made by liberal groups and governments to achieve stability and progress. They set out to frustrate, sometimes by infiltration and sometimes by violence, movements of reform. They make special efforts to capture the allegiance of the idealistic elements in a culture, particularly the youth and professional groups. They seek to narrow the choice before the country between what they call, on the one hand, a Fascist solution identified with the existing government or any other group friendly to the West, and what they call, on the other hand, the truly nationalist or revolutionary solution. The latter is the thinly disguised program of initial demagogy and ultimate total political terror, wielded in the interests of the masses by the Communist Party.

Long before the Communists become a menace in the military way, they conduct full-scale political cold war against communities which are woefully ill prepared to defend themselves or even to recognize accurately the nature of the struggle being waged against them. Any knowledgeable American who has traveled extensively abroad, will find striking evidence of the activity and success of these sustained cold war campaigns against the principles of freedom and the solutions based upon them. One will find the evidence in student movements as well as peasant movements, in trade unions and in cooperatives, in peace organizations and cultural societies, in schools, theaters, the press, and sometimes even in churches.

Three things account for their success.

First, having learned from experience that they are rejected when they straightforwardly present the real party program, the propaganda of Communists today is based on the tactical appropriation and exploitation of the rhetoric and slogans of democracy, and the skillful use for ultimate party purposes of the language and ideals of social reform. Communists not only win a hearing but a considerable following by posing as partisans of peace, or as knights of national independence, defenders of civil rights, or fighters for progress.

Second, Communists have mastered the techniques of organizational penetration and capturing of central. In hardly any of the organizations in which they have won control do the Communists constitute a majority. On the contrary, they are comparatively few in number. Nonetheless, they are ensconced in strategic posts of command, in a position to mobilize mass sentiment, able to organize demonstrations, organize riots, and manipulate public opinion in accordance with instructions received from their masters abroad. They are adept in the use of an entire repertoire of stratagems in capturing meetings, planting key personnel in executive posts and directing committees, and seeding schools, newspapers, and other media of communication with trusted agents.

Third, those liberals and Democrats who are opposed to them have no corresponding know-how in combating these techniques. They lack experience, and by the time they acquire it, it is too late. For all their sincerity and dedication, they do not know how to expose incisively and persuasively the Communist degradation of the word, how to prevent parliamentary rules from being used by the Communist caucus to forestall key votes pending against them, and, finally, how to use in the interests of decency countertechniques to Communist infiltration which have been developed over the years.

Is this picture of Communist activity and success in mobilizing public opinion, and channeling it for their own political purposes, overdrawn?

We have the eyewitness testimony of one formerly doubting Thomas who visited several Asian countries and was appalled at what he found in Japan, Indonesia and elsewhere. Attorney General Robert Kennedy, upon his return from Asia, said:

"In every country, well organized and highly disciplined Communist cadres concentrate their activities on universities, student bodies, labor organizations and intellectual groups. Against these there is no one to question their position, their facts; no organization, no cadre, no disciplined and calculated effort to present the other side. And so it is that a small, able and well-trained unit can take over a meeting or an organization or even a government."

What can we do to counteract this formidable arm of the Communist movement whose activities are paying such rich political dividends—with more of the same in sight?

"If we do not meet the problem head-on," says Attorney General Kennedy, "if we are not ourselves imaginative, tough, dedicated * * * the struggle will be lost by us."

One thing should be clear at once, if Attorney General Kennedy is right. We cannot combat the activity of Communists in foreign countries by American nationals, whether they are American Foreign Service officers, exchange professors, visiting dignitaries, or businessmen. Even with the best will in the world, this would be construed by non-Communists in those countries as interference. I have found in most foreign countries I have visited that when an American official says that twice two is four, the statement is greeted with suspicion and distrust. After all, the Soviet Communists do not play a conspicuous public role in these countries. It is exclusively the native elements, indigenous to the culture, idiom and language, who are the banner-bearers for the Communist idea.

Native Communist propaganda and subversion must be resisted by native non-Communists, liberal elements. What the United States should do is to establish an educational training center—a Freedom Academy—in which those who wish to preserve the freedom of their country from a Communist takeover can master the techniques of ideological and organizational defense and offense. Without this kind of help to the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, all our other forms of aid may prove ineffectual.

Under Secretary of State George W. Ball, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, properly stressed the fact that "the Communist powers have devised a whole new system of aggression—the subversion of men's minds by subtle means of propaganda, employing the most sophisticated methods of communication; the corruption of governments; the employment of new techniques of infiltration and espionage; the exploitation of weakness; systematized terrorism and urgency; utilization of economic welfare."

FREEDOM FROM WITHIN

It is difficult to understand how diplomatic activity, even if supplemented by private American agencies, could combat these tactics with any hope of success. Freedom cannot be brought to a country from without. It must be won and defended by those who live there. At most, the United States can prevent invasion and overt aggression by Communist powers. But over the long run, only those who are willing to fight for freedom in their own country can win it or keep it. But they must know how to fight for it. This the Freedom Academy should undertake to teach them—openly and proudly and before the eyes of the world. The Communists are compelled to conceal the character of their schools of subversion and the curriculum within them. We need not conceal what we teach.

Where will the students of the Freedom Academy come from?

There will be some American citizens among them, but mainly they will be individuals nominated and recommended by non-Communist student groups, free trade unions, cooperatives, peasant unions, liberal political associations and a multiplicity of other organizations whose non-Communist bona fides have been established. They will receive fellowships adequate to cover transportation and costs of residence at the Freedom Academy.

Who will teach the students?

Fortunately, there exist in the United States men and women who have had intensive experiences in combating Communists in schools and universities, trade unions and cooperatives, peace organizations and social clubs. Many have studied Communist techniques of subversion, and have developed effective measures of defense and offense against them. They know how to prevent, for example, a cell of 10 Communists in a university from manipulating democratic rules, and sending all 10 as delegates to the central student body as presumably representatives of 10 different organizations, thus taking over the central student office, including the student newspaper. They know how to expose, say, extreme demands of a Communist faction in a peasant organization, demands presented not because they are viable, but to discredit the democratic leadership. Members of the staff can also be drawn from various countries in which Communist strategies have been repelled by resolute and intelligent leadership.

The chief objection which has been raised against the Freedom Academy is that its alumni, who return to their own countries, will be marked men, subject to the derogatory epithets of "American agent," or something equally unsavory. Undoubtedly, the Communists will seek to discredit those who have studied at the Freedom Academy and will watch their behavior closely.

This, however, will be far from fatal, providing only that the partisans of freedom have been properly trained. First of all, it is not to be expected that most of the students will be public figures coming from the limelight of political life and returning to it. They will be drawn primarily from those social, cultural and educational areas in which Communists are always active in recruiting support for their political spokesman of the moment. As a rule, those who come to the Freedom Academy will be members of groups and associations of a broad democratic range. Normally, nominations will be made by the student, farm, cooperative, cultural, philanthropic, trade union, or business organization with which the individual is affiliated. To some extent, therefore, the organization which nominates the candidate for the academy will have a vested interest in his activity. He will have a natural audience on his return, an audience with whom he can remain in some communication while at the academy. The Communist charge, "American agent," will have to be implausibly directed against the organization to which he belongs.

Upon his return to his own country, the graduate of the Freedom Academy may at first resume his original employment. If there is a continuing need in the organization which nominated him, for the services of someone thoroughly sophisticated in his understanding of communism, he will be a logical person for the post. Presumably, he will have ideas and plans about how to further the prospects of freedom which he will lay before the membership.

Nor is this all. The alumnus of the Freedom Academy is a potentially valuable asset to a newspaper or magazine of general interest. He knows how to spot political crises in the making—if the Communists are behind them. He can become a commentator for radio and television stations. The field of education is wide open to him, and here he will have some of his toughest battles. Indeed, any agency or medium of communication which recognizes its responsibility to keep public opinion informed and alert might use his services. Different situations will suggest to the returning alumni of the Freedom Academy different opportunities for action. If they have been properly trained, they will create their own opportunities.

The foreign alumni of the Freedom Academy will be encouraged to feel free to criticize the United States if, in the interests of our common ideal of freedom, they conscientiously believe it is necessary. Such criticism should not be resented by us, even if it seems a bit exaggerated. It will be proof that the alumni are not wearing the collar of any government, and when they speak up for the common ideal of freedom, their voice will have greater weight and authority.

Occasions for criticism of some American policies will not need to be manufactured. After all, Americans themselves at home engage in such criticism vigorously. There is still sufficient disagreement among freemen and among the free nations of the world to make such critical discussions, now and then, not only inescapable but healthy. One sure sign of the Moscow-trained Communist who will probably be shouting, "American agent," is his eloquent refusal to criticize any of the policies of the Kremlin (or, if he has been trained in Peiping, of Red China). This is a situation made to order for a well-trained alumnus of the Freedom Academy.[1] The Communist curriculum of studies, of stratagems and deceits, cannot be made public without becoming self-defeating. But the more publicity about the methods of countering Communist stratagem, the greater is educational effect.

The time has come to expand our horizons in the struggle for the survival of freedom. It is not enough for us to know the truth about communism. Other countries must know it, too, and learn how to use the truth effectively. The general staff of the Communist movement no longer believes that it will win the world by military conquest, for in the mushroom cloud of the hydrogen bomb, it sees intimations of its own mortality. That is why it has redoubled its efforts everywhere to take over the countries of the world, piecemeal, from within, with a combination of stealth and daring.

The historical evidence shows that it is making gains on every continent—including North America, if Cuba is considered part of our continent. It is aided almost as much by those who fear it without understanding it and who fight it with wrong weapons, as by those who, tender-minded and sentimental, ally themselves in a common or popular front with Communists, brashly confident, in their total ignorance of Communist ideology and history, that they can control the Communists. There is no program or curriculum of studies which adequately explores the relevant problems posed by the advance of communism, or which seeks to develop the appropriate measures to meet them. This is the task of the Freedom Academy which Senate bill 414 seeks to establish.

In the nature of the case, to perform this function well, the Freedom Academy must go beyond it. It must continue research and experiment to discover new means of meeting the new techniques of attack which the Communists are sure to launch as their old methods and stratagems are exposed.

The Freedom Academy must also explore the entire gamut of positive democratic proposals to meet the problems the Communists exploit. We live in an age in which the global political revolution, the universal technological revolution, and the revolution of rising expectations, with its psychological paradoxes, have all converged. Even if there were no Communist movement, the free world would have many grave problems to settle. But it is the presence of the Communist movement which seeks to convert these problems into mortal dangers and threats to democratic survival. That is why the Communists must be repelled on every front of the cold war as the democratic community develops viable solutions to its problems.

A VITAL INVESTMENT

The United States is making an investment in order to safeguard not only the freedom of other countries but also its own freedom. It is making an investment also to safeguard its vast philanthropic investments. In some countries, we provide the means to build schools, and the Communists staff them; in other countries, we send food to sustain life, and, sometimes the Communists get the credit; in still other countries, we help domestic programs to abolish illiteracy, and then the Communists move in with simple, very cheap, political-propaganda reading material on a massive scale. Situations of this kind cannot be corrected from the outside. Only the foreign nationals who believe in freedom can effectively combat the foreign nationals who do not.

---

[1] Founding of the Academy has been proposed in the Freedom Commission Act, now before Congress, with bipartisan legislative blessing, in Senate bill 414. This is not to be confused with the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, an organization proposed in another bill, S. 865. The latter merely broadens present educational programs of the Foreign Service Institute.

For these and many other reasons, I am convinced that the organization of a Freedom Academy is an experiment worth trying. At present, no matter how innocent a person's studies in the United States, he is sure to be denounced as an agent of American imperialism by Communists on his return home. This has been true of physicians, agriculturalists, even men of the cloth. The victims are politically untrained and sometimes become demoralized. Communist denunciations will not cease when graduates of the Freedom Academy return home. But those attacked will be well trained, capable not only of making effective retort but of taking the offensive. This may result, in some countries, in changing the political complexion of things.

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY AT BEIRUT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have long been a supporter of the work of the American University of Beirut and I am glad that its accomplishments are being more widely recognized with each passing year.

The Christian Science Monitor of today, Friday, October 11, carries a fine article about the university on its editorial page and makes the point that the experience gained at this splendid school points the way for service that similar institutions need to follow in many other sections of the world.

Of particular interest to me is the construction at the American University of a medical school to train doctors who are so badly needed in the Middle East and throughout all of Asia. That is the type of foreign aid I can endorse and support.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT

(By Ralph Nader)

Sounds and sights of construction are in full evidence these days at the American University of Beirut. Here on this 85-acre campus of terraced, tree-filled slopes overlooking the serene Mediterranean are springing up additional dormitories, science buildings and classrooms to serve as heterogeneous a student body as ever attended a center of higher learning. They hail from 12 Arab nations and 50 other countries.

It doesn't take a visitor long to realize this diversity as he walks through the semitropical campus, or stops for a cool dish of yogurt at nearby Faysals or Uncle Sams—the two popular and storied restaurants crammed with students in animated conversation.

Nearing the century mark of dedicated activity in the Middle East, the university has much to look back on as a source of inspiration for future endeavors. From the beginning, when young Daniel Bliss and his bride arrived at Beirut in 1856 on the SS *Sultana* to found the school 10 years later, the evolution of AUB has been prolific with human drama, achievement under relentless pressure, and above all creative stamina.

Perhaps the late President Stephen B. L. Penrose was thinking of this latter trait when he counseled the graduating class of 1954 to observe the example of the oyster which, when confronted with the intrusion of an irritating extraneous substance, did not yield to the troublesome matter but endeavored instead to make it into a beautiful pearl. The oyster reacted creatively to the difficulty and produced something worthwhile.

Only such an attitude enabled AUB to survive Ottoman obstructions, revolts, epidemics, famines and the turmoil of the young Arab nations. But it did more than survive. From its graduating classes have come scores of the leading scientific, engineering, business, political and literary figures of the Middle East and beyond. The magnitude of its contribution can never be precisely determined, though graduates are fond of pointing out that 19 alumni—more than from any other university—were delegates to the San Francisco Conference that founded the United Nations. One of these delegates was Charles Malik, later to become president of the U.N.'s 13th General Assembly.

George Antonius, writing of the period before 1920 in his famous book "The Arab Awakening" contributed one of the more treasured assessments. "When account is taken of its contribution to the diffusion of knowledge, of the impetus it gave to literature and science, and of the achievement of its graduates," he commented, "it may justly be said that the influence of the Syrian Protestant College (as it was then called) on the Arab revival was greater than of any other institution."

That it has succeeded in becoming an "institution" in this turbulent area tells something of its philosophy of education. One prominent Arab alluded to it by quoting a saying of the Prophet Mohammed:

> The people shall perish except the learned.
> The learned shall perish except the diligent.
> The diligent shall perish except the virtuous.

Well before the atomic age, the great educators had been telling their classes that knowledge without goodness is too dangerous.

Today the AUB is solidly accepted even by Arab nationalists as a unique force for progress in the region. Paradoxically it has been and continues to be the most convenient university for students from the divided Arab world to study together and exchange views.

It is perhaps not surprising that the most ambitious building program in the university's 97-year history comes at a time when the role of the AUB is being oriented in new directions.

As explained by President Norman Burns, a long-time Point Four specialist and former professor at the university, "the AUB has long ceased being a higher educational 'outpost' in the Middle East. Its 2,900 students represent only a small fraction of the enrollment of students at the burgeoning national universities in Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, and Iraq. Rather than compete with these institutions, AUB intends to concentrate on expanding its graduate programs and establishing adequate research facilities." The aim is to develop centers of creativity in all basic fields and generate the skills, techniques, and basic knowledge for use throughout the Arab world.

These objectives may seem rather commonplace to those whose frame of reference is limited to Europe or North America. Actually they are designed to cope with problems receiving too little attention. Well known are the distressing conditions comprising the vicious circle of poverty in these lands. But the proposed remedies to break this circle have evolved difficulties in their own right. The strategy of growth requires that the gears all work in unison to avoid the treadmill effect.

As an example, a recent faculty committee survey that prepared the university's new 10-year plan took note of the large proportion of Arab students taking their graduate work in Europe and the United States. While not denying the benefits and present necessities of studying there, the committee listed some disadvantages that could be avoided if the student had alternatives closer to home.

For the record shows that exclusive reliance on graduate training abroad frequently alienates the student from local problems to be faced on his return. This leads in many cases to disillusionment or inefficiency. Moreover, superior research facilities and salaries in the West are a strong attraction for many top students to settle there, thus depriving their native lands of greatly needed human resources.

Strengthening of such departments as physics, chemistry, education, economics, and sociology is seen as providing the environment for keeping young scholars from migrating.

Physics Prof. Antoine Zahlan, who is completing an interpretative history of the AUB, believes there is little hope for the Arab world or any underdeveloped area unless creative institutions take root locally. He points to growing disparities in technological and economic levels as the West races ahead in a self-generating spiral of science, technology and productivity. The flow of technological progress to the non-Western world through imitation has serious limitations, both economic and engineering, when duplicated in countries with widely variant resources and human conditions. Also, he adds, heavy reliance on imitation helps produce a climate against risk taking and innovation with potential innovators not receiving the encouragement and facilities needed. Perhaps most important, as technology and the social organization giving rise to it becomes more complex in the West, imitation by less advanced nations becomes difficult or useless. Motor vehicles were rather easily accepted and used, more so than will be computer systems or many kinds of automated factories.

Current opinion at AUB is that an earnest effort must be made to stimulate simultaneous creations of indigenous science and technology. The role of the university is seen as only one part, though a crucial one, of the over-all coordination needed by a society to put this policy into effect.

Such a seeding function of AUB covers more than the physical sciences. The School of Education, headed by dynamic Dr. Habib A. Kurani, plans to establish an experimental school and child study center and also a center for the study of educational problems and development in the Middle East. There are great unmet demands for such services and personnel by the rapidly growing elementary school systems.

Each summer since 1948, Dr. Kurani has directed a 6-week institute with the financial support of U.S. foreign aid agencies and Ford Foundation. School administrators come from many countries to learn methods and broaden horizons.

Since opening its doors to 16 students in 1866, AUB has deliberately related its activities to community betterment in immediate ways as well. Workshops, conferences, and demonstration projects draw participants from a broad area. Professors serve in numerous posts advising governments with their problems of administration and planning—an old practice in the West but relatively new in Asia.

Students complement classroom learning by work in villages where they assist the people and often collect the only data available for these rural locations.

Smack in Lebanon's breadbasket—the historic Bekaa Valley—is the university's 250-acre experimental farm serving the School of Agriculture and helping local farmers. Young agronomy students come from 15 African and Asian lands to this famous station.

In working to make knowledge serve human needs and not be an isolated academic enclave, students are encouraged to rediscover and enrich their own cultures as well as deepen their understanding of Western societies. Most of the courses, other than those in Arabic literature and history, have been taught in English. However greater use of Arabic as a language of instruction is planned to give students an opportunity to express themselves adequately through their own language. This policy is also expected to contribute toward making Arabic a tool of modern scientific exposition and strengthen the ties between the university and its surroundings. Hundreds of scientific and technical books are being translated into Arabic under such sponsors as Franklin Publications of New York.

It is recognized that educating students entirely in English (three-quarters of the students are Arabs) does little to reduce the gap between intellectuals and the masses in these countries.

As one of the few truly intercultural universities in the world, it has pioneered in the meaningful exchange between two dissimilar cultures. The flow is two way. For an American institution operating under a New York State charter, AUB has been a first introduction to scores of Americans now specializing in Middle Eastern studies or policymaking in this country. An active visiting professorship program brings new scholarly infusions and permits the permanent faculty to periodically spend time at Western centers of learning.

Throughout its history, AUB has leaned heavily on private funds for support, chiefly from alumni and generous friends and, more recently, from several foundations including the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. But its facilities are being strained by the 85 percent growth in the student body since 1951, stemming largely from the point 4 program of financing the training of students competitively selected by Middle Eastern and African governments for study in the fields of engineering, agriculture, public health and education. The UN and other governments send an additional 250 students annually on scholarships.

The respected stature of the AUB in the Afro-Asian world comes not just from its legacy of research and action tested by years of valuable experience. It also flows from recognition that the university is leading the way in defining many of the problems common to these countries and coping with challenges all higher educational institutions will have to confront sooner or later in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

TECHNICIAN TRAINING AND THE SENATE BILL

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the last 10 years have witnessed a very quiet, unheralded, but significant change in the pattern of our educational institutions. I refer to the growth of technical education in the United States. In my opinion the bill now before the Senate should provide badly needed encouragement to this trend, which has arisen in response to an acute and very specific need.

The background against which this change should be viewed is the increasingly close relation of basic science and engineering. The engineer today stands closer to the frontiers of advancing knowledge than ever before, and he must be the master of mathematical, design, and operational techniques immensely more complicated than those learned by his counterparts some years ago. So rapid has the advance in engineering techniques become that we no longer train engineers to build machines or design circuits. We train them instead for a lifetime of learning in the rarefied atmosphere of computers, surface properties, solid-state physics, and other complicated fields.

In 1958 the number of freshman engineering enrollments dropped by 11 percent and has not recovered since. And the number of dropouts remains extremely high. One reason for the dropouts, which represent a tragic loss of talent for the Nation, is the increasing complexity of engineering study. The student with a mechanical knack easily masters the simple courses of high school laboratory science and concludes that he should pursue an engineering career. But many such students later discover that they cannot master the higher mathematics required for an engineering degree and they fall to the wayside, casualties of our poor public understanding of science and technology. Not only is there a dropout problem, therefore, but the number of engineers being trained remains at too low a level.

I would like to say a word about engineer shortage. Like many problems of measuring manpower, it is hard to define. Many argue that the most serious lack is in engineers who have a Ph. D. degree, the talented men best able to make significant progress in the solution of engineering problems. The average starting salary has increased by $1,000 in the last 5 years, until it is now around $7,400 today, indicating a shortage in which companies that need engineers must offer steadily increasing inducements to employment. You need only check the advertising columns of a Sunday newspaper to see how desperate the search for engineering talent has become.

One way to improve the engineering manpower situation is to provide technicians to work with the engineers. They are men with greatly needed mechanical skills, but they are not engineers. We might call them semi-professional workers, who perform supporting tasks. They construct the one-of-a-kind prototype which the engineer has designed. They operate the sensitive equipment which yields precise experimental results. Their training does not involve the most advanced elements of mathematics or basic science, but in fact parallels quite closely the training received by the engineer of a generation ago. They are aptly referred to as middle manpower and provide critical skills in the long spectrum that reaches from production workers up through skilled labor, to the engineer, and the investigator in basic research.

Many engineering dropouts, Mr. President, would have been perfectly well suited to technical education. Courses usually run 2 years instead of 4. The engineering courses involved are much more concrete and less bewildering and theoretical than those of the modern bachelor of engineering curriculum. The mathematics is less advanced. And if the number of technicians were adequate, the shortage of engineers would be less acute because there would be supporting workers in sufficient supply. Right now many engineers use their full talents only a small part of the time. Manpower specialists refer to this practice as underutilization, but it is necessary because there are not enough technicians to perform the supporting tasks. Underutilization gives the engineering profession a bad name and aggravates an already existing shortage of first-class engineers. As the engineering schools must rely on admitting students of insufficient talent, the dropout problem becomes worse. This is a vicious circle in which underutilization of engineers' best skills contributes to a shortage of manpower.

THE NEED FOR HIGHLY SKILLED TECHNICIANS

A year ago, Mr. President, the special subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee visited the Soviet Union and returned filled with a sense of urgency about our failure to educate skilled technicians. The Soviets, it is estimated, graduate about 120,000 technicians per year. The members of the subcommittee were astonished to discover that our technical institutes in the United States graduated less than 20,000 technicians per year. The word "technician" denotes a wide range of skills and the figure 20,000 denotes only those whose training involves post-high-school training in mathematics and engineering techniques. The area vocational schools under title VIII of NDEA and the short-term courses conducted by the Armed Forces add about 30,000 more each year, but in a lower range of skills. Many of these technicians will upgrade their training through industrial retraining, correspondence courses, and night school. But the fact remains that the highly skilled technicians graduated from junior colleges and technical institutes are in extremely short supply. This bill will aid the public community junior colleges which produce about one-fourth of our engineering technicians, but will not help to expand technical institutes and private junior colleges, where the need is very great. My own State of New Hampshire plans to construct no fewer than five technical institutes in coming years, because the need for middle manpower is so acute in our rapidly growing electronics and machinery industries, not to mention the shoe and woolen industries which are so important to us.

The President's Science Advisory Committee, acting under urgent instructions from the President in January of 1962, appointed a Manpower Study Panel last year. Their first formal report appeared in December of 1962. But even before that, Mr. President, the Panel had identified the area of greatest importance for swift Federal action the short supply of highly skilled technicians. I ask unanimous consent that the comments of the Panel, as printed in the December 1962 report, "Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Panel recognizes that today's research and development teams include not only a variety of professional disciplines but also a broad spectrum of levels of training that extends from doctoral and postdoctoral on the one hand to technicians with training substantially beyond high school on the other. The Panel believes that critical deficiencies exist at both ends of this spectrum.

Without an adequate supply of technicians, employers frequently use bachelor level personnel on semiprofessional tasks at less than their full potential. Thus, an increase in production of technicians would not only foster the improved utilization of engineers and scientists to help meet immediate technical manpower requirements, but would also upgrade the entire manpower resource to meet needs over the long run. Equally important, increased access to technician training would tend to alleviate some of the problems of technological unemployment, which are especially pronounced in that sector of our population lacking in special skills or training.

Although exact numerical requirements for technicians are difficult to forecast, a substantial increase is necessary. Nevertheless, the Panel finds that only about 11,000 graduates from full-time studies and 3,400 from part-time may be expected this academic year from formal engineering technician programs. Evaluated in the light of an estimated graduation this June of 35,000 B.S. level engineers, the new technician supply will be less than one-half that of the too small supply of engineers themselves. Physical scientists also draw on this same limited supply of technician graduates.

Consequently, the Panel believes that the problem of educating qualified technicians in sufficient numbers is critical enough to warrant Federal attention and Federal legislation especially to assist and otherwise stimulate the growth of educational facilities.

Such a program would have the important quality of rapid "pay," thus meeting partially, even within the next 2–3 years, urgent national requirements such as these represented by our space effort for more technical personnel. Emphasis on the importance of this educational channel would elevate the status of technicians and, in turn, attract to this occupational category many competent youngsters who would otherwise either not begin or fail to complete training beyond high school. Programs offering 2 years of collegiate-level training would not only support the Nation's effort in science and engineering, but would also allow many persons drawn from lower income groups or depressed areas to realize a much greater share of their potential. Specifically, the Panel feels that the program requires recognition at a national level that would in turn be reflected in high school counseling, and in attitudes by private employers toward better utilization of professional staff, considering that the great majority of these technicians will be employed in industry.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, after the report of the White House panel, the panel of consultants on vocational education set up within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare received a most urgent recommendation. Lynn A. Emerson, who has worked as a technician and engineer in industry, a city and State supervisor of industrial education, a teacher in vocational and engineering education, and a consultant on technical education to governments all over the world, made sweeping and urgent recommendations in the field of technical education. His report has been reproduced as appendix I to the report of the HEW consultants, "Education for a Changing World of Work," and I would hope that other Senators who share my concern for this subject might glance through a copy. His projections are based on detailed studies made in New York, Kansas, Utah, North Carolina, Los Angeles, Florida, New Jersey, and elsewhere as well as nationwide studies performed by the National Science Foundation, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Office of Education, American Society of Engineering Education, and others. It is a careful job and Lynn Emerson has certainly earned the thanks of all concerned with employment and training in the United States. His conclusion, Mr. President, is startling. The best level for training of technicians in the United States in the immediate future is not 30,000 but 200,000. And we are grievously short of the level of effort that progress in this direction will require.

The Senate version of H.R. 6143, Mr. President, does not address itself to this need for technicians. The House version provided a program quite closely patterned on the technical education bill introduced by the very able Congressman from Indiana, Mr. BRADEMAS, last year. That bill could have increased annual graduation figures for technicians by at least 15,000 to 20,000 by 1968.

Last year the Department of Defense issued its study of the placement of defense contracts in the several States. Since then many of us in the Congress have drawn the conclusion that the presence of critical engineering, scientific, and technical skills channels the flow of defense dollars. It is not only Government contracts, Mr. President, but the progress of all industry that depends upon an adequate supply of technicians. The Russians employ about 2.5 technicians to every engineer in industry, while we employ a scant 0.7. This does not make sense to me, Mr. President, and I hope the managers of H.R. 6143 will take some opportunity in this debate to state their views on this critical need and what they think the American people should be doing to meet it. The training of technicians is a vital job in America today. I would like to see us get on with that job.

My difficulty with the bill is one of language. Assistance would be made available to public community colleges under title II, but only if one of their major purposes is "the provision of a 2-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree upon the student's transfer to an institution of higher education." Assistance would be made available to institutions of higher education under title I only if it "provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a 2-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree."

The problem, Mr. President, is that we must give greater status and recognition to terminal 2-year technical training. My own State of New Hampshire will give such recognition and will give an associate degree for such training. I hope the Senate will receive an assurance that satisfactory language may be provided to permit assistance for schools offering independent, terminal 2-year programs.

NEW HAMPSHIRE INDUSTRY REVITALIZED

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, it is not often that we hear of the rebirth of an industry. Usually the story is the same, sad one—a factory closes, people are out of work, and the empty plant remains a grim reminder of happier days.

In Littleton, N.H., through the hard work of local committees and the aid received in the form of accelerated public works funds, the story is happier. A business has come back to life.

This story is told movingly in an article in the Littleton Courier which, without objection, I would like to have appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SARANAC OPERATIONS ARE BACK IN BUSINESS AGAIN

"It was a wonderful thrill Thursday morning to see the steam come back into the pipes at the Saranac Tannery in Littleton and to watch this business, founded in 1866, come back to life," this week commented Bradley M. Cooper, chairman of the Industrial Committee of the Littleton Chamber of Commerce.

Saranac leather, soft and pliable, was world famous for handwear.

"The rebirth of this enterprise is the result of many people working together for the good of the community," continued Mr. Cooper. "In 1958 the Littleton Planning Board had the foresight to make preliminary plans for cleaning up the Ammonoosuc river in Littleton. This advanced planning allowed Littleton to apply for and receive accelerated public works Federal funds after favorable action at town meeting in January of this year.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ENLISTS HELP

"Charles Hoyt and Byron Wiswell, the new Saranac owners, had the insight and initiative to envision that the business could be revived. Last fall when the Littleton Chamber of Commerce found out that Mr. Hoyt was having difficulty starting the tannery operation because of possible pollution of the river, the chamber enlisted the help of the Littleton Industrial Development Corp., the planning board, the selectmen and many other citizens.

"Many conferences were held with State and Federal officials. The pollution problem was finally solved by the action taken at town meeting last January which allowed Littleton to build a sewage treatment plant costing $1¼ million which has facilities to take care of the Saranac Tannery wastes—at a total cost to the town of only approximately $700,000.

"This nearly million-dollar saving to Littleton plus the rebirth of the famous old industry would not have been possible without many hours of effort by many Littleton citizens, which proves that if people will work together anything can be accomplished."

On Monday of this week the Saranac Glove Co. made the first shipment of gloves produced under the new operation located on the top floor of the tannery building.

SILVER ANNIVERSARY OF PULASKI MONUMENT, MANCHESTER, N.H.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Casimir Pulaski was born a nobleman, but unlike others of his class, he had within him a burning love of liberty, a feeling that all men should be free. This extended not only to his beloved Poland, where he fought in the unsuccessful battle against partition, but also to the young Colonies of America, where he came in 1777 to help in America's fight for independence.

Pulaski proved a brilliant soldier and soon was leading Washington's cavalry. Later he commanded his own elite Pulaski Legion. For his brave deeds in the Battle of Brandywine, he was commissioned by the Congress as a brigadier general. He also distinguished himself at the Battles of Egg Harbor and Charlestown.

While leading his forces in the Battle of Savannah, he was fatally wounded and died soon after.

In 1934, the people of Polish descent in New Hampshire started a fund drive, and 4 years later unveiled a monument at Manchester to the memory of this great and courageous leader. This weekend marks the 25th anniversary of the unveiling, and the event will be marked with appropriate ceremonies.

Mr. President, Casimir Pulaski proved long ago what is still true today—that when freedom is in danger, good men of all backgrounds will join the battle.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. PROUTY obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REVISED COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF MANUAL"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 536, Senate Concurrent Resolution 59.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) to print for the use of the Committee on Government Operations 25,000 additional copies of a revised committee print entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations twenty-five thousand additional copies of the revised edition of the committee print entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual", which was issued by that committee on August 30, 1963.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON "ORGANIZED CRIME AND ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 537, Senate Concurrent Resolution 61.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 61) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics" of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations not to exceed four thousand additional copies of all parts of the hearings held by its Permanent Investigating Subcommittee during the current session on organized crime and illicit traffic in narcotics.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING AND BINDING OF AN EDITION OF "SENATE PROCEDURE"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 538, Senate Joint Resolution 123.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 123) to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of "Senate Procedure" and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the Senate one thousand five hundred copies of a revised edition of Senate Procedure, to be prepared by Charles L. Watkins, Parliamentarian, and Floyd M. Riddick, Assistant Parliamentarian, to be printed under the supervision of the authors and to be distributed to the Members of the Senate.

SEC. 2. That, notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, such edition of Senate Procedure shall be subject to copyright by the authors thereof.

INDIAN HEIRSHIP LAND PROBLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 455, Senate bill 1049.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1049) relating to the Indian heirship land problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the owners of not less than a 50 per centum interest in any land, where ten or fewer persons own undivided interests, or the owners of not less than a 25 per centum interest in any land, where eleven or more persons own undivided interests, and where all of the undivided interests are in a trust or restricted status, may request the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") and the Secretary is hereby authorized, to partition the land in kind, or to partition part of the land in kind and sell the remainder, or to sell the land if partition is not practicable: *Provided*, That no partition or sale under any provisions of this Act shall be authorized unless the Secretary finds it to be in the best interests of the Indian owners and not detrimental to the Indian tribe.

(b) When any of the undivided interests in a tract of land are in an unrestricted status, the owners of not less than a 50 per centum interest in the remaining undivided trust or restricted interests, where ten or fewer persons own such undivided interests, or the owners of not less than a 25 per centum interest in the remaining undivided trust or restricted interests, where eleven or more own such undivided interests, may request the Secretary, and the Secretary is hereby authorized, to sell all trust or restricted interests. The Secretary may also partition the land in kind, partition part of the land in kind and sell the remainder, or sell all interests if authorized to partition or sell the unrestricted interests by a power of attorney from the owner of the unrestricted interests.

SEC. 2. (a) Whenever the Secretary, after receiving a request to partition or sell any tract of land under subsection (b) of section 1 of this Act, is unable after due effort to obtain the approval of any owner of an unrestricted interest in such tract, he shall, upon application of the persons making the foregoing request, consent to judicial partition or sale of such tract. Where such consent is granted, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States district court for the district in which the land, or any part thereof, is located to hear and determine the partition or sale proceedings and to render judgment for partition in kind or judicial sale in accordance with the law of the State wherein the lands are situated. The United States shall be an indispensable party to any such proceeding and absent defendants may be served as provided in section 1655 of title 28, United States Code. The proceeds of sale of the trust or restricted interests shall be paid to the Secretary for distribution unless he waives this requirement as to any of the owners thereof. If the land so partitioned or sold is acquired by an individual Indian or an Indian tribe, title thereto shall be taken in the manner prescribed in subsection 5(d) of this Act.

The owners of undivided Indian interests or the tribe shall have a right to purchase the property being partitioned or sold, or any part thereof, at its appraised value unless one of the owners objects within a time to be fixed by the court. In the event two or more rights of preference are exercised for the same land, or in the event there is objection by an owner, the court shall order the land sold at sealed bids or at public auction with the right in the tribe or any Indian owner who has previously exercised his right of preference to meet the high bid: *Provided*, That if two or more elect to meet the high bid there shall be a further auction between them and the property shall be sold to the highest bidder. At a sale held pursuant to this subsection, all bids of less than 75 per centum of the appraised value of the land shall be rejected.

SEC. 3. Any trust interest in oil, gas, or other minerals that may be reserved to an Indian owner in any sale of land made pursuant to this Act may be reserved in a trust status. No sale made under this Act shall include any mineral estate that has been reserved to any Indian tribe by any provision of law.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to represent any Indian owner (1) who is a minor, (2) who has been adjudicated non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall give actual notice or notice by publication and provide an opportunity for a hearing before partitioning in kind or selling land, or before consenting to judicial partition or sale pursuant to this Act. All sales of lands made by the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Upon receipt of requests from the required ownership interests, the Secretary shall notify the tribe and each owner of an undivided Indian interest in the land by a registered letter directed to his last known address that each such owner and the tribe has a right to purchase the land for its appraised value, unless one of the owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary, or for a lower price if all of the owners agree: *Provided*, That if more than one owner or if one or more owners and the tribe want to purchase the land it will be sold on the basis of sealed competitive bids restricted to the owners of undivided interests in the land and the tribe unless one of the owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary. All competitive bids of less than 75 per centum of the appraised value of the land shall be rejected.

(b) If any Indian owner or his authorized representative objects to a competitive sale restricted to the owners of undivided interests and the tribe, the Secretary shall offer the land for public sale by sealed competitive bid with a preferential right in the tribe or any Indian owner to meet the high bid, unless one of the Indian owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary. All such bids of less than 75 per centum of the appraised value of the land shall be rejected.

(c) If any Indian owner or his authorized representative objects to an offer of public sale by sealed competitive bid with a preferential right to meet the high bid, or if two or more preference rights are asserted under subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall offer the land for sale by sealed bids: *Provided*, That after legal notice to all interested parties including the tribe, the land shall be sold at auction immediately after the opening of the sealed bids, and auction bidding shall be limited to the Indian owners, the tribe, and persons who submitted sealed bids in amounts not less than 75 per centum of the appraised value of the land. The highest sealed bid shall be considered the opening auction bid. No sale shall be made unless the price is equal to or higher than the highest sealed bid: *Provided further*, That the term "appraised value" as used in this Act shall mean the current appraised value of the land, said appraisal to be not more than one year old.

(d) Title to any land acquired by a tribe or an individual Indian pursuant to this Act may be taken in trust unless the land is located outside the boundaries of the reservation or approved tribal consolidation area. Title to any land acquired by a tribe or an individual Indian that is outside the boundaries of the reservation or approved consolidation area may be taken in trust if the purchaser was the owner of trust or restricted interests in the land before the purchase or partition, otherwise title shall be taken in the name of the purchaser without any restriction on alienation, control, or use.

SEC. 6. In order to assist tribes that wish to purchase land offered for sale under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make loans, subject to such reasonable rules as he may prescribe, from the revolving funds referred to in section 9 of this Act, and in accordance with the following requirements:

(a) The amount of the loan shall not exceed the appraised value of the land plus the value of any other property the tribe may mortgage or pledge as security for the loan.

(b) The tribe shall give to the United States a mortgage on the land purchased by the tribe with the loan, and on any other tribal property which the Secretary deems necessary to adequately secure the loan.

(c) The loan shall be for a term of not to exceed thirty years, and shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary. The loan need not require repayment in equal installments, but it shall require repayment according to a schedule that will fully amortize the loan within the time specified. In the event of a default in the repayment of the loan, the Secretary of the Interior shall take such action as he deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States. If during the period of repayment the tribe is awarded a money judgment against the United States, and if the payment of any installment on the loan is in default, the installment(s) in default, or the balance of the loan in the discretion of the Secretary, shall be collected from the appropriation to satisfy the judgment insofar as the amount of the appropriation will cover the same.

(d) Before a loan is made under this Act the tribe shall submit for the approval of the Secretary of the Interior a plan for the use of all lands to be purchased and lands presently owned. No plan shall be considered by the Secretary unless it has been first considered and acted upon favorably by a majority vote of the duly authorized governing body of the tribe, or in the absence of such a governing body, by a majority vote at a general meeting of tribal members called for that purpose upon due notice to all adult members of the tribe. Any tribe preparing a plan may call upon the Secretary for technical assistance, and the Secretary shall render such assistance as may be necessary. Such plan shall include provisions for consolidation of holdings of the tribe, or acquisition of sufficient lands in conjunction with those held to permit reasonable economic utilization of the land and repayment of the loan. Such plan may be revised from time to time with the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 7. (a) Any tribe that adopts with the approval of the Secretary a plan pursuant to subsection 6(d) of this Act, or any other plan that does not involve a loan from the United States but which provides for the consolidation, management, use, or disposition of tribal land, is hereby authorized, with the approval of the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, subject to the provisions of the tribal constitution, if any, to sell or encumber any tribal land or other property in furtherance of such plan.

(b) Tribal land in trust or restricted status, including land acquired by a tribe pursuant to this Act may, with the approval of the Secretary, be—

(1) sold in trust status to individual tribal members, or

(2) exchanged in trust status for lands within the reservation or approved tribal consolidation area which are held by individual tribal members or other Indians in trust or restricted status, for the purpose of effecting consolidations of land or aiding individual tribal members to acquire economic units or homesites.

SEC. 8. This Act shall not repeal any authority of the Secretary under other law, but it shall supersede any limitation on the authority of the Secretary that is inconsistent with this Act. This Act shall not repeal the laws heretofore enacted with respect to the procedure for disposing of or partitioning lands belonging to members of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma and the Osage Tribe, and this Act shall not apply to any interest in land which is subject to a restriction imposed by such laws.

SEC. 9. (a) All funds that are now or hereafter a part of the revolving fund authorized by the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), the Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968), and the Act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44), as amended and supplemented, including sums received in settlement of debts of livestock pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 190), and sums collected in repayment of loans heretofore or hereafter made, shall hereafter be available for loans to organizations of Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts (hereinafter referred to as Indians), having a form of organization that is satisfactory to the Secretary, and to individual Indians of one-quarter degree or more of Indian blood who are not members of or eligible for membership in an organization that is making loans to its members, for any purpose that will promote the economic development of such organizations and their members, or the individual Indian borrowers.

(b) The appropriation authorization in section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), as amended by the Act of September 15, 1961 (75 Stat. 520), is hereby amended by increasing it from $20,000,000 to $55,000,000.

SEC. 10. The Secretary is authorized to execute such patents, deeds, orders, or other instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 11. The terms, "owner" and "owners" as used herein include, wherever applicable, any tribe, band, group, community, or pueblo of Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts, and also include any federally chartered organization of Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts.

SEC. 12. (a) Sections 1 through 8 of this Act shall become effective one year after the date of its enactment.

(b) The Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of sections 1 through 8 of this Act, notify by publication Indian tribes and owners of undivided interests in Indian trust or restricted land, of the rights of such tribe or owners under this Act.

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary shall, prior to the conclusion of any probate proceeding conducted on or after the effective date of sections 1 through 8 of this Act, notify each heir or devisee having an interest in such proceedings, by actual notice or notice by publication, of his rights under this Act.

(b) Beginning one year after the effective date of sections 1 through 8 of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress setting forth the progress made in the preceding year in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the bill that is now the pending business before the Senate, S. 1049, has been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by unanimous action. It represents the considered judgment of the committee in terms of resolving one of the most complex problems in the field of Indian affairs; and I refer to the matter of multiple ownership of allotted Indian lands.

Beginning in 1959, the staff of our committee and the staff of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, together with the experts of the Library of Congress, undertook extensive studies of the problem of inheritance of Indian allotments. Two heirship reports were published in 1961 that contained detailed information on what the heirship problem is and where it exists. The reports to which I have just referred also offered suggested solutions to the problem from field administrators in the Bureau of Indian Affairs as well as owners of these lands and Indian tribes.

For the information of Senators, let me say that the Indian heirship land problem came about when the Federal Government decided back in the 1880's to subdivide Indian reservations among tribal members into what are known as allotments. These tracts were held in trust by the United States, and when the individual to whom they had been given died, his estate was probated and his heirs received an undivided interest in the property. Over the years successive probates have taken place affecting the same tract, and it is not uncommon at the present time for there to be anywhere from 2 to 100 or more heirs holding fractional interests in a piece of trust land. Today the United States holds in trust for the Indians approximately 41,000 tracts of allotted land—approximately 6 million acres—that are in fractional ownership. Another 6 million acres remains in individual ownership, but in a matter of a few years, they, too, will become fractionated.

In the course of our studies we have found that the economic interests of the Indian owners of these properties have been adversely affected. Frequently, the income from a tract of heirship land may amount to only a few pennies for some of the owners. However, the cost of administering these lands continues to grow and in many cases, the cost of Federal supervision of the land exceeds the income that goes to Indian owners.

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to explain the background of this legislation. In March of 1961, using the committee's studies as a basis for legislation, I introduced S. 1392. That proposal was used as a vehicle for exploring the viewpoints and wishes of the people most concerned with the heirship problem. Hearings were conducted in August 1961, and our committee received valuable testimony from members of the Senate and House, the Interior Department, the Justice Department, the General Accounting Office, Indian organizations, and Indian tribes. At the completion of the hearings I instructed the staff to study the suggestions and recommendations that had been offered and to redraft the bill based on the excellent material that had been made available to us. Due to the excessive congressional workload, there was no opportunity for further hearings during 1961.

In February 1962, I introduced a second heirship bill designated as S. 2899. The provisions of that measure included many of the recommendations that had been made in the hearings of the preceding year. In April 1962, extensive hearings were held and published, and widely distributed to Indian tribes and others concerned with the problem.

The hearings on S. 2899 were analyzed and sifted by the committee staff, and a new draft was prepared which I introduced on March 8, 1963, that is S. 1049, the bill presently before us. In April of this year a third set of hearings were held and, once again, extremely helpful contributions from Indian tribes, their attorneys, and the executive agencies were given to us. Many of their suggestions have been incorporated into the bill as reported by the committee to the Senate.

We have taken every precaution to see that the Indians of this country were fully advised of what we were attempting to do, and we actively solicited their help in framing a piece of legislation that would provide an effective answer to this most perplexing problem. Every effort has been made in this proposed legislation to authorize and implement an effective program to alleviate the heirship problem. Particular attention has been given to designing a bill that will maximize the opportunity to return multiple-owned land to individual Indian ownership or to tribal ownership and to preserve its trust status. This bill, as reported, gives the Secretary of the Interior sufficient latitude to solve the problem, but allows him enough discretion to protect the best interests of the Indian owners. I would not want to mislead anyone into thinking that this legislation offers a panacea to the matter of multiple ownership of Indian land. It does offer a constructive step in that direction.

Mr. President, S. 1049 is a product that represents a consensus of opinion of those most familiar with the complexities of Indian land ownership. It is supported by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, by several prominent Indian organizations, and by a majority of the Indian tribes.

The manner in which it is proposed to attack the question of heirship through S. 1049 is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

SECTION 1

(a) This section applies only to that heirship land where all the undivided interests are in trust status and subdivides that land into two categories. The first category would be tracts owned by up to 10 heirs and the second, tracts owned by 11 or more. Where there are up to 10 owners, any 1 or more owning a 50-percent or larger interest may request the Secretary of the Interior to sell or partition the land. In those tracts where there are 11 or more owners, the requirement is reduced to 1 or more owning at least 25 percent of the land. The Secretary is authorized to partition the entire tract, partition part of the land and sell the remainder, or if this is not practicable he may sell the entire tract if the sale would be in the best interests of the Indian owners and not detrimental to the Indian tribe. If the Secretary determines the sale of a particular tract of land would be detrimental to the interests of the tribe, it must be a specific finding concerning the tract of land under consideration, and not a general finding pertaining to some or all individual land on a reservation. The intent here is to protect the Indian owners in their right to sell the land and protect the tribe from the sale of a key tract that would adversely affect the tribe's economic situation.

The committee feels this section provides a reasonable method for Indian owners and/or the Secretary of the Interior acting for them (under sec. 4) to request sale or partition of a tract of land in multiple ownership.

(b) This subsection applies to those tracts of land where there are interests in nontrust status. Generally this means that a non-Indian has inherited a share in the estate. The same categories are present as in (a) with a 50-percent minimum trust ownership required for authority to request partition or sales in tracts with up to 10 owners and a minimum of 25 percent in tracts with 11 or more owners. The Secretary may sell the trust or restricted interests, and may, with the approval of nontrust owners, partition all of the land, partition part of the land and sell the remainder, or sell the entire tract.

SECTION 2

(a) If the Secretary is unable to obtain the approval of owners with unrestricted interests to sell or partition the land, he shall, upon the request of the required Indian interests consent to judicial partition or sale by the U.S. district court. The United States is an indispensable party to such suits and title to any land so partitioned or purchased will be taken pursuant to subsection 5(d).

(b) Indian owners are given the right to purchase such property at the appraised value if the other owners do not object. If two or more Indians elect to purchase, or if an owner objects, the court will have the land sold by sealed bids or at a public auction with the Indian owners and the tribe having a right to meet the high bid. If two or more meet the high bid they will participate in an auction between them.

SECTION 3

Trust interests in minerals may be reserved in trust at the discretion of the Secretary. Tribal minerals reserved by any other provision of law are unaffected by this section. However, tribal minerals interests in tracts of heirship land where the tribe owns an undivided interest will be covered under the terms of this act.

SECTION 4

The Secretary is authorized to represent minors, those adjudicated non compos mentis, those with undetermined interests, and Indian owners who cannot be located.

SECTION 5

Provision is made for the Secretary to notify all interested parties before sale or partition and provide an opportunity for a hearing.

(a) Upon request for sale, the owners and tribe are notified by registered mail that each has a right to purchase for the appraised value or for a lower price if the owners agree. If more than one chooses to purchase it will be sold by sealed competitive bids restricted to the owners and the tribe unless an owner objects. All bids must be at least 75 percent of the appraised value.

(b) If an owner objects to competitive sale the land will be opened for public sale by sealed competitive bids, with the right of the tribe or an owner to meet the high bid unless one of the owners objects.

(c) If an owner objects or if more than one preference right is asserted the land will be sold by sealed competitive bid but after opening the bids the land shall be sold at auction limited to Indian owners, the tribe, and those bidding not less than 75 percent of the appraised value. The highest sealed bid shall be the opening auction bid.

(d) Title may be taken in trust for a tribe or individual unless the land is outside the reservation or tribal consolidation area. If located inside these areas, trust title can be taken for those who had an interest in the land before sale or partition.

SECTION 6

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make loans for purchase of such lands.

(1) The amount of the loan shall not exceed the land value and/or posted collateral.

(2) The Government shall hold a mortgage on the property and posted collateral.

(3) Interest rates shall be set by the Secretary and the terms shall not exceed 30 years.

In the case of delinquent payments, future money judgments against the United States can be attached and delinquent payments or the loan balance can be collected at the Secretary's discretion.

(4) Before loan approval the tribe must present a land-use plan approved by the governing body.

SECTION 7

(a) Any tribal consolidation plan approved by the Secretary, whether or not requiring a Federal loan, will carry with it approval to sell or encumber any tribal land or other property to carry out the purposes of the plan (subject to limitations imposed by the tribal constitution).

(b) Tribal trust land may be:

(1) Sold in trust to individual tribal members.

(2) Exchanged in trust for individual Indian land to consolidate individual lands.

SECTION 8

The purpose of this act is to add to the Secretary's power and shall not repeal any present authority. The terms of this act do not apply to the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma and the Osage Tribe.

SECTION 9

All funds presently authorized for loans to Indians would be consolidated into one revolving fund. This is in keeping with a recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee. An additional $35 million is authorized for loans, making a total of more than $55 million in authorizations for this purpose and other requirements.

SECTION 12

(a) A delay of 1 year is provided for the Secretary to formulate necessary regulations to implement the program.

(b) During the 1 year the Secretary is to notify by publication Indian tribes and owners of undivided interests in Indian trust or restricted land of their rights under the act.

SECTION 13

(a) At all probate hearings after the expiration of a year, the Secretary shall notify each interested party of their rights under the terms of this act.

(b) Beginning 1 year after the effective date of this act, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress of the progress made in carrying out the purposes of the act.

Mr. President, in recent years, costs of administering the Bureau of Indian Affairs have risen sharply. I am convinced that if we do not enact a bill such as S. 1049, we may expect further increases in the cost of administering the Indian land base and a diminution of income from the lands to the Indian owners. Only by providing a means to place the lands back into single ownership, either individual or tribal, can we expect to obtain the maximum economic potential for the owners. As I have stated, the bill authorizes an increase in the Indian revolving credit loan fund of $35 million. This is a very substantial sum of money, but it will be returned to the Treasury. In the meantime we should have achieved a consolidation of Indian lands that will reduce the dependence of Indians on welfare.

Mr. President, I should like to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and to all the members of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee for their invaluable assistance in bringing this legislation before the Senate. I do not believe this Congress will consider any piece of legislation affecting American Indians that is more important to them than S. 1049. I strongly urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, between lines 6 and 7, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

> (e) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no land within any reservation, or approved consolidation area, shall be sold under this Act unless the Tribe has funds available for the acquisition of such land, or advises the Secretary in writing that it does not desire to acquire the land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, first, I compliment the chairman for a good job. He has labored on the question of heirship and fractionated interests for 3 years. However, the bill contains a glaring error. After the partition or sale proceedings are started, the tribe or Indian having a right to bid at a sale or partition has a right to meet the high bid. However, there is no provision in the bill that would protect the tribe or Indian in case he did not have funds or credit at that time. All my amendment would do is to provide that before the partition or the sale would go through, the tribe shall have funds with which to bid, if it did not consent to the sale. In essence, that is all there is to it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota pressed his case very hard in the committee. It was discussed fully there and voted down, despite the strong arguments that the Senator made for the amendment.

The reason why the committee felt that it could not accept the amendment is that the bill already contains a great many safeguards designed to protect the interest of the Indians. First, under the bill there cannot be a sale or partition proceeding unless owners of a majority interest in the land initiate the procedure. Second, there cannot be a sale or partition of the land without the consent of the Secretary, who has to make a determination that such a sale or partition is in the interest of both the Indian owners and the Indian tribe. Third, the right of first refusal, as it were, is extended to the Indian owners and the Indian tribe against all other bidders in the sale.

Finally, the bill contains language which would increase the authorization for the revolving fund to $55 million for the purpose of supplying additional credit to enable the Indian tribes and Indian owners to participate in the sales which are undertaken, in the first place, to solve the problem of fractionated ownership. So, for all these reasons, the committee felt that the interests of the Indians were fully safeguarded, and it would only break precedent and be quite unworkable besides, to tie this bill to an appropriation which comes through a separate committee and must come at a later date. However, the bill goes as far as practicable in this direction. It contains a provision which would postpone the effective date of the bill for 1 full year, to give the Appropriations Committee ample time to provide the money. For these reasons the committee could not agree with the Senator. But I must say that he pressed his case hard for this provision and I commend him for that. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. BURDICK. Let us assume that 5 years from now the Appropriations Committee would not see fit to appropriate money for the revolving fund. What would be the position of the Indian tribe then in meeting a high bid if it did not have the necessary funds?

Mr. CHURCH. The whole record with respect to the revolving fund indicates that once the money has been appropriated, the fund has operated on a self-sustaining basis. I think it will continue to do so.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, since I have been in the Congress one of my areas of greatest interest has been the American Indian and our Federal program relating to him. I am particularly interested, of course, because I number among my constituency and friends thousands of Indians.

My father, the late Usher L. Burdick, was a great friend of the Indian. My years of experience have taught me that our relations with the American Indian and all of our programs for and about him are casually related to land. After all, our very first contacts with the American Indian concerned land and our latest do also. The Indian considers land differently than the non-Indian. It has been said that to the Indian, land is his mother.

The Indians of this country fear the constant whittling away of their lands that goes on from year to year. At the present time many of the reservations are what we call "checkerboarded"—this term is just about self-explanatory. There are areas of non-Indian land interspersed among the Indian. Over the years this individual land has been decreasing rapidly and poses a threat to the economy of our Indian population.

S. 1049 is a bill that has come through extensive hearings and study over a period of 5 years. Everyone concerned has worked desperately to provide a means to solve this heirship land problem where a tract of individual Indian land is owned by several Indians.

In the bill, provision is made for the majority of owners to indicate they no longer want to retain the land and under sections 1 and 2 procedures are available for the Indian owners or the tribe to purchase the land. Section 2(b) gives the tribe and the Indian owners a preference right to purchase the land. We are all aware of the fact that Indian tribes are not numbered among the more wealthy groups in the country, so consequently the question arises as to how much of a preference this would be.

The problem with the preference we are giving the Indian in this bill was put rather well by one of the witnesses when he said:

> If I have a right to buy the first Rolls Royce off the line or the first Boeing 707 off the line that comes out this year, that preferential right doesn't do me any good if I don't have the money, and we are tremendously concerned that these lands will pass from consolidation and from the Indian land base because of the unavailability of funds to purchase them.

Now, what will happen if the tribe does not have the money to buy the land?

It will be sold, of course, and the Indian land base will decrease again. The seriousness of Indian land sales was recognized by the Senate Interior Committee in 1958 when in their report entitled "Indian Land Transactions" the chairman called attention to the fact that:

> Individual Indian trust land alienation is climbing at a potentially disastrous rate.

We are faced with a situation most confusing to our American Indians and indeed to me.

In one section of the bill we give the tribe a preference to buy the land at the appraised price and/or to meet the high bid. In another section we provide a $55 million loan fund; however, the money must actually be appropriated by another committee, now and in future years.

No doubt the appropriation will be made, but what about the situation 3, 5, or 10 years from now? No one knows what the condition of the fund will be then or what appropriations future Congresses may make.

My amendment provides simply that no heirship land will be put up for sale unless the tribe is in a position to exercise the preference we are giving them.

My amendment will remove the fear of the Indian people that this is just another program designed to separate the Indian from his land.

We will be giving them not lipservice in the form of an unusable preference but a meaningful procedure to prevent the further checkerboarding of their reservations. It will provide the means for Indians to create more economic units of their lands and bring in more income for their people. Consequently there will be more and more opportunities for rehabilitation and self-support.

Again I say this bill is workable and can be of great service to our Indians and help solve one of their most serious problems, but it must certainly contain this safeguard provided by my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike section 7(b) in the committee amendment on page 18, lines 13 through 23, inclusive, as follows:

> (b) Tribal land in trust or restricted status, including land acquired by a tribe pursuant to this Act may, with the approval of the Secretary, be—
>
> (1) sold in trust status to individual tribal members, or
>
> (2) exchanged in trust status for lands within the reservation or approved tribal consolidation area which are held by individual tribal members or other Indians in trust or restricted status, for the purpose of effecting consolidations of land or aiding individual tribal members to acquire economic units or homesites.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], for the leadership he has provided and for the careful and thoughtful manner in which he has proceeded. Like the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] whose amendment I cosponsored—and which I regret was defeated a moment ago—there are one or two sections of the bill which I find quite objectionable.

The amendment which has just been offered would strike section 7(b) of the bill, which provides for a wholly new and revolutionary means for disposing of tribal lands. This particular section of the bill was not in any version of the legislation either as introduced or as considered at any hearings. It was not the subject of discussion and hearings. The tribes were not afforded an opportunity to be heard on what I believe would be a radical change in Federal policy of requiring an act of Congress to authorize the sale of tribal land.

I urgently hope that this section of the bill will be stricken, by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota presented his arguments forcefully in the committee. It is fair to point out, however, that this bill has been 4 years in the making. A series of hearings has been held on the bill in its various versions. Every opportunity has been given to the Indian tribes, to their spokesmen, and to all other interested parties to be heard.

The particular provision to which the Senator refers results from the hearings and an assessment of all the testimony taken. In many cases Indian tribes, in order to get on with the work of consolidating their land holdings, must sell certain parts of the tribally held lands or exchange them for other lands in order to make consolidation possible.

That is the purpose of the language. It is written in such a way as to give full protection to the Indian interests.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1049) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I express my deepest thanks to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] for his courtesy in this matter.

Mr. PROUTY. I was happy to cooperate with the majority leader.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me briefly?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, America was discovered 471 years ago tomorrow. It is on this occasion that we Americans share in the spirit of adventure and achievement which first brought Christopher Columbus from the busy port of Genoa to the wooded shores of this hemisphere.

Inspired by Columbus, succeeding generations of Americans have set sail from Italy over the years to find a promised land in America. They have made a lasting contribution to the bright mosaic pattern of American life today. We admire their courage and generosity—we respect their deep convictions and their fervor for the land of their adoption. And above all, we are grateful for the many significant contributions of Americans of Italian origin in areas of music, art, literature, education, science, business, labor, and other areas—contributions which have brightly enriched our own culture.

The spirit of Christopher Columbus is reflected in each of our hearts as we turn to the new horizons of the 20th century—the unexplored lands of outer space and undersea, the challenges of competition with a Communist enemy, the world of cold war and uneasy peace. We know, as Columbus did, that there is no turning back. The world we seek—new in promise but old in its mighty appeal to all mankind—still lies ahead like an unknown continent. And we, like Columbus, are determined to go on to meet its challenges.

In connection with my interest in honoring the founder of America, I have once again sponsored a bill which would make Columbus Day a national holiday. Columbus Day is already a legal holiday in many States and I look forward to the day when Congress will see fit to follow the lead of these States and appropriately to honor the man who braved the challenging, uncharted seas to discover America.

CANADIAN DUTY EXEMPTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, some time ago I spoke with regard to two problems of special interest to the people of northern New York, and, I assume, also to other States bordering on Canada. One problem is the Canadian tariff on U.S. bread which compared with the U.S. duty-free admission of Canadian bread provides a serious problem to bakers and bakery employees in many parts of the State. That problem, I regret to say, has not yet been forcibly brought to the attention of the Canadian Government and will apparently not be taken up until the Trade Expansion Act negotiations begin next year.

The other problem is the continued maintenance of a very low duty-free exemption for Canadian residents visiting the United States. By maintaining this exemption at $25, the Canadian Government is in effect depriving its citizens of the opportunity to purchase U.S. goods in larger quantities. This matter, I am told, was discussed in the September 20 and 21 meetings between Canadian and U.S. officials. I am informed that the Canadian delegation refused to raise its exemption since the Canadian Government apparently feels that U.S. visitors to Canada do not find merchandise in Canada as attractive as Canadian visitors find merchandise in the United States.

I do not know whether the average Canadian citizen or manufacturer would subscribe to these views or not. In my judgment, Canadian merchandise can be very attractive indeed. But frankly this position appears to reinforce all of the arguments in favor of reducing international barriers to trade. For instead of encouraging Canadian manufacturers to make their wares more attractive both to U.S. citizens and to their own people, the Canadian answer seems to be merely by a low duty-free exemption to prohibit their citizens from having what they want.

I am very glad to note that the Department of State does not accept this Canadian argument as satisfactory. They do not accept the further Canadian view that the low duty-free exemption is therefore ineffective in restraining Canadian purchases in the United States. I am glad to note that Ambassador Butterworth was present at these meeings and will continue to press the matter in Ottawa. If his persuasions are not effective, I am assured that the matter will be brought up again at the next session of the joint committee early in 1964. I am very pleased that the State Department is taking such a firm stand in defense of U.S. interests.

Mr. President, in view of the recent Canadian actions with regard to wheat sales, the alleged manipulations of the wheat market which will have the effect of reducing the price of wheat for American sellers, and in view of the Canadian desire to further restrict purchases of machine parts from the United States, I am extremely disappointed that the Canadian Government maintains its recalcitrant and unyielding position on this matter. I am glad our Government is using all available means of persuasion to remind the Canadians of the inequality in their regulations both as to duty-free exemptions and as to the tariff on U.S. bread.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record following my remarks the text of a report I have just received from George Ball, Acting Secretary of State, summarizing the outcome of the United States-Canadian economic conference activities on these two issues.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1963.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you for your telegram of September 23, requesting a report on the meeting of the Joint United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs in Washington, September 20–21, particularly with respect to the Canadian tourist exemption and the more equal treatment of such items as bread.

The question of the level of duty-free exemptions for residents of Canada returning from visits to the United States was raised by the U.S. delegation. The Canadian delegation contended that while the U.S. allowance for its residents is higher, in general the U.S. visitor to Canada did not find merchandise in Canada as attractive as merchandise in the United States is to the Canadian visitor. As a consequence, it was argued the low Canadian allowance did not, in the majority of cases, have great restrictive effect. This is not, of course, a satisfactory answer. Ambassador Butterworth was present at the meetings and he will continue to press the matter in Ottawa. We are tentatively planning the next session of the joint committee shortly after the first of the year. In the absence of any positive Canadian action between now and then, the subject will again be raised with the Canadians at this next session.

As I stated in my letter of August 28, we consider that the question of the tariff on bread should be taken up within the context of the Trade Expansion Act negotiations scheduled to take place next year. The specific subject of the bread tariff was therefore not considered in the September 20–21 meeting.

If I can be of any further assistance, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BALL,
Acting Secretary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. I am grateful to my friend from Vermont for allowing me to intervene.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me briefly, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICANS OF ITALIAN EXTRACTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the aspects of the so-called Valachi hearings before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations appears to be a feeling on the part of Americans of Italian extraction that it ought to be made very clear that there is no implication in these hearings which reflects upon them as a group in the United States. This feeling is understandable in view of the fact that the hearings have been replete with names of families of Italian extraction, which have been mentioned by the witness Valachi in describing the underworld criminal organization, organized in New York City and other cities in the country.

I am moved to make a statement on this subject by a telegram which I received today by a distinguished New Yorker, which typifies the situation. The telegram reads as follows:

> As president of the National Italian American Anti-Defamation League, I feel that the hearings currently being held and televised before the subcommittee of the Senate Permanent Committee on Investigations, of which you are a member, are giving to the public a grievously false image of the millions of law-abiding American citizens of Italian origin, thereby causing a great damage to them. We feel certain that such consequences are not intended to be wrought by the committee. It is our earnest desire to be as helpful as possible to the committee in obtaining its objectives. We believe it can be accomplished without further prejudice to the great body of American citizens of Italian origin. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to presenting our views as a public hearing of the committee through former Supreme Court Justice Ferdinand Pecora, and as chairman of advisory committee of our league.

The telegram is signed by Samuel DiFalco, who is one of our distinguished judges in New York, on the surrogate court of the county of New York. I know him well. I know the league. I know Judge Pecora.

I take the floor to assure those of Italian extraction in the United States—Italo-Americans, as they are often called—that I cannot see, for the life of me, how any American citizen in his right mind could for a moment associate these crime syndicates with the communities of those of Italian extraction in this country, with which we are so familiar.

I think New York City probably would qualify as a city as large as any city in Italy, in terms of population of those of Italian extraction. I know from firsthand experience that Italo-Americans in New York City are extraordinarily hard-working and gifted and have made contributions to the city in every conceivable field, in the sciences, in the arts, in banking, in government. One could not find a field to which rich contributions have not been made by them.

We are trying to get our hands, in terms of law, on the tentacles of the vast criminal conspiracies and organized crime syndicates. It is not blood that makes a criminal; it is society. I questioned New York Police Department Inspector Shanley, Police Commissioner Murphy of New York, and Police Commissioner Andrews of Detroit upon this very subject. In each case there was unqualified endorsement of what I have said—that there is no such thing as an unusual incidence of crime in communities composed of Americans of Italian extraction. The pattern of crime represents a distinct aberration from the normal; but there is not the remotest implication of unusual incidence or character or responsibility in the community of Americans who are of Italian extraction.

I shall ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] to hear Judge Pecora. I hope the Senator will grant that request. But whether he does or not—and I do not think it is essential—I think it is clear to all Americans that there is no question about the talents, the patriotism, the integrity and the participation in public affairs of those of Italian extraction in this country.

Let us remember that practically every one in this country, including the original settlers from the *Mayflower*, is of European origin. We are of the same boat, class, and quality.

The testimony I received from the police officials I have mentioned should underscore the unusually high regard and prestige enjoyed by the community of Americans of Italian extraction. That is testimony from officials of at least two cities, and I am sure it is generally the thinking everywhere in our great American cities.

I hope the National Italian American Anti-Defamation League gives to its members the most complete assurance, and through them, to the whole community of those of Italian extraction. I hope every American will understand clearly the great debt which our Nation owes to the Italian-American community of the United States, and the fact that, as is true of every other group of European racial origin, there is no disgrace to them from what has been said by Valachi at these hearings.

I close on the note of what was said by the police commissioners of New York and Detroit. They testified to the extraordinarily unusual devotion to duty and skill of police officials in their departments who are of Italian extraction. Both police commissioners, interestingly enough, had with them as their principal aides at the hearings high officials in their departments on whom they had placed great reliance, who happened to be of Italian extraction.

I hope the words I have uttered, together with the facts which are irrefutable, may be of some assurance to Italo-Americans who may feel deeply about these hearings.

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, I associate myself completely with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague. It would be a shame if because of the fact that Italian names have been brought into the crime hearings and that a man of Italian background was the principal witness, the whole Italian community should be smeared.

My colleague from New York has referred to individuals of Italian origin who have contributed much to our way of life. I think always, on Columbus Day, of that great figure in American life who served in the Congress of the United States and afterward became probably the greatest Mayor New York ever had, Fiorello H. La Guardia.

Fiorello La Guardia was a man of Italian origin, and he was proud of it. Few men in our entire history have made the contribution to the life of America that Mayor La Guardia did. That is typical of the contributions made by other Americans of Italian descent throughout our history in such fields as politics, labor, business, music, and the arts. If there is one principle that should be well established by our experience in this country it is that guilt is personal and that no group has a monopoly on either sin or virtue.

I express my appreciation for the fact that my colleague from New York has brought up this subject. I know that in his service on the committee, which he is rendering so valiantly, he will see to it, as he has assured the Senate today, that a great group of American citizens are not smeared because one of their number has been guilty, by his own admission, of some dastardly deeds.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I thank my colleague, especially for the mention of the name of Fiorello La Guardia, who is still referred to in New York, almost with reverence, as "The Mayor." I hesitate to say that he was the greatest, but——

Mr. **KEATING**. I said the greatest.

Mr. **JAVITS**. I believe the Senator is correct. It is difficult to assess the Mitchells, the Gaynors, and others who preceded him; but I believe that Fiorello was the greatest in modern times, and a great credit to people of Italian extraction. It was an excellent name to bring into the discussion today.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. **PROUTY**. Mr. President, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, which was agreed to yesterday, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 6143.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the amendment will not be stated, but will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

Strike out the Senate committee amendment and restore the House bill, reading as follows: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963'.

"Findings and declaration of policy

"Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds that the security and welfare of the United States require that this and future generations of American youth be assured ample opportunity for the fullest development of their intellectual capacities and that this opportunity will be jeopardized unless the Nation's colleges and universities are encouraged and assisted in their efforts to accommodate rapidly growing numbers of youth who aspire to a higher education. The Congress further finds and declares that these needs are so great and these steps so urgent that it is incumbent upon the Nation to take positive and immediate action to meet these needs through assistance to undergraduate and graduate institutions of higher education in providing classrooms and other academic facilities.

"TITLE I—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC FACILITIES

"Appropriations authorized

"Sec. 101. (a) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Commissioner') shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years a program of grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with this title.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $230,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1964, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

"(c) Sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

"Allotments to States

"Sec. 102. (a) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year (1) one-half shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such one-half as the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in such State bears to the total number of students enrolled in such institutions in all the States; and (2) the remaining one-half shall be allotted by him among the States so that the allotment to each State under this clause will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of students enrolled in grades nine to twelve (both inclusive) of schools in such State bears to the total number of students in such grades in schools in all the States. For the purposes of this subsection, (A) the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be equal to the sum of (i) the number of full-time students and (ii) the full-time equivalent of the number of part-time students as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations; and (B) determinations as to enrollment under either clause (1) or clause (2) of this subsection shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of data for the most recent year for which satisfactory data with respect to such enrollment are available to him.

"(b) The amount of each allotment to a State under this section shall be available, in accordance wtih the provisions of this title, for payment of the Federal share (as determined under sections 106(b)(3) and 401(d)) of the development cost of approved projects for the construction of academic facilities within such State by institutions of higher education. Sums allotted to a State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall remain available for reservation as provided in section 107 until the close of the next fiscal year, in addition to the sums allotted to such State for such next fiscal year.

"(c) All amounts allotted under this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year, which are not reserved as provided in section 107 by the close of the fiscal year for which they are allotted, shall be reallotted by the Commissioner among the States on the basis of such factors as he determines to be equitable and reasonable. Amounts reallotted under this subsection shall be available for reservation until the close of the fiscal year next succeeding the fiscal year for which they were originally allotted.

"State commissions and plans

"Sec. 103. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this title shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes) in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereinafter in this title referred to as the 'State commission'), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

"(1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

"(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 105, objective standards and methods (A) for determining the relative priorities of eligible projects for the construction of academic facilities submitted by institutions of higher education within the State, and (B) for determining the Federal share of the development cost of each such project (unless such plan provides for a uniform Federal share for all such projects);

"(3) provides that not less than 22 per centum of the funds allotted (or reallotted) for any year to the State will be available only for use for the construction of academic facilities for junior colleges and technical institutes;

"(4) provides (A) for assigning priorities solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods to eligible projects submitted to the State commission and deemed by it to be otherwise approvable under the provisions of this title; and (B) for approving and recommending to the Commissioner, in the order of such priority, applications covering such eligible projects, and for certifying to the Commissioner the Federal share, determined by the State commission under the State plan of the development cost of the project involved;

"(5) provides for affording to every applicant, which has submitted to the State commission a project, an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State commission as to the priority assigned to such project or as to any other determination of the State commission adversely affecting such applicant; and

"(6) provides (A) for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State commission under this title, and (B) for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this title.

For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'junior colleges and technical institutes' means institutions of higher education which are organized and administered principally to provide a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree or a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, and, if a branch of an institution of higher education offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to expend not exceeding $3,000,000 during the first fiscal year of the program under this title in such amounts as he may consider necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State plans approved under this title, including expenses which he determines were necessary for the preparation of such plans.

"Eligibility for grants

"Sec. 104. An institution of higher education shall be eligible for a grant for construction of an academic facility under this title only if such construction will, either alone or together with other construction to be undertaken within a reasonable time, (1) result in an urgently needed substantial expansion of the institution's student enrollment capacity, or (2) in the case of a new institution of higher education, result in creating needed enrollment capacity.

"Basic criteria for determining priorities and Federal share

"Sec. 105. (a) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which the provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining relative priorities of eligible construction projects, and the application of such standards and methods to such projects under such plans, shall be subject. Such basic criteria (1) shall be such as will best tend to achieve the objectives of this title while leaving opportunity and flexibility for the development of State plan standards and methods that will best accommodate the varied needs of institutions in the several States, and (2) shall give special consideration to expansion of undergraduate enrollment capacity. Subject to the foregoing requirements, such regulations may establish additional and appropriate basic criteria, including provision for considering the degree to which applicant institutions are effectively utilizing existing facilities, provision for allowing State plans to group or provide for grouping, in a reasonable manner, facilities or institutions according to functional or educational type for priority purposes, but, in view of the national objectives of this Act, in no event shall an institution's priority be adversely affected because of its readiness to admit out-of-State students.

"(b) The Commissioner shall further prescribe by regulation the basic criteria for determining the Federal share of the dedevelopment cost of any eligible project under this title with a State, to which criteria the applicable standards and methods set forth in the State plan for such State shall conform in the absence of a uniform statewide Federal share specified in or pursuant to such plan. The Federal share shall in no event exceed 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application approved under this title.

"(c) Section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to the prescription of regulations under this section, notwithstanding the provisions of clause (2) thereof.

"Applications for grants and conditions for approval

"Sec. 106. (a) Institutions of higher education which desire to obtain grants under this title shall submit applications therefor at such time or times and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, and such applications shall contain such information as may be required by or pursuant to regulation for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to make the determinations required to be made by him under this title.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application covering a project for construction of an academic facility and meeting the requirements prescribed pursuant to subsection (a) if—

"(1) the project is an eligible project as determined under section 104;

"(2) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission;

"(3) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, the Federal share of the development cost of the project, and sufficient funds to pay such Federal share are available from the applicable allotment of the State (including any applicable reallotment to the State);

"(4) the project has, pursuant to the State plan, been assigned a priority that is higher than that of all other projects within such State (chargeable to the same allotment) which meet all the requirements of this section (other than this clause) and for which Federal funds have not yet been reserved;

"(5) the Commissioner determines that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials; and

"(6) the Commissioner determines that (in addition to the assurance required by section 403 and such assurance as to title to the site as he may deem necessary) the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

"(A) that Federal funds received by the applicant will be used solely for defraying the development cost of the project covered by such application,

"(B) that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal portion of such cost and to provide for the effective use of the academic facility upon completion, and

"(C) that the facility will be used as an academic facility during at least the period of the Federal interest therein (as defined in section 404).

"(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"Amount of grant—payment

"SEC. 107. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this title, the Commissioner shall reserve from the applicable allotment (including any applicable reallotment) available therefor, the amount of such grant, which (subject to the limits of such allotment or reallotment) shall be equal to the Federal share (ascertain by him under section 106(b)(3)) of the development cost of the project covered by such application. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine. The Commissioner's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application covering such project or upon revision of the estimated development cost of a project with respect to which such reservation was made, and in the event of an upward revision of such estimated cost approved by him he may reserve the Federal share of the added cost only from the applicable allotment (or reallotment) available at the time of such approval.

"Administration of State plans

"SEC. 108. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this title, finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 103(a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 109. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 103(a) or with his final action under section 108(b), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"TITLE II—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GRADUATE ACADEMIC FACILITIES

"Appropriations authorized

"SEC. 201. In order to increase the supply of highly qualified personnel critically needed by the community, industry, government, research, and teaching, the Commissioner shall, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, make construction grants to assist institutions of higher education to improve existing graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers, and to assist in the establishment of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers of excellence. For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. Sums so appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall remain available for grants under this title until the end of the next succeeding fiscal year.

"Grants

"SEC. 202. (a) Grants under this title may be made to institutions of higher education and to cooperative graduate center boards to assist them to meet the development costs for projects for construction of academic facilities for graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers. Such grants may be made only upon application therefor at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner finds necessary to determine eligibility for the grants and the amounts thereof.

"(b) Grants under this title for construction of academic facilities may not exceed 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of any such construction project.

"(c) (1) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant under this title without the advice of the Advisory Committee established under section 203.

"(2) In determining whether to approve applications for grants under this title, the order in which to approve such applications, and the amount of the grants, the Commissioner shall give consideration to the extent to which such projects will contribute to achieving the objectives of this title and also the extent to which they will aid in attaining a wider distribution throughout the United States of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers.

"(d) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this title the total of the payments from the appropriations for any fiscal year under this title made with respect to projects in any State may not exceed an amount equal to 12½ per centum of such appropriation.

"Advisory Committee

"SEC. 203. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Graduate Education, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman; one representative from the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President; one from the National Science Foundation; and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Such appointed members shall be selected from leading authorities in the field of education, at least three of whom shall be from the field of the humanities, with at least one of these three from a graduate school of education.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner (1) on the action to be taken with regard to each application for a grant under this title, and (2) in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Advisory Committee may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out its functions.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee and special advisory and technical experts and consultants appointed pursuant to subsection (b) shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"TITLE III—LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES

"Lending authority

"SEC. 301. The Commissioner may, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make loans to institutions of higher education or to higher education building agencies for construction of academic facilities.

"Loan limit for any State

"SEC. 302. Not more than 12½ per centum of the funds provided for in this title in the form of loans shall be used for loans to institutions of higher education or higher education building agencies within any one State.

"Eligibility conditions, amounts, and terms of loans

"SEC. 303. (a) No loan pursuant to this title shall be made unless the Commissioner finds (1) that not less than one-fourth of the development cost of the facility will be financed from non-Federal sources, (2) that the applicant is unable to secure the amount of such loan from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this title, and (3) that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials.

"(b) A loan pursuant to this title shall be secured in such manner, and shall be repaid within such period not exceeding fifty years, as may be determined by the Commissioner; and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall not be less than a per annum rate that is one-quarter of 1 percentage point above the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the preceding fiscal year, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(c) The Commissioner shall, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, make loans to institutions of higher education for the construction of academic facilities in accordance with the provisions of this title. For the purpose of making loans under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year, for making such loans the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence for preceding fiscal years and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding years under such sentence.

"General provisions for loan program

"SEC. 304. (a) Such financial transactions of the Commissioner as the making of loans and vouchers approved by the Commissioner in connection with such financial transactions, except with respect to administrative expenses, shall be final and conclusive on all officers of the Government.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized (1) to prescribe a schedule of fees which, in his judgment, would be adequate in the aggregate to cover necessary expenses of making inspections (including audits) and providing representatives at the site of projects in connection with loans under this title, and (2) to condition the making of such loans on agreement by the applicant to pay such fees. For the purpose of providing such services, the Commissioner may, as authorized by section 402(b), utilize any agency, and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such applicant or from the Commissioner, and shall, if a Federal agency, credit such amounts to the appropriation or fund against which expenditures by such agency for such services have been charged.

"(c) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Commissioner may—

"(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this title;

"(2) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any district court of the United States, and such district courts shall have jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this title without regard to the amount in controversy, and any action instituted under this subsection by or against the Commissioner shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Commissioner or property under his control, and nothing herein shall be construed to except litigation arising out of activities under this title from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28 of the United States Code and of section 367 for the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316);

"(3) foreclose on any property or commence any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon him by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any property in connection with which he has made a loan pursuant to this title; and, in the event of any such acquisition (and notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States), complete, administer, remodel and convert, dispose of, lease, and otherwise deal with, such property: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive any State or political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under the State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

"(4) sell or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations upon such terms as he may fix;

"(5) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to the rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other term of any contract or agreement to which he is a party or which has been transferred to him pursuant to this section; and

"(6) include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other covenants, conditions, or provisions (including provisions designed to assure against the use of the facility, constructed with the aid of a loan under this title, for purposes described in section 401(a)(2)) as he may deem necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved.

"TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Definitions

"SEC. 401. As used in this Act—

"(a)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the term "academic facilities" means structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs of an institution of higher education, and maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities.

"(2) The term 'academic facilities' shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, (B) any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for athletic or recreational activities, other than for an academic course in physical education or where the Commissioner finds that the physical integration of such facilities with other academic facilities included under this Act is required to carry out the objectives of this Act, (C) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, (D) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity (For the purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'school or department of divinity' means an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.) or (E) any facility used or to be used by a school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health.

"(b)(1) The term 'construction' means (A) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of initial equipment therefor; (B) acquisition of existing structures not owned by the institution involved; (C) rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement (including the acquisition and installation of initial equipment, or modernization or replacement of built-in equipment) of existing structures; or (D) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

"(2) The term 'equipment' includes, in addition to machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as an academic facility, including necessary furniture, except books, curricular and program materials, and items of current operating expense such as fuel, supplies, and the like; the term 'initial equipment' means equipment acquired and installed in connection with construction as defined in paragraph (1) (A) or (B) of this subsection or, in cases referred to in paragraph (1)(C), equipment acquired and installed as part of the rehabilitation, alteration, conversion, or improvement of an existing structure which structure would otherwise not be adequate for use as an academic facility; and the terms 'equipment', 'initial equipment', and 'built-in equipment' shall be more particularly defined by the Commissioner by regulation.

"(c) The term 'development cost', with respect to an academic facility, means the amount found by the Commissioner to be the cost, to the applicant for a grant or loan under this Act, of the construction involved and the cost of necessary acquisition of the land on which the facility is located and of necessary site improvements to permit its use for such facility, but excluding any cost incurred before, or under a contract entered into before, the enactment of this Act. There shall further be excluded from the development cost—

"(1) in determining the amount of any grant under title I or II of this Act, an amount equal to the sum of (A) any Federal grant which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this Act, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a grant under title I or II of this Act, and (B) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant; and

"(2) in determining the amount of any loan under title III of this Act, an amount equal to the amount of any Federal financial assistance which the institution has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, under any law other than this Act, with respect to the construction that is to be financed with the aid of a loan under title III of this Act.

"(d) The term 'Federal share' means a percentage (as determined under the applicable State plan) not in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of a project covered by an application for a grant for the construction of an academic facility under title I of this Act.

"(e) The term 'higher education building agency' means (1) an agency, public authority, or other instrumentality of a State authorized to provide, or finance the construction of, academic facilities for institutions of higher education (whether or not also authorized to provide or finance other facilities for such or other educational institutions, or for their students or faculty), or (2) any corporation (no part of the net earnings of which inures or may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual) (A) established by an institution of higher education for the sole purpose of providing academic facilities for the use of such institution, and (B) upon dissolution of which all title to any property purchased or built from the proceeds of any loan made under title III of this Act will pass to such institution.

"(f) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State which—

"(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

"(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

"(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;

"(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

"(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however*, That in the case of an institution offering a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, if the Commissioner determines there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such institutions, he shall, under section 402(c), appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by such institutions, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify such institutions for assistance under this Act and shall also determine whether particular institutions meet such standards: *Provided, however,* That the requirements of this paragraph (5) shall be deemed to be satisfied in the case of an institution applying for assistance under this Act, if the Commissioner determines that there is satisfactory assurance that upon completion of the project for which such assistance is requested, or upon completion of that project and others under construction or planned and to be commenced within a reasonable time, the institution will meet such requirements. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

"(g) The term 'cooperative graduate center' means an institution or program created by two or more institutions of higher education which will offer to the students of the participating institutions of higher education graduate work which could not be offered with the same proficiency and/or economy at the individual institution of higher education. The center may be located or the program carried out on the campus of any of the participating institutions or at a separate location.

"(h) The term 'cooperative graduate center board' means a duly constituted board established to construct and maintain the cooperative graduate center and coordinate academic programs. The board shall be composed of representatives of each of the higher education institutions participating in the center and of the community involved. At least one-third of the board's members shall be community representatives. The board shall elect by a majority vote a chairman from among its membership.

"(i) The term 'high school' does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

"(j) The term 'nonprofit educational institution' means an educational institution owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(k) The term 'public educational institution' does not include a school or institution of any agency of the United States.

"(l) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"Federal administration

"SEC. 402. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act for which he is responsible, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

"(c) The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, may appoint one or more advisory committees to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to the administration of any of his functions under title I or III of this Act. Members of any such committee, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant or loan under this Act except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such grant or loan will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5), and will receive overtime compensation in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87–581); but, in the case of any nonprofit educational institution, the Commissioner may waive the application of this subsection in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the Commissioner determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the educational institution undertaking the construction.

"(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Recovery of payments

"SEC. 404. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that, if a facility constructed with the aid of a grant or grants under title I or II of this Act is used as an academic facility for twenty years following completion of such construction, the public benefit accruing to the United States from such use will equal or exceed in value the amount of such grant or grants. The period of twenty years after completion of such construction shall therefore be deemed to be the period of Federal interest in such facility for the purposes of this Act.

"(b) If, within twenty years after completion of construction of an academic facility which has been constructed in part with a grant or grants under title I or II of this Act—

"(1) the applicant (or its successor in title or possession) ceases or fails to be a public or nonprofit institution, or

"(2) the facility ceases to be used as an academic facility, or the facility is used as a facility excluded from the term 'academic facility' by section 401(a)(2), the United States shall be entitled to recover from such applicant (or successor) an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal grant or grants bore to the development cost of the facility financed with the aid of such grant or grants. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated.

"Method of payment

"SEC. 405. Payments under this Act to any State or Federal agency, institution of higher education, or any other organization, pursuant to a grant or loan, may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with respect to grants or loans with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Administrative appropriations authorized

"SEC. 406. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

"Federal control not authorized

"SEC. 407. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States, shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over or prescribe any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution with respect to which any funds have been made available or expended pursuant to this Act.

"Strike out the amendment to the title."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment which I am offering comprises the language of H.R. 6143, exactly as it passed the House. My reason for doing so is that I feel very keenly the need for a higher education program at this session of Congress. I am convinced that the only certain way to get a bill passed this year is for the Senate to approve my amendment without amendment. In that way, within a few days we can have a higher education law. I am sure that if my amendment is adopted, the bill will be signed by the President.

In the world of today, one thing is certain. The nation that fritters away the talents of its young boys and girls is the nation that will lose its every chance for eminence, and perhaps even survival.

The doctor that never will be, the scientist that never gets to the test tube, the teacher that never reaches the classroom, are tragedies that neither time nor regret can ever erase.

Let us not be the race of people that looks back and thinks of what might have been.

I believe, and I hope all of you will believe, that ultimately knowledge and love will conquer ignorance and hate, and that only those who make the most of mankind will receive the full embrace of tomorrow.

Make the most of mankind—let that be our goal. Let that be our determination. Let that be our unswerving resolve.

And let us begin by opening the doors of education—higher education—that are now beginning to close, leaving young America on the threshold.

College enrollment for the academic year of 1962 was nearly 4.2 million, a 17-percent increase over 1960. By 1965 it is said that the figure will have increased 46 percent over 1960.

The pressure will not stop there. By 1970 the number in college institutions will increase to 7 million, or a growth of nearly 100 percent in a 10-year period.

The enrollment increase is not something that will go away if we shut our eyes and fold our hands. It is a fact, and a fact that must be faced.

For the first time in history, American college presidents are placed in a position where they must tell hundreds, indeed thousands, of young men and women: "Go away, we have no room for you."

We can open the gates of knowledge for these young people, but we cannot do it without spending more money.

To replace obsolete structures and to modernize usable buildings, higher education needs to invest an average of $2.3 billion annually. From all sources, public and private, we are now spending only $1.3 billion annually for plant expansion.

Many college buildings are in deplorable shape. Indeed, it is said that structures donated by the Federal Government for temporary use after World War II make up 10 percent of all the facilities currently in use on college and university campuses.

The American Council on Education said that the crisis long predicted in the capacity of our institutions to meet the demands upon them is no longer something that will happen in the future. It is a thing of the present. It is here and now.

Institutions of higher learning are now at desperation point. They have hiked tuition and fees 75 percent in the last 10 years, and with this increased revenue they still must say to young men and women: "Go away, we haven't any room."

Since there is a timelag of about 2 years between the contracting of an academic building and its construction for school use, the need for swift and decisive action is doubly important.

It is too bad that we did not act favorably in 1958 following the recommendations of President Eisenhower. It is sad, too, that we were unable to enact the bill passed by the House last year. Colleges need at least 24 months to plan and construct their facilities. So we are able to give aid which will not be truly effective until 1965. Nevertheless the aid must be given because by that time we will have between five and six million students in our institutions of higher learning.

We come now to the question: What kind of aid should be extended for higher education?

Two years ago President Kennedy recommended a weak bill calling for loans to construct academic facilities.

At least two-thirds of the States have forbidden public institutions—or make it difficult for these institutions—to borrow money for nonrevenue producing facilities. Private institutions are in an even worse position. They would have to raise tuition sky high to handle great building indebtedness.

While loans can be useful in some instances, Federal construction grants are absolutely essential for both public and private colleges.

In the eastern part of the United States, nearly 80 percent of the students in higher education go to private colleges and universities, and about 20 percent go to public institutions. In the Nation as a whole, 35 percent of the institutions of higher learning are public and 65 percent are private.

We can thank heaven that our private institutions have been able thus far to perform a significant part of our educational task. If they fail to keep pace with the demands imposed upon them, a tremendous burden will fall upon public colleges and universities.

What is needed is a Federal program to assist in the construction of college classrooms—a combination program of flat grants and loans to both public and private colleges and universities.

Last year the House of Representatives approved such a program and the Senate approved a weak construction loan measure. After weeks of debate, the Senate-House conference reported a bill permitting grants for only a few types of classrooms and the bill failed of enactment in the House.

We have lost 1 valuable year and we have but a few weeks left to adopt a higher education program.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee is asking the Senate to approve a proposal that closely resembles the education bill that went down to defeat last year. I feel that this could be a serious mistake.

The House of Representatives has again approved a flat grant and loan program, and if the Senate votes to accept that program, we can have a higher education law in a matters of hours.

If, on the other hand, we want to gamble with the future of young America and try, as we did last year, to go through the conference route again, we may end up with nothing.

On August 26, the American Council on Education asked all of its member institutions and organizations to communicate with their Senators to urge prompt and favorable action on H.R. 6143 as passed by the House.

I have received hundreds of telegrams from the colleges and universities of this country expressing a preference for the House bill. This preference does not stem solely from the practical aspects of the legislative situation. It springs as well from the desire of college educators to maintain complete freedom of planning and programing for their institutions. They do not want to fashion their education programs to accord with some Federal directive. They want to tailor those programs to meet the needs as they see them.

The Senate committee would have the Federal Government aid in the construction of classrooms only if the classrooms were used for the sciences and engineering.

In following such an approach, do we not run the risk of directing educational endeavor into a narrow canal advancing a few disciplines at the expense of all others? And for what reason?

Is it not patently absurd to say that it is unconstitutional to aid in the construction of history classrooms but constitutional to aid in the construction of science classrooms at a private college or university?

Those who favor grants only for the building of science and engineering classrooms say that such aid is constitutional because the subject matter has a relationship to national defense.

Mr. President, I know of no single person who was excluded from the armed services because of an inadequate foundation in science and engineering.

But I can point to thousands of persons who were barred from the service because they did not know how to read and write the English language.

A grant for the construction of classrooms at a private church-related college is either constitutional or it is not and the law draws no legal distinction between science and history, between engineering and English.

Among the 2,000 or so institutions of higher education, about 1,300 are private schools; 512 are nondenominational, 475 Protestants, 308 Roman Catholic, and 24 are of other denominations.

Even with all the private and public college classrooms, there will not be room for the youngsters who are coming along unless we aid our institutions of higher learning, both private and public.

Let us not send the word out to the country that we will help these institutions only if they build a certain type of classroom.

They have done a wonderful job of educating our young men and women, and if they need some English classrooms, let us not tell them to wait 10 years until they need a science building.

Do we want scientists in our laboratories but not teachers in our schools? Do we want engineers and not writers?

Do we advance the mathematician and discourage the historian? It seems to me we are doing all of these things when we give some disciplines preference over others.

We need the scientist, we need the engineer, we need the English teacher, we need the historian, we need the advancement of all disciplines, in this the most complex era of all time.

When we neglect the arts and the humanities, we jeopardize the values by which we should guide this new world, keep its politics free, its laws just, and insure charity in its common life.

Mr. President, a vote for the House-passed higher education bill without amendment is a vote that will mean a higher education law within a matter of hours.

A vote for the committee reported bill means an uncertain future for higher education because if it is passed we may end up with no bill at all.

That this situation is clearly recognized by the colleges and universities of America is unmistakably evidenced by the wires and letters that are pouring into my office. They are coming from all types of institutions of higher learning and I shall read a number of them into the Record for the benefit of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of them be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President the first telegram is from the University of Hawaii, and is as follows:

Senator Winston Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly recommend you retain House-passed version of higher education bill. Senate version less helpful because of restrictions on construction and duplication of existing Federal aid programs. Desperately need help immediately. We are fearful that Senate-House conference will mean no higher education legislation this year.

Thomas Hamilton,
University of Hawaii.

The next telegram reads as follows:

Cleveland, Ohio.
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

In acknowledgment of your telegram of October 9, I heartily support your proposal to ask Senate to pass House higher education bill rather than to approve Senate committee bill. I am wiring Ohio Senators to this effect.

John S. Millis,
President, Western Reserve University.

Incidentally, Dr. Millis is a former president of the University of Vermont. I continue to read:

Wellesley Hills, Mass.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree that H.R. 6143 as passed by House is a better bill, and amendment by Senate will decrease chance of higher education legislation this year.

Henry A. Kriebel,
President, Babson Institute Wellesley Hills, Mass.

Milwaukee, Wis.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Wholeheartedly support your proposal. Have so informed our Senators as follows: "Strongly urge your support of Senator Prouty's amendment to substitute House-passed higher education bill (H.R. 1643) for Senate committee bill. Senate committee bill is so restrictive that few private institutions will benefit from it. Morse bill would create even greater imbalance between public and private higher education. Would also create an ever greater imbalance between sciences and the humanities." Our gratitude to you.

Sincerely,

William Kelley, S.J.,
President, Marquette University.

Fort Worth, Tex.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

We do want a higher education bill this year. We would prefer House version or any bill which does not restrict grants to certain types of construction. A case can be made, however, for the special urgency of science, engineering, and library construction, and we would find this bill reasonably satisfactory. Letters on this matter were sent yesterday to Senators Tower and Yarborough.

Thank you for your concern.

J. M. Moudy,
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Texas Christian University.

Notre Dame, Ind.,
October 11, 1963.

Hon. Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I fully support your proposal to have Senate approve House education bill. I shall wire our Senators likewise. Many thanks.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburg,
President, University of Notre Dame.

Butte, Mont.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate Building, Washington, D.C.:

Re Senator Prouty's wire this date. House passed bill on higher education is preferable to Senate committee bill.

E. G. Koch,
President, Montana School Mines.

Rapid City, S. Dak.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

This message is going to Senators Prouty, Mundt, and McGovern in response to Senator Prouty's telegram, if we are to have a higher education, academic facilities bill, I favor the House-approved version. The need for facilities is not limited to science, engineering, and libraries. National need is for well-educated people. My experience indicates that they are as scarce in English or the humanities as in science and engineering. I suggest you consider these facts in deciding where to put your support.

F. L. Partlo,
President, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.

Galesburg, Ill.,
October 10, 1963.

U.S. Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse position you are taking with reference to higher education bill.

Sharvy G. Umbeck,
President, Knox College.

Los Angeles, Calif.,
October 10, 1963.

W. L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly favor House bill. Senate committee bill too restrictive. Nonscience higher education vital to Nation's life.

Arthur G. Coons,
Occidental College.

Norman, Okla.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Agree with your position. Urge your support House-passed higher education bill.

G. L. Cross,
President, University of Oklahoma.

Columbus, Ohio,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

I am in full support of Prouty request that Senate approve H.R. 6143 as approved by House. Changes suggested by Senate committee would appear to lead to failure of passage of this needed legislation this year.

Novice G. Fawcett,
President, Ohio State University.

Carbondale, Ill.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge approval of House-passed higher education bill and recommend you proceed with proposed action. Mentioned in your wire, passage this year vital to the continuing progress of higher education and the ever-increasing numbers seeking educational opportunities.

Delyte W. Morris,
President, Southern Illinois University.

Hamilton, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree that Senate should be urged to pass House version of H.R. 6143. Not only is it in my judgment better bill than more restrictive Senate version, but its passage seems more likely to result in adoption of legislation this session. Either bill would be helpful, but adoption one of these urgent. Both in substance and in terms of hope for legislation this session House version of H.R. 6143 seems preferable. I urge your vote in its support.

Vincent M. Barnett, Jr.,
President, Colgate University.

Athens, Tenn.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Tennessee Wesleyan College and I believe all higher education would be served better if Senate were to pass House of Representatives version of educational facilities bill. Most urgent need is assistance for undergraduate education. While Tennessee Wesleyan College is most immediately interested in science building construction, we would prefer to see no restrictions on type of undergraduate facilities assisted by this legislation.

Roy B. Shilling, Jr.,
Assistant to the President, Tennessee Wesleyan College
(For President Mohney in his absence from the country).

South Orange, N.J.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Deeply appreciate your telegram wired New Jersey Senators urging passage of higher education bill as it came from House of Representatives.

Msgr. Edward Fleming,
Executive Vice President, Seton Hall University.

New London, Conn.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily approve your choice of the House bill to aid higher education over the Senate bill. Latter takes a shortsighted view of the American college and intellectual tradition. This woman's college of 1,400, stands in need of a new academic building devoted to the social sciences in which field American women, including graduate of Connecticut College, have offered intelligent leadership for a half a century. Our future plans would be frustrated by loss of House bill. Good luck.

Charles Shain,
President, Connecticut College.

Waterville, Maine,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Colby College strongly urges you to support passage higher education facilities bill. H.R. 6143 preferable to Senate committee version limiting purposes of construction.

Robert E. L. Strider,
President, Colby College.

Vincennes, Ind.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Certainly agree with your approval of H.R. 6143 without amendment. It is much more realistic in facing the needs of higher education than to limit grants only for construction of science, engineering, and library buildings.

Isaac K. Beckes,
President, Vincennes University.

Auburn, Ala.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Re telegram we have recently expressed our view favoring H.R. 6143 to Senators Hill and Sparkman. In past 6 years Auburn University has spent $12 million in State funds for science and mathematics facilities and a library, while we have some continuing needs in engineering and veterinary medicine. Our greatest need is for general classroom facilities for other areas. No educational program in the sciences or engineering is complete without supporting nonscientific disciplines. We favor the provisions of the House bill to those of the Senate committee bill.

Ralph B. Draughon,
President, Auburn University.

East Orange, N.J.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I respectfully request that an effort be made by you to obtain Senate approval of higher education bill as passed by House of Representatives—H.R. 6143. Favorable Senate action on the House bill will avoid delay of a Senate-House conference.

Evald B. Lawson,
President, Upsala College.

Chattanooga, Tenn.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I favor passage of legislation by the Senate, during 1963, which will provide desperately needed resources for education. I am committed to local support and Chattanooga has been most generous in support of the University of Chattanooga, a private institution, but tomorrow's needs are beyond local resources to meet. I commend your leadership in urging resources be made available to meet national needs in education.

Leroy A. Martin,
President, University of Chattanooga.

Cleveland, Ohio,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for telegram. We heartily endorse your recommendation, House version, H.R. 6143.

Sister Mary Inez, SND.,
President, Notre Dame College.

Chester, Pa., *October 10, 1963.*

Senator Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Pennsylvania Military College urges the Senate of the United States to pass the House-passed version of the higher education bill. Your support will prove beneficial to all of higher education.

C. Moll,
President, Pennsylvania Military College.

Charlotte, N.C., *October 10, 1963.*

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge substitution higher education bill H.R. 6143 passed by the House in place of bill recommended by the Senate committee. Overconcentration on science and engineering tends a weakness in American higher education. This is the mistake the Soviet Union has made.

Edwin P. Walker,
President, Queens College.

Alfred, N.Y., *October 10, 1963.*

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Approval of H.R. 6143 by Senate without modification is imperative. This bill designed to give colleges and universities kind of assistance most needed as they prepare to provide college opportunities for rapidly increasing numbers of youth. One of most important bills before Congress in this session. Urge your strong support of this bill.

M. Ellis Drake,
President of Alfred University.

Allegany, N.Y., *October 10, 1963.*

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your telegram. We, too, favor the House-passed bill in lieu of Senate committee bill. I had already contacted our two Senators. Best wishes.

Francis W. Kearney, O.F.M.,
President, St. Bonaventure University.

Kingston, R.I.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your attempt to secure Senate approval of the House-approved version H.R. 6143 in lieu of Senate version. Agree that necessity of a Senate-House conference which would result from passage of the Senate bill, might jeopardize ultimate action on an education facilities bill this year. Would stress strongly that we need passage of a facilities bill as soon as possible.

E. W. Hartung,
Provost, University of Rhode Island.

Tallahassee, Fla.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

I favor House bill for flat grants for university construction, rather than Senate committee restriction. Have previously notified our Senators.

J. Wayne Reitz,
President, University of Florida,
Gainesville, Fla.

Knoxville, Tenn.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to approve and support House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction of education facilities.

James A. Colston,
President, Knoxville College.

Middlebury, Vt.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

My deposition to concur your judgment to favor House-passed higher education bill. As new president, absorbed in affairs Middlebury College, do not have sufficient command of pros and cons to voice strong conviction on differences between House and Senate bill.

James I. Armstrong,
President.

Johnson, Vt.,
October 10, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your support of higher education facilities bill. Prefer House version.

Odino A. Martinett,
President, Johnson State Teachers College.

Plainfield, Vt.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

I agree with you regarding higher education bill. Please refer to my letter, September 2.

Royce S. Pitkin,
President, Goddard College.

Poultney, Vt.,
October 10, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Completely endorsed your stand on higher education bill. Thank you for keeping me informed.

Raymond A. Whithey,
President, Green Mountain College.

Bennington, Vt.,
October 10, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I am fully in agreement with your position and conclusions. May I add my appreciation of your concern for education and my personal regards.

W. C. Fels,
President, Bennington College.

Fullerton, Calif.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge approval by Senate of House-passed higher education bill, rather than Senate committee version, which is much less satisfactory to the best interests of higher education.

W. B. Langsdorf,
President, Orange State College.

Boston, Mass.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

While I am in favor of the House version of a higher education bill, I do not feel any action should be taken which would jeopardize the passage of a higher education bill this year. Certainly the Senate bill would meet my approval if circumstances were right.

President,
Conner Wheelock College.

University Park, N. Mex.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your support of higher education facilities bill. Need results badly. Prefer House version, but will support what gets results, thanks.

R. B. Corbett,
President, New Mexico State University.

Roswell, N. Mex.,
October 11, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

Replying your telegram October 9 requesting views on construction features of House and Senate committee versions of higher education bill, I concur that flexibility allowed by House bill is the more desirable.

Concur also, that delay possibly resulting from Senate-House conference and leading to failure to pass any bill this session of Congress, would be most unfortunate.

Maj. Gen. Sam W. Agee,
Superintendent, New Mexico Military Institute.

Kansas City, Mo.,
October 11, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your wire. Strongly agree that course you suggest is most practical and prudent. Am notifying Senators Long and Symington.

Very Rev. Maurice E. Vanackeren, S.J.,
President, Rockhurst College.

St. Paul, Minn.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request Senate approve House-passed higher education bill in lieu of Senate committee bill.

Rev. Msgr. James P. Shannon,
College of St. Thomas.

Convent Station, N.J.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Urge acceptance of H.R. 6143 without modification by the Senate. Legislation is needed by the colleges at this time.

Sister Hildegard Marie,
President, College of St. Elizabeth.

Grand Rapids, Mich.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

I heartily endorse the higher education bill as passed by the House.

W. Spoelhof,
Calvin College.

Fond Du Lac, Wis.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston Prouty,
Senator from Vermont, Washington, D.C.:

Faculty and administrators of Marian College appreciate your plan for expediting passage of higher education bill.

Sister Fidelis,
President.

Castleton, Vt.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty:

I heartily endorse your intention to ask the Senate to approve the House-passed higher education bill.

Richard J. Dundaf,
President, Castleton State College.

Beaver Falls, Pa.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I agree that House-passed higher education bill is preferable to Senate committee bill. However, either will be most helpful if not unduly restrictive concerning church colleges. We are grateful for your interest in this matter and would appreciate your informing the two Senators from Pennsylvania.

Edwin C. Clark,
President, Geneva College.

Bridgeport, Conn.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge support of House-passed higher education bill, so that some favorable legislative action for college facilities will be approved this year.

James H. Halsey,
Chancellor, University of Bridgeport.

Fairbanks, Alaska,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Urgent necessity for maximum Federal support for higher education facilities required immediate action on House version facilities legislation. Senate version providing categorical grants excellent if immediate passage by House and Senate could be assured. With a 25-percent increase in high school graduates facing the Nation next June and with the exceedingly grave problem arising on employment of youth upon us, failure to pass academic facilities bill now would invite national disaster. Nationally and internationally, we are beyond the point of return to the good old days when higher education could be left to survive on its own.

William R. Wood,
President, University of Alaska.

Tacoma, Wash.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

I endorse your proposal to ask the Senate to approve House-passed higher education bill.

Robert Nortvedt,
President, Pacific Lutheran University.

St. Marys College, Calif.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C:

I encourage the passage of House passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction. This is the best possibility.

Brother T. Michael,
President, St. Marys College.

Mr. President, I said earlier that grants to private institutions of higher learning are either constitutional or they are not.

They are not made constitutional simply by calling them grants related to the national defense.

The real test is whether the grants are or are not related to the teaching of religious subjects.

If grants were made constitutional simply because they had a relationship to national defense why then it would be theoretically possible to build theological schools on the ground that the military services need more chaplains.

The Federal Government is presently and has been for decades making available substantial grants running into hundreds of millions of dollars to both public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education. One of the more recent programs dealing with the transfers of real properties to denominational-sponsored organizations for health and education uses has given aid to some 524 denominational institutions. Two hundred and six grants were made under this program to Catholic institutions and 318 to Protestant and Jewish institutions. The value of the properties transferred is approximately $13.5 million.

I do not think that anyone would seriously contend that the real property which was transferred to colleges, both public and private, was transferred with defense objectives in mind. It was transferred to promote the further development of education in institutions of higher learning.

We can go back to the beginning of this country when George Washington submitted his recommendations to the Congress on January 8, 1790, and we find in that message the concept I advance today that grants to aid higher education may be made to both public and private colleges for the arts as well as the sciences.

In his message, President Washington said:

> Nor am I less persuaded that you will agree with me in opinion that there is nothing which can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. * * * Whether this desirable object will be best promoted by affording aids to seminaries of learning already established, by the institution of a national university, or by any other expedients will be well worthy of a place in the deliberations of the Legislature.

The fact that these two paragraphs comprised 20 percent of the address gives some clue to Washington's feelings about the relative importance of such a program.

The seminaries, or colleges and universities as they are now known, to which President Washington referred were church-controlled, or church-related, colleges then and included even Georgetown, which was founded the year before this message.

THE IMPACT OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION UPON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

In 1961 at the request of congressional committees the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prepared for these committees a brief on the impact of the first amendment to the Constitution upon Federal aid to education. The brief was prepared by Alanson W. Willcox, General Counsel of the Department.

This administration memorandum draws a clear distinction between elementary and college education primarily on the basis that elementary education is compulsory while higher education is voluntary. It is said in the memorandum that the college student who selects an institution where religious instruction is mandatory "is merely asserting his constitutional right to the free exercise thereof."

In addition, the brief brings to focus the fact that at the college and graduate levels public institutions alone "could not begin to cope" with the difficulties involved. Consequently it concludes that "to the extent that Congress finds it appropriate to encourage the expansion of our university and college facilities, Congress must be free to build upon what we have, the private as well as the public institutions."

I shall read now the pertinent excerpts from the HEW memorandum which relate to Federal aid to private colleges:

> The constitutional principles involved are obviously the same whether the subject is elementary and secondary school education or higher education, but the factual circumstances surrounding the application of the principles are dramatically different. The reasons are largely historical.
>
> The history of education in the United States at the grammar and high school

level is largely one of free public schools. While private institutions exist and cannot be constitutionally prohibited, the fact of the matter is that some 85 percent of the children in the United States are educated in public schools. The reason for this historically lies both in the public policy perceived in educating children and in the implementation of that policy by making education at the lower levels compulsory. In order to compel the education of children, States were obliged to provide a system of education which was open to all. In addition, it was prohibited to the States to teach religion or to give a religious education in such schools. Whatever other courses might have, in theory or even in fact, been possible, the States chose to implement their policy by a system of free public schools.

The history of college and university education is almost precisely the opposite. While from a relatively early date the Federal and some State governments subsidized State universities and colleges, the bulk of advanced education has until recently been carried on by private institutions, the majority of which have a religious origin.

Primary schooling has long been accepted as essential for every American child, and secondary education is rapidly becoming recognized as almost equally a necessity. Attendance at a university or college, on the other hand, has always been a matter of individual decision, dictated or influenced by the circumstances and preferences of the individual child and his family. Even today fewer than half of the high school graduates enter college on a full-time basis, and of these 41 percent are students in nonpublic institutions.[1]

Reflecting these differences in history and practice, State laws everywhere require school attendance of all children for a substantial period of years, whereas, needless to say, there is no corresponding requirement at the college level. Those children whose parents so elect may satisfy the compulsory attendance laws by attendance at private schools, but they are still subject to compulsion once that election has been made. The election can be reversed if the parents wish to do so—if not immediately, then at the start of the next school term or year—but while the election stands, the child is not absolved from enforced attendance at classes, secular or sectarian as the case may be.

The position of the college student is very different. His attendance is wholly voluntary, not merely a choice between alternative commands of the State. He is mature enough, moreover, to have made the decision to attend college and to select the institution best suited to his career objectives, or at least to have participated intelligently in those decisions. Furthermore, he can better understand the significance of sectarian as compared to secular teaching. At some sectarian institutions he is not required to study religion, but, if he chooses to do so, or chooses an institution where religious instruction is mandatory, he is merely asserting his constitutional right to the free exercise thereof.

There are thus important differences between school and college, not only in terms of history and tradition but also in terms of the compulsory nature of attendance. There are differences, too, from the standpoint of the national interest involved. At the college and graduate levels the public institutions alone could not begin to cope with the number of young men and women already in pursuit of higher education, and expansion of these institutions or the creation of new ones sufficient to meet the expected increase of enrollment is out of the question. The effort which it is agreed must now be made in the field of higher education would, if confined to public institutions, force an ever more intensive selection of students and ever more concentrated effort to guide them into fields of study deemed important to the national defense and welfare. It would likely induce these institutions to overemphasize particular fields of study to the detriment of a balanced curriculum. Such warping of our educational policies is not to be contemplated lightly, and, to the extent that Congress finds it appropriate to encourage expansion of our university and college facilities, Congress must be free to build upon what we have, the private as well as the public institutions.

All these considerations indicate that aid to higher education is less likely to encounter constitutional difficulty than aid to primary and secondary schools. The same considerations apply even more forcefully to graduate and specialized education.

Governmental assistance directly to colleges for the construction and expansion of academic facilities perhaps raises, in the case of sectarian institutions, a closer constitutional question than scholarships. Fundamentally the distinction between assistance to sectarian colleges and assistance to sectarian elementary and high schools rests upon differences between the educational system which exists in the United States at the college and graduate school level and the predominantly free public educational system at the elementary and secondary school level. These differences create importantly different factual circumstances against which the criteria previously discussed must be considered to determine the constitutional question.

We are not, at the college level, dealing with a system of universal, free, compulsory education available to all students. The process is more selective, the education more specialized, and the role of private institutions vastly more important. There are obvious limitations upon what the Government can hope to accomplish by way of expanding public or other secular educational facilities. If the public purpose is to be achieved at all, it can only be achieved by a general expansion of private as well as public colleges, of sectarian as well as secular ones.

Loans for construction of facilities may be less constitutionally vulnerable than grants for the same purposes. But this distinction is not here the only one or perhaps even the crucial one. More important are the distinctive factors present in American higher education: the fact that the connection between religion and education is less apparent and that religious indoctrination is less pervasive in a sectarian college curriculum; the fact that free public education is not available to all qualified college students; the desirability of maintaining the widest possible choice of colleges in terms of the student's educational needs in a situation no longer limited by the necessity of attending schools located close to home; the extent to which particular skills can be imparted only by a relatively few institutions; the disastrous national consequences in terms of improving educational standards which could result from exclusion of, or discrimination against, certain private institutions on grounds of religious connection; and the fact that, unlike schools, the collegiate enrollment does not have the power of State compulsion supporting it.

LAND-GRANT FUNDS FOR CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOLS

Mr. President, one of the greatest programs ever passed by the Congress of the United States was the program to aid land-grant colleges.

Under this program, both public and private church-related colleges received assistance and no one ever argued that the assistance was valid and constitutional because it had defense objectives.

I shall proceed now to examine the background of some of the colleges and universities that received land-grant funds notwithstanding their religious connection.

THE STATUS OF BROWN UNIVERSITY AS SECTARIAN WHEN RECEIVING LAND-GRANT FUNDS

Brown was specified to be "nonsectarian" in its charter and at the same time to have all of its trustees and Fellows to be Christian and predominently Baptist. Brown underwent no change on this during the period in which it received land-grant funds. This is observed from the following:

In the original charter of February 1764, it is stated that there shall be no religious tests in the institution and that "sectarian differences of opinion shall not make any part of the public and classical instruction."

It is also provided that of 36 trustees, 22 shall forever be of the "Baptist" or "Antipaedobaptist" denomination; 5 shall be Quakers, 5 Episcopalians, and 4 Congregationalists. Of 12 Fellows, 8 shall be forever Baptists and the others chosen indifferently from the other denominations cited for trustees. Vacancies shall always be filled to keep these ratios.

This original charter was unchanged through all of the period in which Brown received land-grant funds. This is indicated by the "Final Report of the Committee Appointed to Consider Changes in the Charter," of June 16, 1910.

OTHER PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES RECEIVING LAND-GRANT FUNDS, WITH REFERENCES TO RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION

Yale University: Yale University received land-grant funds for its Sheffield Scientific School, from 1863–93.

Yale was chartered in 1791 with an intent to uphold and propagate "the Christian Protestant religion." The trustees, not to exceed 11 or be less than 7, were all to be "ministers of the gospel."

The Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University was designated by an act of the State of Connecticut in 1871, and confirmed by the general assembly in 1882, section 3, to have its board of trustees as follows: Of a total of 9, 3 were to be composed of the Governor of the State, the president of Yale and the chairman of the board of trustees of the Peabody Museum of Natural History; at least 3 others were to be from present or past members of the faculty of the Sheffield Scientific School; and the rest chosen from any interested in the welfare of the school and "without regard to ecclesiastical preference".

Rutgers University: Rutgers operated on an original charter given to Queens College and provided for education in "true religion", "useful learning" and to create an "able and learned Protestant ministry" under the disciplines of the Synod of Dort of 1618–19. The charter provided that the president of the college should always be a member of the Dutch Reformed Church.

---

[1] The U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, estimates that of those who graduate from high school 43 percent enter college on a full-time basis and 10 percent on a part-time basis. Of those who do enter, approximately 60 percent eventually graduate.

A statement from the Report of the President of 1920–21, refers to the adoption in final form on October 29, 1920, of amendments to the charter designed for the "elimination of the requirement of the denominational connection of the president and some other phrases in the original document of virtually obsolete meaning."

Dartmouth College: The State of New Hampshire designed Dartmouth to receive land-grant funds from 1866 to 1892.

An act of the State of New Hampshire of June 18, 1816, to amend, enlarge, and improve the corporation of Dartmouth College specifies in section 9 "that perfect freedom of religious opinion shall be enjoyed by all officers and students of the university."

STATE UNIVERSITIES OR COLLEGES RECEIVING LAND-GRANT FUNDS AND HAVING HAD A RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER COLLEGES OF CHURCH AFFILIATION OF SOME DEGREE

University of Kentucky: As Kentucky University it received land-grant funds from 1865–1878, for its Agricultural and Mechanical College.

Kentucky University was formed first by absorbing the assets of Bacon College, in Harrodsburg, Ky. and with additional State moneys, establishing in Lexington, Ky. Bacon had been a school founded by members of the Disciples of Christ denomination. At Lexington, Kentucky University absorbed Transylvania University—at that time a school under dominant influence of the Disciples of Christ, although previously it had been under influence predominantly at different times of Presbyterians, and Baptists. During the time Transylvania was part of the Kentucky University—Transylvania was privileged to retrieve its assets and separate out again as Transylvania—there was established the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Kentucky University to receive land-grant money.

In the act of the Kentucky Legislature establishing this agricultural and mechanical school, it states in section 4:

> In appointment of professors, instructors, and other officers and assistants, and in the prescribing of studies and the exercise thereof, and in every part of the management and government thereof, no partiality shall be shown to any one sect or denomination over another, nor anything sectarian shall be taught.

University of Delaware: The University of Delaware became such in 1921. It was formerly Delaware College, and as such received land-grant funds. Delaware College in turn developed out of Newark College which traces continuity back to an academy established by the Presbyterian Synod of Philadelphia.

We have no records at hand to trace the nature of the Presbyterian influence if any, on the institution from 1867 on, when the State accepted the provisions of the First Morrill Act and designated Delaware College as beneficiary.

Atlanta University: This school was designated to receive Morrill Act funds in 1874 and presumably received them until 1891. Atlanta University then had Baptist affiliation and sponsorship.

Maryland State College: Founded originally as Delaware Conference Academy, a preparatory branch of the Centenary Bible Institute. Designated 1890 as the Negro institution designated to receive funds under second Morrill Act. We have not verified up to this time the possible church significance of "Centenary Bible Institute."

UNIVERSITIES OR COLLEGES RECEIVING LAND-GRANT FUNDS WHICH IN THEIR ORGANIZATION INCORPORATED CHURCH SCHOOLS DONATED BY CHURCHES TO THE STATE

Auburn University: Eastern Alabama Male College at Auburn was given by the Methodist Church to the State on February 26, 1872, and on March 20, 1872, State established Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical College absorbing the Methodist school. State had accepted provisions of Morrill Act in 1867, reaffirmed acceptance, December 31, 1868, presumably did not use any moneys on Eastern Alabama Male College, although this is subject to verification.

Kansas State University: Methodist Church gave Bluemont Central College to State as site for new agricultural college which was to receive land-grant funds. This "Kansas State Agricultural College" became the State university.

Universiy of California: Original forerunner was Contra Costa Academy, established by Presbyterians of San Francisco, and the Congregational Association of California. This developed into College of California. This college offered to convey all of its property to the State, to disincorporate and cease to exist, when State would organize a university and establish a classical course. This the State did, receiving the College of California, disbanding its own Agricultural, Mining, and Mechanics Arts College, to form the University of California.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS UNDER WHICH INSTITUTIONS WITH RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION RECEIVE FEDERAL FUNDS THROUGH GRANTS OR LOANS

On March 28, 1961, the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted to Congress a list of the Federal programs under which institutions with religious affiliation receive Federal funds through grants or loans.

The list of these programs is so long that it would take me hours to read it but I do want to refer briefly to some of the activities.

INSTITUTES FOR TRAINING SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND INSTITUTES FOR TRAINING MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS (NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 85–864), SECS. 511, 611; 20 U.S.C. 491, 521)

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to contract with institutions of higher education for summer and regular academic year training programs to improve the qualifications of counselors in secondary schools and modern foreign language teachers. The teachers from public, sectarian or any other types of private schools receive the opportunity for training without tuition costs. However, the act authorizes the Commissioner to pay a stipend for subsistence only to those who are to teach in public schools.

Although the instruction is conducted under a contractual arrangement pursuant to statute, it is included in this listing because the effect is very similar to that of a grant. The contract finances educational services by which the participating institutions serve a segment of people whom it would be their normal function to train.

LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS (NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 85–864), SEC. 601(a); 20 U.S.C. 511(a)

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to arrange through contracts with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them of centers for the teaching of certain modern foreign languages and studies related to the cultures in which such languages are used. The languages are confined to those for which trained individuals are needed in business, Government or education. While the statute authorizes only contracts for payment of one-half the cost, the program has all the earmarks of a grant situation.

GRANTS FOR TEACHING IN THE EDUCATION OF MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN (PUBLIC LAW 85–926, SEC. 1, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC LAW 86–158 AT 73 STAT. 346 (20 U.S.C. 611))

The Commissioner of Education makes grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher education to assist them in providing training of teachers in fields related to the education of mentally retarded children. These grants may be used both in connection with the costs of instruction and for establishing and maintaining fellowships. This is a new program under which grants have been made to only 19 institutions. One of these is known to have religious affiliation.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION AND TRAINING PROJECTS RELATED TO VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 565, 83D CONG.), SEC. 4(a); 29 U.S.C. 34(a))

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit organizations for paying a part of the cost of projects for research and demonstrations in the field of vocational rehabilitation and training of individuals in professional fields which provide services to physically handicapped individuals. Many of the grants for research and demonstration are made to institutions of higher education, and most of the grants for training are made to such institutions. The training grants include an amount to enable the institutions to pay stipends to persons in training.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH OR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS (SEC. 1110 OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AS ADDED BY SEC. 331 OF PUBLIC LAW 880, 84TH CONG.; 42 U.S.C. 1310)

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to or contracts with public and other nonprofit organizations for paying part of the cost of research or demonstration projects relating to public welfare and social security matters. While the enabling legislation was effective for fiscal year 1957, appropriations were first available to carry out this program during the 1961 fiscal year; $350,000 has been made available for this purpose, and it is anticipated that one-third to one-half of that amount will be for financing projects at institutions of higher education. In the approval of such projects no distinction is made because of religious affiliation of an institution.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU—SPECIAL PROJECTS RELATING TO CRIPPLED CHILDREN AND MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES (SECS. 502(b) AND 512(b) OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AS AMENDED BY SECS. 707(b)(1)(A) AND 707(b)(2)(A) OF PUBLIC LAW 86-778; 42 U.S.C. 702(b) AND 712(b)

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to State health agencies and nonprofit institutions of higher education for special projects in the field of services for crippled children and maternal and child health. Up to now such projects have been financed by State agencies as the result of receiving grants from the Federal Government. In the future, however, grants will be made directly from the Federal Government, and no distinction is planned with respect to sectarian institutions.

SURPLUS PROPERTY UTILIZATION PROGRAM (FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949 (PUBLIC LAW 152, 81ST CONG.), AS AMENDED, SECS. 203(j) AND 203(k); 40 U.S.C. 484(j) AND (k))

Under these provisions the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to allocate surplus personal property for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to State agencies for distribution to educational, health and civil defense organizations. Surplus real estate assigned by the General Services Administrator is transferred by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for educational and public health purposes at a public benefit discount which can be as much as 100 percent of the appraised fair value. The institutions which receive real and personal property include public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION—BUSINESS MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958 (PUBLIC LAW 85-699), SEC. 602 (c) 15 U.S.C. 636(d))

The Small Business Administration is authorized to make grants to various organizations including colleges, universities and schools of business for research in the field of business management and finance. Grants have been made in prior years including those to institutions with religious affiliation. No funds are available to conduct this activity for the 1961 fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM (NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT (PUBLIC LAW 396, 79TH CONG.), AS AMENDED 42 U.S.C. 1751 ET. SEQ.)

The purpose of this program is to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's children by providing funds and foods to States and Territories for use in serving nutritious midday meals to children attending schools of high school grade and less. The Federal assistance is through payments to the educational agency of each State which then channels the aid to participating schools. However, 42 U.S.C. 1759 provides that in any State where the State educational agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds to nonprofit schools they shall be disbursed directly to such schools for program purposes.

USE OF NATIONAL FORESTS (30 STAT. 36; 55TH CONG.; 61 U.S.C. 479)

The act of June 4, 1897, cited above, authorizes a group of persons residing in the vicinity of national forests to occupy not exceeding 2 acres of forest land for the erection of a school and not exceeding 1 acre for the erection of a church; 163 schools were on forest land on June 30, 1959. Information is not available as to possible religious affiliation, but it is believed that few if any of such schools have religious affiliation. There is, however, no rule to prevent erection of a school because of such affiliation.

COMMITTEE HOLDS THAT GEOLOGY IS RELATED TO NATIONAL DEFENSE BUT BARS AID FOR STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The many examples I have cited indicate clearly that the Federal Government over a long period of time has aided private colleges to promote educational objectives, whether or not these objectives had any relationship to national defense.

Since the committee bill authorizes grants only for the construction of engineering, science, and library buildings on the theory that such facilities will have a connection with national defense, we may see some rather weird consequences.

We will see that under the terms of the bill, it would be possible for a college to get a grant for a geology building, but the same college would be barred by the language of the bill from getting a grant for facilities used to study the dangers of communism or the complex background of international relations.

All this seems too absurd for words.

There is no such thing as a Catholic version of the English language, a Jewish version of economics, and a Lutheran version of business administration. Yet the committee would have us believe that if we help provide buildings for these courses, the Constitution will be violated.

It is interesting to note that under the committee bill, you can construct a facility to teach the theory that man is descended from a lower form of animal but you are barred from getting assistance to teach constitutional law.

CONCLUSION

I say to the Senate, approve the committee bill and you downgrade the arts and elevate the sciences.

Approve the House-passed bill as contained in my substitute and you give all courses equal treatment.

Approve the House bill and you send the measure to the White House. Approve the committee bill and what will happen to it we know not.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Vermont has read a number of telegrams. My office has also received some telegrams; and I should like to read one, and then ask for some comment and information, so that I may reply to it.

The telegram reads as follows:

> Recommend Senate follow House bill on construction science and engineering tomorrow. Will cause continuing imbalance emphasis on science large classes in humanities and social sciences. Need crucial assistance science. Lecture can still utilize general lecture hall. Agree with wire received from Senator PROUTY. Approval of House bill would send measure directly to White House. We need action this session to prepare for tidal wave in 1965.

The information I should like to have from the Senator from Vermont is: What is the status of the bill at the present time; what is the difference between the two bodies; and what is his view as to the final settlement?

Mr. PROUTY. The House has already passed the bill, H.R. 6143. It was reported and sent to the Senate, and an amended version has been reported to the Senate from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The pending amendment is one which I have submitted. It will restore the exact language of the House version of the bill. I believe that perhaps what those who sent the Senator the telegram are concerned about is the principal difference between the House version and the Senate committee version. The Senate committee version restricts the construction of classrooms to those used for instruction in engineering and in the physical and natural sciences, and also for libraries. There is no similar restriction in the House version.

Mr. CARLSON. Could any of the funds be used for the salaries of professors and teachers, rather than only for the construction of classrooms?

Mr. PROUTY. No. This measure is for the construction of classroom facilities.

Mr. CARLSON. And only for that purpose?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes. There are no provisions in the bill for teaching.

Mr. CARLSON. Will the Senator from Vermont state the difference in amounts, if any?

Mr. PROUTY. It is a little difficult to do that. I may say the Senate committee version authorizes funds over a 5-year period. The House version also provides for a 5-year program, but has the further provision that at the expiration of 3 years, new authorizations will be required. The total under the Senate committee version is $1,750 million.

Mr. CARLSON. For a 5-year program?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, for a 5-year program. Under the House version, the total is $1,195 million, but that is for a 3-year program. If the House continued for 2 more years the authorization it now proposes for the first 3 years, the total amount would be $2,015 million.

Mr. CARLSON. On the basis of a 5-year program?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, a 5-year program. There is relatively little difference between the two in the cost over a 5-year period.

Mr. CARLSON. Can the Senator from Vermont give us any assurance that we can get action on this in the immediate future; or what is the program?

Mr. PROUTY. If the Senate sees fit to approve my amendment as it now stands, and does not amend it, the bill as thus amended will go directly to the White House, for there will then be no need for a conference with the House. But if we become involved in a conference, I fear that history may repeat itself.

If the House had passed and had sent to us the Senate committee version of the bill, I would favor that version just as strongly as I do this one; I would support it in order to be absolutely certain that a higher education bill would be enacted this year. The only way we can do that is to adopt my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I shall answer the Senator from Vermont when he finishes his remarks; but in order to help the Senator from Kansas, I should like him to turn to pages 7, 8, and 9 of the committee report, where he will find set forth in tabular form a comparative analysis of the Senate committee version and the House version.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have no intention of continuing further today. Later, I shall have some rather detailed remarks to make about the House version and the arguments pro and con which may be raised in the Senate. But I intend to do that next week, rather than take time for it this afternoon.

Exhibit 1

Appleton, Wis.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are ambivalent regarding passage House version H.R. 6143. Would favor if only way to insure passage of other higher education legislation.

Marwin O. Wrolstadt,
Business Manager, Lawrence College.

Jacksonville, Ill.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your concern. Believe House bill is best and quickest way to fiercely needed assistance. Every college president thinks he could draft a better bill. Consensus would require eternity. Have expressed my personal views to both Illinois Senators. Good luck.

Gordon E. Michalson,
President, MacMurray College.

Hanover, N.H.,
October 11, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your telegram on higher education bill. We agree with you completely and urge support in Senate for House bill because of its broader terms which permit assistance for academic facilities in all fields and not just in natural or physical sciences or engineering and thereby will help avoid unfortunate imbalance of support as between sciences and other fields of study. While provision for library grants is in both bills, particularly urge you support that for this vital need.

John S. Dickey,
President, Dartmouth College.

Mansfield, Pa.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I would strongly support Senate approved House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction, in lieu of Senate committee bill.

Thomas J. Costello,
Acting President, Mansfield State College.

Lafayette, Ind.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Reurtel October 10 we of Purdue University prefer and support House-passed higher education facilities bill and I am today wiring Senators Hartke and Bayh asking them to support passage of House bill version in the Senate. However, current educational need for new facilities is so great that we would accept Senate version with its limitation of grants for science, engineering, and library buildings over nothing at all.

Frederick L. Hovde,
President, Purdue University.

Boston, Mass.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you ask Senate to approve House Taft higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction in lieu of Senate committee bill which permits grant only for construction of science, engineering, and library building. I understand approval of House bill will send measure directly to White House while approval of Senate committee bill will require Senate House conference. I am fearful that adoption by Senate of Senate committee bill will mean no higher education legislation this year. We need bill now for next year we will have 20 percent more entering students than this year in colleges of United States. Please be sure that criteria for eligibility of technical institute to participate beyond the basis of either professional or creditation (engineers council for professional development) or regional association of creditation because of regional association rules that office bar be accreditation of 2-year technical institute. Wentworth Institute is professionally accredited but not regionally accredited. Because of New England association rules and not our quality. The United States needs to expand technical institute for engineering technicians are critically needed for space, defense, and the general economy.

H. Russell Beatty,
President, Wentworth Institute.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Please approve higher education bill passed by the House. Measure as such needed to alleviate present demands in higher education.

Sister M. Angela, OSF,
President of Rosary Hill College.

West Haven, Conn.,
October 11, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

In letters to Senators Dodd and Ribicoff some time ago I urged adoption of H.R. 6193. That is still my feeling.

M. K. Peterson,
President, New Haven College.

Brunswick, Maine,
October 11, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Your interest and concern to provide facilities for higher education is greatly appreciated. In my view, either the House bill or the Senate bill, or some combination thereof, would be in the national interest. My support for legislation for higher education has been on record with Senators Smith and Muskie for several months.

James S. Coles,
Bowdoin College.

Tallahassee, Fla.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We support H.R. 6143 and hope it can be passed by Senate. But also support Senate committee bill which would be useful too. Have advised our Senator of our views.

Gordon W. Blackwell.

Detroit, Mich.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree your position and appreciate support House bill. Have no serious objections Senate categories but also fear delay. Grateful for wire.

Sister Mary Emil,
President, Mary Grove College.

Tucson, Ariz.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I concur with you in your view that H.R. 6143 authorizing flat grants for construction is better than Senate commitee bill permitting grants only for construction in certain categories including science, engineering, libraries, not only for reason given by you but also because there is considerable lag now in the rate of construction of buildings in other categories than those named by Senate bill because of high priority already given to science, engineering, mathematics, and in some cases libraries. Have already advised Members of Senate from Arizona and also members of subcommittee of which Senator Morse is chairman. Kindest regards.

Richard A. Harvill,
President, University of Arizona.

West Hartford, Conn.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thoroughly agree with program outlined your telegram. Urban universities such as ours, completely nonsectarian and without tax support of any type greatly need construction grants in accordance with your message. We at the University of Hartford are getting tremendous support from community, but grants of the type you suggest would move us much faster along the road. Thank you for your interest in higher education of the type we have to offer. I am wiring Senators Dodd and Ribicoff as you suggest.

Vincent B. Coffin,
Chancellor, University of Hartford.

Dubuque, Iowa,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I trust your judgment. Thank you very much.

Sister Mary Benedict,
President, Clark College.

PASADENA, CALIF.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am pleased with your position on higher education bill and hope very much the House bill can be enacted by the Senate. Hope you will also assist in restoring the drastic cuts in the appropriation for the National Science Foundation as proposed by the House committee. Such a cut would seriously impede our progress in education and research.

LEE A. DU BRIDGE,
President, California Institute of Technology.

WINNONA, MINN.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

If possible please support H.R. 6143 in original form rather than Senate committee version. Liberal college needs are severe on all fronts, not just science, engineering, and library. Each institution could best determine its immediate need with Government surveillance under H.R. 6143. However use your own judgment. Better to have the Senate committee bill than nothing. Telegram sent to Minnesota Senators per your suggestion.

Brother J. GREGORY,
President, St. Marys College.

MANHATTAN, KANS.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly concur in your proposal to ask Senate to approve House version of higher education bill. I am also notifying Kansas Senators by telegram.

President JAMES A. MCCAIN,
Kansas State University.

BELLINGHAM, WASH.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support House passed higher education bill and have advised Senators MAGNUSON and JACKSON of this. However, urge willingness to compromise on Senate bill if other unavailable.

JAMES L. JARRETT
President, Western Washington State College.

DALLAS PA.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of the higher education bill by the Senate unamended as passed through the House for authorized flat grants for construction.

Sister MARIANNA, R.S.M.,
College Misericordia.

MEMPHIS, TENN.,
October 11, 1963.

WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The President and faculty of Sienna College in Memphis, Tenn., sincerely urge that you approve the House-passed higher education bill (H.R. 6143) authorizing flat grants for construction of academic facilities for use in undergraduate and graduate education. This same message being sent to Senators ALBERT GORE and HERBERT S. WALTERS, of Tennessee.

Sister ALBERTUS MANGUS,
President, Sienna College.

BEAUMONT, TEX.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Washington, D.C.:

Recommend you approve House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction.

F. L. MCDONALD,
Lamar State College of Technology.

ARCATA, CALIF.,
October 10, 1963.

WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of House bill providing grants for colleges construction. Rather Senate committee bill. House bill recognizes needs in this area other than science, engineering and library and its more compatible with balanced college development.

LAWRENCE E. TURNER,
Acting President, Humboldt State College.

STEUBENVILLE, OHIO,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Ask support on House approved bill on higher education rather than Senate Committee bill providing construction grants only.

Fr. COLUMBA J. DEVLIN,
Tor President, the College of Steubenville.

SAVANNAH, GA.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I recommend that the Senate approve House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction rather than the Senate committee bill which permits grants only for construction of science engineering and library buildings. Same message sent to Senators RUSSELL and TALMADGE.

FOREMAN M. HAWES.

OMAHA, NEBR.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We strongly urge you to ask Senate to approve House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction in lieu of Senate committee bill which permits grants only for construction of science, engineering, library buildings. Thank you for all your efforts to further our desire.

Mother CONSTANCE CAMPBELL,
Duchesene College of the Sacred Heart.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily concur that Senate acceptance of House-passed higher education bill would be of great and immediate benefit to colleges and universities. Institutions require assistance at once. Any further delay would hamper trapper facilities being made available to thousands of college students.

JOHN F. HINES,
President, American International College.

HACKETTSTOWN, N.J.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge Senate approval of a higher education bill identical with H.R. 6143 which authorizes flat grants for construction rather than the Senate bill which limits grants to construction of science engineering and library buildings. I further urge that the section relative to grants for buildings for 2-year and community colleges authorize funds for private institutions as well as public.

EDWARD W. SEAY,
President, Centenary College for Women.

ADA, OHIO,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In interest of expediting the matter of support to higher education I would favor Senate approval of H.R. 6143 at earliest possible date.

F. BRINGLEMCINTOSH,
President, Ohio Northern University.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge support of House-passed higher education bill rather than Senate committee bill. Imperative that no obstacle prevent passage of higher education legislation this year.

COMERFORD J. O'MALLEY,
President, De Paul University.

WHARTON, TEX.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Concur wholeheartedly with your position on House-passed higher education bill for two reasons: College boards and administrators are better able to judge construction needs of individual institutions; urgent for higher education legislation immediately without delay of Senate-House conference to avoid denying college admission to youngsters next year.

TRAVIS M. MCKINZIE,
President, Wharton County Junior College.

HEMPSTEAD, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I share the sentiments in your telegram of October 9 entirely. The House bill is entirely acceptable to Hofstra. It should be passed by the Senate.

JOHN CRANFORD ADAMS,
President, Hofstra University.

SALEM, OREG.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your support of House-passed higher education bill to guarantee construction needed for higher education in Oregon.

G. HERBERT SMITH,
President, Willamette University.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Greatly favor Senate's approval of House-passed higher education bill. Appreciate whatever you can do to promote it and prevent delay of passage of bill.

SISTER M. AUGUSTINE, O.S.S.,
President, Alverno College.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your interest in recommending House-passed higher education bill. We believe this version will provide greatest assistance in attempting to solve today's problems in higher education. Our Senators have been advised of our view.

Millard E. Gladfelter,
President, Temple University.

Claremont, Calif.,
October 10, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Both as individual college president and as board member, American Council on Education, representing all colleges, believe House bill superior to Senate bill. Higher education must advance in all disciplines at once or we shall suffer. Greatly appreciate your interest.

Louis T. Bfezet,
President, Remont Graduates School.

Winter Park, Fla.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Believe House-passed higher education bill preferable to Senate committee bill. Therefore definitely recommend House version. Thank you very much for consulting us.

John Tiedtke,
Vice President and Treasurer, Rollins College.

Seattle, Wash.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Most grateful for your help and interest in academic facilities bill. Have wired Senators Magnuson and Jackson urging support of your efforts.

A. A. Lemieux, S.J.,
President, Seattle University.

New York, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Replying your telegram October 9. Strongly favor Senate approval H.R. 6143. Adequate development American higher education requires balanced programs. Many institutions already suffer from undue emphasis on science and technology.

John H. Fischer,
President, Teachers College.

Nashua, N.H.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Absent when telegram arrived. Ask Senate approve House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants. Advising New Hampshire Senators same.

——— ———,
President, Rivier College.

Houston, Tex.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston Prouty,
Senate Office Building, U.S. Senator from Vermont, Washington, D.C.:

Retel there are many factors which I know Senate committee had to consider in limiting construction under H.R. 6143 to certain categories. We respect their views but it is obvious House version would give additional flexibility. In summary we would prefer House version but willing to abide by decision of the Congress.

Phillip G. Hoffman,
President, University of Houston.

Pittsburgh, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Recommend support of original H.R. 6143 to expedite passage of legislation necessary to higher education.

Sister Thomas Aquinas,
President, Mount Mercy College.

Columbia, Mo.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

I would much prefer either version of the higher education facilities bill that has the best chance of passage. Other than that I would prefer the House version for reasons mentioned in your telegram as well as my belief that it is sounder legislation.

Elmer Ellis,
President, University of Missouri.

Pittsburgh, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Deeply appreciate your concern. Chatham College and all others have immediate need for construction grants. Action this session imperative. This should be guiding principle.

Edward D. Eddy,
President, Chatham College.

Davenport, Iowa,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We endorse your effort to seek Senate approval of House-passed higher education bill. The enactment of such legislation is urgently needed by both public and nonprofit institutions of higher learning.

Rev. F. J. McMahan,
Acting President,
St. Ambrose College.

Brooklyn, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily approve substitution in Senate committee bill of House-passed provision for flat grants for construction in lieu of more restrictive provision as being of greater universal benefit to higher education. Grateful for your action.

Best Regards,

Chester C. Wood,
Acting Chancellor,
Long Island University.

San Francisco, Calif.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Fully support your position on House-passed higher education bill. Have sent Senator Kuchel telegram advising him of this. Your help and interest deeply appreciated.

Charles W. Dullea, Jr.,
President,
University of San Francisco.

Danville, Ky.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I am pleased to know that the Senate will be given opportunity to approve higher education bill in form passed by House. Strongly urge your best efforts. Secure favorable action on House version. Action now is of great importance in view of demands of next 2 years. Any failure to secure legislation this session because of stalemate in conference would be most unfortunate.

Thomas A. Spragens,
President, Centre College.

Selinsgrove, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Susquehanna University board administration and faculty endorse your efforts to have Senate pass House-sponsored bill which authorizes grants for construction of college facilities. Our need is urgent and desperate as only one in four applicants has gained admission this year due to lack of space.

Gustave W. Webber,
President, Susquehanna University.

Newport, R.I.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Would like to see Senate approve House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction of undergraduate facilities.

Good luck in your efforts.

Sister Mary Hilda,
President, Salve Regina College.

New Britain, Conn.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Passage of Senate version of higher education bill would hold further the inbalance that is developing to the detriment of the arts and humanities. H.R. 6143 is much preferred. Accept Senate version or a compromise thereof, only as a last resort. Urge your continued support of a higher educational bill.

Herbert B. Welte,
Central Connecticut State College.

Frankfort, Ky.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The cause of higher education at this crucial period can best be served by Senate passage of House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction of all types of classroom buildings. I have already advised my Senator, Mr. Cooper.

Carl M. Hill,
President, Kentucky State College.

Salem, Va.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Roanoke College urges your support of the House-passed higher education bill in its present form relative to grants for construction of academic facilities.

Respectfully,

Perry F. Kindig,
President.

Madison, Wis.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Our faculty and students are grateful for progress on Federal aid to colleges which is ultimately helpful to the entire Nation. We favor passage of H.R. 6143, as formulated by House rather than limitations proposed by Senate committee. Respectfully request your support for the complete program in interest of American youth.

Sister Mary Nana, O.P.,
President, Edgewood College.

Pasadena, Calif.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciative of your communication and wholeheartedly endorse your move to secure passage of the House higher education bill.

Oscar J. Finch,
President, Pasadena College.

New Orleans, La.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request Senate approves House-passed version of higher education bill, H.R. 6143.

Dr. Edward E. Riley, Jr.,
Dean, Dillard University.

Gettysburg, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Applaud your proposal to substitute House version for college aid but in any event hope Senate will pass constructive legislation aiding colleges.

Sister Rosemary,
President, St. Josephs College.

Clarion, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge that you ask Senate to approve House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction in lieu of Senate committee bill, which permits grants only for construction of science, engineering, and library buildings.

James Gimmell,
President, Clarion State College.

Portland, Oreg.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I highly concur with your views and have so expressed myself to our Senators. Am deeply grateful for your effort on behalf of my education. Letter follows.

Paul E. Waldschmidt,
President, University of Portland.

Boston, Mass.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you. Heartily approve House-passed higher education bill. Sent directly to White House.

Sister Ann Bartholomew,
President, Emanuel College.

Silver City, N. Mex.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Received your telegram relative to your desire to recommend Senate approval of original House bill on higher education. To debate this legislation via a Senate-House conference will destroy higher education legislation this year. Consideration of our desperate needs for buildings now, would regard such a failure as a total catastrophe. This would serve to plunge education into total and irrevocable darkness. Will appreciate your efforts to procure Senate approval of the House-passed higher education bill. Will notify Senator Mechem and Senator Anderson of our views concerning this matter. Appreciate very much your perceptions and assistance concerning this dilemma.

Cordially yours,

John H. Snedeker,
President, Western New Mexico University.

Rock Hill, S.C.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge that you vote for House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction in lieu of Senate bill. We must have legislation for more facilities in higher education this year. Your support and influence is deeply appreciated.

Charles S. Davis,
President, Winthrop College.

Oakland, Calif.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge you to push the House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction of academic facilities.

Sister Joan Marie,
President, College of Holy Names.

Menomonie, Wis.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wisconsin Senators have been informed that we heartily approve passage of House-passed higher education bill. Copy of letter follows.

William J. Michels,
President, Stout State College.

Jacksonville, Fla.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Approve your proposal to back House-passed higher education bill.

Benjamin F. Rogers,
Acting President, Jacksonville University.

Greensburg, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.

Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Have already written Senators Clark and Scott my trustees and I approve and encourage your support of House bill without modification.

Msgr. William G. Ryan,
President, Seton Hill College.

Troy, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Acknowledging your telegram today House bill and Senate bill both represent adequate treatment of aid to higher education however if Senate-House conferences will delay legislation this year I favor Senate approval of House bill in interest of progress. I am sending copies of telegram to Senators Javits and Keating.

R. G. Folsom,
President, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

Fulton, Mo.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your wire. I am greatly in favor of House-passed higher education bill and advocate prompt Senate approval.

Have so advised Senators Symington and Long.

Robert L. D. Davidson,
President, Westminster College.

Traverse City, Mich.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly favor H.R. 6143 as passed by House of Representatives.

Preston Tanis,
Director, Northwestern Michigan College.

Columbia, S.C.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Approve House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction.

J. A. Bacoats,
President, Benedict College.

Ithaca, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We concur with you in urging Senate to approve House-passd higher education bill. Ithaca College prepared to double undergraduate enrollment with completion of new campus if such Federal funds materialize.

Howard Dillingham,
President, Ithaca College.

Hollins College, Va.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.:

You have our determined support in attempt to have Senate pass House-enacted academic facilities bill. Please advise further help needed. Good luck.

John A. Logan, Jr.,
President, Hollins College.

Cleveland, Ohio,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your action for Senate approval of House-passed higher education bill. Have urged Ohio Senators to support this move.

Msgr. L. P. Cahill,
President, St. John College of Cleveland.

Baytown, Tex.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request your vote for House-passed version of H.R. 143 in lieu of Senate committee bill.

Geo. H. Gentry,
President, Lee College.

Hays, Kans.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate telegram favor House-passed higher education bill. Do not favor Senate committee bill.

M. C. Cunningham,
President, Fort Hays, Kansas State College.

KENT, OHIO,
October 10, 1963.

WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope the Senate adopts House-passed bill on higher education building in preference to the categorical Senate committee bill.

ROBERT I. WHITE,
President, Kent State University.

SOUTH BEND, IND.,
October 10, 1963.

WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge immediate total acceptance of H.R. 6143. Avoid compromise committees.

Sister MARIA RENATA,
President, St. Marys College.

HAYWARD, CALIF.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Replying to wire we strongly favor approval House-passed education bill by Senate facilities.

Bill badly needed this year. House-Senate compromise could delay too long. Strongly support your stand.

FRED HARCLEROAD,
President, California State College at Hayward.

INDIANOLA, IOWA,
October 10, 1963.

WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

We agree wholeheartedly with the proposal per your wire received today.

R. W. FEYERHARM,
Simpson College.

WINDHAM, MAINE,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Utterly approve House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction of buildings in lieu of Senate committee bill.

Sister MARY CARMEL,
St. Josephs College.

PARKVILLE, MO.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Washington, D.C.:

Reply to your wire needs of higher education too great to jeopardize. Consider it best to obtain action this session even if total is compromised.

PAUL H. MORRILL,
President, Park College.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Earnestly recommend strong support of House-approved higher education bill. Appreciate your interest in this program which is so important to higher education in our country.

Sister ANN IDA,
President, Hundelein College.

ROCHESTER, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with your telegram. Have wired both Senators.

VARK ELLINGSON,
President, Rochester Institute of Technology.

HOLLISTER, CALIF.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Washington, D.C.:

Agree with your suggestion to ask approval of House-passed higher education bill.

Dr. RALPH SCHRODER,
Superintendent of Gavilan College.

COLUMBIA, MO.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily approve your proposal requesting Senate approval of House-passed higher education. Senate committee bill carries unwarranted restriction on types of academic facilities sorely needed. Join you in conviction that that effective compromise unlikely in Senate-House conference.

SEYMOUR A. SMITH,
President, Stephens College.

ALBANY, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I commend your decision to ask Senate approval of H.R. 6143. Limitations of Senate bill further concentrate aid in fields of science and engineering already receiving major share of Federal money and deny help to colleges whose most critical need may be in other areas.

EDMUND F. CHRISTY, O.F.M.,
President, Siena College.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Re telegram, I supported House version 6143, higher education bill across-the-board aid. Senate version with categorical grants satisfactory if this is only way Senate will pass a higher education bill.

DONALD E. DEYO,
Montgomery Junior College.

BELMONT, CALIF.,
October 11, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Washington, D.C.:

I favor House-passed higher education bill and am so advising my Senators.

Sister KATHRYN JULIE,
President, College of Notre Dame, Belmont, Calif.

NORMAL, ILL.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciated your thoughtful wire. Have already corresponded with both Illinois Senators indicating my strong support of the bill.

ROBERT G. BONE,
President,
Illinois State Normal University.

NEW CONCORD, OHIO,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly favor approval of House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction. Higher education desperately in need of this legislation.

GLENN L. MCCONAGHA,
President, Muskingum College.

DALLAS, PA.
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Earnestly urge you to request Senate approval of House-passed higher education bill for authorized flat grants for construction of science engineering and library buildings.

Sister MARY CELESTINE,
College Misericordia.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Higher education House bill vastly more constructive than Seante bill especially for colleges like our own which is mainly concerned with adult education. It would also be more equitable if an institution like ours that contains a senior college and a graduate faculty as well as a major college for adults should not be excluded on the basis that it is not primarily a 4-year institution.

ROBERT M. MACIVER,
President,
New School for Social Research.

WAVERLY, IOWA,
October 10, 1963.

WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senator, Senator Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We urge Senate approval of House education bill authorizing flat grants for construction in lieu of Senate committee bill. Higher education legislation this year is a must for Amercan higher education.

C. H. BECKER,
President, Wartburg College.

PORTLAND, MAINE,
October 10, 1963.

Senator WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for telegram. I have dispatched telegram as follows to Maine Senators: "I am told that Senator PROUTY will ask the Senate to approve the House higher education bill authorizing flat grant for college construction which is in contrast to Senate bill, which limits grants to certain types of buildings. This is to be desired but even more desirable is expediting the action on House bill to insure higher education legislation this year. I hope you can support Senator PROUTY's action."

EDWARD Y. BLEWETT,
President, Westbrook Junior College.

LINDSBORG, KANS.,
October 10, 1963.

WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have already asked Kansas Senators to support House bill.

L. DALE LUND,
President, Bethany College.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
October 11, 1963.

WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Republican, of Vermont,
Care Old Senate Building,
Room 444, Washington, D.C.:

Heartily endorse your decision to push for Senate approval of House-passed higher educational bill that authorizes flat grants for construction in lieu of Senate committee bill. Sincerely appreciate all your effort to get higher education legislation this year. We are alerting our Ohio Senators, LAUSCHE and YOUNG, to sentiments expressed in this message to you.

Sister MARY VIRGINIA,
President,
Our Lady of Cincinnati College.

Wilberforce, Ohio,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston Prouty,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

We are pleased to learn that you plan to support the higher education bill passed by House for flat grants for college building construction in lieu of restricted Senate committee bill. We urge your continued endeavors and will send Senators Young and Lausche our views.

Respectfully and appreciatively,
Charles H. Wesley,
President, Central State College.

New Rochelle, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I approve House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction. Higher education legislation is necessary this year.

Thank you for information.

R. B. Power,
President, Iona College.

Upland, Ind.,
October 10, 1963.
Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your effort in behalf of House-passed higher education bill.

B. Joseph Martin,
President, Taylor University.

Orange, Calif.,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Highly approve action on House-passed education bill. Notify other Senators.

Mother Felix,
President, St. Joseph College.

San Francisco, Calif.,
October 11, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly approve efforts to obtain Senate approval of House-approved version of H.R. 6143 in lieu of Senate committee bill. Am so advising California Senators.

Russell T. Sharpe,
President, Golden Gate College.

Fulton, Mo.,
October 10, 1963.
Hon. Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I would like to indicate my support of your position for the House version of the academic facilities bill. I have contacted the two Missouri Senators indicating my support and have requested that several of my board members do likewise.

Dr. R. B. Cutlip,
President, William Woods College.

Trinidad, Colo.,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Am wiring Senators Allott and Dominick asking support on your position on House-passed higher education bill.

Guy C. Davis,
President, Trinidad State Junior College.

Buffalo, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In interest of higher education we urge Senate to approve House-passed higher education bill.

Sister Mary Lawrence,
St. Josephs Teachers College.

Fairfield, Iowa,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Important education bill for colleges be passed this year without delay. Senate-House conference will certainly delay to next year and beyond. Respectfully request passage of House bill.

Millard G. Roberts,
President, Parsons College.

Dudley, Mass.,
October 10, 1963.
Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Nichols College strongly urges adoption of House bill for higher education.

C. M. Quinn,
Dean of Faculty.

Philadelphia, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.
Hon. Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge Senate approval House-passed higher education bill which authorizes flat grants for construction.

——— ———,
President, Springgarden Institute.

Elizabethtown, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In agreement with your attitude toward higher education bill. Humanities and social sciencies have too long been discriminated against and if this continues American intellectual balances will suffer.

Dr. Roy E. McAuley,
President, Elizabethtown College.

New Rochelle, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.
Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge your support of House-passed bill permitting assistance for all academic construction. Cannot afford to neglect humanities, full liberal arts education; gravely concerned restricting aid to science and engineering jeopardizes good of whole country.

Mother Robert Falls,
President, College of New Rochelle.

Trenton, N.J.,
October 10, 1963.
Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

Sincerely appreciate your support of House-passed higher education bill. Am urging our Senators to add their support. It is vital that this bill pass during current session if our colleges are to meet the tremendous impact of rapidly increasing enrollments.

F. F. Moore,
President, Rider College.

Long Branch, N.J.,
October 10, 1963.
Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Appreciate your fine efforts. Strongly urge your continuing support of House-passed education bill. Deeply appreciate your understanding and interest in our very urgent financial problem in higher education.

William G. Vannote,
President, Monmouth College.

Madison, N.J.,
October 10, 1963.
Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for your wire on October 2. I wrote to Senator Case and Senator Williams urging support for the House bill. I am sending copy of those letters to you. I cannot thank you properly for your backing of higher education legislation in this session, it is imperative in the Nation's best interest that action be taken now.

Robert Fisher Oxnam,
President, Drew University.

Grand Junction, Colo.,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Urge approval of House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction of buildings.

William A. Medesy,
President, Mesa College.

Davenport, Iowa,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Would urge Senate approval of House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction of educational facilities. This legislation needed now and on broad rather than restricted terms if best interests of higher education are to be served.

Sister Sabina Mary,
President, Mary Crest College.

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I suggest you support H.R. 4955 without any crippling amendments.

P. A. Christiansen,
President, North Idaho Junior College.

Inglewood, Calif.,
October 10, 1963.
Hon. Winston Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

In response to your telegram to President West regarding higher education bill, I wish to advise that the California State colleges are willing to support whichever bill appears most likely to get the approval of Congress and the White House this year. Senators Kuchel and Engle being advised accordingly as you requested. Please advise if there is any further action you suggest we take.

Don M. Muchmore,
Vice Chancellor, California State Colleges.

Nashville, Tenn.,
October 10, 1963.
Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Regards your telegram of October 10. Profoundly grateful for your interest in higher education legislation. I originally favored House version but obviously Senate bill would also constitute considerable contribution toward meeting urgent facilities needs. I cannot evaluate internal congressional situation but do hope passage of significant higher education legislation this year will remain chief objective.

Alexander Heerd,
Chancellor, Vanderbilt University.

Chapel Hill, N.C.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Re your telegram. Sincerely hope legislation to assist higher education to provide resources for construction of facilities will be enacted this session. Will be grateful for Senate action approving either bill.

William Friday,
President, University of North Carolina.

Lafayette, La.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Re your telegram. I am interested in the best possible legislation for higher education. Do not oppose your move but am anxious to see best features of House and Senate bills incorporated.

Joel L. Fletcher,
President, University of Southwestern Louisiana.

Omaha, Nebr.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

You will vote as higher education asks if you ask Senate to approve higher education bill without any amendation. Have so informed our Senators.

H. W. Linn, S.J.,
President, Creighton University.

Dayton, Ohio,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senator,
Capitol Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly recommend adoption of your motion that Senate approves H.R. 6143. Every college president I know heartily favors it. Thank you for your efforts to expedite this college facilities bill. Have contacted Lausche, Young, and Morse.

With sincere appreciation,

Raymond A. Roesch,
President, University of Dayton.

Yellow Springs, Ohio,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Since we would favor assistance which is not restricted to science and library facilities, the House version of the higher education bill seems preferable to the amended Senate version.

James B. Dixon,
President, Antioch College.

Potsdam, N.Y.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
Washington, D.C.:

Increased facilities essential at Clarkson College of Technology grants for general construction very important and I urge passage of House-approved bill H.R. 6143 at this session rather than Senate committee bill.

Wm. L. Whitson,
President,
Clarkson College of Technology.

Mobile, Ala.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I heartily commend your plan to ask Senate approval by House-passed higher education bill in lieu of Senate committee bill. It would be most unfortunate for this session of Congress to end without providing desperately needed help, including grants for classroom buildings, for higher educational institutions.

Thank you for your wire.

A. W. Crandell, S.J.

Hartsville, S.C.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegram, my views on pending education legislation are those of the American Council on Education to which I refer you.

Respectfully,

Fenton Keyes,
President, Coker College.

Rome, Ga.,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We deeply appreciate your Senate leadership regarding House-passed higher education bill Although we may not apply for grants or loans, we previously urged Georgia Senators and our district Congressman to support H.R. 6143. We also support the Senate committee bill, believing action on one or other is essential during this session.

John R. Bertrand,
President, Berry College.

Erie, Pa.,
October 10, 1963.

Senator Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Mercyhurst College urges support of House-passed higher education bill authorizing flat grants for construction in lieu of Senate committee bill permitting grants only for construction of science engineering and library buildings. Higher education desperately needs this action now.

Sister Carolyn,
President, Mercyhurst College.

Des Moines, Iowa,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. Winston L. Prouty,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge support of either resolution more likely to pass both Houses. I prefer the House resolution but realize the improbability of Senate acceptance. The Senate resolution should be supported.

Henry G. Harmon,
President, Drake University.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Georgia without losing my right to the floor.

INVASION OF PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in Wednesday's edition of the Atlanta Journal an excellent editorial commenting on the approval of the administration's public accommodations bill by the Senate Commerce Committee.

The editorial noted that although the bill was diluted somewhat in the committee, it is still an objectionable piece of legislation because it trespasses on private property rights.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Still a Risky Bill

A watered-down version of the public accommodations bill for expanding civil rights has been approved by the Senate Commerce Committee by a 14-to-3 vote, but that doesn't automatically give it clear sailing before the full Congress.

So controversial is this legislation that the committee could hardly do anything else but release it for fuller debate.

In an effort to make the bill more palatable, the committee amended it so that it wouldn't apply to neighborhood shops where there is no connection with an interstate chain and little catering to interstate travelers.

Also exempted under the revised bill are rooming houses, if the proprietor uses the premises for his home and doesn't rent more than five rooms.

Actually these are relatively mild adjustments as far as the overall effect of the bill goes.

They do not remove a basic objection to the legislation: that it is a drastic invasion of private property rights and a serious threat to basic democratic processes.

PERSECUTION OF RUSSIAN JEWS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am becoming increasingly distressed and disturbed by reports of religious persecution against the Jews in the Soviet Union.

This intolerable situation is shocking to the entire free world, and it is especially abominable to us here in America who know and cherish freedom of religion.

Russian Jews have been systematically victimized by the Soviet Government almost to the point of strangulation of their faith.

They have been imprisoned and put to death for alleged economic offenses.

They have been stripped of the free and untrammeled exercise of their religion and culture.

Jews and their rabbis, and their houses of worship are made objects of vilification and ridicule in a calculated government campaign to destroy Judaism.

Mr. President, the world did not heed the anguished cries of the Jews in Germany in the 1930's and the madman Hitler was allowed to set out on the most vile, the most inhuman policy of extermination ever contrived by civilized man.

This ghastly lesson in history still sticks in our throats, and we must never forget it or permit it to happen again.

Mr. President, Jews in the Soviet regime are not being gassed or cremated or shipped to concentration camps, but the government's campaign of eradication is nonetheless deadly, though it is more subtle and refined.

We cannot allow such a situation to exist without raising our voices in anger and disgust. Persecution of the Jews in Russia is to be denounced. It is to be condemned and deplored.

Mr. President, we cannot in good conscience look the other way. We must mount a mighty wave of protest until an overwhelming tide of world indignation forces the Government of the Soviet Union to recognize the error of its ways.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter I received from Rabbi Emanuel Feldman, of the Congregation Beth Jacob in Atlanta. Rabbi Feldman expresses the concern that is felt by all of us in protesting Soviet discrimination against Jews.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 7, 1963.

Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TALMADGE: Numerous members of the congregation are very much disturbed concerning the recent events of Soviet discrimination against Jews. I am writing to you in order to transmit their feelings to their elected representatives.

You are undoubtedly aware of the fact that legally constituted Jewish synagogues are isolated from each other, that they are forbidden to organize a central body, that they are allowed no contact with Jewish religious groups in other countries, and that their leaders are singled out for abuse.

Since June 1961, synagogue presidents in six cities have been arbitrarily removed from office; Jewish communal leaders in Leningrad and Moscow have been sentenced to prison for meeting with foreign visitors to their synagogue.

Scores of synagogues have been closed by the Government and except for a lone theological seminary in Moscow, whose enrollment is never permitted to exceed 20, all other such schools have been banned.

It concerns us that no Jewish Bible has been printed in 40 years, that no articles for Jewish ritual can be produced, and that this year, for the first time in Soviet history, even the sale of unleavened bread for Passover was banned.

We urge you to use your good offices and influence to place as much pressure as possible upon the Soviet Union to implement its oft-repeated claim that it is a "champion of human dignity and equality and a guardian of minority rights" by lifting these repressive measures.

I know that you will agree that we who represent the Judeo-Christian tradition of freedom cannot sit idly by while part of the world is forced to live under religious persecution.

Sincerely yours,
RABBI EMANUEL FELDMAN.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the acting majority leader for yielding to me.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this afternoon I wish very briefly to comment on some of the remarks of my very good friend and able colleague on the Senate Subcommittee on Education, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. There is no question about the sincere desire of the Senator from Vermont to pass a higher education bill this year. But I do not yield to him in that sincerity of purpose.

DIFFERENCE IS TACTICAL

The difference between the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Oregon on that phase of the problem is one of parliamentary strategy. I say most respectfully that in my judgment the best way to kill the chances of a higher education bill this year is to press the course of action he advocates.

The Senator from Vermont has put into the RECORD this afternoon a large number of telegrams. As his remarks show, those telegrams are in response to a telegram which he sent to college presidents across the country. The Senator can correct the RECORD if I was misinformed this morning, but apparently some college presidents who talked to me are under the impression that their only chance of getting a higher education bill is to call upon their Senators to vote for the House bill. I believe that explains in no small measure the telegrams which the Senator from Vermont has received, and which he has put into the RECORD.

I have not sent any telegrams to college presidents, and do not intend to do so. Some of them are telegraphing me without any message being received from me in the first instance. The telegram from the administration and faculty of Mercy College, of Detroit, reads:

> The administration and faculty of Mercy College of Detroit asks you to favorably consider the Senate revision of H.R. 6143.

In other words, they are asking for the passage of the bill which the Senate committee, by an overwhelming vote, has sent to the floor of the Senate.

Another wire I have received from a college president reads:

HAMDEN, CONN.,
September 4, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Trustees, faculty, and administration of Quinnipiac College earnestly enlist your influence and best efforts to secure passage of bricks and mortar bill, H.R. 6143. We want no handouts but must have loans at reasonable rates to procure needed facilities and meet the obligations to our young people and the Nation.

NILS G. SAHLIN,
President, Quinnipiac College.

I am not at all interested in seeking to settle this issue by the weight of telegrams. It makes no difference to me how many telegrams are received on either side, unless I can be sure that the senders of the telegrams are fully aware and understand the facts that confront the Senate on the issues.

It is to that point that I wish to address myself, for as an educator of 21 years' experience in college teaching in the United States, I know how quickly the college presidents and deans can change their opinion once they get all the facts.

I am willing to take judicial notice of the substantial number of college presidents, deans, administrators, or members of faculty who have telegraphed to my good friend from Vermont. I only observe that they might send exactly the opposite type of message if they had the benefit of both sides of the debate.

ACE RESOLUTION

As a matter of fact, the American Council on Education, a major spokesman for all higher education institutions in the United States, both public and private, in its 46th annual meeting adopted a resolution making clear its strong endorsement of both versions of H.R. 6143 or of any combination or compromise of the two.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have referred be presented at this point in my remarks; together with a listing of the officers and the membership and affiliates of the American Council on Education.

There being no objection, the resolution and membership list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION FOR ACADEMIC FACILITIES BY AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

The American Council on Education is gratified by certain steps being taken by the 88th Congress toward the solution of some of the Nation's major problems in higher education. Enactment of the medical education bill is one important milestone.

The council notes with approval the passage by the House of Representatives of H.R. 6143 to provide grants and loans for academic facilities, including graduate centers, for colleges and universities. It is encouraged by the action of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in reporting an amended version of H.R. 6143 to provide grants and loans for particular kinds of academic facilities.

In public testimony and in formal statements the council has made clear its strong endorsement of both versions of this bill. We reaffirm our support of either version, or of a combination of the two, in the firm belief that enactment of this legislation this year is essential if the Nation's needs for expanded educational opportunities are to be met.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

OFFICERS, 1962–63

Charles E. Odegaard, president, University of Washington, chairman.

Robert J. Wert, vice provost, Stanford University, vice chairman.

Byron K. Trippet, president, Wabash College, secretary.

Fred S. Vorsanger, business manager, American Council on Education, treasurer.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Until October 1963

Elmer Ellis, president, University of Missouri.

John R. Emens, president, Ball State Teachers College.

Thomas H. Hamilton, president, University of Hawaii.

Gaylord P. Harnwell, president, University of Pennsylvania.

Anne G. Pannell, president, Sweet Briar College.

Until October 1964

Louis T. Benezet, president, Colorado College; president-elect, Claremont Graduate School and University Center.

David D. Henry, president, University of Illinois.

Richard H. Sullivan, president, Reed College.

Until October 1965

George W. Beadle, president, University of Chicago.

Fred C. Cole, president, Washington & Lee University.

James S. Coles, president, Bowdoin College.

Frank G. Dickey, president, University of Kentucky.

Oscar Edinger, Jr., president, Mount San Antonio College.

William Friday, president, University of North Carolina.

Clifford M. Hardin, chancellor, University of Nebraska.

S. M. Nabrit, president, Texas Southern University.

Paul L. O'Connor, S.J., president, Xavier University (Ohio).

Ex officio

Charles E. Odegaard, chairman, American Council on Education.

Robert J. Wert, vice chairman, American Council on Education.

Byron K. Trippet, secretary, American Council on Education.

Robert F. Goheen, president, Princeton University (immediate past chairman of the council).

Logan Wilson, president, American Council on Education.

EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Logan Wilson, president.

Allan M. Cartter, vice president; director, Commission on Plans and Objectives for Higher Education.

Lawrence E. Dennis, director, Commission on Academic Affairs.

Charles G. Dobbins, assistant to the president; director, Commission on Federal Relations.

Richard A. Humphrey, director, Commission on International Education.

John F. Morse, executive associate.

Fred S. Vorsanger, treasurer and business manager.

Charles H. Watts, director, Commission on Administrative Affairs.

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

Barbara Field, staff assistant.

C. Walter Howe, staff associate.

Earl W. Lindveit, staff associate.

Anne N. McClung, research assistant.

William A. Miller, Jr., staff associate (public information).

Olive Mills, production editor.

Robert Quick, director of publications.

Eleanor Quill, secretary to the president.

Barbara Rosenfeld, staff assistant.

Harrison Sasscer, staff associate (legislative services).

Dorothy R. Smith, staff assistant.

Elmer D. West, director, Office of Statistical Information and Research.

PROJECT DIRECTORS

Frederick R. Mangold, leaders and specialists.

Joseph M. Troxell, Inter-American Schools Service.

Cornelius P. Turner, accreditation of service experiences.

SPECIAL CONSULTANTS

Frederick deW. Bolman, C. W. de Kiewiet, Julian Levi, Grant Venn.

MEMBERS AND AFFILIATES OF THE COUNCIL, MARCH 15, 1963

Constituent organization members

Group A

American Association of Junior Colleges.

Association of American Colleges.

Association of American Universities.

Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Association of Urban Universities.

Council of Protestant Colleges and Universities.

Jesuit Educational Association.

National Association of State Universities.

National Catholic Educational Association.

State Universities Association.

Group B

Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges.

American Alumni Council.

American Association for the Advancement of Science.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy.

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business.

American Association of Dental Schools.

American Association of Osteopathic Colleges.

American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

American Association of Theological Schools.

American Association of University Professors.

American Association of University Women.

American College Personnel Association.

American College Public Relations Association.

American Council on Pharmaceutical Education.

American Dental Association (Council on Dental Education).

American Historical Association.

American Home Economics Association.

American Institute of Physics.

American Library Association.

American Osteopathic Association (Bureau of Professional Education).

American Personnel and Guidance Association.

American Pharmaceutical Association.

American Political Science Association.

American Psychological Association.

American Society for Engineering Education.

Association for Higher Education.

Association of American Law Schools.

Association of American Medical Colleges.

Association of College Admissions Counselors.

Association of College and University Housing Officers.

Association of College Unions.

Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions.

Association of University Evening Colleges.

College and University Personnel Association.

College English Association, Inc.

College Entrance Examination Board.

College Physical Education Association.

Commission on Engineering Education.

Conference of Catholic Schools of Nursing.

Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.

Council of Graduate Schools in the United States.

Engineers' Council for Professional Development.

Intercollegiate Association of Women Students.

Mathematical Association of America.

Modern Language Association of America.

National Association of College and University Attorneys.

National Association of College and University Business Officers.

National Association of College Women.

National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

National Association of Foreign Student Advisers.

National Association of Schools of Music.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

National Association of Women Deans and Counselors.

National Collegiate Athletic Association.

National Commission on Accrediting.

National Council of Teachers of English.

National League for Nursing, Inc.

National Research Council.

National University Extension Association.

Phi Delta Kappa.

Speech Association of America.

United States National Student Association.

Associated organization members

American Association of School Administrators.

American College Testing Program.

American Council of Learned Societies.

American Federation of Teachers.

American Teachers Association.

American Textbook Publishers Institute.

American Vocational Association, Inc.

Associated Rocky Mountain Universities, Inc.

Association for Childhood Education International.

Association of Military Colleges and Schools of the United States of America.

Board for Higher Education, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod.

Board of Christian Education of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Board of College Education, American Lutheran Church.

Brookings Institution.

Christian Education Department, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

Council for Financial Aid to Education, Inc.

Division of Christian Education, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

Division of Higher Education, Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Educational Records Bureau.

Educational Testing Service.

General Board of Education of the Methodist Church.

Institute of International Education.

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

National Association of Independent Schools.

National Association of Secondary-School Principals.

National Education Association of the United States.

National Educational Television and Radio Center.

National Lutheran Educational Conference.

National Merit Scholarship Corporation.

National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students.

New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

New England Board of Higher Education.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools.

Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education.

Smithsonian Institution.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Southern Regional Education Board.

Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.

Teaching Film Custodians, Inc.

Western College Association.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Western Personnel Institute.

Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.

Alabama

Alabama Association of Independent Colleges.

California

California Association of Independent Schools.
Oakland Public Schools.
San Francisco Unified School District.

Colorado

Denver Public Schools.

Connecticut

Board of Education of Hartford.
Connecticut State Department of Education.

District of Columbia

Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

Georgia

Atlanta Board of Education.

Illinois

Chicago Archdiocesan School Board.
Chicago Public Schools.

Indiana

Indianapolis Public Schools.

Iowa

Davenport Public Schools.
Iowa State Board of Regents.

Kentucky

Council on Public Higher Education.

Louisiana

Caddo Parish School Board.
New Orleans Archdiocesan School Board.

Maryland

Archdiocesan School System of Baltimore.
Baltimore Department of Education.
Maryland State Department of Education.

Massachusetts

Boston Archdiocesan Department of Education.
Massachusetts State Department of Education.
Newton School Department.
School Committee of the City of Boston.
Springfield Public Schools.
Worcester Public Schools.

Michigan

Detroit Public Schools.
Grosse Pointe Public Schools.
Lansing Public Schools.

Mississippi

Board of Trustees, Jackson Public Schools.
Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning.

Missouri

St. Louis Board of Education.

Nebraska

State Department of Education.

New Jersey

New Jersey Association of Colleges and Universities.
Newark Board of Education.
State Department of Education.

New York

Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York.
Board of Education of the City of New York.
Mount Vernon Public Schools.
New York State Education Department.

North Carolina

North Carolina Board of Higher Education.

Ohio

Cincinnati Archdiocesan School System.
Dayton Board of Education.

Oklahoma

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Oregon

Oregon State System of Higher Education.

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities.
Philadelphia Public Schools.
Reading Public Schools.

Rhode Island

Providence Department of Public Schools.

Texas

Dallas Independent School District.

Utah

Utah Conference on Higher Education.

Virginia

Richmond Public School System.
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.

Wisconsin

Milwaukee Archdiocesan School System.

Institutional members

Alabama

Air University Maxwell Air Force Base.
Alabama College, Montevallo.
Auburn University, Auburn.
Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham.
Florence State College, Florence.
Howard College, Birmingham.
Huntingdon College, Montgomery.
Jacksonville State College, Jacksonville.
Judson College, Marion.
Livingston State College, Livingston.
Marion Institute, Marion.
St. Bernard College, St. Bernard.
Spring Hill College, Mobile.
Stillman College, Tuscaloosa.
Talladega College, Talladega.
Troy State College, Troy.
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute.
University of Alabama, University.

Alaska

University of Alaska, College.

Arizona

Arizona State College, Flagstaff.
Arizona State University, Tempe.
University of Arizona, Tucson.

Arkansas

Agricultural, Mechanical and Normal College, Pine Bluff.
Arkansas College, Batesville.
Arkansas State College, State College.
Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway.
Harding College, Searcy.
Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia.
Hendrix College, Conway.
Philander Smith College, Little Rock.
Southern State College, Magnolia.
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

California

Alameda State College, Hayward.
Bakersfield College, Bakersfield.
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena.
California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks.
California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo.
California Western University, San Diego.
Chapman College, Orange.
Chico State College, Chico.
Claremont Graduate School and University Center, Claremont.
Claremont Men's College, Claremont.
Cogswell Polytechnical College, San Francisco.
College of the Holy Names, Oakland.
College of Notre Dame, Belmont.
Dominican College of San Rafael, San Rafael.
Golden Gate College, San Francisco.
Fresno State College, Fresno.
Harvey Mudd College, Claremont.
Humboldt State College, Arcata.
Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles.
La Sierra College, Arlington.
Loma Linda University, Loma Linda.
Long Beach State College, Long Beach.
Los Angeles Pacific College, Los Angeles.
Los Angeles State College of Applied Arts and Sciences, Los Angeles.
Loyola University of Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
Marymount College, Palos Verdes Estates.
Menlo College, Menlo Park.
Mills College, Oakland.
Modesto Junior College, Modesto.
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles.
Mount San Antonio College, Walnut.
Occidental College, Los Angeles.
Orange Coast College, Costa Mesa.
Orange State College, Fullerton.
Pacific Union College, Angwin.
Pasadena City College, Pasadena.
Pasadena College, Pasadena.
Pepperdine College, Los Angeles.
Pomona College, Claremont.
Sacramento State College, Sacramento.
St. John's Seminary College, Camarillo.
St. Joseph College, Orange.
St. Mary's College of California, St. Mary's College.
San Benito College, Hollister.
San Bernardino Valley College, San Bernardino.
San Diego College for Women, San Diego.
San Diego State College, San Diego.
San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco.
San Francisco State College, San Francisco.
San Jose State College, San Jose.
Scripps College, Claremont.
Stanford University, Stanford.
University of California, Berkeley.
University of the Pacific, Stockton.
University of Redlands, Redlands.
University of San Diego, College for Men, San Diego.
University of San Francisco, San Francisco.
University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara.
University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
Westmont College, Santa Barbara.
Whittier College, Whittier.

Colorado

Adams State College, Alamosa.
Colorado College, Colorado Springs.
Colorado School of Mines, Golden.
Colorado State College, Greeley.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
Colorado Woman's College, Denver.
Fort Lewis Agricultural and Mechanical College, Durango.
Mesa College, Grand Junction.
Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo.
Regis College, Denver.
Trinidad State Junior College, Trinidad.
U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs.
University of Colorado, Boulder.
University of Denver, Denver.
Western State College of Colorado, Gunnison.

Connecticut

Albertus Magnus College, New Haven.
Annhurst College, Woodstock.
Central Connecticut State College, New Britain.
Connecticut College, New London.
Danbury State College, Danbury.
Fairfield University, Fairfield.
New Haven College, West Haven.
Quinnipiac College, Hamden.
St. Joseph College, West Hartford.
Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven.
Trinity College, Hartford.
U.S. Coast Guard Academy, New London.
University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport.
University of Connecticut, Storrs.
University of Hartford, Hartford.
Wesleyan University, Middletown.
Willimantic State College, Willimantic.
Yale University, New Haven.

Delaware

University of Delaware, Newark.
Wesley College, Dover.

District of Columbia

American University.
Catholic University of America.

District of Columbia Teachers College.
Dunbarton College of Holy Cross.
Gallaudet College.
George Washington University.
Georgetown University.
Howard University.
Trinity College.

Florida

Barry College, Miami.
Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach.
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Tallahassee.
Florida Normal and Industrial Memorial College, St. Augustine.
Florida Southern College, Lakeland.
Florida State University, Tallahassee.
Jacksonville University, Jacksonville.
Orlando Junior College, Orlando.
Rollins College, Winter Park.
Stetson University, DeLand.
University of Florida, Gainesville.
University of Miami, Coral Gables.
University of Tampa, Tampa.

Georgia

Agnes Scott College, Decatur.
Albany State College, Albany.
Armstrong College of Savannah, Savannah.
Atlanta University, Atlanta.
Berry College, Mount Berry.
Brenau College, Gainesville.
Clark College, Atlanta.
Emory University, Atlanta.
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.
Georgia Southwestern College, Americus.
La Grange College, La Grange.
Mercer University, Macon.
Morehouse College, Atlanta.
Paine College, Augusta.
Savannah State College, Savannah.
South Georgia College, Douglas.
Spelman College, Atlanta.
University of Georgia, Athens.
Woman's College of Georgia, Milledgeville.

Hawaii

Chaminade College of Honolulu, Honolulu.
University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

Idaho

College of Idaho, Caldwell.
Idaho State College, Pocatello.
North Idaho Junior College, Coeur d'Alene.
Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa.
Ricks College, Rexburg.
University of Idaho, Moscow.

Illinois

Augustana College, Rock Island.
Aurora College, Aurora.
Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Lake Forest.
Backburn College, Carlinville.
Bradley University, Peoria.
Carthage College, Carthage.
Chicago City Junior College, Chicago.
Chicago Teachers College, Chicago.
College of St. Francis, Joliet.
De Paul University, Chicago.
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston.
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst.
Eureka College, Eureka.
George Williams College, Chicago.
Greenville College, Greenville.
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago.
Illinois State Normal University, Normal.
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington.
Kendall College, Evanston.
Knox College, Galesburg.
LaSalle-Peru-Oglesby Junior College, LaSalle.
Loyola University, Chicago.
MacMurray College, Jacksonville.
Maryknoll Seminary, Glen Ellyn.
Millikin University, Decatur.
Monmouth College, Monmouth.
Monticello College, Alton.
Mundelein College, Chicago.
National College of Education, Evanston.
North Central College, Naperville.
North Park College and Theological Seminary, Chicago.
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago.
Northern Illinois University, DeKalb.
Northwestern University, Evanston.
Principia College, Elsah.
Quincy College, Quincy.
Rockford College, Rockford.
Roosevelt University, Chicago.
Rosary College, River Forest.
St. Procopius College, Lisle.
Saint Xavier College, Chicago.
Shimer College, Mount Carroll.
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
Springfield Junior College, Springfield.
University of Chicago, Chicago.
University of Illinois, Urbana.
Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa.
Western Illinois University, Macomb.
Wheaton College, Wheaton.

Indiana

Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Anderson.
Ball State Teachers College, Muncie.
Butler University, Indianapolis.
Concordia Senior College, Fort Wayne.
DePauw University, Greencastle.
Earlham College, Richmond.
Evansville College, Evansville.
Franklin College of Indiana, Franklin.
Goshen College, Goshen.
Hanover College, Hanover.
Indiana Central College, Indianapolis.
Indiana Institute of Technology, Fort Wayne.
Indiana State College, Terre Haute.
Indiana University, Bloomington.
Manchester College, North Manchester.
Marian College, Indianapolis.
Purdue University, Lafayette.
Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute.
Saint Francis College, Fort Wayne.
St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer.
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary-of-the-Woods.
St. Mary's College, Notre Dame.
Taylor University, Upland.
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame.
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso.
Vincennes University, Vincennes.
Wabash College, Crawfordsville.

Iowa

Briar Cliff College, Sioux City.
Central College, Pella.
Clarke College, Dubuque.
Coe College, Cedar Rapids.
Cornell College, Mount Vernon.
Drake University, Des Moines.
Graceland College, Lamoni.
Grinnell College, Grinnell.
Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames.
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant.
Loras College, Dubuque.
Luther College, Decorah.
Marycrest College, Davenport.
Morningside College, Sioux City.
Parsons College, Fairfield.
St. Ambrose College, Davenport.
Simpson College, Indianola.
State College of Iowa, Cedar Falls.
University of Dubuque, Dubuque.
University of Iowa, Iowa City.
Waldorf College, Forest City.
Wartburg College, Waverly.
Westmar College, Le Mars.
William Penn College, Oskaloosa.

Kansas

Baker University, Baldwin.
Bethany College, Lindsborg.
Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays.
Friends University, Wichita.
Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Pittsburg.
Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia.
Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Manhattan.
Marymount College, Salina.
Mount St. Scholastica College, Atchison.
Ottawa University, Ottawa.
St. Benedict's College, Atchison.
Saint Mary College, Xavier.
Southwestern College, Winfield.
University of Kansas, Lawrence.
University of Wichita, Wichita.
Washburn University of Topeka, Topeka.

Kentucky

Berea College, Berea.
Centre College of Kentucky, Danville.
Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond.
Kentucky State College, Frankfort.
Kentucky Wesleyan College, Owensboro.
Morehead State College, Morehead.
Murray State College, Murray.
Nazareth College, Louisville.
Nazareth College of Kentucky, Nazareth.
Transylvania University, Lexington.
University of Kentucky, Lexington.
University of Louisville, Louisville.
Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green.

Louisiana

Centenary College, Shreveport.
Dillard University, New Orleans.
Grambling College, Grambling.
Louisiana College, Pineville.
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston.
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge.
Loyola University, New Orleans.
McNeese State College, Lake Charles.
Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe.
Northwestern State College of Louisiana, Natchitoches.
St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans.
Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond.
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge.
Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans.
University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette.
Xavier University, New Orleans.

Maine

Bowdoin College, Brunswick.
Colby College, Waterville.
Gorham State Teachers College, Gorham.
St. Joseph's College, North Windham.
University of Maine, Orono.
Westbrook Junior College, Portland.

Maryland

College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore.
Columbia Union College, Takoma Park.
Goucher College, Baltimore.
Hood College, Frederick.
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
Loyola College, Baltimore.
Maryland State College, Princess Anne.
Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park.
Morgan State College, Baltimore.
Mount Saint Agnes College, Mount Washington.
Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg.
St. John's College, Annapolis.
St. Joseph College, Emmitsburg.
St. Mary's Seminary Junior College, St. Mary's City.
State Teachers College, Frostburg.
State Teachers College at Towson, Baltimore.
U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis.
University of Maryland, College Park.
Washington College, Chestertown.
Western Maryland College, Westminster.
Woodstock College, Woodstock.

Massachusetts

American International College, Springfield.
Amherst College, Amherst.
Anna Marie College for Women, Paxton.
Assumption College, Worcester.
Babson Institute of Business Administration, Babson Park.
Boston College, Chestnut Hill.
Boston University, Boston.
Bradford Junior College, Bradford.

Brandeis University, Waltham.
Clark University, Worcester.
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester.
College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee.
Eastern Nazarene College, Quincy.
Emerson College, Boston.
Emmanuel College, Boston.
Endicott Junior College, Beverley.
Franklin Institute of Boston, Boston.
Harvard University, Cambridge.
Hebrew Teachers College, Brookline.
Lasell Junior College, Auburndale.
Lesley College, Cambridge.
Lowell Technological Institute, Lowell.
Massachusetts College of Art, Boston.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.
Merrimack College, North Andover.
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley.
New England Conservatory of Music, Boston.
Nichols College of Business Administration (Junior College Division), Dudley.
Northeastern University, Boston.
Pine Manor Junior College, Wellesley.
Regis College, Weston.
Simmons College, Boston.
Smith College, Northampton.
Springfield College, Springfield.
Stonehill College, North Easton.
Tufts University, Medford.
University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
Wellesley College, Wellesley.
Wentworth Institute, Boston.
Wheaton College, Norton.
Wheelock College, Boston.
Williams College, Williamstown.
Worcester Junior College, Worcester.
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester.

Michigan

Albion College, Albion.
Alma College, Alma.
Andrews University, Berrien Springs.
Calvin College, Grand Rapids.
Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant.
Community College & Technical Institute, Benton Harbor.
Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti.
Ferris Institute, Big Rapids.
General Motors Institute, Flint.
Gogebic Community College, Ironwood.
Henry Ford Community College, Dearborn.
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale.
Hope College, Holland.
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo.
Marygrove College, Detroit.
Mercy College, Detroit.
Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit.
Michigan College of Mining & Technology, Houghton.
Michigan State University, East Lansing.
Northern Michigan College, Marquette.
Northwestern Michigan College, Traverse City.
Siena Heights College, Adrian.
University of Detroit, Detroit.
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
Wayne State University, Detroit.
Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Minnesota

Augsburg College & Theological Seminary, Minneapolis.
Bemidji State College, Bemidji.
Bethel College & Seminary, St. Paul.
Carleton College, Northfield.
College of St. Benedict, St. Joseph.
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul.
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth.
College of St. Teresa, Winona.
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.
Concordia College, Moorhead.
Concordia College, St. Paul.
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter.
Hamline University, St. Paul.
Macalester College, St. Paul.
Mankato State College, Mankato.
Minneapolis School of Art, Minneapolis.
Moorhead State College, Moorhead.
Rochester Junior College, Rochester.
St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud.
St. John's University, Collegeville.
St. Mary's College, Winona.
St. Olaf College, Northfield.
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
Virginia Junior College, Virginia.
Winona State College, Winona.

Mississippi

Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College, Lorman.
Delta State College, Cleveland.
Hinds Junior College, Raymond.
Jackson State College, Jackson.
Jones County Junior College, Ellisville.
Millsaps College, Jackson.
Mississippi College, Clinton.
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus.
Mississippi State University, State College.
University of Mississippi, University.
University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg.
William Carey College, Hattiesburg.

Missouri

Avila College, Kansas City.
Central Methodist College, Fayette.
Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg.
Christian College, Columbia.
Culver-Stockton College, Canton.
Drury College, Springfield.
Fontbonne College, St. Louis.
Harris Teachers College, St. Louis.
Junior College of Kansas City, Kansas City.
Lincoln University, Jefferson City.
Lindenwood College, St. Charles.
Marillac College, Normandy.
Maryville College of the Sacred Heart, St. Louis.
Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville.
Northwest Missouri State College, Maryville.
Park College, Parkville.
Rockhurst College, Kansas City.
Saint Louis University, St. Louis.
Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield.
Stephens College, Columbia.
University of Kansas City, Kansas City.
University of Missouri, Columbia.
Washington University, St. Louis.
Webster College, Webster Groves.
Westminster College, Fulton.
William Jewell College, Liberty.
William Woods College, Fulton.

Montana

College of Great Falls, Great Falls.
Eastern Montana College of Education, Billings.
Montana School of Mines, Butte.
Montana State College, Bozeman.
Montana State University, Missoula.
Northern Montana College, Havre.

Nebraska

College of Saint Mary, Omaha.
Creighton University, Omaha.
Doane College, Crete.
Duchesne College of the Sacred Heart, Omaha.
Hastings College, Hastings.
Midland Lutheran College, Fremont.
Municipal University of Omaha, Omaha.
Nebraska State Teachers College, Chadron.
Nebraska State Teachers College, Kearney.
Nebraska State Teachers College, Wayne.
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln.
Union College, Lincoln.
University of Nebraska, Lincoln.

Nevada

University of Nevada, Reno.

New Hampshire

Colby Junior College for Women, New London.
Dartmouth College, Hanover.
Mount Saint Mary College, Hooksett.
Rivier College, Nashua.
St. Anselm's College, Manchester.
University of New Hampshire, Durham.

New Jersey

Bloomfield College, Bloomfield.
Caldwell College for Women, Caldwell.
Centenary College for Women, Hackettstown.
College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station.
Drew University, Madison.
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford.
Georgian Court College, Lakewood.
Glassboro State College, Glassboro.
Jersey City State College, Jersey City.
Monmouth College, West Long Branch.
Montclair State College, Upper Montclair.
Newark College of Engineering, Newark.
Paterson State College, Wayne.
Princeton University, Princeton.
Rider College, Trenton.
Rutgers, The State University, New Brunswick.
St. Peter's College, Jersey City.
Seton Hall University, South Orange.
Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken.
Trenton State College, Trenton.
Union Junior College, Cranford.
Upsala College, East Orange.

New Mexico

New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro.
New Mexico Military Institute, Roswell.
New Mexico State University, University Park.
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
Western New Mexico University, Silver City.

New York

Adephi College, Garden City.
Alfred University, Alfred.
Bank Street College of Education, New York.
Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson.
Bennett College, Millbrook.
Briarcliff College, Briarcliff Manor.
Canisius College, Buffalo.
Cazenovia College, Cazenovia.
The City University of New York; Brooklyn College, Brooklyn; City College, New York; Hunter College, New York; Queens College, Flushing; Staten Island Community College, Staten Island.
Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam.
Colgate University, Hamilton.
College of Mount St. Vincent, New York.
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle.
College of Saint Rose, Albany.
Columbia University, New York.
Cooper Union, New York.
Cornell University, Ithaca.
D'Youville College, Buffalo.
Elmira College, Elmira.
Fashion Institute of Technology, New York.
Finch College, New York.
Fordham University, New York.
Good Counsel College, White Plains.
Hamilton College, Clinton.
Hartwick College, Oneonta.
Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva.
Hofstra College, Hempstead.
Houghton College, Houghton.
Iona College, New Rochelle.
Ithaca College, Ithaca.
Jamestown Community College, Jamestown.
Keuka College, Keuka Park.
Ladycliff College, Highland Falls.
LeMoyne College, Syracuse.
Long Island University, Brooklyn.
Manhattan College, New York.
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Purchase.
Marymount College, Tarrytown.
Marymount Manhattan College, New York.
Mills College of Education, New York.
Mohawk Valley Technical Institute, Utica.

Mount St. Joseph Teachers College, Buffalo.
Nazareth College, Rochester.
New School for Social Research, New York.
New York City Community College of Applied Arts and Sciences, Brooklyn.
New York University, New York.
Niagara University, Niagara, N.Y.
Notre Dame College of Staten Island, Grymes Hill.
Pace College, New York.
Packer Collegiate Institute, Brooklyn.
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Brooklyn.
Pratt Institute, Brooklyn.
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy.
Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester.
Rockefeller Institute, New York.
Rosary Hill College, Buffalo.
Russell Sage College, Troy.
Siena College, Loudonville.
St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure.
St. Francis College, Brooklyn.
St. John Fisher College, Rochester.
St. John's University, Jamaica.
St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn.
St. Lawrence University, Canton.
Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville.
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs.
State University of New York, Albany.
State University at Buffalo, Buffalo.
Syracuse University, Syracuse.
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
Union College and University, Schenectady.
U.S. Military Academy, West Point.
University of Rochester, Rochester.
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie.
Wagner College, Staten Island.
Wells College, Aurora.
Yeshiva University, New York.

North Carolina

Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, Greensboro.
Bennett College, Greensboro.
Catawba College, Salisbury.
Davidson College, Davidson.
Duke University, Durham.
East Carolina College, Greenville.
Elon College, Elon College.
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte.
Lenoir-Rhyne College, Hickory.
Livingstone College, Salisbury.
Meredith College, Raleigh.
North Carolina College at Durham, Durham.
North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, Raleigh.
Queens College, Charlotte.
St. Augustine's College, Raleigh.
Shaw University, Raleigh.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
Western Carolina College, Cullowhee.
Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro.

North Dakota

Jamestown College, Jamestown.
North Dakota State University, Fargo.
State Teachers College, Mayville.
State Teachers College, Minot.
State Teachers College, Valley City.
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

Ohio

Air Force Institute of Technology, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.
Antioch College, Yellow Springs.
Ashland College, Ashland.
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea.
Bluffton College, Bluffton.
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green.
Capital University, Columbus.
Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland.
Central State College, Wilberforce.
College of Mount St. Joseph-on-the-Ohio, Mount St. Joseph.
College of St. Mary, of the Springs, Columbus.
College of Steubenville, Steubenville.
College of Wooster, Wooster.
Defiance College, Defiance.
Denison University, Granville.
Fenn College, Cleveland.
Findlay College, Findlay.
Heidelberg College, Tiffin.
Hiram College, Hiram.
John Carroll University, Cleveland.
Kent State University, Kent.
Kenyon College, Gambier.
Lake Erie College, Painesville.
Marietta College, Marietta.
Miami University, Oxford.
Mount Union College, Alliance.
Muskingum College, New Concord.
Notre Dame College, Cleveland.
Oberlin College, Oberlin.
Ohio College of Applied Science, Cincinnati.
Ohio Northern University, Ada.
Ohio State University, Columbus.
Ohio University, Athens.
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.
Otterbein College, Westerville.
Our Lady of Cincinnati College, Cincinnati.
Saint John College of Cleveland, Cleveland.
University of Akron, Akron.
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.
University of Dayton, Dayton.
University of Toledo, Toledo.
Western College for Women, Oxford.
Western Reserve University, Cleveland.
Wilberforce University, Wilberforce.
Wilmington College, Wilmington.
Wittenberg University, Springfield.
Xavier University, Cincinnati.
Youngstown University, Youngstown.

Oklahoma

Central State College, Edmond.
East Central State College, Ada.
Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Wilburton.
Langston University, Langston.
Northeastern State College, Tahlequah.
Northern Oklahoma Junior College, Tonkawa.
Northwestern State College, Alva.
Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Stillwater.
Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College, Goodwell.
Phillips University, Enid.
Southeastern State College, Durant.
Southwestern State College, Weatherford.
University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Oregon

Lewis and Clark College, Portland.
Linfield College, McMinnville.
Marylhurst College, Marylhurst.
Mount Angel College, Mount Angel.
Oregon College of Education, Monmouth.
Oregon State University, Corvallis.
Pacific University, Forest Grove.
Portland State College, Portland.
Reed College, Portland.
University of Oregon, Eugene.
University of Portland, Portland.
Willamette University, Salem.

Pennsylvania

Albright College, Reading.
Allegheny College, Meadville.
Alliance College, Cambridge Springs.
Beaver College, Glenside.
Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg.
Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr.
Bucknell University, Lewisburg.
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh.
Cedar Crest College, Allentown.
Chatham College, Pittsburgh.
Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia.
Cheyney State College, Cheyney.
Clarion State College, Clarion.
College Misericordia, Dallas.
Dickinson College, Carlisle.
Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia.
Dropsie College, Philadelphia.
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh.
East Stroudsburg State College, East Stroudsburg.
Edinboro State College, Edinboro.
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown.
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.
Gannon College, Erie.
Geneva College, Beaver Falls.
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.
Grove City College, Grove City.
Gwynedd-Mercy Junior College, Gwynedd Valley.
Haverford College, Haverford.
Hershey Junior College, Hershey.
Holy Family College, Philadelphia.
Immaculata College, Immaculata.
Indiana State College, Indiana.
Jefferson Medical College, Philadelphia.
Juniata College, Huntingdon.
Keystone Junior College, La Plume.
King's College, Wilkes-Barre.
Kutztown State College, Kutztown.
Lafayette College, Easton.
LaSalle College, Philadelphia.
Lebanon Valley College, Annville.
Lehigh University, Bethehem.
Lincoln University, Lincoln University.
Lock Haven State College, Lock Haven.
Lycoming College, Williamsport.
Mansfield State College, Mansfield.
Marywood College, Scranton.
Mercyhurst College, Erie.
Millersville State College, Millersville.
Moore College of Art, Philadelphia.
Moravian College, Bethlehem.
Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh.
Muhlenberg College, Allentown.
Pennsylvania Military College, Chester.
Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science, Philadelphia.
Philadelphia Museum College of Art, Philadelphia.
Rosemont College, Rosemont.
St. Francis College, Loretto.
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia.
St. Vincent College, Latrobe.
Seton Hill College, Greensburg.
Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg.
Slippery Rock State College, Slippery Rock.
Spring Garden Institute, Philadelphia.
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove.
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore.
Temple University, Philadelphia.
Thiel College, Greenville.
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
University of Scranton, Scranton.
Ursinus College, Collegeville.
Valley Forge Military Junior College, Wayne.
Villa Maria College, Erie.
Villanova University, Villanova.
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington.
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg.
West Chester State College, West Chester.
Westminster College, New Wilmington.
Westminster Theological Seminary, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia.
Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre.
Wilson College, Chambersburg.
York Junior College, York.

Puerto Rico

Catholic University of Puerto Rico, Ponce.
College of the Sacred Heart, Santurce.
Puerto Rico Junior College, Río Piedras.
University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras.

Rhode Island

Brown University, Providence.
Providence College, Providence.
Rhode Island School of Design, Providence.
Salve Regina College, Newport.
University of Rhode Island, Kingston.

South Carolina

Benedict College, Columbia.
Clemson College, Clemson.
Coker College, Hartsville.
College of Charleston, Charleston.
Erskine College, Due West.
Furman University, Greenville.
Newberry College, Newberry.
South Carolina State College, Orangeburg.
University of South Carolina, Columbia.
Winthrop College, Rock Hill.

South Dakota

Augustana College, Sioux Falls.
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell.
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Rapid City.
South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Brookings.
State University of South Dakota, Vermillion.
Yankton College, Yankton.

Tennessee

Austin Peay State College, Clarksville.
Belmont College, Nashville.
David Lipscomb College, Nashville.
East Tennessee State College, Johnson City.
Fisk University, Nashville.
George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville.
King College, Bristol.
Knoxville College, Knoxville.
Lambuth College, Jackson.
Le Moyne College, Memphis.
Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate.
Maryville College, Maryville.
Memphis State University, Memphis.
Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro.
Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville.
Siena College, Memphis.
Southwestern at Memphis, Memphis.
Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University, Nashville.
Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville.
Tennessee Wesleyan College, Athens.
Tusculum College, Greeneville.
Union University, Jackson.
University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga.
University of the South, Sewanee.
University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
Vanderbilt University, Nashville.

Texas

Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station.
Amarillo College, Amarillo.
Austin College, Sherman.
Baylor University, Waco.
Del Mar College, Corpus Christi.
Frank Phillips College, Borger.
Howard Payne College, Brownwood.
Incarnate Word College, San Antonio.
Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont.
Lee College, Baytown.
North Texas State University, Denton.
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio.
Pan American College, Edinburg.
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College, Prairie View.
Rice University, Houston.
Sacred Heart Dominican College, Houston.
St. Edward's University, Austin.
St. Mary's University of San Antonio, San Antonio.
Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville.
Southern Methodist University, Dallas.
Southwestern University, Georgetown.
Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches.
Sul Ross State College, Alpine.
Tarleton State College, Stephenville.
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.
Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville.
Texas Southern University, Houston.
Texas Technological College, Lubbock.
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth.
Texas Western College of the University of Texas, El Paso.
Texas Woman's University, Denton.
Trinity University, San Antonio.
University of Houston, Houston.
University of Texas, Austin.
West Texas State College, Canyon.
Wharton County Junior College, Wharton.

Utah

Brigham Young University, Provo.
Dixie Junior College, St. George.
University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Logan.
Weber College, Ogden.

Vermont

Bennington College, Bennington.
Castleton State College, Castleton.
Goddard College, Plainfield.
Green Mountain College, Poultney.
Johnson State College, Johnson.
Middlebury College, Middlebury.
Norwich University, Northfield.
St. Michael's College, Winooski.
Trinity College, Burlington.
University of Vermont, Burlington.
Vermont College, Montpelier.

Virginia

Averett College, Danville.
Bridgewater College, Bridgewater.
College of William and Mary, Williamsburg.
Emory and Henry College, Emory.
Ferrum Junior College, Ferrum.
Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney.
Hampton Institute, Hampton.
Hollins College, Hollins College.
Lynchburg College, Lynchburg.
Madison College, Harrisonburg.
Mary Baldwin College, Staunton.
Mary Washington College of the University of Virginia, Fredericksburg.
Marymount College, Arlington.
Medical College of Virginia, Richmond.
Old Dominion College, Norfolk.
Randolph-Macon College, Ashland.
Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg.
Roanoke College, Salem.
Shenandoah College, Winchester.
Sullins College, Bristol.
Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar.
University of Richmond, Richmond.
University of Virginia, Charlottesville.
Virginia Military Institute, Lexington.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.
Virginia State College, Petersburg.
Virginia Union University, Richmond.
Washington and Lee Univeristy, Lexington.

Washington

Central Washington State College, Ellensburg.
Eastern Washington State College, Cheney.
Gonzaga University, Spokane.
Holy Names College, Spokane.
Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma.
Seattle Pacific College, Seattle.
Seattle University, Seattle.
University of Washington, Seattle.
Walla Walla College, College Place.
Washington State University, Pullman.
Western Washington State College, Bellingham.
Whitman College, Walla Walla.
Whitworth College, Spokane.

West Virginia

Alderson-Broaddus College, Philippi.
Bethany College, Bethany.
Bluefield State College, Bluefield.
Concord College, Athens.
Fairmont State College, Fairmont.
Glenville State College, Glenville.
Marshall University, Huntington.
Morris Harvey College, Charleston.
Potomac State College of West Virginia University, Keyser.
Shepherd College, Shepherdstown.
West Liberty State College, West Liberty.
West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery.
West Virginia State College, Institute.
West Virginia Universtiy, Morgantown.
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon.
Wheeling College, Wheeling.

Wisconsin

Alverno College, Milwaukee.
Beloit College, Beloit.
Cardinal Stritch College, Milwaukee.
Carroll College, Waukesha.
Dominican College, Racine.
Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart, Madison.
The Institute of Paper Chemistry, Appleton.
Lakeland College, Sheboygan.
Lawrence College, Appleton.
Marian College of Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac.
Marquette University, Milwaukee.
Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee.
Milwaukee Institute of Technology, Milwaukee.
Milwaukee School of Engineering, Milwaukee.
Mount Mary College, Milwaukee.
Northland College, Ashland.
Ripon College, Ripon.
St. Norbert College, West De Pere.
Stout State College, Menomonie.
University of Wisconsin, Madison.
Viterbo College, La Crosse.
Wisconsin State College, Eau Claire.
Wisconsin State College, Oshkosh.
Wisconsin State College, River Falls.
Wisconsin State College, Superior.
Wisconsin State College, Whitewater.

Wyoming

Casper College, Casper.
University of Wyoming, Laramie.

Affiliates

Alpha Epsilon Delta.
American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
American Book Publishers Council, Committee on Reading Development.
American Dietetic Association.
American Economic Foundation.
American Educational Theater Association.
American Jewish Committee.
American National Red Cross.
American Nurses' Association.
American Psychiatric Association.
American Social Health Association, Inc.
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
Asia Foundation.
Association of College Honor Societies.
Boy Scouts of America.
Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences.
Cooperative Bureau for Teachers.
Delphian Society.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Girl Scouts of the United States of America.
International Business Machines Corp., Education Department.
Japan International Christian University Foundation, Inc.
National Association of Educational Buyers.
National Committee for Careers in Medical Technology.
National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Council of the Young Men's Christian Associations.
National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations.
National Interfraternity Conference.

National Safety Council.
Omicron Delta Kappa Society.
Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia Fraternity of America.
Southern Education Foundation.
Standard Oil Co. of California, Education Section, Public Relations Department.
United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.
World University Service.

Maryland

Oldfields School, Inc., Glencoe.
Park School, Brooklandville.
St. Timothy's School, Stevenson.

Massachusetts

Northampton School for Girls, Northampton.
Phillips Academy, Andover.
St. Mark's School, Southborough.

Minnesota

William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute, Minneapolis.

New Hampshire

St. Paul's School, Concord.

New York

Brooklyn Public Library.
Chapin School, Ltd., New York.
Ethical Culture Schools, New York.
Masters School, Dobbs Ferry.
New York Public Library.

Ohio

Public Library of Cincinnati.

Texas

Texas Foundation of Voluntary Supported Colleges and Universities.

Wisconsin

Milwaukee Public Library.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment the American Council on Education in taking this action as recently as the 4th of October, has shown clearly that it recognizes the problems we face and has indicated its willingness to work constructively with the Congress in achieving the possible in desirable legislation.

But be that as it may, even if I found myself in the position of being opposed by all of the college presidents of the United States, as I hope would never happen, I would still have the duty, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, and as Senator in charge of the bill, to press for the adoption of the bill which the committee by an overwhelming vote, sent to the floor of the Senate. I have a good many reasons for my position, many of which were discussed in my major speech explaining the bill yesterday. But in view of the very able address of the Senator from Vermont, which was the product of the driving sincerity of purpose for which the Senator is well known, I feel that it is necessary for me at least to place a short rebuttal in the RECORD this afternoon, even though some of it may be somewhat repetitious.

BASIC ISSUE

The issue is whether we desire to raise on the floor of the Senate the church-state controversy and get no bill, or whether we wish to try to lead the college leaders of our country down a road that will lead directly to the ultimate goal of helping young men and women obtain a college education. I make that statement because no bill would mean that into the indefinite future, or until legislation is enacted, we would continue to deny tens of thousands of young men and women in our country an opportunity to obtain a college education. Unless the Federal Government proceeds without further delay to take up the burden of its share of the responsibility for aiding institutions of higher learning by providing them with some financial assistance, we shall weaken the security of our Republic by wasting the potential brainpower of tens of thousands of our youth.

The issue is simply stated. The House has passed a general grant bill the benefits of which would be available to religious colleges in the United States. They would be eligible under the provisions of the House bill for across-the-board grants. That is the bill which the Senator from Vermont wants the Senate to approve. As I said yesterday, if it should develop that there is any danger of approval of that bill, we should get ready to eat our Christmas dinners here, because we shall never get to the civil rights filibuster. I have no doubt that if we stir up that hornets' nest on the floor of the Senate, there will be a determined effort—and notice has been served upon me that there will be a determined effort—to cause a prolonged debate on this issue. The separation-of-church-and-state principle reflects the deep convictions of a good many Senators.

I say to the college presidents of the United States who are urging us to pass the House bill, "Get wise to yourselves."

DISCUSSION WITH EDUCATORS

This morning I participated in a 45-minute telephonic broadcast to a regional convention of presidents and deans and administrators of many private colleges in the United States. I was advised that the overwhelming majority of them came from religious colleges. They had received the telegram sent by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

The format of the interview was that I was to speak for 15 minutes, which I did, summarizing my speech of yesterday to the Senate; and then I was to submit myself to their questions, which I gladly did.

During the question period, one of the good fathers, a president of a Catholic college, said—

> But we have a telegram from Senator PROUTY which tells us there will be no higher education legislation at all unless the Senate passes the House bill.

My fondness for my good friend from Vermont was such that I felt constrained and restrained in discussing the point raised by the good father, but I said—

> I have no doubt that my good friend from Vermont feels exactly that way. But you also find yourself in the situation that leads those of us on the opposite side to feel that the best way to assure you there will be no higher education legislation would be to support the Prouty proposal.

Then I came to the crux of the problem, as I see it. I said, "I want to address myself now to you presidents and deans of universities with religious connections. If you continue to insist on the all-or-none approach to this problem—that either there be general grants to Catholic, Presbyterian, Baptist, and other religious colleges or no legislation at all—there will be no legislation in my judgment. I must then take the position that the full responsibility for no legislation in the field of higher education be placed squarely upon the shoulders of the religious leaders, the administrators of Catholic, Baptist, Presbyterian, and other religious schools who are trying to insist upon general grants for religious or denominational colleges."

Such educational leaders ought to recognize what they are doing. They are following a course which in the decades ahead will result in depriving tens of thousands of young men and women of the higher education they need.

I assure Senators that the position which I have taken for some years in the Senate has not made me very popular in some places. I have always said, good naturedly, as I said to the group of private college educators this morning, "I know fully well the result of my position. It has meant that I now have all the Catholics against me, and all the Protestants against me, and all the Jews against me; but, so far as I am concerned, that only proves that I am absolutely correct."

I am not a special pleader, as they are. I have a responsibility as chairman of the subcommittee and the Senator in charge of consideration of the bill to try to get all college administrators, private and public, fully to understand that we have a great obligation to proceed without further delay to obtain Federal assistance for the building of facilities necessary to meet the demands of the young people of this country for an opportunity to go to college. We do not have the facilities available at the present time to accommodate all of those qualified to attend college.

ADMISSION STANDARDS RISE

As the space shortage grows what will happen? There is no other course that a college president can follow but to lift the selection standards again and again. Thus thousands who ought to be able to go to college will be kept from college because they cannot meet the admission standards.

I say to the American people, "Get it out of your heads, if you think that situation is in the public interest."

There is no question that a multitude of young people out of college who have the ability to do college work are not being admitted.

Parents within the sound of my voice with boys or girls who want to go to college, or who have tried to go to college, or parents of boys or girls who were admitted to college, know whereof I speak. Most people would be surprised by the amount of mail I receive from distraught parents with children who have graduated from high school with a C average. They cannot gain admission to college.

My colleagues in the Senate have heard me raise my voice in plea for the C student before. The C student, when all is said and done, is the backbone of American education. The C student, the average student, is the backbone of

American educated citizenry. We must stop denying to the C student an opportunity to attend college. We must stop denying to any young man or woman in this country who has the ability to carry average college work the opportunity to go to college, not only because of the obligation we owe to that individual as a person, but also because of the obligation we owe to the security of the Republic.

I repeat it for emphasis. If one were to ask me to name the three most important defense weapons of the United States in this era of great crisis for the United States, I would name as one the potential brain power of the youth of America.

We either develop that brainpower to the maximum extent possible, or we have no chance of keeping ahead of Russia. We are not going to keep ahead of her in population. There is no question about the fact. We have no brainpower to waste, Mr. President.

NEED FOR AID—TESTIMONY OF DR. WILSON

Yesterday I quoted Dr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education. Here is the man, to qualify my witness, who is the president of a council composed of most of the 2,000 universities and colleges of this country.

In part as rebuttal to my good friend from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], I say to the college and university presidents of America, "Listen to him. He is your executive."

I put his testimony, in some detail, into the RECORD yesterday, but I repeat it again today. Dr. Wilson said, testifying before the committee as a witness—and an able witness he was; he took all the cross examination we could throw at him; he handled himself magnificently—

> I am glad you emphasized the fact that this is not a temporary phenomenon—

We were talking about the great increase in the number of young men and women who are seeking to educate themselves in institutions of higher learning in the United States.

I repeat. He said:

> I am glad you emphasized the fact that this is not a temporary phenomenon. This will go on for at least two decades. A colleague of mine made this quite graphic by saying that between now and 1980 to accommodate these students, we would need to double the size of every existing institution of higher learning and establish a thousand new institutions with an average of 2,500 students.
>
> America, wake up. American taxpayers, American mothers and fathers, come to your senses, before it is too late, in regard to the great educational crisis that faces this country.

We shall have to double the size of every university and college in this country by 1980, and beyond that the need is to establish a thousand new universities and colleges, with an average enrollment of 2,500 students, if we are to meet the facilities' needs by 1980.

There is need before then, too. It is detailed in a letter from Dr. James H. Jensen, president of Oregon State University I received on September 19, 1963. I cite his statistics for the need in just the next few years as an example which I am sure could be duplicated in every State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that relevant excerpts from Dr. Jensen's letter to which I have referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY,
> *September 19, 1963.*
>
> Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The absence of correspondence from me regarding matters educational and particularly regarding matters relating to the Education Subcommittee under your chairmanship must not be taken as indicating a lack of interest or concern on my part. Ordinarily I am reluctant to add to the heavy mail that Senators and Congressmen receive.
>
> I must confess some disappointment that the Education Subcommittee on December 10 decided to take up the vocational educational bill first instead of H.R. 6143. It is, of course, a good likelihood that strategy may have indicated the decision. There is no need, I am sure, of assuring you of the urgency of strongly supporting higher education at both National and State levels.
>
> I know that gross statistics are available to you and that you are well informed. To bring the matter down to a sharp local focus, I include the following data brought together just 2 days ago through telephone calls to the principals of several representative high schools in Oregon:

High schools	Number of 1963 graduates	Number in senior class this fall, candidates for college in 1964	Number in junior class this fall, candidates for college in 1965
David Douglas	382	552	718
Albany	291	388	489
Beaverton	285	416	560
Corvallis	325	400	487
South Eugene	463	537	619
Grant, Portland	607	763	747
Klamath Falls	380	422	557
Medford	460	[1] 600	[1] 700
Ontario	127	137	191
Pendleton	201	251	294
South Salem	400	513	703

[1] Approximate.

> These data are very meaningful to us and, it was thought, might be useful to you, too.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Please be assured of our gratefulness for your excellent support in the past. I hope that you understand that my deep concern stems from a realization of the formidable task ahead.
>
> My best personal wishes to you.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> JAMES H. JENSEN,
> *President.*

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I said yesterday that my first responsibility in this debate is to assume the burden of proof for showing a need for the bill which, on behalf of my committee, I am urging the Senate to pass. That is my proof.

I rest my case, in assuming the burden of proof, because Dr. Logan Wilson's testimony and the statistics are undeniable.

CHURCH-STATE PROBLEM

Are we going to delay or prevent legislation by getting into a state-church "hassle" which will kill the bill? In my judgment, the decision on that question is up to the administrators of private colleges of America more than anybody else, and I do not intend to let them off the hook.

As I said this morning in my telephonic conversation with a group of private college and university administrators, "I would have you take a look realistically at the facts." I used the same hypothetical case in talking to them this morning that I used on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, which I now repeat: Consider two colleges, a public one, called A, and a private one, called X. The private one may be a Catholic college, or a Presbyterian college, or a Baptist college. I care not what, so long as it is a college affiliated with a religious denomination. Let us assume for the sake of argument that the House bill is passed by both bodies and signed by the President. It calls for $2,015 million for the next 5 years.

DOLLAR BENEFITS THE SAME

Does a single college president of a single religious college think he will get $1 more under the House bill than he will get under the Senate bill, if the amount remains the same? There is some difference in the dollar amount between the two versions since the Senate bill carries only $1,750 million.

Does any president of a religious college think he would get $1 more under a general grant bill than he would get under the Senate bill, which is a categorical use bill? The answer is "No."

Mr. President, there is only so much money to allocate and distribute. To continue with my hypothetical, under the Senate bill if a Catholic or Presbyterian or Baptist university or college needs a library, a physics building, a chemistry building, or a building for engineering instruction, it would be just as eligible for money for those purposes, as it would be eligible for money for those purposes under the House bill. Under the House bill it would also be eligible for money for any purpose that the religious college wanted to spend it for with only the divinity and medical school exceptions. That is where the shoe pinches.

Our hypothetical college has not a chance under either bill, because of the limitation of funds, of getting more than enough money for any one of those buildings, whether it be a chemistry or physics building, a library, or an engineering building. The money authorized and appropriated is all the money there is going to be.

I said yesterday, and again this morning to the administrators of religious colleges, "You would be no better off financially under the House bill than under the Senate bill. You would get as many dollars under the Senate bill. Why, in the name of taking a stand on what you consider to be a great principle, do you sacrifice the interest of thousands of young men and women who could be benefited by the adoption of a categorical use bill?"

Mr. President, a few moments ago we heard the Senator from Vermont read telegrams from college educators who claimed that the Senate bill favors the natural sciences and disadvantages social sciences and the humanities.

That is pure nonsense. It shows that those who sent the telegrams have not studied the situation. That is not extraordinary on a college campus, particularly when political problems are involved in connection with legislation. If we brought them here one by one, they would say, "We do not know very much about politics." I would have to say to them, "That happens to be my business."

I must pay attention not only to the art of politics, but also to the legislative process. College presidents ought to know that if they get a physics building which costs a million dollars or $2 million or *x* amount under the Senate bill, their own funds to the extent of that amount would be available to them to build a social science building. The Senate bill is the best prospect they have of getting a physics building or chemistry building built since the funds are equitably distributed among all the colleges, public and private.

The fallacy of the arguments made by the college presidents in the telegrams sent is that they apparently move from the major premise that they will be able to get all the money they need for all the buildings they need to construct. That is not even envisioned in the program. They ought to register for a refresher course in their own university's course in logic, for making that kind of argument to the Senate. This is not an all-inclusive, comprehensive, total support program for the building needs of the colleges and universities of America.

This is an aid bill. It is a Federal assistance bill. The primary monetary obligations will have to be assumed by the States and by the institutions themselves. We propose to help them.

Therefore, let us nail this point down once and for all. We can dismiss all the telegrams that were submitted by the Senator from Vermont on this point, which brings up the old scarecrow argument that the bill favors the natural sciences, the libraries, and the engineering departments.

The bill is offered on the basis of the justification that it is constitutional for Congress to assist denominational schools and universities in those respects where the assistance can be said to be related to the defense of our country. That is the theory.

This leads me into the last point I wish to make by way of rebuttal to my good friend from Vermont.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I would like to make a suggestion to the Senator from Oregon, who works very hard on these points. If the committee were to adopt the procedure of permitting people to use pretax dollars for educational and tuitional fees, we would not have the problem of religious education, because parents would be able to send their children wherever they wished to send them with pretax dollars, and they would get the same benefit as they would get from first collecting the fees and then distributing them.

Mr. MORSE. We have battled out that point for some years in the Senate, and the proposal was rejected each time it was offered. I am sure it will be offered again, and I hope it will be rejected again. There are many objections to such a proposal, and I will not go into them now, but will wait until the proposal is made. I will object to such a proposal and will not support it, because it is class legislation, pure and simple.

It selects a certain part of our population which has children to send to college and gives to them certain benefits, for which we ask certain other people who have no children to assume additional tax burdens.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have heard that argument made before. For some time I have been urging the enactment of this type of bill both in Congress and in the State legislature. The plan gives a person the opportunity to use his own means——

Mr. MORSE. At the expense of the rest of the people.

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not see how it can be called class legislation.

Mr. MORSE. It is done at the expense of other taxpayers. The proposal amounts to our saying to one person, "You can have this tax benefit because you have a boy or girl whom you wish to send to college," and saying to another person, "You cannot have this benefit, because you do not have a boy or girl. You must pay your tax in addition."

I believe we must establish a uniform principle. The money comes out of the General Treasury on the basis of uniform collection based upon ability to pay. Therefore there must be a uniform Federal aid program.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

I wish to speak briefly on the issue that I was raising, the issue of constitutionalism. It will not be settled until the Supreme Court finally passes judgment on the question of how far we can go in aiding religious schools. There are able lawyers in the Senate on both sides of that issue. It is not a black or white issue. I hold to the point of view that a general grant bill to aid religious schools is unconstitutional; that it violates the first amendment; that loans do not, if the interest covers the cost of the use of the money; that categorical grants are not unconstitutional because they go to specific uses related to the defense of the country, based upon a contract with the institution.

I do not accept the position of the White House or of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that sees a difference between general grants to religious schools on the higher education level and religious schools at the secondary and elementary school level.

There are usually two main arguments made by the proponents of that theory. We find the argument made in the brief filed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which the White House spokesmen tells us is accepted by the administration, but which I reject, and which the majority of my committee rejects. Every time it has come up on the floor of the Senate the majority of the Senate has rejected it. I hope it will do so again when the vote is reached next Tuesday.

The fact that the boys and girls who go to elementary and secondary schools do so under compulsory law has nothing to do with the Constitution. If I ever heard a non sequitur, this is it.

It is in the argument made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that we can draw a distinction between higher education and elementary and secondary education because boys and girls in the grade schools and in high schools must go to school for a certain number of years. What has that to do with the first amendment? Absolutely nothing. It is completely immaterial to and disconnected from the issue.

It is unconstitutional in respect to those cases and in respect to those schools, because it violates the first amendment of the Constitution, on the basis, at least, of all the implications and dicta in the Supreme Court decisions to date, but there is not a single decision yet on the point.

It is said that, after all, when young men and women go to a religious college in these days, the religious college really does not exercise any religious influence over them; that even in such a college where there is compulsory chapel attendance, the students can raise conscientious objections to attending. I do not buy that argument either, Mr. President. The fact is that this type of denominational college is an integral and important segment of the program of that church. A general grant to that college can be used by the religious officers and officials of the church that sponsors that college for such purposes as they may decide to use it. In my opinion, that kind of authority over American taxpayer dollars from the general public cannot be given without violating the first amendment of the Constitution. The Supreme Court will eventually decide that question. But, as I said yesterday, from a review of the decisions of the Supreme Court during the last 10 years, dealing with religious problems, I think it is very clear that a good many warning signs have been erected by the Supreme Court, by way of dicta and otherwise, indicating rather clearly that the senior Senator from Oregon is correct when he says that Congress should not pass a general grant bill which would give to religious colleges and universities taxpayer dollars to spend in accordance with the decisions of the officials of the universities that are church connected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by Dr. John F. Morse, last year which was used by the House in conference last year, seeking to justify to me the position taken by the House on general grants to private colleges, including many religious colleges. When the memorandum is read, it will be seen that most of the precedents involve not general grants, but categorical grants, and that others are covered by the individual benefit doctrine, or flow to the institution through what we have called the "conduit of the student" as in this GI Bill of Rights tuition payments or title 4 National Defense Education Act fellowship cost of education allowances.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND LABOR,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 21, 1962.

To: Senator WAYNE MORSE.
From: Dr. John F. Morse.

The following is the information I believe you asked for in regard to the programs I discussed with the Senate conferees Wednesday morning. If additional information is required, please let me know.

1. Grants for construction of health research facilities: This program authorized under Public Law 84–835, title VII, is described by the National Institutes of Health as designed "to provide Federal assistance in the construction and/or equipping of facilities for research * * * and related purposes (including research training)." During the past 6 years, $180 million has been given in 872 grants to 336 institutions in 48 States. Of these institutions 46 percent are non-Federal public institutions and 54 percent are private nonprofit institutions.

2. Transfer of Federal surplus real property: During the past 3 years real property with a value of $51 million has been transferred to nonprofit institutions. There are no currently available breakdowns of these figures except for fiscal year 1961. In that year when real property transfers amounted to $28,773,000, $10,048,000 was transferred to institutions of higher education; 11 percent went to private institutions and 89 percent to public institutions.

3. National Science Foundation institutional grants: This program is described by the National Science Foundation as being "aimed specifically at providing participating colleges and universities with funds that could be used flexibly for strengthening and balancing all the scientific activities. The funds granted under this program foster local initiative in the development of plans and programs for self-improvement in scientific activities and strengthening the independence of institutions of higher learning." The grants go to "institutions granting M.S. and Ph. D. degrees in science * * * and to undergraduate science degree-granting institutions, which prepare students for graduate study." During fiscal year 1961, $1.5 million was used in grants of which 45 percent went to private institutions and 55 percent went to public institutions. The level of the program has been raised to $5 million for the current fiscal year and it is anticipated that it will be at $10 million in fiscal 1963.

4. National Institutes of Health general research support grants: This is a new program instituted this year, designed according to Dr. Shannon "to provide institutions with a steady source of funds uncommitted to any particular research or training project, to be used by them for the general strengthening and adjustment of their health research and research training programs in the manner which they judge to be most effective." The program is supported this year at a level of $20 million—59 percent of the grants have gone to private institutions and 41 percent to public institutions.

5. Atomic Energy Commission grants: This program is designed, according to Dr. Seaborg, to "cover purchase of laboratory equipment and fabrication of neutron sources to initiate or expand curriculums in the life and physical sciences and engineering related to nuclear energy." In the past 6 years $22.8 million have been granted to 505 educational institutions. During the current fiscal year $2,452,000 in grants have been made. Of these, 50.1 percent have gone to private institutions and 49.9 percent to public institutions.

6. National Science Foundation specialized facilities and development of graduate research laboratories: Grants under this program must be matched by at least 50 percent from non-Federal sources. In explaining the purpose and need of this program, Dr. Waterman has said that research laboratories are "of paramount importance in serving the needs of graduate and postdoctoral students working on thesis and independent research problems. As undergraduate student population increases, the number of students entering upon graduate training should reflect a proportionate growth. This growth is in danger of being seriously impeded by the shortage of graduate research facilities. The financial resources at most institutions of higher learning are being strained to the utmost to meet the constant rising cost of operating their education programs particularly in the undergraduate level." During fiscal year 1961 this program operated at a level of $13 million. Of this total, 53 percent went to grants to private institutions and 47 percent to public institutions.

7. National defense fellowships: During the past 4 years, 5,500 fellowships have been awarded in a variety of disciplines including 25 percent to the humanities, 8 percent education, 26 percent to social sciences, 14 percent biological sciences, 17 percent to physical sciences, and 10 percent to engineering—64 percent of all fellowships have been awarded to public institutions and 36 percent to private institutions. In terms of dollars, with a maximum grant of $2,500 to the institution for each fellow, figures are available for the first 3 years of the program. Payments made directly to institutions (not including payments to students for their support) totaled $18,061,000. Of this amount 65 percent went to public institutions and 35 percent to private institutions.

The NASA fellowships, announced this year but not yet awarded, number 100, with an initial cost figure of $2 million anticipated for fiscal 1963. Each of 10 institutions has been awarded 10 fellowships; of these, 7 are public institutions and 3 are private institutions. The same general provisions as in NDEA fellowship for payments to institutions have been announced for the program except that there is no $2,500 ceiling on the grant that may accompany each fellow.

8. Research career award program: This program is a revision of a program which was announced in fiscal year 1961 as the career research professorship program. Its purpose, according to Dr. Shannon, "is to enlarge significantly the opportunity for full-time research careers. This program for the Federal selection and career support of individuals who are appointed to academic or career research positions in universities, medical schools, or research institutions is a unique venture on the part of the Federal Government in the furtherance of research. These awards are intended to finance positions for able scientists who plan to pursue careers in independent research and teaching." Research career awards are made in 5-year increments "with the firm intention to continue Federal support for the full career of the individual." This year, with more awards to be made before the end of the fiscal year, 551 awards totaling $7.7 million have been made in institutions of higher education. Of these 57 percent have gone to private institutions and 43 percent to public institutions.

9. National Institutes of Health training grants: The objective of this program "is to aid training institutions to increase the quality and quantity of persons interested in research and academic careers in the biomedical sciences and related fields. Grantee institutions are not restricted to any set plan or pattern in developing training programs, but are free to propose programs of any nature which best reflect training needs as seen by the institutions." In fiscal year 1961, $107.6 million were granted through this program. Of this total $92 million went to institutions of higher education; 45 percent of the grants were to public institutions and 55 percent to private institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there remains for me to discuss the vital distinction on this issue between the House and the Senate bills. The Senate provides for categorical use grants; that is, the money would have to be spent for specific purposes, which means for physics buildings, chemistry buildings, science buildings, and libraries. The constitutional justification for such construction is that it is related to the defense of the country. A similar justification could be made for the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 or thereabouts, which has thus far remained on the books without successful legal challenge. I think both are sound public policy.

Last year the Senate passed a loan bill and went to conference with the House. The Senate receded from the loan bill and accepted a categorical use bill. That was in title I of H.R. 8900. The Senate bill also had a title II, which was a student scholarship program. In conference we decided on loan assistance for students by providing for loans with a 20 percent forgiveness, feature. This is 20 percent of the loans were to be made to students who it could be shown could not possibly go to college unless they had nonreimbursable loans.

We went to conference with a Senate bill which provided in title III, for wide grant assistance to public community colleges.

What are we doing this year in the bill before the Senate? In a nutshell, we are saying to the House, "We will take the conference bill of last year, striking from it title II." It is a hard bit of swallowing for some of us to do that. We have stricken the student assistance program, which was title II, because the House gave as its reason to the public, at least last year, that it was the student assistance program that caused it to reject the conference report. I happen to think that the student assistance program is of great importance. I am not so sure it is not of greater importance than the facilities part of the bill.

But I agreed to yield on that provision this year, as I had in conference last year on the scholarship issue.

But we can postpone student assistance now and cross the bridge involving that problem later. I am quite agreeable to the program proposed this year to limit the bill to a construction bill. Let us provide the facilities, so that we can answer Dr. Wilson, who says that between now and 1980 it will be necessary to double the size of every university and college in the country and to build a thousand new ones to accommodate at least 2,500 students in each one. Let us get on with that job.

Thus we have before us a bill that will make possible the construction of the needed buildings. The interesting thing is that the bill will provide as many buildings under the categorical use program as would a general grant bill. That is why I say to the presidents of private universities: "Face up to it. You will get just as much by way of facilities under the categorical grant bill as you would get under a general grant bill; and you cannot get a general grant bill through the Senate, as you will discover next Tuesday."

Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly to a few of the more technical aspects of the bill for the purpose of making crystal clear in the record of the debate what the committee feels so that there may be no ambiguity in the interpretation of the points raised.

Under the general provisions for the loan and grant program in section 121(a)(1) which may be found on page 55 of the bill, lines 10 to 18, the term academic facilities is defined to mean "structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs, of an institution of higher education, and maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities."

In the committee view the "related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction" should be understood to include the facilities which are necessary for the effective use of the new educational media. That is to say, we believe that it includes appropriate facilities and equipment in classrooms, laboratories, and libraries as well as special facilities for the storage and distribution of audio-visual materials.

In a similar manner, the language in section 121(b)(2) which is to be found on pages 56 and 57, we understand that the term "initial equipment" is broad enough to include a full range of the new educational media as this term is currently understood by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Mr. President, I am making this history on these points because apparently some educational groups feel that there is a possibility that these two definitions could be narrowly construed and thus deny to the institutions of higher education an opportunity in new construction to plan adequately for such use as they may wish to make of new developments in new educational media.

Also, Mr. President, a typographical error appears on page 11 of the committee report in the table giving information concerning the State-by-State allotments for community colleges under the bill.

I find that under the heading "Federal share as a percent of total amount" for the State of Missouri there appears the figure "3.44." This should read "33.44." I trust this clarification will remove any doubts on this point.

HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES—LIBRARIES

Mr. President, the library has been described as the core of the university. It represents the institution's commitment to making recorded knowledge available to its students, faculty and researchers.

Expansion of the college and university library must necessarily accompany expansion of enrollment capacity.

Testimony before the committee has revealed that extreme pressures have been placed on college and university libraries today by:

First. Increased enrollment which requires more materials, more personnel, and therefore increased space to cope with these elements as well as with the study and research requirements of the vastly augmented student population. Projections of future enrollment increases presented by witnesses make clear that this problem will become increasingly critical within the next few years.

Second. The knowledge explosion. Testimony has indicated that between 1960 and 1970 knowledge will have doubled itself for the fourth time in the history of men. During the past 30 years the number of titles published annually in the United States has risen 80 percent, from 10,000 to 18,000 per year. In the sciences alone more than 50,000 periodicals are being published worldwide and the number is growing. Adequate facilities must be provided to contain this outpouring of knowledge and to promote its efficient use.

Third. The change in the method of instruction. Faculty members are relying more heavily on independent research and study in the library as a valuable technique of teaching. A larger student body making increasingly intensive use of library facilities underlines the need for adequate college and university library buildings.

Despite the importance of libraries to the educational program, witnesses have testified that college and university library facilities throughout the Nation are lagging far behind the standards set by present day needs. American Library Association standards call for campus libraries to seat about one-third of the student body, yet only 5 percent can seat more than one-sixth of their potential users. Expected enrollment increases will intensify this deficiency.

An experienced consultant on college library buildings appearing before the committee has stated that of some 2,000 institutions of higher education in the United States which he has studied, less than 100 have really adequate library buildings. His research has revealed that even where new college libraries have been constructed in recent years, because of pressures on college finances for all other types of buildings to cope with continuing student increases, the new library has been built on a scale inadequate to present, much less to future requirements. For example, the library of Oklahoma State University at Stillwater was built 10 years ago and acclaimed to be the best in the Southwest. Presumably it had sufficient space. It was intended to be adequate for 20 years at least. At that time 2,500 students used the library daily. Today the library is swamped with 7,000 students daily and a new addition is greatly needed.

In addition, a recent survey of college and university libraries in 16 States made by the American Library Association has revealed that over 25 percent of the college and university library buildings in the survey were constructed before 1923 and almost 50 percent date from 1942. The data from this survey also indicate that by 1970 academic libraries need to more than double their physical space, almost double the size of their collections, and substantially more than double their seating capacity. Testimony reveals that the lacks are particularly great in public institutions of smaller size and in junior colleges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have certain material dealing with some other aspects of the bill printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF 20-YEAR LIMITATION ON "PERIOD OF FEDERAL INTEREST" IN H.R. 6143

Section 108 of the committee version of H.R. 6143 (as well as section 404 of the House-passed version) entitles the Government to recover from the grantee the Federal percentage of the current value of a facility constructed with Federal aid under the bill, if within 20 years after the completion of construction the grantee or its successor ceases or fails to be a public or nonprofit institution, or if within that period the facility ceases to be used as an academic facility, or is used for a purpose proscribed by the bill such as religious worship, sectarian instruction, or divinity-school purposes. The bill contains an express finding and declaration that the public benefit accruing to the United States from 20 years' use of such a facility will equal or exceed in value the amount of the grant (i.e., a maximum of one-third of construction cost.)

It is standard in construction grant legislation to put a time limitation on the Government's right to recover for misuse of a facility constructed with a grant. In the Hill-Burton program the limitation is 20 years. In the research construction grant program under title VII of the Public Health Service Act it is 10 years. In the construction programs included in the administration education bill (S. 580), it is 10 years (secs. 244, 263, 424).

The analogy of the surplus real property disposal program of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare illustrates the rationale of the time limitation. Section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to transfer Federal surplus real property for health or educational purposes, and while the disposal is theoretically a sale, the act authorizes the Secretary, in fixing the sale value, to take into consideration any benefit which has accrued or may accrue to the United States from the educational or health use of the property by the transferee. The so-called public-benefit allowance so determined may be and often is as high as 100 percent of fair value of the property, so that the economic effect is the same as a grant of the property. The deed of transfer requires the transferee to use the property, and use it only for purposes of health or education, as the case may be, for a period of 20 years and, if the transferee fails to do so at any time within that period, to pay to the Government the fair value of the property as previously determined less the unamortized value of the property, i.e., less that portion of such value that corresponds to the number of years during which the transferee has observed the use requirements. The theory behind these provisions is that the use of the property for health and education purposes for 20 years creates a benefit to the United States which is equivalent to the fair value of the property at the time of the transfer.

The establishment of a 20-year limit in section 108 of the committee bill is thus very generous to the United States because the maximum grant by the United States is only one-third of the cost of the facility constructed under the bill.

It should also be pointed out that if the 20-year time limit were lengthened or deleted entirely, this would increase the "policing" burden on the Government far beyond the value of any recovery of money that might be obtained if the property were used for a proscribed purpose.

STATEMENT ON DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS UNDER H.R. 6143 (SENATE)

Title I, part A, $180 million per year, grants for academic facilities: Allotments to the States determined as follows: one-half of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative numbers of students enrolled in institutions of higher education in the States, and the remaining one-half of such funds for such fiscal year would be allotted among the States on the basis of the relative numbers of students enrolled in grades 9 to 12, both inclusive, in schools in the States. For this purpose "schools in the States" would include all private schools as well as public schools.

Title I, part B, $120 million per year, loans for academic facilities: No allotment formula. Loans in one State cannot exceed 12½ percent of total funds appropriated for that year.

Title II, $50 million per year, grants for public community colleges: Allotments to the States determined on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. The allotment formula is as follows: Each State shall receive an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated as the product of the number of high school graduates of the State, and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

The allotment ratio is computed as follows: 1-.5 (State per capita income; U.S. per capita income).

An allotment ratio of 0.75 is given to American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Total degree-credit enrollment for each region and State, by institutional control, and by sex, fall 1961

[Sept. 17, 1962]

Region and State	Total enrollment			
	Control		Sex	
	Public	Private	Men	Women
Aggregate United States	2,351,719	1,539,511	2,423,987	1,467,243
The States and the District of Columbia	2,328,912	1,531,731	2,408,601	1,452,042
Contiguous States and the District of Columbia	2,315,672	1,530,284	2,400,003	1,445,953
New England	74,385	176,307	163,975	86,717
Connecticut	21,712	33,607	36,056	19,263
Maine	8,377	5,310	8,349	5,338
Massachusetts	23,612	114,555	92,246	45,921
New Hampshire	7,328	6,296	8,757	4,867
Rhode Island	8,761	11,081	12,630	7,212
Vermont	4,595	5,458	5,937	4,116
Mideast	261,184	521,391	496,574	286,001
Delaware	6,877	1,125	4,987	3,015
District of Columbia	4,517	42,378	30,576	16,319
Maryland	37,230	22,701	39,203	20,728
New Jersey	43,797	48,930	60,773	31,954
New York	119,467	251,152	226,372	144,247
Pennsylvania	49,296	155,105	134,663	69,738
Great Lakes	473,678	287,804	470,921	290,561
Illinois	112,158	104,419	134,307	82,270
Indiana	64,457	40,837	68,122	37,172
Michigan	133,610	36,212	103,982	65,840
Ohio	105,297	82,719	116,284	71,732
Wisconsin	58,156	23,617	48,226	33,547
Plains	226,778	125,393	218,244	133,927
Iowa	30,388	30,766	36,986	24,168
Kansas	45,213	10,935	35,390	20,758
Minnesota	61,655	21,519	50,943	32,231
Missouri	41,621	47,169	55,838	32,952
Nebraska	23,476	9,958	20,373	13,061
North Dakota	13,756	445	9,275	4,926
South Dakota	10,669	4,601	9,439	5,831
Southeast	420,389	207,907	373,984	254,312
Alabama	35,848	12,119	29,237	18,730
Arkansas	20,363	7,356	17,046	10,673
Florida	52,863	26,797	47,967	31,693
Georgia	34,973	16,982	31,821	20,134
Kentucky	33,808	17,976	29,434	22,350
Louisiana	46,788	15,524	36,980	25,332
Mississippi	31,430	7,142	22,681	15,891
North Carolina	43,570	33,911	46,794	30,687
South Carolina	18,191	14,558	19,113	13,636
Tennessee	37,355	27,224	39,461	25,118
Virginia	41,215	20,693	34,675	27,233
West Virginia	23,985	7,625	18,775	12,835
Southwest	238,819	77,080	204,706	111,193
Arizona	37,393	846	24,235	14,004
New Mexico	18,240	1,013	13,110	6,143
Oklahoma	47,636	11,987	39,576	20,047
Texas	135,550	63,234	127,785	70,999
Rocky Mountain	91,894	26,785	74,189	44,490
Colorado	39,781	9,926	30,528	19,179
Idaho	9,770	2,642	8,033	4,379
Montana	11,984	1,885	9,236	4,633
Utah	23,242	12,332	21,946	13,628
Wyoming	7,117		4,446	2,671
Far West	515,155	107,617	384,028	238,744
California	418,575	80,930	309,137	190,368
Nevada	4,738		3,015	1,723
Oregon	37,534	10,252	28,084	19,702
Washington	54,308	16,435	43,792	26,951
U.S. service schools	13,390		13,382	8
Noncontiguous States	13,240	1,447	8,598	6,089
Alaska	2,990		1,929	1,061
Hawaii	10,250	1,447	6,669	5,028
Outlying parts	22,807	7,780	15,386	15,201
Canal Zone	527		298	229
Guam	1,388		830	558
Puerto Rico	20,892	7,780	14,258	14,414

In response to your request for technical assistance:

The terms "physical" and "life" sciences are two of four fields of science described by the National Science Foundation. (The other two are "psychological" and "social.") The most commonly accepted definitions of "physical" and "life" sciences are:

Physical sciences describe the physical sciences proper, the mathematical and engineering sciences.

(i) The physical sciences proper are those sciences concerned primarily with the understanding of the natural phenomena associated with nonliving things.

(ii) The mathematical sciences are those sciences that employ logical reasoning with the aid of symbols and that are concerned with the development of methods of operations employing such symbols.

(iii) The engineering sciences are those sciences that are concerned with studies directed toward developing scientific principles or toward making specific scientific principles usable in engineering practice.

(Please note: Engineering and college level technical training courses are not included in the definition of engineering sciences.)

The term, "life sciences," is used to describe the biological, medical, and agricultural sciences.

(i) The biological sciences are those which, apart from the medical and agricultural sciences defined below, deal with the origin, development, structure, function, and interaction of living things.

(ii) The medical sciences are those which are concerned with maintaining health and understanding disease.

(iii) The agricultural sciences are directed primarily toward understanding and improving the production of animals and plants of economic and cultural importance to man.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that concludes the rebuttal argument I wish to make today in answer to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. This will probably be the last time I shall speak at any length on the bill, for I am placing in the RECORD, under the unanimous consent I just obtained, such additional information as the Senate may wish to have available for a study of the bill between now and next Tuesday.

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of the bill, for yielding to me at this time. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may appear at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered yesterday, it is my understanding, based on the statement made by me, that the time limitation on the pending business will become effective at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next, which, of course, is the time at which the Senate convenes.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the time which was to have been controlled by the majority leader, under the unanimous-consent agreement, be transferred to the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The unanimous-consent agreement, as modified, reduced to writing, is as follows:)

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT (AS MODIFIED)

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, October 15, 1963, upon convening of the Senate, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing and construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1½ hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]: *Provided,* That in the event the Senator from Oregon is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectfully, by the Senator from Oregon and the minority leader: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

OCTOBER 11, 1963.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN RELATION TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn now, very briefly, to another matter. Yesterday, I expressed my disappointment over the lack of definiteness on the part of the President of the United States in his statements at his press conference the day before yesterday as to what our Latin American policy really is. I said most respectfully that, in my judgment, the press conference statements of the President could be interpreted only as meaning that he was seeking to proceed along two divergent roads at the same time, and I thought that was a very dangerous exercise.

Mr. President, this morning the Foreign Relations Committee was in conference with the Under Secretary of State, Mr. George Ball. I have the same high regard for him that I do for Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and certainly every Senator knows of my high regard for the President of the United States and also knows of my dedication to him. Therefore, it is not easy for me to disagree with the President. However, in representing the people of the State of Oregon, I must fulfill both my senatorial duties and my responsibilities to the people of Oregon; and until the President clarifies his position on U.S. foreign policy vis-a-vis Latin America, I believe I have a clear duty to express my disagreement with him.

Mr. President, some of the comments I am about to make, I expressed this morning to the Under Secretary of State.

In light of the demoralizing effect that the military coups in the Dominican Republic and Honduras have had throughout Latin America, I believe the U.S. Government should affirm its support of constitutional, elected governments in this hemisphere, by making clear that it intends to continue to recognize the Bosch and Villeda governments as the legitimate governments of those countries.

In the unfortunate article which the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Martin, had published last week, under his name, in the Washington Post and the New York Herald Tribune, not a word gave this specific assurance. As I said this morning to the Under Secretary of State, I am seeking to get that specific assurance. I believe the administration of our Government has an obligation to tell the freedom-loving peoples throughout Latin America that the U.S. Government is going to continue to recognize the Bosch government of the Dominican Republic, which was overthrown by a military junta, and whose President, Juan Bosch, is now in Puerto Rico; and also the Villeda government of Honduras, which was overthrown by a military junta, and whose President is now outside of Honduras. We should recognize them as the heads of their governments and we should continue to recognize their Ambassadors as the legal representatives of the Dominican Republic and Honduras in the United States. As I have said before these democratic governments were overthrown by military juntas previously trained by U.S. military training programs and equipped with American military-aid weapons.

Is it any wonder that Muñoz-Marín—a great statesman of Latin America, and the head of the Government of Puerto Rico—has officially and privately expressed great concern about our policy? Is it any wonder that José Figueres, who also is recognized as one of the great democratic leaders of Latin America, and has been for the last 10 years and more, has publicly supported the position I am now advocating?

These great democratic leaders, and many more like them in Latin America, know there is no hope of checking communism in Latin America if the United States continues to give actual support to military juntas. Merely verbal criticism of military juntas is not going to raise American prestige in Latin America. We will be judged by our acts, not by our words. It is not enough for the President of the United States to say we are against military juntas. It is not enough to cut off our military aid and our economic aid, and to bring back our missions, unless we announce that such action is permanent.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McINTYRE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Let me say that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee—is more knowledgeable on the subject than any other Member of this body. He has pointed to the only course of action possible for the United States, if we are to preserve our prestige, our good name, and our influence in the Western Hemisphere. It is the only course which will rescue us from the dilemma into which we have plunged ourselves by our previous recognition of dictators and military takeovers. The time has come—this is the zero hour—when it is absolutely imperative to follow the course which the Senator from Oregon has outlined; namely, to say that we will never recognize these juntas; that in these two countries, where free, honest, democratic elections were held, we shall insist on the restoration of those regimes, and the return of constitutional government.

I further agree with the constructive proposal that the United States should continue to accord recognition to the regime of Juan Bosch and its constitution and its legislature, which all were abolished simultaneously by the military takeover, and to the expiring government of Villeda Morales who was there merely to preside over the closing days of that regime, in order to hold an honest and free election so that his successor could be democratically and constitutionally elected.

If we insist on that, and use our power and influence—and we have power and influence if we want to use it—we have the great power of foreign aid, and military missions, we have the Peace Corps, and we have other measures we are justified in taking to insist that these governments be restored until they have carried out their constitutional mandates.

I wish to congratulate the Senator on enunciating what might properly be called the Morse policy, which is the only policy which will save the situation in Latin America. It is not a difficult solution. All it requires is a little guts, a little determination, and a little vision. If that is done, we can pick up the shambles that the Latin American situation is falling into, rescue and restore it. It is a highly desirable objective.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the position taken by the Senator from Alaska, and the very able and effective support that he has given to those of us who have found ourselves in the somewhat embarrassing position of having rather vigorously to disagree with our administration. It is not a very happy plight. Nevertheless, as we see it, it is a clear public duty. I thank him very much for the help he has been to me. He has been very generous in his flattering comments to the senior Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Alaska is recognized across the country as an outstanding authority on Latin America. As I said the other day, when I commented on the great work of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in the field of Latin America, his book on Mexico has for years—and it will continue to be such for years to come—been a standard reference work at both the undergraduate and graduate level on campuses of the United States in courses dealing with United States-Latin American relations.

What the Senator from Alaska and others who share my point of view are urging upon the administration is that we serve clear notice on Latin America that we will continue to do business with constitutional governments that have been thrown out by military juntas, and we will not at any time do business with the military juntas that threw them out.

The time factors become important. It can be said that such action would be a departure from traditional U.S. policy. That statement is exactly correct. It is time that we departed from traditional U.S. policy. The program that I am proposing has not been followed by the United States in the past. But we must depart from the present program to keep a great commitment and a promise uttered by the lips of the present President of the United States when the Alliance for Progress program was promulgated.

The Alliance for Progress program flows from a commitment that the President of the United States made—and we in the Congress backed it up—that we would cooperate with Latin American Republics by way of the aid program encompassed in the Alliance for Progress program for the purpose of strengthening constitutional democratic government in Latin America.

That is what the Alliance for Progress program is all about. The Alliance for Progress program is irreconcilable with dictatorship. The Alliance for Progress program is irreconcilable with military juntas. The Alliance for Progress program is irreconcilable with aiding at any time dictatorial regimes that have destroyed democratic constitutions anywhere in Latin America.

What Latin America is waiting for is not strong statements on the part of the President of the United States against military juntas. It is waiting for those strong statements from the President of the United States plus action that makes perfectly clear that on a permanent basis we will not give support to regimes set up by military juntas. That is why I said to Under Secretary of State Mr. Ball this morning, "Would that you would strengthen our hands in the Congress so that we can join in a warm embrace with the President of the United States and march down the road again a united party in support of the Alliance for Progress program."

As I told the Under Secretary of State this morning, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I cannot vote—and I will not vote—for any more funds for the Alliance for Progress program unless I know that at no time will such funds be used to support the destroyers and devourers of constitutional government in Latin America.

This would be a departure from traditional U.S. policy. But the entire Alliance for Progress is a departure from traditional policy. And the traditional policy of supporting and recognizing any government that came to power proved a failure. That is why we decided to embark on the Alliance for Progress. It was to be an effort to help finance economic and social change through elected, constitutional governments.

If the foundations and assumptions of the Alliance were sound in the first place, it can only bear fruit if we live up to those assumptions in carrying it out.

In keeping with the Alliance for Progress, I hope that the U.S. Government will continue to maintain diplomatic relations with Mr. Bosch, Mr. Villeda, and their representatives. By so doing, we will serve notice on their illegitimate successors that the United States meant what it said in the conferences which formulated the Alliance, and that we will not condone or do business with the juntas.

I was one of the two Senate delegates to the Punta del Este Conference, which brought forth the act of Punta del Este. I saw a great Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, representing the President of the United States, perform acts of statesmanship at Punta del Este that will, throughout my public service, be a source of great inspiration to me. But what is needed is for the administration to reread the act of Punta del Este. What is needed is for this administration to review the pledges that were made when Dean Rusk, on behalf of the U.S. Government, affixed his signature to the act of Punta del Este.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. We have had a good many doctrines of historic import. Perhaps the most famous is the Monroe Doctrine, which nearly a century and a half ago sought to protect the weaker and newer Republics of our hemisphere from reconquest by the European powers which had once held them as colonial acquisitions. Some 30 years ago at Montevideo, in the opening effort of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt administration to implement that doctrine, the United States improved upon it by pronouncing the good neighbor policy and seeking to make the Monroe Doctrine, in the words of President Roosevelt, a joint concern.

We took an important step forward. Unfortunately, the good neighbor policy was not implemented as it might have been by economic measures, and as it is now sought to be implemented by the Alliance for Progress.

But I insist that if this new venture—this important and worthwhile undertaking—is to succeed, we will have to apply the Morse doctrine. I proclaim that the Morse doctrine is the essential step that we must take, a step of nonrecognition of military overthrows of democratic and constitutional governments. That is the only way in which this inspired program—this high purpose of President Kennedy—can be restored to vitality.

I congratulate the senior Senator from Oregon for pronouncing this doctrine. I hope it will be permanently inscribed as a part of American policy. I believe it will be. I believe it must be, because it is right, just, sound, and in accordance with the best American traditions, even if it has not been followed in recent years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska continues to be very kind to me, but there is no Morse doctrine.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes; there is.

Mr. MORSE. There is a doctrine being fought for in the Senate by a considerable number of us who believe in supporting freedom in Latin America. We believe that the only check on communism in Latin America is to help strengthen free governments to help preserve constitutional democratic governments. That is what the pledges of the act of Punta del Este were all about. The doctrine for which I am pleading is the doctrine of the act of Punta del Este. It is the doctrine of the Alliance for Progress.

If we do business with either of these juntas 30 days from today, after the present problem becomes old news, we shall be walking out on those pledges. We shall lose more prestige in Latin America, and pave the way for Communist revolutions against dictatorial governments created by military juntas.

That causes me to discuss the proposal I have made this afternoon from another angle. We had a frank talk with the Under Secretary of State this morning. There is some evidence to support the belief that President Bosch may not want to go back to the Dominican Republic. I do not know. There are obviously a good many reasons why it might be his opinion, if it is his opinion. It may very well be he does not want to go back to the Dominican Republic for reasons of personal safety. It may very well be that his going back to the Dominican Republic would jeopardize his life.

As I have said before in the debates, I hold no brief for any failures of the Bosch administration, but I ask Senators to show me an administration in any country as to which one cannot point out failures. I know nothing about facts that would support any charges that he was not the most efficient of administrators. We do know that he was a democrat, with a small "d." We know he believed in keeping his campaign pledges. We know that he warned the people of the Dominican Republic that they were in for a period of economic austerity. In the campaign he made clear to certain foreign investors in the Dominican Republic—including American oil companies—that some of their policies would have to be modified. I repeat, Mr. President, including American oil companies. That probably had some cause-to-effect relationship to the fact that they were not happy with his administration, and probably had some cause-to-effect relationship to the fact that there seems to be considerable proof that they were involved in a concerted attempt to overthrow the Bosch regime.

We know he was a man who believed that corruption and dishonesty should be eliminated in his administration of the Dominican Republic Government.

We now know that these military junta leaders tried to get President Bosch to sign an order which would have bought for the Dominican Republic, believe it or not, jet fighter planes from Great Britain at a cost of many millions of dollars. The evidence is fairly clear that they were to collect for their pockets a percentage of the costs of those planes.

Bosch refused to sign the order, for several reasons. One was that the Dominican Republic needed jet fighter planes about as much as I need the Washington Monument moved to my farm in Maryland. What in the world would the Dominican Republic want with jet fighter planes, when thousands of people in the Dominican Republic are living at such an economic level that the word "degradation" describes their economic condition?

Bosch is a man with a feeling for the people. He believed there ought to be land reform. To the military mind, any liberal notion of land reform or any liberal notion of raising the standard of living of the people is Communist; it is dangerous Communist doctrine to the typical military mind. One does not have to go to Latin America to find that, either.

So such reactionary forces in the Dominican Republic sought to overthrow Bosch and to build up a junta trained by American military forces. They overthrew him.

We should not forget that one of the campaign pledges of Bosch was to assure civilian control and one of the provisions of the Constitution of the Dominican Republic, the first time that the people of the Dominican Republic had a constitution in 31 years, placed the military under civilian control. As in the United States of America—this copied after the Constitution of the United States—the President of the Dominican Republic by the Constitution became the commander in chief of the military establishment. That was unacceptable to the military tyrants in control of the military of the Dominican Republic. So they went out to "get him" and they "got him."

There is no question about the fact that President Bosch had announced there would be a session of the Dominican Congress at which he would propose approval for an order as commander in chief of the Dominican Republic that Col. Wessin y Wessin be removed from his position in the military.

Bosch knew that this traitor to democracy in the Dominican Republic was in the process of preparing a coup to overthrow him, and he succeeded in doing it.

So I point out that such problems as these existed in the Dominican Republic prior to the coup.

Now let me say, in regard to the problem that faces the United States, the internal controversies within the Dominican Government are irrelevant to the obligation of the United States in the premises. Why do I say they are irrelevant? The fact is that a Constitution existed, and the Constitution provided for succession to the Presidency. The Constitution provided for constitutional processes for removing a President, if there were sufficient grounds for his removal. The Constitution provided for a congress, and it is interesting how, under that Constitution, many of the checks, under a check-and-balance system, the Dominican Republic's Congress had over its executive branch are the same as under our system. But the military junta had no intention of letting those constitutional processes work their will in the Dominican Republic, because the junta knew very well that if constitutionalism was allowed to prevail, the days of military control in the Dominican Republic were numbered.

Mr. President, the United States just cannot walk out on its clear duty to support constitutionalism in Latin America, for we pledged it when we inaugurated the Alliance for Progress program, and we reaffirmed it when we signed the act at Punta del Este.

So where does that leave us procedurally. This is the point I want to make. Then I shall make one more point, and I shall be through.

The President of the Dominican Republic is still Bosch. He is out of the country. I did not say this morning to the Under Secretary, and I do not say now, that the United States should return him to the Dominican Republic. The decision as to whether or not he wishes to seek return is one for him to make.

I hold in my hand the Drew Pearson "Washington Merry-Go-Round," column of this morning, which contains a list of inaccuracies so far as the position of the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned. Others who are commented upon in that column can speak for themselves. This column leaves the impression that the senior Senator from Oregon favors some kind of a military intervention in the Dominican Republic.

I am at a loss to know how the writer of the article could ever have obtained that impression from whoever got the information that is printed in the column. On the floor of the Senate a few days ago I bespoke myself in opposition to a point of view of my very dear friend the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I agreed with much of what he said. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that long before the Foreign Relations Committee meeting about which Mr. Pearson wrote in his column this morning, I opposed any U.S. armed intervention in the Dominican Republic, have always opposed it, continue to oppose it, and will continue to oppose it.

That is not the answer. The people of the Dominican Republic must make their own decision, but I am pleading that they be given an opportunity to make their own decision. They cannot very well make their own decision with military junta machineguns pointed at them.

So I propose these steps: that the President of the United States announce to the world that we continue to recognize the Bosch administration, and the Villeda administration in Honduras, which has now fled the country; that we do not now, and will not in the future, supply any military junta with any military or economic aid; that we make very clear to the Dominican Republic and to Honduras that they must return to their Constitutions and follow those Constitutions before there can be any further relations between them and the United States.

What we need to say to the people of the Dominican Republic and Honduras, and what we need to say to the military juntas that have overthrown the constitutional systems of those people, is that any hope of any further relationship—economically, militarily, and diplomatically—with the United States depends upon their reestablishing their constitutional systems.

We are not going to do business with a group of military tyrants who seek to destroy the Constitution.

That is the policy for which I am pleading. If we follow that policy, I do not believe it would take very long for the voice of the people of the Dominican Republic to be heard.

Now a word about the civilian stooges that the military have put in control. I heard this argument made in committee this morning: "Well, one of them is a graduate of Yale."

So what? What if some of them are graduates of other American universities? We cannot guarantee, when a foreign student graduates from any one of our universities, no matter how good his mind may be, that he has the philosophy of an advocate of freedom. The fact is that these civilians are stooging for military tyrants. They have demonstrated some of their qualities when they accepted the assignment from the military tyrants.

We can take judicial notice of the fact that they cannot do anything that the military will not permit them to do. That is not freedom. That is not constitutionalism. That is dictatorship. We should make perfectly clear that the constitutional processes which existed prior to the overthrow of Bosch must be returned to before there is any relationship between the United States and the Dominican Republic. The same is true in connection with Honduras.

Let me come now to the argument that those who make it, think slays me. It is the argument: "Oh, but the Senator from Oregon is so much interested in the people of the Dominican Republic. What does he think is going to happen to the people if that doctrine is put into effect?" That argument is supposed to make me run to some forensic hole and hide myself.

My answer is that the price of freedom comes high, but it is worth it. Patriots immemorial have been willing to make what sacrifices they have to make for freedom. If anyone thinks that the people in the Dominican Republic or in Honduras will do better under a return to tyranny, they are sadly and grossly mistaken.

We know what happened to the people in the Dominican Republic under 31 years of tyrannical rule by Trujillo. It is very difficult to draw the line of demarcation among the effects of tyranny based upon the person of the tyrant. No; if we are going to support freedom, we must support constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic.

My second answer to this argument that was made to me this morning is that once the people of the Dominican Republic understand that that is the position of Uncle Sam, we will give some strength to their determination, some encouragement to their desire to reestablish constitutionalism in the Dominican Republic. In my judgment we will also give warning to the military tyrants themselves that will cause them to shift their position very quickly, and start to look for places in the world to which they can exile themselves.

I am satisfied that if the United States stands tough in a determination to support constitutionalism in Latin America, the knowledge of that fact will in all likelihood be sufficient to convince these military tyrants that they had better look for an escape hatch, and quickly.

My last point is this. It is said to me, "Well, do you think we ought to do this unilaterally? Do you not think that the other signers of the act of Punta del Este have obligations, too?" My answer is "Yes," they do. But that would not justify the United States stepping aside and violating its pledges under the Alliance for Progress, or betraying its signature on the act of Punta del Este by waiting for others to follow suit in support of freedom in the Dominician Republic and in Honduras. As I said this morning and as I say now on the floor of the Senate, I believe the United States ought to find out just what countries, if any, in Latin America want to leave us on this issue of supporting constitutionalism in Latin America. Let us find out how many allies in the OAS we really have who are ready to stand up and be counted in support of the Alliance for Progress program and the pledge that was made that we would support constitutionalism in connection with its implementation.

We were told this morning that yesterday in a meeting of the Organization of American States there was some division. That is very interesting. We ought to know about it. In knowing about it I believe we ought to make very sure that of course our commitment to the Alliance for Progress program is limited to those countries that are willing to cooperate with us in support of constitutionalism in Latin America. If it is true that we have allies in Latin America who are willing to take millions and millions of dollars of American taxpayer money deceitfully, not acting in good faith in relationship to their signature on the act of Punta del Este, let us find out. I have a proposition to make about what we should do about that too. We cannot make the Alliance for Progress work in any country whose government does not believe in the development and strengthening of constitutional processes. We cannot save those countries from communism no matter how many millions of American taxpayer dollars we pour into them. As we know, we cannot begin to pour enough money into Latin America to save it from communism unless country after country in Latin America is willing to participate in self-help and a mutual aid program with the United States.

I was not at all impressed with an argument I heard this morning, to the effect: "The difficulty, Senator, is that the Organization of American States at the present time is not unanimous." That is to the great discredit of the Organization of American States, if true—and apparently it is true. But I say now to the Organization of American States: "The eyes of the American people have been turned on you. Millions and millions of Americans are fed up with pouring millions of American taxpayer dollars into Latin America, because they are beginning to suspect it is a rat hole."

The answer, I say to the members of the Organization of American States, is to have them demonstrate by their support of freedom in Latin America that they stand ready and willing to fulfill their share of the obligations under the act of Punta del Este, the act of Bogotá, and the program of the Alliance for Progress.

That is my case for today on this subject. But it is not the last time I shall speak on it, for so long as I serve in the Senate, I intend to do what I can to protect the American taxpayer from inexcusable waste in connection with the foreign aid program of this Government.

As I said to the Under Secretary of State this morning, until there is a clarification of the policy of this administration toward Latin America and assurance given that on a permanent basis we will not support military juntas in Latin America or support the successors of military juntas that are not elected by the people and holding office on the basis of constitutional processes, the senior Senator from Oregon will not vote a dime for the Alliance for Progress program. No Member of the Senate can deny the fact that I was among those who had much to do with bringing forth the Alliance for Progress in the first place. It is a sound program, if administered in good faith by all parties connected with it.

So I said to the Under Secretary of State this morning, "I shall offer an amendment to the foreign aid bill that will provide that no aid shall go to any country in Latin America whose constitutional government was overthrown by a military junta." The Under Secretary of State, as did the Secretary of State the other day, when I discussed the same amendment, graciously and fairly expressed an interest in the amendment and assured me that over the weekend they would discuss with me some modification of the language that would not in any way defeat the objective I have in mind, and then give consideration to supporting it, indicating that, under the circumstances, they might be able to support it. That would be helpful; but it would be a long step to be taken by the administration in support of the proposal for which I am pleading; that is, that we make clear to the world that on a permanent basis no aid will be given to any country in Latin America whose constitutional government was overthrown by a military junta, until the constitutional system overthrown is returned to control in that country.

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS VERSUS CHILEAN MINING POLICIES

Mr. President, I now turn to another but related subject because it deals with another Alliance for Progress problem.

Mr. President, I have been a supporter of the objectives of the Alliance for Progress ever since it was started. I have repeatedly affirmed the wisdom of the concept, the timeliness of the program, and the hope it offered for economic, social, and political progress in Latin America.

But today the Alliance is in serious trouble. While we are living up to our part of the bargain, and more, Latin American countries continue to drag their feet when it comes to discharging their side of the agreement.

The Alliance was never intended as a U.S. program, but an inter-American effort. The very essence of the concept was that Latin America itself had equal, perhaps even greater, responsibilities to assume. It was clearly recognized that our economic assistance and our technical aid would yield meager results in the long run unless accompanied by vigorous efforts and far-reaching institutional changes by the Latin American people themselves. More than

3 years ago, upon returning from the Bogotá Conference, I pointed out:

> The basic, most important factor in development is people who really want development and who want it badly enough not only to work for it but to make their own substantial economic contributions as well as to give up certain traditional customs to get it. Unless this basic urge is present, no amount of outside assistance will be effective.

A second basic principle of the Alliance for Progress was that private investment would play a highly significant role in the economic development of the Latin American countries. In fact, it was assumed as a sine qua non of success of the whole Alliance program that private investment would account for more than Government investment over the 10-year period. It was recognized that while Government money could stimulate, it could not replace private venture capital. It was incontestable that Latin America did not have enough capital for its needs, and that internal capital formation in the near future would fall far short of the amount required to make any economic advances. In short, the glorious hopes for a better life for those burgeoning millions in the countries to the south of us, rested on the underpinning of a solid economic structure to be built by private venture capital freely invested—the whole key to success of the Alliance program. But it also became apparent that certain internal economic, social, and political changes would have to be instituted to make the employment of the capital and new technology effective. Thus, the formula of outside aid plus internal reforms was set up.

But when we survey the Latin American scene today, it becomes clear that the objectives of the Alliance are very, very far from fulfillment.

The American taxpayer has contributed more than $2 billion in Alliance for Progress funds, but we have yet to see really adequate or effective land reform, tax reform, housing, education, or resource development programs put into effect. Nor have we witnessed any improvement in the investment climate. In fact, conditions have become less rather than more favorable. Outright expropriation of American property has taken place in some areas. Discriminatory taxation, harsh regulations governing the repatriation of earnings, and other harassments have been put into effect. The amount of new American capital invested in Latin America has fallen from an annual rate of $1,163 million in 1957 to $299 million in 1958, $218 million in 1959, $95 million in 1960, $173 million in 1961, and a disinvestment of $32 million in 1962—Survey of Current Business, August 1963. Moreover, there has been a steady flight of Latin American capital out of Latin America—$653 million in 1961 and $780 million in 1962—Comap report.

Investors' money is impartial—it goes where the combination of reward and risk appear best. The placing of investment by private corporations or private investors is not a matter of sentiment or discrimination. It is, or should be, a matter of the very best judgment of the management of those corporations as to where the greatest rewards can be obtained with the least degree of risk. Government aid money is frequently allocated on the basis of political and military consideration, and even historical friendships, but it is completely irrational to expect private business to place its bets for political or military motives. If private business did that, it would not be conducting its own business, it would be conducting the Government's business.

Now, if private investment is supposed to be the sturdy underpinning of the Alliance program in each country, and if the conditions attractive to free private investment do not exist in an individual country, then Government aid invested in that country is a complete waste. The Government aid may be wasted away through extravagances and inefficiencies, but it is foredoomed to be a complete waste at the outset, if it is put into a country which private investment is avoiding like the plague.

Therefore, I have long since concluded, that allocating U.S. financial assistance for any country where the conditions are such that private investors are afraid to go, just does not make sense. From our taxpayers' dollars there can never be any real accomplishment. The Government money put in is not a stimulus but only a dole, its failure to lead to any permanent improvement in the economy of the country brings with it disillusionment and recrimination against the United States when the financial assistance stops, as it ultimately must. From the taxpayers' dollars the other country gets no benefit and the United States gets precious little appreciation. Under such conditions our taxpaying constituents have shelled out billions of dollars, which could have done a great deal more for millions of human beings in the United States of America, working alongside private venture capital.

Let us see just what conditions do exist today in some of the Latin American countries to attract or to repel private enterprise.

In some of these countries, since the Alliance program started, we have encountered some actual expropriation of foreign investments, usually those of the United States, and even more threats of expropriation. Outright expropriation we have attempted to deal with in the Hickenlooper amendment, but there is very little we can do about repeatedly voiced threats of expropriation, except to bring home to their would-be promulgators the inevitable consequences that follow. No prudent American businessman, president or director of a large corporation, acting in effect as trustee for other people's money, can afford to ignore repeatedly voiced threats of expropriation in any country.

It may be unfair to single out any one country, but Brazil comes to mind as the most glaring example in recent years, aside from Castro's Cuba, of expropriation of U.S. investments and repeated threats of expropriation. The inevitable result, of course, has been that some American companies in Brazil have publicly or quietly undertaken to liquidate their investments and get out, and substantial sums of American capital which would have been invested there—and should have been invested as part of the Alliance program—have never been sent.

Brazil is not only a particularly glaring example but a particularly irritating example, because it has been the recipient of a huge volume of U.S. financial assistance. We have repeatedly been called upon to bail out the Brazilian Government in one financial crisis after another, the latest being a package deal involving commitment by the United States of nearly $400 million in this year and in 1964. This has not been fully implemented to date because Brazil has not met the conditions set forth in the agreement.

Now let me turn to another type of action which is every bit as discouraging to foreign investment as expropriation or the threat of expropriation. I refer to fiscal actions by Latin American governments. These include income taxes that are excessively high or discriminatory, special fees for services or privileges which are only necessary to foreign enterprises, refusal to permit purchase of necessary items abroad so that local items of sometimes inferior quality can be required, and changes of classifications in imports which have the result of throwing on a much higher duty than originally contemplated.

Latin American governments have adopted some or all of these measures in an effort to remedy desperate economic situations or to satisfy latent antigringo feeling. These measures are legal, they are not unconstitutional, and most of them do not violate individual contracts made with foreign investors. Hence, no protection against them is afforded by treaties or guarantee programs now in effect. But their effect on prospective U.S. investment in Latin America has been devastating, not to say disastrous.

Let us consider the first of these, high income taxes. A common technique is to pick a certain industry, frequently a natural resource industry entirely dependent on heavy foreign investment, and fix a special income tax rate for that particular industry.

While several examples could be cited, an illuminating case history is to be found in Chile. American investments in Chile total more than $768 million, placing it seventh among all foreign countries in direct U.S. investments. It ranks second in value of mining investments. Chile is the third largest copper producer in the world, turning out more than 500,000 tons annually. Ninety percent of this copper is produced by two companies which are subsidiaries of American corporations—the Anaconda Co., and Kennecott Copper Corp. The two companies account for three-fifths of Chile's foreign exchange earnings, and pay 15 percent of all taxes collected. Direct employment at the two companies totals some 16,500, and another estimated 66,000 jobs are dependent on these enterprises.

Chile is rated by most observers as having an efficient and honest government, a history of constitutional observance, a complete absence of expropriation of any industry, a reliable and fair judicial system, and a complete absence of any militarism which has been the curse of so many of our Latin American neighbors. But in spite of all these advantages and attractive features for the foreign investor, Chile has adopted policies that strongly discourage foreign investment in her basic industry, copper.

Chile has separate laws, regulations and tax rates for the large, medium, and small copper companies. The large companies include only the two American companies mentioned above; the medium companies include three or four mines, and the small companies consist of a large number of small mines. With this setup, the stage is set for discrimination against foreign investment by the passage of individual laws applicable to the already defined categories.

About 8 years ago the Chilean Government adopted a new copper law which established a tax rate of 50 percent plus a surtax of 25 percent subject to reductions upon increase in production. The law stated that this would be the single and only levy upon the profits of the large copper companies. Despite this provision, the Government levied two new taxes of 5 and 8 percent, respectively, to provide funds for salary increases for civil servants and the armed forces. They were established as temporary levies that could be derogated by the President. They have not been derogated. As a result, the effective tax rate for Braden Copper, Kennecott's subsidiary, has today reached the confiscatory level of 87.1 percent of profit and no relief from this intolerable burden appears in sight.

This tax, by the way, bears the distinction of being the world's highest tax rate on copper mining. The tax on the other large American copper enterprise in Chile, Anaconda, is 70 percent for one mine, and 50 percent for another. To put these rates into perspective, I should point out that the effective tax rate on copper in the United States, after the depletion allowance is applied, is 40.5 percent—which happens, by the way, to be the second highest basic tax rate in the world on copper.

I trust you share my astonishment at the Chilean situation. By what logic of economics was it decided to impose an 87-percent rate on the Braden mine in Chile? And by what reasoning was the rate of 70 percent fixed for the great Chuquicamata mine of Anaconda? And, more important for this discussion, how can any management in its right senses invest in a country when confronted with tax rates of such staggering magnitude? The excessive tax rate not only means that no new investment will be undertaken; it means that present investments simply wither on the vine. It is a fact of life that completely inadequate earnings mean that maintenance of a business will suffer. Failure to correct such a situation will, in the long run, result in a company facing the dilemma of whether it can remain in business.

I emphasize as I said at the outset that money is essentially unsentimental; it goes where the risk and the rewards bear some reasonable ratio to each other. If this were a matter only of the private investor's money, I would not be making these remarks, because I would trust to the hardheaded business sense of the private investors to put their money where the risks are low and the rewards are high without any advice from me.

But more than U.S. private investors' money is at stake here. There are literally billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars which have been spent and are committed to be spent, and we are now asked to approve the spending of more in the full faith and expectation that private investment is going into these same countries and provide the indispensable structure of a free enterprise system, without which our taxpayers' dollars will achieve absolutely nothing.

I am not here to seek the salvation of the American private investor for his sake alone. I am here to seek the salvation of the U.S. taxpayer—either to see that his money is not put into these countries, or if it is put in, that there is some reasonable expectation that the Government money spent will serve a useful purpose in conjunction with private investment funds. For as we were told at the beginning of the Alliance program, we would be undertaking a hopeless task with Government money only. It is only with private investment making up the greater portion of the investment total that there is any remote chance of realizing a substantial portion of the grand design of the 10-year Alliance program.

The greatest irony in the situation is, of course, that Chile's own economic development suffers. In recent years both Anaconda and Kennecott announced extensive plans for substantial capital investments in their properties. Kennecott, for example, proposed to spend approximately $200 million on what was called the Codegua project that would have increased copper production by 100,000 tons annually. The investment would have been a powerful stimulus to the national economy of Chile and a tremendous contribution to solidifying Chile's position as one of the three principal copper production centers of the world. The Codegua project was abandoned 2 years ago when the Government, after agreeing to do so, failed to submit a bill to the Chilean Congress authorizing the investment on the basis of tax stability for 20 years. The logic in seeking such tax stability became painfully evident when not long thereafter the two new taxes were imposed. At the present rate, the danger is that the property is not earning enough to support maintenance and upkeep expenditures to keep production flowing. If that continues, Chile might develop a problem like that of Bolivia with the tin mines, by coming to us for foreign aid and not for production purposes.

The Anaconda Co. substantially reduced a $150 million expansion plan which it had for Chile. Meanwhile, another American copper producer, Cerro Corp., had acquired a copper property in Chile known as Rio Blanco, and announced a $90 million expansion project. This, too, is in abeyance as legislative changes proposed in connection with it have never been enacted.

In short, the Chilean economy has been deprived of an infusion of $440 million of capital for the development and expansion of its leading industry, a program that would have created thousands of new jobs and pumped millions of additional dollars annually into the economy in wages and purchases.

In fairness to the present regime in Chile, it must be reported that President Alessandri has attempted to introduce in Congress a measure to stabilize the taxation of the large copper companies, that is, permit the President to make executive agreements to reduce the excessive rates and to guarantee the permanence of the new rates for a stated period of time. But no such legislation has been passed. Whether such a measure will be passed remains to be seen.

That, in brief, is the tax situation in regard to the industry which accounts for more than three-fifths of Chile's foreign exchange. Is this the climate attractive to the free private investment which is supposed to be the cornerstone of the Alliance for Progress program?

Now let us see what the U.S. Government aid program has been in Chile. In the past 3 years obligations and loan authorizations to Chile averaged approximately $146,500,000 a year, or the equivalent of $18 for every Chilean man, woman, and child. The total includes the $100 million set aside to aid Chile after the earthquake catastrophe of 1960. United States aid in all forms between 1945 and 1962 amounted to more than $650 million, or the equivalent of $80 for every Chilean.

In short, American taxpayers are pumping scores of millions of dollars annually into a country that imposes a discriminatory tax rate on the leading American companies within its borders, and a country that has by its fiscal policies discouraged the investment of several hundred millions of new capital for industrial expansion.

The Chilean copper tax has provoked a storm of criticism in the press and other media in many parts of the world, including Chile.

Two years have now elapsed, and the fate of Chile's 10-year development plan and of the Alliance program in general is well summarized in an article from Ercilla, a Chilean weekly news magazine, of September 4, 1963:

> Two matters of great importance to Chile were in the news again last week: copper and the 10-year development plan. The plan, because Chilean economic development for the next 10 years depends upon it; and copper, because the possibilities of financing the 10-year plan in turn depend largely upon increasing dollar returns.
>
> The plan requires a total investment of approximately $10,000 million, between 20 and 25 percent of which corresponds to foreign currency investments and the rest to Chilean currency. To finance the foreign currency investments the plan envisaged large foreign debts during the first 5 years (1961–65), which would gradually decrease during the last 5 years (1966–70), since it was assumed that the investments made during the first half in export industries would already be producing a considerably larger foreign exchange income than at present. Copper figures among the exports expected

to bring in a greater share of foreign exchange, since it is—and will be for some years yet—our principal export. However, in order for copper to increase its dollar yield, the companies were required to make heavy investments first to increase production.

What were the obstacles that prevented an agreement being signed between the government and the copper companies? At the beginning only the government's reticence in guaranteeing the tax treatment established for the companies in law 11,828. The companies insisted upon a guarantee that taxes would not be increased, which the government dared not grant. There was no agreement, and consequently, no investments. To make matters worse, taxes were considerably increased by virtue of two new laws, Nos. 14,603 and 14,688, to the extent that one of the two large companies is today paying 87 percent on net profits. In view of these confiscatory taxes, the companies canceled their investment plans in Chile. For instance, $100 million of the $200 million Kennecott planned to invest in the first stage of its Codegua project were invested instead in the mines of Utah, United States of America.

CORFO then issued a report on the first 2 years of the 10-year development plan, and it came to light that—in spite of the fact that nitrate and iron investments had exceeded the increase envisaged in the 10-year plan by 50 percent—total mining investments in the country had fallen short of the mark, which, according to the Minister of Economy, was due to the fact that the large copper mining industry had not invested the amount originally planned. This gave rise to the resurrection of the copper plan.

The Government recently introduced modifications in the tax reform presently being debated in the Senate, authorizing the President to negotiate new investments with the copper companies on the basis of the tax stability the companies had been asking for since 1939.

It is too early to say to what extent this will tone up the 10-year development plan. It all depends on the amount of the investments and percentage of increase in production.

In a nutshell, as seen by the Chileans themselves, the fate of their 10-year development plan under the Alliance for Progress program depends on new private investment in the copper industry. This depends in turn, as it has since 1959, on the willingness of Chile to guarantee stability of the tax rates of the companies for a stipulated period—and tax stability at some reasonable rate, not 87 percent. If there is no change in these rates, if there is no tax stability agreed upon, by the terms of their own plan the program of Chile under the Alliance is foredoomed to failure. We can see it here in October 1963. We do not have to wait until 1971.

How can we justify pouring more foreign aid into a country which is either unwilling or unable to take steps to put its own house in order? Continuing such aid is foolish, on two grounds.

First, Chile keeps out, by its discriminatory taxation policy, private investment money, and at the same time asks for more U.S. taxpayers' money in economic aid.

Second, the U.S. taxpayers' money in Chile is not producing the benefits that it could produce and was intended to produce, because private investment money is not being placed alongside it at the same time, and there is no prospect that private money is going to come forth anytime in the near future.

If this is the situation in Chile, and it is, then I submit that a logical conclusion follows; namely, if this is to be the result of putting U.S. Government money in Chile, then such aid ought to be stopped, until Chile creates the necessary conditions to attract private investment funds under the agreement of Punta del Este.

Mr. President, unless Chile takes the necessary steps to correct the unfair policies she is following toward American mining investors and for that matter other American investments in Chile, I should not continue to support Alliance for Progress aid to Chile.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1963

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Tuesday, October 15, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 11 (legislative day of October 10), 1963:

Federal Trade Commission

John R. Reilly, of Iowa, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1962, vice A. Leon Higginbotham.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 11 (legislative day of October 10), 1963:

Department of Defense

Willis Moore Hawkins, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

U.S. Navy

To be vice admirals

Rear Adm. Charles E. Weakley, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

Vice Adm. Edward N. Parker, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade indicated on the retired list, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

U.S. Army

The officers named herein for promotions as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Louis Overton Gravely, Jr., O248412.

Brig. Gen. Robert Clifford Wilson, Jr., O313324.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Stewart Laycock Hall, O349314, Armor.

Col. Norbert John Hennen, O331461, Infantry.

Col. Herbert Toben Johnson, O336101, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Ralph Sheldon Phelps, O370892.

Brig. Gen. Richard John Quigley, O400101.

Brig. Gen. Frank Price Williams, O309461.

Brig. Gen. William Jerome Witte, O333473.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Howard Hosom Arbury, O255103, Infantry.

Col. Jasper Newton Baker, O446010, Infantry.

Col. Kenneth William Brewer, O411361, Infantry.

Col. George Delman Eastes, O436928, Artillery.

Col. William Phelps Simmons, Jr., O306376, Infantry.

Col. Burris Olen Smith, O426235, Artillery.

Col. Raymond Ashby Wilkinson, O373466, Artillery.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, secs. 593(a) and 3392:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. John Samuel Anderson, O1283632.

Brig Gen. Chester James Moeglein, O384958.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Donald Nicholas Anderson, O375021, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Mayhew Yale Foster, O307029, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. George Morris Gelston, O1177407, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Joseph Thornton Willey, O399386, Adjutant General's Corps.

In the Air Force

The nominations beginning George B. Aaron to be captain, and ending Clarence J. Schumaker, Jr., to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 30, 1963.

In the Army

The nominations beginning Kenneth K. Barclay to be major, and ending Gerald J. Winch to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 1, 1963.

In the Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Robert L. Conrad to be colonel, and ending David W. Schumaker to be colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 11, 1963; and

The nominations beginning LeRoy C. Barton to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Haldon E. Lindfeld to be lieutenant colonel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 20, 1963.

In the Navy

The nominations beginning John Abbott to be commander and ending Dorothy L. Maraspin to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 17, 1963; and

The nominations beginning James M. Benavides, Jr., to be captain, and ending Adelyn M. Yankoski to be commander, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 1, 1963.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Thomas W. Amis to be captain in the Marine Corps, and ending Marvin A. Ennis to be chief warrant officer, W-3, in the Navy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 23, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Saul Israel Wisemon, Beth El Synagogue, Torrington, Conn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we pray that Thou wilt bless these men, chosen by the people of this Nation, for Thou knowest them, their needs, their motives, their hopes, their fears. Help them in their offices, in committees, and above all, as they meet here in legislative session.

Our Father, Thou alone knowest the difficulties these men must face and the grave decisions they must make.

We pray for the President of the United States and all who minister to the needs of the people, the representatives of the people, and all those in authority, that it may please Thee so to rule their hearts that they may rightly use the trust committed to them for the good of all people. Vote through these men, we pray Thee, O Lord, that what they say and what they do may be in accordance with Thy will, for this land that we love so much.

May we remember that it takes time to build the Nation that can truly be called God's own country. It takes time to work out the kind of peace that will endure. It takes time to find out what we should do, what is right and what is best.

Experienced though we be in the ways of men, we know all too little of the ways of God. But Thou knowest us by name and deeds, each and every one of us.

Amid all the pressures brought upon them, may they ever hear Thy still small voice and follow Thy guidance for the good of all the people.

O Lord, teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom. Time is short, no one knowing how much or little time he has left. Help us to use it wisely. Give us the faith to believe that there is no problem before us that Thy wisdom cannot solve. As Thou hast guided men and the destiny of this Nation and the world from this sacred place, so, we pray Thee, guide these men today.

We pray for all the people of our country, that they may learn to appreciate more the goodly heritage that is ours. We need to learn in these challenging days that to every right is attached a duty, to every privilege an obligation.

Make us aware, O Lord, of the record that Thou art writing, the record that one day will be read by the King of Kings.

Teach us, O Lord, the disciplines of patience, for we find that to wait is often harder than to work. We ask Thee not for tasks more suited to our strength, but for strength more suited to our tasks. Help us to work with Thee that it may be a good day with good things done. We know that a different world cannot be built by indifferent people. Help us to see that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail. Guide us how to work. Since we cannot always do what we like, grant that we may like what we must do, knowing that truth will prevail.

Grant, we pray Thee, that to all people You give Your benediction.

יברכך יהוה וישמרך,
יאר יהוה פניו אליך ויחנך,
ישא יהוה פניו אליך וישם לך שלום
אמן:

"The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord deal kindly and graciously with you, the Lord bestow his favor upon you and grant you peace."

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, October 10, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1049. An act relating to the Indian heirship land problem;

S. 1588. An act to authorize the extension of conservation reserve contracts through 1965, and increase the limit of annual payments under the cropland conversion program to $20,000,000;

S. 1915. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors;

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution to print, for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, 25,000 additional copies of a revised committee print entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual"; and

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics" of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

PAY RAISE FOR CONGRESS?

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, legislation authorizing an increase in congressional salaries from $22,500 to $35,000 has been introduced as an omnibus bill covering an increase in pay for civil service and postal employees as well as those in the executive and judicial branches. Generally speaking, a salary and wage increase can only be justified by an increase in production or to cover an increase in the cost of living.

Certainly, if we analyze an increase in the salaries of Congressmen, using an increase in production as a yardstick, we not only would not be entitled to an increase in pay, but should be returning part of the salary we are now receiving. I am sure no Member has ever attended such a do-nothing session.

If the increase were analyzed on the basis of a cost-of-living increase, no such increased salary could be justified. As a matter of fact, the President in his recent talk to the Nation on taxes said there was no inflation, using the wholesale price index as his proof. Of course, we all know this analogy will not stand up for there actually has been a cost-of-living increase of approximately 3 percent since 1960, but that will not justify the suggested congressional pay raise.

Frequently, we decry the administration's as well as other efforts to belittle the Congress. Certainly, we should not at this time give them additional reasons to bolster their position by increasing our own salaries.

ARMY ELECTRONICS COMMAND PROCUREMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I had planned today to present to the Members of the House the results of another procurement case I have been studying for some time. I cannot make that speech and here is why:

The subject of my speech was to be the AN/ASW-12 autopilot. The Army Electronics Command awarded a development contract in 1958 and paid $2.3 million for the design and perfection of this system. In many subsequent sole-source—no competition—purchases, the Army paid over a half-million dollars for drawings, technical literature, and the like.

After a long study, I persuaded the Army to buy this autopilot competitively, but now I am told by Maj. Gen. Frank W. Moorman of the Army Electronics Command that the sole-source producer wants at least $725,000 and up to 20 percent more than that to supply the Government with information necessary for a competitive producer to build the set. He also tells me that it would take 21 months to get this information ready.

Mr. Speaker, this Government has spent over a half-million dollars for drawings and technical literature for this set. It has spent over $2 million in developing it.

Information to build the set should have been delivered on past buys. It was not. Information to build the set should be at hand. It is not. Instead, every effort is being made to keep this autopilot under the expensive sole-source type of procurement.

I will have more to say about this within the next few days, Mr. Speaker. As of today, I am asking the Comptroller General to investigate this case thoroughly and report to me as soon as possible.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, October 9, I was unavoidably absent during rollcalls 170 and 171. Had I been present and voting I would have voted "yea" on rollcalls 170 and 171.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on Small Business be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the passage of each of the bills we shall call up today, the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill be permitted to insert in the Record his statement on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SIZE OF MILK AND ICE CREAM CONTAINERS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 6413) to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14 of the Act approved March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1221), as amended (sec. 10–114, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. (a) All fluid and frozen dairy products, including but not limited to whole milk, skimmed milk, cultured milk, sweet cream, sour cream, buttermilk, chocolate milk, chocolate drink, ice cream, and frozen custard, and frozen dairy desserts such as sherbet, water ice, and ice milk, shall, when sold or offered for sale in package form, be packaged only in units of gallons, one and one-half gallons, two and one-half gallons, integral multiples of the gallon, or binary-submultiples of the gallon of not less than one fluid ounce. Packages of less than one fluid ounce shall be permitted if such package be one of a number of identical packages in an outside container the total contents and labeling of which conform with the requirements of this Act. Notwithstanding the foregoing, frozen dairy products and frozen dairy desserts may be sold or offered for sale in individually packaged or wrapped portions each containing four or more but less than sixteen fluid ounces, in integral multiples of one ounce, or, if less than four ounces, in multiples of one-half ounce. The package or wrapper of each individual portion of any such frozen dairy product or frozen dairy dessert shall be clearly labeled to show the net contents in fluid ounces. When two or more such individual portions of a frozen dairy product or frozen dairy dessert are sold or offered for sale in an outside container, the exterior of such container shall be clearly labeled to show the number of individual portions contained therein and the total net contents of such container, in fluid ounces.

"(b) Bottles or containers used for the retail sale of milk, buttermilk, chocolate milk, chocolate drink, or cream shall have clearly blown or otherwise permanently marked in the side of each bottle or container, or printed on the cap or stopple thereof, the name and address of the person, firm, or corporation who or which bottled such milk, buttermilk, chocolate milk, chocolate drink, or cream and the capacity of such bottle or container, except that a package containing less than one fluid ounce need not be labeled as to quantity if such package be one of a number of identical packages in an outside container the total contents and labeling of which conform with the requirements of this Act."

Sec. 2. Section 18a of such Act approved March 3, 1921, as added by the Act approved July 7, 1932 (47 Stat. 609; sec. 10–119, D.C. Code, 1961 edition, second paragraph), is hereby repealed.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Record prior to the passage of each of the bills we shall consider today that are reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend two obsolete provisions in the present act establishing standard weights and measures in the District of Columbia. Specifically, these two provisions presently forbid the sale of milk in the District in quantities smaller than 1 gill—one-fourth of a pint—and ice cream or other frozen dairy products in packages smaller than one-half pint.

The first of these provisions, pertaining to the sale of milk, has made it necessary for restaurants and other food-serving establishments to serve cream or half-and-half, with servings of coffee, in small individual glass containers about 1 ounce in size. The District of Columbia Health Department has become concerned as a result of various unsanitary practices observed in connection with the use of these small creamers, such as refilling of used containers without thorough cleaning, salvaging of partially used servings, and exposure of open servings to various unsanitary conditions. Since milk and cream are readily perishable products and potentially hazardous foods, the Health Department's concern is obviously well founded.

H.R. 6413 will permit the sale of milk in packages as small as 1 ounce. If this is enacted, the local dairies plan to put on the market a small individual container of cream or half-and-half, of suitable size for serving with a cup of coffee. The container will be of plastic-coated paper, filled and sealed of course under sanitary conditions, and the user will tear off a corner to open the container, thus forestalling its reuse.

The District of Columbia Department of Public Health and the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, who requested this legislation, strongly endorse this plan as a progressive step toward more effective sanitation in food-serving establishments. While this bill will not require restaurants to adopt the new and more sanitary method of serving cream with coffee, it is felt that the practice will become standard within a short time.

The present provision with respect to ice cream and frozen desserts is far out of date, as it does not take recognition of present-day practices in regard to packaging and sale of such foods. Packages, ice cream cones, small Dixie cups, Eskimo Pies, and a whole array of familiar frozen dairy products are actually illegal in the District of Columbia today. Hence, the legalizing of such products for sale in the District, as will be provided in this bill, is long overdue.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6413, the bill under consideration, would amend the act of March 3, 1921, which establishes standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia.

This bill was proposed by the District Board of Commissioners at the behest of the Board of Health; is in the public interest inasmuch as it would further upgrade the sanitary handling and packaging of dairy products for public consumption.

Present law limits the minimum quantities of cream and ice cream that can be packaged by the local dairies. This 40-year-old limitation has been made unrealistic and even a threat to the public health due to the revolutionary modern-day methods of sanitary packaging. By this I mean that under present law, sanitary prepackaging by the dairies of 1-ounce servings of coffee cream is prohibited and as a result, many restaurants prepare the 1-ounce servings from larger containers under less sanitary conditions; thus, many abuses—such as reuse by the restaurants of partially used customer portions—have been detected by the health authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate enactment of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 6413—as set forth in House report 835—is to permit the packaging of smaller quantities of milk, ice cream, and other dairy products than is permissible under present law. Under modern methods, dairies are able to package milk and ice cream in very small amounts, and there is demand for such packaging on today's market.

Section 14 of the present District of Columbia Milk Act, as amended, reads in part as follows:

> Bottles or jars used for the sale of milk or cream shall be of the capacity of 1 gallon, half-gallon, 3 pints, 1 quart, 1 pint, half-pint, or 1 gill.

Thus, present law forbids the sale of milk in containers smaller than 1 gill in capacity. For this reason, it is necessary for restaurants and other food service establishments to fill individual 1-ounce containers from bulk packages in order to provide individual servings of cream or half-and-half with coffee servings. We are informed that the District of Columbia Department of Public Health does not approve this practice, as unsanitary conditions often result from the refilling of used containers, salvaging of partially used servings, and exposure of open servings.

If this proposed legislation is enacted, the local dairies propose to produce small, individual packages of plastic-covered paper, sealed, containing an amount of cream or half-and-half-suitable for serving with coffee. These containers will be labeled in accordance with the provisions of the Milk Act, and must be opened in such a manner that they will not be reusable. These individually packaged servings will be distributed to the food service industry in multiunit packages whose volume will equal an amount required by present law, as quoted above.

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 4 on September 30, 1963, an official of the District of Columbia Department of Public Health testified in part that—

> We think milk should be packaged in small quantities in the dairies where the process would be supervised, and where the containers could not be used again.

Present law also prescribes a minimum of one-half pint for the quantity of ice cream, sherbet, and similar frozen food products which may be offered for sale. This obsolete provision does not, of course, take cognizance of modern packaging practices in connection with the sale of ice cream and other frozen dairy products, inasmuch as it renders illegal the sale of ice cream in cups smaller than one-half pint, ice cream cones, Eskimo Pies, et cetera.

H.R. 6413 would repeal this outmoded section, and provide that frozen dairy products and frozen dairy desserts may be sold in individually packaged portions in integral multiples of 1 ounce, between the limits of 4 and 16 ounces, and in integral multiples of one-half ounce if the container is smaller than 4 ounces. Also, when two or more of these small individual portions are sold in a single outside container—as a package of 24 Eskimo Pies of 3 ounces each—the outside package must be labeled to show properly the number of individual portions contained therein and the total net contents of the package.

The letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, expressing their approval of this legislation, is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, July 9, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 6413, 88th Congress, a bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Section 14 of the act approved March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1221), as amended (sec. 10–114, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), reads in part as follows: "bottles or jars used for the sale of milk or cream shall be of the capacity of 1 gallon, half-gallon, 3 pints, 1 quart, 1 pint, half-pint, or 1 gill."

Because of the size of the containers required by the above-quoted provision of existing law, it is necessary for food service establishments to fill individual serving containers from bulk packages; that is, packages of 1 gallon, one-half gallon, 3 pints, 1 quart, 1 pint, one-half pint, or 1 gill. This practice, the Commissioners are informed, leaves much to be desired in the prevention of contamination of cream or half-and-half. The Commissioners are further informed that despite constant supervision both by the management of food service establishments and by the Department of Public Health, many bad practices, such as refilling of used containers, salvaging of partially used servings, and exposure of open servings have frequently been observed.

The Commissioners understand that in an effort to solve the problem described in the preceding paragraph, both the dairy and the packaging industries have approached the Department of Public Health with an offer to produce for distribution to the food service industry individually packaged servings of cream or half-and-half, to be contained in such numbers in a multiunit package that the total volume in the multiunit package would equal an amount required by the above-quoted provision of existing law, with the proper markings required by law. It appears that the individual packages would be made of plastic-coated paper in a tetrahedral shape, sealed (containing a metered amount of cream or half-and-half, and be properly labeled in accordance with the requirements of the Milk Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder. These individual containers would be opened by the consumer by tearing off a corner, thereby signaling others that the package had previously been used or partially used.

The Commissioners are further informed that the Department of Public Health is interested in the foregoing proposal primarily because of a considerable improvement in sanitary food control which the proposed procedures have over some of the indicated food service practices, and because the proposed procedures will permit of easier supervision and greater assurance that the public will be protected against the contamination of cream and milk, both of which are readily perishable products and potentially hazardous foods.

Section 18a of the act approved March 3, 1921, as added by the act approved July 7, 1932 (47 Stat. 609; sec. 10–119, D.C. Code, 1961 ed., 2d par.), reads as follows:

"The standard measure for ice cream, sherbet, and similar frozen food products shall be of the following capacities: One-half pint, pint, quart, half gallon, gallon, 2 gallons, 2½ gallons, and multiples of the gallon; * * *"

This provision of existing law does not, however, take into consideration the fact that modern packaging practices, insofar as the sale of frozen dairy products or frozen dairy desserts are concerned, involve packages smaller or of a different size than those permitted by existing law. The Commissioners are of the view that it is desirable that existing law be changed to recognize modern packaging practices used in connection with the sale of frozen dairy products or frozen dairy desserts.

In the belief that the changes which the bill makes in the act approved March 3, 1921, will be to the benefit of the consuming public and will take cognizance of modern methods utilized in the packaging of fluid and frozen dairy products and frozen dairy desserts, the Commissioners favor the enactment of H.R. 6413.

Very sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

DISCHARGE OF PAROLEES

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4333) to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to establish a Board of Indeterminate Sentence aand Parole for the District of Columbia and to determine its functions, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1932, as amended (sec. 24–204, District of Columbia Code, 1961 edition) is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 4."and by adding a new subsection at the end of section 4 to read as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Board of Parole may, subject to the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, promulgate rules and regulations under which the Board of Parole, in its discretion, may discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 4333—as set forth in House Report No. 838—which was requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is to authorize the Parole Board for the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision when the Board deems that the purpose for which the parole was granted has been accomplished.

The groundwork for this proposed legislation actually was started in 1956, when the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners appointed a Committee on Prisons, Probations, and Parole to supervise a study of the problem of overcrowding in the District's correctional institutions, and also the existing policies with respect to probation and parole. The report of this committee, submitted in 1957, included a recommendation that the Parole Board be granted the authority which is incorporated in this bill.

The District of Columbia Board of Parole has advised the Commissioners that under its parole supervision there are presently many persons under sentences which would require that they be supervised for periods as long as 20 to 30 years, and in some cases even for the rest of their natural lives. Moreover, many such individuals have been out on parole for 10 or even 20 years, and have made very good adjustments to community life. In such cases, the Board of Parole is of the opinion that the purpose for which the sentences were originally imposed, namely, the rehabilitation of the individuals, has been accomplished, and that to require such persons to continue under parole supervision would not serve any useful purpose. It is their opinion, in fact, that such continued supervision might well lead to a depressed mental attitude which in some cases might prove detrimental to a good adjustment previously attained. Moreover, it is felt that this possibility of early discharge from supervision may provide an incentive to prisoners facing long parole terms, to strive to make a good adjustment.

A member of the District of Columbia Parole Board has advised this committee that at present the Board has 107 persons who have been under parole supervision for 5 years or more, perhaps 10 percent of whom might be discharged from supervision under the provisions of this bill; and another 73 persons who have been on parole for 10 years or longer, some 40 percent of whom might be relieved from supervision by the Board. Thus, it seems probable that the parole supervision of some 40 to 50 present parolees might be terminated if this bill is enacted.

This committee understands that the authority which this bill would grant, to discharge such parolees from supervision prior to the termination of the original sentence, would be discretionary with the Board of Parole, and that a favorable recommendation by the parolee's supervisory parole officer will be a prerequisite to consideration of any such case by the Board.

Your committee is informed also that several States, including California, Connecticut, and Ohio, have enacted similar legislation, and that in 1958 the Congress granted this same discretionary authority to the U.S. Board of Parole in connection with Federal employees.

At a public hearing conducted on September 30, 1963, no opposition to this bill was expressed.

The letter from the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, requesting this legislation, follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Washington, January 8, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Commissioners have the honor to submit herewith a draft bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term of terms for which he was sentenced.

On October 30, 1956, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia authorized a comprehensive study of overcrowding in the correctional institutions of the District of Columbia together with a study of existing probation and parole facilities, policies, and practices in the District of Columbia. The Commissioners were particularly interested in determining whether the District of Columbia should in the future make large capital expenditures to construct additional prison facilities or, as an alternative, provide for the increased utilization of expanded probation and parole programs. To carry out the study authorized by them, the Commissioners appointed a Committee on Prisons, Probations, and Parole to oversee and exercise policy direction in the conduct of the study. This Committee, in April 1957, submitted to the Commissioners a report which, among other recommendations, included one that legislation be enacted to provide the Parole Board with the authority to terminate the parole period of persons when in the opinion of the Board the purpose for which parole had been granted has been accomplished.

The Commissioners have been advised by the Board of Parole that in many instances the Board has under its parole supervision persons who have been released on parole under sentences which would require that they be supervised for as long as the rest of their natural lives, or for periods as long as 20 to 30 years. In some of these cases, however, where the individuals have been out on parole for as long as 10, 15, or 20 years and have made especially good adjustments in the community, the Board of Parole is of the view that the purpose for which the sentence was originally imposed has been accomplished; that is, the rehabilitation of the individual. Accordingly, to require such a person to continue under parole supervision for 5 or 10 more years would not, the Board states, serve any useful purpose, and might even result in a depressed mental attitude which has in some cases seriously affected the good adjustment made by a parolee.

Accordingly, the Board of Parole recommends and the Commissioners concur in its recommendation, that the Board be given authority to discharge from supervision persons who have been under supervision for a long period, where it appears to the Board that their rehabilitation has been accomplished and no further useful purpose would be served by maintaining them under parole supervision. Such authority in the Board would, it is believed, serve as an incentive to prisoners who are facing long parole terms since it would give them some hope that if they made an especially good adjustment for a substantial period of years they would not face the prospect of being under parole supervision for an unreasonable length of time.

The Commissioners stress the point that the authority to discharge a parolee from supervision by the Board of Parole would be discretionary with the Board, with each case being considered on its merits and with a favorable recommendation by the parolee's supervising parole officer being a prerequisite to the consideration of any such case by the Board.

The Commissioners are informed that discretionary authority to discharge from parole supervision after a substantial period of satisfactory adjustment has been vested in parole boards in several of the States, including California, Connecticut, and Ohio, to name a few. Furthermore, the Congress, by its enactment of the act approved August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 845), has granted discretionary authority to the U.S. Board of Parole to discharge prisoners from parole supervision.

In the belief that in certain meritorious cases the discharge of a parolee from supervision by the Board of Parole will be of benefit both to the parolee and to the community, the Commissioners strongly recommend the enactment of the attached draft bill authorizing the Board of Parolee to terminate its supervision of a parolee who, after having been so supervised for a substantial period of time, is found to have made a satisfactory adjustment in the community. The attached bill is identical with H.R. 12687 and S. 3729, introduced in the 86th Congress at the request of the Commissioners, and S. 562, similarly introduced in the 87th Congress.

It is anticipated that the enactment of the proposed legislation will not result in any increase in expenditures of the government of the District of Columbia, but rather will result in a decrease in such expenditures by reason of the shortening, in some cases, of the period of time a parolee may be required to be supervised by the Board of Parole.

Yours very sincerely,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which I am pleased to support, is for the purpose of authorizing the District of Columbia Parole Board to terminate the parole supervision of a parolee prior to the expiration of the maximum term for which he was sentenced, when the Board deems that the purpose for which the parole was granted has been accomplished.

The District of Columbia Board of Parole advises that at present, the Board has approximately 75 persons who have been under its supervision for 10 years or longer, and more than 100 others who have been under parole supervision for 5 years or more. The present sentences in many of these cases will require that they be supervised for periods as long as 20 to 30 years longer, or even for the remainder of their lives. Moreover, many of these parolees have made very good adjustments to normal community life and in these cases, the Board of Parole feels that the purpose for which the sentences were originally imposed, namely, the rehabilitation of the individuals, has been accomplished. To require these persons to continue under parole supervision, therefore, not only would not serve any useful purpose, but the Board feels will actually be harmful in some cases, by creating a depressed mental attitude which could prove detrimental to a good adjustment already achieved. A spokesman for the Parole Board estimates that about 40 percent of the parolees enumerated above as having been under supervision for 5 years or longer could now be safely discharged from supervision.

The authority granted the Parole Board under the provisions of this bill would of course be discretionary, and a favorable recommendation by the parolee's supervisory parole officer will be a prerequisite to consideration of any case by the Board.

In 1958, this same authority was granted to the U.S. Board of Parole, in connection with Federal parolees. Several States also have followed this example.

It is estimated that it costs the District about $1.50 per day to maintain supervision over a parolee. Any saving of money or time on the part of the Board, however, is insignificant when compared with the value obtained by restoring human dignity and self-confidence to long-term parolees whose conduct has earned them a right to such consideration.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4333, the bill under immediate consideration, would authorize the Parole Board for the District of Columbia to terminate, at its discretion, direct supervision of a parolee in cases where, after a substantial period of direct supervision, the parolee appears to have made a favorable adjustment. The committee understands that the bill in no way authorizes the shortening or termination of the actual parole period.

H.R. 4333 was proposed by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners after intensive study by its Committee on Prisons, Probations, and Parole. Subsequent testimony before the District Committee by the Corporation Counsel and the Parole Board disclosed that there are a number of cases where parolees who have made excellent adjustments have been under the required supervision for periods of 20 years or more. Paroles in some cases are for life, along with the presently required supervision.

However, the authorities are of the firm opinion that continued mandatory supervision, after an apparent good adjustment, could prove to be detrimental over the long run—evidenced by a depressed mental attitude which could endanger the previous good adjustment.

The authorities emphasize that they are seeking discretionary authority only, and further, that a favorable recommendation by the parolee's supervisory parole officer will be a prerequisite to consideration of any such case by the Parole Board.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the purpose of parole is a humanitarian effort to give the parolee an opportunity to rehabilitate himself under supervisory guidance. However, if it is amply apparent, after a suitably extended period, that the parolee has made a good adjustment, then, according to expert opinion, continued direct supervision could be self-defeating.

Legislation similar to this has already been enacted on the Federal level when Congress, in 1958, granted discretionary authority to the U.S. Board of Parole to discharge Federal prisoners from parole supervision. Several States have also enacted similar measures.

The District Committee is assured that enactment of this bill would in no way result in expense to the District; on the contrary, a possible saving may well result by way of a reduction of the caseload of the supervisory personnel of the Parole Board.

Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate enactment of H.R. 4333.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF UNSAFE BUILDINGS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 7441) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1899 (30 Stat. 923, as amended; title 5, ch. 5, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by striking the term "inspector of buildings" wherever such term appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "Commissioners". The first sentence of the first section of such Act as amended, is amended by striking "his opinion" and inserting in lieu thereof "their opinion" and by striking "he shall" and inserting in lieu thereof "they shall".

SEC. 2. The first section of such Act, as amended (sec. 5–501, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The term 'Commissioners' means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia sitting as a board or the agent or agents designated by them to perform any function vested in said Commissioners by this Act."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of such Act, as amended (sec. 5–503, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is amended by striking the third sentence therefrom.

SEC. 4. Section 4 of the Act of March 1, 1899 (30 Stat. 923), as amended (sec. 5–504, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is hereby amended (a) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 4"; (b) by inserting "any dead, dangerous, or diseased tree, or part thereof," after "excavation," in the first sentence; (c) by striking "excavation" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "excavation, or any dead, dangerous, or diseased tree, or part thereof,"; (d) by striking "or parts thereof, or miscellaneous accumulation of material or debris" in such second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "or parts thereof, any miscellaneous accumulation of material or debris, or any dead or dangerous tree, or part thereof, or the removal or spraying of any diseased tree"; (e) by striking from the second sentence "bear interest at the rate of 10 per centum per annum until paid, and be carried on the regular tax rolls of the District of Columbia and shall be collected in the manner provided for the collection of general taxes" and inserting in lieu thereof "be collected in the manner provided in section 6 of this Act"; (f) by adding at the end of such section 4(a) the following sentence: "Within the meaning of this section, a dead tree shall be any tree with respect to which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent have determined that no part thereof is living; a dangerous tree is any tree or part thereof, living or dead, which the said Commissioners or their designated agent shall find is in such condition and is so located as to constitute a danger to persons or property on public space in the vicinity of such tree; and a diseased tree shall be any tree on private property in such a condition of infection from a major pathogenic disease as to constitute, in the opinion of the said Commissioners or their designated agent, a threat to the health of any other tree.", and (g) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The authority conferred on the Commissioners under subsection (a) with respect to the removal of dangerous and diseased trees constituting a nuisance shall be exercised by the Commissioners only after every reasonable effort has been made to abate such nuisance other than by the removal of any such tree, or part thereof."

SEC. 5. Such Act, as amended, is amended by inserting the following sections immediately after section 4, reading as follows:

"SEC. 5. The Commissioners shall determine the cost and expense of any work performed by them under the authority of the first four sections of this Act, including the cost of making good damage to adjoining premises (except such as may have resulted from carelessness and willful recklessness in the demolition or removal of any structure) less the amount, if any, received from the sale of old material, and shall assess such cost and expense upon the lot or ground whereon such structure, excavation, or nuisance stands, stood, was dug, was located, or existed, and this amount shall be collected in the manner provided in section 6 of this Act. Any person, corporation, partnership, syndicate, or company subject to the provisions of the first three sections of this Act who shall neglect or refuse to perform any act required by such sections shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $50 for each and every day said person, corporation, partnership, syndicate, or company fails to perform any act required by such sections.

"SEC. 6. Any tax authorized to be levied and collected under this Act may be paid without interest within sixty days from the date such tax was levied. Interest of one-half of 1 per centum for each month or part thereof shall be charged on all unpaid amounts from the expiration of sixty days from the date such tax was levied. Any such tax may be paid in three equal installments with interest thereon. If any such tax or part thereof shall remain unpaid after the expiration of two years from the date such tax was levied, the property against which said tax was levied may be sold for such tax or unpaid portion thereof with interest and penalties thereon at the next ensuing annual tax sale in the same manner and under the same conditions as property sold for delinquent general real estate taxes, if said tax with interest and penalties thereon shall not have been paid in full prior to said sale."

SEC. 6. Section 5 of such Act, as amended (sec. 5–505, D.C. Code, 1961 edition), is renumbered "SEC. 7." and is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Any notice required by this Act to be served shall be deemed to have been served when served by any of the following methods: (1) When forwarded to the last known address of the owner as recorded in the real estate assessment records of the District of Columbia, by registered or certified mail, with return receipt, and such receipt shall constitute prima facie evidence of service upon such owner if such receipt is signed either by the owner or by a person of suitable age and discretion located at such address: *Provided*, That valid service upon the owner shall be deemed effected if such notice shall be refused by the owner and not delivered for that reason; or (2) when delivered to the person to be notified; or (3) when left at the usual residence or place of business of the person to be notified with a person of suitable age and discretion then resident or employed therein; or (4) if no such residence or place of business can be found in the District of Columbia by reasonable search, then if left with any person of suitable age and discretion employed at the office of any agent of the person to be notified, which agent has any authority or duty with reference to the land or tenement to which said notice relates; or (5) if any such notice forwarded by registered or certified mail be returned for reasons other than refusal, or if personal service of any such notice, as hereinbefore provided, cannot be effected, then if published on three consecutive days in a daily newspaper published in the District of Columbia; or (6) if by reason of an outstanding unrecorded transfer of title the name of the owner in fact cannot be ascertained beyond a reasonable doubt, then if served on the owner of record in a manner hereinbefore provided. Any notice to a corporation shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to have been served on such corporation if served on the president, secretary, treasurer, general manager, or any principal officer of such corporation in the manner hereinbefore provided for the service of notices on natural persons holding property in their own right, and notices to a foreign corporation shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to have been served if served personally on any agent of such corporation, or if left with any person of suitable age and discretion residing at the usual residence or employed at the usual place of business of such agent in the District of Columbia.

"(b) In case such notice is served by any method other than personal service, a copy of such notice shall also be sent to the owner by ordinary mail."

SEC. 7. Such Act, as amended, is amended by inserting a new section immediately after section 7, as renumbered by this amendatory Act, reading as follows:

"SEC. 8. Whenever the Commissioners find that any building or part of a building, staging, or other structure, or anything attached to or connected with any building or other structure or excavation shall cause a building to be unsafe for human occupancy, they shall give notice of such fact to the owner or other person having an interest in such building, and to the occupant or occupants thereof. If within five days after such notice has been served upon such owner or other interested person, such building or part thereof has not been made safe for human occupancy, the Commissioners may order the use of such building or part thereof discontinued until it has been made safe: *Provided*, That if in the opinion of the Commissioners the unsafe condition of the building or part thereof is such as to be imminently dangerous to the life or limb of any occupant, the Commissioners may order the immediate discontinuance of the use of such building or part thereof. Any person occupying, or permitting the occupancy of, such building or part thereof in violation of such order of the Commissioners shall be fined not more than $300 or imprisoned for not more than thirty days."

SEC. 8. Section 6 of such Act, as amended, is renumbered "SEC. 9."

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 2, line 20, strike out " "excavation" " and insert in lieu thereof " "excavation," ".

2. Page 2, lines 23 and 24, strike out " "or parts thereof, or miscellaneous accumulation of material or debris" " and insert in lieu thereof " ", parts thereof or miscellaneous accumulation of material or debris" ".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 7441, as set forth in House Report No. 842, which was requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is to amend the act authorizing the removal of dangerous and unsafe buildings, or parts thereof, in the District of Columbia, as follows:

First. Provide for a uniform method of assessment of costs incurred by the District in connection with work done in making repairs to unsafe structures, either when the urgency of the situation necessitates immediate repairs by the District, or when the District finds it necessary to make such repairs because the owner has failed to comply, within a period of 10 days, with a notice ordering the repairs made.

Second. Include dead, dangerous, or diseased trees among the nuisances which the Commissioners may abate under the act.

Third. Provide new sections to the act relating to notice to owners and evacuation of unsafe buildings.

Fourth. Modernize the act by striking out the obsolete title, "inspector of buildings," wherever it occurs and substituting the word "Commissioners." There has been no Inspector of Buildings in the District for many years, and the function at one time performed by this officer was transferred to the District of Columbia Commissioners by Reorganization Plan No. 5, in 1952.

Under present law, when any structure in the District is found to be unsafe and the public safety necessitates immediate corrective action, the District of Columbia Commissioners are authorized to make such repairs or take such corrective steps as may be necessary. Where immediate action is not necessary and the owner of the building does not initiate repairs by noon of the day following the serving of a notice by the Commissioners, the Commissioners are authorized to order a survey, the report of which is served upon the owner. If the owner fails to comply with any order included in this notice within a period of 10 days, then the District is authorized to do the work required to make the building safe. In either case, the expense incurred by the District may be assessed against the property. The owner then has 90 days in which he may pay the amount assessed without interest; after that time, any unpaid amount bears interest at the rate of 10 percent per year and can be collected in the same manner as general District of Columbia taxes. However, there is presently no provision in the act of a definite time by which the assessment must eventually be paid. H.R. 7441 would remove this weakness in the present act, by adding a new section limiting to 60 days the period during which the assessment may be paid without interest, and providing for interest at the rate of one-half of 1 percent per month or portion thereof, on any part of the assessment remaining unpaid at the expiration of such period of 60 days. This tax would be payable in three equal installments, with interest, and if any part remains unpaid at the end of 2 years after the assessment is made, then the property would be subject to tax sale.

There is also a provision in H.R. 7441 which would authorize the Commissioners to impose a fine of $50 per day for each day in which the owner of a property fails to comply with a notice requiring correction of unsafe conditions. We are informed that the intent of this provision is to encourage owners to make their own repairs of relatively minor unsafe conditions, thus eliminating the need for District action in such cases.

The present law provides also for the abatement by the District of nuisances such as dangerous holes or excavations, abandoned vehicles, and debris of any kind, as they may affect the public health, comfort, safety, and welfare which are present on any lot or parcel of land in the District, when the owner of such property fails to abate the nuisance within a period of 5 days after being served a notice to do so. A fine of $50 per day for such failure to comply is provided here also, upon conviction of the owner in court. The principal change which H.R. 7441 would incorporate in this section of the present act is to add dead, dangerous, or diseased trees to the list of nuisances coming under its purview.

The District of Columbia Board of Commissioners has informed this committee that such dead, dangerous, or diseased trees pose a real problem in the District at this time, for which reason their being listed as abatable nuisances is justified. This view has been supported by the District of Columbia Department of Licenses and Inspections, and the District of Columbia Department of Public Health.

For some years, under the authority of an agreement between the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Park Service, and the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, District employees have removed trees afflicted with Dutch elm disease from private property in the city when the owners have failed to remove them. In these instances, the District employees have been acting as agents of the Federal Government. However, the city has never had any authority to remove trees from private property for any reason other than the presence of Dutch elm disease.

This provision of H.R. 7441, which would grant this authority, specifies that a "dead" tree is one of which no part is living, a "dangerous" tree must constitute a danger to persons or property on public space, and a "diseased" tree must be one which is infected with a major pathogenic disease which causes it to be a threat to the health of any other tree. Also, it is stipulated further that the authority to remove a dangerous or diseased tree shall be exercised by the Commissioners only after every reasonable effort has been made to abate the condition by other means.

The Chief of Quarantines and Hearings, Plant Quarantine Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Superintendent of National Capital Parks have expressed their endorsement of the Commissioners' request for this authority with respect to diseased trees.

As in the case of unsafe structural conditions, it is proposed in H.R. 7441 that costs to the District incurred when the city is obliged to abate these nuisances will be assessed as taxes against the properties, and collected in the same manner.

The present act specifies methods of serving the notices referred to above, and establishes an order of precedence for the use of these methods. This bill seeks to amend this section by eliminating this order of precedence so as to provide greater flexibility in the choice of methods of serving notice. Further, this bill provides that whenever any method other than personal service is utilized, a copy of the notice shall also be sent to the owner by mail.

H.R. 7441 will also provide the Commissioners with authority to order an unsafe building vacated, by serving of proper notice, when in their judgment the condition is imminently dangerous to the occupants. Failure of any occupant to obey such an order would be punishable by a fine not to exceed $300, or imprisonment for not more than 30 days.

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 5 on September 13, 1963, no opposition to this bill was expressed.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill offers several significant improvements to the present law which authorizes the District of Columbia Commissioners to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings.

The above-mentioned law, enacted on March 1, 1899, provides that in the event a structure in the District is found to be unsafe and dangerous from any cause, and if the owner of the property, after being notified by the District, fails to remedy the unsafe condition, the District is authorized to make such repairs or take such other corrective action as may be necessary for public safety. Also, if public safety requires immediate action, the Commissioners are empowered to take such action. The expense of any work performed by the District under this act may be assessed against the property, with interest at the rate of 10 percent per year, if the owner has not paid the amount within 90 days. However, there is presently no specific time when the assessment as a tax shall be paid. This bill will strengthen this part of the act by reducing the period for payment of such costs without interest to 60 days, increasing the rate of interest thereafter to one-half of 1 percent per month, and providing for sale of the property at tax sale if the amount has not been paid in full within 2 years after the assessment is levied. Also, the bill proposes a fine of $50 for each day the required action is not taken by the owner.

The present act provides also for the abatement of nuisances which may exist on any lot or parcel of land in the District, such as dangerous holes or excavations, abandoned vehicles, or miscellaneous debris of any kind, which may be deemed to affect the public health, comfort, safety, and welfare. As in the case of unsafe structures, such nuisances may be abated by the District if the owner fails to comply with notice, and costs to the District of such work would come under the same new provisions, described above, as the bill provides in the case of unsafe structures.

In this connection, however, a major provision of this bill would be to authorize the Commissioners to remove dangerous trees from private property. At present, this may be done only in the case of trees afflicted with Dutch elm disease, through agreement between the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the National Park Service, and the District of Columbia Department of Highways. However, we understand that dead, dangerous, and diseased trees constitute a problem which justifies their being considered abatable nuisances, and this bill will so provide, with several safeguards to property owners against improper use of this authority. First, a diseased tree must be one which is afflicted with a major, pathogenic disease, and, second, every effort must be made to spare as much of a tree as possible, in corrective action taken under this authority.

This bill will also provide the Commissioners, for the first time, with authority to order and enforce the evacuation of a building which is deemed to be unsafe for habitation, until suitable repairs are made.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill at the request of the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, for the purpose of amending the present law pertaining to the repair or removal of dangerous or unsafe buildings, which dates back to 1899.

Under present law, when a structure in the city is found to be dangerous or unsafe from any cause, the District is authorized to take immediate steps to correct the condition if imminent danger to the public safety exists, and if such immediate action is not necessary then notice is served to the owner of the property. Further provision is made for the District to repair or remove the structure, as may be necessary, if the owner fails to do so within a 10-day period, and the expense incurred by the District in any such operation may be assessed against the property.

This bill will amend this section of the present act by authorizing a penalty of $50 per day to be imposed against the property owner for each day he fails to comply with notice to correct an unsafe condition. Also, the time during which the assessment against his property may be paid without interest is reduced from 90 to 60 days, the interest rate is established at 0.5 percent per month or part thereof, and provision is made for the disposition of the property at tax sale if the assessment remains unpaid for 2 years.

Further improvement in the present law is accomplished by eliminating the order of precedence presently required in the use of the various methods of serving notices to property owners. This bill will also authorize the District of Columbia Commissioners to enforce the removal of hazardous trees from private property, such as those which are dead, structurally dangerous, or afflicted with a major pathogenic disease. This adjunct to the present law is recommended by the National Park Service, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the District of Columbia Department of Public Health, and the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic.

The final major feature of this bill is to authorize the Commissioners to order the evacuation of a dangerous or unsafe building, or any part thereof, whenever in their judgment the safety of the occupants necessitates such action.

I am convinced that this proposed legislation is constructive and in the public interest, and am pleased to offer this measure for the consideration of my colleagues in the Congress.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CREDIT UNIONS ACT

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 8313) to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any credit union organized under the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act (47 Stat. 326), as amended, may apply for conversion into a Federal credit union by filing with the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions (hereinafter referred to as the Director), pursuant to a resolution adopted by a majority of its directors, an organization certificate meeting the requirements of section 4 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1753), as amended.

SEC. 2. The Director shall approve any such organization certificate meeting such requirements. Upon such approval, the applicant credit union shall become a Federal credit union, and shall be vested with all of the assets and shall continue responsible for all of the obligations of such applicant credit union to the same extent as though the conversion had not taken place.

SEC. 3. Any District of Columbia credit union converting into a Federal credit union in accordance with this Act shall thereupon be subject to the limitations, vested with the powers, and charged with the liabilities conferred and imposed by the Federal Credit Union Act upon credit unions organized thereunder, except that—

(1) no fee shall be imposed upon a credit union converting pursuant to this Act as an incident to its conversion;

(2) any loan or investment made by a credit union converting pursuant to this Act in conformity with the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act prior to its conversion, which does not conform to the requirements of the Federal Credit Union Act and is still outstanding at the time of conversion, shall be liquidated at or before maturity or, if it has no maturity date, in a prudent manner and within a reasonable period of time; and

(3) a credit union converting pursuant to this Act shall submit proposed bylaws to the Director for his approval after its conversion, but not later than thirty days following its next annual meeting or six months after the enactment of this Act, whichever is later: *Provided*, That any existing bylaw inconsistent with any other requirement of the Federal Credit Union Act shall be deemed null and void.

SEC. 4. Effective thirty days after enactment of this Act, the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act (47 Stat. 326), as amended, is repealed and all organization certificates issued thereunder and still in force are revoked.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 8313 as set forth in House Report 840, is to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, as amended (47 Stat. 326; D.C. Code 26-501, 1961 ed.), and permit credit unions presently incorporated under the provision of that act to be chartered under the Federal Credit Union Act.

Under existing law, credit unions may receive charters from the State in which they are located, including the District of Columbia, or under the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1751). At the present time, there are 159 credit unions in the District of Columbia chartered under the Federal Act, and 16 chartered under the District of Columbia Act. All are supervised, however, by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions pursuant to the provisions of the respective acts. Thus, while the credit unions chartered in the District of Columbia are subject to regulation by the District of Columbia Commissioners, all auditing functions are carried out by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions. As a result, any recommendation of the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions must first be communicated to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, who in their discretion have authority to carry out or to reject such recommendation. All proposed amendments to the bylaws of the 16 credit unions chartered by the District of Columbia must be approved by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners.

It is the feeling of this committee that in the interest of efficiency and uniformity in the regulation of all credit unions in the District of Columbia, all of the District of Columbia Commissioners functions under the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act should be transferred to the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions.

Moreover, this transfer of functions to the Federal agency appears desirable for other reasons as well. The District of Columbia Credit Unions Act was approved in 1932, approximately 2 years before the Federal Credit Union Act was passed, and since that date virtually no changes have been made to bring the operation of the credit unions chartered by the District into line with more modern practices. As recently as 1959, however, the Federal Credit Union Act was amended and modernized in several important respects. For example, these amendments permit credit unions chartered under the Federal act to establish loan offices and to allow single signature loans up to $750. Also, the boards of directors of such credit unions may now declare dividends either semiannually or annually. Prior to 1959, only annual dividends were authorized. In contrast to these practices, under the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act unsecured loans are permitted only up to a limit of $300, and the members must still approve any dividend rate as recommended by the board of directors. Also such dividends are authorized only on an annual basis. Thus, the provisions of H.R. 8313 would enable the 16 credit unions presently chartered under the obsolete District of Columbia act to operate on a comparable basis with the other 159 local credit unions with whom they must compete.

Still a further consideration of prime importance is the fact that if any Federal Government agency whose credit union is chartered by the District of Columbia should move from the District for any reason, its credit union would become nonfunctional. It would not be permitted to operate as a credit union outside of the District, nor could it convert to either a State or a Federal charter due to the lack of a conversion provision in the code. Furthermore, such a credit union could not liquidate as a District of Columbia chartered organization for the purpose of rechartering except under the corporate liquidation laws, which many smaller credit unions could not afford.

At a public hearing held on September 13, 1963, this committee was informed that this proposed legislation has the approval of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and the District of Columbia Credit Union League on behalf of all the 16 credit unions presently chartered under the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act. No opposition was expressed to the passage of the bill.

Following is a list of the 16 District of Columbia credit unions which would be affected by this legislation, which was submitted to this committee by the attorney for the District of Columbia Credit Union League:

CREDIT UNIONS ORGANIZED UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CREDIT UNIONS ACT

1. Agricultural Employees Credit Union, room 1407, South Building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

2. CAPICO Employees Credit Union, 806 Channing Place NE., Washington, D.C.

3. Department of Commerce Credit Union of the District of Columbia, room 2032, Commerce Building, 14th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

4. District Government Employees Credit Union, room 5029, Municipal Center Building, 300 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

5. Educational Employees Credit Union, Cardoza High School, 13th and Clifton Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

6. FEU Local 262 Credit Union, room 7549, Internal Revenue Building, 12th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.

7. Navy Yard Credit Union of the District of Columbia, building 44, U.S. Naval Weapons Plant, Washington, D.C.

8. Post Office Department Employees Credit Union, room 1424, Post Office Department Building, 12th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

9. Railway Mail Service Credit Union, room 2037, city post office building, Washington, D.C.

10. Standard Credit Union of the District of Columbia, building 37, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.

11. Veterans' Administration Employees Credit Union, room C-57, Veterans' Administration Building, 810 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

12. Washington Postal Employees Credit Union, room 3112, city post office building, North Capitol Street and Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

13. Western Union Employees Credit Union, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

14. GAO Employees Credit Union, room 6424, 441 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

15. In-Com-Co Credit Union of the District of Columbia, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

16. Police Credit Union, room 2072, Municipal Center Building, 300 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act and to bring credit unions now chartered in the District under the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act.

At present, there are 176 credit unions in the District of Columbia chartered under the Federal act, and 16 which are chartered under the District act. All are supervised by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions pursuant to provisions of the respective acts. There is dual authority in connection with the District-chartered credit unions, however, because the District of Columbia Commissioners are authorized to approve their organization certificates, to suspend or revoke their licenses, and to approve their bylaws. The Commissioners do not wish to continue this joint authority, however, and have expressed the belief that all their functions under the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act should be transferred to the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions in the interests of efficiency and uniformity of regulation.

All 16 of the present District-chartered credit unions favor the enactment of this legislation, because their position in relation to the 176 Federal-chartered credit unions has become disadvantageous. The reason for this is that in 1959, the Federal Credit Union Act was changed to allow more modern operation of credit unions in the area chartered under the Federal act. For example, it allowed the establishment of loan offices, the issuance of single signature loans to the extent of $750, and the declaration of dividends by the Board of Directors either annually or semiannually. The provisions of the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, on the other hand, allow none of these privileges. For example, the members of such credit unions must still approve the dividend rate as recommended by the Board of Directors, and dividends may be paid only on an annual basis. Also, unsecured loans are limited to $300.

Further, some of the 16 District-chartered credit unions are in connection with Federal Government agencies, and should these agencies move from the District, their credit unions would become inoperative.

I am informed that for technical reasons, it is not feasible for District-chartered credit unions to change their status under present law and become chartered under the Federal act. Hence, the provisions of this bill appear to offer the only practical means by which these 16 organizations may come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Credit Union Act and be placed in a position where they may operate on a comparable basis with the other 176 credit unions in the city.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 8355) to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145), approved June 19, 1934, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8, chapter III of the Life Insurance Act (48 Stat. 1145) is amended by inserting at the beginning thereof "(a)" and by striking the figure "$100,000" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$500,000", and by adding the following subsection:

"(b) No company shall be exempt from the provisions of this section by reason of its having been incorporated in the District or elsewhere prior to the effective date of this subsection, except that in the case of companies authorized in the District of Columbia on (date of passage) and continuously authorized thereafter without any increase or broadening of authority, the minimum capital required of a stock company shall not be increased by this section."

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection 10(b)(ii) of section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145) is amended to read as follows:

"(ii) if such acquisition will not cause the acquiring company's aggregate cost of investments under this paragraph to exceed, in the case of a capital stock company, the amount of capital, surplus, and contingency reserves in excess of $750,000, or, in the case of a mutual company, the amount of surplus and contingency reserves in excess of $150,000."

"(b) Subsection 15(ii) of section 35 of chapter III of such Act is amended by deleting the words "the amount of capital, surplus, and contingency reserves in excess of $150,000," and substituting therefor the following: "in the case of a capital stock company, the amount of capital, surplus, and contingency reserves in excess of $750,000 or, in the case of a mutual company, the amount of surplus and contingency reserves in excess of $150,000."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 9 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act (48 Stat. 1145) is amended by striking the words "two-thirds of its stockholders" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "stockholders representing at least two-thirds of the capital stock entitled to vote".

SEC. 4. Section 10 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act (48 Stat. 1145) is amended by inserting at the beginning thereof "(a" and by adding the following paragraph:

"(b) Subsection (a) hereof shall not be applicable to an amendment of the articles of incorporation providing for an increase of capital stock wherein said amendment provides that said increase will be reserved for issuance in connection with—

"(1) the acquisition of the ownership or control of another insurance company as an affiliate or subsidiary pursuant to subsection 10(b) of section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act (D.C. Code 35–535 10(b)): *Provided, however,* That no such acquisition shall be consummated until it has been approved or ratified by stockholders representing at least a majority of the capital stock entitled to vote;

"(2) the granting of options to officers or employees of the company to purchase authorized but unissued shares of stock of the company, for such consideration and upon such terms and conditions as may be fixed by the board of directors: *Provided, however,* That (a) at no time shall the number of shares reserved for this purpose exceed, in the aggregate, 5 per centum of the total authorized shares of stock of the company; (b) no more than 10 per centum of the total number of shares authorized to be optioned may be made available to any individual under any and all options issued to him by the company; (c) no option shall be granted to any individual within two years following the termination of his employment with an insurance company authorized to do business in the District of Columbia, other than the company granting the option or a subsidiary of the company granting the option; (d) the option price of shares subject to any such option shall not be less than 95 per centum of the fair market value of such shares at the time the option is granted and shall be not less than the par value of such shares; (e) any such option shall not be transferable except by will or the laws of descent and distribution; (f) any such option shall not be exercisable after the expiration of 10 years from the time the option is granted; or

"(3) the paying of stock dividends: *Provided,* That at no time shall the number of shares of reserved unissued stock exceed the number of shares of issued and outstanding shares of stock of said company."

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which is at least ninety days after its approval.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8355, as set forth in House report 841, is to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145; D.C. Code, sec. 35–508) in three particulars wherein the present law is deemed inadequate; namely, by, first, increasing the capital stock requirements of life insurance companies, second, permitting changes in the corporate charter with the consent of stockholders representing two-thirds of the voting stock, and, third, authorizing the retention by insurance companies of unissued stock for certain limited purposes.

H.R. 8355 is similar in substance to H.R. 12546 of the 87th Congress, which passed the House on September 14, 1962. This bill was passed by the Senate with some minor amendments, but did not go to conference before the session ended. The present bill is quite similar also to H.R. 6640, which was introduced by Chairman MCMILLAN on May 28, 1963. The present bill incorporates certain changes, however, to meet questions raised by the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance and the Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia. The committee is advised that H.R. 8355 is acceptable to these officials.

The first amendment in the bill relates to section 8 of the Life Insurance Act which now requires that capital stock life insurance companies organized under District of Columbia laws must have a minimum paid-up capital stock of $100,000, plus paid-up surplus equal to 50 percent of the capital stock.

This minimum figure of $100,000 was established in 1941, and no longer represents a realistic minimum requirement for a life insurance company. Actually, there are 25 States which now require $200,000 or higher capital stock assets for life insurance companies. Also, Congress in 1940 (54 Stat. 1070; D.C. Code, sec. 35–1316) increased from $10,000 to $150,000 the amount of capital required of a fire and casualty insurance company. However, although the present bill as introduced would have raised this minimum for stock life insurance companies to $500,000, the testimony submitted to Subcommittee No. 5 at its public hearing on October 4, 1963, did not justify, in the opinion of the subcommittee, the increasing of the minimum requirement to this extent. Hence, the subcommittee and the full committee approved the increase under this bill to $200,000. This is consistent with action taken by the committee last year, in connection with H.R. 12546. The bill contains a "grandfather clause," so that in all fairness the bill will not impose any increase of capital requirements in the case of existing life insurance companies, either domestic or foreign.

Section 2 of the bill which was not present in the earlier version, would amend section 35 of the Life Insurance Act dealing with authorized investments, in order to conform it to the change in the required capital.

Section 3 of the bill would amend section 9 of the Life Insurance Act in order to clarify the procedure by which the corporate charter may be amended. The present language of the law could be construed to require the written consent of two-thirds of the stockholders to a charter amendment, regardless of the number of shares which such stockholders may represent. This bill would make it clear that amendments require the consent of stockholders representing at lease two-thirds of the voting stock; and in this respect, the bill subscribes to generally accepted corporate practice.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 10 of the Life Insurance Act which now requires that all shares of authorized capital stock of a District life insurance company must be issued within 1 year, unless an extension of time is granted by the Superintendent of Insurance. The bill would permit life insurance companies to retain authorized but unissued stock for certain limited purposes, namely the acquisition of ownership or control of another life insurance company, the granting of stock options, and the payment of stock dividends. The bill imposes certain protective restrictions upon the authorization of additional shares for any of these three purposes:

First. Acquisitions of another insurance company will require approval of the stockholders by a majority vote, and must also be approved by the Superintendent of Insurance under last year's amendment to the insurance law.

Second. The authorization of shares for stock options to officers and employees would be subject to limitations designed to assure that only reasonable use would be made of stock options. For example, no more than 5 percent of the total authorized shares may be used for stock options and no more than 10 percent of the total shares optioned may be granted to any one individual. Second, options may not be granted to an employee of another insurance company licensed in the District of Columbia until 2 years after termination of his employment with such company. Third, the option price must be at least 95 percent of the fair market value of the shares at the time the option is granted and may in no event be less than par value. Further, such options may not be transferred except on death, and options may not run for more than 10 years. Stock options are now widely recognized throughout American industry as an important method of executive compensation and incentive. This bill will further the public interest by assuring that stock options issued by District life insurance companies will be subject to reasonable terms and conditions.

Third. The third purpose for which authorized shares may be reserved is in order to pay stock dividends. This will bring the District life insurance laws into line with the prevailing laws of most other jurisdictions.

It should be noted that the bill imposes a limitation on the number of shares of stock which may be authorized for any of those three purposes, by requiring that the number of reserved shares shall not at any time exceed the number of issued and outstanding shares. The purpose of this limitation is to avoid excessive authorization of reserve stock and to maintain a reasonable relationship between such authorization and the issued shares.

Section 5 of the bill provides for the effective date thereof.

No opposition to this bill was offered at the hearings. On the other hand, its enactment is recommended by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia, and by leading stock insurance companies of the District, namely, Equitable Life Insurance Co., Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., General Services Life Insurance Co., Government Employees Life Insurance Co., Peoples Life Insurance Co., United Services Life Insurance Co., and Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to amend and improve the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act with respect to stock life insurance companies licensed in the District.

The present law requires stock life insurance companies doing business in the District of Columbia to have a minimum of $100,000 in capital with a surplus of 50 percent thereof, or a total of $150,000. When this requirement was enacted, approximately 30 years ago, $150,000 probably was an adequate amount for the protection of the policyholders. However, in my opinion this figure has become wholly unrealistic and inadequate in the face of today's economic conditions, and thus I thoroughly approve the provision of the first section of this bill which would increase the minimum capital stock requirement to $200,000 and also retain the 50 percent surplus stipulation. Twenty-five States now have minimum capital stock requirements for life insurance companies of at least $200,000 and the District should adopt a similar requirement. Adequacy of capital and surplus is particularly essential for the protection of policyholders, of course, during the first few years of a company's operations, when it is most subject to the grave hazards of inexperience. Consequently, I approve also of the fair and reasonable provision in this bill which states that insurance companies presently authorized in the District will not be required to increase capital and surplus if there is no change in the scope of their operations.

This bill also will correct an unwieldy situation encountered by some of our local stock insurance companies with respect to amending their articles of incorporation. Under present law, such amendment must be approved by consent of two-thirds of the company's stockholders. Inasmuch as these companies have a great many stockholders, who may be scattered throughout the world, this poses a burdensome problem. Also, since the required two-thirds of the stockholders may or may not represent an aggregate of a majority of the company's stock, the will of the majority is not necessarily expressed under this system. H.R. 8355 would greatly improve this procedure, in my opinion, by specifying that a company may amend its charter with the consent of persons holding two-thirds of the capital stock.

Present law provides that when a stock insurance company chartered in the District amends its articles of incorporation to provide for an increase in its capital stock, such increase must be subscribed and fully paid for within a period of 1 year. This bill would waive this requirement and permit stock to be reserved for issuance in connection with certain specified purposes; namely, the acquisition of ownership or control of other insurance companies, granting of stock options to officers or employees of the company, or the payment of stock dividends.

There are presently six principal stock life insurance companies operating in the District of Columbia, and all six endorse this proposed legislation. It has the approval also of the District of Columbia Superintendent of Insurance and the Board of Commissioners.

I am convinced that this is sound, forward-looking legislation, and am pleased to lend it my support.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to declare my support of this bill and support of the amendments and to say that the committee has gone over this rather thoroughly and believe that these amendments are desirable and should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8355, the bill under consideration would amend the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act in three instances where present law is felt to be inadequate by: first, increasing the capital stock requirements of life insurance companies; second, permitting changes in the corporate charter with the consent of stockholders representing two-thirds of the voting stock, and third, authorizing the retention by insurance companies of unissued stock for certain limited purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the requirements of present law were realistic at the time the law was enacted but, times have changed considerably in 30 years making what was adequate then totally unrealistic now. The public must be protected and it is my belief that H.R. 8355 is a most realistic approach to updating the law to meet the present-day problems of regulating the life insurance companies in the interests both of the public and the industry.

My support of this particular bill stems, in part, from my experience with similar legislation while I served in the Iowa Legislature. As I review the record of Iowa experience relating to insurance legislation of this type, it is graphically evident that the insurance law there has worked out extremely well and very much in best interest of the public.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

1. Page 1, line 7, strike out " "$500,000" " and insert in lieu thereof " "$200,000" ".

2. Page 2, strike out lines 8 through 15, and insert in lieu thereof "(48 Stat. 1145) is amended to read as follows: "(ii) if such acquisition will not cause the acquiring company's aggregate cost of investments under this paragraph to exceed, in the case of a capital stock company, the amount of capital, surplus, and contingency reserves in excess of $300,000, or, in the case of a mutual company, the amount of surplus and contingency reserves in excess of $150,000, and" ".

3. Page 2, line 16, strike out the quotation marks.

4. Page 2, line 21, strike out "$750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$300,000".

5. Page 2, line 23, strike out "$150,000." " and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000," ".

6. Page 3, strike out lines 6 and 7, and insert in lieu thereof " ginning thereof "(a)" and by adding the following subsection:".

7. Page 3, lines 11 and 12, strike out "in connection with" and insert in lieu thereof "for".

8. Page 3, line 15, strike out "pursuant to" and insert in lieu thereof "subject to the limitations of".

9. Page 4, line 21, immediately after the semicolon insert "or".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, your committee, in course of consideration of the provisions of the bill, studied its possible effect on the Investment Company Act of 1940. This question was presented to the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Commission indicated that its only concern was that the language of the bill should not be construed to amend in any way the Investment Company Act of 1940 or any other of the Federal security laws. Your committee agrees with and accordingly adopts the suggestion of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and expresses the committee's clear intent that no construction of the provisions of this bill shall result in the amendment or modification of the Investment Company Act of 1940 or any other of the Federal security laws.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTIONS FROM ATTACHMENTS

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 7882) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1107 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 15–403), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the wages (as defined in section 1104A(f) of this Act) of any person not residing in the District of Columbia who does not earn the major portion of his livelihood in the District of Columbia shall be exempt (without claim being made for such exemption), from attachment, levy, seizure, or sale by any process or proceeding of any court, judge, or officer of the District of Columbia in the same amount and to the same extent as is provided by the law of the State in which such person resides for persons residing therein."

With the following committee amendments:

1. Page 1, strike out lines 6 and 7, and insert in lieu thereof "amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting immediately after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):".

2. Page 1, line 8, strike out ' "(d)' and insert in lieu thereof ' "(c)'.

3. Page 2, line 1, strike out "his livelihood" and insert in lieu thereof "such wages".

4. Page 2, line 2, immediately after the word "shall" insert ", in any case arising out of a contract or transaction entered into outside of the District of Columbia,".

5. Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "(without claim being made for such exemption)".

6. Page 2, line 3, immediately after "levy," insert "or".

7. Page 2, line 4, strike out "or sale".

8. Page 2, strike out line 8 and insert in lieu thereof 'therein. Whenever any claim is made for an exemption from attachment pursuant to this subsection, the burden shall be upon the plaintiff to prove that the contract or transaction involved in the case was entered into within the District of Columbia." '.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to stop a practice which has developed in relation to the use of garnishment laws in a way which enables a creditor to do indirectly what he is not permitted to do directly in his own jurisdiction.

This practice involves the filing in the District of Columbia of an action for garnishment against an employer who also has a business in Maryland, so as to secure payment by attachment of wages from an employee who is not a resident of the District. The object of such practice is to escape the limitations in States outside the District, regarding exemptions from garnishment in favor of employees. This bill is designed to assure that where an action in such a case is brought in the District of Columbia, the nonresident defendant involved will be entitled to the same exemptions as are provided by law in the State in which the said defendant may reside.

Maryland law, for example, provides for an exemption from attachment of wages and salaries in the amount of $100 for each pay period. In a month, or 4⅓ weeks, this exemption would aggregate $433. Your committee has been informed that some persons in the debt collection business have found that the District of Columbia garnishment law provides a lower exemption; namely, 90 percent of the first $200 per month of wages, 80 percent of the next $300 per month, and 50 percent of all above $500 per month. In the case of a worker earning a wage of $100 per week, or $433 per month, therefore, an employee's entire salary would be exempt from attachment in Maryland, but in the District of Columbia only $366.40 per month would be exempt, leaving $66.60 per month subject to garnishment.

Accordingly, your committee was advised that Baltimore creditors, with claims against employees living and working in Baltimore, have in several instances determined that the employers also have places of business in the District of Columbia and hence are subject to service of garnishment or attachment process in the District, and accordingly have brought their claims to Washington and filed suits here, laying an attachment against the wages of the employee debtor in the hands of the employer, thus escaping the exemption from attachment provided by Maryland laws.

This same procedure could conceivably be adopted by collection agencies from any State if the employer maintains a place of business in the District, so that he would be subject to the service of garnishment process here.

This committee is of the opinion that it was never intended that District of Columbia law should serve as a collection medium against employees who live elsewhere, work elsewhere, and may even never have been in the District of Columbia. This bill is intended to so amend the District of Columbia law as to terminate this practice by granting to nonresidents of the District the exemptions from garnishment and attachment of wages afforded by their local State laws.

At a public hearing held on September 13, 1963, a representative of the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel stated that the District of Columbia Commissioners felt some misgivings about certain aspects of this proposed legislation, and Subcommittee Chairman HUDDLESTON requested that the Corporation Counsel review the bill and present for the subcommittee's consideration amendments which the Commissioners feel might make the bill compatible with District of Columbia policy.

Accordingly, at the next meeting of the subcommittee, on October 4, 1963, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitted several amendments which would not alter the original purpose of the bill, but which they felt would remove their objections to it. The subcommittee and the full committee accepted these amendments.

The letter from the Board of Commissioners, under date of October 1, 1963, follows:

OCTOBER 1, 1963.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MCMILLAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have for report H.R. 7882, 88th Congress, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill is to amend section 1107 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1363), as amended (§ 15–403, D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), by adding a new subsection thereto which would, in certain cases and to a certain extent, exempt from attachment the wages of nonresidents of the District.

The bill would exempt from attachment, levy, seizure, or sale by any process or proceeding of any court, judge, or officer of the District the amount of wages of any person not a resident of the District and not earning the major portion of his livelihood in the District in the same amount and to the same extent as is granted by the law of the State in which such person resides to residents of such State. The bill provides that the term "wages" includes wages, salary, commissions, or other compensation for services as defined in section 110A(f) of the act, as amended by the act approved August 4, 1959 (73 Stat. 276; § 15–317(c), D.C. Code, 1961 ed.). In addition, the bill provides that the exemption shall be granted without any claim being made therefor.

Testimony given on September 13, 1963, during a hearing on H.R. 7882 before Subcommittee No. 5 revealed that the bill is principally designed to end a practice involving attachment of wages of nonresident debtors by actions initiated in District of Columbia courts by nonresident creditors who are able to press garnishment suits against the employers of such nonresident debtors by virtue of the fact that the employers happen to maintain offices in the District.

It is the view of the Commissioners that the objective of the bill has merit, for, in their belief, a District of Columbia court should not be made a vehicle for the garnishment of wages of persons whose States may provide certain exemptions not provided in this jurisdiction.

However, the Commissioners believe that the bill in its present form is objectionable in that it may impose a heavy burden on the courts of the District and may place citizens and businessmen in the District in a disadvantageous position when dealing with nonresidents who may later be subject to attachment of their wages.

On the one hand, the bill, if enacted, would require a judicial determination as to the place where the major portion of a person's livelihood is earned. Such a determination can involve the complicated question of what constitutes a person's livelihood since the term may include income other than wages. The Commisisoners accordingly suggest that the bill be amended by striking the words "his livelihood" in line 1, page 2, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "such wages". This would provide the courts a more definite factor in determining whether a nonresident debtor has a claim to an exemption.

Further, the bill, in effect, would grant an automatic exemption without any claim being made therefor, thereby placing an undue burden on the courts. The courts may be expected, in proper cases, to continue to issue writs of attachment of wages of nonresidents; but, in any case where a nonresident debtor would be entitled to an automatic exemption under the bill as it is now written, the facts showing that he is so entitled need not be brought to the attention of the court. Thus the court, on its own motion, may be required in each case involving attachment of wages of a nonresident to take steps to determine whether such nonresident is entitled to an exemption, whether such person is in fact a nonresident, and whether he earns a major portion of his livelihood outside the District. In addition, the court would need to inquire as to the amount of any exemption, if any, which is provided by the State in which the person resides. Therefore, the Commissioners suggest that page 2, lines 2 and 3 of the bill be amended by striking so much as reads "without claim being made for such exemption)".

With regard to claims for exemption from attachment, existing law provides in subsection (c) of section 1107 of the act (58 Stat. 818; § 15–403(c), D.C. Code, 1961, ed.) that a notice of claim of exemption, or motion to quash attachment or other process against exempt property or money, may be filed with the court either by the debtor, his spouse, or a garnishee, and the court is directed to act upon such notice, motion, or other claim of exemption. This section permits a garnishee located in the District to claim an exemption in the District of Columbia court on behalf of a nonresident debtor. The Commissioners feel that the making of a claim for exemption would more properly assist the court in reaching the determinations which would be required by H.R. 7882, especially if, as the Commissioners suggest, the automatic exemption provision be eliminated.

Finally, the Commissioners believe that the interests of District residents and merchants require that the effect of the bill be limited to those cases arising out of contracts and transactions entered into outside of the District. This would provide assurance that District merchants, for example, would not be limited by the laws of the place of residence of those persons coming into the District to do business here. In such cases, the Commissioners believe that any exemptions to be provided should be those granted by the laws of the District. Accordingly, the Commissioners suggest that the bill be amended by inserting in line 2, page 2, immediately following the word "shall", ", in any case arising out of a contract or transaction entered into outside of the District of Columbia,". In addition, the Commissioners feel the burden of showing that the contract or transaction was entered into within the District should be placed upon the person seeking the attachment. To so provide, the Commissioners suggest that the bill be further amended by inserting immediately before the quotation mark on line 8, page 2, the following new sentence:

"Whenever any claim is made for an exemption from attachment pursuant to this subsection, the burden shall be upon the plaintiff to prove the contract or transaction involved in the case was entered into within the District of Columbia."

For purposes of clarification, the Commissioners also suggest that the bill be amended as follows:

(a) Page 2, line 3, immediately before the word "seizure" insert "or".

(b) Page 2, line 4, strike "or sale".

(c) Page 1, line 8, strike the subsection designation "(d)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

(d) Page 2, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of such section is hereby redesignated as subsection (d)."

With the amendments suggested in the foregoing discussion, the Commissioners would offer no objection to enactment of H.R. 7882.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which I wish to commend to my colleagues in the House, would amend the present law regarding exemptions from garnishment and attachment of wages in the District of Columbia.

At present, Maryland laws regarding such exemptions from garnishment are more restrictive than are those of the District. For example, a wage of $100 per week would be totally exempt from garnishment in Maryland, but in the District of Columbia more than $65 of this income would be subject to garnishment in a period of 1 month. Because of this situation, and because other provisions of the District of Columbia law presently do not forbid the practice, we understand that collection agencies in Baltimore, for example, may have accounts involving persons living and working in that city, but whose employers also maintain offices or places of business in the District of Columbia, and in such cases are filing actions against them in the District of Columbia. This is done, of course, because greater amounts of wages are subject to garnishment in the District.

I am opposed to the continuation of this practice, which of course, can involve other States as well as Maryland, first because I feel that it is an unfair utilization of the time of the District of Columbia courts and a resulting expense to the District of Columbia taxpayers, and secondly because I do not believe that the Congress ever intended for the District of Columbia court to be made a vehicle for the garnishment of wages of persons who neither reside nor work in the District, merely because the States of their residence may provide certain exemptions not provided in the District of Columbia.

This bill will correct this situation by exempting from attachment or garnishment by any process, the wages of a person who is not a resident of the District and who does not earn a major portion of his livelihood in the District. to the same extent as may be provided by the law of the State in which such person resides.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE PARTIAL PAY FOR SCHOOL BOARD EMPLOYEES ON EDUCATIONAL LEAVE

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] to call up for consideration the bill H.R. 5337, reported by Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 5337) to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia with leave of absence, with part pay, for purposes of educational improvement, and for other purposes", approved June 12, 1940 (54 Stat. 349; sec. 31–632 et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Any employee in the salary class of elementary and secondary school teachers whose salary is fixed by the first section of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, who is granted leave of absence for educational purposes under the provisions of this Act, shall receive compensation during the period of such leave of absence, such compensation to be equal to one-half of the salary which he would have received and paid in the same manner as if he were on active duty during the period of such leave of absence reduced by (1) the amount of contributions which he is required to make to the retirement fund as provided by the Act entitled 'An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia' approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–725, 1961 ed.), (2) any contributions which he may elect to make to group life insurance as provided by the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091 (a)), and (3) any contributions which he may elect to make to any health benefits plan as provided by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 708; 5 U.S.C. 3002)."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such Act approved June 12, 1940, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. Any employee whose salary is fixed by the first section of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, other than employees in the salary class of elementary and secondary school teachers, who is granted leave of absence for educational purposes under the provisions of this act shall receive compensation during the period of such leave of absence, such compensation to be equal to one-half of the salary which he would have received and paid in the same manner as if he were on active duty during the period of such leave of absence or equal to the largest amount to which any employee in the salary class of elementary and secondary school teachers would be entitled if given such educational leave, whichever is less, either payment to be reduced by (1) the amount of contributions which the employee is required to make to the retirement fund as provided by the act entitled 'An Act for the retirement of public school teachers in the District of Columbia' approved August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 875), as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31–725, 1961 ed.), (2) any contributions which he may elect to make to group life insurance as provided by the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 736), as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091 (a)), and (3) any contributions which he may elect to make to any health benefits plan as provided by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 708; 5 U.S.C. 3002): *Provided*, That during the period of the leave of absence of any employee who is an administrative or supervisory officer, the Board of Education, on the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, may authorize the temporary assignment to his position of any teacher or officer who serves under such officer on leave of absence: *And provided further*, That the position of the teacher or officer so assigned may be filled during the period of such absence by a qualified temporary employee."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of such act approved June 12, 1940, is amended by striking "teacher or officer" in the two places where it appears therein and inserting, in lieu thereof, "employee".

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect on and after July 1, 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California if this increase in paid leave is confined exclusively to the need for educational improvements. Or, let me put the question this way: Would this provide for an increase in the leave pay of a teacher in the District of Columbia who is going to join the Peace Corps and teach in the Philippines or some other foreign country?

Mr. SISK. It would not cover such an incident as that. It covers only a situation where the teacher has filed a complete program of self-improvement by going back to college to work on additional degrees and additional matters that would improve her teaching ability. It would have to be approved by the board of trustees, the school board, and by the Commissioners. So it would only apply to teachers who seek to go out for self-improvement.

Mr. GROSS. If a teacher went to Ouagadougou or to Tanganyika or some other such place that would not be called self-improvement?

Mr. SISK. No.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman one or two questions. As I understand it, according to page 3 of the report, a teacher with a master's degree can get $4,600 or $4,700 a year while they are in school supposedly increasing their skill; is that correct?

Mr. SISK. That is correct.

Mr. SNYDER. Let me ask the gentleman, would the salary structure of the District school system be such that upon increasing their skills they would then be entitled to receive more money than they were making before they left the school system for self-improvement?

Mr. SISK. As I understand the gentleman's question, the answer is "Yes," because depending upon the degree which they hold and the position which they are in, relative to their educational background, as that increases it does increase their basic pay.

Mr. SNYDER. In other words, a teacher with a master's degree can get $4,600 or $4,700 a year while they are away in school. As a result of this study the teacher may acquire a doctor's degree and when he comes back with a doctor's degree, he will make more money than before?

Mr. SISK. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SNYDER. How does this compare with the situation in other cities?

Mr. SISK. At the time we held the hearings on the present bill we did compare it with school systems in New York, Dallas, Cleveland, San Francisco, and Chicago, and I think practically all of the major systems in the United States. We found in many instances they were paying considerably more for teachers who went back to school in the way of additional pay than the District of Columbia would pay.

If the gentleman will yield for me to make a further comment here, I understand the question, because this particular question was raised at the time of the hearing on the bill. The situation is such that on the present level of salaries that teachers receive, they simply cannot acquire a sufficient amount of savings to afford to go out on their own and give up their salaries for a year to get that additional training, so that as a result they are precluded from doing the things that we feel are necessary to enable them to train themselves in the manner in which we think they should.

In addition, no more than 2 percent at any one time of the teachers in the District could be on such leave because of the requirements here that they are needed for teaching the youngsters in the District.

Mr. SNYDER. Would the gentleman be more direct as to how many States have such provisions?

Mr. SISK. As far as I know, almost every State has such provisions. These are determined by the individual cities, not the States. Each local school district has its own setup under the laws, of course, within that State, to provide for leave pay. Under these situations, some use one particular formula, some use another. There was quite a difference in the pay. Some paid half of their salaries, some used certain other types of formula. Based on the average, the District was below what the average of the States were paying.

Mr. SNYDER. Under existing law they would receive around $3,700 in going away for the same purposes?

Mr. SISK. That is correct. If I understand the illustration the gentleman used, he would get an increase of about $800 over what he gets now.

Mr. SNYDER. I think the present law is adequate under these circumstances and I would like to be recorded as opposed to this legislation.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 5337, as set forth in House Report 837, would amend the present law with respect to partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, by providing that—

First. District of Columbia teachers and other school personnel in class 15 of the present salary scale for school employees, while on leave of absence for educational purposes, shall receive compensation equal to one-half their active duty salaries, less deductions for retirement, group life insurance, health benefits, and income taxes;

Second. A school employee in any of the other 14 pay-scale classes, on leave for the purpose of educational improvement, shall receive compensation equal to one-half his active duty salary or the largest amount to which any employee in the salary class of elementary and secondary schoolteachers—class 15—would be entitled while on educational leave—whichever is the lesser—also subject to the deductions listed above.

This committee is informed that section 6 of the District of Columbia School Board regulations, pertaining to leave of absence for the purpose of educational improvement, will continue in effect if H.R. 5337 is adopted. The text of this section is as follows:

[Excerpt from "Rules for the Public Schools of the District of Columbia," authorized for publication Oct. 18, 1961, pp. 59–69]

EDUCATIONAL LEAVE WITH PART PAY, EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 6. 1. The Board of Education, upon recommendation of the Superintendent, may

grant leave of absence with part pay for purposes of educational improvement to any school officer, teacher, or other educational employee on permanent tenure whose salary is established in classes 2-18, both inclusive, of the Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended by Public Law 85-838, 1958, who has served in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia not less than 6 consecutive years on probationary and/or permanent status immediately prior to filing application for such leave, who shall submit a written plan of the educational work to be undertaken during the period of such leave of absence, which plan shall be approved by the Superintendent, and who shall file with him a written pledge to perform service in the public schools of the District of Columbia for a period of not less than 2 years after reinstatement from such leave of absence. If a teacher should resign before fulfilling this pledge, his resignation may be accepted with prejudice and he may not be considered eligible for reappointment, as defined in chapter IX, section 7, and all salary paid to this employee while on educational leave with part pay must be refunded.

2. The granting of such leave of absence with part pay shall be governed by existing law and by such provisions in these rules as control leave of absence without pay to teachers, school officers, and other educational employees entitled to such leave for educational improvement.

3. A second leave of absence with part pay for purposes of educational improvement shall not be granted until the employee concerned has served another continuous 6-year term.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT LAW AND H.R. 5337

Under present law, however, a teacher on educational leave of absence receives compensation equal to the difference between his regular salary and the base—minimum—pay for his salary class.

A comparison of the amounts of compensation per annum for teachers and other employees in group A of salary class 15—for those with bachelor's degree—under present law and under the provisions of H.R. 5337, is shown in the following table:

Salary class 15—Group A (with bachelor's degree)

Pay status	Salary	Compensation for educational leave under—	
		Present law [1]	H.R. 5337 [1]
Service step 7	$6,380	$1,380	$3,190.00
Service step 8	6,595	1,595	3,197.50
Service step 9	6,810	1,810	3,405.00
Service step 10	7,025	2,025	3,512.50
Service step 11	7,240	2,240	3,620.00
Service step 12	7,455	2,455	3,727.50
Service step 13	7,670	2,670	3,835.00
Longevity step X	8,190	3,190	4,095.00
Longevity step Y	8,710	3,710	4,355.00

[1] All figures shown are subject to deductions for retirement, group life insurance, health benefits (if any), and income tax.

NOTE.—Inasmuch as teachers and other educational employees are not eligible for educational leave until they have completed 6 years of continuous service in the system, the above table begins with service step 7, which represents the salary level of such employees after 6 years of service.

Similarly, under the provisions of H.R. 5337 the maximum compensation for teachers in group B—with master's degree—would be increased from $3,710 to $4,605, and for those in group C—master's degree plus 30 credit hours—from $3,710 per year to $4,705. This latter is, of course, the greatest amount which could accrue to any teacher or other employee in salary class 15 under this bill, while on educational leave.

An educational employee in a salary class other than that of elementary and secondary teachers—class 15—is presently entitled to $3,710 per year while on educational leave of absence. Under the provisions of H.R. 5337, such an employee would receive $4,705—the largest amount a teacher could receive—or 50 percent of his own annual salary, whichever is the lesser. The deductions listed with respect to part pay for class 15 employees would apply also, of course, in the case of employees in all other salary classes.

In view of the very considerable increase in the cost of education and the cost of living since 1940, when the present law was enacted, this committee feels that the present scale of part-pay allowances for teachers engaged in educational self-improvement is inadequate and unrealistic, and the proposed amendments to this scale are warranted. The entire educational system of the city benefits when teachers and other school personnel are encouraged to augment their own educational backgrounds.

Any estimate of the additional cost involved in these increased salary benefits would be largely speculative, because of the difficulty of determining how many teachers and other school employees would take leave for educational purposes if the partial pay were increased. However, the existing stipulation that an employee must have served continuously for at least 6 years in the system to be eligible for such leave, and the further limitation that not more than 2 percent of the Board of Education's employees may be on leave at the same time, offer some assurance that the cost would remain within reasonable limits. Also, it appears probable that the great majority of the teachers taking educational leave would be in group A and group B of their salary class, where the salaries and consequently the leave allowances are the lowest, because these are the teachers who may advance into the higher salary groups through additional education.

At a public hearing conducted by Subcommittee No. 2 on April 9, 1963, no opposition was expressed to the passage of this bill, which was requested by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the District of Columbia Board of Education. The following exhibit of comparative data was furnished to this committee by the Department of General Research, Budget, and Legislation of the public schools of the District of Columbia:

Public schools of the District of Columbia—General provisions with respect to teachers' leaves of absence for professional study in city school systems over 400,000 in population and in suburban systems near Washington, D.C., 1961–62 [1]

	Is leave allowed?		Amount of leave allowed		Amount of pay allowed
	Without pay	With part pay [2]	Without pay	With part pay	
A. CITIES OVER 400,000 IN POPULATION (IN ORDER OF SIZE)					
1. New York	Not stated	Yes		6 months	Not stated.
2. Chicago	Yes	Yes	200 days	200 days	Do.
3. Los Angeles	Yes	Yes	Not stated	do	½ pay.
4. Philadelphia	Yes	Yes	do	1 year	Do.
5. Detroit	Yes	Yes	200 days	200 days	Do.
6. Baltimore	Yes	Yes	Not stated	Not stated	Do.
7. Houston	Yes	No	do		
8. Cleveland	Yes	No	2 years		
9. Washington	Yes	Yes	1 year	1 year	(3).
10. St. Louis	Yes	No	Not stated		
11. Milwaukee	Yes	Yes	190 days	190 days	½ pay.
12. San Francisco	Yes	Yes	Not stated	Not stated	60 percent.
13. Boston	Yes	Yes	do	1 year	½ pay.
14. Dallas	Yes	No	do		Do.
15. New Orleans	Not stated	Yes		180 days	(4).
16. Pittsburgh	do	Yes		Not stated	Maximum, $3,000.
17. San Antonio	Yes	Not stated	Not stated		
18. San Diego	Yes	Yes	1 year	1 year	½ pay.
19. Seattle	Yes	Yes	180 days	180 days	Not stated.
20. Buffalo	Yes	No	1 year		
21. Cincinnati	Yes	Yes	Not stated	195 days	
22. Memphis	No	No			
23. Denver	Not stated	Yes		Not stated	½ pay.
24. Atlanta	Yes	Yes	1 year	1 semester	Full pay.[5]
25. Indianapolis	Yes	No	Not stated		
26. Columbus	Yes	No	do		
27. Phoenix	Yes [6]	No	do		
28. Newark	Not stated	Yes		Not stated	½ pay.

See footnotes at end of table.

Public schools of the District of Columbia—General provisions with respect to teachers' leaves of absence for professional study in city school systems over 400,000 in population and in suburban systems near Washington, D.C., 1961–62 [1]—Continued

	Is leave allowed?		Amount of leave allowed		Amount of pay allowed
	Without pay	With part pay [2]	Without pay	With part pay	
B. SUBURBAN SYSTEMS NEAR WASHINGTON, D.C.					
1. Montgomery County, Md.	Yes	Yes	1 year	1 year	Do.
2. Prince Georges County, Md.	Not stated	Yes		180 days	Do.
3. Arlington County, Va.	Yes	Yes	Not stated	Not stated	Do.
4. Fairfax County, Va.	Yes	Yes	do	1 year	Maximum, $2,000.[7]
5. Alexandria, Va.[7]	No	No			
6. Falls Church, Va.[7]	Yes	Yes	1 year	1 year	½ pay.

[1] Information obtained from the Research Division of the National Education Association, chiefly as reported in "Educational Research Service Circular No. 7, 1962," July 1962.

[2] The National Education Association report uses the term "sabbatical" to indicate the basis for granting leaves of absence with pay, and does not give for each city the number of years which a teacher must serve before being granted such leave. However, a report issued in January 1962 by the U.S. Office of Education entitled "Staff Personnel Policies," shows for 25 relatively large school systems (not identified) the following distribution of service requirements for the granting of sabbatical leave:

Number of systems:	*Consecutive years*
1	4
2	5
2	6
17	7
3	10

The same report shows for 17 of these cities the following service requirements upon return from sabbatical leave:

Number of systems:	*Years*
8	1
6	2
3	3

[3] Teachers receive the difference between the minimum salary scheduled for the individual's training level and the salary which the individual would have received if he had remained in active school service.

[4] Teacher receives full pay, less cost of substitute's salary.

[5] 1 semester of sabbatical leave with full pay is granted for doctoral study only.

[6] High school teachers only.

[7] Information obtained by telephone.

Source: Prepared by Department of General Research, Budget, and Legislation, April 1963.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lend my support to this bill, which seeks to increase the partial pay of District of Columbia educational employees on leave of absence for educational improvement.

Public Law 610 of the 76th Congress, enacted on June 12, 1940, provides for educational leave with partial pay for educational employees of the District of Columbia public schools. This is the practice also in virtually every other city in the country. The amount of such partial pay in the District is the difference between the regular salary of such teacher or other employee for the period of leave and the base pay for his salary class. For example, a teacher in service step 7 of group A—that is, a teacher with a bachelor's degree and with 6 years of experience—now receives an annual salary of $6,380. The base pay in this salary class, however, is $5,000. Thus, the present leave pay available for such a teacher is $1,380, which is subject to deductions for retirement, group life insurance, health benefits, and income tax. This is sufficient to explain the fact that within the past several years, a total of only about 25 teachers in the District public school system have taken educational leave.

H.R. 5337 would establish the partial pay for teachers on such leave at one-half his regular salary, less the above-mentioned deductions. In the case cited above, therefore, the partial pay allowance would amount to $3,190, which is far more realistic than the present emolument.

This bill would provide increases also in such partial pay for educational employees other than teachers, in the same or in other salary classes. The maximum annual amount which any school employee could receive under the provisions of this bill, however, is $4,705.

Educational leave is governed by District of Columbia School Board regulation, in which no change is contemplated. This regulation provides that a teacher is eligible for educational leave only after having served 6 years continuously in the District of Columbia public school system, and her application and study plan must be submitted for approval by the Superintendent of Schools. Further, after such leave, which is limited to 1 year in length, a teacher must then serve another 6 years before again being eligible for educational leave. Also, a teacher in accepting educational leave agrees to return for at least 2 additional years of service in the District of Columbia school system, and if any teacher fails to fulfill this agreement, then her resignation is accepted with prejudice and she is liable for the refund of all her partial leave salary.

I feel that present economic conditions make this bill essential for the encouragement of District teachers to augment their educational backgrounds, and that this accrues to the benefit of the entire school system and of the city.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JUDGES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 5871) to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia court of appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942 (D.C. Code, sec. 11–776), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 11. (a) Any judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, any judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, as established by this Act, or any judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, may hereafter retire after having served as a judge of such court or courts for a period or periods aggregating ten years or more, whether continuously or not. Any judge who so retires shall receive annually in equal monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the date of such retirement as the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of thirty years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge: *Provided,* That if any such judge shall retire after twenty or more years of service, other than for permanent disability, his retirement shall not commence until he shall have reached the age of fifty: *Provided further, however,* That if any such judge shall retire after less than twenty years of service, other than for permanent disability, his retirement shall not commence until he shall have reached the age of sixty-two, except that such judge may elect to receive a reduced retirement salary beginning at the age of fifty-five or at the date of his retirement if subsequent to that age, the reduction in retirement salary in such case to be one-half of 1 per centum for each month or fraction of a month the judge is under the age of sixty-two at the time of commencement of his reduced retirement salary. In no event shall the sum received by any judge hereunder be in excess of the salary of such judge at the date of such retirement. In computing the years of service under this section, service in either the Police Court of the District of Columbia or the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, or the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, as heretofore constituted, shall be included whether or not such service be continuous. The terms 'retire' and 'retirement' as used in this section shall mean and include retirement, resignation, or failure of reappointment upon the expiration of the term of office of an incumbent.

"(b)(1) Any judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, any judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and any judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia may hereafter retire after having served five years or more having become permanently disabled from performing his duties.

"(2) Such judge may retire for disability by furnishing to the Attorney General of the United States a certificate of disability signed by a duly licensed physician and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. A judge who retires under this subsection shall receive annually in equal monthly installments, during the remainder of his life, a sum equal to such proportion of the salary received by such judge at the date of such retirement as the total of his aggregate years of service bears to the period of thirty years, the same to be paid in the same manner as the salary of such judge.

"(c) Any judge receiving retirement salary under the provisions hereof may be called upon by the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, or the chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, or the chief judge of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, to perform such judicial duties as may be requested of him in any of such courts, but in any event no such retired judge shall be required to render such service for more than ninety days in any calendar year after such retirement. Any judge called upon pursuant to this subsection to perform judicial duties who fails to perform such duties so requested shall forfeit all right to retired pay under this section for the one-year period which begins on the first day on which he so fails to perform such duties, in. case of illness or disability precluding the rendering of such service such judge shall be fully relieved of any such duty during such illness or disability.

"(d)(1) Any judge of any of the courts herein named, or any judge retired prior to the enactment of this amendment, may by written election filed with the Commissioners within six months after the date on which he takes office, or is reappointed to office (or within six months after the enactment of this section) bring himself within the purview of this subsection.

"(2) There shall be deducted and withheld from the salary of each judge electing to bring himself within the purview of this subsection a sum equal to 3 per centum of such judge's salary, including salary paid after retirement under the provisions of this section. The amounts so deducted and withheld from the salary of each such judge shall, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Commissioners, be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a fund to be known as the 'District of Columbia judicial survivors annuity fund' and said fund is appropriated for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided by this subsection. If, at any time, the balance in such fund is not sufficient to pay current obligations arising pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, there is authorized to be appropriated to such fund, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary to pay such current obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare the estimates of the annual appropriations required to be made to the District of Columbia judicial survivors annuity fund, and shall make actuarial valuations of such fund at intervals of five years, or more often if deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Treasury. Every judge who elects to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall be deemed thereby to consent and agree to the deductions from his salary as provided in this subsection, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all judicial services rendered by such judge during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he or his survivors shall be entitled under the provisions of this section.

"(3) Each judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall deposit, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the judicial survivors annuity fund created by this subsection a sum equal to 3 per centum of his salary received for service as a judge of any of the five courts referred to in subsection (a), salary received after retirement, and of his basic salary, pay, or compensation for services as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress and for any other civilian service within the purview of section 2253 of title 5, United States Code. Such interest shall not be required for any period during which the judge was separated from all such service and was not receiving salary under this section. Each judge may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his judicial service in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Commissioners. Notwithstanding the failure of a judge to make such deposit, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered, but the annuity of the widow of such judge shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount of such deposit, computed as of the date of the death of such judge, unless such widow shall elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit under paragraph (15) of this subsection: *Provided,* That no deposit shall be required from a judge for any service rendered prior to August 1, 1920, or for any honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"(4) The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest from time to time, in interest-bearing securities of the United States or Federal farm loan bonds, such portions of the District of Columbia judicial survivors annuity fund as in his judgment may not be immediately required for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided in this subsection. The income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of said fund for the purpose of paying annuities and of carrying out the provisions of paragraphs (6), (7), (9), and (10) of this subsection.

"(5) The amount deposited by or deducted and withheld from the salary of each judge electing to bring himself within the purview of this subsection for credit to the District of Columbia judicial survivors annuity fund created by this subsection covering service from and after August 1, 1920, shall be credited to an individual account of such judge.

"(6) If any judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection resigns from office otherwise than under the provisions of this section, the amount credited to his individual account, together with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum, thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of his relinquishment of office, shall be returned to him.

"(7) In case any judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall die while in office (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under the provisions of this section), after having rendered at least five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in paragraph (15) of this subsection for the last five years of which the salary deductions provided for by paragraph (2) of this subsection or the deposits required by paragraph (3) of this subsection have actually been made—

"(A) If such judge is survived by a widow but not by a dependent child, there shall be paid to such widow an annuity beginning with the day of the death of the judge or following the widow's attainment of the age of fifty years, whichever is later, in an amount computed as provided in paragraph (14) of this subsection; or

"(B) If such judge is survived by a widow and a dependent child or children, there shall be paid to such widow an immediate annuity in an amount computed as provided in paragraph (14) of this subsection and there shall also be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-half the amount of the annuity of such widow, but not to exceed $900 per year divided by the number of such children or $360 per year, whichever is lesser; or

"(C) If such judge leaves no surviving widow or widower but leaves a surviving dependent child or children, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to the amount of the annuity to which such widow would have been entitled under paragraph (A) of this subsection had she survived, but not to exceed $480 per year.

The annuity payable to a widow under this subsection shall be terminable upon her death or remarriage. The annuity payable to a child under this subsection shall be terminable upon (1) his attaining the age of eighteen years, (2) his marriage, or (3) his death, whichever first occurs except that if such child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental of physical disability his annuity shall be terminable only upon death, marriage, or recovery from such disability after attaining the age of eighteen years. In case of the death of a widow of a judge leaving a dependent child or children of the judge surviving her the annuity of such child or children shall be recomputed and paid as provided in subparagraph (C) of this paragraph. In any case in which the annuity of a dependent child, under this subsection, is terminated, the annuities of any remaining dependent child or children, based upon the services of the same judge, shall be recomputed and paid as though the child whose annuity was so terminated had not survived such judge.

"(8) As used in this subsection—

"(A) The term 'widow' means a surviving wife of an individual who either (1) shall have been married to such individual for at least two years immediately preceding his death or (2) is the mother of issue by such marriage, and who has not remarried.

"(B) The term 'dependent child' means an unmarried child, including a dependent stepchild or an adopted child, who is under the age of eighteen years or who because of physical or mental disability is incapable of self-support.

Questions of dependency and disability arising under this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioners. Commissioners may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as they shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any dependent child who is an annuitant or applicant for annuity under this subsection, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any examination.

"(9) In any case in which (A) a judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall die while in office (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under the provisions of this section) before having rendered five years of civilian service computed as prescribed in paragraph (15) of this subsection, or after having rendered five years of such civilian service but without a survivor or survivors entitled to annuity benefits provided by paragraph (7) of this subsection, or (B) the right of all persons entitled to annuity under paragraph (7) of this subsection based on the service of such judge shall terminate before a valid claim therefor shall have been established, the total amount credited to an individual account of such judge, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum, thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving at the date title to the payment arises, in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries whom the judge may have designated by a writing received by the Commissioners prior to his death;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow of such judge;

"Third, if none of the above, to the child, or children of such judge and the descendants of any deceased children by representation;

"Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of such judge or the survivor of them;

"Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such judge;

"Sixth, if none of the above, to such other next of kin of such judge as may be determined by the Commissioners to be entitled under the laws of the domicile of such judge at the time of his death.

Determination as to the widow or child of a judge for the purposes of this subsection shall be made by the Commissioners without regard to the definition of these terms stated in paragraph (8) of this subsection.

"(10) In any case in which the annuities of all persons entitled to annuity based upon the service of a judge shall terminate before the aggregate amount of annuity paid equals the total amount credited to the individual account of such judge, with interest at 4 per centum per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 per centum per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, the difference shall be paid, upon establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in paragraph (9) of this subsection.

"(11) Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the termination (other than death) of the annuity of any person based upon the service of a judge shall be paid to such person. Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the death of any person receiving annuity based upon the service of a judge shall be paid, upon establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"First, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such person;

"Second, if there is no such executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of thirty days from the date of the death of such person, to such individual or individuals as may appear in the judgment of the Commissioners to be legally entitled thereto, and such payments shall be a bar to recovery by any other individual.

"(12) Where any payment under this subsection is to be made to a minor or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the jurisdiction wherein the claimant resides or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the jurisdiction wherein the claimant resides, the Commissioners shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate.

"(13) Annuities granted under the terms of this subsection shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued. None of the moneys mentioned in this section shall be assignable, either in law or in equity, or subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"(14) The annuity of the widow of a judge who has elected to bring himself within the purview of this subsection shall be an amount equal to the sum of (A) 1¼ per centum of the average annual salary received by such judge for judicial service and any other prior allowable service during the last five years of such service prior to his death, or retirement from office under this section, multiplied by the sum of his years of judicial service, his years of prior allowable service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of prior allowable service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and his years, not exceeding fifteen, of prior allowable service performed as an employee described in section 2251(c) (formerly section 698(g)) of title 5, United States Code and (B) three-fourths of 1 per centum of such average annual salary multiplied by his years of any other prior allowable service, but such annuity shall not exceed 37½ per centum of such average annual salary and shall be further reduced in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection, if applicable.

"(15) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (3) of this subsection, the years of service of a judge which are allowable as the basis for calculating the amount of the annuity of his widow shall include his years of service as a judge of one of the five courts herein named (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under this section), his years of service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States not exceeding five years in the aggregate and not including any such service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retirement or retired pay under any other provision of law, and his years of any other civilian service within the purview of section 2253 of title 5, United States Code.

"(16) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prevent a widow eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving an annuity under this subsection and any annuity to which she would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this subsection, but in computing such other annuity, service used in the computation of her annuity under this subsection shall not be credited.

"(17) Wherever used in this section the term 'Commissioners' shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a judge eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving his retirement salary under this section and any annuity to which he would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this section, but in computing such annuity, service used in the computation of retirement salary under this section shall not be credited: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a judge from electing to waive the provisions of this section regarding retirement compensation and crediting service hereunder in computing any annuity to which he would otherwise be entitled, under any other law without regard to this section; nor shall anything contained in this section or in any other law be construed to require a judge eligible therefor to elect to waive either the provisions of this section regarding retirement compensation and annuities or the provisions of any other law relating to retirement compensation or annuities prior to the date of his retirement."

SEC. 2. That part of the amendment made by this Act to section 11 of the Act of April 1, 1942, contained in subsection (a) of such section shall be applicable in the case of any judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, or the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia who retires after the effective date of this Act; except that any person now serving as a judge of any such court on the effective date of this Act may, at the time of his application for retirement salary, elect in writing to have his right to such salary and the amount thereof determined under the provisions of section 11 of the Act of April 1, 1942, as such section existed immediately prior to its amendment by this Act. Any election made pursuant to this subsection shall be irrevocable.

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective on and after the first day of the first month following its approval.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 22, strike out "in" and insert in lieu thereof ". In".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman to explain this bill briefly. What do you propose?

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield, I will do the best I can to give a summary of what I understand to be the purposes of this legislation.

The gentleman from Iowa understands that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] is chairman of this subcommittee and presided over the hearings. In his absence today, I called up the bill.

At the present time, judges must have served 20 years before they are able to retire with any benefits.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is speaking now of municipal judges in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SISK. That is correct. I am speaking now of District of Columbia judges. They are the only ones dealt with in this particular bill.

This bill would provide for retirement with certain benefits after 10 years of service. This was felt to be equitable in view of the fact that judges are appointed for 10-year terms in the District of Columbia. Further benefits which would be received under this legislation would be based on one-thirtieth of their salary so that, of course, if they retire in 10 or 11 years, they would draw substantially less in retirement benefits than they would if they went on to 20 years. That was one of the reasons.

There are also some additional provisions providing for retirement of a judge after 5 years where the incumbent is declared to be totally disabled and certain benefits are provided in such instances.

This again, as I understand, as a member of the subcommittee, places these people pretty well on all fours with other government employees and other people in similar station, something that has not been done heretofore for District of Columbia judges.

Mr. **GROSS**. Do these municipal court judges make a contribution to any retirement fund?

Mr. **SISK**. It is not my understanding that they do make a contribution. Let me say, it is my understanding that they are, so far as that subject is concerned, in exactly the same category as other Federal district judges or Federal judges.

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. As I understand this legislation, this does not increase their rate of retirement as to the amount of dollars that they would receive, but merely permits them to retire after a fewer number of years of service—10 years or more of service—at age 62—or 20 years of service at age 50. But they still compute their retirement on the same formula that they compute their retirement at the present time.

Mr. **GROSS**. Do these judges make any contribution to any retirement fund?

Mr. **BROYHILL** of Virginia. They do not. This legislation does not change that one iota. Nor do Federal judges contribute to a retirement fund.

Mr. **GROSS**. That is all right but where else over the country are there municipal judges who have a retirement system to which they make no contribution?

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **GROSS**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. I think the district judges in my State retire without paying any funds into the retirement fund. That is my understanding.

Mr. **GROSS**. You mean in your State?

Mr. **McMILLAN**. Yes.

Mr. **GROSS**. City and municipal judges in South Carolina retire on some kind of pension to which they make no contribution at all?

Mr. **McMILLAN**. That is the State judges, the same as these District of Columbia judges—they have the same rank, yes. They have the same rank as these judges in the District of Columbia.

Mr. **GROSS**. You are talking about Federal district judges; are you not?

Mr. **McMILLAN**. No, not Federal judges. I am talking about our State judges. We have State judges and I believe they draw about $19,000 a year, and it is my understanding they retire at a certain age without paying anything into a retirement fund after a certain number of years of service.

Mr. **GROSS**. What are they paid when they retire? What kind of an annuity do they have?

Mr. **McMILLAN**. I cannot tell you that exactly.

Mr. **GROSS**. Well, this is the point. Where I come from, if our municipal judges have a retirement fund, they pay into that retirement fund and I see no reason why the municipal judges in the District of Columbia should be treated on any other basis. I am not about to liberalize a retirement system for municipal judges, especially where they make no contribution to their retirement fund; where the entire cost is borne by the taxpayers.

The **SPEAKER**. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. Does the gentleman desire to make a unanimous consent request for further time?

Mr. **GROSS**. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. I would say to the gentleman, you and I both pay into a retirement fund but it seems no judges and the U.S. Army people do not pay into a retirement fund. How that started, I do not know.

Mr. **GROSS**. There is quite a difference. Let us not mix up the military and the Federal judiciary. You know very well why military personnel retire without making a direct contribution.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. No, sir.

Mr. **GROSS**. Military personnel presumably make their contribution to retirement through lower pay schedules than judges and others in the Federal Government. That is why the military makes no contribution.

Mr. **McMILLAN**. I see.

Mr. **GROSS**. This system of giving Federal judges lifetime appointments and then permitting them to retire after 10 or 15 years or after attaining a certain age, at their full salary, is fantastic and beyond belief. That is one of the reasons why I am not about to support a pay increase for Justices of the Supreme Court and Federal judges such as is provided in the omnibus pay increase bill pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. It would mean that Justices of the Supreme Court could retire, if the bill is enacted, at $50,000 a year and they would have contributed not one thin dime to their retirements. I am opposed to this bill that makes it easier for District of Columbia municipal judges to retire without having made any contribution whatever to any retirement fund. I think this is going beyond all reason. Moreover, when Congress starts reducing the requirements for retirement where will it end?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. **SCHWENGEL**. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I want to say also that I have some sympathy for the position taken by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. In Iowa we have retirement plans for judges of this classification, but they do make a contribution on their own along with communities or the State, as the case may be. I think the idea of having a pension and this kind of arrangement for judges is a good thing. We are not voting, though, on the question of contribution, and I agree with the gentleman on that point. However, this has already been established and after evaluating the pros and cons of this legislation, I decided that the public interest would be served by passing this legislation which would make it possible in certain instances for judges to retire in case their health was such that they could not continue. They should not suffer an undue penalty under those conditions. This is a precedent that we have set in other areas. That is the reason why I am in support of this legislation, although, as I say, I have some sympathy for the gentleman's position.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **SCHWENGEL**. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. **GROSS**. But the gentleman will admit you are substantially liberalizing the retirement system for municipal judges, will you not?

Mr. **SCHWENGEL**. I think it has been pointed out that the benefits, if they retire earlier, would be reduced accordingly. So as I see it, there would be no extra cost, if any, on the retirement system.

Mr. **GROSS**. There is bound to be an increased cost.

Mr. **SISK**. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 5871, as set forth in House report 839, is to provide a more equitable and realistic retirement law for the judges of the several courts of the District of Columbia.

Present law (sec. 11 of the act approved April 1, 1942, 56 Stat. 197, sec. 11–776, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.) does not permit the retirement of a judge coming under its provisions until he has served a minimum of 20 years on the bench. The Commissioners are of the opinion that such minimum service requirement should be reduced to 10 years, because the majority of appointments to such courts are for a 10-year period.

Other than the provisions in the Civil Service Retirement Act, there is no provision in existing law providing disability retirement for such judges or for annuities for widows or children of such judges. The Commissioners are of the opinion that such provisions should be contained in the present judge's retirement law because most current retirement laws contain such realistic and equitable provisions.

The bill corrects these present law inadequacies (1) by reducing the minimum required service on the bench for retirement from 20 years to 10 years, while keeping the present law computation ratio of retirement salary; that is, one-thirtieth of a judge's salary at the time of retirement for each year served on the bench, but not to exceed 100 percent of such salary; (2) by providing that a judge, after 5 years or more of service, may retire for disability of a permanent nature and he shall receive a retirement salary computed in accordance with the above ratio; and (3) by providing that survivorship benefits may be granted to any judge who elects to come within the purview of the subsection authorizing such benefits. The rate of contribution, annuities, and related provisions of such subsection are substantially the same as those contained in the current Retirement Act for Federal judges (title 28, United States Code, sec. 376).

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia court of appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

The bill is designed to provide retirement features for the judges of the court of general sessions, the District of Columbia court of appeals, and the District of Columbia juvenile court, comparable to those of Federal judges serving a term for years, not those with life tenure.

Because of the present structure of District of Columbia Code, section 11-776 it was necessary to invert the numerical and alphabetical designations of the subsections, paragraphs, and so forth, of title 28, United States Code, section 376.

This committee has been informed that on the basis of data supplied by the Government actuary of the U.S. Treasury Department, the Commissioners have estimated that the cost to the District of Columbia in paying judges' annuities under the provisions of this bill, for fiscal years 1964 through 1968, is $115,600 and that the survivors' annuities for the same period would cost $50,900.

This bill is identical in all its major provisions to H.R. 5831 of the 87th Congress, which was approved by the House on August 28, 1961, and passed by the Senate, with amendments, on September 14, 1962, too late for further consideration in that Congress.

Following is a comparison of the benefits to retired judges under the present law and under the provisions of the reported bill, prepared for this committee by the District of Columbia Personnel Office, and the letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, expressing their approval of H.R. 5871.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT BASIC RETIREMENT BENEFITS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL JUDGES WITH THOSE PROPOSED UNDER H.R. 5871

PRESENT LAW	H.R. 5871
Permissive retirement after 20 or more years' service.	Ten or more years' service but less than 20 must be 62 years of age, or elect reduced annuity at age 55.
No minimum age.	Twenty or more years of service, must be age 50.
Pension: Proportioned on basis of aggregate years of service to 30 years computed on salary at time of retirement, or 3⅓ percent of salary per year.	Same.
Contributions to pension: None.	None.
Disability retirement: None.	After 5 years of service if a certificate of disability signed by a duly licensed physician is furnished the Attorney General and approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.
Survivor benefits: None.	For widows not to exceed 37½ percent of average salary as determined by service formula.
	For dependent child, one-half of widows annuity not exceeding $900 per year divided by the number of children or $360 per year, whichever is lesser.
Contributions for survivor benefits: None.	Three percent of salary in fund subject to control of Secretary of Treasury. Should fund be inadequate, District of Columbia required to p:ovide necessary funds to meet obligations.

NOTE.—Incumbent judges may elect to remain under existing law or convert to H.R. 5871 if enacted. Such election is irrevocable.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to expand the provisions of the present law regarding retirement benefits for judges of the various District of Columbia courts, so as to bring such benefits into line with those accruing to judges in the Federal courts.

The present District of Columbia Judges' Retirement Act, approved April 1, 1942, does not permit the retirement of a judge under its provisions until he has served a minimum of 20 years on the bench. Retirement salary after 20 years or more of service is computed at one-thirtieth of the judge's salary at the time of his retirement, per year of his service. Hence, retirement after 20 years of service would entitle him to an annuity of two-thirds his final annual salary, and after 30 years he could retire at full salary.

Also, under present law there is no provision for disability retirement for such judges, or for annuities for widows or children in the event of a judge's death prior to retirement.

These limitations, and particularly the requirement of 20 years of service before retirement, are so restrictive that at present, I am told, only two District of Columbia judges are retired under this law. Inasmuch as appointments to the District of Columbia courts are for 10-year terms, and since most judges are not appointed until they have attained rather mature years, the 20-year minimum for retirement imposed by the Judges' Retirement Act appears so formidable that these judges elect to place themselves instead under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act. This is also the only means by which District of Columbia court judges can assure themselves disability retirement benefits, or annuity programs for the benefit of their dependents in the event of their death while in service on the bench. However, benefits obtainable under the Civil Service Retirement Act are not as advantageous as those which accrue to Federal court judges, or to judges in the District courts who are able to serve as long as 20 years.

H.R. 5871 would correct this inequitable situation, by providing for retirement of District of Columbia court judges after 10 years of service, under the same formula for computation of annuity as under present law. However, a judge retiring after 10 years must be at least 62 years of age, except that he may elect to receive a reduced annuity at the age of 55 years. A judge retiring after 20 years or more of service will be required to be at least 50 years of age. In addition, provision is made for retirement for disability after at least 5 years of service, and for an elective survivor benefit plan for judges' dependents.

I am pleased to endorse this bill, which has been recommended by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and the District of Columbia Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 150, nays 86, not voting 196, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—150

Abbitt
Abernethy
Anderson
Arends
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Chamberlain
Clausen, Don H.
Conte
Cooley
Corman
Cramer
Daddario
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Flood
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gathings
Gill
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Griffin
Hagen, Calif.
Harding
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hawkins
Hechler
Holland
Horan
Horton
Huddleston
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kilgore
Lennon
Libonati
McClory
McCulloch

McFall
McIntire
McMillan
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Morgan
Morris
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Patman
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Purcell
Rains
Randall
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Colo.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Schweiker
Schwengel
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stubblefield
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Watson
White
Whitener
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Young
Pucinski
Quie
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sibal
Sikes
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Whalley
Wickersham
Widnall
Wydler
Wyman
Zablocki

NAYS—86

Abele
Alger
Andrews
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Cleveland
Colmer
Corbett
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Dole
Findley
Fisher
Foreman
Glenn
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Harrison
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Jensen
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lipscomb
McLoskey
Martin, Nebr.
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Mosher
O'Konski
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Riehlman
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rumsfeld
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Talcott
Tollefson
Utt
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Younger

NOT VOTING—196

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Avery
Ayres
Barrett
Barry
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Buckley
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Collier
Curtis
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Donohue
Dorn
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goodell
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Hardy
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Holifield
Hosmer
Hull
Hutchinson
Joelson
Johansen
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lesinski
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi
Nix
Norblad
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Neill
Osmers
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Powell

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Johansen against.

Mr. Morse of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Martin of California against.

Mr. Wallhauser for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Lindsay for, with Mr. Devine against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Short.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Minish with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Fino.

Mr. King of California with Mr. Moore.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Widnall.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Wyman.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Gary with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Cameron with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Halpern.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Vinson with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Ford.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Reifel.

Mr. Chelf with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Quie.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Sibal.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Bromwell.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Healey with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Hutchinson.

Mr. Ryan of New York with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Lankford with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Nix with Mr. McDade.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Barry of New York.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Latta.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Stinson.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Wydler.

Mr. Ryan of Michigan with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Tuck.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. McDowell with Mrs. Kee.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Hansen.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. Montoya with Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Dorn.

Mr. Joelson with Mr. Staebler.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Flynt with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Grant.

Mr. Selden with Mr. Smith of Iowa.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Patten with Mr. Pepper.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Wickersham.

Mr. Moss with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Fascell.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Hagan of Georgia.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Vanik.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. BRUCE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FINDLEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ALGER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter and table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I requested the Chief of Police, Maj. Robert Murray, to furnish me as chairman of the House District Committee a weekly report on the crime conditions in the District of Columbia and all other information possible on this subject.

I am requesting permission to insert last week's report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and a statement from the Budget Bureau Director on this subject.

The people throughout the United States are expecting and demanding the Congress of the United States to do something toward curbing crime in the Nation's Capital and our efficient Chief of Police is doing everything possible to solve the crime problem in the District of Columbia with the tools he has to work with at the present time.

Government of the District
of Columbia,
Metropolitan Police Department,
October 10, 1963.

Hon. John L. McMillan,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman McMillan: Forwarded herewith are copies of the weekly crime report for the District of Columbia for the week beginning September 29, 1963.

Sincerely yours,
Robert V. Murray,
Chief of Police.

Pt. I offenses reported, Sept. 29 through Oct. 5, 1963, Metropolitan Police Department, government of the District of Columbia

Classification	Week beginning Sept. 22, 1963	Week beginning Sept. 29, 1963	Change	
			Amount	Percent
Criminal homicide	3	4	+1	+33.3
Rape	4	--------	−4	−100.0
Robbery	40	37	−3	−7.5
Aggravated assault	72	74	+2	+2.8
Housebreaking	147	124	−23	−15.6
Grand larceny	30	23	−7	−23.3
Petit larceny	155	157	+2	+1.3
Auto theft	70	93	+23	+32.8
Total	521	512	−9	−1.7

Government of the
District of Columbia,
Metropolitan Police Department,
October 9, 1963.

Hon. John L. McMillan,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The District of Columbia Budget Office, under date of August 7, 1962, requested this department to forward for information to each congressional committee on District matters one copy of any special report, study, survey, or similar document which is released by this department to the public and the press.

Accordingly, the enclosed material, which is being released by this department on this date, is provided for your information.

Robert V. Murray,
Chief of Police.

Crime in the District of Columbia, September 1963

During September 1963 a total of 2,182 part I offenses were reported in the District, an increase of 324 offenses or 17.4 percent from September 1962. This total was below the alltime high (2,512 offenses) for a single month established in August, but did establish a record high for the month of September, which ordinarily reflects a seasonal drop from August.

This was the 16th consecutive month with an increase in crime for Washington. During this month increases are found in all categories except robbery and aggravated assault, both of which declined. Noteworthy were the increases in criminal homicide and rape, both of which doubled the number for last September, and in housebreaking, which showed the greatest numerical increase.

The increase for this month brought the trend of offenses to 24,676, an increase of 71 offenses from the peak established in December 1952 and making the trend period (the 12 months ending with September) the alltime high for crime in this city.

GREATEST PARLIAMENTARIAN IN THE WORLD, LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call attention to another honor that has come to a great fellow Ohioan, a man well known to all of you, loved and respected by every Member of this House and by every individual who has served in this House in the last third of a century, the Honorable Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian. In the recent issue of the Rainbow, which is the national publication of the great fraternity Delta Tau Delta, to which Lew Deschler belongs, there is an article entitled "Greatest Parliamentarian in the World, Lewis Deschler," prepared from material furnished by our colleague from Ohio, Congressman Jackson E. Betts, who is also a member of Delta Tau Delta. This article recites some of the tributes that have been paid to Lew Deschler here in the House of Representatives and tells of the great tribute that was paid to him by his own alma mater, Miami University of Ohio, in June of this year at which time he was given a doctor's degree because of the great work he has performed in the field of parliamentary law, and tells of his service to Delta Tau Delta.

Seldom in our time has such recognition been given to any man by his own alma mater, by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, by his own State organizations, by his own fraternity, and generally by all who have known him. I am, therefore, very desirous in seeing that this latest tribute paid to him in the Rainbow by his own fraternity, Delta Tau Delta, be made a part of the official Record of this Congress and of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I file this article.

The article is as follows:

Greatest Parliamentarian in the World, Lewis Deschler

(Editor's Note.—The material for the following article was furnished by Jackson E. Betts, Kenyon, 1926, U.S. Congressman from Ohio, and was gathered from the Congressional Record, March 1963; the Washington Sunday Star, April 28, 1963; and an honorary degree of doctor of laws conferred on Mr. Deschler by Miami University on June 9, 1963.)

On June 9, 1963, the University of Miami awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws to Lewis Deschler, Miami, 1926, Parliamentarian of the U.S. House of Representatives since January 1, 1928. The citation reads as follows:

"Upon you, Lewis Deschler, former student of this university, faithful servant of the legislative process in our great Republic, recognized authority upon parliamentary procedure, by vote of the university senate with the approval of the board of trustees and under authority granted by the State of Ohio, Miami University confers the degree of doctor of laws honoris causa, in token whereof I hand you this diploma and have you invested with the hood appropriate to your rank."

Lewis Deschler never held an elective office. Yet he has had a powerful influence on the laws and history of the United States. He is the man who lays down the law to the lawmakers of the Nation. A native of Chillicothe, Ohio, Lew Deschler went to Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, where he played tackle on the football team and was engaged in other extracurricular activities while a member of Gamma Upsilon chapter. In 1925, he went to the Nation's Capital and completed his undergraduate work at George Washington University. In 1932 he received his law degree and in 1934 was admitted to the bar of the District of Columbia. He became a member of the U.S. Supreme Court bar in December 1937.

In 1925 Lewis Deschler began his career in the Nation's Capital when he was appointed messenger at the Speaker's table of the House of Representatives. At that time the Clerk at the Speaker's table performed the role of Parliamentarian. In 1927 Congress created the positions of Parliamentarian and Assistant Parliamentarian. Mr. Deschler was the first Assistant Parliamentarian of the House but he served in that capacity for only 1 year as in January 1928, he was appointed Parliamentarian. He has served continuously in that position down to the present, serving under Republicans and Democrats alike. Speaker of the House McCormack has said that "Lew Deschler is the greatest Parliamentarian in the world." He is generally credited with having a great part to play in Alaska and Hawaii achieving statehood by successfully finding House precedents to permit the statehood bills to bypass the Rules Committee, where they had been blocked, and come to the floor for a vote.

Republican House Leader Charles A. Halleck said, "I never cease to be amazed at the length and breadth of his knowledge of the Rules of the House of Representatives." Mr. Halleck went on to say that "* * * never have I known Lew Deschler's advice, his judgments, or his decisions to be influenced by any partisan considerations whatever. * * * He has a deep understanding of his job that transcends its purely technical aspects."

House Speaker McCormack has said "* * * he is a man of wisdom, a man whose influence in the legislative affairs of our country for so many years has been tremendous, unseen possibly from the angle of the public but well known to each and every Member who has ever served in this great body." Vice President Lyndon Johnson advised his successor in the House of Representatives in this fashion, "You get to know the Parliamentarian, Mr. Lewis Deschler. He is a wise man, he is a good man, he is nonpartisan, and he will always advise you not only as to the rules of the House, not only as to the proper procedure, but also as to the proper conduct of a Member of the House."

In March of 1963, the House of Representatives paid special tribute to Lew Deschler on the occasion of his 58th birthday and 36th year as Parliamentarian. The rare tribute included speeches and comments by many Members of the House and the proceedings covered five pages of the Congressional Record, including a message from President Kennedy. The resolution read:

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby tenders its thanks and appreciation to Lewis Dechler, whose 35th anniversary as its Parliamentarian occurred on January 1, 1963, in recognition of his dedication to this House, his wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and Members, and his exceptional contribution to the operation of its rules."

After reading the tributes paid to him by so many prominent men in Government circles, tributes not only as to his ability but to his character as well, and after appraising the vast importance and influence of his official position, it is perfectly obvious that Lew Deschler is, indeed, one of the important personalities of our country, truly a "giant among men." That he is content to sit back and not seek acclaim and recognition for the important role that he plays is but added testimony supporting his greatness.

Truly, Lewis Deschler merits a position with his fellow Delts who have served their country as Vice Presidents, as Supreme Court Justices, as U.S. Senators, and Representatives, as Governors, judges, business and industrial leaders, astronauts, sports and entertainment celebrities.

Mr. Parliamentarian, your fraternity salutes you.

A TRIBUTE TO THE NATION'S NEWSPAPERS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, 273 years ago in Boston, Mass., Benjamin Harris published America's first newspaper, the Publick Occurences Both Foreign and Domestick. Because the paper incurred the disapproval of the Government, it was soon suspended.

Fourteen years later, in 1704, the Boston News-Letter appeared and contained articles taken from the London newspapers—news that was already months old.

Time has seen drastic changes made since this very early means of printed communication. Throughout the years, our newspapers have reflected our changing moods, aspirations, ambitions, and thoughts. It is an extremely important means of spreading knowledge and shaping public opinion.

This week we pay special tribute to the newspapers of America. It is a well-earned recognition and one which I gladly acknowledge.

Idaho, too, has seen great strides in this field. As you know, this year Idaho is celebrating its territorial centennial. The first newspaper in my State was called the Golden Age, which was published weekly in Lewiston. The first issue was printed on August 2, 1862—less than a year before Idaho became a territory to the United States. The first paper lacked sources of outside information and therefore copied freely from such leading west coast and Eastern newspapers as the San Francisco Evening Bulletin, the Walla Walla Statesman, the Dallas Journal, the Dallas Mountaineer, the Oregonian, the Oregon Argus, the Oregon Statesman, the Sacramento Bee, and the New York Tribune. The annual subscription charge was $9.

The first newspaper in southern Idaho and the second in the State was the Boise News, which published its first copy September 29, 1863, in Idaho City. While on the way to Boise Basin with a pack train, J. S. Butler stopped in Walla Walla where he met Major Reese, the publisher of the Walla Walla Watchman. Major Reese had recently bought out a competitor and was in possession of two printing outfits; and when Mr. Butler learned of this, he conceived the idea of starting a newspaper in Idaho City, purchased the equipment, and sent for his brother, Thomas J. Butler. For 15 months the two brothers published the Boise News until the plant was purchased as an organ of the Democratic Party and its name was changed to the Idaho World.

Idaho's oldest newspaper still being published is the Idaho Statesman, of Boise, which first opened on July 26, 1864. Three men named Reynolds, who were on their way to Idaho City where they intended to open a printing office, were persuaded to remain in Boise and begin publication. The early citizens of Boise recognized the value of a newspaper in building up a town and so were anxious for the printers to stay on. The Idaho Tri-Weekly Statesman, as it was called, was a small four-column newspaper that sold for $1 a week by carrier or for $20 a year by mail. An early worker on the Statesman, A. J. Boyakin, said:

> In getting out the paper on time we worked nearly all night and frequently the Boise Basin stage would pull out ahead of us, and we would have to send Dick Reynolds to overtake it on a horse with the mail packages for the different mining camps.

In the following years, the newspaper changed hands several times and also became a daily newspaper. Then, in 1889, the Statesman Printing Co. was organized and took over the outfit, and today the Statesman is still published by this company.

It will interest my colleagues that this fine newspaper was sold within the last 2 weeks. Bill Johnston, a leading northern Idaho editor had this to say about the Statesman in an editorial in the Lewiston Morning Tribune:

> THE SALE OF THE IDAHO DAILY STATESMAN
>
> The sale of the Idaho Daily Statesman of Boise perhaps marks the end of one of the most colorful eras of Idaho journalism and certainly will have profound effects upon the State's development.
>
> The Statesman, largest newspaper in Idaho and one most strategically located to influence public affairs, has been directed since 1940 by James L. Brown, a personally retiring but extremely vigorous executive who has become something of a legend in journalistic and political circles in Idaho.
>
> Brown never forgot for a moment, in his management of the evening and morning Statesman papers, that he was linked directly with the traditions of the newspaper's founders. The Statesman became a pillar of Idaho's development under the guidance of Calvin Cobb, an editor and publisher who exemplified the independence of pioneering Western journalism. After his death in 1929 direction of the paper became the responsibility of his daughter, Mrs. Margaret Cobb Ailshie. She zealously served the traditions established by her father. In 1940 she called upon Brown, trained chiefly until then in the mechanical side of the business, to become general manager. He became the owner of the properties after her death in 1959.
>
> Despite his determination to stay out of the spotlight of personal publicity, Brown became known in the arena of public affairs as one of the most influential and colorful men in Idaho. He was noted for his firm and sometimes fiery opinions on political issues, his exceptional generosity in dealing with friends or worthy causes, his sometimes unorthodox but ever-straightforward management methods, and his astonishing personal energy.
>
> As Brown wrote in an editorial Sunday, the Statesman "is to be recognized as a conservative newspaper but not to the extreme of the John Birch movement or any similar group. We do not accept the theory advanced by the liberty amendment supporters that all income taxes could be terminated in a single day. We, as much as any individual voice, would rejoice in the complete elimination of all taxation, but we would not rejoice in the annihilation of our Government even though we have contended ever since bureaucracy started expanding that we have too much government."
>
> This seems to us to be a fairly accurate summary of the Statesman's basic political position—but woe betide the politician who expected the paper to hue without deviation to this or any other philosophical line. Under Brown's direction, the Statesman's editorial positions never were dishonorable or dishonest, seldom were dull and frequently were surprising.
>
> This newspaper, sometimes in league and often in disagreement with the Statesman on assorted public issues, perhaps is in a better position than most to testify. Through the many years in which the Statesman chronicled and influenced the developing history of Idaho, it was a true friend and a worthy opponent to any newspaper neighbor that likewise endeavored to speak its mind openly.
>
> As a business enterprise, the Statesman long has been one of the prize newspaper properties of the Nation. The paper serves a rich agricultural region. It rather naturally dominates a sizable circulation area. Many major newspaper chains and individual papers have cast covetous eyes in the past at Idaho's capital newspaper.
>
> The purchaser of the property is Federated Publications, Inc., with headquarters at Battle Creek, Mich. The corporation publishes newspapers at Lafayette and Marion, Ind., and Battle Creek and Lansing, Mich. Two of these newspapers list themselves politically as "Independent" and two as "Independent-Republican." What news and editorial policies the corporation may decide to export to Idaho naturally remains to be seen.
>
> It is almost certain, though, that the traditions of Calvin Cobb, Margaret Cobb Ailshie, and James L. Brown will be reflected subtly but unmistakably in the editorial pages of the Statesman for years to come. An institution may indeed be the lengthened shadow of one man. The traditions of this great Idaho institution have come down in an unbroken line through three notable custodians. They will not soon be erased.
>
> In selling the paper now—for the reasons of health and age—Brown has cut the more tangible links with the past. But the intangible links—the ties of habit and memory and community consensus—will continue to join the Statesman with the State it serves.
>
> As a newspaper neighbor, we welcome the new owners of the Idaho Daily Statesman to a State which urgently needs their best efforts. The Statesman, through the years, has never lacked for color, for controversy, or for character. That is the heritage the new owners acquire. The responsibilities they acquire are at least equally impressive.
>
> B.J.

Mr. Speaker, even though newspapers are a commercial enterprise, their responsibility to the communities go much further than the ledger sheets. Mark Ethridge, in an interview with the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions stated:

> The responsibility of the newspapers—more than ever before in my life—is to explain what the issues in the world are. And yet at the same time there seems to be a trend for the newspapers to become only commercial enterprises. There are exceptions, of course. But I think some publishers think that it

> doesn't make much difference what a paper says as long as the balance sheet is all right. Well, it makes a great deal of difference what the paper says; it does to me and I think it should to the American people. If newspapers are going to survive they're going to survive because they are vital factors in the life of our society and in the lives of their readers.

It is my pleasure to acknowledge this week set aside in recognition of this valuable communication media.

KENNEDY-RUSSIAN WHEAT DEAL—TAXPAYER HOLDS THE WHEAT SACK

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman appeared on nationwide television yesterday to defend the administration's sale of wheat to Communist Russia and other Red nations. His remarks are printed in the press today under the headline, "Agriculture Chief Expects Taxpayers To Save $200 Million."

Mr. Speaker, this is a ridiculous statement. This so-called savings is based on the assumption that a sale to the Communists will avoid storing surplus wheat for at least 5 years at a cost of 26 cents a bushel per year. It really does not make any difference to whom we sell wheat if this is the only so-called savings we will enjoy. Under this reasoning, every bushel of wheat sold to West Germany, England, or any free world nation also results in a paper savings of 26 cents a bushel for 5 years, or $1.30. This type of saving would also result if we dumped all excess wheat into the ocean.

What the Secretary did not explain fully on his television program and what is still generally misunderstood is that U.S. taxpayers subsidize the export of wheat so that foreign purchasers are able to obtain U.S.-grown wheat for approximately 60 cents a bushel cheaper than can U.S. consumers.

Mr. Khrushchev will buy American wheat at the world price of $1.77 per bushel at Galveston, Tex. The U.S. price is currently 56 cents a bushel more at that port. The U.S. taxpayer will pick up the 56-cent difference.

Now I realize that a fancy argument in semantics can be made as to how export subsidies are paid, how the Kennedy-Russian deal will be from replenished stocks, and how the American farmer is the recipient of the subsidy. I think we all recognize the fact that export subsidies are actually paid by the U.S. Government to grain companies which are wheat exporters and are for the general benefit of U.S. farmers. But the undisputable and undeniable fact remains that the foreign purchaser receives the benefit of the lower world price.

In the past, we have tolerated a situation whereby an English housewife could buy U.S. wheat products at 50 to 60 cents per bushel cheaper than could an American housewife. The English are at least our allies in the cold war. Now a Russian housewife will be able to do so unless that great humanitarian, Nikita Khrushchev, collects for himself and the Soviet Communist Party the profit from the resale of U.S. wheat in Russia where internal wheat prices are much higher than in the United States or in the world market.

Where, then, does the U.S. taxpayer fit into the picture? Yesterday Mr. Freeman ventured a guess that total U.S. wheat exports might go to a billion bushels as a result of the Kennedy-Russian deal.

Since our normal wheat exports are from 600 to 700 million bushels, this means that the Secretary thinks the Communists will buy 300 to 400 million bushels of U.S. subsidized wheat. Since the export subsidy—or loss to taxpayers—currently averages 56 cents per bushel, U.S. taxpayers will be paying from $168 to $224 million for the privilege of providing wheat to the man who is dedicated to the burial of our Nation, our Government, our system, our families, and us. A Chicago Tribune cartoon of recent date put the situation in perspective when it showed Khrushchev holding an empty bread basket up to Uncle Sam while saying, "I'll bury you if you sustain me until I get my strength back."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, if I am correct in the understanding that American millers who purchase wheat in the United States, whether it be Government-owned surplus or any other type of wheat, are not required to pay 56 cents per bushel more for the wheat that they will mill into flour to make bread for the American people to eat than would the Russian miller under this arrangement.

Mr. HOEVEN. That is correct. Unless Khrushchev pockets the profit himself, the Russian consumer will be benefited to the extent of 56 cents a bushel more than will the American consumer.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I listened with a great deal of interest and some concern to the statement made by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in what I thought was more or less of a rigged interview. I noted particularly that no mention was made of the fact that American consumers, American millers, for instance, would have to pay more for this wheat than the Russians were paying, that is, for Government-owned surplus wheat or for any other type of wheat grown in this country. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HOEVEN. That is correct. And ultimately, of course, the taxpayer holds the sack in that kind of an operation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right. Thank you.

SPRINGMAID CHALLENGES THE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, October 13, 1963, has now passed into history but the events, the oratory, the announcements and related incidents of that day will echo in today's and tomorrow's parade of progress which we all feel South Carolina will be so much a part of in the future decades. At Fort Lawn, S.C., in Chester County, in the Fifth South Carolina Congressional District, Springs Cotton Mills under the leadership of its present executive, H. Williams Close, in dedicating two great and new plants to the late and beloved Col. Elliott White Springs, the Elliott plant, and to his helpmate, counselor, and lifelong companion, Mrs. Frances Ley Springs, the Frances plant, told those privileged to be gathered on the beautiful grounds of this new part of the Springmaid complex, and published an exciting and courageous history of challenge and determination, which I am happy to catalog here.

The events culminated the challenge attendant to the 75th anniversary of the Springs Cotton Mills, now a vast organization giving products and prosperity to men and women, to communities, and to South Carolina, and from the "Springs History" I quote:

> A cotton-raising South was compelled in the 1880's to turn to the manufacture of textiles. The New England mills were prospering but the fabulous white gold of the southern cottonfields had become Midas gold. It could neither be eaten nor sold for enough to buy bread and meat.
>
> Early in 1887 a group of leading citizens in the small town of Fort Mill, S.C., decided that a cotton mill would bring some badly needed prosperity to their community. A mass meeting approved the proposal, stock was subscribed and the Fort Mill Manufacturing Co. was organized.
>
> This little mill was the first unit of what is now the Springs Cotton Mills. It went into production in 1888 with 200 looms. Capt. Samuel E. White was president. Among the 24 original stockholders was Leroy Springs, who married Captain White's daughter, Grace Allison White, in 1892 and went on to become one of the great textile financiers and mill executives of his time.
>
> An important event in the story of the Springs Cotton Mills was the organization in 1895 of the Lancaster Cotton Mills by Col. Leroy Springs and a group of Lancaster citizens. It went into production in 1896 with 10,000 spindles and 250 looms. Although it had its bad years, the mill was a profitable enterprise and furnished the credit needed by Leroy Springs in rescuing mills in Fort Mill and Chester in which he had an interest.
>
> The history of the Lancaster mill is one of continuous expansion. A second plant was added in 1902 and the big Weave Shed, considered the largest in the world at that time, was built in 1914. The mill had a total of 129,000 spindles and 3,000 looms when World War I struck Europe.
>
> Where does Springs stand today? It is the largest producer of exclusively cotton textiles in the world. It is the largest producer of sheets and pillowcases in the world. It is a completely integrated and centrally controlled manufacturing organization and the

first in the industry to go to electronic data processing for all operations.

Today Springs' plants run more than 140 hours a week and employ 12,500 people. These employees operate 850,000 spindles, 18,500 looms, and 350 sewing machines. In the year 1962 they produced 500 million linear yards of cloth and 36 million sheets and pillowcases from 395,000 bales of cotton. The new plants at Fort Lawn will employ 600 people and add 80,000 spindles and 1,000 looms to productive capacity.

The list of Springmaid products includes 25,000 items used in one form or another by nearly every man, woman, and child in the United States. The quality of these products is the most carefully maintained in the textile industry.

The 30-mile-long Lancaster & Chester Railway is a hard-working affiliate of the Springs Cotton Mills. It hauls freight between Lancaster and Chester and serves the Grace Finishing Plant and the Fort Lawn installations. Chartered as the Cheraw & Chester Railroad in 1873, it led a hard life for many years. It was purchased at public auction by Col. Leroy Springs in 1896 for $25,000. It went out of the passenger business after a wreck in 1913 and almost out of all business in 1916 when a Catawba River flood washed away the bridge between its two terminals. However, it was the first railroad in the United States to go all diesel and the first, also, to replace its early diesels with new diesels.

Mr. H. W. Close, president of the Springs Cotton Mills, presided. He opened the meeting by calling upon the Reverend Sinclair E. Lewis, pastor of the Fort Lawn Methodist Church, Fort Lawn, S.C., to give the invocation, which I quote here:

Our Father, we give thanks this day for this land blessed with much of the world's riches and endowed with the great spiritual heritage. We give Thee thanks for all that is worthy and noble in the name of America—for growth of industry and the good life that this growth brings to us all. We pause at this moment of dedication thanking you for Thy help that we may be mindful of the divine providence upon which the highways of the future are built. May we assuredly believe that the people and the Nation that know God is alone enduringly strong, granting us power to see anew the commandments that secure our foundation, the wisdom that safeguards our Government, the righteousness that protects our democracy, and the spirit that begets peace here and in all the world. We pray in the name of the Prince upon whose shoulders is the government of all the universe. Amen.

After the invocation President Close introduced the platform guests:

Mrs. Elliott White Springs, wife of the late and beloved Col. Elliott White Springs.

Mrs. James F. Byrnes, wife of Hon. James F. Byrnes, former Governor, Senator, Supreme Court Justice, and Secretary of State of the United States.

Mrs. Donald Russell, wife of Hon. Donald Russell, Governor of South Carolina.

Mrs. H. W. Close, wife of President H. W. Close.

Gov. James F. Byrnes

Gov. Donald Russell.

Congressman Robert W. Hemphill.

Walter W. Harper, chairman of State development board.

Mr. Burnet Valentine, executive vice president of Springs Mills, Inc.

Mr. John L. Hallett, vice president and general manager of Springs Cotton Mills, in charge of the Gray Mill's production.

Mr. Charles F. Marshall, vice president in charge of engineering and construction.

Rev. Sinclair E. Lewis, pastor of Fort Lawn Methodist Church, Fort Lawn, S.C.

Mayor W. R. Rheu, Mayor of Fort Lawn.

Mr. Julian Hinson, manager of Elliott plant.

Mr. W. M. Moredock, manager of the Frances plant.

Gathered to hear the remarks of dedication were thousands of proud and happy Springs employees, officials, and friends from all over the Nation. Before making his remarks, President Close reminded those assembled at the plant to see the Springmaid production displays and Springmaid fashion shows, all of which were incidents of the day of dedication of the Elliott and Springs plants.

Then President Close addressed the crowd by timely and significant remarks which I include at this point:

Address of Mr. H. W. Close, President, the Springs Cotton Mills, for Dedication Ceremony, Elliott and Frances Plants, Fort Lawn, S. C., October 13, 1963

To me, today is the high point of the first 75 years of the growth and success of the Springs Cotton Mills.

Behind me stand two impressive examples of the value of years of work, thought, and financial savings on the part of many people in this area.

The Elliott plant and its twin, the Frances plant, are the most modern and the most efficient textile plants in the world. They are the results of the dreams and plans of 3½ generations of Springs employees and owners.

Col. Elliott White Springs had many goals in his business life. But all of them were tied together by his great desire to strengthen the communities in which he lived and to create opportunities for a better life for the citizens of these communities—especially his employees.

These new plants have sprung from that one key desire of the colonel's. Indirectly, they are the result of his 28 years as president of the Springs organization.

Why build new plants in the face of a steady stream of bad news from overseas and from Washington?

The answer is simple: This company is now, and always has been, completely determined to compete with all comers. We feel that these new plants, and others like them, can do just that.

Thank goodness, Springs management over the years has operated in such a way that, when the time comes to expand, we have the money and the manpower and the inventiveness to build plants like these.

The owners, the management and the employees of the Springs organization have provided the money for expansion by efficient textile manufacturing over a long period of years.

The technical knowledge accumulated during those years has enabled our staff to select the best machinery and to lay it out in the best way for efficient, low-cost production. Mr. John L. Hallett, Mr. V. A. Ballard, Mr. Julian Hinson, Mr. William M. Moredock and Mr. Jesse Williams headed up that project.

Our own engineering department has designed and built these plants and I will match them against any other textile facilities in the world. The design and construction of these plants was directed by Mr. Charles F. Marshall. He was ably assisted by Mr. Robert Swanson, Mr. James A. Woodruff, Mr. G. Cleve Miller, Mr. Stanley Likens and many others.

A vital factor in the construction of these new plants has been the attitude of our selling and merchandising organization, founded by Colonel Springs in 1945. Run first by the late Joe Hunter, then by Robert Amory, and now by Burnet Valentine, our selling house has developed into a highly effective organization, capable of aggressively merchandising the goods produced in these plants. Confident of their own abilities, and of the abilities of our manufacturing people, our sales force strongly endorsed the construction of these plants.

Many other people, too numerous to name, have helped to make the construction of these plants a success. But I feel that we must go back to Colonel Springs, and particularly to his able management since World War II, to find the magic touch that guided this company to its present enviable position in the textile industry.

What were the colonel's aims in life? Some I know. Others I can guess because of my long association with him.

First. The development of these communities and the improvement of the daily lives of his employees and their neighbors.

Second. The determination to make his plants second to none in efficiency and quality, so that they would always be in a position to compete with all comers.

Third. The belief that this company must continually grow with the population and with expanding world markets.

Growth has been the big story of the Springs Cotton Mills ever since the end of World War II in 1945. Then we had slightly over 500,000 spindles and 13,000 looms in operation.

Like many of us, Colonel Springs had various yardsticks or benchmarks that he used. Among these he said that he thought we would need 1 million spindles and 20,000 looms in order to diversify properly and stay competitive and efficient. This meant doubling the number of spindles and increasing the number of looms by more than 50 percent.

In the 18 years since the war ended, we have done that—and more.

I'm sure you're all familiar with the fact that we purchased Morgan mills, Scotland mills, and the Morgan-Jones selling organization recently to further diversify our consumer lines. (And I hope you'll notice our displays.)

Including the 72,000 spindles and the 1,100 looms in our new Scotland division, we have reached this benchmark of the colonel's and now have in operation 1,014,228 spindles and 20,314 looms.

We've passed the colonel's first goal.

Most of you are familiar with our growth during this period.

From 1945 to 1948 we built what is now the finest and largest finishing plant in the world. By the end of 1962 it represented an investment of about $25 million.

Now a $7 million expansion and modernization of that plant is nearing completion. When it is done, it will add about 250 new jobs to the economy of this area.

Today we are dedicating the Elliott and Frances plants, which cost a total of $15 million and which will add 500 new jobs.

And that's not all.

We are expanding still more—with two new projects that will be news to many of you.

We are now at work on the addition of a combed mill unit in our Lancaster plant. It will occupy space created by the improvement of cardroom facilities. The project will cost $5 million and is scheduled to be completed early in 1964. It will add 25,000 spindles and more than 400 looms to our operations—and it will create 217 new jobs.

The second new project is the changeover of our Springsteen plant in Chester. It is being converted to the production of our new blend of cotton and Kodel IV, a polyester synthetic. In the process, the plant will be completely refrigerated. The Springsteen project will add about 300 looms and 30 new jobs and will cost nearly $3 million. It is scheduled for completion early in 1964.

These two projects together, costing a total of nearly $8 million, and adding nearly 250 new jobs, are equivalent to the construction of a new plant, such as the Elliott plant behind me.

Perhaps of even more significance, these four projects mean a total of 1,100 new jobs added to the economy of this area in 1963 and early 1964. This brings the total number of employees of the Springs Cotton Mills to more than 13,500. We are building new jobs as well as new plants.

In addition to these projects, we are renovating and expanding all seven of our existing gray mills and will continue to do so.

Such growth and expansion is a vital part of our philosophy in Springs.

We have spent $74 million on plant improvements in the last 10 years and 9 months—and we have allocated $21 million to be spent in the near future. That comes to $95 million for expansion in a little over 11 years.

I'm sure this first plateau would have pleased Colonel Springs.

Following his wonderful example, we're looking ahead for further sensible, conservative growth in the textile industry and in the national and international markets of the future.

President Close then introduced Hon. James F. Byrnes, elder statesman, former Governor, Congressman, Supreme Court Justice, War Mobilization Director and Secretary of State of the United States of America. I include Governor Byrnes' remarks at this point.

Address of Gov. James F. Byrnes, Dedication of Elliott and Frances Plants, the Springs Cotton Mills, Fort Lawn, S.C., October 13, 1963

I welcome the opportunity to attend these exercises and by my presence show appreciation to the Springs organization for the naming of these two plants in honor of Frances Springs, for whom I entertain genuine affections, and Elliott Springs, whose memory I shall always cherish.

The construction of these 2 plants involving an expenditure of approximately $15 million and employing about 500 persons is a demonstration of confidence in the future of cotton textiles. It also is a remarkable exhibition of courage.

The only justification for construction of such plants is to make a profit. Today our cotton manufacturers must meet the competition of Japanese and other foreign manufacturers, who are subsidized by the U.S. Government, as well as the competition of the synthetic fiber industry in the United States.

Prior to World War II our manufacturers had to meet the competition of foreign competitors who paid workers much less than the wages paid by our mills. We were able to meet that competition because of our more modern machinery and high tariff duties placed upon imported goods.

At the end of that war our Government, with a generosity unequaled in world history, gave to Japan, Germany and other enemy governments, millions of dollars to make possible the rehabilitation of industries destroyed or crippled during the war.

Because of the aid from the United States, the Japanese, for instance, were able to purchase new machinery which made possible the production of better materials, and with their cheap labor they now are able to undersell American manufacturers in our own markets.

In recent years, our Japanese competitors have received an additional and very important subsidy by the U.S. Government's two-price cotton system, which enables them to buy raw cotton grown in South Carolina for 8 cents less per pound than the South Carolina manufacturers must pay.

Many efforts to remedy the situation have been made by southern Representatives in the Congress, who appealed to President Kennedy to establish a quota greatly limiting the amount of cotton goods that could be shipped into the United States.

On May 2, 1961, the President announced he would give serious consideration to granting the request and would ask the Tariff Commission for a report as to whether the cotton textile industry was one of the industries necessary for the security of the country and what quota, if any, should be fixed. Two and a half years have passed and nothing has been done to remedy the situation.

I can recall that a few months before we entered World War II, I presented to President Roosevelt facts showing how Japanese goods were being sold in South Carolina for less than the cost of producing similar goods in this State. Mr. Roosevelt told me to make the same presentation to the Tariff Commission and advise the Chairman that if my facts were correct he favored placing an embargo upon Japanese goods until we could decide what limitation would be reasonable under the circumstances. The Commission did not wait 2 years. In 2 days the Chairman submitted a report and the President promptly placed an embargo upon cotton goods shipped from Japan.

Since southern Congressmen appealed to President Kennedy to reduce the Japanese importations, I have been told by an official of the State Department that the President has hesitated to greatly reduce them because the Japanese Government stated the United States objected to their selling cotton goods to the Soviets and they had to have a market for their goods. He said the Japanese preferred to sell in the Soviet and Chinese markets if we would remove our objections.

If that is true, then in view of the President's approval last week of our selling wheat to the Soviets, certainly he will no longer object to the Japanese selling cotton goods to them, and he should stop the Japanese from flooding the American market with goods made of subsidized raw cotton with cheap labor.

Manufacturers in South Carolinia tell me that if the Government would put an end to the two-price system which enables foreigners to buy our raw cotton for 8 cents less than Americans must pay, they believe many mills can successfully compete with Japan because of the continued improvement in machinery and the superior efficiency of our workers.

The plants dedicated today contain the latest developments in textile machinery. If any American manufacturer can overcome the unfair competition I have described, it will be Bill Close and his Springs organization, because it has workers who are recognized as superior in intelligence, efficiency, and loyalty. With such employees, I hope the new plants will prove profitable and continue to provide jobs for 500 South Carolinians.

Next, President Close introduced the Honorable Donald Russell, Governor of South Carolina, who made another significant contribution to the thoughts and reflections of the day. I include the remarks of Governor Russell at this point:

Remarks of Gov. Donald Russell, Dedication of Elliott and Frances Plants, Springs Cotton Mills, Fort Lawn, S.C., October 13, 1963

Ladies and gentlemen, since I took the oath of office in January, I have discovered that a significant part of my official duties is to run fast enough to keep up with Springs Cotton mills. Twice already, once in New York and here in Fort Lawn, Mrs. Russell and I have enjoyed participating in marking major milestones in the history of his progressive and strong business organization. And today Bill Close, moving ever forward, announces more important developments about the company which he so ably heads, developments which are not only important to Springs, but to the people of South Carolina.

I promise the executives and the workers of Springs that I shall never weary of joining you on such occasions as this, however; for we are immensely proud of the ingenuity and talent which has enabled a South Carolina company to command the attention and respect of the Nation's business community, such as Springs has done. The new developments which Springs announces today, even while celebrating the opening of two modern plants, will bring more investment dollars and additional jobs to this area of our State. In less than 3 years, as Bill Close has pointed out, Springs will have invested $30 million in new plant facilities and created 1,100 new jobs in the process.

We like that, and we are properly grateful. We are grateful for the jobs and the dollars, but even more so are we appreciative of the faith in South Carolina's future that is evidenced by this magnificent expansion of operations which Springs is experiencing. It means to us that Springs and other textile companies are buying themselves a share in South Carolina's future; that despite the forebodings of gloom from many quarters, the textile industry of the South is not about to give up and move elsewhere because of either short-range or long-range difficulties.

The industry is demonstrating anew every day in South Carolina a tenacity of purpose and determination to survive and prosper which augurs well for our State and our country. I am not oblivious to the inequities which prevail in the competitive situation which challenges the industry. Particularly have I sought to have removed or alleviated those inequities which have been created by Government action. Such relief has not, to date, been forthcoming. However, I am certain that the iniquitous two-price cotton system which burdens the domestic textile industry cannot endure. It it too patently unjustifiable, and I continue to hope that Congress will act to remedy the situation.

Be that as it may, it is to the everlasting credit of the textile industry that its leaders have not been satisfied simply to sulk over unfavorable conditions, refusing to make a move to insure the future. Rather, the industry has presented a clear and compelling case to the Nation, seeking just relief, and at the same time embarked on an expansion and modernization effort which will keep this country in the forefront of the textile-producing nations of the world.

The Frances and Elliott plants are the most modern that man can devise to date. In these plants, the investment required to create a single job is approximately $30,000. This compares with investment per employee of approximately $10,000 for the company in 1962.

These figures mean that machinery is taking over a portion of the jobs formerly done by workers, but fortunately Springs has expanded its operations to such an extent that its work force by design has grown, instead of dwindled. We are indeed fortunate to claim as our own in South Carolina such a company.

Industry of various kinds is moving into our State at a rapid pace, and we have put forth considerable effort to keep that industry flowing into South Carolina. It is said that the movement of a company here indicates its faith in our State; indicates that the company believes it can prosper, and grow, and make a profit.

But how much more is indicated by the expansion of a company which has long operated in South Carolina. Such an expansion is an indication of all those things mentioned in connection with a brandnew industrial citizen—and even more. For when an existing industry decides to expand in South Carolina, it is a sure sign that the past has been good, that the company is happy and prosperous as a South Carolina citizen, and that it expects the same conditions, which allowed it to prosper in the past, to exist in the future.

This is the faith in South Carolina which we all share, and which Springs exhibits so abundantly when it embarks on ambitious projects such as the Elliott and Frances plants and these other wonderful undertakings which Bill Close has outlined for us.

In our drive to provide jobs and security for our people, the influx of new industry will play a vital role. But it will be for naught if those companies which have already created a home in South Carolina do not demonstrate their continued faith in our State. We shall attempt always to maintain a community where organizations such as Springs will find it to their best advantage to expand their economic partnership with the people of South Carolina.

I am pleased to be here, and I want to tell the Springs folks that whenever they are ready to go again, we'll be prepared to join in the celebration. These are important events for Springs, but so, also, are they important for South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I think it well here to call attention to certain publicity which appeared in the South Carolina State and Columbia Record on October 13, 1963, the day of the dedication of the Elliott and Frances plants. I include in my remarks at this time a copy of an interview by State news reporter, Ron Wenzell:

TEXTILE COMPETITION: A TWO-HAND FIGHT

(By Ron Wenzell)

FORT MILL.—H. William Close, president of Springs Cotton Mills and Springs Mills, Inc., thinks the U.S. textile industry can compete with most other countries if it will spend money for new plants and modern equipment, get cotton at a decent price and receives fair treatment from the Federal Government.

He is just back from a 3 week trip to Europe. He attended international textile meetings and exhibits in Greece, Germany, and France. He came home for the opening of Springs' two new mills at Fort Lawn, built at a cost of $15 million and said to be the most modern cotton mills in the world today.

Close said the trip, instead of changing his mind about anything, served to strengthen what he already believed.

"The United States can compete in the future with all other countries except those in the Far East. We can't compete there even if we use gold yarn," said textile's Man-of-the-Year (selected by the New York Board of Trade) in an exclusive interview with the State.

"But, the American textile industry must invest more and more in improving and streamlining its operation.

"It has to build plants like our two new ones at Fort Lawn. It has to find better chemical finishes and improve its customer service. It needs better fashions and more efficiency.

"Springs isn't alone in thinking this. All the progressive companies in the United States are doing the same things Springs is, consolidating, trying new methods, installing modern machinery.

"Our Elliott plant at Fort Lawn is the best cotton mill in the world. I'm not sure it still will be a week from now. That's how fast the industry is moving. That's how fast the industry in the United States has got to move to compete with the rest of the world. We can't lay down and play dead until the Federal Government takes the load off our backs and restores one-price cotton.

"We must keep spending, keep improving, and moving ahead. If we allow two-price cotton to pull us down now we will never be able to catch up.

"I'm optimistic about the American textile industry's future. But, it's difficult to be too optimistic as long as there is two-price cotton."

Close is an outspoken critic of two-price cotton. He never misses an opportunity to criticize the practice.

Addressing the annual meeting of stockholders this year at Fort Lawn he said "We must move forward despite what President Kennedy has called a 'unique burden,' the burden of two-price cotton.

"Make no mistake, the penalty of two-price cotton takes its toll among even the leaders of the textile industry.

"The American textile industry will pay a fearful price as long as the iniquitous two-price cotton system is permitted to exist.

"We can produce efficiently. We can spend heavily on modernization. We can merchandise aggressively. We can seek new products and new markets. But, we cannot pay one-third more than our foreign competitors pay for our basic raw material and hope to meet the competition on even ground.

"We ask only this of the U.S. Congress. Let us buy U.S. cotton at the same price it is offered to our oversea competitors. Could any request be more fair?

"We in the Springs organization are willing to take on any competition in the world on even terms. We seek no favors. As we have said before, all we ask is the freedom to fight with both hands."

Even with one hand, Springs, under the leadership of Close, is fighting what appears to be a winning battle.

Sales and profits for 1962 were down slightly from the year before, but at $197.6 million and $14.4 million were the second highest in the company's history. And the net income per dollar of sales is still the highest in the industry.

Since Close took over as president from his late father-in-law, Colonel Elliott White Springs, in 1959, Springs has:

Increased its net sales to almost $200 million.

Gone to automated and electrically-controlled production.

Completed a $1.5 million warehouse complex.

Opened two new mills valued at $15 million at Fort Lawn.

Opened a 21-story, multimillion-dollar office building in New York City.

Began a $7 million improvement of the Grace Bleachery near Lancaster.

Entered the field of synthetics.

Purchased Morgan-Jones, Inc., and its manufacturing companies.

Acquired Pequot brand name in sheets and pillow cases.

And there is more to come.

"We have under serious consideration still other areas of diversification, both in this country and abroad," Close said. "We look to the future with confidence. We have the ability and the determination to move with the times and to maintain our dominant position. We shall win our share of the steadily expanding world markets for textiles.

"My father-in-law attributed his success with the company to three things, do it yourself, stay at home and work like hell. That's what I'm trying to do."

Mr. Speaker, also there was a short salute to the celebration which we have discussed here in detail and I include that salute:

SPRINGS COTTON MILLS CELEBRATES

Springs Cotton Mills is celebrating its 75th anniversary.

It was founded in 1888 at Fort Mill when Leroy Springs opened the Fort Mill Manufacturing Co. There were 200 looms, no spinning and very little capital.

Leroy Springs nursed the business along and when he died in 1931 it was valued at over $7 million and had an annual sales of more than $8 million.

Elliott White Springs took over for his father. Although he was a flying ace in World War I and a successful author, more than a few persons questioned Elliott's ability to manage a textile company.

But manage it he did and in spectacular fashion.

When he died in 1959 the company was valued at $114 million and had annual sales of $184 million.

He was responsible for running the mills 6 days a week and for expanding production to include consumer goods finished by Springs and marketed under the Springmaid label.

The Springmaid seal was an example of the man's genius. There has never been anything before or since to equal its national advertising campaign.

It has been described as bouncy, sexy, and compelling. It was all this and more and it sold Springs' products and made the name Springs a household word.

When Colonel Springs died it was the end of an era.

His young successor and son-in-law, H. William Close, is writing his own kind of success story.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, all of us who have watched Bill Close continue the great leadership so characteristic of this organization, were delighted to have a vignette about him personally and I include that at this time:

HE STANDS AT THE TOP

(By Ron Wenzell)

At an age when most men are still working their way up the ladder, 43-year-old H. William Close stands at the very top.

As president of Springs Mills, Inc., and Springs Cotton Mills, he rules a textile empire that is the world's largest producer of cottons and pays more than 11 percent of all corporate income tax paid in South Carolina.

He employs 12,500 persons and owns 850,000 spindles, 18,500 looms and 350 sewing machines.

Last year, Springs produced more than 500 million linear yards of finished cloth, including 36 million sheets and pillowcases.

The 1962 payroll was almost $49 million. Employees' share of profits, over and above regular pay, was $4.2.

In 1962 sales totaled $197.6 million. Profit was $14.4 million. Total assets were $196.4 million.

A few weeks ago, the New York Board of Trade named Close "Textile Man of the Year."

He was born at Philadelphia, Pa., November 18, 1919, the son of a dentist; the oldest of two boys.

He attended Wharton School of business at the University of Pennsylvania, receiving his degree in 1942.

After graduation he enlisted in the Navy, was commissioned a lieutenant and served aboard the aircraft carrier *Franklin*.

In 1945 he met Anne Kingsley Springs, then a student at Smith College, they were married the following year.

Close went to work at Springs in June, 1946. His first job was in the sample room in New York City.

He was sent to South Carolina in 1947 to learn the fundamentals of textile manufacturing.

For the next 13 years he worked at every job imaginable, learning the business from the ground up.

In 1958, his father-in-law, Col. Elliott White Springs, president of the organization, brought Close into his office and schooled him in the financial end of textiles.

When Colonel Springs died in 1959, Close was named president.

Almost the opposite in personality from his flamboyant, at time eccentric, father-in-law, Close has made no radical changes.

His explanation is that he sees no reason to change what has been a very successful policy.

One difference is in the leadership of the two men. It was a one-man operation under the colonel. He was Springs. With Close it is a team effort with him calling the signals.

When he is not busy on Springs business, which isn't very often, he likes to be at home with his children—all eight of them.

Recently the periodical entitled America's Textile Reporter took delight in doing honor to H. W. Close in an article entitled "H. W. Close—From Sample Room to Presidency in 13 Years." I salute the editor of this fine trade magazine for dedicating the October 10, 1963, edition as the Spring Cotton Mills 75th birthday issue. There is so much in this magazine that we hesitate to select, but we think it is in keeping with our comments of yesterday, and I include in my remarks at this time an article on "This Is Bill Close."

This Is Bill Close

Thirteen years and five months after Hugh William Close began work in the sample room of Springs Mills, Inc., at 200 Church Street, New York, he was elected the fourth president of the Springs Cotton Mills.

About his stepping into the shoes of his father-in-law, Col. Elliott White Springs, we wrote in our May 9, 1963, issue:

"When Colonel Springs died in October of 1959, needless to say there were some qualms as to whether Hugh William Close, the new President and the colonel's son-in-law, could carry on in the best tradition of the colonel. In 1960, however, Mr. Close's first full year in the colonel's chair, he rather astonished the industry by producing a net profit of about 10 percent on sales of $187,648,617. Bill Close will tell you he's not responsible for all this, and the colonel would have liked this attitude. But we also have no doubt that the colonel, were he living today, would be justifiably proud of Springs past 3 years" and of Bill Close.

Being the colonel's son-in-law may have helped Bill Close in his rise to the Presidency of the Springs Cotton Mills, but it is not responsible.

Hugh William Close is a young man, age 43, the first of two sons of a Philadelphia dentist, now deceased. A graduate of the Wharton School of Business, University of Pennsylvania, class of 1942, he entered the Army a few days after graduation. Two months later, he applied for duty in the Navy and got it. In 1943, as a part of the precommission crew, he went aboard the carrier, U.S.S. *Franklin*, where he remained until the end of World War II.

It was in June 1945, when the *Franklin* was in the port of New York getting patched up after being shot up in the Pacific, that Bill Close met a Smith College girl named Anne Springs, on a blind date, beneath the clock at the Biltmore Hotel—traditional meeting place of many thousands of young couples over the years.

A year later, while on terminal leave from the Navy and with discharge approaching, he took a serious look at the business world. His only conviction was that he would not be a dentist. "Like all good Wharton schoolboys," he considered the advertising business, but after several job offers at $35 per week, he took a series of tests for a job with the Vick Chemical Co. which appeared to offer the challenge he was seeking in business life.

Still courting Anne Springs and still in uniform, Bill Close had already met the colonel, head of the Springs Cotton Mills. He recalls that occasion, in New York, when the colonel walked into the room and, after the usual howdy-do's, said in his own inimitable manner, "Carriers are out. They are ridiculous—the biggest waste of time and manpower in the world."

Somewhat taken aback by the colonel's candor to a young Navy lieutenant, Bill Close now recalls: "I had to admit he was right, for every time we stuck our heads out, they shot the top off our flight deck." (The *Franklin* was badly damaged several times during the last year of the war in the Pacific and suffered 832 casualties on March 19, 1945, during a Japanese kamikaze attack—the heaviest loss sustained by an American ship during the war.)

Shortly after his engagement to Anne Springs, Bill Close was persuaded by her father to have a try at the textile business. During this same period the colonel's son, Leroy Springs II, was killed in an airplane accident.

In June 1946, at the age of 26, Bill Close went to work in the sample room of the Springs selling house, Springs Mills, Inc., at 200 Church Street, New York, "cutting swatches and learning about cloth." Later he was a clerk in the cost department and then he became a junior sales trainee. To speed up the learning process, he took night courses in textiles at Columbia University.

In November of 1946, Bill Close and Anne Springs were married.

A year later, in September 1947, they moved South temporarily so that Mr. Close could learn the fundamentals of textile manufacturing. He undertook what was to be a 3-month training program as a selected textile graduate apprentice (STGA). The STGA training program is for college graduates who are preparing for supervisory careers in textiles.

For Bill Close, the 3-month program lasted for 3 years. During its course, he worked in every department and in practically every plant. He had experience on every job, from opening and picking to carding, spinning, doffing, spooling, and weaving. He erected combers, moved looms, fixed machinery—the works.

Recalling those years, he says: "I think the greatest thing you can get out of the time you spend in a mill is the time you spend talking with people. You need time with people to understand them and to have them understand you, so you can have confidence in one another."

In 1950–51, with about 4 years of manufacturing experience under his belt, Mr. Close was named assistant superintendent of the Fort Mill plant. Later he was named assistant manager of the Fort Mill and White plants, both in Fort Mill.

In 1952–53, he moved to the newly built Executive Office Building in Fort Mill, where he worked as a loom technician and did some work in the standards department.

Following this he was named general superintendent of carding and spinning, then was appointed assistant to W. C. Summersby, at that time vice president and general manager in charge of grey goods manufacturing.

In 1958, Colonel Springs brought Bill Close downstairs to the office that he still occupies. At this point Mr. Close began his education in the financial end of the textile business, meanwhile continuing his work in the grey mills.

Bill Close recalls that Colonel Springs "always had me following a plan. That year he was pushing me in the financial end. His next step was to keep me in New York more, to learn the selling end. He never got to that step."

On October 15, 1959, the colonel died of cancer. Shortly afterward, at the age of 39, Bill Close was elected president and chairman of the board of the Springs Cotton Mills and president of Spring Mills, Inc., the selling organization.

Seventeen years have passed now since Bill Close got into textiles through the colonel's persuasion. What does he think about the industry with those years of experience behind him? He says:

"I have liked it all from the day I got into it. I was apprehensive about coming down here (down South), but when I got here I literally never had a day that I did not enjoy.

"I felt a little frustrated in New York because I didn't know anything about cloth."

And what was his reaction to the manufacturing end of the business? He says:

"I felt that I was learning to do something. I learned about people. I learned to run machinery."

Since that time Bill Close has been too busy to look back. He was trained by a master, a genius who skyrocketed the Springs Cotton Mills from five relatively obsolete little mills in 1931 to a position of leadership in the textiles field at the time of his death 28 years later. Of the colonel he says:

"The colonel always provided me with a terrific challenge. He was tough but I don't know anybody in the world who could have taught me as much in as little time—and I wasn't going to let him catch me wanting."

The colonel was indeed a great tutor. Bill Close not only admired him but respected his methods—methods that would turn some young men to anger.

"The colonel never did anything except on purpose," Bill Close recalls.

"Once I tried to explain to him about life and the next day he brought me a book on logic and said: 'Before you start explaining anything to me again you had better read this and find out what you are talking about.'

"His statements made in the 1950's are more and more true. In 1950 he felt and publicized that he had no confidence in any administration then or in the future to do anything for textiles. The last thing some people would believe is that he recommended consolidations for the survival of the textile industry—but he did.

"He also said there were certain other areas in which we would have to change when the proper time came."

How did Bill Close feel when he succeeded the colonel as president of the vast Springs organization in 1959 at the age of 39? He says:

"I didn't feel so badly as a lot of people have made out. I did have a fairly broad preparation. I quake much more now. This revolution that we are in now didn't really get rolling until the late 1950's—the matter of tariffs and imports, the world opening up for trade, and the move to quick changes in style and color."

Bill Close had the advantage of being able to argue with his father-in-law, but sometimes it was fruitless. The colonel knew what he wanted—and he got it.

Four years have passed since the colonel died.

Springs has gone forward with new ideas, new buildings, new products, and new techniques. Sales have risen. And there is talk of still more projects.

Where will Springs go from here? Bill Close replies:

"Diversification of product and up-to-date, efficient manufacturing facilities are the keys. We have to diversify if we are going to last, go into fields we feel are going to last, such as domestics. I am certain that the domestics business will survive in the United States. You won't survive making only print, cloths and sheetings. These markets may be taken over by the depressed areas of the world."

He said that there will be acquisitions too, if they are related to diversification.

An example of this is the recent acquisition by Springs Mills, Inc., of Morgan-Jones, Inc., and the companies that manufacture Morgan-Jones products. Morgan-Jones is the Nation's largest seller of brand-name kitchen cottons, kitchen towels, and quality bedspreads. The product line also includes bath towels, blankets, broadcloth, and oxfords. All of these are additions to the Springs line of consumer items available to the housewife.

Of the Morgan-Jones purchase, Mr. Close says: "We think that we are picking up 4 or 5 years of merchandising by acquiring the talents within the Morgan-Jones organization. You can't just add to production and hope you will get the top designers and top technicians of the world."

Concerning other mergers within the industry: "I am sure they will come, but some companies have waited too long already."

About the industry's perspective, he comments: "We have got to stop crying about the cost to us of low tariffs and high quotas. We are not going to get any help from any administration. We are going to have to go into other markets, into Europe and eventually into Central and South America. We've got to produce better fashions, better types of chemical finishes. We've got to cover the field and give better merchandising, scheduling and delivery than we've given in the past."

About the "future" of the U.S. textile industry, H. W. Close declares: "There will be fewer and bigger textile companies in the years ahead, but the industry will survive. I think the fewer hands that will run it 10 years from now will be more efficient—something like those in the auto industry, but not that far along. We are rapidly becoming more efficient, however."

How about the additional productive capacity being added at Springs? He answers: "Every spindle we have put in is going to have to go off the market somewhere else. I think that in 10 years the number of textile companies in this country will be reduced considerably. I think a lot of people have come to this line of thinking, as you can see by the mergers that are now being considered."

What's the explanation for the excellent profits the Springs Cotton Mills has realized over the years?

"The colonel could never give an answer to this and I'm sure I can't, and I've had hundreds of other people try. Its not know-how. Everybody's got know-how. However, being a private company, we've been able to move faster and with more flexibility. We have a good cash position. We honestly have more loyal and dedicated employees than most. Our plants are close to one another—although we've just broken out of the area a bit. Up to now, management has not been forced to take 2-day jaunts to Alabama or Kansas or someplace in Georgia to oversee a project." (Until the Morgan-Jones acquisition, all Springs plants were in a tight tricounty area of South Carolina.) "Southern on-the-spot ownership also helps. So do full workweeks and little turnover of help."

You are a young man, Mr. Close, but how long do you think you can keep up the pace at which you, personally, have been moving?

Bill Close's reply: "Just as long as is necessary."

He can do it. He thrives on it. Bill Close is abnormally energetic, seems to possess physical and mental stamina that allows him to move at computer speeds without breaking. And through it all, he manages to retain a remarkable percentage of humanness. He's quick to spot the needs and wishes of his associates and of the 12,500 employees within the Springs organization.

His door is opened to any employee in the company. The reception desk at the executive office building has orders to drop everything if an employee walks in with a problem. If the problem requires the resources of Bill Close, he handles it personally. If not, it is directed to a department head for immediate action.

Bill Close is a shirtsleeves president, as informal as any cotton mill president who ever walked the pike. His informality extends throughout the organization. It is apparent at all levels, without any sacrifice of efficiency or respect for management. It is practiced not for effect, but by choice.

Bill Close has intelligence amply bolstered with commonsense. He is stubborn at times, fiercely determined to get a job done, frequently impetuous, downright honest, and forthright in speaking his mind, in the mill or out. At the same time, he is a man of compassion, warmth and sensitivity, without relinquishing the right to be arbitrary when the occasion demands.

In some respects, he is like the colonel. One of the clearest dissimilarities is that he relies heavily upon his associates for advice in running the 10-mill organization. He encourages discussions, advocates objections to his own ideas, and is always willing to bend an ear to a man's problems, regardless of their size. He is an excellent listener.

He is an entrepreneur but no wheeler dealer. He has a fine sense of humor tempered with the right amount of seriousness.

Bill Close's relationship with his wife and their eight children, ranging in age from 2 to 16, is warm and unpretentious. The Closes are determined that their good fortune shall not separate them nor their children from a normal life. It could be otherwise. This is not a calculated position. It is a reaction by normal, unpretentious people.

This is Bill Close. He could be president of any company—without marrying the boss' daughter.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a great day in textile history and today and tomorrow we are delighted to find them prepared to make everything, and include finally the article in the same issue of the Textile Reporter which gives added emphasis and meaning to the timely remarks made at yesterday's dedication:

Prepared To Make Everything

On a sultry June 1948 midafternoon, this writer shuffled into the taproom of the Arkwright Club, and a goodly crowd was there.

Now it is fitting and proper that a scrivener take time out to quench his thirst at such an hour, but the rag peddlers present should have been on the street vending their wares.

So all could hear, we spoofed in loud tones, "That's a bad mess of news just came over the wire."

In one voice, my fellow topers queried, "What news?" "Why, Springs just cut the price of sheetings 2 cents a yard."

In less than a minute, we and the barkeep were alone in that room. But there was no spoofing, when a few weeks later, Elliott White Springs phoned his New York office in early morning and ordered an immediate price cut of 6 cents a yard on broadcloth, and threw Worth Street into a panic. The Worth Street oldtimers still refer to that day as "black Friday."

We relate these two episodes to illustrate the violent impact the rather frequent announcements of Springs' price changes (or any Springs' announcement) had on the cotton textile trade in the late 1940's.

Indeed, Col. Elliott Springs had most of the Nation in an uproar in the last 2 years of the "roarin' forties"—he had the lads and lasses chuckling and giggling, the parent-teachers associations and the better business bureaus scowling and frowning, the Madison Avenue boys and magazine publishers in a dither, and all the Indian maidens trying to buy a Springmaid sheet for a buck, or, for even two bucks.

Elsewhere, in these pages you may read the 75-year history of the Spring Cotton Mills, but let this chapter concern itself with Springs Mills, Inc., the selling division, and that story must start with the saga of Elliott White Springs.

Born in 1896, he was the grandson of Capt. Samuel E. White, first president of the Fort Mill Manufacturing Co., the first unit of what later became the Springs Cotton Mills, and son of Col. Leroy Springs, whose financial wisdom and business acumen saved the mills from "going over the dam" through 36 hazardous years.

During World War I, young Elliott Springs hedgehopped from Princeton University into the newborn Army Air Corps, where his reckless courage enabled him to bullseye 11 enemy planes. When the armistice came, he and his ace flying companions gallivanted around the bistros of Paris and the speakeasies of New York until in 1919, he was persuaded to give up his riotous life and take a job as office boy in his father's mills.

For 5 years, the only thing the youthful hedonist enjoyed about this monastic career was the opportunity it provided for an occasional trip to the New York textile market. He saw very little of the market, but a great deal of the Aviation Club and other "speaks," where he held forth with his former flying chums. Further, the sinecure at the mills afforded his talent time for writing risque short stories, which found ready acceptance in the blue magazines.

In these yarns, he took a rakish delight in the shocking word, the carefully ill-timed anecdote. He enjoyed nothing better than poking fun at the prudery of ranking textile executives.

His long-harrowed father decided his son was making no great contribution to the progress of the mills, and to save the family and his associates further embarrassment, he lectured Elliott on the perils of his wayward ways and informed him the mills could get along without him very well.

The discharged employee took up writing magazine stories and novels as a serious vocation and for the next 5 years was receiving publishers' checks to the tune of $50,000 annually.

By his own admission, his writings and well-reported nocturnal activities were almost too difficult for the family to endure. His father, horrified by his son's way of life and convinced that some catastrophe would overtake him, offered him a good berth at the mills, provided he would agree to put his "hot" typewriter in permanent cold storage.

Back in the mills, Elliott forsook his fiction and other renegade predilections and worked restlessly and diligently at learning every phase of the textile business.

He became president of the mills upon the death of his father in 1931.

The five mills, suffering from the blight of the great depression, were in a state of almost complete obsolescence. The Eureka mill at Chester, S.C., had been closed. Management and sales were disorganized; production was out of whack; and the machinery out of kilter.

The 35-year-old new president set about consolidating the individual plants and companies, rebuilding, refurbishing and equipping the mills with modern equipment.

In 1933, a new corporation, the Springs Cotton Mills, was set up to own and operate all Springs textile properties. One hundred percent of the common stock in the new corporation was held by the original investors, or their offspring or heirs, of the mills which Leroy Springs had held together through war and strife.

When Elliott Springs assumed presidency of the Springs Cotton Mills, the physical property was listed as worth $7,500,000 and annual sales were $8,100,000. At his death in 1959, plant property was valued at $114,500,000 and sales for that year were $184,300,000.

The president's star burned increasingly bright in the 28 years of his command. He proved there was a vast contradiction between the man as he was, and as he sometimes chose to appear.

Despite the long hours of hard work, the mountains of detail entailed in reorganizing every department of the new corporation, the president's facile pen took time out to register drollish beefs against anyone or anything that affected the welfare of the textile industry.

In 1934, complaining to a textile machinery executive about the stupidity of government officials, he wrote: "The Blue Eagle can roost in my belfry, and Mr. Sloan and Mr. McMahon can pitch their tents in the weave room to debate the number of hours per week which I will not run. Mr. Wolman can shout out of the spinning room windows that costs to the customers cannot be raised under the NRA while Mr. Wallace will issue bulletins from the cotton platform promising that all prices must be raised under the AAA, even if he has to stretch the Declaration of Independence 33⅓ percent. General Johnson can ride down on one elevator, after forbidding me to purchase any new equipment, just as Chairman Jesse Jones comes up on the other, bringing me Government funds to pay for it with."

During the dark days of the 1930's, his time was almost completely consumed in day-to-day modernizations of plants and equipment, and the broadening of the company's line of fabrics. There was little time for impish correspondence. Sales figures increased steadily until they approached the $60 million level when the tragedy of Pearl Harbor stunned the Nation out of its complacency.

Characteristically, Elliott Springs instantly placed the entire resources and facilities of his company at the disposal of the Armed Forces. As a captain in the Army Reserve, he promptly volunteered for active service. He was assigned to the Charlotte Army Air Base as executive officer and in 1942 was promoted to lieutenant colonel.

After a brief term of service (brief, because the Army felt he would be more valuable directing the manufacture of the multitude of textile items needed in the war effort), he returned to his mills, which now numbered seven. All Springs plants were presented the coveted Army and Navy "E" Award for excellent performance on war contracts.

In the war years, the colonel did a lot of thinking about his firm's future. Shrewdly, he foresaw that even with the stepped-up production of textiles during the war that (a) there would be an enormous demand for civilian textiles from the war-rationed and textiles-hungry consumer at the end of the war; (b) there would be integrations and mergers in the industry that would deprive him of grey goods sales to other mills and jobbers; (c) there was a larger margin of profit in consumer goods. And, perhaps the clincher, the compelling reason for his great decision to enter the consumer goods market, it would give him an opportunity to exercise his extraordinary talents as a communications and merchandising genius.

The Springs Cotton Mills had no finishing facilities. It produced its fabrics "in the grey" and sold them to other mills and to jobbers for conversion to print cloths, solid colors, sheets and pillowcases, and other finished goods and end products.

The colonel concluded his mills' production and sales would not be placed at the mercy of his former customers, he would be his own best customer.

When his decision to manufacture finished goods became known in the no-secrets industry, his textile friends whispered to each other at the Merchants Club, "Elliott Springs has gone out of his mind" * * * "There are 13 makers of sheets and pillowcases with enough capacity to supply the world" * * * "He will lose all his other mill business" * * * "The converters and big chains will drop him like a hot biscuit out of the oven" * * * "We'll give him 12 months before he is back in gray goods."

Once the decision was made, he acted with speed and typical courage. Construction was started on the Grace Bleachery in 1945 and completed in 1948. It is significant that the planning was so thorough practically all of the original equipment is still in efficient operation. About the only important change in the 1945–48 construction are walls that have been knocked down to make room for expansion.

When finished goods were ready to come off the Grace Bleachery line, Springs notified its selling agent, J. P. Stevens & Co., that it was setting up its own selling division, Springs Mills, Inc.

With two cubbyhole offices at 40 Worth Street, New York, and five people, the selling force of "Springs Folly" started taking orders for Springmaid brand goods. Springmaid had no place to go but up—it was lower in the cellar than the "Mets." It was in 13th position in the field of 13 manufacturers of sheets and pillowcases.

Making a quality product is something Springs has always done well, but it soon became very apparent the Springmaid line needed powerful advertising, merchandising, and promotional support to take its place in the sun.

Three advertising agencies took a shot at confecting the kind of ads suggested by the colonel. In turn, these three agencies were dropped.

Late in 1947, Springs wrote to his advertising man in New York, "I have a good friend, who runs a big agency and he might like to represent us. Go and see him and tell him we don't want his editorial or art services, but we are going to take some space and will be glad for him to get the 15-percent agency discount."

In a few days, the adman wrote the colonel that he had seen his agency friend and was told the agency would not touch such a campaign as suggested and wouldn't even accept the 15 percent commission for just placing space for it.

The colonel instructed his young adman, "Go ahead and book the space yourself and to hell with the 15 percent."

Shortly, the colonel wrote his adman, "Don't bother any more about an agent. I wrapped up that problem with a red ribbon."

The agency selected was Erwin Wasey Co. and here's how that agency was selected as the "red ribbon," as told to this writer by Lou Wasey, president of the agency:

"Elliott Springs, several of his friends and their wives, steamed into Cat Cay, my island off the coast of Florida, in a palatial yacht, which they had borrowed from a friend for the Christmas holidays.

"I made it an ironclad rule to never talk business at Cat Cay. Cat Cay was for fun.

"However, one of the colonel's friends kept needling him, in my presence, about spending a million and a quarter dollars on a proposed advertising campaign for his sheet business. Said he thought the job could be done for a million.

"After 3 days and nights of this incessant palaver, I finally cornered Elliott at the bar in the club, and asked him point blank how much he really planned to spend.

"He replied, 'I don't know. I might spend 50,000 or I might spend a million.'

"I told him I would like to have the account and he said, 'You got it. That's why we came to Cat Cay, to give it to you.'

"I turned the account over to my son, Gager, and my office hasn't been the same since."

Now, all hell broke loose. The advertising fraternity and magazine publishers have not before or since seen such a display of pyrotechnics. The bombs were shooting off in all directions.

The colonel had written copy and had several artists do illustrations for a series of four-color, full-page advertisements. The Wasey agency sent out insertion orders to a score of mass-media consumer magazines, including such fussy copy takers as Saturday Evening Post, Life, Good Housekeeping, Ladies' Home Journal, McCall's and Parents Magazine.

The advertising trade papers printed stories about the "biggest advertising campaign in the history of the sheet and pillowcase business."

The orders for Springmaid products avalanched into the Springs Mills office.

But when the proofs of the ads to be run reached the publishers, the Wasey office was bombarded with wires and phone calls—"We cannot accept these advertisements, they are in bad taste" * * * "We will run ad No. 3, but must refuse to accept ads No. 1, 2, and 4." "We will run the text, but not the illustration." "We will be happy to print the illustration, but not the text."

Invariably, the colonel's reply to the recalcitrant publishers was—"Take them all or none." * * * "Take them as is or skip it."

However, enough magazines printed the ads to give them several million circulation.

Thousands of letters were addressed to Springs Mills' office, ranging in comment from "crude," "vulgar," "vile," "evil," "lewd," "obscene," "shocking," "disgusting" to "hilarious," "entertaining," "diverting," "amusing," "Screamingly funny," "Give us more pretty girls." Many of the letters, censorious and complimentary, contained coins for reprints.

Perhaps the most sensational and best-remembered of the colonel's ads was "A Buck Well Spent on a Springmaid Sheet." This cause celebre in the advertising fraternity featured an illustration of a voluptuous Indian cutie stepping out of a sheet hammock slung between two trees; still supine in the hammock is a droopy, almost lifeless Indian chief. As one looks at the facial expression of the sprightly Indian lass, one can almost hear her say, "You've been through the wringer, Chiefie Boy, now you can hang up and dry." Springs Mills to this day receives requests for prints of this ad, although it appeared 15 years ago.

Or, there is the one that took this writer's fancy—a tasty blond doll, wading barefoot in a pool, with an indicated wind blowing her flouncy skirt above her panties and up to her waistline. What caused a furor over this ad was a boxed-in message in small type, which read, "Elliott Springs, president of the Springs Cotton Mills, says he is prepared to make everything shown in this picture."

Another one that drew a heavy barrage of criticism from former members of the WCTU was a collaboration between the colonel and his old friend, Zito, the famous cartoonist. They were having dinner at Nino's Continental in Palm Beach and Zito sketched the rough for the ad on the back of a menu. It shows a bunch of cannibals heating up their cooking pot and a very ripe, practically naked blond roped to a palm tree. Another cannibal comes rushing from the bushes, screaming, "Hold everything. The chief has just bought some Springmaid sheets and wants breakfast in bed."

Some 100 of these ribald ads appeared in large circulation magazines in the late 1940's and early 1950's, the copy and captions written by the colonel and the illustrations suggested by him.

Before this indelicate ad campaign started in May 1948, Colonel Springs had been featuring a dainty, puritanically attired Miss Springmaid in national advertising since 1945. The drawings for these ads were done by such renowned illustrators as Rockwell Kent, James Montgomery Flagg, Russell Patterson, Petty, and Arthur William Brown.

The question was asked then as it is asked now—Why did Colonel Springs take the gamble of offending American women with naughty ads, lush with double entendres and suggestive text? Was he gambling the future prosperity of his company for the fun of being jocular or capricious?

No, not this "Foxy Grandpa," as one of his competitors dubbed him. His business record is replete with evidence that he knew where his ultimate target was all the time and the artillery and ammunition that would score a direct hit. He was completely aware that no orthodox advertising campaign would elevate Springmaid from last position in its field to the heights where the front runners were scrambling for leadership.

Innovation was called for—something new, yes, even bizarre—and the colonel was an innovator par excellence.

The risque Springmaid campaign resulted in probably the greatest word-of-mouth propaganda program ever perpetrated on the unsuspecting American female.

At the bridge tables, the sewing circles, over the backyard fences, in the mushrooming surburban developments, at PTA meetings, in the garden apartment courts, at the sorority and sodality gatherings, the young brides and their older sisters were giggling, "Did you see that Springmaid ad, 'A buck well spent?' "

The sophisticated gals caught on quickly and once they tumbled, their naive sisters dropped into the Springmaid basket like ripe cherries.

Young and old husbands and bachelors in their offices, at the neighborhood bars, at the country clubs and at the stock ticker tape were chuckling at "We love to catch them on a Springmaid sheet."

Radio commentators and comics were throwing knives or roses at "those Springmaid ads."

Elliott Springs did not develop a mass market for Springmaid, he created thousands of group and neighborhood markets, developing an identity for Springmaid over the country that spread like a prairie fire—and at a fraction of the cost of a conventional advertising program.

Springs competition looked suspiciously at this phenomenon, convinced that Springmaid had made such rapid growth in the consumer market, and that Springs Mills' sales personnel was so completely overshadowed by the genius of Colonel Springs, this Springmaid boom was a Roman candle that would burn out momentarily.

But among his other talents, the colonel knew how to choose men. He brought into Springs Mills, as his chief executive, the diplomatic, able knowledgeable and experienced Robert Amory, who had spent more than three decades as a top executive in textiles. The colonel surrounded "Bob" Amory with competent, enthusiastic youngsters like Norman Wynroth, William A. Kirk, and J. P. Kelley. And to keep the balance were and are Henry Schniewind and James Logan; all ranking officers today of Springs Mills.

Then in 1956, came in the soft-spoken, reserved, dignified Burnet Valentine with his solid background of selling textiles. Today, he is the executive vice president of this alert outfit.

And sitting in his quiet office, always available for advice and counsel, is the retired Proper Bostonian, Robert Amory.

And the old Worth Street boys will not forget the contributions made to the success of Springs Mills by a great gentleman, Harold Hoskins.

The colonel had that kind of determination, once he made a decision that took a load of persuasion to break down. Yet, he maintained that to be effective his top men had to believe in his aims and his objectives—that it was more a matter of seeming to secure their consent to decisions and policy—rather than a matter of giving peremptory orders. And, further, he had to have the interest and loyalty of his rank-and-file employees to sustain effective management and policy.

In the early 1950's, he remarked to this writer, "There are only a few things I expect from an employee. He owes the company his loyalty, and an intelligent and cooperative interest in its affairs and problems. He has an obligation to strive to have the company reflect high purpose and high quality. And it is in his own self-interest to do these things."

While the advertising and promotion was blazing a fast identity for Springmaid with the consumer, the new and small sales force were fighting to get a foothold in a market which had been captured long since by the competition, whose brand names were household bywords.

In the early strategy councils at Springs Mills, it had been decided that (a) the line was to have national distribution and (b) distribution of consumer goods was to be primarily through direct sales to retail department stores. In their presentation to retailers, Springs salesmen focused on four major points.

First, they stressed the quality of the product and the fact that it was made by a firm with a long history in textiles. The men carried fluorescent light boxes which they used to show buyers the even weave and lack of imperfections in Springmaid sheets as compared to other brands. When a retail store bought the line, buyers were urged to use this same kind of demonstration in selling Springmaid sheets to consumers. Springs also provided stores with newspaper ad mats illustrating how housewives could hold sheets up to a window and see the fine construction of Springmaid percales and muslins. Secondly, retailers were offered an exclusive franchise for the line in their cities. This established a distinction for the line and the store. The exclusive distributorship feature still exists in most cities.

Third, Springmaid sheets were attractively packaged in cellophane. At that time, many sheet houses did not package their product with the result that sheets tended to become soiled and one brand looked much the same as the other. Thus, the Springmaid line would stand out in the sheet department and the knowledge that the sheet could be brought home, removed from its package and be put directly on the bed made a strong appeal to the consumer. Fourth, because Springmaid was a new brand name and realizing that the low markup on sheets would permit very little local advertising by retailers, Springs offered a comprehensive co-op advertising program to stores which bought the line. This was very successful in promoting the line at the retail level and co-op advertising is still an integral part of Springmaid sheet merchandising.

The company's national advertising and promotion was extraordinarily successful in making the name Springmaid familiar to people throughout the country; its careful merchandising, implemented by the conscientious service given customers by the Springs sales staff, gained the respect and confidence of retailers; and the quality of the product resulted in ready acceptance by housewives. Building on this firm foundation, sales increased rapidly and steadily and distribution was broadened in all parts of the country to the point where the Springmaid line is now the top-branded sheet and pillowcase operation in the world, producing 36 million units last year.

Some 9 years ago, Springs began approaching house-to-house installment firms and the trading stamp companies. The name that Springs had established in the retail field was an important asset to the company in these new areas of merchandising. Stamp companies began to use the Springmaid line and Springs is now one of the stamp industry's primary resource for sheets and pillowcases.

In the house-to-house trade, sheets and pillowcases are important products because they are staple items needed in all homes. Having such an item frequently opens the door with a customer who might otherwise be reluctant to look at the merchandise in a salesman's line. To further enhance this merchandise for the industry, Springs has developed the Sleepway line of sheets and pillowcases, exclusive to the house-to-house industry. The Sleepway line has been very successful with installment companies.

To keep up with the growing volume in sheets, as well as the advances being made by the apparel fabrics division in its sales to garment manufacturers, Springs Mills, Inc., now has salesmen and offices in all parts of the country and in Canada. The company's products are also sold internationally in more than 47 countries throughout the world. This progress has also been reflected in a steady expansion in production facilities by the Springs Cotton Mills in South Carolina.

During the 75-year history, the firm has dealt exclusively in cotton textiles. At the dedication of the new Springs Building in New York this past February, president H. W. Close, young son-in-law of Col. Elliott White Springs, announced that the company would start a synthetics program. This will affect the fabrics the company offers through its apparel fabrics division. It does not represent a curtailment in production of all-cotton textiles, but rather a step in expanding the firm's products.

At the dedication exercise, Mr. Close strongly condemned, as he has on many occasions, the two-price cotton system, which he maintains is an "immoral and unreasonable burden" not only on the Springs organization but on all domestic producers of cotton textiles.

Recently, President Close announced a major expansion, the acquisition of six plants and the sales division of Morgan-Jones, Inc., the Nation's largest seller of brand-name kitchen cottons, kitchen towels, and bedspreads. The product line also includes bath towels and blankets, broadcloths and oxfords. Kitchen cottons include such items as dishcloths and pot holders.

Mr. Close said, "This expansion immediately will add between 15 and 20 percent to our sales volume."

He said that the employees of Morgan-Jones, Inc., and the 2,400 employees of the manufacturing companies would be retained and that the Morgan-Jones brand name would continue to be used. W. S. Mays, president of the Morgan-Jones, Inc., the selling company, will remain in that position and "will continue the company's strong merchandising and promotion program."

Spring Mills, Inc., is a healthy, vibrant organization.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I include some general information about the new plants and the organization in general, to complete my report of a great day of courage and hope for the textile industry:

GENERAL DESCRIPTION—ELLIOTT AND FRANCES PLANTS, THE SPRINGS COTTON MILLS

The Elliott and Frances plants are designed and constructed as the most modern and efficient textile plants in the world.

They cost a total of $15 million and will employ a total of about 500 persons. This represents an investment of about $30,000 per employee.

The plants are virtually identical, the main difference being that Elliott plant will produce combed broadcloth and Frances plant will produce combed sheeting.

Elliott plant already is in production, turning out about 400,000 yards of cloth per week. Frances plant is scheduled for completion in December.

The most unusual feature of the new plants is the refrigeration and return air system. In each of the plants, this system will turn over 1 million cubic feet of air per minute.

Both plants are refrigerated and air conditioned. Air-return systems beneath the floor and hoods mounted over many pieces of machinery remove lint from the air and from the equipment and return it to a central waste room.

Although there are no walls separating the production areas, from the picker room to the cloth room, air conditions can be controlled at the desired level in any production area.

A central control panel records temperature and humidity, which can be regulated from the control panel.

These twin one-story plants have straight-through production lines, with raw cotton coming in at one end and grey cloth emerging at the other end.

Dropped ceilings of acoustical tile conceal all overhead duct work, conduit and pipes in the production areas.

The plants have fluorescent lighting and pastel colored walls of glazed ceramic tile. The floors are concrete.

Production lines run down the center or core of each plant, with service areas on either side.

Designed and built by Springs' own engineering and construction departments, the Elliott and Frances plants incorporate many features for employee comfort. Each plant has tiled showers and locker rooms. Every employee has a locker. The women's locker rooms have closed-in showers and private dressing rooms. Each plant has its own cafeteria. Both plants are served by a spacious medical clinic in Elliott plant.

The plants contain an impressive list of engineering and manufacturing "firsts"—including an electronic monitoring system to record the productivity and performance of each loom and a completely automatic picker lap doffing and handling system.

Another feature is an elaborate electrical power distribution system, with interior power substations.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY "FIRSTS" AT FORT LAWN

Automatic equipment to remove and handle cotton from pickers; automatic removal of card fly; automatic noil removal from combers; automatic central waste collection.

Air return systems beneath floors in all production areas constantly clean equipment and remove lint from the air.

Electronic monitor automatically keeps a record of performance and production of each loom.

High speed cards are used exclusively, running at 40 pounds per hour.

Central control panels, recessed roof penthouses, dropped ceilings throughout.

Wall-less production areas from picker room to cloth inspection room.

GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE SPRINGS COTTON MILLS

Springs is the second largest employer in South Carolina. With the completion of the Elliott and Frances plants, and other additions now underway, it will have 13,600 employees.

Springs has nine cotton mills and one bleaching and finishing plant. When present additions are complete, Springs will be operating 941,824 spindles, 19,222 looms, and 350 sewing machines. Including the 72,000 spindles and 1,100 looms of its Scotland mills division, the Springs organization has 1,014,228 spindles and 20,314 looms.

Springs is the largest corporate income taxpayer in the State of South Carolina. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, Springs paid 11.4 percent of the total State income taxes paid by corporations in South Carolina.

Payrolls of the Springs Cotton Mills are the second largest in South Carolina and amounted to nearly $49 million in 1962.

Profits shared with employees in 1962, in addition to their paychecks, amounted to $4,250,486.

Springs is the world's largest producer of exclusively cotton cloth. In addition, it recently entered the field of cotton and synthetic blends.

In 1962, Springs produced more than 500 million linear yards of finished cloth and used more than 376,000 bales of cotton.

Springs is the world's largest producer of sheets and pillowcases and turned out more than 36 million units in 1962.

Fact sheet, Elliott and Frances plants, the Springs Cotton Mills

	Elliott plant	Frances plant
Cost	$7,500,000	$7,500,000.
Size	768 by 296 feet	768 by 296 feet.
Square feet (production and service areas).	227,328	227,328.
Looms	520	594.
Spindles	38,640	30,240.
Products	Combed broadcloth.	Combed sheeting.
Employees	250	250.
Investment per employee.	$30,000 [1]	$30,000.[1]

[1] Compares with investment per employee of $9,967 for entire company in 1962.

FRIENDSHIP DAY IN SAN ANTONIO

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, this last weekend on my return to my home district, the 20th Congressional District of Texas, Bexar County, Tex., also a very historical spot, the county of Bexar, or, as it is pronounced in Spanish, "Behar," has been the scene of some of the most monumentous and historical events in the history of our country. It has been known as the cradle of liberty in Texas, because it is here that the Alamo, the shrine of Texas liberty, is located.

This last weekend it was my privilege to visit my native hometown and to see there one of the most eventful and significant things that I have seen anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. It was the occasion of a visit on an extended basis of 500 visitors and citizens from the neighboring Republic of Mexico who are members of what is known as the Sembradores de Amistad, which means in English sowers of friendship or good will. This is an organization which is purely private in origin and initiative. It has membership in the United States, in every single one of the States of Mexico, in the Republic of El Salvador, and in two or three other Central and South American countries. Saturday there were 500 individuals, private citizens, if you please, who journeyed all the way to Texas and who remained there 3 days and who came over as a token of good will. They joined in the celebration of Columbus Day October 12. There were representatives, their families, and friends from every single State of the Republic of Mexico and from the Republic of El Salvador. This group has had mutual international exchanges over the course of the past 3 years. The occasion of their visit last week was the second international convention, which was held, of course, in my native city of San Antonio. It was inspiring to see that last Friday the mayor of the city of Monterrey presided over the council meeting of the City Council of the City of San Antonio as a matter of courtesy. This is the first time in the history of the State that this type of mutual exchange of friendship and esteem and good will has been recorded. It marks a very significant—a very significant—course of events in the mutual understanding that we know has existed basically between our neighboring countries along the border. It has tremendous potentials for the stimulation not only of cultural but business and civic ties between the two nations and, in fact, between more than the two nations. It also marks another event which perhaps escapes national attention. It is for that reason that I rise in this forum to call the attention of this House to this very momentous event in my home city.

I speak of the fact that San Antonio is located on the historic royal road or the King's Highway which was visualized by Charles V, the King of Spain several hundred years ago. The King of Spain in the 16th century ordered that a road be built from what is today North America clear on down to South America. It took the passage of several centuries before this became a reality, but today we have what is known as the Inter-American Highway, although this was begun as the Pan-American Highway. San Antonio, my native city, which I call the Queen of the Southwest, has been and still is located on this royal road, the King's Highway, the Camino Real. These people who came to this event last week rode on this King's Highway, which is a modern highway that has been made possible because of the constant, sustained efforts of several Republics in the last three or four decades. This, I think, is a good omen.

This is what I believe is the answer to some of those who doubt and are cynical about the continuing sharing of good will, the sharing of life in the Western Hemisphere by the two great cultures that destiny has so set to share this New World.

It was very inspiring to see a mayor of this great city of Monterrey in Mexico presiding over the city council business in this other great city of San Antonio. It was also inspiring to note that this was a reciprocal exchange which originated several weeks ago when the mayor of San Antonio presided over a similar meeting of the City Council of Monterrey.

So often we have been told how desirable it is to stimulate a citizen to citizen, or to take a person to person approach in achieving better understanding and improving relations between nations, that when something as spontaneous and as successful as this recent gathering in San Antonio happens we should pause and take note.

Also, I wish to point out that several citizens in particular, have been instrumental in the creation of such organizations as the Sembradores de Amistad. Special credit should be given to such men as Bennie Cantu, a San Antonio businessman, for his untiring efforts in behalf of friendship and good relations with Mexico and other countries. Mayor W. W. McAllister, of San Antonio, as well as the City Council of San Antonio, should be especially commended. The San Antonio newspapers, the San Antonio Light and the San Antonio Express, and the San Antonio Evening News, are to be thanked for their awareness and acknowledgment of this auspicious occasion. The San Antonio Express, with the only Spanish-language page in a large city metropolitan newspaper in the United States with the special intention in mind of servicing our visitors from the countries to the south, is also to be congratulated for its monumental contribution.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] has expired.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] is making such an interesting speech, I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. There are other special orders to follow, so that unanimous-consent request is not in order at this time.

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my profound gratitude to my colleague, the dean of the Texas delegation. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

IDLEWILD AIRPORT CRASH

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **GONZALEZ**. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, October 11, 1963, the newspapers reported that the Civil Aeronautics Board had released its report of the investigation of the crash of an Eastern Air Lines DC-7B at New York's Idlewild Airport November 30, 1962. According to the CAB report the Federal Aviation Agency bears direct responsibility for this collision which resulted in the death of 25 people.

It is true that the newspaper headlines state that the pilot of this plane was blamed by the report, and in fact the CAB report does state that the crew employed faulty technique during abandonment of the approach to the runway.

But a reading of the news story also revealed the following language:

> The CAB noted that since the accident the Federal Aviation Agency and the U.S. Weather Bureau have instituted seven reforms in weather observing and reporting—all of which, it indicated, might have prevented the Eastern crash.

The entire news story appeared in the Washington Post on October 11, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, this news article intrigued me because I have stated on numerous occasions that the FAA is being run in a slipshod manner, that the present Administrator is more interested in assuming the role of a military commandant than in looking after the safety of air traffic. I have stated that the Administrator is preoccupied with moving men and air route traffic control centers around the country like so many pieces of chess and that the safety of the countless numbers of persons who travel by air is in jeopardy as a result. Because of my interest and my grave concern for air safety I requested a copy of the CAB report of the Eastern crash. It saddens me to say that the report has borne out my worst fears and doubts. I consider this report tantamount to an indictment of the FAA. It should be required reading for every Member of Congress and every person who has even a slight interest in air travel.

Readers of the CAB report would learn for example that there were such things amiss with the safety procedures and safety equipment at Idlewild field at the time of the crash as the following:

First. The precision approach radar was declared by a notice to airmen to be out of service.

Second. The Eastern Air Lines plane was not notified of this weather forecast made for the period when the plane was expected to make its approach to the field:

> Ceiling zero obscuration, visibility zero, fog, variable to clear, visibility 1½ miles ground fog.

Third. The TEL-autograph transreceivers in the FAA control tower cab and instrument flight rules room was inoperative.

Fourth. The Idlewild runway visual range digital readout displays in the control tower were malfunctioning.

Readers of the CAB report would also find a section entitled "Analysis" which states, in part:

> The system of weather observation and reporting as it concerned the flight deserve special attention. The U.S. Weather Bureau, the Federal Aviation Agency tower controllers, and the Eastern Air Lines dispatch organization each had duties relating to weather observation and reporting. The system placed the initial responsibility on the Weather Bureau to observe and record the weather information. Since the official Idlewild visibility was less than 4 miles, the responsibility for taking visibility observations was assumed by the FAA tower controllers. There was an exception in the rules which provided that the responsibility for taking official visibility observations would revert from the tower to the Weather Bureau, when the tower was above the top of the phenomena. However, during the period with which this report is concerned, the tower was observing restricted visibilities which indicated that the top of the phenomena was, in fact, above the tower. The FAA tower controllers furnish meteorological information to aircraft in flight, particularly in the terminal area.

Mr. Speaker, one does not have to be an expert or a consultant on matters of air safety to understand that this is severely critical of the air safety procedures and facilities that existed at the time of the tragedy we are discussing. And there is no question about the responsibility of the FAA for this crash. And one does not have to be an expert to understand the meaning of the CAB recommendations set out in its report. These recommendations include the following:

First. It was recommended that the air traffic control procedures require the transmission of all operationally significant weather information in terminal areas to approaching aircraft. The FAA, by letter dated January 8, 1963, stated that the necessary procedural changes were being prepared.

Second. It was recommended that the runway visual range instrumentation in the recently commissioned instrument flight rules room of the Idlewild tower was inadequate. On January 11, 1963, the FAA stated that corrective action was being taken and that a new program would permit installation of new safety equipment.

Third. It was recommended that an alternative method be developed to determine runway visibility when the runway visual range is inoperative. On January 14, 1963, the FAA stated that a new procedure would be implemented on a trial basis.

Fourth. The FAA was informed that there was a period of time on the evening of the accident when no record of tower visibility observations was retained. The FAA on February 4, 1963 stated that corrective procedures were being taken.

Fifth. It was recommended that the "Remarks" portion of weather reports be broadcast to aircraft. The FAA informed the CAB that a priority project had been initiated to correct this.

It is encouraging to a limited extent that the FAA have taken steps to correct the errors it committed last November at Idlewild. But it is frightening to know that they were committed. This CAB report raises a serious question as to the kind of job that the present FAA Administrator is performing. If so many things were being done wrong and so many errors were detected on this single occasion, the question naturally arises as to what is going on from day to day in air route traffic control centers and airport control towers. How many mistakes and errors go unnoticed and unreported. Must we have tragic crashes in order for the CAB to be authorized to make an investigation and to require that the FAA do the things it is supposed to be doing?

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, IKE

Mr. **HARRISON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Barry] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, today a great American soldier, citizen, and statesman, celebrates his 73d birthday. I am sure Members on both sides of the aisle will join me in wishing General Eisenhower a very happy birthday.

For over half a century, General Eisenhower has been serving his country. Even though he no longer holds active public office, Ike continues to take an interest in matters vital to all Americans. His words of wisdom appear in newspapers and magazines, whenever he feels he can make a contribution.

Dedication to duty is one of the outstanding traits of our former President. The New York Herald Statesman of Yonkers, N.Y., on October 12, 1963, in speaking of Ike said:

> He has demonstrated that he is concerned.

The full text of the remarks of the Herald Statesman of Yonkers is as follows:

IKE'S CHOICEST BIRTHDAY PRESENT IS CONTINUING ADMIRATION OF ALL

"Ike" will be 73 years old Monday and the Republican Party is not letting Dwight David Eisenhower forget that he is still a factor, not only in party deliberations but in the formulation of national public opinion.

Some 700 leading members of the party are gathered today for an all-day celebration of the occasion in Hershey, Pa., culminating in a banquet tonight to toast the former President.

It would have been unreasonable to expect that the man who led the greatest armed force in history to an Allied conquest of European totalitarianism and later was elected to the Presidency of the most powerful Nation of the world would be content to rusticate on a placid farm in Gettysburg, unconcerned over the great national and international issues of the day.

And Mr. Eisenhower has demonstrated that he is concerned.

He has been speaking out on matters of leadership, responsibility, and political philosophy.

He has become the solid, known rock of Republican middle-road traditionalism, about which swirl whirlpools of liberalism and conservatism set in frantic motion by several Presidential hopefuls.

So "Ike" is still a political factor and a potent one.

More than that he is still a hero, whose glory has not tarnished and whose personal popularity remain undiminished.

But he is a hero who refuses to rest on his laurels.

The continuing admiration and respect of the American people are the best birthday present a man can have and Dwight Eisenhower, indeed, has that.

Mr. Speaker, Americans and, indeed, citizens of good will throughout the world, hope that Ike will have many happy years to come. We all hope to benefit from his mature and thoroughly considered advice on national and international issues of the day.

RESIDUAL OIL QUOTAS—EFFECT ON THE DISTRICT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, those of us in New England who have been fighting against the costly residual oil quotas that place our economy in an unfair competitive situation in relation to other parts of the country, have frequently pointed out that these discriminatory quotas also adversely affect the entire eastern seaboard. This battle is not just a New England battle.

An interesting example of how the quotas affect taxpayers and industrial consumers right here in the District of Columbia, has been outlined by John K. Evans, the executive director of the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., in a letter carried in the Washington Post today. Although many of my colleagues will have read this letter, the point it makes is of such importance generally, that I am placing it in the RECORD at this time. I commend this thoughtful communication to my colleagues and to all who are interested in fairness and facts:

RESTRICTING OIL IMPORTS

Early in 1959, as a result of tremendous political pressure by the coal industry, residual fuel oil imports were placed under control and volumes were restricted. In February of this year the Office of Emergency Planning released a detailed study on the subject and its findings were that the coal industry was not being harmed by residual fuel oil imports and national security was not imperiled by these imports. This is a subject that is of concern to every consumer of energy on the Atlantic seaboard.

In the case of the Washington area the largest consumer is our Government and a million and a half barrels for the heating of Government buildings are purchased each year by the General Services Administration. Up to 1959 GSA, through its efficient procurement program, was able to get extremely competitive price quotations for this business with each year showing a lower price that culminated in a price of $2.06 per barrel in the year that import restrictions were put into effect.

In the case of the District of Columbia an import quota of over a million barrels was arbitrarily given to a New York supplier who for profit reasons prefers to market this product in areas other than the District of Columbia. A form of cartel/monopoly has been established by Government decree with the consumer and the taxpayer paying the piper.

Each year since 1959 GSA has been handcuffed in its attempts to get true competitive bids for this business. It was again forced to resort to a negotiated contract with the New York supplier who received the District of Columbia quota.

The cost of heating Government buildings this year is $300,000 higher than last year and this upward cost trend has been true for every year since controls have been in effect. Further, a local supplier in the District of Columbia quoted a firm price of $1.95 for the coming contract period with the proviso that GSA would have to supply the import license.

The million barrels negotiated contract price was $2.31 with an escalator clause based upon any increased tanker rates and posted prices which conceivably could result in a price in excess of $2.50 during the peak consumption winter season. Just comparing the local supplier's price of a flat $1.95 with the low basic negotiated price of $2.31 yields a higher cost of 36 cents per barrel or a total savings of $360,000 if GSA could have awarded the business to the local supplier.

The above proves that the taxpayers in the District of Columbia as well as the industrial consumers in this area are being forced to pay a subsidy because of a program that was adopted for purely political reasons by the previous administration and which is being continued in spite of the findings of the Office of Emergency Planning Study Group. The latter report specifically recommended a meaningful relaxation of these controls and either the controls should be removed or the governing regulations revised so that the best interest of both the taxpayer and the consumer are served.

JOHN K. EVANS,
Executive Director, Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc.
WASHINGTON.

EVENTS PROVE KENNEDY WRONG IN DEALING WITH COMMUNISTS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it must be embarrassing indeed for President Kennedy when the Communists refuse to go along, even for a few hours, with his fantasy that the Soviet Union has changed and that we are entering a great new era of understanding.

The headlines over the weekend would be uproariously funny, if the ultimate results for the United States and the free world were not so potentially tragic.

No more dramatic exposé of the Kennedy failure to understand or to successfully meet the Communist conspiracy is possible than the front page of the Baltimore Sun for Friday, October 11. I wish it were possible to reproduce the page in the RECORD, but as it is not I will try to give you a word picture. The lead article deals with President Kennedy's meeting with Gromyko where he discussed Laos and other areas of possible understanding. This is the same Laos where the Soviet Union has already broken the agreement and has won a Communist victory. This is the same Gromyko who blandly lied to President Kennedy only 1 short year ago about missiles in Cuba.

The No. 2 story on the front page of the Sun deals with the President's proposal for a joint moonshot with the Soviet Union. The No. 3 story is about the President's wheat deal with the Communists. In all of these areas the President has been telling the American people of the new face of Soviet Russia, the softening of the hard line by Khrushchev, the first small step toward peace.

Then, alas, the fourth story explodes the whole myth. It is the story of the new incident created by the Soviet troops, not East German troops, but Russian troops evidently on orders from Khrushchev, in halting American convoys en route to West Berlin. This is the usual Soviet procedure—the sly smile, the coquettish flirtation, and then the assault just to prove that they are smarter, stronger, and hold the United States and its leadership in complete contempt.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have consistently warned that the Soviets cannot be trusted, that in making deals with Khrushchev we are endangering the security of the United States and the peace of the world. The President either does not understand this or he is deliberately ignoring history, the facts, and commonsense in his almost fanatic desire to accommodate the Soviet Union. For what purpose?

I say it is imperative that Congress demand to know the full purpose behind the Kennedy proposals for making deals with the Soviet Union. I think we should know how important a part the Rostow memorandum is playing in our efforts to please the Kremlin. We should have a full accounting of the background of Walter Rostow and his motives in preparing the memorandum. We should know more about George Ball's report on trade. We should have a thorough investigation of the personnel of the Department of State to determine who is responsible for and why we continually guess wrong in meeting the Communist threat in Cuba, in the Far East, in our coddling of Tito.

It is apparent that the Nation cannot stand many more Kennedy failures in foreign affairs.

DISARMAMENT: WEAPON OF CONQUEST

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if we have thought that the United States had no patterned foreign policy, and I was among those or that it was improvising foreign policy on a day-to-day basis, or that it is simply the "no win" policy frequently charged—we have been wrong.

The truth is emerging that the United States has a clear foreign policy. It is set forth in detail in "The Rostow Memorandum," in the pertinent sections of "The U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," "The UNESCO Convention on Education," and in some of the articles of the United Nations Charter which are being interpreted as a framework for the new foreign policy of the United States, a foreign policy which dangerously threatens our security and the individual freedoms of all our people.

These facts are all documented in a newly published book by Dr. Robert Morris of Dallas, "Disarmament: Weapon of Conquest." Dr. Morris, former chief counsel for the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security and one of our foremost authorities on the Communist conspiracy, meticulously documents the revolutionary new concept of our foreign policy through a careful collection of the speeches, writings, and Government documents which enunciate it.

I highly recommend Dr. Morris' book to my colleagues in Congress and to all Americans who are interested in preserving the security of the United States of America.

In this context, we should remember that Lenin and Khrushchev both defined disarmament as "disarm your enemy and arm yourself."

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE INVESTIGATION OF URBAN RENEWAL OPERATIONS IN CLEVELAND, OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last month, on September 12, the chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter he had received from Commissioner William L. Slayton, of the Urban Renewal Administration, in answer to an inquiry made concerning a report of the General Accounting Office on Cleveland, Ohio's, Erieview project. After reading Mr. Slayton's reply, it was my opinion that considerable clarification of the attitudes taken with regard to the report was needed. Accordingly, I wrote the Comptroller General of the United States asking four specific questions on the positions and recommendations made in his report. I now have his reply.

Mr. Speaker, in less than a week, the housing subcommittee of which I have the honor to be the ranking minority member, is going to review a number of urban renewal programs. I think it is timely and important to the Congress, and the citizens of the Nation, that they have the benefit of the Comptroller General's reply to my inquiry. I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include that reply printed in the RECORD:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., October 10, 1963.
Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: This is in reference to your letter dated September 18, 1963, in which you request us to comment on a letter appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 12, 1963, from Commissioner William L. Slayton of the Urban Renewal Administration to Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN. Mr. Slayton's letter sets forth his agency's comments on our report on the premature approval of large-scale demolition for Erieview urban renewal project I by the Urban Renewal Administration (B–118754, June 28, 1963).

Your letter poses four specific questions to obtain clarification of our position on a number of points raised by Mr. Slayton. The questions, and our replies thereto, are set forth below.

1. "Does the General Accounting Office believe that the Federal Government should dictate the type of urban renewal any city should undertake?"

The General Accounting Office does not advocate that the Federal Government dictate the type of urban renewal project that a city should undertake. We believe that proposals for projects to renew areas of cities are properly matters for local determination. However, we believe also that the Federal Government should establish standards to be applied in cases where it is asked to share in the cost of such proposals.

With regard to the Erieview project, our report did not comment on the desirability, necessity, or effectiveness of the urban renewal plan. Rather, our report was confined to the manner in which, and the circumstances under which, the Urban Renewal Administration approved the expenditure of Federal funds for participation in the project. Accordingly, our report did not criticize the Erieview project as such; our criticism was directed toward the Urban Renewal Administration's criteria and procedures for approving Federal expenditures for the proposed large-scale demolition of urban renewal areas.

In his letter, Mr. Slayton emphasizes that the urban renewal program "is a local program, locally conceived, locally planned, and locally carried out. Federal financial assistance is provided to aid localities in the carrying out of these local plans and programs." Although we agree that the program is essentially local in nature, there is obviously a need for Federal regulations which set forth, in clear terms, standards with which a community must comply in order to obtain Federal financial assistance. The Urban Renewal Administration recognized this principle when it issued its 3-volume set of regulations. Indeed, Mr. Slayton seems to emphasize this principle when he states that, "We do feel, however, that the GAO report has revealed the need for strengthening the documentation required to demonstrate that adequate consideration has been given to alternate plans that would result in the retention of a greater number of structurally sound structures. Our requirements are being strengthened in this respect."

It would seem, therefore, that the Urban Renewal Administration agrees that there is a need for certain Federal standards. As we noted on page 34 of our report, the legislation for the slum clearance and urban renewal program gives broad powers and responsibilities to the officials responsible for administering the program. In our opinion, such circumstances place special responsibility on the officials to establish rules and regulations which will enable the Agency to administer the program in an efficient and prudent manner and to properly protect the interests of the Federal Government, consistent with the intent of the legislation.

2. "Was the decision on what was or was not a substandard building, as set forth in your report, reached as a result of GAO inspection, or by inspection by the Housing and Home Finance Agency's expert qualified personnel?"

The Urban Renewal Administration approved the expenditure of Federal funds for large-scale demolition in Project I—Erieview on the basis of inspection reports submitted by the city of Cleveland to the Housing and Home Finance Agency's Chicago regional office. These inspection reports classified 84 (or about 71 percent) of the 118 existing buildings in the project area as substandard. Most of the reports did not disclose the bases used in classifying the 84 buildings as substandard or the extent of the buildings' structural deficiencies.

We reviewed the reports for each of the 84 buildings which had been classified as substandard. We noted that (1) many of the deficiencies cited appeared to constitute only minor violations of the city's building or housing code, which could have been corrected by effective code enforcement, (2) buildings which were admittedly sound or in good condition received a substandard classification, and (3) some of the cited violations could have been overcome by normal repairs and maintenance.

We then decided to determine the actual structural conditions of the buildings. We

requested the Agency's Chicago regional office to assign a technically qualified staff member to accompany the city inspectors and our representatives on a detailed inspection of the buildings. The Agency's specialist found that only 24 buildings in the project were structurally substandard and that 60 of the 84 buildings were structurally sound.

In his letter to Senator SPARKMAN, Mr. Slayton states that 50 buildings were structurally substandard. (He had previously informed us that the other 34 buildings were substandard for other reasons.) Mr. Slayton states that, "The GAO auditors * * * characterized 24 (buildings) as structurally substandard. The GAO count of 24 buildings represents too narrow a view of what is structurally substandard." It should be noted, however, that the General Accounting Office did not characterize any buildings as being substandard, nor did we establish the definition for what constitutes a standard building. The definition and the characterizations were made by the expert assigned to us by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. In this regard, we note that the Housing and Home Finance Agency's determination that 50 buildings were structurally substandard was based upon a reevaluation of the city's inspection reports and that no new examination of the buildings was made. This determination differs significantly from that arrived at by the Agency's specialist who did physically inspect the buildings. This substantial difference has not been reconciled.

The Urban Renewal Administration's established standards regarding eligibility for clearance provide that, if less than 50 percent of the buildings in a project area are substandard to a degree warranting clearance, (1) more than 20 percent of the buildings must be substandard to a degree requiring clearance and (2) there must be blighting influences, e.g., incompatible land uses or hazards to the general welfare, in the area. We pointed out in our report that the Agency defended the use of blighting influences (factor 2) in arriving at determinations of whether buildings are substandard to a degree requiring clearance. We stated that, under the Agency's current criteria, a city may, with Urban Renewal Administration approval, designate any of its buildings as substandard and schedule such buildings for large-scale demolition even though far less costly methods of urban renewal may accomplish the objectives of the urban renewal legislation. We recommended that the Agency's criteria be revised to more clearly define the phrase "substandard requiring clearance" and to relate this condition solely to the structural condition of the specific buildings being considered.

The Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, informed us that "* * * we do not agree with the concept that buildings should be designated as substandard solely on the basis of structural soundness * * *." The Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration, also informed us that we had failed to consider buildings as being substandard because of other than structural factors. However, in his letter to Senator SPARKMAN, Mr. Slayton states that, "The 50- and 20-percent requirements relate only to those buildings that are structurally substandard. No other buildings may be included in these categories." He states that the Urban Renewal Manual will be clarified accordingly. We are pleased to note that the Commissioner has adopted our recommendation.

3. "Does the General Accounting Office advocate control of the project on a building-by-building basis?"

In our report we recommended that qualified Housing and Home Finance Agency personnel inspect the condition of structures in proposed project areas before such areas are approved for large-scale demolition. We made this recommendation because we noted that regional office Agency personnel did not inspect the interiors of the buildings in the project prior to the time the Urban Renewal Administration authorized Federal assistance for the project. The Agency's records indicate that such authorization was made on the basis of an examination of the project area. We stated that the examination was too limited in scope to provide proper support for the Agency's determination that large-scale demolition was warranted.

In his letter to Senator SPARKMAN, Mr. Slayton states that, "The regional office had adequate knowledge of the area to evaluate data submitted by the city in terms of the presence of a sufficient percentage of structurally substandard buildings and also of other blighting factors such as incompatible or deleterious uses, obsolescence or incompatible land use relationships, all of which are recognized under the Urban Renewal Administration policy as conditions which may warrant clearance."

We do not contest the statement that the Agency had knowledge of the blighting factors in the area. Indeed, our report notes that these factors are so broad that they can be applied to any building. **Our point was** that the agency did not have adequate knowledge as to the structural condition of the buildings. Except in extreme cases, it would seem that such knowledge can only be obtained by inspecting the interiors of the buildings; the Agency made no such inspections prior to the approval of large-scale demolition. In view of Mr. Slayton's statement that, as a requisite for clearance, a specified percentage of buildings in the project area must be structurally substandard, it follows that the interiors of the buildings should be inspected in order to determine whether this standard has been met. The Agency's knowledge of the structural condition of the buildings was based on the city's inspection reports. In view of the facts that (1) the reports did not specify the extent to which the classifications of substandard were based upon structural defects and (2) as noted above, the classifications were subsequently contested by the Agency's specialist, we believe that the city's inspection reports did not afford the Agency adequate knowledge as to the actual structural condition of the buildings. Mr. Slayton informed us that the city's classification system needs modification.

In view of the large amount of Federal expenditures involved, we believe that it was incumbent upon the Agency to have its specialists inspect the interiors of the buildings. We believe that such inspections need not necessarily be made of each building. However, we believe that the inspections should be of sufficient scope and depth to (1) verify the validity of the city's reports and classifications and (2) satisfy the Agency that its structural standards for clearance have been properly met.

4. "Does the General Accounting Office have knowledge of any consideration given by the Urban Renewal Administration or the local public agency to alternate plans for the Erieview project which were designed to save or utilize more of the standard structures in the area?"

In his letter to Senator SPARKMAN, Mr. Slayton states that the Agency "determined that the city in submitting the present plan had given adequate consideration to alternative plans that might have permitted the retention of some of these structures." During our review, we noted that the urban renewal plan was not prepared by the city. In June 1960, the city engaged the architecture firm of I. M. Pei & Associates to draw up a detailed plan for the redevelopment of the Erieview urban renewal area. **Its plan was adopted by the city planning commission in November 1960. The loan and grant contract providing for Federal financial assistance for the project was executed in March 1961. The plan submitted to the city provided for large-scale demolition. Although we do not know to what extent, if any, the architecture firm considered plans other than the one submitted, we could find no evidence that the city, or the Urban Renewal Administration, gave consideration to any alternate plan.**

We noted in our report that sizable areas within the project I boundaries were substantially free of structurally substandard buildings and that such buildings accounted for a relatively small proportion of the ground and total floor area of the buildings in the project area. We concluded that, because the actual condition of the buildings in the project area was not determined by the Agency, the Urban Renewal Administration approved the demolition of many sound structures which might have been improved and successfully integrated into the project. Accordingly, we recommended that the Administrator and Commissioner review the proposed demolition of buildings in the area with the view toward retaining those buildings that can be successfully integrated into the project.

In his letter to Senator SPARKMAN, Mr. Slayton states that we have recommended "that the Urban Renewal Administration inspect each building and itself make the determination as to whether it should be retained." He states that such a recommendation is not consistent with the local nature of the program. With regard to the Erieview project, he states that the retention of the structurally sound buildings in the project area "would have prevented achievement of an urban renewal plan that was the result of the city's intensive study of its own needs, * * * and it would have accorded with neither law nor public policy for the Urban Renewal Administration to have overruled the city's carefully considered plans."

Our recommendation did not contemplate that the Urban Renewal Administration determine whether each building in a project area should be demolished or retained and integrated into the project, nor did it contemplate the retention of any specific building or group of buildings in the Erieview area. Moreover, we agree that the Urban Renewal Administration should not "overrule" a city's determinations regarding the extent of demolition that it considers desirable. However, we believe that the Urban Renewal Administration should carefully and prudently consider the extent to which the Federal Government will share in the cost of such proposed demolition.

With regard to large-scale demolition projects, most cities submitting plans for such projects presumably have made intensive studies of their own needs and have carefully considered the plans. If the Urban Renewal Administration does not wish to realistically evaluate such plans, it would seem that the practical effect would be that Federal financial assistance would be provided without any Federal safeguards. However, it appears to be the intent of the urban renewal legislation that there is a need for Federal scrutiny as a condition to such financial assistance. This need is recognized by the agency's regulations which prescribe that "The LPA must also (1) show that the extent of clearance proposed is warranted, and (2) fully justify the acquisition of individual parcels of basically sound property which involves high acquisition costs and might not be incompatible with land use proposals. Every possibility must be explored to develop an urban renewal plan which permits a maximum number of sound structures to remain in the area."

We agree with the intent of this policy and have recommended that more effective administration, at all levels, of this policy be obtained. We believe that to effectively implement this policy, it is essential that the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Urban Renewal Administration make critical evaluations of proposed urban renewal plans in order to arrive at an informed judgment as to the extent to which the Federal Government should participate in the costs of implementing the plans. We could not find evidence to show that the required evaluations were made of the plan for Project I—Erieview.

We trust that the foregoing has been responsive to your letter. We will be pleased to furnish you with any additional information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL.

Mr. Speaker, from my reading of the report, Commissioner Slayton's letter, and that of the Comptroller General, I note a wide area of disagreement. For example, Commissioner Slayton implies that the General Accounting Office is in opposition to Urban Renewal's Erieview project. In contrast, Comptroller General Campbell says that the GAO is only recommending that existing procedures, protective of the taxpayer's dollar, be observed and tightened. The Erieview project is presently estimated as costing $38 million and the city of Cleveland is contributing, according to the last urban renewal records available, no cash, land, nor demolition work to it.

Also, Commissioner Slayton says that of the 118 buildings in the Erieview area only 13 are salvageable, and of the 105 remaining, 84 are substandard. Comptroller General Campbell, in behalf of the General Accounting Office, reported that 60 of these 84 were rated structurally sound and so rated not by the General Accounting Office personnel, but by a technically qualified expert of the Chicago office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Included in this 60, were 5 buildings with appraisals of $900,000, $840,000, $660,000, $186,000, and $80,000. These sums, plus removal expenses for the businesses located within the buildings, go to make up a large portion of the $38 million cost of the project. In addition, Mr. Speaker, an attempt has been made recently to discredit the report by attacking the former head of the Cleveland Branch of the General Accounting Office as the admittedly prejudiced author of the GAO's report. The gentleman in question, a Mr. Beeman, a career public servant of 37 years standing, and a Democrat, denies admitting prejudice, does say he was concerned about the Erieview project. I think he is correct and I do not think he is alone.

Also, within the past week, the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the House, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], has established that within the District an illegal urban renewal project has been approved. This has been done, contrary to the law as set forth by the Congress, and despite the supposed safeguards set up by the Urban Renewal Administration.

In view of the facts I have just detailed, I earnestly recommend that Members of Congress, particularly those with urban renewal projects within their districts, give careful attention to Comptroller General Campbell's report and letter to me.

POLICY IN LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am chairman of a special subcommittee on Cuba and subversion in the Western Hemisphere. The committee is a part of the Republican policy committee special projects.

It is time for the Kennedy administration to realize that there will be no real stability in Latin America as long as a Communist government is on the loose anywhere in this hemisphere.

Six Latin American governments have been overthrown since the disaster at the Bay of Pigs—Argentina, Ecuador, Peru, Guatemala, Honduras, and the Dominican Republic.

The administration has expressed alarm, dismay, and exhibited more than a little bit of confusion, each time such a government has fallen. It is becoming increasingly clear, moreover, that the administration does not fully comprehend exactly what there is to be alarmed and dismayed about.

The administration has shown that it does understand that these governments have fallen because they were unstable. It has shown some understanding of the basic economic and social conditions that contribute to instability. But it has failed utterly to recognize that an insecurity created by its own policies, as well as those of the Castro regime, have had an all-important bearing on the recent upheavals.

Two facts are crystal clear to those who live under unstable governments in Latin America: First, the single-minded and ruthless campaign conducted by Moscow and through Havana to seize power in every Latin American nation; and, second, the paralysis of the will of the Government of the United States—most plainly exhibited on the beaches of the Bay of Pigs in April of 1961—which prevents the Kennedy administration from acting in time, or from acting with sufficient vigor, or from acting at all in times of crisis.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that men decide that weak and unstable governments lead inevitably to Communist chaos and takeovers and must therefore be overthrown before they are undermined by the Communists.

These considerations have particular application to the overthrow of the Bosch government in the Dominican Republic. Responsible journalists have published evidence which cannot be disregarded of dangerous infiltration by Castroites in positions of influence under the Bosch regime. The first words uttered by Bosch when he reached a foreign port after his expulsion from the Dominican Republic were words of praise for Castro's followers in his country as a force which "is not calling for a struggle to achieve communism, but to achieve liberty"—UPI dispatch October 1, 1963. And Castro praised Bosch for his "discreet policy." He said:

> Bosch deserves a little more respect than the rest of them * * *. He was not characterized like the Somozas, the Romulos (President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela), and the worst lackeys of imperialism, by his hate of Cuba, by his anti-Cuban policy, but rather he dedicated himself to the problems of his country and maintained a discreet attitude."—Castro on Havana Radio-TV, September 30, 1963.

This exchange of compliments has great significance.

Now, at a time when indecision and confusion on the part of the United States can produce disaster, the Kennedy administration appears to be without a policy toward the Dominican Republic. Secretary Rusk and Assistant Secretary Martin have made conflicting statements on the matter.

In order to help the administration to make up its mind, this committee offers a proposal.

We urge that the administration send a mission to the Dominican Republic to determine whether the Government now in power should be recognized and assisted by the Government of the United States. We recommend that representatives of the Congress be included in the membership of such a mission.

If the present Government of the Dominican Republic enjoys stability and popular support, if it will proceed toward the goals of freedom and economic progress, it deserves speedy recognition and sympathetic support from the United States.

To deal effectively with the general problem of promoting stability in Latin American countries, the administration must begin to act resolutely to curb Cuban based subversion.

It is nonsense to think that Castro has been isolated when his followers create turmoil in Venezuela and Cuban vessels invade British islands to kidnap refugees.

Within the next few days this committee will release a report offering recommendations to accomplish this result.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODINO, for the week of October 14, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), through October 16, on account of official business.

Mr. VAN PELT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WHITENER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for 60 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday and Thursday next, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), for 60 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTIN (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, October 16, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 1 hour, on Thursday, October 17, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON), for 60 minutes, on October 17, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. HOEVEN.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of CHARLES H. WILSON and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. GREEN.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. GARMATZ.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1049. An act relating to the Indian heirship land problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1588. An act to authorize the extension of conservation reserve contracts through 1965, and increase the limit of annual payments under the cropland conversion program to $20 million; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1915. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and to encourage the reduction of excess marketings of milk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to authorize the printing and binding of an edition of Senate procedure and providing the same shall be subject to copyright by the authors; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution to print, for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, 25,000 additional copies of a revised committee print entitled "Federal Disaster Relief Manual"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 61. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings on "Organized Crime and Illicit Traffic in Narcotics" of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 10, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 242. An act to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; and

H.R. 7179. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 15, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1282. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting the texts of the following: (1) ILO Convention (No. 117) concerning basic aims and standards of social policy, (2) ILO recommendation (No. 116) concerning the reduction of hours of work, and (3) ILO recommendation (No. 117) concerning vocational training, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 46th session, at Geneva, June 22, June 26, and June 27, 1962, respectively, pursuant to article 19 of the constitution of the International Labor Organization (H. Doc. No. 165); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

1283. A letter from the Acting Secretary o Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1284. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting chapter 1 entitled "Basic Principles of the National Plan for Emergency Preparedness," developed in collaboration with the various executive departments and agencies with emergency preparedness responsibilities, pursuant to a Presidential letter of promulgation dated August 1963; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1285. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for $50,000 or more which were awarded during the period January 1, 1963, through June 30, 1963, in accordance with provisions of section 4 of Public Law 557, chapter 882, 82d Congress, 2d session, approved July 16, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1286. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the "Report on Borrowing Authority" for the period ending June 30, 1963, prepared semiannually in compliance with section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1287. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on inadequacies in planning and operation of electronic data processing systems at the Kansas City and Evanston commodity offices, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1288. A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report showing that the proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to several Indian tribes, pursuant to provisions of section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1289. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting copies of a report of tort claims paid by the administration during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act, title IV, Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1290. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting various reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the act, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1291. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a report of all claims paid by the Federal Aviation Agency during the fiscal year 1963, under part 2 of said act, pursuant to the provisions of section 404 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1292. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. S. 1064. An Act to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity; without amendment (Rept. No. 846). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 5838. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449) as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to make certain improvements of fiscal and administrative practices for more effective conduct of its research and development activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 1523. An act to make certain changes in the functions of the Beach Erosion Board and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 5244. A bill to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 6001. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the Waukegan Port District, Illinois, of certain real property of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 8821. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 8822. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the State pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ABELE:

H.R. 8823. A bill to impose quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE (by request):

H.R. 8824. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for third-level air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8825. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 8826. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national system of minimum retirement payments for all aged, blind, and disabled individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 8827. A bill to extend the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay, to cover the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 774. Joint resolution providing for the recognition and endorsement of the 17th International Publishers Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 775. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the preservation of the freedom of association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 8828. A bill for the relief of John T. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 8829. A bill for the relief of Milan Knor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 8830. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Nigro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

355. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Wayne E. Vincent, Tulsa, Okla., requesting Congress to take corrective action on the proposition of discrimination against handicapped people; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

356. Also, petition of Secretary Deputy, House of Representatives, Lima, Peru, petitioning consideration of their motion of the day with reference to expressing its democratic solidarity with the Dominican people, formulating wishes for the prompt reestablishment of the constitutional normality in that fellow country and trusts that the Executive power, backing up the basic principles of the inter-American system, may reaffirm the principal position of our country, adverse to the overthrow, by violence, of the popular regimes legally constituted; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

357. Also, petition of Edgar Seymour Kalb, Mayo, Md., relative to proposed legislation included in his petition receiving committee hearings and floor action; the legislation dealing with protection from improper fines and punishments and for the protection of the civil liberties of the people; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

358. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to legislation that would abolish the Federal subsidy to wheat farmers in their foreign sales, that is, those who receive a differential of 55 cents for every bushel of wheat sold on the foreign market; to the Committee on Agriculture.

359. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to legislation that would limit the total profit of all U.S. Defense Department business contracts to 10 percent of the total of such contracts, thus eliminating unwarranted returns on Government contracts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

360. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to passing a congressional resolution to praise outgoing Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany as a true Democrat and a real friend of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

361. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to enacting legislation providing that in any wheat deals with Communist countries, certain concessions on certain test areas be made as to free, open elections demanding honest, representative democratic government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

362. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to printing as a House document a study entitled "Imprisonment in the United States for Contempt of Court as a Method To Evade Imprisonment for Debt"; to the Committee on House Administration.

363. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to prohibiting usage in public documents the phrase "War Between the States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

364. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to legislation that would establish the sequicentennial commission for the celebration of the Battle of New Orleans, and change the name of Chalmette National Historical Park to the Battle of New Orleans National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

365. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to disposition of the site of the former Alcatraz Federal Penitentiary, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

366. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to requesting Congress to disregard memorials from State legislatures calling upon Congress to call a new U.S. Constitutional Convention for a specific purpose, and in case of such convention the agenda will be unlimited; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

367. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to passage of H.R. 8421, legislation that provides for a much-needed park on U.S. Capitol Hill, and suggesting several appropriate names for the park; to the Committee on Public Works.

368. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to legislation that would amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to abolish the motion to recommit; to the Committee on Rules.

369. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to abolishing the concept of tax-exempt bonds and securities for U.S. income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Wheat to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Republican members of the House Committee on Agriculture on the Soviet wheat transaction:

STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON SOVIET WHEAT TRANSACTION

The undersigned, as individual Congressmen and as members of the House Committee on Agriculture, regret deeply that the President has seen fit to approve the sale of subsidized wheat to the Soviet Union.

We oppose this action because we believe trading with the enemy is morally wrong.

With the President's announcement, we have destroyed our position of moral leadership. How can we hope to stiffen free world resistence to communism? How can we expect other countries to cooperate in our embargo of Cuba?

We oppose this action because it clearly is in direct contradiction to the expressed will of the U.S. Congress, as embodied in the Latta amendment in the Agricultural Act of 1961. This amendment expresses the firm opposition of Congress to the sale of tax-subsidized farm commodities to Soviet Russia.

We oppose this action because we believe the vast majority of American farmers, like the vast majority of all Americans, are unwilling to sell out a high moral principle, even for solid gold.

Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Clifford G. McIntire, Maine; Don L. Short, North Dakota; Catherine May, Washington; Delbert L. Latta, Ohio; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Paul Findley, Illinois; Ralph F. Beermann, Nebraska; Edward Hutchinson, Michigan.

Address by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, Before the Propeller Club, Baltimore, Md., October 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 1963, the senior Senator from Maine, the Honorable Margaret Chase Smith, addressed the national conference of the Women's Propeller Conference in Baltimore, Md., of my home district. I, as a vigorous advocate for an improved and expanded U.S. merchant marine, found it to be timely and of considerable interest. I believe that it is worthy of the attention of the Members of Congress and, in that belief, I include it in the Record, as follows:

Mrs. McCary, ladies of the Women's Propeller Club, and members of the Men's Propeller Club, I am delighted to be here this morning, and am very grateful for the invitation to meet with you.

Coming from Maine where everyone feels a kinship for the sea, it is natural that I would be very interested in this club's major activity, which is to sell the people of the United States on the importance of having an adequate fleet of merchant ships which will guarantee all our people free access to world markets.

I am very happy that my committee assignments in the Senate keep me in close touch with nautical matters. Even without these assignments on Appropriations and Armed Services, the fact that the State of Maine has two thriving ports, Portland and Searsport, keeps me constantly aware of the problems of harbor maintenance and improvements. The presence of the Bath Iron Works, a private shipyard, and the Portsmouth Navy Yard at Kittery, a Government shipyard, also gives me insight into the problems of workers in both types of yards. I have still another contact with the merchant marine, in that Maine has one of the six fine maritime academies producing much-needed officers for your industry. From all this you can see that I can strongly identify with the Propeller Club.

I am very conscious of the often repeated statement "that no nation with a seacoast can stay strong without a strong merchant marine and navy." I also realize that because of our high standard of living, because of stringent Coast Guard safety regulations, because the Department of Defense insists on expensive betterments on our new ships, and because we have strong vigorous maritime unions, it is impossible for the ships of the U.S. merchant marine to compete with ships of other nations whose standard of living makes it possible for them to pay their crews and shipyard workers less money, and who do not have to contend with the four items just mentioned.

I have read speeches within months which have called upon the operators of our ships to use their American ingenuity to find a way to operate our merchant ships without subsidy in the future. To believe that the United States will ever get to a point where they can operate ships in competition with the other nations of the world without a subsidy is just wishful thinking. I believe it is one of your major tasks as a club interested in promoting the U.S. merchant marine to make it plain why a subsidy is necessary and unavoidable.

This country has always subsidized transportation. Railroads could never have been built without either direct subsidies or great gifts of land. The trucking industry has been subsidized by the building of great roads all over our Nation, but the strangest subsidy that we have spent on transportation is the billions of dollars that we have given foreign countries so that they could buy our war surplus ships and build new and modern shipyards. In other words, under the guise of foreign aid and mutual security, we have been generously subsidizing our maritime competitors in other parts of the world.

Because many other maritime nations, with our aid, have shipyards as well, if not better, equipped than some of our yards, we have taken away from our merchant marine the possibility of building ships with innovations which would cut down their operational cost so that we can compete on an equal footing with the ships of other nations. A few years ago, we could hope that automation, resulting in small crews on our ships would put us in a competitive position, but it now seems that other nations will have automated ships long before we will. We should use every means in our power to minimize subsidy payments to shipping companies but we should be very careful not to curtail the effectiveness of our ships. The simplest and most logical approach to cutting down subsidy would be for our great industries and governmental departments to insist on the use of our own ships to carry 50 percent of the goods to and from this country even when it appears on the surface that a small advantage is present in the using of the foreign tonnage. Both industry and Government must be shown that by using foreign ships they are indirectly increasing subsidy payments in amounts that exceed the immediate savings.

I believe that the individual members of your club should devote their energies to convince industry and Government to use ships that fly our flag whenever it is possible.

Because many Congressmen and Senators come from States where they do not consider the merchant marine one of their major problems, you should spend considerable more time explaining to them that any belief or assumption that the merchant marine is not important to the whole country is in grave error. If U.S. flagships were not providing competition to the other merchant ships of the world, foreign owners and perhaps foreign governments could dictate to us freight rates that we would have to pay, we would be virtually at their mercy, and they could use their merchant ships as weapons of economic warfare to keep us out of profitable and necessary markets.

Some of our economists have not found it hard to calculate that if the United States did not have ships on all the major sea lanes of the world, the volume of our exports could be materially decreased and many raw materials which we need would be more costly or inaccessible to us altogether. Some people have estimated that the very existence of the U.S. merchant marine adds $1 billion a month to our national wealth.

With the many facts at hand which prove the need for the United States to have a strong merchant marine of its own, there are many persons in Washington with responsible positions who see little or no need for the United States to own and operate its own merchant ships. They need to be told what is going on in the U.S.S.R.

During the last few years this Communist nation, which is dedicated to the domination of the world, has become conscious of the need of merchant ships to carry out their national policy of burying all non-Communist nations. While our merchant fleet dwindles 200,000 or 300,000 deadweight tons a year, the Russian merchant marine is increasing by leaps and bounds. At the present rate of progress for them and deterioration by us, by 1970, they will have a larger merchant marine than the United States.

Even now this country should be aware that we are in a commercial war with no holds barred. The ironic part of this situation is that many of these ships being built for the U.S.S.R. are being constructed in shipyards built with our money. I am sure you are aware that in Washington both the legislative and administrative branches of Government are very much guided by the thinking of the people throughout the land. A club such as yours, which has members from all parts of the country and in every segment of the maritime industry, could be an ideal agency to disseminate this information. Although public relations campaigns in newspapers and magazines are very effective, more could be done by pin-pointing those who are going to cast the votes or make the decisions which are going to affect our merchant marine. It would seem that a direct contact with the persons who vote and make the decisions would be the most fruitful program. I am very glad to be with you and, for my part, I will always do everything I can to help strengthen the U.S. merchant marine.

Dr. Romaine P. Mackie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently this House passed some legislation which will provide additional training of personnel and services for handicapped children. No program is better than the leadership at the top wants to make it. It is dependent on those who have the knowledge, the training, the experience to administer the program wisely and understandingly.

Today, I want to pay my respects to Dr. Romaine P. Mackie, who has brought wisdom and understanding to one of the agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Mackie is a national and international leader in the education of handicapped children. Since 1954 she has been Chief of the Unit on Exceptional Children and Youth in the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In that capacity she is concerned with aiding the schools of the Nation in providing suitable educational opportunities for about 6 million exceptional children of school age. These include some with mental retardation, some with physical handicaps, such as impaired vision or hearing, and others with serious emotional disturbances or social maladjustments. She is also concerned to some extent with the education of the highly gifted.

BACKGROUND

Dr. Mackie has had wide experience in the education of all types of exceptional children. In her native State of Ohio, she began her work as teacher of the mentally retarded and served as principal of a school for crippled children. Later in New York City, she conducted teacher education programs both at Teachers College, Columbia University, and at Hunter College of the city of New York. Prior to coming to the Office of Education as a specialist in 1947, she served as consultant in education of the handicapped in the California State Department of Education. Thus, she brought to the Office of Education a unique experience in State and local school systems as well as college and university teaching in the field of special education.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

When Dr. Mackie became Chief of the Section on Exceptional Children and Youth in 1954, she was the only professional person on the staff. In 1956, a specialist in the education of the mentally retarded was added. Since that time several other specialists have joined the staff. Working together, these staff members gave assistance on current and crucial issues in the field of special education.

When Dr. Mackie first came to the Office of Education, only about one-third of the State education agencies had even one specialist concerned with handicapped children on their staffs. Thus, she gave much attention to the problems of States with limited staffs or no staffs at all, at a time when State education agency programs were developing. In 1963, every State has at least one person on its staff concerned with the education of handicapped children.

During the years from 1947 until the present, Dr. Mackie and her staff, as others were added, gave consultation and provided information to the State education agencies on specialized State legislation, financing patterns, personnel qualifications, and other related matters. At the same time, she also worked with national organizations having a specialized program interest in one or more types of exceptionality, such as the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults and the National Association for Retarded Children.

As early as 1952, Dr. Mackie singled out as the most critical issue in special education the need for securing more and better qualified special educators. She launched and directed, with the aid of outside assistance, a massive study on the "Qualification and Preparation of Teachers of Exceptional Children." This was conducted with the aid of 15 national committees and about 2,000 teachers and other specialists who gave information through questionnaires. In addition, both large and small information conferences contributed to the study which resulted in the publication of 13 Office of Education bulletins. Two of these bulletins were status reports which helped to provide some of the information sought by Members of Congress in relation to pending bills which finally became Public Law 85-926, Expansion of Teaching in the Education of the Mentally Retarded. The other publications resulting from this extensive study were concerned with competencies needed by special educators such as teachers of the deaf or teachers of the mentally retarded. These reports are aimed at improving the quality of the professional standards and preparation of teachers of handicapped children. Since the beginning of this study, Dr. Mackie has continued to work closely with colleges and universities having programs for the professional preparation of teachers of handicapped children.

In the Office of Education, Dr. Mackie has helped to formulate and direct an information service on the education of various types of exceptional children which is used not only nationally but also internationally. This service includes statistical as well as descriptive and opinion information.

In recent years, Dr. Mackie has given much of her time to the development of Office of Education grant programs which aid the handicapped. The first of these was that part of the Office of Education cooperative research program pertaining to the mentally retarded. She had administrative responsibility for this during fiscal year 1957 when the appropriation provided earmarked funds for research in the education of the mentally retarded. In fiscal year 1960, she carried the major responsibility for launching the fellowship program in the education of the mentally retarded authorized by Public Law 85-926. Since that time she has recruited and supervised the staff responsible for the administration of this highly successful program. Under this program, several hundred graduate fellowships have been granted for the preparation of persons who will engage in leadership positions in the education of the mentally retarded. More recently, she has aided in the scholarship program for the education of the deaf authorized by Public Law 87-276.

INTERNATIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Internationally, Dr. Mackie's contributions in her field of special education have been numerous and outstanding. During the summer of 1963, she presented a major address at an International Seminar on Special Education in Denmark, under the sponsorship of the International Society for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled. She is currently a member of the World Committee on Education of this organization. In 1960 she was a member of the U.S. official delegation to the Conference on Public Education sponsored by UNESCO and the International Bureau of Education. One of the special topics for that year was "Education of the Mentally Deficient." She has been a representative of the U.S. Government or of the Office of Education at other international conferences which took place in Puerto Rico, Stockholm, and Geneva. She went on a special mission in relation to the education of blind children to Libya and other points in the Near East. She has recently served in several capacities in formulating plans for international conferences in the United States. Examples are the Eighth World Congress of the International Society for the Welfare of Cripples in 1960, and more recently, the International Congress on Education of the Deaf held in Washington, D. C., in June 1963.

AWARDS AND CITATIONS

A distinguished educator, author, and Government administrator, Dr. Mackie is listed in Who's Who of American Women. She holds citations and awards from such organizations as the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, the International Society for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled, the National Epilepsy League, and the Boy Scouts of America. From 1936 to 1939, she was awarded teaching fellowships at Teachers College, Columbia University, where she studied education of the handicapped. She is a member of Pi Lambda Theta, a women's honorary society in education, and numerous other professional organizations. She has been active in the American Association of University Women, a member of the National Council of Administrative Women in Education, and was a charter member of the Columbus (Ohio) Quota Club. Since 1956, she has been a member of the Secretary's Committee on Mental Retardation in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. She has directed conferences during the past year concerned with the implementation of the recommendations of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. One of these was a conference of representatives of national organizations having an interest in at least one area of exceptionality; another was a conference of special education staff members from State education agencies.

Dr. Mackie holds degrees from Ohio Wesleyan University, Ohio State University, and has her Ph. D. from Columbia University. How fortunate we are to have Dr. Mackie as a public servant dedicated to the work of educating handicapped children. We still have much to do, but I hope that under her continuing leadership, much greater progress can be made and the lives of hundreds of thousands of children will be enriched because of her love and devotion.

B'nai B'rith—Sons of the Covenant—1843-1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the great American organization known as B'nai B'rith celebrated yesterday, October 13, 1963, the 120th anniversary of its founding. The name in Hebrew means "Sons of the Covenant." At the time of its organization, the then small American Jewish community, chiefly composed of immigrants from different European nations, was not only subject to disabilities and discrimination from outside, but suffered from internal disunion and disagreements. A group of public-spirited leaders among the Jewish people, headed by Henry Jones, perceived the necessity of forming a group that would unite in social brotherhood and fraternal affection, those who valued their cultural and ethical inheritance of Judaism. Even from the moment of formation, however, this organization looked beyond the fraternal benefits to accrue to its own membership, and the promotion of the interests of their fellow Jews. The stated purpose of the brotherhood in its founding was: "Uniting Israelites in the work of promoting their highest interests and those of humanity." From that moment to this, B'nai B'rith has not faltered in directing its efforts toward the good, not of the Jewish people alone, but of all America and all the world. The current form of the preamble to the constitution is more detailed and specific, but still looks to the welfare of all humanity:

> B'nai B'rith has taken upon itself the mission of uniting persons of the Jewish faith in the work of promoting their highest interests and those of humanity; of developing and elevating the mental and moral character of the people of our faith; of inculcating the purest principles of philanthropy, honor, and patriotism; of supporting science and art; alleviating the wants of the poor and needy; visiting and caring for the sick; coming to the rescue of victims of persecution; providing for, protecting, and assisting the aged, the widow, and the orphan on the broadest principles of humanity.

In this spirit B'nai B'rith has contributed to the great advance of Judaism in America, in the past century and a quarter. This contribution has been principally and basically in the development of the principle of unity. Jews of American ancestry, immigrants from Portugal and Germany, Poland, Bohemia, and Austria, all found in B'nai B'rith the essential unity of brotherhood, honoring, in one another, their precious religious and racial heritage, and joining in brotherly fashion to improve their own lot and that of the community around them. One of the watchwords of American liberty is the phrase: "In union there is strength." In the history of B'nai B'rith we have a fine example of the strength of union being used in the building of the America we love. May this fine patriotic organization go on from strength to strength, through the coming years.

No. 16—Kentucky: The Gamblers' Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to mention to the Members of this House, more particularly the congressional delegation from the State of Kentucky, about the hold of gambling on Kentucky. Parts of this State are famed as sportsmen's paradise. Several areas of Kentucky were long havens for gamblers. The extent of gambling in Kentucky is still great even now that Newport and Covington are no longer front page open cities.

In 1962, the parimutuel turnover in that State was $58 million from which the treasury received almost $3 million in legal tax revenues. However, this is only a small part of the story. The share of national offtrack betting turnover, based on testimony given to the McClellan committee that can be allocated to Kentucky is $850 million annually. The interesting chapter of the story is the total gambling in that State. Based on the testimony at those hearings, it can be estimated that the yearly gambling turnover can reach $1.7 billion.

This type of gambling, Mr. Speaker, is the checkbook of most other criminal ventures. Every bet placed in the hands of the professional gamblers helps to subsidize the criminal activities in that State—it provides organized crime with a solid treasury.

The gambling syndicates normally hang on to 10 percent of the total turnover, which would easily place their illicit profits at about $170 million a year.

One big expense is unavoidable. Protection is necessary for illegal gambling operations and the other criminal activities they support. Moneys illegally gambled thus also go to corrupt the political process.

Mr. Speaker, legalized and controlled gambling would do away with all of this. It would undermine crime syndicates, put badly needed revenues into Government hands and, at the same time, remove a source of corruption from the governmental process.

The best and only means to accomplish this is one that has worked all around the world—a Government-run lottery.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of October 12, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

OCTOBER 12, 1963.

GOVERNMENT BY DECREE

Is Congress being robbed of its legislative functions by way of Executive orders? The number of Executive orders issued by President Kennedy, together with the import of his decrees, is setting up a pattern for dictatorship. How these Executive orders are becoming more and more a pattern can be shown in these facts:

1. The first Executive order issued in the United States was dated October 20, 1862. The first 15 Presidents issued no Executive orders.

2. From President Washington through President Eisenhower there were 10,913 numbered Executive orders.

3. In his first 3 years in office, President Kennedy has issued 207 numbered Executive orders. The increased acceleration is apparent when you consider President Eisenhower issued only 407 in 8 years. The unnumbered Kennedy orders are undetermined. (One source gave me a verbal estimate of 11,000, but this cannot be verified.)

Just two examples of Kennedy Executive orders indicate how constitutional power may be abused:

1. His first Executive order issued immediately after he took office in January 1961 directed the Secretary of Agriculture to buy eggs, pork, and beans for distribution to people in so-called depressed areas. The order was a clear violation of section 32 funds in the Agriculture Act and as such was unconstitutional and illegal.

2. His Executive order ending discrimination in housing clearly exceeded his authority and has actually resulted in curtailing FHA activity.

Little known, but highly significant, are 12 Executive orders which appeared in the Federal Register of February 20, 1962. Properly implemented these 12 decrees could end freedom for the people in America and establish President Kennedy as an absolute dictator.

1. Executive Order No. 10995, take over communications media.

2. Executive Order No. 10997, take over electric power, oil and gas, fuels, minerals.

3. Executive Order No. 10998, take over food resources and farms (including farm equipment).

4. Executive Order No. 10999, take over all modes of transportation, highways, seaports, etc.

5. Executive Order No. 11000, mobilization of civilians into work force under Government supervision.

6. Executive Order No. 11001, Government take over health, education, and welfare functions.

7. Executive Order No. 11002, Postmaster General operate national registration of all persons.

8. Executive Order No. 11003, Government take over all airports and craft.

9. Executive Order No. 11004, housing and finance authorities to relocate communities, to build new housing with public funds, designates areas to be abandoned as unsafe, establish new locations for populations.

10. Executive Order No. 11005, take over railroads, inland waterways and storage.

11. Executive Order No. 11051, designates responsibilities of emergency planning, gives authorization to put all other Executive orders into effect in times of internal tension, economic or financial crisis. Part I, section 101d, states director to perform additional functions as President may direct.

Congress alone can protect our constitutional form of government, the Republic within a democracy, with its separation of powers by refusing to delegate constitutional responsibility to the Executive and by taking action to override his Executive orders. Is this trend toward dictatorship of concern to the people of Dallas? What do you think?

SIGNIFICANT HAPPENINGS THIS WEEK

There were three votes against the conference report on appropriations for the Defense Department. Mine was one of the three—not because I am against adequate appropriations for defense, but because we can cut back on unessential activities without endangering our defense position. My vote was a protest against the Senate increasing the appropriations amendments earlier trimmed by the House.

I opposed the appropriation bill for independent agencies. It was political duplicity and gave Congressmen a chance to talk out of both sides of our mouths. While claiming to have trimmed $1.5 billion from the budget we increased the amount for these 26 agencies by $1.2 billion. We should establish priority in spending and so balance the budget without cutting any essential projects. On the public buildings section, I pointed out the lack of proper priority by the inclusion of certain projects less meritorious than the Dallas Federal Building.

The President's wheat deal with Soviet Russia subsidizes Russian purchase of wheat, releases Russian farmworkers to work in missile and weapons production, hides from their own people the failure of Communist planning in agriculture. I wonder how many American boys have been killed by Communists, for instance in Vietnam, who have been kept strong with American-produced food.

Christopher Columbus Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as in many cities, Christopher Columbus was honored in Jersey City and Bayonne last Saturday, the anniversary of the birth of the man who discovered America. But in Jersey City, which is in my district, Christopher Columbus, of Genoa, Italy, was present in person. This latter-day Columbus was brought from his native land to lead a parade of 20,000 marchers, 40 bands and 50 beautiful floats that passed for review before nearly 200,000 citizens. It was an inspiring demonstration of the spirit that must have sustained the great navigator on his heroic voyage, a spirit which has encouraged hundreds of thousands of Italians who settled in America to succeed in their adopted land in business and in government. The contributions which the men and women of Columbus' land have made to this country are beyond counting.

In Jersey City and Bayonne the sons and daughters of early immigrants from Italy are prominent in the professions, in education, business and in government.

On a prominent site at Journal Square in Jersey City there stands a magnificent statue of Christopher Columbus, a reminder to all of the courage and perseverance that led to the discovery of this great land, a reminder to the millions who followed Columbus that these attributes are requisites for success today in any endeavor.

We were mindful as we witnessed that wonderful parade that not only did Columbus discover America, but he left a heritage of wisdom and courage that benefits mankind to this day.

Wheat Sales to the Reds: Government by Executive Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I realize that individuals may honestly differ as to the merits of selling wheat to Russia and I have carefully evaluated arguments on both sides of this issue. I recall discussing with Secretary Freeman earlier this year, during the hearings on the agriculture appropriations bill, the effect of sales of surplus commodities abroad. Among other things Secretary Freeman stated:

> Any country that seeks to make economic progress is going to need food, because they spend 80 to 90 percent of their income for food, and as soon as they have money in their pocket, they buy food. If the food is not there, they will have inflation. * * * That doesn't mean that is practical or reasonable or sensible to run a relief program for the world, far from it. Nor does any political leader I know in any country in the world want us to. Nor do they want to become that dependent on us. But somewhere in between these different motivations and these different interests, there develops a program that I think is increasingly becoming more constructive, both as a part of American agriculture and as a part of American foreign policy, and as a part of trying to add strength to the free world.

Mr. Speaker, on the basis of that statement I will have to assume that Secretary Freeman would be opposed to the sale of surplus commodities to Russia. It would be impossible to rationalize the sale of wheat to Russia as trying to add strength to the free world. Moreover, our Government should be preoccupied with the policy of proving to the world that the system of communism is not infallible. If Russia's agricultural practices result in inflation we can harm the cause of the Russian farmer who desires free enterprise by selling wheat to a government that has sworn to bury us. At this point I wish to include an editorial from the September 26, 1963, issue of the New York Journal-American:

> GRAIN OF SENSE
>
> To our neighbor Canada, a dollar is a dollar and nobody is fussy about the source. That is, as long as the amount of dollars is big enough. Thus we have the spectacle of a member of the Western alliance selling a half billion dollars' worth of wheat to the Soviet Union, part of which was known in advance to be earmarked for Castro's Cuba.
>
> As a result of this deal, the largest ever for 1 year, U.S. wheat farmers, their congressional representatives and the "Let's-not-be-beastly-to-the-Communists" school have been whooping it up for relaxing our rules against selling to the Soviet.
>
> We think selling wheat to the Soviet is a sacrifice of principle and a help to a foe who has sworn to bury us.
>
> It would be far better to sell all the wheat possible to the Western European countries.
>
> Western Europe, restored to prosperity by U.S. help, needs no charity and can pay the top price. These countries mostly have been trading with the Communists as they can, despite the fact that it helps the common foe. In so doing they have—ironically—acquired a lot of U.S. gold dollars which this country needs to balance our payments deficit.
>
> The United States is a signatory to the International Wheat Agreement which prevents us from dumping our surplus wheat on the world market at this point. Since that pact makes it possible for the Canadians and such to trade with the enemy without punitive action by us, it seems logical that the United States should reconsider it when it comes up for renewal.
>
> Not the least important aspect of the wheat deal is the proof that Soviet crop failures are much more castastrophic than the Russians admit because farmers won't produce adequately under the Communist system.
>
> This may be the only way the Russian people can get back at their Communist masters. It makes no sense for the United States to help the tyrants off the hook.

Mr. Speaker, although some may differ as to the merits, I do not see how it is possible to differ on the legality of the sale. The Latta amendment to the 1961 Agriculture Act expressly prohibits the export or sale of subsidized U.S. farm commodities to nonfriendly nations. There can be no question as to the intent of this amendment. If President Kennedy wanted this law repealed, he should have come to Congress for approval—for article I, section 1 of the Constitution provides that—

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The ruling from the Attorney General, the President's brother, was a farce, and in the days ahead, the people of this country will come to realize that it had no basis in law. It reminds us that Attorney General Kennedy legally approved the transfer of tractors for Cuba to assist President Kennedy in his answer to Castro's prisoner bribe. It was not long, however, before the pressure of public opinion exposed that fraud on the judicial system of this country and the deal was called off.

Mr. Speaker, just as Mr. Chuck Dancey points out in his editorial of October 11, 1963, in the Peoria Journal Star, the American people are not stupid. The editorial follows:

PUTTING A GOOD FACE ON WHEAT DEAL

(By C. L. Dancey)

So we're selling wheat to the Soviet Union for the very good reason that if we don't according to the President, others will. He can back this up by the fact that others have done so in huge quantities.

Everybody knew we were going to. The delays came about in order, it would seem, to manage juggling the laws to get around them, and to put as good a face on it as possible.

Our Government is prohibited by law from such trade deals, but now they've got around that by juggling the Government-bought wheat into the hands of private traders and thence into the hands of the Soviets—who will get it for less money than our Government paid for it.

That little maneuver had to be arranged, although it wasn't too difficult for the President to get a favorable ruling from his brother, the Attorney General.

It is true that Canada and Australia have sold huge quantities of wheat to Russia, and we might as well pick up our $250 million and put a small dent in our surplus.

This thinking slides over the fact, however, that such a confession is a complete reversal of the role so impressively assumed by the President of the United States at his inauguration. He then proclaimed himself the "leader of the free world" and announced that he would be a real and effective leader thereof.

Now, we are told that the nations of Canada and Australia have compromised us and we have no choice but to follow their lead.

This situation comes less than a year after we had a row with the Conservative government in Canada that resulted in its ouster and replacement by a Liberal government friendly to U.S. policy.

The sour taste of the whole wheat situation climaxed by the wheat deal, itself, has a final sickly touch in the crude joke of the restriction against using our wheat for Cuba or China.

Obviously, with this wheat from us for their own use, the Russians can spare Canadian wheat for Cuba and Australian wheat for China.

Indeed, the way this whole thing was staged-managed, one wonders if the Russians didn't know in advance long before the President told us that they would get American wheat. For the early shipments of Canadian wheat were already directed to Cuba before he publicly announced approval of the sale of U.S. wheat to Russia.

With wheat for Russia and the satellites from the United States, they can send Australian wheat over the short haul to China more cheaply, as well as serve Cuba directly from Canada. We've just saved them from roundabout deliveries—and we present it under the cloak of a "restriction."

Why was all that fancy footwork necessary?

We had to sell the wheat as a practical matter. Everybody else is doing it. We've become such great leaders of the free world that we are now forced to fall in at the rear of the line. That is decisive enough.

Why try to dress it up, crudely, with a transparent pretense that it won't help Cuba, won't help China, and will hurt Russia to spend the money?

That is unnecessary, cheapening, and an insult to the intelligence of the people to whom it was addressed—the American people.

Some young "sharpie" was probably real proud of thinking up that bit of trickery.

Whoever it was may be a great angle-shooter, but he doesn't know much about the American people. They aren't stupid, but he obviously thinks they are very stupid indeed, to fall for that.

U.S. Adherence to OECD Film Code Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 14, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, many film industry employees live in my congressional district, and from time to time they have expressed to me their concern with regard to the effect on the domestic industry of the number of films produced by U.S. motion picture producers in foreign countries. The attached letter and news release from Assistant Secretary of Labor George L-P Weaver will be of interest, I am sure, to my colleagues and many of my constituents:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, October 15, 1963.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: As you may recall, the Department of Labor is seeking measures to alleviate unemployment problems in the American film industry. Part of the difficulty, according to the Joint Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Film Production, stems from considerable foreign production by U.S. motion picture producers.

It was the recommendation of the Joint Labor-Management Committee that if the United States should adhere to the film code of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), American filmmakers would have a greater voice in seeking fair competitive conditions for U.S.-made films abroad. Therefore, as one step to take in dealing with this problem, the United States will adhere to the OECD films provisions. I expect to announce this fact at a meeting with the Joint Labor-Management Committee in Hollywood on Wednesday, October 16. The attached press release, which will be isued at that meeting, explains in detail the significance of our OECD film code adherence.

I thought you would find this information useful.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE L-P WEAVER,
Assistant Secretary, International Affairs.

LABOR SECRETARY WIRTZ ANNOUNCES U.S. ADHERENCE TO OECD FILM CODE PROVISIONS

In order to deal more effectively with international questions of governmental policy affecting trade and employment in the motion picture industry, the United States has established a closer relationship with the member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz announced today.

The administration took this step by notifying the OECD at its headquarters in Paris that the United States was adhering to the organization's code of rules for international trade and financial transactions involving motion picture films.

A Joint Labor-Management Committee on Foreign Film Production of the American motion picture industry had petitioned Secretary Wirtz earlier this year to help in reducing the industry's unemployment. One of the recommendations of the joint committee was that the United States adhere to the OECD film code.

The joint committee attributes much of the industry's unemployment to foreign production by U.S. motion picture producers. Subsidies provided by certain European governments help to make it attractive for U.S. filmmakers to produce films within their countries.

Adherence to the OECD film code, Secretary Wirtz explained, would permit full U.S. participation in the proceedings of this OECD forum concerning motion pictures. In this way U.S. officials may work more effectively for fair competitive conditions for American-made films abroad.

The OECD's regular consultations on trade policy and liberalization of restrictions on international financial transactions provide opportunities for frank discussions among officials of members nations about the problems they share. The OECD holds periodic meetings of motion picture experts to give effect to its program of liberalization.

The OECD's rules on films constitute an annex to the code of liberalization of current invisible operations. The OECD code sets forth obligations to remove restrictions from current international transactions and payments. The United States adhered to the main body of the code in 1961. Article 2 of the annex to the code provides that production subsidies for full-length feature films "should be abolished to the extent that they significantly distort international competition in export markets."

The terms of accession to the OECD will involve no change in American laws or regulations affecting the use of imported films, nor will they affect the treatment to which American films are entitled under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Members countries of the 20-nation OECD include the United States, the countries of Western Europe, and Canada. Japan's accession is expected soon. The membership thus includes almost all of the world's largest producers of motion pictures.

Labor and management representatives of the American motion picture industry have held a series of meetings this year with Assistant Secretary of Labor George L-P Weaver whom Secretary Wirtz had asked to find ways for easing the industry's unemployment problems. Mr. Weaver, in turn, has brought in representatives of the Departments of State, Commerce and Treasury.

"The American motion picture industry should benefit by our country's adherence to the OECD's provision on films," Secretary Wirtz said. "We will continue our efforts on behalf of the industry."

SENATE

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. John R. Anschutz, D.D., rector, Christ Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Guide our minds, O God, as we pause for this moment to acknowledge Thee as our Creator, our Sustainer, and He who finally orders all things.

Without Thy guidance, we cannot be led to unshakable truths; and without strength which comes from Thee, we cannot uphold what we know to be Thy will. Indeed, our trust is in Thee.

As we go on our way today, come with us. Cleanse our motives. Inspire our minds. Free us from the crippling bondage of self-service, so that when the evening has come, the world may know that here, in this place, a prayer was heard and answered. Thy will was done. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4333. An act to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced;

H.R. 5337. An act to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5871. An act to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6413. An act to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7441. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended;

H.R. 7882. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 8313. An act to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8355. An act to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145), approved June 19, 1934, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H.R. 4333. An act to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced;

H.R. 5337. An act to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5871. An act to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, in order to modify the retirement benefits of the judges of the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6413. An act to amend the act approved March 3, 1921, as amended, establishing standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7441. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended;

H.R. 7882. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to exemptions from attachment and certain other process in the case of persons not residing in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 8313. An act to repeal the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, to convert credit unions incorporated under the provisions of the act to Federal credit unions, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8355. An act to amend the Life Insurance Company Act of the District of Columbia (48 Stat. 1145), approved June 19, 1934, as amended.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be allowed to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate. This request has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of last Friday, the Senate now resumes the consideration of House bill 6143, to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, under a unanimous-consent agreement which limits the debate and provides for control of the time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me 2 minutes, under the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 11, 1963, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT BY MADAM NHU TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as the Senate is well aware, Madam Ngo Dinh Nhu is traveling in this country at the present time. She has been invited by many American groups to speak, and she has been repeatedly interviewed by the press on the Vietnamese situation and our relations with Vietnam.

As one Senator, I do not necessarily agree with Madam Nhu's views on any particular issue of United States-Vietnamese relations. I would most certainly disagree with some of her views, as she would disagree with some of mine. I may say, for example, that some of her comments on U.S. military personnel and officials of this Government I find most disturbing.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that Madam Nhu is in this country on a valid passport bearing a valid visa. She is speaking her mind when she is invited by the press or by groups to do so. It seems to me, therefore, that she has every right to expect from us a full measure of courtesy. This Nation has played host to many prominent visitors, before Madam Nhu, whose views were, to say the least, not exactly music to our ears. But never let it be said that this Nation is unwilling to receive and to hear with courtesy and decency what is on the other person's mind, no matter how farfetched or unpalatable it may be.

It would be my hope, therefore, that Madam Nhu would be received, wherever she may go, on the basis of the Voltairian principle that although some Americans may disagree with what she says, we would defend without question her right to say it. Indeed, it may be that a diligent application of this principle would provide the deepest and most enduring souvenir of her visit to this Nation which she might then carry back to her own land and relay to her own government and people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the words just spoken by the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. Once again he gives us reason to be very proud of his leadership of the Senate.

The plea he has made for the American people to respect one of our precious rights of freedom—namely, freedom of speech, which is granted even to visitors who have a legal right to be in our country—needed to be made; and I am proud that the majority leader made it. I associate myself with it.

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial dealing with the Morse amendment to the foreign aid bill. The editorial was published today in the New York Times. The amendment to which it refers seeks to deny any military or economic aid under the Alliance for Progress to any Latin American government which has been taken over by a military junta.

Mr. President, I shall comment very briefly on the editorial: the editorial writer needs to refresh his knowledge of our constitutional system of checks and balances, for he seems to be of the opinion that no check should be placed by Congress on the determination of foreign policy by the President and the Secretary of State. He could not be more in error. The editorial shows a lack of understanding and a lack of knowledge on the part of the editorial writer of the meaning of our system of checks and balances.

I seek to protect, by way of check, the U.S. taxpayers from the spending in Latin America of any money to support a military junta or to support a government which has been put into power by civilian stooges set up by a military junta. That is a power which Congress has; it is a responsibility of Congress; and it is one of the constitutional checks given to Congress over any President or over any party. The dictate of the Constitution that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law is a specific and deliberate check upon the executive branch in the field of foreign policy as in all other fields.

Therefore, I shall press for action on my amendment, both in the Foreign Relations Committee and in the Senate, because I think the time has come to make perfectly clear to this administration or to any other administration that it cannot justify the expenditure of American taxpayers' funds to give support to any government in Latin America that has come into power by way of an overthrow of a constitutionally established government elected in a free election by the people.

So let me say, for the benefit of the information of the writer of the editorial published in the New York Times, that this check is a clear obligation of Congress.

Furthermore, I serve notice on all Members of Congress that millions of Americans will be watching to see whether we keep faith with our professions that we are supporting democratic constitutionalism, not military regimes, in Latin America. The only way that can be done—no matter who happens to be sitting in the White House—is to deny to any administration funds which could be used to support military juntas in Latin America.

As a matter of fact, I am convinced that a major reason why foreign aid has failed in so many respects to be an effective policy is the very failure of Congress to include enough firm policy guidelines for its administration.

Mr. President, I now request that the editorial be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Limiting Foreign Policy

Congressional encroachments on the Chief Executive's conduct of foreign policy can be harmful—even dangerous—through limiting his flexibility of decision and actions. The most recent development in this direction is Senator Wayne Morse's well-intentioned amendment to the foreign aid bill to prohibit Alliance for Progress assistance to those Latin American countries where legitimate governments have been overthrown by the military.

It can be conceded that such countries should normally not be recipients of U.S. aid, but a congressional prohibition is not the way to handle the matter. There should, at the very least, be a discretionary clause leaving it up to the President to decide when and if a ban on such aid is to be applied. It would be still better if the Senate confined itself to a resolution, merely giving its opinion.

Last year the Hickenlooper amendment was attached to the foreign aid bill. It provided for stopping aid altogether to countries where American properties were confiscated without compensation or negotiation within 6 months. Thanks to a loophole, it was possible to avoid the application of this amendment in the case of Brazil, but not in the case of Ceylon. Another problem may now arise with Argentina, where the new Illia government, which the United States wants to help, is planning measures against American oil investments.

Congress also legislated last year to prevent most-favored-nation treatment from being extended to Communist Poland and Yugoslavia. The measure was fortunately amended to give the President discretionary power in respect to the two countries; but this year the bill as it now stands, after passage by the House, again contains such a prohibition. Presumably, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will modify it, but meanwhile our relations with Eastern Europe are unnecessarily hampered and the President is helpless.

Measures of this sort are indirect ways of making foreign policy. Under our system of government, it is for the President, assisted by the State Department and other executive agencies, and not for Congress, to be primarily responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs.

THE AMERICAN PRESENCE IN EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield again to me, on the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a series of articles entitled "The American Presence in Europe," which appeared in the October 6 issue of the Kansas City Star. The articles, written by the Star's outstanding foreign affairs correspondent, John R. Cauley, are a first-rate explanation of America's military and economic involvement with the European continent, and are well worth consideration by the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cauley's piece be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Presence in Europe

(By John R. Cauley)

In Western Europe and in England—from the grim ramparts of Berlin to the sunny Mediterranean, from the barracks of Stuttgart to the docks of Liverpool—there are, these days, more than 1 million Americans.

Wherever you look, you see them: Military men from Dubuque or Cheyenne, spinning contrails in the sky or churning up dusty plains on maneuvers * * * businessmen and diplomats in bustling capitals and industrial communities * * * tourists, visiting museums and thronging at historic sites along the Rhine, Seine and Thames * * * students in ancient university towns.

The fighting men are typified by such Midwesterners as Lt. Col. Donn Starry, of Kansas City, Kans., commander of a tank battalion in Germany, 40 miles from the Communist border, and Capt. Harold Wilson, of Burlington, Kans., a fighter pilot stationed at Ramstein, Germany, only 10 minutes away from enemy territory.

Starry and Wilson exemplify the awesome U.S. military presence in Europe—a force of more than 400,000 strong, poised and alert to defend the free world against any Communist aggression.

The U.S. political presence in Europe is personified by the diplomats—veteran Ambassadors such as Charles E. (Chip) Bohlen in Paris, George McGhee in Bonn, and David Bruce in London. They are men of long experience in dealing with the Communists, men who articulate and execute American policy to deter the enemy and solidify the Atlantic Alliance.

Then there is the tremendous American business and financial presence representing billions of dollars in investment, designed to expand markets overseas for the richly productive factories at home, to get in on the ground floor of the Common Market and to export U.S. technology and know-how to make life more abundant for millions of Europeans.

Everywhere a reporter goes in a prosperous and booming Europe he sees these manifestations and penetrations of the free enterprise system that has made America great—General Motors, International Business Machines, Monsanto Chemical, Singer Sewing Machines, Ford, Procter and Gamble, and Standard Oil of New Jersey.

On the beautiful Camps Élysées in Paris, a newsman encounters four former Kansas Citians, all top executives in the international sales organization of Trans World Airlines. Also in Paris he may meet the representatives of two other widely known Kansas City businesses, Vendo and Hallmark Cards, taking careful aim at the lucrative European market.

Other evidences abound of this fabulous American presence in Europe: the click of the hign heels of a diplomat's wife in the sumptuous American Embassy club near Bonn; the sight of pretty Embassy secretaries swimming under the late afternoon sun; the lines of khaki, sports shirts, and slacks at the post exchanges, and the American-style supermarkets springing up all over the Continent.

American tourists, tens of thousands of them, swarm about the Arch of Triumph and Piccadilly Circus and St. Peter's square, sometimes pausing to bow their heads in prayer in the great cathedrals, soberly observing the infamous wall at Berlin, laughing and drinking champagne at the Lido, and snapping their cameras at everything in sight.

Indirectly and psychologically, the American presence extends deep into the mores of European society.

Reducing salons, catering to plump women who want to emulate the trim figures of their American sisters, are springing up all over Germany.

In Frankfurt, this reporter was fascinated by the sight of German teenagers dressed in American-style cowboy hats and boots.

These realities of the American presence in Europe suggest two questions: Why are we so deeply involved, on the other side of the Atlantic? How long are we going to stay?

The answer to the first question goes back to the end of World War II, when Europe was flat on its back from the devastation wrought by Nazi Germany.

The United States helped Europe to its feet with billions of dollars in Marshall plan money. At the same time we were confronted with evidence of hostile and aggressive intent by one of our wartime Allies, the Soviet Union.

Reacting to the clamor of "bring the boys home," the United States dismantled its powerful military force. This left a vacuum into which the Soviets soon moved relentlessly.

The fears previously expressed by some of our wise men at home proved to be well founded when the Russians began to take over and impose their system on all of Eastern Europe.

Alarmed at the prospect of a possible Soviet sweep through all of Europe, the West responded with the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The U.S. position was clear, direct, and simple: Two world wars, fought at the cost of thousands of American lives, were enough. To prevent this disaster from happening again, it was decided to station thousands of ground troops and fliers and tanks and aircraft in Europe.

The answer to the second question is that the United States probably will stay in Europe for a long time.

Why? Why can't we bring our boys home, stop the drain on our gold reserve, reduce the defense budget, and give every American a hefty tax cut?

The reason for this is that Western Europe at this time is in no position to defend itself We cannot leave England, West Germany, France, and the Benelux countries exposed to the machinations of Communist power.

This is why the United States has deployed Colonel Starry's tanks and Captain Wilson's fighter planes at strategic points along the border.

Perhaps the most lucid explanation of why the United States is in Europe, how long we are going to say, and the fateful stakes for us there, comes from a man who should know—President Kennedy.

"Now Europe is relatively secure," the President said. "The day may come when Europe will not need the United States and its guarantees. I don't think that day has come yet, but it may come and we would welcome that.

"We have no desire to stay in Europe except to participate in the defense of Europe.

"Once Europe is secure and feels itself secure, then the United States has 400,000 troops there and we would, of course, want to bring them home.

"We do not desire to influence or dominate. What we desire to do is to see Europe and the United States together engaged in the struggle in other parts of the world.

"We cannot possibly survive if Europe and the United States are rich and prosperous and isolated.

"We are asking that Europe together, united, join in the great effort and I am hopeful they will, because, after all, that has been the policy of, as I say, a great many Europeans for a great many years.

"Now, when success is in sight, we don't want to see this great partnership dissolved."

The fact is—and this is clearly implied by the President—that the American presence in Europe is not merely for the benefit of the Europeans. It is there because the security of Europe is essential to the security of the United States.

It is a fact, too—and not many Americans are aware of this—that today the United States is the strongest military power in Europe.

Ironically, it is this dominance of American power in Europe that has posed some real dilemmas for us.

The more secure Europe feels under the umbrella of American protection, the more it can afford to be resentful of U.S. power and the more difficult some of the countries are to deal with.

And ironically, too, many of our problems in Europe stem from our successes on the international scene.

Because we were able to deter the Russian squeeze on Berlin and to call the Soviet bluff on Cuba, the Atlantic alliance began to indulge in the rare luxury of relaxation.

But if the Russians begin to heat up the Berlin crisis again, the alliance no doubt would cast aside its dissensions and join together to meet the threat.

Thus Europe today has not yet become the kind of a Europe this country has envisaged since the end of World War II.

Our basic policy has been—and still is—to encourage Europe to unite itself politically and economically so that it can stand on its own feet and, with the productivity and talents of its people, assume some of the free world responsibilities in other parts of the globe.

At the end of the war, the United States, with some help from Canada, was the only one pulling the 20-mule-team wagon. Our other allies, still shaken and sick from the war, were riding in the wagon.

As time went on and recuperation came about we thought some of these allies would get out of the wagon and help pull. But it hasn't worked out exactly that way.

President Kennedy himself has said more than once, publicly and privately, that although the United States has only 6 percent of the world's population, it is carrying by far the greatest share of the burden of the free world all the way from Berlin to Saigon.

The American presence in Europe, combined with other factors, have led to all kinds of difficulties with that proud and imperious Frenchman, President Charles de Gaulle.

Of course, if you were a Frenchman in uniform you might be consumed, as De Gaulle is, by a passion to rebuild France's military establishment to its former power and glory. If you were a Frenchman, you, too, would want a nuclear force of your own.

But the trouble with De Gaulle, as Washington sees it, is that the French President is operating from weakness rather than from strength. He is trying to build at the expense of his friends and not his enemies.

De Gaulle wants France to be the spokesman for all of Europe, and he has asked for a position in Europe that the other countries are not yet ready to give him.

If France would throw itself into the drive for a really united Europe, Washington believes, this would not only increase the prestige of France but all of Europe as well.

De Gaulle's drive for an independent nuclear force and his veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market have been viewed by some as fatal blows to the concept of Western allied unity.

There have been complains, too, that the United States does not seek to deal equally with Europe as an equal partner.

Replying to these observations, President Kennedy said:

"I think anyone who would bother to fairly analyze American policy in the last 15 years would come to a reverse conclusion.

"We put over $50 billion worth of assistance in rebuilding Europe. We supported strongly the Common Market, Euratom and other efforts to provide for a more unified Europe, which provides for a stronger Europe, which permits Europe to speak with a stronger voice, to accept greater responsibilities and greater burdens, as well as to take advantage of greater opportunities.

"So we believe in a steadily increasing and growing Europe. We felt Britain would be an effective member of Europe.

"And it was our hope and still is our hope, that the powerful Europe, joined with the power of the North American Continent, would provide a source of strength in this decade which would permit the balance of power to be maintained with us, and would inevitably provide for an attraction to the underdeveloped world."

For nearly 20 years American policy has cherished the vision of a united Europe whose leaders could talk the same language of power and responsibility as its own.

Indeed, during the early years of that policy there was little conflict between its economic and political aspects, for almost all of the strategic power of the West was effectively in the hands of the United States.

But nations, like people, have dreams and sometimes inordinate pride, and strains and stresses began to develop in the Atlantic alliance.

Such a distinguished European statesman as Paul-Henri Spaak of Belgium, former secretary general of NATO, believes that the Atlantic alliance and the European community are going through the most serious crisis they have so far experienced.

"One of their members, France—or at any rate official France—no longer believes in the two basic principles which led to the formation of NATO and the Common Market," he says.

"It no longer believes that the defense of the free world is indivisible and it is looking for a substitute formula. It also does not believe in the community spirit.

"We are thousands of miles away from the concept of a federated Europe, where each country would retain its basic national characteristics while pooling what the modern world requires must be handled in common international policy, defense and economic policy."

Contrary to what Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Spaak advocate, President De Gaulle's concept of Europe is one based on a loose confederation of states on the Continent, barring Britain and Scandinavia, dominated by France and Germany, but under French hegemony.

Indeed, the present policy of France strikes at the heart of President Kennedy's "grand design" for an Atlantic community embracing the countries of Western Europe and America north of the Rio Grande.

He rejects the U.S. proposal for a multilateral nuclear defense force for Europe, insisting that France must have an independent deterrent.

And he engineered the France-German treaty of cooperation, a pact regarded as the first step toward construction of a Gaullist Europe of states.

But Washington still is convinced that De Gaulle is a boulder in the stream and not a dam to further progress and unity.

Another basic problem facing the United States in Europe is the future of Germany.

Our fundamental policy has been to integrate Germany so deeply into Western Europe, both politically and economically, that Germany would no longer be a threat to the world.

But Washington believes that the United States and Europe must face up to the fact that a policy which does not open the door to an eventual reunification will not bring about a stable Germany itself.

Authorities in our country are not convinced by the arguments of those who point out that Germany lost the war; that it has two different social systems, and that the realities of division must be recognized.

To follow this course, it is argued here, would expose the world to great dangers. The way for reunification in a peaceful manner should be left open.

The reunification of Germany, it is pointed out, is something like heaven. Everyone wants to end there, but no one is in a hurry to get there.

This observation rests upon a host of fears. West Germany fears that the test ban treaty signed by Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union may prove a kind of a Munich. The British fear that German obsession with reunification could produce a Gaullist Western Europe.

Meanwhile, the United States confidently believes that European progress toward unity, in spite of its difficulties, has been among the most constructive and promising achievements of the postwar period.

A united Europe would eliminate the frictions and jealousies that have been the cause of so many past conflicts—conflicts that on two occasions have embroiled the entire world in catastrophe.

It should thus be able to play the role of an equal partner with the United States, carrying its full share of the common responsibilities imposed by history on the economically advanced people of the free world.

The basis for such a partnership is hard economic fact: In the North Atlantic world—Western Europe and North America—90 percent of all free world industrial strength is concentrated, as well as the great bulk of the free world's technical skill and knowledge.

These combined resources must be put to the defense and advancement of the free world.

In his historic speech July 4 last year at Philadelphia, President Kennedy pointed out that the nations of Western Europe, long divided by feuds more bitter than any which existed among the Thirteen Colonies, are joining together, seeking to find freedom in diversity and unity in strength.

After asserting that the building of the Atlantic partnership will not be cheap or easily finished, the President spoke these stirring words:

"But I will say here and now on this day of independence that the United States will be ready for a declaration of interdependence—that we will be prepared to discuss with a united Europe the ways and means of forming a concrete Atlantic partnership.

MONTICELLO COLLEGE, ILLINOIS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on October 18, there will be a dedication in the little town of Godfrey, Ill., of a new hall for Monticello College, which was established when Martin Van Buren was President of the United States and the 24th Congress was in session. That cultural enterprise has been continued from that day to this, and has been sustained without any Government assistance. I submit a concurrent resolution commemorating that fact.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas in 1835, during the administration of President Martin Van Buren and while the 24th Congress was in session, Monticello College for Girls was founded at Godfrey, Illinois, as a private educational institution; and

Whereas Monticello College has been a true and continuing example of free enterprise in the educational field; and

Whereas during the long period of its operation, Monticello College has met its responsibilities in the traditional American spirit by keeping fully abreast of progress in the cultural and classical fields, expanding its facilities without governmental assistance, contributing in constructive fashion to the cultural needs of the community which it serves, and serving as an inspiration to small colleges everywhere in their struggle to survive and meet the education needs of the day; and

Whereas Monticello College, with a student body of three hundred and fifty, has operated within a balanced budget, retired its bonded obligations, improved teachers' salaries, liberalized employee benefits, and strengthened its academic standards without the benefit of large donations and without public funds; and

Whereas on October 18, 1963, Monticello College will hold formal dedication ceremonies for a new facility to be known as Hatheway Hall in which it will sponsor professional programs as a part of its cultural services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives, concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby extends its greetings and felicitations to Monticello College at Godfrey, Illinois, upon the occasion of the dedication of Hatheway Hall on October 18, 1963, and expresses its recognition and appreciation of the achievements Monticello College has made in the educational field, the courage and vision of its trustees and faculty who have carried on in the great self-help tradition of America, and the example which it has set for educators and communities in all the land.

TAX BILL HEARINGS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this morning the Senate Finance Committee began hearings on the tax bill. In his opening statement, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the committee, made a factual statement showing the unfoldment, in time periods, of the recommendations for tax legislation and how long it required before the bill ever came before the Senate Finance Committee.

The statement has been very carefully prepared. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD

The Senate Finance Committee today is starting public hearings on H.R. 8363 to reduce individual and corporate income taxes and make numerous other changes in the Federal Tax Code.

The first witness in open session will be the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, who is here to advocate passage of the bill, discuss its provisions, and perhaps to suggest certain changes he thinks should be made.

Before the Secretary presents his statement, the Chair thinks it is appropriate briefly to review the rate of progress that has been made on this bill to date—both in the Finance Committee and elsewhere.

The facts are:

The President, in a message to Congress on April 21, 1961—30 months ago—announced that he had directed the Treasury Department to prepare recommendations for comprehensive tax legislation.

It took the executive branch 21 months to prepare the recommendations. They were made to Congress in the President's tax message of January 24, 1963.

The House Committee on Ways and Means—which implements the constitutional responsibility of the House of Representatives for originating revenue legislation—started hearings and consideration of the President's recommendations on February 6, 1963. That was 8 months ago.

The Ways and Means Committee reported a bill—previously unavailable to either the Finance Committee, or the public—on September 13. That was a month ago.

A week later on September 19, 1963, the House Rules Committee reported the tax bill to the floor of the House of Representatives.

The House debated the bill, under a closed rule, for 2 days—September 24 and 25.

The pending bill (H.R. 8363) was referred to the Senate Finance Committee on September 30. That was 15 days ago, including Saturdays and Sundays. The committee cleared its calendar of other matters on October 1, preparatory to consideration of the tax bill.

On the same day the committee determined procedure for consideration of the bill; and the procedure being followed was adopted by a committee vote of 12 to 4.

The procedure adopted represents virtually no change from committee practice on major tax legislation for 30 years to my knowledge, under Chairman Pat Harrison, Walter George, and Eugene Millikin.

The only variation in the procedure has been to start a briefing of committee members on provisions in the House bill by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The Secretary of the Treasury was advised of this change, and his reaction was favorable.

This is a major tax bill. It covers 304 pages. It contains 234 proposals to amend the complex tax code, and it would add 7 new provisions. It would involve every individual and corporate taxpayer in the country. It should not be considered lightly. It cannot be considered hurriedly.

The Finance Committee cannot overlook the fact that its members and the public—including the lawyers and accountants who represent taxpayers—have had relatively little opportunity to study the actual provisions in the bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee; and there have been no public hearings on them.

This committee has always given the public a reasonable opportunity to be heard on major legislation before it.

This was done last year when the administration's 1962 tax bill was before the Finance Committee, and the committee's examination led to substantial changes, some at the request of the administration, itself. And the bill was passed as amended.

The same procedure was followed, also last year, with respect to the administration's reciprocal trade expansion bill.

On August 13, 1962, more than a year ago, when the President, in a nationwide broadcast, said tax bill recommendations would be submitted to Congress in January 1963, he took the position that there was no need for a "quickie" tax bill at that time.

In that same broadcast he said there was no indication of a recession, and that there was "every reason for confidence."

He repeated these views in a major tax program speech before the New York Economic Club on December 14, 1962.

In his tax message of January 24, this year, the President said the revisions he proposed were "not motivated by any threat of imminent recession," and his recommendations could be met under the January 1, 1964 effective date in the bill, if enacted.

The Ways and Means Committee considered the President's recommendations over a period of some 7 months. It took 4,000 pages of testimony in 7 volumes.

To date the bill, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and passed by the House, has been before the Finance Committee 2 weeks. And, to date, some 140 requests for time to be heard have been received. Their testimony will be received in accordance with committee policy of long standing. The first of the witnesses in public hearing is Secretary Dillon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator in charge of the bill and in control of the time, would be willing to yield to me not to exceed 5 minutes, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have the Senate proceed to consider a joint resolution which is noncontroversial. I understand that it was reported favorably, from the subcommittee by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and from the full Committee on Banking and Currency by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. The joint resolution has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield.

ADDITIONAL HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be set aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 539, House Joint Resolution 724.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 724) to provide additional housing for the elderly.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement covering the details of this particular measure, which I understand was reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

House Joint Resolution 724, as amended by the committee, would authorize the appropriation of an additional $50 million for loans to nonprofit corporations and consumer cooperatives to provide housing for the elderly. Of the $25 million authorized in existing law, $150 million has been appropriated, all of which has been committed. The budget requests for fiscal year 1964 included $125 million for this program. The $50 million which would be authorized by House Joint Resolution 724, as amended, is needed to supplement the remaining $75 million authorized under existing law to meet this request. A letter from the Housing and Home Finance Agency expressing the administration endorsement of the resolution is included in this report.

Committee action

As introduced, House Joint Resolution 724 would have authorized the appropriation of $75 million, the amount originally requested by the administration at the time of the budget message. Since then it has been found that the carryover of existing authorization from the previous fiscal year was larger than expected so that only $50 million would be needed for the rest of this fiscal year and the committee amendment reduced the new authorization accordingly.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

Section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 authorized a new program of direct loans on liberal terms to provide housing for elderly people designed to meet their special needs at rents which they can afford. The interest rate on these loans, currently 3⅝ percent, is set by a formula which reflects the cost of money to the Government, and the term may be as long as 50 years. Eligible sponsors are limited to nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and certain public bodies (excluding public housing authorities). This financing makes it possible to provide housing which rents for approximately $20 a month less per dwelling unit than projects financed through regular private sources. There has been a marked increase in activity under the program since enactment of the Housing Act of 1961. In the past 2½ years cumulative applications have risen from 5,000 units to over 36,000 units and 98 percent of the fund reservations under the program have been made in this period.

The housing for the elderly direct loan program is administered by the Community Facilities Administration in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The housing is designed and constructed to meet the physical and other special needs of the elderly. To carry out the provision in the law that the program should serve the needs of those of modest income, eligibility for occupancy has been limited by administrative action to elderly couples whose incomes range between $2,500 and $4,800 a year and for single elderly persons whose incomes are between $2,000 and $4,000 a year.

As of July 31, 1963, the program showed the following progress:

	Projects	Units	Federal loan
Loan reservation (net)	125	13,149	$149,005 000
Final loan agreements	68	6,357	70,421,000
Under construction	24	2,721	32,508,000
Completed	18	1,033	10,364,000

It should be pointed out that there is no conflict between this program and the assistance for housing for the elderly provided by FHA mortgage insurance under section 231 of the National Housing Act. The FHA insurance program which is available to regular profitmaking sponsors, as well as nonprofit organizations, is designed to help those who can afford the higher rents required under private financing. In contrast, the direct loan program is restricted to those of modest incomes who frequently find it impossible to obtain suitable housing without this kind of assistance.

NEED FOR HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

By 1980, it is anticipated that there will be at least 30 million people 62 years of age and over, compared to 21 million at present. A far greater proportion of senior citizens live in inferior housing than is true of younger persons. One-fourth of those 60 and over do not have housing of their own but live with relatives, in lodging houses, or in institutions. The available evidence indicates that older people live with their relatives generally not from choice, but because of financial necessity or need for some care. Of those who live in their own homes where the head of the family is 65 years of age or over, 30 percent live in homes which are in dilapidated or deteriorated condition or lack some or all plumbing facilities. In addition, many elderly people live in housing which is standard but unsafe for them, too large, too costly to maintain, and inefficient for the special needs that occur with age.

As a group, the aged of the Nation are in the low or moderate income categories. The median money income of the people over 65 is only half of that of those under 65. About half of the elderly families have an income less than $3,000 a year including a third with less than $2,000 a year. At the other end of the scale, only 16 percent have more than $7,000 a year. Single individuals are in the most desperate category—half of them have less than $1,050 a year.

The direct loan program fills an important need in this field. For many families this kind of aid represents the only opportunity to find housing with the design features needed by the elderly and which is in a suitable area with congenial neighbors. In fact, many of the existing projects have been sponsored by churches, cooperatives, and groups, such as teachers associations, which assures the success of the projects both financially and in terms of the satisfaction of our senior citizens who live there.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. I yield.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. I understand that there has been a reduction in the amount that would be authorized.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. The joint resolution is in the nature of a stopgap measure until the subject can have further examination.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. The Senator is correct. It is my further understanding that the joint resolution has been brought in line with the resolution as it passed the House.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 724) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. **DIRKSEN**. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished majority leader would like now to indicate to the Senate the measures that will be pursued during the next few days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, due to a misunderstanding, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], who intended to make some speeches yesterday, seems to have been foreclosed because of the leadership agreement to go over to Tuesday and not to meet yesterday.

In all fairness to the Senator from North Carolina, who has been most cooperative and helpful, I believe he should be assured that he will have available as much time as he needs to bring out the points that he wishes, regardless of the limitation to which the Senate has agreed.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the majority leader for his generosity.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I believe the Senator gave me the same assurance. Obviously I shall require more time than is available under the unanimous-consent agreement. When I discussed the subject with the majority leader, he indicated to me very definitely that such time as I might need would be available.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. Additional time will be available.

Mr. President, the Senate will consider all day today Calendar No. 535, the bill H.R. 6143, to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions. Because of unusual personal circumstances, it is anticipated, with the concurrence of the minority leader and the Senate as a whole, that at the conclusion of business today—and I hope the session will be a long one—that the pending business will be put over until Monday next.

It is anticipated that tomorrow the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 534, S. 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes.

Following consideration of Calendar No. 534, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following bills, though not necessarily in the order in which I shall state them:

Calendar No. 423, S. 1543, to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency or any similar agency.

Calendar No. 424, H.R. 4638, to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President.

Calendar No. 458, S. 283, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956.

Calendar No. 482, House Joint Resolution 192, relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years.

There are other measures on the calendar. I believe the total number is 18. But because of various holds and questions which have been raised, at the moment the leadership is not prepared to say that they will be brought up this week, although I should like a little leeway in that respect.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The pending bill will then be laid aside at the end of today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Tomorrow the Senate will proceed to consider the water pollution bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. I hope we shall be able to dispose of as many amendments as possible to the bill H.R. 6143 today, and that no Senator will take advantage of the fact that, because of circumstances over which no one had any control, the bill must be put over until the following Monday at the conclusion of today's business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I most respectfully inform the distinguished majority leader that tonight there will be a testimonial dinner given for our great former President, General Eisenhower. I believe it starts at a reasonably early hour. I make that statement only to provide a guideline with relation to the end of the session today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall keep that event in mind and do what we can to see that the proper precautions are taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New York.

FOREIGN AID ASSISTANCE TO LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it may be received out of order, a concurrent resolution on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] calling for the denial of diplomatic recognition and the canceling of U.S. assistance programs to regimes established by military juntas, and also authorizing the President to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in Latin America in the protection of its territorial integrity and political independence from aggression or subversion by any nation or from any source controlled by international communism.

The analogy between my resolution and the resolution relating to the repelling of communism from the Near East is a very real one. My reason for submitting the resolution, together with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], which is a sense resolution is that our problem in Latin America is not only to discourage military takeovers of constitutionally elected governments, but also to prevent a Communist infiltration or subversion which can succeed as a military takeover, or otherwise, to enable the government in office, under the constitution of a particular country, to appeal to the United States for help before it is ousted by a military coup. That is precisely the character and intent of the resolution with respect to the Near East.

It seems to me that to "lock the door after the horse has been stolen" is not the full remedy that we need, namely, to deny recognition and to cancel aid programs. Nations which find their constitutional governments jeopardized ought to have the right to turn to the United States for help before they are in an irretrievable situation. I make that statement because classically in history military juntas, which deprive the people of any hope of self-determination and self-government, inevitably turn to extremism, either of the right or the left. Castroism being what it is in Latin America, the danger of leftist takeovers following takeovers by military juntas is real.

So the resolution which I submit is a "sense" resolution. It differs from the idea of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] for an absolute prohibition of aid to the junta takeover governments which he will propose as an amendment to the foreign aid bill. The Senator finds it entirely consistent also to express the sense of the Congress in the form in which I have proposed to the Senate.

I hope very much that the subject will have the urgent consideration it deserves. A great part of Latin America is in jeopardy. There have been too many military takeovers in recent months, capped by those in the Dominican Republic and in Honduras. The way to deal with the problem is not only to make it unprofitable for the regimes which take over, but also to give the President, at the request of a constitutional government, the authority to utilize every resource of the United States to help that government before it is taken over.

It may well be that the President has the type of authority I have mentioned here under the constitution, but Presidents are reluctant to invoke such authority without the assurance that Congress is in back of them. The consideration of this sense-of-the-Congress resolution is to enable the Congress to propose to the President the policy which it will support in Latin America.

The dangers are real and present, and I am convinced that our present stand and policy are inadequate to meet them. Therefore, I have offered this resolution as an opportunity for considering a new and more effective policy.

Mr. President, I hope the concurrent resolution will have consideration by the Senate and early action—perhaps on the foreign aid bill, to which it could be offered as an amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the concurrent resolution and an editorial entitled "Limiting Foreign Policy" from the New York Times of October 15 may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the constitutionally elected governments of the Dominican Republic, Honduras and of four other Latin American nations have been overthrown by military force within the last eighteen months; and

Whereas a prime objective of the United States in its Alliance for Progress program and in its relations with the nations of Latin America is to strengthen freedom by upholding the right of self-determination, respect for constitutions and the authority of elected legitimate governments; and

Whereas control by military juntas undermines the confidence of the people in self-determination and constitutional government, creates instability and establishes conditions fertile for subversion or infiltration by the forces of international communism which are present and are seeking just such opportunities in Latin America; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of Congress that diplomatic recognition of regimes established by military juntas should be denied and U.S. assistance programs should be cancelled; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be and hereby is authorized, consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and the actions and recommendations of the Organization of American States and the United Nations, to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in Latin America in the protection of its territorial integrity and political independence from aggression or subversion by any nation or from any source controlled by international communism.

SEC. 2. The authority of this joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of Latin America are reasonably assured by international conditions created by actions of the Organization of American States, the United Nations or otherwise; or sooner by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The editorial presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

LIMITING FOREIGN POLICY

Congressional encroachments on the Chief Executive's conduct of foreign policy can be harmful—even dangerous—through limiting his flexibility of decision and action. The most recent development in this direction is Senator WAYNE MORSE's well-intentioned amendment to the foreign aid bill to prohibit Alliance for Progress assistance to those Latin American countries where legitimate governments have been overthrown by the military.

It can be conceded that such countries should normally not be recipients of U.S. aid, but a congressional prohibition is not the way to handle the matter. There should, at the very least, be a discretionary clause leaving it up to the President to decide when and if a ban on such aid is to be applied. It would be still better if the Senate confined itself to a resolution, merely giving its opinion.

Last year the Hickenlooper amendment was attached to the foreign aid bill. It provided for stopping aid altogether to countries where American properties were confiscated without compensation or negotiation within 6 months. Thanks to a loophole, it was possible to avoid the application of this amendment in the case of Brazil, but not in the case of Ceylon. Another problem may now arise with Argentina, where the new Illia government, which the United States wants to help, is planning measures against American oil investments.

Congress also legislated last year to prevent most-favored-nation treatment from being extended to Communist Poland and Yugoslavia. The measure was fortunately amended to give the President discretionary power in respect to the two countries; but this year the bill as it now stands, after passage by the House, again contains such a prohibition. Presumably, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will modify it, but meanwhile our relations with Eastern Europe are unnecessarily hampered and the President is helpless.

Measures of this sort are indirect ways of making foreign policy. Under our system of government, it is for the President, assisted by the State Department and other executive agencies, and not for Congress, to be primarily responsible for the conduct of foreign affairs.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said, Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute from the time on the bill, to comment upon the "sense" resolution on military juntas in Latin America about which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] spoke. As the Senator knows, I am delighted to associate myself with him on the resolution he has submitted. I agree with every observation the Senator made.

KONRAD ADENAUER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the retirement of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer marks the end of an era in world history as well as in the history of Germany. He has served his nation in a critically historic hour with dignity and distinction, and we in the United States—especially those of us in political life—appreciate the great contribution he has made in advancing the aims of the Western Alliance and in strengthening the cause of peace throughout the world.

In the days when the contrast between the new Germany and the old Germany was being weighed in the balance, this extraordinary devotion and dedication to the finest traditions of the free world proved equal to the challenge. Chancellor Adenauer faced many difficult decisions: on the questions of postwar rehabilitation and readjustment, on restitution for Jews and others whom the Nazi regime had so wantonly destroyed and despoiled, on the reunification of Germany and on the freedom of Berlin. Under his leadership Germany has returned to the family of democratic nations as a powerful and increasingly respected member. The free world was fortunate indeed to have had at the helm in Germany during these decisive postwar decades a man with the outstanding abilities and wisdom and vision of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. We honor him for his love of freedom and wish him many more years of good health and productive life in which to see his efforts come to full fruition.

Many fine tributes have been paid to Chancellor Adenauer and I am sure that further tributes will be made here on the Senate floor; the German magazine Der Spiegel has published a special edition dedicated to the career of the Chancellor. Many of our outstanding Americans have contributed statements of tribute to Dr. Adenauer to this special edition. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statements of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Ambassador David K. E. Bruce, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Gen. Lauris Norstad, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon, and Henry R. Luce, publisher of Time, Life, and Fortune, which appeared in Der Spiegel, Hamburg, on October 9.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Replying to your telegram, it is a privilege to express through your magazine, a simple tribute to my good friend Konrad Adenauer, as he relinquishes the post of Chancellor of the German Federated Republic. The laying down of his high office by Chancellor Adenauer will mark the passing from official life of a towering international figure. As the postwar leader of his nation he has stood firmly with those of all nations who have championed human liberty and dignity and have opposed Communist penetration in whatever guise it might assume. I have long admired, respected and liked the Chancellor and have profited immeasurably from his keen analyses of international problems and his wise counsel concerning desirable courses of action. With his myriad of friends and admirers I salute the inspiring record of leadership he has left to freedom-loving people everywhere and wish him many years of happiness in his retirement.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

I am delighted over the opportunity to pay tribute to Chancellor Adenauer as he retires from office.

It is almost impossible to overestimate the contribution he has made not only to his country, but to the world, by his successful conduct of the foreign relations of the Federal Republic of Germany.

No statesman could have been confronted by more difficult problems which, for solution, demanded the highest gifts of political imagination, as well as the exercise of the sternest attributes of character. He is entitled more than any other man to credit for the restoration of Germany to respectable partnership with its former enemies; he has been an indispensable and constructive architect of European unity; he has unfailingly promoted intimate ties between Germany and the other free nations.

The role of his achievements is impressive and lengthy; his eminent place in history is secure.

I should like to add a few comments of another description. No one who has been on terms of friendship with the Chancellor could have failed to appreciate the magnetism of his personality. His courtesy is in the grand manner; his wit uncommonly keen; his palate for food and wine extraordinarily discriminating; his knowledge, judgment and love of classical painting noteworthy; his hospitality delightful. Dr. Adenauer, amongst his pictures or his roses, at a convivial table, in his family circle, playing bowls, or conversing with friends at his ease, is as attractive a figure as one could contemplate.

His religious instincts are intense, his convictions profound, especially on the subject of the dignity of the individual and man's right to liberty and freedom in an orderly society.

I think that any biographer should not neglect in appraising the political achievements of the Chancellor to evaluate the part played in them by his quality of personal charm.

DAVID K. E. BRUCE.

It is good to have the chance to join in paying tribute to one of the truly great men of our times. It is fitting indeed that homage be paid to Chancellor Adenauer on the occasion of his retirement from office. He has clearly been a strong guiding hand in the rebuilding of Germany both materially and as a bastion of democracy in Western Europe. During the dark days following 1945, he has been a rallying figure and an inspiring influence in encouraging others to make the hard upward pull in Germany. Since that time he has symbolized the new Germany, devoted to peace and determined to respond to its finest humanitarian traditions.

I have the greatest admiration and respect for the Chancellor and extend to him my best wishes for health and happiness.

Henry Cabot Lodge.

I am glad to learn that Der Spiegel plans a special issue to honor Chancellor Adenauer as he relinquishes his office after 14 years of service.

It is difficult to find words to pay tribute to Chancellor Adenauer, as the Federal Republic of Germany is his lasting monument. Of course, it was not his work alone but it was his leadership which made possible the almost unbelievable accomplishments of the new republic.

It has been my privilege to have known Chancellor Adenauer for more years than the life of the republic; I have witnessed his contribution to the writing of the basic law and in the creation of a strong and prosperous country which has allied itself with the free nations of the world. As Chancellor, he has not only helped to build a strong and prosperous Germany, but has also helped immeasurably to strengthen the free world.

His contributions have been so many that it is impossible to select even a few of the more significant. Perhaps it can best be said that most certainly the history of the past 14 years might have been quite different if it had not been for him, and the strong free world of today might well not exist in its present strength.

With many others, I admire and respect his statesmanship. I have also felt and appreciated his friendship. I know he will continue to hold the respect and affection of the German people and of those who love freedom everywhere, and that his wise counsel will continue to be valued throughout the free world.

Lucius Clay.

No words of mine are adequate to add to the tribute that has already been paid to Chancellor Adenauer. I can only say a personal thank you to this great leader of Germany, of Europe, and of the West for his understanding, for his direction and advice, and for his friendship throughout the years I was charged with the defense of Europe. With his strength he has added to the power of the alliance, under his guidance a great nation has firmly reestablished itself in the society of free peoples. He has been a director, as well as a major player, in the drama of current history. The world is indebted to him.

Lauris Norstad.

I was delighted to learn that Der Spiegel is planning a special edition of its publication to honor Chancellor Adenauer as he retires from the chancellorship and goes to a highly deserved respite from the arduous labors which were his.

I remembered his first visit to the United States and how royally he was acclaimed not merely for the great work he did in pulling together and vitalizing the Federal Republic of West Germany, but what an impressive contribution he made to the stability of the entire continent of Europe and its salutary reverberations in all parts of the world.

It was our pleasure to entertain him in the great city of Chicago and his visit there was marked with great acclaim.

As he turned over the command to his worthy successor he will have time to reflect upon the good work he has wrought and it will be as a constant source of inspiration and comfort to him, his associates, and to the German people.

May all life's choicest blessings be his in the days ahead and may he be spared for many years to share his wisdom, his prudence, and his judgment not only with his fellow countrymen, but with all others for the benefit of mankind.

Everett M. Dirksen.

I welcome this opportunity to join in your commemorative issue tribute to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer.

He has truly been one of the few giants on the world scene during these troubled times. Millions of Americans of both our political parties feel a deep sense of loss as he leaves his post as Chancellor of the Federal Republic.

His decision to continue to provide guidance and leadership for his party is most reassuring, particularly since this is a time when the free world will continue to need his moral strength and wisdom.

Richard Nixon.

Labuntur anni, says the poet, and for few men of our time have the years run with such historic distinction as for Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany for 14 years and more, architect of his nation's massive new structure, benefactor of our Judaeo-Christian culture, and my good friend.

Building upon the ruins of war called for more than political skill and fortitude, more than ready wit and a capacity for wise and honorable compromise. It called for more basic virtues—devotion to principle, good humor in the face of reverses, patience, religious faith and a deep understanding of the nature of man. These and many other attributes of greatness have made the leadership of Konrad Adenauer an inspiration to millions of people of many nations. It is good to know that in relinquishing his high office he will still go on in public service, as a member of his nation's national legislature.

Henry R. Luce.

BRIDGE LINKING SUFFOLK COUNTY, N.Y., WITH NEW ENGLAND

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about what could become a great project—the possibility of construction of a new interstate bridge linking the eastern end of Long Island with Connecticut and Rhode Island.

Recently there has been considerable interest in Long Island, N.Y., particularly in Suffolk County, in the construction of a new interstate bridge extending from Orient Point, Long Island, to Groton Point, Conn., and Nepatree Point, R.I. There has also been some discussion of such a project in Rhode Island. At this time my staff is exploring the possibilities of initial Federal action with the staff of my colleague [Senator Keating] and of the Senators from Rhode Island and Connecticut.

The future possibilities of such an interstate bridge system may be awesome. One Suffolk County official predicted that the first blow of a sledge hammer to start construction on the bridge span would signal "the dawn of a whole new industry" in the county. Construction of such a bridge would not only alleviate tremendous New York traffic problems but also would create new jobs in the building industries of the States concerned and new positions in all types of commercial enterprises in the areas. The creation of new construction jobs for Long Island would do much for Long Island's economic situation.

Yesterday, my colleague [Mr. Keating] and I requested the Federal Highway Administrator of the Bureau of Public Roads to undertake whatever studies may be necessary, and to advise us whether the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce would be prepared to conduct a feasibility study on the proposed bridge construction. I am hopeful that such a feasibility study may be conducted and look forward to constructive efforts by all the States involved in behalf of meaningful work on a bridge linking Suffolk County with New England.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an article appearing in Newsday, October 10, 1963, on this proposed interstate bridge project, connecting New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island; and also an article appearing in the New York Times today on action taken by the Suffolk County Board of Supervisors in connection with this proposed bridge.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Newsday, Oct. 10, 1963]

SENATOR BACKS BRIDGE TO RHODE ISLAND

(By Robert A. Caro)

Senator Claiborne Pell, Democrat, of Rhode Island, said last night that construction of a bridge linking Suffolk County with New England is inevitable. And a Suffolk official predicted that the first blow of a sledgehammer to start construction on the huge span would signal the dawn of a whole new industry in the county.

Pell, in a statement issued by his Washington office, said the proposed bridge would "offer economic benefits and more accessibility of transportation and communication" to Rhode Island as well as to Suffolk. "A project of this magnitude can be somewhat controversial," the Senator declared, "but I believe that overall advantages are in its favor. I think that the eventual construction of the bridge is inevitable, although a great deal more study and thought have to be given to planning and a means of financing."

Suffolk Planning Director Lee E. Koppelman said the job of constructing the bridge would be so big that it would create a minimum of 4,000 new construction jobs on Long Island. "Let's forget about the potentialities of the bridge for just a minute," Koppelman said. "Let's just talk about the bridge itself. Building it would take a minimum of 6 years and 8,000 new jobs would be created. If only 4,000 of those jobs went to Long Island, there would be a minimum payroll to these men of $30 million over 6 years."

"And," Koppelman said, "that's just the direct payroll. A good portion of this money would be spent in Suffolk. It would generate about 6,000 new jobs in retail stores, restaurants, gas stations, bowling alleys, home building, and the clothing industry. This would pyramid the thing into one of the prime industries of Suffolk County. It would be the dawn of a whole new industry."

The creation of 4,000 new construction jobs, observers feel, would also give a lift to Suffolk's sagging construction industry. In a recent series, Newsday disclosed that home building, the key to the construction industry, was slumping in Suffolk because the county was not generating enough manufacturing jobs to maintain the rapid pace of its population growth. John E. "Buddy" Long, president of the Nassau-Suffolk Building & Construction Trades Council, estimated that at least 15,000 of the council's 80,000 members are currently unemployed.

Last night, Long said that the 4,000 jobs the bridge would create would be a tremendous thing for Long Island. "The bridge would bring industry to the Island," he said. "It would take an awful lot of traffic away from New York. And it would absorb a lot of our unemployed, particularly in the East End, where we need construction. It will mean jobs for all types of construction workers, from operating engineers to ironworkers, from the metallic lathers to the laborers, from the cement mason to the bricklayers—in fact, to most of the trades in the building trades council."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Oct. 14, 1963]

STUDY FOR BRIDGE URGED BY SUFFOLK—SURVEY BY UNITED STATES AND THREE STATES OF NEED FOR LINK TO MAINLAND IS ASKED

RIVERHEAD, LONG ISLAND, October 14.—The Suffolk County Board of Supervisors asked three States and the Federal Government today to study the feasibility of a bridge across Long Island Sound from eastern Suffolk to Connecticut and Rhode Island.

The proposed structure, discussed by planners and commerce groups for many years as a way to end Long Island's dead end status, had never been officially endorsed before today's action at the board's meeting.

A resolution was submitted to the board by Lester M. Albertson, supervisor of Southold Township. The 24-mile bridge would run from Orient Point on the eastern tip of Suffolk's North Fork and "island hop" over Plum Island, Great and Little Gull Islands and Fishers Island to Groton Long Point, Conn., or Napatree Point, R.I.

County Executive H. Lee Dennison, a strong supporter of the proposal, said that a private engineering company recently estimated that the bridge would cost $260 million and that construction would take 8 to 10 years.

WORK PROJECTS URGED

Also at today's meeting representatives of labor urged the supervisors to accelerate the public works program to lift employment in the building trades. A spokesman said that 20,000 are unemployed in the construction trades.

The delegates also asked the supervisors to ease zoning restrictions so developers could build less expensive houses. Restricting building plots to one-half acre and larger could cause builders to leave the county, the board was told.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator for the time he has yielded to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDENT** Pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending question?

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, conforming to the suggestion made by the distinguished majority leader, I am prepared to yield, from the time on the bill, 1 hour to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would withhold for just a moment. I wish to be sure this meets with the approval of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], because I am under commitment to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement, which will take only 2 or 3 minutes, and then I shall be happy to follow that course.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has agreed to be a cosponsor of my amendment. As all Senators know, the Senator from Connecticut is a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and is fully cognizant of the crisis which confronts higher education in America at the present time. Moreover, he has experienced the frustrations of seeing no legislation enacted because of an inability of the two bodies of Congress to agree.

Because the Senator realizes the crisis is so desperate that a bill must be enacted this year, he has decided to collaborate with me in support of my amendment, and I am delighted to receive his support. The Senator, of course, will speak for himself later.

Mr. President, at the outset of the proceedings I wish to say a word about the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the chairman of the Education Subcommittee. Through the years we have worked shoulder to shoulder on many education questions, and our views have coincided more often than not. He has been a dedicated man in every sense of the word, and I have found it a pleasure to serve under his leadership.

This year, as was true last year, we seek the same objective—a higher education law. Though we differ on the legislative strategy which should be followed and with respect to the type of legislation which should be approved, we both wish to aid our institutions of higher learning. I regret that we must take opposite sides on some issues today, because I like working with the Senator from Oregon. I want him to know, and I want the Senate to know, if he should prevail rather than I on the question of which bill the Senate should pass, I shall go right down to the wire with him in support of higher education.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from the time on the bill I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 4 minutes.

AN INFECTION IN THE DEMOCRATIC PROCESS: MAIL ON THE FREIGHT FORWARDER LEGISLATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on June 6, 1963, S. 684, which would permit freight forwarders to acquire rail, motor, and water common carriers, was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Commerce. Since no minority report was filed, there seemed little likelihood that there would be much dispute over this legislation and that the bill would be approved in short order.

My first suspicions regarding this bill were aroused when almost 3,000 telegrams in support of it descended upon my office. As the Senator from a State with more than 17½ million people, I am used to a lot of mail. Most of it is extremely helpful and thoughtful. Some of it, of course, depending on the issues, falls clearly into the organized pressure variety. With the avalanche of telegrams on S. 684 all arriving within a 24-hour period, it was obvious that this was the case with the communications in support of S. 684.

I proceeded to examine the legislation in great detail. Having examined S. 684, I found it wanting in many respects. While there was seeming logic to the legislation, since common carriers can now acquire freight forwarders but freight forwarders are prohibited from acquiring common carriers, the superficiality of this logic becomes readily apparent when one considers what the role of the freight forwarder should be. In my judgment, a freight forwarder must be sufficiently independent to secure for the shipper which utilizes his services the most appropriate and efficient mode of transportation to meet the shipper's needs. I fail to see how the freight forwarder can do this if he has a vested interest in a particular mode of transportation. Other Senators voiced similar reservations. As a result, S. 684, which was before the Senate for debate, was temporarily set aside from further consideration and remains to this day on the calendar.

Mr. President, we are all used to pressure mail. We respect a vigorous opinion, whether it be in support of or opposed to our own judgment on a particular issue. In fact, mail on a specific technical issue such as that involved in our transportation laws usually carries more weight than the mail on issues with which we have a long-standing familiarity and experience. Continuous two-way communication between the elected and the elector is the heart of the democratic process of this Republic. Each American citizen has a basic constitutional right to petition his government and those who represent him. It is one thing to receive an opinion from a fellow citizen, however, and it is quite another to find out subsequent to the resolution of a particular issue that the letter, telegram, or communication received did not, in fact, come from the individual whose name had been affixed to it. This is desecration of the democratic process. It is despicable conduct at best. With regard to the passage of S. 684, it appears that an organized attempt was made by unknown individuals or groups to mislead this Senator and possibly other Senators into believing that there was overwhelming support for this legislation in our States. In reality, this supposed support appeared to be phony when the letters began returning, in response to my acknowledgement of their original communication, from the person whose name had been originally used. These citizens wrote to me that they had never written or wired me in support of S. 684; indeed, from what they knew of the bill, some of them stated that they were completely opposed to it.

Mr. President, upon consulting with the Federal Communications Commission and the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, I find that there is no Federal law which covers this matter—the misuse of one's name on a communication to his elected representative. In the last session of the California Legislature it was made a misdemeanor under State law to send such a communication to a newspaper. I suggest that it is time for the Congress to remedy this situation. I intend to introduce such legislation and I hope that other Senators will join with me in eradicating this evil which occasionally infects the democratic process of this Republic.

Mr. President, so that the record may be perfectly clear on this matter, I ask unanimous consent that some of the original communications sent to me—supposedly in support of this legislation—be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as the letter I subsequently received in response to my reply, since they demonstrate that the names which were used in urging me to support this bill were used fraudulently, and with complete and willful falsification.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 15, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Freight forwarders are entitled to equal rights with other forms of transportation. Please support S. 684.

ROBERT HANKOFF,
Old Town Corp.
NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

OLD TOWN RIBBON &
CARBON CO., INC.
OF CALIFORNIA,
Van Nuys, Calif., August 1, 1963.

Mr. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter regarding my support for S. 684 considered for action in the Senate.

I have no idea of the merits or lack of merits in this particular legislation nor did I communicate with you in any way regarding it. As a matter of curiosity I would like to know how you got my name as being a supporter of this bill, for evidently someone is using my name without my permission.

I regret that I must use the time of your office personnel for a matter so small but I feel that the use of my name without authorization is something that requires immediate action.

I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation to you for a job well done in representing the interests of our State.

Sincerely,
ROBERT R. HANKOFF.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF,
June 18, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Equal rights must exist in transportation. Urge your enthusiastic support to S. 684 favoring freight forwarders.

LYLE SALISBURY.
UPLAND, CALIF.

ONTARIO, CALIF., *July 15, 1963.*

Mr. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: On July 8th you wrote a letter to me at my home, 1192 Winston Court, Upland, Calif., relative to S. 684.

On July 26 I also received a letter from CLAIR ENGLE thanking me for a telegram relative to S. 684.

To the best of my knowledge I never sent either of you any letters or telegrams. Further I am completely in the dark as to what S. 684 is about, other than in CLAIR ENGLE'S letter it states it affects freight forwarders.

Could someone in your office check to see if my "request" was in letter form, telegram or what and if on file would you mail me a photostat copy?

I would appreciate also a condensed copy of S. 684 to read.

Somewhere along the line I hope to find out who used my name falsely so we may eliminate the use of one freight carrier.

Anything you can do to help us out will be appreciated.

Yours truly,
DON RANCHO, INC.
LYLE P. SALISBURY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 18, 1963.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly request passage S. 684 providing equal rights freight forwarders with others in transportation industry.

ROBERT L. ANDERSON.
HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIF.

DEAR SENATOR: I did not write, wire, or phone. Would be interested in knowing who is using my name to further their interest.

Cordially,
ROBERT L. ANDERSON.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Sacramento, Calif.:

Request your support S. 684 to equalize all modes of transportation.

RICHARD SHERER.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
July 17, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I am in receipt of your letter of July 10, 1963. Unfortunately, I have no recollection of inquiring about proposed bill S. 684. Will you kindly send me a copy of this bill for my enlightenment? What does it pertain to?

Thanking you in advance for your kind consideration, I am,

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD L. SHERER.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Passage S. 684 essential to maintaining balance in transportation of our products. Please support.

MIKE SPRAGUE.
LA HABRA, CALIF.

LA HABRA, CALIF.,
July 15, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUCHEL: Referring to your letter of July 8, 1963, in which you stated that I wrote you supporting legislation S. 684. I wish to go on record that I did not write you, in fact I have no knowledge of S. 684.

My wife and I are quite disturbed as we received a similar letter from Senator ENGEL thanking us for supporting legislation on freight rates. We have no knowledge of this bill either.

It appears that some one, or group, is trying to bring influence on these bills and is signing letters fraudulently.

If it is not presuming on your time I would appreciate hearing from you on this matter and bringing us up to date as to what S. 684 stands for.

Sincerely,
MIKE SPRAGUE.
LA HABRA, CALIF.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 14, 1963.*

Senator THOMAS KUCHEL,
Washington, D.C.:

Request your support for passage of bill S. 684 to remove inequalities in transportation industry and permit freight forwarders to acquire other modes of transportation. Motor carriers now have this right.

GILBERT & BARKER MANUFACTURING CO.
SAN FRANCISCO.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: The above file should be listed in the name of Bob Storch, a person. Our company, Gilbert & Barker Manufacturing Co., should not be involved.

I was asked my opinion and if my name (Bob Storch) could be used. To this I agreed but I cannot answer for my company.

Please make this correction in your files.

Yours very truly,
BOB STORCH.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
June 15, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Present law discriminates against freight forwarders. Support Senate bill 684.

GEORGE KELLEY,
Traffic Manager, A. H. Meyer Co.
SAN FRANCISCO.

A. H. MEYER CO.,
San Francisco, Calif., July 26, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator from California,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of July 17 acknowledging my communication concerning S. 684 legislation I want you to know I did not send any communication on this subject and did not authorize any one to do so.

I believe a U.S. Senator from California is capable of handling this type of legislation without my help.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE O. KELLEY.

Sacramento, Calif.,
June 4, 1963.

Hon. Thomas Kuchel,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please vote for passage of Senate bill 684.

At present the law only provides for certain type carriers to purchase other modes of transportation. This law will eliminate the discrimination against the freight forwarders.

Mr. G. Edwards,
Agent, Global Van Lines, Inc.
Sacramento, Calif.

Global Van Lines, Inc.,
Sacramento, Calif., August 5, 1963.

Re legislation S. 684, freight forwarders.
Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator.

Dear Senator Kuchel: Your letter came as somewhat of a surprise to me, as I did not, nor did I authorize anyone to send you a telegram regarding S. 684.

After some investigation, I find that quite some time ago, someone from Universal Carloading & Distributing Co., Inc., called this office to solicit a telegram in support of the freight forwarders position on S. 684. This solicitation came at a time when I was absent from the office and the conversation was held with my warehouse foreman, whom they duped into approving their sending and paying for the telegram.

It so happens that I am absolutely opposed to S. 684 and do not wish my name or the name of my corporation affiliated in any way with the support of the freight forwarders position on this bill.

I wish it made of record that no officer of this corporation authorized the sending of that telegram or sanctions the action of any employee who sent that telegram without corporate permission.

Sincerely yours,
Global Van & Storage Sacramento, Inc.
George Z. Edwards, *President.*

Los Angeles, Calif.,
June 19, 1963.

Senator Thomas Kuchel,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Freight forwarders are entitled to equal rights with other forms of transportation. Please support S. 684.

John Kraker.
Covina, Calif.

Covina, Calif.,
July 19, 1963.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kuchel: I recently received a letter from you stating of my support for S. 684. I must say that I have never written you on this measure or any other. I know nothing about the measure.

Therefore if you will mail me a copy of this bill S. 684 I will appreciate it.

Thank you kindly,
Yours very truly,
John J. Kraker.

San Francisco, Calif.,
June 19, 1963.

Senator Thomas H. Kuchel,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request your support for passage of Senate bill 684 to give freight forwarders same rights as truck companies.

Mr. and Mrs. G. Connell.
Oakland, Calif.

Oakland, Calif.,
September 9, 1963.

Gentlemen: Regarding your letter of July 8 in appreciation of my support of S. 684 legislation, would like you to know that I did not send any correspondence to you regarding same.

Is it not an illegal act to use other persons' names to pressure Senators into giving bills their support or rejection? Can not something be done to stop it?

We are interested citizens who would like to see that our names are not used without our permission.

Sincerely,
Mr. and Mrs. G. A. Connell.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education financing the instruction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I thank the Senator from Vermont for his kind remarks with regard to the way we have worked together on the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I paid my tribute to him last Friday, as the Record will show. In my judgment, we could not have done the work and accomplished what we have accomplished in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare if it had not been for the wonderful cooperation the Senator has always shown me and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill]. I thank him very much for it.

As the Senator from Vermont has said, our objectives are the same. We differ mostly with respect to the parliamentary procedure we should follow and the preference which should be given one version of a bill or the other. I think we are both going to give our support to the bill finally adopted.

To show the great influence the Senator from Vermont has on me, I make the announcement, although the amendment will be offered later, that there will be an amendment offered which I will take to conference; namely, title II, dealing with graduate study. I am informed that the amendment will be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. I know it will be proper for me to say for the committee that I will accept the amendment and take it to conference.

In my judgment, that is quite an accomplishment for the Senator from Vermont. He is responsible for no small measure of accomplishments, and he is responsible for it not as a concession on my part to the Senator from Vermont, but because he has convinced me that that is the approach that should be taken.

I would not go as far as the Senator from Vermont would want me to go by the adoption of the amendment he has offered, for the reasons set forth last Thursday and Friday.

So far as I am concerned, on most of the issues that will be raised, I have made my case. I have no intention of using my time. I shall, in 5 minutes, summarize my points with respect to the amendment. But, as I said in the cloakroom, and as I now repeat on the floor of the Senate, we either have the votes or we have not. All the arguments we make will not change the decision.

This legislation has been debated so frequently in the past several years on the floor of the Senate that, in my judgment, those of us in support of it need to say very little more except to give a capsule summarization of our position.

SUFFOLK BRIDGE FOR LONG ISLAND

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, my colleague referred to the proposed bridge linking Suffolk County in Long Island with Rhode Island and Connecticut.

There has been renewed interest throughout Long Island in the possibility of a bridge linking Orient Point in Suffolk County to Rhode Island and Connecticut. Newsday, in a provocative series entitled "Suffolk—The Sick Giant," has pinpointed transportation problems as a real drawback in Suffolk's expansion. The charm and isolation which for generations has made Suffolk County a summer home beloved by New Yorkers and others has given way to increased homebuilding and defense work. Yet the county still suffers from its lack of direct access to New England market areas.

The proposed bridge to Connecticut and Rhode Island would eliminate this difficulty and open the door to new income and expansion throughout the county. The interest of Suffolk County in closer ties with New England is a most encouraging sign of the enterprise and initiative which over the last decade have made Long Island one of the fastest growing parts of the country. The New England bridge deserves careful study. I believe it could become a most useful part of the Federal highway system, with very substantial long-term benefits for Suffolk County.

Mr. President, I am therefore contacting Rex Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, urging that he undertake whatever studies may be necessary in order to designate such a bridge as an integral part of the Interstate Highway System.

B'NAI B'RITH TO MARK 120TH ANNIVERSARY ON OCTOBER 13

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at a meeting 120 years ago in Sunsheimer's Cafe in New York, there was founded the world's oldest Jewish Service organization—B'nai B'rith—the Sons of the Covenant. On October 13, 1843, 12 Jews of German origin gathered there with the purpose of establishing an organization which would unite all Jews "in the work of promoting their highest interest, of inculcating the purest principles of philanthropy, honor, and patriotism."

Since that meeting, B'nai B'rith has grown and expanded into a world renowned organization. Because it transcends ethnic and cultural barriers, B'nai B'rith has become a rallying point for all Jews. In addition to creating a greater awareness of the Jewish heritage, B'nai B'rith has made numerous practical and vital contributions to our society. Back in the 1860's, B'nai B'rith answered Lincoln's call for volunteers to increase the ranks of the Union Army. Later, B'nai B'rith volunteers were cited for their distinguished service during the two World Wars. Furthermore, B'nai B'rith members aided the victims of the Baltimore flood in 1868, the Chicago fire in 1871, and the San Francisco earthquake in 1906. Forerunner of the American Red Cross, B'nai B'rith has helped those in need whatever their religion.

In connection with their community service activities, B'nai B'rith has organized the Anti-Defamation League to combat anti-Semitism in the United States and the Hillel Foundation which has been an active religious and cultural force on campuses throughout America.

Mr. President, I salute the B'nai B'rith Foundation on its 120th anniversary. I know I share the feelings of millions of Americans throughout the country in praising the many contributions this foundation has made to our society. On the eve of their yearlong celebration, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate B'nai B'rith on past achievements and to offer every good wish for future success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, following my remarks, an excellent survey by Milton Friedman of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency of B'nai B'rith, which has lived 120 years, the traditional lifespan of Moses, but which I am sure has only just begun its constructive work on earth.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

B'NAI B'RITH HAS LIVED TRADITIONAL LIFE SPAN OF MOSES—120 YEARS

(By Milton Friedman)

B'nai B'rith, marking its 120th anniversary, has not only transcended differences among Jews and created unity in diversity but has become an integral part of the American scene.

The 12 Jews who founded B'nai B'rith in October 1843, in a New York cafe, created a unifying Jewish force which now links almost 500,000 members in 40 countries. The founders also contributed a new factor to American life.

B'nai B'rith has become as American as baseball and Coca Cola. The history of the U.S. Jewish community is inseparable from that of B'nai B'rith.

FIRST OF ITS KIND

It was actually the first national service organization founded in America. It preceded such groups as the Salvation Army, Knights of Columbus, WCTU, Grange, Kiwanis, Rotary, and even the Daughters of the American Revolution.

B'nai B'rith organized the first disaster relief campaign by a national organization. This was for victims of a Baltimore flood in 1868. Jewish aid was given without regard to the religion or race beneficiaries. This occurred 13 years before the creation of the American National Red Cross.

The American Red Cross was founded by Clara Barton and her colleagues in the Washington home of Adolphus Solomons, a B'nai B'rith leader.

B'nai B'rith organized relief drives for victims of the great Chicago fire, San Francisco earthquake and scores of other catastrophies in America and abroad. Victims of the "potato famine" in Ireland received B'nai B'rith help.

IN CIVIL WAR

A single B'nai B'rith Chicago lodge outfitted and recruited 1,000 Jewish volunteers for Civil War service in the 82d Illinois Infantry Regiment. Only 250 survived.

The Pioneer American Hospital for research on tuberculosis and chest diseases was founded by B'nai B'rith at Denver. At Hot Springs, Ark., B'nai B'rith initiated the first important hospital center devoted to relief of arthritic victims. Both are nonsectarian, free hospitals for the needy.

U.S. CHAPLAIN

Abraham Lincoln was familiar with B'nai B'rith when he granted its request for appointment of the first U.S. Army chaplain of Jewish faith.

Earlier, in 1851, Secretary of State Daniel Webster used information provided by B'nai B'rith for intercession with Switzerland over an affront to the United States. It seems American tourists of Jewish faith were meeting with discrimination in some Swiss cantons. Switzerland alleviated the practice in response to Daniel Webster's complaint.

The preamble of the B'nai B'rith constitution sought to "unite persons of the Jewish faith in their highest interests, and those of humanity." Apart from its general humanitarian role, familiar to non-Jews, B'nai B'rith activated a spirit of K'lal Yisroel—Jewish brotherhood—especially on the American scene. B'nai B'rith linked Orthodox and Reform, Russian and German, Zionist and non-Zionist.

AID TO PALESTINE

As early as the 1860's, long before creation of the world Zionist structure, B'nai B'rith sent aid to the Jewish community in Palestine. The B'nai B'rith role was noted by David Ben-Gurion in 1959 when B'nai B'rith convened a world convention in Jerusalem.

American history reveals that B'nai B'rith opened the first Jewish community center—Covenant Hall in New York City—and the first Jewish library, both in 1852.

B'nai B'rith membership grew to include such diverse personages as Chaim Weizmann and Dr. Sigmund Freud.

Its activities in antidefamation, education, culture, youth work, intergroup relations, and so forth, are well known.

FINANCES U.S. CONSULATE

But less known is the role of B'nai B'rith in American foreign policy. President U. S. Grant deliberately selected a former B'nai B'rith president, Benjamin Franklin Peixotto, as American consul in Bucharest to show American repudiation of the anti-Semitism then rampant in Rumania. The State Department lacked funds for this consulate so expenses were financed by B'nai B'rith.

Another B'nai B'rith leader was Simon Wolf, known in Washington by various Presidents for 58 years. Mr. Wolf was appointed by President James A. Garfield to be U.S. consul general to Egypt. This was in 1881. Mr. Wolf was received by the Khedive in Cairo with royal splendor and cordiality. "I was sent for," he reported, "with a gilded coach, white Arabian horses, and the chamberlain of the Khedive to greet me."

Now that B'nai B'rith has lived "until 120 years," the traditional lifespan of Moses, it has not completed its work but only really just begun.

WISCONSIN TOP IN THE NATION'S DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Wisconsin Agriculturalist has recently disclosed figures from the Wisconsin crop reporting service showing that Wisconsin remains the No. 1 dairy State of the Union by a very wide margin. These impressive statistics support our desire to enact dairy legislation this year. The dairy bill passed last week is the first major dairy bill which has passed the Senate since 1949, and the first change in the Agricultural Marketing Act since 1937.

Wisconsin has a deep interest in this legislation. The latest figures show that Wisconsin produces 42 percent of all the American cheese produced in the United States; 50 percent of the Limburger cheese; 54 percent of the Italian cheese; three quarters, or 73 percent, of the blue mold cheese; 74.9 percent of the munster. Wisconsin produces about 15 percent of all the milk produced in the Nation.

Therefore, what happens to the dairy industry is of vital importance to our Nation's economy and to Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation and explanation from the Wisconsin Agriculturalist be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE STILL NO. 1

Wisconsin outranked all other States last year with 12 firsts in the output of manufactured dairy products. This was achieved by our dairy herds producing a record-breaking 18½ billion pounds of milk.

Two changes occurred from 1961 in Wisconsin's rank in dairy manufactures. The State's long-held first place in output of case evaporated whole milk fell to fifth place last year. But our rank in output of dry whole milk rose from fifth to fourth place.

Nearly 14 billion pounds of milk produced in Wisconsin last year were used for manufactured dairy products. Wisconsin's 1962 milk production accounted for 14 percent of the Nation's total. Milk used in making dairy products was 22 percent of the national total used for manufacturing.

Wisconsin's rank in the Nation's dairy industry, 1962

Product	Rank among States	Wisconsin production	Percent of United States
		Thousand pounds	
Butter	2	324, 569	21. 2
Cheese:			
American	1	464, 049	42. 4
Swiss	2	31, 618	28. 9
Munster	1	17, 497	74. 9
Brick	1	15, 613	66. 8
Limburger	1	1, 838	50. 8
Italian	1	89, 526	54. 1
Blue mold	1	10, 596	73. 0
Total cheese excluding cottage cheese	1	667, 540	42. 1
Condensed milk, bulk:			
Sweetened, whole	1	21, 237	41. 1
Sweetened, skim	1	22, 768	40. 1
Unsweetened, whole	4	32, 220	9. 1
Unsweetened, skim	1	112, 972	13. 9
Evaporated whole milk:			
Unsweetened, case	5	176, 668	9. 2
Dry products:			
Whole milk	4	10, 421	13. 2
Skim milk for human use	2	510, 206	22. 9
Skim milk for animal feed	2	5, 987	19. 8
Whey	1	94, 595	33. 4
Buttermilk	2	20, 342	23. 6
Malted milk powder	1	23, 111	100. 0
Ice cream (gallons)	9	23, 968	3. 4
Milk production	1	18, 301, 000	14. 5

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I now yield 1 hour on the bill to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I contend that the provisions of the bill relating to colleges and universities owned, controlled, or operated, by religious denominations are unconstitutional under the first amendment.

Moreover, I feel that the bill should be amended to remove from uncertainty the question whether there can be a judicial determination of the constitutionality of specific grants or loans which the Federal Commissioner of Education may attempt to make under the provisions of the bill.

To cure the constitutional infirmity in respect of the provisions of the bill relating to church owned, controlled, or operated, institutions of higher education, I have proposed two amendments which will be called up later for action. They are amendments Nos. 215 and 218.

I have also proposed an amendment which would make it certain that there could be a judicial determination of the constitutional validity of the specific grants or loans which the Commissioner of Education may propose to make under the bill.

I am delighted to state that the able and distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] has agreed to become a cosponsor of these proposed amendments, and I ask unanimous consent to have that fact recorded on the Record.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the willingness of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina to have me join as a cosponsor of the amendment. I think we both agree that we are dealing with a problem which is difficult for both of us, because I know he has been a distinguished advocate of all legitimate means to support educational institutions, as I have in my term in the Senate. Nevertheless, I agree that the bill presents squarely to the Congress a question which ought to be determined; that is, the question whether the first amendment prohibits financial Federal aid to church schools and institutions. I have studied this question with care. I have read the decisions which are applicable to it. Difficult as the decision may be, I have no doubt in my mind that the first amendment prohibits the kind of Federal aid which is proposed for religious colleges in the pending bill. I join with the Senator from North Carolina in his amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, let me analyze briefly the provisions of H.R. 6143 applicable to religious colleges and universities.

Part A of title I of H.R. 6143, which appears upon pages 37–49 of the Senate version, authorizes the appropriation of $900 million from Federal tax-raised funds for use as grants during the 5 fiscal years ending June 30, 1968.

Part B of title I of H.R. 6143, which appears on pages 50–55 of the Senate version, authorizes the appropriation of an additional $600 million from Federal tax-raised funds for use as loans during the same 5 fiscal years.

H.R. 6143 empowers the Federal Commissioner of Education to make grants and loans from such funds to institutions of higher education to assist them in acquiring lands and in constructing upon such lands or other lands owned by them what the bill calls academic facilities. Subsection (a)(1) of section 121 of the bill specifies, in substance, that the term academic facilities means buildings suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and the like for the instruction of students or for research.

The institutions of higher education now existing in the United States are divisible into these three categories:

First. Public colleges and universities.

Second. Private nonsectarian colleges and universities.

Third. Church owned, controlled, or operated colleges and universities.

The bill makes colleges and universities falling within each of these categories eligible for the grants or loans authorized by it.

The proponents of the bill obviously anticipated that the validity of the provisions of the bill authorizing grants and loans of tax-raised funds to colleges and universities owned, controlled, or operated by religious denominations would be challenged as a violation of the first amendment. As a consequence, they have attempted to circumvent such challenge by subsection (a)(2) of section 121, which prescribes, in essence, that the term "academic facility" shall not include any facility to be used for sectarian instruction, or as a place for religious worship, or in connection with a school or department of divinity.

As we shall see in a little while, the first amendment forbids government to finance religious institutions—not simply the religious activities of such institutions.

When all is said, the proponents of the bill stake the constitutionality of the provisions relating to religious colleges and universities upon this strange proposition: Congress can designate certain activities of a religious institution as the irreligious or the nonreligious or the unreligious activities of the religious institution, and finance them without offending the constitutional principle that Congress cannot finance a religious institution.

Before discussing the strange proposition that Congress can put asunder the things which religious institutions join together, I shall digress to point out that the pious provision embodied in subsection (a)(2) of section 121 does not really divorce the supposedly secular activities of religious colleges and universities from their religious endeavors.

Under section 108(a) of the bill, any obligation imposed upon such a college or university by subsection (a)(2) of section 121 to use any academic facility financed by grants for instruction or research in secular fields solely ends completely after 20 years. So far as the language of the bill is concerned a religious college or university may use any academic facility financed by loans for any purpose it desires from the day of its completion.

These things being so, subsection (a)(2) of section 121 is merely "sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal."

The bill clearly gives colleges and universities owned, controlled, or operated by religious denominations the power to extract tax-raised moneys from the public purse to acquire lands and buildings to be used by them in all their activities, whether religious or otherwise, until the last lingering echo of Gabriel's horn trembles into ultimate silence.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY SENATOR VITORINO FREIRE, OF THE BRAZILIAN SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me for 2 minutes, without his losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the Senator with that understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my honor to introduce to the Senate a distinguished senatorial colleague from the great Nation of Brazil, the largest nation in this hemisphere, a nation which plays and has played a great part in its relations with the United States.

I point out to the Senate that Brazil has served, actually and physically, on the side of the United States in two World Wars, and that the friendship between our countries is of long standing, and, we all hope, will endure for many centuries to come. It is my honor at this time to introduce to the Senate Senator Vitorino Freire, the leader of the largest party in the Brazilian Senate, the Social Democratic Party. He has served in the Senate since 1945. Senator Freire is the leading political figure in his home state of Maranháo, in northeast Brazil.

I wish to express to Senator Freire our appreciation for his visit, and to extend to him our very best wishes on this most auspicious occasion.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6143) to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the instruction, rehabilitation or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I contend that, apart from any question of constitutionality, Congress ought not to pass a bill authorizing grants or loans of tax-raised funds to religious colleges or universities.

Federal financial aid to church colleges or universities is unwise as a matter of policy.

In discussing this point of the bill, and the unconstitutionality of these provisions, I shall call attention to a number of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Among these decisions will be *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1; *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203; *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306; *McGowan* v. *Maryland*, 366 U.S. 420; *Torcasco* v. *Watkins*, 367 U.S. 488; and *Abington School District* v. *Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203.

In three of these decisions, namely, the Zorach case, the McCollum case, and the Everson case, members of the Supreme Court of the United States set out reasons why it is unwise as a matter of policy for Congress to undertake to enact a bill extending grants or loans of tax-raised moneys to religious colleges and universities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of Justice Black in the Zorach case, of Justice Frankfurter, in the McCollum case, and of Justice Rutledge, in the Everson case, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Black, J. in the Zorach case (pp. 318, 319, and 320): "It was precisely because 18th century Americans were a religious people divided into many fighting sects that we were given the constitutional mandate to keep church and state completely separate. Colonial history had already shown that, here as elsewhere zealous sectarians entrusted with governmental power to further their causes would sometimes torture, maim, and kill those they branded 'heretics,' 'atheists,' or 'agnostics.' The first amendment was therefore to insure that no one powerful sect or combination of sects could use political or governmental power to punish dissenters whom they could not convert to their faith. Now as then, it is only by wholly isolating the state from the religious sphere and compelling it to be completely neutral, that the freedom of each and every denomination and of all nonbelievers can be maintained. * * * State help to religion injects political and party prejudices into a holy field. It too often substitutes force for prayer, hate for love, and persecution for persuasion. Government should not be allowed, under cover of the soft euphemism of 'cooperation,' to steal into the sacred area of religious choice."
>
> Frankfurter, J., in the McCollum case (p. 215): "In Massachusetts, largely through the efforts of Horace Mann, all sectarian teachings were barred from the common school to save it from being rent by denominational conflict. The upshot of these controversies, often long and fierce, is fairly summarized by saying that long before the 14th amendment subjected the States to new limitations, the prohibition of furtherance by the State of religious instruction became the guiding principle, in law and feeling, of the American people. In sustaining Stephen Girard's will, this court referred to the inevitable conflicts engendered by matters 'connected with religious polity' and particularly 'in a country composed of such a variety of religious sects as our country.' "
>
> Rutledge, J., in the Everson case (pp. 53 and 54): "The reasons underlying the amendment's policy have not vanished with time or diminished in force. * * * Public money devoted to payment of religious costs, educational, or other, brings the quest for more. It brings too, the struggle of sect against sect for the larger share or for any. Here one by numbers alone will benefit most, there another. That is precisely the history of societies which have had an established religion and dissident groups. It is the very thing Jefferson and Madison experienced and sought to guard against, whether in its blunt or in its more screened forms. The end of such strife cannot be other than to destroy the cherished liberty. The dominating group will achieve the dominant benefit; or all will embroil the State in their dissensions.
>
> "Exactly such conflicts have centered of late around providing transportation to religious schools from public funds. The issue and the dissension work typically, in Madison's phrase, to 'destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with religion, has produced amongst its several sects.' "

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in addition to the reasons given by the three Justices why it is unwise as a matter of policy for Congress to embark on such a program as that set forth in the bill, history makes one thing crystal clear; that is, that religious institutions sacrifice much of their spiritual power whenever they look to the taxes of Caesar rather than to the voluntary contributions of their adherents for their support. It would be tragic to witness in this country what the bill would bring into play; that is, the contest among all the powerful religious denominations in the United States for more and more funds from the public purse.

RELIGIOUS CONFLICT

If we are to determine aright whether the provisions of H.R. 6143 authorizing grants or loans of tax-raised funds to religious colleges and universities contravene the first amendment, we must recur to history. This is so because we cannot understand the institutions and laws of today unless we understand the historical events out of which they arise.

As we recur to history, we will do well to remember that a nation which ignores the lessons history teaches is doomed to repeat the tragic mistakes of the past. Let us pray that America may not do this in respect to church and state relationships.

The most heart-rending story of history is that of man's struggle against civil and ecclesiastical tyranny for the simple right to bow his own knees before his own God in his own way.

As one of America's wisest jurists of all time, the late Chief Justice Walter P. Stacy, of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, declared in the opinion he wrote in *State* v. *Beal* (199 N.C. 278):

> For some reason, too deep to fathom, men contend more furiously over the road to heaven, which they cannot see, than over their visible walks on earth [and]It would be almost unbelievable, if history did not record the tragic fact, that men have gone to war and cut each other's throats because they could not agree as to what was to become of them after their throats were cut.

The Founding Fathers who wrote the Constitution of the United States were acutely aware of these truths.

They saw with the eyes of history the cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition, the massacre of the Huguenots of France, the slaughter of the Waldensians in the Alpine Valleys of Italy, the hanging and jailing of English and Irish Catholics by Protestant England, the hunting down of the Covenanters upon the crags and moors of Scotland, the branding, hanging, and whipping of Quakers, and the banishing of Baptists by Puritan Massachusetts, and the hundreds of other atrocities committed in the name of religion.

The Founding Fathers knew, moreover, that even during their own lifetimes those who did not conform to the doctrines and practices of the churches established by law in the places where they lived, such as Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in Ulster, Catholics in England and Ireland, and dissenters in various American colonies, had been barred from civil and military offices because of their faiths, had been compelled to pay tithes for the propagation of religious opinions they disbelieved, and had had their marriages annulled and their children adjudged illegitimate for daring to speak their marriage vows before ministers of their own faiths, rather than before clergymen of the established churches.

The Founding Fathers were determined that none of these tragic historical events should be repeated in the nation they were creating.

To this end they inserted two provisions in the Constitution of the United States.

The first of these provisions appears in article VI and declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust in the United States."

The second appears in the first amendment, and states that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

What did the Founding Fathers intend to do when they embodied these words in the first amendment? The answer to this question becomes clear when we consider the events which preceded the writing of the first amendment.

At the time of the settlement of the Thirteen Original Colonies, virtually every nation in Western Europe and the British Isles had what were known as established churches. Those churches were established by law, and the law compelled all persons, including those who dissented from their religious beliefs, to attend their services. The law furthermore required all persons to pay taxes for the construction of church buildings and the support of the clergy of the established churches.

An overwhelming number of the colonists who came from Europe to America came primarily to secure religious liberty and freedom from taxation for the support of established churches. Unfortunately, when those people came to America, they found that in many of the colonies predominant groups had set up established churches here, and that in consequence they were compelled, in such colonies, to pay taxes for the support of churches whose religious doctrines they disbelieved.

There is more than a modicum of historical truth in the statement of Artemus Ward to the effect that:

> The Puritans nobly fled from a land of despotism to a land of freedom, where they could not only enjoy their own religion, but could prevent everybody else from enjoying his.

The colonies of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Maryland had established churches, and the Anglican Church was the favorite under their laws.

In the colonies of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire, the Congregational Church was established by law.

In the colony of New York, the Dutch Reformed and Anglican Churches, in turn, were established by law.

The people who lived in those colonies were compelled to pay taxes for the support of religious institutions whose doctrines they disbelieved. Moreover, they were compelled to frequent the services of such religious institutions. They rebelled against those practices. They said, in the first place, that it was tyrannical for a government to attempt to regulate the relationship of worship between the individual man and his God. Then, as they pondered the words found in the 22d chapter of Matthew, verses 15 to 22, which declare that we are enjoined to "Render, therefore, unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's," they also came to the conclusion that in addition to being tyrannical, the regulation of worship by government was also sinful. So they began to fight to separate church from state and to disestablish all churches. Their demand for the disestablishment of churches comprised two things: First, an end to the financial-legal connection between state and church; and second, a recognition of the rights of all persons to exercise freely their own modes of worship.

The process by which church and state became separated in the original States is an interesting story, and I wish time sufficed for me to detail it. However, the story has been told in a most accurate and most illuminating manner by R. Freeman Butts, in chapter 3, at pages 39–45, of his work entitled "The American Tradition in Religion and Education." I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his book, in which he pictures how the people of the various original States secured the separation of church and state prior to the writing of the first amendment, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The historical meaning of separation of church and state cannot be determined by a narrow analysis of any specific event in any one place at any one time. It must be seen as a developing principle and practice that had its roots in the past and that took form on an uneven front throughout the new Nation that was struggling to come into existence during the Revolutionary and early national periods. It was a principle that emerged more rapidly in some States and more slowly in others. But the trend was unmistakable.

In some States where establishment had never gained a foothold and the practice of religious freedom was strong, there was little or no problem of separation as in Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. In other States where the establishment was strong, where the religious population was highly homogeneous, and where the tradition of religious freedom was weak, the principle of separation was slower in formulation and in practice, as in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. In still other States where the establishment was strong but where the religious population was rapidly becoming heterogeneous, the process of separation and the formulation of the principle of separation was relatively rapid, notably in Virginia. Thus it took Virginia scarcely 10 years from 1776 to 1786 to complete the process by legal enactment, whereas it took Massachusetts more than 50 years from 1776 to 1833 to arrive at virtually the same stage in its constitutional development.

It was in the midst of this unmistakable historical process that the first amendment was debated in Congress in 1789 and finally ratified in 1791. The meaning of the first amendment cannot be discovered by a narrow examination of the meaning of its specific words at a specific time, but those words must receive their meaning from the more inclusive process in which they were formulated, debated, and approved. Any sound historical interpretation of the meaning of the first amendment should be derived from the larger cultural setting in which it was developed. No narrow historicism will suffice. The indisputable fact, as we shall see in the next few pages, is that the American people were moving from establishment to separation in the Revolutionary and early national periods; they were moving in different States at different rates and it is fair to say from different motives, but they were moving.

The first amendment was an integral part of this movement. It was sponsored by and fought for by persons who had been through the process in their own States or who otherwise clearly saw the direction of the trend as did the followers of the enlightenment. The framers of the first amendment were in the vanguard of the movement. The first amendment thus reflected the most advanced thinking on the subject of separation at the time of its adoption, and it in turn not only showed the way but speeded up the process in the laggard States.

In general, the process of separation, from the pre-Revolutionary to the early national periods, went through three identifiable stages:

1. Toleration by the single establishments: Dissenting groups and the leaders who believed in religious freedom continued and speeded up the fight against the established churches in the effort to win the right to the free exercise of public religious worship. This right they wrung from the conservative groups in State after State in the form of concessions and the granting of privileges of free worship. Something of this process has been described in chapter 2.

2. Multiple establishments: The liberal groups believing in religious freedom discovered, however, that they were still in an underprivileged position because the legal support of taxes and property rights was still assigned by the state to the established churches. They discovered that free exercise was still a shadowy grant of toleration so long as the established churches had the support of tithes and so they renewed the fight to disestablish more completely the favored churches. The established churches, on their part, tried to compromise by persuading the legislatures to open up the tax privileges to the dissenting groups one by one. This meant that gradually more and more churches were admitted into the establishment and given the legal rights of taxation for their own public worship.

Thus, establishment came to be applied, not just to one church, but to any or all churches that had legal and financial connections with the state. This extended meaning of establishment was widely recognized at the time of the passing of the first amendment. Any cooperation between the state and any or all churches was considered to be establishment. In some States this compromise was agreed upon and was maintained for a relatively long time, as in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire; in other States the compromise lasted for only a short time, as in Maryland and South Carolina. In still other States the effort to achieve this compromise was defeated, notably in Virginia. It was this expanded meaning of multiple establishment that the first amendment was designed to prevent on the national level as well as to prevent the narrow establishment of a single church.

At the time of the formulation and ratification of the first amendment in the period 1789–91 all States that still had some form of establishment in effect had moved into the form of multiple establishment. As described in chapter 2, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire all provided for their distinctive town form of multiple establishment, and Maryland and South Carolina had provided for their respective State forms of multiple establishment. These were the only States in which establishment was still recognized in the basic laws of the several States, when the debates over the first amendment began in 1789. South Carolina quickly dropped its elaborate provisions for multiple establishment from its constitution of 1790, whereas Maryland did not amend its constitution until 1810.

Thus, in 1789 five of the original States still had authorized establishments. They were all multiple establishments. Before the first amendment was ratified in 1791, South Carolina had eliminated its constitutional provisions for multiple establishment. After the adoption of the first amendment in 1791 there were only four States whose basic laws embodied the principle of establishment. The Massachusetts constitution of 1780 and the Connecticut codified laws of 1784 made multiple establishment compulsory; Maryland's constitution of 1776 and New Hampshire's constitutions of 1784 and 1791 permitted multiple establishments at the discretion of the legislatures.

It is this meaning of multiple establishment which has been forgotten, conveniently overlooked, or never understood by the various groups today who urge that cooperation between church and state is admissible so long as the state treats all religious groups equally and fairly. That was exactly the purpose of the several colonial provisions for multiple establishment as described in chapter 2, and it was exactly the purpose of the attempts made in Virginia to achieve multiple establishment, as will be described in the following pages. Of course, they would have ruled out some sects which the dominant churches did not consider to be "safe" or legitimate religious groups, but the principle of multiple establishment is the same whether few, many, or all religious groups are taken into it. The state would always have to decide what was and what was not a religious group if it set out to "cooperate" with them all.

3. Separation: It was soon discovered that the compromise of establishing all recognized churches even on an equal or impartial basis was not sufficient. It might be possible to reconcile this kind of establishment with the outward forms of free exercise of public worship, but it was soon clearly seen that it could not be reconciled with genuinely equal rights of conscience.

So long as the state was in the position of determining which churches should have legal and financial privileges of support, there could be no real equality of religious conscience. It was still a grant of privilege by the state to a religious doctrine. Such a principle could not square with the growing belief fostered by the enlightenment that equal rights of conscience were natural and inalienable rights which the state could not infringe and which the state must protect.

Therefore, the struggle went on to sever all legal connections and to prohibit all financial support for any and all religious beliefs. It was recognized that if the state could grant a privilege, it could define which religious beliefs were entitled to that privilege. So the final stage in separation came when all forms of establishment were abolished. Thus, complete disestablishment of financial and legal support for religion by the state was necessary to achieve a genuinely free exercise of religion resting upon the solid grounds of equal rights of conscience.

This final step was clearly in the minds of those who proposed and struggled for the adoption of the first amendment of the Constitution. The first amendment was clearly an integral part of the larger definition of civil rights as contained in the other amendments which made up the American Bill of Rights.

The whole story of this historical process in the course of which the principle of separation of church and state emerged should be told in detail State by State, but the necessities of space limit us to presenting only one example of a State which had a strong establishment. This example, Virginia, shows the completion of the process before the first amendment was formulated, and is important because the leaders in Congress from Virginia were the ones who gave the primary form to the first amendment as it went through the various stages of debate and adoption.

Other examples among the original States could be given to show that the process of separation was well underway in a majority of States before the adoption of the first amendment. Separation had already been achieved in eight of the original States. This was accomplished in the constitutions of 1776 of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and North Carolina; in the constitutions of 1777 of New York and Georgia; by statute in 1786 in Virginia; and by original charter in Rhode Island.

The fact that some States did not complete the process of separation until after the first amendment simply means that they were somewhat later in a process of which the first amendment was at once a reflection and also a formative influence. The first amendment was the application on the national level of the same principle that was developing in the States.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to add to this story further details of the movements in the various original States to obtain religious freedom and freedom from taxation to support religious institutions. Suffice it to say that by the time the first amendment was written, the original States of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, New York, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey disestablished religion, and did so under constitutions and laws which forbade the establishment of any religion and the levying of taxation for the support of any religion.

So, Mr. President, at the time when the first amendment was drafted, the only States in which any establishment of religion was still in existence were Massachusetts—which continued such establishment until 1833; Connecticut—which continued such establishment until 1818; Maryland—which continued such establishment until 1810; New Hampshire—which continued such establishment until 1819; and South Carolina—which abolished such establishment in 1790. But in those four States there was no single established church at that time. There was an establishment of all of the churches which the people who dominated those States deemed to be respectable churches. They provided for an impartial use of taxes for the support of all of the churches which, in their view, were respectable.

However, it is interesting to consider the specific events in the State of Virginia which preceded the writing and the ratification of the first amendment. This is true because those most responsible for the writing into our Constitution of the first amendment were two Virginians—Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. By referring to the events in the State of Virginia which preceded the writing of the first amendment, we can find exactly what was meant by the Founding Fathers when, in the first amendment, they provided that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

This is true because the events in Virginia show exactly what James Madison meant when he insisted on writing into the first amendment the words "an establishment of religion."

In 1776, Virginia, as an independent Commonwealth, adopted a new constitution; James Madison was a member of the constitutional convention which drafted it. He succeeded in writing into the constitution of that great Commonwealth the proposition that all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience. After the adoption of that constitution, the Virginia Legislature met, and there ensued a great conflict between those who wanted religious freedom and freedom from taxation and those who wanted to retain an establishment of religion in that great Commonwealth. In the legislature of 1776, where the contest between those two groups began, Madison was able to persuade the legislature to provide that no dissenters should be compelled to pay any taxes to the established church of Virginia—the Church of England, which had been established there in 1629.

He also secured at that session the passage of a law which suspended for the time being the requirement that even members of the Church of England should pay taxes for its support. But the legislature of 1776 expressly reserved the most crucial question; namely, whether general taxes should be levied for the support of all of the denominations which the controlling element in the Virginia Legislature deemed to be respectable denominations. This question was reserved for subsequent legislatures.

In the Virginia Legislature of 1779 there occurred another great fight which centered around two bills. One was introduced by James Henry. It undertook to establish, by law, virtually all of the Christian churches as the established churches of Virginia, and to lay taxes for the support of all of them on an impartial basis. It is significant that in this bill references to an establishment of religion appear at a number of points, in contexts which clearly show that James Henry and the others of his day understood the term "an establishment of religion" to mean an official connection between the State and one or more churches, whereby the State recognized such church or churches and provided for taxation for its or their support.

In the same legislature, James Madison introduced Thomas Jefferson's bill for religious freedom in Virginia. It is one of the great documents which preceded the writing of the Constitution. It laid down two propositions: First, the proposition that there should be no religious qualification as a test for holding office; and second, the proposition that it is sinful and tyrannical to tax a man for the propagation of religious doctrine which he disbelieves. This document is of so much importance that it should be made available to all Members of the Senate before they vote on this bill and on the amendments which the Senator from Kentucky and I will offer. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, Thomas Jefferson's bill for religious freedom in Virginia.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S BILL FOR RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

I

Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free * * * to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor, whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness * * * therefore the proscribing any citizen as unworthy the public confidence by laying upon him an incapacity of being called to offices of trust and emolument, unless he profess or renounce this or that religious opinion, is depriving him injuriously of those privileges and advantages to which in common with his fellow citizens he has a natural right; that it tends only to corrupt the principles of that religion it is meant to encourage, by bribing with a monopoly of worldly honors and emoluments, those who will externally profess and conform to it * * * to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion, and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy, which at once destroys all religious liberty, because he being of course judge of that tendency will make his opinions the rule of judgment, and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government, for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; and finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself, that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict, unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate, errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them:

II

Be it enacted by the general assembly, That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinion in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities.

III

The rights hereby asserted are of the natural rights of mankind, and that if any act shall be hereafter passed to repeal the present, or to narrow its operation, such act will be an infringement of natural right.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the opposing forces in the Virginia Legislature of 1779 were so nearly equally in power that it was impossible to secure the enactment of either of those bills. So the contest, which had been renewed there, was renewed a third time in the legislature of 1784.

In that legislative body was introduced not only Jefferson's bill for religious freedom in Virginia, but also a new bill which was sponsored by Patrick Henry. That bill was entitled "A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion." It undertook to give official recognition to virtually all Christian churches and to provide taxes for their support. In order that we might understand what Madison meant when he used the term "an establishment of religion," it is necessary that the bill to which I have referred should be called to the attention of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion

Whereas the general diffusion of Christian knowledge hath a natural tendency to correct the morals of men, restrain their vices, and preserve the peace of society; which cannot be effected without a competent provision for learned teachers, who may be thereby enabled to devote their time and attention to the duty of instructing such citizens, as from their circumstances and want of education, cannot otherwise attain such knowledge; and it is judged that such provision may be made by the legislature, without counteracting the liberal principle heretofore adopted and intended to be preserved by abolishing all distinctions of preeminence amongst the different societies or communities of Christians;

Be it therefore enacted by the general assembly, That for the support of Christian teachers—per centum on the amount, or—in the pound on the sum payable for tax on the property within this Commonwealth, is hereby assessed, and shall be paid by every person chargeable with the said tax at the time the same shall become due; and the sheriffs of the several counties shall have power to levy and collect the same in the same manner and under the like restrictions and limitations, as are or may be prescribed by the laws for raising the revenues of this State; and be it

Enacted, That for every sum so paid, the sheriff or collector shall give a receipt, expressing therein to what society of Christians the person from whom he may receive the same shall direct the money to be paid, keeping a distinct account thereof in his books. The sheriff of every county, shall on or before the —— day of —— in every year, return to the court, upon oath, two alphabetical lists of the payments to him made, distinguishing in columns opposite to the names of the persons who shall have paid the same, the society to which the money so paid was by them appropriated; and one column for the names where no appropriation shall be made. One of which lists, after being recorded in a book to be kept for that purpose, shall be filed by the clerk in his office; the other shall by the sheriff be fixed up in the courthouse, there to remain for the inspection of all concerned. And the sheriff, after deducting 5 per centum for the collection, shall forthwith pay to such person or persons as shall be appointed to receive the same by the vestry, elders, or directors, however denominated of each such society, the sum so stated to be due to that society; or in default thereof, upon the motion of such person or persons to the next or any succeeding court, execution shall be awarded for the same against the sheriff and his security, his and their executors or administrators; provided that 10 days previous notice be given of such motion. And upon every such execution, the officer serving the same shall proceed to immediate sale of the estate taken, and shall not accept of security for payment at the end of 3 months, nor to have the goods forthcoming at the day of sale; for his better direction wherein, the clerk shall endorse upon every such execution that no security of any kind shall be taken; and be it

Further enacted, That the money to be raised by virtue of this act, shall be by the vestries, elders, or directors of each religious society, appropriated to a provision for a minister or teacher of the gospel of their denomination, or the providing places of divine worship, and to none other use whatsoever; except in the denominations of Quakers and Menonists, who may receive what is collected from their members, and place it in their general funds, to be disposed of in a manner which they shall think best calculated to promote their particular mode of worship; and be it

Enacted, That all sums which at the time of payment to the sheriff or collector may not be appropriated by the person paying the same, shall be accounted for with the court in manner as by this act is directed; and after deducting for his collection, the sheriff shall pay the amount thereof (upon account certified by the court to the auditors of public accounts, and by them to the treasurer) into the public treasury, to be disposed of under the direction of the general assembly, for the encouragement of seminaries of learning within the counties whence such sums shall arise, and to no other use or purpose whatsoever.

This act shall commence, and be in force, from and after the —— day of —— in the year ——.

Mr. ERVIN. The importance of the bill sponsored in 1784 by Patrick Henry becomes apparent when we recall that it provoked one of the greatest documents vindicating the cause of religious freedom ever penned on the face of the earth. There was a bitter contest between Madison and his opponents in the Virginia Legislature of 1784. The legislature was on the verge of passing the bill sponsored by Patrick Henry, which would have recognized the legal interest of the State in virtually all the Christian churches then functioning in Virginia, and which would have imposed taxes on all Virginians for the support of such churches. But Madison, at the last moment, was able to persuade the Legislature of Virginia to put off the final vote on the bill sponsored by Patrick Henry until the next session of the legislature, which was scheduled for November 1785. Between that time and the time when the legislature next met James Madison made one of the greatest of all appeals for religious freedom. It was called "The Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments." The memorial of James Madison is crucial in determining what the Founding Fathers meant when they yielded to the insistence of James Madison and wrote into the first amendment the provision that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion.

On a number of occasions in his remonstrance, which was a protest against the bill sponsored by Patrick Henry during the preceding legislature to levy taxes for the support of virtually all Christian churches in Virginia, James Madison used the word "establishment" at least five times in contexts which showed that in the mind of James Madison "an establishment of religion" meant an official relationship between the State and one church or many or all churches and the imposition of taxation for the support of one church or many churches or all churches.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorial and remonstrance of James Madison against religious assessments be printed at this point in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorial and remonstrance were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments to the Honorable the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia

We, the subscribers, citizens of the said Commonwealth, having taken into serious consideration, a bill printed by order of the last session of general assembly, entitled "A Bill Establishing a Provision for Teachers of the Christian Religion," and conceiving that the same, if finally armed with the sanctions of a law, will be a dangerous abuse of power, are bound as faithful members of a free State, to remonstrate against it, and to declare the reasons by which we are determined. We remonstrate against the said bill:

1. Because we hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth, "that religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence." The religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable; because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated by their own minds, cannot follow the dictates of other men: It is unalienable also; because what is here a right toward men, is a duty toward the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent both in order of time and degree of obligation, to the claims of civil society. Before any man can be considered as a member of civil society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the Universe: And if a member

of civil society, who enters into any subordinate association, must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority; much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular civil society, do it with a saving of his allegiance to the Universal Sovereign. We maintain therefore that in matters of religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance. True it is, that no other rule exists, by which any question which may divide a society, can be ultimately determined, but the will of the majority; but it is also true, that the majority may trespass on the rights of the minority.

2. Because if religion be exempt from the authority of the society at large, still less can it be subject to that of the legislative body. The latter are but the creatures and vicegerents of the former. Their jurisdiction is both derivative and limited: it is limited with regard to the coordinate departments, more necessarily is it limited with regard to the constituents. The preservation of a free government requires not merely, that the metes and bounds which separate each department of power may be invariably maintained; but more especially, that neither of them be suffered to overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment, exceed the commission from which they derive their authority, and are tyrants. The people who submit to it are governed by laws made neither by themselves, nor by an authority derived from them, and are slaves.

3. Because, it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens, and one of [the] noblest characteristics of the late revolution. The freemen of America did not wait until usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise, and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much, soon to forget it. Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christians, in exclusion of all other sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute 3 pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

4. Because, the bill violates that equality which ought to be the basis of every law, and which is more indispensable, in proportion as the validity or expediency of any law is more liable to be impeached. If "all men are by nature equally free and independent," all men are to be considered as entering into society on equal conditions; as relinquishing no more, and therefore retaining no less, one than another, of their natural rights. Above all are they to be considered as retaining an "equal title to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience." Whilst we assert for ourselves a freedom to embrace, to profess, and to observe the religion which we believe to be of divine origin, we cannot deny an equal freedom to those whose minds have not yet yielded to the evidence which has convinced us. If this freedom be abused, it is an offense against God, not against man: To God, therefore, not to men, must an account of it be rendered. As the bill violates equality by subjecting some to peculiar burdens; so it violates the same principle, by granting to others peculiar exemptions. Are the Quakers and Menonists the only sects who think a compulsive support of their religions unnecessary and unwarrantable? Can their piety alone be intrusted with the care of public worship? Ought their religions to be endowed above all others, with extraordinary privileges, by which proselytes may be enticed from all others? We think too favorably of the justice and good sense of these denominations, to believe that they either covet preeminencies over their fellow citizens, or that they will be seduced by them, from the common opposition to the measure.

5. Because the bill implies either that the civil magistrate is a competent judge of religious truth; or that he may employ religion as an engine of civil policy. The first is an arrogant pretension falsified by the contradictory opinions of rulers in all ages, and throughout the world; the second an unhallowed perversion of the means of salvation.

6. Because the establishment proposed by the bill is not requisite for the support of the Christian religion. To say that it is, is a contradiction to the Christian religion itself; for every page of it disavows a dependence on the powers of this world: it is a contradiction to fact; for it is known that this religion both existed and flourished, not only without the support of human laws, but in spite of every opposition from them; and not only during the period of miraculous aid, but long after it had been left to its own evidence, and the ordinary care of providence. Nay, it is a contradiction in terms; for a religion not invented by human policy, must have preexisted and been supported, before it was established by human policy. It is moreover to weaken in those who profess this religion a pious confidence in its innate excellence, and the patronage of its author; and to foster in those who still reject it, a suspicion that its friends are too conscious of its fallacies, to trust it to its own merits.

7. Because experience witnesseth that ecclesiastical establishments, instead of maintaining the purity and efficacy of religion, have had a contrary operation. During almost 15 centuries, has the legal establishment of Christianity been on trial. What have been its fruits? More or less in all places, pride and indolence in the clergy; ignorance and servility in the laity; in both, superstition, bigotry, and persecution. Inquire of the teachers of Christianity for the ages in which it appeared in its greatest luster; those of every sect point to the ages prior to its incorporation with civil policy. Propose a restoration of this primitive state in which its teachers depended on the voluntary rewards of their flocks; many of them predict its downfall. On which side ought their testimony to have greatest weight, when for or when against their interest?

8. Because the establishment in question is not necessary for the support of civil government. If it be urged as necessary for the support of civil government only as it is a means of supporting religion, and it be not necessary for the latter purpose, it cannot be necessary for the former. If religion be not within [the] cognizance of civil government, how can its legal establishment be said to be necessary to civil government? What influence in fact have ecclesiastical establishments had on civil society? In some instances they have been seen to erect a spiritual tyranny on the ruins of civil authority; in many instances they have been seen upholding the thrones of political tyranny; in no instance have they been seen the guardians of the liberties of the people. Rulers who wished to subvert the public liberty, may have found an established clergy convenient auxiliaries. A just government, instituted to secure and perpetuate it, needs them not. Such a government will be best supported by protecting every citizen in the enjoyment of his religion with the same equal hand which protects his person and his property; by neither invading the equal rights of any sect, nor suffering any sect to invade those of another.

9. Because the proposed establishment is a departure from that generous policy, which, offering an asylum to the persecuted and oppressed of every nation and religion, promised a luster to our country, and an accession to the number of its citizens. What a melancholy mark is the bill of sudden degeneracy? Instead of holding forth an asylum to the persecuted, it is itself a signal of persecution. It degrades from the equal rank of citizens all those whose opinions in religion do not bend to those of the legislative authority. Distant as it may be, in its present form, from the inquisition it differs from it only in degree. The one is the first step, the other the last in the career of intolerance. The magnanimous sufferer under this cruel scourge in foreign regions, must view the bill as a beacon on our coast, warning him to seek some other haven, where liberty and philanthropy in their due extent may offer a more certain repose from his troubles.

10. Because, it will have a like tendency to banish our citizens. The allurements presented by other situations are every day thinning their number. To superadd a fresh motive to emigration, by revoking the liberty which they now enjoy, would be the same species of folly which has dishonored and depopulated flourishing kingdoms.

11. Because, it will destroy that moderation and harmony which the forbearance of our laws to intermeddle with religion, has produced amongst its several sects. Torrents of blood have been spilt in the Old World, by vain attempts of the secular arm to extinguish religious discord, by proscribing all difference in religious opinions. Time has at length revealed the true remedy. Every relaxation of narrow and rigorous policy, wherever it has been tried, has been found to assuage the disease. The American theater has exhibited proofs, that equal and complete liberty, if it does not wholly eradicate it, sufficiently destroys its malignant influence on the health and prosperity of the State. If with the salutary effects of this system under own eyes, we begin to contract the bonds of religious freedom, we know no name that will too severely reproach our folly. At least let warning be taken at the first fruits of the threatened innovation. The very apperance of the bill has transformed that "Christian forbearance, love and charity," which of late mutually prevailed, into animosities and jealousies, which may not soon be appeased. What mischiefs may not be dreaded should this enemy to the public quiet be armed with the force of a law?

12. Because, the policy of the bill is adverse to the diffusion of the light of Christianity. The first wish of those who enjoy this precious gift, ought to be that it may be imparted to the whole race of mankind. Compare the number of those who have as yet received it with the number still remaining under the dominion of false religions; and how small is the former. Does the policy of the bill tend to lessen the disproportion? No; it at once discourages those who are strangers to the light of (revelation) from coming into the region of it; and countenances, by example the nations who continue in darkness, in shutting out those who might convey it to them. Instead of leveling as far as possible, every obstacle to the victorious progress of truth, the bill with an ignoble and unchristian timidity would circumscribe it, with a wall of defense, against the encroachments of error.

13. Because attempts to enforce by legal sanctions, acts obnoxious to so great a proportion of citizens, tend to enervate the laws in general, and to slacken the bands of society. If it be difficult to execute any law which is not generally deemed necessary or salutary, what must be the case where it is deemed invalid and dangerous? and what may be the effect of so striking an example of impotency in the government, on its general authority.

14. Because a measure of such singular magnitude and delicacy ought not to be imposed, without the clearest evidence that it is called for by a majority of citizens; and no satisfactory method is yet proposed by which the voice of the majority in this case may be determined, or its influence secured. "The people of the respective counties are indeed requested to signify their opinion respecting the adoption of the bill to the next session of assembly." But the representation must be made equal, before the voice either of the representatives or of the counties, will be that of the people. Our hope is that neither of the former will, after due consideration, espouse the dangerous principle of the bill. Should the event disappoint us, it will still leave us in full confidence, that a fair appeal to the latter will reverse the sentence against our liberties.

15. Because, finally, "the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion according to the dictates of conscience" is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the declaration of those rights which pertain to the good people of Virginia, as the "basis and foundation of government," it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather studied emphasis. Either then, we must say, that the will of the legislature is the only measure of their authority; and that in the plenitude of this authority, they may sweep away all our fundamental rights; or, that they are bound to leave this particular right untouched and sacred: Either we must say, that they may control the freedom of the press, may abolish the trial by jury, may swallow up the executive and judiciary powers of the State; nay that they may despoil us of our very right of suffrage, and erect themselves into an independent and hereditary assembly; or we must say, that they have no authority to enact into law the bill under consideration. We the subscribers say, that the general assembly of this Commonwealth have no such authority: And that no effort may be omitted on our part against so dangerous an usurpation, we oppose to it, this remonstrance; earnestly praying, as we are in duty bound, that the Supreme Lawgiver of the Universe, by illuminating those to whom it is addressed, may on the one hand, turn their councils from every act which would affront His holy prerogative, or violate the trust committed to them; and on the other, guide them into every measure which may be worthy of His [blessing, may re]dound to their own praise, and may establish more firmly the liberties, the prosperity, and the happiness of the Commonwealth.

Mr. **ERVIN**. I make the assertion without fear of successful contradiction that no man can read James Madison's Remonstrance without coming to the conclusion that what James Madison and the other men of his generation had in mind when they wrote the first amendment was that there should be no official relationship of any character between government and any church, or many churches, or all churches, and no levying of taxes for the support of any church, or many churches, or all churches or any institutions conducted by any of them.

Madison caused his remonstrance to be widely distributed throughout the State of Virginia. As a result of his remonstrance, when the members of the legislature which was scheduled to convene in November 1785 were elected, those who supported Madison in his fight for religious freedom were in an overwhelming majority. They enacted into law by a large majority Jefferson's bill for religious freedom. We cannot overmagnify the importance which Thomas Jefferson and James Madison attributed to Jefferson's Statute for Religious Freedom or their demand that people should not be compelled by law to support in an official manner or by taxes any religious institutions.

I believe the clearest proof of the transcendent importance which Thomas Jefferson attributed to that statute is shown by the epitaph on the gravestone which he is said to have written himself.

As one ascends the hill which leads to Jefferson's home at Monticello, he passes the burial ground of members of the Jefferson family. He passes the spot where the mortal remains of Thomas Jefferson rest in the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust. On the gravestone of Thomas Jefferson is the epitaph which speaks with as much eloquence as Jefferson used in writing the Declaration of Independence or the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom. The statement is as follows:

> Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence; of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Liberty; and father of the University of Virginia.

At the time that Jefferson decided that those were the words which he wished to have engraved on the stone which marks his last resting place, he had been a member of the Legislature of Virginia; he had been Governor of the State of Virginia; he had represented Virginia in the Continental Congress; he had served as American Minister to France; he had officiated as Secretary of State in George Washington's Cabinet; he had been Vice President of the United States under John Adams; and he had been twice elected to the highest office within the gift of the American people—the Presidency itself.

Yet Thomas Jefferson was not concerned that he should be remembered for the high offices which he had filled, but he was concerned that he should be remembered as the author of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom, one of the greatest documents ever penned by man. It lays down the proposition that it is sinful and tyrannical to compel a man to make contributions of money for the propagation of opinions that he disbelieves.

After the drafting of the Constitution of the United States, many Americans were dissatisfied with it because it did not contain any bill of rights, and particularly because it did not contain any provision which would guarantee religious freedom beyond the provision which merely specified that no religious qualification should ever be required as a test for holding public office in our Nation. When New York, New Hampshire, and Virginia ratified the Constitution, they adopted resolutions which insisted that the Constitution should be amended by incorporating into it a guarantee of religious freedom and a guarantee of freedom from taxation for the support of religious institutions.

My own State of North Carolina and the State of Rhode Island both postponed ratifying the Constitution, and their conventions stated in substance that they would not ratify the Constitution unless it were amended so as to provide for a total disestablishment of religion.

As a result of the demands of these five States, and the demands of thousands of other Americans throughout the other original States, the Constitution was amended in this respect. It was amended at the instigation of James Madison, who was elected to serve in Congress from the State of Virginia in the First Congress which met under the Constitution. As soon as this Congress convened, he began his great fight to have the first amendment written into the Constitution.

I wish I had sufficient time to detail the fight which occurred in Congress on this point. There were some who wished to maintain some vestige of religious support by Government, and some who merely wished to put in the restriction that there should be no single established church. But Madison insisted at all times that the first amendment should embody in it the provision that Congress should pass no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

James Madison triumphed after much fighting. On September 23, 1789, Madison made a report to the House of Representatives concerning the action of the conference committee of the Senate and House, which had been appointed to reconcile varying views as to the language of the first amendment This conference committee agreed with Madison and recommended the words which now are incorporated in the first amendment

So we can say that James Madison, whom historians call the father of the Constitution, was responsible for the phrasing of the first amendment. The meaning of the words of the first amendment that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" is crystal clear. By those words, James Madison and his contemporaries intended to prohibit the Government from establishing any official relation between Government and religion and to prevent the Government from using tax moneys to support or assist in the support of any religious institutions of any character whatsoever.

As Justice Black said in the Everson case:

> The people there, as elsewhere, reached the conviction that individual religious liberty could be achieved best under a government which was stripped of all power to tax, to support, or otherwise to assist any or all religions, or to interfere with the beliefs of any religious individual or group.

I have attempted to set out as clearly as possible the conviction of James Madison and his contemporaries that there should be no establishment of religion, and the meaning which they attributed to the words, "establishment of religion." Those words clearly implied to them that there should be no official relationship between Government and any religious organization and no support of any religious organization by tax moneys.

It is interesting to note that the Supreme Court of the United States has consistently adhered to this meaning of this term, "an establishment of religion," when it has dealt with cases involving the first amendment.

I wish to read some excerpts from opinions of the Supreme Court dealing with this question. Justice Jackson declared in the Everson case:

> This freedom (i.e., religious freedom) was first in the Bill of Rights because it was first in the forefathers' minds; it was set forth in absolute terms, and its strength is its rigidity. It was intended not only to keep the States' hands out of religion, but to keep religion's hands off the state, and above all, to keep bitter religious controversy out of public life by denying to every denomination any advantage from getting control of public policy or the public purse.

Justice Rutledge, declared in the Everson case:

> Not simply an established church, but any law respecting an establishment of religion is forbidden * * *. It was to create a complete and permanent separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion.

Justice Black, writing the majority opinion in the McCollum case, said:

> For the first amendment rests upon the premise that both religion and Government can best work to achieve their lofty aims if each is left free from the other within its respective sphere. Or, as we said in the Everson case, the first amendment has erected a wall between church and state which must be kept high and impregnable.

Justice Frankfurter asserted this, in the McCollum case:

> "The great American principle of eternal separation"—Elihu Root's phrase bears repetition—is one of the vital reliances of our constitutional system for assuring unities among our people stronger than our diversities. It is the Court's duty to enforce this principle in its full integrity.
>
> We renew our conviction that "we have staked the very existence of our country on the faith that complete separation between the state and religion is best for the state and best for religion."

Justice Douglas said in the Zorach case:

> There cannot be the slightest doubt that the first amendment reflects the philosophy that church and state should be separated. And so far as interference with the free exercise of religion and an establishment of religion are concerned, the separation must be complete and unequivocal. The first amendment within the scope of its coverage permits no exception; the prohibition is absolute.

So much for the statements of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States in respect to the objective of the establishment clause of the first amendment. The greatest declaration as to the overall meaning of the provisions of the first amendment denying to Congress the power to make any laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, is that contained in the majority opinion written by Justice Black in the Everson case. This is what he said:

> The establishment of religion clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly, or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state.

Three times since that statement was made in the Everson case back in 1947, the Supreme Court of the United States has quoted that statement and declared that it represents a correct interpretation of the provisions of the first amendment, providing that the Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise of religion. The subsequent cases were the McCollum case, the McGowan case, and the Torcaso case. I gave the citations of these cases earlier during the course of these remarks.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator just stated that the Supreme Court, in the Everson case and in three subsequent cases, laid down the constitutional principle of its interpretation of the first amendment. The Senator said it represented the statement of the majority. I ask the Senator if it is not correct that in the Everson case both the majority and those who dissented agreed on this constitutional principle, and that in the following cases this constitutional principle has been agreed upon as the decision of the Court interpreting the first amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. The able and distinguished Senator from Kentucky could not possibly be on more sound ground than he is on this question. The statement was approved, in effect, by all the judges in all those cases, both those who joined in the majority opinions and those who wrote concurring or dissenting opinions.

I now invite attention to three ways in which the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment invalidates the provisions of the bill relating to religious colleges and universities.

The first is that under the first amendment neither the Federal Government nor a State can finance religious institutions with tax-raised funds.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, statements made by the majority opinion in the Everson case, by Justice Rutledge in the Everson case, and by Justice Douglas in the Zorach case, to sustain the point that the first amendment prohibits the Federal Government, as well as all the States, from making contributions of tax-raised funds to the support of any churches or any organizations maintained by any churches.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Majority opinion (Black, J.) in the Everson case (p. 16): "New Jersey cannot consistently with the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment contribute tax-raised funds to the support of an institution which teaches the tenets and faith of any church."
>
> Rutledge, J. in the Everson case (p. 33): "The prohibition broadly forbids State support, financial, or other, of religion in any guise, form or degree. It outlaws all use of public funds for religious purposes."
>
> Rutledge, J. in the Everson case (p. 41): "In view of this history no further proof is needed that the amendment forbids any appropriation, large or small, from public funds to aid or support any and all religious exercises."
>
> Majority opinion (Douglas, J.) Zorach case (p. 314): "Government may not finance religious groups nor undertake religious instruction nor blend secular and sectarian education nor use secular institutions to force one or some religion on any person."

Mr. ERVIN. Some of the proponents of governmental aid of a financial nature to religious institutions maintain that the prohibition of the amendment merely applies to the selection of one particular religious denomination as a beneficiary of governmental assistance, and does not forbid giving equal and impartial aid to all religious institutions.

That argument has been made many times, and it has been rejected every time it has been made. There is not a syllable in any judicial opinion which sustains that argument. On the contrary, in the statement which I read from the Everson case, and which was subsequently followed in the McCollum, McGowan, and Torcaso cases, it was stated in express language that neither the State nor the Federal Government may enact laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another.

Justice Rutledge said, in his great opinion in the Everson case:

> Again, it was the furnishing of contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves that the fathers outlawed. That consequence and effect are not removed by multiplying to all-inclusiveness the sects for which support is exacted. The Constitution requires, not comprehensive identification of state with religion, but complete separation.

Again, in the McCollum case, this argument was renewed, as appears from these words by Justice Black in the majority opinion:

> They argue that historically the first amendment was intended to forbid only government preference of one religion over another, not an impartial governmental assistance of all religions.

The majority opinion proceeded to say: "After giving full consideration to the arguments presented we are unable to accept" this contention.

I wish to discuss another point. As I stated at the outset, the proponents of Federal aid to church owned, controlled, or operated colleges or universities attempt to circumvent the provisions of the first amendment by divorcing—so they say—the religious activities of such institutions of learning from their other activities. It has been adjudged that this cannot be done.

I invite attention to statements of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to the effect that the establishment clause of the first amendment forbids the Federal Government to aid or support the blending or mixing of religious and secular instruction—a thing which all church owned, controlled, or operated colleges and universities do. Indeed, the chief reason for the existence of a church owned, controlled, or operated college or university is the teaching of the religion of the church which establishes it.

The proponents of Federal aid to religious colleges and universities base their claim that the provisions of the bill relating to them are constitutional on the theory that Congress can finance the construction of a science building or other structure for a religious college or university if it declares that such building constitutes the irreligious or nonreligious or unreligious part of the religious college or university. It seems to me that reduces to an absurdity the argument of those who contend under the first amendment that Congress can aid religious colleges and universities. But let us see what the Justices have said on this point.

Justice Rutledge said in the Everson case:

> Accordingly, daily religious education commingled with secular is religion within the guaranty's comprehensive scope.

He said further, in that case:

> Indeed the view is sincerely avowed by many of various faiths, that the basic purpose of all education is or should be religious, that the secular cannot be and should not be separated from the religious phase and emphasis. Hence, the inadequacy of public or secular education and the necessity for sending the child to a school where religion is taught. But whatever may be the philosophy or its justification, there is undeniably an admixture of religious with secular teaching in all such institutions. That is the very reason for their being. Certainly for purposes of constitutionality we cannot contradict the whole basis of the ethical and educational convictions of people who believe in religious schooling.
>
> Yet this very admixture is what was disestablished when the first amendment forbade "an establishment of religion." Commingling the religious with the secular teaching does not divest the whole of its religious permeation and emphasis or make them of minor part, if proportion were material. Indeed, on any other view, the constitutional prohibition always could be brought to naught by adding a modicum of the secular.

Justice Rutledge then points out in one sentence the absurdity of the theory on which the proponents of aid to church-owned, operated, or controlled colleges and universities rest their claim of constitutionality, that is to say, that one building may be designated as a nonreligious building and another building may be called a religious building; and that Congress finance the one, but not the other. He says:

> Surely constitutionality does not turn on where or how often the mixed teaching occurs.

Justice Frankfurter said in the McCollum case:

> Illinois has here authorized the commingling of religious with secular instruction in the public schools. The Constitution of the United States forbids this.

Justice Frankfurter adds this in the McCollum case:

> Separation is a requirement to abstain from fusing functions of Government and of religious sects, not merely to treat them all equally.

I have read extracts from the majority opinions and from the concurring opinions and from the dissenting opinions in the Everson, McCollum, and Zorach cases, which state in express terms that Government cannot aid or support the blending or mixing of secular and religious instruction. By this it is meant that Government cannot support a college or university which offers both secular and religious instruction. This conclusion is made crystal clear by Justice Douglas in his concurring opinion in Abington School District against Schempp, which was handed down on June 17, 1963, and which is reported in 374 U.S. 203. I quote from the words of Justice Douglas set forth on pages 3 and 4 of his concurring opinion:

> But the establishment clause is not limited to precluding the State itself from conducting religious exercises. It also forbids the State to employ its facilities or funds in a way that gives any church, or all churches, greater strength in our society than it would have by relying on its members alone. Thus, the present regimes must fall under that clause for the additional reason that public funds, though small in amount, are being used to promote a religious exercise. Through the mechanism of the State, all of the people are being required to finance a religious exercise that only some of the people want and that violates the sensibilities of others.
>
> The most effective way to establish any institution is to finance it; and this truth is reflected in the appeals by church groups for public funds to finance their religious schools. Financing a church either in its strictly religious activities or in its other activities is equally unconstitutional, as I understand the establishment clause. Budgets for one activity may be technically separable from budgets for others. But the institution is an inseparable whole, a living organism, which is strengthened in proselytizing when it is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members.
>
> Such contributions may not be made by the State even in a minor degree without violating the establishment clause. It is not the amount of public funds expended; as this case illustrates, it is the use to which public funds are put that is controlling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask that I be yielded 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the bill proposes to tax Catholics and Jews for the support of Protestant colleges and universities. It proposes to tax Catholics and Protestants for the support of Jewish colleges and universities. It proposes to tax Jews and Protestants for the support of Catholic colleges and universities. It proposes to tax Mohammedans, Buddhists, and adherents of other faiths and nonbelievers for the support of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant colleges and universities.

Thomas Jefferson said that to do so is both sinful and tyrannical. I also say that to do that is sinful and tyrannical; furthermore, I say that it is unconstitutional under the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment.

It has been stated by the Supreme Court of the United States that we have staked the very existence of this Nation upon religious freedom. The pending bill proposes to abolish religious freedom in America by compelling people to pay taxes for the propagation of doctrines which they disbelieve. If we enact a bill of this nature, and give the churches of the United States access to the public purse for financing their activities of any character, we will be destroying the America we have known and loved, the America which made its greatest contribution to civilization when it decreed in the first amendment that state and church should be kept separate and apart from each other.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I join with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in offering two amendments. I do not know that I can add a great deal to his full exposition of the purpose of the amendments, and the history and legal precedents upon which they are based. However, I do wish to give my reasons for joining with him in offering the two amendments.

As he has noted, the first amendment we offer would strike from the bill the authority of Congress to provide loans to church-related schools for the construction of academic facilities. Our second amendment would establish a procedure which would enable the Supreme Court to review and determine the constitutionality of such a loan to a church school, if Congress should refuse to adopt the first amendment submitted by the Senator from North Carolina and myself.

This subject is a difficult one. I have supported, during my service in the Senate, many educational bills. In my first term in the Senate, I joined Senator Taft in the introduction of the bill to provide aid to public elementary and secondary schools—which the Senate passed in 1948. In 1954 I introduced a bill, which was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to provide funds for the construction of elementary and secondary schools; it was the only such bill reported in the years between the Taft bill and the bill passed by the Senate in 1960. In 1958, I joined as a cosponsor of the National Defense Education Act. I believe that with one exception, I have supported all educational bills which have been before the Senate, including those supporting higher education.

The issue of Federal aid to church schools is controversial. It stirs emotions and even bias and prejudice. I think it very important that the subject be discussed rationally and dispassionately, and that Congress undertake its responsibility to determine if the provision in the bill providing loan funds for the construction of academic facilities for sectarian schools is prohibited by the first amendment to the Constitution. Congress has this responsibility and duty. Because of a peculiar legal situation, it is difficult for the issue to reach the Supreme Court and so have its constitutionality determined.

It is a curious thing that few cases interpreting the first amendment, which has been so ably discussed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], and the clause which is in question—"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"—have been decided by the Supreme Court with respect to the power of the Congress or the States to provide aid or support to church schools. In my view, there are three reasons for this situation.

The first reason is that it was not until about 20 years ago that the Supreme Court held that the 14th amendment made by the 1st amendment of the Constitution applicable to the States, and that under the first amendment the States had no more authority to enact legislation which would support a church, church school, religion, or religious institution than does the Federal Government.

The second reason so few cases have been decided upon this important question is that in 1923 the Supreme Court held, in the case of *Frothingham* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, that a taxpayer could not question an appropriation made by Congress unless he was able to show a substantial interest, separate from that in his capacity as one of a number of taxpayers.

I believe the third reason the Supreme Court has not been called upon to decide specifically what constitutes Federal support of a church or a religious institution rests upon the fact that until recently, the Congress has respected the prohibition of the first amendment, and has not attempted to enact legislation providing general financial support to sectarian institutions, which would be clearly barred by the first amendment.

As the able Senator from North Carolina has outlined, a number of cases dealing with State legislative action have reached the courts, and decisions have been made by the Supreme Court of the United States as to whether State legislation fell within the prohibition of the first amendment. The Senator from North Carolina cited the New Jersey case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, decided in 1947; the case of *Illinois ex rel. McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203, decided in 1948; *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, decided in 1952; and the recent prayer cases, which were decided this year.

The first case, Everson against Board of Education, originating in New Jersey, involved the constitutionality of a State legislative enactment which provided that local boards of education could reimburse parents for the cost of bus transportation of their children to parochial schools. In that case, the Court held that such aid was constitutional, upon the ground that the expenditures were for public welfare—for the primary benefit of the child, and only of incidental benefit to the church school.

In the second case, the McCollum case, the issue was whether a public school could be used on a released-time basis by various denominations to conduct religious exercises. In that case, the Supreme Court held that a public school building, a building supported by tax funds paid by all the people, could not be used—could not be loaned—to a religious denomination for religious exercises.

The third case, the case of Zorach against Clauson, upheld legislation which permitted children to be released from school to engage in religious exercises outside the public school buildings.

I believe these are the only cases which have dealt with the constitutionality under the first amendment to the Constitution of State aid to church schools.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator made a fine analysis of the holding in the Everson case. I ask the Senator, first, if in that case all members of the Court did not agree on the fundamental principle.

Mr. COOPER. They did.

Mr. ERVIN. They disagreed only on the question of whether the fundamental principle barred reimbursement of parents for the cost of bus transportation.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not true that one of the five Justices of the majority who held that the reimbursement of transportation costs did not violate the first amendment, was Justice Douglas?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. I call the Senator's attention to the concurring opinion of Justice Douglas in the case of *Engel* v. *Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421, in which he said:

> My problem today would be uncomplicated but for *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1, 17, which allowed taxpayers' money to be used to pay "the bus fares of parochial school pupils as part of a general program under which" the fares of pupils attending public and other schools were also paid. The Everson case seems in retrospect to be out of line with the first amendment.

Does not the Senator from Kentucky construe that statement of Justice Douglas to indicate that if he were to construe the Everson case anew, he would vote with Justices Burton, Jackson, Rutledge, and Frankfurter, and make the majority opinion contrary to what it actually was?

Mr. COOPER. I only know that Justice Douglas did make the statement in the Vitale case, and its implication is clear.

No case involving the appropriation of Federal funds in aid of a church school has as yet come before the Supreme Court, for the reasons I have given. However, I think it would have to be admitted that if such a case did come before the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court would follow the reasoning and the constitutional principle that it has applied to State legislation, because the first amendment was in the first instance only applicable to congressional legislation.

In the Everson case, the Court laid down the constitutional principle. The Senator from North Carolina read the principle into the Record; but I repeat it now because it is the basis upon which any decision must rest, and upon which we must determine whether the provision of the bill which we question falls within the prohibition of the first amendment.

In the opinion which Mr. Justice Black rendered in the Everson case, he said—at page 15:

> The "establishment of religion" clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion.

In the cases which have followed—the McCollum case and the Zorach case—the Court said, "We affirm this constitutional principle and we agree upon it."

Of course, it is still necessary for the Court to apply the constitutional principle to each case upon its facts, as it arises. That is the task we have today as we consider this part of the bill, which would loan to church schools tax funds obtained from levies imposed upon all the people of the United States.

In section 121, on page 55 of the bill, we find the following:

> PART C—GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR LOAN AND GRANT
>
> *Programs*
>
> Definitions
>
> Sec. 121. As used in this title—
>
> (a) (1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph, the term "academic facilities" means structures suitable for use as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and related facilities necessary or appropriate for instruction of students, or for research, or for administration of the educational or research programs, of an institution of higher education, and maintenance, storage, or utility facilities essential to operation of the foregoing facilities.

Some exceptions are set forth, as follows:

> (2) The term "academic facilities" shall not include (A) any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public, or (B) any gymnasium or other facility specially designed for athletic or recreational activities, other than for an academic course in physical education or where the Commissioner finds that the physical integration of such facilities with other academic facilities included under this title is required to carry

out the objectives of this title, or (C) any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, or (D) any facility which (although not a facility described in the preceding clause) is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school of divinity.

I am sure it will be argued that because of the exclusion from the definition of "academic facilities" of structures "used for secretarian instruction or as a place for religious worship," this exclusion removes this part of the bill from the prohibition of the first amendment. I must say that I do not think this proposition is tenable in the light of the decisions of the Court which I have cited.

Let us examine the Supreme Court decisions rendered thus far, and compare them to the far-reaching aid which would be made available by this bill, for the construction of church school structures, with certain exclusions.

In the Everson case, the Court held that reimbursement of bus transportation charges constituted a benefit for the child, as a part of a welfare program; and if a church school was benefited, the benefit was only incidental. But in the Everson case the Court intimated that it had gone to the very edge in holding the New Jersey statute constitutional.

But this bill includes a provision which would enable the Federal Government to finance all the buildings of a church school, other than those specifically excluded, if the Government desired to do so and if the necessary funds were made available. If the Congress were to make funds available, the Federal Government could, through loans, finance the construction of academic facilities for every church school in the Nation. Of course, I realize that is unlikely, but the principle is the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The time the Senator from Kentucky has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 more minutes, on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 10 more minutes, on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in the McCollum case, the Court said it was unconstitutional to allow the use of a public-school building by a religious denomination as a building for religious exercises.

Mr. President, is it not rather illogical to say that although a public-school building cannot be loaned to a church to conduct religious exercises, the Congress can appropriate millions of dollars for the financing of the academic facilities of church schools? The illogical character of such a situation is evident.

In my view, it does not matter that the exclusion in the provision before us attempts to evade the first amendment to the Constitution by providing that none of the funds which would be made available to a church school could be used for buildings in which religious exercises or sectarian teaching would be conducted. I call attention again to the principle laid down in the Everson case, which is now affirmed in two later cases. The principle does not refer to school rooms or school buildings. The cases establish the principle that the aid of the Government shall not be furnished to a religious institution. The term "religious institution" embraces its buildings and functions.

The true question before the Congress, is the constitutional principle, enunciated by the courts: Will the Congress provide Federal funds levied upon all the taxpayers to support the general needs of a religious institution or a religious school? This is not a bill affording incidental benefits to religious institutions or religious schools. It is a bill of primary benefit, which would enable the institution to construct buildings, and thus maintain its religious character.

I know that it will be argued, "What about the other programs which have been enacted?" Some States provide bus transportation to students who attend church schools.

How about the free lunch program? Lunches are provided for all students. How about the public health services?

In my judgment, those programs do not come within the prohibition of the first amendment, because they are benefits made available to all children.

What about the bills which we have passed that provide loans to church schools for dormitories? It can be argued that while such loans are connected with and provide some benefit to church schools, their essential purpose is to provide a place for the student to live and sleep, are for the students' benefit, and thus constitutional.

What about scholarships which we have provided for students under the GI bill of rights, and under the National Defense Education Act? Under those programs students may attend any school they choose, church affiliated or otherwise, since free choice is left to the individual, and the loan is for the pupil's primary benefit, I do not believe such loans are prohibited by the first amendment.

But I say to my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, that if we push the exceptions to the very limit, as this bill does, we will endanger programs which have heretofore been enacted by the Congress and which probably are constitutional—programs which I have supported, as he has.

I realize the great need for school facilities in our country. I know the need is real in church schools as well as in public schools and institutions. I have served as a member of the board of trustees of the University of Kentucky. I have served as a member of the board of trustees of two denominational schools, one Presbyterian and one Baptist. I am a member of the council of Yale University. I am familiar with the needs of both our public and private colleges and universities.

But whatever the need, we must not breach the Constitution. In its definition of the constitutional principle, the Supreme Court has declared the national purpose of the first amendment. A majority—even a majority of Congress—cannot strike down the Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights was enacted to protect the minority and their liberties, including their religious liberties, even against the will of the majority.

Mr. President, the position which I have taken is a difficult one because of the great need of church colleges and universities. It is a difficult one for me because I have supported many education programs where benefits have been made available to the students at church schools. I know that these schools—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, of whatever faith—are needed badly, because they contribute values—religious values—to our Nation and people.

But one of the greatest interests of our country has been to preserve religious freedom and erect, as Thomas Jefferson said, "a wall of separation between church and state." Madison called it, I believe, a wall of separation between religion and government.

I remember reading not long ago that in "The American Commonwealth," Bryce said, "of all the differences between the Old World and the New," the separation of church and state "is perhaps the most salient."

Mr. President, if this bill is passed as it has been presented to us, we shall enter upon a new avenue, a new course, which will erode, if not strike down, the meaning of the first amendment to the Constitution. I hope that the amendment which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and I have offered will be adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself not more than 10 minutes, and I hope to use not more than 5 minutes.

Whenever I find myself in disagreement with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], I am greatly concerned. I make not only doubly sure, but sure many, many times over, that I am right before I express that disagreement. But I find myself in complete disagreement with my good friend from Kentucky.

I was very much interested in his discussion toward the end of his speech in which he proceeded to dismiss the programs of categorical grants to religious schools in this country for some years. We have been on that course for a long time. The latest action we took in connection with that course was in connection with the bill—H.R. 12—now Public Law 88-129, signed by the President on September 24, 1963, which provided $105 million in grants for new medical teaching facilities in private as well as in public medical schools, and religious medical schools as well as public medical schools. Exactly the same principle is involved in H.R. 6143.

In addition, $35 million was provided for new dental facilities in H.R. 12, and $35 million more was provided for the rehabilitation of existing facilities. This makes a total of $175 million in grants to public and private universities and colleges and schools in our country, many of them Catholic, many of them Presbyterian, and many of them of a good many other denominations. We have been on this course since 1950, at least. We have spent many millions of dollars. After listening to the Senator from Kentucky, I called for the total amount that we have spent. I wished to have the exact figures in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have those figures placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Program	Period	Amount (millions)	Percent of amount granted to private institutions
NIH health research facilities.	6 years.	$180.0	54
Surplus property	3 years.	51.0	----------
NSF institutional grants.	1 year	16.5	----------
NIH general research support grants.	do	20.0	59
AEC grants	6 years.	22.8	50
NSF specialized grants	1 year	13.0	53
NDEA fellowships; grants to institutions.	4 years.	18.0	35
NASA fellowships	1 year	2.0	30
NIH research career award.	do	7.7	57
NIH training grants	do	107.0	55
Total of 10 programs	----------	438.0	----------

Mr. MORSE. Last Friday, as shown on page 19402 of the Congressional Record, I discussed the problem and pointed out that the categorical use grant program has been a part of congressional legislation now for a great many years.

I placed these programs in the Record on Friday.

First. Grants for construction of health research facilities authorized under Public Law 84-835 in title VII. We did not draw any line between private and public institutions in that legislation.

Second. Transfer of Federal surplus real property. We have not drawn any line between public and religious institutions in this program.

Third. National Science Foundation institutional grants. Millions of dollars are currently being appropriated and have been since 1950, but we have not drawn any line between our public and private institutions.

Fourth. The National Institutes of Health general research support grants. Millions of dollars—yet again we have not drawn any line between religious and public institutions.

Fifth. Atomic Energy Commission grants. Millions of dollars in this area also—and I did not hear anyone arguing in the Senate, when a great atomic reactor was made available to Notre Dame University, that the first amendment was being violated.

The list is as long as one's arm of grants to private as well as to public institutions, involving this principle.

Sixth. The National Science Foundation specialized facilities—millions of dollars.

Seventh. National defense fellowships and NASA fellowships with this cost of education allowances involving great sums of money.

Eighth. Research career award program.

Ninth. National Institutes of Health training grants.

We have been conducting this program for a long time. Because we have been doing it does not necessarily mean that it is constitutional. That does not follow.

I have great respect for the position taken by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], in which they raise the constitutional issue. No Senator should vote for the bill which the committee has reported to the Senate unless he thinks it is constitutional.

Mr. President, in my capacity as floor leader of the bill, I now propose to discuss briefly, the judicial review amendment which will be voted upon today. In doing so, I am acting as an advocate for the committee position that the amendment be rejected. This is, if you will, in the nature of a brief against the amendment.

ANALYSIS OF JUDICIAL REVIEW AMENDMENT

Senator Ervin's amendment 216, proposed to be offered to H.R. 6143—College Academic Facilities Act—would insert in the bill a new section authorizing taxpayers' suits to test the constitutionality of proposed grants or loans by the Commissioner of Education under the bill.

Specifically, the Commissioner would be required to publish in the Federal Register at least 60 days' notice of his intention to make a grant or loan to an institution of higher education under the bill. Any "taxpayer of the United States" would then be authorized, on behalf of himself and all other taxpayers, to bring against the Commissioner, in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a civil action in the nature of an action for a declaratory judgment, alleging that the proposed grant or loan "is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States." Such suits could be instituted at any time before the announced date of the proposed grant or loan. And the court would be authorized to try and determine the action, and to enjoin the making of the grant or loan if it adjudges the grant or loan to be unconstitutional. The Commissioner in the meantime would have to refrain from consummating the grant or loan "until final determination" of the action, that is, not only until the case has been tried and the judgment of the court has been rendered, but until available appellate reviews by higher courts, to which the losing party would undoubtedly resort, have been exhausted. It is not clear whether the grant or loan funds could be reserved for the project so as not to lapse in the event of protracted litigation, though this is presumedly intended.

There are a number of reasons, each of them compelling, which call for the rejection of this amendment. Let me summarize these reasons before enlarging on some of them. It can be argued:

First. If the Supreme Court adheres to an unbroken line of precedent—and there is no reason why it should not do so on this matter—the provision for Federal taxpayers' suits would itself be held unconstitutional. If so, and if the constitutionality of a grant or loan under the bill should in some other way properly come before the Court, the invalidity of the provision for taxpayers' suits would in turn give rise to, and require a decision on, the troublesome, indeed agonizing, question whether this provision was intended to be such a key feature of the bill that Congress would not have enacted the measure without it, and whether therefore the grant and loan provisions, though valid in themselves, must also fall. Even the insertion of the standard separability clause in the bill would not be conclusive on that point.

Second. The insertion of a provision for taxpayers' suits would almost certainly kill the bill in the House or at least delay it beyond this session, as I shall explain in the course of this discussion. Senators should weigh carefully the probable effect of their votes on the ultimate fate of the bill in conference, if we get to conference, or later during consideration of a conference report.

Third. The Senate cannot, by inserting provisions for judicial review, divert itself of the responsibility of determining the constitutionality of the grant and loan provisions for itself. The Senate did so determine in the case of the loan provisions by passing its version of S. 1241–H.R. 8900 last year, which included the Hill-Morse amendment to exclude facilities used for worship, sectarian instruction, or the purposes of a divinity school. The committee substitute for this year's House version, H.R. 6143, has added to the Hill-Morse amendment the further safeguard of last year's conference version which, while including grants, limits them to those facilities that are especially designed, and used solely, for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library, and thus clearly are essential to our national security, as I have previously explained in the debate on that subject. To enact this bill with an unprecedented provision for Federal taxpayers' suits to determine the constitutionality of grants and loans could imply congressional doubts about their constitutionality and thus would tend to prejudice the matter before the courts.

Fourth. To authorize suits by "taxpayers of the United States"—I venture, by the way, that almost everyone pays Federal taxes of one kind or another daily—would invite interests hostile to the measure to tie up this 5-year program in years of litigation, and would thus seriously jeopardize the objectives of this bill regardless of the eventual outcome of the litigation. This would be true even if the proposal were limited to the question of testing the validity of grants and loans under the first amendment of the Constitution; it is all the more true because the proposal specifically embraces within its sweep the fifth amendment and "any other provision of the Constitution of the United States." Senators can imagine what a free-for-all this could lead to. If we pass this provision, we had better provide enough Government lawyers to defend these suits and enough judges to try and decide them.

Fifth. Lastly, if the provision for taxpayers' suits were to be enacted and if, the Court were to overrule itself by entertaining such suits, this could be a most dangerous innovation in the Federal judicial system, and one almost certain to invite imitation. I understand that, when a taxpayer-suit provision was included in a predecessor of this bill in this Congress, H.R. 4797, the Justice Department, informally, not only pointed out that in its view the provision was unconstitutional, but expressed concern lest such a precedent open the dam to a flood of similar enactments in other related fields, such as foreign aid, veterans' benefits, and numerous aid and welfare programs, in which taxpayers' suits could swamp the courts and for years hold up the operation of such programs.

No doubt considerations such as these—as well as the reservations expressed about the validity of providing for Federal taxpayers' suits—weighed heavily in the decision of the House subcommittee in omitting this provision from the "clean bill," H.R. 6143. It is instructive, in this connection, that the House defeated a less far reaching, and in my judgment clearly valid floor amendment to H.R. 6143, that would merely have entitled an educational institution to test in the courts the constitutionality of a grant or loan to another institution where the plaintiff institution was prejudiced because of the insufficiency of funds to aid both institutions. Congressman GOODELL, in successfully opposing the provision, argued that Congress should not abdicate its own authority to interpret the Constitution "any further" and then added:

> I think that clearly the action that we [would] take here by passing such an amendment would have reverberations and ramifications that most of us are not even thinking about today; and it might very well shake the foundations in ways that we have not anticipated. * * * If we do this, we will not be able to judge the consequences for years ahead (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 14889).

Mr. President, I now propose to enlarge on two of the points in this summary: first, the view that a provision for taxpayers' suits would put the bill in serious jeopardy when it reaches the other body, and second, the view that under the precedents the provision would itself be unconstitutional.

1. THE FATE OF THE BILL IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I have already pointed out that a provision for taxpayers' suits, included in a predecessor bill in this Congress, H.R. 4797, was deliberately omitted from the "clean bill", H.R. 6143, which was introduced as the result of subcommittee consideration of the earlier measure. What is more, a clearly valid provision for judicial review of the first-amendment validity of grants or loans to an institution, at the instance of another institution of lower priority, was deleted from the "clean bill" as reported by the full Committee on Education and Labor. It is, I believe, common knowledge that when H.R. 6143 came before the House Rules Committee, strong objections to revival of this deleted provision—let alone a provision for taxpayers' suits—were raised in that committee, and that a rule for floor consideration of the bill was granted only on assurance that such a provision would not be revived on the floor by those managing the bill. The provision for suits by sister institutions—not the provision for taxpayers' suits—was, however, offered on the floor in technically perfected form by a Congressman who was not a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, and was, as I have already mentioned, defeated after debate. It seems a virtual certainty that if a provision such as that now proposed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina were to be adopted by the Senate, there would, as last year, be objection in the House to the appointment of conferees and thus the bill would once more go to the Rules Committee. One need not be clairvoyant to predict that the bill would probably rest for a very long time in the Rules Committee or that if, at best, it is permitted to go to conference—after assurance that the review provision would not be agreed to—it may be too late to resolve the differences during the current session especially in view of the other business still awaiting us.

2. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT IS ITSELF UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN THE VIEW OF MANY LEGAL SCHOLARS

Let it be said at the outset that even if Senators were to consider such a provision favorably on its merits, it would be their duty to satisfy themselves that the provision for judicial review is constitutional, just as it is their duty, under their constitutional oath, to satisfy themselves that the substantive provisions of the bill which they are supporting is constitutional. If there is grave doubt that the proposed judicial-review provision is itself constitutional, it ought therefore to be excluded from the bill, as it has been from the committee version.

Many distinguished students of the law point out that article III, section 2, of the Constitution, limits the judicial power of the United States to "cases" arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States, and to certain other types of "cases" and "controversies." Hence, they argue Congress does not have power to vest jurisdiction in the Supreme Court or other constitutional courts of the United States except for the adjudication of "cases" and "controversies" within the meaning of article III of the Constitution. *Muskrat* v. *United States,* 219 U.S. 346 (1911).

The first, and leading, cases discussing and passing upon the standing of Federal taxpayers to challenge the validity of an Act of Congress are ***Massachusetts*** v. ***Mellon*** and ***Frothingham*** v. ***Mellon,*** 262 U.S. 447 (1923), involving two separate suits in which the constitutionality of an act of Congress authorizing grants to the States to reduce maternal and infant mortality and to protect the health of mothers and infants was challenged. The suit of the Commonwealth, which was dismissed for want of jurisdiction, need not concern us here. The plaintiff in the other action, Mrs. Frothingham, in addition to making the same general attack on the statute as the Commonwealth, alleged that she was a taxpayer of the United States, and apparently contended though this was not clear, that the effect of the legislation would be to increase the burden of future taxation and thereby take her property without due process of law. Mr. Justice Sutherland, speaking for a unanimous Court in holding that it was without jurisdiction of the cause, said:

> We have no power per se to review and annul acts of Congress on the ground that they are unconstitutional. That question may be considered only when the justification for some direct injury suffered or threatened, presenting a justiciable issue, is made to rest upon such an act. Then the power exercised is that of ascertaining and declaring the law applicable to the controversy. It amounts to little more than the negative power to disregard an unconstitutional enactment, which otherwise would stand in the way of the enforcement of a legal right. The party who invokes the power must be able to show not only that the statute is invalid but that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some direct injury as the result of its enforcement, and not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally. If a case for preventive relief be presented the court enjoins, in effect, not the execution of the statute, but the acts of the official, the statute notwithstanding. Here the parties plaintiff have no such case. Looking through forms of words to the substance of their complaint, it is merely that officials of the executive department of the Government are executing and will execute an act of Congress asserted to be unconstitutional; and this we are asked to prevent. To do so would be not to decide a judicial controversy, but to assume a position of authority over the governmental acts of another and coequal department, an authority which plainly we do not possess (262 U.S. at 488–489).

And he distinguished in this respect the standing of a municipal taxpayer, as follows:

> The interest of a taxpayer of a municipality in the application of its moneys is direct and immediate and the remedy by injunction to prevent their misuse is not inappropriate. It is upheld by a large number of State cases and is the rule of this Court. *Crampton* v. *Zabriskie,* 101 U.S. 601, 609. Nevertheless, there are decisions to the contrary. See, for example, *Miller* v. *Grandy,* 13 Mich. 540, 550. The reasons which support the extension of the equitable remedy to a single taxpayer in such cases are based upon the peculiar relation of the corporate taxpayer to the corporation, which is not without some resemblance to that subsisting between stockholder and private corporation—IV Dillon Municipal Corporations, 5th edition, section 1580, et seq. But the relation of a taxpayer of the United States to the Federal Government is very different. His interest in the moneys of the Treasury—partly realized from taxation and partly from other sources—is shared with millions of others; is comparatively minute and indeterminable; and the effect upon future taxation, of any payment out of the funds, so remote, fluctuating and uncertain, that no basis is afforded for an appeal to the preventive powers of a court of equity.
>
> The administration of any statute, likely to produce additional taxation to be imposed upon a vast number of taxpayers, the extent of whose several liability is indefinite and constantly changing, is essentially a matter of public and not of individual concern. If one taxpayer may champion and litigate such a cause, then every other taxpayer may do the same, not only in respect to the statute here under review but also in respect of every other appropriation act and statute whose administration requires the outlay of public money, and whose validity may be questioned. The bare suggestion of such a

> result, with its attendant inconveniences, goes far to sustain the conclusion which we have reached, that a suit of this character cannot be maintained. It is of much significance that no precedent sustaining the right to maintain suits like this has been called to our attention, although, since the formation of the Government, as an examination of the acts of Congress will disclose, a large number of statutes appropriating or involving the expenditure of moneys for non-Federal purposes have been enacted and carried into effect (262 U.S. at 486–488).

The doctrine of Massachusetts against Mellon has retained its full vigor, having been applied as well as cited with approval by the Supreme Court in subsequent cases. See, for example, *Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes,* 302 U.S. 464, 478–479 (1938). It is difficult for many constitutional lawyers to see, in the face of these decisions, how the Congress could confer jurisdiction on a "constitutional" Federal court to review the validity of grants and loans under this bill at the instance of a Federal taxpayer, since these decisions appear to rest on the basis of constitutional limitations of Federal power. I am not unaware that Professor Jaffe, and perhaps some others, have argued that the Court should modify its position, but the Court has not done so. I am aware, too, of cases, such as *F.C.C.* v. *Sanders Bros. Radio Station,* 309 U.S. 470, which recognize the power of Congress to confer standing on certain litigants, as vindicators of the public interest, to challenge official action, but it will be noted in such cases that the litigant also has a strong personal interest that is at stake, such as, for example, that of a competitor of the recipient of a radio license, an interest compared to which the interest of a taxpayer, which he shares with millions of others, is extremely tenuous and remote.

The view that an act of Congress attempting to confer jurisdiction on a Federal court by a Federal taxpayer to challenge the validity of a Federal grant or loan would be beyond the power of Congress is also supported by the opinion of the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare submitted to the Subcommittee on Education in connection with another bill in the 87th Congress—Senate Document No. 29, 87th Congress, 1st session, page 27. As stated by him:

> This requirement of a "case or controversy" is imposed upon the Federal courts by article III of the Constitution, and there appears to be no way in which legislation can dilute this requirement.

I am informed that in connection with the predecessor of this bill in the House of Representatives, that is, H.R. 4797, which contained a provision for judicial review of the validity of grants or loans at the instance of a Federal taxpayer, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and, I believe, the subcommittee considering the bill, were informally advised by the Department of Justice that in its opinion such a provision would itself be unconstitutional.

Perhaps recognizing the weight of these considerations, my distinguished colleague's amendment would limit jurisdiction of taxpayers' suits under the amendment to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. However, it seems plain that such a provision would be no more valid than one vesting jurisdiction in such cases in U.S. district courts for the State in which the Federal taxpayer is a resident or in which the institution of higher education concerned is situated. It is true that, while the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District have been held to be so-called constitutional courts, *O'Donaghue* v. *United States,* 289 U.S. 516 (1933), Congress, by virtue of its plenary legislative power over the District of Columbia, could confer and in fact has conferred, on such courts additional powers outside the limits of the judicial power conferred by article III of the Constitution. However, these additional powers relate to the affairs of the District of Columbia and it would seem clear that functions not involving the adjudication of a "case" or "controversy" cannot be conferred by Congress on the District of Columbia when such functions are not related to the affairs of the District.

As said by Mr. Justice Harlan in *Glidden Co.* v. *Zdanok,* 370 U.S. 530, 580 (1962), to extend the O'Donaghue holding "to the wholly nationwide jurisdiction of courts whose seat is in the District of Columbia would be to ignore the special importance attached in the O'Donaghue opinion to the need there for an independent national judiciary." Moreover, even if it were constitutional for Congress, under its special powers over the District of Columbia, to confer such extraneous powers on the U.S. District Court or the Court of Appeals for the District, Congress would still be powerless to confer certiorari jurisdiction in such cases on the U.S. Supreme Court, so that the Court of Appeals for the District would become the court of last resort of the National constitutional issues which would be raised by a Federal taxpayer under this bill. This clearly is felt by many to be incompatible with the design of the Constitution or with the public interest. In fact, Mrs. Frothingham's taxpayer's suit was brought in the District of Columbia. See also, *Wheless* v. *Millon,* 10F (2d) 893 (1926), and *Elliott* v. *White,* 23F (2d) 997 (1928), holding that taxpayers had no standing in District of Columbia courts to enjoin, in the one case, enforcement of the Act providing for adjusted compensation to veterans and, in the other case, to enjoin payment of appropriated funds for salaries of Chaplains of Congress, the Army, and the Navy.

I have tried to point out that we have a legislative responsibility, in my judgment, to pass legislation which we consider to be constitutional. If any Senator thinks it is not constitutional, he has the trust to vote against it.

I further say, most respectfully, that the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky will kill this legislation if they should succeed in having it adopted and I trust they will not succeed. We must make up our minds whether or not to enact legislation in this critical area.

As I pointed out last Friday in the quotation from Dr. Logan Wilson, the president of the American Council on Education, by 1980—17 years from today—in order to meet the student needs which will be pressing upon the college doors of this country, there must be a doubling of the size of every university and college now existing in the United States, and an adding of more than a thousand new colleges with an average enrollment of 2,500 students each. To meet this need is the national policy question before us.

Mr. President, in my judgment, we should not approve amendments which would result in no legislation, if they were to be adopted. It would be a mistake to agree to them. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Now I come to a point which I believe is of the greatest concern; namely, that this amendment is necessary in order to get a Supreme Court ruling on the legislation. That I deny.

As I said last Friday, the Maryland case is now on its way, moving upstairs to the Supreme Court, and I trust it will reach there eventually. In my judgment, the Maryland case is on point: In the Maryland case there will be a decision as to the application of the first amendment to legislation which puts taxpayers' money into categorical use grants or into categorical use loans.

H.R. 6143, in the committee version is not a general grant bill. As the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Carolina know, I hold to the proposition that a general grant bill would be clearly unconstitutional. I disagree with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with the legal advice which the White House has endorsed on that matter. I believe they are wrong. I believe a general grant bill would be unconstitutional, but I do not believe that a categorical use bill which is related to the security and defense needs of this country would be held to be unconstitutional, because underlying it is the contract agency relationship whereby the Government in effect is entering into a contract or an agency relationship with a private institution to perform certain specific services essential to the defense and security of this country.

That is the theory of the bill. That is the theory of the National Defense Education Act. It is the theory of the Atomic Energy Commission grants. It is the theory of the National Science Foundation programs.

I do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky or the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that the legal questions involved will not reach the Supreme Court without an amendment such as they propose. I believe they will. Because of the great national need that confronts us, I strongly recommend following the course of action recommended by the committee.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Supreme Court of Oregon—the home State of my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], has told us why other kinds of bills have been getting by.

In the case of *Dickman* v. *School Distric No. 62c, Oregon City*, 366 Pacific 2d, 533, the Supreme Court of Oregon held that the State could not even give free textbooks to children in the religious schools. Yet the bill proposes to give free buildings to religious schools.

As to the reason why they have been getting away with this practice, the court said:

> In many instances it is obvious that constitutional principles have been sacrificed to serve urgent needs of the community and State; and in others there simply has not been real analysis of the problem.

That explains why Congress may have transgressed the first amendment in times past.

While Congress may have violated the first amendment in times past, people have been murdering and stealing a longer time. The long established practice of murder and stealing has not made murder meritorious or larceny legal.

With reference to a court review, there is grave doubt whether one could get into a Federal court to test the constitutionality of this bill. The bill would be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department stated before the House committee about 2 years ago, in a written memorandum, that one could not expect to get a decision from the courts on the settlement of this problem under existing conditions. Certainly Congress does not want to legislate in constitutional darkness. Therefore, I call on the Senate to make it certain that we can get a court determination of the constitutionality of such grants. Let us legislate in constitutional light instead of constitutional darkness.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall take only a few moments. In all respect to the Senator from Oregon, I must point out that his response was not at all directed to the constitutional question involved here.

First, I made it very clear in my statement, as did the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], that a constitutional principle respecting the interpretation of the first amendment has been laid down by the Supreme Court in the Everson case, and affirmed in three later cases; but, of course, in every case the facts must be applied to the constitutional principle. So the recital by the Senator from Oregon of the various kinds of aid that have been provided to church related schools in the past has no relevance to the issue before us today. The issue is whether the provision of tax funds to church schools for the construction of buildings for general purposes is prohibited by the first amendment.

If any of the forms of aid had been permitted to be reviewed by the Supreme Court—and the Senator knows the question cannot very well get there—perhaps some of them which had been approved by the Congress would have been held not to comply with the first amendment. Perhaps others would have been approved. But our amendment would not affect existing programs directly; it would prohibit the use of tax funds in this bill for general building purposes on church schools.

The question we are dealing with in this bill is, Does such aid to church schools fall within the prohibition of the first amendment? I can only say that the provisions of this bill are more far-reaching than any kind of aid to church-related schools ever previously provided by Congress. The bill would provide for all instruction needs practically. It covers almost all the needs of a sectarian college except the payment of salaries of teachers or administrators. Yet, it is argued that this is not aid to church institutions.

Our second amendment should be adopted to assure that there will be a review by the Supreme Court of these provisions.

The Senator from Oregon referred to the Maryland case. The case involves State aid, not Federal aid as in this case. I make my constitutional arguments with all respect to the Senator from Oregon, because he is a great teacher and a great lawyer. I have worked with him many times on educational bills, but I think the argument is against him in this case.

The argument that Congress has in the past provided different types of aid to church schools and facilities does not go to the issue facing us today. Each type of aid stands on its own in reference to the first amendment.

In conclusion, I quote former Justice Stone:

> History teaches us that there have been few infringements of personal liberty by the State which have not been justified either in the name of righteousness or the public good.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would a general taxpayer, under existing law and existing decisions, have a pecuniary interest of a value that would warrant him in bringing a taxpayer's suit against the expenditure of funds contemplated in the bill?

Mr. COOPER. I referred earlier to the case of Frothingham against Melon. The case held that the taxpayer did not have a sufficient interest—that is, a separate interest from other taxpayers—to enable him to test an appropriation. However, I believe the Court could, if it wanted to, hear such a case, and go to the merits of this issue—and I think it should do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my State there is a law which provides that when taxpayers' moneys are improperly expended, a taxpayer has a right of action to challenge the expenditure. I believe there is no such authority given under Federal law to a taxpayer to bring an action of that kind.

Mr. COOPER. I think that is correct. In many States it is provided that a taxpayer cannot test an appropriation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am trying to explore in my own mind the question as to who can bring such a suit.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from North Carolina has written the amendment, in which I have joined, by which the right would be given.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point so that I may reply?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. This amendment provides that a taxpayer can bring a suit in his own behalf and in behalf of all other taxpayers. In order to avoid harassment of the Federal Commissioner of Education, the amendment provides that suit may be brought only in the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia. Consequently suits could not be brought all over the land. In order to bring about a speedy determination of any question raised, the amendment provides that all suits to test the constitutional validity of a specific grant or specific loan can be consolidated for purposes of trial and judgment in the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia. As a consequence, there will be only one trial in respect to any specific grant or specific loan.

The amendment is very simple, and is in complete harmony with the State law which prevails in Ohio and virtually all other States. It is consistent with the law which the Federal courts recognize in suits brought to test the constitutionality of State aid to religion.

If this bill should be enacted without this amendment, we shall continue to legislate in constitutional darkness, and not be permitted to ascertain whether our legislation in this field is constitutional or not.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to myself.

We owe it to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] to get on with his amendment, because we agreed to a variation in procedure in order that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] might be able to present his amendment to discuss it and so the Senator from Kentucky could join in offering it. I do not propose to continue my rebuttal until the Ervin amendment is called up.

May I say good naturedly to my friends from North Carolina and Kentucky that, as I listened to a discussion of the U.S. Supreme Court cases which they have been discussing, it occurred to me that cases reaching the Supreme Court with the question of the first amendment involved are not irrelevant to a discussion of the issue involving a State case. In due course, I believe it will be found that the Maryland case will raise the question of the first amendment, from the action taken by the lower courts we shall be getting some decisions of the Supreme Court in regard to application of the first amendment, with reference to the question of how far taxpayers' dollars can be used in giving support to private schools of a religious denomination.

I understand the Senator from Texas wants the floor. May I ask him for how long?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Five minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that is acceptable to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator object if I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas, with the understanding that then the Senator from Vermont will take the floor and proceed on his amendment, which I hope can be acted on within the next hour or hour and a half?

Mr. PROUTY. I have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

FEDERAL AID IN HIGHER EDUCATION CLASSROOM CONSTRUCTION NEEDED IN UNITED STATES NOW

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Senator from Oregon for the time and attention he has given to this bill. For years many of us in the Senate have been seeking authorization of a program to aid in meeting the building crisis in American colleges and universities. We have long sought to add to the existing college housing program so as to allow Federal aid for classroom construction adequate to educate the greatly increasing numbers of Americans who are seeking higher education. I need not recount now the tangled legislative history of college classroom construction proposals. Over several Congresses each House has expressed more than once its support of such a program; yet we have not been able to prevent a series of untimely accidental deaths. However, this year, I hope we have learned from experience; the prospects for enactment look good, largely because of the leadership of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and his willingness to take more than the first step toward accommodating all views and enlisting all possible support for the bill.

The need for this bill is one of the best attested facts of our times. For years, the number of college age youths has been rising rapidly, and the percentage of those youths actually entering college has been rising. Every reputable voice in the field of higher education has been heard to state that the need is urgent, that the colleges and universities just cannot acquire the funds needed for expansion through their traditional sources. Certainly college tuition fees are higher than is ideally desirable. Indeed, the ideal institution of higher learning would charge no more fees than a high school. Emphasis would be put on a student's brain power, not on his pocketbook power. If we want a college system in this country that gives higher education to at least the same percentage of our youth as in the past, and it is one of the glories of America that it is such a high percentage, we must take some positive action to help provide the classroom space. The distinguished Dr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, pointed out before our committee, that by 1980 this country will need to effectively double the size of every existing institution of higher learning, and in addition establish a thousand new colleges with average enrollments of 2,500 students.

In my State of Texas, college enrollments will rise by 56,000 by 1965, more than twice the present 22,000 enrollment of the University of Texas. Classrooms for these students must be provided.

In what form should this aid be provided? I admit my own reservations as to whether the Senate-reported bill is the ideal combination. But we must recognize that to be equitable a higher education construction program must contain both grant and loan assistance. Some colleges lack legal authority for any or further borrowing; some colleges are constrained from accepting governmental grants. I feel the Senate committee bill is a reasonable constitutional attempt, through its grants for science, technical and library buildings, and loans for general classroom construction, to provide effective aid for every college needing additional classroom space.

The special recognition given to public community colleges under the committee bill is very commendable. This is a great improvement on the House bill. The large increase in numbers of these institutions in recent years is a desirable response to the needs of the times by providing higher education and post-high-school training near the homes of the students. A great many educators feel it is the most desirable means of meeting the booming college enrollments. Yet these institutions are less able than the older 4-year colleges to meet their budgets through alumni contributions and higher tuition. It is sound policy to write our bill so that these 2-year institutions will receive an adequate measure of support. There should be a junior college within 50 miles of every student in America. As in California, tuition in these junior colleges should be free to all. College tuition is too high in America. An adequate building program is needed to keep rates from going higher.

The most expensive college classroom buildings to construct and equip are the science, technical, and library buildings. If we in the Congress vote the money growth for these expensive buildings, conventional classrooms can be more easily financed by the Federal loans in the Senate bill, or from State or local funds. That justifies the Senate bill's being more particularly directed toward easing the shortages in these categories of buildings—science, technical, and library buildings.

The bill as reported by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee is a sound and constructive approach to this great problem. I think it is the surest route to enactment of a bill this session. It deserves the overwhelming support of the Senate.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield one minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in 1957, when I first introduced proposed legislation to provide Federal aid to the States in order to stimulate the construction of 2-year junior colleges, now generally known as community colleges, we were concerned about the postwar baby crop and its educational needs. This group has now grown to college age and is eager to benefit by college education.

Unfortunately, we have not carried out the expansion of college facilities, both 2-year and 4-year, to the point of meeting this growing need. It is not merely a matter of growth in population. Every year a higher percentage of high school graduates go on to college. In 1950, 15 percent of high school graduates went on to college. Today 40 percent of high school graduates are in college, and in 1970 it is expected that more than half will go on to some form of higher education.

In the last 5 years, there has been a tremendous spurt of interest and enthusiasm in the 2-year colleges. Of the 90 new colleges established in this country during the past 5 years, 69 are junior colleges, and I am confident that if the stimulus of Federal aid were available, this number would be multiplied many times.

The 1960 census figures provide dramatic evidence of the migration of Americans from rural areas to the big cities and their suburbs. Currently, more than half the population of the United States lives in the 125 largest metropolitan areas. Indeed, two-thirds of the population of the United States lives in the 212 standard metropolitan areas of the United States.

It is in these centers of population that the need for higher education facilities is the greatest. It is to these areas that the populations have migrated and the demands for educational services have mounted rapidly.

The 2-year community colleges which I have supported are particularly effective in such areas. These neighborhood junior colleges can reach the largest number of people and meet a broad variety of needs.

What are community colleges? The community college is properly named. It is indeed a community institution. It has the capability to meet a wide range of needs in the community, and to do so economically.

The community colleges provide a 2-year terminal program for students not going on to a 4-year college course, a transfer program for those who do wish to complete a college training program of 4 or more years, technical training for those who desire to enter skilled vocational and subprofessional careers, and continuing education for adults who want to further their education while working.

Community colleges are economical to establish and economical to attend. Community colleges do not include expensive dormitory and eating facilities, and, therefore, do not require the tremendous sums involved in such structures. Student expenses are usually low, because, for the most part, junior colleges are within commuting distance, and thus make it possible for students to live at home. If need be, they can work part time in their own communities.

New Jersey has acted to authorize a program for the construction of 2-year colleges, and 11 of the 21 counties have study committees to consider programs for their development. Two counties have already agreed to establish community colleges, and a third county application is moving along. New Jersey's Commissioner of Education Frederick Raubinger has described this plan for 2-year community colleges as "one of the most important proposals currently before the State."

The Federal program of matching grants, which I have been urging for several years, would be helpful to New Jersey and to other States in meeting the increasing need for community colleges. Under the pending bill, New Jersey's allotment when matched by the State, for example, would amount to $4,030,059. This would be a real help.

I believe that three paragraphs from President Kennedy's education message last January are worthy of repetition here. The President noted:

> The opportunity for a college education is severely limited for hundreds of thousands of young people because there is no college in their own community. Studies indicate that the likelihood of going to college on the part of a high school graduate who lives within 20–25 miles of a college is 50-percent greater than it is for the student who lives beyond commuting distance. This absence of college facilities in many communities causes an unfortunate waste of some of our most promising youthful talent. A demonstrated method of meeting this particular problem effectively is the creation of 2-year community colleges—a program that should be undertaken without delay and which will require Federal assistance for the construction of adequate facilities.
>
> I recommend, therefore, a program of grants to States for construction of public community junior colleges.
>
> There is an especially urgent need for college level training of technicians to assist scientists, engineers, and doctors. Although ideally one scientist or engineer should have the backing of two or three technicians, our institutions today are not producing even 1 technician for each 3 science and engineering graduates. This shortage results in an inefficient use of professional manpower—the occupation of critically needed time and talent to perform tasks which could be performed by others—an extravagance which cannot be tolerated when the Nation's demand for scientists, engineers, and doctors continues to grow. * * *

I hope that the Senate will support community colleges as a part of a higher education bill. They represent the only chance for higher education for thousands and thousands of our bright young men and women who might otherwise be denied this opportunity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield myself a half hour. I am happy to yield 10 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this is a most important piece of legislation. It is important to our colleges, to our students, and to the future strength of our Nation.

For the third time in 3 years we stand on the verge of success with this legislation. In 1961 a college aid bill reached the Senate floor. In 1962 a bill passed the Senate and also passed the House, but the conference report was defeated in the House. This year there must not be a third out; what we need is a solid base hit.

The bill as reported by the distinguished Senator from Oregon is a valuable measure. It deserves the support of every Senator who wants to help the cause of education. It is a good bill. I believe it can become a better bill. But before I discuss the pending amendment, I want the Senator from Oregon to understand that I recognize and value the great work he has done to bring this bill before the Senate, and if the effort to improve the measure is not successful, the bill will nevertheless have my full support.

The issue before us now is whether we should make an improvement in this bill. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont, which I am pleased to cosponsor, proposes a significant improvement.

The crucial difference between the House bill, as proposed in our amendment, and the committee version, urged by the Senator from Oregon, comes down to the purposes for which the grant funds can be used. The House bill permits grant funds to be used broadly for construction of any academic facilities. The committee version limits the use of grant funds to buildings for teaching the natural and physical sciences and engineering, and also for libraries.

The broader purposes of the House bill are clearly preferable. Higher education needs support in all fields. It simply cannot be argued that funds should be used to aid the teaching of physics but not the teaching of foreign languages, to aid the teaching of biology but not the teaching of economics, to aid the teaching of botany but not the teaching of history.

On the merits of this point, little more need be said, except to respond to one argument advanced on Friday by the Senator from Oregon. It was his contention that the House bill would offer little added benefit in practice, since colleges could receive funds for the stated purposes of the committee bill and thereby release their own funds for such other academic facilities as they may need. The flaw in this argument is that many colleges have no need whatever for the limited facilities authorized by the committee bill, but have a desperate need for facilities which are prohibited by the bill.

For example, I have received a telegram from Charles Shain, president of the Connecticut College for Women, at New London, Conn. This college does not need a new library or an engineering building. But it does urgently need a new building for instruction in the social sciences. The grant funds provided in the committee bill are simply useless for this college, and for many others with similar needs.

Looking at this matter realistically, I think it must be obvious that the educational merits of the argument are not in dispute. I am sure the Senator from Oregon would agree that from the standpoint of education, it makes far more sense to provide financial support for instruction in all academic subjects, not just a selected few.

What is at issue here is not the educational merits but the religious controversy. This is the heart of the issue, and we might as well deal with it directly. For the plain fact is that the committee bill is being put forth not because it does more for education but because it is alleged to do less to stir up the religious controversy.

The argument has been made that the constitutional limits of the first amendment permit grants for science teaching and libraries but not for other academic subjects.

With all deference to the wisdom of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—and that wisdom is deep and great in constitutional matters, and he is a learned scholar of the law—this argument cannot be supported. There is not one single decision of the U.S. Supreme Court that gives the slightest indication that teaching of some academic subjects may be supported at church-related colleges but other academic subjects may not be.

After reading carefully the argument of the Senator from Oregon, I do not believe he finds in the first amendment a distinction between academic courses, a distinction, say, between ecology and economics. Rather his basic argument is one with which I can readily agree. He has expressed his point of view in these words:

> I hold to the point of view that a general grant of Federal funds to a university with religious ties to do with the money whatever it wants to do with it cannot be squared with the doctrine of separation of church under our constitutional system.

The key words in that statement are "to do with the money whatever it wants to do."

I agree that the Constitution does limit a grant of that sort. The Senator is referring to unrestricted funds. He is talking about across-the-board aid. Such aid does raise the most serious constitutional problems, because aid given on that basis can be used for any aspect of a church-related college, including the obviously religious aspects. Aid that is given on an across-the-board basis can be used to build a chapel, to purchase religious ornaments and in a variety of ways to promote the purely religious aspects of a church-related college.

My argument with the Senator from Oregon is that the broader legislation passed by the House and supported here by the Senator from Vermont and myself does not provide for unrestricted grants that could be used for such purposes. The Senator from Oregon has said "The House bill is an across-the-board grant bill. The Senate bill is a categorical grant bill." With the utmost respect, I must disagree with that characterization, and this is the crux of the dispute.

The House bill does not provide grant funds on an across-the-board basis. Like the Senate commission version, it is careful to exclude from any Federal financial assistance "any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship" and "any facility which is used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity."

These plainly religious aspects of church-related colleges are specifically excluded from the benefits of the legislation, in both the Senate and House versions.

The choice is not between a grant program that is restricted and one that is unrestricted. The choice is between two restricted programs, and the question is: Having already excluded all that we need to exclude to satisfy the Constitution, what academic subjects shall we choose to include? The question is no longer the constitutional one, because both bills are careful to deal with that question. The real issue is the educational one: Shall we support only the natural and physical sciences or all academic subjects?

I think the pointlessness of limiting our assistance to a few subjects is highlighted by the provision in the Senate committee bill for grants to build libraries. It is well known that college libraries contain books on all academic subjects, and it is not at all uncommon for such buildings to contain carrels for individual study and seminar rooms and even classrooms for group study. I fail to understand why those who will grant funds to build a library in which a student can read history books, study history, and attend a seminar in history, will not provide funds to build a classroom building in which history can be taught.

There may be some who believe that not every academic subject is of sufficient importance to warrant Federal financial support. If that is the case, then let us carefully consider which subjects we choose to support and which ones we prefer not to. Possibly broad support of all academic subjects would include some subjects that do not need support. If that is the objection to the pending amendment, if there is virtue in naming the subjects to be supported, then let us at least broaden the list of supported subjects beyond the narrow confines of the natural and physical sciences and engineering. Important as these subjects are, they are not entitled to a preferred position among all other subjects. College-trained men and women in a host of other fields are vital to the future of our Nation. If our amendment should fail of adoption, it is my earnest hope that the conference committee that will reconcile the limited purposes of the Senate bill with the broader scope of the House bill will end up with financial support for a wide range of academic subjects.

I hope the pending amendment will be approved, because I believe it better meets the needs of higher education. But as I said at the outset, my greater interest is in seeing the passage of a college aid bill.

For too long, now, the cause of education has been set back by those who have said: "Unless you do it our way, we are opposed." That is most emphatically not my position. I support the pending amendment. If it fails, I will support the committee bill. If the bill passes, I hope it will be improved in conference. But if the committee bill is all that can be achieved in conference, then I will support a conference report that brings back that result.

For too long, now, the cause of education has been harmed by its friends. Let us now be concerned only with our opponents. And let the friends of education pay more attention to what unites them than to what divides them. In short, let the friends of education support the cause of education.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his thoughtful statement. As a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, his qualifications to discuss this all-important question are equaled by few Members of the Senate. I am proud and happy to have him as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

COLLEGES AND MEMBERS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OVERWHELMINGLY ENDORSE HOUSE-PASSED BILL

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am asking the Senate to approve a higher education bill which has twice received the overwhelming approval of the U.S. House of Representatives. It is endorsed by the Democratic leadership of the House; it is endorsed by the Republican leadership of the House; and it is favored by the vast majority of the universities and colleges of this country.

This House-passed measure, which I want to send directly to the White House, for signature, the Senator from Oregon would have the Senate defeat. He would have Senators vote for a bill that would go to conference—perhaps never to see the light of day as a public law.

I ask Senators to vote for a bill that will give us a higher education law within a matter of hours—a bill that was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 287 to 113.

When Senators make their choice, it is a choice that they will have to live with. If they vote against the House version of the bill, and if we end up with no higher education law, Senators will have to answer to the colleges and universities of this country. Senators will have to answer to the boys and girls of America who cannot go to college because they are told "there is no room for you."

Let me make it unmistakably clear that I do not want a single Senator to vote for the House version of the bill unless he is willing to vote against every attempt that may be made to amend that version, however meritorious the amendment may be.

The whole purpose of my fight in this matter is to get a higher education bill this year, and to avoid running the risk of going to conference. So, if Senators want to help in this struggle, so if they want to make room for the boys and girls who want a higher education, then Senators should join me in support of the House version of the bill, and against any amendment that may be offered to that bill.

The Senator from Oregon would have us believe that the finest lawyers in the House of Representatives have voted for a bill that is unconstitutional. He would have us believe that we should disregard the official views of the present administration on the constitutional question. Those views, which fully sustain the House version of the bill, were inserted in the RECORD on Friday, October 11.

Should any Member of the Senate wish to have a copy of the administration memorandum which relates to Federal aid to private colleges, I shall be happy to furnish him a copy. However, I shall read at this time one of its most significant paragraphs:

> We are not, at the college level, dealing with a system of universal, free, compulsory education available to all students. The process is more selective, the education more specialized, and the role of private institutions vastly more important. There are obvious limitations upon what the Government can hope to accomplish by way of expanding public or other secular educational facilities. If the public purpose is to be achieved at all, it can only be achieved by a general expansion of private as well as public colleges, of sectarian as well as secular ones.

THE SENATE BILL WOULD PROVIDE NO AID TO JUNIOR COLLEGES

One of the greatest weaknesses of the Senate committee version of the bill is that it would not provide any help for the private junior colleges. If Senators vote for the committee version, they may have to answer to these junior colleges—and I am talking about all private junior colleges, both those which are church-related and those which are not.

These private junior colleges, which are shunted aside by the committee version, are part of the very backbone of our educational system.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I am very much interested in the junior colleges. I have received the following telegram from the Maryland State superintendent of schools:

> Request that you vote against the Prouty amendment to the education bill which comes before you on Tuesday, October 15. It is inimical to the interest of 10,000 students enrolled in 11 Maryland public junior colleges, as it eliminates public junior and community college title entirely. The House bill which the Prouty amendment actually supports would provide direct Federal contact with local junior and community colleges, bypassing State and local school authorities, and establishing Federal control and direction of public education on this level in its rankest and most objectionable form. In my opinion, presently proposed legislation, as represented by House bill on education, is selling public education down the river. Request conference of Senate and

> House on this important issue. I hope you will be on guard to protect the interest of your constituents.
>
> THOMAS G. PULLEN, Jr.,
> *State Superintendent of Schools.*

I ask the Senator from Vermont whether his substitute would bypass the organized, recognized school boards of the various States.

Mr. PROUTY. It would not. The gentleman who sent the telegram must have been completely misinformed.

To provide clarification on this point, I read from section 103 of the House version of the bill:

> STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS
>
> SEC. 103. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the grant program under this title shall designate for that purpose an existing State agency which is broadly representative of the public and of institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and technical institutes) in the State, or, if no such State agency exists, shall establish such a State agency, and submit to the Commissioner through the agency so designated or established (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "State commission"), a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—
>
> (1) provides that it shall be administered by the State commission;

There is no real substantive difference between the language of my amendment and the language of the Senate committee version with the respect to the procedure to be followed.

Mr. BEALL. To clarify the matter, as I understand in States which have, as Maryland has, a State board of education which is authorized by the State legislature and is appointed by the Governor, such State boards of education would be the recognized bodies in the States to administer the act, under the provisions of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, would they?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes, if the State government so desired.

Mr. BEALL. If the State government so desired?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. BEALL. Next, I should like to refer specifically to the junior colleges. I read the following part of the telegram:

> Request that you vote against the Prouty amendment * * *. It is inimical to the interest of 10,000 students enrolled in 11 Maryland public junior colleges, as it eliminates public junior and community college title entirely.

Are they definitely included in the amendment of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes; they are very definitely included. The House version provides that 22 percent of the funds allocated shall be given to both public and private junior colleges and technical institutes—which are not included under the Senate committee version.

Mr. BEALL. So the amendment of the Senator from Vermont would expand the coverage of the bill, insofar as junior colleges are concerned, would it?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. BEALL. And all of them would be under a State regulatory agency, would they?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, junior colleges have absorbed much of the increase in student enrollment in recent years, and will assume an even greater share in the years ahead. Junior college enrollments last fall showed a 13.7-percent increase over 1961, compared with an overall increase of 8.1 percent for all higher education institutions.

These private junior colleges are carrying an important part of the load. The House version of the bill would help them bear that load; the Senate committee version would not give them a dime.

I ask, how will Senators answer the private junior colleges of this country when they inquire: "Why did you leave us out?"

If Senators vote for the House version, they will be able to say: "I vote to assist you." If Senators vote for the committee version, they will have to say: "I voted to leave you out."

THE SENATE BILL WILL PROVIDE NO AID TO TECHNICAL INSTITUTES

I said that the private junior colleges of America might ask some rather embarrassing questions if Senators vote for the committee version of the bill, in preference to the House version.

Now I want to talk about another "sleeper" that you Senators will have to watch out for: One of the most significant omissions of the Senate committee version is its failure to provide grants to technical institutes.

Under the terms of the Prouty-Ribicoff substitute, the House version, and at least 22 percent of the funds allotted for the construction of undergraduate facilities must be used for the construction of technical institutes and junior colleges, both public and private.

Why is it important that we guarantee aid to technical institutes? Why would it be a serious mistake to leave them out or give them no significant assistance?

I will tell why; but first let us clarify what is meant by technical institutes. They are institutions of higher learning which prepare the specialists and semiprofessional technicians to assist our scientists and engineers. The President's Science Advisory Committee's Panel on Scientific and Technical Manpower recently warned of the necessity of a substantial increase in this type of personnel.

These people are, in effect, the mainstays of scientific progress, for without them our scientists and engineers are impeded immeasurably by attention to perfunctory tasks. To further accentuate this urgent need, I quote President Kennedy's education message this year:

> This shortage results in an inefficient use of professional manpower, the occupation of critically needed time and talent to perform tasks which could be performed by others, and extravagance which cannot be tolerated when the Nation's demand for scientists, engineers, and doctors continues to grow.

And the then Under Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz, testified last year before the House Education and Labor Committee that:

> Our particular need is for semiprofessional personnel who can assist engineers, scientists, and other professional workers. The manufacture of missiles and spacecraft has not only created an increasing demand for scientists and engineers, but it has also stimulated a tremendous need for supporting personnel.

The House version has taken this need into consideration, by including technical institutes and junior colleges among those eligible for grants. I feel that this oversight in the Senate Committee version is, indeed, an unacceptable one.

Further excerpts from Mr. Wirtz's testimony at that juncture serve to illustrate the continuing nature of this requirement:

> Our studies show that these subprofessional engineering and scientific occupations have been among the fastest growing occupational fields in recent decades and that at the present we do not have enough persons with the requisite education. There is every indication that these occupations will continue to grow rapidly in the years ahead and that if future requirements in this field are to be met, a considerable increase in the number of persons who receive the necessary education will be necessary.

Citing the proposed lunar landing as an example, Secretary Wirtz estimated that a figure of 70,000 semiprofessional supporting personnel would be needed between now and 1970 for that program alone, with the demand concentrated mostly in the next 3 to 5 years. Even more revealing, however, is the estimate that overall approximately 1,450,000 of these workers will be needed by 1970.

Paul Robbins, executive director of the National Society of Professional Engineers, concluded from extensive surveys that the ratio of technicians to professional personnel should be about four or five to one for maximum utilization of ability. At present, he said, "the overall industry ratio is 73 technicians for every 100 engineers and scientists."

These statistics are perhaps, in part, the reason for the finding of the President's Science Advisory Committee report of December 12, 1962, which stated that there was a need to increase the number of technicians in order to "conserve professional skills and thus enhance total manpower resources."

The Committee also felt that the problem is "critical enough to warrant Federal attention and Federal legislation especially to assist and otherwise stimulate the growth of educational facilities."

These technicians are needed in: First, research and development; second, space; third, civilian industry; and fourth, defense.

A very important point to note is that the education of this type of personnel is completely ignored by the Senate version. A statement made by Dr. W. G. Torpey, of the Office of Emergency Planning, in the Executive Office of the President, will allow us to focus more directly on the issue:

> Of all the sources of technicians, evidence indicates that, on the whole, 2-year college level technician education programs—offered primarily through technical institutes and junior and community colleges—produce the highest quality technician personnel, having a basic but broad technical orientation and able to contribute to present as well as future technical work challenges.

The obvious conclusion that we should draw from these statements of the existing need for technicians, and in what type of institutions they are best educated, is that the need for increased facilities dovetails with such needs for science and engineering facilities. This is one of the primary reasons I support the House version of the bill which would include these institutions within its scope.

IF WE DOWNGRADE THE ARTS WE DOWNGRADE AMERICA

Mr. President, the educators of America want to remain free to plan and program for their institutions. They do not want to orient their curriculum in a particular direction unless the needs of the Nation warrant it. They want to tailor their courses to meet the needs as they see them.

The House version of the bill says to the institutions of higher learnings: Build the facilities you need for undergraduate education and we will assist you.

The committee version of the bill provides for the construction of academic facilities, but you will not get a Federal dime unless the facilities are used for the sciences, engineering or a library.

Who knows better what kinds of buildings the colleges need—the Federal Government or the colleges themselves?

Who among us is wise enough to say that we must shove the entire liberal arts curriculum into the background and advance only the sciences and engineering?

I for one am not yet prepared to concede that democracy must give way for technocracy or that the ghost of Federal control must walk again.

Listen to what the colleges of America have to say about their needs and why they support the House bill.

Charles Shain, president of Connecticut College says:

> This woman's college of 1,400 stands in need of a new academic building devoted to the social sciences in which field American women, including graduates of Connecticut College, have offered intelligent leadership for a half a century. Our future plans would be frustrated by loss of House bill.

Even the scientific and technological colleges that would benefit most from the committee version of the bill favor the House measure. Listen to the words of F. L. Partlo, president, South Dakota School of Mines and Technology:

> I favor the House-approved version. The need for facilities is not limited to science, engineering, and libraries. National need is for well-educated people. My experience indicates that they are as scarce in English or the humanities as in science and engineering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has used 30 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 13 minutes remaining on the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. The president of one of the finest schools in the country, the California Institute of Technology, recognizes the importance of a well-balanced educational curriculum. He said:

> I am pleased with your position on higher education bill and hope very much the House bill can be enacted by the Senate.

Richard A. Harvill, president of the University of Arizona, has stressed the need for a flat grant program that will give the colleges and universities a freedom to construct the buildings they need. He said:

> There is considerable lag now in the rate of construction of buildings in other categories than those named by Senate bill because of high priority already given to science, engineering, mathematics, and in some cases libraries.

The president of Marquette University says that the committee version of the bill "would create even greater imbalance between public and private higher education. Would also create an ever-greater imbalance between sciences and the humanities.

John S. Dickey, president of Dartmouth College, urges the Senate to support the House bill and "avoid unfortunate imbalance of support as between sciences and other fields of study."

The same point of view has been taken by Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University, and by hundreds of other educators that have written and wired me.

I stress the fact that even those who would get the lion's share of help from the Senate bill prefer the House measure. They are thinking about the future of education. They are thinking about the welfare of the country and they want the House bill.

If we really want to know what the educators of this country are thinking, I ask Senators to read for themselves the many telegrams I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Friday, October 11.

I have a great many more telegrams with me today. If Senators wish to read them, I shall be glad to make them available. About 96 percent of all the letters and wires I have received from college presidents around the country insist that the House version of the bill is the most meritorious and will do the most for higher education.

Let us not tell these college and university presidents that we will not help them meet their needs unless they construct science and engineering buildings. Let us not tell the boy who wants to be a social scientist, or the girl who wishes to be an English teacher, that we are not going to help them.

A time like this demands men and women who are skilled in foreign languages—men and women who understand and know how to teach English and history.

We need at every level—Federal, State, and local—sound political scientists, men and women who know the theory and practice of government in a free society.

Those who support the committee bill would have us believe it is unconstitutional to use Federal money to construct a building at a private college in which constitutional law will be taught.

I am not yet prepared to shove into the shadows the arts and humanities.

It is from these fields of study that we garner the knowledge to promote and protect our way of life.

It is from these studies that we come to know what justice is and how important liberty can be.

I say to the Senate, "Downgrade the arts and humanities and you downgrade America."

If we downgrade the arts and humanities, American education will be flying on one wing.

Mr. President, where are the leaders of tomorrow coming from?

The President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, did not take his training in science and engineering. He received a bachelor of arts degree and did graduate work in economics. Indeed, virtually all of our Presidents since the inception of the Republic have been men with backgrounds other than science and engineering.

When the President selected his Secretary of State, he chose Dean Rusk, a man with training in the arts and humanities.

When the President decided upon a Secretary of Defense, he chose a man who had studied the arts and business administration.

All of our service Secretaries—Army, Navy, and Air Force—are men with degrees in the arts.

These men who run the largest defense establishment on the face of the earth were prepared in the fields I am fighting for today and which are excluded from the committee proposal.

Let us look at the man the President chose for his Secretary of the Treasury. Douglas Dillon is a gentleman who has studied in the field of economics.

Those who favor the Senate bill would have us believe that only science and engineering are related to national defense, notwithstanding the fact that our highest defense leaders, including the Commander in Chief, are all men with training in the arts and humanities.

Look at the men in Congress who are making important decisions. In the entire House of Representatives there are only six men who have been trained in the fields of medicine or engineering. In the Senate there are but three. The other 526 Members of Congress are men who received their preparation in journalism, law, teaching, and other fields.

Those who favor the Senate bill would have us believe it is unconstitutional to make room in our colleges for young men and women who wish to study the balance-of-payments problem or governmental and commercial finance.

ABSURD TO CONTEND THAT GRANTS MAY BE MADE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION ONLY IN CONNECTION WITH DEFENSE OBJECTIVES

It is said it is all right to aid the geology department of a college but not the history department.

It is said it is all right to construct a building for mathematics but not for economics.

It is said we can aid engineering facilities but do nothing in the social sciences.

Apparently, from a constitutional standpoint, some are in and some are out, but we are left in the dark as to which are in and which are out.

Neither are we "given the calculus for determining which go in and which stay out" unless we can take our clue from a remark which was made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

He stated as a constitutional justification for the committee proposal the fact that it provides only categorical use grants for specific purposes which are related to defense objectives.

Are we asked to believe, Mr. President, that all Federal programs under which institutions with religious affiliation receive Federal funds are unconstitutional if they do not relate to defense objectives?

We now make grants to assist in the training of teachers for mentally retarded children. At least one of the colleges receiving these grants has a religious affiliation. Must we strike down aid to the mentally retarded because such aid has no defense objective?

In the past we have had a program under which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made grants to private institutions for projects relating to public welfare and social security. Is this program unconstitutional because it has no defense objectives?

There are on the statute books special programs relating to crippled children, and sectarian institutions participate in these programs. Are they unconstitutional because there is no defense connection?

The Small Business Administration makes grants to institutions with religious affiliation for projects in the field of business management and finance. Are these projects unconstitutional because there is no defense objective?

Mr. President, I should hate to think that all grants to private colleges with a religious affiliation are unconstitutional unless they have a defense objective.

If this absurd contention were valid, we would have to strike down virtually every program of Federal aid to higher education that has been conceived and developed during the past 100 years.

As I pointed out on Friday of last week, our land-grant program would never have gotten off the ground if the defense objective theory had been applied to it.

If we accept the strange notion that Federal aid to sectarian institutions is constitutional only if it relates to national defense, then we must of necessity accept the corollary argument that many—perhaps most—of our higher education programs are unconstitutional because they are not so related.

Mr. President, let us examine further the argument that the committee bill is a bill with defense objectives.

Would it foster, through construction aid, a study of the economics of communism? No, it would not, because economics is excluded.

Would it foster, through construction aid, our efforts in the field of propaganda and psychological warfare? No, it would not, because the fields of psychology and communications are excluded.

Would the committee proposal encourage, through construction aid, the study of cold war diplomacy? No, it would not, because the field of international relations is excluded from the bill.

Would the committee proposal help make available additional personnel trained in the foreign languages so necessary to counterintelligence? No, it would not, because foreign language facilities are excluded from the bill.

The committee proposal would provide grants only for engineering, sciences, and libraries. Geology and mathematics are to be put in a hallowed category, and many other fields ignored.

What am I saying, Mr. President? I am saying that if the test of constitutionality is whether aid is defense related, we must strike down many of our programs on the statute books. I am saying that while supporters of the committee proposal claim that it has defense objectives, it advances some that have only a remote connection with defense and excludes others that are essential to national security.

NOTHING SACROSANCT ABOUT CATEGORY AID AS OPPOSED TO GENERAL GRANTS

Mr. President, both proposals would authorize grants and loans to public and private colleges, whether church related or not. My basic view is that a grant for the construction of a political science building is as constitutional as a grant for the construction of a physical science building. In short, a grant is either constitutional or it is not.

Assume that we accept the very questionable idea that grants may be made in categories, but that flat grants are not valid.

Does this mean that it is constitutionally permissible to aid all secular subjects by passing four or five category bills, but that Congress cannot approve a bill covering all the categories?

If so, then the whole is not equal to the sum of its parts—an idea that would be rejected by any sensible person.

When it comes to higher education and the question of aid to private church-related schools, the real issue is whether the aid promotes a religion or the teaching of a religious subject.

We cannot do a Mexican hat dance around the Constitution by saying that the aid deals with defense objectives or is only given in category forms.

As I stated last week, we cannot aid departments of divinity simply because the military needs chaplains, so the defense objective test is a poor one.

Nor is the legal status of a bill altered because it is written in category form.

To paraphrase Orwell, when it comes to grants, all animals are equal and none is more equal than others.

CONCLUSION

Let us not tell the educators of this country that we will help them do their job only if they construct a certain type of classroom.

Let us not make room for the engineer in college and at the same time close the door on the teacher of tomorrow.

Let us not build classrooms solely for the scientist and shut out from higher education the future Hemingway or Faulkner.

Let us not shunt aside the composer, the economist, the historian, the philosopher, the student of government. America and the world need all of these, as well as the scientist and engineer.

I ask Senators to support the arts as well as the sciences.

Under the terms of the committee bill, it would be possible for a college to get a grant for a botany building, but the same college would be barred from getting a grant for the study of foreign languages.

All of this seems out of touch with reality.

There is no such thing as a Catholic version of economics, a Jewish version of the Russian language, and a Protestant version of political studies. Yet we are told that if we aid these courses, the Constitution will be violated.

I ask Senators to vote for a bill that will go to the White House, and not to conference.

I ask Senators not to advance some disciplines at the expense of others.

The challenges of this era are so great that we must get from our colleges and universities the well-rounded man—the man who can make moral as well as mechanical decisions.

If we build bridges but cannot construct a simple English sentence, if we gain inventions and lose ideals, what meaning will our education have?

If we neglect the arts and humanities, what will happen to our set of values? Will our heritage still be meaningful, our aims noble, our laws just?

Will we know how to administer justice, promote the common welfare, and keep our politics free?

All these things we must do, and we cannot do them unless our educators continue to operate in an atmosphere of freedom—an atmosphere that will be fostered by approval of the House-passed bill.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The Senator has used up all of his time on the amendment, and has used 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. **PROUTY.** I yield myself 10 minutes on the bill, and reserve it.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Does any Senator wish recognition?

Mr. **MORSE.** Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont has made a most eloquent plea for his amendment. In commenting on it at this time, I would only point out that in the committee bill we do have $50 million a year for 5 years in categorical grant assistance for community and junior colleges which are public in nature. Private junior colleges, since they are defined as institutions of higher education under title I of the bill, are eligible to participate in the $180 million provided for categorical grants and the $120 million each year provided for loans. Therefore, we have not dealt unfairly with junior colleges, private in nature, that may be denominational in character.

However, with regard to the specific problem of the technical institutes which do not offer a 2-year program which carries with it transferrable credit, there is much to be said for the position of the Senator from Vermont on this point. Earlier, as the result of a most able speech on the floor of the Senate made by the Senator from the State of New Hampshire, I had discussed with him the points he had raised, and I can assure the Senate that at an appropriate time the Senator from New Hampshire plans to bring to the attention of the Senate an amendment which would broaden the definition in title I of the committee bill to bring it into line with the House language on this point.

I am sure it will be in such form that I shall be able to accept it.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to expand the scope of aid under the higher education bill not only to facilities for work in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or libraries, but also to facilities for all academic subjects excluding, of course, theology or religious training. In my view the House version of the higher education bill, which does not, like the Senate bill, restrict its aid to facilities for the teaching of certain specific subjects, is a far better measure. It undoubtedly has greater support from the academic community and certainly deserves to be considered on its merits.

Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of appropriate assistance to institutions of higher education, and I wish to make clear that I expect to support whatever measure is finally put to the Senate for a vote. But for a number of reasons I find the House version preferable to the Senate version.

First. I believe it is a serious mistake to put the financial aid of the Federal Government behind only one area of academic study—science and engineering. Undoubtedly, our Nation needs scientists. But it is increasingly clear that we also need competent economists. We need people who understand political developments. We need people who can express themselves clearly in the English language. We need people who are educated in foreign cultures and foreign languages. To limit Federal assistance only to science is a dangerous distortion both of academic studies and of the long-range needs of our country.

Second. The Congress has already provided in a number of different ways for assistance to the physical and natural sciences. The National Defense Education Act offers aid along these lines. The National Science Foundation offers assistance not only to individuals in this field, but also for certain facilities. The Senate has recently passed an act offering assistance in the construction of facilities for the health professions, which also represents aid for scientific education. The Public Health Service makes funds available for work in these fields. Even the space agency will be spending some $50 million this year alone, not only in grants for individual projects, but also in the construction of space science oriented facilities. Everywhere one turns in the Federal establishment there is aid of one kind or another for scientific work. In fact, institutions seeking assistance of this type often have three or four choices as to where they can apply.

So it seems to me we have already fairly well taken care of the science facilities.

Third. The Senate committee bill makes it clear that for 20 years the Federal interest in facilities constructed through this program will be continued. In other words, should the institution which has received Federal aid teach a subject which in the view of the Federal Government is not included among the physical or natural sciences or engineering, then the Government could recover a proportion of the funds. Nothing, it seems to me, opens the door more insidiously to Federal interference in our educational institutions. Will enforcement agents from the Office of Education patrol these institutions to make sure that not a word of history, English, or foreign languages are taught within these halls? Will we have FBI agents patrolling the campus to make sure that only the permitted subjects and nothing else is inculcated in students within these federally subsidized buildings? The thought may seem absurd, Mr. President, but the fact is that regulations of this type will inevitably result in greater and greater Federal oversight for a purpose that seems to me wholly unworthy of Federal concern, namely whether a so-called forbidden subject is taught in a science building.

Fourth. Mr. President, it is argued that this bill will not really injure the development of nonscientific facilities, for institutions will set aside their own funds for such purposes while relying more heavily on Government aid in scientific fields. That is all very well for large institutions who may have five or six different buildings planned, but for our smaller colleges the only feasible and economic way to expand may be by combined structures, by a classroom building for all lectures, or by a combination library and classroom structure. The smaller colleges may not be able to afford the luxury of having separate buildings for every subject. They will be seriously handicapped, restricted, and penalized by the provision suggested in the Senate version of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Finally, Mr. President, it is argued that any effort to expand the scope of aid under this bill will run into constitutional difficulties insofar as such assistance is extended to religious institutions. I cannot understand how it can be considered unconstitutional to offer, for example, aid in teaching English or languages, yet not unconstitutional to offer this aid in the field of science.

The Constitution prohibits the establishment of religion. However, in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 342 U.S. 306, the Court declared:

> We find no constitutional requirement which makes it necessary for the Government to be hostile to religion.

The first amendment requires, as Justice Black pointed out in the *Everson* case (330 U.S. 1), that the State must be neutral in its relations with religious believers and nonbelievers. It does not require the State to be their adversary. State power is no more to be used to handicap religions than it is to favor them. The Everson case is the law today, and it is significant that basically the majority upheld the position that provision of transportation for students attending Catholic as well as public schools could constitutionally be offered by the State.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in the Sunday closing law cases and Torcaso against Watkins, both decided in 1961, the Supreme Court further revealed its thinking on the first amendment. In the former, the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutionality of Sunday closing laws on the grounds that the primary purpose of the Sunday laws was not religious but to provide a common day of rest, and that the burden imposed on those opposing the Sunday closings was economic in impact rather than religious. In the Torcaso case the Supreme Court unanimously invalidated the requirement for Maryland public officials of making a declaration of belief in the existence of God. This requirement in the Maryland constitution, the Court held, gave preferred treatment to those religions which permitted public declarations of belief of this type.

In short, Mr. President, in both cases the Supreme Court indicated that if a law imposes a religious test as a requirement for public office or public benefit-sharing, it will surely be considered unconstitutional. If, on the other hand, the purpose and effect of the law are primarily nonreligious, the Court will not automatically declare it unconstitutional because it may have religious side effects, particularly where those side effects are essentially economic in nature and cannot be eliminated without thwarting the basic public purpose and general welfare intent of the law.

Furthermore, the distinctions that the Supreme Court has made in the past strongly indicate that bona fide assistance to education approved by Congress would not be struck down merely because of economic byproducts affecting religion. Quite the contrary, the distinctions insisted upon by the Court in the past suggest that if Congress should attempt deliberately to exclude church-related colleges because of their religious background, Congress will have imposed in effect a religious test that is not constitutional.

In my view, Mr. President, the constitutional question would be raised not by the inclusion of religiously owned or operated institutions, but rather by the exclusion of such institutions from a program of across-the-board assistance for higher education. In short, I am at a loss to understand the argument that would on constitutional grounds distinguish between aid in the field of humanity and aid in the field of science.

The Senate is not being asked to judge this issue on its merits or on rational grounds. On this issue, as in the question of civil rights legislation, a gun is being held at our head. The floor manager of the bill has already stated that if the Senate approves a general grant bill available to all colleges we should get ready to eat our Christmas dinners because we shall never get to the civil rights filibuster. I have no doubt that if we stir up that hornets' nest on the floor of the Senate, there will be a determined effort—and notice has been served upon me that there will be a determined effort—to cause a prolonged debate on this issue. The separation-of-church-and-state principle reflects the deep convictions of a good many Senators.

I have great respect for the deep convictions of any Senator, but on this matter, as in the question of civil rights, the only reasonable course is to permit the will of the majority to prevail. For a small group to threaten a filibuster on every issue in which their will differs from that of the majority is a denial of the very basis of constitutional and representative government. I see no reason why the Senate should have to consider this or any other issue under the threat of a filibuster. If the majority of Senators are opposed to across-the-board aid, let them vote against it and the matter will be settled. If the majority favor across-the-board aid, then I see no reason why the majority should be forced to yield on the matter merely to avoid a threatened talkathon.

The country expects the Congress to vote on a rational basis, considering legislation upon its merits. We had no higher education bill last year because, in spite of the approval of both Houses of Congress for the general principle of aid to higher education, it was impossible for the conferees to reach agreement. The best way to make sure that that does not happen again is to approve the language of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. This is all the more important in view of the many objective reasons why the House language is preferable on its merits to the restricted aid in the Senate version.

There is no reason to vote against one's own convictions merely because the boogyman threat of a filibuster seems to be lurking on the sidelines. We should vote on this matter from conviction, not merely from timidity. We should vote on this matter from study and evaluation of the legislation itself, not from fright at the threats of its opponents.

Mr. PROUTY. How much time have I remaining on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 54 minutes remaining on the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. I reserve 15 minutes of that time.

Mr. MORSE. I withdraw my yielding back the remainder of my time, and yield myself 2 minutes before yielding to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

I wish to make some comments on what the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] said. When I discussed the subject the other day I pointed out what I, as the Senator in charge of the bill, felt was a very deep and strong opposition to the Prouty amendment, and I said I thought I owed it to the Senate to tell the Senate what the situation was. I shall be no participant in any filibuster. However, I point out that were the Prouty amendment to be adopted that would not mean that the bill passed. The House language of H.R. 6143 will be open to amendment. Innumerable amendments can be offered to it, from now until doomsday.

What I have been urging is that we try to avoid another side of the religious controversy in connection with the pending bill. I believe that the Ervin-Cooper amendment raises it from another angle. The pending amendment raises it from its own angle. The Senate will have to work its will. Senators know that I will support the majority will of the Senate. I felt it my duty to advise the Senate of what the parliamentary situation in the Senate was.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In my remarks I expressed my gratitude to the Senator from Oregon for keeping Senators informed; and, of course, we all recognize his responsibilities as the Senator in charge of the bill. However, I cling to the thesis that we should try to get the best bill we can, and should not yield to the threat of extended debate in doing what we believe in our minds and hearts is the right thing to do.

Mr. MORSE. I do not quarrel with that statement.

I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a conferee on the bill, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as the author of the bill which is now before the Senate. I address myself to the subject because I believe the amendment which is now before us is critically important to what we had in mind in committee in reporting this particular measure.

Mr. President, if the Senate takes the approach of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], we shall be back where we began. The disagreement between the Senate and the House was exactly the one which is posed to us now; namely, that the House is in favor of providing grants and loans for the construction of facilities by colleges for general purposes without regard to sectarian purposes, while the Senate view would limit them to specific categories.

In conference last year, we finally arrived at a compromise, in which we proceeded to provide a categorical basis for grants and loans on the theory, first, that this represented the direction which Congress generally had taken in the field of education; that is, to try to aid the national interest by closing the manpower gap in the sciences, mathematics, foreign languages, and teaching.

For reasons which we deeply believed were not inherent in that agreed compromise, the House rejected the conference report last year.

This year I felt that we should not go back to the place where we began, but, rather to make progress. Therefore, I joined in introducing a measure to which we ought to try to apply the conference report arrived at last year. That is the question now before the Senate.

What we are asking the Senate to adopt is what we could have accepted last year. If we had thought that to be the temper of the Senate, that would have been the end of the procedure. That is what the House has been insisting upon. The Senate has been asking for something else. The measure now before the Senate represents the compromise we reached. Of course there will be another opportunity to seek agreement when we go to conference this year. However, merely to yield and say, "This is it. We will take the House version," is asking the Senate to do precisely what the Senate was ardently against doing, and therefore would be counterproductive.

Should the Prouty amendment be adopted, it would place us in a completely impossible position from which we would not be able to come to terms with the other body, because it would be stubbornly resisted, and lead to many complications. In addition, if the Prouty amendment is adopted, there is much more likelihood that the Ervin-Cooper amendment will be adopted too. Then we shall have not only the strict question of constitutionality, with those who are contending for unconstitutionality arguing, "It is limited to a number of places, but it is still unconstitutional," but we shall also face the fundamental policy question, that this is something that the United States should not lend itself to. In my opinion, this would buttress the likelihood that the Ervin-Cooper amendment would be adopted. If that happens, the fat will really be in the fire. There will be a complete deadlock, and we shall get nowhere.

Therefore, there is no need to prove the urgency of the need for Federal aid to education. What we are really trying to deal with is the parliamentary situation. It therefore seems to me that the course we have chosen, which starts with the compromise of last year, is the best chance Congress will have of enacting a bill, and thus we shall have another opportunity to arrive at a bill that the Senate will approve and a bill agreed upon with the House.

There are always those who say, "Let us take what the House will give us; then we shall be through." But we always find before a bill is finally enacted, that some kind of amendment gets into it, thus making it necessary to go to conference.

We are laboring under a complete illusion if we assume that by adopting this amendment, the bill will go directly to the President. It will not, contrary to the whole history of the situation.

Therefore, from a practical point of view, if we want a bill—and I most urgently do, and so do the colleges—we should start from the major progress we previously made, and go on to the additional opportunity to agree. Such a course would afford an excellent prospect of getting a bill. But if we again assume an inflexible position, I do not believe we shall get anywhere this year, any more than we did last year.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York for the support he has given to the committee amendment. I agree with every word he has said.

Mr. President, is it agreeable to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] that he and I now join in a unanimous-consent request that there be a call for a live quorum, the time for the quorum call not to be charged to either side; and that following the quorum call, the Senator from Vermont will be recognized to speak for about 10 minutes, and then the Senate proceed to vote?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a live quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 190 Leg.]

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Vermont yield himself?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield myself 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 12 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Let me point out that in all probability I shall not speak for longer than 12 minutes.

Mr. President, at this time, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to the Prouty-Ribicoff amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, public opinion pollsters contact only a fraction of 1 percent of the people, in order to determine the reaction to various questions of interest. I sent a telegram to the president of virtually every college and university in the country. I received approximately 500 replies, and approximately 96 percent of them are in support of my position.

One of the responses sets forth effectively the attitude and feelings of a great majority of educators. This response expresses the views of the heads of great colleges and universities, both public and private, and also from the heads of small colleges which are not known at the national level:

> Tactically, I share your fears that if there has to be a Senate-House conference on the bill, the likelihood of any legislation this year is remote.
>
> Further, I feel that the Senate committee version really fails to accomplish what it pretends to do. Anyone connected with higher education is aware that there is no college or university offering a program in the physical or natural sciences or engineering in which humanities or liberal arts courses are not required. If the objective of the bill is to help provide more opportunity for educating our citizens in these sciences, providing facilities for classes in these sciences only will not achieve this objective.
>
> Furthermore, one of the besetting problems of administrators in colleges and universities is to fight against the desire on the part of certain divisions of the institution to secure exclusive rights to particular classrooms and facilities. We have little choice when it is a question of laboratories; but in the interest of economy and good management we have to be firm in demanding maximum usage of our classroom facilities. The Senate committee bill seems to me to be encouraging the development of facilities for only the natural and physical sciences and engineering, and by so doing to encourage inefficient usage of physical plant.
>
> Finally, I have been concerned for some time about the implicit attitude of Congress toward education—an attitude which viewed the higher education of its citizens only under the aspect of national defense. It is significant, I believe, that the only major action of Congress related to higher education in recent years was the National Defense Education Act. I was encouraged to believe that this attitude was changing when the House passed H.R. 6143. The Senate committee version, however, has dashed those hopes; it has returned to the "education for defense purposes" mentality. I regret that I cannot agree that even our national defense is served by encouraging and developing education only in the physical and natural sciences and engineering. Consequently I am deeply grateful for your efforts to restore the bill as passed by the House.
>
> Wishing you every success and promising my continued support to the extent possible, I am,
>
> ——— ———.

That letter is typical of hundreds of telegrams and letters which I have received from college and university presidents, who, I submit, are in a better position than Congress to determine the needs of the institutions they administer.

THE CRUX OF THE DEBATE

In summary, Mr. President: A vote for the amendment proposed by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], will be to send the higher education bill directly to the White House.

A vote for the committee version will be to send higher education legislation to conference, where it may fail, as it failed last year.

A vote for my amendment will be for a bill that has the overwhelming support of the great majority of universities and colleges of this country, both public and private.

A vote for the Senate committee version will be to restrict educators in their programing and planning.

If Senators vote for the House version of the bill, which is the same as my substitute, they will be voting in favor of the construction of buildings for all fields of learning.

If Senators vote for the Senate committee version they will be voting to exclude the humanities and arts, and to aid only sciences and engineering.

If Senators vote for our amendment, they will be voting to make room in our colleges for every boy or girl who seeks higher education.

If Senators vote for the Senate committee version, they will be voting to help only those who are going into the scientific and engineering fields.

If Senators want to help all junior colleges, both public and private, they should support my amendment.

If Senators want to leave high and dry all private junior colleges, they should vote for the Senate committee version of the bill.

If Senators believe there is a need for semiprofessional technicians, they should vote for our amendment, which provides aid to technical institutes.

If Senators do not think there is a shortage of technical manpower, they should vote for the Senate committee version, because it provides no aid to technical institutes.

If Senators think the colleges themselves should determine what kind of buildings they should construct, Senators should back our amendment.

If Senators think the Federal Government should select the buildings to be constructed, they should vote for the committee version of the bill.

If Senators want to achieve a fair balance between the arts and sciences, they should vote for the Prouty-Ribicoff amendment.

If Senators want to make education lopsided, they should vote for the committee version of the bill.

If Senators want to vote for a bill that the House of Representatives has twice passed by overwhelming votes, they should vote for the Prouty-Ribicoff amendment.

If Senators want to vote for a bill that has previously been rejected by the House, they should vote for the committee version.

In short, if Senators believe in education, if they want to make room in our colleges for all boys and girls, regardless of their courses of study, if Senators want a higher education bill that will go straight to the President's desk, for his signature, they should vote for the Prouty-Ribicoff amendment, which is the House version of the bill.

If Senators wish to help a few courses of study and downgrade others; if Senators wish to discourage the writer, the economist, and the language student; if Senators desire to vote for the uncertainty of a conference, and perhaps no higher education bill at all, they should vote for the committee version of the bill.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **PROUTY**. I yield.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont one question. One of the big objections that has always arisen when we have discussed bills related to education at any level has been the element of Federal control that must accompany the money appropriated. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if his amendment would not, in large measure, remove the complaint that I have mentioned which could be lodged against the bill if it were not amended as the Senator has suggested.

Mr. **PROUTY**. The Senator is absolutely correct. There is no provision in the bill for Federal control in any way. I am glad that the Senator raised that point.

Mr. **GOLDWATER**. The point that I was trying to bring out was that under the Senate committee version of the bill the universities would be very limited as to what they could do with the moneys available. Under the provisions of the Prouty-Ribicoff amendment, colleges would be allowed to do pretty much as they pleased, with some limitations. The Prouty-Ribicoff amendment would make the bill much more palatable, and one which would be better directed toward the improvement of education than is the Senate version of the bill.

Mr. **PROUTY**. I am very grateful to the Senator from Arizona. I agree with him completely. I point out that there are exclusions which should be noted. They include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is charged to the public; any gymnasium or other facility especially designed for athletic or recreational activity other than a course in physical education——

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **PROUTY**. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The exclusions include any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship; any facility used or to be used primarily in connection with any part of the program of a school or department of divinity; any facility used or to be used by a school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health. Those are excluded. But with those exceptions, the colleges themselves would determine what their greatest needs are.

The administrative officials of our colleges and universities are far more competent to make that determination than those of us who function in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes, and then I shall yield back the remainder of my time.

I make the following reply to the Senator from Vermont:

First, the Senate committee amendment has never been rejected by the House. Last year we went into conference with the House and came out with a three-title bill. The title of the bill that the House gave as its reason for rejecting the conference report was title II, which related to student assistance. We have eliminated that title from the Senate committee amendment.

The bill presented to the Senate is the conference report of last year with the one title that the House said it opposed eliminated from that bill.

Second, I wish to comment on the argument of the Senator from Vermont that the bill would discriminate in favor of the natural sciences and against the social sciences. Not at all. We know what will happen. If, under the bill, a physics building, a chemistry building, or a library is built, the university will then have its other funds to use for the social sciences. The bill does not begin to provide the amount of money necessary for a university to meet all of its needs. So there is no discrimination against the social sciences. The provisions of the bill are limited, of course, to aiding the universities in the field of natural and physical sciences, engineering, and libraries.

Fourth, I point out that the bill would give to any college or university, public or private, the same number of dollars that it would receive under the Prouty bill, or the so-called House version of the bill. Why? Because there are only so many dollars to go around anyway. Institutions would not get any more money under a general grant bill than they would get under a categorical use bill.

Let us face the facts. Private college X wishes a physics building. At best, that is all it would be able to get. That is evident when we look at the total amount of money available and the equitable distribution of that money among the various universities and colleges.

Lastly—and the point is delicate and ticklish, but we must face it—the Prouty amendment would bring up the whole religious issue. We would have an issue that has plagued our country. We would provide money to religious denominational colleges to the great concern of millions of Americans.

In the opinion of the members of the committee, we have brought forth a sound compromise. We have arrived at a compromise that is constitutional. We believe that categorical use grants meet the test. I have already put into the Record, and earlier this afternoon pointed out, that we have already contributed approximately $450 million—and that is only a partial amount—since 1950 under some 10 Federal programs in which categorical use money has gone to universities and colleges.

On September 24 the President signed the bill for medical facilities. The benefits of that bill will go to Catholic medical schools, Baptist medical schools, Presbyterian medical schools, and all others on a categorical use basis. I did not hear objections raised then any more than I have heard them raised in connection with 10 other Federal programs since 1950.

We have a practical problem, and I close with a statement of that problem: Do we wish a bill? Do we wish a program? In my judgment, the committee is offering to the Senate a compromise program that would provide aid in the field of higher education to thousands of young men and women who need it. I have quoted before, and I should like to quote once more, what Dr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education—the president of all colleges, public and private—said. This is the statistic. I should like Senators never to forget that point in the debate. By the year 1980—only 17 years away—in order to meet the higher education student enrollment needs in our country, we shall have to double the size of every university and college in our country and create 1,000 new ones with an additional enrollment of 2,500 students apiece.

I have answered the burden of proof by showing the need for the Senate committee version of the bill. With that statistic I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. **PROUTY**. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr Jordan]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 49, as follows:

[No. 191 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Allott
Bartlett
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Brewster
Clark
Cotton
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hart
Hickenlooper
Inouye
Jackson
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mechem
Morton
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Williams, Del.

NAYS—49

Anderson
Bayh
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Ellender
Ervin
Gore
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken
Church
Curtis
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hruska
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
Miller
Mundt
Neuberger
Pearson
Stennis

So Mr. Prouty's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the colleges and universities of Michigan have made it clear to me, over a considerable period of time, that they support the principle of Federal aid to help them meet the ever-expanding enrollment that pours in their doors.

The table inserted in the Congressional Record of October 10 by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] explains in short order why this assistance is needed. In 1962 Michigan had a college enrollment of 183,000. In 1965 it can expect an enrollment of 229,000. In 1970 it will be 305,000. Our educators know this, and they have a sense of urgency about preparing for this upsurge.

And so I believe we are all indebted to the chairman of the Education Subcommittee for the diligence and skill with which he brought to the Senate floor a bill which could meet the demands of a majority of both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President. I believe he has presented us with such a bill in the Senate committee version. Nonetheless, I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. I wish the amendment had been adopted but, failing that, I shall vote for the bill and urge my colleagues to similar action.

Let me make clear again my own position on Federal aid to education. The justification for Federal participation and support of education is the fact that the strength, the security, and the future of our Nation depend on the training and the skills of our people. The quality of our education determines largely the measure of these skills. Because the Nation's future is contingent upon maximum development of the intellectual abilities of our peoples and this development is based on the quality of our educational systems, I believe Federal assistance should be directed toward all educational institutions—public and private, elementary, secondary and higher, vocational and medical—to the very broadest extent possible under our Constitution. I want to see an increase in the quantity of educational opportunity and I want to see an improvement in the quality of educational training.

Admittedly, the constitutional question is a difficult one. But insofar as aid to institutions of higher education is concerned, as proposed in the bill before us, I am satisfied no constitutional bar is involved. There is, however, the important practical question: what is the best and most equitable bill that can be gotten through the Congress?

None of us can "write our own ticket" in this legislative process. If but one portion of this ticket could be given me to write without consultation with my colleagues in the Congress, I would have this bill expanded to include the humanities. In this world which grows smaller by the day and in which time runs faster by the minute, I believe intensification of study in the humanities is necessary if the peoples of this world are to learn to live together in one world in peace. True enough, a grant of Federal funds for the limited purposes enumerated in this bill will free State, local, and private funds for other educational needs, importantly the humanities. It does nothing, regrettably, for schools which have the facilities specifically authorized by this bill, but which have great need for other educational facilities. This roundabout approach is far better than no action at all and for this reason the committee bill is a defensible approach. In the future, however, this Senator will continue to urge the committee and others to support the broadest possible application of this Federal support both with respect to systems of education and areas of study to be supported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and myself, I have two amendments, which are amendment No. 215 and amendment No. 218. They are both designed to remove from eligibility for grants and loans under this bill, church owned, controlled, and operated colleges and universities.

I think the two amendments are identical in purpose. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered and voted upon en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I inquire, for the convenience of Senators, how long the Senator from North Carolina wishes to discuss the amendments?

Mr. ERVIN. I think about 20 minutes will be sufficient.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not discuss the amendments for more than 10 minutes, at the most, but I have agreed to yield to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], who has a short speech on the bill, and to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] for a brief speech.

I have just been informed that the Senator from West Virginia will make his speech afterward. The Senator from Ohio will not take more than 5 or 6 minutes. So I believe the whole matter can be disposed of in 30 or 40 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments (Nos. 215 and 218), offered by the Senator from North Carolina for himself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], will be stated.

The legislative clerk read amendments Nos. 215 and 218, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 215

On page 68, line 10, insert the following between the word "institution" and the semicolon: "which is not owned, controlled, or operated by a religious denomination, or which has no sectarian religious requirements applicable to its students, to its teachers, or to the members of its controlling board or trustees".

AMENDMENT NO. 218

On page 69, line 12, insert the following additional sentence after the word "individual": "The term 'nonprofit institution', as used in subsection (a) (4) of section 310, does not include any educational institution which is owned, controlled, or operated by a religious denomination, or which has any sectarian religious requirements applicable to its students, to its teachers, or to the members of its controlling board or trustees."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I shall not take long to present these amendments. I hope they can be voted on very shortly. I believe that can be done if Senators will remain in the Chamber.

The purpose of these two amendments, which are to be voted on en bloc, is to remove from eligibility for grants and loans under the bill colleges and universities which are in essence owned or controlled or operated by religious denominations.

The adoption of the amendments would not affect the provisions of the bill relating to grants or loans to either public colleges or universities or to private, nonsectarian colleges, or universities.

The Senator from Kentucky and I have offered these amendments because we are convinced that the inclusion of religious colleges and universities for eligibility for grants and loans from moneys raised by taxation violates the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment.

The clearest exposition of the meaning of this clause is that which appears in the majority opinion in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1. I shall read from pages 15 and 16. This language has been approved not only in the Everson case but also in three subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States as being a correct interpretation of the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment:

> The establishment of religion clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly, or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between church and state."

As I have stated, three times since this statement was made in the Everson case, the Supreme Court has approved it as the correct interpretation of the first amendment.

Under this clause, no tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion.

It is to be noted that this does not merely prohibit support of the religious activities of a religious institution—it prohibits support of a religious institution as such.

The pending bill violates this interpretation of the first amendment in at least three ways. It attempts to use tax moneys for grants and loans to church-owned, operated, or controlled colleges or universities.

It also violates that provision of the interpretation of the first amendment which states that tax moneys cannot be used to aid all religions.

It is contended by the proponents of Federal aid to religious colleges and universities that such a provision takes the bill out of the condemnation of the first amendment. But that is not what the Court said. The Court said that neither the Federal Government nor a State can enact laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another.

The bill violates that principle.

It violates also another principle established by the first amendment: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can openly or secretly participate in the affairs of religious organizations or groups.

Certainly Government would be participating in the affairs of religious organizations if Congress should enact a bill like this which prescribes the terms under which such organizations can obtain grants or loans.

The Everson case and also the Clauson case and the McCollum case, hold that neither the State nor the Federal Government can blend secular and religious instruction. Yet that is exactly what all religious colleges and universities in the United States do. The chief reason they exist is to give religious instruction.

What do the cases mean when they hold that government cannot aid or support religious institutions which blend religious and secular instruction? That is made very clear in a case handed down on the 17th day of June, this year. I will call your attention to that case in a moment. Evidently the proponents of the bill anticipated that an attack would be made on the provisions relating to grants and loans to religious colleges and universities. They attempt to circumvent the first amendment by this strange proposition: They say, "We will divorce the religious activities of these colleges and universities from their other activities, and we will support their secular activities only." They confine aid to religious colleges and universities to providing buildings suitable for use as classrooms, libraries, and the like.

Mr. President, Congress cannot divorce the irreligious, nonreligious, and unreligious activities of religious institutions from their other activities, and say, "We will support only the irreligious, the nonreligious, and the unreligious activities of religious institutions, and not their religious activities." Yet that is the theory upon which the proponents of the bill rest their claim of the constitutionality of the provisions relating to religious colleges and universities. That is precisely what Justice Douglas said could not be done in the Abingdon School District case, decided on June 17, 1963. I read from the concurring opinion of Justice Douglas in that case, and I invite particular attention to these words. He said:

> The most effective way to establish any institution is to finance it; and this truth is reflected in the appeals by church groups for public funds to finance their religious schools. Financing a church either in its strictly religious activities or in its other activities is equally unconstitutional, as I understand the establishment clause. Budgets for one activity may be technically separable from budgets for others. But the institution is an inseparable whole, a living organism, which is strengthened in proselytizing when it is strengthened in any department by contributions from other than its own members.

In other words, Justice Douglas stated that it is impossible under the first amendment for Congress to divorce the secular activities from the religious activities of a religious institution. That is precisely what the Supreme Court held in the Clauson case, and what it held in the McCollum case.

The argument will be made that in times past Congress has approved aid to some religious institutions. In doing so in many cases Congress perhaps violated the first amendment. At least it failed to make a true analysis of the first amendment.

It will be argued that because we may have sinned in the past, we should sin now. My reply is that people have been committing murder and stealing for generations, but their conduct has not made murder meritorious or larceny legal. Congress cannot alter the meaning of the Constitution by ignoring or violating it.

It is time for us to stand up for the Constitution. Thomas Jefferson said that it is both sinful and tyrannical for government to compel people to make contributions of money to the propagation of doctrines which they disbelieve. The bill proposes that Catholics and Jews shall be taxed to support Protestant colleges and universities. It proposes that Catholics and Protestants shall be taxed to support Jewish colleges and universities. It proposes that Jews and Protestants shall be taxed to support Catholic colleges and universities. It proposes that Mohammedans and Buddhists and adherents of other beliefs and nonbelievers shall be taxed to support Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant colleges and universities.

Thomas Jefferson said to do so is sinful and tyrannical. I believe it is sinful and tyrannical. Millions of Americans believe it to be sinful and tyrannical and to be a violation of the first amendment to the Constitution.

If we are to preserve liberty in this country, we must make it certain that churches cannot dictate to the state. If churches dictate to the state, there can be no political liberty. If we are to preserve liberty in this country, we must make it certain that the state cannot dictate to churches. If the state dictates to churches, then we cannot have religious liberty.

We must preserve what one great historian has declared the greatest contribution that America has made to civilization, that is, religious liberty.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

EDUCATION—A NATIONAL PROBLEM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the colleges and universities of our Nation are among the best in the world. We are proud of these institutions of higher learning. Americans have always recognized the importance of education to the individual and to the strength of our free democratic society. Our young people are our greatest resource.

More Americans aspire to higher education today than ever before. The complex and changing world in which we live demands increased knowledge and understanding by all citizens. Education is the key. Moreover, our population growth demands a rapid increase in educational facilities and personnel if present high standards of education available to all citizens are to be maintained.

The world is changing with each tick of the clock. Our educational system must be able to adapt itself to meet the phenomenal onslaught of scientific and technological change, which will require thousands of additional scientists, engineers, and technicians in the coming years. Our universities are not now turning out graduates in these areas sufficient to meet current demand. We cannot risk falling further behind.

Colleges and universities are straining under these pressures. Five years ago our secondary schools graduated 1.5 million students in a single year. Five years from now they will graduate 2.5 million. By 1970, 7 million students will be knocking at the doors of our colleges and universities—more than twice the number enrolled in 1960. If we are successfully to meet this rising demand for higher education, steps must be taken now.

It has been estimated that at least $23 billion will be needed for new facilities by the end of this decade to keep pace with expected college enrollment. This is more than three times the amount spent during the 1950's. If colleges and universities, already financially strained, do not expand at a rate of almost three times their present rate, the doors of education and opportunity will be closed to many qualified young Americans.

Moreover, if through our inaction young people are compelled to study in underequipped laboratories and libraries, in understaffed institutions, overcrowded classrooms, and in a generally undesirable atmosphere, those who are fortunate enough to pass through the "open door" to education, will be deceived. Such an education can only be second rate.

A strong nation cannot maintain its strength with a second-rate educational system. The time has come when the Congress must act to assure that our system will be first rate.

Federal assistance to higher education is not a new idea. The Federal Government has always played a vital role in the development of educational opportunity in this country. Our land-grant colleges were founded under the Morrill Act over 100 years ago. They remain strong and active educational institutions today, many of them among the top-rated colleges in the Nation. Furthermore, the GI bill made it possible for thousands of veterans to obtain a college education. It would be impossible to assess the contribution they have made to their country. How many fewer teachers, doctors, physicists, engineers, and scientists would there be today had it not been for this beneficent legislation? They are a living example to all who decry Federal assistance in the field of education, claiming that such assistance will bring thought control and loss of individual freedom.

The legislation now before the Senate would permit colleges and universities to begin to expand their capacity to meet the needs of the coming decades. It is a good beginning.

In recent weeks bills for aid to medical schools and for increased assistance for vocational and technical training for our youth, have been enacted into law. Both were indeed steps in the right direction. The medical school bill will help to erase the critical shortage of doctors, dentists, and other health personnel which looms in the future of this Nation.

The vocational assistance bill will train more young Americans in skills which are necessary in the 20th century automated economy. However, we are still a long way from our goal of providing the best education possible for all Americans. There is still a great need for Federal assistance to elementary and secondary schools. Our entire educational system must be viewed as an integral whole. Elementary and secondary schools must also meet the demands of a growing population and a changing society. Many of our children are studying in overcrowded classrooms with limited materials and half-day sessions. Certainly, this is less than the best. The Federal Government can and must assist our States in the building of classrooms, the upgrading of teachers' salaries, and in other areas where our educational system is not meeting the needs of the day.

Earlier this year, President Kennedy pointed out that education cannot be treated in piecemeal fashion. There must be a comprehensive attack on all areas of inadequacy. I am disappointed that we have not had an opportunity to vote upon a comprehensive bill. Nevertheless, I urge that the Senate take prompt action on bills dealing with individual problems in the field of education, such as the bill now under consideration.

"Twenty-twenty hindsight" is something with which we are all remarkably well endowed. I fervently hope that we shall not look back 10 years hence upon unskilled and unemployed workers, upon shortages of doctors, of lawyers, of scientists, and of professional men, and upon colleges closed to all but the privileged few, and say "if only we had known." The enactment into law of the bill before us means a continuation of our tradition of nothing short of excellence in America and American education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina because I am entirely satisfied that the type of aid this bill proposes to extend is constitutional.

This is not the first time Congress has sought to provide funds in the field of higher education. There are already on the statute books a score of laws that aid the education of young men and women at colleges throughout the country—public and private, sectarian and nonsectarian.

Funds are now provided by the Office of Education, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Defense Department that in a variety of ways aid the education of college students.

I see no basis for doubting the validity of all this financial assistance nor of raising constitutional objections to the pending measure.

Not once has the Supreme Court set aside the use of public funds to aid the education of college students.

The Senator from North Carolina, in his communication to all Senators, has quoted extensively from the concurring opinion of a single Justice in a recent case. The view of that Justice is clearly opposed to use of public funds for religious schools, though whether even he would view church-related colleges in the same light is not clear. But I am far more impressed by what was said in the opinion of the Court in that very same case.

To survive attack under the establishment clause, said Mr. Justice Clark, writing for a majority of the Court, a public benefit must have a secular purpose and a primary secular effect. Without a doubt, we in the Congress are striving to achieve a secular purpose when we seek to improve the educational opportunities for our young men and women at all of our Nation's colleges. The strength of our Nation depends on the education of these students. And it seems clear to me that the primary effect of the assistance in this bill is plainly secular.

Aid for the religious aspects of church related colleges has been specifically excluded. There will be no assistance for sectarian instruction, for places of worship or for schools of divinity. We are concerned with providing these young men and women with the best in educational opportunities. We want to be sure there will be enough classrooms, enough laboratories, and enough libraries for the millions of students we know will be applying for admission in the years just ahead.

That is our purpose, and that will be our effect. The constitutional issue has been met and answered by the terms of the bill itself. Now we have the responsibility of deciding what we will do on the merits, and I believe we should do as much as we can for the greatest number of students.

Again, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his leadership in connection with the pending measure.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First, I compliment the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for an excellent and brilliant statement. I quite agree with him that nothing in the proposed legislation would violate the Constitution in that it would establish a religion. If the thought which is now being expressed by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] takes effect, the entire framework of higher education in the United States will be destroyed.

Speaking from experience, and being familiar with Notre Dame, as I am, I can say that Notre Dame is an educational institution that opens its doors to young men and women of every denomination. Notre Dame makes no discrimination whatsoever. If we grant it money to build a physics building, as we grant money to other colleges, bear in mind that Notre Dame is educating the young men and women of America. That is its very purpose. For us to close the doors to them and say that Notre Dame is establishing a religion that is being State-supported is, I think, stretching logic too far.

I shall vote against the amendment, and I hope every other Senator will do likewise.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, it is most significant to examine some of the figures relating to higher education in the United States. There are some 743 public colleges and universities and 515 private, nonsectarian colleges and universities. There are 842 sectarian private colleges and universities of every type, whether Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish. Those colleges and universities make it possible for us to try to help solve some of the educational problems in the United States.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has said, with some 4,100,000 students in colleges this year, and considering that approximately 7 million students will be in our colleges in 1970, if we swept away the opportunity for the growth of our private colleges, be they sectarian or nonsectarian, there would be a fantastic collapse of education in the United States.

What is education? Education is national power; education is happiness; education is national strength. This Nation, if it is to compete today with Communist Russia, must move full steam ahead in the field of education. Our public colleges and universities cannot do the entire job. The first college or university ever founded in this country was a Congregational school—Harvard College. Private colleges having a sectarian background admit boys and girls of every race, color, and creed; and they have done magnificent work.

It would be a tragedy for this country to limit the ability of those colleges to play their full part in the education of young men and women and in the future growth of this country.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] as much time as he may desire.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I spoke earlier on the amendment at some length. I joined with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] in offering the amendment, and I must say not without study.

As Senators know, I have supported many education bills during my membership in the Senate. I know that the position I have taken today may be misinterpreted by some as involving a question of tolerance. I know, too, that many persons consider the constitutional question raised by the bill before us to be a very dull, theoretical, and academic subject. But in this case it is not, for two reasons.

The first reason is that it is difficult to have this constitutional question passed upon by the Supreme Court. There is scarcely any way to get it before the Supreme Court, unless the amendment which the Senator from North Carolina and I have offered is adopted. I believe it would be wrong not to make it possible for the Supreme Court to pass upon an issue which has concerned the people of our Nation since the very beginning of the Republic. For that reason, it is more important that this body make its judgment as to whether or not this particular provision in the bill falls within the prohibition of the first amendment.

The second reason is that the Supreme Court in recent decisions has given its interpretation of the first amendment to the Constitution. As the Senator from North Carolina has said, it is not a question of whether a church is established. The Supreme Court has held that no tax funds shall be levied to support a religious institution.

It does not make any difference whether the funds be in the form of a grant or a loan. We are dealing with tax funds.

The Supreme Court has made some exceptions. It made an exception in the Everson case, stating that if the benefit could be shown to be primarily one to the pupil, with only an indirect benefit to the school, the payment was constitutional.

It does not make any difference how many programs have been passed in recent years. It may be that all these programs are constitutional. The school lunch program, the scholarship loan program, the public health program, and even the college housing or dormitory program are, in my judgment, constitutional, because they are for the primary benefit of the pupil.

But this bill goes far beyond existing programs. It provides that funds may be made available for the construction of nearly any facility of any church school. I am not of course talking about any one church. There are more Protestant schools than there are schools of other faiths—Catholic, Jewish, or any other kind. Under the bill nearly every form of aid could be provided to a church school except the payment of teachers' and administrators' salaries.

Congress did not write the first amendment to the Constitution. Congress did not make the Supreme Court decisions. Every one of the decisions rendered by the Supreme Court on this subject in the last few years is backed by the firm constitutional provision that public funds cannot be used to support a religious institution.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. How does the Senator make a legal distinction between a dormitory and a physics building?

Mr. COOPER. I have just said that the Court has never passed on any of the Federal programs; but the Court said in the Everson case—I am sure the Senator has read it——

Mr. PASTORE. I have read that case.

Mr. COOPER. The Everson case went to the very limit of constitutionality. The Court made the distinction that where it could be shown on the facts that the aid provided was for the direct benefit of the students, and of only incidental benefit to the school, the aid was constitutional.

But in the McCollum case the Court held that a public school building could not even be loaned for use in holding religious exercises. In this bill, on the other hand, it is proposed that Congress authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of buildings to be used by schools affiliated with religious denominations.

I have tried to make clear the distinction. As I have said, every case depends upon the facts involved. I have stated my position in connection with this case. I think this bill goes too far.

Furthermore, I believe that these amendments, which would provide a means of access to the Supreme Court in order to obtain a decision from it, should be adopted.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. These amendments go farther than that; as I understand the amendments of the Senator from North Carolina, they prohibit the making of a grant to a school affiliated with a religious order.

Mr. MORSE. Or a loan.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. And, as the Senator from Oregon has also pointed out, the amendments also prohibit the making of loans for use in connection with the construction of such buildings.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to make only one observation: No part of the bill really makes it obligatory upon these institutions to use the buildings for secular purposes. It provides that they shall use them for the instruction of pupils and for research in secular subjects for 20 years, if the buildings are constructed in part by the use of grants; but the bill does not contain a provision which would require, even for 5 minutes, their use for such purposes if they were constructed by means of loans. So, in the case of grants, after the expiration of 20 years; and, in the case of loans, from the very beginning, universities and colleges could use the buildings for any purposes they wished, beginning with that time and until the last, lingering echo of Gabriel's horn trembles into ultimate silence.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to these amendments, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the committee's case has been made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore].

I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the two amendments—No. 215 and No. 218—of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], to the committee amendment, which amendments are to be voted upon en bloc. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 192 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Allott
Bennett
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Cannon
Cooper
Dirksen
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
McClellan
Mechem
Morton
Moss
Robertson
Russell
Sparkman
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Walters
Yarborough

NAYS—54

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Dominick
Douglas
Fong
Goldwater
Hart
Hickenlooper
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—19

Aiken
Church
Curtis
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
Miller
Mundt
Neuberger
Pearson
Saltonstall
Smathers
Stennis

So Mr. Ervin's amendments No. 215 and No. 218 to the committee amendment were rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], I call up the amendment No. 216 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from North Carolina will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 71 it is proposed to insert the following new section between subsection (c) of section 303 and section 304:

> Sec. 304. Not less than sixty days before making any grant or loan to any institution of higher education under the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice that he proposes to make such grant or loan on a day to be specified in such notice. At any time before the day so specified, any taxpayer of the United States suing in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers may bring a civil action in the nature of an action for a declaratory judgment against the Commissioner in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia alleging that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Notwithstanding any decision, statute, or rule to the contrary, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to entertain, try, and determine such civil action, and to enjoin the making of the proposed grant or loan in case it adjudges that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States. Upon the bringing of such civil action, the Commissioner shall refrain from consummating the proposed grant or loan and withhold the amount of the proposed grant or loan until the final determination of the civil action. In the event two or more civil actions are brought under the provisions of this section challenging the constitutional validity of the same proposed grant or loan, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may consolidate such civil actions for the purpose of trial and judgment.

It is proposed to renumber section 304 on page 71 as section 305; section 305 on page 73 as section 306; section 306 on page 73 as section 307; section 307 on page 73 as section 308.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to request that Senators remain in the Chamber. I understand that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina will not take much time. The business of the Senate will be expedited if Senators remain in the Chamber instead of wandering off.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I believe I can explain the amendment very simply. It is offered because of the uncertainty as to whether or not anyone can gain access to the Federal courts for the purpose of having them pass on the constitutionality of grants or loans to religious colleges and universities under the bill. That uncertainty arises from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447. In that case a single taxpayer sued to enjoin the execution of an appropriation made by Congress. The Supreme Court held that a single taxpayer could not bring suit because the amount of a single taxpayer's interest in the appropriation was too minute and undeterminable to comply with the rules of equity, which are to the effect that no equitable relief can be granted by injunction unless the taxpayer is about to suffer irreparable injury.

In the course of that opinion the Court said that if one taxpayer could bring a suit of that nature against one appropriation, other taxpayers could bring suits against all appropriations, and that such action would interfere with the operation of the Government.

If the bill is passed, its administration will be in the hands of the Federal Commissioner of Education, who is an official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. When a representative of that Department appeared before the House committee in 1961 to advocate the passage of a bill of the nature of the one before the Senate, he filed a memorandum in behalf of the Department. I quote from the memorandum of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

> There appears to be no realistic likelihood that Federal legislation raising the constitutional issue discussed in this memorandum will be resolved by judicial decision.

The amendment which the Senator from Kentucky and I now offer is very simple. In order to make certain that there will be no great delay in a court test under the bill, we provide that before the Commissioner of Education makes a specific grant or loan, he shall publish a notice in the Federal Register that he proposes to make such specific grant or loan to a specific institution on a day to be designated by him. Then the amendment provides that any time before that day any taxpayer suing in his own behalf and in behalf of the taxpayers generally may bring a suit to test the validity of the proposed grant or loan on the basis of the first amendment, the fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution.

The fifth amendment is specifically referred to because it contains the due process clause binding on the Federal Government. Under this provision there could be no delay, because the suit would have to be brought within a limited time, fixed by the Commissioner himself. This amendment would change the situation from that of the Mellon case, because it provides that the taxpayer sues not for his own interest only but in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers. Consequently, he would represent a substantial interest.

Furthermore, in order to avoid the possibility of the Commissioner of Education being sued all over the United States, the proposal restricts jurisdiction to entertain a case of this kind to the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia. That would avoid the harassment that would have been allowed under the procedure which the plaintiff attempted to invoke in the Mellon case.

Then, in order to avoid a multiplicity of trials, this amendment provides that if two or more cases are brought to test the validity under the Constitution of the same proposed grant, or loan, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia can consolidate all of such cases for trial and judgment. As a consequence, there would be only one trial.

Then, in order to make it certain that the institution that might be affected will not suffer any loss in case the loan or grant proposed is valid, the amendment provides that upon the filing of the action the Federal Commissioner of Education will refrain from consummating the grant or loan but will hold the amount of the proposed grant or loan in escrow until the suit is decided. The amendment does not authorize a challenge to the entire appropriation. It merely permits a challenge of a specific proposed grant or loan to a specific college or university.

I cannot for the life of me see why any Senator should object to having the Federal courts pass upon the constitutionality of an act of Congress. We should not nail the courthouse door shut against anyone who seeks to have determined the question whether or not a specific proposed grant or loan is unconstitutional under the first amendment or the due process clause of the fifth amendment, or any other constitutional provision.

The Senator from Oregon argues that there is no need for a court determination at the Federal level because there is a State case in the State of Maryland which challenges the validity of some State uses of funds for the benefit of religious colleges. The fact that the State of Maryland may have an adequate method for judicial review of questions of this nature is no reason why the Federal Government should not have any kind of procedure whatsoever for similar controversies relating to Federal funds.

Senators who have been in the Chamber today have heard arguments made by lawyers on one side that certain provisions of the bill are unconstitutional, and arguments made by lawyers on the other side that they are not unconstitutional. These arguments show the necessity for the adoption of the pending amendment, which would allow the Federal courts to proceed at once to the merits of the controversy instead of wasting years on the question whether the courts have jurisdiction to act at all.

This amendment would make it certain that the Court could hear the matter, and hear it speedily, and determine the meaning of the Constitution, and let the Congress hereafter legislate in constitutional light instead of the way we are legislating today, which is in constitutional darkness.

Why should anyone want to nail the courthouse door shut? And yet today under the Mellon case and under the statement of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there is grave reason to doubt whether anyone cannot obtain a Court review of the constitutionality of the specific loans or grants to be made under the provisions of the bill. It seems to me it would be a fine solution of the problem if the Federal courts could pass upon this question.

If the Federal courts should decide that the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island are correct, and the Senator from Kentucky and I are in error, Congress would not be bothered with this problem again, because there will be no constitutional objection to the passage of a bill of this kind. On the contrary, if the Court should be permitted to decide the controversy as this amendment provides and should decide that the Senator from Kentucky and I and the millions of other Americans who agree with us are correct, then the Senate could hereafter refrain from making unconstitutional appropriations of tax-raised funds. The issue is that simple.

Do Senators believe Congress should legislate in constitutional light instead of in constitutional darkness? If so, they should vote for this amendment. But if they believe Congress should continue legislating in constitutional darkness, they should vote against it. Senators should vote against it if they believe the courthouse door should be nailed shut. But they should vote for it if they believe the courthouse door should be open to those who seek a judicial determination whether Congress is exceeding its constitutional powers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in voting upon the previous amendment offered, I was in considerable doubt as to whether I should vote for or against. I was impressed with the idea that challenge could be made to the power of Congress to expend money for the purpose of promoting religion in the sectarian schools of our country.

I recognize that the bill as written excludes the granting of money for the specific purpose of teaching religion. It did so with the declaration that the moneys shall be used only for the construction of facilities used in the promotion of science generally. The Senator from North Carolina has stated that Senators who have been in the Chamber today could not help but be impressed with the divergence of opinion concerning the constitutionality of the bill pending before the Senate.

When one recognizes that the Supreme Court has declared that the utterance of the prayer of the Lord is unconstitutional in our schools, one cannot help but reach the conclusion that there may be grave doubt about the constitutionality of granting money to sectarian institutions of higher learning.

With that premise, there is before the Senate the simple issue: Shall provisions be written into this bill which will give the taxpayer the right, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated, to bring an action for a declaration of law on the Constitution? That is the simple issue before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield 3 more minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If this bill is unambiguously and unquestionably constitutional, those who sponsor it should not for one moment oppose the proposal of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Carolina. To Senators who are not lawyers, I say that in practically every State there are laws giving specifically by statute, the right of a taxpayer to bring an action to stop illegal and unconstitutional expenditures of money.

Ohio has it. I doubt if there is any State—or, if there are, there are only a few—that does not have such a provision.

All that the proposal of the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Kentucky contemplates is giving to a taxpayer who contributes money to the Federal Treasury the right to bring an action in his own name and, in conjunction with others similarly situated, to challenge the expenditure.

In States where this right exists, challenges have frequently been made. On the Federal level, there is no such law. There is no such law giving to an individual taxpayer the right to bring an action. The Supreme Court has held that when such an action was brought in a court of equity, the interest of the complaining litigant was not adequate in value to warrant him in prosecuting the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, the Court has held "de minimis non curat lex"—the law does not concern itself with insignificant rights of litigants. They must be of a substantial nature.

I conclude by asking, What is wrong with writing into the bill a provision that a taxpayer may bring an action and ask for a declaration by the courts on the legitimacy of the contemplated expenditure?

I urge the point on the basis of fairness, of carrying into effect the purpose of the writers of our Constitution that religion shall be preserved by keeping government out of it. That was their purpose. I say that if the individual taxpayer is given the right to bring the action, Congress will be maintaining the purpose of the writers of our Constitution.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Are we not assuming a little too much that is not established by documentation? The Senator is saying that if the constitutional right of a taxpayer is being violated by the proposed law we are contemplating today, he does not have any standing in a Federal court to state that his constitutional rights are violated. How were all the other cases brought before the Supreme Court?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall answer that question. The Court has held specifically that when a person brings an action to enjoin the expenditure of money—and that is what the effect of the action would be—he must prove that he has a substantial fiscal interest in the litigation. Let us assume the Senator from Rhode Island is correct. What is wrong with specifically his right in the law?

Mr. PASTORE. Because the Senator goes a step further than what he has just said. If it were a simple statute which would be a declaration that extends to the taxpayer the right to bring a suit if he thought his constitutional rights were being violated, I would vote for it. But this issue involves a complex, cumbersome procedure, which compels a person to come to the District of Columbia to begin to enforce his rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 more minutes?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I was on the bench for 10 years. I was in equity for 8. This is no more than a declaration of general law—that when a man's money is being unjustly taken from him, he should have his day in court. If the Senator from Rhode Island is correct, fear not what is being proposed. If the Senator from Rhode Island is in error, run for cover.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island does not fear and is not going to run for cover. I invite the Senator to read the amendment. It does more than give a person the right to sue. It directs the Commissioner of Education to do many things that are rather cumbersome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ERVIN. My good friend from Rhode Island has complicated simplicity. This is about the simplest legislative proposal made in this session of Congress. It is made to get a judicial determination of whether or not the provisions of this bill are unconstitutional, as I have said they are, and as the court decisions have said they are.

Mr. PASTORE. I will tell the Senator how much I am complicating simplicity. Let us see how involved the procedure is. The amendment provides, after section 303 to add the following language:

> Not less than sixty days before making any grant or loan—

And we are going to have a multitude of them—

> to any institution of higher education under the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner shall cause to be published in the Federal Register a notice that he proposes to make such a grant or loan on a day to be specified in such notice. At any time before the day so specified, any taxpayer of the United States suing in behalf of himself and all other taxpayers—

May do thus and so.

Why are we complicating it. Why does not the Senator say that if any citizen or taxpayer of the United States believes his constitutional rights are being violated, he shall have the right to sue in his name in any Federal court?

Mr. ERVIN. Would the Senator from Rhode Island vote for such a proposal?

Mr. PASTORE. I would.

Mr. ERVIN. I included that provision to make it certain that the Commissioner of Education can fix the time when a civil action can be brought to challenge the constitutionality of a specific proposed grant or loan. It will prevent legal delays. It has no other purpose. The Federal Register can contain the Commissioner's statement concerning hundreds of proposed grants and loans on a single page.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The general law is that a litigant cannot ask for prohibitive or injunctive relief unless he shows that a threatened wrong is to be committed upon him.

Mr. ERVIN. Irreparable injury.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The provision in question states that the litigant shall be able to show that a wrong will be committed upon him, and therefore be able to ask relief of the court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I urge the Senate to vote against the amendment for these reasons: I am pleading with the Senate to permit us to take to conference a bill brought to the floor of the Senate from the committee because it is identical with the bill brought out of conference last year, except for title II, which was the student assistance program which the House of Representatives gave us last year as the reason for not approving the conference report.

If we really want some higher education legislation this year—and we had better want it and had better do something about it—I plead with my colleagues in the Senate to let us take to conference last year's conference report and discuss that report with the House.

Second, an amendment not even as comprehensive as this amendment was badly beaten in the House this year. I tell the Senate—and I believe nobody can successfully dispute my word—that the House presents us with a parliamentary situation that leaves me in grave doubt as to whether it can even obtain a rule to go to conference with this amendment. For 6 weeks last year we were tied up.

Third, this is not the place for its enactment. I respectfully point out that this amendment had no hearing, and not a single statement was made to the committee on the proposal.

I respectfully plead with the proponents of the amendment that a number of much broader amendments which we have approved since 1950 have provided for grants, and we have already provided $485 million, plus; we do not know how many millions of dollars more. Recently we approved a $175 million appropriation for medical schools. That money was provided for schools of religious denominations as well as others. I did not hear any proposals then that we should have such an amendment as this.

I am presenting to the Senate a practical situation. If Senators want a bill, we have one that we can take to conference.

I think this amendment should be introduced as a separate bill. It ought to go to the committee for hearings. It ought to be more comprehensive than this is. It ought to cover the entire problem.

Lastly, I say to my good friend from North Carolina that the bill of complaint in the Horace Mann League case, a Maryland case, states:

> [The expenditure of State funds] violates the 1st amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America as made applicable to the State of Maryland by the 14th amendment to said Constitution, in that they constitute in each case a law respecting an establishment of religion and prohibiting the full exercise thereof by the State of Maryland.

And so forth. Speaking humorously, I never heard my good friend from North Carolina express any fear about getting a case to the Supreme Court. I thought he was more concerned about too many cases getting to the Supreme Court.

All joshing aside, I have no doubt that in the not too distant future the Supreme Court will rule on that case, as to the application of the first amendment. I believe we ought to let that legal process run its course, and not endanger the bill before us by the proposed amendment.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield such time to the Senator from Kentucky as he may require.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not need to speak further on the amendment. I support it. One of the problems that has been with us constantly is that under the decisions of the Supreme Court a taxpayer must show a special interest, separate and distinct from that held by all taxpayers, in order to get a case before the Supreme Court. If a taxpayer has the same interest as taxpayers generally, and cannot demonstrate a special and separate interest, he cannot get into the Supreme Court.

The same situation applies in the States. Several States have enacted statutes to enable an individual to get into court.

The amendment before the Senate merely provides that in this specific situation, because of the great constitutional question involved, a taxpayer could bring the matter to the Court in order to obtain a decision. I believe the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Congress should never pass a bill if it is unwilling to have it undergo the test of constitutionality in the courts. The fact that a case is brought in Maryland gives us no assurance that it will reach the Supreme Court of the United States. Fifteen such cases have been brought in State courts during the last few years. One of them was the Dickman case in Oregon. In virtually all of them the State courts held that assistance to religions was unconstitutional under the State constitutions. They refrained from even passing upon the first amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, how much time remains to the Senator from North Carolina?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-three minutes remain of the time of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment for all the good reasons that have already been stated, and for two additional reasons, which I hope will be considered by Senators. In the first place, the amendment does not propose to establish machinery whereby all of the bill's worthwhile purposes can be challenged or defeated. Everyone knows that in the case of grants or loans to publicly supported institutions of higher learning, there is no question of the constitutionality of the act. The proposal is to allow citizens who have doubts in their minds about whether it is constitutional to make loans or grants to schools which are controlled by religious institutions, to have those doubts made litigable in the courts.

There will be various kinds of cases, because there are various controls in religious schools. Everyone knows that one case will not decide all cases.

I like the proposed approach because it states that the attack must be made case by case. A suit will run only against a particular loan or grant sought to be made to a particular school at a particular time. I read from the amendment these words:

> Notwithstanding any decision, statute, or rule to the contrary, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to entertain, try, and determine such civil action, and to enjoin the making of the proposed grant or loan in case it adjudges that the proposed grant or loan is inconsistent with the first amendment, fifth amendment, or any other provision of the Constitution of the United States.

I see no reason why doubtful loans or grants—and there will be doubtful ones—should not be subject to speedy litigation, or why any citizen who feels in his conscience that a loan or grant violates the Constitution, should not have the right to have that issue tried. The amendment would give a citizen that right without jeopardizing the useful coverage of the act over publicly financed institutions.

The second reason why I support the amendment is that a great many other Senators besides myself are in the position of being trustees of religious schools. I am looking now at four or five Senators who I know to be trustees of religious schools or universities. The Senator from Florida is a trustee of three such religious institutions. I would dislike to have the RECORD indicate that Senators, particularly those Members who are in that position, which presents something of a conflict of interest, are unwilling to have any other citizen, who may not agree with the purpose of the loan or grant made to an institution in which they are trustees, given the right to take that question quickly to a court which has the clear right to make a prompt disposition of the constitutional issue.

Personally, being a trustee of three religious institutions of higher learning, I would not deprive any citizen of the right to test out any proposed grant or loan to any of those institutions.

I do not believe any other Senator would permit such a citizen to be deprived of his right. I shall support the amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield back any time I may have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WALTERS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARK (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona, [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 33, as follows:

[No. 193 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Allott
Bennett
Bible
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Cooper
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Ervin

Goldwater
Gore
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
McGovern
Mechem
Metcalf

Monroney
Morton
Moss
Nelson
Robertson
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—33

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Boggs
Brewster
Cotton
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Hart
Humphrey
Inouye
Javits
Keating
Kuchel
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Morse
Muskie
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken
Church
Clark
Curtis
Eastland
Edmondson
Engle
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Long, Mo.
Miller
Mundt
Neuberger
Pearson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Stennis
Walters
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. ERVIN's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it had been our hope that action on the bill might perhaps be completed this evening. It was a long-shot expectation, and it did not work out. This will be the last vote today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield from the time on the bill as much time as the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may require.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States will shortly be called on to vote on one of the most significant phases of domestic legislation facing the 88th Congress. The Senate in 1962 gave overwhelming endorsement to the importance of such legislation by a vote of 68 to 17. The other body recently reaffirmed its recognition of the critical need for this bill by a vote of 287 to 113. I am confident that this body will once again respond with affirmative action to the challenge presented by the challenging needs of our burgeoning college population.

H.R. 6143 is an effective vehicle to meet the demands and hopes of the American people and the States in the decades ahead when the quality of our thought and skills will determine the future of our Nation. Such an investment in higher education may conceivably spell the difference between national prosperity and security and tenuous economic, cultural, and military survival.

I commend the scholarly chairman of the Subcommittee on Education [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], both of whom have labored so conscientiously and effectively. The senior Senator from Alabama and the senior Senator from Oregon place all of us in their debt by virtue of their continuing dedication to the goal of a quality education for all Americans, regardless of status or condition of life.

Mr. President, the needs for this legislation are generally well understood and widely accepted. The votes of the Senate and the House of Representatives to which I have referred indicate that to be true. Yet, as the minority views in the committee report on H.R. 6143 indicate, there is still some question concerning the ability of America's colleges and universities to meet rising student enrollments without new aid from the Federal Government.

As the minority views also point out, the November 4, 1962, issue of This Week magazine contained an article "The College Shortage Is a Myth" by Gene R. Hawes. Mr. Hawes gathered his information from more than 2,000 colleges in preparation for the second edition of his popular book. "The American Guide to Colleges." As a result of this study, Mr. Hawes was able to report that leaders of America's colleges and universities expected to expand sufficiently to be able to accommodate all of the expected enrollment increase in 1970. But the key point made by Mr. Hawes is that these were expectations of the colleges and universities.

These are intentions of the colleges and universities. These expectations and intentions require money—an estimated $15 billion of new construction, much of which will not be available without the Federal aid for the construction of such facilities provided in the pending legislation.

Mr. Hawes has specifically written that the This Week article has been misconstrued as representing resources in hand rather than resources needed and planned for in the decade ahead. To quote him:

> No mention of Federal aid was made in the article and * * * it is an unfounded conclusion that no Federal aid is needed.

Such a conclusion, according to Mr. Hawes, "could lead to very serious consequences for the Nation's youth and future strength."

Yet the minority would point to the article of Mr. Hawes to indicate that we have no problem from the standpoint of the burgeoning population in our colleges and universities in the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator from West Virginia for the very able speech which he is making. It is a speech that has needed to be made on the floor of the Senate.

Does the Senator from West Virginia agree with me that there is another weakness in the Hawes argument? The Senator talked about expectations that have been suggested by the colleges. Those expectations are on the basis of present admission policies. There is great criticism of present admission policies, which deny to thousands of young men and women an opportunity to go to college. They are young men and women who could do average work in colleges. Since facilities do not exist to admit them, they are denied admission.

In the automated age into which we are moving so fast the problem that will confront them is not the problem of employment, but the problem of employability. They will be unemployable because they will not have had the training necessary to make the economic adjustments to an age of automation.

When we consider the need, we must take into account present admission standards. The sad fact is that at the present time our colleges are rapidly becoming so devoid of adequate facilities that many young men and women run the danger of being denied an opportunity to go to college because the college administrators do not have the facilities with which to accommodate them. Colleges continue to raise their admission standards and thus will deny increasing thousands an opportunity to go to college. It is a tragedy. It is shameful that in our country any young man or woman who has the ability to do average work in college should be denied an opportunity to go to college.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The validity of the statement of the Senator from Oregon is frankly recognized by those who have studied the problem in the United States. Such facilities are sorely needed. The testimony received by our committee from dozens of educators, Government officials, and citizens' groups overwhelmingly supports the view that Federal assistance in construction of college academic facilities—libraries, laboratories, engineering facilities, junior college campuses—is vitally needed and needed now if the Nation is to accommodate a college enrollment rising from the present 4.2 million to 5.2 million in 1965 and almost 7 million in 1970. There simply is no other answer. Without such a program we shall fail in our responsibilities to our young people and to the Nation.

Mr. President, this legislation holds forth hope for each of the States, and not least among them, our State of West Virginia.

I referred to the projected enrollment increases in the Nation as a whole. In West Virginia, enrollments should rise from the present 33,700 students to over 42,000 in 1965 and over 56,000 in 1970. In place of our present 20 institutions of higher learning—3 junior colleges and 17 liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges and universities—we shall need to construct many new facilities for high quality instruction, both public and private, and we shall have to strengthen each and every one of the institutions of which we are so proud.

By 1965 we shall have to expend in West Virginia some $50 million on new academic buildings, not including residential quarters, to accommodate anticipated enrollment. A substantial additional investment will be needed to replace antiquated facilities and to remodel unsatisfactory quarters.

By 1970, West Virginia will need to invest not $50 million but $135 million merely for enrollment increases. Mr. President, that means an annual average expenditure rate of some $17 million. Sorely pressed fellow citizens in our State have in recent years been able to expend only $6 million annually for these purposes. Thus, it is obvious that we are falling behind at a rapid rate just at a time when we should be redoubling our efforts in preparation for the marked expansion which has already begun and which will soon reach its peak.

There will be some who say that West Virginia ought to be able to build the needed buildings by its own effort. We ardently wish that that were possible. But these are certain inescapable economic facts. In college-age population, as a percentage of the total population, West Virginia ranks in the top five States. That is to say, we have a very high burden in attempting to give higher educational opportunities to each and every qualified person. At the same time, we have, as is well known, a relatively low per capita income. West Virginia ranks behind seven-tenths of the other States in the Union. In short, the burden exceeds the resources of our State. And since we believe that it is in the national interest to increase higher educational opportunities for all Americans, regardless of their place of residence, we look to the one Government all Americans share in common as a means of helping us do our part to make America strong.

H.R. 6143 would, in the next 3 years, give West Virginia some $1,850,000 per year to construct facilities needed for instruction or research in the natural or physical sciences or engineering or for use as a library. It would also provide more than three-fourths of a million dollars per annum during the same 3-year period for the construction of community college facilities as well as loans for the construction of general purpose academic facilities.

Mr. President, I would not want to close my remarks without drawing at least briefly upon the abundant and highly relevant testimony on manpower and our reservoir of skills which has been submitted to another subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

For many months now, the Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment, on which I am privileged to serve under the most able chairmanship of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has been engaged in a broad-scale inquiry into the many related facets of manpower, employment, and technological change. Among the number of experts who have testified before our committee—from Government, industry, organized labor, universities, and foundations—none, I believe, submitted a more trenchant analysis of the national problems in this area than Prof. Charles C. Killingsworth from Michigan State University.

Speaking with particular reference to the College Academic Facilities Act of 1963, I would like to quote from the conclusions Professor Killingsworth submitted to our subcommittee:

> When you put all of these considerations together, I believe that you are ineluctably led to the conclusion that long before we could get down to an overall unemployment rate as low as 4 percent, we would have a severe shortage of workers at the top of the educational ladder. This shortage would be a bottleneck to further expansion of employment. I cannot pinpoint the level at which the bottleneck would begin to seriously impede expansion; but * * * it seems reasonable to believe that we could not get very far below a 5-percent overall unemployment level without hitting that bottleneck.
>
> The most fundamental conclusion—

Continues Professor Killingsworth—

> that emerges from my analysis is that automation and the changing pattern of consumer wants have greatly increased the importance of investment in human beings as a factor in economic growth. More investment in plant and equipment, without very large increases in our investment in human beings, seems certain to enlarge the surplus of underdeveloped manpower and to create a shortage of the highly developed manpower needed to design, install, and man modern production facilities.

Mr. President, the evidence is conclusive, in my opinion, that we are not only here considering a measure which will expand the individual opportunities for educational achievement; we are also debating a measure which is freighted with significance for the economic development of the Nation as a whole. Senators recognize that all Americans will share in the benefits of this measure and should share in the costs of meeting national needs for college academic facilities construction. I know that the people of West Virginia will overwhelmingly support the passage of the pending bill. I will cast my vote for the enactment of the College Academic Facilities Act of 1963, believing it to be in the public interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment which I sent to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 68, line 9, it is proposed to substitute a comma for the semicolon and add the following: "or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;".

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, as I observed in the Senate on Friday, 2-year terminal programs of technical education are becoming increasingly important. Some technical institutes and most public junior colleges can qualify for assistance under title II of the Senate bill. Facilities for use in technical education apparently would qualify under the term "engineering" in the definitions under title II. But there are institutions which will not necessarily qualify under title II. These include private 2-year technical institutes. They include public technical institutes whose programs are not offered as part of a 4-year curriculum, and some public junior colleges may be disqualified for the same reason. As I understand the bill, Mr. President, those institutions disqualified under title II may be eligible under title I, which provides for assistance to institutions of higher education. I should like to recommend to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that some attention be given to including technical education facilities under title I. This might be done, for example, by adopting this amendment which embodies the House definition of an "institution of higher education" which appears on pages 28 and 29 of the bill as reported in the Senate. I should like to direct the Senator's attention to these words, as part of the definition: "or offers a 2-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;".

I would like to know if the senior Senator from Oregon agrees with my argument that technical education facilities should be given assistance and that, if so, a change in language along the lines suggested might be most helpful?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself such additional time as I shall need.

Mr. President, the committee is indebted to the Senator from New Hampshire for his amendment. This amendment will strengthen the bill, and I am pleased to recommend to the Senate that it be adopted, because I am willing to take it to conference. It is the House language, which will lock the provision into the bill in conference, and I urge that the Senate adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon to yield me such time as I may require to propose an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer the amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD without being read.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 49, following line 21, insert the following:

PART B—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GRADUATE ACADEMIC FACILITIES

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 121. In order to increase the supply of highly qualified personnel critically needed by the community, industry, government, research, and teaching, the Commissioner shall, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, make construction grants to assist institutions of higher education to improve existing graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers, and to assist in the establishment of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers of excellence. For the purpose of making grants under this part B, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the sum of $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and the succeeding fiscal year; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. Sums so appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall remain available for grants under this part B until the end of the next succeeding fiscal year.

Grants

SEC. 122. (a) Grants under this part B may be made to institutions of higher education and to cooperative graduate center boards to assist them to meet the development costs for projects for construction of academic facilities for graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers. Such grants may be made only upon application therefor at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner finds necessary to determine eligibility for the grants and the amounts thereof.

(b) Grants under this part B for construction of academic facilities may not exceed 33⅓ per centum of the development cost of any such construction project.

(c) (1) The Commissioner shall not approve any application for a grant under this part B without the advice of the Advisory Committee established under section 123.

(2) In determining whether to approve applications for grants under this part B, the order in which to approve such applications, and the amount of the grants, the Commissioner shall give consideration to the extent to which such projects will contribute to achieving the objectives of this part B and also the extent to which they will aid in attaining a wider distribution throughout the United States of graduate schools and cooperative graduate centers.

(d) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this part B the total of the payments from the appropriations for any fiscal year under this part B made with respect to projects in any State may not exceed an amount equal to 12½ per centum of such appropriation.

Advisory committee

SEC. 123. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Graduate Education, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman; one representative from the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President; one from the National Science Foundation; and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. Such appointed members shall be selected from leading authorities in the field of education, at least three of whom shall be from the field of the humanities, with at least one of these three from a graduate school of education.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner (1) on the action to be taken with regard to each application for a grant under this part B, and (2) in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part B, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Advisory Committee may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out its functions.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee and special advisory and technical experts and consultants appointed pursuant to subsection (b) shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but not exceeding $75 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Definitions for part B

SEC. 124. As used in this part B—

(a) The term "cooperative graduate center" means an institution or program created by two or more institutions of higher education which will offer to the students of the participating institutions of higher education graduate work which could not be offered with the same proficiency and/or economy at the individual institution of higher education. The center may be located or the program carried out on the campus of any of the participating institutions or at a separate location.

(b) The term "cooperative graduate center board" means a duly constituted board established to construct and maintain a cooperative graduate center and coordinate academic programs. The board shall be composed of representatives of each of the higher education institutions participating in the center and of the community involved. At least one-third of the board's members shall be community representatives. The board shall elect by a majority vote a chairman from among its membership.

Redesignate sections 111 through 114 of part B of title I, beginning on page 50, as sections 131 through 134, respectively, and redesignate such part B, and all references thereto on page 50 and subsequent pages, as part C.

On page 55, line 7, strike out "C" and insert in lieu thereof "D".

On page 55, line 10, strike out "121" and insert in lieu thereof "141".

On page 39, line 8; page 48, line 5; and page 55, line 5, strike out "121" and insert in lieu thereof "141"; and on page 48, line 21, strike out "122" and insert in lieu thereof "141".

In section 108, beginning on page 47, insert "or part B" after each reference therein to "part A".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I asked that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with because I can discuss it quite briefly.

Mr. President, this amendment would reinstate title II of the bill as it passed the House. Title II provides for grants of $25 million the first year, $60 million the second year; $60 million the third year, and an open authorization for the fourth and fifth years of the program, the money authorized to be used to improve existing graduate schools, to build new graduate schools, and to build cooperative graduate centers. Cooperative graduate centers occur when two or more institutions of higher learning combine to create a joint graduate school.

The amendment provides that not more than one-third of the cost of improving the graduate school or creating the new one shall be borne by the Federal Government, and that not more than 12½ percent of the amount authorized in any 1 year may be expended in any one State.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Is the matter in the amendment just offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, like the previous one, noncontroversial and approved by the minority?

Mr. CLARK. I shall have to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon whether my answer is accurate. This title was in the House bill. I undertook to offer it as an addition to the Senate bill. The Senator from Oregon indicated that he would be glad to accept the amendment. Other than that, I do not know.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from California that I have also cleared it with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. This is really in line with a substantial amount of what the Senator from Vermont has sought. I am sure that the Senator will find that the overwhelming majority of the members on the Senate committee approve my taking it to conference. I cleared it with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. He agrees that I should take it to conference. I assure the Senator that the overwhelming majority of, if not all of my committee members, would have me take it to conference. I have not been able to see one or two members of the committee, but the others I have seen. There are enough votes to take it to conference, so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. May I ask him if this amendment and the one immediately preceding represent language which was lifted verbatim from the House bill and therefore were a part of the proposal offered by the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct with the usual renumbering.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] which has been adopted by the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum on engineering and science technicians, prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGINEERING AND SCIENCE TECHNICIANS

Definition: The term "technician" is used to describe a large and loosely defined group of occupations at many levels of skill and with a wide variety of training requirements. "There is no one term which can be realistically used to designate the subprofessional engineering, scientific and medical occupations. There is such a great diversity in their functions, educational requirements and other characteristics that there is no generally accepted definition. In general, these occupations require scientific and mathematical knowledge and specialized education and training in some aspect of technology or science. Workers in these occupations assist or support professional personnel, and are utilized in research, production, testing and other activities where technical know-how is required. All of their tasks are functional parts of the work of the professional person." [1]

Definition of engineering and science technicians used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect employment data on technicians from employers is as follows: All persons engaged in work requiring knowledge of physical, life, engineering, and mathematical sciences comparable to knowledge acquired through technical institute, junior college, or other formal post high school training, or through equivalent on-the-job training or experience. Some typical job titles are: Laboratory assistants, physical science aids, and electronic technicians. All employees in positions requiring the indicated level of knowledge and training should be included regardless of job title and company department in which employed. Exclude craftsmen such as machinists and electricians.[2]

---

[1] Statement of W. Willard Wirtz, Under Secretary of Labor, before the Special Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee on H.R. 10396-10401 "Technical Education Act of 1962" June 1, 1962.

Employment characteristics, 1960 [1]

Estimated employment of technicians, by employer, 1960:	
Total	855,000
Industry	620,000
Colleges and universities	10,000
Government	145,000
Medical and dental practitioners	80,000
Estimated employment of technicians, by specialty, 1960:	
Total	855,000
Engineering and science technicians	775,000
Draftsmen	(210,000)
Technicians supporting physicians and other doctors	80,000
Percent of technicians in research and development in industry, 1960:	
Technicians	600,000
Technicians in research and development	162,000
Percent in research and development	27.0
Ratio of technicians (excluding those supporting physicians and other doctors) to scientists and engineers, 1960:	
Scientists and engineers	1,157,000
Technicians (excluding those supporting physicians and other doctors)	775,000
Technicians per 100 scientists and engineers	67
Ratio of technicians (excluding those supporting physicians and other doctors) to scientists and engineers in industry, 1960:	
Scientists and engineers	860,000
Technicians (excluding those supporting physicians and other doctors)	600,000
Technicians per 100 scientists and engineers	70

[1] Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates.

Projected requirements for technicians, 1970 [1]

Employment, 1960	855,000
Requirements, 1970	1,450,000
Increase, 1960–70	595,000
Percent increase, 1960–70	70
Engineering and science technicians:	
Employment, 1960	775,000
Requirements, 1970	1,350,000
Increase, 1960–70	575,000
Percent increase, 1960–70	75
Technicians supporting physicians and other doctors:	
Employment, 1960	80,000
Requirements, 1970	96,000
Increase, 1960–70	16,000
Percent increase	20
Replacement needs—to replace technicians who die, retire or transfer out of the field:	
Total replacement needs, 1960–70	175,000
Annual average replacement needs, 1960–70	17,500
Total demand for technicians, including replacement needs and growth requirements, 1960–70:	

[1] Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates.

	Total, 1960–70	Annual average, 1960–70
Total	770,000	[1] 77,000
Growth in requirements	595,000	59,500
Replacement needs	175,000	17,500

[1] This still assumes less than 1 technician per professional scientist and engineer, a proportion that should be increased to improve utilization of our professionals.

SUPPLY OF TECHNICIANS

Because of the wide variety of ways in which technicians obtain their training, and the lack of historical data on these occupations and their sources of supply, it is virtually impossible to estimate the overall supply of technicians available for employment in any one year. Although technicians are training in a variety of ways, only a small part are formally trained, primarily in technical institutes, junior colleges, colleges and universities, and other institutions. Others are trained on the job, in the Armed Forces, and in other ways. In 1959, about 23,000 persons graduated from institutions offering organized occupational curriculums in engineering related, agriculture, forestry, and health service fields. We don't know how many actually enter the field.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, returning to the amendment, it would require the creation of an advisory committee of 11, 8 of whom would be from the general public, with 3 of the 8 required to be educational experts in the field of the humanities.

The advice of this committee must be considered by the Commissioner of Education before he makes any grant.

One of the marked patterns of American education is the concentration of Federal and other research activities in fewer than 100 institutions of higher learning.

Less than 30 graduate schools in this country award two-thirds of all the doctoral degrees given, and only 20 universities in a dozen States confer more than half of the Nation's doctorate degrees each year.

I suggest these facts indicate a requirement for the adoption of a policy to develop new and expanded centers of graduate excellence.

As has been done in the National Defense Education Act graduate fellowship program, we need to provide new facilities and programs for the very highest levels of education in institutions which hitherto have not been favored by stimulative Federal support efforts.

These centers will be more than mere places for the training of manpower. The parallel development of strong graduate schools and high level industrial and business activity is very clear.

Key education and research institutions will encourage dynamic regional economic development and, consequently, will contribute much toward the national goal of accelerated economic growth and diversification.

The program of matching grants called for by the amendment I have just sent to the desk will clearly help achieve these purposes.

I am, therefore, hopeful the Senate will adopt it.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the testimony of Mr. Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, made before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in connection with our consideration of the President's omnibus education bill, S. 580, may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Graduate education is, of course, even costlier than undergraduate studies and, consequently, far too many who begin graduate-degree programs do not complete their M.A. or Ph. D. studies. The loss of this potentially highly trained personnel is an equally serious problem, particularly were some of these men and women to enter the college teaching profession upon completion of their advanced degrees. If the present dropout rate continues in graduate study, probably only 143,000 doctorates will be earned this decade, and of these only about 46 percent can be expected to enter or remain in college teaching. Moreover, from 1953 to 1962, the percentage of new college teachers holding the doctorate declined from 31.4 to 25.4 percent. We thus estimate that whereas over 40 percent of college teachers possessed the Ph. D. in 1953, by 1970 our colleges will not meet the present minimum acceptable standards—a faculty of which at least 30 percent hold doctoral degrees. These institutions will fall short of this standard by an estimated 90,000 college teachers possessing the doctorate. Indeed, unless checked by vigorous Federal programs, shortages in many key academic fields will soon become as severe as they are today in mathematics. In this field some 300 Ph. D.'s are granted annually, with over half of the recipients entering industrial research. The less than 150 remaining Ph. D.'s must then be distributed among the 2,100 accredited colleges and universities of the Nation, a ratio of 1.14 Ph. D. per college.

Expanding the number of graduate students, speeding completion of their studies and reducing the dropout rate will make it possible to maintain academic standards as higher education grows to accommodate the larger coming generation of students. Without such an expansion of graduate education, coupled with a determined drive to recruit and retain able professors, the mounting wave of undergraduate college enrollments may well be ruinous to academic quality, rather than a boon to our growing market for trained manpower.

Aside from the need for college teachers, a larger number of National Defense Education Act graduate fellowships will also help meet the growing demand for persons with advanced training, particularly scientists and engineers for business, industry, and government. The President's Science Advisory Committee, for example, reported that we must increase the annual award of Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences from 3,000 in 1960 to 7,500 in 1970, and increase the number of first-year graduate students in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences alone from 17,000 full-time students in 1960 to 40,000 in 1970.

---

[2] National Science Foundation, Scientific and Technical Personnel in Industry, 1960, NSF 61–75.

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the committee, we have prepared a table showing Federal support of graduate study by various levels and agencies. It is our firm belief that, despite the variety of existing programs, the total output under all federally supported graduate programs is but a fraction of that required by our times.

The National Defense Education Act graduate fellowship program, designed in part to encourage students to prepare for college teaching careers, has demonstrated its success, but the current limitation of 1,500 fellowships per year is much too low. Eighty percent of the applications for National Defense Education Act fellowships have to be refused, chiefly because of the relatively small number of fellowships. Title I–D of S. 580, therefore, proposes that 10,000 fellowships be authorized annually for award to would-be college teachers and other critical personnel and that, in addition, 2,000 summer school fellowships be offered to college teachers and graduates who wish to accelerate their work toward the doctorate.

If we hope to increase the supply of highly trained teachers and other critically needed professional personnel, we must also encourage development of more graduate schools of high quality. The present fellowship programs under the National Defense Education Act, the National Science Foundation and other agencies provide graduate schools with good students but, except for cost of education payments on behalf of the fellows, these programs do not provide support for needed faculty, facilities, or supplies. Title II–E would authorize grants to strengthen the basic educational program of the graduate schools, many of which have inclined their direction to absorb research funds from the Federal Government and other sources. These graduate school grants would be aimed particularly at strengthening and expanding centers of high-level study and research in areas of the Nation now without such centers.

In 1960, there were 11 States in which fewer than 10 doctoral degrees were awarded. In four of these States no doctorates were awarded. It is clear that the 187 institutions conferring such degrees are not distributed proportionally throughout the Nation. On the contrary, there is a high degree of concentration of research funds, fellowships; and degrees awarded in fewer than 30 graduate schools. Only 29 graduate schools awarded more than 100 doctor's degrees in 1960, and in the decade of 1950–60 these 29 institutions awarded 66.2 percent of all doctorates. Indeed, approximately 55 percent of all doctoral degrees are awarded by some 20 universities located in 12 States.

One of the purposes of this National Defense Educational Act title is to develop new and expanded graduate programs. Whereas 62 percent of all Federal Government fellowships were awarded to students in 25 institutions in 1960, only 35 percent of National Defense Education Act fellowships went to 25 institutions. Our success in developing language and area centers under National Defense Education Act—may I have the record give some indication of the scope of this admirable program—has also shown the practicality of this "centers approach" to strengthen new graduate programs and to increase the number of "strong" graduate schools.

Our objective in title II–E is 75 strong graduate centers. The proposal before you would authorize $40 million for fiscal year 1964 to help several such new centers to get started or to develop embryonic ones. If each were ultimately to award 200 advanced degrees annually, these centers would account for 15,000 such degrees. The remaining institutions could be expected to increase their awards so that we might at least develop a ratio of 1 doctoral degree each year for each 10,000 persons in the population—19,000 doctorates.

New centers of graduate and professional studies will do much more than provide trained manpower and the faculties needed for expansion of higher education. These centers will also immeasurably stimulate economic development and will, therefore, contribute to regional and national goals of economic growth and diversification. This, I think, is clear beyond dispute to anyone who has observed that research and development industries locate adjacent to our great institutions of higher learning and that manufacturing plants soon follow in the wake of research and development.

Mr. CLARK. I hope very much that the Senator from Oregon will be agreeable to accepting this amendment and agreeing to take it to conference. I point out it is practically verbatim from the House-passed bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have conferred with members of the committee, and a majority have authorized me to accept the amendment and take it to conference. Therefore I urge the Senate to adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me long enough to allow me to send to the desk and call up another clarifying amendment?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor. I assume I would still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment to the committee amendment. I ask that the clerk not read it.

The amendment to the committee amendment offered by Senator Morse is as follows:

On page 56, line 8, insert the following immediately before the period: ", or (E) any facility used or to be used by a 'school of medicine', 'school of dentistry', 'school of osteopathy', 'school of pharmacy', 'school of optometry', 'school of podiatry', 'school of nursing', or 'school of public health', as defined in section 724 of the Public Health Service Act."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment restores to the bill the provision of the House version which excludes from the scope of the provisions relating to aid for construction of academic facilities any facility used or to be used by a school of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, nursing, or public health.

The purpose of this amendment is to avoid the possibility of any duplication or overlap between this bill and the provisions of the recently enacted Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1963 which became law on September 24 of this year as Public Law 88–129.

I should like to make clear, Mr. President, that it is intended that this exclusionary provision be given a sensible reading in line with this purpose. For example, the mere fact that classrooms or laboratories in a college chemistry building might also be used to a certain extent but not primarily by medical students of a university of which the college is a part would not, in my opinion, make that facility a "facility used or to be used by a school of medicine" within the meaning of this amendment to the bill.

This is the language of the House bill. It is needed to make certain that we are not permitting any overlapping or duplication, to assure that we are not proposing that an institution of higher education can get money under H.R. 12, which is now law, and also under the pending bill.

Mr. President, again I have been authorized by a majority of the committee to have the Senate agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—personally I think the Senator's remarks are much in point. Particularly, I agree it ought not to be given too strict a reading, because we do not want any duplication; neither do we want to have a gap.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] is not present, but I am sure that the Senator, who offered the language of the House bill today, is particularly enthusiastic in regard to the amendments which have been adopted. They not only clarify the bill but they also bring the bill much more in line with the bill as passed by the House. I urge that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it take a recess until noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] and with the ranking Members on both sides the possibilities in connection with consideration by the Senate of Calendar No. 534, Senate bill 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

Senators will recall that at the beginning of the session today, I announced that if the Senate could not take final action today on the pending business, House bill 6143, to authorize assistance to institutions of higher education, that bill would go over until the following Monday, because of circumstances beyond the control of any of us, and that it was the intention of the leadership to have the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 534, Senate bill 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and so forth.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of that bill, in order to have the committee amendments agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Walters in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 649) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by inserting after section 1(b) thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) It is the purpose of this Act to establish a positive national water pollution control policy of keeping waters as clean as possible as opposed to the negative policy of attempting to use the full capacity of such waters for waste assimilation."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

That (a)(1) section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by inserting after the words "Section 1." a new subsection (a) as follows:

"(a) The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

(2) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) thereof as (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) Subsection (b) of such section (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act called the 'Secretary') shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by him, shall supervise and direct the head of the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2 and the administration of all other functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to water pollution. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such additional functions as the Secretary may prescribe."

(b) Section 2 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953, as made effective April 1, 1953, by Public Law 83-13, is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

On page 3, line 10, after the word "through", to strike out "14" and insert "4 and references thereto"; in line 11, after the word "through", to strike out "15" and insert "5"; in the same line, after the word "respectively", to insert "sections 5 through 9 as sections 7 through 11, respectively, sections 10 through 14, as sections 13 through 17, respectively,"; in line 13, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and"; after line 15, to strike out:

Sec. 2. There is is hereby created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (herein referred to as the "Administration"). The Administration shall be headed by a Commissioner of Water Pollution Control (herein referred to as the "Commissioner"). The Commissioner shall administer this Act through the Administration under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by the Secretary. The Commissioner and such other professional, technical, and clerical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the responsibilities of the Administration shall be provided from the personnel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Sec. 2. Effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this section there is created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Administration"). The head of the Administration shall be appointed, and his compensation fixed, by the Secretary, and shall, through the Administration, administer sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of this Act and such other provisions of this Act as the Secretary may prescribe. The head of the Administration may, in addition to regular staff of the Administration, which shall be initially provided from personnel of the Department, obtain from within the Department or otherwise as authorized by law, such professional, technical, and clerical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the Administration's functions and may for that purpose use funds available for carrying out such functions.

On page 4, after line 22, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 3. Such Act is further amended by inserting after the section redesignated as section 5 a new section follows.

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"Sec. 6. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by an appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration of a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any water of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grants shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized by this section in any one fiscal year."

On page 6, at the beginning of line 11, to change the section number from "3" to "4"; in line 13, after the word "section", to strike out "7" and insert "8"; in line 16, after the word "section", to strike out "7" and insert "8"; after line 18, to insert:

(c) Subsection (f) of such redesignated section 8 is redesignated as subsection (g) thereof and is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276(c))."

On page 7, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)"; in the same line, after the word "section", to strike out "7" and insert "8"; in line 4, after the word "by", to insert "inserting therein, immediately after subsection (e) thereof, the following new subsection"; in line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:"; after line 6, to strike out:

(g) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for separation of combined sewers which carry both storm water and sewage or other wastes on the date of enactment of this subsection to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any water, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this subsection unless a comprehensive plan for storm drainage in connection therewith shall have been submitted by the applicant to the appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and to the Secretary and unless such project shall have been approved by such appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary and unless such project is included in a comprehensive program developed pursuant to this Act; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 30 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this subsection until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for assuring proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the separated sewers after completion of the construction thereof; (4) no grant shall be made for any project under this subsection unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 5 and has been certified by the State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each succeeding fiscal year, the sum of $100,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this subsection. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

The provisions of subsections (c), (e), and (f) of this section shall be and are hereby made applicable to and for the purposes of this subsection except that the proviso contained in subsection (c) shall not be thus applicable.

On page 8, at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "(h)" and insert "(f)"; on page 9, line 6, after the word "area", to strike out "which has been defined by the Bureau of the Budget as a standard metropolitan statistical area and" "; at the beginning of line 13, to insert:

For the purposes of this subsection, the term "metropolitan area" means either (1) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President or by the Bureau of the Budget as not being appropriate for the purposes hereof, or (2) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President or the Bureau of the Budget lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof.

On page 10, after line 3, to strike out:

Sec. 4. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 9 is amended by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (j) and inserting after subsection (h) the following:

"(i) In order to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters in or adjacent to any State or States which will or is likely to endanger the health or welfare of any persons, and to protect industries dependent on clean water such as the commercial shellfish and fishing industries, the Secretary shall, after reasonable notice and public hearing and in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other affected Federal, State, and local interests, issue regulations setting forth (a) standards of quality to be applicable to such interstate or navigable waters and (b) the type, volume, or strength of matter permitted to be discharged directly into interstate or navigable waters or reaching such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters. Such standards of quality and of matter discharged shall be based on present and future uses of interstate or navigable waters for public water supplies, propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses. The alteration of the physical, chemical, or biological properties of such interstate or navigable waters or the placing of matter in such waters in violation of regulations issued under this subsection is hereby declared to be a public nuisance and subject to abatement under the provisions of this section. Nothing in this subsection shall prevent the application of the provisions of this section to any case to which they would otherwise be applicable.

On page 11, after line 9, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 5. (a) Redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j).

(b) Such redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is further amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c)(1) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and public hearing and in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and Interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(2) The Secretary shall also call such a public hearing on his own motion or when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any State subject to or affected by the water quality standards set pursuant to this subsection for the purpose of considering a revision in such standards.

"(3) Such standards of quality shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare and serve the purposes of this Act. In establishing standards designed to enhance the quality of such waters, the Secretary shall take into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

"(4) The Secretary shall promulgate the standards pursuant to this subsection with respect to any waters only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(5) The discharge of matter into such interstate waters, which reduces the quality of such waters below the water quality standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection or established by the appropriate State or interstate agencies consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection (whether the matter causing or contributing to such reduction is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into tributaries of such waters), is subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(6) Nothing in this subsection shall (a) prevent the application of this section to any case to which subsection (a) of this section would otherwise be applicable, or (b) extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by this Act."

(c) Paragraph (1) of redesignated subsection (d) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by striking out the final period after the third sentence of such subsection and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "; or he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution referred to in subsection (a) and action of Federal, State, or local authorities."

(d) Redesignated subsection (h) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by inserting after the word "practicability" in the second sentence thereof, the words "of complying with such standards as may be applicable".

On page 13, after line 22, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 6. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 11 is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 11." and by inserting at the end of such section the following:

"(b) In order to control water pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, before discharging any matter into the waters of the United States, obtain a permit from the Secretary for the disposal of such matter, such permits to be issued for a specified period of time to be determined by the Secretary and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons or otherwise violating standards of water quality promulgated or otherwise established in accordance with section 10 of this Act. In connection with the issuance of such permits, there shall be submitted to the Secretary such plans, specifications, and other information as he deems relevant thereto and under such conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall report each January to the Congress the status of such permits and compliance therewith."

On page 14, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 7. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act hereinbefore redesignated as section 13 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act."

On page 15, after line 14, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 8. Following redesignated section 11 of such Act there is included the following new section:

"Synthetic detergents

"Sec. 12. (a) The Congress finds that the surface and underground waters in the United States are being polluted through the ever-increasing discharge into such waters of synthetic detergents which decompose slowly or do not decompose at all. The Congress further finds that to prevent the further pollution of such waters in the public interest it is necessary to assure that the composition of detergents which may eventually be discharged into such waters and which are offered for introduction or delivery into interstate commerce in the United States or imported into the United States will not cause or contribute to such pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall encourage the continued efforts to develop detergents which will decompose quickly and completely after use and to this end shall maintain liaison with the manufacturers of detergents and of products used in the manufacture of detergents. For this purpose, he shall appoint a technical committee, whose membership shall consist of an equal number of representatives of the Department and of the soap and detergents manufacturing industry. The Committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary to evaluate progress in the development of such decomposable detergents and to develop and recommend standards of decomposability for detergents.

"(c) The standards of decomposability recommended by the Committee shall be based on the latest scientific and technical knowledge available with respect to the manufacture of (foreign or domestic) detergents and the operation of sewage treatment systems, which will assure that detergents conforming to such standards will decompose reasonably quickly and completely after use, and including specific methods by which detergents shall be tested to determine if they conform to such standards.

"(d) On or before January 1, 1965, and on June 30, 1965, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on measures taken toward the resolution of the detergent pollution problem including (A) occurrence of pollution of surface and underground waters attributable to the discharge of synthetic detergents; (B) the manufacture, importation, and sale of synthetic detergents in the United States; (C) standards of decomposability for detergents, based on the recommendations of the technical committee; (D) the nature of delays, if any, being encountered in the development of detergents which will conform to the standards referred to in (C); and (E) his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the composition of detergents in order to prevent, control, and abate pollution resulting from their manufacture, sale, and use.

"(e) When the Committee has recommended standards of decomposability and has certified to the Secretary that a detergent or detergents conforming to the recommended standards are generally available to the manufacturers of detergents, the Secretary may, if he concurs in the findings of the Committee and, after providing an appropriate opportunity for comments on such proposed standards of decomposability, promulgate such standards and establish such rules and regulations as are necessary to prevent the transportation or sale in interstate commerce of detergents not meeting the standards of decomposability. Such rules and regulations shall take effect on December 31, 1965, or six months after the issuance of such regulations, whichever is later.

"(f) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly promulgate rules and regulations that prohibit the importation of any detergent or detergents which fail to meet the standards of decomposability as established herein.

"(g) All action taken under this section for the adoption of standards and the promulgation of rules and regulations shall be taken in conformity with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act."

And, on page 18, after line 11, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 9. (a) Section 7(f)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 6(b)(4)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 8(b)(4)".

(b) Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 5" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 7".

(c) Section 10(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "subsection (g)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (h)".

(d) Section 10(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "subsection (e)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f)".

(e) Section 11(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 8(c)(3)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 10(d)(3)" and by striking out "section 8(e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 10(f)".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) section 1 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466) is amended by inserting after the words "Section 1," a new subsection (a) as follows:

"(a) The purpose of this Act is to enhance the quality and value of our water resources and to establish a national policy for the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution."

(2) Such section is further amended by redesignating subsections (a) and (b) thereof as (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) Subsection (b) of such section (as redesignated by paragraph (2) of this subsection) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act called the 'Secretary') shall administer this Act and, with the assistance of an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare designated by him, shall supervise and direct the head of the Water Pollution Control Administration created by section 2 and the administration of all other functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare related to water pollution. Such Assistant Secretary shall perform such additional functions as the Secretary may prescribe."

(b) Section 2 of Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953, as made effective April 1, 1953, by Public Law 83-13, is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "three".

Sec. 2. Such Act is further amended by redesignating sections 2 through 4 and references thereto, as sections 3 through 5, respectively, sections 5 through 9 as sections 7 through 11, respectively, sections 10 through 14, as sections 13 through 17, respectively, by inserting after section 1 the following new section:

"FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 2. Effective ninety days after the date of enactment of this section there is created within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Administration'). The head of the Administration shall be appointed, and his compensation fixed, by the Secretary, and shall, through the Administration, administer sections 3, 4, 10, and 11 of this Act and such other provisions of this Act as the Secretary may prescribe. The head of the Administration may, in addition to regular staff of the Administration, which shall be initially provided from personnel of the Department, obtain, from within the Department or otherwise as authorized by law, such professional, technical, and clerical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the Administration's functions and may for that purpose use funds available for carrying out such functions."

Sec. 3. Such Act is further amended by inserting after the section redesignated as section 5 a new section as follows:

"GRANTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

"Sec. 6. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the purpose of assisting in the development of any project which will demonstrate a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any waters of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes, and for the purpose of reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith.

"Federal grants under this section shall be subject to the following limitations: (1) No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to this section unless such project shall have been approved by an appropriate State water pollution control agency or agencies and by the Secretary; (2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 50 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost thereof as determined by the Secretary; (3) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless the Secretary determines that such project will serve as a useful demonstration of a new or improved method of controlling the discharge into any water of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste from sewers which carry storm water or both storm water and sewage or other wastes.

"There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for each of the next three succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $20,000,000 per fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding 5 per centum of the total amount authorized by this section in any one fiscal year."

Sec. 4. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (b) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 8 is amended by striking out "$600,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,".

(b) The second proviso in clause (2) of subsection (b) of such redesignated section 8 is amended by striking out "$2,400,000," and inserting in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,".

(c) Subsection (f) of such redesignated section 8 is redesignated as subsection (g) thereof and is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948; 40 U.S.C. 276(c))."

(d) Such redesignated section 8 is further amended by inserting therein, immediately after subsection (e) thereof, the following new subsection:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant by 10 per centum for any project which has been certified to him by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan or regional planning for a metropolitan area within which the assistance is to be used, or other agency or instrumentality designated for such purposes by the Governor (or Governors in the case of interstate planning) as being in conformity with the comprehensive plan developed or in process of development for such metropolitan area. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'metropolitan area' means either (1) a standard metropolitan statistical area as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, except as may be determined by the President or by the Bureau of the Budget as not being appropriate for the purposes hereof, or (2) any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President or the Bureau of the Budget lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof."

Sec. 5. (a) Redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by redesignating subsections (c) through (i) as subsections (d) through (j).

(b) Such redesignated section 10 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is further amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) (1) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and public hearing and in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and with other Federal agencies, with State and interstate water pollution control agencies, and with municipalities and industries involved, prepare regulations setting forth standards of water quality to be applicable to interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(2) The Secretary shall also call such a public hearing on his own motion or when petitioned to do so by the Governor of any State subject to or affected by the water quality standards set pursuant to this subsection for the purpose of considering a revision in such standards.

"(3) Such standards of quality shall be such as to protect the public health and welfare and serve the purposes of this Act. In establishing standards designed to enhance the quality of such waters, the Secretary shall take into consideration their use and value for public water supplies, propagation of fish and wildlife, recreational purposes, and agricultural, industrial, and other legitimate uses.

"(4) The Secretary shall promulgate the standards pursuant to this subsection with respect to any waters only if, within a reasonable time after being requested by the Secretary to do so, the appropriate States and interstate agencies have not developed standards found by the Secretary to be consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection and applicable to such interstate waters or portions thereof.

"(5) The discharge of matter into such interstate waters, which reduces the quality of such waters below the water quality standards promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to paragraph (4) of this subsection or established by the appropriate State or interstate agencies consistent with paragraph (3) of this subsection (whether the matter causing or contributing to such reduction is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discarge into tributaries of such waters), is subject to abatement in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(6) Nothing in this subsection shall (a) prevent the application of this section to any case to which subsection (a) of this section would otherwise be applicable, or (b) extend Federal jurisdiction over water not otherwise authorized by this Act."

(c) Paragraph (1) of redesignated subsection (d) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by striking out the final period after the third sentence of such subsection and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "; or he finds that substantial economic injury results from the inability to market shellfish or shellfish products in interstate commerce because of pollution referred to in subsection (a) and action of Federal, State, or local authorities."

(d) Redesignated subsection (h) of the section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 10 is amended by inserting after the word "practicability" in the second sentence thereof, the words "of complying with such standards as may be applicable".

Sec. 6. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act herein redesignated as section 11 is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 11." and by inserting at the end of such section the following:

"(b) In order to control water pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, before discharging any matter into the waters of the United States, obtain a permit from the Secretary for the disposal of such matter, such permits to be issued for a specified period of time to be determined by the Secretary and subject to revocation if the Secretary finds pollution is endangering the health and welfare of any persons or otherwise violating standards of water quality promulgated or otherwise established in accordance with section 10 of this Act. In connection with the issuance of such permits, there shall be submitted to the Secretary such plans, specifications, and other information as he deems relevant thereto and under such conditions as he may prescribe. The Secretary shall report each January to the Congress the status of such permits and compliance therewith."

Sec. 7. The section of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act hereinbefore redesignated as section 13 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(e) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this Act."

Sec. 8. Following redesignated section 11 of such Act there is included the following new section:

"SYNTHETIC DETERGENTS

"Sec. 12. (a) The Congress finds that the surface and underground waters in the United States are being polluted through the ever-increasing discharge into such waters of synthetic detergents which decompose slowly or do not decompose at all. The Congress further finds that to prevent the further pollution of such waters in the public interest it is necessary to assure that the composition of detergents which may eventually be discharged into such waters and which are offered for introduction or delivery into interstate commerce in the United States or imported into the United States will not cause or contribute to such pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall encourage the continued efforts to develop detergents which will decompose quickly and completely after use and to this end shall maintain liaison with the manufacturers of detergents and of products used in the manufacture of detergents. For this purpose, he shall appoint a technical committee, whose membership shall consist of an equal number of representatives of the Department and of the soap and detergents manufacturing industry. The Committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary to evaluate progress in the development of such decomposable detergents and to develop and recommend standards of decomposability for detergents.

"(c) The standards of decomposability recommended by the Committee shall be based on the latest scientific and technical knowledge available with respect to the manufacture of (foreign or domestic) detergents and the operation of sewage treatment systems, which will assure that detergents conforming to such standards will decompose reasonably quickly and completely after use, and including specific methods by which detergents shall be tested to determine if they conform to such standards.

"(d) On or before January 1, 1965, and on June 30, 1965, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on measures taken toward the resolution of the detergent pollution problem including (A) occurrence of pollution of surface and underground waters attributable to the discharge of synthetic detergents; (B) the manufacture, importation, and sale of synthetic detergents in the United States; (C) standards of decomposability for detergents, based on the recommendations of the technical committee; (D) the nature of delays, if any, being encountered in the development of detergents which will conform to the standards referred to in (C); and (E) his recommendations for additional legislation, if necessary, to regulate the composition of detergents in order to prevent, control, and abate pollution resulting from their manufacture, sale, and use.

"(e) When the Committee has recommended standards of decomposability and has certified to the Secretary that a detergent or detergents conforming to the recommended standards are generally available to the manufacturers of detergents, the Secretary may, if he concurs in the findings of the Committee and, after providing an appropriate opportunity for comments on such proposed standards of decomposability, promulgate such standards and establish such rules and regulations as are necessary to prevent the transportation or sale in interstate commerce of detergents not meeting the standards of decomposability. Such rules and regulations shall take effect on December 31, 1965, or six months after the issuance of such regulations, whichever is later.

"(f) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly promulgate rules and regulations that prohibit the importation of any detergent or detergents which fail to meet the standards of decomposability as established herein.

"(g) All action taken under this section for the adoption of standards and the promulgation of rules and regulations shall be taken in conformity with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act."

Sec. 9. (a) Section 7(f)(6) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 6(b)(4) ' as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 8(b)(4)".

(b) Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 5" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 7".

(c) Section 10(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "subsection (g)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (h)".

(d) Section 10(i) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "subsection (e)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (f)".

(e) Section 11(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as that section is redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "section 8(c)(3)" as contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 10(d)(3)" and by striking out "section 8(e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 10(f)".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the request of the Senator from Montana is agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the session today, the pending business, House bill 6143, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of Calendar No. 534, Senate bill 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and that it be laid down and made the pending business, to be taken up again tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] and myself, and after consultation with the members of the appropriate committee, I make the usual unanimous-consent request that during the consideration on tomorrow of Senate bill 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, there be a limitation of 1 hour on each amendment and 4 hours on the bill, with the understanding that 1 of the 4 hours on the bill will be allotted to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], for his use in connection with one of his amendments, and with the assurance of the leadership that if additional time is needed, it will be forthcoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the usual requirement of germaneness be included?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That, effective on Wednesday, October 16, 1963, upon the convening of the Senate, during the further consideration of the bill, S. 649, amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal: *Provided,* That 1 hour of the above 4 hours be allotted to Mr. Cooper on one of his amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is it the understanding of the Chair that under the unanimous-consent agreement just entered into, when the Senate convenes at noon tomorrow, Calendar No. 534, Senate bill 649, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, will be the pending business, and also that at noon tomorrow the time limitation, as agreed to, will begin to run?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to be informed whether I am correct in understanding that next Monday, October 21, the unanimous-consent agreement, previously entered into, in regard to House bill 6143, Calendar No. 535, to authorize assistance to institutions of higher education, will again be in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; and, without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Sale of Surplus American Wheat

A communication from the President of the United States, reporting on the sale of surplus American wheat (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Act Relating to Certain Inspection Services Involving Overtime Work

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspections services involving overtime work (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Commodity Exchange Act, Relating to Sugar

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to include sugar within the provisions thereof and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate margin requirements with respect to transactions and positions in sugar futures on or subject to the rules of contract markets (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Title I Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of August 1963 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Department of the Army Research and Development Contracts

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (R. & D.), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army Research and Development contracts, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Borrowing Authority

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the 6-month period ended June 30, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report on Commissary Activities Outside the United States

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, reporting, pursuant to law, that no commissary activities were conducted outside the continental United States during the fiscal year 1963; to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Inadequacies in Planning and Operation of Electronic Data Processing Systems at Kansas City and Evanston Commodity Offices, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequacies in planning and operation of electronic data processing systems at the Kansas City and Evanston commodity offices, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, dated October 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Restriction of Certain Areas for Defense Purposes

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Gulf Test Range, Gulf of Mexico) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Final Settlement of Claims of Certain Indians

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the final settlement of the following claims of certain Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Docket No. 68, *the Ottawa Tribe of Indians, Petitioner,* v. *The United States of America, Defendant.*

Docket No. 70, *the Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Arizona, Petitioner,* v. *the United States of America, Defendant.*

Docket No. 76, *the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, also known as the Maimi Tribe, et al., Petitioners,* v. *the United States of America, Defendant.*

Docket No. 82, *the Northern Arapaho Tribe of Indians, Petitioner* v. *the United States of America, Defendant.*

Docket No. 124–G, *Ira Sylvester Godfroy, William Allolia Godfroy, John A. Owens, on relation of the Miami Indian Tribe and Miami Tribe of Indiana, and each on behalf of others similarly situated and on behalf of the Miami Indian Tribe and various bands* *and groups of each of them, comprising the Miami Tribe and Nation, Petitioner* v. *the United States of America, Defendant.*

Docket No. 135–A, *The Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, et al., Petitioners* v. *the United States of America, Defendant.*

Docket No. 152, *the Seminole Nation, Petitioner,* v. *the United States of America, Defendant.*

Docket No. 163, *the Yakima Tribe, Petitioner* v. *the United States of America, Defendant.*

Docket No. 175–A, *the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, or Charles E. Williams and Joseph Redthunder, as representatives of the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians, Petitioner* v. *the United States of America, Defendant.*

Order allowing fees to attorneys for the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians in Docket No. 175–A.

LT. COL. NICHOLAS A. STATHIS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Lt. Col. Nicholas A. Stathis, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Agency, during the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration, during the fiscal year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON VISA PETITIONS ACCORDING FIRST PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATION

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 5

"Joint resolution relating to the return to the State of Fort Miles at Cape Henlopen;

"Whereas major segments of the area of Sussex County known as Cape Henlopen (Fort Miles), Del., were willingly ceded by the State to the Federal Government in a time of need for national defense for a quarantine station, and for Coast Guard purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government no longer has need for the property for the purposes for which the State of Delaware made the cession; and

"Whereas there have been several reports prepared by Federal and State agencies which recognized the importance and suitability of the Cape Henlopen area for State Park development; and

"Whereas the Delaware State Planning Office has prepared a 'Plan for the Public Utilization of Cape Henlopen' upon the request of the U.S. Army which supports the desirability of the area as a State Park; and

"Whereas the State of Delaware has need of Cape Henlopen as a State park; and

"Whereas the State of Delaware is the logical government which has the knowledge, experience, and authority to develop the Cape Henlopen area as a unit for public use in response to the needs of the people of Delaware; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is encouraging the States to plan, acquire, and develop State parks: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 122d General Assembly of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein), That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the U.S. Army take such action as may be necessary to return to the State of Delaware the lands ceded to the United States at Cape Henlopen and its vicinity; and be it further

"Resolved, That the attention of the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Army be called to this attempt by the people of Delaware to reobtain the lands which have been theirs for centuries for use as a State park; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Delaware Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 88th Congress and to the Secretary of the U.S. Army, Washington, D.C.; and be it further

"Resolved, That House Joint Resolution 4 be repealed."

Approved by the Governor September 17, 1963.

A resolution adopted at the 17th annual convention of the Air Force Association favoring the enactment of legislation to designate permanently December 17 as Wright Brothers Day, in commemoration of the first successful flights in a heavier than air, mechanically propelled airplane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Episcopal Churchwomen, Province of the Northwest VI, assembled in Fargo, N. Dak., September 24–26, 1963, favoring the enactment of the civil rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of Edgar Seymour Kalb, of Mayo, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the protection of civil liberties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 920. A bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the public interest, convenience, or necessity may be served, issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by United States amateurs on a reciprocal basis (Rept. No. 562).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Wallace M. Greene, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps, with the rank of general.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2235. A bill for the relief of Mauricia Reyes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 2236. A bill for the relief of Lena Woo Djeu and Vung-Shung Djeu also known as Victor Djeu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2237. A bill for the relief of Henry H. Balch, a retired Foreign Service officer; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

GREETINGS TO MONTICELLO COLLEGE, GODFREY, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 62) extending greetings to Monticello College at Godfrey, Ill., upon the occasion of the dedication of Hatheway Hall on October 18, 1963, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

STRENGTHENING AND DEFENSE OF LATIN AMERICA AGAINST COMMUNISM

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. MORSE) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) to authorize the President to cooperate with nations in Latin America for the strengthening and defense of Latin America against the loss of self-determination or the assault of internal communism, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

PLANNING FOR PEACE

Mr. CLARK (for himself and Senators RANDOLPH, YOUNG of Ohio, BARTLETT, INOUYE, GRUENING, LONG of Missouri, MOSS, MCGOVERN, CHURCH, MORSE, NEUBERGER, HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MCGEE, HUMPHREY, and BURDICK) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) favoring suport of the President in his efforts to achieve disarmament, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CLARK, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

SHIPMENT OF WHEAT SOLD TO RUSSIA IN AMERICAN-FLAG VESSELS

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 214); which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

Whereas the United States Government has indicated its willingness to permit the sale of millions of bushels of wheat to the Soviet Union; and

Whereas it is the policy of the United States Government to encourage the use of American-flag vessels wherever possible to assist in the Nation's balance-of-payments posture; and

Whereas, the American maritime industry is in a depressed state and employment in the industry is at a low level; and

Whereas the President has declared that "the wheat we sell to the Soviet Union will be carried in available American ships": Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the shipping policy voiced by the President be fully implemented; and be it further

Resolved, That one of the conditions of the sale of wheat should be the mandatory participation of United States-flag vessels in the delivery of not less than fifty percent of the cargoes involved in such transactions; and be it further

Resolved, That foreign-flag vessels which have engaged in transportation of cargoes to Cuba since the Presidential embargo shall under all circumstances be barred from participation in the delivery of such wheat.

REPEAL OF ACT RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT OF PINKERTON DETECTIVE AGENCY—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 223)

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1543) to repeal that portion of the act of March 3, 1893, which prohibits the employment, in any Government service or by any officer of the District of Columbia, of any employee of the Pinkerton Detective Agency or any similar agency, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO REDUCE INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE INCOME TAXES—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 224 AND 225)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference two amendments I expect to offer to the tax bill, H.R. 8363.

Both of these amendments deal with problems of tax reform. Both move in the direction the administration has indicated it wants to go. The Treasury Department, in the very recent past, has supported the concept and purpose of these amendments. I would hope for, and shall expect, support from the Treasury for these amendments.

The first amendment deals with the problem posed by large enterprises which organize artificially in a multicorporate form. In this way, it is often possible to hold down the corporate tax to the 30-percent level, or 22-percent level if H.R. 8363 becomes law, rather than having the greater part of taxable income receive the 52-percent rate, or 48-percent rate under this bill.

The Ways and Means Committee recognized that this bill would lend added encouragement to and bestow vastly greater benefits on those who are in a position to set up a multicorporate structure, and provided that a group of corporations under common ownership shall file a cnsolidated return, or share one surtax exemption among all the corporations involved. An alternative was provided, however, by allowing each corporation a surtax exemption but imposing a 6-percent penalty tax on the first $25,000 of its taxable income. This, as I say, serves to give recognition to the problem, but hardly provides an appropriate remedy.

My amendment would remove the alternative method of filing multiple returns and paying the 6-percent penalty, thus requiring corporations under common ownership to file a consolidated return or share one surtax exemption. This would help to insure to truly small businesses the tax advantage ostensibly given them by this bill.

The second amendment is, perhaps, more controversial, although its equity can hardly be questioned.

In his January message, President Kennedy recommended that a tax be imposed at death on certain unrealized capital gains. This appeared harsh to some and would have caused some practical difficulties although it is theoretically a correct position. It was decided, then, to carry forward the decedent's basis so that eventually a capital gains tax would be paid by someone.

The Ways and Means Committee adopted a provision to accomplish this very worthwhile purpose and objective, after having watered down the provision with all sorts of adjustments and additions to basis in various instances. But at the proverbial 11th hour even this was discarded.

With the assistance of the very able experts of the Legislative Counsel I believe I have here a good draft.

I shall press for adoption of these amendments and hope for Treasury support.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 224 and 225) were referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 226 AND 227)

Mr. COOPER submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 649) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to provide financial assistance to municipalities and others for the separation of combined sewers, to authorize the issuance of regulations to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate or navigable waters, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS], may be added as an additional cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 176) to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs—for the Veterans' Administration, submitted by me on July 24, 1963.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930, RELATING TO OVERTIME SERVICES OF CUSTOMS OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2173) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BERNARD T. MOYNAHAN, JR. TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, October 22, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Bernard T. Moynahan, Jr., of Kentucky, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Kentucky, vice H. Church Ford, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] as chairman.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

LaVern R. Dilweg, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term of 1 year from October 22, 1963. (Reappointment.)

Theodore Jaffe, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States for a term of 2 years from October 22, 1963. (Reappointment.)

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, October 22, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

CLOSING OF ROLLS OF COLVILLE CONFEDERATED TRIBES—PAYMENT FROM COLVILLE JUDGMENT FUNDS—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I announce, for the information of the Senate and other interested parties, that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will hold field hearings in the State of Washington on S. 1442 and S. 1169. S. 1442 is a bill providing for the closing of the rolls of the Colville Confederated Tribes preparatory to the submission of a plan for the termination of Federal supervision over the property and affairs of the Colville Confederated Tribes.

S. 1169 is a bill to provide a $350 per capita payment from the Colville judgment funds.

The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, will conduct these hearings in Spokane, Nespelem, and Seattle, Wash. A hearing is scheduled at Spokane, Wash., on Thursday, October 24, at 10 a.m., in the auditorium of the Washington Water Power Co. A hearing is scheduled in Nespelem, Wash., at the Nespelem School at 9 a.m., on Friday, October 25. The final hearing is scheduled in Seattle, Wash., at 9 a.m., on Saturday, October 26, in the auditorium of the Student Union Building of the University of Washington.

All those wishing to appear before the subcommittee should communicate their intention to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., before October 20.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 838. An act for the relief of George Crokos; and

S. 1313. An act for the relief of Tim L. Yen.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

Address of Senator Cannon, delivered before the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Las Vegas, Nev., on September 26, 1963.

SALE OF WHEAT BY UNITED STATES TO SOVIET UNION

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, two member newspapers of the Guy Gannett publishing chain in Maine published editorials on October 12, 1963, on the wheat deal. The Waterville Morning Sentinel in a rather lengthy editorial supported and justified the wheat deal—although on the qualified basis that it is a "one-shot deal" implying that it was reserving judgment on any similar program of more than one deal.

The Daily Kennebec Journal, of Augusta, Maine, in a much shorter and more pithy editorial criticizes the deal and characterizes it as ironic.

The contrast not only shows how opinion can vary on such a deal, but it does show that newspapers of the same chain can differ in their editorial policy. Let us be thankful for that.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Morning Sentinel, Oct. 12, 1963]

The Wheat Deal

Opposition to the sale of surplus wheat to the Russians appears to be based on two premises. One is that by not doing so we would be dealing the Communists an economic blow that would help us in the cold war. The other is that if we were going to sell we could have used their need for wheat as a lever to obtain concessions such as withdrawal from Cuba.

There is little evidence that either premise is a valid one.

In view of the trading the Russians have done with other countries for wheat, it is unlikely that the people behind the Iron Curtain would have been hungry enough to have shaken the Red police state very seriously.

And for the same reason it is quite unlikely that the Soviets would have agreed to any major political concessions in order to get the wheat from us.

Thus, the issue of whether or not the purchase of wheat by the Russians should have been approved seems really to rest on the moral question of whether we should allow our grain dealers to make a trade with a cold war foe.

We would have gained nothing in not permitting the sale but the self-satisfaction of not dealing with a nation which is our ideological enemy.

We had considerable to gain by approving the sale. We will dispose of 150 million bushels of surplus wheat, thus saving the taxpayers $200 million in storage and handling costs in addition to profiting dealers and farmers.

We will reduce our international payments deficit which has been building up for 13 years by some $250 million. And we are not, as taxpayers, subsidizing the Russians, since the subsidy paid American farmers would be paid whether the wheat was sold to the Russians or allowed to rot in storage.

As a one-shot deal, it appears on balance to be a good business proposition in which we gained more than the Russians.

There may be a political issue involved in expansion of trade generally with the Russians, something the Congress is now investigating. This issue, however, would have arisen regardless of how the wheat deal was decided.

[From the Daily Kennebec Journal, Oct. 12, 1963]

Containment Policy?

Here's irony:

This country sells no strategic goods—or so the American people are asked to believe—to its mortal enemy, Communist Russia.

But we'll sell surplus wheat to the Russians. Is anything of greater strategic value to our enemy than food? An army, as Napoleon observed long ago, marches on its stomach.

Oh, well. Anyway, the wheat deal delights our grain growers, shippers, and bankers. They expect to split among themselves a Russian melon worth some $250 million.

Meanwhile, they and all the rest of us foot the bills for the $50 billion it costs per year to maintain a defense establishment to "contain" the Communist buyers of our surplus grain.

We're "on our way." Definitely. But can anyone say whither?

THE TAX BILL

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, during the past week the Senate Finance Committee has been going over the provisions of the tax bill—H.R. 8363—as passed by the House of Representatives, with the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

During the course of this examination, I asked the staff director, Mr. Colin Stam, for a summary of structural changes in the bill which might increase an individual's Federal tax. I asked him also for estimates of the average annual tax reduction per individual income tax payer under the bill when it would be fully effective.

Mr. Stam's reply is a matter of interest to all individual Federal taxpayers in the country. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have this information inserted in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

October 14, 1963.

Hon. Harry F. Byrd,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Byrd: In the briefing session of October 10, you asked for a list of the structural changes in the bill under consideration which might increase an individual's tax. These together with their estimated revenue impact in a full year of liability are as follows:

1. Repeal of dividend credit and doubling of dividend exclusion: The 4-percent dividend received credit is reduced by the bill to 2 percent for 1964, and repealed for subsequent years. The $50 dividend exclusion is increased to $100 (usually $200 in the case of married couples) for 1964 and subsequent years. This is expected to increase revenues by $300 million.

2. Group term insurance: The bill limits the employee exclusion for premiums on group term insurance furnished through the employer to premiums paid for the first $30,000 of coverage; it also provides a special deduction for employees who are in effect part of paying someone else's insurance costs in the case of coverage above $30,000. This is expected to increase revenues by $5 million.

3. Sick pay exclusion: The bill restricts the sick pay exclusion, of up to $100 weekly to those who are out of work for more than 30 days (and makes the exclusion available only for the period beyond that time). This

is expected to increase revenues by $110 million.

4. Deduction of certain State and local taxes: The bill denies a deduction in computing income subject to Federal tax for State and local taxes other than property, income, and general sales taxes (the principal taxes for which a deduction is denied are gasoline, auto license, alcoholic beverage, cigarette, and selected excise taxes). This is expected to increase revenues by $520 million.

5. Casualty loss deduction: The deduction for personal casualty and theft losses is limited to the amount in excess of $100 per loss (similar to $100 deductible insurance). This is expected to increase revenues by $50 million.

6. Charitable contribution deduction: The bill denies charitable contribution deductions for future interests in tangible personal property until the gifts are completed except where the property is retained for the life or lives of the donor or donors. This is expected to increase revenues by a negligible amount.

7. Bank loan insurance: An interest deduction is denied for amounts borrowed under a systematic plan to pay premiums on life insurance (certain exceptions are provided). This is expected to increase revenues by $5 million.

8. Personal holding companies: The tax treatment of personal holding companies is made considerably more restrictive. For example, the percentage of passive income which may result in a company being classified as a personal holding company is reduced from 80 to 60 percent and amendments are made so that the tax cannot be avoided by using rental or oil or gas or mineral royalties (or working interests) to shelter substantial amounts of investment income, such as dividends and interest, from the personal holding company tax. A number of other restrictive amendments are also made. On the other hand, relief is provided for those companies which are not now personal holding companies, but which would be under the new definitions. This is expected to increase revenues by $15 million.

9. Aggregation of oil and gas properties: For the future, oil and gas leases or acquisitions are no longer to be aggregated in determining what constitutes a property for purposes of computing the percentage depletion deduction. This is expected to increase revenues by $40 million.

10. Multiple surtax exemptions: For corporations where there is common control to the extent of 80 percent or more, the corporations involved generally are limited to one $25,000 surtax exemption for the group or alternatively required to pay a special tax of 6 percent on the first $25,000 of their income. No penalty tax is imposed where a consolidated return is filed for the group. This is expected to increase revenues by $35 million.

11. Interest on certain deferred payments: Where property is sold on an installment basis and either no, or very low, interest is charged on the installments, the bill provides that an appropriate amount of each installment is to be treated as if it were an interest payment. This is expected to increase revenues by a negligible amount.

12. Reimbursed medical expenses: The bill includes in gross income reimbursed medical expenses to the extent the reimbursement exceeds the actual medical expenses incurred with respect to the illness or accident. This is expected to increase revenues by a negligible amount.

13. Stock options: The present tax treatment of employee stock options is further restricted, the principal additional restrictions being that (a) the stock when acquired must be held for 3 years or more; (b) the option must not be for a period of more than 5 years; (c) the option price must at least equal the market price of the stock when issued; (d) stockholders' approval for the options must be obtained; and (e) the extent to which new options may be exercised when the old options are outstanding is restricted. Separate tax treatment is provided for employee stock purchase plans which are available to all employees on a nondiscriminatory basis under rules which are substantially the same as under present law. This is expected to increase revenues by a negligible amount.

14. Sale or exchange of depreciable real estate: In the case of real estate sold at a gain in the future, depreciation deductions, generally to the extent these deductions exceed depreciation allowable under the "straight line" method (to the extent of the gain), will be treated by the bill as giving rise to ordinary income. However, in the case of property held more than 20 months the amount treated as ordinary income will be reduced by 1 percent for each month of holding over 20, with the result that no amount will be treated as ordinary income in the case of real property held more than 10 years. For the fiscal year 1965, this provision is expected to result in a revenue gain of less than $2.5 million but in subsequent years when the provision becomes fully effective it is anticipated that it will result in revenue gain of approximately $15 million.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Estimated average annual tax reduction[1] *per individual income taxpayer*[2] *under H.R. 8363 when fully effective, by adjusted gross income class*

	Average annual tax reduction[1]
0 to $3,000	$49
$3,000 to $5,000	67
$5,000 to $10,000	90
$10,000 to $20,000	165
$20,000 to $50,000	560
$50,000 and over	2,194
All taxpayers	110

[1] Including capital gains without induced effects; and before feedback.

[2] Joint returns counted as two taxpayers.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation October 14, 1963.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING—RESOLUTION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the National Conference of Weights and Measures has taken the unusual step of passing a resolution at its last annual meeting commending a U.S. Senator and subcommittee for an outstanding contribution to truth in packaging.

The conference, composed of the State weights and measures officials of America, testified earlier this year in support of S. 387, the truth-in-packaging bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, aimed at giving the consumer a fair shake in the modern marketplace. The endorsement of these State officials for this vital legislation must be given a great deal of weight as they are daily in the firing line against deceptive and confusing packaging and labeling practices.

They are in the best position to judge the extent of such practices and the inadequacy of existing law to control the situation. It is important that the Senate be aware of the value attached to S. 387 by this outstanding group of State officials.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution commending Senator PHIL A. HART, of Michigan, principal sponsor of this legislation, and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, which has reported it favorably to the Judiciary Committee, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION TO ANTITRUST AND MONOPLY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE U.S. SENATE

Whereas the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate and particularly Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, in his capacity as special subcommittee chairman, have done so much to emphasize the economic importance of truth in packaging; and

Whereas efforts of this subcommittee have been recognized by weights and measures officials and others as being both desirable and effective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this 48th National Conference on Weights and Measures hereby express its sincere appreciation to the subcommittee and to Senator HART for the splendid work that has been done and is continuing to be done, in this area.

COMMEMORATION OF COLUMBUS DAY, 1963

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, during the past weekend, on October 12, we marked a most renowned anniversary: the landing of Christopher Columbus on the shores of the New World in 1492.

The anniversary, I believe, has a special significance to us today; for we are engaged in our own explorations, not only in outer space, but in so many phases of scientific and technological advancement as they pertain to contemporary life.

Born in the Italian seaport of Genoa, where I was once stationed as American vice consul and recall Columbus' birthplace as a hallowed monument, Columbus set an example of inspiring magnitude. His voyage across hitherto uncharted seas has, of course, an abiding importance and a supreme worth to us in the United States—and in celebrating the anniversary we honor Italy, its spirit, its imaginative enterprise, and all those among us who are linked to the essential value of this heritage.

We think of the bursting forth of the Italian Renaissance, of man's emergence from the Dark Ages in a country which has imparted to the world and to the United States its vision and ideals: in such eminent scientists as Guglielmo Marconi; in illustrious artists like Arturo Toscanini. In the field of government, one need look no further than my own State of Rhode Island, to its senior Senator, for a representation of the meaningful heritage I have mentioned.

In Rhode Island we are indeed fortunate to have such a large number of citizens who perpetuate this heritage and give added luster to our State. Many of them chose Rhode Island during the days of widespread immigration; many are now nativeborn citizens. They contribute in multiple ways to Rhode Island's cultural life and economic growth. They personify the ideals in which we can all take pride.

Mr. President, earlier this year I had the privilege of cosponsoring a bill which would make October 12 a national holiday. Observance of Columbus Day helps us pay our respect and admiration to an historic event whose implications remain vital.

Columbus was a pioneer in the best sense of the word. We would do well to remember his example as we strive to chart our own future course.

MAINTENANCE AND PROTECTION OF SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address delivered by Daniel D. Strohmeier, vice president of Bethlehem Steel Co., before the American Merchant Marine Conference, in Baltimore, on October 11, 1963.

Mr. President, the private shipbuilding industry of this Nation is in a slump; participation in our own foreign trade has decreased to only 9 percent. Our merchant marine does not seem to be functioning as efficiently as it should.

I hope my colleagues will examine this problem carefully and give thought to the necessity of maintaining and protecting our shipbuilding industry.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPECTS FOR SHIPBUILDERS

Basically, from my view as a private American shipbuilder, there appear to be three broad shipyard groups in the world: the foreign yards, the U.S. naval shipyards, and the private American shipbuilders.

I do not propose to dwell at length on the first two groups. The foreign yards will prosper with the ebb and flow of world shipping. The U.S. naval shipyards appear to be immune from economic considerations and will undoubtedly be going strong, courtesy of the American taxpayer, long after those of us here have gone to our reward.

The private U.S. shipbuilding industry, my subject today, is by economic disadvantage stranded so far above any conceivable high tide mark of world shipping requirements that nothing short of the high water of a world hurricane will cause the flood to reach our level.

Since the war, more than 70 foreign-flag ships have been built in the United States. These orders resulted from a combination of circumstances which, in my opinion, are unlikely to be repeated. After the war, American shipyard capacity represented a fair proportion of world capacity and our cost differentials were less. Thus, the great tanker programs of 1948, 1951, and 1956, spurred on by high charter rates, spilled over into American yards. Today there is no conceivable spurt in world demand for ships that will bring any business to American yards.

Five years ago world shipbuilding capacity had grown to about 10½ million gross tons annually and was about 83 percent utilized.

Today world shipbuilding capacity is in the order of 14 million gross tons annually and is only about one-half utilized.

Not only is there a widening imbalance between supply and demand but the differential between domestic and foreign costs has also widened. Where cost differentials were in the order of 40 percent shortly after the war, it has been necessary for Congress recently to raise the statutory limit for subsidies to 55 percent.

With so much idle foreign capacity and with our widening cost differential, it is little wonder then that no shipowner, whether private or government, will order a ship in an American yard, unless there is a compelling reason.

Thus, for all practical purposes the prospects for American shipbuilders depend on the demand for American-flag ships, where the compelling reason is supplied by law.

What are these prospects? Here it would perhaps be well to consider separately each of the three principal sources of shipbuilding demand; namely, the private segment, the Navy, and the subsidized merchant fleet.

The private segment means coastwise and intercoastal ships only where the trade is restricted to American-flag vessels. This means principally coastwise tankers. There may also be some special purpose vessels for the carriage of chemicals in bulk, both dry and liquid. The success of some container ship conversions may presage some eventual new construction. However, the bulk of the volume will be tankers and these are under competitive pressure from the construction of more and larger pipelines. The Colonial pipeline alone, now building, will have a capacity to deliver what now requires the equivalent of about 90 T-2's.

To maintain those 90 tankers, new ships would have to be built at the average rate of about 5 per year. That means that because of that one pipeline alone, the shipbuilding industry has lost a demand for about five T-2 equivalents per year.

At present there are only seven private unsubsidized ships being built in the United States, all tankers. As in the off-shore trades, coastwise tankers are trending toward larger ships in the 45,000 to 70,000 deadweight tons range. Simplification of design and omission of frills are helping to make these ships more competitive with the pipelines. There is some trend toward placing the bridge aft and simplifying the cargo system with fewer and larger tanks. Crew reductions will also contribute to their competitive status. There are presently about 260 active American-flag tankers. To maintain that number an average of 10 ships a year would have to be built. Since replacement vessels are larger and faster, it seems to me that there is no prospect of maintaining that number of units and so the tanker replacement rate will average less than 10 units per year.

Turning to the category of naval construction, the big question mark affecting the outlook for shipbuilding is the matter of block obsolescence of the fleet and whether this country has the will to do anything about it.

Last year a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House reported substantially as follows: There are about 860 ships in the active fleet. According to the subcommittee approximately the same number is planned for 1973, 10 years hence, but the composition will vary somewhat. Of the present fleet 598 were authorized in World War II and the average age of the fleet is 15 years. Applying the accepted 20-year life criterion, only 335 ships, built or authorized, will be assets 10 years from now. Since 1948, we have been building at the average rate of 24 ships a year. At that rate we will have only about 503 useful ships 10 years from now. Only by averaging 70 new ships a year starting immediately will the objectives be met in 1973. Programs for fiscal 1962 and 1963 included 36 and 37 new ships respectively, a 50-percent increase over the 24-ship-a-year average but only half of what it will take to meet the 10-year objective. It is obvious that at the rate we are now building our naval power is deteriorating.

Another factor affecting the outlook for shipbuilders is the changing composition of the naval fleet. The development of nuclear power, nuclear weapons, missiles, and the changing military posture of our potential adversary are important factors. In general the days of the large fighting ship seem to be numbered, with emphasis today on submarine, destroyer types with antisubmarine capability, and auxiliary vessels.

Navy work represents by far the largest dollar volume of shipbuilding available in the United States, but shipbuilders are worried that the same school of thought, or lack of it, that is permitting our Navy to lose the race with obsolescence, might not manifest itself in further reduced volume of work.

Another source of concern on the part of the private shipbuilders is the vast capacity being maintained in 11 active Navy shipyards, the same number that existed in World War II. This capacity is a menace to the private industry, already hard pressed for orders, and a very real obstacle to the investment of new funds in private shipyard modernization.

Our third category, the subsidized fleet, provides some shipbuilding but the numbers of ships offered each year are so small as to leave the shipbuilding industry decidedly undernourished. In recent years the annual programs have averaged 17 ships per year. A total of 18 shipyards have bid for these. An offering of only one ship per yard per year is what I would call a buyers' market and the prices are inevitably so low as to render this work unprofitable to the industry.

Are there too many shipyards or are there too few ships to build? Consider the following:

At the present time there are about 900 active merchant ships under the U.S. flag. Twelve years ago our participation in our own foreign trade was about 40 percent. It has gone downward steadily until today it is only 9 percent. The trend is still downward.

If we consider a 25-year vessel life, we should be replacing our ships at an average rate of 36 ships per year or double the current and projected program, just to maintain our disgraceful 9 percent.

It would appear inescapable that at the rate we are building, our active fleet of 900 ships will shrink to half that number. When that time comes, we shall look back to 1963 and wonder how we managed to carry even 9 percent.

Our national merchant marine policy is stated in title I of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—I doubt if all the combined resolutions committees of the Propeller Club, the AMMI, CASL, Shipbuilders Council, and others could even today improve on it. Let me read it.

"It is necessary for the national defense and development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine (a) sufficient to carry its domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce of the United States and to provide shipping service on all routes essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency, (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States insofar as may be practicable, and (d) composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States and manned with a trained and efficient citizen personnel. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine."

It would seem to me that there is a serious gap between that statement of policy and the course we are pursuing in this country. First, we are not carrying a substantial portion of our foreign trade, unless you would call 9 percent substantial. Second, we are not fostering a merchant fleet of the most suitable types. In the past 15 years the only vessel types admitted by administrative action to the subsidy provisions of the act have been berth-line passenger ships and freighters. Now, these are important segments of a balanced merchant marine but they cannot and do not carry many of the cargoes that make up our foreign trade and which require other types of vessels. Yet, legislative history of the act makes it perfectly clear that all types of merchant ships essential to our trade are intended to be covered.

Our administratively narrowed application of the Merchant Marine Act has already resulted in an unbalanced and inadequate merchant fleet.

In my opinion the outlook for shipbuilders depends on the value this country puts on seapower. With the average age of our naval vessels over 15 years and growing older, and with our merchant fleet carrying less than 9 percent of our trade and shrinking, I believe Congress and the executive branch of the Government should take stock and decide whether the low and sinking estate of our seapower is commensurate with our role in the world. In my opinion it is not.

In contrast, the Russians have belatedly given evidence that they understand sea power and have underway a tremendous program to build up both their naval and merchant marine strength. In May 1963 Russia had 236 merchant ships under construction, five times as many as our 47. Their submarine fleet already in being totals more than 400. In the great struggle between East and West, our diametrically opposite views on the importance of seapower mean that one of us is right and one of us is wrong. However, our position is the dangerous one, for if it proves to be wrong we will be in mortal peril. If the Russians turn out to be wrong, they are in a fail-safe position.

To remedy our dwindling seapower will cost money. Where is it coming from? If we have to delay our trip to the moon to divert funds to bolster our seapower, that would not be too much of a price to pay.

In the final analysis, who wouldn't swap a few years on the moon for a few more on earth?

NATIONAL HEALTH: KEY TO THE FUTURE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the story of the U.S. Public Health Service as told by Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, in the September–October issue of the Retired Officer is extremely interesting and most informative, as well as timely and challenging. I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "National Health: Key to the Future" printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HEALTH: KEY TO THE FUTURE

(By Dr. Luther L. Terry, Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service)

In the nuclear-space age, national health—reservoir of human power—fuels the creative-productive engines of the Nation. To advance science and technology—agriculture and industry—military defense—space exploration—human well-being: all of these depend upon healthy, dynamic citizens.

In scope, mid-20th century health horizons have expanded from physician-patient, local community relationships to en masse nationwide—yes, global—programs. The life-and-death struggle reaches far into remote, disease-lurking corners of the earth * * * and deep into the secrets of human life itself. As long as disease—uncured, unprevented, or uncontrolled—exists anywhere in the world, it threatens human life.

PROGRESS IN HEALTH

In recent decades, fortunately, there has been significant progress—greater, in fact, than in all previous history. The prominent results include: Extension of life expectancy from 47 years in 1900 to 70 now. A sharp decrease in infant mortality. Advances in controlling and/or preventing such diseases as: tuberculosis, poliomyelitis, measles, influenza, and venereal disease, extension of medical care to more citizens (although many still remain unprotected), and general improvement in the Nation's health.

CHALLENGES AHEAD

Despite such progress, however, the fight has just begun * * *. Yearly, disease and illness still result in more fatalities than all U.S. military battles of history. (Over 1½ million die prematurely, as compared to 989,000 battle deaths for all wars.)

On the health fronts, the major crippler-killer enemies include:

The chronic conditions—such as heart disease, cancer, and mental illness—are high on the list of causes of disability and death.

Diseases of the heart and blood vessels result in nearly 1 million deaths annually.

Cancer: According to estimates, about one of every six persons will die of cancer—unless more effective treatment is found.

Mental illness: Over 500,000 are in public mental hospitals; and over 15 million are considered to suffer from a degree of such illness.

Chronic disabilities: Approximately 19 million persons are limited to some extent in their activities due to chronic disease or impairment. Among 4 million of those unable to work, keep house, or carry on other major activities, 24 percent report heart conditions as the cause; 16 percent, arthritis or rheumatism; and 11 percent visual impairment. For 16 days a year (higher among aging), also, the average person's activities are restricted by illness or injury—including 6 days of bed disability.

As reflected by such diseases and illnesses, there still exist many dangers to health and life.

OPERATION LIFESAVING

For Operation Health and Lifesaving the Nation has greatly expanded the U.S. Public Health Service (PHS). Under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, PHS now serves as the major Federal agency charged with protecting and improving the health of the Nation.

Headed by the Surgeon General, the Service administers health laws and programs; spurs the development of nongovernmental health facilities and services throughout the Nation; provides medical services to persons lawfully authorized to receive such care; mans foreign quarantine stations—to prevent importation of disease; and advises on national health policy.

MANNING HEALTH BATTLELINE

Headquartered in Washington, D.C., the health forces—largest in U.S. history—include over 34,000 employees engaged in over 300 occupations; 15 hospitals; 135 outpatient clinics; 50 Indian hospitals; over 100 health centers, field stations, and other facilities. A system of grant support for worthy medical efforts in nongovernmental institutions further extends the health-defending arm of the Service.

HEALTH COMMAND POST

Across the Nation—and around the world—the PHS "Command Post"—in peace and war—includes:

Combating epidemics: The Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta, Ga., commando-like units of Epidemic Intelligence Officers stand ready to launch on-the-scene attacks on epidemics, or other health hazards, anywhere in the Nation * * * or the world.

Fighting chronic disease: For persons suffering from chronic diseases and illnesses, six special programs are now in operation: Cancer control, diabetes and arthritis, gerontology, heart disease control, neurological and sensory disease service, and nursing homes.

Radiological health: In the nuclear age, radioactivity in air we breathe—particularly from bomb tests—creates an ever-greater threat to health. The radiological health forces wage a nationwide campaign to monitor radioactivity; and then, to develop methods to protect human life.

International health: Realistically, disease recognizes no national boundaries. For this reason, the PHS Office of International Health cooperates with nations around the globe—and through international organizations such as the World Health Organization and the Pan American Health Organization—for the conquest and stamping out of disease.

Guarding U.S. health borders: The Foreign Quarantine Service stands guard at 380 land and sea ports of entry—and in foreign ports of departure for U.S. to stop disease—carried by humans, animals, or plants—from invading the Nation.

Home front protection: For protecting the home front, the community health services program spurs the development of health-protecting capabilities through: (1) Technical assistance training and guidance; and (2) helping hand financial support as necessary.

Research—Key to health progress: For the future, research in human health—like defense, space, industry, agriculture—remains a key to progress.

Within PHS, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) carry forward the greatest research effort in the world.

In scope, the Programs are aimed toward cure, prevention, or control of all the diseases and illnesses of mankind. In major health fields, nine special institutes have been established, including: Cancer; heart disease; allergy and infectious diseases; arthritis and metabolic diseases; child health and human development; dental research; general medical science; mental health; neurological diseases and blindness.

By research NIH transfuses a great flow of lifesaving medical knowledge into the bloodstream of America.

Surviving atomic attack: The 20th century capability for catastrophic wars—nuclear, biological, chemical—also requires strong defenses not only against existing—but also potential—dangers to health and life.

In event of nuclear attack, for example, the Nation could well suffer:

A casualty level of over 60 million persons; a third of the population:

Twelve million immediate deaths; which could increase to 34 million in 30 days; and over 40 million at the end of 6 months;

Blast, thermal, and radiation casualties surviving D-day to beyond 6 months would number about 20 million—a majority of whom would recover.

To help protect Citizens, PHS has established a health mobilization program. The objectives include: mobilizing—civilian health manpower; setting up thousands of emergency hospitals; developing a casualty-care capability; protecting of noncasualty population; and other preattack and postattack health services.

An atomic attack—despite safeguarding precautions—would deprive millions of citizens of access to doctors and medical facilities. For survival aid, PHS, also has developed a medical self-help program. This includes locally taught lessons on: radioactive shelters and fallout; preservation of food, water, and other supplies; treatment of shock and care of sick and injured; emergency childbirth; and other lifesaving measures.

A PROUD HISTORY

Historically, PHS has a proud record of service to the Nation. Organizationally, the highlights of progress include:

In 1798: The forerunner of PHS—a single marine hospital—was established to care for ill and injured merchant seamen.

In 1870: The marine hospital service was reorganized and expanded; a surgeon general was appointed for the service.

In 1878: A foreign quarantine service was established to prevent the importation of disease.

In 1912: The act of 1912—establishing the Public Health Service—further extended the health-protecting responsibilities to include studies of the diseases of man.

COMMISSIONED CORPS

With ever-broadening, health-protecting responsibilities, the Nation required a professionally competent, disciplined staff to serve as a nucleus of the Public Health Service.

For this reason, the commissioned corps was established in 1873; and, 16 years later, was given recognition by Congress.

In stature, the corps ranks comparable to other uniformed services—Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Presently, the corps is a professional career organization of exceptionally qualified physicians, dentists, sanitary engineers, nurses, scientists, and other categories of professional personnel.

Like the Armed Services, PHS regular officers are appointed by the President—agree to serve wherever the needs of the Service require—and are governed by similar promotion, rank, and tenure systems.

The reserve corps is appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on behalf of the President.

In contrast to the regular corps, the reserve is not necessarily a career service, as such; rather, it increases or decreases in size as programs of the Service expand or contract.

For emergency preparedness, the inactive reserve comprises an organization of trained professional health and health-related personnel. They are held in reserve for national emergencies involving partial or full mobilization of the Nation's health resources.

Selective service obligations: By serving in PHS, draft registrants can fulfill their Selective Service obligation by serving 2 years of active duty as officers in the commissioned corps. Upon completion of their tour of duty, officers will have complied with all requirements of the Universal Military Training and Service Act regarding obligated military service. Internship (medical, dental, and pharmacy) or training under certain student programs, however, are not considered part of the obligated service.

The corps is administered by the Surgeon General, who is appointed by the President from the regular corps. The Surgeon General holds rank equivalent to the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

CHALLENGES OF TOMORROW

For the future—as in the past—the commissioned corps will serve as a disciplined nucleus of health protecting forces for the Nation.

To win the war against disease, illness, and human maladies will require a greater mustering of human resources of the Nation. The major features of the all-front battle for better health include:

Health Forces: A mustering of greater health forces—to win more victories over the diseases and illnesses that cripple or kill more than 1½ million persons each year.

Broader health care: The goal is adequate medical care for more—and ultimately all—U.S. citizens.

Environmental health: The technological industrial age casts off deadly byproducts—such as radiation and harmful chemicals—that pollute air and water and jeopardize health. To guard against such hazards requires a more effective, protective system.

Medical communications: A better communications system is esential for speedily transfusing advancements and breakthroughs in medical knowledge into the lifeblood of America.

For accomplishing its mission, the Nation will depend upon human resources—intelligent, creative, dedicated individuals—to carry forward its health-protection and improvement programs. The health professions—physicians, nurses, dentists, sanitary engineers, serve as the "heart" of the program.

A national-global, all-out war for better health, however, cannot be fought by the medical profession alone. Like a military operation, rather, it requires organization, supply, transportation, all kinds of strategic and logistic support for a campaign. This requires a variety of skills and professions including: administrators, engineers, legal advisers, mechanics, statisticians, secretaries—in PHS, numbering over 300 occupations.

As in exploration of outer space, the ultimate in health progress is still beyond the known horizons—beyond, perhaps, even the imagination of man. But victories can—and will—be won.

The challenges are great. The rewards, however, are even greater. For the Nation: stronger, more dynamic citizens; and for humanity: promise of a longer, better life.

(NOTE.—Dr. Luther L. Terry was commissioned in the regular corps of the Public Health Service in 1944. He has served as Chief of Medical Services, PHS hospital in Baltimore, Md.; Chairman of the Medical Board of the NIH Clinical Center; Acting Director of the National Heart Institute. He was appointed Surgeon General in 1961. On special assignment, he has served as: member of Medical Division of Strategic Army Survey to Japan, 1945–46; staff member of subcommittee investigating Malmedy atrocities, Senate Committee on Military Affairs; chief U.S. delegate to the 15th World Health Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland. Dr. Terry is a governor of the American College of Physicians; and a diplomat of the American Board of Internal Medicine. He has authored, or coauthored, more than 50 publications in the medical and scientific fields.)

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN POLAND

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently a press release of the Polish Peoples Republic dated September 9, 1963, passed my desk. It was titled "Some Facts of the Catholic Church in Poland." This release paints quite a pretty picture in that the implication is that the Catholic Church which has been so strong in holding the Polish Nation together enjoyed complete freedom with little or no interference from its Communist Russian-controlled government.

Because I could not bring myself to believe the facts as expressed by this Communist puppet government, I sent the statement to the National Catholic Welfare Conference in hopes they can clarify exactly what the situation was.

I ask unanimous consent that the press release of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, dated September 16, be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIEST-EXPERT SEES POLISH STATEMENT ON CHURCH AS "MISLEADING"

NEW YORK, September 14.—A priest-expert on the status of the church in Poland characterized as "very misleading" a statement on church life in Poland issued by the Polish Embassy in Washington.

Father Ignatius Olszewski, editor of the Inter-Catholic News Agency, which specializes in church news concerning Poland, said that the embassy statement distorted its picture of the church in Poland by omission.

The embassy press office report, dated September 9, was entitled "Some Facts About Catholic Church in Poland." It gave statistics for the increase in the numbers of bishops, priests, sisters, and men religious between 1937 and 1960; cited postwar statistics for church construction; referred to the existence of 15,000 catechetical centers, and spoke of the wide circulation of the more than 50 Catholic papers.

Father Olszewski said that generally the Embassy's statistics appeared to be correct. But he said the Embassy's portrayal of the Catholic press in Poland gives a very erroneous image. The more than 50 Catholic papers alluded to include the 2 dozen diocesan bulletins which are distributed only to the clergy, he said, adding that they are essentially only newsletters.

The Polish-born priest said also that the two major Catholic publications in Poland, Tygodnik Powszechny (Universal Weekly) of Cracow, and Prezewodnik Katolicki (Catholic Leader) of Poznan, are limited by their newsprint allotment to about 50,000 copies an issue apiece. "This is a negative quantity compared to the actual needs of a nation of 28 million Catholics," he said.

Father Olszewski added that the lion's share of the newsprint for Catholic periodicals goes to the publications of the Pax association and the Christian Social Association. "If not condemned outright, by the hierarchy, these publications are certainly ignored, and cannot be called Catholic in any normal sense," he said.

The 15,000 catechetical centers in Poland—opened after the Communist regime outlawed the teaching of religion in the schools—are constantly hamstrung by government harassment, according to Father Olszewski. Men religious—unless they are pastors—sisters, and lay people are all barred from teaching religion classes. This rule so overburdens the diocesan priests that in many places religion classes are impossible, said the priest-editor. He said that in addition, the government at whim imposes confiscatory taxes on church property and on priests.

The Warsaw regime generally maintains an air of legality and reason in its dealing with the church, the priest said. But he added that in practice it seizes on "the flimsiest excuses or pretexts so as to pester the Catholic people."

POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE—RESOLUTION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 16 of this year, I had the privilege and honor to address the convention of the Polish National Alliance at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia. In keeping with its tradition of fighting for freedom and against oppression, the alliance passed a straightforward and strong resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Zgoda, Oct. 1, 1963]

Resolution Adopted at the 34th Quadrennial Convention of the Polish National Alliance Held at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia, Pa., September 15 to 20, 1963

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Polish National Alliance was organized in 1880 in Philadelphia, Pa., for the purposes, inter alia, of awakening all Americans of Polish birth or descent to a realization of the richness of their American heritage. We have always hoped that the achievement of these purposes will elevate at the same time the good name and prestige of Americans of Polish descent; and

Whereas the Polish National Alliance, one of the largest fraternals in the United States, composed of 330,000 members, has sought for years the enactment of legislation which would fully serve the national interests and reflect in every detail the principles of equality and human dignity. Our organization as a leading exponent of these principles has been in the forefront in these efforts to alert public opinion to this end; and

Whereas the Communist Government of Poland is increasing its oppression by attacks on religious freedom, particularly on the Roman Catholic Church in Poland; and

Whereas by such acts the Communist government aims to destroy the spiritual and moral foundation of the Polish people, by depriving them of the exercise of an inviolate and inalienable right to man in his pursuit of happiness in accordance with the tenets of his conscience and belief to worship, thereby resulting in the destruction of his will, human dignity and his very essence; and

Whereas the President of the United States on July 23, 1963, forwarded to Congress proposed legislation, designed to revise and liberalize our existing immigration laws which would eliminate altogether the national origin system for allocating quotas and other racially discriminatory aspects of our present laws, culminating in the introduction in the Senate of bill, S. 1932 and bill, H.R. 7700 in the House of Representatives. The proposed legislation will establish a series of priorities for admission of immigrants to this country: First, to immigrants with skills and training needed in our national economy; second, to persons related to U.S. citizens and aliens legally admitted to the United States; and third, all other immigrants on a first-come-first-serve basis. The enactment of this legislation will reflect American ideals of equality of all men without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin, and will enhance America's image as the leader of the free world, according equal dignity and respect to all peoples of the world; and

Whereas we commend the recent action of the President of the United States in appointing an American of Polish ancestry a member of his Cabinet; the appointment of Postmaster General John Gronouski, is a recognition of the contributions made to our country by Americans of Polish extraction, and is the most important recognition so obtained. We Americans of Polish descent express our heartfelt appreciation on the acknowledgement that among 13 million Americans of Polish ancestry there is one worthy and qualified of appointment to a Presidential Cabinet post; and

Whereas we again appeal to the U.S. Government and its allied powers, for a positive and unequivocal declaration against the status quo of east central Europe; we maintain that continued acquiescence to the Communist government forced upon these former free people will strengthen the Soviet plan to finally annex Poland and other enslaved countries to the Soviet empire and permanently extend its power to the heart of Europe; and

Whereas we again stress the fact that the most effective action against the present situation in central Europe is the recognition of the Oder-Niesse boundary by the Western powers, and recognition of Poland's rights to her former Eastern Provinces. It would deprive Russia of powerful psychological weapons which she wields over Poland and her neighbors, as the "sole protector" against possible German aggression; and

Whereas we are mindful of the fact that Poland, as the key to the peace in Europe, and ultimately, to American security, stands on the threshold of a millennial, as a Christian nation which, in A.D. 966 accepted baptism of the Latin rite and consequently linked her destiny with Western culture and civilization. Thus, by a millennial heritage, Poland belongs to the West and should not be left at the mercy of the Russo-Mongolian Communist Empire, and its godless ideology. Because of faulty past diplomacy, the West has a solemn obligation to help Poland regain her rightful place in the Western family of nations: Now, therefore,

The 34th Quadrennial Convention of the Polish National Alliance assembled from September 15 to 21, 1963, in the city of Philadelphia, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the cradle of American liberty and the cradle of the founding fathers of the Polish National Alliance in the year A.D. 1880 resolves as follows:

We vigorously protest the concerted action of the leaders of the Communist government of Poland in their endeavors to destroy the religious freedom of the Polish nation by depriving its people their inviolate and inalienable rights of their pursuit of happiness to worship God in accordance with their tenets of their consciences and beliefs, thereby destroying their will, their human dignity, their very essence.

We commend and congratulate the President of the United States for his action in appointing John Gronouski, the Postmaster General of the United States, and we trust that this example of his recognition of the achievements and contributions made by Americans of Polish ancestry to the heritage and well-being of our great and beloved country is the beginning of full political emancipation of our national group which will permeate, generate and be emulated throughout the depth and breadth of the United States on the State, county, city, town and village levels.

We unequivocally commend and congratulate the President of the United States for his vigorous and courageous message to the Congress of the United States requesting the aforementioned changes in our immigration laws. We further commend and congratulate the Senators who have joined in cosponsoring bill S. 1932 and we also commend and congratulate the Members of the House of Representatives who have joined in cosponoring bill H.R. 7700. We do hereby go on record as enthusiastically endorsing and supporting these proposed changes of the immigration laws and we entreat and pray that by expeditious enactment of this legislation we will once again assume our rightful leadership enjoyed since the birth of our Nation of being the chief guarantor of freedom, equality and dignity of man.

We urge the United States to make it known to all the nations of the world that we will not be a signatory to any nonaggression pact or any other agreement with the Soviet Union which tends to continue Soviet domination over central and eastern European nations, which for centuries have been free and independent.

We again urge that now is the time while a new West Germany is emerging that the consent be obtained to the Oder-Neisse line as Poland's boundary.

We appeal to the entire American Nation for the mobilization of its moral and spiritual forces and material resources for the decisive struggle against communism, which has been immeasurably intensified by Soviet occupation of Cuba, and Soviet penetration and activity in Latin America. Today, in the sphere of ideological struggle for the minds of free man the entire world is a vast battlefield. Communism is attacking us relentlessly with psychological, political, and economic weapons. In this mortal contest, every free citizen of the world must become a soldier of liberty, ready to fight with vigor communism everywhere. It is, rather, a highly opportune time for the United States with its allies to make unified efforts for a settlement of the main problems of the cold war; namely, liberation of enslaved nations of east central Europe, complete withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and its agents from Cuba, agreement on Berlin, and Soviet assent to a general binding disarmament under adequate control and inspection; be it further

Resolved, That on our part we pledge our honor and worldly goods to the defense, perpetuation and further development of the American way of life, which represents an ideal state of freedom and democracy, born in the hearts and minds of the great Fathers of our Republic and the authors of the immortal Declaration of Independence; be it finally

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be promptly forwarded to John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; to LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President; to all Members of the U.S. Senate; and to all of the Members of the House of Representatives; the United Nations; and to the Committee of Human Rights, United Nations.

By the Resolutions Committee: John J. Kozaren, Council 122, chairman; Harry S. Czaplicki, Council 166, vice chairman; Lucian F. Pazulski, Esq., Council 1, secretary; Stephen T. Potok, Esq., Council 1; Hon. Joseph P. Kuszynski, Council 92; Boleslaus I. Piotrowski, Council 6; Telesphor Jendrasiak, Council 19; Estelle M. Nieder, Council 73; Maryann C. Golembiewski, Council 88; Anthony Saratowicz, Council 79; Joseph J. Vance, Esq., Council 35.

Mr. SCOTT. As you may know, Mr. President, the Polish National Alliance of North America was founded in 1880 in Philadelphia, Pa., under the leadership of Julius Andrzejkowicz. I think it would be of interest to the Members of the Congress to include in the RECORD at this point a brief history of the Polish National Alliance, as well as excerpts from the keynote address by Charles Rozmark, president of the alliance, given at the convention of the Polish National Alliance at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

History of the Polish National Alliance

The Polish National Alliance of North America, founded in 1880, owes its rise to the immigrants longing for their native land and to their desire to preserve the Polish spirit and to organize with a view to aiding Poland which at that time was partitioned off among Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

The men planning this organization of the scattered forces of Polish newcomers to this country, were mostly heroes of the insurrection of 1863, ardent patriots, inspired by the imperishable dream of a free and independent Poland.

Under the leadership of Julius Andrzejkowicz, a meeting was called on February 15, 1880, in Philadelphia, Pa., whence an eloquent appeal was issued to the Poles of America to unite into one great organization.

Only six societies responded to this appeal, four from Chicago, one from San Francisco, Calif., and one from Shenandoah, Pa., and on September 20, 1880, the first organization meeting of the proposed PNA was held, at which it was formally called into being.

FOUNDERS OF THE PNA

The founders of the PNA were: Julius Andrzejkowicz, John B. Blachowski, Julian Lipinski, John Popielinski, and Julian Szajnert.

The first PNA censor was Julian Andrzejkowicz, of Philadelphia, Pa., and the first convention was held at the Palmer House and the convention mass at St. Wenceslaus (Polish-Slovak Church), corner DeKoven-Desplaines Streets, near Jefferson-Clinton Streets, in Chicago, Ill.

From its humble beginning in 1880, with only six societies, the Polish National Alliance has risen to a position as the largest fraternal organization of Americans of Polish descent in the world, with a membership of 340,000 and assets of $120 million.

OPERATES ALLIANCE COLLEGE

Among the PNA's proudest and most signal achievements was the founding of the PNA High School and Technical Institute at Cambridge Springs, Pa., on October 26, 1912, with the President of the United States, William Howard Taft, officiating at the opening. During World War I, the Student's Army Training Corps used the school grounds while the technical high school turned over to the government trained technicians and workers.

Alliance College, as the school is now known nationally, is an accredited 4-year coeducational institution of higher learning, and generally recognized as one of the finest of its kind in the country.

Currently in the process of unprecedented expansion, Alliance College truly represents a matchless gem in the long and meritorious crown of achievements of the PNA.

EDUCATIONAL, SPORTS-YOUTH DEPARTMENTS

The PNA also sponsors the educational and the sports-youth departments, with headquarters in Chicago, Ill.

A queen of the PNA contest is staged annually under the auspices of the educational department. The 16 districts of the alliance select their respective queens, who then compete for the title of "Queen of the PNA." Prizes valued at thousands of dollars are awarded to the winner and runnersup each year.

The PNA Sports-Youth Department awards financial assistance to hundreds of youth groups (choirs, drum-bugle corps, singers, and dancers), and also sponsors annual national bowling and golf tournaments. It also publishes a quarterly magazine, Promien, which is distributed to PNA youth leaders, lodge and council secretaries, commissioners, schools and libraries.

The Polish National Alliance has for many years conducted a well-stocked library in the PNA Headquarters Building in Chicago, which is used by students of local parochial and public schools in addition to the members of the PNA and our Polonia.

ZGODA AND DZIENNIK ZWIAZKOWY PUBLICATIONS

Two of the country's most widely-read and circulated publications, boasting the largest circulations in their respective fields—the Zgoda and Dziennik Zwiazkowy—are the property of, and published by, the Polish National Alliance.

The Zgoda, issued twice monthly, is the largest and oldest Polish and in fact the largest foreign language newspaper in the country. And the Dziennik Zwiazkowy, published 6 days a week, boasts the largest circulation of any Polish daily newspaper in the United States.

These represent only some of the projects carried on by the PNA, not only for members of the alliance but for the Polonia as well.

And the future should bring a continued acceleration of its many accomplishments which will serve to elevate our Polish people in the eyes of the rest of the world.

Excerpts From the Keynote Address by Charles Rozmarek, President of the Polish National Alliance, the Largest Polish-American Fraternal Organization, at Its Quadrennial Convention on Sunday, September 15, at Hotel Ben Franklin in Philadelphia, Pa.

The Polish National Alliance has come to its birthplace—Philadelphia—for its 34th convention.

Eighty-three years ago, a small group of Polish fighters for freedom, who fled from German and Russian oppression in their native land, organized, in this cradle of American freedom, the Polish National Alliance.

Today in membership and in resources we stand among the greatest fraternal orders in America.

Many humanitarian, patriotic and educational values played a significant part in our history. For example, out of concern for the education of youth, we founded Alliance College. This institution of higher learning, listed in "Who's Who in American Education" has been praised on several occasions in the U.S. Congress.

We were, and still are, the trailblazers in the anti-Communist movement in this country.

In view of Communist aggression, treachery and conspiracy in Cuba, Laos, South Vietnam, I question the wisdom of so-called letter diplomacy conducted with Khrushchev. We are not going to win the cold war with letters.

And let us not think that the atomic treaty in Moscow has any meaning. It can be discarded any time it suits Russia's purposes. Treaties depend upon good faith and no faith can ever be placed in Soviet promises.

It was primarily due to the naive faith in the Soviets that enabled the Communist conspiracy to conquer, subjugate and enslave almost half of humanity—over half a billion people.

To believe that the Communists will undergo a change of heart is dangerous self-delusion. It seems that the great curse of our times is that among our intellectuals there are too many bewildered wishful thinkers.

We should never lose sight of the fact that we are engaged in a mortal struggle with a Communist worldwide conspiracy. If Moscow really wants peaceful coexistence with the West, let her withdraw all troops from Cuba. Let her stop Communist conspiracies in Latin America and southeast Asia. And let her withdraw all troops from Cuba. Let her stop Communist conspiracies in Latin America and southeast Asia. And let her liberate all captive nations and especially Poland, which occupies a key position in Eastern Europe.

Khrushchev's Warsaw agent, Gomulka, openly stated not long ago, that the ideological struggle with the free world would never cease, until communism wins a total victory.

Thus the cold war will go on and we cannot let down our guard. On the contrary, we must increase our vigilance and never trust any Communists.

Communism is a devastating disease that saps the lifeblood of freedom. Its policy may be summarized as honeycombed with aggression and punctuated with deceit and treachery.

Only when we make American strength, coupled with a tough foreign policy, the perpetual partner of peace, will we witness then the ultimate triumph of liberty over Red slavery.

AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE FLORISTS' TELEGRAPH DELIVERY ASSOCIATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a significant partnership of business and Government was created recently with the signing of a precedent-making cooperator agreement between the Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This program is a first step in a significant new effort to maintain a vital, healthy floriculture industry able to serve increasing public demand for floral products and at the same time provide increased economic opportunity for our citizens.

Initially, it calls for cooperation between industry and Government in a broad program of economic and marketing research urgently needed to develop guidelines for the entire floriculture industry in a decade of change and challenge.

The unusual aspect of this partnership for progress is the willingness of small businessmen to make a joint investment in their own future which none could make by himself. Under the terms of the cooperator agreement, the more than 11,000 retail florist members of Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association will appropriate $40,000 this year to the Department of Agriculture to finance the initial phase of two research programs.

These are, first, a market development study aimed at evaluating current merchandising and promotion practices and developing new techniques which will continue and enhance expanding consumer demand for floral products; and, second, a basic analysis of economic and structural changes in the floral industry and in marketing—distribution channels to enable firms in the floriculture industry, from grower to retailer, to adjust to rapidly changing conditions in the industry.

Mr. President, this agreement, the first of its kind in the floriculture industry, was developed under the farsighted and positive leadership of Mr. Ralph W. Bachman, of Minneapolis, immediate past president, and Mr. John L. Bodette, executive vice president, of Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, who personally signed for the Department in his offices, places the greatest significance on this agreement as a step toward greater expansion of the floriculture industry.

Mr. President, I am impressed with the fact that Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association not only has shown a keen sense of leadership in seeking solutions to its problems, but has evidenced a willingness to contribute substantially to the solution of these problems.

I am especially pleased to see that emphasis has been placed on basic economic and marketing research, which will pinpoint consumer needs and desires, expand markets, create jobs, and result in greater service to the public.

In contracting for the use of public resources, Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association will be helping the billion-dollar floral industry grow and expand at a time when leaders of the industry, the Department, and many Members of Congress have become concerned with floriculture's need to do this in keeping with the general growth of our economy.

Mr. Bachman and Mr. Bodette, on behalf of this enterprising organization of small businessmen, have chosen wisely in seeking to develop a much-needed, long-range working relationship with the USDA which looks to a brighter, more abundant future for both the industry and the Nation.

Mr. Bodette has pointed out that this agreement, and I quote: "will overcome a serious lack of marketing and economic information available to the industry." Mr. Bachman has stated that the agreement, and again I quote: "will pay dividends to all members of an industry composed almost entirely of small businesses by providing answers to retailers and others in floriculture determined to survive and grow in an expanding marketplace." Secretary Freeman, at the signing ceremony at the USDA, stated that, I quote: "Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association has presented the Department of Agriculture with a new challenge" and an opportunity to lessen uncertainties and mitigate the effect of possibly drastic changes resulting from "the growing complexity of our economy."

Mr. President, we can take pride in the fact that the floriculture industry has demonstrated an enlightened self-interest by taking positive steps to help itself under the leadership of Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association. We will watch this development with interest and with the thought that an even more comprehensive program of research vital to the future of this major agricultural industry can be developed.

INTERCONTINENTAL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in this day of a growing deficit of payments, it is encouraging to note the action taken by Trans World Airlines.

TWA has just indicated its intention to purchase the first American-built supersonic transport, as well as five additional ones for a total of six. Mr. Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., in a letter to Mr. Gordon M. Bain, Deputy Administrator of the FAA, said:

> From the national viewpoint, we see many benefits accruing from this program in such matters as our prestige, our continuing problem with the balance of payments, and our further development of our outstanding airframe and engine design skills.

TWA has deposited with FAA a check for $600,000 as initial payment on the order.

As a leader in intercontinental transportation, it is incumbent upon American industry, working within the guidelines of the appropriate Federal agency to come up with a superior supersonic transport to meet the challenge of foreign competition. TWA's action today is certainly a step in the right direction.

I ask unanimous consent to include the press release issued by TWA at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWA COMMITS FOR FIRST U.S. SUPERSONIC JET IN ORDER FOR SIX PLANES

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 14.—Trans World Airlines today advised the U.S. Government of its intention to purchase the first American-built supersonic transport which is scheduled for delivery in 1970 carrying passengers at upwards of 1,500 miles an hour.

TWA announced that it has committed with Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, for six American-built supersonic aircraft and that it has deposited a check for $600,000 with the FAA as an initial payment on the order.

The commitment was made in a letter from Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., president of TWA, to Gordon M. Bain, Deputy Administrator for the supersonic transport development program for the FAA.

"From the national viewpoint," Mr. Tillinghast wrote, "we see many benefits accruing from this program in such matters as U.S. prestige, our continuing problem with the balance of payments, and our further development of our outstanding airframe and engine design skills."

Mr. Tillinghast said TWA desired to place "an initial order with the manufacturing consortium or corporation selected to build the supersonic transport * * * for the first and thereafter every second plane up to a total of six." He added that the $600,000 check represents a partial payment of $100,000 per aircraft.

The TWA president specified the following conditions of the order:

1. FAA certification of such aircraft for use in transatlantic passenger and cargo service.

2. A price (including any royalty which may be payable) for these aircraft which, on the basis of objective engineering studies, will permit their profitable operation on competitive transatlantic routes at unsubsidized fares.

3. A price no higher than that charged to other airline users.

4 Certification of such aircraft to cruise economically at no less than mach 2.2, notwithstanding our hope that a speed of 2.4 or greater can be achieved, toward which objective we trust the development program will continue.

5. Delivery of the first production model certificated as noted above, not later than January 1, 1971, or one year after introduction of the Concorde into scheduled commercial service, whichever is later.

Mr. Bain praised the airline for its convictions about the national effort to build an SST superior to the Concorde, now under development by a group of British and French manufacturers. Two U.S. airlines have ordered the Concorde.

"Without necessarily endorsing every aspect of the program," Mr. Tillinghast wrote, "we applaud the efforts you are making and wish to make it clear that TWA wholeheartedly and enthusiastically endorses continuing joint government-industry efforts to produce a superior supersonic transport."

Mr. Bain said TWA's commitment "will go a long way toward encouraging the industry to embark on the most meaningful program that can be completed at the earliest possible date."

Mr. Tillinghast said TWA contemplates the American-built supersonic transport would be suitable both for transcontinental and transatlantic service, but TWA would use it initially across the Atlantic.

TWA currently serves 53 U.S. cities and 15 world centers in Europe, Africa and Asia with a jet fleet of 76 planes. The largest operator of Boeing-built jets, TWA inaugurated the first jet service in 1959 between New York and San Francisco.

DISPOSITION OF RIGHTS TO INVENTIONS MADE THROUGH THE EXPENDITURE OF PUBLIC FUNDS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on October 10, the President of the United States submitted a memorandum to the heads of executive departments and agencies concerning the disposition of rights to inventions made through the expenditure of public funds. The purpose of this action was to develop greater consistency in agency patent practices and to avoid the difficulties which are caused by the different patent policies of agencies conducting research in related areas.

The Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary has been engaged for sometime in a study of the patent policies of the various Government departments. As chairman of this subcommittee, I welcome the President's memorandum as a constructive effort toward securing a reasonable solution to the complex Government patent policy question. It will be of considerable assistance in the consideration of patent policy legislation now pending before the subcommittee.

The need for legislation still persists however. General policy relating to the disposition of patent rights in inventions resulting from the $15 billion of federally funded research and development must be determined by the Congress. Furthermore, the objective of greater uniformity sought by the President cannot be secured until a number of statutory patent provisions have been amended.

The President's statement makes clear that its basic policy is subject to specific statutes which govern the patent policies of certain agencies. While I support the amending of these statutes, until this is accomplished, any regulations which may be promulgated by such agencies must reflect both the letter and the spirit of existing law.

ELECTRIC POWER—PRIVATE AND NATIONALIZED

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President in light of the carefully planned attacks from some quarters on the principle of privately owned electric power in the United States, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief comment and table compiled by the United Business Service.

The material is from the service's October 7, 1963, publication.

In comparing the kilowatt price of common market electricity and private power produced in the United States, the service notes that "common market electricity is Government produced—and more expensive than ours." The service also compares Britain's nationalized utilities with the utility service provided by private companies in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the comment and the table be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comment and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BACKYARD

While Britain's exceptionally bad winter was being accentuated by repeated power failures last year, hapless customers of the nationalized utilities were told that the industry could not be expected to maintain a sufficient margin of safety to cope with such severe weather conditions. British critics now claim that the slow growing utility industry is actually holding back growth of the Nation's economy.

By contrast, our privately owned electric utility industry has a safety margin of 30 percent, enough to cover any weather severities and national growth as well. Moreover, our electricity has fallen in price since the end of World War II while Britain's has become more expensive.

Interestingly enough, most common market electricity is government produced—and more expensive than ours.

[In cents per kilowatt-hour]

	Residential	Industrial
Belgium	4.68	1.58
Luxembourg	4.29	1.71
Italy	4.16	1.54
France	3.72	1.54
Western Germany	3.50	1.84
The Netherlands	9.90	1.51
United States	2.47	0.97

The trend all over the world is toward State-owned facilities. The proponents of this trend ought to stop and have a look at what free enterprise has accomplished. In this country we are getting our money's worth.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, no single program instituted by the Kennedy administration has caught the public fancy as has the Peace Corps. This program, a blend of American idealism and generosity, has received bipartisan support in the Congress and won approval throughout the Nation.

A valuable assessment of the Peace Corps was made by the Sheridan, Wyoming, Press in an editorial printed on September 10. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESS BLESSED THAN WE

The U.S. Peace Corps, that group of Americans embarked on a basic people-to-people service program throughout the world, is currently involved in that annual period of self-preservation known as "selling the budget."

The Corps, which began in 1961 with 5,000 volunteers and an appropriation of $30 million is now asking for $108 million to support an operation of 13,000.

The Corps, because it is doing an effective job and because it has not been afraid to admit its weaknesses, has received good treatment from Congress in the past. In 1961 it sought $40 million and received $30 million; in 1962 it asked for $63.7 million and got $59 million.

There are currently 4,100 serving in about 45 countries and another 2,500 in training. About 9,000 volunteers are expected to be serving in 51 countries by the end of 1963.

Word from Washington is that the current Peace Corps budget request may be one of the victims of this year's economy drive. Congressmen are reportedly telling Director R. Sargent Shriver that the Corps may be getting too big and they want to take a hard look before approving the leap to 13,000 volunteers.

We can appreciate this attitude on the part of Congress so long as the question of value received is given equal consideration. The Peace Corps in our opinion, stands as the outstanding achievement in our total foreign aid program. Furthermore, the large majority of additional volunteers to be included in the expanded Peace Corps would be sent to Latin America where, we feel, a great deal more emphasis should be placed—particularly this type of people-to-people emphasis.

It could represent a false economy to hinder the expansion of the Peace Corps. It remains the outstanding effort on the part of this country to really reach the basic needs of the people and countries less blessed than we.

PURCHASE OF AMERICAN WHEAT BY SOVIET UNION

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it would be foolish to assume that every transaction in our cold war diplomacy is either a complete victory for our side or an ignominious defeat. Rather we must look at each transaction for its total effect—will it be when the final summation is made for or against our interest.

Therefore, it is impossible to say that the Soviet Union will not benefit from the purchase of American wheat. But, it is equally true that we stand to gain even more through that transaction.

Mr. President, the Casper Tribune carried an excellent editorial on this subject in its October 7 issue.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT WHEAT?

Politics, not cold war strategy, will determine whether the United States sells surplus wheat to the Soviet Union. The Kennedy administration is willing, as Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman have told the Senate Foreign Relations and Agriculture Committees.

Undersecretary of State George W. Ball has also briefed these committees on the pros and cons of such a sale, now placed at $250 million for 3 million tons of wheat, if the Soviet Union wants to buy in the U.S. market.

However, the administration is reluctant to authorize the sale without some form of backing from Congress. It has been negotiating wtih congressional leaders, particularly Senate Minority Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, whose support eased the way for the limited nuclear test ban treaty.

The truth is that little opposition has developed to the sale in Congress. Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, would expect no more than two votes against it in a showdown in his committee, and Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, saw only four of his committeemen voting against it.

But they would rather not go on record, for fear their votes might boomerang if relations with Moscow took a turn for the worse after the sale.

The United States has always been ready to alleviate hunger, even in the Soviet Union, as witness the Hoover Commission's work which saved millions from starvation in the early days of the Communist revolution.

It is another matter, some say, to bail out Khrushchev after a bad harvest, so that he can fulfill his commitments to Cuba and his European satellites. For any sale of wheat by the United States, even if it all went to the Soviet Union, would free Soviet wheat for distribution to other Communist nations.

That is political use of American harvests, which is the reason for the caution shown both by the Kennedy administration and the Senate. Khrushchev is not noted either for keeping his word or showing his appreciation.

Still, the reasoning is pretty shallow other than on an emotional basis, for the Soviet Union can buy all the wheat it wants in Western markets, as witness Canada's huge sale. The question is not one of withholding wheat, but of who will supply it. On that basis, it becomes a question of good business.

The United States freely sells other nonstrategic materials to the Soviet Union. Why not wheat, with which it is overburdened?

PHILIPPINE YOUTH CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we note with pleasure and approval the announcement that the Agency for International Development has entered into a 3-way arrangement with the Philippine Government and CARE to help reforest 150,000 acres in the Philippines and to provide work for more than 6,000 young men.

The program in the Philippines is evidently clearly patterned on the proposal which the senior Senator from Minnesota and others of this body proposed and which the Senate has approved for a Youth Conservation Corps.

It is ironic, however, that the Philippines has been able to move faster to establish such a program than the Government of the United States. As Senators know, the House of Representatives has not yet taken action on the legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps. I would hope that Members of the other body would take note of this constructive and forward looking action taken by the Government of the Philippines and CARE.

It is more imperative each year, Mr. President, that young men and boys who cannot find work in the current economy should have useful constructive work to do. The Youth Conservation Corps offers one important, if partial, solution to this problem.

LATIN AMERICAN TROUBLES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the New York Times in October 14, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point. I call especial attention to the last paragraph of the bill which reads as follows:

This confusion was confounded by an ill-timed and indiscreet statement by Edwin Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Martin argued that while the United States opposes military coups, some military leaders were progressive and paved the way for democratic elections, as they did in Peru and Argentina. This is true, but the time to say it was not immediately after unjustifiable military coups in the Dominican Republic and Honduras. The important thing to say—and Secretary Rusk and President Kennedy did say it—is that the United States strongly condemns all military coups in Latin America against legitimate governments.

I stress the comments of the editorial on the unfortunate position taken by the Hon. Edwin Martin, Assistant Secretary of State on Latin American Affairs on military coups. I agree with the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICAN TROUBLES

Latin America is going to be more of a political football than ever in the year that faces the United States before the next presidential election. In 1952 General Eisenhower and his foreordained Secretary of State Dulles effectively attacked the Truman administration for "neglecting" Latin America—after which Latin America was probably never more neglected than in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration. In 1960 Senator Kennedy had a fine time in his presidential campaign accusing the Eisenhower administration of lacking "leadership and the vigor to act." He spoke boldly of eliminating "all despotism in Latin America."

Business is business and politics is politics, and President Kennedy has no reason to be surprised if Governor Rockefeller, joining many other Republican critics, says that under the Kennedy administration "the security of the hemisphere has been seriously jeopardized." Mr. Rockefeller, who really knows about Latin America, must also know that in the present conjuncture of events, especially after the Cuban revolution which began in the Eisenhower administration, if Blankety-Blank had been President of the United States the security of the hemisphere would inescapably have been jeopardized.

The Governor also surely knows that it is unfair and harmful to call the Alliance for Progress "a failure" when it has hardly had a chance to get off the ground. Mr. Rockefeller was more justified in talking about the "confusion and uncertainty" in Latin America caused by the Kennedy policies.

This confusion was confounded by an illtimed and indiscreet statement by Edwin Martin, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Martin argued that while the United States opposes military coups, some military leaders were progressive and paved the way for democratic elections, as they did in Peru and Argentina. This is true, but the time to say it was not immediately after unjustifiable military coups in the Dominican Republic and Honduras. The important thing to say—and Secretary Rusk and President Kennedy did say it—is that the United States strongly condemns all military coups in Latin America against legitimate governments.

LUMBER PRESSURE MAIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the September issue of Western Timber Industry reproduces what it reports to be a copy of a Western Pine Association memorandum to its members urging that "employees * * * of * * * companies, their friends, and relatives" write letters to the Senators from Oregon and Washington, urging them to support new lumber sizes being promoted by the National Lumber Manufacturers.

I ask unanimous consent that this memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN PINE ASKS LETTERS FOR SENATORS

SEPTEMBER 3, 1963.

To Oregon and Washington members, Western Pine Association.

Re letters to Senators JACKSON, MAGNUSON, MORSE, and NEUBERGER.

NLM advises that, although Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, and JACKSON were inclined to favor the new lumber sizes as being beneficial to both the industry and the consumers of lumber, all of them are being bombarded by letters, wires, and phone calls from opponents of the program.

This obviously is part of an organized campaign to keep the Department of Commerce from circulating the proposal to the acceptor's list.

Politicians always are influenced by letters from their constituents. Consequently, our course of action seems obvious. Supporters of the program simply have to enter the contest for numbers of letters in support. In a contest of this kind, very little consideration will be given to the amount of production represented by the letterwriter or the contribution of his company to the community. Therefore, NLMA suggests an immediate and intensive effort to have individual employees of supporting companies, their friends and relatives, and their business associates, write individual letters of endorsement directly to Senators JACKSON, MAGNUSON, MORSE, and NEUBERGER.

Copies of each of these letters should be sent to the Commodity Standards Division of the Department of Commerce. Blind copies of letters should be sent to NLMA, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D.C., for its followup.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. GRIFFEE,
Secretary-Manager,
Western Pine Association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Western Pine Association reasons that "politicians always are influenced by letters from their constituents." They view their effort as one designed to convince the four Senators of the merits of their case by use of argument based on its loudness rather than its soundness.

My concern over the memorandum relates to the lack of understanding of the function and operation of Congress being displayed by the association.

Lobbyists can and do play useful roles. The more factual and well presented their case; the more they stick to the merits and to arguments of substance, the better they will convince the senior Senator from Oregon that they have a case.

From my desk here in the Senate I wish to point out to the Western Pine Association that they can generate a truckload of so-called boilerplate or form letters and they will not convince me as effectively as will one carefully prepared detailed analysis from a thoughtful and thought-provoking citizen in my State.

Stereotyped letters urging this Senator to support or oppose a particular proposal, be it legislation or some executive action, have little value. This Senator wants to know why a particular course of action is in the public interest and he wants to be sure that it is not merely in the special interest of those urging this course.

Far too often special interest pleaders think that congressional bombardment via the post office is convincing. In all good humor, I should observe that perhaps the only reason that Congress has not outlawed this sort of pressure mail is that most of the letters come special delivery, airmail, or first class and they at least contribute to postal revenues.

Stereotyped pressure mail is a source of great concern to me because it cannot be ignored. It has to be answered for reasons of courtesy, if for no other reason. It takes up my time and that of my staff in preparing acknowledgments.

The people of Oregon, when they elected me to the Senate, expected me to fulfill my pledge to give careful consideration to every issue and act in accordance with the facts. This I have tried to do and this I intend to do. I am somewhat surprised that any industry association would think that this Senator, who has never hesitated to vote his convictions on a bill even if it was the only vote, would be convinced by a volume mail petition of the type suggested in the Western Pine Association memorandum.

I have one suggestion now for the Western Pine Association. I authorize the association to reproduce my comments of today on its memorandum of September 3 and my remarks of September 23 on lumber standards.

Perhaps the Western Pine Association would then like to arrange to have the N.L.M.A. send to them the blind copies of all letters on this issue that were sent to me under the prompting of the Western Pine September 3 memorandum.

The Western Pine Association could then send my Senate remarks to each individual who wrote as suggested by the association. This would assure that the authors of those letters would have no misunderstanding concerning my views on such a volume mail campaign.

Now, what about the allegation that the Senators named in the September 3 memorandum "were inclined to favor the new lumber sizes as being beneficial to both the industry and the consumers of lumber"? Speaking for myself only, I wish to make clear that there is no basis in fact for the statement of any lumber association that I am "inclined to favor the new lumber sizes as being beneficial to both the industry and the consumers of lumber." I have never taken an official position on the issue because I believe this is a subject that requires thorough review by the Lumber Standards Committee and the Department of Commerce. If and when I am called upon to consider legislation in this field, I will then make a final determination of the issue on the basis of what I think the preponderance of the evidence shows the public interest to be.

I have urged the Secretary of Commerce to make sure that any new lumber standards advance the general welfare of the lumber industry and that if changes are adopted they be effected in such a manner that there will be an absolute minimum of economic dislocation for the lumber producers.

POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO. RATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I am naturally interested in the rates charged to more than 375,000 Washington customers by the Potomac Electric Power Co. This company also has customers in parts of Maryland and Virginia adjoining the District.

I have been particularly interested in Pepco's rates ever since last spring. At that time, the vice chairman of the District Public Utilities Commission estimated that Pepco had taken in since 1959 nearly $18 million in profits above and beyond the allowable return of 5.85 percent annually.

Since the middle of the summer, I have understood that the PUC was going to investigate all of the rates, charges, services, level of earnings, and rate of return of the Potomac Electric Power Co. And I certainly have agreed that the PUC should investigate these factors. No public utility should be permitted to make excess profits at the expense of consumers who can buy from no other supplier.

As I understand the situation now, the first open hearing of the PUC's investigation is scheduled for November 1. I also am told, however, that the PUC is considering an informal Pepco proposal to cut its rates by $2.5 million a year.

Mr. President, I hope the PUC will promptly reject the company's informal proposal and proceed with a full and complete investigation of the rates. This matter first came to public attention last March, and a rate reduction of $2.5 million simply is not enough. The company apparently is making as much as $7 million a year over and above the approved rate of return.

Indeed, the PUC apparently expected Pepco to lower its rates by a considerable amount last summer. The Commission actually asked for a schedule of lower rates to be effective July 1. But R. Roy Dunn, president of Pepco, replied that Pepco would work up a plan of "promotional rates to benefit" its customers.

Such rates are supposed to encourage the customer to use more electricity. If the customer does, in fact, use more electricity, he is charged a lower rate. The point is, he cannot get the lower rate unless he uses more electricity.

Mr. Dunn told the Washington Star he did not know whether the plan of promotional rates would mean lower electric bills for customers who did not use more electricity.

Finally on July 30, the PUC announced it would investigate "all rates, charges, services, level of earnings and rate of return" of the Potomac Electric Power Co.

What caused the Commission to act? I think it acted because it had analyzed Pepco's proposals to reduce rates for space heating, hot water heating, and commercial use. Pepco itself had estimated these proposals would cut its annual revenues by $400,000.

This was a long, long way from $7 million. It was just a little more than $1 for each Pepco customer, and the customers could not get the rate reduction unless they used more electricity.

The company now has withdrawn its $400,000 proposal and has brought forward another proposal, which is still not formal, to reduce its rates by $2.5 million a year. I repeat, Mr. President, that the PUC should promptly reject this informal proposal and proceed with a formal and complete investigation of Pepco's rates.

These discussions of informal proposals have required nearly 8 months, and Washington customers of Pepco are still paying the same rates in effect when the discussions began. It might be argued, in view of these facts, that the PUC should accept the $2.5 million reduction and see that it is installed promptly. This, it might be said, would be practical and efficient.

But let me point out, Mr. President, that $2.5 million is just slightly more than one-third of the excess revenues that the company apparently is taking in each year. And there is absolutely no way for Washington customers to recover any of the overcharges they have paid since 1959. The PUC should not accept a one-third measure nor even a one-half measure; it should seek, and obtain, a full equitable measure of rate reduction.

Mr. President, the PUC's vice chairman, Edgar H. Bernstein, says Pepco has regularly, since 1959, earned more than its allowable rate. I think the company should be held to its allowable rate, and the PUC's full investigation should establish just what that rate is. The company must not be permitted to continue taking excess profits from its customers in the Washington area.

Mr. President, I would also like to call attention to a series of articles on utility regulation which appeared recently in the Washington Daily News. Written by Mr. Rice Odell, the articles constitute an excellent outline of the problems of regulating utilities, of the problems facing utilities, and of the problems of the utility consumers.

Mr. Odell noted in his final article that even if utility rates are found to be excesive, "you—the consumer—will not get back any of the extra money you have been paying."

This means, of course, that no matter how much of an overcharge might be disclosed by the District of Columbia PUC in the Pepco case, this money cannot be recaptured. Regulation of electric rates simply does not contain provisions for recapturing excess profits.

Mr. Odell added that this problem "suggests the need for some type of legislation" and that "it appears that the cumbersome, vulnerable system—of regulation—designed to protect the consumer is not a success. It is too easy for him to be overcharged, and with no chance of getting any refund."

Mr. President, I certainly hope the District of Columbia PUC will consider possible solutions to this chronic problem of utility regulation, one which the current Pepco case dramatizes all too vividly.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION REGULATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Governor of Oregon, Hon. Mark O. Hatfield, has forwarded to me a wire expressing his opinion that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1963, if enacted, will hamper the water pollution programs of the States and prejudice the rights of many citizens.

In order that my colleagues may be apprised of the views of Governor Hatfield, I ask unanimous consent that his wire of October 13 be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, OREG.,
October 14, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Have just reviewed Public Works Committee Report No. 556 on S. 649, Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1963. We believe amended bill would hamper State efforts in water pollution field, conflict with statutory authority of several agencies and prejudice rights of many citizens. Request you attempt delay further consideration pending advice from Oregon and other States. Letter will follow.

MARK O. HATFIELD.

RESTORATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a telegram I have received from the consul general of the constitutional government of the Dominican Republic. It shows that any policy of the United States to circumvent the constitutional government of the Dominican Republic which was overthrown by a military junta will be resented by the supporters of constitutional government in that tragic country.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
October 14, 1963.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

As consul general of the lawful constitutional Government of the Dominican Republic representing more than 30,000 Dominicans in New York I wish to convey to you the gratitude of the Dominican people for your strong and rightful position in favor of the restoration of the constitutional Government in my country and the halt of diplomatic recognition and all aid from this great democracy to the military dictatorship that is conducting a reign of terror in the Dominican Republic.

Respectfully yours,
GASTON ESPINAL,
Consul General of the Constitutional Government of Dominican Republic.

CHILE'S TAX AND FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce in the RECORD a recent column by Eliot Janeway entitled "Chile Ought To Be Independently Rich." It is an excellent and able discussion of the subject. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD three articles on some of Chile's tax and fiscal policies. One of May 14, 1963, from El Mercurio (Santiago). Another from PEC (Santiago), August 24, 1963, and still another from El Diario Ilustrado, September 3, 1963.

There being no objection, the column and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 24, 1963]

CHILE OUGHT TO BE INDEPENDENTLY RICH

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, March 24.—The longer we persist in thinking of the region to the south of us as Latin America, the longer we'll go on having troubles there. Latin America is made up of a number of different areas. Some of them are more advanced than others. Some of them are poorer than others. Some of them produce goods that are in glut. A few of them produce goods that the world wants and will pay a premium to get. One of these fortunate few is Chile.

What Chile produces, as everyone knows, is mainly copper. In a rational world, this would mean that Chile is rich. For in all the major consuming countries which need copper and are able and anxious to pay for it, native copper either doesn't exist (as in Western Europe) or is in short supply (as in the United States or Russia).

Of the four major industrial regions in the world, the United States is the most important copper producer. Nevertheless, the United States is and always must be a net copper importer—even if domestic consumption were at depression levels. And in any national emergency, the United States would find itself caught overnight in a copper famine, as it was during the Korean emergency.

ARE COPPER HAVE-NOTS

The three other centers of industrial production—Western Europe, Russia, and the Asiatic complex stretching from the islands of Japan through Red China to Hong Kong—are all copper have-nots. They are all dependent on oversea points of supply of which Chile's are rich, available, centrally located, and militarily trustworthy.

This means that our rich creditors in Western Europe, as well as our resourceful enemies in Russia and China and our energetic competitors in Japan, all need Chile, and are anxious to pay her whatever the traffic will bear for the copper that they want and she has.

On the face of it, therefore, Chile ought to be calling the turn, and the United States, Western Europe, Russia, China, and Japan ought to be lining up for the privilege of buying from her. If Chile were taking advantage of her potential hold over the great powers, most of which are copper have-nots, she would be financially self-sufficient at the very least; and she could be financing her own social progress and copper expansion.

PAYS CASH ON THE LINE

The most eloquent proof of this is the way Russia buys copper. It is the one basic commodity for which she pays cash on the barrelhead, no questions asked, and no complaints.

This points up Chile's potential strength in the marketplace, and explains why, in a commonsense world, she certainly would be solvent and a good investment risk for private capital.

EASY, UNSTABLE MENDICANT

Instead, Chile is a mendicant, and a very easy and, unstable one. If the Alliance for Progress is going to be worth the powder to blow it to hell, it will have to figure out some commercial way to enable Chile to take advantage of commercial opportunities.

If only the political climate in Chile were conducive to private investment in copper expansion, Chilean capital invested elsewhere would migrate home again and grab at the chance.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, is chairman of the Latin American Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He is preparing to hold hearings, postponed since the Cuban crisis, on the problem of private investment in Latin America—why it is that European customers for Latin America's basic commodities aren't willing to make it, and why U.S. foreign aid should continue where U.S. private capital needs the product and would be willing (if welcome) to invest in needed new capacity.

So long as Chile continues to rely on U.S. foreign aid or, what is the same thing, on the hope of U.S. Government-guaranteed private advances; and so long as she ignores the chance to graduate from political handouts and to go into business on a self-financing basis (as she can); she will be reaching for the short end of the stick.

[From the El Mercurio (Santiago), May 14, 1963]

Creation of conditions which offer an attractive (investment) climate is needed for possible new capital as well as for expansion of investments already in effect. If we must call things by their name, we must recognize that institutional stability and democratic normality are not the only stimulants which the investor seeks. To these must be added the stability of the conditions which we establish (for new capital), and the observance of juridical norms which offers the guarantee that we will not suddenly and arbitrarily change them or will there be unjustified discrimination between national and foreign companies.

One of the factors that has held back the Large Copper Mining Industry has been the frequent change in legal criteria regarding it, and the instability of the tax dispositions affecting it. After having established what is called the "new deal," diverse laws have altered the basis of that legislation and the idea of establishing still higher taxes on the industry to finance various expenditures is continually heard.

Capital, no matter of what origin, looks for confidence above everything. To have that there must be stability in the system under which they work. Continued changes in criteria and measures create uncertainty and misgiving. The discouragement of those who have investments in the country provokes, in turn, the hesitancy of those who might bring in more capital.

[From the PEC, Santiago, Aug. 24, 1963]

The tax instability has resulted in a reluctance on the part of the mining companies to invest. This is obvious because it is difficult to explain to foreign shareholders that an insignificant profit margin is left after taxes, wages, salaries, social laws, local purchases, etc., so that they receive less, in dividends, than what the Chilean banks pay on time deposits.

We cannot find it strange that international capital moves its investments to Africa, Canada, United States, Peru, and other countries. The tax rate even in the most politically unstable nation is below 45 percent. However, in Chile, the copper tax has gone above the 80-percent average, and in the case of one company, to almost 87 percent.

For these reasons, the least we can expect is congressional approval of the governmental initiative to introduce the necessary dispositions in the tax reform bill to provide tax stability to foreign investors.

[From El Diario Ilustrado, Sept. 3, 1963]

Is anyone in the world capable of being interested in a business that pays 87 percent of its earnings in taxes? This clearly explains the reason why the (copper) companies are not interested in continuing to invest more capital in Chile while there is much interest in making investments in other countries such as Katanga, Canada, Peru, United States, etc., where the taxes on copper profits are less than 45 percent.

These facts of overwhelming eloquence, demonstrating the suicidal policy that we have followed with copper, very similar to that which we followed with nitrate and which brought down a great source of national wealth, has made the Government think about the necessity of establishing tax stability for copper as established in law 11,828.

Someone may ask if it would not be imprudent, in view of the Treasury's situation, to open up the possibilities of repealing laws levying taxes. This argument will be used by the opposition, because the opposition in Chile is distinguished by its obstructive will, by its combating any initiative that might be helpful to the nation's progress and general well-being. The opposition is angered by any effective realization because it takes away electoral support which is what it is eagerly seeking because it finds it needs it.

THE NATIONAL BORDER PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senator Don Antonio J. Bermudez, director general of the Mexican national border program made a very able speech at Ciudad Juárez, on September 25, 1963. Because the Mexican border project is of great importance to all of the American communities along our long border with Mexico I ask unanimous consent that this fine speech, which is really binational in effect, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DON ANTONIO J. BERMUDEZ, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL BORDER PROGRAM AT THE DEDICATION OF THE WORKS CARRIED OUT IN PIEDRAS NEGRAS, COAHUILA, AND CIUDAD JUÁREZ, CHIHUAHUA, SEPTEMBER 25, 1963

Mr. President, one of the worthy accomplishments of your administration that posterity will recognize, is the fact of having discovered that our borders—and this is particularly noteworthy in the case of our very extensive north frontier—constitute true geographic-economic regions, and the consequent formulation of a border policy as part of the noble endeavor in behalf of national integration.

You perceived that along the 2,597 kilometers of our northern border there is a persistent peculiarity (with variations only in degree): The contrast, more often than not disagreeable, between the material living conditions of our frontier towns and those of the United States.

A line of contact between two peoples with a differing historic tradition and disparate levels of economic development, the border should and can provide an opportunity for a fruitful interchange of human experience within an environment of cooperation and peace and the encouragement of economic activities that favor mutual improvement within a dynamic and respectful interdependence. However, the abovementioned contrast often operates in an opposite sense, generating sentiments that are contrary to the necessary fraternity that your international policy has so actively advocated, with the general applause of the Mexican people.

For all these reasons you created the national border program, in the certainty that the vigorous Mexican people, in response simply to the encouragement afforded by the creation of favorable material conditions, would with high morale undertake the task of raising their standard of living, refine their native values, and strengthen the sense of their own worth—an indispensable requisite for authentic friendship with our neighboring country.

Today, in your visit to Piedras Negras and to this city you cannot fail to have received the impression that people of the frontier regard you with profound gratitude and recognition, accompanied by a strong rebirth of their powers and an enormous confidence in a better future.

Piedras Negras, your first stop, is the most important border city in the State of Coahuila and one endowed with a sound revolutionary tradition. The town has undergone a complete transformation with the demolition of the group of blocks that made up the city's downtown area, to make way for the great gateway to Mexico that now houses, with distinction and decorum, the customs, immigration, health, and tourism offices, thus improving the services rendered to the public.

Within a short while the city of Piedras Negras has recovered its own physiognomy, that of Mexico that had been hidden heretofore under the mantle of poverty and abandonment—all for the lack of the initiative of a great Mexican, President Lopez Mateos, to awaken the creative enthusiasm of all the frontier towns.

This great gateway to Mexico is an invitation to friendship and stands for the self-respecting and, at the same time, cordial hospitality that distinguishes every Mexican. Piedras Negras is proud to present to the visitor today the true appearance of our nationality.

Ciudad Juárez is the most important city on the frontier and bears the name of the immortal leader who definitively consolidated Mexico's nationality and whose life and example, today and forever, rule the destinies of our native land. Here we should like to show you the initial works, part of the greater and more important projects, of the national border program:

Friendship Bridge, thus called because friendship is the virtue on which border relations should be founded—friendship based on dignity, on understanding, on mutual respect;

Urbanization projects that are being executed from the Corte de Córdova as far as the new development in the eastern part of the city which, together with the new bridge, has a share in the two-way flow of international traffic;

The Museum of History, where the visitor can obtain in short order a panoramic view, real and exciting, of an admirable and varied culture such as ours. In this museum the foreigner can gain an unsuspected insight into what we really are, which will fully support our claim to receiving the respect that we, for our part, always give to other peoples.

For the time being in the museum building we are holding a border exhibition of the Mexican textile and garment industry, so that the pride of being Mexican will also mean the pride of consuming what Mexico produces. This exhibit will give a clear idea of the quality, good taste, and splendid finish shown in cloth and fashions, that point up our possibilities in those industries.

You will see the hall designed for conventions and expositions, now under construction, a site for civic meetings that will be open for United States as well as Mexican conventions. Here the inhabitants of Ciudad Juárez and El Paso, Tex., can submit their common problems to fraternal discussion. You will also see the works for the commercial center where, as is natural, we will—present to the border public—foreign as well as Mexican—the various products turned out by our domestic industry.

Before 2 months are up construction will have begun on a splendid hotel-motel of the class merited by this city.

The master plan provides for an area devoted to new industries, connected with the commercial and residential sections by means of "President López Mateos" Avenue, so named by the people of Ciudad Juárez in remembrance of, and paying homage to the Chief Executive who knew how to enhance the energies and encourage the enthusiasm of the border dweller. The industrial zone has been laid out in keeping with factors that favor its development, such as: two railroads, two highways, sufficient water supply, electricity and petroleum-produced energy, and an abundance of land plots. For while our immediate aim is to bring commodities produced by national industry to the border, our next step, and perhaps the most important one, should be to create a local industry here that has the right to serve a market that, although belonging to us, has heretofore contributed mainly to a strengthening of the economy of the neighboring cities in the United States.

With its 2,597 kilometers in length, the border line in size terms is comparable only to the great opportunities afforded all Mexicans (not just the border inhabitants) to contribute to the integration of the national economy. The support given by private enterprise to the projects sponsored by the national border program figures as one of the most eloquent manifestations of the harmony existing between the supreme government and Mexico's businessmen.

As a result of the material projects of the program, numerous opportunities have arisen for the initiation of varied industrial and commercial activities, all of which will be (or are if already established) in the hands of private enterprise, since the program was not intended to play the role of entrepreneur or administrator. So great are the prospects that have been opened up that I take the liberty once again to exhort Mexico's businessmen to invest their capital and demonstrate their initiative in the development of businesses along the frontier.

The long distances between the frontier zone and the centers of highest domestic production, as well as communications and transportation deficiences, had helped seggregate this zone from our market—a zone where the population explosion indices outdistance those for the rest of the country. As a result of this circumstance, in many, and very important areas, this expanding market has been able to satisfy its needs solely in the neighboring U.S. commercial centers.

Progress achieved at every level through the application of the program of the Mexican Revolution, together with the specific stimulus that the national border program offers to domestic businessmen, support the forecast that this great market, with its enormous potential resources, will at an early date have been integrated within national economic development plans. It is anticipated that products from the central portion of the country will very soon contribute in a greater proportion to regional border development. Even more important, we trust that factories, laboratories, and various other industries will settle all along the border that will have an output capable of competing in quality and price with the U.S. goods that up until now have been acquired by this industrious portion of the Mexican population.

There is no conflict of interest in what I have just said, for in our day every economist recognizes that unilateral trade produces disastrous final consequences; he acknowledges that a good market is the basis for increasingly active and favorable commerce, and that there is no better way to strengthen the economy of a country than to follow the road to industrialization.

Our neighbors to the north, with their broad understanding and profound practical sense, regard our material development with approval. Those who best represent and embody this constructive spirit are the progressives, who are well aware that their own interests do not depend on the maintenance of a situation of predominance by their products over our market, but on the steady growth of that market.

For this reason, and because of the simple but realistic consideration that a rich customer, is a better customer—for this reason, I say, the progressive men in the United States look with favor on the Mexicans' endeavor to improve their own standard of living.

The national border program is not limited to the realization of material projects alone. Much more important is the utilization of these projects as a spring mechanism to promote an awareness of the fundamental values that should govern our lives. First of all, there is the recognition that work is the only thing that exalts men and nations. Founded on the natural resources we possess and on the undeniable capabilities of our manpower, work is the best source of physical and spiritual—well-being on which we can rely. Work, material resources, and the human element constitute the threefold key to the progress and well-being that are the right of a people that has suffered the privation imposed by poverty.

Thus it is that peace, work, and progress comprise Mexico's road, the road mapped out by you, Mr. President, the road down which we are traveling.

The honor of your visit coincides with two great national events that have secured for you a well-merited place and chapter in our history: the anniversary of the nationalization of the electric power industry and the most outstanding development of our time in Mexican life—the recovery of the Chamizal area.

Mexicans everywhere, but particularly the men from Chihuahua, have cause for the deepest emotion on seeing the patriotic manner in which you conducted the negotiations.

Another important feature of the agreement regarding the Chamizal is the correspondingly enhanced hope that in the very near future, under the same terms of friendship and justice, the problem of the salinity of the waters that irrigate the lands of Lower California will be solved.

If after a century we were able to recover a piece of land that has now been reincorporated into our territory, with the same faith we should work toward recovering the Mexican border market, strengthening legitimate pride in our nationality, and consolidating our economic independence.

This is the task that you have assigned us, Mr. President, a task which thousands upon thousands of border dwellers are bound and determined to bring to fruition.

Thank you.

AN ALLIANCE FOR LIFE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on September 20, 1963, President Kennedy delivered a historic address before the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations.

News reports of his great speech tended to highlight—and quite naturally—the President's suggestion that the United States and the Soviet Union explore the possibility of joint efforts to reach the moon.

But elsewhere in the speech, President Kennedy submitted magnificent proposals for improving the conditions of man here on earth.

He spoke inspiringly of joint endeavors in the battle against, and I quote:

> Plague and pestilence, and plunder and pollution, the hazards of nature and the hunger of children.

He mentioned the indirect, as well as the direct, effects of works for peace. He noted that, and again I quote:

> Peace is a daily, a weekly, a monthly process, gradually changing opinions, slowly eroding old barriers, quietly building new structures. * * * However undramatic the pursuit of peace, that pursuit must go on.

The pursuit of peace is immeasurably aided by concrete deeds to serve the family of man—deeds which speak in ways that all men can hear and understand.

Few deeds speak more eloquently than actions against deadly killers which threaten all mankind—cancer, heart disease and other foes of health.

In the battle against these diseases, all men are united.

I mention specifically the President's two great proposals for worldwide teamwork in health. This is what he said:

> More can be done—a world center for health communications under the World Health Organization could warn of epidemics and the adverse effects of certain drugs as well as transmit the results of new experiments and new discoveries.
>
> Regional research centers could advance our common medical knowledge and train new scientists and doctors for new nations.

Mr. President, I strongly endorse the proposed World Center for Health Communications under the World Health Organization and regional medical research centers.

It has been my privilege to strive for these and related objectives through the years.

The purpose of this statement today is, therefore, to support the President and to expand upon it with certain additional closely allied suggestions.

I propose a program which might be called an alliance for life. This Nation is already well embarked in a great Alliance for Progress program with our sister Republics of Latin America.

Health aid, of course, is a keystone of the joint inter-American effort to raise overall living standards. Aid for other goals—for education, farming, industry, transportation, housing—are additional vital elements in economic progress.

But health is the most basic element of all. With poor health, life ebbs.

With good health, life can be fulfilled in all its potential.

NINE-POINT PROGRAM

I recommend at this time, therefore, this nine-point program.

First. We must revitalize a 3-year-old law which is on the statute books but which, because of a variety of factors, has been severely handicapped.

I refer to Public Law 86–610, the International Health Research Act of 1960.

This act provided a broad mandate to the U.S. Government for international health research cooperation. The act bears the great name of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

It was my personal privilege to cosponsor this law with him and with other Senators.

Unfortunately, as my colleague knows, one of the most crucial parts of that law has not been implemented in all this time.

Let me describe the background of this problem. Public Law 86–610 had two major purposes: To advance the status of the health sciences in the United States and thereby the health of the American people through cooperative endeavors with other countries in health research and research training and to advance the international status of the health sciences through cooperative enterprises in health research, research planning, and research training.

In order to enable the executive branch of the Government to carry out the intent of the first major purpose, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service was granted authorization to participate with other countries in the furtherance of health research and research training, through the awarding of research grants and fellowships, the interchange of medical research scientists and experts, the participation in scientific meetings and conferences and other international activities. However, authority to carry out the second purpose was reserved for the President of the United States.

Since 1960, the U.S. Public Health Service, through the National Institutes of Health—to which responsibility for executing the "national" program was delegated—has proceeded to develop a program of international cooperation involving many countries and almost every important international organization engaged in biomedical research in the world.

The Department of State has preferred, however, that the Office of the President not delegate authority under the second purpose of Public Law 86–610, which I mentioned earlier.

Year after year, I have taken up this issue with the Department of State, as have the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service and other sources, including the senior Senator from Alabama. However, the view has persisted within the State Department, and within the Agency for International Development, that the President's conduct of foreign policy is indivisible and precludes such delegation. I do not agree. I have never agreed. This is one U.S. Government. There is no reason the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cannot be relied upon to spearhead oversea health efforts which remain in faithful conformity to overall U.S. diplomatic policy abroad, as laid down by the Office of the President, and as implemented by the Department of State.

My view is shared, I know, by Senator HILL, and by the able Member of the House of Representatives who has been most closely identified in that body with health research. I refer, of course, to the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.

In a recent excellent address before the Third National Conference on World Health, Congressman FOGARTY reiterated the case for full delegation of authority under Public Law 86–610 to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Within a few days, one of the great leaders in U.S. medical journalism, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, added his own plea for this and related goals. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Rusk's fine column on this subject, as published in the New York Times, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this Nation, I may say, is profoundly indebted to Dr. Rusk. We should be grateful not only for his expert articles on leading health issues and for his incomparable contributions in his own medical field of rehabilitation, but for serving as a conscience of the American people on a wide variety of humanitarian issues.

And so, I earnestly hope the President will delegate to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the authority granted to him by the International Health Research Act of 1960, "to advance the international status of the health sciences through cooperative enterprises in health research, research planning and research training."

EXPAND NIH OVERSEA PROGRAM

Second. We must expand the present National Institutes of Health program for oversea support. I refer to three such programs—support of international research, of research training, and of research communication.

All are authorized under Public Law 86–610. Under this program the National Institutes of Health expended $30 million for international cooperative activities in fiscal year 1963. Of this total about $20 million was invested in foreign medical research and the remaining $10 million for research training abroad, or in the United States.

During fiscal year 1963 about $13.6 of the $20 million was awarded to foreign institutions through research grants and contracts. Another $1.8 million was awarded to international organizations, including $614,000 in grants to the World Health Organization, $500,000 in grants to the regional Pan American Health Organization and $400,000 in grants to the Institute of Nutrition in Central America and Panama.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing estimated projections for international health programs be printed at the conclusion of my comments.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the figures which I have just mentioned may seem large. Actually, they are modest in comparison to what the U.S. Senate originally approved years ago and what the United States and the world actually need today.

In 1958, Senator HILL proposed and, in 1959, the Senate approved a $50 million authorization for what he, others, and I sought as a new National Institute for International Medical Research.

Unfortunately, in the final law, as enacted in conference, neither the new Institute nor the specific authorization were approved. The program has, therefore, grown only slowly in scope and depth. In fiscal year 1964, the program involves $32.2 million. That is a sizable amount, and yet, when you break it down by its major components, each is comparatively small.

For example, the medical research elements of the Public Law 480 foreign currency program in fiscal year 1964 are scheduled to be only $2.1 million and in fiscal year 1965 only $1.5 million. This program literally has been going backward instead of forward. I shall have more to say on this in a few moments.

The NIH visiting scientists program is scheduled to be only $1.3 million in fiscal year 1964 and the identical figure in fiscal year 1965.

Let me state very frankly that one of the principal obstacles to the orderly growth of the vital international program has been the concern of the Bureau of the Budget over the level of oversea spending. I have commented in the Senate on previous occasions on the issue which concerns the Bureau—the U.S. balance-of-payments problem.

At the same time, it seems to me absurd to hold back an oversea health program whose grand total is only $32 million when we are speaking of a multibillion-dollar balance-of-payments problem.

I know of no single program in the entire international scientific effort, with the exception of defense research, which is more important than medical research.

ESTABLISH SEPARATE INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH BUDGET

Third. Congress should proceed to realize the goal which Senator HILL, other Senators, and I originally had in mind in the first version of the "Health for Peace" Act—namely, a separately identifiable international health research program; I mean a program which is not obscured as one of but many elements in the present omnibus efforts of the Office of the Director of NIH.

Thus, there should be a separate budget for international medical research. In this way, we could increase the degree of effort being put forth in this area. This budget should include what I believe should be an appropriation of $25 million to accommodate new activities which would result from the proposed Presidential delegation of authority to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ESTABLISH INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL CONFERENCE CENTER

Fourth. Congress should make specific provision for an International Medical Conference Center. Such a Center would greatly facilitate NIH's international program.

It would end the deplorable embarrassment which U.S. medical leaders chronically and inevitably experience because conference facilities are so sadly lacking.

The Center would cost around $4 million. Through it, both NIH and the National Library of Medicine would have for the first time the resources to bring together scientists to share their experiences under the most favorable and timesaving conditions.

It is a regrettable paradox that in spite of the extensive participation of the United States in international medical affairs and the desirability and probability that this involvement will increase, there is no place in the United States available for the efficient conduct of medical meetings, symposia, and working seminars attended by scientists of different countries.

While the National Institutes of Health is a medical research center which attracts hundreds of people from foreign countries every year, it has no facilities equipped, for example, for simultaneous translation and for suitable conduct of this important aspect of medical research.

This issue has been discussed in the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees. I earnestly hope that my colleagues in both Houses will support what I believe is the sympathetic interest of these subcommittees toward establishing such a center.

ESTABLISH TWO NEW INTERNATIONAL CENTERS WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Fifth. Not less than two additional international centers for medical research and training should be established.

There are at present five such NIH-supported centers. Each has been established through collaborative agreements between American medical schools and foreign medical research institutions in developing nations: the University of California with the Institute of Medical Research, Kuala Lumpur, Malaya; Tulane University with the University del Valle, Cali, Colombia; Johns Hopkins University with Calcutta School of Tropical Medicine, India; Louisiana State University with the University of Costa Rica, San Jose; and the University of Maryland with the Institute of Hygiene, Lahore, West Pakistan.

Each of the international centers consists of two operational elements: one, a research and training activity in the United States, including both American and foreign medical investigators which is closely related to, two, specific research and training conducted in the oversea institution. There, American scientists may have the advantage of conducting research under unusual environmental, ethnic, and medical conditions not available for study at home. The centers are oriented generally toward the need of American physicians and scientists—giving them the stimulus of research in foreign settings. But a corollary advantage of the centers is the stimulus and experience afforded the foreign collaborating institutions to develop and expand indigenous medical research and training resources. Two and one-half million dollars is spent for this purpose at present.

At least $1 million dollars in additional funds is urgently needed.

JOINT CENTERS WITH WESTERN NATIONS

Sixth. I urge the prompt implementation of the President's concept for joint research centers, both with the Western nations which have so much to contribute and with the Eastern bloc powers.

In March 1962, it was my pleasure to address several distinguished Canadian audiences on the subject of international health, including the Health Committees of the Canadian Senate and House of Commons and the Health League of Canada.

At that time, I proposed a Canadian-United States Joint Research Center as a nucleus for additional joint centers to be established in other countries.

One such Center could, for example, be established in a country which is a natural "meeting ground" for East and West—namely, Poland. The Center could be set up at the American Research Hospital for Children in Poland. This historic institution now is approaching completion by virtue of what is known as the Zablocki-Humphrey law.

In no single area of health are East and West more united than as regards the health of our children. At the great city of Krakow, with its ancient traditions of science and learning, there could be built a pioneering center in which the entire Eastern bloc and the Western nations could conveniently work as a team.

We could "break new ground" in a great work of peace—a great Health for Peace Center.

INTERNATIONAL DRUG COOPERATION PROGRAM

Seventh. Next, I should like to elaborate upon the President's proposal for the World Health Organization to serve as a Communication Center on adverse effects on drugs.

This sound idea should, in my judgment, be part and parcel of making the World Health Organization a center of a worldwide communications network on the favorable effects of drugs, as well.

After all, adverse effects and beneficial effects are two sides of the same coin.

We all know that drugs which are so superb that they can genuinely be called miraculous have literally saved scores of millions of lives. New drugs are constantly emerging—principally from the laboratories of the American pharmaceutical industry and, to a lesser extent, from drug industries in a few other countries and from Government supported and other private institutions.

But there is too long a timelag in communication of information about these new drugs—their positive and their occasional negative side. The World Health Organization is an ideal instrument to "accentuate the positive" and help "eliminate the negative."

Let there be no fear that WHO might in any way "interfere with or try to substitute for" regular world channels of medical communication.

The medical profession, for example, has its own valuable "arm" in the form of the World Medical Association.

Literally 5,000 medical journals and many medical congresses and symposia already serve as international communication arteries.

But everyone who has ever studied the world health communication problem knows that some one organization such as WHO is needed as a catalyst to strengthen existing haphazard, scrambled drug communication programs. In accordance with decisions reached at the 1962 assembly, WHO is, at present, embarked on a limited drug program. It will receive data on drugs withdrawn from markets or on severe adverse reactions, and will transmit such data to member governments. But this program does not represent the tiniest fraction of what WHO can do and should do to spearhead international pharmaceutical cooperation and communication. This requires funds. The funds should be made available by every country in a position to do so.

Let me state very frankly that there remain some in this country, including in the American pharmaceutical industry, who are somewhat concerned lest an expanding WHO act as what is sometimes mistakenly termed a "supergovernment." No such fear is justified.

WHO is the instrument—not the master—of its member governments. WHO has one of the finest records of all intergovernmental organizations, in serving and carrying out the democratic mandate of its member countries.

In no major issue that I can recall, for example, has the Communist bloc been able to bend WHO to communism's will against the will of the ovewhelming mass of mankind.

Indeed, in few intergovernmental organizations has there been less of a cold war than in WHO. In few organizations have we genuinely cooperated more with countries of different ideology than in WHO.

In urging WHO to assist in the drug field, we lead from U.S. strength. No country has done more for mankind to develop safe, efficacious drugs than the United States. No country can be prouder of its present and projected future drug role than the United States. No country will gain more in prestige from expanded drug assistance than the United States.

And this would not in any way jeopardize—indeed it should and would strengthen—the private enterprise character of American drug effort. It would and could expand the oversea market for our privately made drugs and vaccines.

Let no one expect that WHO can undertake a drug program without expanded funds. All of its existing funds are long since committed to priority needs.

I urge the Department of State to redouble its efforts to impress upon other member governments which have the financial means, the need to help finance the type of expanded program which I have recommended.

The U.S. Government should not have to bear this fiscal burden alone. It is we who have carried almost the exclusive burden of WHO in medical research and support. Four years ago I pointed out in a subcommittee report on WHO that foreign multilateral support is essential. The Soviet Union and the industrialized Western countries certainly can afford to dig down into their pockets to provide special contributions to WHO to realize the research objectives which I have just mentioned.

If the Soviet Union, in particular, can afford to spend billions of rubles to send rockets to the moon, it can afford a few hundred million rubles to assist the World Health Organization in the type of projects which President Kennedy proposed.

USE MORE FOREIGN CURRENCY OWNED OR MANAGED BY THE UNITED STATES

Eighth. Earlier, I referred to the very small amount of foreign currency being used under the Public Law 480 program for oversea medical research and communication.

I want to say very frankly that I am seriously disappointed with the relatively paltry use of funds of this nature for health research. A variety of factors is responsible.

Generally speaking, the United States tends to have the biggest credits of foreign currency accumulated in countries whose governments may be disinclined or unable to commit these currencies for health research because of several factors: First, acute shortage of skilled scientists; second, fear of an alleged "inflationary" impact of more health spending; and third, inability to add new health projects because of relatively rigid 5-, 6-, or 7-year plans.

Therefore, I understand NIH's difficulties in moving ahead with this program.

One of the ways to help overcome these difficulties is through the Congress appropriating—in the next fiscal year—not less than a million American dollars in order to backstop foreign currency in the Public Law 480 program. Time and again, I have been told in developing countries that they cannot purchase modern-type equipment with their own foreign currency. A small amount of American dollars would, therefore, help make fruitful a much larger amount of foreign currencies in this specific program.

My colleagues will, I believe, appreciate that I speak of these Public Law 480 funds out of long experience.

This specific use of these funds was made possible by what is known as the Humphrey amendment which added section 104K to Public Law 480 by Public Law 85-477, enacted June 30, 1958.

Senate Report No. 1627, 85th Congress, explained:

> The amendment would make it possible to use foreign currencies accruing under title I of Public Law 480 to collect, collate, translate, abstract, and disseminate scientific and technological information and to conduct and support scientific activities overseas. It is specified that these activities could include programs and projects of scientific cooperation between the United States and other countries, such as coordinated research against diseases common to all of mankind or unique to individual regions of the globe.
>
> Activities of this kind authorized by the amendment seem to the committee to hold great promise.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Obvious possibilities are raised of fruitful collaboration between the American and foreign scientific communities. This collaboration should be advantageous not only in terms of its scientific results but also in terms of better people-to-people understanding. This is perhaps particularly true in regard to medical research.

In a final conference report, House Report No. 2038, however, it was specified that—

> No foreign currencies can be used for this purpose unless specific appropriations are made therefor.

This requirement has been one of but many delaying factors in the implementation of the program.

Two months later, in Senate Resolution 347, 85th Congress, August 1958, the Senate approved a resolution for a study of international health which I sponsored. Out of this resolution came, I believe, the broadest study of international health activities ever made by a committee of the Congress.

It was conducted by the Senate Committee on Government Operations through the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of which I am chairman.

From this study came three hearing-exhibit volumes, 11 committee prints and a report. But most important, there came major actions on the international health front. This included improved coordination of U.S. Government oversea health programs.

STRENGTHEN INTERNATIONAL HEALTH ASSISTANCE

Ninth. At this point, a careful distinction must now be made. In speaking of international health, we are considering two distinct, but related, aspects. One is international health assistance to the developing countries. This refers primarily to programs of public health—like eradication of malaria, and, in time to come, of cholera, smallpox, and other scourges, plus provision of sanitary water and sewage systems, training of more physicians, nurses, sanitarians, and other auxiliary health personnel.

The other challenge, to which I have already referred in detail, is more universal—medical research. It includes both the developed and the developing countries. It is geared to the solution of unsolved mysteries in diseases which afflict all mankind—cancer, heart disease, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, and so forth.

Health assistance is the less glamorous; yet it involves—immediately—the most dramatic, the most tangible, the most uplifting effects. It helps to "liberate" tens of millions of helpless people.

They—like their fathers and forefathers—have been enslaved by the bite of the anopheles mosquito or of the tsetse fly or by the infestation of blood flukes which devitalize them as human beings. They, like their fathers, have been blinded by trachoma or wracked by the tubercle bacillus. Despite all this, health assistance has invariably been at "the short end of the stick" both in our U.S. AID budget and in foreign budgets.

Fortunately, great good has been achieved in malaria eradication. But here, as elsewhere, tens of millions still suffer because only a relatively few million dollars are allocated; and programs are "stretched out" needlessly, instead of being accelerated.

And so, I urge strengthening of international health assistance—on both a bilateral and a multilateral basis.

These points, then, comprise the alliance for life program.

This program definitely involves the expenditure of additional American funds. Let this fiscal fact be faced not with fear, but with gratification.

Actually, this affluent Nation of ours can afford to spend more for its own and others health. The grand total of all the funds which I have projected does not equal the amount which we spend in a few experimental rocket shots at Cape Canaveral.

And the total propaganda effect of America's $20-or-so billion man-to-the-moon program will be infinitely less than the effect of the United States successfully announcing to the world—someday, we hope—"we have found the cure for cancer."

According to the latest estimates, there are 3.1 billion people on this planet. Each day, new life is born and old life—very often young life—dies.

Time is of the essence in the battle for life and in creating the Alliance for Life. Human beings, who die today, or tomorrow, or the next day, will be dead forever.

We cannot save them.

But we can save lives next year and in the years which follow—the lives of our own citizens and of others. We can spare them anguish which is so vast that it is beyond calculation—because of premature disease, disability and death.

Finally, we have reached a historic turning point in relations between East and West. We have an opportunity now—one which may not, perhaps, exist for a long time, unless we capitalize upon it to the fullest.

Mr. Khrushchev is not a young man. He knows the meaning of the health concepts I have expressed today.

On December 1, 1958, I discussed many of these concepts in my meeting with him in the Kremlin in Moscow. The meeting resulted in health advances. Out of my proposal to him, for example, for a Joint Perinatal Health Research Project, came the subsequent exchange of United States and Soviet delegations in maternal and child health. And out of our discussion, too, came increases in other U.S.-U.S.S.R. exchange of scientists.

I propose that we "sign" the Alliance for Life with Mr. Khrushchev and with the leaders of all other nations.

Let this be a treaty, not of parchment, but of concrete actions—of building new laboratories, new research hospitals and of training new and old scientists.

Let the Alliance for Life be written in life. Let it be manifest in the smiles and laughter of healthy bodies of countless children and adults.

Let us act so that future generations will bless us for our vision and humanity.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DELAYS IMPLEMENTING TOTAL PROGRAM DESPITE RECENT SCIENTIFIC ADVANCES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

WASHINGTON, September 28.—Despite a substantial increase in international scientific activities in health in recent years, the United States is still failing to take full advantage of the potential contributions of such activities to world peace.

This assertion was made here Wednesday by Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, in the opening presentation of the Third National Conference on World Health.

The conference was sponsored by the U.S. Committee for the World Health Organization, a voluntary citizens' group founded 11 years ago to promote understanding and support of international health activities by U.S. citizens. The committee is headed by Frank G. Boudreau, M.D., of New York. Dr. Boudreau formerly was president of the Milbank Memorial Fund.

Mr. FOGARTY's statement remained the theme of the 3-day conference.

HEALTH FOR PEACE BILL

Five years ago a measure known popularly as the "Health for Peace" bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. FOGARTY and in the Senate by Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama.

The measure had bipartisan support and among the 63 Senators who sponsored the bill was John F. Kennedy.

As Mr. FOGARTY pointed out to the conference, the original "health for peace" legislation was based on these major concepts:

That support of medical research outside the United States can advance our own national health because of the increased knowledge that would result from such research.

That the intimate contact resulting from collaborative efforts of U.S. scientists and those of other nations would improve the level of research not only abroad but in the United States as well.

That research directed toward the solution of the health problems of man on an international basis constitutes a powerful force for mutual understanding among nations.

These basic concepts, however, were greatly modified when the legislation was finally enacted as the International Health Research Act of 1961.

There was a clear delineation in the final bill between the national and the international objectives of the legislation.

To meet the national objectives, the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service was authorized to support programs abroad that would advance the health status of the American people. This is being done.

In the fiscal year 1962, the Public Health Service expended approximately $30 million in support of international research and research training.

COUNTERPART FUNDS USED

A portion of these expenditures was in U.S. dollars and a portion in counterpart funds. The latter are the currencies of other nations that accrue to the United States as the result of sales of surplus commodities. Under the terms of the sales these funds must be spent in the country making the purchase.

To meet the international objectives, the President was authorized to make grants and awards to support international health research and research training to further the international status of the health sciences.

The legislation provided he could delegate this authority, if he desired, to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This delegation has been requested by the Department, but the request has never been acted upon by the President.

As Representative FOGARTY told the conference: "Reluctance to delegate the Presidential authority in this area has prevented the most effective exploitation of this potential."

President Kennedy has repeatedly endorsed the principles of international cooperation in a unified global attack on disease, hunger, and poverty.

He did so again eloquently before the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 20, when he said:

"Never before has man had such capacity to control his own environment—to end thirst and hunger—to conquer poverty and disease—to banish illiteracy and massive human misery. We have the power to make this the best generation of mankind in the history of the world—or make it the last."

President Kennedy specifically proposed a world center for health communication under the World Health Organization and regional research centers to "advance our common medical knowledge and train new scientists and doctors for new nations."

In analyzing the factors behind President Kennedy's failure to implement the provisions of the health for peace program by not delegating this authority to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, one can arrive at only two possible conclusions.

The first is that the Government fears such a program would have a serious adverse effect on the international balance of payments confronting the United States.

The second is that there may be a jurisdictional dispute between the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning basic responsibility for administering the program.

The latter seems difficult to understand, for even the most elementary reasoning points out clearly that only the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has the staff and experience to direct and administer such a program.

The Department of State clearly does not have a capability for promoting, directing, and supervising highly technical, scientific research in the health fields.

FURTHER DELAY UNNEEDED

Within the area of international cooperative health research, we have the congressional authority and administrative mechanisms to move forward immediately toward the goals set by President Kennedy in his inaugural address, when he said: "Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease."

There is no logical reason for further delay.

The argument that implementation of the health for peace concepts would contribute adversely to our balance-of-payments problem would be logical if significant sums of money were involved.

The cost of the original proposals of Mr. FOGARTY and Senator HILL would be but about one-thousandth of our total governmental and private oversea expenditures. This is not a great amount when contrasted with the enormous contribution it would make both to our foreign policy objectives and the health of the world.

EXHIBIT 2

U.S. Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, estimated projections for the international program

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1964	Fiscal year 1965
Total	32,270	32,050
Medical research:		
Research grants and contracts	15,000	15,000
Foreign institutions	13,100	13,100
International organizations	1,900	1,900
Intergovernmental	1,600	1,600
World Health Organization	400	400
Pan American Health Organization	700	700
Institute of Nutrition, Central America and Panama	500	500
International professional organizations	300	300
Public Law 480 foreign currency program	2,100	1,500
Visiting scientists program	1,300	1,300
Medical research communications	----------	200
OIR headquarters and field offices	1,000	1,000
Research training:		
Foreign trainees at U.S. institutions	6,000	6,000
Foreign research fellows in United States	1,250	1,500
Americans studying abroad	2,200	2,200
Training grants to foreign institutions	420	350
ICMRT program	3,000	3,000

WHEAT DECISION IS WISE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Kennedy's decision to permit the sale of surplus wheat to the Soviet Union was sound. The Soviet Union is suffering from the disaster of a crop failure due in part to lack of rainfall and adverse weather conditions, but more importantly to the inability of the Communist system to compete with nations of the free world in agricultural production. Russian officials have appealed to this country to sell some of our surplus wheat.

With the wheat surplus a gigantic burden for American taxpayers, a big sale of wheat to the Russians at a good price will help solve our balance-of-payments problems and ease the burden on American taxpayers for storage charges. At present we have 1,156 million bushels of wheat in storage costing American taxpayers $145 million a year or $398,000 every day for storage alone. This in addition to the $2,168 million of taxpayers' money originally paid for this wheat. Rats and mice have been the only beneficiaries to date. At the same time the current drain on our gold reserves is about $2 billion a year. The proposed "cash on the barrelhead" sale of about $250 million of our surplus wheat would reduce storage charges by $200 million over a 5-year span, and help reduce our balance-of-payments deficit by more than 10 percent.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union will pay us the same price per bushel as it pays to the Canadian and Australian Governments for the huge quantities of wheat which these allies are shipping to the Russians. Also, President Kennedy has stated that this wheat is for delivery to and use in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe only. None of our wheat will be shipped to Castro's Cuba.

It has been charged that in making this sale the American taxpayer is subsidizing the Russian economy. It is true that the price our Government pays our farmers for surplus wheat is higher than the world market price which the Russians will pay. However, the Government subsidy price for wheat has been paid and will continue to be paid to our farmers regardless of whether we sell it to the Communists or store it at the expense of our taxpayers.

The only difference is that if we do not make the sale, taxpayers will continue to pay additional storage charges. Also, we shall continue to have useless wheat in storage for which the Russians will now pay us a quarter of a billion dollars. Furthermore, it is possible if we refuse such a sale our allies will purchase this wheat, convert it to flour, and then sell the needed flour to the Soviet Union. Whatever the economic arguments, it is likely that American wheat sooner or later will flow behind the Iron Curtain if these nations want it and are willing to pay shippers for it. We can and should exact what advantages we can from the exchange, and our President is doing just that.

Aside from many practical benefits, it is an American tradition to aid men, women, and children of any nation suffering hunger or famine. It would be inconsistent with the position of this country historically toward the requirements of other people for food if our Government were to object to selling American wheat to nations behind the Iron Curtain, whose people would otherwise go hungry. In 1922 the American Relief Administration under Herbert Hoover fed 18 million people in the Soviet Union during a severe famine and is credited with saving the lives of 9 million Russians.

History tells us that nations engaged in mutually satisfactory trade relations are unlikely to fight each other. The proposed sale of wheat would help somewhat toward reducing our present adverse balance of payments. It is possible that a wheat agreement would not only save American taxpayers money, bring in revenue, and help stop the outflow of gold, but also accelerate a new movement for understanding and peace. Most of all, it would display to the world that America's free enterprise system can outproduce Russian communism.

Mr. President, on October 10, 1963, the Plain Dealer, one of the great newspapers in Ohio and the Nation, published an editorial entitled "Wheat Decision Is Wise," supporting the President in his decision to sell wheat to the Soviet Union and other Communist bloc nations. This excellent editorial calls for bipartisan support of the President's action in this matter and states that it would be a mistake to make an issue of it for political purposes. I commend this editorial to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEAT DECISION IS WISE

President Kennedy's decision to permit the sale of several million tons of wheat to Russia and other Communist nations is a good one.

Reasons cited by the President for his decision are convincing.

Among these are that the sale would reduce the balance-of-payments deficit, would help our gold reserve, and would provide income for Americans.

And, as he pointed out, the United States has always answered the appeals for food from those needing it.

Mr. Kennedy realistically noted that there was nothing to prevent friendly nations from buying American grain, converting it to flour and then selling it to the Communist bloc, so why halt direct sales?

Another important benefit will be the reduction in the wheat surplus, for the storage of which the taxpayers are now putting out large sums.

Many of the arguments cited by Mr. Kennedy in favor of allowing the sale had been used previously by the Plain Dealer in an editorial recommending that this decision be made.

As the President admitted in response to a question at his news conference, there will be some disagreement with the decision.

Republicans will be well advised, however, not to try to make an issue of the wheat sale for mere political purposes. The people would be certain to see through such a maneuver and label it for exactly what it would be.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, a man of great courage and vision sailed west through uncharted waters in 1492 in search of a new route to the Orient. Christopher Columbus did not find the treasure he sought, his heroic effort was unacclaimed, and he died in poverty with only an unfulfilled dream. He died, not knowing that the primitive shores on which his voyage ended were to provide the opportunity for the realization of the greatest and most noble dreams of all mankind.

We pause each year to honor this explorer extraordinary and to pay him the deserved tribute he never received during his lifetime. His spirit, his determination, and his devotion are now recognized as embodying those qualities we honor in the highest.

Columbus' dream was the first of many which, woven together and pursued, have built the strong and solid foundation upon which the cause of democracy stands today. And democracy has been realized and perpetuated by men who, like Columbus, have been undaunted in the pursuit of a vision.

The heritage of many nations and cultures, brought to this country by men in pursuit of the finest aspirations of mankind, is the base on which our country has developed. Indeed, the preeminent position of our country today must be largely attributed to the efforts of such men, and it is on them that we depend so heavily for our continued growth and development.

Italian-Americans are especially proud of their great ancestor. As their friends we join with them in praising Christopher Columbus and the qualities for which he stands. Columbus discovered America. His countrymen have helped make our Nation what it is today, bringing to it their talents, their character, and their rich heritage.

Here in the Senate on the anniversary of his great discovery I know that all join in saluting Christopher Columbus and the qualities which he represents so well.

A BILL TO CLARIFY AND PROTECT THE RIGHT OF THE PUBLIC TO INFORMATION—COSPONSOR

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, Thomas Jefferson, in his inaugural address of 1801, listed "the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason" as one of those essential principles of American Government which should form the creed of our political faith, and the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust.

The right of the public and press to government information is a subject which has been studied by committees of Congress for several years. The related right of Congress, moreover, as agent of the people to acquire information from the executive branch has caused problems which have been with this body since the early days of our Republic. Although they frequently acquire political overtones, the issues in this area are continuing and many faceted. They are, apparently, problems which our democratic bureaucracy is heir to, for regardless of the party in power, they infect our government like a plague that will, if unchecked, weaken and eventually destroy that doctrine of separation of powers upon which this government was founded.

S. 1666, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] would amend the Administrative Procedure Act to clarify and protect the right of the public to information.

By describing precisely the only kinds of information which can be exempted from disclosure, and by providing a recourse for the citizen when agencies disobey the mandate of Congress, this measure will provide further guarantees for the citizen's fundamental right to know what his government is doing.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has long been interested in problems concerning secrecy in government. Legislation similar to S. 1666 was introduced by the late Senator Hennings in the 85th and 86th Congresses and was the subject of hearings and studies by the subcommittee.

See S. 2148, 85th Congress, hearing, April 16, 1958; and appendix material, printed. Also committee print: "A Bill To Amend the Public Information Section of the Administrative Procedure Act," Reports of Executive Departments and Agencies and Views of National, State and Local Press Associations, on S. 2149. Also S. 186, 86th Congress, hearing, April 17, 1959, printed; reported from subcommittee as clean bill, S. 2780. Also committee print: "Withholding of Information From the Public and Press; A Survey of Federal Departments and Agencies, 1960"; hearing, on S. 921 and the "Powers of the President to Withhold Information From the Congress," March 6, 1959, printed.

During the 85th Congress, 2d session, the subcommittee studied and the Congress enacted, another measure, designed to prevent officials from relying on an innocuous "housekeeping statute" as authority to withhold information. But experience has shown that administrative officials have many weapons in their arsenal, many of them in the form of statutory authority granted by Congress for specific purposes, but broadly interpreted in the executive branch.

It is clear from the legislative history of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 that Congress never intended that the public information section of the act should be used as a device for withholding information from the public. Rather, it was drafted to insure that the public could obtain information about the operations and procedures of government agencies.

Despite the stated intent of Congress, surveys have shown that this section has been cited again and again as authority for restricting availability of information. The results of three of these surveys, made in 1957, 1958, and 1959 are contained in documents of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee—see previous references. I refer to them because, although compiled several years ago, this material will, I believe, reveal that the problem posed by the act is a continuing one which has disturbed people for a number of years.

The war against secrecy, however, must proceed on every front. The amendment of one statute, unfortunately, will not remedy the more devious and more dangerous forms of denial of government information to the people, which occur when executive branch officials withhold information from Congress, or yield it too slowly to be of value, or when they manage the release of news to the public, and control its dissemination through various channels.

Then, of course, we have before us a more obvious instance of tax-supported secrecy. I refer to the vast, complex, but unsupervised operations of the Central Intelligence Agency, a creature of Congress which has mushroomed beyond the control of its creator. Although by their very nature, the activities of this Agency require a proper measure of secrecy, there is, in my opinion, no basis for the awe which this Agency appears to inspire in some parts of the very body which created it. Considering the large appropriations expended each year by the CIA, the taxpayers supporting the Agency are, I believe, due that exercise of diligent legislative oversight which is the proper function of Congress.

When all is said, only an alert citizenry and a vigilant Congress can guard against such threats to our democracy.

During my tenure as chairman, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has continued its efforts to protect not only the right of the public and press to disclosure of information but also the right of Congress to knowledge about the operations of the Federal Government. In furtherance of this interest, the subcommittee has conducted several surveys of Government agencies and departments to ascertain agency policies concerning the right of Federal employees to petition Congress and the right of Congress to acquire information from them.

The right to counsel which agencies accord to witnesses before them has also been studied by the subcommittee. This problem is relevant to the general one treated by S. 1666 in that the right to information can be nullified if persons trained to interpret the information in question are barred from proceedings. Since our investigation, at least one agency has changed its rules to provide more liberal access to counsel.

Another area which has concerned me is the extent to which rights of confrontation and cross-examination are available in proceedings of Government agencies. This area, also, is relevant to the subject matter of S. 1666 since it avails an individual little to know the rules and orders of an agency if he is denied fair procedures in contesting those rules which are invalid or if the rules are insufficient in this regard initially.

These are all matters which we cannot afford to overlook, if we are to hold securely those fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Although they are procedural matters, we cannot forget that "liberty is wedged in the interstices of procedure." If it is not a panacea for all the information ills of the Federal Government, S. 1666 should aid, in some measure, our progress toward those national goals set by Thomas Jefferson and the Founding Fathers.

Mr. President, I am happy to cosponsor S. 1666, and I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX CUT AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the United States today faces two critical domestic challenges which require congressional action.

We are challenged to provide the economic thrust necessary to eliminate unemployment. And we are challenged to close the Nation's citizenship gap with an effective civil rights program.

These are not isolated, separate issues. They are inextricably linked. And in the administration's programs for tax reduction and civil rights we have a dual answer to the twin problems of a lagging economy and a lack of equal opportunity for all citizens.

Speaking for myself—and I suspect that my view reflects the thinking of most Members of the Senate—I do not like to be told that the legislative capacity of Congress is limited to action on only half of today's dual domestic challenge.

Yet that is what we are being told. We are told that the U.S. Congress is incapable of acting on more than one major legislative issue. We are told that Congress can act on only one of the two vital programs before it. We are told that Congress cannot enact both the civil rights and the tax reduction programs this year.

Those who say that Congress will not be able to enact both the tax reduction and civil rights programs this year are engaging in political maneuvering and tricks of propaganda.

The leaders of Congress do not accept such cynical assessments. We do not believe that Congress and the Nation are so naive or indifferent that they will ignore either of these essential programs before us.

Let me repeat now what has been expressed many times: I and other members of the leadership are determined to get action this year on both the civil rights and the tax reduction programs.

These programs are essential for the strength and the progress of America. Both are supported by the people. Both can and must be approved by the end of the year.

Approving only one of these programs would be like adding only half the fuel a car would need to reach its destination. This country cannot move ahead and prosper with halfhearted legislative thrust.

Each program is vital for the fulfillment of the purpose of the other.

The American Negro cannot hope for real opportunity until the economy is growing fast enough to provide jobs for all the people. And the economy cannot reach its full potential until the Negro is freed from the chains of discrimination and privation.

There have been reports that the administration has decided to relax its efforts for the tax reduction program by giving a higher priority to the civil rights program. These reports are not true.

Why is the tax reduction program needed?

The essential reason is that this Nation still has more than 5 million men and women unemployed. This is a personal tragedy for each of these jobless citizens.

But our unemployment rate also offers proof that the economy is not growing and expanding fast enough to achieve and maintain full employment and full use of our plant capacity.

The $11 billion tax cut program means that $11 billion will be freed to go to work in our economy—to boost purchasing power, to increase production, to create new jobs for all citizens, and ultimately to strengthen the United States with a more sound economic basis.

Last week we saw additional proof of the widespread support for the tax reduction program.

The AFL-CIO Executive Council issued a statement firmly endorsing and urging action on both civil rights and tax reduction. I commend and salute the AFL-CIO for this policy statement.

The tax reduction program is supported not only by organized labor, but by the business community and the people generally. My own mail—from Minnesota and other States throughout the Nation—heavily favors the tax reduction legislation. And I am confident that the overwhelming vote for the program in the House of Representatives reflects this public support.

The American people expect Congress to face up to the compelling issues of our time. We are not fulfilling our responsibility if we take the view that only one issue will be resolved now, and the other can wait until next year.

When we talk about extending the promises of America to all citizens regardless of race, color, religion or national origin, we must realize that a dynamic, expanding economy is absolutely essential to that purpose.

The administration's tax reduction program is absolutely essential to build the economy this Nation must have to assure opportunity for progress for all of the people.

The tax cut will not only reduce unemployment, but also will help the economy grow enough to meet the costs of increased public services.

Every Governor and mayor has a personal political stake in the passage of the tax bill. Tax reduction would help State and local governments pay their bills without increasing local tax rates. Reduction in Federal taxes means expanding economies—and increasing revenues—in every State and community.

Both the tax cut and civil rights have top priority. Any attempt for undue delay of either program will be met with firm determination by the Democratic leadership—and long sessions in the months of October, November, and December.

If Members of Congress want Christmas at home, they will have to complete action on these top priority programs in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council issued on October 8, an editorial from the Denver Post of September 22, titled "GOP Makes Mistake To Fight Tax Cut," and a letter to the editor in this morning's Washington Post, titled "Kill the Tax Cut?" by Prof. Seymour E. Harris of Harvard University.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON MAJOR LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS, WASHINGTON, D.C., OCTOBER 8, 1963

Two bills of overriding importance to the welfare of the Nation and its citizens are before the U.S. Congress today. Rarely in recent times has the Congress faced two challenges so great and two answers so obvious.

One of these is the challenge to secure and protect the constitutional rights of all American citizens. In every quarter of our Nation minority groups, especially Negroes, are denied in varying degrees the benefits of our society which the majority enjoy.

The greatest humiliation thrust upon them is the denial of equal access to restaurants, stores, and other public accommodations. The greatest economic hardship thrust upon them is the denial of equal opportunities in employment. The greatest political hardship thrust upon them is the denial of the right to vote and of other political rights of free citizens. The greatest cultural hardship thrust upon them is the denial of equal educational opportunities.

Together this is a shameful list of denials which no human being should be asked to bear and no citizen of a free nation can conscientiously condone.

For a hundred years following the emancipation of the slaves, the American Negro has borne these burdens, sometimes with despair, sometimes with patience, often with anger, but always with faith that the democratic ideals upon which our Nation is founded would someday be extended to him.

The time to reward that faith is now.

In both North and South and in increasing numbers both Negroes and whites are engaging in a growing number of peaceful, legal demonstrations to secure civil rights for all. Every American should join with them in exercising their legal right to petition Congress to pass the necessary legislation.

The civil rights bill which has been reported by House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 is a strong, well-balanced bill which should be approved promptly by the full committee, by the House of Representatives and by the Senate. It recognizes the varied nature of the problem of civil rights, and provides reasonable solutions for it.

It deserves the support of every Member of Congress and of every American citizen.

Failure to pass it in this session of Congress would be a cruel punishment to millions of Americans, and would fail to destroy the shadow of hyprocisy which hovers over our constitutional Government.

The other bill of critical importance is the tax bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives.

The proposed Revenue Act of 1963 has been urged upon the Congress by the President, by labor and by business groups as a means to reduce high unemployment and spur economic growth.

For 72 consecutive months more than 3 million men and women in the United States have sought work and have been unable to find it. This has meant hardship and deprivation to them and to millions of other Americans, including women and children, who depend upon them.

That such conditions have existed for so long is a tragedy; that they have not stirred Americans and their representatives in government to take action against this human waste is a shocking condemnation of free institutions.

The tax bill passed by the House will, if enacted, go far to provide jobs for those who seek them. Much of the tax reductions in the bill would go to low and moderate income groups. These families will spend their tax savings promptly on consumer goods and services.

This spending will, in turn, provide more jobs for those who make those goods and provide those services, and these new jobholders will in turn provide more jobs through their own increased consumption.

The result will be to put the Nation back on the road to economic health.

It should be pointed out that the success or failure of efforts to pass the tax bill bear heavily on the effectiveness of the civil rights bill now before the House Judiciary Committee. Among other things, that bill provides for Federal guarantees of equal employment opportunities and of equal access to public accommodations.

If the tax bill fails of prompt passage, however, guarantees of those rights may prove hollow indeed. If no jobs are to be had, the Negro will have achieved only the equal opportunity to be unemployed, and if he has no income, he cannot spend it in public accommodations.

Unfortunately, the civil rights bill and the tax bill have become embroiled in political maneuver. Americans are being told that one of the other can be passed in this session of Congress, but not both.

We reject this contention.

The Senate Finance Committee has before it a tax bill on which extensive hearings have already been held in the House of Representatives, where witnesses from every walk of life have stated their views. The House Judiciary Committee has before it a civil rights bill over which its subcommittee has already labored long and arduously.

The groundwork has therefore been laid, and prompt action by the committee is necessary on this high priority legislation. The 3 months remaining in this session is ample time to give due consideration to both measures and to have them both on the statute books by New Year's Day.

Neither the Congress nor the Nation can face the new year with hope or pride unless this has been done.

[From the Denver Post, Sept. 22, 1963]

GOP Makes Mistake To Fight Tax Cut

We are amazed by reports from Washington, among them the one from William White on this page today, that House Republicans have decided to make a major partisan fight against the proposed Federal income tax cut.

In theory, the Republican fight is not against the tax cut itself. But the Republican effort to attach a deficit-limiting cancellation clause to the tax cut bill will in fact destroy most of the stimulating effect of the tax cut and could wipe it out entirely.

What the Republicans want to do, specifically, is to attach a rider to the bill canceling the cut unless Federal spending is held to $97 billion this year and $98 billion next year. Otherwise, says Representative John Byrnes, Republican, of Wisconsin, spokesman for the House Republicans, deficits expected with the $11 billion tax cut in the next 2 years could lead to inflation and financial ruin.

This is politically inspired nonsense. If the Republicans persist in it, and should succeed in their fight, it is they, not President Kennedy, who will have the albatross of fiscal irresponsibility hanging around their collective neck in 1964. They will be the ones who will have stifled the effort to get some of the burden of the Federal tax off the economy.

President Kennedy made a powerful and logical case for the tax cut last week, and now the Republicans have replied. Their reply is not impressive.

To get a nonpolitical view of the facts, let us look at what a group of responsible businessmen say:

"The deficits in recent years have, in large part, been the product of the failure of our economy to achieve its full potential because of the burden of oppressive individual and corporate tax rates. If unemployment is to be reduced, if idle plant is to be put into production, and if we are to achieve meaningful long-term economic growth, individual and corporate rates must be reduced.

"We recognize that tax reduction in the magnitude contemplated * * * will add temporarily to an otherwise existing deficit. However, we believe that additional income flowing from the tax cut will bring the budget into * * * balance significantly sooner than if there were no tax cut at all.

"We commend these Members of Congress for their concern and urge them to do everything possible to assure expenditure control. We also sincerely urge them to reconsider their position and to work aggressively for the passage of a tax reduction as soon as possible."

Who are these businessmen? They are members of a committee headed by Henry Ford II, chairman of the Ford Motor Co., and Stuart Saunders, president of the Norfolk & Western Railway—the most consistent moneymaker among American railroads.

Other members include financiers such as Frazar Wilde, chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.; David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Bank; and Robert C. Baker, chairman of the American Security and Trust Co., in Washington.

It is quite doubtful that there's a Democrat in the lot. And it's quite certain that men of this caliber are not advocating anything that will lead the Nation to financial ruin. Since even Congressman Byrnes himself agreed that President Kennedy was "dead right" in saying a tax cut is urgently needed, there is no sound reason for playing politics with it. There is not even a sound political reason for doing so—considering that the effect would rebound on the Republicans.

This tax cut should be passed. It should be passed soon. And it should be passed without any uncertainty creating "ifs" or "buts."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 9, 1963]

Kill the Tax Cut?

I refuse to believe that the Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, the party that is in every great crisis has sacrificed partisan gain for the welfare of the country will now follow, for purely partisan reasons, the advice of Congressmen Byrnes, Curtis, and also the able, and I believe mistaken, senior Senator from Virginia and try to kill the President's tax program.

For once in our history, management, labor, and professional economists have agreed almost unanimously to support a tax cut. At the Ways and Means Committee hearings only 2 out of 200 witnesses opposed the tax cut. Here is the one and only major attack on unemployment, on growth, and on cutting Government deficits eventually, on which there is agreement, and to lose this advance for partisan gains would be an unforgivable denouement.

The major thrust of these critics of the tax cut is that it must be accompanied by guarantees on curbing expenditures. But have expenditures been so large? In the three last Eisenhower years (fiscal years 1958 to 1961), expenditures rose by $10 billion as compared to $17 billion (estimated) under Kennedy 1961 to 1964. The nondefense (and space) rises were $10 billion for Eisenhower and $11 billion for Kennedy. Without any new programs or extension of old, and with prices rising by 1½ percent, population by 2 percent, and wages by 3 percent per year and built-in expansion in many programs (e.g., veterans, aid to State and local government), it is almost unbelievable that the President could have actually deflated nondefense expenditures in stable dollars. Yet they have actually declined in fiscal year 1964 plans by several percent per capita.

Let us consider the net cost of a stillbirth of the President's tax program. A major goal has been to reduce unemployment to 4 percent. I doubt that even the President's tax program will bring unemployment down to 4 percent by 1966, and it certainly will not with drastic reductions in expenditures or even with absolute stability in expenditures. In fact, then, unemployment would probably rise.

In order to keep unemployment from rising in the next 3 years we shall need an increase of GNP of about $133 billion.

A tax cut of $10 billion, according to various estimates, will increase GNP by 1966 from $25 to $60 billion per year, or say $40 billion. Hence the tax cut will yield 30 percent of the rise of GNP needed to keep unemployment from rising.

If any criticism is to be directed against the President's fiscal program, it may be that on purely economic consideration, it is not enough. The economics surely point to a larger tax cut and to a greater rise in spending. Yet in view of the difficulties confronting the President in getting through even this moderate program accompanied by retrenchments in nondefense spending, it must be clear to the liberals that the President, taking large political risks even with this modest program, was wise not to be even more audacious. A smaller cut would not have helped much, a larger one would have attracted hostile treatment in the Congress.

Then is there no way out of our unemployment fix? Until the public and the Congress become adequately educated on modern economics, we are not likely to have the kind of fiscal policies that will solve the unemployment problem, at least temporarily aggravated by structural maladjustments.

In one area we could do more. It costs perhaps one-tenth as much to get an additional job by treating structural unemployment directly as through the deficit route. I believe we could eliminate 500,000 unfilled vacancies and cut down perhaps 40 percent of our excess unemployment through adequate educational, vocational, manpower training, youth and area development programs. One billion dollars might well provide as much as 500,000 additional jobs. The only limitation on the yield is set by the level of unemployment. At 6-percent unemployment, unfilled vacancies are limited. Hence the need of depending primarily on the demand approach.

Seymour E. Harris,
Littauer Professor of Political Economy, Harvard University.

TRADE AGREEMENT BETWEEN HARVEY ALUMINUM AND GOVERNMENT OF GUINEA

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] is in Geneva representing this body at two conferences. He had intended speaking to the Senate before his departure relative to an agreement reached last week between the Government of Guinea and Harvey Aluminum.

The senior Senator from Indiana visited Guinea on a trade mission on behalf of the Committee on Commerce last fall and, therefore, took exceptional interest in the agreement. He was unable to bring his remarks to the attention of this body prior to his departure to Geneva on Senate business.

I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARTKE

I noticed in the New York Times the other day that one of our primary aluminum producers—namely, Harvey Aluminum—has entered into an agreement with the Government of Guinea to develop the bauxite deposits in the northwest section of that country. Because I am vitally concerned with our foreign affairs, especially in Africa, I asked the company to tell me something about the agreement that was made with the Republic of Guinea. The facts I learned are pleasing and surprising, and demonstrate to me how American industry in the exercise of business statesmanship of the highest order can implement the foreign policy of this Nation. Because of our drive for better understanding abroad, I would like to share what I learned, not only with my colleagues but with Americans everywhere.

In this agreement, a young American aluminum company and a young nation in Africa have joined hands to develop the economic, social, and technological needs of a new country. Together, in a notable demonstration of international harmony, the company and the country will develop new industry in Guinea.

What is important about the agreement is that the company will not only teach the African workers technical skills, but will also train them to administer and manage an industrial operation profitably. Thus, the Guineans will perform all of the management functions of a typical American company. With this new approach, the very principles of our free enterprise system will be ingrained into the growth of this young nation, into its people, its education, and its commerce.

In this region of the world, where the incentives of our democratic way of life are relatively unknown, the Harvey organization will work with the Government of Guinea to help shift the nation from subsistence farming to industrial production in a two-pronged major program. This program in the main will devote itself to the development of the rich bauxite resources of the country and the establishment of a manufacturing plant for the production of aluminum products. Utilizing its technological experience, the Harvey organization will join with Guinea to establish a manufacturing plant in the Republic to make corrugated aluminum building sheet and aluminum utensils. The company will train local workers to make these aluminum products, to market the utensils and sheet produced, and instruct the Guineans in management of the business. Harvey will concurrently turn its attention to the development of the bauxite deposits situated 100 miles inland, to engage with Guinea in the mining of such bauxite and the processing thereof into metallurgical, calcined, and chemical grades of such material. Likewise, in this endeavor, the company will train local workers in the art of mining and processing the bauxite as well as the management of such endeavor.

The Government of Guinea has undertaken to construct the necessary roads, railroads, and port facilities, to encourage not only the mining and processing of bauxite in the area but other natural resources that are available in abundance in this region. Because learning is so highly prized as the key to progress in a newly independent nation, the Harvey team will provide the engineering, scientific, and technical know-how and instruction in teaching the Guineans to build, operate, and manage these facilities.

It would appear therefore that the country will not only benefit from the profitable development of its bauxite resources but that the economy of the northwest section and all of the people situated in this area will accelerate rapidly because the advent of railroads, ships, ports, and roads will spur both agricultural and other industrial growth.

In this one agreement, an American company has undertaken to cut the cords of colonialism by developing a program and a relationship to advance the industrialization of this new country and thereby infuse the strength of American free-enterprise into the sinews of a proud and growing nation.

This is a noteworthy endeavor in the annals of international business. I hope that this worthwhile undertaking will receive the cooperation of the industrial communities of the West, and, last but not least, receive strong and sympathetic support from governmental agencies. The Harvey Co. is to be congratulated in securing for the West needed raw materials and in return providing management training for our African friends.

PLANNING FOR PEACE RESOLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators RANDOLPH, YOUNG of Ohio, BARTLETT, INOUYE, GRUENING, LONG of Missouri, MOSS, MORSE, MCGOVERN, CHURCH, NEUBERGER, HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MCGEE, HUMPHREY, and BURDICK, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution known as the "planning for peace" resolution, and ask that it may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that the resolution may lie on the desk for 2 weeks, in order that other Members may have an opportunity to cosponsor it before it is sent to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 64

Whereas the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States, in the interests of each and of all mankind, have concluded a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water, which over one hundred nations have signed; and

Whereas the adoption of this treaty, which constitutes a small but significant first step in reducing the risk of war, has enhanced the prospect for the negotiation of further international agreements based upon mutual interest and calculated to advance the cause of world peace; and

Whereas the basic purpose of United States foreign policy is the achievement of a just and lasting peace, which cannot be attained without the development of the rule of law in the international community; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, at its fourteenth session, unanimously adopted "the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control," and called upon governments "to make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of this problem"; and

Whereas President Eisenhower stated on September 22, 1960, to the fifteenth General Assembly, "Thus, we see as our goal, not a superstate above nations, but a world community embracing them all, rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all peoples"; and

Whereas President Kennedy stated on June 10, 1963, that "our primary long-range interest" is "general and complete disarmament—designed to take place by stages, permitting parallel political developments to build the new institutions of peace which would take the place of arms"; and

Whereas the United States program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, introduced at the sixteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly, defined the objective of the United States as "a world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control" and the "institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations" and called for the creation of an international disarmament organization to insure compliance with disarmament obligations, a United Nations peace force to keep the peace during the period of disarmament and thereafter, and improved processes for the peaceful settlement of international disputes; and

Whereas President Kennedy, in addressing the eighteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 20, 1963, called for the revision of the Charter of the United Nations to permit the development of that body into "a genuine world security system," and declared that the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations must be strengthened by the adoption of sound financial arrangements and the maintenance of standby peace force contingents by member nations, and that resort to special missions for the conciliation and adjudication of international disputes be increased: and

Whereas the realization of these goals through international negotiations, United Nations Charter revision, or otherwise, is a matter of urgency because (1) the increasing number and destructive capabilities of nuclear weapons at the disposal of individual states and groups of states threaten mankind with the catastrophe of all-out war; and (2) the increasing cost of the arms race is preventing human needs from being met in all the countries of the world; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, during recent sessions, has resolved to keep in being the committee on arrangements for the purpose of reviewing the charter, and has further resolved to ask the committee to submit periodic reports, with recommendations, to future sessions of the General Assembly; and

Whereas the achievement of an international accord for general and complete disarmament under effective controls and the development of international peacekeeping machinery require not only the support of the Congress, but also an informed public opinion in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under legally effective control and to develop international institutions capable of keeping the peace during and after disarmament.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an International Disarmament Organization; (2) a permanent World Peace Force; (3) world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.

SEC. 3. The President should make such proposals available to the Congress and to the public generally.

SEC. 4. The President is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the heads of government of all of the nations of the world and to urge them to initiate within their governments studies of matters germane to this resolution and to formulate and make generally available recommendations based upon such studies.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time limitation under which the Senate has been working in connection with the education bill be waived for the rest of the day, because we are through with any further consideration of the education bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object unless the situation is intolerable—this will lead to a speech of what length by the Senator?

Mr. MORSE. I do not propose to speak for the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I will respond, with all appropriate candor to the Senator from New Jersey, that I expect to continue with deliberate speed for not in excess of 15 minutes; but I have been advised—and I hope it will not shock my friend from New Jersey—that the distinguished, able, and articulate senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is on his way to the floor for a speech the duration of which I would be unable to predict.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield,

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is going to goad the Senator from Minnesota into extending his remarks, I am afraid——

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Pennsylvania regrets very much that he will be unable to remain in the Chamber to listen to the eloquence of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CASE. I am not reassured, but I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the resolution which I have just sent to the desk expresses support for the President's efforts "to achieve general and complete disarmament under legally effective controls." It calls for him to move toward developing international institutions capable of keeping the peace during and after disarmament.

I should point out that parallel resolutions were offered today in the House of Representatives by Representative BROWN of California, ROSENTHAL, HALPERN, KASTENMEIER, and RYAN of New York, and Representative GREEN of Oregon.

This resolution requests the President to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including first, an International Disarmament Organization; second, a permanent world peace force; third, world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; fourth, other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and fifth, appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.

With the tensions of the cold war temporarily relieved as a result of the test ban treaty, the recent wheat deal, and the active discussions now being conducted with the Soviet Union on a variety of subjects—and with the increased pressure upon both the United States and the U.S.S.R. to divert resources from armament programs to meet pressing civilian needs, such as, in our case, upgrading our educational system, rebuilding our cities, clearing our streams and rivers of pollution, and conserving our natural heritage—this is an excellent time to make a further effort toward the goal of an adequately safeguarded general and complete disarmament.

Let us remember that both the U.S.S.R. and the United States are firmly committed to the attainment of general and complete disarmament, as evidenced by the recent statement of Premier Khrushchev and President Kennedy, and by the two outline treaties for a general and complete disarmament tabled at Geneva last year.

The serious rift between China and Russia is also a positive factor in bringing the two most heavily armed countries the world has ever seen together in a mutual search for peace. The absence of France and Communist China from the mainstream of discussion between East and West on general and complete disarmament poses a serious problem. But I am confident that there are ways in which the United States and the Soviet Union, acting jointly, can handle this problem, as we must if a meaningful agreement is to be reached.

It must be stressed—and I want to place special emphasis on this—that we must negotiate any such agreement from strength. The long record of Russian unreliability in keeping international agreements when they no longer suited their purposes must be a warning to us to remain alert to the dangers which are present, and to guard our Nation's security. Yet—to paraphrase the President's words—we must never fear to negotiate, and negotiate seriously.

The present resolution is being introduced with the aim of encouraging our country to make further steps in formulating the specific and detailed proposals without which serious negotiations cannot proceed. This resolution is the successor to earlier resolutions on the same subject offered in the 87th and previous Congresses and cosponsored by many of the same Senators who have cosponsored the present version.

Mention should also be made of the able Members of the House of Representatives who have joined in this effort and are today introducing in that body parallel resolutions.

I am happy to note the presence as cosponsors of the resolution of several newly elected Senators who have joined their senior colleagues. I welcome them to the club of those who are working so seriously for peace. I hope that, as the resolution lies on the desk for 2 weeks, a number of our Republican colleagues, none of whom has been willing to cosponsor the resolution up to the present time, will be found joining us in what should be a completely bipartisan effort in the search for further ways and means of achieving peace. If my friends on the other side of the aisle are dissatisfied with any particular verbiage in the pending resolution, I hope they will prepare their own resolution, with the same general idea in mind, so that when we meet in the appropriate committee for hearing, which I hope will be promptly called, we shall be able to iron out any differences of wording which might separate us.

Mr. President, there are three channels for conducting serious negotiations to achieve general and complete disarmament. The first and most obvious form is in the United Nations. Yet, in my opinion, the present Charter of the United Nations is not appropriate for positive action in the area of disarmament.

In the first place, the problem of the veto in the Security Council makes difficult if not impossible any effective agreement in the very complex and complicated area which is involved in terms of a general and complete disarmament agreement.

In the second place, the rule of one vote for one nation in the General Assembly, no matter how large or small a nation may be, is to my way of thinking a completely ineffective legislative procedure. This one-vote-for-one-nation procedure, to my way of thinking, will have to be changed, just as the one-nation veto in the Security Council will have to be changed, if the United Nations is to achieve anything like the impact on general and complete disarmament which all of us hope it may one day have.

In the third place, the United Nations has completely failed to create an international armed force to enforce the peace which was contemplated in the original charter. I see no evidence that the failure, which has lasted ever since 1945, is by way of being remedied.

I would be reluctant to have the United States make a substantial contribution to the creation of any such international armed force directly under the United Nations and subject to the provision of its charter, in view of the veto in the Security Council and the one vote for one nation rule in the General Assembly, and the complete inadequacy of the present provisions in the United Nations for raising adequate funds to carry out its obligations.

In the fourth place, as I have just noted, we have seen the disastrous effects of the inability of the United Nations to raise even the modest sums of money necessary to maintain its present quite inadequate armed forces in the Gaza strip, in the Congo, and elsewhere.

Unless some more effective provision through a revision of the United Nations Charter can be obtained to achieve this result, I will be rather pessimistic and skeptical of our ability to utilize the United Nations as the forum through which a meaningful treaty of general and complete disarmament can be negotiated.

We turn, then, to the 18-nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva. This Conference appears to be stalemated. France has not been willing to join the Conference. Communist China has not been invited. For the last 2 years, negotiations have proceeded at the Palace of Nations in Geneva. However, very little progress has been made in bringing the two versions of the disarmament agreement, which the U.S.S.R. and the United States have tabled there, into anything approaching accord.

Nevertheless, there has been one hopeful development, and that is that at the instance of the Italian delegation to the Conference at Geneva, an informal committee of jurists has been created. It held its first meeting in Geneva late in November of last year. I had the privilege, as a congressional observer, of attending that first meeting, at which we were represented by the able Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, a trained and skilled lawyer, Mr. Adrian Fisher. The committee of jurists includes representatives from Italy, the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States. It has set as its task the obtaining of agreement on three important matters: First, the constitution and the organization and the powers of that International Disarmament Organization which is referred to in the American draft of the treaty on general and complete disarmament. How should such an organization be organized? How should it be created? What should be its financial arrangements? What powers and what duties should it have to supervise and, indeed, to enforce the disarmament process?

The second question to which the committee of jurists have addressed themselves is: What should be the position of the world peace force, called for in our treaty of general and complete disarmament, and also referred to in the Russian treaty? The function of this peace force would be to put down breaches of the peace which were a violation of the treaty of complete and general disarmament and, indeed, a violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Clearly much legal work has to go into the framework of the world peace force statute.

In the third place, there is a clear need to create an additional organization of international mediation, conciliation, and adjudication which will implement and supplement the present World Court of Justice, and provide an alternative to the settlement of international disputes by force.

The committee of jurists has met a number of times since November. The primary responsibility for creating a statute dealing with the International Disarmament Organization was taken by the United States of America. The British undertook to provide the first working papers for the world peace force, and the Italians are undertaking to take the initiative with respect to additional international organizations of conciliation, mediation, and adjudication.

I have some modest hope that out of this committee of jurists may eventually come a breakthrough in terms of an agreement by all the free countries of the world as to what a treaty of general and complete disarmament should contain. I also have some modest hope that in due course the Russians will see the necessity for the creation of these institutions and will cooperate in a meaningful agreement to bring them into being.

Thus the proceedings of the committee of jurists at the International Disarmament Conference in Geneva is the second area where we would like the President to explore the possibility of planning for peace.

The third forum, and perhaps the one where we can look forward with the greatest hope, is the high-level, direct, bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. As the test ban agreement evidences, there is a possibility of successful direct negotiations with the Soviets on matters looking toward peace. I would hope it would not be too long before the two great military powers of the world would be able to initiate meaningful discussions and, indeed, negotiations in the whole area of general and complete disarmament. Yet there is cause for grave doubt that the necessary thinking has been done either in Moscow or in Washington to equip the negotiators with the refined tools that they must use to create a flexible, workable structure with adequate safeguards in the area of general and complete disarmament.

Accordingly, the purpose of the resolution is to encourage the President to press on with the detailed planning which must be done. This planning can be done in large part in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. However, it will require the active cooperation of the Assistant Secretary of State for International Institutions and his staff. No doubt conversations in depth will have to be held with our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson. The policy planning staff of the Department of State might well be called in to assist in the necessary work which must be done in this area.

In short, in my opinion, it is later than we think. I do not believe that our Government has pressed with sufficient vigor its objective so eloquently stated by the President in his great speeches, first at the United Nations on September 21, 1961, and at American University on June 10, 1963, toward the implementation of a policy with programs and procedures. It is my hope that many other Senators will join in cosponsoring the resolution, that the administration will support it, that we may have a prompt hearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations, perhaps early next year, that a similar hearing may be held on the resolution proposed by my colleagues in the House today, and that we can show that Congress is still capable of taking the initiative for peace and does not have to sit back and wait until the executive arm of our Government prods us into action.

ADDRESS BY HON. MORRIS UDALL, OF ARIZONA, BEFORE ARIZONA CHAPTER, AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, Representative MORRIS UDALL, of Arizona, speaking before the Arizona Chapter of the American Cancer Society on September 27 of this year, made what to me is a brilliant speech, calling attention to the close connection between the smoking of cigarettes and lung cancer and other forms of cancer. The speech is provocative; it is, of course, controversial. However, speaking for myself, I concur in what Representative UDALL said. I recommend his speech highly to my colleagues for their reading. In my view, it is a subject in which we have waited too long to take some initiative in Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Representative UDALL's speech may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO NEEDS ENEMIES WHEN WE HAVE FRIENDS LIKE THE MARLBORO MAN?

My friends, I have here in my hand an envelope. It has all the appearances of an ordinary envelope. It may be empty. It may have no message for this meeting. But suppose I told you that in this envelope was a secret plan to undermine the United States and take the lives of 100,000 or more Americans in the next 12 months. I didn't say a hundred, or a thousand, but 100,000. And I didn't say Chinese; I said Americans. Suppose I told you that this 100,000 figure was only a conservative estimate, that in fact the number of fatalities resulting from this secret plan might exceed a quarter of a million—say roughly the population of Tucson. Would you be shocked? Would you want to know who had hatched this evil scheme? Would you want to know how to head it off? I'm confident you would.

But let's go a little further. Suppose I told you that the contents of this envelope were already known by persons in the highest places, and that they were doing nothing about it. Suppose I told you that many of your fellow Americans were not only aware of these facts but were coconspirators in the plot. Suppose I told you that most of your fellow Americans were already aware of this evil design, and they didn't really care. Suppose I told you that your own neighbors, and perhaps some people in this very room, would help contribute more than $7 billion in this same 12-month period to carry out this mass murder. Would you wonder about the sanity of the American people?

My friends, there is such a plan. It may or may not be formulated in specific terms and placed in this envelope. Like a certain Senator a few years back, I'm not going to show it to you. I'll keep you guessing. But I'll tell you this: Formulated or not, conscious or not, deliberate or not, a program is going forward that will take 100,000 or more lives this coming year, and every succeeding year, and up to this point nobody is doing much about it. If Nikita Khrushchev had hatched the scheme, it couldn't be more effective. If Americans had been brainwashed by the Communists, they couldn't care less.

By this time I'm sure you know what I'm talking about. I'm not talking about some Soviet plot, or even some plan of those lunatics in Arlington, Va., the members of the American Nazi Party. I'm talking about the plan of the American tobacco industry to lure more and more young people to smoke cigarettes, to stimulate more and more adults to smoke more and more packs a day, in the face of mounting scientific evidence showing that the end product of this massive sales effort will be annual casualties from 300 to a thousand percent higher than the much-publicized death toll on America's highways.

Speaking as a parent and a concerned citizen, I might express my reaction to these facts in some such manner as this: Who needs enemies when we have friends like the "Marlboro Man"?

I am speaking to you this evening also as a Member of Congress. I have devoted some study to the problems of tobacco consumption as they relate to cancer, emphysema, heart disorders and other ailments, often fatal in their consequences. I have introduced legislation which may be a first step in the direction of getting at these problems.

Let's look at some of the facts I have come upon in my study:

In 1920 consumption of cigarettes in this country was 750 for each adult American.

In 1961 the American people smoked nearly half a trillion cigarettes, and the average per adult was 4,000.

Medical experts, including your own American Cancer Society, say that three-fourths of all lung cancer cases are caused by cigarette smoking. Among men who smoke two packs a day, more than 25 times as many will die of lung cancer than among those who do not smoke at all. Deaths attributable to lung cancer now total over 36,000 a year in the United States.

The U.S. Public Health Service completed a study in July of last year showing that there is a relationship between cigarette smoking during pregnancy and the occurrence of premature births. Birth weight was found to be inversely proportional to the amount of cigarettes the mother smoked during pregnancy. More startling relationships, such as infant breathing difficulties and other abnormalities, are likely to show up as a result of further studies.

The same U.S. Public Health Service has said that the death rate among persons who have smoked is 32 percent greater than for persons who have never smoked. Among persons who smoke regularly, the ratio of deaths from cancer is approximately 10 times that of nonsmokers. (Let me point out that these statistics apply to any given year of life. I assume that, no matter how many advances we make, the overall death rate is going to continue right around 100 percent.)

The Surgeon General of the U.S. Air Force said last year that there is an ever-increasing link between cigarette smoking and lung cancer, pulmonary diseases, cardiovascular diseases, etc. Because of the seriousness of the evidence now accumulating he announced that the Air Force no longer will permit cigarette companies to make free distribution of cigarettes in Air Force hospitals and flight lunches.

A study published by the Scientific American last year revealed that out of 3,361 deaths among cigarette smokers felled by coronary artery disease, only 1,973 would have died, had they been nonsmokers. That meant that more than 40 percent of the deaths from coronary artery disease in this group were attributable to cigarette smoking. Reflect for a moment on the fact that, nationally, heart disease is our No. 1 killer, taking around a million lives a year, and consider for yourselves whether this percentage might be important.

These are just a few of the facts that are accumulating in regard to the effects of cigarette smoking in this country, and yet what are we doing about them?

I'll tell you one thing that has been done the last few years. The cigarette companies stepped up their advertising. And they set up a so-called Tobacco Industry Reesarch Committee ostensibly to determine and publicize factual reports on the hazards of smoking, but in fact to minimize the importance of scientific findings and to question the truth of scientific findings.

As a parent I have watched this heightened advertising campaign with some alarm, for it has been obvious to me that the cigarette companies were brazenly setting out to lure youngsters in high school and college to their harmful products. I have seen the sensual, alluring appeals using pretty young girls no red-blooded young man could possibly resist. I have seen the pictures of leading sports figures lighting up in the locker room and on the way back to the clubhouse. I have seen my own youngsters watching commercials like this on television, listening to them on radio, and looking at ads like this in magazines and newspapers. How much influence they will have no one can say. But we're all human. We all want to be admired by our peers. We hate being on the outside when other people are having fun. We want to belong. And how does one belong in this day and age? To look at the ads, it seems you have to smoke Kent, or Pall Mall, or—if you really want to be a man—Marlboro.

Just to give you an idea of what effect all this advertising has had, let me cite the following facts, reported in a major study published in 1959 in the American Journal of Public Health:

"Of high school students in Portland, Oreg., it was found that by the time they were seniors only 19 percent of the boys and 32 percent of the girls had never smoked. Here is how the progression went on regular smoking among the boys:

	Percent
"Freshman year	15
Sophomore year	25
Junior year	31
Senior year	35"

"Figures on the girls were somewhat lower, but even so by the time they had reached their senior years 26 percent of the girls were, not occasional experimenters, but regular smokers."

I think these figures are shocking, and considering the evidence now coming in on the serious effects bound to occur among many, or even most, of these young people later in life, it is time we started doing something to head off a national catastrophe.

Through the years, since the American Cancer Society began its campaign to acquaint the American public with the dangers of smoking, we have heard a variety of arguments attempting to show that the case had not been made, that the facts weren't in, and that, in all probability, people wouldn't be harmed by continuing to smoke. Let me cite some of the more interesting arguments along these lines.

1. People who are going to get lung cancer have an increased desire to smoke throughout their adult lives. Thus the correlation of high mortality with high cigarette smoking is not significant and can be ignored.

2. Smoking produces cancer only in the lungs of people who are in any case going to get cancer somewhere anyway, and smoking simply determines it will be in the lungs instead of, say, the left ear lobe.

3. Lung cancer affects people who would have died of tuberculosis in former times but who have now survived with lungs susceptible to cancer.

4. Smokers inherit their desire to smoke and with it inherit a susceptibility to some other undiscovered agent that causes lung cancer.

5. Smokers are by their nature more liable to many diseases, including lung cancer, than the "self-protective" minority of nonsmokers.

6. Smokers tend to drink more alcohol than nonsmokers, and it's the booze, and not the cigarettes, that does them in.

Such explanations, of course, are ludicrous, but they're understandable when one considers this important fact: the tobacco industry is a $7 billion industry. It pays $3 billion in taxes to various levels of government. It is one of the major users of advertising in all media, adding heavily to the earnings of Madison Avenue agencies, television networks, publications of all kinds, and thousands of local radio and television stations.

I know something about the size of that advertising dollar because I ran up against it early this year. I sent out a questionnaire in which I asked constituents whether they thought we should limit advertising of beer, wine, and tobacco products to hours after children go to bed. Fifty-six percent of my respondents said "yes," and I reported this fact. That's all I did. I didn't even introduce a bill, or say that I was going to introduce a bill. You should have seen the flood of mail and angry telegrams my little question produced. "UDALL, are you out of your cotton-picking mind?" That's the way one radio man addressed me in a hot letter a few days later. One advertising man on the west coast even went so far as to say, in print, that the children of America needed protection from Congressmen like MORRIS K. UDALL.

To be sure, a lot is at stake when we talk about doing something to reduce the hazards of smoking. However, a lot is at stake when we talk about winning the space race, or building antimissile missiles, or probing toward some kind of disarmament. Imagine what would happen to towns like Tucson or Phoenix if this country suddenly stopped building missiles or maintaining bomber and missile squadrons. The economic effect would be tremendous. But I don't think anyone would suggest we should maintain a military machine just to keep dollars flowing into Phoenix and Tucson. The same is true of the prosperity enjoyed by the tobacco industry.

I don't have any ill will for my friends in North Carolina and Kentucky. I want them to have all the prosperity possible. But I don't want them enjoying that prosperity at the expense of the American people, and that is what they are doing now. If a way can be devised to take all the harm out of tobacco, and I hope it can, I will bless their efforts at expanding their industry, and they can run all the ads they want. Until that millenium, however, I think the American people had better do something about the menace in their midst.

Actually, there are a number of changes taking place today in the tobacco and advertising industries. How much good they will do I don't know. Perhaps the most important is the decision, made this summer, to discontinue cigarette advertising in college newspapers around the country. This is a major step. Up until now 40 percent of all advertising in college newspapers has come from the cigarette companies. That's a big percentage, and it indicates how much importance the cigarette people attached to the college market.

Here is how the college sales director of one cigarette company put it: "Students are tremendously loyal. If you catch them, they'll stick with you like glue because your brand reminds them of their happy college days."

How is that for bringing the issue out into the open?

Last summer I had a young student from the University of Arizona in my office as a congressional intern. In the course of the summer he mentioned that he had a regular job during the school year distributing free cigarettes at college functions. For this he received a regular salary of $50 per month. He said other companies did the same thing, and one company—I believe it was Marlboro—had a contest to see who could bring in the most wrappers. He said all the fraternities assigned quotas to all their pledges—generally freshmen newly arrived from the innocence of hearth and home—which they would have to meet each month.

They might just as well have given prizes for the pledges who could infect the most people with cancer per month. It would amount pretty much to the same thing.

But, as I said, the major companies have decided to pull back from their intensive college campaigns, and this is a step in the right direction. Here is another development: The major companies several months ago decided to tone down their appeals to young people to start smoking. They began emphasizing that smoking is an "adult" habit. However, the success of this attempt may be less than overwhelming. I'm sure you have heard this new advertising pitch, now being used on radio.

"Luckies separate the men from the boys—but not from the girls."

Well, that's fine. It suggests smoking is for men. But it strikes me that that business about "the girls" is going to cancel out all the good qualities of the so-called "adult" appeal. After all, young men are known to have an interest in young girls. And I don't see anything in this copy about "adult girls" or "old girls" or "old ladies." It just says "girls." It just may be that this advertising juggernaut will not be stopped.

There are some changes in advertising, however, and I suppose they're all to the good. We ought to be glad for any change from the all-out grab-the-kids campaign of recent years.

Because of the enormous accumulation of scientific evidence indicating serious effects from cigarette smoking I have wondered for some time what I might do as a Member of Congress to reduce or check the toll being taken every year by tobacco. Then I came across this startling fact:

The Food and Drug Administration controls the nicotine content of foods sold to the public. The FDA permits nicotine to be present as a residue in food only to the extent of 2 parts of nicotine to 1 million parts of food. But what about the nicotine content of cigarettes, some of which gets into the human organism when cigarettes are smoked? There is no regulation affecting this. And what is the nicotine content of the average cigarette? It's not 2 parts in a million; it's 12,000 parts in a million. In other words, cigarettes are permitted to be sold containing 6,000 times as much nicotine as the Food and Drug Administration permits in food products.

When I discovered this fact, I decided the time had come for one concrete step by the Congress, and that was legislation to bring smoking products under our Federal food and drug laws. I prepared such a bill and introduced it last April 30. Since then companion bills have been introduced on the Senate side by Senators Clark, of Pennsylvania, and Moss, of Utah. We are awaiting reports from the Food and Drug Administration and the scheduling of committee hearings. I don't expect we will see any progress on our bills this year.

But there is another development which is under way and which may involve the Government in this problem in the next 2 or 3 years. I think it's coming. The development was appointment by the President last year of the President's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health. That Committee is composed of seven doctors, a chemist, and a statistician, and it has been working steadily for nearly a year. Its report is due before the end of the year. I predict the report will conclude that there is a clear and unquestioned link between cigarette smoking and various diseases, and that subsequently the Committee will recommend specific legislation to reduce those hazards.

In truth, I don't see how this Nation can go on indefinitely ignoring this problem. The evidence is everywhere at hand. Since I introduced my bill I have received letters from leading physicians and medical research people throughout the United States. Their letters have been an education to me.

Not only do these leading medical researchers agree that smoking is linked to cancer and heart disease, but they go on to point to other diseases as well which are very probably caused by or aggravated by smoking.

One of the most informative letters I have received was from Dr. Charles F. Tate, associate professor of medicine at the University of Miami. Dr. Tate asserted in his letter that, unless something is done about the smoking problem in this country, this Nation will be faced with one of the biggest medical catastrophes it has ever known within the next 25 to 30 years.

Dr. Tate said, also, that the increased consumption of cigarettes by youngsters aged 10 to 15 years of age was likely to result in a tremendous increase in disabling emphysema in the years ahead. He pointed out that chest specialists now believe emphysema is caused principally by smoking. And emphysema now ranks as the second highest cause of total physical disability in this country.

This kind of testimony from top medical people has been coming into my office for months. It convinces me all the more of the need for some kind of Federal action to stop the onward march of tobacco consumption in this country.

Are we headed for legislation? I think we are. Whether it will be my food and drug bill or some other kind of legislation I do not know. But the temper of the country is inclined toward some action. Consider these facts:

Recently a contestant on television was asked to rattle off the first word which occurred to her when another word was mentioned. One word given her was "Cigarette." Her immediate response: "Cancer."

A few months ago one of the country's top advertising men, Fairfax Cone, was asked about commercials for beer, wine, and cigarettes on radio and television. He said he thought there ought to be more decent ways of advertising than giving kids the idea that the best athletes light up every chance they get. He said: "Last football season almost any time you turned on a set there was Paul Hornung, the hottest star in football, nice clean-looking kid, puffing away." He also said he hates the pictures of young people in cigarette commercials. "And especially I hate the ones that show the sexy girl lying in clover, with the copy about 'treat you kindly.' It is cheap and degrading." When a top advertising man admits to sins like that, I think we are making a little progress.

In the end, of course, none of us ever really believes anything until the facts are brought home to him personally. I had them brought home to me recently in reading a report published by the Royal College of Physicians on smoking in relation to cancer and other diseases.

Here is what I found out. At my age—I'm 41—there is one chance in 90 that I will die before I am 45. But if I smoked 25 or more cigarettes a day, the odds would be 1 in 23. When I get into the next bracket, over 45, the odds that I will die in the succeeding decade will be 1 in 27. But if I smoked in the same amount, the odds would be 1 in 10. Those are pretty low odds when it's your life that is at stake.

So this is not only a national, it's a personal problem as well for each of us. I know you people are concerned or you wouldn't be here tonight. The problem is making the great American public sufficiently concerned to do something about it.

I think the time is coming when we can do that something, but it's going to take the educational efforts of people like yourselves to do it. I commend you for your part in this enterprise.

If we get hearings on my food and drug bill, or if the President recommends some other legislation following his committee's report, I may have to ask you people to stir up the bushes out here in Arizona and get some support for this legislation. Contrary to what some people think, we don't pass bills back in Washington in a vacuum. Legislation always comes in response to expressed needs of the people. I'm going to depend on many of you here tonight to make the need for anticancer legislation felt in the offices of the Arizona congressional delegation and elsewhere. That's how the job can be done, and it's the only way it will be done.

And now, if there are any smokers present, let me say that I brought along tonight a new product perfected by a friend of mine in New York. It's a tobaccoless cigarette. It tastes pretty awful, and it smells worse. But it doesn't have any nicotine. It's made of lettuce.

Any of you who still want to smoke can see me after the meeting.

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the question of congressional reorganization continues to occupy a substantial interest not only in the daily press but also among commentators and, in general, the public. I do not hesitate to say that in the 4 years since I undertook to persuade my colleagues that it was highly important that we should reorganize the rules, procedures, customs, and manners of the Senate—and also of the House—a very strong groundswell has developed in support of this movement.

An editorial strongly critical of Congress, yet to my mind one of the most lucid statements of the case for congressional reorganization, was published in the Washington Post of Sunday, October 13, 1963. It is entitled "The Congressional Crisis."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Congressional Crisis

One year ago today Congress adjourned amid complaints that it had been dilatory and inefficient. Today the mountain of unfinished business appears to be greater than ever before in history after 10 months of continuous session, and there is no thought of adjournment before Christmas.

The measure of this breakdown in our congressional machinery is clearly shown in the box score kept by the Congressional Quarterly. By mid-October Congress had approved 37 of President Kennedy's 405 legislative requests. In other words, it had accomplished slightly more than 9 percent of the work the President had marked out for it to say nothing of measures independently sponsored by its own Members. By comparison, the 87th Congress had approved 44.6 percent of the President's 1962 requests before it went home.

Further indication of the paralysis that has settled on the legislative branch may be seen in the fact that only 4 of the 12 major appropriation bills have cleared both Houses. Several others have passed the House and some are in conference, but the fact that only one-third of the big money bills have been sent to the President 3½ months after the beginning of the fiscal year is in itself evidence of shocking mismanagement.

Even more alarming is the outlook for the two bills by which this Congress will be known in history. Sponsors of the tax-reduction bill appear to have reconciled themselves to the probability that no vote on it will be taken in the Senate this year. And the civil rights bill, which has not yet passed the House, appears to be moving toward an inglorious yearend filibuster in the Senate.

The chief cause of this malfunctioning on Capitol Hill must be apparent to the most casual observer. The executive branch has a legislative program, but the legislative branch has no orderly procedure for getting it enacted. There is no legislative agenda because neither House has enough centralized leadership to provide one. Power and leadership are recklessly dispersed among committee chairmen, many of whom are more interested in thwarting legislation than in promoting it.

The President urged prompt action on his proposed tax cut more than 10 months ago. The Senate Finance Committee, under the sway of its hostile chairman, Senator HARRY BYRD, has not yet begun its hearings. This is not responsive policymaking but misuse of a horse-and-buggy system to sabotage national leadership that is seeking to stimulate the national economy.

Congress itself is thus rapidly becoming the most troublesome issue on the national horizon. It is making a mockery of representative government in the nuclear age. The little tyrants who preside over the slowdown are unintentionally telling the American people that they cannot achieve their objectives under the present system.

The time for a showdown is rapidly approaching. We doubt that it will be possible to restore Congress as an efficient and responsible policymaking body in this dynamic age without a major operation. Legislators are always loath to face such a necessity, but when it has come to a choice between new methods and national stagnation for want of governmental machinery that can function, the country has seldom hesitated in the past.

RECESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I understand that the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has decided not to speak tonight. Therefore, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 16, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Thessalonians 3: 12: *The Lord make you to increase and abound in love toward all men.*

Eternal God, our Father, who art the source and sanction of our noblest efforts and endeavors, may we begin this new day with the supreme desire and determination to build a more fraternal social order.

Grant that we may cultivate a sacred regard and reverent concern for the moral and spiritual capacities with which the members of the human family have been created and endowed.

May we understand and be willing to acknowledge that humanity cannot be lifted to a loftier degree of character and conduct unless it becomes inspired by the principles of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert immediately after the legislative business of today a speech delivered on the floor yesterday but inadvertently left out of the RECORD last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CRIME IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I imagine the American people, particularly those who live in Washington, are wondering what has happened to our court system here. There were three criminals who were convicted of many crimes, as I understand from the newspapers, and sent to prison, and because of a transfer to a Federal prison due to their actions in the local prison a judge has released them to go out on the community and continue their robbing, mugging, and raping of the people of Washington, D.C.

If that is any indication of the system of justice in this city, God help us all over the Nation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman asks what has happened to the judicial system in the District of Columbia, and the city of Washington. On yesterday, if my memory serves me correctly, we passed a bill here to increase their retirement pay, of such judges, although they have paid nothing into the fund toward their own retirement. So that seemingly is the reward for some of these peculiar decisions we have been getting out of the local courts recently in connection with criminal activities in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BECKER. I understand that, and I voted against that bill yesterday for the reason they did not deserve any consideration.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Public Works be allowed to sit for hearings this afternoon and for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MacPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HANS-DIETER SIEMONEIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1277) for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

BAY KOW JUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1273) for the relief of Bay Kow Jung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bay Kow Jung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNIE ZAMBELLI STILETTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1566) for the relief of Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401(e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Mrs. Annie Zambelli Stiletto shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "section 401(e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "section 349(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANG SHENG (ALSO KNOWN AS RAFAEL CHANG SING)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3908) for the relief of Chang Sheng (also known as Rafael Chang Sing).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chang Sheng (also known as Rafael Chang Sing) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Jeung Sing shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jeung Sing, also known as Chang Sheng and Rafael Chang Sing."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENEROSO BUCCI CAMMISA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6316) for the relief of Generoso Bucci Cammisa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Generoso Bucci Cammisa may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Cammisa, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHING HEING YEN AND CHING CHIAO HOANG YEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1495) for the relief of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the cases of Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Ching Heing Yen and Ching Chiao Hoang Yen shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIANO CARRESE AND VINCENZINA CIAVATTINI RESTUCCIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6038) for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mariano Carrese, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401–E of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Mariano Carrese shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, after the name "Mariano Carrese" insert the following: "and Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia".

On page 1, line 4, strike out "section 401–E" and insert in lieu thereof "section 401 (e)".

On page 1, line 11, after the name "Mariano Carrese" insert the following: "and the said Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mariano Carrese and Vincenzina Ciavattini Restuccia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JAMES T. MADDUX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1201) for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

WIILLIAM RADKOVICH CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4076) for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, arising under contracts with the United States for the construction of various structures, said contracts being numbered W–04–353–eng–2036 and W–04–353–eng–2050, against the United States for the difference between the reasonable value of said structures as of the time of the completion of such contracts and the amount paid to said company for such structures, said recovery to be permitted only in the event that it shall be established that the actual cost to the said William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, of erecting such structures exceeded the reasonable value of such structures, such judgment to be entered not withstanding any limitations imposed by law upon Government representatives whose responsibility it was to let the aforementioned contracts and notwithstanding the technical provisions of said contracts with respect to payment thereunder: *Provided,* That the suit herein authorized shall be instituted within six months from the date of the approval of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, arising out of contracts numbered W–04–353–eng–2036 and W–04–353–eng–2050, against the United States for the reasonable value, computed as of the time when made, of any reasonable and necessary changes and increases beyond the terms of said contracts made at the direction of the contracting officer and also including any additional or increased costs incident to delays and difficulties encountered due to unusual construction problems and unusual weather conditions, for which the said William Radkovich Company, Incorporated, was not compensated because of the provisions of section 12 of the Military Appropriation Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 565), which precluded payment of more than $7,500 per unit for the construction of temporary family quarters: *Provided,* That the suit herein authorized shall be instituted within six months from the date of the approval of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CWO JAMES A. McQUAIG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4681) for the relief of CWO James A. McQuaig.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That James A. McQuaig, chief warrant officer, W–2, United States Army (W2205393), of Atlantic Beach, Florida, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $901.80, representing an erroneous payment of per diem between May 1, 1954, and August 22, 1954, both dates inclusive, while he was stationed at Camp North Koga, Honshu, Japan. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Chief Warrant Officer James A. McQuaig an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHESTER A. BROTHERS AND ANNA BROTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1851) for the relief of Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chester A. Brothers and Anna Brothers, his wife, of Pueblo, Colorado, are hereby relieved of liability to the United States for interest on income taxes imposed upon them pursuant to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the calendar years 1955 and 1956.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOREN CLAY PRODUCTS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4766) for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other law or rule of law and notwithstanding any election made under the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 674; Public Law 87–312), for purposes of applying section 613(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (and corresponding provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939) to the Boren Clay Products Company, Pleasant Garden, North Carolina, for taxable years beginning before December 14, 1956, in the case of brick and tile clay, fire clay, or shale used by such company in the manufacture of building or paving brick, drainage and roofing tile, sewer pipe, flower pots, and kindred products, the terms "gross income from mining" and "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mine owners or operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product or products" shall be treated as having a meaning consistent with the decisions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in United States against Cherokee Brick and Tile Company (1955) (218 F. 2d 424) and United States against Merry Brothers Brick and Tile Company (1957) (242 F. 2d 708) (certiorari denied, 355 U.S. 824).

SEC. 2. The election made by the Boren Clay Products Company, Pleasant Garden, North Carolina, under subsection (c) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 674, Public Law 87–312), shall, notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of such Act, not be effective for any taxable year beginning before December 14, 1956.

SEC. 3. If credit or refund of any overpayment of tax resulting from the application of the first section of this Act is prevented, at any time on or before the expiration of one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, by the operation of any law or rule of law, such credit or refund of such overpayment may, nevertheless, be allowed or made if claim therefor is filed on or before the expiration of such one-year period.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6182) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CAPT. OTIS R. BOWLES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6477) for the relief of Capt. Otis R. Bowles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Captain Otis R. Bowles, Army of the United States, retired, of Keokuk, Iowa, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of $6,933.34, representing the compensation received by him from June 20, 1960, to December 15, 1961, and from January 29, 1962, to May 18, 1962, while employed by the Department of the Army in violation of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62). In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Captain Otis R. Bowles an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD J. MAURUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8222) for the relief of Edward J. Maurus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward J. Maurus, former disbursing officer of the United States Navy, the amount of $170.72. This amount represents money paid from his personal funds to liquidate deficiencies incurred in his accounts, which deficiencies did not result from bad faith or lack of due care on his part.

SEC. 2. The relief herein authorized shall not bar recovery from the payees or beneficiaries of the amounts improperly received by them.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNETTE M. RASOR AND DR. ROBERT W. RASOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8280) for the relief of Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and Dr. Robert W. Rasor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that, on September 14, 1962, while Mrs. Annette M. Rasor and her husband, Doctor Robert W. Rasor, were occupying quarters assigned to him as medical officer in charge of the Public Health Service hospital at Lexington, Kentucky, Mrs. Rasor, without any fault on her part, sustained severe injuries causing permanent and total disability (including paralysis of her arms, legs, and various organs) when shot in the neck by a psychotic former patient of the hospital, following a course of events which commenced when the assailant in a threatening and irrational manner demanded to see a former medical officer in charge of the hospital, whom he believed to be occupying such quarters; and further finds that the shooting occurred because, in the deranged mind of the assailant, the Rasors were identified with the hospital administration and the authority of the United States.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations available to the Public Health Service for furnishing hospitalization and medical care for dependents of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service shall be available, in accordance with this section, to pay for medical services, appliances, and supplies on account of the injuries sustained by Mrs. Annette M. Rasor on September 14, 1962, or the disability arising as the result of such injuries. Insofar as practicable, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service is authorized and directed to provide such medical services, appliances, and supplies in the facilities of the Public Health Service or otherwise, including appropriate arrangements for procurement thereof. Doctor Robert W. Rasor or Mrs. Rasor shall, further, be entitled to reimbursement, from such appropriations, for any expenses for medical services, appliances, and supplies heretofore or hereafter incurred by either of them (and not provided by the Public Health Service) on account of such injuries or disability, if found necessary and reasonable by the Surgeon General. As used in this Act, the term "medical services, appliances, and supplies" includes, but is not limited to, medical and surgical services, drugs and devices as defined by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, physical therapy and rehabilitation services, hospitalization, private duty nursing (including practical nursing), nursing home care, transportation of Mrs. Rasor between hospitals or between hospital and home by such mode of transportation (including ambulance service) as may be medically indicated, and transportation of physicians and other medical personnel for purposes of examining and treating Mrs. Rasor.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Doctor Robert W. Rasor the sum of $750 for the period prior to July 1, 1963, and thereafter, so long as Mrs. Annette M. Rasor shall live, a monthly payment, to be paid in advance, which the Surgeon General finds reasonably necessary for employing a housekeeper and for other household expenses (except expenses for medical services, appliances, and supplies) attributable to her incapacity and her care at home: *Provided,* That the total of such payments shall not, in any year, exceed $8,000: *Provided further,* That, if Doctor Rasor predeceases her, such monthly payments shall thereafter be made to Mrs. Rasor or, for her use and benefit, to such other person as the Surgeon General may designate, so long as she is cared for at home. The Secretary of the Treasury shall likewise, upon her death, pay the funeral and burial expenses of Mrs. Rasor in an amount not to exceed $800 if the Surgeon General finds that her death was causally related to the injuries sustained as a result of the shooting on September 14, 1962.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General is authorized to delegate any of his functions under this Act to any officer or employee of the Public Health Service.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 23: Strike "$8,000" and insert "$6,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WARREN A. JEFFERS AND FRANCIS H. LEIK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8470) for the relief of Warren A. Jeffers and Francis H. Leik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Warren A. Jeffers, 256 Eighteenth Avenue South, South Saint Paul, Minnesota, the sum of $218.45, and to Francis H. Leik, of 5704 Wentworth Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota, the sum of $255.90. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Warren A. Jeffers and Francis H. Leik against the United States growing out of the accident of March 2, 1963, at Missoula, Montana, in which Federal Aviation Agency Beechcraft N136, piloted by Warren A. Jeffers and copiloted by Francis H. Leik, was destroyed by fire: *Provided,* That no part of the money appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE CROKOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 838) for the relief of George Crokos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Crokos may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Stelianos Crokos, citizens of the United States, in behalf of the said George Crokos pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIM L. YEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1313) for the relief of Tim L. Yen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tim L. Yen shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Don Y. Yen, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Tim L. Yen shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELFRIEDE UNTERHOLZER SHARBLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1174) for the relief of Elfriede Unterholzer Sharble.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elfriede Unterholzer Sharble may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA MERGHETTI (MOTHER BENEDETTA)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1289) for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27)(B) and 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina), shall be held and considered to be returning resident aliens."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Merghetti (Mother Benedetta) and Annunziata Colombo (Mother Cherubina)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PASQUALE MARRELLA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1432) for the relief of Pasquale Marrella.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pasquale Marrella may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZOLTAN FRIEDMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2305) for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Zoltan Friedmann may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARITA M. RESPICIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2799) for the relief of Mrs. Margarita M. Respicio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Margarita M. Respicio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Margarita M. Respicio. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Margarita M. Respicio shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELIKI DEVARIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4507) for the relief of Angeliki Devaris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angeliki Devaris shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Angeliki Devaris. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Angeliki Devaris shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH MARY MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4760) for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elizabeth Mary Martin may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DENISE JEANNE ESCOBAR (NEE ARNOUX)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5453) for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux) shall be deemed to be chargeable to the quota for France."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. INGRID GUDRUN SCHRODER BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7268) for the relief of Mrs. Ingrid Gudrun Schroder Brown.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

GRANTING TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 540 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 79, Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to send four of its members and one of its employees to Rome and Larderello, Italy, and Reykjavik, Iceland, to investigate and study the development of geothermal steam resources in Italy and Iceland. Participation by members and the staff assistant in such studies and investigations, as herein authorized, shall occur in conjunction with authorized travel to Geneva, Switzerland, for international meetings concerned with tungsten and lead and zinc, and the duration of the trip commencing on October 1, 1963, shall not exceed thirty days.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and its employee engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget, or for payment of actual, reasonable transportation costs, actual food and lodging expenses; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated fund shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of the committee expending such foreign currencies shall report to the chairman of the committee the amounts and dollar equivalent value of each such foreign currency expended for actual transportation costs, for actual food and lodging expenses, and for per diem allowances and such report shall include proper documentation for each such expenditure, and by dates the length of time spent in each foreign country. For the purpose of this report the statement of a per diem allowance shall be considered a sufficient itemization of any expenditures made from such allowance. If transportation was furnished by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States the cost of such transportation shall be included in such report at the value assigned it by such department, agency, or instrumentality. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman help me out on the definition of geothermal steam? Is this what they use in baths in Iceland? Just what is geothermal steam?

Mr. BOLLING. I am happy to tell the gentleman there is a person on the floor who can answer that question. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] to answer that question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Thank you very much.

Geothermal steam, of course, is steam that comes out from below the surface of the ground, or globe, the word "geo" meaning earth or the area of the globe itself. In some places such steam has been put to work as an energy producer, producing electricity. We have bills before this Congress which would request the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to go into this matter and study it to see whether or not in this great public land area of ours we have a natural resource which is worth further consideration and development.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explicit explanation of the meaning of geothermal steam.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and pending that such time to myself as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no controversy over this resolution and therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. SPEAKER, I join in the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. This resolution is in keeping with the rules and regulations which the Committee on Rules asked the House to adopt earlier this year. There are involved four Members and one employee who are in Europe at the present time and who wish to make these two stops on their way home, for the purpose mentioned in the resolution.

It has been my experience that the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, would never ask for anything that would be out of order in any way in connection with travel authority. I stand on that statement, I say to the gentleman from Iowa, very firmly.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the resolution and I urge its immediate adoption.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 540 provides authority at minimum expense to permit a special Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to investigate and study essential matters bearing upon legislation now under consideration.

First, let me say that the Secretary of State, in a letter to the Speaker, invited the House of Representatives to designate four Members and one staff assistant to participate with the U.S. delegation in meetings of the International Lead-Zinc Study Group in Geneva. In addition, the Secretary of State will accredit the designated Members to participate in international meetings on tungsten that will be held in Geneva on October 28 and 29 preceding the lead-zinc meetings.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that, because these meetings pertaining to minerals are of great concern to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, you have designated four members of our committee and the committee's staff consultant on mines and mining matters to represent this body at the Geneva meetings. House Resolution 540 proposes, in order to obtain the maximum benefit from the money to be expended on this trip, to permit the group, incidental to its travel to Geneva, to stop in Italy en route and in Ireland on the return trip to examine into procedures utilized in those countries for the development and disposition of geothermal steam resources—a problem now being studied by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee as it relates to the public lands of the United States.

There are at the present time no public land areas producing geothermal steam energy. There is one development on private lands in the United States. However, there are indications that this phenomenon exists in many public land areas throughout the West and Alaska. We have been informed that the size of some fields is quite large, perhaps exceeding that of the most famous one, which is at Larderello, Italy.

At the present time the subcommittee is considering three bills that have been referred to us: H.R. 278, H.R. 1091, and H.R. 7358 offering varying proposals for the disposition of geothermal steam from public lands. The subcommittee has held initial hearings on the bills and heard various conflicting testimony from Government and industry witnesses. But one thing everyone agreed on was that we could benefit from the experience of those foreign countries in which the greatest progress has been made in the development of geothermal energy. Two of these countries are Italy and Iceland.

We have worked out, through the State Department, a schedule whereby it is possible to stop in Italy on the way to Geneva and stop in Iceland on the way back to the United States. House Resolution 540 by its terms limits the travel to Italy and Iceland to be made in conjunction with the travel to Geneva in connection with the international meetings referred to a moment ago. The consultations with the Government officials in Italy and Iceland will be extremely helpful in consideration of domestic legislation; and inspection of the geothermal fields will give Members background concerning the provisions, if any, that must be made for the protection of areas designated for development.

I urge favorable consideration of House Resolution 540.

The **SPEAKER**. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "October 1," and insert "October 23,"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. **BOLLING**. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTION, REPRODUCTION, AND PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTARY SOURCE MATERIAL SIGNIFICANT TO THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. **BOLLING**. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 538 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes. After general debate, which should be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **BOLLING**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 173]

Abernethy
Anderson
Ashley
Avery
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Buckley
Cameron
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Colmer
Cooley
Curtis
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Giaimo
Goodell
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Halleck
Hanna
Hansen
Healey
Hébert
Henderson
Hull
Hutchinson
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kee
Kelly
Kilburn
Knox
Kyl
Lesinski
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Passman
Pilcher
Powell
Reifel
Rivers, S.C.
Rostenkowski
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Saylor
Scott
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sibal
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Stephens
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuten
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Westland
Whalley
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams
Winstead
Wyman
Zablocki

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. On this rollcall 314 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7544) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 8, line 24, strike out "agency" and insert "agency, which may be an interdepartmental agency,".

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object I reserve the right only so that the chairman might make clear that this is a technical amendment. As far as my understanding goes, it is really a conforming amendment expressing what the House intended the situation to be when we passed the bill.

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I concur completely in the statement of my friend from Wisconsin. It merely carries out in the statute what the gentleman and I both said was the intention in connection with the bill passing the House.

Also let me say this, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield further to me.

Mr. **BYRNES** of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. **MILLS**. One section of the bill authorizes a grant to States on a one-time basis for planning and other activities designed to strengthen the State's total program for the mentally retarded. As a matter of fiscal control, this section includes a requirement that there be a single State agency responsible for the receipt and disbursement of funds. As I explained when the bill was debated here, any type of agency would be eligible for designation for this purpose. However, in a number of States there is an interdepartmental committee which is presently responsible for coordinating mental retardation activities of the various departments of the State government. These agencies apparently wanted to have it made clear in the statute itself that they were eligible recipients for the grants. The Senate Committee on Finance accordingly, after the words "single State agency," added the words "which may be an interdepartmental agency."

It has to do, in other words, only with the question of what agency it is that may receive funds for purposes of beginning this planning and other activities in connection with the mentally retarded program. As I have indicated we had said in our bill a single State agency, and it is after the words "single State agency" that the Senate amendment adds "which may be an interdepartmental agency." We said on the floor when the bill passed the House that the single State agency meant that, anyway.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It develops that there are some States that do not have a single agency which has the responsibility in this field.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But they do have an interdepartmental committee which has the responsibility.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And we authorize that interdepartmental committee also to be the agency in the State to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have permission to sit this afternoon to hear the Attorney General.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 172, on yesterday, I did not vote because I was downtown on official business.

COLLECTION, REPRODUCTION, AND PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTARY SOURCE MATERIAL SIGNIFICANT TO THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that such time to myself as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 538 provides for consideration of H.R. 6237, a bill to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 6237 would authorize the expenditure by the Administrator of General Services of up to $500,000 annually in appropriated funds, together with whatever donated funds may be available, to make allocations and grants, based upon the recommendations and advice of the National Historical Publications Commission, to Federal, State, and local agencies, and nonprofit organizations and institutions, for the collection and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that one of our distinguished colleagues is a member of the National Historical Publications Commission. The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is the House member on that Commission. The representative from the other body is the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] so the Congress finds itself represented on this Commission which will advise and recommend the disposition of the funds.

The bill would authorize the National Historical Publications Commission to establish special advisory committees for purposes of consultation on its various endeavors; and it would authorize the National Historical Publications Commission to reimburse members of established advisory committees for transportation costs and other expenses on the same basis as members of the Commission.

The two principal results of this legislation would be, first, the actual preservation of historical source material which might otherwise be lost; the second result would be to make historical source material of significance to the history of the United States available to colleges and universities and to scholars and students generally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 538.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the majority leader is in the chair, because as one Member of this House, and speaking not for the minority leader nor for the minority but only for myself as an individual member of the minority, I am trying to find out just what this Congress is doing; where we are going and when we are going to wind up. It is my understanding that the Government is now operating under continuing resolutions that have three factors involved in the control of spending by the departments on the basis of their previous year's operations. Here we are on October 15, 3½ months after the start of this fiscal year and I believe there are eight or nine major appropriation bills that have not yet been acted upon by the Congress; and there are authorization bills that have not yet been acted upon.

I am wondering about the irresponsibility of the Democratic majority in control of Congress when here in the middle of October we do not even know what the appropriations are going to be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the distinguished majority leader is in the Chair. I wish the gentleman could answer these questions. I have one particular case in point on these continuing resolutions. The next one which comes up I am going to ask for a rollcall vote on it for this reason: The foreign aid appropriations last year amounted to approximately $4 billion. This means the aid program can, under the continuing rule today, operate and spend and commit $4 billion of the taxpayers' money; whereas, the authorization bill that has been passed by this House but not passed by the other body, only calls for $3.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the wind is blowing free to the effect that the Committee on Appropriations will even cut this $3.5 billion, and I hope so.

Mr. Speaker, what is the aid program operating on today? How much are they spending? Do we know? Does this Congress know? Are we going to be committed, as we were at Punta del Este to committing the United States to a program of $20 billion to the Alliance for Progress program, without the consent of Congress? I would like to point out the fact—and I repeat that I am sorry the majority leader is not in a position to answer the question, I wish somebody would—are we again going to be committed by the executive branch of Government to spending all kinds of funds and then find the Congress in a position where we are going to have to vote for the commitments of the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we as the legislative body—one of the three separate but equal branches of this Government—have something to say about what is going on. I, as one of the minority—speaking for myself alone—hope that the majority leader at a forthcoming session, or later today, will give some of the answers as to why the Democratic leadership and the Democratic-controlled committees have let this go on month after month until October 15 without bringing this legislation onto the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be voting for continuing resolutions unless there is a declared emergency. And there is no emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the majority leader will answer some of these questions.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling] has explained, House Resolution 538 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 6237, a bill which would authorize for the first time the payment of certain Federal grants, up to $500,000 a year, and as the bill is written, for an indeterminate number of years, for collecting materials, such as records of all kinds, historical documents, and so forth, for the purpose of, as I understand it, preserving history or making history.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, I did not have an opportunity to hear the discussion which took place in connection with the hearings which were held on this bill by the committee. I do know from the reports, however, that seemingly none of the departments actually urged the enactment of this particular piece of legislation. But, instead, some of the departments said that they had no objection to it, and some of the other agencies of Government, such as the General Accounting Office, said they took no position in connection with the legislation, and made no recommendation whatsoever.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it we have had for a good many years—I believe since 1934—the National Historical Publications Commission which the gentleman from Missouri mentioned a few moments ago in his remarks, correctly of course, and that Commission has been made up of some distinguished individuals who have given certain advice, but the activities of that Commission and the preservation of documents and other informative material under the provisions of the 1934 act has been largely financed, almost entirely financed, through the use of private funds. Five of the projects alone, including the Adams Papers, the Franklin Papers, the Madison Papers, and the Wilson Papers, have thus far received grants from various foundations and other private sources totaling about $2,850,000 in addition to substantial support from newspaper editorials, radio, television comment, and so forth, with publication costs often underwritten by colleges and universities, or by some university press organizations.

Two or three questions arise in my mind in connection with this legislation. Other members of the legislative committee will discuss the bill fully when we take it up in the Committee of the Whole. One question arises in my mind, first of all, whether or not, in the present state of our finances in this country, with the largest national debt in the peacetime history of this Republic or any other nation, with a huge deficit, some $9 billion, I understand, staring us in the face, with a greater deficit to come in the future, we should start a new spending program, or whether we should carry on under the present established program where most, or practically all, of this work is financed by foundations or by private sources instead of at the expense of the American taxpayers.

I have another question in my mind that gives me some concern in connection with this legislation, and I expressed it in the Rules Committee as a newspaper publisher. We have a saying in the profession, or the industry, or the newspaper business: "Let me write the headlines, and I don't care who writes the editorials."

You let me or any other individual select what documents and what papers are to be considered in writing the history or the story of that which goes on in Government or any agency, or in any administration or in any of its activities, yes, in any session of the Congress, or in any particular meeting of the House of Representatives, let me select the material that is to be used as a basis from which we interpret the action of that agency or that body, I can make history for you different from what perhaps someone else might make it.

I have seen reports of some of the activities which have taken place on the floor of the House, some of which have gone through in wire reports to my own newspapers, and when I read the story there I did not recognize the activity described in that press report as that which I had seen and heard on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Take the Congressional Record, if you please. Pick out the remarks of a few individual Members of this House on any given bill or piece of legislation, and say that describes what went on in connection therewith, and you may have an entirely different picture than you would get if you selected the remarks, statements and speeches made by other Members of the House on the very same legislative bill.

I am very much interested in knowing who might collect and coordinate all of these documents and say, "This is worthy of consideration as a historical document of the Nation." That is the situation when you get to playing with history through bureaucratic control. I think we had better leave it in the hands of these private foundations, these colleges and universities, or these individual historians who, it is true, in their own way at times may distort, or may misrepresent, or may give an untrue picture as they see it as something that has happened in history. But along comes another historian who gives the other side of the story and differently describes the status of the Nation, that those who come afterwards can read, as you and I have read most of these historical papers that have been prepared in the past by different organizations, for it is those papers that reveal what the true history is, and what the true story may be. That is why we have across the way a great structure known as the Congressional Library, in which you will find almost every document, or a copy of it, almost every book, every magazine, a copy of almost every newspaper, every treatise, published in the United States on almost any subject that you can mention under the sun. That is where the students of history go, not down to the General Services Administration, not down to some bureaucratic individual named by some political administration which may be on the national stage or in the limelight for a few short years and then disappear from the public scene. That is where history is recorded. Here in the Congress of the United States is where history is made.

I am fearful that if we enact this legislation today as proposed here we may be making a wrong sort of history for future generations to read, to study, and perhaps to be misled by in the days to come.

I think this legislation is so controversial and so questionable that every thoughtful Member of the House should listen to the debate on this bill and study it carefully, and make up his or her own mind as to just what they want to do about saying for the first time in the history of this Republic that we will have a Government agency more or less control what shall be considered of historical importance in the way of documentary and other information to be passed on to future generations.

So while I will not oppose the rule as such, I do want to urge that every consideration be given to this measure before we vote on it, for or against final passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman in his warning to Members that this legislation should be scrutinized carefully. I assume the gentleman would hope with me that in the editing of the history of this country and in the case of the former President and patron saint of the original Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, quotations such as this would not be stricken. Jefferson said:

> I am for a government vigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the pubic revenue to the discharge of the national debt. I place economy among the first and most important of governmental virtues and the public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will answer the gentleman quickly, and then I want to yield the floor, by saying who knows what some individual agent of this Government in selecting and collating these documents might decide about that. He might decide it is ancient history, that it has been outmoded, that it should not be included. Or some other individual might decide that some of the latest philosophies espoused by some people who believe in the welfare state and perhaps in some other form of government different from that which we now have are historic and important to our way of life and should be included as part of the history of this generation. We can understand that, and that is where the danger lies. Who will make the decision? Who will finally decide what is to be the great mass of documentary and other information that is to be used as a basis for writing history?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Meader].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I do not take this time to oppose the rule or discuss the legislation on its merits.

I take this time only to call the attention of the Members to the additional views contained on page 20, 21, and 22 of the committee report, joined in by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and myself.

I also call attention to the discussion of an amendment which I offered in the full committee which appears on page 21 requiring that the recipients of grant assistance keep records of their disbursements under these grants and authorizing the Administrator of General Services and the General Accounting Office access to such records.

The letter of the Comptroller General in which the exact language of these amendments was recommended appears on page 13 of the committee report.

It is my understanding that the majority in charge of the management of this bill intends at the appropriate time to offer this language as an amendment to the committee amendment, and I hope that that will be done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6237) to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union with Mr. HEMPHILL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule. the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6237 would amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States. This measure reflects the strong recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission and would provide for a well-balanced program in keeping with Federal responsibilities in this area.

The bill as approved by the Government Operations Committee would authorize up to $500,000 a year to be expended by the Administrator of General Services pursuant to the recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission. The Commission, as well as the Government Operations Committee, expects that these funds will be more than matched by private donations and the coordinated efforts of universities, historical societies, and others, so that this material essential to a proper understanding of our history can first be preserved and second be made available to scholars and students in colleges and universities, to jurists, legislators, executive leaders, and to the public throughout the Nation.

At the appropriate time I will offer two additional amendments to H.R. 6237 aside from those recommended by the Government Operations Committee. Aside from minor technical amendments the committee recommends adoption of an amendment requiring the Administrator of General Services to submit comprehensive annual reports to Congress relative to the receipt and expenditure of funds under this program. The two additional amendments I propose would first limit the program authorized in H.R. 6237 to a period of 5 years. The second amendment would require audit of grantee books and records by the General Accounting Office as recommended by the Comptroller General.

This legislation would not set any new precedent of Federal financial participation in a new field. The Federal Government has financed countless projects in the past relating to the preservation and publication of historical source material of significance to the United States.

Unfortunately, however, this financial participation has been on a sporadic basis and, although Federal contributions from time to time have been substantial, a comprehensive, systematic approach has never been developed. As a result, much material of great significance which logically should be available to colleges and universities, to jurists and legislators, executive leaders and to the public generally has not been adequately compiled or preserved either by microfilming or other forms of publication. As a result, much of the historical source material upon which colleges and universities and others must rely as a source of basic reference to our history is in the form of out-of-print, incomplete 19th century compilations which, even when available, are grossly inadequate under present day standards. Thus, while there has been Federal participation which dates back to the time of the Continental Congress, and while we are better off today because of this Federal participation, it has been generally recognized for decades that this participation has not been on the most effective or efficient basis.

The purpose of H.R. 6237, as recommended by the National Historical Publications Commission and reflecting the thinking of leaders in the historical field dating back as far as Ebenezer Hazard in 1778, is to substitute an effective systematic program fulfilling Federal responsibilities in this area for the present sporadic hit-and-miss approach.

Under this program up to $500,000 would be made available each year to the Administrator of General Services to be expended by him in cognizance of the National Historical Publications Commission recommendations. The Commission's overall budget, however, anticipates that this $500,000 would be matched by private donations, primarily from large foundations, so as to give the program an annual working budget of $1 million. It is the further expectation of the Commission that private donations in the form of a $5 million endowment fund would be made available by private sources, the income of which would assure the continuation and completion of five major projects now underway relating to the papers of Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Franklin, and the Adamses.

Since 1778, at the time the Continental Congress appropriated $1,000 to be used by Ebenezer Hazard in the collection of historical source material, Congress has recognized that the Federal Government has an obvious responsibility in this field. Congress has also recognized on numerous occasions over the past 172 years that the preservation and publication of certain types of material is wholly a responsibility of the Federal Government.

It is anticipated that with the funds made available to the Administrator of General Services, the Commission would recommend the systematic collection and publication of source material coming within the public category. Two projects of this nature which the Commission would expect to give priority during the initial years of this program would be the completion by letter press publication of the debate leading to the adoption of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. A second such project would be the work and the debates of the First Congress. By any standard of the past or present, the preservation and publication of material such as this is essential and well within the confines of Federal responsibility.

A second area wherein the Commission would recommend the expenditure of available funds would be with regard to projects of significance to U.S. history but which cannot be considered wholly the responsibility of the Federal Government. In these instances, the Commission would recommend the expenditure of funds on a grant basis to augment the contributions of universities, historical societies, and others in an effort to broaden and increase the Nation's overall program. In such projects, it would not be anticipated that the funds under this program would constitute a sole source of financial support. Program funds would be used carefully to coordinate and encourage and make possible the institution and continuation of projects which otherwise could not be undertaken or continued. The Commission would act in partnership—matching offers of institutions ready, willing, and able to contribute their reasonable share of the necessary funds.

By this means, a growing momentum of private interest and financial participation can be attained—a systematic and comprehensive approach developed, all of which, of course, would be under the watchful eye of Congress. Our Appropriations Committees with traditional control over fund levels, would annually review the nature and extent of Commission participation in various projects to assure adherence to rigid standards in the selection of material as well as in all other aspects of the program. In this connection, the Government Operations Committee has recommended an amendment to H.R. 6237 which will provide for a detailed financial report to Congress each year from which our committees, as well as members generally, can maintain an accurate awareness as to Commission actions and recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, it is a tragic consequence indeed that almost 200 years have elapsed without our scholars, our history students, our jurists, legislators, executive leaders, and the public generally having the fullest insight into critical periods of our past. Unless and until we a have a systematic program, which will not necessarily increase the level of Federal financial participation—unless and until we have such an effective program, we will continue to be handicapped in our knowledge and understanding in effect as if this material some time in the past had been destroyed. It is unthinkable that this best evidence of what occurred, what was said, and what was done should be lost to us and to future generations. Until it is published and made available generally, it can be of little value to us, and we must continue to read from a book of history which has many missing pages.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize that Federal participation in this field is not new. What would be new under this legislation would be effective and efficient Federal participation. In an address delivered in April 1938, the late Clarence E. Carter, dean of American historical compilers of the last century—after discussing the nature of Federal participation in this field from the time of the Continental Congress and suggesting the benefits which could flow from the establishment of the National Historical Publications Commission—expressed the hope that theye would evolve a long-range plan to be submitted to Congress which would supplement what was then being done and what had been accomplished in former years. This expression of hope was made more than 25 years ago.

In H.R. 6237, we have a program as he and many historians and statesmen before him envisaged as necessary to the fulfillment of Federal responsibilities—a systematic and comprehensive program which will encourage rather than discourage private participation—a systematic and comprehensive program which will result in the preservation of essential source material from which a clearer and more accurate insight into our history can be obtained.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Stinson], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by saying that I am 100 percent in favor of preserving our historical documents and documents of national interest.

I do not believe, however, that that is the issue at stake today. The issue is whether or not we are going to finance this history program through our traditional method of private contributions, or are we going to do it with Federal funds?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that there are now too many areas where the Federal Government is becoming involved already. However, I would like to point out that the Federal Government does not have the $500,000 that is being proposed for this particular program. The Federal Government would have to borrow this money in order to put H.R. 6237 into effect.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under the conditions that the National Historical Publications Commission was originally established back in 1934, no Federal funds were to be used for its program. Under those conditions the Commission performed a valuable function. However, with the introduction of Federal funds the nature of the Commission will be changed from a coordinating organization to one which is actively involved in preserving, editing, and publication of American history.

Mr. Chairman, during the hearings of the subcommittee it was mentioned that there are approximately 20 projects for preserving historical documents currently underway. There was no evidence presented that any of these 20 projects was in any financial difficulty. The National Historical Publications Committee did not submit any financial statement proving that there were not sufficient funds to carry forth these programs to their completion. The only reference made on this subject was made by the Administrator of the General Services Administration and he said that there was a possibility that some of these program studies would not be completed. But there was no evidence at all, only some vague references which were made, that private contributions would not complete the projects. What is going to happen, if the Federal Government should get into this particular field, is that the many private contributors are going to halt their funds. Private contributors are unlikely to give their money to projects that the Federal Government is behind. There is a very good possibility they would decide that they would go into fields with their contributions where the Federal Government is not participating in any way.

Now, next, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get into the subject of editing. I would call the Chairman's attention to page 24 of the committee report where Dr. Shafer made the following statement:

> Again if I may mention one other, documents may be edited and some parts left out and sometimes certain parts might well be left out without any difficulty, without any problem, parts that are clearly unimportant and irrelevant, etc.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the Federal Government should get into the position of determining what parts of our historical past should be left out. I do not think that it should get into the question of deciding which documents are the right copies of a particular historical document. A very interesting sidelight here was brought out in the hearings by one of the witnesses to the effect that the copy of the Declaration of Independence that we have accepted as the original for many years was an incorrect copy and that Thomas Jefferson did not correctly determine which was the original copy.

I question just how far things like this can go. If historians can determine that the copy of the Declaration of Independence that we have used for many years is not the correct copy, then perhaps similar rulings can be made on additional documents.

Another confusing thing that happened in the hearings was in the testimony of Dr. Arthur Schlesinger. Quite frankly, I wish I had the opportunity to question him further on this particular subject. In his testimony he was discussing the writing of history and he made the following statement on page 39 of the hearings when questioned on whether this bill would contribute to the writing of history:

> Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman, we are not engaged in the writing of history or the interpreting of history.

I would call your attention to the present tense of his verb.

He is referring to the Commission of the present time which is not being financed by the Federal Government.

On page 18 he was making his rather formal statement, and he said:

> I cannot imagine anything that would do more to promote accuracy, judgment, and wisdom in the writing and teaching of American history than the program that is already underway and in which we are asking for really minor financial help from the Congress. I think it would give a tremendous lift to both the teaching and the writing of American history, would lift it to a new plateau.

I again direct attention to the tense of the verb. He used the future tense in referring to the writing of American history. Is there a possibility that once they obtained Federal money that the Commission would enter into the writing of history?

Another thing I would like to call to the attention of the Members appears in the report on this particular bill. If one were to make a cursory examination he could get the impression that several former Presidents of the United States are in favor of H.R. 6237. The implication is that Jefferson was in favor of this bill. Then you get to Hoover, Truman, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower. I assure you none of these gentlemen testified in favor of H.R. 6237. The only President that specifically was in favor of this bill is President Kennedy, who wrote a letter to this effect. This possibly could be an example of what would happen if the Federal Government should get further involved.

I would like to call the attention of the Members present to page 3 of the report on this bill. About a third of the way down the page there is reference made to Thomas Jefferson. This is in reference to a statement made by Jefferson many years ago when he said he was in favor of preserving historical documents, just as every Member of this House is in favor of preserving historical documents. I have serious doubts as to whether Thomas Jefferson would have been in favor of H.R. 6237.

The report says:

> This committee is similarly impressed by the logic of Jefferson's letter. His comments apply with equal consistence and effect in support of H.R. 6237. The object of and the need for this measure could not be stated with greater force or more telling accuracy. This proposed legislation could not be supported by a more qualified witness.

I think it would be bad if one administration were given power to perhaps make judgments on a previous administration. Perhaps the history of an administration could be twisted around for the benefit of another for political purposes.

Just to sum things up, I believe we have no need for this legislation, especially when the country simply does not have the money at the present time.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. The gentleman has raised the question of whether the Federal Government's financial participation is necessary. I would suggest to the gentleman that it is relatively easy to acquire private funds for documents concerning what I call the big names, but equally important to the understanding of history is the collection of documents from people who are probably less well known. I am sure the gentleman well knows that in the State of Washington there are 10 depositaries with some 40 collections. These documents describe the development of our country in that area, yet they are not available to the historians and scholars on the east coast. I think we from the East would understand the gentleman's State better if these collections were made available. For example, Governor Ferry has a fabulous collection of anecdotes of the frontier, of the Hudson's Bay Co. I think all of these things should be made part of the national educational heritage, and not be kept exclusively in the gentleman's State.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman for the question. I assure the gentleman there has been no request for Federal money, to my knowledge, at least, for preserving these particular documents. As far as I know, private and local contributions are adequate to preserve these documents.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman from Ohio has made reference to the collection of the anecdotes of the frontier in Washington. I think if we pass this law, we might well put in a collection of anecdotes of the New Frontier.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, a few blocks from this Capitol stands the Archives Building, where the valuable papers and documents of our Government are housed. At the entrance to this building is an inscription engraved in stone which reads, "What is Past is Prologue". I am told that a taxicab driver, who recently was showing some sightseers the places of interest in the city, was asked what the inscription meant. His quick reply was: "Lady, it means you ain't seen nothing yet."

He was right. Today we stand on the threshold of the greatest era of progress that the world has ever known, but we should remember that buried in our archives are the traditions and the priceless heritage of America. Our progress in the future will be sadly stifled unless we can build on the experience of the past.

Patrick Henry, one of our great American patriots, once said:

> I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past.

It is, therefore, most important that we preserve and make available to future generations the historical documents of the past.

I am advised that one of the projects which it is hoped might be undertaken under the provisions of the bill now under discussion is a collection and preservation of the papers and documents of the great Chief Justice John Marshall, such as has already been done with the immortal Thomas Jefferson.

This project is sponsored by the College of William and Mary and Colonial Williamsburg, both of which will contribute to its accomplishment. The College of William and Mary is the second oldest college in the United States, and there Jefferson, Marshall, and many other molders of American history sat at the feet of George Wythe, the first law professor of the New World. Colonial Williamsburg is the foundation which restored the city of Williamsburg, Va., to its pristine appearance so that this cradle of democracy might stand as a historical monument.

I must confess that I entertain profound respect and considerable sentiment for the great Chief Justice John Marshall. It was my privilege as a high school senior to attend classes in the living room of his home in Richmond, Va. I have the extreme honor today to represent the district which he once represented in the Congress of the United States. He was a distinguished soldier, scholar, statesman, and jurist. It was he who breathed life into the Constitution of the United States of America and made it a living document which has charted our course through the years and brought our country to the pinnacle of success as one of the greatest nations of all times.

His life has been a source of inspiration to me. The poet tells us that lives of great men oft remind us we can make our lives sublime and, departing, leave behind us footprints on the sands of time. The dim footprints which I may have made will soon be obliterated but we must preserve the records of men such as John Marshall so that future generations will not lose the sparks of sublimity which their lives generate.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, I must say I concur with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia. I dislike to see the spending of even $1 unless there is a proven necessity for such spending. But this may be more essential than we realize. In this day and time when it is said that we are departing from the principles which were set out by our forefathers, perhaps, it is a wise thing to go back and collect these documents and put them in such form so that they can be read by the people of this country.

I think if it is properly accounted for and if the projects are properly supervised, it would be a good thing. I thank you very much.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as one who has some interest in American history to declare my support of this legislation which, when adopted with the proposed amendment will ensure the enrichment of our national historic treasures, enlarge the understanding of our institutions, and endow the Nation with a permanent national resource of inestimable value. This proposed law, it seems to me, has been carefully drafted. My investigation indicates that after months of earnest consideration and inquiry, by some of the most judicious minds and greatest hearts in the land who serve the interest of freedom through history has come forth this proposal that will truly serve the historical interest of our country. Among its brilliant framers and supporters are Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Sr., who for 6 years was a member of the faculty of the great University of Iowa, in Iowa City, as head of its department of history, Avery Craven, professor of history, University of Chicago, Allan Nevins, the famous Pulitzer Prize winning historian, and Roy F. Nicholas, professor of history at the University of Pennsylvania. After considerable study I have concluded and am confident that it seeks to serve a sound and noble purpose. Indeed, it seems to me that the general welfare, which we are sworn to promote, demands its prompt passage.

To oppose it is to expose to the world a gross indifference to the American experience. To oppose it is to risk suspension and abandonment of magnificent undertakings now in progress. The completion of the papers of Jefferson, of Adams, of Franklin, of Madison, and of Wilson are all jeopardized. Worse, to oppose it, is to deny to the American people access to those sources of information upon which their society and its traditions rest. Abraham Lincoln assured the gentlemen of the 37th Congress that "we cannot escape history";

it is inconceivable that we as Members of the 88th should try.

Now let us ask ourselves what is the specific objective of H.R. 6237? It authorizes an annual appropriation of half of a million dollars to the Administrator of General Services, to be expended, upon the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission, in allocating funds to Federal agencies, and in making grants to State and local agencies, and to nonprofit organizations and institutions, in return "for the collecting, describing, editing, and publishing—including microfilming and other forms of reproduction—of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States."

One of the main projects would be to finance the completion of the documentary history of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as well as editing and publishing the records of the First Congress. These works should be available to the American people. They represent some of the high points in American history, a critical time that needs to be better understood.

This, then, is what this proposition will preserve for the Nation. How can any thoughtful person dispute the benefits that will come from its passage? Can there be those who would deny its value? Are we to dismiss it as, at best, a highly speculative investment? Is this an obligation that we can ignore and leave unacknowledged? Reason, if one will pause and ponder, pronounces a resounding no.

And yet there are people who would belittle it with the suspicious title: "The Federal Aid to History Bill." It more properly should be called, it seems to me, "History's Aid to the United States." If we will ponder on it we will find that today history assumes a greater importance than ever before.

To me, one of the most compelling reasons is for the rewarding and soul-satisfying experience of feeling personally identified with one of the most ambitious experiments ever undertaken in the history of man—a truly great and noble experiment in the intermingling of peoples, in religious toleration, in social equality, in economic opportunity, and in political democracy.

An equally compelling reason for studying our great venture in democracy and freedom is brought home to us because of the times in which we Americans are living. Today, our Nation is facing the test of its worth and the meaning of its history. If ever we needed to get close to our history and to understand the forces that shaped our destiny, it is today. A study of our history cannot fail to bring to us the realization that we did not become what we are without toil, dedication, and sacrifice for freedom on the part of our Founding Fathers, our pioneer settlers, and all the courageous and loyal patriots who have gone before us. Our history makes quite clear that the Republic under which we live is not an object, but a method; that it is not a goal, but a process, and that each generation of Americans has a responsibility to understand the ideals for which our forefathers sacrificed, to add something to our free society if we are to retain the vitality required to win out over hostile rival systems.

This is why history should be recognized and considered as an inseparable and integral part of the provisions for national defense. How can we call upon our countrymen and especially young people to protect freedoms which they misunderstand or understand imperfectly? How can we appraise and preserve the glories won in our yesterdays without a knowledge of the tragedies and travails, the strivings and their surmountings, the compelling aspirations and their slow, patient accomplishment, which alone can give them actuality and meaning? How can we, in our own generation, pursue a steadfast, courageous, righteous course, without first learning from whence and why and how we have reached this present place in our national life? These are rhetorical questions; they answer themselves.

The argument is made, however, that "at the present time the Federal Government does not have the $500,000 to grant for this purpose. The Government would have to borrow the money." This is, in the strictest sense, true, but to borrow the money would not be to establish some glaring, unparalleled, unique precedent. It is done, I am told, every day. The point is, it seems to me, that we cannot afford to reject this proposal. By its very nature it cannot, even in the wildest sense of the imagination, be construed an extravagance, a luxury, a concession to vanity. This is not a cosmetic, a facial makeup that is designed to improve our collective appearance. It is more likely to accentuate rather than soften lines and furrows, to harden rather than obscure features, to reveal rather than hide scars, and blemishes, and little disfigurations. At the same time, it will increase the powers of our vision, stimulate our ears to listen to the lesson of history, render coherent our utterance, arouse our minds, strengthen our hearts, and prepare us stoutly to meet the many problems of government and society which confront us today and which will continue to confront us.

Again, it is insisted that "the Federal Government should not subsidize this work. In the past, historical societies have been able to cope with this work very well financially, and there is no proof that projects currently underway are in any financial straits. Federal subsidization would tend to dry up private financial sources."

These are mistaken conclusions that the facts do not bear out. Everyone knows the superb work that is being done in publicly presenting the American patrology: The "Papers of Alexander Hamilton," the "Papers of Benjamin Franklin," the "Papers of the Adamses," the "Papers of Thomas Jefferson," the "Papers of James Madison," the "Papers of Henry Clay"—a former Speaker of this House, a Senator, and five times a candidate for President—and many others. For the first time editorial techniques and standards have been developed which satisfy the requirements of the modern scholarly community. These projects currently in progress, have won universal approval, they deserve every ounce of encouragement from the American people, for whose use and study they have been undertaken. They must be continued; they must be brought to conclusion.

It is shocking, therefore, to learn from the Chairman of the National Historical Publications Commission that, with the possible single exception of the "Papers of Woodrow Wilson," none of these great editions is financed to conclusion. Most have funds ahead for only a few years, and several are in immediate danger of collapse, unless we provide the help. The financial plight of these projects is grave, indeed. They proceed from month to month and from hand to mouth. The funds which launched, and, for a time sustained them, have dwindled away. The editors, instead of directing their attention and energies to the important tasks to which they have so unselfishly dedicated their lives, are obliged to spend much of their time seeking sponsorship and support. Because of the uncertainty of tenure, it becomes increasingly difficult to obtain adequately trained assistants. In the absence of a program, whose continuance would be assured, such as the legislation pending would create, private patrons are hesitant, or reluctant, to offer help.

With the passage of this law, however, there is every reason to suppose that the well-endowed foundations and philanthropic trusts can be persuaded to make substantial contributions to the good cause. This they may do singly or in unison. They were asked, however, by the Commission in its report to contribute an amount—$10 million—twice that requested from the Congress—$5 million—over a 10-year period, and the formal request for this amount has already been submitted by the Commission.

The fear is expressed that "the real danger lies in the editing process by the scholars who prepare these courses. In this process certain facts which the scholar deems irrelevant can be deleted from the published copy. With Federal subsidization there is always the danger of Federal direction." If this means that partisan policy may dictate the suppression and censorship of information or the expurgation of factual data, the suggestion may be unequivocally repudiated. The commission is nonpartisan, it always has been and always should be. The collection of historical source materials, fixed by competent scholars firmly in their context, will prevent slanted history, prejudiced history, biased history, a relationship identical with that borne by pure science to applied science. This is not to say that they cannot be perverted, but, in themselves, source materials are innocent, objective, and detached from any contemporary strife. Actually, of course, the reproduction and wide distribution of these copies are a restraining influence upon the circulation of slanted and prejudiced documents.

The main object, let it be remembered throughout these deliberations, is to make available immediately, in all of our great centers of research, including college, and university libraries, and even public libraries, throughout the land, the American record, produced in its most useful form, for all people from all places to study, and independently to shape their own conclusions. A free people, such as we are, should have this opportunity. We should have access to all information that would give us a better understanding of the great country we live in.

Just a decade ago these questions were asked in a symposium conducted by the American Philosophical Society, at Philadelphia:

> Will an economy-minded administration and Congress regard the editing of American historical documents as a form of intellectual boondoggling by no means to be encouraged? Or will the Government recognize its obligation to publish its own records in adequate editions and to cooperate in a meaningful way with related projects elsewhere?

This is the issue squarely presented. Inaction will not resolve it. Let us, then generously affirm our cooperation with what is after all, an inalienable responsibility to the American cause.

A former esteemed Member of this House, one who has become immortal in the history of this body, John Quincy Adams, has very ably stated the importance of and our reliance on history.

Speaking December 22, 1802, at an anniversary celebration of the Pilgrims landing at Plymouth Rock he said:

> Man, therefore, was not made for himself alone—no. He was made for his country by the obligations of his social compact; he was made for his species, by the Christian duties of universal charity; he was made for all ages past by the sentiment of reverence for his forefathers, and he was made for all future times by the impulse of affection for his progeny.

On that historic day he concluded:

> The voice of history has not in all its compass a note but answers in unison with these sentiments. The barbarians' chieftain who defended his country against the Roman invasion, driven to the remotest extremity of Britain, and stimulating his followers to battle by all his power of persuasion upon the human heart concludes his exhortation by an appeal to these irresistible feelings * * * "Think of your forefathers and of your posterity."

This is what I am asking today. Let us think of our forefathers, let us remember our posterity. What we are being asked to do today is not something new. We have approved authorizations for commissions honoring Teddy Roosevelt, Booker T. Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and perhaps the one which has done the greatest work of all, the Civil War Centennial Commission.

We have a responsibility to preserve the memory, the work of those who came before us for our use today and for those who will follow us. This is one way we can do it. We must keep alive that spirit of freedom which is uniquely American. The basis for that freedom was laid by these early great Americans whose works this legislation would forever make available to the world. This is part of the American story. It needs to be told again and again. We can help in its telling, we can help in its spreading. Let us not lay down that opportunity and responsibility.

The following historians of prominence in the profession, all of them authors of books of importance, have expressed their strong support of the legislation represented by H.R. 6237:

Crane Brinton, professor of history, Harvard University; present president of the American Historical Association.

Avery Craven, professor of American history, University of Chicago; past president of the Southern History Association and of the Agricultural History Society; present president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association.

Ray A. Billington, formerly professor of American history at Northwestern University and president of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association; now president of the Western History Association and Research Associate at the Huntington Library, San Marino, Calif.

Samuel F. Bemis, professor-emeritus of diplomatic history, Yale University; past president, American Historical Association; winner of Pulitzer Prize for his biography of John Quincy Adams.

Allan Nevins, professor-emeritus of American history, Columbia University; past president, American Historical Association; winner of Pulitzer Prize for biography in 1932 and 1937 and many other history prizes.

A. Whitney Griswold, late president Yale University; formerly professor of history there.

Edmund S. Morgan, professor of history, Yale University.

Louis B. Wright, director, Folger Shakespeare Library, author of many well-known volumes in American colonial history.

Waldo G. Leland, formerly director, American Council of Learned Societies; author of standard guides to archival resources in America and in France.

James C. Olson, professor of history and chairman of the department, University of Nebraska, present president of the American Association for State and Local History.

Dexter Perkins, formerly professor of history and chairman of the department, University of Rochester; former president, American Historical Association.

MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS COMMISSION

Wayne Grover, Archivist of the United States, chairman.

Julian R. Boyd, professor of history, Princeton University.

Felix Frankfurter, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, retired.

William M. Franklin, Director of the Historical Office, Department of State.

David C. Mearns, Chief of Manuscript Department, Library of Congress.

George P. Miller, Member of the House from California.

Leverett Saltonstall, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr., professor emeritus of history, Harvard.

Boyd C. Shafer, executive secretary of the American Historical Society.

Tracy E. Strevey, vice president for academic affairs, University of Southern California.

Rudolph A. Winnacker, historian, office of the Secretary of Defense.

They are appointed in the following manner:

The Chairman of the Commission is always the Archivist of the United States or an alternate appointed by him. This is Dr. Grover.

The Librarian of Congress is also a member or an alternate appointed by him. This is David Mearns.

One member is a Senator appointed by the President of the Senate: Leverett Saltonstall, and he is appointed for 4 years.

The Speaker of the House appoints a Member for 2 years: George Miller.

Member of the judicial branch of the Government appointed by the Chief Justice for a term of 4 years: Felix Frankfurter.

One Representative from the State Department appointed by the Secretary of State for a 4-year term: William Franklin.

One representative from the State Department appointed by the Secretary of Defense for a 4-year term: Rudolph A. Winnacker.

Two representatives from the American Historical Society appointed by its national council. They are Julian Boyd and Boyd Shafer. They are appointed for 4-year terms.

Two members from the fields of social or physical sciences appointed by the President of the United States for terms of 4 years. Ike's appointee is Tracy Strevey and President Kennedy's appointee is Arthur Schlesinger, Sr.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I join the gentleman in his statement and congratulate him on his fine work in the field of American history. We can understand ourselves and we will be understood by posterity and by future generations both here and elsewhere by our history. In turn, our history can only be reliable in terms of the preservation of basic documents. I recall in that connection an example from history which I think significant. There was a time not many years ago when there was a lot of speculation about the classical Roman law. There was speculation among great scholars. But when a copy of the Gaisus' Institutes was discovered it was found that the best minds in the civil law countries really did not know exactly what the great principles of Roman law in the classical age were.

It seems to me that this is illustrative of the necessity of preserving the original papers, the original documents which constitute the basic source material of our history.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman for his comments. What he has said is absolutely true, and I agree with him completely. I would like to say at this point that I have observed often, and I have talked about history and I do quite often, that whenever a nation or an institution forgets its hard beginnings, it is beginning to decay. And maybe there is some evidence in America today that we have forgotten some of our early struggles and our early hard beginnings. This is the reason why I, with a number of others, decided to organize the U.S. Capitol Historical Society last year which we decided should be a publications society to research on and delve into this Capitol Building, what happened here, to publish a book and make it available to the public.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman for the wonderful work he has done in preserving items and materials important to this country. I know that the Members of the House recognize his accomplishments and efforts. But also I would like to point out to the gentleman that all of these 20 projects that are currently underway are not going to be abandoned if we do not pass this bill. That is not the question. There was no evidence that the private contributions are not going to continue to finance these projects that are currently underway and that these projects cannot continue unimpeded under the present program.

Also I wanted to refer to the statement made that a document should be compiled by the Government to preserve some of the wonderful phrases that have been made by some of the important patriots in years past. I would be 100 percent in favor of that. But what I object to is a federally appointed scholar to determine which phrases should be in the book. An important thing to remember is that the recent list of some 100 books the Attorney General, Mr. Kennedy, helped to compile did not even include a book on the wonderful system of private enterprise that has worked so successfully and built up this country to be the most powerful nation in the world.

I am suggesting only that we are not harming in any way the preservation of our historical documents, which I am in favor of, if we vote down this bill; we will probably close off some of our private contributors and the Federal Government possibly will have to take over the whole program. And then I assure you, Mr. Chairman, there would be much more control than there has been in the past.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I did want to point out that these 20 projects are not now in any financial trouble.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I thank the gentleman and I shall comment later on that point.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I shall be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am very disturbed over this bill because I have had to do with some research and I have found that there is usually a movement of editing out the things that are not popular.

If the bill said "copy," I would feel very differently. And such material could be put in a small microfilm and it could be preserved in that fashion. But to permit the leeway of editing, I would have the greatest, greatest suspicion of any man, Republican or Democrat, who went to work to edit these manuscripts, these basic formulas, these basic documents, upon which we have built our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I trust very sincerely that this bill will be voted down.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The gentlewoman from Ohio raises a very good point. But in answer to that I would like to point out that nothing is going to be edited out that does not meet the approval of the National Historical Publications Commission. If one would read the impressive list of people who are serving on this Commission one would soon recognize that these are men who would not stand by for a minute to permit any sort of thing like that to happen. There is not any program contained in this bill which would provide for editing anything out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa on his statement and aline myself with his statement. I know of the tremendous work which the gentleman has done with the National Capital Historical Society here at the Nation's Capital. As the gentleman knows, I am a member of that society. It is my opinion that the gentleman has rendered a great service in that field.

It is my opinion further that this bill, if passed, will do the same thing from a national standpoint. I further want to say that part of the purpose of this bill is not just to edit documents, but it is to collate those documents and preserve them so that any individual or group interpretation of the documents can be subject to challenge and subject to reference to the original document if they are not done in a scholarly way.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is correct.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. I share the concern that was just expressed by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON]. But I hasten to add that in 1959, and again in 1961, I introduced bills that would provide within the present machinery of the Library of Congress audiovisual aids which would serve what I believe to be the same purpose as perhaps the intent of this bill.

I find nothing in this bill, however, that would deal with the visual aids, which I think are tremendously important. I see no reason why an approach as was generally embraced in the legislation which I introduced 5 or 6 years ago could not be included here.

Incidentally, the bill was at that time referred to the Committee on House Administration. There is no reason, I do not believe further, that if we were to not only microfilm but to provide a means of permanently recording as well as filming the speeches of Presidents and the great historical speeches, that these could not be made available to colleges, schools, and universities wherein the cost would not amount to what is proposed in the pending legislation but wherein there could be a revolving fund to recoup some of the cost through fees, which fees would be paid for the use of these materials by the various educational institutions which would cause the generation of sufficient funds in order to keep this going, without getting into an entirely new area since we already have the machinery of the Library of Congress to perform this job.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I was interested in the comment of the gentleman from Iowa to the effect that the members of the National Historical Publications Commission would not, I think he said, "stand for" certain actions to be taken, concern about which was expressed by the gentlewoman from Ohio.

As I read this bill, I do not find any control to be exercised by the Commission. In fact, I do not find that the Administrator even has to follow the advice of the Commission. The bill simply states that he should seek the advice of the Commission. But there is nothing contained in the bill which would require him to follow the advice and recommendations of the Commission.

Therefore, would the gentleman from Iowa please explain how the Commission could exercise the control that the gentleman says it would exercise and therefore protect the integrity of these documents?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think that these people are bound to and by precedent they have in the past. I have had a lot of experience with people in Government who work in the historical field. You take a man like David Mearns; he is not a man who goes off half-cocked. He wants to reflect the interest of the real historians. That is the reason all of the historians in America respect him highly. He is on the Commission. I am happy that he is and all of us should be.

Mr. JONAS. I recognize that, but what authority does he have? The bill does not require the Administrator of GSA to follow his recommendations.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The man who will be in charge has a pretty good record of representing the public interest in these things.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. The reason the National Historical Publications Commission is instructed to give advice to the Administrator of General Services is that it would be less than wise to just give the Commission complete authority. It would be wiser to put ultimate authority in the hands of a Government Administrator who must come to the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to get one dime for this program. Before the committee he can be interrogated as to what he has done. The Administrator, however, can take advantage of the advice of the experts on the Commission who are appointed for their know-how.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Texas, the author of the bill, but he does not read this bill the way I do. I do not read anything in the bill that requires the Commission to advise the Administrator. As I read the bill, the Administrator is simply authorized to seek the advice, if he wishes. Am I correct about that, or incorrect?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. The Administrator testified he thought that was desirable. His testimony reflects that thought. There can be no real question but that the Administrator of GSA would welcome that advice. A principal reason is that the Commission will be working with the foundations, the historical associations, and with the universities that would be putting up the major part of funds for this program. Generally, it would be essential for an effective program that the Administrator get this advice. There would be many people who would not want the Commission to have complete authority.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Just to clarify one thing: On page 118 of the hearings there was a ruling made by the General Accounting Office. Mr. Campbell said in his letter to the committee:

> The enactment of H.R. 6237 would within the limits of funds available for such purposes grant authority to the Administrator of the General Services Administration to make allocations to Federal agencies and grants to States, local agencies, and nonprofit organizations for the purpose of collecting, describing, editing, and publishing certain documentary source material.

I hope that clarifies the situation.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to close by quoting a former esteemed Member of this House, one who has become immortal in the history of this body; John Quincy Adams, has very ably stated the importance of and our reliance on history.

Speaking December 22, 1802, at an anniversary celebration of the Pilgrim's landing at Plymouth Rock he said:

> Man, therefore, was not made for himself alone—no. He was made for his country by the obligations of his social compact; he was made for his species, by the Christian duties of universal charity; he was made for all ages past by the sentiment of reverence for his forefathers, and he was made for all future times by the impulse of affection for his progeny.

On that historic day he concluded:

> The voice of history has not in all its compass a note but answers in unison with these sentiments. The barbarians' chieftain who defended his country against the Roman invasion, driven to the remotest extremity of Britain, and stimulating his followers to battle by all his power of persuasion upon the human heart concludes his exhortation by an appeal to these irresistible feelings. * * * "Think of your forefathers and of your posterity."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have had the honor of serving on the National Historical Publications Commission as a Member of the House of Representatives for the past 6 years. My colleague representing the Senate is the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts.

Thank goodness, today we are publishing the papers of the Presidents as expediency permits. As they fill a volume, a new volume is published.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Are they taken exactly as they were found or are they edited?

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentlewoman gets them in her office every 2 or 3 months.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I want to know if they are edited.

Mr. MILLER of California. They have not been edited. They are the way the papers were given. I want to point out to the House, too, that we have a precedent for this, because on the occasion of George Washington's bicentennial the House of Representatives published 48 volumes of the papers of Washington, and they were given to the Members and distributed free. All of the Members who were here then got copies of these volumes, and copies of them were deposited in libraries throughout the United States.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Copies, but not edited.

Mr. MILLER of California. No; they were not edited. Neither are these edited.

The thing we are up against is preserving, reclaiming, saving, and publishing the papers of the past. We are well started in this country on the matter of preserving the documents of the Presidents by establishing, generally at the birthplace of the President, a library for that purpose. This was done in the case of the late great Speaker Sam Rayburn, so his papers are available to scholars and students of history and they will be there preserved for all time. But many of the papers of the early Presidents are not available. They have to be dug out of attics in France, as were some of the papers of Thomas Jefferson that were referred to by the gentleman from Iowa.

These papers are published by the Princeton Press and edited by Dr. Julian Boyd, who I believe is the foremost historian in the United States today. It is a question of determining what papers were Jefferson's, what were not Jefferson's, and the order in which they come, perhaps modernizing the spelling and giving you the footnotes and bibliographies to allow you to interpret them, but not to change those papers, and this has not been done.

Through the Ford Foundation, the National Historical Publications Commission has collected the papers pertaining to the adoption of the Bill of Rights. I submit to you that there are no more important papers in this country. But the Ford Foundation, despite what the genial gentleman from Washington says, feeling that it has put about $250,000 into this project, is not going forward with it. I was hopeful that this House would publish the papers pertaining to the formation of the Bill of Rights as a public document. It should be in every library in the country. It should be in every university. It should be on the bookshelf of every student so that it can be referred to and so that the student could see the progress that has been made in human government and in establishing in this country the very basis of democracy, a government based on the dignity of man. This is what has marked our Government. Our Declaration of Independence might be considered the first document which forms the basis of our Government. The Constitution further elaborates and sets forth the mechanics by which the philosophy announced in the Declaration of Independence can be put into effect and made a part of government.

Now what are we quibbling about here—changing this and changing that? We have documents in this country, sacred documents, irreplaceable documents that have never been copied and have never been microfilmed. Do you know that of the records of the first 10 Congresses, only 1 copy exists and that those records have never been published? They should be published.

Now I want to talk to my colleagues about cost. At one time in connection with a part of this work, I tried to evaluate the cost of publishing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It costs over $20,000 a day to publish the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and half of that RECORD consists of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For the amount of money that it costs to publish the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we could save for posterity these vital documents that are so essential to the preservation of the history of this country.

There is nothing partisan about this bill. I have a letter here from Senator SALTONSTALL, which I read, as follows:

> U.S. SENATE,
> COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
> *June 17, 1963.*
>
> Hon. JACK BROOKS,
> *Chairman, Government Activities Subcommittee of Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have had the privilege of serving on the National Historical Publications Commission for the past 4 years and am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in behalf of H.R. 6237. The Commission, as you know, was established in 1950 by President Truman to make available "the public and private writings of men whose contributions to our history are now inadequately represented by published works."
>
> In less than 200 years our National Government has grown from a handful of States acting together in their mutual self-interest,

to a vast executive, legislative, and judicial complex governing the lives of 180 million people. The story of this growth and its trials and triumphs, is the story of the development of a free democracy. It is most important that we preserve the historical records of this development so that we may have a complete and accurate picture of the events and personalities which contributed to the formation of our Government.

I have been much impressed with the work of the Commission in this field, and feel that great strides have been made in the past 12 years toward making these documents, which are so essential to the telling of our Nation's history, available on a much wider scale. Not only is it important to increase the accessibility of these documents, but it is imperative that they be edited and presented more reliably than has been true in the past. Rather than give a historian's interpretation of historical events, or a simple narration of what took place, the Commission has tried to preserve and publish the actual records of the formative years of our Government.

To date, the Commission has initiated, in cooperation with other Federal, State, and local nongovernmental agencies, more than 20 separate documentary publication projects. The first volumes of the Jefferson, Adams, and Franklin papers have already been published and have been received with much acclaim. Little known details of the lives and ideas of the men involved are at last being brought to light and put forth in a comprehensive and readable form. Through the efforts of the Commission such knowledge will now be available to all interested in their Nation's history. In addition to these high priority projects which the Commission felt had too long been neglected, 10 more projects are now in the planning stage.

Along with the editing and publication of historical documents, the work of the Commission includes the discovery, collection, and preservation of historical sources and the creation of guides to their use. Its "Guide to Archives and Manuscripts in the United States," compiled in 1961, was the first attempt in this area. Such a guide can be of great assistance to scholars doing research in this field. However, it presents only a summary view, and there is a demand for more detailed information in specific areas.

Although our Nation is young in comparison with other countries of the world, we have a proud heritage which we want to preserve. I feel it is most important for the National Historical Publications Commission to continue the work which it has so excellently begun. Though State historical societies, universities, and research institutions can make vast contributions to the preservation of our historical records, the Commission is in the best position to focus and coordinate the efforts in this area. It serves as an informed and discriminating channel to evaluate priorities and prevent duplication of activity.

I therefore urge that the committee consider favorably H.R. 6237, to grant the Commission funds so that it may continue, in conjunction with other agencies on a matching basis, this vital work. The values to be gained in the preservation of our national heritage are incalculable.

Sincerely,

Leverett Saltonstall,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. Chairman, among the scholars who constitute the National Historical Publications Commission, and among them are to be found some of the greatest historians alive in this country today and I am humble but proud to be able to serve with them—at no time, Mr. Chairman, has anything but the truth and the preservation of the truth with respect to this country been considered.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I was impressed by some of the remarks made by the gentleman who preceded me in the well, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], who happens to be a member of the Historical Commission. I was particularly interested in his remarks to the effect that at the present time there is no editing and no intention or need to edit historical source documents. I will be very frank to say that I have mixed feelings about this bill. I subscribe to the remarks made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] as to the desirability and the need of preserving these important source documents. However, I question what the role of the Federal Government should be in this general field. When it comes to selecting various documents for publication or editing such documents, I do not believe this is an appropriate function for the Federal Government. On the other hand, I would have no objection if the Federal Government, directly or indirectly, collects and preserves historical source material and makes it available, through microfilming or in other ways, to scholars who then write history based upon the unedited source material. However, as it is now written, this legislation goes a little further than that. For example, I would call attention to page 2 of the bill, line 4, where it speaks in terms of making allocations to State and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions for "collecting, describing, editing, and publishing."

I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], particularly in view of the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller], how important are the words, "describing and editing" on line 4 of page 2 of the bill? What if those words were stricken and the word "preserving" were substituted so that the line read, "for the collecting, preserving, and publishing of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States"?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. In reply to my distinguished friend, by "editing" these people mean the selection of the best evidence they have—the most authentic documents. The first thing they have to do is to determine whether or not this particular document is authentic. If there are five different copies, all different, which one is the most or the best authenticated? Which one has a record of having been in a given library the longest, and what is the documentation attached to it? The editing process includes selection of the most authentic and the presentation of the document. It does not mean changing the thought or the intent or the words or language. Historical editing as used in this proposal does not involve changing or altering or limiting any of the material so as to reflect the personal feelings or political beliefs or philosophies but, rather, just to present the very best evidence of what Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and others said.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would say to the gentleman that his remarks only underscore my concern. Let me say that he seems to be at odds with the gentleman from California who indicated that no editing would be involved.

Mr. BROOKS. Pardon me, but the gentleman from California and I have long been friends and we are surely not at odds now, though we may have little differences.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. The editing in these cases involves such things as the fact the spelling in some of these documents is quite archaic and abbreviated quite frequently. Many of the documents in the old type were instances where a man made notes or wrote a letter in longhand and you did not have reproducing machinery at that time. Therefore, it was given to a copyist to copy. These people can trace the copyist to know which man copied a particular letter. It becomes necessary, to make it intelligible to us, then, sometimes to make these changes. They are generally reflected in the letter itself in parentheses or in the document, but it in no way changes the sense.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I can only indicate that this colloquy has pointed up, I think, and underscored my concern. I would think that if the papers of a President, or someone else important in our history, are worth preserving at all, particularly with modern-day microfilming and reproduction methods, we should preserve all of such papers and let the scholars individually and separately decide for themselves as they write their histories and their commentaries which of the papers are important and whether there were misspellings and so forth. It seems to me that such papers should be preserved as originally written or in a microfilmed form if it is necessary or desirable. Would the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. MILLER of California. They are preserved in that form. If you will refer, for instance, to the writings of George Washington, which were preserved, every little fragment of his writing that we get is put in the book. Some of it has no historic interest. There were letters that he sent to his factors in Europe, or in Dublin, asking for another pair of shoes—"The ones you sent me did not fit"—all of that kind of material is included. So that the person who wants to use it can draw from that his own conclusions. This is the only way it should be done, and it is the only way it will be done, because the archivists throughout the country and the historians, as well as the associations, have extremely high standards.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I think Mr. Webster defines editing as preparing, revising, and correcting.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Having been a newspaper editor of sorts myself, I agree that the term "editing" is a very broad term. I cringe a little bit at the thought that Government bureaucrats will select the people who are going to edit our historical source material. At the appropriate time I believe I shall offer or support an amendment striking out the language "describing, editing" and substitute the word "preserving."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the Members the fact that just 12½ years from now, when we are making traditional 4th of July speeches—and I hope that each and everyone present here today will still be a Member of this body and making 4th of July speeches—that on July 4, 1976, we will be celebrating the 200th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence and the founding of this Nation.

A shocking fact presented to our committee during the hearings on this bill is that there is considerable source material relating to the formation of this Nation which has yet to be properly preserved, published, and available for the use of historians.

After almost 200 years, we still do not have adequate preservation of documents which are essential to an understanding of the most crucial events in the history of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the traditions of the United States, and I want my children and my children's children to have access as accurately as possible to the thoughts of the great men who brought about the foundation and early development of this Nation.

But it is not merely the papers of the Founding Fathers which are important. Every State of the Union has produced great men and great ideas which have contributed to the richness of American history.

In the States of the United States there are some 398 repositories with some 12,251 collections of historical documents.

If H.R. 6237 is not enacted, the papers of these great men may be lost to posterity.

Let us remember what Santayana said: "Those who do not remember the past are condemned to relive it."

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, my objections to this legislation are primarily with regard to the appropriation of Federal funds for this purpose. The existing law, it seems to me, is adequate so far as the preservation of appropriate and authentic historical documents are concerned. I know that the entire business of records management and the choosing of those documents which are important so far as their historical significance is concerned, is one which is of national concern and, for that matter, the concern of the various States of the Nation. States which have not already undertaken programs in this area, it seems to me, should do so. I know that in Illinois we have undertaken a comprehensive program of records management and preservation of historical documents. If we had not undertaken to identify and preserve only those papers of historical significance we would not have room for all the documents which the State accumulates over a short period of time. So, those documents which have historical significance have to be culled out and preserved and the rest of them have to be destroyed. It seems to me that adding provisions for grants of funds to the States and local governments and providing for appropriations for an indefinite period of time is not necessary at this time. Certainly, at a time when we have a planned deficit; when we have an unbalanced budget; to undertake an entire new program of this type is unwise. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, it is entirely inappropriate. Since private agencies and foundations have already undertaken this work, there seems to me no reason why this cannot continue. Certainly that part of the bill which would provide for grants of Federal funds to the States—and very little could be granted from a $500,000 annual appropriation—we know this is just the beginning of a huge, large, new bureaucracy.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me unfortunate where we all agree upon the need for preserving authentic and essential historical documents that we should have to get into a debate of this type.

Mr. Chairman, I object to the authorization for the appropriation of Federal funds for these purposes. I feel that we can get along without this legislation. Therefore, I urge that the bill be defeated.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those few bills that every Member can have an opportunity to support without any reservations. So many times on this floor of the House there are bills which provide for only sectional benefits. This is a bill which is for all America. We have heard from our colleagues of the South, we have heard from our colleagues of New England and we have heard from Members of the Middle West in favor of this bill. Not only is this bill not sectional but it is also nonpartisan.

Mr. Chairman, in western Missouri at Independence the Federal Government operates a library for housing the papers of our former President, Mr. Truman. There is nothing partisan about this, because we went right on out to Abilene, Kans., and now have a library for the housing of important documents of another former President, Mr. Eisenhower. History is not something that is partisan.

Independence, Mo., is the starting point of three great trails, the Santa Fe Trail, the Oregon Trail, and the California Trail. Those records or documentory sources about these trails are being scattered and lost. They may be forever lost if they are not soon preserved by collecting and reproducing them now.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read from a telegram which I have received from the Jackson County Historical Association, addressed to its Member of Congress, urging support of H.R. 6237 to provide funds to the National Historical Publications Commission:

Hon. William J. Randall,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope you will support H.R. 6237, to provide funds to the National Historical Publications Commission, coming up for debate on Tuesday, October 15.

Mrs. J. Roger DeWitt,
President, Jackson County Historical Society.
Independence, Mo.

This is an organization of between 500 and 600 members. It is composed of businessmen and industrialists who know very well there will be some cost for this program but who have notwithstanding expressed their support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, if I may further point out, the nonpartisan nature of this backing when I say that one of the leaders of the opposite political party in our area, has urged the enactment of similar legislation in other years. I have today received other telegrams urging passage of this bill by business leaders in my district who recognize the value of preserving sources of history.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a little bit about the objection to the word "editing" in the bill. If one will read the report and if one will look at the makeup of the National Historical Publication Commission, he will find it is made up of some of the outstanding men in this country and who in my opinion could not be made to be subject to any influence so far as editing is concerned.

There has been expressed here today the concern that documentary sources significant to the history of the United States may be edited or rewritten different from the sources. No one wishes to see this happen. In my opinion the best reason that this will not happen comes from a look at the makeup of the National Historical Publications Commission. It is an 11-member body. The chairman is the Archivist of the United States. He holds civil service status for life. This is equally true of the Librarian of Congress. The other body has a member on the Commission. The House of Representatives has a member. The judicial branch is represented, as is the Department of State, and the Department of Defense. The American Historical Society has two representatives.

I, for one, will never concede there could be a lack of integrity on the part of the National Historical Publications Commission, but I submit if there is any effort to edit any of this material by the General Services' Administrator, or if there should be any abuse, such a procedure would certainly come to light and would be dealt with summarily by the Congress the very first year it was discovered. Bear in mind we are today considering an authorization bill and if there are any abuses by the process of editing in an effort to rewrite any portion of history, we as a Congress do not lose control because of our continuing control over appropriations. Herein in my opinion lies a very strong control over any possible future abuses. Perhaps words other than editing might have been used in the bill. A better wording might have been "compiling" or "describing and preserving" but nevertheless the Congress will have control over this work on documentary sources in future years through the appropriation process.

There is a lot of talk today about duplication of work in the executive branch of Government on overlapping of effort by different departments. It is even possible this sort of thing applies to historical research as between the Archivist or Library of Congress, or the Department of Interior or even by State and local governments. There is a considerable total effort going on today to collect and publish significant historical material, but the effort is not now coordinated. If this bill is adopted, there will be a systematic coordinated compilation of historical material.

A good question to ask is why we need this bill at this particular time. The answer is that if we don't preserve this historical material now much of it will be forever lost. Furthermore, this effort will yield significant material which, if made available to schools and colleges, can result in further research to the existing materials of even greater value. There has been some objection that this bill has an open end or is without time limits. The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, has assured us he will propose an amendment limiting the program to 5 years and also provide for an audit of all books, records, and accounts by the General Accounting Office. This will require detailed reports each year. Both of these amendments should be accepted and welcomed.

The question might well be asked, Why should Federal funds be made available to assist county and local government and nonprofit organizations in this work?

The answer is twofold.

First, our history is something that is national in nature and, second, a considerable portion of the basic documents that deserve the attention contemplated by H.R. 6237 are in the custody of the Federal Government.

We talk so freely about preserving our national resources such as our forests, and parks. We should remember that our Nation's history is really our national heritage. I believe it is the obligation of the Federal Government to preserve this heritage just as much as our wildlife, or our forests and our parks.

Local governments and nonprofit organizations such as historical societies are ready to assist in financing of these projects but they need help from Federal grants. Given the stimulation of this legislation, my home county could commence the microfilming, or some other process of preserving of the early day court records which go back to 1827 and which are fast becoming illegible and may not last much longer if not preserved or reproduced. A few years ago a portion of county's real estate transfers were microfilmed. It was never completely finished. It just sort of ran out of gas. To put the matter differently the spirit was willing, but the funds were not available to carry on.

In Independence, Mo., we are proud of the fact that it is the starting point of three westward trails: The Santa Fe Trail, Oregon Trail, and the California Trail. We proudly label our community the "Queen City of the Trails." Northeast of Independence, Mo. is the now restored, Fort Osage, that was one of the forts proposed and established as a result of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. Throughout the West, there are places that are equally rich in history, places that mark struggles for the winning of the West, and in every one of these instances, there are some things of interest that should and must be preserved.

We all realize debate here on the floor of the House does not influence or change the vote of many Members. Every Member must make up his own mind as to whether or not he believes the people of his own district would favor the passage of such a bill as this but also if it is in the national interest. For my own district I can answer both of these questions in the affirmative. Before coming to Congress, I served for over 12 years in a county administrative capacity. I know that the county government of my home county has expended several hundred thousands of dollars in the restoration of places of historical interest, including Fort Osage and Lone Jack Museum. Yet, I know they do not have the means to carry on much further on other projects. I know too that this historical research and restoration should continue to go forward. These local people need the benefit and guidance of the U.S. Archivist and the guiding hand of historians that could be provided through the advisory committee set up under H.R. 6237 and have as well the help of the National Historical Publications Commission.

This bill should be supported by every Member on the floor today. Our history is a national resource just as much as our forests and parks. It is our national heritage. History has been described in so many different ways. Down on the Archives Building are the words "the past is but prologue." History has been described as the lamp of experience. One great philosopher has said, "Those who do not know history will be condemned to relive it." I think that something every Member should ponder before he votes on this measure is the fact we spend $50 billion for defense. Five hundred thousand dollars is a tiny fraction of that total to spend on the preservation of history.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion under the rule I called attention to additional views appearing on pages 20, 21 and 22 of the report. In those additional views the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] and myself referred to existing law authorizing the preservation, duplication microfilming and publication of records and documents.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read title 44, Public Printing and Documents, under a heading "Responsibility of Agency Heads:"

(a) General duties: The head of each Federal agency shall cause to be made and preserved records containing adequate and proper documentation of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and essential transactions of the agency and designed to furnish the information necessary to protect the legal and financial rights of the Government and of persons directly affected by the agency's activities.

(b) Establishment of program of management: The head of each Federal agency shall establish and maintain an active, continuing program for the economical and efficient management of the records of the agency. Such program shall, among other things, provide for (1) effective controls over the creation, maintenance, and use of records in the conduct of current business; (2) cooperation with the Administrator in applying standards, procedures, and techniques designed to improve the management of records, promote the maintenance and security of records deemed appropriate for preservation, and facilitate the segregation and disposal of records of temporary value; and (3) compliance with the provisions of sections 392–396, 397–401 of this title and the regulations issued thereunder.

(c) Storage, processing, and servicing of records: Whenever the head of a Federal agency determines that substantial economies or increased operating efficiency can be effected thereby, he shall provide for the storage, processing, and servicing of records that are appropriate therefor in a records center maintained and operated by the Administrator or, when approved by the Administrator, in such a center maintained and operated by the head of such Federal agency.

(d) Certification of transferred records: Any official of the Government who is authorized to certify to facts on the basis of records in his custody, is authorized to certify to facts on the basis of records that have been transferred by him or his predecessors to the Administrator.

(e) Safeguards: The head of each Federal agency shall establish such safeguards against the removal or loss of records as he shall determine to be necessary and as may be required by regulations of the Administrator. Such safeguards shall include making it known to all officials and employees of the agency (1) that no records in the custody of the agency are to be alienated or destroyed except in accordance with the provisions of sections 366–376 and 378–380 of this title, and (2) the penalties provided by law for the unlawful removal or destruction of records.

(f) Unlawful removal, destruction, etc.: The head of each Federal agency shall notify the Administrator of any actual, impending, or threatened unlawful removal, defacing, alteration, or destruction of records in the custody of the agency of which he is the head that shall come to his attention, and with the assistance of the Administrator shall initiate action through the Attorney General for the recovery of records he knows or has reason to believe have been unlawfully removed from his agency, or from any other Federal agency whose records have been transferred to his legal custody.

(g) Authority of Comptroller General: Nothing in sections 392–396, 397–401 of this title shall be construed as limiting the authority of the Comptroller General of the United States with respect to prescribing accounting systems, forms, and procedures, or lessening the responsibility of collecting and disbursing officers for rendition of their accounts for settlement by the General Accounting Office. (June 30, 1949, ch. 228, title V, § 506, as added Sept. 5, 1950, ch. 849, § 6(d), 64 Stat. 583).

§ 396a. Final authority of Administrator in matters regarding surveys of records, etc.

Notwithstanding any other provision of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, the Administrator shall have final authority in all matters involving the conduct of surveys of Government records, and records creation, maintenance, management, and disposal practices in Federal agencies, pursuant to sections 395 and 396 of this title, and the implementation of recommendations based on such surveys. (Aug. 26, 1954, ch. 935, ch. VIII, § 801, 68 Stat. 816.)

REFERENCES IN TEXT

The Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, referred to in the text of this section, is classified to this chapter, chapter 11C of title 5, Executive Departments and Government Officers and Employees, chapter 10 of title 40, Public Buildings, Property and Works, and section 5 of chapter 4 of title 41, Public Contracts.

CODIFICATION

Section was enacted as a part of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, and not as a part of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, part of which comprises this chapter, or of the Federal Records Act of 1950, which is a part of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and which is classified to sections 392–396 and 397–401 of this title (see references in text note above, codification note under section 391 of this title, and short title note under section 392 of this title).

§ 397. Archival administration.

(a) Acceptance of records for historical preservation: The Administrator, whenever it appears to him to be in the public interest, is authorized—

(1) to accept for deposit with the National Archives of the United States the records of any Federal agency or of the Congress of the United States that are determined by the Archivist to have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government;

(2) to direct and effect the transfer to the National Archives of the United States of any records of any Federal agency that have been in existence for more than fifty years and that are determined by the Archivist to have sufficient historical or other value to warrant their continued preservation by the United States Government, unless the head of the agency which has custody of them shall certify in writing to the Administrator that they must be retained in his custody for use in the conduct of the regular current business of the said agency;

(3) to direct and effect, with the approval of the head of the originating agency (or if the existence of such agency shall have been terminated, then with the approval of his successor in function, if any), the transfer of records deposited, (or approved for deposit) with the National Archives of the United States to public or educational institutions or associations: *Provided*, That the title to such records shall remain vested in the United States unless otherwise authorized by Congress; and

(4) to direct and effect the transfer of materials from private sources authorized to be received by the Administrator by the provisions of subsection (e) of this section.

(b) Responsibility for custody, use, and withdrawal of records: The Administrator shall be responsible for the custody, use, and withdrawal of records transferred to him: *Provided*, That whenever any records the use of which is subject to statutory limitations and restrictions are so transferred, permissive and restrictive statutory provisions with respect to the examination and use of such records applicable to the head of the agency from which the records were transferred or to employees of that agency shall thereafter likewise be applicable to the Administrator, the Archivist, and to the employees of the General Services Administration, respectively: *Provided further*, That whenever the head of any agency shall specify in writing restrictions that appear to him to be necessary or desirable in the public interest, on the use or examination of records being considered for transfer from his custody to the Administrator, the Administrator shall impose such restrictions on the records so transferred, and shall not remove or relax such restrictions without the concurrence in writing of the head of the agency from which the material shall have been transferred (or if the existence of such agency shall have been terminated, then he shall not remove or relax such restrictions without the concurrence of the successor in function, if any, of such agency head): *Provided, however*, That statutory and other restrictions referred to in the provisos of this subsection shall not remain in force or effect after the records have been in existence for fifty years unless the Administrator by order shall determine with respect to specific bodies of records that such restrictions shall remain in force and effect for a longer period: *And provided further*, That restrictions on the use or examination of records deposited with the National Archives of the United States heretofore imposed and now in force and effect under the terms of section 3 of the National Archives Act, approved June 19, 1934, shall continue in force and effect regardless of the expiration of the tenure of office of the official who imposed them but may be removed or relaxed by the Administrator with the concurrence in writing of the head of the agency from which material has been transferred (or if the existence of such agency shall have been terminated, then with the concurrence in writing of his successor in function, if any).

(c) Preservation, arrangement, duplication, exhibition, etc., of records: The Administrator shall make provisions for the preservation, arrangement, repair and rehabilitation, duplication and reproduction (including microcopy publications), description, and exhibition of records or other documentary material transferred to him as may be needful or appropriate, including the preparation and publication of inventories, indexes, catalogs, and other finding aids or guides facilitating their use; and he may also prepare guides and other finding aids to Federal records and, when approved by the National Historical Publications Commission, publish such historical works and collections of sources as seem appropriate for printing or otherwise recording at the public expense.

I should like to also read Title 2—Library of Congress, as follows:

CHANGE OF NAME

Act of June 25, 1948, eff. Sept. 1, 1948, as amended by Act May 24, 1949, substituted "U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia" for "district court of the United States for the District of Columbia."

§ 160. Same; gifts, etc., to Library not affected.

Nothing in sections 154–163 of this title shall be construed as prohibiting or restricting the Librarian of Congress from accepting in the name of the United States gifts or bequests of money for immediate disbursement in the interest of the Library, its collections, or its service. Such gifts or bequests, after acceptance by the librarian, shall be paid by the donor or his representative to the Treasurer of the United States, whose receipts shall be their acquittance. The Treasurer of the United States shall enter them in a special account to the credit of the Library of Congress and subject to disbursement by the librarian for the purposes in each case specified. (Mar. 3, 1925, ch. 423, § 4, 43 Stat. 1108.)

§ 161. Same; gifts, etc., exempt from Federal taxes.

Gifts or bequests or devises to or for the benefit of the Library of Congress, including those to the board, and the income therefrom, shall be exempt from all Federal taxes, including all taxes levied by the District of Columbia. (Mar. 3, 1925, ch. 423, § 5, 43 Stat. 1108; Oct. 2, 1942, ch. 576, 56 Stat. 765.)

I point out these existing laws to show that for some of the purposes of this bill no further legislation is necessary. About the only thing in the bill, in my judgment, which is not already authorized by law is the granting of funds to those outside the Government as is provided in subsection (d) of section 503.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, two points have been brought out by the opponents of this legislation. One is the concern that the so-called editing may result in taking out valuable historical material from historical documents. On that point I would like to indicate that manuscript collections contain many miscellaneous materials. For instance, William Howard Taft saved laundry slips, restaurant checks, and things like that, which certainly do not need to be published and microfilmed as basic historical material. Is a historical editor doing wrong because he does not select irrelevant material for his compilation?

In testimony before the committee, the executive secretary of the American Historical Association, Dr. Boyd C. Shafer, mentions the original rough draft of the Declaration of Independence.

Dr. Schafer testified:

> Take the most famous document, and I think the most interesting document in American history, the draft of the Declaration of Independence. In the papers of Thomas Jefferson in the Library of Congress is the draft which he himself labeled in his old age as the original rough draft. It was not until 1943 that the publications of the Library of Congress proved that Mr. Jefferson was mistaken—that this was not the original rough draft but it had been preceded by previous composition drafts, and it was not until about 1947 or 1948 that a fragment of that composition draft was discovered. So I think that that is terribly important.

Many other examples such as this could be cited. Through the careful editing of these historical documents we try to present to scholars the raw materials of history exactly as they were produced by those great men whom we honor.

There is the argument that has been made here that people are afraid of getting the Federal Government into this if the project is partially financed by Federal funds. What is more directly related to the public concern than the publication of documents of the First Congress, the documents leading up to the Bill of Rights and the Constitution? Certainly these are matters of public concern which deserve Federal support.

This legislation is predicated on the belief so well expressed by Thomas Jefferson that the preservation and study of the "precious monuments of our history" are a matter of public concern.

At Cape Canaveral, the American astronauts ascended into space and the Nation and the world watched, fascinated, as they orbited around the earth, and maneuvered to safe landings in the ocean. The strength of a free and open society was revealed by the extensive, on-the-spot coverage of each of these orbital flights. The publication of great historical documents, like the flights of the astronauts, reveals to the world the complete and unvarnished truth about the American way of life.

Just what goes to make up this free and open society which we call the United States of America? What are the wellsprings which have helped make our Nation the leading apostle of freedom in the world? The answers to these questions are contained in the documents we seek to preserve, to compile and to disseminate.

In past years, much of the work of identifying and preserving these historical documents has been privately financed. A substantial portion of the work planned for the future will continue to be financed through foundations and through private contributions.

This bill merely attempts to bring a little more order into the slightly haphazard way these projects are being undertaken. By authorizing an annual Federal appropriation of $500,000, a much more orderly program may be mapped out. Such a Federal appropriation would not dry up Federal support—in fact, the hearings demonstrate that steady and assured Federal funds would attract greater private support. The point was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead] that certain popular figures or areas attract private support, while an orderly and well-balanced program can only be assured by a small but steady contribution of Federal support.

I am amazed by the lack of understanding and appreciation of historical values and the ethics of the historical profession which have been displayed on the floor today. As a military historian during and after World War II, I rubbed elbows with many Army officers and civilian employees of the Army who collected documentary materials, conducted interviews, and wrote histories of combat actions. They were all on the Army payroll, were paid and promoted by the Army, yet I never once saw an instance of a military historian who tried to cover up Army mistakes, or produced anything less than a professional and objective compilation of source materials and drafts.

Over at the National Archives today, highly competent historians are working on documentary materials relating to the adoption of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. This project has been under the supervision of Prof. Robert Cushman, formerly of Cornell University, one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the Constitution. I have talked many times about this project with a friend of mine, Leonard Rapport, who is working on it. These people are on the Government payroll, but this does not diminish their utter dedication and loyalty to the principles of truth, accuracy, and integrity. I sometimes wonder why Members of Congress get the twisted idea that just because a man works for the U.S. Government he throws away his principles and becomes engaged in a conspiracy to distort the truth.

On the floor today, several Members expressed the fear that editors on the Government payroll might present great historical documents in such a way as to support or oppose some current philosophy. Commonsense should tell us that if any person employed by the Government were as stupid as to attempt this, his action would bring such a storm of disapproval as to hurt seriously whatever cause he was misguidedly trying to espouse.

Mr. Chairman, I guess I am somewhat of a longhair, although my hirsute adornment is minimal. A quarter of a century ago, I sat at the feet of two great historians while studying at Columbia University: Allan Nevins and Henry Steele Commager. They taught me the priceless value of historical documents. While writing a doctoral dissertation on the great Republican revolt against Uncle Joe Cannon and Nelson Aldrich, I hitchhiked around in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, unearthing gold mines of hidden documents in cellars, attics, old trunks, bank vaults, and many other unlikely places. I had the good fortune as a fledgling professor at Princeton University to get to see at work that incomparable Jeffersonian scholar and editor, Dr. Julian Boyd, who has done such outstanding work in the editing and publication of the first 16 volumes of the Jefferson papers.

Then in 1950, as a minor flunky at the White House, I was in on the great rebirth of the National Historical Publications Commission, about which we are legislating today. George M. Elsey, a man with a keen interest and deep understanding of history, was administrative assistant to President Truman at the time. The Commission was formally established in 1934, but it was virtually moribund until May 17, 1950, when President Truman suddenly gave the Commission a tremendous shot in the arm for which the cause of history will be ever indebted. Over here at the Library of Congress, a simple little ceremony had been arranged for Dr. Julian Boyd to present the first volume of the edited Jefferson papers. Instead of simply taking the volume for his bookshelves and delivering a few inconsequential bromides, President Truman shook the foundations of the Library a little by launching into a penetrating address which challenged every scholar present. He said that he wanted to see a definite plan worked out for the publication of the public and private papers of the Nation's leaders. Various words have been used to describe the activities of the National Historical Publications Commission since the Truman address of May 17, 1950: "reactivated, reinvigorated, and reanimated." Suffice it to say, the Commission suddenly awoke from its 16-year hibernation.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I might also mention an enriching association I had for many years with Judge Samuel I. Rosenman, editor of the massive "Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt" which runs to 13 volumes.

All of these experiences helped to drive home the value and necessity of historical documents as a basis for history.

We are now going into a period which will prove very vital from a historical standpoint. Not too many years hence, as pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead], we will celebrate the bicentennial of the Declaration of Independence. This period will focus new attention and world interest in those documents which relate to the birth of the Union.

It is therefore critical that we establish an orderly program now for the documentation and dissemination of materials which relate to the founding of our Nation. That is why I trust that this bill will be supported.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me most of the debate here today has been devoted to convincing the Members of the House that we must preserve historical documents and record history. We might save a little verbiage the rest of the afternoon by coming to the obvious conclusion there is no one here who does understand the importance of it and appreciate the need for it.

In evaluating this bill I am convinced that the problem does resolve itself to how this can best be done, and how it can most efficiently be accomplished.

I pose this question: Were staff members of the Historical Document Section of the Library of Congress—which has been recognized certainly by every Member of this House and by people all over the country as the prime source for data on historical documents and for historical information—called in to testify at the time hearings were conducted on this bill for the purpose of determining or whether it could be embraced as a function of the Library of Congress at the present time?

One other thing. The gentleman from California pointed out that we have very famous documents of major historical importance that have not even been microfilmed. Anyone who knows anything about microfilming process knows this bill is not necessary merely to microfilm famous historical documents, the Bill of Rights, which he mentioned, or any other document. If the concern runs as deeply as it does today, then several years ago adequate microfilming equipment could have been set up so that today none of these historical documents would not have been filmed.

The objection I have to this approach is that which I previously voiced. The proper place to start is in the Library of Congress, in my opinion, to provide the funds necessary for audio-visual equipment. Where can we better provide the machinery and functional operations for achieving the purpose and the intent of this bill?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that in using the word "editing" perhaps a word has been used which does not quite cover the meaning my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], has in mind. I have heard him say what he attempts to accomplish by this bill. I may say I am in sympathy with this bill. But I have taken the trouble to copy from the dictionary the meaning of the word "edit." It is this:

> To revise and prepare as for publication, as to edit a manuscript, a motion picture, to select, correct, arrange, etc., the matter of, for publication.
>
> To superintend or direct the publication of—to direct the editorial policies of, as to edit a newspaper.

In these words, I think, are inherent the power to change wording, which might even change the meaning of some of our most valuable documents. I am particularly worried about the fact this is in the same bill allowing microfilming, because I think it might also authorize the editing of material which is microfilmed.

It seems to me it might be much better and fit the intent and purpose of my friend from Texas just as well if we were to substitute for this very indefinite word the word "selection" or "authentication" or some such word. I sincerely hope if an amendment is offered to change the word which is now in the bill, the word "editing," it will have the consent of the members of the committee and the approbation of the members of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, the gentleman knows the word "editing" as used loosely in newspaper or other work is a broad term. You can add to or take away. If we actually want to do something here, let us put some language in the bill that would preserve these historical documents, and not have some wild-eyed fellow adding to or changing the meaning of such a document. If somebody would offer such an amendment I would certainly support it.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman from Florida, 100 percent. As many people as I know and trust—I do not know anybody who I would trust to edit one of our famous documents upon which this Republic was based. The word "edit" should not be in this bill.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. I propose to offer an amendment to strike out the words "describing and editing" and in lieu thereof, to insert the word "preserving."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Lloyd].

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, in studying the committee report on this bill last evening, it struck me that this is a typical example of the mischievous way in which a new Federal program starts. In the most innocent, well intentioned fashion and after brief and even desultory committee consideration—in this case 2 hours—it grows and grows until the time when thoughtful persons making the appropriation in some future year look and puzzle at its origins and wonder, "How did we ever become so deeply involved?"

The good intent of this legislation to encourage the preservation of important historical data is unquestioned, but I think it is very wrong for us to assume here that this is a proper and essential service to be rendered by the Federal Government. Existing agencies such as the Library of Congress already have certain essential authority necessary in the national interest.

I note that the program starts with a relatively small commitment of $500,000. Who knows what the officials and beneficiaries of the 50 States will be urging their Congressmen to appropriate in the years ahead. In this regard, I answered a letter to a constituent yesterday who complained that this House had cut back the appropriation of an agency whose funds were committed to a purpose with which he was involved. The facts are that the appropriation for this agency to which he referred was, in 1958, $49,950,000. The next year this rose to $134 million. In 1960, we appropriated over $152 million; in 1961 over $175 million; and in 1962 this was increased to $263,250,000. This year, we simply retained the 1963 level, and yet my constituent was indignant over what he termed our action in "drastically cutting the budget." He further stated:

> The direct effect on the State of Utah of a curtailment in this program could be severe, to say the least.

I believe I am somewhat typical of many Americans in my active concern for the preservation of essential historical data. My own State is a relatively new one having been settled a mere 116 years ago. In 1856, one of my grandmothers, a single girl, joined with two other girls and pulled and pushed a handcart, in a famous handcart migration, for 1,300 miles from Iowa City, Iowa, to Salt Lake City. Yet I have been unable to find original early journals which were written by the approximately 400 members of that early company of pioneers, despite the fact that many are undoubtedly available and are deteriorating in attics. This certainly is a part of America's history, but I believe the preservation of this and other matters of historic value is the problem of informed and responsible individual members of our society acting in any number of ways, individually, or in concert with others including foundations, local and State governments, and that the intercession of the Federal Government will lessen the responsibility which now is being met by individuals and organizations of individuals rather than increase it and will further encourage the building of an officialdom in the various States whose future powers of blandishment and persuasion will embroil the Federal Government in appropriations far beyond what can presently be realized.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that these are the crucial moments in this House when those who have a responsible concern for the spreading of Federal Government into areas of questionable jurisdiction involving financial drain must by their alertness give voice and action to their legitimate apprehensions over the excessive spread of Federal service.

There is a second point I would like to make. It is often said by those desiring to receive Federal aid, that it is not necessary for aid to be accompanied by "strings." The statement by Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, carried on page 13 of the committee report on this bill, I believe to be significant. He states:

> We believe that in order to determine whether funds provided for a particular purpose have been expended for that purpose, the recipient should be required by law to keep records which would fully disclose the disposition of such funds. We believe also that the agency making the funds available, as well as our Office, should be permitted to have access to the recipient's records for the purpose of audit and examination.

To this quote I should like to add my own belief that any appropriation which we make should most certainly be tied down to the express purpose for which we make the appropriation and that we should state that purpose with accuracy and precision before we tax and spend, not only for a program such as proposed here but for any program carrying a Federal financial trust and responsibility. Mr. Campbell has correctly stated the Federal responsibility.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose that the passage or the failure to pass this legislation will seriously affect the peace or prosperity or even the history of the world or the Nation because I do not assume anybody is going to destroy any records, and in time I am certain records will come out of the attics and the trunks and the State libraries and the libraries of the universities. But the purpose of the legislation is a worthy one, namely, to preserve and publish source material significant to our Nation's history. Because the purpose is worthy, I voted to report it out of committee—not only to give the Members of the House an opportunity to debate, but I even intended to be favorable to the legislation at that point.

However, since then I have come to a somewhat different conclusion and I state this very frankly. First of all, it is my considered judgment that the private foundations have been doing a very adequate job. They have been contributing educational and historical value, and I compliment them for this. I suppose that enjoying the tax free status that they do, they probably recognize something of their responsibility toward the general national interest. No evidence was introduced in the hearings indicating they had any intention of withdrawing their support. This, I believe, could lead—that is the introduction of Federal funds into the program—could lead to their seriously giving consideration to do so. If the Federal Government is willing to pick up the tab, it seems to me private foundations can easily find other sources of interest for them to pursue.

Again, even if there is an amendment introduced, and I understand there will be to limit the authorization, it seems to me this will be meaningless because once a program has started, and we seem to know from experience especially with a continuing fountain of fresh material coming out every year—it will never end. Therefore, we probably are legislating into perpetuity. No expiration date written into this bill by this Congress will have any effect on any future Congress or any binding effect.

Finally, the passage of the bill, H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963, has materially changed the fiscal picture. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in debate on that legislation said this:

> The President has committed himself to a course of true economy in Government expenditures.

He also said:

> I anticipate that this philosophy will be reflected in the administering of the programs already provided, or soon to be provided, for the current year.

The President, himself, in a letter to Chairman MILLS, dated August 19, 1963, said:

> Second, the tax reduction must also, therefore, be accompanied by the exercise of an even tighter rein on Government expenditures, limiting outlays to those expenditures which meet strict criteria of national need.

I submit that no pressing need has been demonstrated requiring the immediate favorable consideration of this legislation.

Further, we of the Congress expressed ourselves very clearly in section I of the tax bill when we said this:

> To further the objective of obtaining a balanced budget in the near future, Congress, by this action, recognizes the importance of taking all reasonable means to restrain Government spending and urges the President to declare his accord with this objective.

Now, I suggest that since the funds which would be authorized by H.R. 6237 were not contained in the budget for fiscal 1964, it becomes a question of priorities, and my belief is that the beginning of this new grant could wait and should wait until our Federal financial house is in better order and the budget is in better balance.

I say to you that since all or the bulk of the funds will go into microfilming, good as this is, this can wait, too, because I believe I recall in previous testimony that the Archivist of the United States said that microfilming is a very expensive procedure. It is possible that through the electronic development of other means better and less expensive methods can be found.

My opinion is a "no" vote will please the already overburdened taxpayer and, under the present conditions, I submit that we should be persuaded by their situation and the situation in which we find ourselves in fiscal 1964.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I would simply like to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, on his decision. I would rather have one friend based on judgment than many that were born friends. I would like to ask this one additional question in addition to those that you have so succinctly summarized. Is there anything in the legislative intent or in the bill itself that would require public disclosure of the donations by private enterprise other than Government?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. There will be, as I understand it, a committee amendment offered which will require that the private foundations justify the money that they receive or the private institutions. I believe this will be a committee amendment.

Is that right, Mr. Chairman, that you will offer an amendment to the bill which will require that the General Accounting Office have access to the records of the private institutions?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. This is a dangerous thing, and I am sure Members of the House will recall that only recently we have debated and turned down legislation requiring public disclosure of donors to things which are the concern of the public weal and betterment.

Secondly, I do believe that I could agree as a former member of the Army, who helped select the Medical Library Board, now the National Medical Library; and having appointed two of the Army librarians in the old days and having known that organization to have replenished through microfilming many of the libraries around the world that were destroyed during World War II—a thing for which our Nation should take great credit along with the Library of Congress—that it is not an unduly expensive process. We need no legislation or expenditures such as this, to authorize it. I would like very much to associate myself with the remarks of the Member in the well and his summary and urge that this bill be defeated.

Mr. BROOKS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, we are spending $50 billion a year on national defense. This bill authorizes only one one-hundred-thousandth of that amount for preserving documents constituting the heritage of this Nation and the security that we are protecting with the $50 billion. I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 6237. At the outset I would like to say a word of tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], the author of this bill, for the zeal and diligence with which he has defended it and his wisdom in introducing it.

Although I am not a member of the committee which drafted this bill, there are two or three reasons why I take this time to speak in support of it. As a college teacher before coming to Congress, and as a graduate student doing historical research in libraries in our own country and abroad, I can testify from personal experience of the very great importance to be attached to historical documents. As a matter of fact, I was supposed to have gone today to my own alma mater on an academic mission as a member of the board of visitors of the department of romance languages at Harvard, but when I learned from the gentleman from Texas that this bill was being brought up today, instead of last week, I canceled that visit to remain here because I believe this legislation is of such very great importance. Moreover, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, which is the committee that has primary jurisdiction over library legislation, I have heard scholars and educators who were witnesses on other matters before our committee, express themselves on the importance of some Federal assistance in collecting, preserving, and publishing documentary sources of the history of our country.

The specific need for a national program to achieve these ends was set forth in January of this year in a report to President Kennedy by the National Historical Publications Commission. This commission is made up of 11 persons, including the Archivest of the United States who serves as chairman. The remaining membership is composed of six representatives of three branches of the Federal Government, two representatives of the American Historical Society and two men, "outstanding in the fields of the social or physical sciences," who are appointed by the President.

President Kennedy, in his letter of acceptance of the Commission's report, said:

> Documents are the primary sources of history; they are the means by which later generations draw close to historical events and enter into the thoughts, fears, and hopes of the past.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say just a word about why the study of history is of such great importance to our country and why it is essential that the writing of the history of our country be based on documentary sources.

First of all, it seems to me that a free people must have a knowledge of the sources of its freedom. This knowledge comes largely from an awareness of the roots from which the institutions of Government and our society grew. With this knowledge of the history of our Nation as it fits into the history of the world, or people can guide its course in this present day as no people ignorant of the lessons of its history can do.

An accurate recounting of history, moreover, can do much to inspire the emulation of past greatness on the part of both men and nations. And at times the portents of oncoming disaster can be recognized by the student of history.

Certainly not even the most complete knowledge of history can give us the ability to predict the future, but a knowledge of history can supply man and peoples and governments with the ability to understand the present and to appreciate what may be expected in the future.

Prof. Jacques Barzun has said that the individual needs history "for the conquest of provincialism." I would add that nations, too require history for the conquest of provincialism—the provincialism that turns nations narrow, that limits their horizons, that leads to chauvinism as distinguished from patriotism.

I think we are all aware that one of the great weaknesses of totalitarian governments, whether Nazi or Communist or some other, is the necessity that they display to rewrite their history books periodically in order to manufacture so-called facts that will conform to the pronouncements of the dogmas on which their governments are based. One of the best ways to assure that this cannot happen in a free nation is to make available to the public the full and complete records of the sources of our history, to make available to the public the full, complete, and, I may say, unexpurgated records of the institutions of government and the nation as a whole; and to make them available, as Thomas Jefferson once said by "such a multiplication of copies" that they will be beyond the reach of accidental or intended destruction.

The bill now being considered by the House of Representatives would strengthen our free and open society by, first, accomplishing the actual preservation of historical source materials about the United States and, second, making it available to schools and scholars. Indeed, the authorization of $500,000 a year to make allocations to Federal agencies and to grants to State and local agencies and to nonprofit organizations and institutions for the collecting, describing, editing, and publishing of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States seems a small sum in view of all that has to be accomplished in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make another point.

Millions of dollars are being expended by the Federal Government to support research in the physical sciences and I am glad this is the case. But this bill will authorize a small amount of money for the humanities and I think we should do more for the humanities.

This bill will also make the present Federal support in the field of historical documentation more effective. It will amplify present programs without useless duplication.

To those who claim that the introduction of more Federal activity in this field will drive out private financial support I would point out, and this is a matter of historical fact, that Federal support in such fields as education and scientific research has stimulated participation by the private sector of the economy.

I urge, therefore, that H.R. 6237, the historical sources material bill, be passed by the House so that the documents that form the basis of our democracy may be preserved, reproduced, and distributed. Knowledge of the roots and the freedom of the American people is the best guarantee we have that the American people will continue to be free.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 6237 is to make some funds available from the Federal Government to assist in locating, preserving, and making available, through publication, microfilming, and so forth, basic documents of U.S. history. The sum involved, $500,000 a year, is modest in view of the tasks that remain. We expect that expenditures from private foundations and other sources of private funds in the effort which will be stimulated by this legislation will be considerably more than the Federal contribution.

Knowledge of our Nation's history can inspire us. Our history has been a stirring example to the people of the world. It has given them hope in their struggle to secure and keep for themselves the blessings of democratic government. It shows us all how problems of the greatest magnitude have been met by the democratic process.

But there is much valuable research and much valuable publication that remains to be done. For example, major work remains to complete the compilation and publication of "The Adams Papers," "The Franklin Papers," "The Hamilton Papers," "The Jefferson Papers," "The Madison Papers," and the papers dealing with the adoption of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The importance of these documents to a full knowledge and understanding of our national heritage is self-evident. The National Historical Publications Commission has pledged that it will give priority to these projects if this legislation is enacted.

I urge the House to pass H.R. 6237, and make possible now this work which will be so valuable to ourselves and to the world.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (44 U.S.C. 393) be amended as follows:

Subsection 503(d) is amended by inserting after the words "United States." the second time it appears the following language: "The Administrator is authorized, within the limits of appropriated and donated funds available therefor, to make allocations to Federal agencies, and grants to State and local agencies and to nonprofit organizations and institutions, for the collecting, describing, editing, and publishing (including microfilming and other forms of reproduction) of documentary sources significant to the history of the United States. Prior to making such allocations and grants, the Administrator should seek the advice and recommendations of the National Historical Publications Commission."

Section 503 is further amended by the addition of two new subsections as follows:

"(e) The Commission is authorized to establish special advisory committees to consult with and make recommendations to it. The members of such special advisory committees shall be chosen from among the leading historians, political scientists, archivists, librarians, and other specialists of the Nation. Members of such special advisory committees shall be reimbursed for transportation and other expenses on the same basis as members of the Commission.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the General Services Administration an amount not to exceed $500,000 each year for the purposes specified in (d) above: *Provided,* That such appropriations shall be available until expended when so provided in appropriations Acts."

Mr. BROOKS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 11, strike out "two" and insert in lieu there of "three".

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, we reserve the first committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The first committee amendment is reserved.

The Clerk will report the second committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 25, strike out the quotation marks.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 1, insert: (g) The Administrator shall make an annual report to the Congress concerning projects undertaken and carried out pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, including detailed information concerning the receipt and use of all appropriated and donated funds made available to the Administrator.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. I just want to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS] if we are going to have to borrow the $500,000 that would be appropriated through this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. I would advise my friend from Iowa, whom I have known and enjoyed for some years here, that I do not imagine that problem will come up until the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate have acted on the authorizing legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Well, perhaps, I should have said "authorization," but if the bill is passed, the likelihood is that there will be $500,000 or a half a million dollars appropriated. Does the gentleman agree that this would have to be borrowed?

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, it may be that they can make arrangements without having to borrow it.

Mr. GROSS. I hope that the fact that the money to be borrowed to carry out this editing job will be duly recorded in the future history of the United States.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the action the committee has taken so far is to defer action on the first committee amendment which appears on line 11 at page 2?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MEADER. And the committee has acted upon the second committee amendment which appears on page 2, line 25, striking out the quotation marks?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEADER. And the committee now has under consideration the committee amendment which appears on page 3, lines 1 through 6; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is correct.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Brooks: Page 3, strike out lines 1 through 6, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) (1) Each recipient of grant assistance under subsection (d) of this section shall keep such records as the Administrator shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grants, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such funds are given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(2) The Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purposes of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under subsection (d) of this section.

"(h) The Administrator shall make an annual report to the Congress concerning projects undertaken and carried out pursuant to subsection (d) of this section, including detailed information concerning the receipt and use of all appropriated and donated funds made available to the Administrator."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "three" and insert in lieu thereof "four".

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brooks: On page 2, lines 22 and 23, strike out "an amount not to exceed $500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, an amount not to exceed $500,000".

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which the members of the committee discussed with the Rules Committee. I think it is the consensus that this authorization be limited to 5 years, at the end of which time if the program is as desirable as we think it will be, it can be continued.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. My mathematics were short today. How much are you wanting here for 5 years, or whatever it is? What is the total of this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. The total of this bill would be only that which our great Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate would approve, not to exceed that authorized on an annual basis, or not to exceed $500,000. Its portion of this sum will be expended on a grant basis. The total sum may not be expended. If it is, that is the limit. They cannot go beyond the authorization. Of course, we have just adopted an amendment which would put the matter under the close scrutiny of the Comptroller of the United States as well as the Appropriation Committee and the investigating committees of the House. I say that with this amendment we would limit the authorization to a 5-year period which seems to me to be long enough to set up a comprehensive and systematic plan for preserving and publishing these significant documents.

Mr. GROSS. Is the total authorization $2½ million?

Mr. BROOKS. If the Appropriations Committee made the total appropriation for 5 years, it could run to that amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Latta: Page 2, line 4, strike out "describing, editing," and insert the word "preserving."

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, listening to the debate on this bill today, it seems to center around whether or not we are going to change history or preserve it. I think the opposition to the bill, other than the expense of it at a time when the deficit is mounting comes from the words "describing" and "editing" in line 4. To remove part of the opposition to the bill, we should strike out "describing" and "editing" and insert "preserving," as that is all we want to do. We want to keep our historical documents intact. We do not want somebody editing them for us. We do not want to see them through another person's eyes. We want to see and read the documents themselves. We do not want people describing or interpreting history for us. We want to interpret it ourselves. I offer an amendment to preserve history if we are going to go to all of this expense at this time. Personally, I would rather wait a few years to pass this bill, until such time as our budget is in balance.

I understand there were only 2 hours of hearings on this bill. I do not think this is sufficient consideration of such an important bill. Its wording is not all that it should be. We ought to clarify some of these points.

At this time I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee as to line 6, page 2, where he uses the words "documentary sources" and ask whether or not we are not attempting to preserve the documents and their sources rather than the sources themselves?

Mr. BROOKS. I did not follow the gentleman's question. The gentleman mentioned line 6 on page 2?

Mr. LATTA. Yes. I am talking about the "documentary sources" that we are attempting to preserve. Are we interested in preserving only the sources of these documents or preserving the documents and their sources? The way the bill reads now it is "documentary sources significant to the history of the United States." I was under the impression from the debate that the interest was in preserving the documents, not just the documentary sources.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the interest is in preserving the documents themselves. "Documentary sources" would mean the actual papers, and include the actual reproduction by microfilm or other means of reproduction of the documents themselves. That is the term used in historical collecting.

Mr. LATTA. I understand what the gentleman intended to do. Should he have no objection to saying "documents and their sources," there would be no question as to what he was trying to preserve.

Mr. BROOKS. I do not think there would be any objection to it, but it would not clarify the matter as to documentary sources. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in the significance and importance of preserving these fundamentals of America. We who are living now understand their importance. It is important we know what Alexander Hamilton and others had to say. It is significant to know what happened in the First Congress. If we are to preserve this country we ought to spend a little time seeing what went before. I think the gentleman's attitude reflects sincere interest in that.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for his comments and his interest in preserving these items for posterity. I would judge, then, that he has no objection to my amendment?

Mr. BROOKS. I am very much impressed with the gentleman's sincerity and I agree with the general purposes, but the language might be more carefully selected, we could agree if the gentleman accepted a substitute amendment which might say "copy editing." I say this because it was suggested to me by a man with long newspaper heritage as meaning exactly what we are talking about, which is to compile, preserve, and put together documents that are significant to our history. His suggestion was a good one. This would, I think, meet the objections of those who are concerned about it, and I think would be acceptable.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to conform to what the distinguished chairman has just indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to the amendment that is pending?

Mr. REID of New York. There should be a vote on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Then he is not offering the amendment at this time.

Mr. REID of New York. What I want to comment on is the phrase "copy editing." I think on most good newspapers the copy desk has a clearly defined function, that is, to deal with accuracy, style, grammar, and spelling of copy. I think that is the intent of what we are concerned with here today, to make sure that the historical presentation of material is accurately presented and that there is no change in substance. Therefore I think it might be appropriate to consider the phrase "copy editing" to clearly reflect the intent of the House on this matter.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. I discussed this matter with our very able newspaperman on this side, the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN, as to what copy editing actually is and using him as an authority, being in the newspaper business for years, he says copy editing goes much further than just correcting the mistakes and it actually is the editing job done in newspaper offices.

Mr. REID of New York. I have the highest regard for my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I would not attempt to comment on newspapers in Ohio, but I can only talk about a small town newspaper in New York, and on the Herald Tribune the copy desk was never instructed to change the substance of any copy. It was directed solely to concern itself with style and the theory was clearly implied that the copy desk was not to use a scissors and pastepot, but to see that the reporter's story went through the copy desk as he had written it, with minor changes in spelling that were indicated.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. As I understand from what you are describing as the prerogatives of the copy desk, you are going to change the style of Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Lincoln; and I would not approve of that.

Mr. REID of New York. I would not suggest changing the style of any distinguished historical document. What I am talking about is to make clear through editorial notes what might be concerned with the accuracy of the statement. If there were misspellings, there could be an editorial footnote. The whole sense of the copy desk is not to change the substance or the language to any degree.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I believe you mean to say that the copy desk is not to rewrite the story.

Mr. REID of New York. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. They are not to rewrite the story or change the substance of it. So really we are trying to prevent the rewriting of history. I sometimes personally have made a correction or a change, but not to change the basic substance and meaning; is that not correct?

Mr. REID of New York. That is correct. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The purpose is clearly not to rewrite history but to see that history is reported accurately.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It seems to me, everybody agrees on what their intention is, that there should not be any change. If it is a documentary source material, it should be as it is and let the people decide and interpret themselves. That is what this is for. I cannot for the life of me understand why we even have the word "edit" here. If they can collect and describe and can publish, is that not all we are asking them to do?

Mr. REID of New York. I think what we are trying to do is to be sure that history is not rewritten and we are making it clear that we do not want history edited in the broad sense.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Surely, we do not here mean by the word "editing" that somebody is going to change a paragraph or sentence or a word written or spoken by any important great American figure. A footnote might be provided to advise the reader that a certain word spelled in a certain way by the author had a certain meaning. Whether it does or does not, such a footnote would surely not change the meaning of any historic document. I am sure the legislative history being made here in this debate indicates that it is the purpose of the committee that nobody is going to come along and say that one paragraph written by Abraham Lincoln is important and that another is not or that one word should be spelled in one way and not in some other way. Surely, we do not mean to change history. We merely mean that footnotes or parentheses may be provided so as to make the matter more intelligible to the reader.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the hearings the testimony of Dr. Boyd C. Shafer, executive secretary of the American Historical Association, appears on page 43, and he says:

> Again, if I may mention one other, documents may be edited and some parts left out. And sometimes certain parts might well be left out without any difficulty, without any problem, parts that are clearly unimportant and irrelevant and so on. But there are two things that are necessary in this work of scholarship. First, that the document be presented in its full form; and, second, if there are any omissions for reasons which are valid, that these omissions be properly indicated and brought to the attention of the reader.

I think this man is an authority.

I think the legislative history regarding this legislation should note that his comment is not directed to the fact that parts can be left out but, if they are left out, then it must be indicated and brought to the attention of the reader.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey, because I believe the way to get over this minor difficulty we have in defining the word "edit," a word which we all understand, in the purposes of this bill is by legislative history. I think the quotations which the gentleman read indicate that the committee intended "edit" in the historical scholarship sense of the word and in the language in which he has put it in testifying. I believe the majority of the committee understand editing in that way.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I am inclined toward the view of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] who prefers the words "copy editing" because I believe he has had sufficient experience in the newspaper profession to know what the words "copy editing" means. I think he has explained it adequately. Therefore, if his amendment is presented, I shall certainly favor it.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. As I am listening to the debate all afternoon on this particular bill, I wonder why, if all of the argument is over the word "editing," we just do not amend the word out. If they are not going to be edited, as the gentleman on the other side has said and as the gentlemen over here have said, why do we not accept an amendment and eliminate the word "editing" and one part of the argument is solved. Is that not a simple thing, I ask my colleague?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. It sounds simple, but, of course, there are times, as Dr. Shafer points out, when a word might be misspelled or certain parts are irrelevant and they should be left out, but the attention of the reader should be called to the fact that they are being left out.

Mr. BECKER. But then you cannot write that in this legislation, can you?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. By the use of the words "copy editing"; I think that takes care of it.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman will concede with the newspaperman on the floor a few minutes ago that a copydesk has a function and a theoretical function, but sometimes when I read my releases in the newspapers after they go through the copydesk I am quite sure it had not come in in substantially the way I put it in. In theory it is fine, but in practice it is different.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. You are talking about a rewrite.

Mr. BECKER. No. I am talking about the copydesk.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman. I think I know what the gentleman means when he says copy editing, and what the newspaper means. The question here is, how is somebody in a Government agency going to interpret the word "editing" at some subsequent time? We know that there have been serious accusations from time to time. In the case, for instance, of international discussions and conferences relating to treaties and international agreements that we have entered into there have been suggestions made and, as a matter of fact, there have even been accusations made that some of the memorandums of these international conferences have been altered and edited by somebody in the State Department. Therefore, I would be inclined to agree with those who suggest that to play it on the safe side no violence will be done to the basic purpose of this act by taking the word "editing" out, and on the other hand, we are certainly going to preserve the integrity of the historic documents that will be preserved by this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can defeat this amendment. I anticipate offering an amendment which would say "preserving and compiling," which I believe will do the same thing. It means that there will be an opportunity to put material together in the proper order without in any sense of the word changing the intent or the meaning.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we have discussed this proposed amendment to my amendment and I am in full accord with it. It does delete the word "edit", which I think will be good.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Why does not the gentleman from Ohio ask unanimous consent to have his amendment amended to conform to the suggestion offered, so that we can dispose of this matter?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to amend my amendment by inserting after the word "preserving" the words "and compiling."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have just looked up the definition of the word "compiling" and it says "to put together in a new form." I am not sure that that satisfies me. So, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADER) there were—ayes 51, noes 63.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. LATTA and Mr. BROOKS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 63, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROOKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS: On page 2, line 4, strike out "editing" and insert in lieu thereof "preserving and compiling."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I think I can say that this will meet the objections of those who have doubts about the word "editing."

It is my opinion that this will enable the persons who will compile this information to put it in in orderly form. They are scholarly historians who know their business. This will enable them to do a proper job.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I would be pleased to yield to my distinguished newspaper colleague and congressional colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. I presume, in view of the point raised by the gentleman from Washington, that the word "compiling" could also be constructed to at least connote a change? The gentleman means that the word "compiling" is to assemble and not alter or change?

Mr. BROOKS. That is the general meaning, upon which the gentleman and I agree.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. If I understand the amendment which has just been offered by the gentleman from Texas, it is substantially the same thing that we agreed upon previously, striking out the words "describing and editing" and inserting in lieu thereof "compiling"?

Mr. BROOKS. We would strike out the word "editing" and leave in the word "describing," as we did agree to do.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a very thrilling and exciting week of debate in the House of Representatives. Yesterday I understand there was debate on the selling of Popsicles and Eskimo Pies. I missed this stirring moment in history. But today I have been treated to hours of debate on the meaning of newspaper journalese. I think we have spent over an hour on this. I would remind the members of the committee that last week in a period of 2 minutes we disposed of the problem of whether or not we should share an appropriation with Russia for the purpose of moon exploration. So, Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to be part of a Congress where important things are really given long, careful, due consideration and deliberation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. For the information of the gentleman, and we missed him yesterday, there was no debate over Popsicles or Eskimo Pies. We would have welcomed the presence of the gentleman to open up debate on that subject.

Mr. JOELSON. For the information of the gentleman from Iowa, I was here in Washington but I thought that the 88th Congress could solve the question of whether or not we should sell Eskimo Pies without my presence.

Mr. GROSS. I am delighted to hear of the gentleman's concern.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment which accomplishes exactly what I wanted to accomplish by the amendment that has just been rejected. It leaves in the word "describing".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HEMPHILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6237) to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize grants for the collection, reproduction, and publication of documentary source material significant to the history of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 538, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALLHAUSER moves to recommit the bill H.R. 6237 to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. **STINSON**. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 158, nays 154, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 174]

YEAS—158

Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Beckworth
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cannon
Casey
Celler
Clark
Cleveland
Corman
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Dent
Denton
Dingell
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Flood
Forrester
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Ichord
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Libonati
Lindsay
Long, Md.
McFall
Mahon
Marsh
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Nedzi
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Poage
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, Mich.
Schwengel
Secrest
Sheppard
Sickles
Sisk
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stratton
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Watson
Weltner
White
Whitener
Willis
Wright
Young

NAYS—154

Abbitt
Abele
Adair
Alger
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brock
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clausen, Don H.
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Derounian
Dole
Dowdy
Duncan
Findley
Fisher
Ford
Foreman
Fountain
Fulton, Pa.
Gathings
Glenn
Goodling
Gross
Grover
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Henderson
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Jarman
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Morton
Mosher
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
O'Konski
Ostertag
Passman
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Pool
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rich
Riehlman
Roberts, Ala.
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson
Tuck
Tupper
Utt
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—120

Abernethy
Anderson
Avery
Barrett
Bass
Battin
Bennett, Mich.
Boggs
Bow
Bray
Broomfield
Buckley
Cameron
Carey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Delaney
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dorn
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Finnegan
Fino
Flynt
Fogarty
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Giaimo
Goodell
Grant
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hanna
Hansen
Hawkins
Healey
Hull
Hutchinson
Jensen
Jones, Ala.
Kee
Kelly
Kilburn
Knox
Kyl
Lesinski
Long, La.
McDowell
Macdonald
MacGregor
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Miller, N.Y.
Mills
Moore
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Osmers
Philbin
Pilcher
Powell
Reifel
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Rodino
Rostenkowski
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scott
Shelley
Short
Sibal
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Stephens
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuten
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Whalley
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wyman
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.
Mr. St Germain for, with Mr. Hutchinson against.
Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Waggonner against.
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Dorn against.
Mr. Daddario for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.
Mr. Sibal for, with Mr. Anderson against.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Rivers of Alaska for, with Mr. Del Clawson against.
Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Gurney against.
Mr. Daniels for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Cooley for, with Mr. Martin of California against.
Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin against.
Mr. Madden for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.
Mr. Farbstein for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.
Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Battin against.
Mr. Giaimo for, with Mr. Stubblefield against.
Mr. Slack for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Curtis against.
Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Derwinski against.
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Fino against.
Mr. Cohelan for, with Mr. MacGregor against.
Mrs. Hansen for, with Mr. Moore against.
Mr. Healey for, with Mr. Wyman against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Bow against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Jensen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Powell with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Ryan of New York with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Kyl.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Vanik with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Springer.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Tuten.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mrs. Kee.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Finnegan.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Bass.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Frazier.

Mr. **FULTON** of Pennsylvania changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HALLECK**. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week?

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, tomorrow we will have up for consideration House Resolution 542 from the Committee on House Administration providing funds for the Committee on Labor and Education in connection with an investigation of St. Elizabeths Hospital. I would like also to advise the minority leader and other Members of the House that we do expect to make a further announcement of the program on tomorrow for the balance of the week.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. **PERKINS**. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4955) to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation, together with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree with the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky. If I am correct, it is my understanding this Senate bill would include, as passed by the Senate, not only vocational education on a considerably expanded basis but it also includes an extension of the National Defense Education Act which has not even emerged from the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and it also includes provision for extension of the impacted school aid bill which is before the House Rules Committee.

Mr. PERKINS. I would say to the gentleman that the Senate did add those two amendments, but the extension of the National Defense Education Act is a simple extension, extending the act 3 years, and it adds $35 million for loan purposes. There is no reason why we cannot iron out this disagreement in conference. The gentlewoman from Oregon, chairman of that subcommittee, will be one of the conferees, and I feel confident we will be able to iron out that disagreement in a manner satisfactory to the House.

On the impacted area legislation, that has been before the Members of this body so often that we all understand it. It has been before the Rules Committee and it has thoroughly considered it. As to the disagreement between the two bodies, I have every confidence we can iron out the differences on both the National Defense Education Act and the impacted area bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Senate bill would actually convert the vocational education bill into an omnibus education bill, I object to the request.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 6237, just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House last Thursday, October 10, when H.R. 8784, the independent offices appropriations bill was considered and voted upon. If I had been able to be present, I would have voted against the motion for recommittal and for final passage of the bill.

GENERAL CLAY PROTESTS AID CUTS

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over the foreign aid appropriation, perhaps the most misquoted person has been Gen. Lucius D. Clay, who headed the foreign aid Clay Committee, formally called the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World.

The statements attributed to General Clay have caused so much misunderstanding that the general, in a recent letter to the Detroit Free Press, saw fit to set the record straight.

He stressed the point that he is concerned that the cut may fail to secure an adequate foreign aid bill partly because of the lack of public understanding.

I want to place in the RECORD his entire letter, which was published in the Detroit Free Press last week.

GENERAL CLAY PROTESTS

I am concerned that we may fail to secure an adequate foreign aid bill this year, due in part, to a lack of public understanding about its importance to our national security.

Obviously, the present period is a vital one for the consideration of our foreign aid program.

The Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World which I headed, in its comprehensive examination of the aid program earlier this year, found that a sound foreign aid program "is essential to the security of our Nation."

Our report did recommend certain reductions. However, the report stressed the importance of these cuts being made over a period of several years to avoid drastic consequences.

The recommendations which we had made were closely paralleled by many in the report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Indeed, this committee made somewhat greater cuts than were embodied in our suggestions.

Nevertheless, its considered recommendation for an authorization of $4.1 billion, which was in itself $400 million below the President's request, was slashed by $585 million to $3.5 billion on the House floor.

I believe that the larger cut is a threat to vital U.S. interests abroad. I am disturbed, in particular, by the reduction in the Alliance for Progress and for the military assistance program.

In proposing the Alliance for Progress the United States undertook solemn commitments to provide external support to the self-help efforts of the Latin American countries.

A failure to authorize the appropriation of funds which would meet this commitment would be taken by many as evidence of our lack of sincerity.

Certainly, political stability on this continent is highly desirable, and such stability can develop only in an atmosphere of economic improvement. If the Alliance for Progress does not provide this atmosphere, I know of no other way to proceed, and it seems to me that it justifies our full support as long as it holds promise.

I also believe the House has made much too sharp a reduction in the military assistance program to be accomplished in 1 year without encouraging damaging results to the security of the free world.

Certainly, our policy of supporting the defense establishments of free nations adjacent to Communist countries has prevented the political penetration which was so successful in taking over the countries of Eastern Europe.

We might well reduce the resources of our own defense budget rather than to discontinue or too sharply reduce the support which makes possible the contribution of the foreign military forces to the security of the free world. If allowed to stand, the House cuts would have its effect on future years, even if not immediately apparent. The Senate has, of course, not yet acted on the authorization bill, nor has the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as yet reported to the Senate.

False charges, valid criticism, and general indifference may have obscured, and even overshadowed, an appreciation of the value of our foreign aid program.

It can be carefully and gradually reduced, barring extraordinary developments.

Nevertheless, real progress is being made both in improving the administration of the program and in directing funds to countries and projects which offer optimum return.

LUCIUS D. CLAY,
General, Retired, U.S. Army.

CAPE FLORIDA LIGHTHOUSE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, because of the historic importance of the old Cape Florida Lighthouse in Dade County, Fla., I should like to commend the attention of the House to the following editorial which was broadcast over radio station WGBS in Miami a few days ago.

The news editorial follows:

Renewed effort to preserve the Cape Florida Lighthouse as a public memorial must be given the support it deserves, or else this attempt will surely fail as others have so often in the past.

The latest move to protect the historic landmark from further deterioration and wanton destruction by vandals came from Representative CLAUDE PEPPER, who said he will join with Representative DANTE FASCELL in asking the Congress to declare the lighthouse a national monument.

With the aid of an aroused and determined public, this instance of woeful community neglect can be corrected. Without it, the effort may stir only a breeze of interest in Washington, or become strangled in red tape as has happened before.

For 138 years, the 95-foot, red-brick tower has been a silent witness to the sometimes turbulent, sometimes peaceful history of southern Florida. It was there before Florida was admitted to the Union in 1845. During the span of years when the only communication to the area was by way of the sea, its beacon guided ships through the treacherous reefs.

The lighthouse had a part in the Indian wars. In 1836, it was besieged by Indians who set fire to its base. Later it was the gathering place for a Navy squadron, which had a flotilla of canoes for forays into the Everglades. Violence marred the tower again when it was damaged during the Civil War.

Its beacon winked out for the last time in 1878, its usefulness as a guide ended.

And so, for decade after decade, the lighthouse has withstood the violence of man, the violence of nature and errant vandalism so far. It can be preserved as a symbol of the heritage of our history. But it will take action, the collective voice of the community speaking as one.

Why not do your part, now.

TOURISM

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the balance-of-payments problem as it affects tourism abroad and in this country, I have received a letter by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon commenting on a bill which is pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary.

My colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Oregon, Representative AL ULLMAN, introduced this proposed law which provides for a "See America Now" proclamation.

I am sure that all Members of the House will be interested in Secretary Dillon's comments and therefore I quote below the text of his letter:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, October 10, 1963.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am very pleased to respond to your letter of September 10, in which you request my views on the pending House Joint Resolution 658, "Authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim 1964 as 'See America Year' and for other purposes." Such a proclamation would give further impetus to the "See America Now" program which the President announced in his special message on balance of payments to the Congress last July 18 and enhance our efforts to make travel at home a more appealing alternative to travel abroad.

As the President pointed out, the dollar outflows from the United States resulting from travel abroad by Americans are substantial. In 1962, our expenditures for such travel, including payments to foreign air and sea carriers for transocean transportation, amounted to almost $2.5 billion and a further increase is estimated for 1963. To the extent that our citizens may be attracted to the many beautiful spots throughout our country, in place of oversea travel, it will of course result in much needed improvement in our payments deficit.

The success of the "See America Now" program will primarily depend upon the extent to which the American people are made aware of the desirability and importance of their looking more to the United States for vacation and travel opportunities. The strong support of the Congress for this objective which would be indicated by the passage of House Joint Resolution 658 could make a major contribution in this respect.

Consequently, I welcome this initiative of Congressman ULLMAN and urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 658.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee and that enactment of legislation along these lines would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

REVENUE ACT OF 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Miami News, one of the great Democratic newspapers of the South, has commented editorially on our action in passing the Revenue Act of 1963 and has pointed out what this will mean with regard to increased job opportunities and stimuli to our economic system.

I am sure that many Members of Congress will be interested in knowing the reaction of my district to the passage of this vitally important bill. The Miami News quite accurately reflects the attitude of most of my constituents on this matter.

I might also add that nearly all civic organizations, governing bodies, both muncipal and county, together with hundreds of private citizens have written me urging favorable House action on the Area Redevelopment Act. Our area has suffered adversely because of the tremendous number of Cuban refugees that we have absorbed with the resultant adverse impact on the local labor market.

We hope to qualify for ARA assistance under the provisions of this act, and we are badly in need of this help. I am hopeful that the ARA bill will be successful when it is again presented to the House of Representatives.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News, Sept. 30, 1963]

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY MILLION STRONG NOW, WE NEED MORE JOBS

What the sociologists call our "population explosion" set a new record at 11 a.m. last Friday, thus adding to our growing problem of providing jobs for our people.

On Friday the population clock in the Department of Commerce in Washington showed that we had become a nation of 190 million people. The event was duly noted by Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, although the figure remained constant only 11 seconds.

Probably the greatest problem our free enterprise system faces is that of jobs. The new population figure compares with 179,300,000 in the 1960 census. At the present rate of growth we will reach a total of 200 million persons by early 1967.

Already we have an unemployment problem with fewer opportunities all the time for those reaching working age. Obviously, what we need are more production industries. The problem grows steadily more serious as automation displaces workers in established industries. Jobless Americans, once their unemployment insurance is used up, are no longer customers for the consumer goods which account for such jobs as remain.

President Kennedy has shown a keen awareness of the threat to our economic system in this situation. Last March he predicted that even without a recession our unemployment rate will climb "steadily and swiftly" to 7 percent "unless we step up our rate of growth."

To the end of providing an increase in jobs the President proposed a Federal income tax cut which happily has now passed the House and is before the Senate.

Of course, the theory is that if workers pay less taxes they will have more to spend for consumer goods. That in turn will increase the supply of jobs and provide more wage earners to pay income taxes. Moreover, a reduction in business taxes will provide capital necessary for new and expanded industries.

That Commerce Department population clock becomes a mighty important instrument as we look into the future.

THE ARA PROGRAM IS INDEED A MORAL ISSUE AND A POLITICAL ISSUE AS WELL AS AN ECONOMIC ISSUE—THESE ISSUES MUST BE RESOLVED FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a banker president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is campaigning against the Federal "subsidies," making his main attack on the ARA program, which he calls "immoral." I have looked into the amount of funds which the U.S. Treasury leaves on deposit with this gentleman's bank—interest free. The amount is $17 million. The taxpayers are paying an interest rate of 3.46 percent on this money, or $590,000 a year. This is the same as an interest-free loan which this bank can invest in Government securities at a profit of $590,000 a year—a subsidy—or invest in other securities at an even higher profit.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Are there any other programs—for example, I am specifically referring to the Small Business Administration—under which loans are made of a type similar to the loans of the ARA?

Mr. PATMAN. The Small Business Administration does not make exactly that type loan. The Small Business Administration makes loans to small business firms for the purpose of aiding small business and promoting the free enterprise system, but the SBA does not go to the point to which the ARA addresses itself. The ARA is something different. The SBA does not make the loans solely for the purpose of creating jobs; the ARA does.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The only difference between the SBA loan and the ARA loan is a matter of terms, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. No, the type loan is different, and the purpose is different, although as a general rule the terms are different, too. The ARA loans are made on more liberal terms.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. What does the gentleman mean by type loan?

Mr. PATMAN. They do not have the same objective. The No. 1 objective of ARA is to create job opportunities and the question of the economic development is their paramount consideration, not the profitability or profit prospects of a particular firm. The SBA is not charged with the public interest at all, except to make it possible for small businesses to get loans where they are unable to get loans from private financial institutions, and to protect the Government's funds—to make sure that any small firm that gets a loan pledges enough assets to assure that the Government will get its money back.

Of course, helping small business is in the public interest, too. But the public interest does not enter into the making of these loans as it does in connection with the ARA, in the sense that the ARA requires the local community to develop a program for the economic development of the community.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take so much of the gentleman's time——

Mr. PATMAN. That is all right; please go right ahead.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. But when a loan is made by the Small Business Administration, does not this create a new facility which creates more jobs?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, there is another reason why it is inadequate. The amount of the loan is so small it would not create many job opportunities. If the gentleman were to refer to a comparable agency, the Export-Import Bank, the gentleman would be right, because the Export-Import Bank is a 100-percent owned operation of the Government and they can make very large loans, to Government units, to big business firms—including U.S. firms—for the purpose of economic development in the distressed areas, or underdeveloped areas, in foreign countries. They make loans in Mexico, they make them in South America, they make them in Europe, they make them everywhere except in the Communist countries and in the United States. They are really able to do things, but they are not qualified to accept applications in this country.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is of course absolutely correct as usual. But is the limitation on the size of the loan which SBA can grant smaller than that which ARA can grant for industrial purposes?

Mr. PATMAN. The loan that the ARA can grant can be a sizable loan, up to many millions of dollars. In fact, I do not know of any over $6 million. But, even that is a pretty good sized loan. It could even go higher. However, the Small Business Administration, I think, has been limited to about $200,000. The act permits loans up to $350,000 but on account of the limited amount of money and by executive order of the Administrator, it is just limited to $200,000. So, that does not create many job opportunities.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, am I correct that in the individual industrial loans the same type standards have been applied under ARA?

Mr. PATMAN. As SBA?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about that, but I am sure that is not the intention of the legislation. All of the financial dealings that are made are made with the SBA assistance and approval, however.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. That was done on the theory that we did not want to create a huge organization like the RFC, for instance. We wanted an organization that could give guidance and direction and assistance, but not to have all the engineers and the other different categories of staff. But, instead, to have coordinating, cooperating agencies of the Government to supply that assistance. For example, representatives of the Department of Agriculture are to be consulted about certain things relating to the farm. The Small Business Administration is consulted about making loans to business firms, in order to make sure that they are made in a businesslike way. The Department of Commerce is also consulted. There are about nine different agencies of Government that are consulted by the ARA in carrying out its program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "SOCIALISTIC SUBSIDIES" AND "INCENTIVES TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE"

Mr. PATMAN. The ARA makes loans to help new industries get started in depressed areas, for the purpose of creating more employment in private enterprise. It brings about less unemployment and more productive taxpaying citizens able to stand on their own feet and send their children to school. But the ARA loans are not interest free; they must be repaid with full interest cost to the Treasury—and more.

So it seems that some of the loudest critics of ARA are operating on some rather strange definitions. They seem to feel that any time the Government does something to help people who need help, that's a "subsidy" leading to "socialism." But when the Government does something to help some powerful economic group that does not need help, that's only "an incentive to private enterprise."

ARA HAS BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Fortunately, however, the ARA program has had some strong and bipartisan support, and I hope it will continue to have support from both sides of the aisle. By reducing unemployment, creating new jobs in private industry, raising the productivity of the whole country, and taking people off relief rolls, everybody will be helped. Business will be helped, the taxpayers will be helped, and both political parties will be helped. Indeed, America will be helped.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas who is making a special plea for the reenactment of the area redevelopment legislation. This is beneficial legislation which helps our own country. The gentleman from Texas has pointed out that we are helping nations around the world in many types of projects. However, this is legislation which helps to build our own communities and our own countries.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to be associated with the gentleman in urging that we pass this legislation again.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman, particularly in view of the fact he is chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and is deeply interested in small business. His support is certainly appreciated for that reason, although he can always be counted on to be on the side of the public interest.

The question of whether we should do at least in a small way for our own people what we are doing in a big way for the people of other countries should be considered by every Member of this House. How can a Member of this body consistently vote against permitting our own people here in the United States to have the same opportunity to apply for and to obtain loans for the same purposes that six different agencies being supported by the United States do for other countries of the world?

SIX AGENCIES USING BILLIONS OF U.S. FUNDS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

I have no feeling against Mexico. Mexico is our friend and our good neighbor. I am glad to see everything done for Mexico that is done. There are six different agencies—three of them owned entirely by the United States, and in three of them the United States is the principal contributing supporter—making loans down in Mexico, in Central America, South America, Europe—everywhere in the world except in Communist countries and in the United States. If you were to have a good project that would create jobs in your district and you went to any of these six agencies, and you said: "I want to apply for a loan for my community," that agency would tell you that you are not qualified to apply. They would tell you "We make loans to all other countries in the world, except the United States and the Communist countries, but you are excluded. Like the Communists, you are not eligible."

The same thing would apply to all of the six agencies I mentioned. If we do not pass the ARA bill, we are in effect saying that we are discriminating against our own people; that we do not want them to have the same opportunities and benefits we are providing for all other countries of the world, except the Communist countries.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I had a conference with the Administrator recently and he tells me there are a billion dollars in backlog in applications, or requests, for various projects that exist in our country—if we could pass this legislation.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. EVINS. These are applications by citizens who want assistance in connection with various community projects.

Mr. PATMAN. All they want is the opportunity to earn a living for themselves and their families.

ARA IS THE ONLY FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR CREATING NEW JOBS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

There are several Federal programs for aiding the unemployed.

There is the extended unemployment compensation program. This helps an unemployed man, if he is covered by the program, for a limited time, but it does not give him an opportunity to obtain a job. It is a temporary, "stopgap" aid, pending the time the unemployed person can obtain a job.

There is also the accelerated public works program. This is also a temporary program, to provide jobs on useful public works such as county courthouses, streets, and so forth. This is also a stopgap, and that program is drawing to an end.

We have one program, and one program only, which is aimed at increasing permanent, private employment in the economically distressed areas. That is the area redevelopment program. Some confusion between the area redevelopment program and the accelerated public works program has developed because in some instances there is ARA assistance for public facilities, such as an access road, a sewer, and so forth. But when the ARA assists in a public facility such as this, it is only incidental to the development of some private operation to expand permanent private jobs, such as a manufacturing plant or a mine.

The ARA legislation contains a small amount of money for grants, but grants, too, are an incidental part of the program. It is a loan program for those areas of the country which have long suffered chronically high unemployment. These are economic development loans.

We now have in this country six agencies making grants and loans for economic development abroad. They make loans and grants to help develop the economically undeveloped areas of all countries of the world, except the Iron Curtain countries and the United States. Three of these agencies are financed 100 percent by U.S. taxpayers. The other three are international agencies for which the United States provides the major share of the funds.

These foreign lending agencies expect to make loans and grants for economic development abroad in the amount of $3.6 billion in the present fiscal year. This includes for the foreign aid bill, the reduced amount as passed by the House of Representatives.

In the ARA bill we are asking for $355 million for use over a period of 2 years. In other words, the average per year is $178 million, as compared to $3.6 billion for economic development abroad. We are asking for less than 5 percent of the amount that is to be spent and lent for economic development abroad, to help our own people with economic development at home.

I will insert at this point in the Record a table showing the amount of funds which have been spent and lent for economic development abroad for these six agencies and also their budgets for the present fiscal year.

The table follows:

Loans and grants for economic development abroad by six agencies supported with Federal funds

[In millions of dollars]

	Cumulative to June 30, 1962	Estimated projection for fiscal year 1964
World Bank (IBRD)	$635	$350
IDA	135	130
International Finance Corporation	35	10
Inter-American Development Bank	190	110
Export-Import Bank	[1] 7,506	500
American foreign aid and related programs	[2] 57,954	[3] 2,500
Total foreign aid	66,455	3,600

[1] Long-term loans (over 5 years).
[2] Does not include military assistance.
[3] 1964 figures based on House action.

Note.—Data for fiscal year 1963 are omitted from table.

It is a strange thing to me that we are willing to have the money of U.S. taxpayers used to do so much toward economic development abroad—and we do not consider it immoral—yet some people yell that it is "immoral" to help the American people develop the economies of the underdeveloped areas at home.

The Export-Import Bank alone, which operates 100 percent from Federal funds, has made loans to or on behalf of every big corporation in the country for economic development abroad. Let me give a few examples. A loan of $27 million to the Government of the United Arab Republic for the purchase of locomotives made by General Motors; a loan of $1 million to the Government of Nigeria to help them acquire television equipment made by RCA; a loan of $8 million to the Government of India to help them purchase Boeing aircraft; a loan of $5 million to Indonesia to help them purchase Lockheed aircraft; a loan of $33 million to Japan to help them purchase Westinghouse generating equipment; a loan of $34 million to the Government of Italy to build a nuclear powerplant.

And so it goes for thousands and thousands of loans and grants made all over the world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give us a list of foreign countries that have bought foreign goods on the loans and gifts we have made to foreign countries? I think we ought to have that right along with the cases the gentleman has cited.

Mr. PATMAN. It would be very interesting if I had it available at this time. I do not, but I have it in the reports. I think if the gentleman will refer to the published reports of the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, and the other six agencies I have mentioned, he will find that information.

Mr. GROSS. How about the locomotives that the Yugoslavs bought in foreign countries instead of from the United States? You can find any number of cases of that kind. I would like to see it in the Record.

Mr. PATMAN. I would like to see it, too. I am inserting in the Record here a statement of all the billions of dollars that have been made available to other countries of the world and I am breaking that down, the World Bank so much and others so much. I have that, but I am afraid I cannot give the gentleman the information he requested. I will ask permission for it to be placed in the Record if the gentleman would like to supply it.

Mr. GROSS. If I could get it I would like to have it. If I could get it before printing tomorrow's Record I would be glad to. Get the permission, and I will see what I can do.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] be allowed to extend his remarks today or on a subsequent day during this session of Congress and to insert the information which he expects to obtain in connection with the remarks that he made.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. According to the rules, as I understand them, it will not necessarily have to be done tonight. It can be done subsequently.

WHY ARA IS NEEDED

The Area Redevelopment Act was the first major piece of legislation ever passed by the Congress as an attempt to meet head on the problem of pockets of chronic unemployment. And unless the application for a rule for S. 1163 now pending before the Committee on Rules is favorably considered, and unless this bill is then passed by this House, this first attempt at legislation dealing directly with the problems of structural unemployment, which took the form of Public Law 87-27, will have been largely in vain, for it will not have been given the full opportunity for trial which the Congress intended at the time of its passage.

The reasons for the economically depressed condition of these areas are by now well known. They include changes in demand for products, new and improved methods of production which reduce the need for manpower, changes in the location of industrial and commercial operations because of mergers, market conditions, relocations, and the like, and the depletion of, or changes in the demand for, certain natural resources. These primary changes have been accompanied by resulting conditions which further hamper economic development, such as a reduced availability of local capital for investment or expansion, and increasing deficiencies in manpower skills, including those necessary for new operations and the attraction of new industry. The most obvious example is, of course, the coal mining areas of the Appalachian region, where in many cases decreasing demand and increasing output per man-day have decreased employment in that industry by 90 percent or more. It is not the fault of the workers who have been thrown out of work that other fuels have been substituted for coal or that more efficient methods of production have been devised, but the outcome is nevertheless that they are without jobs and without hope of ever regaining them.

In other geographic areas, primary natural resources have been exhausted, and the industry has simply moved out, leaving the population without work. Examples of this plight can be seen in northern Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, and in sections of New Hampshire and Maine, where huge timber companies have cut down existing trees and moved out, leaving the land desolate and the population stranded.

In other cases unforeseen changes have been the cause of an area's economic downfall. For example, an increase in the temperature of the Atlantic Ocean caused a deterioration in the fishing industry on the east coast, from which these areas have not yet recovered. And the hat and glove and woolen industries have all suffered because of changes in fashion, new synthetic fabrics, and better methods of heating. Carpeting is also going out of fashion; waxed, natural wood flooring is now the thing to have. The result is that the garment and woolen and rug industries of New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and of most of the other textile regions of the country, have been severely affected.

But while the mining and textile industries may have been the hardest hit, the specter of automation, and more recently of cybernation, continues to haunt almost every industry, and even more the farming occupations which have traditionally employed so much of the unskilled labor force. Fewer people each year are needed to produce and harvest crops.

UNDEREMPLOYMENT IN RURAL AREAS IS NO LESS A PROBLEM THAN UNEMPLOYMENT IN INDUSTRIAL AREAS

Some of those who criticized and condemned the ARA program have done so for the reason that this program is available to the people of small towns and rural areas of the United States. For some strange reason, these critics seem to think the rural areas really do not have an economic problem and in any case the people in these areas somehow do not count. Let them move, they say.

Well, millions of families in the farm and small town areas have been moving. Over the past 20 years an average of 1 million people a year have migrated from these areas into the cities and the suburbs of the cities. This migration brings about some partial solution to the problems of these areas, of course. But migration is far from a complete solution.

Senator **Douglas** has quoted Adam Smith as saying that "man of all commodities is the most difficult to be transported." This is just as true today as it was in Adam Smith's day. People have strong ties to the local communities which they cannot easily break. No matter how strong the economic pressures, a great many families are going to stay home and try to make the best of it. To a certain extent, we have got to bring economic opportunities to the people or they will not have economic opportunities.

With the resultant reduction in the number of people living on farms, employment opportunities have likewise shrunk in the small towns and villages where economic activity has been organized on services to the farm families.

In those areas where migration is high and prolonged, inevitably large percentages of unemployed and substantially underemployed workers remain in the community despite extremes of economic pressures. Family and other ties to the local community are not easily broken. Thus, the proposal sometimes made that the rural counties should be eliminated from the ARA program simply because they are "rural" overlooks one of the most serious economic problems of our times. It seems evident that more problems would be created than solved if substantially all of the population of the Nation piled up in the great cities. In terms of total cost to the Nation, it is frequently a more efficient use of material and human resources to help develop new economic activity in the distressed community than it is to have the population move into the great urban areas.

The costs of moving are high, and there is no certainty, especially for those whose skills are no longer required, of finding employment. Those who did move often did not find jobs, and crime, delinquency, and frustration were frequently the result. Migration to the cities is also costly from a national point of view because of the tremendous social and economic investments which have already been made in the rural communities. In these communities such facilities as water and sewer systems, electrification, telephone service, schools, public safety buildings, parks and recreation centers, and similar facilities already exist. These facilities would have to be duplicated if the population moves elsewhere. Hence these communities, and particularly the rural communities which long have suffered from underemployment, continue to struggle along. But the situation in the 1950's was becoming worse, and more and more people within these areas were becoming unemployed; and the economic blight of these communities was beginning to act like a cancer on the whole economy.

THE REAL NATIONAL SCANDAL IS UNEMPLOYMENT

If there was any national scandal involved, it was in the fact that these communities were left to continue to struggle alone for more than 6 years after the problem was fully recognized before the enactment of the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, despite two previous attempts by the Congress to pass the bill. During these 6 or more years, American workmen were unable to find work, and whole communities had to eke out their subsistence through inadequate part-time employment and public welfare assistance. Family savings were used up, the tax base was depressed, community facilities deteriorated, and hope for the future within these communities in this land of opportunity dwindled to nothingness.

TWO HUNDRED PERCENT PROFIT TO UNITED STATES ON "SEED CORN" MONEY

Lone Star Steel at Lone Star, Tex., could not have been built without a Federal loan—RFC. Now the company has been refinanced with private capital, after paying back most of the loan, and the Government has its money back plus interest. Furthermore, the company, its employees, contractors and dealers, have paid twice as much in Federal taxes as the original loan to Lone Star Steel, so that the Government has gotten a 200 percent profit in taxes and all its money back. What is more important, Texas and the Nation have had more productive jobs, more profit opportunities for both the company and thousands of suppliers and contractors in and out of Texas. The Nation has produced more and thus enjoyed a higher standard of living.

Billions of dollars were spent, and are being spent, by our six international agencies, three of which operate entirely on money provided by American taxpayers. And in the other three, we are the major contributor. They made loans for industrial and commercial expansion all over the globe, except in the Iron Curtain countries, but not a single dollar was available for our American citizens. Now I am not against foreign aid, and I have voted for it on many an occasion. But during these years some of us began to wonder why we should not be doing at least a fraction as much for the economically depressed urban centers and rural communities of our Nation as we were doing for the nations abroad.

THE ARA PROVIDES "SEED CORN" LOANS

The result was the Area Redevelopment Act, which provided essentially a business loan program to help our areas of substantial and persistent unemployment obtain their fair share of the Nation's future economic growth. No other program was specifically set up to operate on the basis of unemployment criteria or to make loans primarily on employment effect. The program provided that more than $3 out of every $4 would be repaid with interest, and that these funds would not be provided where private funds were available. For the most part, this program would not "cost" anything, since the loans would be repaid, and it was far cheaper than doing nothing. We recognized at the time the act was passed that it was inadequate, even as far as it went; and no one who was acquainted with the problems of structural unemployment ever thought it would provide the whole solution. But it was a beginning, and it had to be done. The choice was really between pouring more and more dollars into unemployment compensation and welfare payments without any return and without ever getting at the root of the problem—and thus allowing our communities to further deteriorate—or of providing a means for them to help themselves get back on the road to economic recovery. For the Federal Government to do nothing was unthinkable.

The function of ARA is to provide seed corn money to economically disadvantaged areas to enable them to have a share in the growth which we all confidently predict. Let me reiterate a personal example which I have frequently used in the past. Years ago I succeeded in getting a steel mill constructed in my area of the country. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or RFC, put up $75 million or more in order to construct the mill. The big steel mills did not want it. They said every devastating thing about it that they could think of and tried to discourage people from going into it. But the RFC investigated the matter and said that it was all right. They put up the money, and the Government got every dollar of its money back with interest, along with taxes and other benefits which exceeded many times the cost of the project.

ARA, like RFC, is not a matter of the Government taking over industry or of interfering in private enterprises. Each project is begun by local initiative, and the Government just provides some of the money to help it get off the ground. That is what seed corn money is for. It is giving the people an opportunity to do something for their own community which they could not do otherwise, in order to help the community get back on its feet socially and economically.

The Area Redevelopment Administration, I am told, is reliving the experiences of RFC days. It is receiving applications, for example, for the construction of steel mills and similar projects in other highly competitive industries. And many of these applications are being bitterly opposed by existing businesses. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that those who were assisted during the war by defense contracts and after the war by RFC, and at various other times by various other Government programs, will not want to deny to others the benefits they were able to obtain for themselves. Our Nation is too great and our economy too prosperous for those who have attained wealth to attempt to oppose those who are only trying to get started. If ARA is a moral issue, I think the people of this country will readily recognize where the morality lies.

COUNTRY NEEDS ARA

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this country needs the area redevelopment program because the people of this country need it, especially the millions of people in our redevelopment areas who had all but lost hope before ARA appeared on the scene. It is up to this Congress to give the people of this country what they need and are entitled to by giving them a means to help themselves obtain a decent standard of living. It is up to this Congress to give the area redevelopment program a fair chance to show what it can do, rather than to kill it almost before it gets off the ground. We cannot lose sight of the fact that we are talking about a program to help American workers, and that ARA is the only program they have got to help them solve their problems. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee will give the ARA bill the rule it needs before too much more time has elapsed and the program has begun to falter. In view of the billions of dollars we spend on foreign aid, justice and morality demand that we do a little something—at least—for the people at home.

But more than this, putting our unemployed and underemployed back to work is good economics. It is good for the whole country.

THE ACCORDANCE OF PRINCIPLES IN SPACE TECHNOLOGY AND HUMAN RELATIONS

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, what I have to say will not take long, nor will it occupy a great amount of space in this RECORD. But these thoughts are, I feel, important. They are born from a rediscovery of an old truth: that whether one is occupied with the works of God or man, certain principles apply identically.

Last year, and the year before that, I was a member of this House's Committee on Science and Astronautics, dealing with the efforts of man to reach to the stars. This year, I am proud to be a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, dealing with the efforts of man to achieve justice and equality. And I have been struck by the diligence of men in both fields to bring their respective aspirations to reality.

In the race for space, our scientists and technicians strive for the lowest degree of error. They labor to see that the natural laws of the universe are respected by the spacecraft they send aloft. Where a human passenger is involved, precautions are even more stringent. For these men learned early that the life of a single man is worth any amount of preparation and attention to technical detail. In our space program, I am proud to say, no man is expendable.

This year, on the Judiciary Committee, I have seen another group of men—attorneys, judges and legal scholars—striving for a similarly low degree of error in the administration of justice. Countless hours have been consumed in seeing to it that no law emerges from this Congress that will unfairly treat any American. And, because only human "passengers" are involved in civil rights legislation, there can be no question of sparing effort and time to achieve fairness. As in space, the life—and freedom—of a single man is worth any amount of judicious attention. Thus, in our preparation of laws, no man is expendable either.

Let us see that the scales of justice are balanced as delicately as the machinery of space.

TITO'S RECORD

The **SPEAKER.** Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] is recognized for 3 hours.

The Chair desires to state that he hopes that in the future Members requesting special orders will not request them for a greater period of time than 1 hour.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the visit of Josip Broz Tito, Yugoslavia's Red dictator, is mounting. Already the scheduled overnight stay at Blair House has been canceled, and his visit in Washington will be a 5½ hour "working visit." That means he will be working on President Kennedy for as much of your tax money as possible.

Tito was one of Stalin's contemporaries. He fought with the Communists in Russia from 1917 to 1921 and in the International Brigade during the Spanish Civil War. He became secretary of the Yugoslavian Communist Party in 1937, organized and led the Communist guerrillas in Yugoslavia during World War II.

In 1946 Tito said:

> The capitalist forces constitute our natural enemy despite the fact that they helped us to defeat their most dangerous representatives. It may happen that we shall again decide to make use of their aid, but always with the sole aim of accelerating their final ruin.

This was the gratitude of the Communists after we had saved them from Hitler. They will take our aid as long as they feel we are spending ourselves toward ruin.

In 1962, Tito explained further his link with the Soviet Union when he said:

> We aspire toward the same goal—building of a new society of socialism and communism. On the question of war and peace, peaceful coexistence, disarmament, liquidation of colonialism, the German question, and other problems which trouble the world today, our points of view are either identical with or close to one another.

Tito has never opposed the Soviets on a single United Nations vote, according to a report in the Dallas Evening News. Tito has taken our aid, and distributed it to other Communist bloc nations.

Josip Broz became Marshal Tito in December 1945 when he took over as dictator of Yugoslavia. His early reign was characterized by brutality, suppression of personal freedoms, persecution of religious leaders, and outlawing of many religious activities and meetings.

Tito's government has been recognized by the United States as the government de facto in Yugoslavia—a temporary designation. In 1957, Tito wanted to visit the United States. President Eisenhower refused to receive him.

If President Kennedy receives him, it will amount to recognition of the Tito government as the government de jure in Yugoslavia. Called the Trojan Horse of communism, Tito wants to tell the Yugoslav people that the United States officially recognizes him as the just and proper ruler of that nation.

In 1946, the United States had to issue a war ultimatum to Tito to get him to return the corpses of five American aviators shot down by Tito's forces.

Since 1957, Tito has operated in accord with Moscow. He could not stay in power if the Soviet Union desired his removal. He and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev met about a month ago and expressed complete accord on the relationship between their two countries.

Tito got $116.7 million in U.S. foreign aid last year. Tito has received $2.4 billion since 1945.

QUOTES ON TITO'S VISIT

Macedonian Patriotic Organization, Indianapolis, Ind.:

> Although we do not wish to elaborate on the tragic fate of our enslaved brothers

> and sisters—the Macedonian Bulgarians, Arumanians, etc.—suffering under the cruel domination of Tito's dictatorial regime in Macedonia, it is appropriate that we mention their heroic struggle for freedom and national independence. They and other oppressed groups in Yugoslavia are true and faithful friends of the United States. The record of this deceitful and arrogant visitor and of his Communist semarilla in Belgrade is a mockery of every noble effort that is made in the name of lasting peace. To recognize a leader who has propogated death and destruction is to turn our back on the universal principles which acknowledge as man's birthright those inalienable human rights for which our forefathers fought and died.

United American Croats:

> Since 1957, Communist Yugoslavia has tied herself completely to the Soviet Alliance * * * the adoption throughout Yugoslavia of the term: "Union of Socialist Republics," the same as the U.S.S.R. The limit of Communist insolence was manifested during the Conference of Neutral Nations in Belgrade, whose chairman was Tito; he, the opportunity having presented itself, disregarding the millions of dollars of American aid, clearly declared himself for the Communist line of Moscow and accused American imperialism. The peoples of Yugoslavia, as in other Communist countries where a minority group of Communists reigns, would like to be freed from the Red yoke. When the United States chose not to receive Tito in 1957, in what paradoxical light will the United States appear if she receives him now, when he has completely sided with the U.S.S.R.

Serbian National Defense Council of America:

> We feel that this visit has been poorly evaluated, that its consequences were not properly taken into consideration. The United States has nothing to gain from such a visit and has a lot to lose. We can confidently predict that in Eastern Europe and in Yugoslavia specifically the image of the United States would sink to a new low.

The American Association of War Veterans of the Former Kingdom of Yugoslavia:

> Now, after this visit the legality of the Tito government will be recognized by implication. Moreover, Tito will be able to tell the peoples of Yugoslavia that the United States approves his policies of suppression of the most basic human rights and to show urbi et orbi that the United States condones his role of the "Trojan horse of communism."

FACTS ON PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S AUTHORIZING THE SALE OF MILITARY PARTS TO YUGOSLAVIA

For a classic example of thwarting the expressed will of Congress, there is no better example than President Kennedy's secret action authorizing sale of military supplies to Yugoslavia, just revealed by the October 7 publication of May 21 hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

To specifically prevent any further military assistance to Yugoslavia, Congress adopted section 109(a) to the foreign aid appropriations act for fiscal 1963—author, Representative RHODES of Arizona—which reads:

> No assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based—on—communism for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, or any articles, materials or supplies.

And so forth. Thus the right of the Executive to make a determination to the contrary on military aid, as provided in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961—authorizing legislation—was removed, although section 109(b) of the appropriations act specifically continued the President's authority in the realm of economic aid.

Nevertheless, President Kennedy authorized sale of $2 million in military supplies to Yugoslavia on May 14, 1963, by using section 614 of the 1961 authorization which permitted the President to furnish up to $250 million in assistance regardless of other law. He also employed section 620 which required him to find the military aid to Yugoslavia, first, "vital to the support of the United States," and second, Yugoslavia "is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy." He so found.

Next the State Department classified the Executive order "secret" and it was dispatched, as required by law, to the Speaker of the House and the Senate Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees advising them of the action, but these notices were also classified and could not be made public by the recipients. As Subcommittee Chairman PASSMAN said on May 21:

> They have sewed up our mouths. If the time has come when the Congress, through an appropriations act cannot specifically deny funds for a project, then we have indeed abdicated to the Executive.

TITO—PAY A LITTLE, GET A LOT

Josip Broz, who is better known as Marshal Tito, did not get where he is today without being clever. Having read in the American press that there was some opposition stirring because he is due to be feted in Washington at taxpayer expense, he decided to make things easier and build his "image" in this country.

Tito caused what the Washington Post labeled as "excited ripples among Western delegates to the United Nations" when he suddenly announced that Yugoslavia would pay its back assessments to the United Nations for the Congo "peacekeeping" operation—a bloody experiment in international force.

Yugoslavia has purchased $400,000 in U.N. bonds, but still owes $300,000 for the Congo fiasco. The rest of the international delinquents owe $72 million to the U.N. Congo fund. Our Pollyanna group at the U.N. has termed Yugoslavia's move the first link in a chain reaction of paying off assessments by delinquents.

Tito is just putting his house in order a bit so that he can come to the United States with an outstretched hand and expect a handout, not a dun notice for back dues to the U.N. Congo club.

It seems impossible that the officials of the world's first or second most powerful nation—depending on how far New Frontier disarmament has progressed—must seize eagerly on any crumb of decency dropped from the table of communism. Because the Reds are perpetually bad, a kind word seems almost like a change of heart, and has time and time again led the West into disgraceful gyrations and impossible predictions of general accord and harmony between East and West.

It was just a month ago that Tito and Khrushchev were sailing arm in arm on a Yugoslavia yacht, smiling and showing all kinds of solidarity. The Dallas Morning News described the session as a "back-slapping, cheek-kissing meeting between the Communist leaders."

Tito will be after two things during his Red-carpet visit with President Kennedy. First, the most-favored-nation tariff treatment that Congress dropped for Poland and Yugoslavia last year has not yet gone into effect. No action has been taken by the administration, which has a year to make the drop effective. Tito was promised by Orville Freeman this summer that the drop would be reversed. Secondly, Tito will want more trade and more money.

Before too many raptures are expressed over Tito's U.N. payment, it should be remembered that last year we gave Yugoslavia $116.7 millions, which leaves a tidy profit after paying $300,000 worth of bills. In fact, it is hardly a "sacrifice" at all.

SECONDHAND AID VIA TITO

When Marshal Tito comes to Washington, he can bask in the warm glow of having done a good deed—in effect, with our money. On October 3, amid the hoopla attending this great "people's leader," Tito pledged a $5 million loan to Bolivia. He will get a fat U.S. foreign aid allotment from us this year. According to Bolivian President Victor Paz Esenssoro, Tito's generosity "has left a deep impression on this country." The United States last year gave Bolivia $39.5 million and altogether has ladled $262 million to the tin-producing country. Since the Government there has grabbed private industry and runs a socialistic shop, it is apparent that all the U.S. largesse has failed to make too much impression. It is nice to be able to finance not only our own, but our friendly enemies' giveway programs.

The planned visit to Washington later this month of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia recalls reports of a similar visit of the Communist leader to the United States in 1957.

At that time, Republican and Democratic House Members drafted a petition to present to President Eisenhower protesting the proposed visit. One of the four sponsors of the petition: Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, then House majority leader. MCCORMACK said in a statement at the time that "it is not our purpose to embarrass the President" by the petition, but "we do not believe the millions of good people of the United States should be embarrassed" by the Tito visit. He added:

> We do not believe that national or international communism can be compromised. We do not believe that the high prestige of the United States should be lowered nor Tito's prestige raised by sending an invitation.

Altogether, 168 Members of both parties from 41 States signed the petition. It was never presented to the President because the visit was called off.

The text of the 1957 House petition read:

We, Members of the House of Representatives, representing both parties, expressing our own individual opposition and responding to widespread and emphatic protests, respectfully urge you not to extend an invitation to Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, to be an official guest of the United States. If such an invitation has been extended, we respectfully urge you to reconsider this action.

We do this with full knowledge of your responsibilities as Chief Executive. We believe, however, that Marshal Tito's record and affiliation with communism and the Kremlin, his position as Communist dictator of Yugoslavia, his persecution of Cardinal Stepanic, his attack on American fliers which killed five American airmen, his forceful return of escaped Hungarian freedom fighters to their country for execution as well as countless other despicable acts, have made him repugnant and detestable in the eyes of the American people.

We further believe that the high position of the United States among the free nations of the world would be compromised if such an invitation were issued by you as President of the United States. Furthermore, such action would lend to Tito a dignity and standing to which his conduct distinctly does not entitle him. We respectfully request your favorable consideration of our petition.

The people of America are tolerant in having heads of some governments visit our country, but to invite Tito to come here is asking too much of them. Whatever dealings our country has had with Tito have been purely on the basis of expediency, and his dealings with our country has been on the same basis. An official invitation to visit the United States would be resented by the American people, and properly so. They would consider it an insult. In addition, the resentment of our people would make it more difficult to pass an effective foreign assistance bill, as well as obtain the necessary appropriations. There are many other reasons why Tito should not be invited. The implications involved if he is invited are so great and grave that, if contemplated, an invitation should not be extended to him.—Representative John W. McCormack, Democrat, of Massachusetts, January 16, 1957.

These were fine sentiments then, Mr. Speaker, and they are fine sentiments today. This visit of Tito is not a partisan matter, as I have related by the wholehearted support of Members of both parties in 1957. I am sorry that he is coming here. I do not think it will help our image nor will it give any faith to those behind the Iron Curtain who have believed our slogans that we are fighters for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter in two instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 3, 1963]

KHRUSH, TITO KISS GOODBY

BELGRADE, September 3.—Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev today concluded a 15-day visit which apparently ended the Kremlin's feud with President Tito and brought Yugoslavia closer to the Soviet camp.

Khrushchev's special plane left for Moscow after a lavish airport sendoff in which Tito said, "There are a lot of possibilities for our cooperation."

The two leaders kissed each other on the cheek as a parting gesture for the rebirth of Soviet-Yugoslav friendship. The Soviet premier was given a 21-gun salute and an honor guard as he boarded the plane.

ABSENT

The diplomatic corps was present, except for representatives of Communist China and Albania, the two principal nations that have defied Moscow's leadership.

Khrushchev told the airport audience his talks with Tito "will serve the cause of further strengthening friendship and cooperation between socialist countries." He said views were exchanged "in a spirit of complete mutual understanding and friendliness."

Tito said he is pleased with the detailed and frank talks.

"The relations between our countries have been put on very strong foundations," he said.

The visit was seen as a success for both.

For Khrushchev, the talks and the tour through Yugoslavia's provinces meant Tito's support in the Kremlin's political and ideological quarrel with Communist China.

CLOSER TIES

For Tito, the visit resulted in increased Soviet aid and closer trade ties with eastern Europe. But no apparent commitment to sever economic links with the West, an important part of Yugoslavia's independent communism.

An indication of Tito's tight-rope walking between East and West, he will entertain President Kennedy's brother, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, 9 days after Khrushchev's departure.

Senator Kennedy is coming with the congressional delegation to the September 12–20 Interparliamentary Union meeting.

TITO LIVES UP TO WORST EXPECTATIONS

(By Barry Goldwater, U.S. Senator from Arizona)

It certainly should come as no surprise to the American people that Josip Broz Tito has taken Yugoslavia back into the Soviet Communist bloc.

Despite all the wishful thinking to the contrary and despite the millions and millions of dollars we have sent to Tito to bolster his alleged "independence," he has been leaning that way for a long time.

All that remained to be done at the recent Moscow meeting of the Supreme Soviet Parliament was for Tito to make it official and binding. And it is fair to say that his expulsion from the Eastern European bloc by Stalin ended finally when the Yugoslav dictator took the rostrum in the Kremlin Palace and declared:

"On the question of war and peace, on peaceful coexistence, disarmament, on the abolition of colonialism, on the German and other issues agitating the world today, our viewpoints are identical or very close to each other."

That says just about everything that needed saying to cement Yugoslavia once again into the position of a strong satellite of the Soviet Union, and, ironically enough, Yugoslavia returns to the Russian bloc a much stronger nation than she was when she left.

One of the important reasons for this is the heavy amount of American foreign aid that has been sent to Tito ever since he split with Stalin and went his own Communist way.

What this situation amounts to is a defeat for a policy of the United States which places unreasonable and ridiculous importance on the bare possibility that we will be able to buy friends among Communist nations.

Time and time again, the American people and their representatives in Congress have questioned the wisdom of sending hundreds of millions of dollars of aid to Yugoslavia.

To them, it seemed for all the world as though American money was going to build up communism under a program that was originally designed to promote the interest of freedom, order, and justice throughout the world.

And just as often as this policy of spending money to Communist countries was questioned, our policymakers insisted that we had everything to win and nothing to lose by encouraging Yugoslavia to remain at odds with Moscow.

This argument, of course, began to wear thin when Tito began to cozy up to Nikita Khrushchev, but it nevertheless was pushed just as hard and just as successfully on Capitol Hill when foreign aid appropriations were under consideration.

But now we have the final returns—direct from Moscow. All the aid we sent to Yugoslavia went down the drain. And not just a drain that led nowhere. This drain led to the camp of the enemy.

In the light of Tito's speech in Moscow, there can be no doubt of where Yugoslavia would stand in the event of a military showdown between the East and the West.

For example, if the crisis in Cuba had developed into a shooting war, on which side would the jet fighters we sent to Yugoslavia have been used? And what side would those Yugoslav pilots we trained in Texas have been flying for in the event the Cuban crisis had turned into a war?

I suggest we can assume that every dollar and bit of equipment we sent to Yugoslavia under the foreign aid program is now part of the Soviet bloc arsenal. For all the good it has done the cause of freedom, we might just as well have sent the Yugoslavs' aid direct to Moscow.

This being the case, is there any wonder that the American foreign aid program is now coming under heavy criticism from the citizens of the United States?

After all, it is in their money, taken in the form of exorbitant taxes, which has gone to build up Tito all these years. I say they have a right to complain and to demand that aid to countries like Yugoslavia and Poland be stopped.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. BECKER. I want to associate myself with my colleague from New York in his remarks. I am in complete opposition, as previously, to Tito's coming to the United States for full recognition. I am wondering what the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain feel when we recognize one such as Tito, head of a Communist state.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I thank the gentleman from New York, who has been a sterling fighter for freedom and opposes Communist tyrants wherever they may appear.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McLoskey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to compliment the gentlemen from New York for the time he has taken today, and to associate myself with his outstanding remarks.

Mr. Speaker, many persons in my district are asking just what is our foreign policy today, and they are becoming more and more disturbed over recent happenings and decisions.

I too am deeply disturbed and the apparent open-arms welcome to the arrogant and deceitful visitor, the ruthless dictator of Yugoslavia, Tito, is something I cannot understand.

Not only is this visit of Tito's to Washington and the White House a disappointment to many Americans, but I wonder how the peoples of the free world feel about our kowtowing to this bloodthirsty tyrant.

Are we now turning our backs on the principles of freedom and on the principles which acknowledge those inalienable human rights for which our forefathers fought?

Are we turning our backs on all those citizens who are behind the Iron Curtain and who are making such valiant efforts to free themselves from the shackles of communism?

What must those downtrodden nations of the world, who look to the United States as the symbol of freedom, think about the red-carpet treatment offered Tito?

It seems to me the leaders of America are cultivating strange bedfellows. I suppose since we are playing footsie with Khrushchev it is all right to also welcome Tito into the fold. I, for one, do not like it.

It would seem to me we should learn from experience that we cannot trust Communist leaders. I only hope the apparent errors in foreign policy which have already been made by this administration will soon be corrected—that we will soon shift course before the continuation of this "I love Reds" policy leads us down the road to international disaster.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the argument that Tito is a "friendly type of Communist" is heard again and again. The question is a reoccurring one so I have conducted some independent research on this topic.

IS YUGOSLAVIA A COMMUNIST COUNTRY?

Since the advent of foreign aid the United States has sent a total of approximately $2.4 billion to Yugoslavia. The argument made in the beginning, that aid to Tito would woo him from the Communist bloc, is still the contention of some of the proponents of the program.

It is difficult to understand how a serious question could arise as to whether Yugoslavia is a Communist country. The record is clear. Tito himself, in 1956, clearly defined his position. He said:

> Yugoslavia, in time of war as well as in time of peace, marches shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet people toward the same goal—victory of socialism.

Tito has never repudiated that statement. Last year, on the 17th of May, Khrushchev further documented the close relationship that exists between Russia and Yugoslavia. He commented:

> Our relations with Yugoslavia were rather strained previously, but now I can say with satisfaction that our relations are normal, and I would even say good.

BELGRADE CONFERENCE

If any doubt existed concerning Tito's loyalty to the goals of communism, it should have been dispelled in 1961 when he led the Belgrade Conference of Nonalined Nations. The final report of that conference, supported fully by Tito, makes the following policy statements:

> Condemnation of the U.S. policy in the Middle East.
>
> Denunciation of foreign bases as a "gross violation of the sovereignty of the states where the bases are established."
>
> Singled out the U.S. base at Guantanamo as an example of such "violations."
>
> Sided with Cuba against the position of the United States.
>
> Recommended that representatives of Red China be seated in the United Nations.

This is the record of the Belgrade Conference. It should dispel the belief that Tito supports the United States or any free country.

TITO'S VOTING RECORD IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The voting record of Yugoslavia in the United Nations is additional proof of the close alinement between Tito and Khrushchev. According to research by the Library of Congress, completed at my request, in 1960 Yugoslavia voted with the United States only once, but it voted with Russia 14 times. In 1961, the record was 6 U.N votes with the United States and 25 votes with Russia. Last year, Tito voted with us only 4 times and he followed Khrushchev on 12 votes.

After approximately $2.4 billion in American money sent to Yugoslavia under the foreign aid program, the votes in the United Nations are compelling proof that our dollars are not enticing Tito away from the Communist bloc.

ALEXEI YEPISHEV

My research uncovered another little-known fact, but one that further substantiates the close relationship between Yugoslavia and Russia. For 2 years Alexei Yepishev was the Russian Ambassador to Yugoslavia. He was not a career diplomat, however. He had been a colonel general in the Red army. Dr. Slovodan Draskovich, a noted author on Yugoslavia, comments:

> In Belgrade it is a matter of common knowledge that Yepishev was sent to Belgrade with a special and most important mission of working out plans for the rearming of the Yugoslav Army with Soviet weapons. His mission was successfully accomplished.

For these reasons, substantiated by additional documentation too detailed to list, I oppose sending additional foreign aid to Yugoslavia or any other Communist-controlled country.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems rather inconsistent to me that the administration should be entertaining Marshal Tito who ascended to his present position as head of the Communist regime by a military takeover, when the administration at the same time is wringing its hands over recent military coups in Latin America and has suspended diplomatic recognition and economic aid to some of them.

Marshal Tito is now completing an extensive tour of Latin America during which he said he had been afforded an opportunity to exchange opinions with Latin American officials on world affairs and found a similarity of expression and agreement on political questions.

Before embarking on his tour, the Marshal had been host to Soviet Premier Khrushchev. The two Communist dictators have reavowed their mutual understanding and agreement to march in a single rank toward their goal of building socialism and communism in their struggle against a common enemy—imperialism. I believe, in their language, the common imperialist enemy is us.

It seems ridiculous to me that we should continue our handsome aid to Yugoslavia after Tito left behind in Bolivia, another country we are aiding extensively, a $5 million economic aid program and a political message described as having left a deep impression.

I can only guess what such a political message may have been in view of the avowed aims of Marshal Tito and Premier Khrushchev to communize the world.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York and congratulate and compliment the gentleman on bringing this information, in detail, before the House of Representatives, today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to protest once again the visit which Tito, the Communist Yugoslav dictator, is shortly to make to the United States.

This visit is described as informal, but obviously the invitation comes from our Government and it is obvious also that Tito will be received warmly.

This is part of a strange pattern whereby we fawn and truckle before Communist and leftist dictators but are almost unwaveringly hostile toward dictators who are conservative and anti-Communist.

I pointed out that our excuse for helping the Communist dictators is that our bribes may make them less communistic. In the case of Tito, I might also point out that he is on fraternal terms with Khrushchev and has indicated quite clearly that, if a general war came, he would be in the Communist camp. He is a dedicated Communist and a part of that dedication is to help bury capitalism. Yet our Government seems to feel that the $2.5 billion we have given Tito has been money well spent. Unquestionably his visit here means that we will beseech him to be allowed to give him hundreds of millions of dollars more, all of which comes from our taxpayers. Unquestionably also, Tito will graciously consent to allow us to continue bribing him. Why not? We are not only underwriting the Communist regime in Yugoslavia; we are underwriting Tito's regime.

As a prelude to his visit to the United States, Tito did a remarkable thing. On a visit to Bolivia, where the Communists are very active and threaten a takeover, he pledged $5 million to help the Bolivian economy. I am not surprised that he has $5 million to give away. We will make that up, and much more, in a hurry. I would like to know, however, whether Tito had an understanding as to how the $5 million is to be spent. Will it go to the strong leftist elements in the Bolivian Government, elements which are sympathetic with communism? If so, is this not a violation of the Monroe Doctrine? And is it not a violation of the Monroe Doctrine for the head of another government outside the Americas to meddle directly in the affairs of this hemisphere?

My able colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], raised this question in an illuminating speech in the House the other day. His address, which was masterly, discussed some questions which have confused and upset me greatly. He said:

> Let me put it bluntly—a dictatorship is odious, but if driven to a choice, I prefer a dictatorship seeking our support and friendship rather than a Communist dictatorship capable of furnishing missile emplacements to those who would bury us. Would our recognition of military juntas in the Dominican Republic and Honduras be immoral policy for our country? Incredibly, some of the very people who make this argument see nothing wrong with recognizing, doing business with, and even furnishing U.S. foreign aid funds to Communist dictators.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] stated very aptly something which puzzles me greatly and which has puzzled many other people. Why does the administration court Communist dictators when the basic creed of communism is the destruction of our system, and why are we so hostile toward the anti-Communist dictators?

I must say that the President, in his press conference of October 9, did nothing to clear up my confusion. On the eve of Tito's visit, he strongly condemned the military takeover of two governments: the Dominican Republic and Honduras. There is a good deal of evidence, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] points out, to indicate that the governments which fell were weak and had been infiltrated by Communists. Yet we have broken off relationships with the new governments in the Dominican Republic and Honduras. This means that the new regimes will be denied aid from the United States. Obviously, if this policy is continued, the anti-Communist governments now operating in Honduras and the Dominican Republic will be weakened. If they fall, does anyone think that a more democratic and friendly regime will take over? No, I do not think even our State Department thinks so. The new governments are likely to be far to the left, if not outright Communists. But I must say there is consistency in our coldness to the governments of the Dominican Republic and Honduras. They are conservative and anti-Communist. We dislike them. But meanwhile we are continuing to press hundreds of millions of dollars upon Communist regimes in Yugoslavia and Poland, and we are helping Ben Bella, the Algerian dictator, who makes no secret of his admiration for Fidel Castro and actually seems to be patterning his rule in Algeria after him. We are giving both money and food to Ben Bella.

The President, at his press conference, said that dictatorships are the seedbeds from which communism ultimately springs. Perhaps he had in mind events in Cuba, where the fall of the Batista regime was followed by the regime of Fidel Castro. I might point out that one big reason for the downfall of Batista, perhaps the real reason, was the withdrawal of support by our Government. One of the preliminaries to our abandonment of Batista was a propaganda campaign waged against him by liberal elements in this country. One of our great newspapers, the New York Times, lent its prestige to this drive against Batista. Actually the Times became Castro's press agent. So Batista fell. His successor, hailed by our liberals as a combination of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln for a long, long time, permitted missile emplacements to be installed in Cuba. This brought us to the brink of atomic war, and today Cuba is the focal point for the Communist effort to take over all Central and South America. Our own State Department had a sizable faction which was anti-Batista and pro-Castro, just as our State Department still has sizable factions which are anti-Salazar, anti-Franco, anti-Diem, and which are against every conservative governmental leader in the world, whether he is a dictator or not. I might comment at this point that the liberals kept hammering away at the Trujillo regime in the Dominican Republic until it was brought down. I have no doubt that there was reason for severe criticism of this regime. But, from the standpoint of the people of the United States and of the Dominican Republic because they feared communism. If this is the case, I think the new government should be helped, even if it means diverting some of the tremendous sums we are giving Tito; the Communist regime in Poland; Ben Bella, Castro's buddy; Sukarno, the leftist Indonesian dictator; and even Nehru, the neutralist, once the idol of the liberals, who has turned out to be a pious fraud. And the things I have said for the Dominican Republic can be applied equally well, I think, to the situation in Honduras.

I might paraphrase the President's remarks by saying that conservative dictatorships are the seedbeds of communism if the Government pursues existing policies. As is exemplified by Cuba, we brought down a conservative government friendly to us and anti-Communist and got Fidel Castro. We have apparently given up completely any idea of helping to overthrow Castro, and many Cubans say bitterly that our Government is doing everything it can to hamper their attempts to unseat the Communist dictator who maintains power just off our own coast.

There is a good deal of evidence that we pulled the rug out from under Chiang Kai-shek in China and helped turn that country into a Communist dictatorship. Anyone who has ever read Senate report 2050, the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee on its inquiry into the Institute of Pacific Relations, will forever have that suspicion in his mind.

Just now one of our primary targets is Salazar in Portugal. We are angry at him because he will not turn the Portuguese provinces of Angola and Mozambique in Africa over to primitive tribesmen and terrorists. Apparently this administration wants to turn these two areas into the shambles which exist in the former Belgian Congo. In the name of anticolonialism, we pressured Belgium into vacating the Congo before this colony was ready for independence. The result has been robbery, murder, rape, chaos; and the civilization built up by the Belgians has been almost completely destroyed. Today Angola and Mozambique are better off than any of the new states in Africa which we have helped bring into being. As a matter of fact, while we are on the subject of dictatorships, a whole crop of them have sprung up in Africa in the wake of the freedom wave. If, as the President says, dictatorship is a prelude to communism, we had better keep an eye on Africa. But most of the African dictators are leftist, and our State Department is quite solicitous about them, forcing the American taxpayers to help them to the tune of millions and millions of dollars every year.

Our policy against colonialism is, as I have stated before, hypocritical and fraudulent. We go meekly along with the colonialism of Russia and the Red Chinese, Russia today being the world's foremost colonial power. We even worked out a deal with Sukarno whereby this cocky little ruler made a colony of former Dutch New Guinea. Nevertheless, we are trying to force the Portuguese out of Africa in the name of anticolonialism, even though once again the resultant mess will be loaded onto the backs of our taxpayers. We are allowing the terrorists who are fighting the Portuguese in Angola to use the Belgian Congo as headquarters and to flee back to the Congo when the Portuguese Army pursues them. Premier Adoula of the Congo is our creature and could not stay in office a month if we stopped contributing money and arms to him. We also are bearing the major part of the expense of the U.N. force which is maintaining law and order in the Congo, or trying to maintain it. This administration could, if it wished, with a word or two, end the Congo haven for the Portuguese foes, which incidentally is a violation of the U.N. Charter. We do nothing, and by our acquiescence in this arrangement, we are parties to the war on Portugal, a friendly country, a NATO ally, and stanchly anti-Communist. Perhaps the trouble lies in the fact that the Portuguese Premier, Salazar, is both conservative and anti-Communist.

Our Portuguese policy is unusually devious and obscure. I can see only two possible reasons for it: the hatred of our liberals for all conservatives, and the thought of the Negro vote in the United States. For our own Negro leaders have been persuaded apparently that the Portuguese should be run out of Africa, even though the Portuguese have pursued a multiracial policy for generations and have freely accorded to the Negroes all the privileges which the latter are seeking in the United States.

I try to study our foreign policy, but the more I study it the less sense it makes. The Communists are dedicated to our destruction, yet we give it up completely. The Communists beset us constantly. They have been attacking us since the end of World War II. They have even established a Communist dictator just off the Florida coast, to say nothing of tremendous inroads in Asia and Africa and the creation of situations which promise communism tomorrow in many parts of the world. We do not counterattack. We are always on the defensive. Apparently we are afraid of uprisings in the Communist countries, for these will show that we have no will to free the enslaved millions. Two instances of our shameful impotence which come to mind are our hand wringing when the Russians mowed down the brave Hungarian revolutionists and our supineness as the Communists threw up the Berlin Wall in our faces.

We are, however, adamant against conservative dictatorships. Here our bravery and high moral principles shine. We have brought many of the rightists down and we are after the others.

As I have stated, I have studied our foreign policy. To me it does not make sense. I am hopeful that one day an administration spokesman will explain it in terms that we, the plain people of America, can understand.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for calling the attention of the American public to this visit. This is a great victory for communism, to entertain a No. 1 or No. 2 Communist royally in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the people in the enslaved countries of the world who are resisting communism are getting stabbed in the back by having a man of Tito's caliber come to this country on a so-called royal visit. We must not forget the fact that Tito is not only a Communist leader, he is a murderer, he is a gangster, he is a thief, and everything that is abhorrent to mankind is represented in this man who is now the dictator of the people of the country called Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a black page in American history, to open our doors and invite a man of that caliber to this country. It is breaking the hearts of the resisters of communism throughout the world.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The gentleman from Wisconsin has always opposed Tito regardless of the day or year or the administration in which he planned a visit.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and want to associate myself with the succinct way in which the gentleman has summarized the history of this Communist dictator and has decried in many areas the reasons that he should not be welcomed with open arms to our Nation at this particular juncture. It not only does, as the previous gentleman stated, tear down those who are resisting communism and its inroads in this great native Nation of freedom lovers from without, but it is a slap with the back of the hand to the captive nations people who are represented.

It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that only this morning I made a radio transcription, a copy of which I have herewith, back to the district which I have the honor to represent which went to our various radio outlets and which summarizes many of the points heretofore made.

Mr. Speaker, under previous consent I include that transcription at this point in the record.

The matter referred to follows:

The United States has a visitor coming this week. He is Josip Broz, better known as Marshal Tito, dictator of Yugoslavia. Since 1945, the Communist government of Yugoslavia has received almost $2½ billion dollars in foreign aid from the United States presumably in an effort to woo Yugoslavia away from the Communist bloc. Last year alone, Tito received $116.7 million in U.S. foreign aid. If the purpose of all this aid has been to drive a wedge between Tito and the rest of the Communist bloc, it has failed miserably and again demonstrates how foolish it is to try to buy friends.

Perhaps the best appraisal of this policy comes from an organization of Yugoslavian patriots now living in America known as the United American Croats. They point out that since 1957, Communist Yugoslavia has tied herself completely to the Soviet alliance—the adoption throughout Yugoslavia of the term "Union of Socialist Republics,"—the same except word "Soviet"—as the U.S.S.R. The limit of Communist insolence, the statement goes on to say, was manifested during 1963 conference of "neutral" nations in Belgrade, whose chairman was Tito. Disregarding the millions of dollars of American aid, Tito clearly declared himself for the Communist line of Moscow and accused the United States as imperialistic. The peoples of Yugoslavia, as in other Communist countries where a minority group of Communists reigns, would like to be freed from the Red yoke. The statement notes that the United States chose not to receive Tito in 1957, and points out what a paradox it will be if the United States receives him now, when he has sided completely with the Soviet Union.

The United States has never recognized the Tito dictatorship as the legal government of Yugoslavia. It has granted a de facto recognition, which is only a temporary designation. If our President should receive Tito now during his visit, it will amount to true recognition, which would mean that we acknowledge him as the just and proper ruler of that nation.

It was back in 1946, that the United States had to issue a war ultimatum to Tito to get him to return the corpses of five American aviators who were shot down by Tito's forces and settle the question of Trieste. I was there. Since 1957, Tito has operated in complete accord with Moscow. He and Soviet Premier Khrushchev met less than a month ago, and expressed complete accord on the relationship between their two countries. Obviously one reason for Tito's visit to America is to dip his hand in the foreign aid till and see if there are any more American dollars where the previous $2½ billion came from, to help support his Communist government. Only last week, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations released previous secret testimony to demonstrate how the will and intent of congressional legislation has been circumvented.

To specifically prevent any further military assistance to Yugoslavia, Congress adopted an amendment to the Foreign Aid Appropriation Act which read:

> No assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based on communism, for any arms, ammunition, implements of war, or any articles, materials or supplies.

Thus the right of the Executive to make a determination to the contrary on military aid was removed; although another section of the law continued the President's authority in the realm of economic aid. Nevertheless, the President authorized sale of $2 million in military supplies to Yugoslavia on May 14, 1963, by using section 614 of the 1961 authorization law which permitted the President to furnish up to $250 million in assistance regardless of other law. He also employed another section of the law which required him to find that military aid to Yugoslavia is first, vital to the support of the United States, and second, that Yugoslavia is not controlled by the international Communist conspiracy. His legal beagles are adept.

Next the State Department classified the Executive order as "secret" and it was dispatched as required by law to the Speaker of the House and the Senate Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees advising them of the action; but these notices were also "classified" and were not to be made public.

I look forward to Dictator Tito's visit here about as much as I would welcome a rattlesnake in my living room.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's kind remarks and his dedication to this Republic.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from New York for taking the time to bring to our attention again the inconsistency in inviting this Communist leader into our midst and giving him a royal welcome. I am concerned somewhat about the double standards today. The State Department and the administration are turning a complete cold shoulder to Madame Nhu because of religious persecution in South Vietnam. Few of us know whether there is religious persecution or whether there are certain sects that are Communist infiltrated and because of their opposition to the government they are having to be rounded up by the Central Government of South Vietnam. At the same time we are bringing into this country Tito whose religious persecutions far outnumber anything that has ever happened in South Vietnam. Tito, over the last several years has been guilty of murder, imprisonment of people, and harassment, and still he is invited and given the red-carpet treatment, and we forget all about his religious persecutions, to say nothing of his political persecutions. I think the gentleman has done a fine thing to bring this matter to the attention of the House today.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I thank the gentleman. He will recall last year during the consideration of the trade expansion bill in our committee, he, together with many of that committee, voted to put a restriction against giving the most favored treatment to Yugoslavia. In that action the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Mills], was a supporter. So we in the Congress know of this Red dictator, Tito of Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian] deserves acknowledgment for leading the House in this discussion over the tragic consequences of our foreign policy relations with President Tito and the dictatorial regime in Yugoslavia.

Let me state emphatically my belief that the invitation extended by President Kennedy to Tito is a national disgrace. A leopard does not change its spots; communism, the false philosophy which threatens the free world, cannot ideologically become compatible with freedom.

It is especially alarming to note the New Frontier foreign policy concessions to the Tito Communist government before it even sets foot into this country. I refer specifically to the President's questionable decision to renew military aid to Yugoslavia, and the fierce pressure that has been placed upon Congress to grant special treatment to Yugoslavia under the most-favored-nation tariff clause.

Why should we rush frantically to bolster a regime which holds its power by attacking and suppressing its own countrymen, and remains in power by police-state methods in defiance of the true aspirations of the people of Yugoslavia?

The claim that Yugoslavia under Tito is a "liberal" Communist regime and therefore morally and politically acceptable is a tragic foreign policy error. The fact is that Yugoslavia is moving steadily toward completely rigid communism.

As troubles mount in that country, the government applies greater pressure on the populace and as a result, any gap between the Soviet and Yugoslavia economic practices diminishes.

May I remind the House that in the last few years Tito has given an almost blanket endorsement of the Soviet position, and in the Belgrade Conference with 25 nonalined nations in September 1961, Yugoslavia contributed directly to the pro-Soviet bias of the entire conference.

Another example which recent history gives us is that Tito approved the Soviet military intervention in Hungary in 1956.

We must always remember that while we have given billions to Yugoslavia it has been spending hundreds of millions in a foreign aid program of its own, designed to expand leftist-neutralist influence in the non-Communist world. India, Indonesia, Burma, Egypt, Ghana, and other Afro-Asian nations with neutralist leanings have received Yugoslav aid. In effect, through our aid, we have been underwriting the expansion of anti-Western neutralism in the countries of Asia and Africa.

It is disturbing to note that four American Presidents, starting with President Roosevelt, who acquiesced to Stalin's demands that we support Tito and betray General Mikhailovitch; President Truman, who initiated huge foreign aid gifts to Tito; President Eisenhower, who continued that policy, and now President Kennedy, who reestablished the State Department policy of embracing Tito—have all been completely misled.

A clue to this consistent erroneous foreign policy can be found in the official views of our State Department which, among other things, has accepted the Communist version of the history of prewar, wartime, and postwar Yugoslavia. The State Department goes far in disseminating through its own information media the Communist line of glorifying Tito and his Red government. They conveniently forget the heroic struggle of King Peter and the Royal Government of Yugoslavia and its Chetniks in their courageous struggle against the Nazis in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Yugoslavia are as fervent in their desire for political freedom today as they have been throughout their history. Their tenacity stood them well as they survived previous centuries of foreign domination, and I am confident that they will survive the present Communist oppression and once again see a legitimate government, and freedom restored to their land.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORTATION

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Trans World Airlines announced on Monday that it had delivered to the Federal Aviation Agency a check for $600,000 as the initial payment of an order for six American-built supersonic transport planes scheduled for delivery in 1970. Pan American Airways has followed with a procurement of its own. TWA and Pan Am in taking this far-sighted action and in demonstrating their faith in American industry should be complemented. These American-built planes will carry passengers across the continent and across the Atlantic and the Pacific at speeds up to 1,500 miles per hour.

We can applaud this decision by two of our U.S. air carriers for its constructive effect on the development of air transportation here and abroad, and for its contribution to the development of the aircraft industry within the United States.

The House of Representatives just a few days ago approved the first $60 million in Federal funds for the necessary research and development of this important program. This joint effort by Government and industry must go forward if America is to maintain position in the forefront for commercial aircraft development.

MANAGEMENT IN THE AIR FORCE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have always held in highest regard Gen. Curtis LeMay, presently Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force. Last Wednesday, October 9, 1963, General LeMay addressed the convention of the American Bankers Association on the important subject of "Management in the Air Force." This is a matter of deep concern to us who vote the appropriations for the defense of our country and to all American taxpayers who foot the bill.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include General LeMay's address, as follows:

Members of the American Bankers Association, ladies, and gentlemen, I value greatly this opportunity to meet with an organization which for 88 years has contributed so much to the economic development of our country. We in the Air Force also have a direct and continuing concern with the economic well-being of the United States. There are those in this world, however, who constitute a threat to our well-being and way of life. This threat is the No. 1 reason we are in business. But I didn't come here to talk about that threat today.

What I do want to talk to you about today is management—Air Force management.

Let's take a look at the overall dimensions of the management task facing the Air Force.

The capital investment of the Air Force amounts to $90 billion, which is more than twice the gross property investment of seven of our largest manufacturing corporations.

We have 230 major air bases and 3,900 other installations in 65 different countries.

They range in population from 32,000 people at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., to a handful of dedicated men at the lonely radar stations on the Arctic rim.

Altogether we have 868,000 military personnel and 306,000 civilians for a total force of 1,174,000.

Of this year's approximately $50 billion military budget, the Air Force portion is about $20 billion.

The business end of the Air Force embraces some 16,000 aircraft and hundreds of missiles—Atlas, Titan, Minuteman—with the new ICBM's coming in at the rate of one a day.

Missiles aptly illustrate the size and complexity of our management job. They involve the biggest construction effort ever undertaken. Our three ICBM programs involve contracts with thousands of companies and will cost about $17 billion, almost five times the effort of the World War II Manhattan project.

Obtaining the greatest defense capability with a globally deployed organization of this size requires constant improvement of our methods for managing all of the resources available to us whether they be men, money, or materiel.

Many of our practices, concepts, and endeavors are comparable to yours. We are both conducting operations to enhance the Nation's position in its role of world leadership. Both of our fields of activity depend upon progressive, extensive holdings and assets and we are both vitally concerned with improved management and security practices.

One of the things the Air Force has in common with the banking community is the crucial function of stewardship. Your contributions in making capital available to business and in maintaining a sound medium of exchange are vital to the health of the Nation. We, too, are entrusted with a major responsibility for the national wellbeing. Our responsibility, like yours, requires us to be the custodians of a large share of the Nation's wealth. We recognize our heavy obligations as stewards and earnestly strive to be worthy of the trust placed in us. We realize full well, as you do, that our success depends upon developing high standards of professional competence among all the members of the Air Force.

Another facet of our similarity is the "glass house" or "goldfish bowl" environment in which the Air Force, as a member of the Department of Defense team, operates. All of our actions and management decisions are, as they should be, open to public scrutiny. Because of this some of the criticism we receive is made without an understanding of the context or environment in which past decisions were made.

You measure the degree of your management capability by the profit-and-loss statement. Our purpose is also to operate at a profit. However, we are unique in that our measure is the effectiveness with which we provide, maintain, and operate the weapons required to support the Air Force mission of deterring war or gaining a decision if war occurs.

I'm sure you recognize the term "management by exception." This is a technique which has a place in any large operation. We use this a great deal. By this we mean that we are selective in those problems which receive the attention of our top people, leaving as many as possible to be dealt with by a manager who is close to the source of the difficulty. One unfortunate side effect is that we often see only the things that are out of line. This is not very good for one's perspective. When information from this technique is offered to the public, I think it also affects their perspective. One of my reasons for being here today is to try to bring our management skill and results into proper focus.

We take pains to assure that those programs which are crucial or where large sums of money are involved have complete management control. Not functional review alone but a project approach where there is a "crew chief" responsible for the whole effort. This is one of the major tools of Air Force management, called the systems concept: I am sure you have heard much about this in recent years. This systems approach brings under one program director all of the functional talents necessary such as development, procurement, production, maintenance, supply and operations. Originating in the Air Force, this concept is now a basic management method throughout the Department of Defense. It has been of great significance in focusing the efforts of our functional organizations directly upon the major problem of the rapid acquisition of new weapons. Through its use, we have placed new aircraft and intercontinental ballistic missiles in the hands of our operational commands at a rate and with an efficiency that would not have otherwise been possible. For instance, the Minuteman system, from go-ahead to operational status, took less than 4 years. Contrast this with the 7 to 8 years usually accepted as typical for development of new weapons.

After reviewing the utilization of electronic data processing equipment and systems, you in the banking industry have discovered, as have we in the Air Force, the tremendous potential which computers provide toward improving our management capabilities. We are currently using 328 computers, and rely on them heavily in the scientific, engineering, logistics and finance areas to insure responsive support. Some of the functions in which we use them are inventory management, automatic resupply, computation of materiel requirements, maintenance engineering management, fiscal accounting, payrolls and budgeting.

But our most important resource is people. If we fail to use our human resources properly, all prospects for success in other areas are nullified. In this era of highly complex, costly, and powerful weapons we have an unprecedented requirement for professionalism.

It is through people that we manage and accomplish our required tasks. We've come a long way toward making a service career attractive to the kind of professionally qualified people we need—but we still have a long way to go.

The educational level of our Air Force people, both military and civilian, has been elevated in the past few years. Many more of our people today have baccalaureate and advanced degrees. Not only are those degrees in the scientific and engineering fields, but also in business and logistics management. Much of this improvement comes from personal voluntary effort. We also have courses of training in our air university and civilian institutions offering degrees in both the technical and management fields.

The demand for continuous training is apparent. We in the Air Force are taking advantage of every means available to increase the effectiveness of our management capability at all levels. This training effort has produced some favorable results. We are better able to perform our tasks. Fewer people can now do more, permitting us an opportunity to realine our personnel resources to assume new and greater responsibilities.

These management tools and techniques combined with sound judgment have resulted in major changes in the business-management capability of the Air Force. I am sure that many of you have served in the military forces, and I can assure you that if you came back into the Air Force today and could see these modern techniques and professional people at work, you would be pleased with the great progress. It's a new kind of Air Force and here are some examples:

First of all, the Air Force today operates a mixed force of complex weapons with an operationally ready rate 50 percent higher than we experienced 10 years ago. At the same time, we have reduced inventories and pipeline times considerably. The ability to respond to the needs of a global force and maintain such a readiness status is a definite tribute to all our Air Force people, whatever their field of endeavor.

Soon after World War II, we realized that a system of mass logistics was not suitable to support the highly mobile and flexible forces required to counter aggression on a global basis. The solution to this was to build a new management system around automatic data processing, fast communications, an effective reporting system, and rapid transport, usually airlift.

In our application of computers, we expect to mechanize more than half of the points where supply stock records are maintained. A hundred of these have been converted already. As a result of this modernization, our improvements over the past 10 years have been impressive. In our base supply activities we found that use of an electronic data processing system improved our ability to provide required items faster from local stock and gave us a much more accurate inventory picture. At the same time we reduced our supply depots worldwide from 24 to 9. This has been accomplished in spite of the fact that the number of line items in our inventory has doubled over the past 10 years.

Further applications in the field of aircraft maintenance have also paid big dividends. It has assisted us to evaluate the reliability and inspection requirements for parts, systems and components across a much wider spectrum than we could have with manual methods. One of the results of this was to cut our inspection downtime on aircraft significantly. In the case of the KC–135, our jet refueling aircraft, the time required for a major inspection was reduced from 9 to 2½ days and depot inspections were eliminated entirely. This, in effect, made about 70 airplanes available for operational use.

Pipeline time for aircraft engines has been reduced from 145 days in 1952 to the present level of only 7 to 9 days. This applies to shipments from stateside depots to the oversea bases. This type of speedup has greatly reduced the cost of our aircraft spares in relation to the value of the aircraft we are supporting. Compared to a spares inventory which represented 75 percent of the value of our aircraft inventory in 1956, our spares now represent only 25 percent of the $20 billion aircraft inventory. In engines alone, we've reduced our inventory from over $5 billion to under $2 billion and we're still driving it down.

The efficiency of our operations with industry is another area toward which we are directing our management attention. Our combat readiness depends to a large degree upon our capability to acquire modern weapon systems and to support them in a timely and effective manner. We continuously monitor our acquisition process with industry. Improved techniques and procedures have resulted in reducing procurement leadtime. The utilization of more effective contracting methods has resulted in a large reduction in the use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee type contracts. We are taking advantage of the highly competitive atmosphere that exists and are using more fixed-price and incentive-fee type contracts.

Our philosophy today is to negotiate a good touch deal—but one with an opportunity for the contractor to make more money by rewarding him for economy in operation as well as recognizing good quality and performance.

All of the things I've mentioned result in reduced costs. Through more efficient procurement, logistics, and operating management procedures in fiscal year 1963, we realized a reduction in costs of more than $1 billion. That is more than half of the total defense reductions recently reported to the President by the Secretary of Defense for the same period and has been taken into account in our current budget. While striving to increase our responsiveness and effectiveness to meet any threat, we've not overlooked our accounting and finance operations. Such things as general ledgers, stock and industrial funds, commercial services, expense accounting, and financial inventory accounts are now on either punchcards accounting or electronic data processing equipment. Each system is standard throughout the Air Force. Our accounting and finance center at Denver, with which many of you are familiar, uses computers extensively to do a job similar to yours. The checks prepared and issued by the center cover 1½ million pay allotment accounts and over 75,000 retired pay accounts. In the savings bond area, they issue 100,000 a month, plus 162,000 each quarter. Altogether, these accounts represent a monthly disbursal of $90 million going to 1½ million recipients in all parts of the world.

The operational side of the Air Force—which is really the "payoff" has also made improvements in the application of management techniques, and the introduction of automatic data processing equipment.

Intelligence information is rapidly sifted and evaluated by these means. The Strategic Air Command uses computers to control its global bomber and tanker fleets, to set up and check numerous flight plans, and to evaluate the combat readiness of its many operational components. A management rating system has been in operation at the Strategic Air Command for over 14 years. In devising this management rating system my overall objective was to insure combat readiness 24 hours a day. Every month, every crew is rated, every squadron is rated, and every wing is rated. They are in competition with each other. These monthly reports flow from the aircraft commander to the squadron commander to the Strategic Air Command headquarters. They cover the capability of the crew, of the individual member, and the overall efficiency of the aircraft as a separate unit as well as the capability of the wing and of the division. Without this extensive reporting procedure our ability to measure the capability of the Strategic Air Command would be impossible. In addition, a rating system evaluates all facets of the day-to-day operation of our other units to assure peak performance. No detail is too large or too small to be included. Not only does this approach keep all echelons of commands informed but it engenders a spirit of competition which is all important.

For example, the effectiveness of our depots is measured through an executive management control system, monthly. The productivity of each depot is reviewed against previously established goals. This standardized management system has been in use since 1949 and continually undergoes periodic revisions. This deep look at relative short intervals allows timely revision to current programs and assures the necessary flexibility to respond to the basic Air Force mission support requirements. In other words: We have established goals for each functional area in our system and we undertake to see that these goals are accomplished.

Another way of putting it is that we have instituted management by exception so that we immediately know where the soft spots are so that corrective action can be taken.

This same type of rating system is applied to all our commands.

In the final analysis the operational readiness of our combat potential represents the net sum of the effectiveness of our management. One of our measurement tools is the combat unit operational readiness tests which reflect the ability of the combat forces to meet their mission requirements. Through these and other no-notice audits we periodically assure ourselves that we have the proper discipline in our system.

As a result of heavy reliance on these rating systems, I am happy to state to you that our capability in our combat readiness area has steadily improved.

The guardian of our offensive might is the Strategic Air Command. It provides the protective shield under which its tactical partner and other forces can operate in levels of conflict below that of general war.

Units of the Strategic Air Command are closely integrated with the fighter interceptor, missile, and radar warning elements of the North American Air Defense Forces.

Operationally ready forces of the Tactical Air Command and the Continental Army Command are working together more closely for developing improved techniques and operating procedures.

Equipmentwise we are steadily increasing our tactical fighters' range, endurance, and load-carrying capacity to provide better support to the Army. Conventional capabilities of our tactical forces have been enhanced through improved conventional munitions and supporting hardware. Reconnaissance, too, has been improved to provide day, night, and all-weather surveillance of the battlefields and areas behind the frontlines.

In addition, the Air Force today is facing a new and different requirement for the use of tactical airpower in counterinsurgency activities in support of governments friendly to the United States.

As I mentioned, SAC forces consist of both manned aircraft, and long-range missiles. They are complementary weapon systems, each with its own capabilities to do specific tasks and each with its strengths, weaknesses, and reliability factors. Our missile forces gain strength daily. The Atlas missile program is now completed. The Titan missile program is at a stage where over half its authorized strength is on alert. An improved version of the solid propellant Minuteman is already entering the inventory.

To better survive an enemy attack hardening of missile sites is going ahead at a rapid rate. In addition, survival of manned aircraft and the ability to retaliate against an enemy is assured to a greater degree by means of airborne alerts and dispersal.

A recent example of the efficiency of MATS in maintaining the readiness of our global forces was provided by its airlift operation during the Cuban crisis.

You can take great pride in the superior professionalism which these forces have exhibited in recent years and months. The callup during the Berlin contingency in August of 1961 and the more recent Cuban crisis amply demonstrated their state of constant readiness.

Today we live in a fast-changing and challenging world. This is an era of rapidly advancing technology. How well we can keep pace will depend to a large degree upon our leadership and management effectiveness.

Meeting the Air Force mission responsibility during this missile and space era is a tremendous challenge for all of us including the members of the great American industrial complex. The need for control and sound fiscal management must be met by our acquisition people as well as those responsible for operations, support, budget, planning and financial accounting.

We have made significant advancements in our management capability. The future presents a challenge that we accept. The job ahead is a very complex one. However, our people are geared to respond in a manner that will not only reflect credit upon themselves and the operation of the Air Force, but will also meet the demands created by our National objectives and policies.

I believe from my report today that you can continue to have confidence in your Defense "corporation." Its directors are acutely aware of the importance of maintaining a credible deterrent. They realize the costs are great and they are constantly battling those costs. But uppermost in their minds is the thought that the cost of an inferior deterrent is national disaster.

This is our balance sheet—we are running at a profit and I am equally confident that the American people, our stockholders, will continue the interest and support which will enable this country and our free world allies to maintain the peace.

NATIONAL FREE ENTERPRISE DAY

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to join with my colleagues in observing National Free Enterprise Day. Every day of every year should be Free Enterprise Day, but it is appropriate that we designate one particular day where special tribute is paid to the greatest economic system in the history of the world. Through the observance of Free Enterprise Day we pause to refresh our memories concerning the importance of our economic organization and to refurbish our support of the principles of economic freedom and individual liberty.

It has been said that a prophet is never recognized at home. Similarly, the economic system that has been the vehicle through which the United States has scaled unchartered heights of productivity and abundance is taken for granted. Like the cobbler's children who go barefoot because father is so busy repairing shoes for the rest of the village, we are sometimes so engrossed in enjoying the fruits of the free enterprise tree we fail to recognize the genius of the plant that has produced happiness and well-being for the citizens of this land.

Has the free enterprise system worked in the United States? The answer is patently clear. You merely have to look around you to see visible and measurable evidence of its success. Four out of every five of your neighbors own automobiles, 20th century magic carpets, that go faster, farther and more comfortably, traveling on smoother highways to the sunny summits of the Colorado Rockies or the dark depths of the Florida Everglades.

Ninety-six percent of your neighbors own radios and 91 percent of them own television sets. The width of the living room becomes the scope of the world and the important developments in a jet-moving age are less than a moment away from the ear or the eye.

The United States, approximately 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's land area, produces almost half of the world's wealth. Where other economies stagnate and stand on dead center, ours blooms. Where unfortunately others face scarcity and famine, we face abundance and plenty. Where the standard of living in other countries remains steady or inches ahead, ours skyrockets.

Free enterprise does not provide for the bread of life alone. It is not confined to the world that is measured solely by material things, measured by the dollar. It also feeds the spirit. Man has an inherent, intrinsic, native yearning to be free; an insatiable desire to be self-reliant, to make his own decisions, to choose his own field of employment. Man seeks the golden goal of passing on to his progeny and his fellow man the rewards of his life's work, giving continuity to his efforts.

The free enterprise system is the best economic organization to protect these rights, to serve as the guardian of these guarantees, to open the cages of economic confinement and to free the basic spirit of man.

Few people in our country advocate openly the abolition of this system but there are those who condemn by faint praise. These are the "except" proponents of free enterprise. These are the ones who say "This system works except in times of recession, except in times of great prosperity, except in certain areas, except at certain times."

These are the faint-of-heart who believe that a heavily centralized Federal Government is not the umpire in the economic ball game but the pitcher—for both sides.

These are the ones who believe that this centralized government knows as well as the citizen—and perhaps a shade better—how to spend his money and therefore justify increased Federal expenditures, increased Federal control, and increased Federal deficits.

Even sterling silver loses its gleam unless it is polished. Every time the Government allows itself to compete with private industry, our free system is tarnished. Every time we allow a Government bureau or department to assume dictatorial powers over an industry or a segment of our economy, our free system is tarnished. Every time we use tax money to finance a Government operation that threatens the existence of private industry, our free system is tarnished and we all lose a little. Every time our Government appropriates money to be used by foreign countries to destroy or weaken free enterprise in that country, the system is also weakened at home and we all lose.

It should be palpably clear to all of us that the way to protect human rights is to fight every minute of every day for them. It should be abundantly apparent to all of us that Government was designed to be the servant of the people, not their master. It must be crystal clear to all of us that every time Government pushes its foot through the door that should be reserved for individual and private effort, we deviate from the pattern of this great system. Like the steady drip of the stream that eventually wears away the stone, each encroachment against the rock of private enterprise and initiative is a step down from the high road of economic and political freedom.

We have come of economic age in this country. We have grown from a toddling infant to a giant of nations in a comparatively short time. We have the highest wages, the best working conditions, the happiest people in the world. We are the beacon light of hope, the light at the end of the corridor, for those who walk in economic and political darkness.

This is the genius of the free enterprise system. Let us keep it gleaming and untarnished.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the announcement yesterday by Trans World Airlines and Pan American Airways regarding their intentions to purchase the first U.S.-built supersonic airliners is highly significant and underscores the importance of encouraging and assisting private industry in this vast undertaking.

According to news reports, TWA has deposited a $600,000 check with the Federal Aviation Agency toward the eventual purchase of six supersonic planes. Pan American Airways said it would purchase 15 such planes and indicated a deposit of $1.5 million would be forthcoming to FAA.

These payments made by these two great airlines will be credited toward the royalties that the Government expects to receive to help recover outlays for development of the supersonic airliner.

The supersonic transport is the next inevitable advance in commercial aviation. The United States should not lag behind other nations in aeronautical developments. Other nations have already begun to design and build supersonic airliners. France and England, for example, have been working for several years on supersonic transports. Now they are jointly engaged in the development of an airliner designed to fly at speeds up to mach 2.2—about 1,450 miles per hour.

Aviation leaders in this country have estimated that the development of a prototype supersonic transport will cost approximately $150 million, which is 7½ times the cost of the jet transport just 10 years ago, and more than 200 times that of the first Flying Fortress.

No one will deny that this will be an expensive undertaking. There are great risks for private industry. For example, the Boeing Co., which is one of three aviation firms participating in this competition, already has expended in the neighborhood of $15 million on supersonic transport study. And the big costs are still ahead in supersonic prototype development.

We have been assured that—

> If we move quickly enough, there is no reason to believe the Concorde, or any other foreign made aircraft, will preempt the supersonic air transport market.

Last week the House of Representatives took the first step in providing $60 million to assist private industry in the development of the supersonic airliner. The United States must not relinquish its leadership in the aeronautics field. Yesterday's actions by two U.S. airlines tells us that there will be a ready market for American-built supersonic transport planes; and there is great confidence in the technical know-how of the U.S. aviation industry.

COLD WAR OUTLOOK

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Allen Dulles, the former Director of Central Intelligence, continues to take an interest in international affairs. To his everlasting credit, he is devoting his retirement years to giving fellow Americans the benefit of lessons learned during a lifetime of service to his country.

Mr. Dulles has written an article for the October 1963 issue of Nation's Business entitled, "Cold War Outlook." Because of Mr. Dulles' unique background, this article is of importance. I recommend it to all of my colleagues who have an interest in international affairs.

I will not attempt to quote the entire article. However, one section of the article struck me as having significance because of the current state of Soviet-American relations. The section to which I refer deals with the possibilities of agreements with the Soviet Union. Mr. Dulles is very careful to point out the pitfalls of dealing with the Soviets. He suggests seven guidelines in dealing with the Russians. I quote:

> It is not easy to draw up clear specifications as to what type or types of agreements can safely and profitably be entered into with the representatives of the Soviet Union with its Communist principles and its Communist ambitions. Here are some possible guideposts:
>
> 1. The agreement should be executory in character and the actions under it should be

so timed as to be simultaneously carried out; that is to say, neither party should modify its position to its possible disadvantage until the other party has acted likewise. (Example: Austrian State Treaty.)

2. The agreement should not depend upon unilateral action on our side against the promise of some future action by the Soviets.

3. The execution of the agreement should be self-policing or self-evident (as most experts tell us is the case with the test ban treaty).

4. The agreement should not be subject to misconstruction due to any possible difference of interpretation of its terms. (Our postwar agreements with the Soviets providing for free elections are examples. Here we found that this meant to them freedom to vote solely for Communist candidates.)

5. The agreement should be as clear, precise, and comprehensive as the subject matter requires. (In the original 1945 agreement on allied access to Berlin, too much latitude was left to those who later had to interpret it.)

6. Gentlemen's agreements, which are usually vague in content and uncertain in performance, should never be relied upon in our dealings with the Soviets. (The test ban agreement which Khrushchev broke in 1961 is an example.)

7. Any agreements which tend to open up the barrier of the Iron Curtain to freer intercourse, fuller exchanges of ideas, of culture, and information should be encouraged. We have little to fear ourselves from what they in peacetime may send to us, except for their spies, whom they can and will send us anyway.

DO FARMERS REALLY APPROVE WHEAT SALE?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked Illinois farmers to tell me what they think of the Russian wheat sale before the deal is completely wrapped up.

I have invited them to drop me a postcard with a "yes" or "no" on the Russian wheat sale. I will deliver the responses personally to the White House.

The Kennedy administration has approved selling wheat to Communist bloc governments and claims that farmers overwhelmingly support this decision. My mail does not bear this out.

Russian emissaries are expected in Washington in a few days to make final arrangements. Before they wrap up the deal, I would like to get the true facts on Illinois farmer opinion and report to the President.

The President's decision marks a definite and fundamental change in policy toward the Communists. Congress itself went on record 2 years ago in opposition to such sales. What is the attitude of the American farmer? Does he believe selling to the Communists is right or wrong?

If the farmers themselves actually oppose selling wheat to the Communists, Congress may respond by strengthening laws which ban such trade.

Certainly, the attitude of Illinois farmers is significant. Forty percent of Illinois farms grow wheat.

THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION MEETS IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL IN A TIME OF CRISIS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the congressionally chartered National Trust for Historic Preservation will hold its 17th annual meeting and preservation conference in the Nation's Capital October 17 through October 20 this year.

I am especially proud to welcome this fine organization to the Nation's Capital, and I strongly recommend the discussions which will be held by it on such matters as "Salvaging Historic Areas," "Solutions to the Salvage Problem," and "Private Renewal, Without Federal Aid."

This meeting occurs in a time of crisis.

As many publications, including Reader's Digest, the Kiplinger magazine Changing Times, the Journal of the American Institute of Architects, and Architectural Forum have shown time and time again, our visible heritage of historic buildings is being thoughtlessly wasted and destroyed.

"America the Beautiful—Heritage or Honky-tonk?" was the title of a November 1962 article in Changing Times magazine that told how the spreading disease of tourist blight is eating away the spirit and substance of our Nation's scenic wonders and historic shrines. A September 1963 article in the same publication reported how communities across the country are trying to protect and rescue our national heritage from commercial exploitation and debasement.

The Washington (D.C.) Star newspaper of September 13, 1963, reported the destruction in Boston, Mass., of a score of historically important sites:

> Wiped out in the construction of the subway system, new buildings and highways, according to the Boston National Historic Sites Commission.

The sites destroyed included Griffin wharf, scene of the Boston Tea Party; the birthplace of Benjamin Franklin, and the chandlery shop which Franklin tended for his father; the birthplace of Samuel Adams, "the father of the Revolution," and our country's second President; the home on Beacon Hill of John Hancock, president of the Continental Congress and first signer of the Declaration of Independence; Boston Public Latin School, the Nation's first public school; and Green Dragon Tavern, "headquarters of the Revolution," where nightly patrols under Paul Revere were assigned to keep watch on the British.

Money alone is not going to solve the many and complex problems of historic preservation. A chart prepared by the historic American buildings survey of the National Park Service shows that of the 10,000 buildings recorded to date 4,500 have been demolished.

More funds for the historic American buildings survey will result in more complete records, but will it save the buildings we want saved?

Perhaps there is hope. All of you, I am sure, saw the recent announcement by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, of the new Federal policy aimed at preventing damage to fish and wildlife habitats by Federal-aid highway construction. This policy was worked out by the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

This policy, which had strong Democratic support in the Senate and House, especially from Senators and Representatives from the Western States, requires each State, in requesting Federal aid funds, to certify that it has given consideration to the effects of the proposed highway projects on fish and wildlife resources.

Now, since fish and wildlife habitats are safe from "modern progress" programs and human habitats are not safe from them this may be simply a case of the fish and wildlife outvoting us human beings at the polls. If this is the case, then we should rapidly find out how they manage to have so much power at the voting booths. If we find out soon enough, we may be able to save what remains of our rapidly disappearing heritage, but time is of the essence.

There is so little time left that I am considering the introduction in the House of Representatives of legislation drafted for me at my request by the National Park Service to establish a National Heritage Commission based on the sound precedent of the high-level National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission headed by Laurence Rockefeller. Only such a high-level National Heritage Commission can successfully mobilize in time the appropriate and interested Federal, State, local, and private agencies and preservation-minded leaders in each community in time to assure the preservation of our visible heritage by aiding and aid and advance the meritorious work of such an outstanding organization as the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

I include as part of my remarks a recent speech before the Capitol Hill Restoration Society, Washington, D.C., on the subject of preserving our Nation's heritage.

PRESERVING OUR NATION'S HERITAGE

New Jersey's citizens, like the embattled residents of Capitol Hill, have had to wage a constant, unremitting campaign to save their priceless heritage of historic parks, sites, buildings, and pleasant residential areas from "modern progress" programs.

I am a member of the New Jersey Tercentary Commission, established by act of the Congress, which is undertaking extensive historic preservation programs in connection with our State's year-long celebration in 1964. I have worked with other New Jerseyites to save historic covered bridges, the Morristown National Historical Park, and a number of significant buildings and sites which are an important part of our Nation's history. So it is with some personal knowledge of what is involved in the term "historic preservation" that I speak to you this evening on the subject of preserving our Nation's heritage.

This same constant, unremitting campaign to preserve our Nation's visible heritage of buildings, sites, and objects is being waged in most other States by dedicated and selfless citizens. The Sunday Star on October 13, 1963, spoke of the disappearance of Griffin wharf in Boston. This wharf was the scene of the famous Boston Tea Party where "the spirit of the people conceived an embryonic nation."

According to the Star: "Griffin wharf is but one of more than a score of historically important sites wiped out in Boston by previous administrations in the construction of the subway system, new buildings and highways, according to the Boston National Historic Sites Commission."

What is needed, if further destruction of our country's irreplaceable heritage is to be prevented, is a renewed dedication, a new national preservation effort at all levels of government in cooperation with all patriotic citizens and such interested organizations as the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and such local organizations as your own Capitol Hill Restoration Society, if we are to keep what remains of our heritage from being thoughtlessly destroyed.

The Department of the Interior's National Park Service administers a number of preservation programs under the broad authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935. This act grew out of a Rockefeller-financed study of the historic preservation programs of European countries, programs which are much further advanced than our own. This act enunciated for the first time a Federal policy concerning the preservation of our own heritage which states in part: "It is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."

Money alone isn't going to solve the many and complex problems of historic preservation. A chart prepared by the Historic American Buildings Survey of the National Park Service shows that of the 10,000 buildings recorded to date, 4,500 have been demolished. This pathetic note appeared at one side: "The rate of demolition is increasing sharply. Our rate of recording will have to increase also, in order to stay ahead of 'the wrecker's ball.' "

More funds for the Historic American Buildings Survey will result in more complete records, but will it save the buildings we want saved?

Perhaps another course is possible. All of you, I am sure, saw the newspaper stories on August 27 this year on the announcement by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, of the new Federal policy aimed at preventing damage to fish and wildlife habitats by Federal-aid highway construction. This policy was worked out by the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

This policy, which had strong Democratic support in the Senate and House, especially from Senators and Representatives from Western States, requires that State highway departments give State fish and wildlife agencies advance plans for Federal-aid highway construction. After next January 1, each State, in requesting Federal-aid funds, must certify that it has given consideration to the effects of the proposed highway projects on fish and wildlife resources.

A number of bills have been introduced by Democrats and Republicans in the Senate and House, mainly from the older States in the East and South with a large and significant heritage of buildings, sites, and residential neighborhoods to preserve, having as their purpose the protection of this visible heritage.

A number of preservation groups, including the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and the Historic American Buildings Survey officials, have shown great interest in these bipartisan bills. However, the preservation of human habitats has not had the kind of Democratic support either in the Congress, the President's Cabinet, or by the President himself, which came so gallantly to the rescue of our fish and wildlife brethren.

Now, this may simply be a case of the fish and wildlife outvoting us human beings at the polls. If this is the case, then we should rapidly find out how they manage to have so much power at the voting booths. If we find out soon enough, we may be able to save what remains of our rapidly disappearing heritage, but time is of the essence.

There is so little time left that I am considering the introduction in the House of Representatives of legislation to establish a National Heritage Commission based on the sound precedent of the high-level National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission headed by Laurence Rockefeller.

Only such a high-level National Heritage Commission can successfully mobilize in time the appropriate and interested Federal, State, local, and private agencies to assure the preservation of our visible heritage.

In looking closely at the historic areas of Capitol Hill and its environs, let us begin by recognizing a fact which should be obvious to everyone but unfortunately is not, and this is that Capitol Hill is one of the most significant historic areas in the world. An early map shows Jenkins' Hill as the site where the Capitol Building now stands. L'Enfant saw the area extending from the Capitol Building to the Anacostia as the Eastern Gateway to the Capitol City, the Congress, and the President's House, the grand entrance to the seat of government.

The January 1963 issue of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects points out that: "To L'Enfant this hill was a podium awaiting a major edifice. It seemed logical and advantageous to L'Enfant to locate the Congress House at the approximate center of the site, about halfway between the rivers."

Despite this central role in L'Enfant's plan, this area extending south and east to the Anacostia must sometime seem these days to be almost bereft of friends at the highest levels of government.

The Commission of Fine Arts, which was established in 1910 to advance the L'Enfant plan has, at the most crucial and critical period in the history of Capitol Hill, deserted it entirely. Under its long-time Chairman, David E. Finley, recently retired, who lives in Georgetown, this Commission has chosen only to throw its powerful influence behind Old Georgetown's preservation movement. Under its new chairman, William Walton, the Georgetown neighbor of President Kennedy, this Commission may be expected to continue to support Old Georgetown and to ignore Capitol Hill.

Historic Capitol Hill and its residential environs are not protected by such acts of Congress as the Old Georgetown Act, and the Shipstead-Luce Act which were initiated by the Commission of Fine Arts, or the 1955 Act of Congress creating the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, or the more recent act of Congress, pressed by President Kennedy during his final Senate years, creating the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Capitol Hill would be happy, indeed, to have the same kind of Presidential and congressional interest exerted in its behalf.

Charles A. Horsky, President Kennedy's Adviser on National Capital Affairs, has spoken to this group, as well as to the Capitol Hill Community Council in recent weeks. But he came emptyhanded as far as bringing any expression of Presidential concern for preserving the residential areas of Capitol Hill equal to the President's known interest in historic preservation in his home State of Massachusetts—yet President Kennedy worked on Capitol Hill for many years first in the House and then in the Senate.

Also, as you know so well that I hesitate to even refer to it in this company, Democratic speakers of the House, and the present Capitol Architect, Mr. J. George Stewart, have for years strongly opposed all historic preservation efforts of the citizens of Capitol Hill and that opposition is extremely effective and far reaching.

The development of preservation legislation for Capitol Hill and its residential environs is vitally necessary. I am confident that such legislation will come before long, especially if the Capitol Hill Restoration Society, the Capitol Hill Community Council, the Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association, your garden groups and other organizations redouble their efforts in this direction.

It is possible that the development of such legislation has been held up by:

1. A Congress insufficiently aware, and, perhaps, even oblivious to, the problems of its neighbors across the street from it on Capitol Hill, and almost totally concerned with the neighbors of our country in the far corners of the world. It is possible, I am convinced, to be wisely and actively concerned with our neighbors abroad, and our neighbors at home, at one and the same time.

2. An indefinite preference for grass over people by the Members of the Senate and House Office Building Commissions.

3. The Capitol Architect should be adaptable, be able to learn new ways, and not be so busy with his building programs that he is unable to become acquainted with his Capitor Hill neighbors, and be interested in, and helpful with their problems.

4. The Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission, both have Chairmen with Georgetown backgrounds, and the members of these Commissions are deeply under the Georgetown influence.

It is high time for Georgetown's urban conservationists to raise their eyes to Capitol Hill and try, at least, to meet a challenge worthy of this day and time.

Today, Georgetown is quite insignificant, as fas as restoration needs are concerned, when compared with Capitol Hill.

Capitol Hill is important because it is the place where the decisions are made that shape our Nation's destiny and where they will be made as long as our form of Government endures.

Those who went into Georgetown and reclaimed it as one of the more glamorous residential areas of the Nation are to be commended, but there should be certain caveats. For one certainly can be permitted to wonder if Georgetown's rehabilitation could not have been accomplished without almost entirely displacing the Negroes who lived there before the New Deal Democrats arrived.

In this more enlightened day, with our greater awareness of the God-given individual worth of each human being, the rehabilitation of Capitol Hill is advancing without displacing its Negro citizens.

The rehabilitation and restoration of Capitol Hill should be strongly supported and not opposed, as it is at present by leaders of this Democratic administration in the Congress, by President Kennedy, and by top officials in the government of the District of Columbia. If these Democrats would rise to the challenge posed by the restoration and rehabilitation of Capitol Hill they could write a much more important and significant chapter in city restoration and rehabilitation than the Roosevelt liberals of the 1930's did in Old Georgetown. I say this because our people must find a more equitable solution to urban renewal than the present solution which is based on Negro removal in every urban renewal project in this country. An equitable solution would have a profound effect in this country and before the bar of world opinion.

However, the opportunities for national leadership which await the Democratic Party in the restoration and renewal of Capitol Hill have not been seized. Capitol Hill residential preservation lacks champions of the power and influence of Michael J. Mansfield, top Senate Democrat, or Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, who spring into action every time there is the slightest hint that Glover-Archbold Park and its residential environs are threatened by a highway, a bridge, or any other "modern progress" program.

Unfortunately, too, the residential areas of Capitol Hill have yet to find defenders among the Democrats in Congress equal in power and influence to such great Senators as J. William Fulbright and A. S. Monroney who regularly do battle for the Kalorama Circle residential area.

I wish that the present leaders among the Democrats could find it in their hearts to muster the same enthusiasm for preserving from destruction and despoliation the residential areas of historic Capitol Hill as they presently muster for saving such privileged areas as Spring Valley, Georgetown, Cleveland Park, and the Chevy Chase areas of the District from "modern progress" programs.

I believe historic Capitol Hill and its residential environs with their striking evidence of substantial private rehabilitation, restoration, and construction, and their even more striking evidence of good neighborly relations between its citizens without regard to race, creed, or color, which is also a significant part of our historic American heritage, are more deserving of governmental encouragement and support than are those racially restricted enclaves in the Nation's Capital which this Democratic administration protects so wholeheartedly from Government-financed, modern progress programs.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation reports in the current issue of its magazine Historic Preservation on the advances which the National Capital Planning Commission is making toward a citywide preservation program in the District of Columbia. A citywide preservation program is long overdue, and Capitol Hill should and must benefit greatly through the establishment of a well-thought-out citywide preservation program under sound leadership and direction. This may be the opportunity we have all been looking for, despite the obvious shortcomings of the Commission through the years, and its failure to be concerned with the people its plans affect most deeply—the residents of the District of Columbia. The Federal interest is overwhelmingly represented in this Commission, and the legitimate and just interests of the District's citizens have been consistently subordinated to this Federal interest.

One can, therefore, be permitted some polite doubts about the National Capital Planning Commission being the most suitable agency for the execution of such an important preservation program, however. I say this because the idea that Capitol Hill is one of the Nation's historic areas apparently has come as a great, but recent, revelation to the members of this Commission. On a tour of the Naval Weapons Plant on October 3, the members of this Federal agency were impressed, according to the Washington Post, with the potential for development of the gun factory's riverfront site, and were moved to keep this potential from being frittered away. Commission member C. McKim Norton stated, "It is an opportunity almost like Rockefeller Center," while Seattle architect Paul Thiry, said: "There are chances here for restoration and preservation and public uses no one has yet thought of."

This is an exhilarating beginning, to say the least. One can only ask, however, "Where have they been all these years?" while Capitol Architect J. George Stewart was insisting on his control of everything from Independence Avenue south to the Anacostia, and the District's highwaymen were demanding their pound of flesh? Where has this powerful Commission been while the members of the Capitol Hill Restoration Society fought their lonely, frustrating battle against all those forces bent on the destruction of the historic heritage of Capitol Hill and its residential environs?

A very important step in the preservation of Capitol Hill would be the enactment of my bill, H.R. 7391, to provide a third Library of Congress building on square 732 where some of you lived until recently.

I am happy, indeed, that Senator Paul H. Douglas has introduced an identical bill in the Senate, S. 1920, which is cosponsored by Senators Joseph Clark, Eugene McCarthy, and Frank Lausche.

The report to the Senate and House Public Works Committees by the American Institute of Architects on the bills to provide for the third Library building calls for the development of a master plan for the Capitol Hill area. The AIA report states that: "The institute recommends that a long-range, comprehensive master plan of the Capitol Hill area which envisions future needs of the legislative branch, the Library of Congress, the Supreme Court, and other needs, should be developed. In preparing this master plan, the Architect of the Capitol should seek the advice of experts and interested parties, such as the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Park Service, and other Government agencies, the American Institute of Architects and other related professional societies.

"If a comprehensive master plan is prepared and adopted, the institute believes that problems of site selection, land use, and design such as those raised by the subject bills will be greatly simplified in the future, and a more orderly and efficient development of the Capitol Hill area will be possible."

I most heartily agree, but the AIA report contends, without supporting data or argument, that squares 732, 637, and 691 do not provide appropriate sites for: "expansion of Library of Congress facilities. Their utilization would serve only to further disperse the functions of the Library. It would appear that such expansion of the Library would be better served in an easterly direction."

This otherwise fine report unrealistically ignores the fact that the Library of Congress is to serve Congress, and that placing the third Library building on square 732, which was originally cleared for this purpose, would locate it physically several blocks nearer the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives than it would be if it is built east of the present Library Annex.

I am very pleased that one especially significant piece of information in this $39 million Madison Memorial puzzle has not escaped the vigilant eyes of your able president, Austin Beall, and the hard-working members of your special committee which has been working with me on this Library plan. They have successfully brought to the attention of Members of the Senate and House the fact that square 732 is 15 percent larger than the combined area of the two blocks east of the Library Annex suggested as a preferred site by the Librarian of Congress, the Architect of the Capitol, and the American Institute of Architects.

It is important to note that when the taking of square 732 was discussed by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on June 17, 1960, such distinguished Democrats as the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, Clarence Cannon, Carl Vinson, and subcommittee chairman Albert Thomas, gave every indication that this 5 acre-plot would be the site of the third Library of Congress building. The Architect of the Capitol, Mr. J. George Stewart, told the subcommittee that square 732 "would be an ideal location for the Library." The same sound position was taken by the Democratic leadership of the House in the debate on the House floor 10 days later. In fact, no mention was made at any time during the consideration of the $5 million appropriation of any intent to acquire square 732 for a special $39 million Madison Memorial.

The later proposal for a special Madison Memorial on square 732, as now proposed in House Joint Resolution 123, would force the taking at great expense of more church and private property on Capitol Hill for the third Library building. Under the bills Senator Douglas and his colleagues and I have sponsored, this now privately held land would remain on the District of Columbia tax rolls where it is sorely needed. The good faith of the Congress is at stake in this matter. Under present conditions, property owners many blocks from the Capitol Building have good reason to wonder whether it is worthwhile to upgrade their properties. This has led to conditions of blight and crime in the vicinity of the Capitol and its surrounding complex of Federal buildings, so that employees of the Supreme Court and the Congress have to be given special police escort protection.

I would like to urge that you support by resolution my bill to preserve the stately Union Station building. As you know, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation have both called for the preservation of this monumental building. In presenting this measure, H.R. 8234, to preserve Union Station, I hoped to develop a feasible plan early enough to save this building for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States, and prevent its destruction as New York City's Pennsylvania Station is being destroyed.

The desire, need, and interest in a central repository for transport relics has found expression in several bills in recent years to establish a National Museum of Transport. My own bill provides only that there shall be in the Nation's Capital a place where important and representative pieces in danger of destruction can be assembled for the benefit and instruction of future generations.

In summary, then, the further development of Capitol Hill and the preservation of its visible heritage have not bogged down because of a lack of ideas or the apathy of its citizens. The present impasse is a direct result of the apathy and outright opposition of those in authority in this administration from President Kennedy down. This is the area where we must concentrate our efforts in the months ahead, and we must enlist everyone who does not want this Capitol Hill residential area of pleasing homes and hidden, miniature, gardens to become an unending marble, concrete, and black-top wasteland deserted at day's end as its working inhabitants flee to the city's suburbs.

Surely this Capitol Hill area, which has played such a major and intimate role in our Nation's history, and has seen the politicians and the statesmen at close range, has acquired during its past of more than 170 years enough claim on history to deserve, if any area in our country does, the protection of the Congress and this administration—including President Kennedy.

If Boston, Sturbridge Village, and Plymouth Plantation in Massachusetts, and Williamsburg, and Jamestown in Virginia, and other historic areas, including Georgetown, deserve to be preserved then surely Capitol Hill and its residential environs do.

I thank you.

DR. OSKAR MORGENSTERN ISSUES A WARNING OF USE OF ECONOMIC STATISTICS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a subject of deep concern to me as a member of the Joint Economic Committee is the frequently uncritical reliance placed upon economic statistics as a guide to policymaking. The economic growth rate, for example, is increasingly being used as the basis upon which to justify expansionary economic policies. Likewise, the unemployment rate, Consumer Price Index, figures of utilization of industrial capacity, national income and many other statistics, while necessary to the policymaking process, are fed to the public via press, radio, and television and often uncritically used as the justification for pursuing a particular policy.

In the process, it is often forgotten that our economic statistics have limitations, in some cases serious ones. Our statistics gathering agencies do a vital job and, on the whole, they do it well. But while our economic statistics are good, they must be better if they are to serve as a reliable guide to policy. We must understand the limitations of our statistics and then get to work improving them.

Because of this important need, I was highly pleased to see that one of America's great scholars and teachers, Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, professor of political economy at Princeton University, has written an important article—which is actually a condensation of a forthcoming book—on this subject which appears in the October 1963 issue of Fortune magazine. Dr. Morganstern, who is perhaps best known as coauthor, with John Von Neumann, of "The Theory of Games and Economic Behavior," believes that a greater awareness of the flaws in our statistics is needed and that they should be used with greater caution.

One of the most serious problems is that most economic statistics are reported in a manner which pretends to an accuracy that may be completely out of reach. In a powerfully persuasive argument, he says that the margin of error in our statistics should always be stated in order to avoid exaggerating the significance of the results. Congress, the press and the public must, says Dr. Morgenstern, be made to understand that there cannot be absolute accuracy, that there must be error, and that the important thing to do is to try to uncover, remove, or at least limit the error.

With regard to the statistics on national income, Dr. Morgenstern points out that neither the conceptual nor statistical problems in this field have been resolved to anyone's satisfaction. As Simon Kuznets, probably the Nation's leading authority in national income accounting, has said, the error in our composite national income statistics is a "complex amalgam of errors in the parts whose magniture is not easily determined." Dr. Morganstern cites Dr. Kuznets' study on margin of error in national income estimates. Yet the Department of Commerce in releasing national income statistics provides no measure of the possible error. The article points out that the fact that little or nothing is said about accuracy is more dangerous than if the margins of error were frankly stated to be very high. Yet the statistics are accepted at face value, and no one seems very conscious of their severe limitations.

Comparing national income of one country to another is even more difficult. Problems arise both with regard to the comparability and applicability of concepts used in compiling the data and in the quality of the component data. Statistics of the Soviet Union are especially difficult to assess and are seldom what they purport to be. Dr. Morgenstern concludes that "international comparisons of national incomes are among the most uncertain and unreliable statistics with which the public in confronted." This should be remembered when the gross national product or growth rates of the United States are compared to those of other countries, as has so often been done in recent years.

Dr. Morgenstern also has much to say about the accuracy of growth rates. As he points out, a reliable growth rate of two significant digits is impossible to establish.

> Even the first digit is in grave doubt * * * Yet the emphasis of the public discussion is on the second digit, usually the first decimal, and it is carried on in all seriousness as if a distinction between, say, 3.2 and 3.3 percent were really possible, and as if the transition, within a short time, from the former to the latter constituted an advance by the country. But a growth rate simply cannot be computed with the stated or demanded degree of refinement and reliability. This applies to the existing national income data of any country in the world.

Dr. Morgenstern presents a table which shows growth rates as commonly computed but with 1, 3 and 5 percent plus or minus variations of the underlying figures. "We recall," he says, "that the assumption of a plus or minus 5 percent accuracy of the nondeflated gross national product is conservative." According to current practices in computing growth rates, Dr. Morgenstern's table shows a growth rate of 1.8 percent. But even when modest errors are introduced in the data, the variations in growth rates become very large. The table shows that conceivably, considering all possible combinations, the growth rate could vary from a plus 12.5 percent to a minus 7.9 percent. As Dr. Morgenstern says:

> The computations obviously apply to any situation where rates of change are involved and where the data are subject to error. In other words, they apply to all economic data. And it cannot be assumed without further proof that the errors remain constant over time, that they change uniformly over time, and that the signs of the errors never reverse themselves.

Dr. Morgenstern also points to the problem of choosing the base year and shows how "an unscrupulous or politically oriented writer will choose that base year which produces the sequence of—alleged—growth rates best suited to his aims and programs."

Dr. Morgenstern says:

> The need for a base year arises from the desire to compare long periods by means of the compound rate. Such periods will often comprise a whole series of business cycles and therefore several decades. If a year with a high (or low) gross national product is chosen as base year, this will depress (or raise) the growth rate of subsequent years. Since there is no such thing as a normal year, the investigator has a great amount of freedom in determining a base year.

In view of the high degree of unreliability of basic national income data, Dr. Morgenstern says:

> The growth rates for the United States are at best very shaky. From their relatively better quality we have to go over to the lesser and lesser quality of the national-income statistics of other countries. The computation, and hence the comparison, of international growth rates under these conditions is a most dubious undertaking.
>
> It will always be necessary to supplement the rates by qualitative information.

Precise use of growth rates, he says, "are entirely inadmissible, whether for comparing different countries or short periods of the same country. Their computation is largely arbitrary. The concept itself is vague and unreliable."

> Economics—

Says Dr. Morgenstern—

> is not nearly so much of a science as the free use of allegedly accurate figures would seem to indicate.

There is one line of action in particular which can be taken to put a stop to the practices which Dr. Morgenstern rightly deplores. As he puts it:

> That is to stop important Government agencies, such as the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the various Government departments, the Federal Reserve Board, and other agencies, public and private, from presenting to the public economic statistics as if these were free from fault.

Dr. Morgenstern says that we must insist that economic statistics be released with an accompanying estimate of their error. Even if only roughly estimated this would produce a wholesome and, perhaps, profound effect. Those who compile statistics and those who use them might refrain from making claims and demands that cannot be supported scientifically if the publication of error estimates became a general practice.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee and of its Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, I intend to do what I can to see that the agencies give serious consideration to Dr. Morgenstern's recommendations. As a first step, I am sending a copy of Dr. Morgenstern's article and my comments upon it to a number of economists, statisticians, and Government officials for their comments. If it appears that hearings would be fruitful, I plan to request hearings on the subject by the Joint Economic Committee's Economic Statistics Subcommittee early next year.

Considering the wide use and misuse of statistics and the fact that policy is

often made to depend on what the statistics are alleged to show, I can think of no subject that deserves the more thoughtful and careful attention of the Congress. Under unanimous consent I include a copy of Dr. Morgenstern's article in the RECORD at this point:

QUI NUMERARE INCIPIT ERRARE INCIPIT

(By Oskar Morgenstern)

(NOTE.—It is no news that imperfections exist in the statistics used in discussions of business, economics, and politics. But it is not generally recognized how significant the imperfections may be. That is what this article is about. Greater awareness of these flaws may lead to a more cautious use of certain statistics and force Government agencies and other producers of statistical material toward explicit calculation of the error margins involved in their figures. The following article is a condensation by Oskar Morgenstern of his forthcoming book, "On the Accuracy of Economic Observations," which in turn is a complete revision of an earlier work with the same title. Best known as coauthor with John von Neumann of "The Theory of Games and Economic Behavior," Dr. Morgenstern is a professor of political economy at Princeton. He has contributed a number of articles to Fortune. Dr. Morgenstern believes that an increasingly sophisticated handling of statistics will yield important insights into economic behavior. While the statistics now in use obviously cannot be abandoned, further progress in economics must start from scholarly recognition that the figures aren't as precise as they seem. For as some Roman once put it: "He who begins to count begins to err.")

Although the natural sciences—sometimes called the exact sciences—have been concerned with the accuracy of measurements and observations from their earliest beginnings, they nevertheless suffered a great crisis when it became clear that absolute precision and certainty of important kinds of observations were impossible to achieve in principle. At least all sources of error that occur in the natural sciences also occur in the social sciences; or, in other words, the statistical problems of the social sciences cannot possibly be less serious than those of the natural sciences. But the social sciences pay far less attention to errors than the physical. This is undoubtedly one of the reasons why the social sciences have had a rather uncertain development.

In the physical sciences, when an error is not mentioned explicitly, it is because it can generally be assumed to be well known, or because the values have already entered into physical theories that determine an admissible error level, and their limitations are then those of the respective theory. To give an illustration, it may not be necessary to state every time the error in the measurement of the velocity of light because this value is indissolubly tied up with the theory of relativity. But when new measurements are made the error margin must always be stated. Thus exaggeration of the significance of the new results is avoided, and they assume their proper place in physical history.

It ought to be clear a priori that most economic statistics should not be stated in the manner in which they are so often reported, pretending an accuracy that may be completely out of reach. Changes in consumers' total spending power down to the last billion or less (i.e., variations of less than one-half of 1 percent) are reported and taken seriously. Price indexes for wholesale and retail prices are shown to second decimals, even though there have been so many computing steps that the rounding-off errors alone may preclude such a degree of precision. Unemployment figures of several millions are given down to the last 1,000's (i.e., one-hundredth of 1 percent "accuracy"), when certainly the 100,000's or in some cases perhaps even the milions are in doubt. It will be seen later that national income and consumers' spending power probably cannot be known now in part without an error of plus or minus 10 to plus or minus 15 percent.

Business must be deeply concerned about these matters; its decisions are dependent upon statistical information. For example, wage agreements involving millions of workers are sometimes based on price indexes that record alleged changes of price levels up to one-tenth of 1 percent. Common price and cost-of-living indexes are reported in this form. They are splashed across the front pages of newspapers together with the most important political news of the day. These price changes are then interpreted as a measure of the success or failure of Government policy and the existence or absence of inflation. In fact, these minute changes show nothing at all. The public in general and Congress in particular must be made to understand that there cannot be absolute accuracy, that there must be error, and that the important thing to do is to try to uncover, remove, or at least limit the error.

DO ERRORS CANCEL OUT?

People gathering statistics all too often face a deliberate attempt to hide information. In other words, economic and social statistics are frequently based on evasive answers and even deliberate lies. Lies arise principally from fear of tax authorities, from dislike of Government interference, or from the desire to mislead competitors. Nothing of this sort stands in the path of the physical scientists. Nature may hold back information, is always difficult to understand, but it is believed that she does not lie deliberately. Einstein has aptly expressed this fact by saying: "Raffiniert ist der Herr Gott, aber boshaft ist er nicht." ("The Lord God is sophisticated, but not malicious.")

In addition to deliberate lies and evasions there are many other sources of error in the data from which economic observations are made. Anyone familiar with the actual handling of statistical data at the primary level is aware of the great number of possible errors and mistakes and of the frequency with which they occur. The increasing use of machines in handling economic data does not eliminate the main sources of error. These are so deeply rooted that it is impossible, on purely theoretical-probabilistic grounds, to eliminate all of them all of the time. The problem is to appraise them and to reduce them to the minimum.

It is possible that the influence of one error that drives a number in one direction is exactly offset by the influence of another error doing the opposite. In that case, by coincidence, the errors could cancel out—if their "extent" or strength balance—and we obtain a "true" figure for our observation. But we have not made a true observation. The notion that errors do cancel out is widespread, and when not explicitly stated, it appears as the almost inevitable argument of investigators when they are pressed to say why their statistics should be acceptable. Yet any statement that errors cancel one another has to be proved. The world would, indeed, be even more of a miracle than it is if the influence of one set of errors offset that of another set of errors so conveniently that we need not bother much with the whole matter.

It is also widely believed that more recent statistics are more accurate and trustworthy than earlier ones. This is probably sound, in a vague, general way, but only when sufficiently large intervals of time are taken. There are, however, many instances where statistics produced today are probably no better—and are indeed worse—than statistics produced decades ago. It is obviously more difficult, for example, to describe statistically an economy in a state of vigorous development, signified by the introduction of many new products, changes in quality of existing products, and a rapidly advancing technology.

In particular, modern statistics of the value of foreign trade—an enormously important field—are virtually worthless where countries practicing discriminatory exchange rates are concerned; many nations do so right now and did not in earlier years. Domestic statistics do not necessarily improve either. Sometimes governments change rapidly and bring forth the deliberate falsifications associated with Nazi and Communist practices. Or strategic considerations play havoc with reliability.

HOW OLD IS THE RIVER?

There is a tendency toward specious accuracy, a pretense that things have been counted more precisely than they can be—e.g., the U.S. Army published enemy casualties for the Korean war to one-thousandth of 1 percent, at a time when our own losses were not well known even to the thousands of men. An even better example is given by the official publication of the Austrian Finance Administration, which states that the population of Salzburg Province in 1951 was 327,232 people—4.719303 percent of the entire population of Austria. The classical case is, of course, that of the story in which a man, asked about the age of a river, states that it is 3,000,021 years old. Asked how he could give such accurate information, the answer was that 21 years ago the river's age was given as 3 million years. There is a fair amount of this in economic (and other social) statistics.[1] Economic series, reported in billions, are often aggregated with others, reported in millions or thousands, by simple addition. The result is a new series which gives the impression that the aggregate has been measured, counted, or determined to far more digits than is actually the case.

Another kind of specious accuracy is perhaps even more dangerous. It is functional speciousness. Here data are given that, even when they have only a very small margin of error, are nevertheless useless. This is the case, for example, when the exchange rate of a country with exchange control is given at the official rate (quite accurately to any desired number of decimals), although the vast majority of transactions take place at different rates that are not disclosed or cannot be determined.

The success or failure of a government's economic policy is often measured by the number of the nation's involuntary unemployed. Full employment is a national goal in most advanced nations. But as soon as one tries to discover when that desired condition has been reached, considerable difficulties are encountered. They are conceptual as well as statistical.

First, it is known that there is always some unemployment which may not be truly involuntary, because labor shifts from one place to another, young people enter the labor force, others more or less gradually slip from it because of age, ill health, emigration. These transitions take time for purely technological reasons, such as slow transmission and dissemination of knowledge, time needed to move to other places of employment, etc. This is then the so-called frictional unemployment, which is at some level unrelated to the state of the economy. There is also possibly a great deal of hidden unemployment, e.g., when persons becoming unemployed in industry go back to farms for varying periods of time. There is a shift in occupations, for example, when skilled workers are displaced by machines and then have to find employment at lesser skills.

---

[1] Years ago an example made the rounds: in order to determine the precise height of the Emperor of China, whom none of his subjects has ever seen, it suffices to ask each of 300 million Chinese what he thinks the height is and average their opinions. This will necessarily give a very precise figure.

Second, because of the high political significance of unemployment figures, this area is charged with emotions, insinuations, assertions, etc. This applies in particular to times of great stress, of political upheavals, and changes in the form of government. Some countries, such as the Soviet Union, flatly assert that they never have unemployment, this allegedly being impossible because of their political system. Others, such as Nazi Germany, reduced unemployment by drafting men into the army and thereby changed the statistics to their liking.

In the United States two distinct series of unemployment statistics are produced by the Bureau of Employment Statistics and the Census. The discrepancies between these series are enormous; the BES series has averaged lower than that of the Census in every year but 1946. It is not uncommon, indeed it is frequent, to find the Government making strong statements about developments in unemployment over periods as short as 1 month. The Nation's largest or most important newspapers play up a drop in the unemployment rate, say from 5.8 to 5.5 percent, as a highly significant event and the Secretary of Labor will not hesitate to make speeches on that occasion. All this is done on the basis of seasonal correction and dealing with figures given to four significant digits. It is clear, of course, that statements of this kind are completely devoid of the meaning attributed to them.

In the notion of a national income, most difficulties of economics culminate. Neither the conceptual nor the statistical problems in this field have been resolved to anyone's satisfaction, though a great deal of progress has been made in both respects. The two areas are interdependent, since nothing can be measured for which there exist no good concepts, and concepts, no matter how precise, are of little practical value if the corresponding measurements cannot be performed.

National income is a total of composites that differ in reliability from sector to sector and year to year, and hence, the error of the composite is, as Economist Simon Kuznets has said, "a complex amalgam of errors in the parts whose magnitude is not easily determined." The National Income Division of the Department of Commerce provides no measure of the possible error, taking the position that meaningful mathematical measures of reliability cannot be calculated for national income statistics; only a frank evaluation of the sources and methods underlying them can provide the understanding which is needed for their effective use in economic analysis. Any quantitative estimate is left to the user of the statistics, who must base his estimate on his knowledge of the sources and methods as provided by the U.S. Income and Output and 1954 National Income supplements. It is impossible for the user to determine with what confidence he may employ the data. The fact that little or nothing is said about accuracy is more dangerous than if the margins of error were frankly stated to be very high.

To throw the burden of estimating the errors and the reliability upon the user, though exceedingly convenient for the maker, is a totally inadmissible procedure. How can the individual user be expected to accomplish something where the Government, with its vast resources for compiling statistics, fails?

Kuznets' study on margins of error in national-income estimates is the most important one that has been made so far. He considered the aggregate national income as composed of 520 cells (40 industries, 13 income and employment categories). Then he and two of his coworkers attempted to classify each of these entries according to its margin of error. The possible margins of error were grouped into four categories:

1. 5–10 percent with average of 7.5 percent.
2. 11–20 percent with average of 15 percent.
3. 21–40 percent with average of 30 percent.
4. 41–80 percent with average of 60 percent.

And for each cell each of these three investigators made independent classifications. An average was taken of the investigators' judgments and the deviation between them was noted. As a result, a measure was obtained of the general magnitude of errors in each of the component estimates of national income as well as of the aggregate itself. From this classification, Kuznets distinguished three groups of industries according to the relative margins of error judged to be present in their estimates. First, those with a margin of error well below 15 percent (in categories 1 and 2 above) were the basic manufacturing industries and public utilities—electric light and power, railroads, street railways, telephone, telegraph; second, with margins of error of about 15 percent but well below 30 percent, were agriculture, mining, manufactured gas, pipelines, trade, banking, insurance, and government—industries for which information is extensive but not complete; and third were industries with an error margin of about 30 percent and higher—construction, water transportation, real estate, direct service industries, and the miscellaneous division.

Textbooks on national income and macroeconomics and trade journals accept the statistics at face value and do not seem to be conscious of their severe limitations. But let us see what even a 5-percent difference in national income means. Assuming a gross national product of about $550 billion, a 5-percent error equals plus or minus $30 billion. This is far more than the total annual production of the entire electronics industry in the United States. Yet a 10-percent error in national income is even more reasonable to assume than a 5-percent error. But 10 percent amounts to a plus or minus variation of about three times the total exports of the United States. The possible differences are, of course, not concentrated in the manner of these illustrations; instead they are scattered in an unknown way throughout all activities producing the national income. On the other hand, the reader, like everyone else, has probably become conditioned to accept economic data as being so highly accurate that even an alleged mere 1- to 2-percent variation of national income is considered significant enough for making statements about true variations in the state of the economy.

COMPARING ONE NATION WITH ANOTHER

There are two principal questions involved: the first is one referring to the comparability and applicability of concepts, and the second is one referring to the quality of the component data. Conceptually different situations arise for each class or category of countries. For example, home-consumed agricultural produce, which is an enormous part of the total in underdeveloped agricultural countries, is practically irrelevant in the United States. Clearly, this is much more difficult to measure in the former than in the latter. Yet agricultural statistics in the United States are far from satisfactory. How, then, could the agricultural income of, say, Ceylon, the Congo, China, Bolivia, or Tibet be known at least as accurately? How can they be made comparable—e.g., on a per capita basis—when even the number of inhabitants in these countries is in far greater doubt than that in the United States?

International comparisons, however, are constantly being made. No doubt some information can be had from existing figures, and whether they are useful depends, as we shall not tire of repeating, on the purposes of the comparisons. To ascertain in a rather general manner the gross differences in the income of different nations, to show that they differ by large factors,[2] and to see whether these differences have changed over the years, etc., is one thing, but to believe that we can state this and much more reliably to two, three, or even four "significant" digits is an entirely different matter.

DEFECT OF SOVIET STATISTICS

A special problem is offered by the Soviet Union. The statistics of that country are exceedingly difficult to assess, but it is generally known that they are seldom what they purport to be. There has been a great deal of deliberate doctoring of statistics at many levels, in order, for example, to make production results appear better than they are or to receive assignments of raw materials that would not otherwise be allocated. Even Khrushchev has repeatedly referred to falsified accounts of various activities, especially in farming, and there is no reason to assume that statistical practices were better in Stalin's time. A particular trouble in measuring aggregates is (as in all other countries) the double counting, or rather the multiple counting. Double counting has apparently been a most serious defect of Soviet statistics, with the necessary result that accounts of national income have been exaggerated, and increasingly so in more recent times. This is the gist of criticism by S. G. Strumilin, a well-known Soviet economist. For example, in 1945 industrial output was, according to him, more than 30 percent below 1940, rather than only 8 percent, as the official statistics show. Again according to Strumilin, industrial production rose from 1945 to 1956 only threefold, rather than fourfold, as officially asserted. (Strumilin's own figure may, of course, still be an exaggeration.) Though industrial production is not identical with national income, it is a substantial component; its difficulties are illustrative for the larger aggregate and show how limited the value is of any growth factor based on such data.

Figures giving international comparisons of national incomes are among the most uncertain and unreliable statistics with which the public is confronted. The area is full of complicated and unsolved problems, despite great efforts to overcome them. This is a field where politics reigns supreme and where lack of critical economic appraisal is particularly detrimental.

THE ACCURACY OF GROWTH RATES

In recent years there has been much concern about the rate of economic growth of the United States and other countries. In addition to the goals of maintaining a high level of employment and providing for general stability in the price level, a third goal, that of maintaining a satisfactory rate of economic growth, has been added to the responsibilities of fiscal and monetary authorities.

The value of a growth rate depends on the accuracy both of the figures for gross national product and of the prices going into the construction of the deflator indexes. The former are subject to considerable uncertainties; the latter depend on the precision with which actual prices, as distinguished from posted prices, list prices, etc., can be determined and applied to the correct sectors of gross national product.

A reliable growth rate of two significant digits is impossible to establish. Even the first digit is in grave doubt, as will be shown below. Yet the emphasis of the public discussion is on the second digit, usually the first decimal, and it is carried on in all seriousness as if a distinction between, say,

---

[2] But probably not by as large factors as is suggested by the official statistics. As Kuznets has observed, if the frequently stated low figures were correct the inhabitants of the poorest countries would all have starved a long time ago.

3.2 and 3.3 percent were really possible, and as if the transition, within a short time, from the former to the latter constituted an advance by the country. But a growth rate simply cannot be computed with the stated or demanded degree of refinement and reliability. This applies to the existing national income data of any country in the world.

We know that countries have grown and that, at periods, some have grown faster than others. But such observations and statements can be made with confidence only qualitatively and for longer periods. They are impossible to make for 1 year (or less), when a nation's growth is as imperceptible as the growth of a person's teeth in a month.

The table below shows growth rates as commonly computed, but for 1, 3, and 5 percent plus or minus variations of the underlying figures. We recall that the assumption of a plus or minus 5 percent accuracy of the nondeflated gross national product is conservative. The results of this simple computation should shake the confidence of anyone who thinks that the difference between, say, 3.2 and 3.3 percent is significant.

The computation is for a (hypothetical) change in U.S. gross national product from $550 billion in period I to $560 billion in period II. The first column lists the values of gross national product assuming the reported figure for period I—i.e., $550 billion—to be subjected to the above-mentioned error of plus or minus 1 percent, 3 percent, and 5 percent. The top row carries the same assumption through for the period II figures. The body of the table contains the growth rates obtained for all combinations of the assumed possible errors. When there is no error assumed or when an error of a given magnitude is exactly compensated by an error of the same magnitude and with the same sign, the growth rate is 1.8 percent. This rate would, according to current practices, be reported (and analyzed) as the rate. It is, of course, impossible that there be no errors at all, and most improbable that they always exactly compensate for each other. The table now shows clearly what happens when even the modest 1 percent or 3 percent errors are introduced. Magnitudes and even signs are affected. If we assume that the reported figure of 550 for period I is 5 percent too high and the figure for period II 5 percent too low, we arrive, instead of at 1.8 percent, at 12.5 percent as the growth rate. If we reverse the signs, the growth rate is minus 7.9 percent. Suppose gross national product for the second year is only plus 1 percent off and gross national product for the preceding one is minus 1 percent off (a total error of only 2 percent), then the growth rate is 3.9 percent. But if the signs of the errors are reversed, the growth rate is minus 0.2 percent. It is in the essence of an error estimate that the occurrence of a positive and negative deviation has to be admitted. Surely, the assumption of only a 1-percent error for each period is a very mild one. The reader should contemplate what this trifling difference in our assumption entails. If our basic figures of 550 and 560 are more than 1.8 percent apart, say 3 percent, the results of a corresponding table are necessarily worse. For example, a minus 1-percent error in the first period and a plus 1-percent error in the second then give a growth rate of 5.1 percent, and if the signs are reversed a growth rate of 1 percent. With plus or minus 3 percent the corresponding figures are 9.4 percent and minus 3 percent.

Apparent rate of growth for ±1, ±3, ±5 percent errors

A. Assuming reported gross national product figures 550 and 560 in 2 successive periods

Period I GNP 550±error	Period II GNP 560±error	532.0	543.2	554.4	560.0	565.6	576.8	588.0
	Percent error	−5	−3	−1	0	+1	+3	+5
522.5	−5	1.8	4.0	6.1	7.2	8.2	10.4	12.5
533.5	−3	−.3	1.8	3.9	5.0	6.0	8.1	10.2
544.5	−1	−2.3	−.2	1.8	2.9	3.9	5.9	8.0
550.0	0	−3.3	−1.2	.8	1.8	2.9	4.9	7.0
555.5	+1	−4.2	−2.2	−.2	.8	1.8	3.8	5.9
566.5	+3	−6.1	−4.1	−2.1	−1.2	−.2	1.8	3.8
577.5	+5	−7.9	−5.9	−4.0	−3.0	−2.1	−.1	1.8

Computed rate of growth assuming the reported figures to be correct is $\frac{560-500}{550} = 1.8$ percent.

B. Assuming reported gross national product figures 550 and 566.5 in 2 successive periods

Period I GNP 550±error	Period II GNP 566.5±error	538.2	549.5	560.8	566.5	572.2	583.5	594.8
	Percent error	−5	−3	−1	0	+1	+3	+5
522.5	−5	3.0	5.2	7.3	8.4	9.5	11.7	13.8
533.5	−3	.9	3.0	5.1	6.2	7.3	9.4	11.5
544.5	−1	−1.2	.9	3.0	4.1	5.1	7.2	9.2
550.0	0	−2.2	−.1	2.0	3.0	4.1	6.1	8.2
555.5	+1	−3.1	−1.1	1.0	2.0	3.0	5.0	7.1
566.5	+3	−5.0	−3.0	−1.0	0.0	1.0	3.0	5.0
577.5	+5	−6.8	−4.8	−2.9	−1.9	−.9	1.0	3.0

Computed rate of growth assuming the reported figures to be correct is $\frac{566.5-550}{550} = 3.0$ percent.

The computations obviously apply to any situation where rates of change are involved and where the data are subject to error. In other words, they apply to all economic data. And it cannot be assumed without further proof that the errors remain constant over time, that they change uniformly over time, and that the signs of the errors never reverse themselves.

This simple arithmetical exercise combined with the indisputable fact that our final gross national product or national income data cannot possibly be free of error raises the question whether the computation of growth rates has any value whatsoever.

PICK YOUR TIME

The usefulness of growth rates become even more dubious when revisions are considered. If the rate for the change from 1947 to 1948 was determined in February 1949, when the first figures became available, it was 10.8 percent. In July 1950, using officially corrected figures, it became 12.5 percent; in July 1956, it fell to 11.8 percent—a full percentage point. All this for the growth from 1947 to 1948. Similar observations apply to the other years for which this computation has been made. There is no consistency in the changes. In stating what the growth rate of the country is, much depends, therefore, on the moment of time when a growth rate is computed. Though not surprising in the light of our previous investigations, this result is nevertheless noteworthy. And all this applies to figures where we have abstracted from the fact that they are necessarily afflicted with errors which, when low, must be at least 5 percent.

In addition to all these difficulties, there is the ambiguity in choosing the base year. The need for a base year arises from the desire to compare long periods by means of the compound rate. Such periods will often comprise a whole series of business cycles and therefore several decades. If a year with a high (or low) gross national product is chosen as base year, this will depress (or raise) the growth rate of subsequent years. Since there is no such thing as a normal year, the investigator has a great amount of freedom in determining a base year. An unscrupulous or politically oriented writer will choose that base year which produces the sequence of (alleged) growth rates best suited to his aims and programs. An advocate of government spending and inflation will pick a year with a high gross national product as base year in order to show a low rate of growth and thereby strengthen his argument in favor of inflation, government deficits, and the like. An opponent of such policies will choose a relatively poor gross national product as base year, thus obtaining a series of growth rates carrying the comforting message that the development of the country is progressing well. These are, of course, standard tricks, used, undoubtedly, ever since index numbers were invented.

Suppose a 3.5-percent growth is considered desirable: then the goal has been reached only when 1949 is chosen as a base year.

It is clear, furthermore, that in view of the high degree of unreliability of its basic national-income data, the growth rates for the United States are at best very shaky. From their relatively better quality we have to go over to the lesser and lesser quality of the national-income statistics of other countries. The computation, and hence the comparison, of international growth rates under these conditions is a most dubious undertaking.

It will always be necessary to supplement the rates by qualitative information. We emphasize again that there can be no doubt that countries develop at different speeds and that this fact is noticeable over longer periods of time, particularly when the initial level of economic activity is low and the state of technology is primitive. When big gaps exist, a comparison of change can be made with some confidence provided a sufficiently long time interval is admitted. When countries are very dissimilar in their structure, such comparisons become immeasurably more difficult and unreliable.

If there is any value at all in the notion that countries grow in characteristic patterns, depending on their history, technological age, geographic position, size, etc., then it is unlikely that a single simple number can state adequately (or at least not in a misleading sense) how they evolve relatively to each other. In this respect, the problems of finding a proper solution for describing the gross national product or the national income are compounded many times.

SWIMMING POOLS OR POWERPLANTS

There is also a conceptual problem that has to be taken care of even if the statistics are in good shape. Let us say country A expands by adding to its output of automobiles, refrigerators, swimming pools, etc., while country B increases its output of machine tools, power plants, mines, etc. B is laying the foundation for further output increase while A is not. Similar considerations apply when weapons and other tools for war are involved. The ordinary growth rate, computed for the big gross-national-product aggregate, covers up these profoundly different developments and would easily give entirely erroneous and misleading information about the relative development of these countries. Yet this is the figure commonly used to assess past progress and future tendencies. The answer would be to compute instead "power indexes" (of growth), which would have to be based on the information given by special aggregates made up of better related components.

To summarize: precise uses of "growth rates" are entirely inadmissible, whether for comparing different countries or short periods of the same country. Their computation is largely arbitrary. The concept itself is vague and unreliable.

An argument often heard is: "True, the statistics are not as good as we would want them to be, but what would we do without them?" This is, indeed, a dilemma. The answers, of course, are manifold. The primary consideration is to make the data better (admittedly easier said than done and involving costs and time delays, both of which may not be permissible; many statistics are needed precisely because decisions have to be made at the moment when the first estimates become available). The next point is to distinguish in what sense the data are unsatisfactory: Is it due to deliberate obstruction, lies, falsifications? Or is it due to inherent difficulties of measurement and observation, which otherwise have been carried out scrupulously?

In the first case there is but one answer: discard the data if the element of lying affects a significant part of the information or is suspected of doing so.

In the second case, where the data are unsatisfactory because of incomplete information or inherent difficulties of measurement, the only answer must be to say: modify the theory into which the poor data are to be fitted. Here the truth is that much of economic theory merely appears to be highly accurate and precise. It can maintain this appearance, like any theory, by virtue of being an abstraction. The problems arise therefore in the act of application; it is here that the difficulties have to be faced.

ABANDON OLD VIEWS

Economics is not nearly so much of a science as the free use of allegedly accurate figures would seem to indicate. On the other hand, there is no reason to conclude that there cannot be or is no theory at all. The belief that we have to get more and more data, make more and more descriptions before we can formulate valid theories is entirely mistaken. A theory means a commitment, and in scientific life that is exactly what is wanted. When new facts come to light and new interpretations are needed, a new situation can arise. This may then call for abandoning the old views and for making a new decision.

There is, however, one definite action that is possible, though it will take time before desirable results will become visible. That is to stop important government agencies, such as the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the various government departments, the Federal Reserve Board, and other agencies, public and private, from presenting to the public economic statistics as if these were free from fault.

Perhaps the greatest step forward that can be taken, even at short notice, is to insist that economic statistics should not be released without an accompanying estimate of their error. Even if only roughly estimated, this would produce a wholesome and perhaps a profound effect. Makers and users of economic statistics both might refrain from making claims and demands that cannot be supported scientifically if the publication of error estimates became a general practice.

Eventually a new generation of economists will have learned to live with data of widely differing quality, in that they will emulate the physicists, who have created a magnificent and terrifying theory through their data range in accuracy from better than one one-hundred-millionth percent to only 50 percent—that is, when they can measure at all. In appreciating the true condition of the data, economists cannot fail to develop economic theory in conformity with the high scientific standards set in the physical sciences.

THE PLIGHT OF PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a problem of great importance to the Nation; namely, the plight of the public community colleges.

Available statistics indicate that one out of every eight students entering a college level academic program today is an enrollee in a junior college. And even more significantly, one out of every four students in college, part time or full time, for transfer or terminal programs, is in junior college.

This fantastic growth, Mr. Speaker, has taken place in this century. In 1900 there were no public community colleges and according to D. G. Morrison, U.S. Office of Education specialist in community and junior colleges, the number of public and private junior colleges in the Nation could exceed 1,000 by 1975 if the present growth rate continues.

Of all the States that have developed these programs over the past years, Massachusetts has had the greatest percentage growth. Our commonwealth did not have a community college in 1959 and today there is a community college in every major section of the commonwealth, except the New Bedford area. This is a great tribute to early planners of the community college program in the commonwealth. Notable among these is John Mallan, of the Government Department at Smith College, who remains actively interested in the growth and development of the public colleges.

He is one of many students of this program who are deeply concerned with the legislative amendments rewritten by the other body recently, and under discussion today.

While I intend to speak often of this problem in the future, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say today that I have strong preferences for H.R. 6143, as it passed the House of Representatives recently.

As amended by the Senate Labor Committee, the bill would place restrictive categorical distinctions upon the growth of these community colleges as opposed to the general aid provisions of the House-passed version.

While I am hopeful that the other body will keep the language of the House bill by adopting the Prouty amendment—which is the undisputed favorite of almost every college president in the Nation—I want to make my preferences clear.

According to estimates made available by Thomas O'Connell, director of the Berkshire Community College in my home city of Pittsfield, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts might expect to receive about 7 percent or less of their total capital costs, while under the House version—general aid to community colleges—the commonwealth would receive approximately 33 percent. This is a substantial difference in terms of millions of dollars involved. About 20 percent of the total capital cost so far has gone for science and library, exclusive of books—which is roughly the Senate version. One-third of this—which would be paid by the Federal Government—amounts to 7 percent of the total, with approximately 93 percent being borne by the State itself.

I further suspect, Mr. Speaker, that a number of other States, particularly those with a high per capita income, would face similar problems if the House version of the bill is amended in the present Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee manner.

In view of the desperate need faced by community college development not only in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but across the Nation, Mr. Speaker, I think it is the utmost responsibility of the U.S. Congress to pass a bill which will be meaningful.

Of course, I want an education bill and if my suggestions are not adopted, I will vigorously support the bill in the manner that is finally agreed to by all parties.

In closing, however, I would like to quote William G. Shannon, assistant executive director, American Association of Junior Colleges, who said that the "potential that was foreseen for them (the community colleges of America) by education leaders in an earlier day has just begun to be realized."

It has just begun to be realized, Mr. Speaker, and the future of these public colleges is inextricably tied to the future of our American way of life.

The enduring principle of democracy has always been strength at the community level, and these colleges—more than anything else—give credence to the development of that ideal to the ultimate benefit of the entire Nation.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, at the time the vote was taken by rollcall on the bill H.R. 6237 I was unavoidably detained downtown on official business. I would like the RECORD to show if I had been present I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 6237.

A SHOCKING CASE HISTORY OF A DEFENSE PROCUREMENT—OR WHY MIDWEST IS SHORT-CHANGED ON DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order this afternoon to discuss with my colleagues a case study in military procurement which should be of serious concern to all of us.

The particular case which I will discuss today deals with a multimillion-dollar military procurement contract which has been denied to a firm which was, for all practical purposes, originally the low responsible bidder but which was denied the contract because of a decision by one man at Wright Field. I have chosen this case study because I know that there is not a Member of Congress on either side of the aisle who is not anxious to bring into his constituency a fair share of this Nation's defense procurement.

Mr. Speaker, my attention was called to the case which I shall discuss today during an exhaustive study which I have been conducting to determine why Chicago and the Midwest are not getting more of the defense dollar.

During World War II, the Midwest—including Chicago, Detroit, Milwaukee, Cleveland, and the other huge industrial areas of the Great Lake States—constituted freedom's arsenal for democracy.

With all due respect to the other areas of our Nation, no one will deny that Chicago and the Midwest served as the hub which produced those sinews which made victory possible against overwhelming odds.

And yet today scarcely two decades later, Chicago and the Midwest receive only a fraction—an infinitesimal fraction—of the defense dollar.

Efforts by local authorities and State authorities to find out why the Midwest is being bypassed have met with various explanations from the Defense Department—all of which sooner or later wind up with the lament that these midwestern communities, including Chicago, have failed to develop adequate research and development programs.

Is there a Member of Congress from the Midwest—and for that matter from many other parts of the Nation—who has not been told by the Defense Department that his community cannot participate in the full stream of this country's defense procurement program because it lacks the magic formula of R. & D.?

Mr. Speaker, the case which I shall discuss today clearly demonstrates that this meager excuse of R. & D. is too often just plain old-fashioned hogwash. It is nothing more than an excuse to fend off complaints not only from Illinois but from numerous other States as well which not only have a capability but a strong desire to share in the Nation's defense effort.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that to suggest that Chicago has no research and development facility is to make a mockery of the truth. Chicago has perhaps one of the Nation's, and most probably the world's, greatest concentration of universities, renowned scientific institutions, and topflight public and private research and technical laboratories.

Within Chicago and its immediate surrounding area in the Midwest, one-third of all advanced degrees in the physical sciences are awarded by 15 universities in nine Midwestern States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is cruel to tell the people of my city and my State as the Defense Department has done for the past 10 years, that they cannot share in the Nation's multibillion dollar defense and space program because they do not have a research and development capability.

It is cruel, Mr. Speaker, because Chicago stands unequaled as the science capital of the world.

What then, Mr. Speaker, is the trouble? What is the real force behind contract awards? What factors really decide whether a crucial contract, or subcontract, goes to Illinois, or Michigan, or Kansas, or New York?

The case I shall detail today will give us at least a capsule view of how factors drastically removed from research and development decide the distribution of the defense dollar by the Defense Department.

We shall see from the case which I have personally investigated involving a Chicago firm what profound powers lie in the hands of the middle-grade military and civilian civil servants, that usually nameless, faceless, seldom identified, individual buried halfway down the huge, tangled governmental hierarchy, who, from his strategic position, makes the key decisions that often actually determine to a major degree how our Government is run.

Their power, in most instances, is absolute. So absolute that frequently it is frightening.

President Eisenhower quite properly warned in his farewell address about the military industrial complex. His words will go down in history as most profound.

Bor it is here in this middle-grade bureaucracy that we find the genesis of decisions which may alter the face of entire communities. Decisions that too often are irrevocably absolute and unappealable.

I am sure there is no Member of Congress who has not had the pleasure of working with those dedicated civil servants who, with pride in their job, and too often underpaid, give their Government a degree of loyalty that money itself could never buy. These are not the people I speak of today. Too often these dedicated civil servants are submerged in their efforts by their small minority of administrators who make the controlling technical decisions which, with one scratch of the pen, with one clatter of the typewriter, preordain the course of a procurement—indeed, the future of an entire series of procurements.

Destiny was kind when it brought into our Defense Department, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara who, in my judgment, shall go down in history as one of the most capable public servants ever to serve this Nation. Mr. McNamara, with his assistants—including Assistant Secretary Thomas B. Morris, Secretary Vance, Secretary Korth, and Secretary Zuckert—provide the policy guidance for our Defense Department. They have all done an outstanding job and we Americans can look to our security with confidence because of their dedication. Their initiative and dedication in laying out broad procurement policies and reforms are most commendable.

But these men constitute only the top—the strong and visible—head of the iceberg.

It is the middle-grade military and civil servants who implement our policies, molding them too often to their own particular liking, bending them, too often to fit their own entrenched interests, often ignoring them totally when it suits their own particular purpose.

This is the type of individual that destroys the zeal of the thousands upon thousands of decent Americans who work for their government as civil servants at pay scales too often too low to meet their basic needs.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss today the activities of one of these middle-grade administrators who, in my judgment, has done irreparable harm to the people of Chicago and to the cause of fair play in our Defense Department.

The case I wish to discuss today revolves around an item of aircraft equipment called a chaff dispenser. This is a device that ejects from an aircraft a quantity of tinfoil chaff or other electronically reactive material which can be detected on radar screens of enemy installations or aircraft seeking to track down our planes.

This chaff is designed to confuse the radar picture and make it difficult for the enemy to track our aircraft or plot and interpret. During World War II, I had occasion to use this chaff to confuse Japanese antiaircraft batteries trying to detect my B–29 while bombing Tokyo and other cities in Japan.

The case which I shall discuss today and the airplanes involved are the F–111 fighter, experimental, and the B–52 long-range bomber—although far more is at stake in the future.

The middle-grade military and civil servants in this case study today are assigned to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, one of the most crucial bases in the entire Air Force procurement system.

The companies involved are Boeing Aircraft, which needs no introduction; the Webcor Corp., of Chicago, one of the best known names in the electronics industry in America, and the Lundy Electronics Corp., of Glen Head, N.Y., a firm that got its start in the military electronics field less than 10 years ago.

The Webcor Corp., which makes sizable sales to all three military services, got into the chaff dispenser field in 1954, when it began producing electro-mechanical-type dispensers for the Air Force.

Between the years 1954 and 1957, Webcor received several contracts on electromechanical chaff dispensing systems and there was never any question about its research and development capability.

As a matter of fact, Webcor has maintained such a fine research and development facility, throughout the years, that by 1957 Webcor became convinced that problems inherent in the operation of electromechanical chaff dispensers—problems deeply involved in reliability and effectiveness experienced by the Air

Force—made it necessary to explore new methods of dispensing tinfoil chaff from fast-moving aircraft more effectively.

Webcor engineers were convinced that the electromechanical devices could never be brought to the high degree of reliability needed for the Air Force's modern aircraft requirements if the lives and aircraft of our American pilots were indeed to be saved.

In late 1957, after considerable research by Webcor's entire highly respected research and development section, Webcor, at its own expense, developed an airpowered dispenser, employing pneumatics to eject the chaff carriers from the aircraft. The Air Force liked the idea and awarded Webcor a $180,000 research and development contract to produce an operational service test model.

The model when completed by Webcor's passive countermeasures research and development group, was flight tested in an F-104 fighter and the results, Mr. Speaker, are a matter of record. This Webcor pneumatic dispenser performed so successfully that it was considered by the Air Force to represent a major breakthrough in the "state of the art" for chaff dispensers.

Webcor's experience in chaff dispensers attracted considerable attention and so, understandably, in 1959, the Boeing Aircraft Co., which earlier had designed a mechanical chaff dispensing system of its own, requested a proposal—RFP—from Webcor covering the chaff dispensing requirements for the B-52G series and subsequent series aircraft.

Since Boeing had developed its own electromechanical chaff dispensing system in the earlier models it requested a cost proposal on a roller-accelerator electro-mechanical system of their own design.

On April 22, 1959, which was prior to receipt of the Boeing request for proposal, Webcor personnel went to the Boeing Corp., the B-52 prime contractor, to discuss the merits of the Boeing system and to acquaint the company with the highly praised Webcor pneumatic system.

Webcor engineers emphasized very strongly the fact that Boeing's roller system had not been perfected or demonstrated to that date to be completely satisfactory. Webcor engineers indicated that they could not sufficiently guarantee the performance of a roller-type dispenser in accordance with the Boeing request for proposal. It is essential to point out, Mr. Speaker, that no similar concern for the highest performance reliability was shown by others interested in chaff dispensers.

Boeing engineers admitted that they had not achieved the degree of perfection desired in the new mechanical model, particularly from the standpoint of reliability. They mentioned the fact that if they obtained 80 percent reliability and consumed the stockpile of taped chaff stored by the Air Force, they would be happy.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many American Air Force pilots would today want to fly into enemy territory against heavy antiaircraft and fighter resistance knowing that their antiradar mechanism has only 80 percent reliability factor?

Is it any wonder then that Webcor resisted bidding on the highly unreliable mechanical dispenser for taped chaff? In my judgment, if the facts are as I have related them, and I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that they are, then the Webcor engineers deserve the highest commendation for refusing to participate in this charade.

Mr. Speaker, the wisdom of Webcor's opposition to the taped chaff mechanical dispenser was proven when a few days after the Webcor people declined to bid on Boeing's original request for proposal, Boeing prepared a specification for new tapeless roller-accelerated electromechanical chaff dispenser system and solicited a new proposal from Webcor. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, this new proposal called for a tapeless type of chaff.

I might add here, Mr. Speaker, that it is my understanding that some $35 million worth of taped chaff stockpiled by the Air Force had to be scrapped and actually destroyed by burying it in the ground when Boeing decided to go to the tapeless chaff dispenser.

It is my understanding, further, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that a subsequent investigation will go into this matter, that Boeing was willing to accept an 80 percent degree of reliability on tape chaff cartridges because it wanted to consume as much of this taped chaff stockpiled as possible.

Webcor again declined to bid on the new tapeless electromechanical chaff dispenser proposed by Boeing because Webcor's engineers, based on their vast research and development in this field, were convinced that they could not give American pilots the degree of protection against enemy detection with a mechanical chaff dispenser. Webcor engineers pleaded with Boeing to turn to the more reliable pneumatic dispenser developed by Webcor.

Mr. Speaker, just so there will be no misunderstanding about Webcor's motives in pressing for a pneumatic system, it is my understanding that the Webcor pneumatic system was substantially cheaper than the mechanical system requested by Boeing.

It was at this point, in the fall of 1959, that the Lundy Electronics Co., of Glen Head, N.Y., proposed the electromechanical system in accordance with the Boeing specification and was awarded the contract.

Mr. Speaker, we shall see in due time in this dissertation today why the Boeing people, even though their own engineers acknowledged the benefits of the pneumatic dispenser, were compelled to stay with the mechanical system instead of acquiring what Webcor believed to be a superior pneumatic system.

But before we go into this aspect of this procurement, it should be pointed out that even though the first contract went to another firm, Webcor's engineers continued improving the pneumatic concept because all of their research showed this to be a more reliable system. Webcor developed, and so advised Boeing, a pneumatic system which would dispense the new tapeless chaff to which Boeing had now converted.

It should be kept in mind at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the B-52 was not the only aircraft in our arsenal confronted with enemy detection problems. Every single one of our aircraft fighters, transports, and interceptors, need adequate protection from enemy radar detection.

Webcor was aware of this and so its engineers continued developing improved models for the various types of aircraft. In 1959, Webcor submitted an unsolicited proposal for their demonstration models covering the new tapeless pneumatic dispensers to Defense Department. In March 1960, the Air Force responded by awarding Webcor three research and development contracts totaling $300,000 for production of models of the new tapeless dispenser and an even more improved unit which could eject both chaff and the new infrared flares.

In April 1960, Webcor submitted a proposal to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for fabrication of a pneumatic dispenser designed primarily for installation in the B-52, either in the wing or in the fuselage.

In November, 1960, Webcor was awarded a contract for development of that model. This contract subsequently provided for sufficient flight tests to enable the Air Force to determine whether a pneumatic chaff dispenser should be used in additional upcoming B-52 retrofit programs. Webcor produced this model in its research and development laboratories, and turned it over for testing to Mr. E. Leaphart, of Wright-Patterson's electronics countermeasures laboratory No. 2, known by code designation as ASNPVD-2, or, as we will call it here, Lab-2. However, Mr. Speaker, before Lab-2 could begin the tests, it was ordered to turn the Webcor equipment over to the electronics countermeasures laboratory No. 3, better known as ASNPVD-3, or, Lab-3, as we shall refer to it hereafter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we get down to the heart of this matter.

Why did this happen?

At that time, the Lab-3 section chief in charge of testing out chaff dispensers was an Air Force civilian engineer named Ross Vendt, a former Air Force pilot who, on the basis of all the information I have been able to obtain from all sources, including Webcor and Boeing, was the central figure in this whole procurement.

Mr. Vendt was a longtime employee at Wright-Patterson. He was, in effect, serving as a technical adviser at Wright-Pat, as it is called, in the early 1950's. At the same time, the president of the Lundy Corp., Mr. Robert C. Barbato, was serving there, also as an Air Force technical adviser.

Mr. Vendt says he first remembers meeting Mr. Barbato in 1951 or so, and Mr. Barbato's service record indicates he left Wright Field to go into private industry in 1953.

The private industry that he joined was the Lundy Electronics Corp. and after Mr. Barbato made the move, Mr. Vendt acknowledges that their acquaintanceship grew steadily.

In fact, it persisted to such a degree through the following years that at one point Mr. Vendt even arranged a dinner meeting between Mr. Barbato and Mr. David DeBusman, Webcor's representative at Wright-Patterson Field. It is my understanding from Mr. DeBusman that Mr. Barbato suggested that he, Mr. DeBusman, leave the Webcor Corp. and join Lundy and, Mr. Speaker, it is my further understanding that although Mr. Vendt did not attend this particular dinner, he did later urge Mr. DeBusman to make the switch to the Lundy Corp. which was getting into the chaff dispenser development program.

I am advised that it is a source of great comfort to the Webcor Corp. that its loyal employee, Mr. DeBusman, turned the offer down.

In 1957, another meeting was similarly arranged by, to my understanding, Mr. Vendt. This time between Mr. Barbato and Mr. Harvey Brown, Webcor's top chaff dispenser engineer. Shortly after this meeting, Mr. Brown quit the Webcor Co. and went to work for Mr. Barbato's Lundy Electronics Corp.

Mr. Vendt, then, was the middle-grade Government employee into whose hands Webcor's new chaff dispenser was abruptly transferred in March 1961 for tests to determine whether it should replace the unit being manufactured by the Lundy Electronics Corp. in the B-52 retrofit program.

Keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that this test would determine future high stakes. For certainly this test would set the pace for the multimillion-dollar B-52 retrofit program.

For anyone not initiated in the ruthlessly competitive world of electronics procurement, the things that happened next, as I understand them, might defy credibility if they were not a matter of record.

Although a specific deadline had to be made for a decision on the dispenser for the B-52 retrofit program, installation of the Webcor unit, which was now under Mr. Vendt's control, in a test plane was not begun for more than one-half a year, in September 1961. The installation job was finally completed in November 1961. And, Mr. Speaker, if my facts are correct, it was quite a job of installation indeed under Mr. Vendt's direction.

First, Lab-3 decided not to install the Webcor dispenser in the wing section and more important, it ordered that only one-half of the fuselage dispenser be installed. But that was only the beginning of this strange odyssey of the Webcor chaff dispenser. Although the dispenser was designed to be installed on a vertical line—up and down—it is my understanding that Mr. Vendt ordered that it be installed in a horizontal plane—to eject the chaff out to the side and also, although the dispenser was designed to function with the ejector exits flush with the skin of the aircraft, the unit was installed with the exits 9 inches inside the skin.

Both the Webcor representatives and the personnel from Lab-2, which was originally assigned the job of testing this equipment, were relegated to the occasional role of "consultants." Both of these groups protested that the equipment was improperly installed. But their protests, which were lodged officially, it is my understanding, were ignored and at no time in the months of testing that followed, under Mr. Vendt's direction, was the installation corrected and used as its design intended.

On December 3, while the Webcor was running a ground check of their equipment, they noticed that a Lundy electromechanical unit had also been installed in the test aircraft. A query to Lab-3 disclosed that Mr. Vendt had decided to run direct comparison tests between the Webcor and Lundy equipment. A later query was made to Mr. Vendt's superior, Lt. Col. D. Papp, as to why the comparison tests were ordered and why the flight tests had been delayed so long. I have been advised by Webcor officials that Colonel Papp answered eventually that he had never authorized the comparison tests and that although he had asked he had never been given a satisfactory explanation by Lab-3 for the test delays, even though time for a decision on the retrofit program was rapidly running out.

After noting the Lundy equipment, Webcor personnel, it is my understanding, then asked that they be notified of the time of the flight tests, so they could go along as observers to make sure that their improperly installed equipment was at least handled and maintained properly. This request was made because Webcor's research and development contract for development of the unit specifically provided for 4 man-weeks of engineering field services, which meant that Webcor's engineers were to be on-site to give the Air Force the full benefit of their knowledge and experience with the unit.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, that in the ensuing series of tests, Webcor was not notified in advance of most of the flights, and was never given the opportunity to observe the conduct of the tests.

Three "shakedown" flights were run on December 13, 14, and 15—unknown to Webcor. Afterward, Mr. Leaphart from Lab-2, notified Webcor that a cable in one of the hoppers had come loose—although Webcor never learned at what point in that series of tests the malfunction occurred. Afterward, Webcor personnel refastened the cable.

From the last week in December through mid-February, nine flight tests were run, with the two dispenser's radar-confusing abilities tested by runs against radar facilities at Eglin Air Force Base. Webcor was unaware of most of the flights.

After the SG test flights were completed, a flight-test engineer from Wright-Pat reported to the Webcor people that during a number of the tests, the Webcor dispenser was operated at the maximum dispensing rate indicated on the control panel. However, that rate was the one established for the entire fuselage unit, while the tests were conducted with only half the unit. Thus the maximum rate expected should have been cut in half inasmuch as the two halves could not be operated alternately to achieve this rate.

But it was not. In fact, Webcor reports that while it was permitted to brief flight test personnel on the operation of its unit, it was never consulted on the proper operational procedures for the system as it was ultimately installed.

Furthermore, Webcor points out that Wright-Pat maintenance personnel reported that Lundy Electronics was allowed to make several complete system changes during the flights, while Webcor was able to make only minor repairs on its equipment.

One such repair involved tightening a loose plastic gasket on one hopper—a gasket since eliminated in a design improvement. The loose gasket—unnoticed by test personnel—had led to a marked reduction in the pneumatic force available for ejection, seriously impairing that hopper's efficiency.

The entire conduct of these comparison tests seemed so blatantly improper that upon their conclusion, Webcor officially protested to Mr. G. W. Schivley, branch chief of the electronics countermeasures laboratories at Wright-Pat. In addition to the questions of installation, Webcor contended that improper loading—due to lack of proper supervision—had been directly responsible for the cable failure. The protest also covered Lab-3's failure to notify Webcor of flight tests or to permit Webcor observers on board; and lack of free access to the equipment during the test period, in contrast to the privileges given Lundy.

In answer, Webcor was told to write us a report, which Webcor did.

The results of those tests were put out in a report dated August 7, 1962. Lab-3 never showed the results to Webcor nor told the firm what the report contained.

Toward the end of September, and in November, two more flight tests were conducted. These were not run against radar, but were only to check operation of the equipment, and obtain pictures of how the chaff performed once the chaff package was ejected from the aircraft.

Webcor personnel were permitted aboard this time. And during the flights they noted that the chaff did not appear to be performing properly. Repeated checks of the equipment, and slight alteration of the unit, failed to correct the problem. Ultimately, after Webcor had duplicated the flight test conditions in its own labs and explored all possible explanations for the malfunction, a theory was evolved—a theory that proved to be correct when the test aircraft was examined.

Unknown to Webcor, it turned out that the B-52 used in the tests had been generating a low voltage—lower than bottom design limits for the Webcor equipment.

Webcor contacted Lab-3, and talked to Mr. E. McDaniel, Mr. Vendt's assistant, who said, "Yes," Lab-3 had been aware of the B-52's low-voltage situation and he was "sorry" to learn that Webcor had not been aware of it, too.

Webcor then requested that the flights be conducted over again, after a quick equipment modification to compensate for the reduced voltage. Mr. Ross Vendt refused and announced instead that the flight tests were being ended.

Meanwhile, Boeing, the designer of the electromechanical system, had sent out a request for proposal on the next phase in the B–52 retrofit program. The RFQ was received by Webcor June 28, 1962, and—not surprisingly—called for offers on an electromechanical system with both wing and fuselage dispensers.

Mr. Speaker, I would find it difficult to quarrel or place any blame on the Boeing Corp. for calling for mechanical chaff dispensers in this second procurement period. It should be perfectly obvious to all of us that Mr. Vendt had made up his mind at Wright-Patterson Field that no pneumatic dispensers would find their way into the B–52 retrofit program. I do not think that Boeing would have had a chance, under the circumstances, to advertise for anything but mechanical dispensers because Webcor's pneumatic system—even though this system has been proven consistently superior—was barred by Mr. Vendt when he refused to approve a contract for the pneumatic system.

I stress this point only to emphasize that, under the system of procurement which I am describing today, I think that with some of these middle-grade civilians having absolute authority in specific determinations, even such giants as Boeing must capitulate to their whims and caprices.

Webcor submitted a proposal in answer, but it called for use of its pneumatic alternate to perform in accordance with Boeing's requirements. That bid went in in August. Shortly afterward, personnel at Wright-Patterson expressed unofficial wonder to Webcor about its bid. It had been so much lower than Lundy's, they said, that there was speculation that Webcor might have made an error in its bid.

Six months later when I learned of this scandalous treatment afforded a Chicago industry, I queried the Air Force as to the precise terms of the contract, and the difference between the Lundy and Webcor bids.

The Air Force reported that Lundy was low bidder by $174,738, which was why it got the award. The Lundy figure was $2,820,113 for 112 units, while Webcor's bid had totaled $2,994,851. The actual contract price, after further negotiations and provision for spare parts and other equipment, was $2,921,890.55.

On the surface, that would seem to be the end of it. But, gentlemen, that was just the beginning. What had been the results of the tests? And what had happened to Webcor's prices—which were low the first time, yet high the second time, even though Webcor had not changed the individual price components of its bid one iota?

On November 28, Boeing put out an amended RFQ, this one calling only for fuselage dispensers—again of the electromechanical type.

Webcor answered this proposal—again with its pneumatic alternate—on December 8.

I have asked the GAO to make a thorough investigation of the disposition of these two proposals submitted by Webcor and Lundy in 1962.

On the basis of the best available information which I have been able to obtain, the Webcor bid on the first request for proposal, which was solicited by Boeing in June of 1962, and delivered by Webcor to Boeing in August 1962, was 20.88 percent lower than the Lundy bid. It would appear, therefore, that unless the Boeing Corp. threw out the Webcor proposal as nonresponsive because Webcor submitted a proposal for pneumatic dispensers, while Boeing asked for mechanical dispensers, it would appear that because of its low price Webcor should have received the award.

But this did not happen. For reasons known best to itself, Boeing did not reject the August proposal from Webcor as nonresponsive. Instead, Boeing scuttled both proposals and requested new proposals in November 1962, this time merely changing the number of units to be bid on.

This is indeed a most strange manner of awarding contracts. I submit that the change between the August invitation to bid, when Webcor was 20.88 percent lower than Lundy, and the November invitation, is so insignificant that GAO should order the 1962 contract to Lundy set aside and this whole program readvertised for competitive proposals. This whole matter should be of particular concern to us because it constitutes a difference that could be as great as $3½ million for the larger quantities. It is my understanding that, had Webcor received this contract under the August proposals, the total retrofit program would have cost somewhere in the vicinity of $6½ million; whereas, under the Lundy proposition contract, the full program could run as high as $10 million.

The last week in December, without public announcement, the award was made—to the Lundy Co.

A senatorial letter of inquiry in April asked the Air Force about the test results, and about the outcome of the Boeing competition—since Boeing had never officially informed Webcor of the award to Lundy.

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, Brockway McMillan, replied that Lundy was chosen because tests had found its equipment to be technically superior. It confused radar more effectively, McMillan said, and dispersed the chaff quicker and more thoroughly. The equipment, he added, had been installed as per drawings provided by both manufacturers, and both firms had been permitted to service their units.

Indeed.

On the one hand, a full unit of the Lundy equipment had been installed as designed, in a vertical plane, flush with the aircraft skin, and its makers had been given repeated access during the tests to make complete system changes.

In contrast, only one-half of Webcor's equipment was installed—and then horizontally, contrary to design, and 9 inches from the aircraft skin. Part of the time the equipment was called on to perform at the full represented dispensing rate, even though only half the equipment had been installed.

Additionally, in key tests involving photos of dispersement patterns, Webcor was not informed that the plane was generating only half the voltage needed to make the equipment function properly.

And Webcor representatives were given only the most sporadic access to their equipment, with no opportunity for complete systems changes such as Lundy was afforded.

And these were "comparison" tests?

These were tests in which an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force reported to a Member of the U.S. Senate that no favoritism was involved, and that the decision for Lundy was based strictly on technical superiority.

So much for the test results. What about the price?

You will recall that Webcor was told, informally, that it had been low bidder on the first set of proposals involving the larger quantities.

I wrote the Air Force asking about this. The only bidding on B–52's, I was told, was the December 1962 bidding, won by Lundy at a lower price. I was informed additionally that no further retrofit programs were planned.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force reply was almost a total misstatement of fact, because there had, of course, been an earlier bid submitted, and Webcor had indeed been lower—substantially lower than Lundy. On the second round of bids, when Boeing had cut the size of purchase down following Webcor's first low bid, it was Webcor, not Lundy, that was in reality low bidder. A further addition to the retrofit program—to make up for the quantities eliminated in the second round of bidding—was at that very time being planned and is now, today, in its final phases.

First, on the August bidding, Boeing has now acknowledged to Webcor personnel that Webcor's large quantity bid was roughly $6.5 million while Lundy's was somewhere between $8 to $10 million.

Second, the individual components of Webcor's December small quantity bid were actually lower—more than $600,000 lower—than Lundy's. But a Webcor accountant, in adding the totals of the various components, made a $700,000 computation error. So the total bid, presented to Boeing along with the correctly priced, itemized components, was slightly higher than Lundy's.

I am told Boeing now contends that it did not discover the error until after Lundy had been awarded the contract. This statement, if correctly attributed, is patently ridiculous. For anyone familiar with procurement knows that what's important—and what is examined closely in any bidding situation—is the unit price of the various components that go to make up a total offer. The grand total itself, in contrast, is often meaningless.

Thus Boeing, beyond a shadow of a doubt, should have known it was awarding the B–52 retrofit contract to the higher bidder when it made its decision for Lundy in December 1962.

Nonetheless, the "cow was already out of the barn" so to speak, and Webcor would have been willing to accept that particular retrofit contract decision—if that is as far as the problem had gone. But it turned out that for Webcor, the worst was yet to come.

Parallel to the B–52 retrofit program, there were plans under development for procurement of the now-famous supersonic TFX all-service fighter, more formally designated the F–111.

The company eventually chosen as prime contractor—General Dynamics Corp.—contacted Webcor in March 1962, disclosed that it was surveying the field to find the best possible chaff dispenser for this new aircraft, and asked details from Webcor on its pneumatic system.

In July 1962 General Dynamics asked additional data on Webcor's dispenser that would eject infrared flares as well as chaff.

During the following months, General Dynamics engineers examined the entire chaff field in detail, making exhaustive comparisons between the available systems.

In December 1962 General Dynamics was awarded the TFX contract.

In January, GD notified Webcor that they were a leading contender for the chaff dispenser subcontract, and asked for up-to-date priced proposal. This was followed by inspection visits to Webcor's plant by GD engineers, further discussions on details of the chaff system with GD management, and a fourth—and supposedly final—request for proposal, in February 1963.

On April 15, Webcor was sent a purchase order by General Dynamics calling for fabrication of several Webcor units specifically tailored to the exacting demands of the TFX, at a cost of $700,000.

Then the trouble began.

As required by Air Force regulations, major subcontracts on important components like chaff dispensers must be submitted to the Air Force for approval.

GD's proposed subcontract with Webcor, for supplying pneumatic dispenser prototypes, was promptly submitted to Wright-Patterson Field—and just as promptly kicked back to GD.

The subcontract evaluation group told GD that they wanted no pneumatic dispenser on the TFX—only the electromechanical dispenser would be accepted.

Why? The evaluation group pointed to an official pronouncement by Ross Vendt's Lab–3, which stated:

> Pneumatics as a concept has been shown to be unsuitable for a practical chaff dispensing system.

That was it. Webcor—at that point—apparently was going to be blackballed not just on the B–52, but on the TFX and in all retrofit and original production contracts in the future.

Fortunately for our pilots who will eventually fly these and other airplanes, Webcor refused to say die.

It registered a complaint with my office, charging it was the object of prejudicial treatment, and at my request, provided me with a complete, documented history of the chaff dispenser problem.

Three conclusions become immediately apparent:

First. General Dynamics had surveyed the entire chaff dispenser field to find the best unit available for the world's most modern fighter plane. Its unbiased decision for Webcor's pneumatic unit was a substantial "plus."

Second. The Air Force had tested and approved Webcor's dispenser earlier on fighter planes and found it to be highly satisfactory.

Third. While the Lab–3 personnel did not know it at the time, Air Force personnel from Lab–2 had taken the half of the Webcor unit that Lab–3 had refused to install in the B–52, and installed it in a B–47.

While Lab–3 personnel were testing half the unit in the B–52, and reporting all sorts of faults, Lab–2 personnel ran similar tests in the B–47, and reported that the equipment functioned properly as Webcor claimed it could.

Lab–2 wrote a report on its interpretation of the tests and concluded that the Webcor pneumatic dispenser was superior to any chaff dispenser they had previously tested and even though the Lab–2 report recommended further refinements, it stated that the Webcor pneumatic dispenser was suitable for tactical use. This report completely contradicts the conclusions reached by Ross Vendt when he decided that pneumatic dispensers were not acceptable.

The Lab–2 report with its favorable findings on the Webcor pneumatic dispenser was circulated to Boeing and other interested parties. Immediately thereafter, this Lab–2 report was denounced by a personal letter from Ross Vendt in which he ordered the Lab–2 report to be discounted and ignored. Lab–2 responded by disclosing to authorized personnel at Webcor an additional classified report on comparative flight tests held at Eglin Field between the Webcor dispenser and the Lundy dispenser which showed that Ross Vendt's group had no sound basis for ruling out the Webcor pneumatic dispenser without also ruling out the Lundy mechanical dispenser. Yet, Mr. Vendt chose to bar the Webcor dispenser and award a contract to Lundy. I submit, Mr. Speaker, this was as brazen a demonstration of favoritism as will be found in the whole defense procurement program.

I called Air Force Secretary Zuckert's attention to the Wright-Patterson blockade of the General Dynamics subcontract for Webcor's chaff dispenser.

Secretary Zuckert's office—which has acted with vigor since this matter was called to their attention—began an immediate investigation.

General Dynamics, in the meantime, tried twice more to put through the Webcor subcontract, and twice more it was blocked.

Meeting this stone wall, GD finally bowed to pressure and in May put out an alternate request for proposals, asking bids on an electromechanical system.

Lundy Electronics promptly put in a bid.

Meanwhile, Ross Vendt was not idle. On Saturday, June 23, 1963, the flight tests which Vendt had refused to continue back in November 1962, were reopened—although Webcor was not informed.

Lundy, however, was given the opportunity to update and completely renovate its equipment.

Webcor learned of the June 23d test flight after it was completed, and asked for its equipment back, so that it could be checked and the latest improvements incorporated. Permission was refused. Instead, Vendt notified Webcor that the equipment was being removed from the aircraft and that the test B–52 was being sent back to Boeing because it was no longer needed.

There may have been two reasons for conducting those June 23 tests:

First. Lab–3 personnel may have hoped that the results would provide help in influencing the TFX subcontract.

Second. Although the Air Force denied it in a letter to my office, another sizable chaff dispenser procurement for the B–52 retrofit program was scheduled for this fall.

Under the supervision of Lab–3, the June 23 tests could be expected to reinforce the earlier Lab–3 contention that Lundy Electronics should get any such contract.

Fortunately for Webcor, and our Defense Establishment, Secretary Zuckert's office was acting with dispatch. As a result of his top level investigation, Webcor and Congress have been treated to this heartening result:

In a virtually unprecedented action, the Wright-Patterson "blackball" on the Webcor chaff dispenser was overriden, and General Dynamics was told that it could award the key dispenser subcontract to Webcor.

Additionally, the matter was reviewed by the new Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, Mr. Eugene G. Fubini, in a reappraisal of all countermeasures equipment proposed for the TFX. The pneumatic equipment again was approved, and Webcor was finally given the go-ahead last month.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary Fubini is considered—and properly so—one of the world's foremost authorities on countermeasures.

Many of my colleagues would assume that with this recent, successful final step, Webcor's problems are over at last.

That is far from the truth—and one of the main reasons that I have taken the time to lay out in detail the shocking history of this case this afternoon.

Where is Ross Vendt today—after supervising some of the most questionable tests ever inflicted upon a piece of military equipment—after using those rigged test results in an effort to wrongly blackball Webcor's dispenser in the $6.5 billion TFX program, and all future programs?

As often happens in the military, Vendt apparently has been promoted. He is now, of all things, a key engineer on the electrical countermeasures staff supervising development of the TFX fighter.

Meanwhile, as icing on the cake, the lower-level Air Force personnel, from Lab–2 and elsewhere, who provided routine but honest aid to Webcor in attempting to get a fair test for its equipment are now being accused of favoritism and improper activity.

Secretary Zuckert's office has now launched a full investigation of the B–52 retrofit contract. In the meantime, Secretary Zuckert placed a freeze on the planned retrofit contract, and ordered Boeing to let Webcor bid whenever the procurement is permitted to go forward.

Boeing responded by putting out a request for quotations for the same old Lundy electromechanical system—a system which has already resulted in many, many unsatisfactory reports—UR's—on its reliability from using commands all over the world.

And as late as last month, Boeing made clear to Webcor personnel, when Webcor representatives visited Wichita, that Boeing had sent the RFQ to Webcor only because the Secretary of the Air Force had ordered Boeing to do so.

Just as before, time is now running out when a decision must be made on the B-52 retrofit program. And just as before, it appears that the skids are greased for a contract award to a favored firm, regardless of the merits of competing equipment offered.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that Congress began considering some action that would curb the activities of these middle-grade employees, like Ross Vendt, who are running this Government to suit their own whims and caprice.

And we need an investigation, by this Congress, of the conduct of the so-called comparison tests conducted on the Webcor and Lundy equipment by Wright-Patterson's Electronics Counter Measures Lab-3.

The absolute necessity for such an investigation should be obvious.

If the facts are as the record indicates, then the persons responsible for those tests have no business holding an Air Force position of authority, in the field of procurement or anywhere else, and particularly not in a crucial defense program like the TFX project.

Instead, they should be disciplined—made an example—so that any others who might be tempted to follow Mr. Vendt's tactics will know that a new order is at hand.

This will be a new order when Government contracts are handed out on the basis of merit—on the basis of what a manufacturer can produce, not on the basis of whom he knows.

This will be a new order in which we stop winking at goings-on like those at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and stop letting a small minority of middle-grade public servants give a black eye to the great majority of such servants who are trying to do an honest job for their service and their country.

If, on the other hand, Congress fails to investigate this case fully, it will flash a green light to every engineer, every contracting officer, every other civil servant who is entertaining ideas about perverting the Government's procurement system to his own private goals.

Such inaction would be to the detriment of our defense effort, our fighting men who expect superior equipment, and the taxpayers, who get clipped for the inflated bill.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, that Ross Vendt is now predicting the Webcor Pneumatic will not work in the TFX and trying to demoralize Convair. He is making these predictions even before Webcor has had an opportunity to complete its development program. Because of the position he is in today, you can see from Mr. Vendt's attitude what kind of treatment Webcor can expect if and when Convair seeks Wright Field's approval for a production contract for Webcor. Based on the previous record, we have every reason to believe Mr. Vendt will fight the Webcor offer and history can repeat itself in the sordid analysis of chaff dispenser procurement.

I cannot believe that the Secretary would want to leave Ross Vendt in his present critical spot in procurement for the F-111—(TFX)—in the light of his activities in the B-52 retrofit program.

Mr. Speaker, I have detailed here at considerable length information that I have been able to assemble from various sources in an effort to get to the bottom of this procurement, and more important, in an effort to determine whether current practices in some of our Nation's defense procurement facilities unjustly prevent Chicago from getting its fair share of the defense dollar.

In all fairness, however, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make it clear here that much of the information which I have cited previously regarding this B-52 retrofit program comes from sources representing only one side of this controversy.

It would appear to me, therefore, that in order to remove any suspicion or doubt as to the propriety in the handling of this B-52 chaff dispenser retrofit program, the following recommendations should be immediately carried out and let the chips fall where they may:

First. All of the presently available comparative flight test data processed by the Air Force regarding the performance of both the Webcor and Lundy dispensers should be nullified on the basis of having been conducted under unfair, prejudicial, and improper circumstances.

Second. A new series of detailed documented and comprehensive comparative tests should be ordered at once in order to demonstrate without doubt the factual ability of Webcor's pneumatic dispenser equipment in comparison to that of the Lundy mechanical dispenser in order that all future contract negotiations will be able to be conducted on the basis of fact.

Third. A thorough investigation of the bid proposal pricing of both Lundy and Webcor at the time of the June, 1962, Boeing bidding request must be made in order to substantiate whether Webcor was indeed the low bidder.

Fourth. Ross Vendt's official statement that "pneumatics" as a concept has been shown to be unusable for practical chaff systems should be carefully restudied since it has already been the basis for prior contract award.

Fifth. Ross Vendt, himself, having proclaimed his prejudice against pneumatic dispensing systems should be removed from any official area having cognizance or control over such systems.

Sixth. If the evaluation of the results of a new comparative flight testing program conclusively shows the superiority of the Webcor dispenser over that of Lundy's then the present Lundy contract should be canceled in its entirety.

Seventh. Webcor should be assured by the Air Force that the actions it has taken in protesting the treatment it received from Ross Vendt will not be prejudicial to its future interests; in fact, Webcor should be assured that it will be given a fair and unbiased opportunity to bid on all present and future chaff dispenser and flare dispenser programs.

Eighth. Those at Wright-Patterson who have supported Webcor in this dispenser controversy should be protected from vengeful repercussions.

Mr. Speaker, these recommendations, in my judgment, are fair but more so they are imperative because Boeing is now asking for bids for retrofitting an additional 175 B-52 bombers at a cost of at least $2 million plus. Boeing is again asking for mechanical dispensers because their engineers claim the Lundy system is satisfactory. Yet, Mr. Speaker, neither Boeing nor the Air Force at this moment have a single test with radar coverage to show the effectiveness, if my information is correct, of the Lundy mechanical dispenser in a fuselage installation. All of the tests which have heretofore been used to sustain the Lundy mechanical system in a fuselage were performed on mechanical dispensers installed in the wings of test aircraft. The contract now under consideration again calls for fuselage installation.

Boeing argues that since it started with mechanical systems, it should remain with mechanical systems to simplify maintenance and stockpiling of spare parts. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of economy and efficiency, this would appear to be a very logical position. However, this logic falls apart when one is reminded that those dispensers installed in the wings and those installed in the fuselage are totally different and incompatible. An entirely new supply of spare parts must be assembled for the fuselage dispensers which the program now calls for. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that while Lundy received the contract last December for 112 fuselage dispensers, it is my understanding that to this date, Lundy has not delivered a single preproduction model for a fuselage dispenser. I might add further, that before production can start on the 112 dispensers, they must be flight-tested and found satisfactory.

Yet, in the face of all of this, Boeing is requesting bids for 175 additional mechanical dispensers for fuselage installation even though it has been demonstrated repeatedly that pneumatic dispensers are reliable, effective, and substantially lower in cost.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in pursuing all the facts regarding this procurement, I asked the Webcor people why, if Boeing wants mechanical dispensers, does not Webcor bid on mechanical dispensers. Certainly, it would appear that a responsible firm like Webcor should be able to give the Air Force what it wants and if the Air Force, for whatever reason, insists on staying with mechanical systems, it appeared to me that Webcor should make a bid on such dispensers.

You will recall that I have already related why Webcor engineers became convinced several years ago that mechanical dispensers cannot work effectively. The Webcor people have advised me that no one can guarantee successful performance of mechanical dispensers.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was even more disturbed to learn that another reason why

Webcor could not bid on mechanical dispensers, even if Webcor engineers now conclude that since the Air Force insists on mechanical dispensers that is the model, is because it now appears that the Air Force would not purchase the original drawings from Lundy when it designed the mechanical dispensers with Federal funds several years ago. Mind you, even if Webcor now wanted to respond to Boeing's latest request for bids on mechanical dispensers, it could not do so without having the drawings made available. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that refusal by the Air Force to purchase the drawings from Lundy was another way to make certain that Lundy retained the exclusive rights to the multimillion-dollar B-52 retrofitting program. I am not at all persuaded by arguments that one manufacturer often finds it difficult to work with another manufacturer's drawings. Mr. Speaker, I submit that too frequently drawings are purposely made difficult by the development contractor to make certain that no one else can work from these drawings. Fortunately, this is not the rule, but rather the exception. The whole field of subcontracting is based on working from drawings frequently developed by either the prime contractor or another developer. I submit, that failure to buy the Lundy drawings was just another facet of this effort to deny Webcor and the people of Chicago an opportunity to get a part of this contract.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 years when the defense appropriation measure was before this House, I have proposed changes in the law which would remove from people like Ross Vendt the absolute powers which they now possess in dealing with distribution of defense contracts.

Secretary of Defense McNamara and his assistants, including Secretary Zuckert, have been waging an uphill struggle to remove from the Defense Establishment these forces that have prevented communities like Chicago from sharing to a greater extent in the defense dollar. I think Secretary McNamara and Secretary Zuckert and all these other men at the policymaking level deserve our highest commendation. But, that in itself is not enough. They should be given full cooperation from the legislative branch of Government to the spotlight on cases such as the one I have described here. The case that I have cited here today is important because it refutes the oft-stated theory that the Midwest is not getting its share of defense work because it has lagged in building research and development facilities. Research and development have nothing to do with this procurement. I have shown why the Webcor people have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars of their own resources in research and development in order to be able to compete for defense contracts and to bring some of this work to the people of Chicago while Webcor's efforts were rolled back and frustrated by the whims and compressing apparently of one man whose powers at Wright Field are virtually omnipotent in the distribution of certain types of defense contracts.

It is my hope that if the investigations now being conducted by the General Accounting Office and Secretary Zuckert's Office confirm the facts as I have related them, Secretary McNamara will be able to similarly implement a program he has been trying to institute to make the whole procurement effort operate more efficiently, fairly, and economically.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the case history which I have cited here today will not only open new opportunities for the Midwest to participate in defense efforts, but will also help other communities get the kind of fairness in their bidding that all American firms are entitled to.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the forthcoming House debate on whether to extend for the seventh time Public Law 78, I have often wondered, "how permanent is temporary?"

We have always been told that the bracero program is "temporary" but the proponents of the law seem to feel otherwise about it. They promise that if we pass H.R. 8195 to extend Public Law 78 for 1 more year, that they will be back again next year. To me, "temporary" means "used for a time only" or "not permanent." Of course, one can renew a "temporary" thing year after year, so it is really permanent.

Why is this done in the case of Public Law 78?

Because the House defeated last May a 2-year extension of this law, it is known that it cannot be made permanent. Therefore, the best expedient is to hope for a one year extension, or maybe a six month extension, on the ground that a cutoff date of December 31 would be ruinous. The fact is that the bracero users have had ample time—since May—to adjust their operations to work without braceros. Some have probably tried to do so, but others have gone ahead on their old patterns, thinking that the bracero program is too good a thing to ever really die.

Mr. Speaker, if we enact a 1 year extension of the bracero law, we are simply asking for another round next year on this same subject. Because next year we will be told that you just can not cut off this labor supply on "short notice."

Every time we have extended this law, we have put bracero users on notice that it is a temporary extension. Every 2 years or so, we have been asked to extend the law "just one more time." If we enact H.R. 8195, you can be sure that next session, we will get a bill exactly like it, calling for "just one more time."

IRRESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, in recent days I have been trying to bring to the attention of this Congress and the public the mess that exists in one of our vital Federal agencies, the Federal Aviation Agency. Almost every day brings new evidence, either of practices inimical to the goal of safety in air traffic or of fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Administrator of that Agency.

Only last Thursday, October 10, 1963, the Civil Aeronautics Board released its report of the investigation of the crash that occurred at Idlewild Airport in New York last November. In that crash 25 persons were killed. According to the report the crash came about during the abandonment of an approach to the landing field by an Eastern Air Lines DC-7B. During the approach, the pilot of that plane was ordered not to land because of a fog condition near the runway. Enveloped in fog the plane crashed at this point. The CAB report makes it very clear that the FAA was responsible for getting the plane into its predicament because of the faulty procedures it employed in reporting weather conditions to approaching aircraft and because of defective and inoperative safety equipment. In my judgment the FAA stands accused by the CAB report on this crash.

This type of irresponsibility naturally shows up in other areas of FAA activities, principally the way it manages the public moneys entrusted to it by the Congress. To illustrate, I would like to submit for the Record, and I now offer the following news item that appeared in Aviation Daily on June 6, 1963, which was recently brought to my attention:

FAA Blamed for High Cost of NAVAIDS

The cost of navigational aids is rising sharply and most of the blame can be attributed to FAA's methods of procurement and construction, according to S. B. Poritzky, manager-navigations for ATA. In a paper delivered to the ATA's 1-day conference on "smaller city airports" on Tuesday, Poritzky pointed out that FAA costs are in some cases 10 times more than industry costs for the same equipment.

Poritzky compared FAA budgets for the installation of runway end identification lights (REIL) with the costs borne by the State of Minnesota for the same equipment. FAA pays $18,200; Minnesota spends $3,000 for the lights to serve exactly the same purpose. FAA's estimate, Poritzky said, for a 75 mc fan marker is $25,800. The State of Nebraska estimates $3,250. The Wilcox Electric Co. markets a package for $2,413.

Poritzky pointed out that the costs of an ILS installation and system have risen from $194,000 in fiscal year 1960 to $276,460 in fiscal year 1963, an increase of 42 percent. Despite the cost increase "the curious thing is that ILS did not significantly change in the intervening years. The overall U.S. commodity price index has risen only 2.7 percent since 1960," Poritzky said.

In the field of remote control communications, a comparison between an FAA-constructed limited remote communications outlet and an AIRINC installation serving a similar function shows that FAA spends $38,000 for construction and $14,000 for materials. AIRINC pays a little less than $2,000 for construction and materials, Poritzky said.

Despite this greater cost, the operational availability of the two systems is quite comparable and in fact the AIRINC facility has the slightly better reliability rate of 99.4 percent compared to FAA's 99.08 percent.

Poritzky then compared FAA costs for a TVOR construction with those paid by Minnesota and Nebraska. The average cost to the States was about one half the FAA's cost. "The major difference comes in construction material and construction," Poritzky said. "The FAA cost was $54,000. The State cost was about $10,000. The electronic installation cost ratio: nearly two to one. In comparing the Minnesota average with the FAA cost, note that Minnesota's VOR's were built to FAA standards and are identical to what FAA itself has purchased. One more thing: the estimates in the FAA case are for a single station TVOR whereas in the Minnesota facility we wind up with a dual facility."

In other comparisons Poritzky showed where Collins Radio and Wilcox Electric could provide electronic equipment and installation for a dual VOR for a slight bit more than what FAA pays for a single VOR.

Poritzky said that by "designing and contracting for buildings piecemeal with different contracts for building panels, antenna shelters, chain link fence and voltage regulators FAA spends far more money than it needs to and needs far more people to run the show. A determined austerity program is needed to make the buildings do the job they must do and no more. A far better way and one which has been proven to work and work well would be for the Government to procure its facilities as packages, complete and ready to place on a concrete pad * * * it is the most obvious point of departure for economy," Poritzky said.

Mr. Speaker, some of this language employs technical terms and abbreviations and could stand a small amount of translation into everyday language, although the import of the article is clear: the FAA is wasting the taxpayers' money by spending many times more for equipment and construction of navigational aids than the States and private organizations are paying for the same items.

For example, Mr. S. B. Poritzky, an executive with the Air Transport Association (ATA), points out in this article that the FAA pays $18,200 for the installation of runway and identification lights, whereas the State of Minnesota pays $3,000 for the same item. In other words, the FAA is spending more than 600 percent more of the public's money for this item than it should cost. That, my friends, is mismanagement. That is waste.

Again, it is pointed out that for a limited remote communications outlet, providing radio communications to aircraft in flight, FAA spends $38,000 for construction and $14,000 for materials, or a total of $52,000. But Aeronautical Radio Inc., a nonprofit adjunct of ATA, pays a little less than $2,000 for construction and materials of an installation serving a similar purpose. In other words, the FAA is spending more than 2,600 percent of the public's money for this item than it should cost. Somehow the words "mismanagement" and "waste" do not adequately describe this situation. And there are several other examples of such flagrant misuses of the public trust in the news story above.

As you probably know, the Air Transport Association is a private organization made up of most, if not all, of our major air lines. This organization is to be commended for bringing this situation to light. It is never easy for a group to criticize the agency which regulates it. Accusations of this nature by such a responsible organization should never be taken lightly. Just about any governmental agency would be expected to answer a charge that it is spending $52,000 for an item that should cost less than $2,000. Such a discrepancy demands an explanation. The public is entitled to know why it has to spend 2,600 percent more for an item than a private organization has to pay. Yet the FAA has consistently refused to answer these charges since they were made last June.

In fact, similar charges were made last May by the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association in their confidential newsletter for May 1963. That newsletter states that "many FAA 'services' were either excessive or nonessential," and recommends drastic cuts in the FAA budget requests for fiscal year 1964.

I personally invite the FAA Administrator to answer these charges. Satisfactory answers will surely settle the doubts that currently exist in many places about the activities of that Agency.

WHEN THE RACE FOR SPACE BEGAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the greatest compensations of being a Member of the Congress are the vantage points it affords from which to observe or study notable events in the progress of science and an occasional opportunity to encourage such endeavors.

One of the key achievements from which emerged the race for space between Soviet power and the United States was the historic balloon ascent on November 20, 1933, into the stratosphere by Lt. Comdr.—later Vice Adm.—T. G. W. Settle of the U.S. Navy and his copilot and scientific observer, the late Maj.—subsequently Col.—Chester L. Fordney of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. The stirring story of their flight was published in the August 1963 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, the highly respected professional magazine of the Navy, in an authoritative article, "When the Race for Space Began," by J. Gordon Vaeth. The following biographical sketch of the author accompanying the article shows that he has the background of experience and study to qualify him to appraise the Settle-Fordney flight objectively:

A graduate of New York University in 1941, Mr. Vaeth served for 4 years with lighter-than-air commands of the Atlantic Fleet during World War II. He later became head, New Weapons and Systems Division, U.S. Naval Training Devices Center, Port Washington, N.Y.

He was also a staff member of the Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense. The author of three books: "Two Hundred Miles Up," "Graf Zeppelin," and "To the Ends of the Earth." He is presently Assistant Director for Systems, National Weather Satellite Center, U.S. Weather Bureau.

In addition to making a new world's altitude record of 61,237 feet, Vaeth emphasizes that this flight was an epochal step in the race toward manned spacecraft. The first flight in which high altitude radiations on human beings was the subject of serious concern and study, the first in the United States to expose living organisms to stratospheric conditions, and the first in our country to pioneer the field of sealed cabins and life support systems used in manned spacecraft today, thereby making Settle and Fordney our "first men in space."

The qualifications of these two powers for their task were unique. Settle, in addition to a fine naval training, postgraduate education in engineering and the making of several other records, was the only man in the world then known to be licensed to fly all types of aircraft. Fordney was a lifetime student of science and was then in charge of the mathematics exhibit in the Hall of Science at the 1933 Century of Progress Exposition at Chicago. Their performance, involving serious risk to their lives, was far beyond the normal call of duty and reflected great credit, not only upon the Navy and Marine Corps, but as well upon the Nation. Such achievement, Mr. Speaker, as so well recorded in the Vaeth article in the Naval Institute Proceedings, for the publication of which the Board of Control of the Institute is to be commended, merits the highest award of our Government for that tremendous service. It is regrettable, however, that such recognition, in the case of Colonel Fordney, would have to be posthumously made.

In order that the moving story by Mr. Vaeth may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress and thus be made available to the Nation-at-large as a source of inspiration for the youth of our country, I quote the full text as part of my remarks.

WHEN THE RACE FOR SPACE BEGAN

(By J. Gordon Vaeth)

On November 20, 1933—while a great, pear-shaped, white-colored envelope drifted silently above the Ohio countryside—a message was received by naval communications in Washington: "Stratosphere Balloon Lieutenant Commander Settle, Major Fordney took off Akron 0930. Please inform Opnav, Buaer, Major General Commandant.

Those who originated and received this dispatch could have hardly foreseen its implications. The takeoff which it reported would result in the achievement of a world's altitude record. The Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union, commenting on the flight, would use it as a basis for challenging the United States to compete with his country for the conquest of the heights. Josef Stalin, apparently irked by the Settle-Fordney achievement, allegedly would order three Soviet balloonists into the air and to their deaths in an attempt to break the American-held record. And from this there would emerge the race for space, a race that began with piloted balloons before graduating to satellites and manned spacecraft.

The balloon which rose from the Akron Municipal Airport that morning 30 years ago had emblazoned on its gondola the crossed anchors, shield, and eagle of the Navy, and the globe, eagle, and anchor of the Marine Corps. The pilot was Lt. Comdr. Thomas ("Tex.") Greenhow Williams Settle, U.S. Navy, known at that time for his interest in rocket experiments and his predictions of the coming era of manned rocket flight. Lieutenant Commander Settle's scientific observer was a ground-based Marine reservist, Maj. Chester L. Fordney.

Their ascent did much more than begin the race for space. It pioneered the sealed cabins and life-support systems used in manned spacecraft today. As far as is known, it was the first flight to expose living organisms, spores, directly to conditions at the top of the atmosphere. It is believed to have been the first flight in which the biological effects of very high altitude radiation upon human beings was the subject of serious concern and study.

Settle and Fordney rode no rocket. They could hardly be called astronauts in today's sense of the word. They were, however, the first Americans to reach, enter, and remain for any period of time (2 hours) in a space-equivalent environment. In this sense, they were America's first men in space—and the press and public of the times considered them such.

The story of their flight had its beginnings half a decade before in the mid-1920's. Settle, an airship officer based at Lakehurst, N.J., had become interested in taking a free balloon, as high as possible into the atmosphere. He watched, therefore, the altitude attempts being made at the time in an open balloon basket by the Army's Capt. Hawthorne Gray. When, in 1927, Gray reached 42,470 feet, but lost his life through oxygen supply failure, Settle quickly concluded that flight to this and greater heights would demand sealed and pressurized cabins.

With C. P. Burgess, of the Bureau of Aeronautics, he worked out a design for such a cabin. It was among the first in aviation history. Dubbed "The Flying Coffin" because of its shape, it consisted of a cylinder about 7 feet long, with rounded ends and a diameter of approximately 3 feet. Inside was room for one man, his life support system, instruments, and flight controls. Sitting on a shelf, Settle had hoped to ride this tube-shaped gondola far into the stratosphere.

Rear Adm. William A. Moffett, the Bureau's research-minded chief, took a personal interest in the "coffin" and authorized its fabrication by the Naval Aircraft Factory, Philadelphia. It was never built, however. About this time, Navy efforts to develop a seaplane to win the Schneider Racing Trophy had begun to attract congressional and public attention. There was an outcry against so-called "unconventional projects." The Bureau of Aeronautics yielded to pressure, and among the projects canceled was "The Flying Coffin."

Others, however, had been quick to adopt the idea. Auguste Piccard, the Swiss-born physicist, was one. Independently, he had hit upon the same solution to protect himself against the low pressure, extreme cold, and lack of oxygen found at the heights he wanted to reach for cosmic ray studies. Instead of a cylinder, however, his cabin was a sphere. In it, he and an assistant twice reached record altitudes over Europe: 51,000 feet in 1931 and 53,000 feet a year later.

Early in 1933, Auguste Piccard came to the United States for a lecture tour which he hoped would help raise funds for still another ascent. This was the year that Chicago was playing host to the World's Fair—"A Century of Progress" Exposition. Piccard suggested that he make his new scientific flight as one of the attractions of the fair. Its managers were enthusiastic; the National Broadcasting Co. and the Chicago Daily News quickly volunteered to help as sponsors. Two Nobel prize-winning American scientists, Arthur H. Compton, and Robert A. Millikan, would provide cosmic ray equipment. The Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. agreed to donate the hydrogen and the Dow Chemical Co., a gondola. The balloon would be designed and built at cost by the Goodyear Zeppelin Corp. The pilot would be Auguste Piccard. His twin brother Jean, a chemist living in Wilmington, Del., would accompany him aloft as observer.

An unforseen circumstance in Europe, however, necessitated Auguste Piccard's return. Settle, the only man in the world then known to be licensed to fly all types of aircraft, record distance-holder for balloon flying and winner of the 16-entry Gordon Bennett International Balloon Race of 1932, was loaned by the Navy to serve as pilot. When uncertainty arose about the balloon's ability to reach a record height, Jean Piccard graciously withdrew from the flight to reduce the weight not disposable for ballast.

Settle would go it alone—and, to see his takeoff, tens of thousands arrived at Chicago's Soldier Field on the summer night of August 4, 1933. They looked out upon a sight never before seen in that great stadium. White ground cloths had been spread across the grass. On them lay a pile of wrinkled fabric, the envelope of the largest balloon yet built. Nearby was a stack of 700 steel cylinders filled with hydrogen gas. From these cylinders a long inflation tube stretched over to the giant bag.

Inflating the 600,000-cubic-foot, single-ply, rubberized-cotton envelope was slow and tedious. Gradually, however, the 105-foot-diameter balloon began mushrooming into shape. It was kept earthbound by ropes which passed through eyelets in a catenary band circling the envelope near its top.

Toward 2 a.m., the gondola was wheeled beneath the towering bag to be connected by shroudlines with another catenary band girding the lower part of the balloon. Seven feet in diameter, the sphere had a shell only three-sixteenths of an inch thick.

At 2:15 a.m., it was announced over the public address system that Settle wanted to test the balloon valve. Complete silence was requested. The crowd fell quiet. He gave the valve cord a hard pull, let go, and listened. Many could hear it—a prolonged hissing and whistling that gradually lessened and then stopped, which meant that, instead of slamming shut as they should have done, the valve doors had only slowly, very slowly, moved back into the closed position.

The envelope was only partially inflated to leave room for the hydrogen to expand as greater heights and lower pressures were reached. The 125,000 cubic feet which had been fed into the bag had concentrated as a ball of gas in the upper portion of the balloon; the lower part was empty and hung as loose folds of fabric. Passing through these folds, the valve cord had been restrained. The balloon's designers had foreseen this possibility, had heavily coated the cord with graphite, and had brought it down through the interior of the bag and out through the fabric at a point where they thought the valve cord would be relatively free from the sucked-in folds and curtains. Still, the cord continued to be restrained.

Settle stood on the field, looking alternately at the balloon and at the crowd. Unable to valve properly, he knew that the flight would probably fail. He also knew that to abort the launch attempt by ripping the balloon and releasing its hydrogen in the middle of the stadium would endanger the people in the stands.

"Let's go," he said.

Bathed in the light of powerful searchlights, the *A Century of Progress*, as the balloon had been christened on the field, began a slow majestic climb. It was 3 a.m.

At 5,000 feet, seeing himself over deserted railroad yards, Settle tried the valve again. This time it stayed open, showing no signs of closing whatsoever.

Three thousand feet and falling, Settle began dumping sand and lead pellet ballast upon the tracks beneath.

Still illuminated by the lights at Soldier Field, the sinking balloon was clearly visible to the spectators. Marine Major Fordney, whose men had been helping with the launch operation, took four Marines with him, jumped into a car and headed for the balloon, keeping it barely in sight as it dropped ever lower in the sky. When he reached it, he found it lying deflated on the Chicago, Burlington Quincy right-of-way at 14th and Canal Streets. A cigarette-smoking crowd had begun to gather and was tramping over the envelope. Settle, uninjured, was doing his best to keep them away. Few paid any attention to his shouts that the big bag still had pockets of explosive hydrogen in it. Some had begun cutting the fabric up for souvenirs. One or two were even eyeing the equipment and instruments inside the gondola.

Fordney and his men made their entry. According to the Chicago Daily News, "in the ensuing 3 minutes, the mob was treated to a gala performance of language and action that have won reputations for potency from the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli. Neither lost any of its traditional effectiveness under the circumstances." With the help of other military personnel arriving on the scene, the balloon was rolled up, placed on a railroad freight car, and, with the gondola, taken to a nearby warehouse where it was secured for the night and guarded by Fordney's marines.

The flight had reached 5,000 feet. It had lasted about 15 minutes. The great spectacle at Soldier Field had ended in a tremendous flop. Yet the press treated the episode good-naturedly. One paper headlined the story, "Settle up; Settle down." Almost every editorial expressed the hope that the flight would be attempted again.

And it was. The hydrogen was reordered; two thousand holes and bruise marks were patched in the envelope; the gondola was refitted and its dents removed.

Settle, whose duty assignment was Inspector of Naval Aircraft in Akron, remained on loan by the Navy for this second attempt. His experience on the first flight had convinced him that, regardless of weight considerations, he needed another man on board. He chose "Mike" Fordney, who had saved the balloon from the mob and whom he had known for some months in connection with the Exposition and with the preparations for takeoff at Soldier Field. Fordney, a student of science, and in charge of the mathematics exhibit at the fair, was detailed as flight observer.

On September 24, 1933, came news from overseas that the Soviets had that date tried unsuccessfully to launch a record-seeking, high-altitude, sealed-cabin balloon. Its name: the *USSR*. Six days later, they succeeded. In a flight lasting 8 hours and 18 minutes, three Russian aeronauts, Georgi Prokofiev, Konstantin Gudenoff, and Ernest Birnbaum reached a height of 62,230 feet. In their ascent from Moscow to a point 11.8 miles above the earth, they had surpassed Auguste Piccard's "highest aloft" record by almost 10,000 feet.

In replying to the Soviet achievement Settle and Fordney decided not to try another ascent from the Exposition grounds in Chicago. They would transfer operations to the Goodyear Zeppelin dock at Akron. Inside this mammoth hangar, the balloon could be inflated and rigged regardless of the weather and in privacy, without fanfare and public relations pressures.

On November 17, the *A Century of Progress* was erected and pronounced ready for flight again. The troublesome valve cord, now encased in a flexible tube and led out of the bag at the equator, worked perfectly. Only the wait for favorable weather remained.

Early the morning of the 20th, the already inflated balloon was walked through the northeast hangar doors and out onto the field. Fordney, dressed in leather flying jacket, took his place inside the gondola for what would be the first and only balloon flight he ever made. His was the responsibility for the scientific equipment.

Settle, hatless and wearing white tennis shoes, blue trousers, and a light leather jacket, was atop the gondola checking shroud lines and attachments.

Because a "high sun" was desired for some of the scientific experiments aboard, the plan was to reach peak altitude about midday. High velocity winds waited in the stratosphere. Driftwise, Settle and Fordney could not afford to spend any more time than absolutely necessary in their eastward flow. The coastline was too close. Accordingly, it was hoped to delay the launch as late into the morning as possible.

The balloon had been undocked at daybreak to take advantage of the early morning wind lull. As the sun rose, so did the wind. By 9 o'clock it was blowing out of the northwest at almost 8 m.p.h. The craft could not be held on the ground much longer. Minutes later the *A Century of Progress* began its ascent with Settle riding atop the gondola roof jettisoning bags of lead and sand ballast.

For the second time it was headed up, its destination the upper atmosphere. Gross weight as it left the ground was 7,700 pounds, of which 4,100 was ballast.

Inexorably the aerostat began its drift toward the coast where the Atlantic lapped at the shoreline only 400 miles away. Altitude was maintained at between 2,000 and 5,000 feet as Settle tried to stay in low-velocity winds as long as possible before starting up toward ceiling about noon.

Casually killing time and drifting along with hatches open, Settle and Fordney quickly began to feel at home in their little sphere. It was not a strange environment to either of them. They had spent many preflight hours in it. Procedure trainers being unknown in 1933, they had used the gondola for dry runs and closed-hatch simulated flights to prove out the adequacy of their air regeneration system.

Of the equipment crammed into the 7-foot ball, this was perhaps the most important. The heart of the system was a double-walled flask containing liquid oxygen which was evaporated to replace oxygen consumed by breathing. It could also be used to maintain or build up cabin pressure. To remove carbon dioxide and water vapor, absorbents used in the submarine service were employed. Anticipating latter-day bailout bottles, Momsen submarine escape lungs were carried to be worn in the event of having to parachute down from very high altitudes.

The chutes were attached to the shroud lines of the rigging. Each man wore a parachute harness. If he had to jump, he would quickly fasten the harness D-rings to the chute and dive over the side. A tie-down arrangement in the rigging would, like a static line, automatically open the parachute.

The gondola had a deck, 4 feet in diameter, to stand upon. Three tiers of shelves circled the white-painted interior of the sphere. Deck and shelves were supported by eight vertical stanchions attached directly to the load ring atop the gondola. Thus, the weight of men and shelf-mounted equipment was taken directly by the rigging of the balloon and not by the thin gondola skin. Ten observation ports, 3¼ inches in diameter, had been built into the shell. So had two hatches, each with an airtight double door. To control internal temperature, the upper half of the outer surface from the gondola's equator to 60° North latitude had been painted white, the lower half, black.

At 12:45 p.m., over East Liverpool, Ohio, Settle began ballasting continuously. The ascent to the heights had begun in earnest. Hatches were closed at 13,750 feet. Ground visibility was poor and obscured by haze while the balloon rose ever higher into clearer and more rarefied air. As it did, the faint clicking of the cosmic ray counters became more insistent.

Peak altitude was reached about 2:10. The altimeter read 58,000 feet. Exact height would not be known until the balloon's return to earth and an examination made of its sealed barograph by the Bureau of Standards. At ceiling, cabin pressure held at the equivalent of 12,000 to 15,000 feet while inboard temperature ranged between 40° and 50° F.

In addition to three pieces of cosmic ray apparatus, there were cameras, a spectrograph, a light polarization indicator, and air sample bottles to monitor, operate, or use. Also aboard were standard color charts to compare with and determine the color of the sky.

Suspended in the rigging above the gondola was the aerial for the 3-watt radio transmitter carried. Dangling 60 feet below was the receiver antenna. Call letters were W9XZ. From the beginning of the flight, Settle and Fordney were in voice contact with ground stations. They talked with flight sponsors Frank Knox, publisher of the Chicago Daily News, Niles Trammell, NBC vice president, and Rear Adm. Ernest J. King, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics.

For 2 hours the balloon floated at near-maximum altitude. With the approach of late afternoon, the hydrogen began to cool and contract. A loss of lift set in. As it did, Settle began ballasting again, this time to control the rate of descent.

From a ballast hopper inside the gondola poured a mixture of lead shot. One millimeter and one-half millimeter in diameter, the size of these pellets had been carefully selected to insure that no one could be injured on the ground by their fall. Tests had shown that at terminal velocity they would not puncture the eyeball of a person looking skyward at the balloon.

Descent was maintained at a rate of less than 15 feet per second. At about 30,000 feet, inboard and outboard pressures were equalized. At 26,500, the hatches were opened. Now Settle could begin ballasting with equipment from inside the cabin. Out went the heavy radio batteries, tools, food, each item with a small parachute attached to it to slow its fall and protect life and property below.

At 5:40 p.m., and a height of 800 feet, the *A Century of Progress* leveled off near Bridgeton, N.J. Owing to the near-darkness and proximity of the coast, Settle decided to land as soon as possible. Ten minutes later, with the balloon almost down to the ground, he pulled the red-dyed ripcord. Seconds later, the envelope draped itself across a Jersey marsh.

The flight had ended in a bayoulike terrain of bays, inlets, and partly submerged patches of weeds and mud. The two men set out with a flashlight in various directions from the undamaged gondola to try to reach a house or telephone—always to be stopped by a body of water so large they were unable to see its other side in the darkness. Under the circumstances, they could do little else but return to the deflated balloon, wrap themselves in its folds for warmth, and await the return of daylight.

Next morning, while an aerial search began for the unreported fliers, Fordney stripped to his skin and, holding his clothes above his head, set out through the cold marsh waters in search of civilization. Settle stayed behind to protect the scientific instruments and particularly the barograph upon which the official record of altitude would depend. After sloshing along for about 5 miles, the marine finally reached a farmhouse where he was able to telephone the balloon's position (at the confluence of the Delaware and Cohansey Rivers) and report "all safe." Shortly afterward, State police, naval personnel, and flight officials arrived on the scene and the rollup and cleanup operations began.

At 3 that afternoon, a Coast Guard plane landed at the naval air station, Anacostia, with Settle and the barograph aboard. Two days later, on the 23d, the Bureau of Standards, after examining the instrument, announced that an altitude of 61,237 feet had been achieved. This was about a thousand feet below that reached by the Russian balloon, *USSR*. The Soviet Union, however, was not at that time a member of the Fédération Aeronautique Internationale, the aviation body which certifies world flying records. For this reason, the Russian record had never been recognized. On January 4, 1934, the FAI advised that the Settle-Fordney flight had been entered in the list of world records.

Despite the failure of their own record to be recognized, the Russian aeronauts sent cordial greetings and congratulations. Delivered to the Army and Navy Club in Washington, they took the form of cablegrams received by the Soviet Embassy and forwarded to Settle by mail. They came not only from the crew of the *"USSR"* but also from Fedor Ilin, president of the Committee-on-Construction of Osoaviakhim, Russia's popular aviation organization. Osoaviakhim was readying its own balloon for yet another Soviet "stratostat" ascent.

From Maxim Litvinoff, Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union, came this message: "Hearty congratulations on your great achievement. I am sure that your colleagues in the Soviet Union have watched with greatest interest your flight. May both our countries continue to contest the heights in every sphere of science and technique."

"Contest the heights"—these were the words that Litvinoff used. The Soviet intent to compete with American technology had been declared, the challenge given, the race toward space begun.

Russia's response to the new American record came only 2 months after the Settle-Fordney flight. The *Osoaviatkhim*, with a crew of three, Fedossejenko, Vassenko, and Oussyskine, climbed to a height of 72,182 feet on January 30, 1934. During descent, however, the balloon fell, out of control, killing all on board. The Soviets said that the crew, in their enthusiasm, had simply overexpended their ballast, failing to keep enough to control their descent. American balloonists, quick to doubt that their Russian counterparts would make such a fundamental error, were more inclined to believe that the *Osoaviakhim*, or *Sirius* as it was also known, had iced up during its descent through the clouds. One factor was unclear—why the flight had been attempted at such an unfavorable time of year.

Later, newspaper sources would provide an interesting, perhaps accurate, answer. That week in January was the week when the 17th All-Union Communist Party Congress was meeting in Moscow. Stalin, so the story went, anxious that a spectacular Soviet achievement take place while the Congress was in session, let it be known that he expected the *Osoaviakhim* to provide that achievement. When adverse midwinter weather threatened to cancel the operation, he allegedly sent word direct: "You go or else." Perhaps, then, with good reason, Fedossejenko had leaned from the hatch at takeoff to cry "Long live the 17th party congress. Long live the world revolution."

In April 1934, the First All-Union Stratostat Congress was convened in Leningrad. During its deliberations, the Settle-Fordney ascent was described as "a sign of great advance in American technology," and Settle was referred to as the Russians' worthiest competitor in their assault upon the upper air.

Settle, however, could not longer compete. Due for a change in duty, he had been transferred to China waters, there to take command of the Yangtze River gunboat *Palos*. Others would have to take his place.

They did, Kepner, Stevens, and Anderson, in the U.S. Army Air Corps-National Geographic Society balloon, *Explorer*, reached about 60,000 feet on July 26, 1934, barely parachuting to safety when the envelope failed and its hydrogen burned in flight.

Drs. Jean and Jeanette Piccard, to whom ownership of the *A Century of Progress* had reverted following the Settle-Fordney flight, took the balloon skyward once more on October 23, 1934, this time to 57,579 feet.

At this point, the Soviets returned to the fringes-of-space sweepstakes. Their entry was the balloon of Varigo and Christopzille. In a caution-filled ascent reflecting the accident to the *Osoaviakhim*, they went to 53,000 feet on June 26, 1935.

Armistice Day that same year saw Stevens and Anderson attain 72,395 feet in the *Explorer II*.

Thus, with balloons did the United States first answer Soviet Commissar Litvinoff. Today, three decades later, Americans and Russians "continue to contest the heights" with the newest flight vehicles their respective technologies can provide.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection?

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret that because of illness I was not able to attend today's session, however, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a significant resolution which I am sponsoring and which is being introduced today in the other body by Senator Joseph Clark and 15 other Senators. I have introduced in the House this resolution which states the following:

> That the President should be supported in his efforts to achieve general and complete disarmament under legally effective controls and to develop international institutions capable of keeping the peace during and after disarmament.
>
> Sec. 2. The President is hereby requested to formulate as speedily as possible specific and detailed proposals for the implementation of the foreign policy objectives of the United States regarding the establishment of an international authority to keep the peace under conditions of general and complete disarmament effectively guaranteed by adequate inspection and controls. In formulating such proposals, the President is requested to consider whether the development of effective international machinery for the supervision of disarmament and the maintenance of peace, including (1) an International Disarmament Organization; (2) a permanent World Peace Force; (3) world tribunals for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes not settled by negotiations; (4) other international institutions necessary for the enforcement of world peace under the rule of law; and (5) appropriate and reliable financial arrangements for the support of such peacekeeping machinery, may best be achieved by revision of the Charter of the United Nations, by a new treaty, or by a combination of the two.
>
> Sec. 3. The President should make such prosposals available to the Congress and to the public generally.
>
> Sec. 4. The President is requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the heads of government of all of the nations of the world and to urge them to initiate within their governments studies of matters germane to this resolution and to formulate and make generally available recommendations based upon such studies.

Mr. Speaker, on September 25, 1961, the President in his magnificent address to the United Nations stated:

> Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness.

Although the test ban treaty has been signed, the President's statement is as valid today as it was in 1961. The test ban treaty is the first step toward the day when the nuclear sword of Damocles will no longer hang over our heads. However, we must realize that, although "a journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step," that journey will never be completed unless the first step is followed by many others. The road to be traveled if the world is to know peace and security is clear. It is the road toward disarmament under effective international control. As long as nations retain nuclear weapons with their capacity to destroy civilization, we will remain threatened by extinction. For, as the President so eloquently has pointed out, the danger from "accident or miscalculation or madness" will not be removed until disarmament under effective international control is achieved.

The realization that "the weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us" led to the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. This proposal, which was introduced in 1961 at the 16th session of the United Nations General Assembly, defined the objective of the United States as "A world where there shall be a permanent state of general and complete disarmament under effective international control."

The resolution introduced today will move us toward that goal. It is a constructive step forward toward the establishment of the only genuine security system for the United States and the world—disarmament under effective international control. I urge all my colleagues to join with me in support of this resolution.

THE PASSING OF A DISTINGUISHED CANADIAN STATESMAN, SENATOR MARK DROUIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks following my remarks today regarding the late Senator Mark Drouin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, the sad word has reached us of the death in Canada of Senator Mark R. Drouin, former Speaker of the Canadian Senate and a friend of long standing of many Members of this body.

Senator Drouin was a prime mover of the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Union and I had the pleasure of serving as a Cochairman with him in this group. We not only enjoyed his company on the occasions when the group met, but we learned much from him. He was knowledgeable in the affairs of government and had a wisdom that had developed over the years he served his country's government.

He was an extraordinary advocate of the best interests of Canada and, yet, he was an understanding friend of the United States. The viewpoints of this Nation always received from him fair and honest consideration. As he will be sorely missed in Canada, so will he be equally missed at future meetings of the Interparliamentary Union. I am sure, however, that his spirit will long remain the guiding force of future meetings and in a larger sense his memory will always be a symbol of all the things that bind Canada and the United States in a friendship unparalleled in the recorded history of the world.

Mark Drouin was possessed of a deep warmness and graciousness that is all too rare in these hectic days in which we live. His loss is a loss to all who ever came in contact with him.

Mark Drouin was born in Quebec in 1903. He was educated at Quebec Seminary and Laval University and was admitted to the Quebec bar in 1934.

He became a most prominent member of the Canadian bar and over the years of his fruitful life, he was active in cultural, civic, political, and governmental affairs. He was, without question, one of Canada's most distinguished statesmen. His passing will be mourned by the Governments and the people of both Canada and the United States.

I am sure that all my colleagues in the Congress of the United States extend to his charming wife our most sincere condolences.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I join with the gentleman in his tribute to a great Canadian and a great statesman of this hemisphere. I know I express, as the gentleman does, the sentiment of all Members of the House in this statement.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us who had the privilege and pleasure of knowing Senator Mark Drouin, the former Speaker of the Canadian Senate, were saddened to learn of his untimely passing last Saturday night.

Senator Drouin had been most active in the work of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group and on each of his official visits to Washington did much to further cement and increase the traditional friendship and mutual good will between our two countries.

Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Senator Mark Drouin, Canada has lost one of her ablest statesmen and the United States one of its stanch, true friends. I join with my colleagues here today and the host of his other good friends in the United States in extending heartfelt condolences to his widow and daughter.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sadness that I was informed yesterday of the death of one of Canada's most distinguished statesmen—the Honorable Mark Robert Drouin, a member of the Canadian Senate and former speaker of that body.

As a member of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary group for the last 3 years, it became my privilege to meet several times in Ottawa and in Washington with members of the Canadian Parliament. Mark Drouin took a particular interest in this group and made many friends among Members of the U.S. Congress.

He was a very warm-hearted man with boundless energy and a tremendous capacity to make friends. At a time when relationships between the United States and Canadian Governments are becoming more strained, Mark's death leaves a void that will be difficult to fill.

Mark Drouin was a member of the Quebec Bar, former governor of St. Lawrence College of Quebec, governor of Laval University at the time of his death. He was active in many civic and social organizations. He was chairman of the Quebec Conservative Organization 1949, 1953, and 1957, and in 1955 was first vice president of the National Progressive-Conservative Party of Canada. He was called to the Senate and appointed speaker October 4, 1957.

Mark Drouin was an important voice in Canada and his untimely passing will be grieved throughout his country.

I feel I have lost a friend, and would like to convey to Mrs. Drouin and her daughter, Julie, my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate during the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader limit that to tomorrow in view of the uncertainty of rather important legislation coming up on Thursday and until we know definitely whether we will have this legislation on Thursday?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withdraw his reservation, I shall rephrase the request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit while the House is in session tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MILLER of California, for 3 days, on account of official business.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, through October 25, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CONTE (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BROCK (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, October 16.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. HARRISON), for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, October 16.

Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HARRISON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WIDNALL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COOLEY in two instances.

Mr. SHELLEY.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. DOWNING.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 16, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1293. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to include sugar within the provisions thereof and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate margin requirements with respect to transactions and positions in sugar futures on or subject to the rules of contract markets"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1294. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report of the Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department of the Air Force without formal advertising for the period January 1, 1963, through June 30, 1963, pursuant to section 605, Public Law 87–554; to the Committee Armed Services.

1295. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the ninth report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment submitted by the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, for the quarter ending September 30, 1963, and covers items acquired pursuant to the authority transferred to the Secretary of Defense by Executive Order No. 10952, effective August 1, 1961, pursuant to subsection 201(h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1296. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification and listing of the location, nature and estimated cost of facilities proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard within the authorization contained in section 702 of Public Law 87–554, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1) and authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1297. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the overpricing of K–27 tube sheet assemblies produced from Fairbanks, Morse & Co. by Union Carbide Nuclear Co. under Atomic Energy Commission cost-type contract, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2206); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1298. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the use of $615,000 for modification of vertical test stand No. 3 (VTS–3), Propulsion Field Laboratory, Santa Susana, Calif., pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1299. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a letter relative to the number of officers assigned or detailed to permanent duty in the executive element of the Air Force at the seat of government at the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 8031(c), title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1300. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to unnecessary procurement and repair costs by the Department of the Army for J-2 gyromagnetic compass components available in the military supply systems, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7771. A bill to amend various acts providing Federal assistance for education to assure that Federal funds will not be used to assist educational institutions which practice racial discrimination; without amendment (Rept. No. 851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 530. An act to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; with amendment (Rept. No. 852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 8831. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to help dramatize the progress of the American Negro from the time of the Emancipation Proclamation until the present; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 8832. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1958, to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 8833. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 8834. A bill to provide for the disposition of the funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Shawnee Tribe or Nation of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 8835. A bill to amend Title I—Tariff Schedules of the United States, of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 to correct certain inequities in the classification and duty provided for certain aluminum products, television picture tubes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON (by request):

H.R. 8836. A bill to remove the limitation on the number of apprentices authorized to be employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 8837. A bill to establish a Citizens Committee on the Arts; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8838. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code (relating to patents), to provide counsel for the defense and prosecution of rights of indigent patentees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8839. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, under certain circumstances, disclose the current addresses of husbands and parents who have deserted their families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution relative to planning for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 219. Concurrent resolution relative to planning for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Con. Res. 220. Concurrent resolution relative to planning for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 221. Concurrent resolution relative to planning for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution relative to planning for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 547. Resolution to provide additional funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 179; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. Res. 548. Resolution authorizing a full review of the procedures involved in the selection and confirmation of postmasters; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 8840. A bill for the relief of Baggett Transportation Co., Inc., authorizing an appropriation to compensate Baggett Transportation Co., Inc., for certain services performed for the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 8841. A bill for the relief of Miss Antonia M. Mallamaci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 8842. A bill for the relief of Efraz Arsaguli Istepanyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8843. A bill for the relief of John L. Afros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 8844. A bill for the relief of Alojzy Brzezinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 8845. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rafael Loscos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 8846. A bill for the relief of Dr. Edmund J. Trembath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

370. By Mr. O'NEILL: Petition of Mrs. Patrick E. Shaughnessy, Woburn, Mass., and 50 others requesting the Congress of the United States to permit again the recitation of nondenominational public prayer at the opening of our public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

371. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary, the Conservative Council-Syracuse, Syracuse, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to condemning the hasty, unwise, unconstitutional ratification of the Moscow test ban treaty by the Senate of the United States displaying a reversal of our foreign policy by agreeing to a treaty of appeasement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

372. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to passing legislation providing for a suitable memorial to Amerigo Vespucci, the Italian explorer after whom America was named, and suggesting a university as appropriate; to the Committee on House Administration.

373. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to passing legislation providing for a Federal system of work-cure camps for sexual deviates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

374. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to passing legislation to create a special House committee on controversial U.S. Constitutional points and suggesting its modus operandi; to the Committee on Rules.

375. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Old Faithful Station, Wyo., with reference to certain conditions regarding passage of H.R. 8363, the Revenue Act of 1963; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

B'nai B'rith's 120th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1963, B'nai B'rith—it means "Sons of the Covenant"—celebrated its 120th anniversary. The age of 120 has a very special meaning in Jewish tradition. Moses, by Biblical account, lived that span of years. The scope of its philanthropic ventures from its infancy gave impetus to many civic-minded groups that followed. Among all of our national organizations, only the Masons and Odd Fellows—and these originated outside this country—are older. It is interesting to note that B'nai B'rith was born before the Grange, the Salvation Army, the Knights of Columbus, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and scores of other groups which are now so very much a part of us.

It is not generally known that B'nai B'rith organized the first disaster relief for the victims of the Baltimore flood of 1868. It brought into being the famed National Jewish Hospital of Denver and the Leo N. Levi Hospital in Hot Springs, Ark., both nonsectarian, nonfee hospitals. Among other firsts, were B'nai B'rith's establishment of a free employment bureau in Chicago, and manual and technical schools in Philadelphia and New Orleans. It maintained orphanges and homes for the aged in more than a dozen cities. It mobilized relief drives for victims of the Chicago fire and the San Francisco quake.

B'nai B'rith was founded by 12 men who contributed $60 to start a widows' and orphans' fund. Today, B'nai B'rith will spend more than $15 million in programs of education, social service, youth activities, vocational counseling, intergroup relations and oversea aid.

Nor is it generally known that in the Civil War, B'nai B'rith conducted its own recruitment drive and outfitted a Jewish company of 106 soldiers and arranged for the care of their families. The company served in the 82d Illinois Infantry Regiment.

I think that the spirit of B'nai B'rith is best expressed in a letter which a Brooklyn corporal of Italian origin wrote home to his mother, after he had visited the Hospitality House established in Los Angeles for soldiers on leave. "B'nai B'rith," he wrote, "is a Jewish name meaning a place to rest."

It is indeed a happy birthday for B'nai B'rith.

National Newspaper Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it appears that all of us take for granted those things with which we are most familiar, such as our daily newspaper. Therefore, it is right and proper that we should pause in our deliberations for the purpose of making the observation of National Newspaper Week during the period from October 13 to 19, 1963.

Newspapers are our most accepted medium to inform the people of what is happening in their own community, in their State, in their Nation, in the world, and now even of developments in the far reaches of outer space. The more informed and the more enlightened the people are, the better; and our newspapers are the society's primary instrument for mass communication. I feel that we owe a great debt of genuine gratitude to the publishers, editors, feature writers, reporters, as well as to the other dedicated men and women who make our newspapers possible, such as those who operate the presses, the linotypes, the other necessary machinery, and those who are engaged in the circulation and distribution of our papers. The world and an accounting of what is happening everywhere is brought to the very doorstep of our homes to inform and even to entertain us.

As a Member of the Congress of the United States, I wish to especially pay a well-deserved tribute to the newspapers of our land in that they are, in reality, a fourth estate, independent, free, and responsible. A democratic society needs a free press. Although newspapers have become large private businesses, the best tradition of American journalism has always insisted upon maintaining the press as a public trust. For this they deserve our deepest thanks.

There is also another facet involved in the newspaper industry and that is in their being a vehicle in aiding and assisting commerce and industry by means of the advertisements they carry. This brings buyers and sellers of commodities and services together and fosters trade, bringing new life to the marketplace and thereby creating employment for countless persons. This aspect of our papers should not be forgotten in our consideration of the prime purpose of the press in supplying information in depth respecting current events.

All in the great and important newspaper industry merit our salute and best wishes for successful continuance of the part they play so well in keeping the American people well informed and in stimulating the economy of our Nation.

I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to compliment the management and employees of our two great Maryland papers, the Baltimore Morning and Evening Sun and the Baltimore News-Post and Sunday American.

A Tribute to Ochi Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the expression, "That's Greek to me," usually denotes something unknown. Yet, if one were really to question the use of the word "Greek" and to apply it to our everyday life, the usage would be incorrect. Many ideas, words, and architectural designs with a Greek origin are in common use and have become an integral part of American society.

Our system of government is a democracy, which enables the individual the maximum freedom and a voice in the running of his country. Democracy, though, was not something dreamed up by our Founding Fathers. The term and embodiment of the system came from the ancient Greeks, who, under a democratic government, rose to the greatest heights then known to man.

The English language is not pure Teutonic in origin. It is composed of many languages, primarily Latin. But our technical words, such as "philosophy" and "psychiatry," those used in science, medicine, and the arts, have their derivations in the Greek tongue.

Many of our public buildings, churches, and homes, with their fluted columns and porticos, have their designs originating in the temples at Athens, Epirus, and Thebes. A perfect example is the Supreme Court Building in Washington, D.C., with its gleaming white stones, Corinthian columns, and symbolic frieze.

Mr. Speaker, a young nation, we felt close kinship with the valiant Greeks who were, in 1821, fighting for their independence from the Ottoman Empire. Hundreds of volunteers left our shores to participate in the struggle; thousands more gave freely of their time, money, and goods to succor a heritage from which we derived so much. Sparta, Athens, Troy, Ypsilanti, our numerous Greek-named cities, appeared as symbolic gestures of participation and accord.

Greek participation in the development of our country has not ended with the incorporation of just ideas and words. Immigrants from the Peloponnesus and the Aegean Isles have added to the American scene their own culture. During the first two decades of the 20th century, the Greek immigrants, driven from the homeland by poverty, brought with them the urge to achieve economic independence for their children. They succeeded in their goals. Today, their descendants are respected businessmen, doctors, lawyers, politicians, and government employees.

In San Francisco as in the other Greek communities throughout the United States, certain festivals indigenous to the Greeks are held, commemorating a saint or historic event in their homeland. One such event honors "Ochi Day." In 1940, General Metaxas, then President of the council governing Greece, received the Fascist Italian Ambassador, who delivered an ultimatum which stated:

> The Italian Government decided to demand from the Hellenic Government the right to occupy with her armed forces a number of strategic points in Greek territory. Should the Italian forces meet with resistance, the resistance will be crushed by force of arms.

Metaxas' reply was simple and to the point, "Ochi" which means "no." Mussolini's troops plunged across the border but found themselves no match for the Greek soldiers defending their homes. Within a month, the invaders had been pushed back into Albania, thoroughly defeated and demoralized.

Greek resistance, however, was no contestant to the armed might of Nazi Germany. The 3½-year occupation devastated the land, ruined the economy, and depleted the population. Yet hope survived. When the last of the German occupation forces had been driven from their land, the Greek people industriously began building again. Communist bands, however, abetted by Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, soon began terrorizing the Greek countryside. An appeal by the Government to the United States brought immediate help in the form of dollars, military equipment, food, clothing, and technical assistance. The Truman doctrine, proclaimed in 1947, inaugurated a massive assistance program which was to send to Greece approximately three and a half billion dollars worth of aid and to save the country from Communist domination.

Greece today is a member of NATO and a staunch ally of the United States, as it has been throughout the years. Modern transportation, books, and communications media have brought the two nations closer together in understanding and mutual appreciation. It is only right that we in the United States, and not just our citizens of Greek origin, should participate with the people of Greece in the celebration of their festivals and independence day anniversary. As they commemorate "Ochi Day" this month, we, too, must remember that valiant refusal to bow to the dictates of tyranny and honor the defenders of freedom, democracy, and the heritage of Western civilization.

Tolerance in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, several weeks ago, my distinguished junior colleague, Senator HOWARD CANNON, spoke before the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Las Vegas.

He gave a very inspiring talk on bigotry as related to brotherhood and how it affects our Nation.

I believe it deserves the attention of this body. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON, OF NEVADA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS, LAS VEGAS, NEV., SEPTEMBER 26

It is certainly a great pleasure for me to participate in your annual meeting and to be afforded the oportunity to address you on the subject of the power of tolerance in action—which has been so effectively demonstrated by this group.

Every American has heard many times over that the best way for this country to keep out of war is to prepare to defend itself on such a scale that a potential aggressor would shrink from the thought of attacking this country. One of the great leaders of our century, Winston Churchill, said, "We arm to parley." What we are really saying is that a nation set upon a policy of conquest and subjugation is certain to pick on the one who is not strong enough to effectively resist. Therefore, we look to American security, in effect, to advise the potential aggressor that an attack in our direction will be at his own peril.

Most of us are old enough to remember another period in our history when so many believed that military preparedness was not the way to accomplish peace, but that the establishment of a peaceful society could only come about by a headlong rush to disarmament. This was the argument both before and after World War II, when we sought to compel other nations to follow our example merely by the force of moral persuasion.

But people have come to realize throughout the world today that military preparedness is our only road to peace, because we have learned that aggression has no off season in the contest between freedom and communism, for the power mongers of the world never sleep. They are constantly on the alert like a pack of roaming wolves, ready to pounce upon any people, any nation showing signs of defensive weakness.

In a similar vein, I think it is also clear that the hate mongers of the world, the aggressors among us, are constantly busy preparing an assault of one kind or another on this or that group, depending upon who has aroused their anger. And since this is true, there is no time when men and women of tolerant mind and spirit can relax their vigilance.

These aggressors—and I lump them together deliberately—do not respect our peaceful ideas of democracy and freedom. As a country and as individuals, we know that the forces of evil are an angry, unruly element in our society to whom the fight will never be over so long as they draw breath.

Under these circumstances, I think it proper that your organization should be working as busily and as effectively today as ever before.

I am sure that there are those who believe that we protest too much, that we denounce the villains when there are none in our midst. They tell us that Hitler is dead and that bigotry in general is crumbling here and abroad. They say that George Lincoln Rockwell has not attracted any great number of Americans to his cause of forming a Nazi party in the United States. So why don't we sit down and keep quiet?

I suppose we all have an answer to this one, and mine goes something like this: That all of the battles which persons of conscience, tolerance, and good will find themselves involved in today, are battles that have gone on in one form or another from the beginning of time. Indeed, we never win this battle, and are instead glad to settle merely for winning a round or two, here and there. If we have learned nothing from our fight for decency and tolerance, we ought to have learned at least that our foe is truly dedicated, with as much determination as we, and that they are fired by the flame of fanaticism.

These handmaidens of general ignorance, racial, ethnic and religious prejudices, never die. They ebb and flow in response to changing social, political, and economic conditions. There was anti-Semitism in Germany before Hitler, and perhaps there will be again. Because these emotions can be suddenly whipped to life by lies, poverty, hunger, or humiliation. And where these conditions exist, aggression and hate are sure to follow.

We are witnessing an illustration of these forces in the South today. The two races, white and Negro, did settle down for a while throughout the 1870's and 1880's in a rather uneasy acceptance of the postwar status quo which followed the enactment of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. Ku Klux Klan raids did take place, and people were lynched and riots did occur, but Negroes, nevertheless, were accorded a place in the Southern political system in which they voted and held office; and for a time it did appear that reason might prevail. Integration at one time did exist in the South, even in public places; but when economic catastrophe struck in 1890, race hatred became the order of the day. Reason was washed away, progress canceled, and the Negro in the South became disenfranchised and saddled with segregation laws.

The South was not and is not an isolated, sectional case. There have been periods when Chinese and Japanese on the west coast were targets for bigotry, and virtually every minority group has had its own recurrent stories to tell. The significant thing to me is that most of these uprisings were in protest to the belief that members of minority groups were somehow, unexplainably and mysteriously, responsible for poverty and the logical recipients of physical abuse.

In these circumstances, the majority often reacts in the same kind of spirit and the panic of people aboard a sinking ship, a panic which drives many people to act in their own behalf at the expense of others.

Nor are these instances isolated to our own society. In Red China, the Chinese Government is currently coping with a race issue which is once again disproving the fiction that Communist methods are superior to Western methods in the matter of securing social justice for all. It so happens that about 92 percent of the Chinese population is comprised of persons belonging to the "Han" race, and the other 8 percent is referred to by the majority as "dogs." It has been thus throughout Chinese history, and the Communist takeover did not change this one iota.

We also have been reading in the papers lately about the Chinese hatred for the white race generally in their relations with the Soviet Union and certainly with this country. We also know that while antisemitism was officially outlawed in Russia, it continues to flourish to this day with the connivance of Soviet officials.

The important lesson for us should be that no government can of itself preach tolerance to its people, even enact laws forbidding persecution with any considerable effect. It may defend its minorities against outrageous attack and can generally protect their rights. But when all is said and done, the only force that can work effectively among the people to offset ignorance and fear is the force of the people themselves, such as the part represented by yourselves here tonight.

It is my impression in witnessing the growing influence of the national conference over the years and the decrease of bigotry in the United States, that there is a close connection between the two developments and one in which you as members of the national conference can take great pride.

As I have already implied, it is my belief that there will be no real test of how free we are from bigotry in this country until the economic picture worsens. I certainly hope that my words are never put to the test, for we want at all costs to avoid an economic disaster or serious recession. Economics alone is certainly not the only determining factor in the degree of tolerance we are able to achieve. Certainly the work of the churches is uppermost and it is they who will have to bear much of the burden of our continuing vigilance. We must further recognize the importance of guarding against the oversimplified solution to complex and difficult problems with which we are faced. In my opinion, the hate groups, the radicals, and the extremists have been able to make headway in this country in recent years because there are some who believe there are easy, quick, and obvious solutions to the complex problems that confront us today.

Before concluding, I would like to say something concerning civil rights, an issue with which the present Congress is attempting to deal. I have been quoted in the press as stating that I believe that jobs are the key to the solution of the Negro problem in this country. I would like to elaborate. The job problem is not solvable on a racial issue. Automation draws no color line and affects people at every level, particularly the lower income groups. I do not believe that any Negro leader will quarrel with the fact that in this age of automation jobs must be found and they are found only by men and women who are skilled, educated, and in good health.

The President himself said only 2 weeks ago that jobs cannot be filled on a quota system according to race. I agree wholeheartedly. They must be filled on the basis of merit and ability. It is only through an educated and skilled America that our productivity and manpower can be fully utilized. This is a job in which political pressure and even legislation can only create a proper climate; it cannot create the education and skills that are needed so desperately by much of the Negro population.

Surely the civil rights issue will be acted upon one way or another by this session of Congress, but the basic goals and aspirations of the Negro minority, or any other minority for that matter, cannot be answered by legislation alone.

I should like to compliment this organization on its efforts in the cause of brotherhood regardless of race, religion, or country—for your efforts have gone beyond the borders of the United States.

When the national conference first came into existence, it threw its weight against the 1928 hate campaign involving the religious beliefs of New York Governor Al Smith. The national conference demonstrated then that it was willing to fight in behalf of any victim of undemocratic, unprincipled attack. In the thirties it was responsible for launching Brotherhood Week which has become a national institution headed every year by the President of the United States. In 1941 the national conference began its summer workshops for teachers, and at the same time sent speaker teams to our Armed Forces in all parts of the United States and overseas. Then, following the close of World War II, the national conference program was greatly expanded so that not only teachers but community leaders, police, businessmen, union leaders, and youth groups were enlisted.

What all this may amount to—indeed, what I hope it will amount to—is to bring to an end the cycle of which I spoke earlier—the traditional cycle, by which race hate and ethnic hate can be severely reduced when times are good but revived again when times get bad. Indeed, with the work of your organization and like organizations throughout the country, the time may soon arrive when it can be said in all truth that the great mass of Americans are able to meet their troubles—of every kind—without blaming somebody else for them, and without feeling obliged to defame their fellow Americans at this or any other time.

In the event that this blessed condition ever, in fact, develops, you, of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, will have the right to take as many bows as you wish—and it is my hope, when that happens, that I will be on hand as a witness, in order to join in the applause.

I thank you for your attention.

New Maritime Bill Is Seen as Stabilizer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, one of the most knowledgeable men in maritime affairs of this country is our own colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, the honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, longtime chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives.

For years he and this great committee of the Congress have endeavored to protect and promote the maritime interests of this country. This is a difficult task in these trying times of overwhelming competition from the foreign countries.

The maritime industry is beset with many problems. We need the cooperation of labor as well as management if the American-flag marine is to survive.

Recently the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has been considering legislation which sought some form of equitable solution to these labor-management problems which are virtually stagnating this great industry.

Chairman BONNER has written an article concerning this legislation which appeared in the October 9, 1963, issue of the Journal of Commerce. I urge the leaders of management and labor in the maritime field as well as my colleagues to carefully read the statements contained therein.

NEW MARITIME BILL IS SEEN AS STABILIZER

(By Representative H. C. BONNER, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee)

The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers & Proprietors International Union of America recently wired me to advise of its opposition to our maritime labor bill, H.R. 1897. The bill was characterized as "legislation restricting collective bargaining in the maritime industry." At about the same time, and subsequently, I received similar communications by wire and by letter from such varied union groups as the United Cement, Lime & Gypsum Workers International Union; International Brotherhood of Bookbinders; American Bakery & Confectionery Workers International Union; American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers; United Textile Workers of America; Operative Plasterers' & Cement Masons' International Association; American Federation of Teachers; Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America; United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union; and others.

These communications, obviously part of a campaign against the bill, view with alarm and predict that passage of the bill would be the death knell for free enterprise and would give the Federal Government a free hand to emasculate or destroy collective bargaining.

FAVORS COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

I favor free collective bargaining. Our free labor movement with collective bargaining and the right to strike has contributed greatly to our high standard of living shared by all of our citizens. But another fact having a great bearing on this discussion is that our complex economy and the maintenance of our security depend upon the proper functioning of our transportation system.

Therefore, the right to strike or lockout in any part of our transportation system should consistently be tempered by a high degree of responsibility for the welfare of the United States as a whole.

We have just passed a period of crisis when a nationwide railroad strike threatened. It was conceded by all that such a strike of any duration would have had paralyzing effect on our economy through interference with delivery of raw material and finished goods.

Mr. George Meany, the distinguished President of the AFL-CIO, said during the recent Senate hearings on the railway dispute, "I have no quarrel with the President of the United States when he says the American economy cannot stand a railroad strike. I am in complete agreement with this. A national railroad strike would be a national catastrophe."

While opposing any step that would amount to compulsory arbitration, Mr. Meany proposed that "Congress allow collective bargaining to work under the eye of Congress, and then if Congress decides that collective bargaining can't work, then let Congress take whatever action it feels it must take in order to protect the interests of all of the people of this country." He proposed that in the interim service would be continued.

Now let us leave the transportation industry for a moment. It is inconceivable that a complete tieup, by strike or lockout, of any of the industries served by the unions mentioned at the opening of this statement could ever create such national paralysis as to make such a labor-management deadlock intolerable. A nationwide strike of the bookbinders might confront us with an awful lot of loose paper; a strike by the barbers and hairdressers would make us look pretty shaggy; and even in the shipbuilding industry complete tieup could be endured for a long period without reaching national emergency proportions.

IMPACT OF MARITIME STRIKES

But the effect of even a short strike affecting a substantial segment of our maritime transportation has a crippling effect on a large part of our economy. A tieup on the waterfront not only deprives us of essential raw materials and manufactured imports, but our export trade is at a standstill. While labor and management are refusing to talk responsibly to each other and the longshoremen are idle up and down the coast, the exporters in other portions of the world have a field day with our foreign customers, many of whom do not return to our American suppliers after the strike is settled.

Similarly, a tieup by our American merchant marine of necessity causes our exporters to utilize the services of foreign-flag vessels. Many of these, too, do not return to the American-flag ships at the end of the dispute. This in turn reduces the demand for American-flag vessels and seagoing opportunities for American labor. In the end it is not only self-defeating in labor relations, but has damaged our economy and weakened our seaborne strength.

Thus, it would appear that those engaged in the maritime transportation industry, both labor and management, have a greater degree of responsibility to the public than those engaged in other industries. The very nature of their work in the very sensitive field of foreign commerce vests power in the maritime industry all out of proportion to its size relative to other American industry. It permits, and, on occasion, seems to invite the use of the powerful lever of public distress reaching national proportions in lieu of reasonable and responsible negotiations.

IMPROPER EXERCISE OF POWER

That the improper exercise of this power has an extreme effect on the welfare of the United States is demonstrated by the fact that the emergency dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act had to be invoked in the maritime strikes 8 out of the 21 times the injunctive process has been used. The eight findings of detriment to the national welfare were made by all three Presidents who have been in office since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act. All of them could not have been wrong on all of these eight occasions, although most of the labor witnesses before the committee denied that the national welfare was involved on any single occasion.

Our committee held lengthy and comprehensive hearings on labor-management problems in 1955. At that time I had hopes that the mutual interests of labor and management, as clearly set forth in those hearings, would bring them voluntarily to closer relationships and improvement in the collective-bargaining processes. But, in spite of professions of cooperation at that time, five Taft-Hartley injunctions have been necessary since then.

It was my hope and expectation when I introduced H.R. 1897 that it would help to strengthen collective bargaining and would, if all else failed, ultimately protect the country against the disastrous effects of major work stoppages in the maritime industry. I felt that the provisions for final discretionary authority in the President to direct a settlement through an arbitration board was a reasonable requirement and would strengthen his hand for the national welfare. I felt that this provision would encourage the parties to reach agreement through their own efforts, and that the final step might never have to be taken.

The hearings on this bill began on March 5 of this year, and continued until August 1, during which time a printed record of 1,677 pages was amassed. We heard testimony from 69 witnesses, representing labor, management, the Government, importers and exporters, and the public generally. We received and considered a large number of communications.

EFFECT OF NEW LEGISLATION

The effect of this legislation would be to take the maritime industry to a large extent out of the operation of the Taft-Hartley Act. It is my belief that the Taft-Hartley Act has proven inadequate to cope with the situations created by labor relations in this vital industry. The views of three Presidents with respect to the importance of the industry by our own experience and recent international events demonstrates conclusively that the machinery to cope with labor disturbances in other industries is insufficient for this one. Not only are we dependent upon incoming raw materials, but our exports are an appreciable element of our overall economy. Most importantly, we need only to refer to the balance-of-payments problem to demonstrate that the continued flow of exports is our lifeblood. Any solution that will contribute to the unimpeded flow of exports and imports is one that we can and must achieve.

I feel that my bill, H.R. 1897, is a long step on the road to that end. I further believe very strongly that through greater stability in maritime labor-management relations we will develop a climate in which further steps may be taken to strengthen our merchant marine, enlarge the fleet under our flag, and provide more employment.

The Responsibility of the Congress in U.S. Operations Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose, with the permission of the House, to emphasize a foremost function, responsibility and obligation of each Member of the Congress.

This is the duty of overseeing our far-flung operations abroad.

There was a day when the interest and the work of the individual Member of the House or the Senate was confined largely to the immediate problems and purposes of the people of his own district or his own State.

But now, Mr. Speaker, the United States is the world's greatest power. We are the world's principal missionary of democracy and freedom.

Therefore, whether we like it or not, the interest and the work of the individual Member of the Congress must extend to the far reaches of the earth.

Our troops and our arms are located at many stations over the globe, guarding the ramparts of democracy against the onslaught of communism.

Since the World War II the United States has expended over $100 billion in aid, first to relieve suffering and, second, to bolster the economies of those areas where the flame of freedom is unquenched and the spirit of democracy is invincible.

We have sent billions and billions of dollars worth of food to friendly peoples. Our abundance of food now is being shared, under various Government programs, with 100 millions of people in a hundred nations.

As chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, my principal interest and responsibility in this worldwide complex, relates directly to the sale, distribution and use of the products of our farms. This interest and this responsibility resides primarily in the Committee on Agriculture, as other committees of this House hold overseeing responsibilities and obligations with respect to other aspects of this Nation's foreign operations.

Mr. Speaker, each Member of the Congress must vote upon appropriations to finance these foreign operations that are in our own interest and which strengthen the free world.

Thereby, we assume responsibility of seeing that this money of the American taxpayers is spent prudently, wisely and effectively.

We must know how these programs are administered and what they accomplish.

We cannot act upon hearsay information. It is essential that occasionally Members of Congress most closely associated with the programs visit the areas where they are in operation, so that the Congress may have firsthand knowledge of the efficiency, effectiveness and worth of each operation.

Such studies and such investigations in the past have resulted in immeasurable improvements of various programs, and have saved the United States millions, and perhaps billions, of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that a few people seem to be totally unaware that Congress has a duty to the taxpayers, to our people, to see that no dollar is spent abroad dishonestly or squandered upon operations that do not return dividends to the United States, in building the strength of the free world to resist communism.

These people are prone to criticize, to tag any mission of a Member of Congress abroad as a jaunt or a junket, no matter how serious or how necessary the purpose.

Because some may have abused the privilege of travel abroad, the House amended its rules so that any travel in foreign countries must be approved by specific resolution of the House.

I want to express my appreciation to this body for its recent action upon a resolution authorizing me, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to appoint a subcommittee to attend the 12th biennial Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations which meets in Rome, Italy, November 16 to December 5, and to direct the subcommittee, which will be accompanied by two members of our staff, to conduct certain studies relating to U.S. food and agriculture operations abroad and to confer with the heads of U.S. missions in foreign countries. The group will report to me as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and the report will be considered by our Departmental Oversight and Consumer Relations Subcommittee.

For those who may not be familiar with the purposes of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, I quote from the preamble of the constitution of that world organization:

> The nations accepting this constitution being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of: Raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions; securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products; bettering the condition of rural populations; and thus contributing toward an expanding world economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that our Committee on Agriculture has spent less money than any other major committee in the entire Congress, even far less than many subcommittees, and we have been able to turn back into the Treasury a substantial amount of money made available to this committee. On many occasions we have turned back more than half of the money provided.

During the years I have been authorized, by law, to make available counterpart funds to the members of our committee for travel and expenses abroad. I have authorized use of counterpart funds by various subcommittees but never on any occasion have I had any reason to believe that any member has abused the privileges granted or misappropriated any of the funds made available. At my request, important studies have been made in foreign countries and reports have been filed with our committee.

I cannot recall that I personally ever have spent one dollar of funds of the Committee on Agriculture for travel abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier the magnitude of our agricultural operations overseas. We export annually farm products valued at over $5 billion and more than one-third of this is accomplished through Government-sponsored and financed programs.

The Committee on Agriculture has jurisdiction over legislation and programs relating to foreign markets for American agriculture and the distribution of food among needy peoples in other nations. We have agricultural attachés stationed in all of the important countries of the world. Our Nation has a vital interest in world markets and our committee would be derelict in its duty if it did not concern itself with exports and make certain that the various programs abroad are honestly, properly, and effectively operated. Studies must be at least occasionally made on the spot if we are to obtain accurate information concerning foreign markets and the distribution of American food.

The European Common Market is a threat to American agriculture. Various countries are throwing up trade barriers against our agricultural commodities. Bilateral arrangements, preferential treatment of other producing areas of the world are adversely affecting our exports. Congress could not possibly legislate wisely, in the interest of our own commerce and our own people, without firsthand information of what is going on in other nations.

Our agriculture is the most productive in all the world. It is essential that we build new markets. Our various programs of food distribution are changing the eating habits of many people in many nations. There is a great and growing opportunity to expand our exports.

Our food abundance is the greatest stabilizing force in the economy of the free world and can be a tremendous force for peace.

The members of our committee, sometimes at great sacrifice, accept the responsibility of membership on special study groups to make investigations and to collect information essential to sound and wise judgment on policies relating to other nations.

Mr. Speaker, during the House consideration of the resolution just mentioned, one member used the occasion to criticize the Interparliamentary Union.

Certainly any intelligent person should know that agriculture is important to all of our people and should further know that the work of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives is in no way connected with nor related to the work of the Interparliamentary Union, the oldest of all international organizations devoted to a better understanding among nations.

The Interparliamentary Union is 74 years old, and our Government has been affiliated with the Union from the very time that it was first organized in Paris, France. Sixty-nine nations of the world are now affiliated with the Interparliamentary Union. Recently in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, the American group, of which the honorable and distinguished Representative from New York, Mrs. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, is President, attended the largest world meeting of lawmakers ever held in all time of human history. Delegates came from around the world. Yes, the Soviets and the satellites were there, and subjects of worldwide importance were discussed and considered.

Our late, beloved Vice President, Alben Barkley, caused me to be interested in the work of the Interparliamentary Union at the end of World War II. He was then the President of the American group and appointed me as a delegate and we attended a conference in Cairo, Egypt. I have been interested in the Interparliamentary Union for the past 16 years and have been elected to the Executive Committee for two 4-year terms. I realize, of course, that many Members of Congress and the public generally are not advised fully as to the purposes and plans or achievements of the Interparliamentary Union. Every Member of this Congress is eligible and is actually a member of the American group, but unfortunately, many Members have taken no interest in the work of the Union. Certainly, no Member of the Congress has a moral right to lambaste and abuse other Members of Congress who recognize and understand the importance of the Interparliamentary Union.

I am certain that the President of the American group will be delighted to provide any Member of Congress with detailed information concerning the activities of the Interparliamentary Union and to submit for the record the resolutions adopted at the recent conference held in Belgrade.

Those of us who are interested in the work of the Interparliamentary Union are thoroughly disgusted and sick and tired of all the criticism which must be prompted by ignorance which has been leveled at the American group and at the activities of this important worldwide organization.

Most of the criticisms which have been leveled at the Interparliamentary Union by Members of Congress must be prompted by ignorance and stupidity or inspired by demagoguery of the most insidious and evil type.

If the Interparliamentary Union is worth while we should continue our participation in its deliberations. If there are some here who consider this great organization to be worthless, then I challenge them to offer a resolution to end America's affiliation with the organization.

Frankly, I do not believe that any Member of this House or the Senate would be so wanting in wisdom even to suggest that America should abandon the organization which came into being 74 years ago and with which we have been consistently affiliated. Intelligent people in both East and West appreciate the importance of the Interparliamentary Union and yet some people seem to believe that it is some sort of an organization which provides an excuse for junkets.

If there is any Member of this House who honestly believes that the Interparliamentary Union is a junketing organization, then I urge that Member to attend the next conference and to observe the organization in action.

Surrender of the Public Interest for the Benefit of a Favored Redeveloper by District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I include a staff study of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia which states, among other things that—

> Disposition of the 20 acres of land at an average price of $2.65 per square foot, would be a disgraceful surrender of the public interest for the benefit of a favored redeveloper who is heavily in default on his contractual obligations with the RLA.

The staff study commented on an article in the Washington Sunday Star of October 13, 1963, and I include the complete text of that article for the information of my colleagues.

The study and article follows:

> STAFF STUDY—SALE OF LAND TO WEBB & KNAPP BY THE RLA
>
> Hon. JOHN DOWDY,
> *Chairman, Subcommittee No. 4, District of Columbia Committee, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress:*
>
> On Tuesday October 15, 1963, the Redevelopment Land Agency propose to dispose of an additional 20 acres of land to the firm of Webb & Knapp, which considering the circumstances outlined in this report, must be considered as against the best public (taxpayers) interest.
>
> Disposition of the 20 acres of land at an average price of $2.65 per square foot, would be a disgraceful surrender of the public interest for the benefit of a favored redeveloper who is heavily in default on his contractual obligations with the Redevelopment Land Agency.
>
> The $2.65 land price cannot be justified either by comparable land prices in the District for similar undertakings, or by the residual land value method of appraisal which has proved out to be much too low on the Town Houses constructed by the same redeveloper.
>
> By transferring the 20 acres of land to Webb & Knapp, the Redevelopment Land Agency is closing the door to the erection of any middle-income family housing in the southwest project area, thus designating the area as a two-income area, high and low, with no middle, which no responsible planner can justify as being in the best community or social interest.
>
> Attempts made to try and justify this disposition, if newspaper stories are correct, border on the ridiculous.
>
> It was stated in Sunday's Star of October 13, 1963, that the Redevelopment Land Agency Vice Chairman, Mr. Atkinson, made the following statements which will be quoted in order:
>
> 1. "That under the memorandum of understanding entered into between Redevelopment Land Agency and Mr. Zeckendorf, the Agency was limited to negotiating only with the New Yorker for certain lands."
>
> Take particular notice of the word "was", which is clearly past tense. Mr. Atkinson did not say that RLA "is" limited to negotiating with Webb & Knapp, or Mr. Zeckendorf, as that would have been untrue, because the memo of understanding is no longer in effect, it not having been renewed since 1957, according to the General Accounting Office. So RLA can, and should, in the Federal and taxpayers' interest, attempt to obtain a more equitable land price to help prevent a further rise in the net project cost which has already reached astronomical proportions.
>
> 2. Mr. Atkinson stated, "He [Zeckendorf] gets the benefit of coming in when the project was in the hatching stage. * * * He had the wisdom to come in when no one else was willing to, and we were glad to do business with someone."
>
> Mr. Atkinson must know that statement is an untruth, as he has been on the Board of Directors since its inception. There were others willing to come in, and they offered more money for the land, but RLA refused

to entertain any offers, using the memo of understanding as a cloak under which they kept everybody else out, which proves Mr. Atkinson's statement to be false.

3. "If we were free to negotiate now, and with other interested parties, the story would be different," said Mr. Atkinson.

The Agency is free to negotiate now, because as stated previously, the memorandum of understanding no longer exists, not having been renewed, which removes any preferential claim by Webb & Knapp.

4. I again quote Mr. Atkinson. "I'm convinced the prices we negotiated with him, in view of all the factors involved, are fair and legal."

What are the factors involved that make such land prices fair and legal? The National Capital Housing Authority has paid $4.20 and $4.93 per square foot for land it purchased to build homes for the lowest segment of the District's population, yet the Redevelopment Land Agency is selling 873,704.99 square feet for the erection of luxury apartments and other uses, for $2.65, and RLA's Board of Directors say land is too high to build middle income housing.

4. One final statement of Mr. Atkinson merits attention: "The Board is not disposed to tolerate delay in having construction start."

That statement is obviously made for public consumption. Here is a firm that is in default after default on its present contracts, and the something that has been done to overcome delays is exactly nothing.

River Park was started and finished; Capital Park is moving rapidly; Tiber Island, Harbour Square and Carrollsburg Square were not even on the drawing boards when Webb & Knapp entered in agreements and contracts, yet they are all underway, while not one Webb & Knapp project is actually under construction at this time, yet Mr. Atkinson talks of his Board not tolerating any delay. Nine and one-half years have passed, and out of the approximately 64 acres committed to Webb & Knapp, only 18 have been redeveloped.

No private organization could remain in business with that kind of operation as overhead costs would eat up its capital investment, but with Redevelopment Land Agency using Federal funds, taxpayers' dollars, the Agency does not appear to concern itself with what is or is not sound economic practice.

Further, Redevelopment Land Agency is paying taxes running into the hundreds of thousands of dollars on land being held for this particular redeveloper. Had Redevelopment Land Agency insisted on transferring the land to the redeveloper, it would have been the redeveloper, not the taxpayers, who paid the taxes. The result would have been that the redeveloper would have been forced to proceed expeditiously with the work, instead of sitting back and doing nothing other than what suits him, and what has suited him has resulted in delaying redevelopment for 9½ years, and sent the net project cost soaring up and up.

Sound business practice would demand that the Board of Directors of Redevelopment Land Agency take no action relative to the land disposition to Webb & Knapp at this time, and demand instead that the firm comply with all their contractual obligations financially and construction-wise in order to eliminate their defaults.

Mr. Milton Semer, Chief Counsel for the Housing and Home Finance Agency, told me that HHFA is anxious to get middle income family housing built, and that the Administrator, Mr. Robert Weaver, is ready to do everything possible to encourage such building, even, if necessary, to agreeing to a write-down of land cost. Even though regional funds have been exhausted for construction under section 221(d)(3), Mr. Semer has assured me that the Administrator will arrange for the transfer of such funds as may be required for building such family housing in any urban renewal project in the District.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 13, 1963]

RLA Sets Land Prices for Southwest Tract—Agency To Turn Over Big Area to Zeckendorf for Development

(By Robert J. Lewis)

The Redevelopment Land Agency has set prices on more than 20 acres of residential land in Southwest Washington that it proposes to turn over shortly to William Zeckendorf, the New York developer.

This will be individually the largest residential land transaction ever projected in the huge Southwest Washington redevelopment area.

The proposed prices are considerably lower than those paid in recent years by the National Capital Housing Authority for public housing sites, both on the basis of the price per square foot and on the cost of land per dwelling unit.

Nine parcels are included in the transaction. They are in four tracts adjacent to each other. All will be leased at 6 percent of the land price annually. Land for 180 townhouses, which are to be designated for sale, will eventually be purchased.

Of a total of 1,028 units projected for construction, 728 will be elevator apartment units, 120 will be walkup apartments and 180 will be the townhouses to be sold.

HEARING SLATED

A public hearing on the proposed decision to lease the land has been scheduled by RLA for 10:30 a.m., Tuesday, in its offices at 919 18th Street NW.

In a recent resolution setting land prices, the RLA Board said disposal of the parcels to Zeckendorf corporations "without solicitation of other offers is hereby determined to be the appropriate method of marketing these parcels."

The resolution called attention to a memorandum of understanding dated March 15, 1954, in which it said the Agency agreed to sell or lease certain land in project area C to Webb & Knapp, Inc.," (the Zeckendorf firm). Lease of the present parcels, the resolution said, "is considered to be in the best interests of the project."

The resolution set a price of $1.96 a square foot for land to be used as sites for the 120 walkup apartments and for the 180 townhouses.

OTHER PRICES LISTED

The price of one elevator apartment site was set at $3.40 a square foot. The price of the other elevator apartment site was fixed at $3.75 a square foot.

The 728 units of elevator apartment construction are proposed to be financed with mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration. Townhouses and walkup apartments would be financed conventionally.

The forthcoming leasing transaction will be the third in which Redevelopment Land Agency has turned over important tracts by lease to Mr. Zeckendorf's corporations.

Previously, Mr. Zeckendorf acquired the large commercial-residential site adjacent to Fourth and M Streets SW., in which four 128-unit apartment buildings and a shopping-center building have been constructed. Additional residential and commercial development is proposed there.

In addition, the developer has acquired major office and hotel sites surrounding the proposed L'Enfant Plaza, a large square projected for construction on the 10th Street Mall south of Independence Avenue. Work on this project has not been started.

The most recent tracts which Redevelopment Land Agency proposes to lease form an irregularly shaped area extending from the Southwest Freeway to the Maine Avenue waterfront.

The eastern boundary is Fourth Street and the grounds of Amidon School. The western boundary is Seventh Street and Maine Avenue, and is adjacent to Thomas Jefferson Junior High School and a proposed site for St. Dominic's School just north of the junior high school.

The land cost for each of the 282 elevator apartments in one project would be $1,704, under the proposed pricing.

The land cost per unit in the 446-unit elevator project would be $1,878.

The unit cost of the land for each walkup apartment would be $2,172.

The lot price for each townhouse (proposed to sell for from $35,000 to $45,000) is $4,094.

LAND RATES VARY

In recent years, the National Capital Housing Authority has had to pay generally from $4.20 to $4.93 per square foot for land it purchased for public housing sites, with one transaction requiring payment in excess of $8 a square foot, based on the market value.

NCHA's land cost for each unit in the Park Morton development, Georgia Avenue and Park Road NW., including site clearance, was $4,093. These are walkup units.

For Greenleaf Gardens on M Street SW., adjacent to the Southwest redevelopment area, the land cost per unit was $2,885, including clearance. These are mostly elevator apartments.

In the case of Arthur Capper dwellings, on M Street SE., the land cost to NCHA, including clearance, was $3,223 per unit. Five-sixths of the 612 units in this project are in elevator buildings.

A spokesman for the public housing agency said land for two additional developments now projected has been acquired at a cost, including clearance, of $3,716 and $3,255, respectively, per unit.

NEAR U.S. AVERAGE

In an appearance before a House Appropriations Subcommittee last March, Mrs. Marie C. McGuire, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, testified that the average cost of land for each public housing unit throughout the country was $3,000.

On the basis of this testimony, NCHA's land costs have been either below or slightly above the national average, though Washington is conceded to be a high-land-cost area.

The Redevelopment Land Agency is understood to feel that the prices set on the new parcels to be leased to Mr. Zeckendorf's corporations are adequate, considering all circumstances.

Richard R. Atkinson, Vice Chairman of the Redevelopment Land Agency Board, said last night: "All the prices have been justified to the Board's satisfaction."

Mr. Atkinson said the Board felt, "considering all the factors involved, that it was getting the best price possible."

The Board member pointed out that under the memorandum of understanding entered into between Redevelopment Land Agency and Mr. Zeckendorf, the Agency was limited to negotiating only with the New Yorker for certain land.

"He gets the benefit of coming in when the project was in the hatching stage," he said.

"He had the wisdom in the beginning to come in when no one else was willing to, and we were glad to do business with somebody.

"If we were free to negotiate now, the story would be quite different, but I'm convinced the prices we negotiated with him, in view of all the factors involved, are fair and and legal."

Mr. Atkinson, who has been a member of the Redevelopment Land Agency Board since its inception, said, however, the Board is not disposed to tolerate delay in having construction start.

"If he doesn't act fast, a default will be declared and we will do something about it," Mr. Atkinson said.

PLANS DISCLOSED

A spokesman for the Zeckendorf corporations told the Star it was planned to start construction of walkup apartments and town houses by next June.

Rents for walkup apartments, he said, are expected to be from $105 a month for efficiencies to around $200 for 2-bedroom apartments.

The townhouses, expected to sell from $35,000 to $45,000, would be designed by the firm of Walter M. Macomber and Walter G. Peter, Jr., well-known Washington architects.

Our Fisheries Must Be Protected

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 15, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who foresee increasing importance in the wealth of the seas within the framework of an exploding world population, the alarming increase in the exploitation of fishing grounds adjacent to the United States by fishing fleets of foreign nations during the past 2 years is cause for consternation and deep concern. Indulging in careless and wanton drag operations, these foreign fleets not only destroy the bottom fisheries on our Continental Shelf but damage and destroy gear of American fishermen, and thereby force them from their traditional fishing grounds.

The time has come for the United States to take strong and affirmative action to secure our national interest, while at the same time protecting the livelihood of our fishermen.

To highlight the seriousness of the situation, I point to the aggressive action of Russian fishing fleets which have been engaged in modern large-scale, subsidized operations in the process of dragging for king crab and other fisheries resources off the coast of Kodiak Island, Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to help resolve this problem by lending their weight in passing the important and pertinent legislation now pending before this House and which I have discussed in my letter of October 14 to President Kennedy. Therein I have also stressed the need for positive Executive action to protect our fishermen and fisheries resources. My letter to him follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 14, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: By means of this letter I urgently submit for your consideration the emphasis which I place upon a recent legislative development designed to stem the tide of foreign encroachment upon traditional American fishing grounds. I refer to passage by the Senate on October 1, 1963, of the bill, S. 1988, introduced in the Senate by my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, and cosponsored by nine other Senators, including the senior Senator from the State of Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, who states the purpose of the bill to be as follows: "First, to protect our territorial waters from encroachment by foreign fishing vessels; and, second, to preserve our marine resources on, or attached to, the Continental Shelf." The bill also defines violations and prescribes penalties.

Except for amendments adopted in the Senate, S. 1988 is identical to my bill, H.R. 7954, pending in the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which committee S. 1988 has also been assigned, as well as a like bill, H.R. 8296, introduced by my colleague, Representative HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts. At the Senate committee hearings, S. 1988 was supported by the State Department, Department of the Interior, Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Treasury, and was strongly endorsed by the entire fishing industry of the United States. My urgent request that House action in the form of a hearing upon this vital legislation be expedited has already been transmitted to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of said committee.

Commencing at page 18495 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 1, 1963, we find strong supporting statements by many Senators pertaining to the following salient points:

(a) The need for this legislation is urgent because during the past summer there have been numerous incidents off both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts in which Russian and Japanese vessels have engaged in fishing activities within our territorial waters or exploited resources of our Continental Shelf;

(b) Our Government presently lacks statutory authority to protect both our territorial waters within the 3-mile limit and resources upon the Continental Shelf. At present, encroachments by foreign vessels within our 3-mile limit can be met only by boarding and a polite request to leave;

(c) The bill does not define "territorial waters" thereby leaving it open for our Government to follow the lead of Canada in establishing a 12-mile limit with straight base lines for fishing purposes. This would take the place of our present 3-mile limit and thereby match the 12-mile limit imposed and enforced by the Soviet Union;

(d) There are two bases upon which the United States may claim the resources upon or attached to our Continental Shelf—first, pursuant to the provisions of the 1953 Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act, and, second, provisions found in the International Convention on the Continental Shelf, which convention will take effect upon the ratification of one more nation. Twenty-one nations have thus far signed this convention, including the Soviet Union and the United States;

(e) In addition to trawling for king crab in international waters near Kodiak Island, Russians navigating fleets of modern fast vessels have ruthlessly moved through waters already occupied by Alaskan fishermen and deliberately damaged or destroyed their gear, consisting of crab pots marked with buoys. This, of course, has created an explosive situation leading to the depletion of the great Alaska king crab fishery upon our Continental Shelf, concurrently with driving Alaskans from one of their traditional fishing grounds and thereby—unless brought to a stop—ruining their means of earning a livelihood.

In the light of the foregoing, I now indicate my view of the great significance of the subject legislation as mentioned at the outset of this letter. The points I am about to make would, if pursued, constitute a timely supplementation to your strong stand supporting the principle of abstention as it has applied during the past 10 years to the Japanese North Pacific salmon fishery on the high seas, with varying periods of application to halibut and herring. I emphasize the triple importance of this legislation as follows:

First, it is needed as legal implementation for accomplishment by our Government of protection of our territorial waters; second, its undefined reference to "territorial waters" leaves the door open for enlargement of our territorial waters by Executive assertion of American jurisdiction over the sea to the 12-mile limit, especially for fishery purposes; and, third, it provides suitable provisions for enforcement of an official claim by the United States to ownership and control over the resources on or attached to its Continental Shelf, including king crab, to be effective at such time as such claim is made.

The first objective, which is to fill the void in Federal law with respect to violations of our territorial waters by foreign vessels, would be immediately accomplished by passage and approval of the bill. The second and third objectives, however, depend upon companion action by the Executive. Therefore, I seek and urge your direction and support of appropriate steps to establish the 12-mile limit along our coasts especially for fishing, in harmony with certain historical rights of Canadian fishermen in exchange for reciprocal acknowledgment by Canada of certain historical rights of U.S. fishermen off the coasts of Canada. I further respectfully urge your issuance of such Presidential proclamation as is necessary to constitute a formal claim by the United States to resources of the Continental Shelf which appertain to the United States, to be done pursuant to the provisions of the 1953 Submerged Lands Act and the Outer Continental Shelf Act without awaiting the one final ratification to the Convention on the Continental Shelf, if you foresee substantial delay thereof.

Sincerely and cordially yours,

RALPH J. RIVERS,
Member of Congress.